

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
BOARD OF SELECTMEN MEETING
MINUTES
December 10, 2013
APPROVED – December 26, 2013

CALL TO ORDER - approximately 6:00PM

PRESENT: Mr. Edmund Gleason, Mr. Doug Viger, Mr. Robert Haverty, Mr. Hal Lynde, Town Administrator Tom Gaydos

ABSENT: Mr. William McDevitt

REQUEST FOR NON-PUBLIC SESSION

MOTION: Request for a non-public session per RSA 91-A:3,II, a, c & e (Personnel; Matters which, if discussed publicly, would affect adversely the reputation of any person; and Consideration or negotiation of pending claims or litigation)

ROLL CALL: Mr. Gleason-Yes; Mr. Viger-Yes; Mr. Haverty-Yes

It was noted that when the Board returned, after the non-public session, the Board would then take up the items on the agenda and conduct their public meeting. The Board entered into a non-public session at approximately 6:00pm.

Mr. Lynde arrived at approximately 6:10pm.

The Board returned to public session at approximately 6:45pm.

MOTION: To adjourn the non-public session.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Haverty/Viger) To seal the minutes of the non-public session indefinitely.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MINUTES REVIEW:

November 12, 2013 (public session)

MOTION: (Viger/Lynde) To approve the November 12, 2013 public meeting minutes as amended.

VOTE: (3-0-1) The motion carried. Mr. Haverty abstained.

Non Public Meeting Minutes

The non-public meeting minutes of November 12, 2013 and December 3, 2013 were not discussed.

OPEN FORUM

None.

APPOINTMENT(S):

Jonathan “Jay” Law – Retirement Appreciation for nearly 40 years of service to the Town of Pelham

The Selectmen called Mr. Jonathan Law forward to award him with a Certificate of Appreciation. Mr. Gleason read the award aloud. The Selectmen extended their best wishes for a happy retirement and provided him with a small token of appreciation with a gift certificate for snow mobile registrations for 2014.

Jeff Gowan, Planning Director

- Update/report from Jeff Gowan and Department of Transportation regarding Route 38/Old Gage Hill Road. Also Department of Transportation Study.
- Muldoon Egress – Highway Safety Committee Recommendation.
- Flood Study – (*deferred*)

Present from the Department of Transportation (‘DOT’) were Bill Lambert, Michelle Marshall, Trent Zanes and present from the Nashua Regional Planning Commission was Julie Chizmas.

Department of Transportation Highway Safety Engineer Michelle Marshall reviewed concepts for the Route 38/Old Gage Hill Road intersection and the Mammoth Road (Route 128)/Sherburne Road intersection. She explained how the road safety audits were conducted and the information contained within them. She commented that the DOT had revised the road safety audit process; originally an audit was developed into a report and not carried out into work orders. The process has been changed to start with a road safety audit and end up with a project. Ms. Marshall told the Board that the road safety audits for Pelham previously fell into the category of having reports, without associated projects. She stated she recently submitted work orders to both the district and the Traffic Bureau to look at possible short term solutions that came out of the road safety audit. She discussed Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (‘HSIP’) and associated funding that would be available for the intersections reviewed based on the recommended concept displayed for the Board.

Mr. Viger recalled a previous group meeting with the Board to review short term solutions. Ms. Marshall was new to the team and unsure if the items previously discussed were captured in the information being presented. Mr. Gowan believed the short term solution items were contained in the presentation. Mr. Gleason believed the proposal for the Board’s approval were two approaches that qualified for the HSIP funding; one proposal for Route 38/Old Gage Hill Road intersection and the other for the Mammoth Road/Sherburne Road intersection. Ms. Marshall reviewed the options for the intersections that would not qualify for the HSIP funds.

Mr. Gleason asked what the time line would be for the recommended plans versus the timeline associated with the options. Mr. Zanes explained two of the options qualified for the HSIP funding; they would need to be approved by Federal Highway and then a project and project schedule would be created. He said the options that didn’t qualify for the HSIP funding but might be more effective

80 in improving capacity and at the same time have an affect with safety. He noted that the proposals
81 that qualified for funding might be effective options in consideration of safety and the capacity issues.
82 He said the two options would have to get into a schedule for additional information to be realized.

83
84 Mr. Gleason asked if there would be any Town responsibility associated with funding the options.
85 Mr. Zanes said Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ') funds may be available for the
86 roundabout and signals. He said they might be able to get back to the Town with other options. Mr.
87 Gowan asked if there was a Town match for the CMAQ funds. Mr. Zanes didn't have an answer. Mr.
88 Gowan said the Planning Board had a couple exactions taking place that may be able to provide the
89 Town's match on the project.

90
91 Mr. Lynde questioned how the monetary benefit of the projects were calculated. Ms. Marshall said
92 the benefit is based upon the national standard of the safety improvements for the intersection. Mr.
93 Lynde asked if traffic flow/ease of traffic was taken into consideration. He felt even with the islands
94 and turning lanes on Sherburne Road there would still be traffic stacking that occurs. He wanted to
95 know if the added capacity during the next ten years had been considered. He believed a roundabout
96 (at the Sherburne Road intersection) was the solution and the benefit it would have to traffic flow far
97 exceeded the other option. He felt it might be better to spend the money on a long term solution to
98 correct the problem.

99
100 Ms. Chizmas explained that the improvements fell under the highway safety and improvement
101 programs. She said traffic congestion was not the intent of the road safety audit. She said CMAQ
102 was a competitive program that the Town didn't have funds for unless they applied and were
103 successful competing with the rest of the State for those funds. She said there was an argument that
104 an improvement could be shown through implementing something such as a roundabout.

105
106 Mr. Gowan understood that highway safety funding may be available for the shorter term solutions.
107 He asked if the funding was mutually exclusive, meaning if there was a short term solution that had
108 federal dollars attached to it would the Town then not have the ability (or lessen chances) of getting
109 CMAQ funds. Ms. Chizmas didn't have an answer. She said if they were to implement the short
110 term improvements, they would reassess the area (along with traffic counts) to see what improvement
111 was made to the congestion issue and re-run the analysis. Mr. Lambert clarified that in computing the
112 benefits they are done based on crash reduction/modification factors. It was strictly a safety benefit
113 not a capacity benefit.

114
115 Mr. Viger said he believed in the roundabout project done in the Town center, but felt it may be the
116 'latest and greatest' thing. He would like to see the results from the Town center roundabouts before
117 having roundabouts in other locations.

118
119 Mr. Gleason commented there were two concerns expressed; one being the lack of activity after areas
120 were reviewed. He recalled there were three levels of solutions; short, medium and long-term. He
121 said the short term improvements never happened. He said the current proposals seemed to be a
122 deviation from the previous reviews. He believed the Old Gage Hill location to be more of a concern
123 than Sherburne Road. He said it was suggested that taking out shrubbery and some modification to
124 the store entrance. He wanted to know if doing so would mitigate the risks and solve the problems.
125 Ms. Marshall replied that their process had changed from when they originally reviewed the areas. At
126 that time they didn't have a method to move projects from the road safety audit report to an actual
127 project. She said that process was developed this year. She said the concept being shown wouldn't
128 solve all the problems, but would reduce some of the sight distance issues. Mr. Gleason questioned if
129 there were other measures that could be reviewed regarding the safety of the area. Mr. Lambert said
130 one of the short term remedies being reviewed is the speed limit. He was concerned with reducing

131 the speed below the prevailing speed was a lot of the warning systems were based between the posted
132 speed limit and the hazard. He felt with the vertical crest of the road, the more appropriate solution
133 would be to have an advisory sign tied to a road condition.

134
135 Mr. Viger wanted to know how the short term solutions brought forward could be addressed. Mr.
136 Zanes said when the road safety audit was originally created it was an opportunity for a number of
137 people from different disciplines to get together and review the site. They came together and made
138 suggestions; no suggestion was considered a 'bad idea'. A lot of the suggestions made it to the report
139 because they didn't want to exclude anything. He believed the complication came from the
140 misunderstanding that all the solutions would be implemented. With regard to Gage Hill Road, Mr.
141 Zanes said they had a fixed cost based on the number of accidents per year and explained how they
142 arrived at solutions and the associated cost for them. Mr. Viger questioned what information was in
143 in front of the Selectmen; if they were real solutions or suggestions. Mr. Zanes said the items on the
144 list were the result of a brain storming session. Mr. Viger asked what the Selectmen could do to get
145 the State to determine what could be done as the next step. Mr. Zanes said they could provide a
146 response based on the road audit and give an explanation why options were reviewed. Mr. Viger felt
147 the Selectmen should get the State's recommendations. Ms. Marshall said the information provided
148 to the Selectmen was a fact sheet used during the DOT office meeting; the options posted were the
149 State's recommendations.

150
151 There was a discussion regarding the concepts for the Rt. 38/Old Gage Hill Road intersection. Mr.
152 Gleason asked if store (on Route 38) was in agreement with the proposal to adjust their access. . Ms.
153 Marshall said they had not gone to the store; the access management was within the right-of-way and
154 would need to be negotiated. Mr. Gleason confirmed that changing the road profile was a future
155 action and not currently under consideration. Ms. Marshall answered they had not drawn a concept
156 because the HSIP funds couldn't be used for that concept.

157
158 With regard to the Sherburne Road/Mammoth Road intersection, four design concepts were listed.
159 The proposal qualifying for HSIP funds was the construction of median island on Sherburne Road
160 with separate lanes for left and right turns; traffic signs will also be reviewed. Mr. Haverty recalled
161 the suggestion to making the turn from Mammoth Road (heading south) onto Sherburne Road
162 (turning right) more severe so vehicles would have to slow down to take a harder right turn onto
163 Sherburne Road. Currently the corner is too open and vehicles are hitting the turn at speed which
164 decreases the timing for vehicles (on Sherburne Road) to turn left onto Mammoth Road. Mr. Haverty
165 believed that theory was previously going to be tested, but didn't see mention of such on the
166 information provided. Mr. Zanes said that was something they could do without having a project. He
167 said they could go to the site with State personnel and place barrels to implement the theory. Ms.
168 Marshall apologized for that suggestion not being capsulized in the proposal.

169
170 Mr. Gowan said at the Sherburne intersection they observed vehicles had made their own turning lane
171 to head south onto Mammoth Road, which was felt to have compacted the problem. He asked if the
172 short term recommendation of separating the lanes with a median island would reduce the room so
173 there would be less likelihood of cars making their own lanes. Mr. Zanes said it would create more of
174 a right turn lane ability. He believed sight distance was a factor for having a median island. He said
175 the crash modification numbers say if traffic could be separated, a certain amount of safety
176 improvement would be gained. He said it was being presented as an alternative/concept, but was not
177 sure they would hold lot of confidence that it would provide a huge safety impact. He said it could be
178 one consideration given it met the criteria for Federal money.

179
180 Mr. Gowan spoke to the Route 38/Old Gage Hill Road intersection. Initially he was doubtful that the
181 vegetation clearing would provide a significant improvement. When in the field he was convinced

otherwise as saw there would be some benefit to that clearing because it would also include relocating telephone poles and removing a piece of ledge. Doing so with help with the sight distance for cars on Old Gage Hill Road, but it doesn't solve the road crest problem. In Mr. Gowan's opinion, any improvement at the intersection was worth trying to implement. He said improving the store traffic should be included.

Mr. Gleason believed the Selectmen were being asked for their concurrence/approval on the two recommendations made. Ms. Marshall said they would like to know if the Selectmen would like the two proposals to move forward into a project. If not, she asked that the Selectmen state that fact. Mr. Gowan recommended moving ahead with the two proposals. The pursuit of the other options seemed likely to be a multi-year process.

Mr. Lynde asked that the comment regarding ledge removal at the Old Gage Hill Road intersection be elaborated upon. Mr. Zanes said looking south on Route 38 there were poles and a small ledge outcrop they would like to clear as much as they could for sight and safety purposes. Mr. Lynde said it was a terrible intersection and any improvement would be beneficial. He said it was a shame the Sherburne Road intersection wasn't scored for increased air pollution and wasted time from people sitting in traffic. He liked the idea of testing the intersection by placing the jersey barriers versus spending money prior to knowing an outcome. He believed roundabouts worked when designed properly. He agreed with installing better signage and jersey barriers so the intersection could be further assessed.

Mr. Gaydos understood there were two teams for the road safety audits. He asked Mr. Gowan if he had the original notes from the first team at Sherburne and Mammoth Roads. Mr. Gowan said he had them electronically and could forward them. Mr. Gaydos suggested the previous notes be provided to the current team for review to see if it would affect their recommendation for something that may qualify for federal funding.

Mr. Gleason asked they Selectmen if they wanted to give approval for the concepts to proceed. He believed the proposal for Route 38 and Old Gage Hill Road was acceptable. No objection was voiced. However, with regard to Sherburne Road there seemed to be some concern relative to whether adequate research was done from the initial study. He said the Selectmen will defer approval for that intersection pending further review. The Board agreed. The discussion concluded.

Mr. Gowan discussed the Highway Safety Committee's ('HSC') recommendation (dated December 9, 2013) regarding lighting for Coach's Way at Nashua Road and within Muldoon. In the short term it was their opinion to add reflective markers at the intersection of Nashua Road and Coach's Way. It was also agreed by the HSC that adding a light within the park to illuminate the area described above would improve pedestrian traffic. There was a brief discussion regarding the addition of a light. Investigation was needed as to how/where a light would be added at the park, either inside the park or at the road intersection. Mr. Gleason asked if the Selectmen would prefer to take action regarding the reflectors and defer action regarding lights pending further investigation for what it would entail and determination of cost.

It was the Selectmen's decision to authorize Mr. Gaydos to work with the Highway Department to put reflectors up at the Nashua Road egress to Muldoon Park. They also asked Mr. Gaydos to work with Mr. Gowan and the Park & Recreation Director to review what it would take to implement a light.

Mr. Gleason asked for a status update regarding the Dunkin' Donuts project and the disposition of the section of Valley Hill Road. He questioned if a warrant article would come forward to discontinue the road. Mr. Gowan said the Planning Board would like a warrant article. He noted a meeting was

being scheduled between the applicant, their representative and Town representatives to determine a resolution.

Mr. Viger asked when the discontinuance of the road became a Planning Board issue. He said he was told that the road was under the Selectmen's purview. Mr. Gowan said as part of the Planning Board's motion they recommended to the Board of Selectmen that they put forward a warrant article to discontinue the road. Mr. Viger asked if building or business would be impacted if the warrant article were to fail. Mr. Gowan answered no; if the warrant failed the developer would have no obligation to complete off-site improvements.

Mr. Gleason asked if they would still have drive thru capabilities. Mr. Gowan answered yes. Mr. Gleason questioned why the 'spur' of Valley Hill Road should be discontinued. Mr. Gowan said the Department of Transportation ('DOT') won't approve the 'spur'. He said the DOT would like the road to either be left as it currently was, or to improve Valley Hill Road to have only one entrance.

Mr. Haverty explained in effect, the Planning Board had said the plan can go forward as it was and recommended to the Board of Selectmen to close the street (with the off-site improvement); but if they don't the Planning Board will still allow the business to open. He said closing the road would impact an abutter. It came down to whether the Selectmen wanted to close the road. Mr. Haverty said they were trying to get the applicant's engineer, the abutter and to develop a solution that worked in everyone's best interest, being that the Town's engineer has indicated the road layout shouldn't be left as it currently was. He said the Selectmen were well within their rights to leave the road alone, given that the business would still open.

Mr. Viger questioned what would happen if they did nothing with the road, the business opened and they revisited the project in a year. He wanted to know if it was in their purview to change the situation at that later date. Mr. Gowan said the southern leg of Valley Hill Road, but if the plan wasn't consummated during this voting season there would be no bond in place to have the developer pay for those improvements. There was a brief discussion regarding the bond process. Mr. Gleason said if Mr. Maynard wanted to come back in front of the Selectmen he should be prepared to explain in detail what he was seeking to be done. Mr. Viger asked that Mr. Gaydos be allowed to speak with Town Counsel to explore their options regarding the road.

Mr. Haverty noted that the engineer, the abutter and the applicant had asked that he participate in a future meeting. He wanted it understood that during such meeting he would simply listen and bring the facts back to the Selectmen. He was not in a position as a negotiator; the process was entirely between the applicant and the abutter.

Mr. Gleason said he had been asked by the engineer for the Selectmen to accommodate a later meeting. He said they were up against a deadline for warrant articles. Mr. Gowan said the applicant understood. Mr. Haverty suggested if a warrant article were to come forward that Mr. Gowan present the recommended language for such so the Selectmen could then make their decision.

Given the fact the Selectmen received a recommendation from the Highway Safety Committee to fix the road, Mr. Lynde felt it should be done.

Mr. Viger asked if the DOT indicated whether or not they would approve the plan 'as is'. Mr. Gowan said the DOT would not approve the plan last approved by the Selectmen. He said the DOT would approve the plan submitted previous to the most recent. Mr. Viger clarified his question and asked if the DOT had approved, or had an issue with the Dunkin' Donuts going in without road

improvements. Mr. Gowan said they preferred leaving it alone versus what was proposed in the most recent plan.

Mr. Gleason asked Mr. Gowan to indicate to the applicant's engineer if they are scheduled to meet with the Selectmen they better be prepared to rationalize why something should be done with the road.

2013 Expenditures

- **Fire Department**
- **Transfer Station/Recycling Center**

Mr. Gleason said when the default budget was imposed the departments were challenged to meet a further reduced budget. At that time the additional challenge was agreed upon. The departments were told the Selectmen would revisit the budgets at the end of the year to consider any items that may be appropriate to include. He said the Fire Department accepted a challenge of \$75,000. The Selectmen have been asked by the department to consider spending a portion of that. The Transfer Station accepted a \$35,000 challenge and submitted a request to make improvements that would be cost effective and improve efficiency at the facility. Mr. Gleason stated at this time the challenges would be met and the Selectmen were only considering two departments for potential spending. Mr. Gaydos suggested asking the department heads if their requests would be invoiced in 2013 or 2014.

Fire Chief James Midgley and Lieutenant Greg Atwood came forward to discuss the requested items. Chief Midgley said their two issues related to IMC, the software 'backbone' for Fire, Police and the Dispatch Center. It also drives the mobile data terminals. He discussed the situation of IMC lagging and being out of date for their needs. He noted they had dropped their patient care/EMS portion. At this time, it appeared they would be switching over to a system covered by the State.

Lt. Atwood discussed the IMC software program that was currently run through the Police Department. This software had certain regulations and restrictions due to privacy issues that inhibited them from gaining access through the internet. He said they were looking at the Temsis software for the medical side that allowed them to get away from IMC for their mobile data terminals. They were looking to use Public Eye software for the fire. The benefit was the ability to work over the internet and have a 'user friendly' software, connecting to other mobile devices with GPS capabilities. The cost for software is \$18,500 which includes a license for users.

Mr. Viger asked how the new technology would work with dispatch. Lt. Atwood discussed how the software worked through a database that detects changes every 5-10 seconds. Mr. Viger asked if dispatch would have any issues transferring over. Lt. Atwood said the change would be seamless.

Mr. Gleason asked if there would be any security issues. Lt. Atwood said hackers hack because that's what they do; however, there were surrounding communities that purchased the software and had very good results. Privacy data would be controlled in-house. Chief Midgley said the main backbone for the medical side would be the Temsis software. He said Public Eye software would be used for the fire side which is very user friendly and allows the department to have a broader view of what was happening within the community. He said they would have the capability to link with other department using the software. In speaking with Victor Danevich (Town's technology consultant) the proposed software wouldn't have issues with Criminal Justice Information System ('CJIS') compliance. Chief Midgley said because the company was gaining market share they would be increasing their costs beginning January 1st.

Mr. Gleason understood that the requested \$18,500 was the implementation cost. He asked if there would be an annual fee or upgrade fee. Lt. Atwood said the annual support would cost \$1,000. Chief Midgley said there was currently a budget line for IMC which could be replaced with the new system. Lt. Atwood believed there would be a minimal budget impact or possibly a wash. Mr. Gleason asked Mr. Gaydos about the status of the fire department budget. Mr. Gaydos said the budget was on target for maintaining the 'cushion' and staying within budget.

The Selectmen were in concurrence with the Fire Department purchasing the software package this year. Mr. Gleason asked Mr. Gaydos to encumber the money for the purchase. Chief Midgley said they would test the software again prior to purchase. The amount to be encumbered was \$18,500.

Mr. Gleason asked Transfer Station Director Stan Walczak to come forward. He said the department accepted a challenge of approximately \$35,000. Mr. Walczak said they would meet and exceed the challenge. He was requesting four items that would total \$6,900: 1) heavy duty belt for conveyor system - \$1,000; 2) set of tires for the BobCat - \$2,400; 3) steel plating of 40 additional feet inside two walls of the transfer building - \$2,500; and 4) set of forks for BobCat - \$1,000.

Mr. Haverty wanted to know how much revenue had been increased. Mr. Walczak replied \$47,000. Mr. Haverty had no objection to allowing the department to spend the requested \$6,900. Mr. Viger felt it was important to state the Selectmen tasked the department heads to cut their budgets. There were specific items that would make the department more efficient. He had no objection to allowing the requested amount. There was a consensus of the Selectmen to allow Mr. Walczak to proceed. Mr. Gaydos was asked to encumber the money.

Mr. Gleason brought up the fact that the Budget Committee had asked the Selectmen not to put the gasoline pumps into a warrant article, but to include them in the 2014 operating budget. The Selectmen haven't made a decision how to proceed. He understood that Mr. Gaydos and Mr. Walczak had spoken with the gas pump manufacturer and received an offer from Prime of a reduced price from \$26,000 down to \$20,000. Mr. Walczak stated that was correct, if they signed a purchase order before the first of next year. There were three quotes received; two of which were approximately \$28,000.

Mr. Gleason asked the Selectmen if they wanted to spend the money this year out of the Transfer Station's budget to capture the savings or take the money from FEMA funds. There was a consensus of the Selectmen to spend the money now. Mr. Gaydos said it would be under Town Buildings. He said there were two options: 1) take the money from this year's surplus by encumbering it; or 2) take the money from the FEMA funds. Given that there may be unexpected expenses due to the Surrey Road project, he suggested taking the money from the operating account. Money would be transferred to supplement in the Town Building account.

Mr. Gleason asked if the gas pump proposals had been reviewed to ensure all needs would be satisfied. Mr. Gaydos said it was the same company that did the electrical work at the fire station, which everyone was very pleased with. Mr. Walczak believed the cost savings would pay for itself within a year and a half.

MOTION: (Viger/Lynde) To authorize Mr. Gaydos to enter into a contract with Gaftek to spend \$20,000 for replacement of the gas dispensers in compliance with the scope of work as provided in their quote.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Lynde noted that three valid quotes had been received and there was a cost savings of \$6,000 to act quickly. He felt the criteria of the purchasing policy were met and there was justification for the Selectmen to take the action.

2013 Encumbrances

Mr. Gaydos reviewed an expenditure report for the current year. He noted which accounts that had remaining amounts to encumber: 1) Willow Street - \$175,000; 2) Highway Block Grant - \$22,285.85; 3) Forestry Maintenance - \$25,000; 4) Fire Station construction- \$211,947.14; and 5) Raymond Park Maintenance - \$14,164. He noted the Muldoon Egress account had \$7,304.75 remaining. He asked if the Selectmen would like to keep the funds in the account until they determine how to proceed with reflectors, lighting etc. The Selectmen asked that the money remain in the account.

Mr. Gleason asked if there was any other money they would have to encumber from this year's operating budget, other than what was discussed at the meeting. Mr. Gaydos wasn't aware of any.

The Selectmen were in agreement for the funds to be encumbered as listed by Mr. Gaydos.

Review of 2014 Warrant Articles

Mr. Gleason commented that all warrant articles needed to be done by January 13th for a January 14th posting. He said they had the Fire and Police contracts pending and would therefore reserve December 26th or 27th as a meeting date if those contracts were ready. This would allow the Budget Committee time to review those contracts prior to reconsideration.

The Selectmen reviewed the proposed listing of warrant articles.

- A) Election of Officers;
- B) State Highway Grant – figure to be updated at reconsideration;
- C) Fuel pumps – eliminated from warrant;
- D) Ambulance Fund increase from \$25,000 to \$60,000 funded from service fees;
- E) Police Contract;
- F) Firefighter Contract;
- G) Elderly Exemption;

There were two possible citizen petitions coming forward for inclusion on the Warrant.

Mr. Gleason questioned how they could have people understand that the current elderly exemption would be replaced with the proposed. Mr. Gaydos said the wording came from legal. He will review the RSA for wording.

Procurement, Brief Discussion Regarding Critical Service Providers

- **Electrical Work/Alarm System & Monitoring; HVAC; Phone, IT Services, Security Cameras; Cleaning Services; Landscaping Services; Roofing Repair**

Mr. Gleason said he reviewed the invoices from the past week and saw that an electrical company was given a series of awards pertaining to monitoring. He said it begged the question as to how to comply with the procurement policy. He had a conversation with Selectmen McDevitt, who indicated the Selectmen should look at having a system in place that complied with the procurement policy but would authorize them to make decisions with certain suppliers based on experience, quality and performance. He said the electrical service would be one of them.

Mr. Gaydos asked the Board's concurrence to continue for another year: 1) D.E.M. Electric for the electrical work that was also combined with the alarm system and monitoring work; 2) Rick Tarpey for the HVAC; 3) Rockport for phone, IT services, security cameras (except if the decision was made to purchase a new phone system, which would be a bid item); 4) CCS for cleaning services; and 5) Boyden Landscaping for landscaping and snow removal.

Mr. Gleason confirmed they were all companies that had demonstrated satisfactory performance with no history of problems and had been readily available on an emergency basis to satisfy the Town's need and demonstrated capability. Mr. Gaydos said that was correct; the companies had proven track records. He asked that they continue to work with the listed companies for one year and discuss a bidding process in the future.

Mr. Lynde said he didn't support the suggestion and would like to see more details and understand what the current bids were. On the electrical invoice he saw that it was for an item to be done in 2014 that he wasn't aware of it needing to be done. Mr. Gaydos said there was a discussion approximately two years ago with Fire Chief Midgley about getting rid of two telephone lines for alarms. He said they found there was greater reliability in running a different system that could attach to any one of the Town's buildings and sent a signal to the monitoring company that would immediately contact dispatch if there was a break in the signal. He said the company will not bill individual customers directly so the response was to go ahead with the system and the company would bill D.E.M. Electric for the alarm monitoring; the cost would then be passed to the Town.

Mr. Gaydos said if there were any questions, he would provide the Selectmen with a copy of the contract so they could review what the 'extras' were.

Mr. Gleason asked the Selectmen how they wanted to proceed. He believed the question was how they knew they were getting a good price for services. Mr. Lynde felt it would be good to review the contracts. Mr. Gaydos replied not every service had a contract. Mr. Haverly said there should be a scope and rates along with something in place that specified what would be done, how much it would cost and when it would be done. He said ultimately the responsibility was to the tax payer and at some point they needed to get to a place where they put the items out to bid to ensure that they were doing what they should.

Mr. Gleason said the Selectmen would review the companies at the beginning of the year. At that time they would like have contracts or descriptions of the scope of work. Mr. Viger wanted the Selectmen to take into account the company's involvement in the community and how they responded to the Town.

ANNOUNCEMENT(S)

2014 Town Meeting Schedule

- 2014 Town Deliberative Session – Tuesday, February 4, 2014 @ Sherburne Hall
- 2014 School Deliberative Session – Wednesday, February 5, 2014 @ Sherburne Hall
- 2014 Town Meeting – Tuesday, March 11, 2014 @ PHS
- Tuesday, January 14, 2014 Last day for voters to petition selectmen to include an article in the town meeting warrant.

Wednesday, January 22, 2014 First day for candidates in towns with non-partisan official ballot system to file declarations of candidacy with town clerk. Friday, January 31, 2014 Last day for candidates to file.

480

481 **List of Openings:**

482 Selectmen – 2 for 3 years Town Moderator – 1 for 3 years

483 Town Treasurer – 1 for 3 years Budget Committee – 3 for 3 years

484 Cemetery Trustee – 2 for 3 years Library Trustee – 2 for 3 years

485 Trustees of the Trust Funds – 1 for 3 years Planning Board – 2 for 3 years

486

487 **TOWN ADMINISTRATOR / SELECTMEN REPORTS**

488

489 None.

490

491 **ADJOURNMENT**

492

MOTION: (Viger/Lynde) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (4-0-0) The motion carried.

493

494 The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:05pm.

495

496

497

498

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary