

1 **MINUTES OF THE**  
2  
3 **CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN COMMITTEE**

4  
5 **June 29, 2023**  
6

7 The CIP Committee held a meeting on Thursday, June 29<sup>th</sup> at the Salem Town Hall, 33  
8 Geremonty Drive, Salem, NH.  
9

10 **Committee Members Present:** Sean Lewis, Chair (Planning Board Representative, attending  
11 via Zoom), Jeff Boyer, Vice-Chair (Budget Committee Representative), Nicole McGee,  
12 Secretary (Finance Director), and Linda Harvey (Resident), and Joe Devine (Assistant Town  
13 Manager)  
14

15 **Staff Present:** Roy Sorenson, Municipal Services Director; Crayton Brubaker, Community  
16 Development Program Manager  
17

18 **1. Call to Order**  
19

20 *The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.*  
21

22 My Boyer explained that he was acting as chair for a few minutes until the committee voted to  
23 allow Sean Lewis to participate remotely.  
24

25 Mr. Lewis has requested to attend the meeting remotely for childcare purposes. He is at his  
26 home, and no one is in the room with him.  
27

28 **MOTION BY: Jeff Boyer**

29 *Motion pursuant to RSA 91-A:2, III (a) to allow Sean Lewis to participate in the meeting*  
30 *remotely via Zoom and that any votes for the duration of his participation will be conducted by*  
31 *roll call, pursuant to RSA 91-A:2, III (e).*

32 **SECOND BY: Linda Harvey**

33 **ROLL CALL VOTE:** 4-0-0

34 **JEFF BOYER** – **YES**

35 **NICOLE MCGEE** – **YES**

36 **LINDA HARVEY** – **YES**

37 **JOE DEVINE** – **YES**  
38

**The motion passed unanimously.**  
39

40 *Sean Lewis started participating at 10:06 am.*  
41

42 **2. Review of Minutes from June 20, 2023**  
43

44 **MOTION BY: Jeff Boyer**

45 *To accept the June 20, 2023 minutes.*

46 **SECOND BY: Nicole McGee**

1 **ROLL CALL VOTE: 5-0-0**

2 **SEAN LEWIS – YES**

3 **JEFF BOYER – YES**

4 **NICOLE MCGEE – YES**

5 **LINDA HARVEY – YES**

6 **JOE DEVINE – YES**

7 **The motion passed unanimously.**

8  
9 **3. Municipal Services – DPW, Water, Sewer Presentation and Discussion**

10  
11 Mr. Sorenson explained that his presentation today will work out of the Easy CIP (Capital  
12 Improvement Program) website and that he will be reviewing the water, sewer, and Division of  
13 Public Works (DPW) project requests for 2024. A project handout was provided in the agenda  
14 packet.

15  
16 Mr. Sorenson overviewed the 6-year outlook and said that approximately \$63 million in project  
17 requests are anticipated. The Engineering operating budget is relatively low, mostly consisting of  
18 staffing costs. However, engineering has several significant capital projects that are consolidated  
19 in their capital budget.

20  
21 Mr. Sorenson explained that the department frequently pursues grants, but the inclusion of grant  
22 money in the request doesn't necessarily mean that the Town will receive a grant.

23  
24 Mr. Sorenson explained that his department includes backup documents and materials in their  
25 CIP requests. It was noted that committee members can see the projects that need to be ranked.

26  
27 The committee began their review with the Lake/Bluff Street Water Main Extension, which is on  
28 page 10 of the provided handout. The design and engineering for this project is already  
29 underway. This project is in the Town's Water System Master Plan. The project is also on the  
30 regional water project priority list. Mr. Sorenson expects that once the design is complete, the  
31 Town will explore options for potential state funding. The cost of the project is approximately  
32 \$3,980,000. However, more reliable numbers will be available in December when bids are  
33 expected to come in. The bids don't necessarily have to be accepted. They are often contingent  
34 on funding approved at Town Meeting.

35  
36 Mr. Sorenson showed a map of the proposed project area. Mr. Sorenson noted that if Town water  
37 ever needed to be pushed to the north of the project area, this project would set up the  
38 infrastructure necessary for that.

39  
40 Mr. Boyer asked if any of the houses shown have wells. Mr. Sorenson stated that some do have  
41 wells, but many wells are having contamination issues due to PFAS and PFOA. Ms. Harvey  
42 asked where the sewer lines are located on the map. Mr. Sorenson noted that a proper layout for  
43 this water main needs to be fully designed first. This project will be accommodating for future  
44 sewer infrastructure. However, no sewer will be implemented in this project. The Wastewater  
45 Treatment Plant takes away significant capital for the sewer fund to take on new projects. This  
46 could change if the plant property is sold.

1 Ms. Harvey asked if the DBA would kick in if this project is included. Mr. Sorenson confirmed.

2  
3 Mr. Boyer noted that the road is in good shape and asked when it was last paved. Mr. Sorenson  
4 stated it was paved at least ten years ago. The new road pavement schedule would align with the  
5 implementation of this water project, if approved.

6  
7 Ms. Harvey asked if the project could be split into phases. Mr. Sorenson noted that he would not  
8 recommend that. Splitting the project into phases would create duplicitous costs due to  
9 maintenance, mobilization, and other construction costs.

10  
11 Mr. Lewis asked, in terms of necessity, if Mr. Sorenson believes this project should go through,  
12 even if the Town does not receive state funding. Mr. Sorenson agreed. Mr. Lewis asked if  
13 approval at the Town Meeting necessitates the acceptance of bids. Mr. Sorenson stated that the  
14 Town can build in any stipulations needed in the contract. Mr. Lewis asked if the goal is to serve  
15 the majority of Salem on Town water. Mr. Sorenson said yes, the goal is to fill in gaps where  
16 Town water is not. Mr. Sorenson noted that the Brady Avenue area is on the Department's radar.

17  
18 Mr. Lewis asked if the Lake/Bluff Street Water Main Extension project serves as a long-term  
19 solution. Mr. Sorenson said yes and that this project would put the water system in a better  
20 condition to withstand any problems that may arise from groundwater / well contamination. Mr.  
21 Sorenson stated it is necessary due to PFAS / PFOA requirements from the state and federal  
22 government.

23  
24 Mr. Boyer asked, in terms of readiness, would anything be put on the warrant article without  
25 hard, reliable numbers. Mr. Sorenson stated that they typically don't put up a warrant article  
26 without hard numbers. The project is crucial for the implementation of the Water Master Plan.  
27 The project could be pushed out a year or two, if necessary.

28  
29 The committee began their review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Water Main, which is on page 6 of the  
30 provided handout. This project includes design, engineering, and construction. The project cost is  
31 approximately \$650,000. Design and construction can be conducted all in one year. Separating  
32 the design and construction would result in a higher price.

33  
34 Weston and Sampson is the Town's water design engineer. The project would include 1,050  
35 linear feet of water line. Water needs to be flowing and moving to be of a high quality. Two  
36 years ago, there were two water main extension projects that increased water flow into the North  
37 Main Street area. State funding was used for these projects. The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Water Main  
38 project was not included in these projects. The few remaining neighborhoods would be included  
39 in the completion of this project.

40  
41 Mr. Sorenson stated that this would be a good project depending on where water funding sits this  
42 year. Mr. Boyer asked if this project is ready to go. Mr. Sorenson said no, it would need to be  
43 designed and engineered. This would be a design-build project.

44  
45 This project would help solve the looping problem with water lines in the area. Mr. Lewis asked,  
46 in terms of water quality, if there are any issues with low pressure in any area. Mr. Sorenson said

1 there are in some areas due to elevation. In some areas, water boosters will be used. These are  
2 planned for in the Water Master Plan. Ms. Harvey said the picture shows a continuous loop.

3  
4 If some people have groundwater issues, then they may not be able to use wells due to NH  
5 Department of Environmental Services (NHDES) requirements.

6  
7 Mr. Sorenson said that if there are pockets of areas that could be connected to the system, it is  
8 better to be proactive and prevent potentially higher costs in the future. Conducting piecemeal  
9 projects isn't the best approach. The Town coordinates these projects with road paving projects.

10  
11 The purchase of the D69 – F600 Dump Truck, on page 9 of the provided handout, was moved to  
12 2026.

13  
14 The committee's discussion turned to sewer projects. Alignment with master plans, funding  
15 considerations, and other factors go into the process of getting projects built. Mr. Sorenson noted  
16 he aligns his project requests with these factors in mind. No major sewer fund projects are  
17 requested for 2024. Two minor projects are requested.

18  
19 The committee began their review of the Infiltration and Inflow project, which is on page 8 of  
20 the provided handout. Infiltration and inflow (I&I) projects are a contractual part of what the  
21 Town does as a member of the Greater Lawrence Sanitary District (GLSD). The Town does not  
22 want to send excess clean water to GLSD. So, major sewer interceptors (12+ inches) need to be  
23 repaired and replaced when necessary. The Town allocates approximately \$200,000 each year  
24 for this ongoing project.

25  
26 Mr. Boyer asked, speaking of readiness and significance, if this year has the same readiness as  
27 past years. Mr. Sorenson said yes, the project is ongoing. This project is an investment into the  
28 Town system. The I&I program requests \$200,000 each year to help those systems. Annual  
29 project costs may increase occasionally if there is a critical need to update these systems. These  
30 improvements are in the Sewer Master Plan and are a part of the GLSD requirements /  
31 agreements. Mr. Sorenson stated that wet weather events lead to extra surface water being put  
32 into the I&I system. Mr. Boyer stated that he believes this project is significant and ready to go.

33  
34 Ms. Harvey asked how the \$200,000 estimate was developed. Mr. Sorenson stated the \$200,000  
35 figure is from a letter from GLSD that recommended that amount for routine improvements; it is  
36 also included in the Sewer Master Plan. After that Master Plan was finalized, the consultant did  
37 an extensive analysis of sewer system. From that, numbers were developed for future needs. The  
38 consultant recommended \$200,000 per year for I&I. Discussion ensued regarding the design for  
39 the I&I project and that the Town is under agreement for these improvements. Some grant  
40 funding has been used in prior years.

41  
42 Ms. Harvey asked if the identified areas are based on the 2017 study. Mr. Sorenson stated yes  
43 and explained the process of identifying areas and the necessity of having a scheduled program  
44 for receiving updated data. Mr. Sorenson also said that a sewer rate study may need to be  
45 conducted in the next few years. Forecasting rates over a series of years is important.

1 The committee began their review of the Butler Street Sewer Pump Station, which is on page 7  
2 of the provided handout. Mr. Sorenson said that at pump stations sewer water is lifted and  
3 pushed into a sewer main. Salem has ten of these sewer mains in the Town. The Sewer Master  
4 Plan finished in 2017. This project would be the first large pump station as a part of the  
5 recommendations from the Master Plan. This project is first because it is the most critical and in  
6 need of being replaced. This project is the first of a series of pump stations that need to be  
7 improved. The state paid for the design of this project through their ARPA funding. The design  
8 of this project will be completed mid-summer with bids expected in September. The bids will  
9 provide hard, reliable numbers. The build estimate is approximately \$780,000. This project is  
10 recommended to be paid out of the sewer fund.

11  
12 Ms. Harvey asked if this pump station had failed. Mr. Sorenson said yes, there are pumping  
13 deficiencies and the Butler Street pump station cannot handle the current flowing capacity. This  
14 is due to parts aging and the flow increasing.

15  
16 A lift station has not been completely replaced since their installation in 1984. The pump station  
17 would be an overall 25-year asset. Most of the components are expected to last 15 years.

18  
19 The committee's discussion turned to DPW projects. The committee began their review of the  
20 Pine Grove Cemetery Culvert / Road project, which is on page 2 of the provided handout. Mr.  
21 Sorenson stated that the current road is in decrepit condition, and this project is significant. This  
22 road is necessary to get to the new section of the cemetery. A second layer of pavement has not  
23 been put in yet because of the culvert. The original culvert was built 30-40 years ago and is  
24 falling apart. A prime wetland goes through the culvert, so the Town will need to go through  
25 NHDES for permitting. A significant cost of this project will be to pave the road. All roads in the  
26 cemetery need to be paved, but this project is the most critical. There is a Pine Grove Cemetery  
27 Master Plan that provides funding and timeline recommendations.

28  
29 This project is one that Mr. Sorenson hopes the CIP Committee will endorse. This project is a  
30 design-build. The project has been pushed down the road many times and is in critical condition.  
31 A large portion of the project engineering will be handled in-house. The estimated project cost is  
32 \$250,000.

33  
34 Mr. Lewis asked if there are any potential complications with the NHDES permit. Mr. Sorenson  
35 stated no and noted that the Town will follow NHDES process and instructions.

36  
37 Mr. Boyer asked if the project could have the engineering to be conducted in 2024 and then  
38 phase out the rest. Mr. Sorenson said no and that the major portion of the project is the  
39 permitting. He also noted that the Town does not have emergency funding in case an emergency  
40 occurs in the project area.

41  
42 Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Sorenson if this project is critical. Mr. Sorenson replied yes, there is  
43 imminent failure, and the culvert could break at any point.

44  
45 It was noted that the remaining DPW requests are for equipment / vehicles.

1 The committee began their review of the S27 Large 6 Wheel Multipurpose J Hook Truck, which  
2 is on page 3 of the provided handout. The request is to replace a 2006 and a 2007 vehicle with  
3 this one new vehicle. Mr. Sorenson showed the committee the vehicle condition index (VCI) for  
4 the 2006 and 2007 trucks. The current vehicles are high on the VCI. The new truck would take  
5 approximately a year and a half to arrive from the order date. The estimated cost is \$235,000.

6  
7 Mr. Boyer asked how many J Hook trucks are anticipated in the future. Mr. Sorenson anticipates  
8 one small and two large J Hook trucks more to be requested in the future.

9  
10 Ms. Harvey asked about salt damage to the trucks. Mr. Sorenson said that the new vehicle should  
11 withstand salt damage better than the current ones. Ms. Harvey asked where the cost estimate  
12 came from. Mr. Sorenson stated that it came from a vendor estimate. However, due to the  
13 volatility in the market, the price is not guaranteed. Mr. Boyer asked if other communities are  
14 using these vehicles. Mr. Sorenson stated yes, and that the vehicle is proven and reliable.

15  
16 Mr. Lewis asked, if the project is approved, how many vehicles are left that are the old, non-  
17 multi-purpose vehicles. There are five salter vehicles and four sidewalk machines. Discussion  
18 ensued about the long-term impact of salt corrosion on older vehicles. With a multiple purpose  
19 truck, the useful life would be extended by about five years longer than current vehicles.

20  
21 The committee began their review of the T2 Sidewalk Machine, which is on page 4 of the  
22 provided handout. Mr. Sorenson noted that this purchase has been pushed out for the past five or  
23 six years. The vehicle would be used for snow plowing and roadside mowing and would be used  
24 year-round. The estimated cost is \$175,000 for the vehicle and this price is guaranteed. The  
25 vehicle purchase is proposed to be paid through the general fund. The vehicle is approximately  
26 five feet wide. The current T2 sidewalk machine is a 2001 vehicle that is in critical condition on  
27 the VCI. The standard useful life of the new T2 machine is 20 years.

28  
29 The purchase of the SW50 Streetsweeper, on page 5 of the provided handout, was moved to  
30 2025.

31  
32 The committee began their review of the L35 Rubber Tire Excavator, which is on page 1 of the  
33 provided handout. This vehicle would provide better reach and maneuverability and would be  
34 more versatile for a variety of needs. It could be used for cleaning culverts. Mr. Sorenson  
35 envisions not ordering more backhoes if the Town begins to use this equipment. Typically, DPW  
36 rents vehicles to try them out before considering purchasing. The Town does not have this type  
37 of vehicle yet. The Town currently has three backhoes – one for street use, one for cemetery use,  
38 and one for water use. This would not initially replace one of these backhoes. This vehicle would  
39 be nice to have but is not critical. The estimated cost of the vehicle is \$260,000. This cost is  
40 derived from a vendor quote. The useful life of the vehicle is 25-30 years.

41  
42 Mr. Lewis asked if a special license is needed to operate this. Mr. Sorenson said no, an operator  
43 would not even need a Commercial Driver's License (CDL). Discussion ensued about staffing  
44 for various vehicles and the need for CDL vehicles and their required staffing.

1 Mr. Lewis asked if the Town should sell one of three backhoes to offset purchase costs. Mr.  
2 Sorenson said no, the Town needs those three backhoes, and their useful life isn't close to an  
3 end.

4  
5 Discussion ensued regarding how grant funding is described in the CIP. Mr. Sorenson explained  
6 that state grant funding entities only prefer fund shovel-ready projects. When submitting grant  
7 applications, Salem does not typically rank high. Cities with larger populations tend to rank  
8 higher. Discussion ensued about the Town not participating in the Rockingham Planning  
9 Commission and grant ranking considerations related thereto.

10  
11 The next meeting will be on Tuesday, July 11 at 10:00 am to discuss Engineering projects.

12  
13 *Mr. Sorenson left the meeting at 12:11 pm.*

14  
15 Discussion ensued regarding the outer years and the consideration of the ceiling and floor  
16 amounts inclusion in the current year project rankings. Staff will provide a list of 2024 projects  
17 with a ceiling and floor by the next meeting.

18  
19 **4. Old Business**

20 **a. Review of Projects Slated for 2025 and 2026**

21 The committee did not discuss this issue in the interest of time.

22  
23 **ADJOURNMENT AT 12:17 pm.**

24  
25 **MOTION BY: Jeff Boyer**

26 *Move to adjourn at 12:17 pm.*

27 **SECOND BY: Nicole McGee**

28 **ROLL CALL VOTE: 5-0-0**

29 **SEAN LEWIS – YES**

30 **JEFF BOYER – YES**

31 **NICOLE MCGEE – YES**

32 **LINDA HARVEY – YES**

33 **JOE DEVINE – YES**

34 **The motion passed unanimously.**

35  
36 Notes/minutes taken by: Crayton Brubaker

37  
38 Approved: Capital Improvements Plan Committee

39  
40 Date: \_\_\_\_\_