

Appointments

Michael Garrepy (Cullen Woods) on Smoke Street wants to cut back the banks of the street to improve site lines. Peter Cook is in agreement. The project is before the Planning Board. We will need a bond (see policy for excavation in Right of Way at end of this report). Second issue is he wishes the conservation land to go to the Town, being adjacent to the brook on the back side of Clark Goodwill/Turbocam development, the lot that showed a recreation field. The Conservation Commission had not yet made a recommendation when this was written, but conditional on their recommendation I recommend the Town accept the land as buffer for the brook. ***Does the Board approve letting Mr. Garrepy work in the Right of Way with the bond per the excavation policy? Does the Town accept the conservation easement conditional upon a positive recommendation to do so from the Conservation Commission?***

Architect with presentation on Town Hall designs: He has 4 options, two options for a one story and two for a two story. A variation off one of the one story plans would be a small basement under only a part of the building for utilities and storage that creates a two story look from Route 9. Since this would only have access from outside, it does not need two stairs and an elevator. He indicated one building this size saved \$100,000 by having the ducts under the slab from the furnaces located in this kind of space. One decision that has not been thoroughly discussed yet is whether we are going with a construction manager or a bid to detailed specs. **What decisions would the Board like to make and what questions does the Board still have?**

Semi-annual Department Head Reports: Building Inspection, Tax Collector, Town Clerk, Planning, and Police

Action items:

Highway Equipment Garage: The alternates selected (other than a final decision on the kick-wall insulation option) brings the total to \$235,565.60. The kick-wall insulation involves going to the footings and would be buried 4 feet so definitely should be done as part of the initial construction. My understanding is the Board has approved doing this even though we haven't yet selected which option is best. The kick wall options I recommend we consider are option 2 at \$3,080 (sheetrock over foam), option 4 at \$8,800 (foam inside concrete) option 5 at \$5,731 (foam with fire retardant paint covered with a plywood-like material) and an additional unlisted option #6 at \$5,200 foam with foil covered with a plywood-like material). Option #4 puts the insulation in the middle of the poured concrete so the exterior and interior surfaces are concrete. The other options require us to cover the insulation with some surface that meets fire code and is further complicated by the likelihood of water from melting snow under the trucks contacting it. By way of disclosure, the Thermomass system subcontractor is a neighbor with whom the church I serve is engaged in a real estate transaction. We believe option 1 does

not meet code. Option 3 has no covering and is subject to damage when banged. As is often the case the most expensive option, Option 4 is probably the best long-term. Options #5 and #6 are similar and I would recommend #6 between the two. If we went with the cheapest, Option 2, we would likely have staff later add plywood or something over the sheetrock at less than the cost for options 4, 5 or 6 to protect the sheetrock from damage from machinery. ***Does the Board have preference as to which kick-wall option we use?***

The added cost of doing the floor in a future year is \$4,300. The builder recommends if we are not putting in the floor now but plan to do it later we leave the grade 6 inches below the final grade and install wood or temporary concrete barriers at the doors. There would then be ramps up to them. Removing the ramps would not be too expensive. Grading the floor to final level and then removing down to put in the floor would be expensive according to the builder. One disadvantage of leaving the floor down 6 inches with barriers at the door, is nothing would run out of the building so we could get some ponding/freezing if the ground inside were too frozen for liquid to percolate, as is likely. If we don't put the barriers, the doors don't fully close. We can start this project without a decision on this issue (or the kick-wall) at this time, but there are two outstanding issues. ***Does the Board wish to delay the floor until another year or to use funds from the building lines in Highway and Government Buildings to finish the floor now?***

Discussion of not heating the former Town Hall. We have been spending money to heat the former Town Hall. I recommend that we stop doing so. As I have indicated in the past the biggest issue is the roof drain which could freeze and burst if not properly treated. I have asked Paul to determine ways to keep the pipe from freezing that are less expensive than heating the building all winter. There will be some interior deterioration likely, but unless the pipe bursts, this should not increase the high rehab costs. Given the voters have twice voted down rehabilitation, it would seem there is little point in continuing to heat it. 2012 was \$12,240; 2013 was \$8,209 (delivery timing could have been an issue). For 2014 we are at \$8,934 expenditure for heat so far this year (shut heat off in spring). ***Does the Board agree we should either not heat the former Town Hall this fall (or if it is the cheapest solution for the roof drain, only heat the area that includes the roof drain which goes down in SAU and Planning/Codes offices)?***

Solar: Now that a decision has been made for the highway garage I want to put out the RFP for Solar to the two companies who submitted earlier statements of qualifications. I have a number of questions.

As a general summary of what we have determined so far is that there should be no more than 60 Kw on one meter. It also makes financial sense to apply the power credit to the one to which it is attached and one other secondary meter that can be anywhere on the grid. A third

meter can be listed for power credits, but financially it makes sense for this to be one of the pair off another 60 Kw pair. The town uses about 145 Kw primarily on 6 meters (in decreasing draw: Public Safety, Library/gym, Town Office, former Town Hall and Highway garage (these are nearly the same) and Food Pantry). We have four other meters, two use about the same as a single family home (Recycling and another DPW meter) and two are minimal (Rec building by playground and cemetery). An additional meter will be added for the new Highway Garage, but initially usage should be more like the single family home volume usage.

- I believe we need to give clearer guidelines on what buildings and what areas on the ground we will let the companies make a proposal upon which to build solar. I do not believe we have sufficient area to do 145 Kw of ground mount. The two ground areas we can reasonably consider are the Public Safety Complex and Highway Garage. While the Cemetery would be a third option, I did not give that further consideration as it would cover an area reserved for future expansion of the cemetery and it would be a long underground run to the existing cemetery meter. Most of the mowed grassy area behind the safety complex is a Hydric B soil, meaning any digging or disturbing of the soil would require wetlands permits. I believe we could obtain wetlands permit for minimal disturbance in an area near Cate and the back entrance to the Safety Complex. If the remaining 85Kw capacity were to go at the Highway Garage, it would take an area 200'x75' (split between two meters). The problem is we currently are using a significant area of the BYA's land for stockpiles that we may have to move as they want to expand on their land. We currently have the material for crushing, crushed gravel, assorted culverts and parts, part of the stump pile and part of the screened loam pile on their land. They have indicated a desire to expand on their land. If we have to move them to our current area, there would not be enough room for them and for that size set of panels. Also we use the grassy area behind the current Recycling/Highway Garage for snow storage in the winter. Finally while it is probably a decade away, there may be a need to replace the wooden highway garage with another building like the one we are building now. A likely location would be beside the one we are about to erect. For these reasons I believe the most we would want to commit to for space for a solar ground mount area would be 60 KW. That would mean roof mounts somewhere if we were trying to get to 145 Kw. I had Jack Bingham and Chris Dundorf look at the plans for the new Highway Garage and they are concerned that with shallow pitch it could be obscured by snow in winter, plus it is not the best orientation. Indications are that the Landfill cap presents too many technical problems. I believe the roofs of various town buildings including the Safety Complex, Highway Garage and the library/gym are options, but then the issue of roof maintenance enters into the equation. We could consider other roof areas at the DPW facility. One thing I will want addressed is how

they will deal with roofs that are not new given the life of the panels exceeds the expected life of the roof. I have been told that a flat roof is easier to move the panels for replacement than a sloped shingle roof. In particular the Public Safety Complex shingled roof is probably half way through its useful life. We would want to be sure any installation did not impact the guarantees we have on the buildings/roofs. Closely related to this question is the answer to the next one. If we give them 2 areas for 60 KW ground mounts, that would not provide for our entire electrical usage but would avoid roof mounts. Another alternative is just do a 60 Kw set at the Safety Complex to avoid all our eggs being in one basket. ***What kind of guidance does the Town wish to give to the companies on location of the panels?***

- I believe we need to decide what total Kw to have the firms bid. For the reasons given above, I believe we not bid our entire capacity. This would also reduce our problem with application of the credits. The Town could bid just 60 Kw at the Safety Complex and/or at the Highway Garage. The Town could bid the 145 Kw and indicate the proposals should specify where they are putting them. Town could bid some in-between number. ***What does the Board wish to do?***
- My expectation is the Town will ask for a specific formula for cost per Kw as well as what it would be at today's rates. I would like a specific buyout price, not just a percentage range. The other is fairly open-ended.
- I would like a fixed price for buyout at the end of 6 years and whatever other points the Board would like to have.
- As I have expressed before, this is an area in which my knowledge and experience is very limited. I believe it is very difficult to compare prices so would like these to be as specific as possible.
- ***At what stage beyond 6 years does the Town wish to have repurchase opportunities?***
- ***Does the Board have other concerns on this RFP?***

Clark Goodwill Property: Turbocam is pursuing their right to purchase Lot # 5 for a 34,000 square foot building. In order to develop that property, they request easements for drainage, parking and access over Lot # 6. Lot # 6 has a long "neck" to get to the circle. There are already easements on it for Lot #1; the other Lot Turbocam has a right to purchase. ***Does the Board agree?***

Items Suzanne usually brings forward:

- 1. Two intents to cut and one Supplemental Intent**
- 2. Minutes August 11, 2014**

3. **Abatement 35 (2007 Bankruptcy resulted in errors over the years incorrectly applying payments to interest)**
4. **Payroll manifests August 10 & 17, 2014**
5. **Vendor Manifests August 14 & 21, 2014**

Information:

NHMA Legislative Policy. The meeting for communities to vote upon legislative policy is September 26. I will put them on the September 8 meeting for the Board to elect a representative to the meeting and discussion of which to support or oppose. The policy proposals can be found at <http://www.nhmunicipal.org/Advocacy> scroll down to

2015-2016 Legislative Policy Recommendations

and then click where it says at the end of the sentence for the recommendations from committee and the Floor Policy recommendations.

Here is what the two sentences will look like:

To view the 2015-2016 Legislative Policy Recommendations, click here.

To view the 2015-2016 Floor Policies, click here.

Dock Assessments: Here is Wil's response to the question on assessing docks, including removable ones:

Barrington's previous assessor ran into a buzz saw when he appeared before the Board of Tax & Lands Appeals on a case brought by the DRA in Stoddard. As with Barrington (and numerous other municipalities) the contractor had a self-subscribed policy of not listing or appraising docks. The Board found that docks are taxable per RSA 72:7, referencing buildings, mills and wharves. The Board found wharves to be synonymous with docks as improvements to the land, and therefore taxable. They also found that docks are permitted and regulated by the Dept. of Environmental Services, and at times, add significant value to the adjoining real estate. (case: Town of Stoddard, Docket 18362-00RA). There are a number of other similar cases that received the same decision, that docks, even seasonal (pull-out docks) were taxable because they must be affixed to the land at some point (such as anchor tubing to hold the floating docks in place). In 1989 a taxpayer brought a case forward in Alton where I had removed a portion of land from current use because there were

floating dock anchors on the shore and I also assessed them for dock 'rights', even though I found no dock present. The Board denied the appeal on the grounds that the 'intent' of the land owners was to use the pilings to anchor removable docks (case: Alton Bay Campground v. Town of Alton).

Highway Garage: There was an error on the survey as to location of North, so the following differs somewhat from the previous details. For orientation Smoke Street at Brewster is South-East (120) from the Garage. Smoke street where it heads toward the Barrington Youth Association is going North-West (300) (Barrington Youth Association end). The best orientation for the new building will be for the roof ridge to run North-Easterly (35 +/- degrees). The three garage doors on the Gable end will be on the South West Side. The single garage door will be on the North East side. The building will be close to the road which goes around the sand pile and thus half of the South West Gable end will be behind the existing garage and half behind the space between the Highway Garage and the Sander units. It will be set back about 80 feet from the existing garage. We expect to cut more trees behind the proposed new garage for moving stored materials off BYA land (as mentioned above).

Trees: Town has received the certificate for the County Champion Big Hemlock (107 inches around, 91 feet tall). Our previously award winning aspen has now been surpassed by another.

Insurance: Our insurance carrier will not cover the bounce house or water slide for the recreation summer camp. Fortunately, camp is over for this year so we have time to make decisions for next year. The inspector has also cited a number of deficiencies at the playground that need to be corrected. We are getting a quote on the repair costs. I have asked Tara to research other alternatives on the first two items.

Tentative Budget Schedule: Here is the tentative Budget schedule (not all have been scheduled).

October 20 overview presentation to the Board (most of meeting Green Hill Road Bridge)

October 27, DPW, Administration, Finance

November 10 Police, Recreation, Library (John S is on vacation that date)

November 17 Planning

November 24 Town Clerk, Fire Rescue, Cemetery, Building Inspection

(Not yet scheduled Tax and Govt. Building)

I request a nonpublic session under personnel, under reputation, and under land.

Town's excavation policy, adopted 2012**Excavation Policy (for work in Town's Right of Way)**

Before issuing an excavation permit, the Highway Agent will require financial security to cover all reasonable costs associated with the repair and reconstruction of the area disturbed in case the person doing the work does not properly make repairs. This shall include the costs of the engineering firm the town uses to review any plans and construction. The Highway Agent can require the pre-submittal of a design to be sure the work planned meets town standards. This can also include seam removal. The financial security can be in the form of a bond, a letter of credit or cash. The Treasurer will hold any deposit. The owner supplying the financial security will give the town the authority to use the funds to fix the road if it is not repaired properly and within the timeframe stated in the application. See RSA 236:10 Upon completion, the Town shall not arbitrarily withhold funds from any cash bond or letter of credit, but shall first make a good faith effort to resolve any differences with the owner/applicant doing the excavation or restoration.