



OLD VALUES - NEW HORIZONS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PO Box 120, Windham, New Hampshire 03087
(603) 432-3806 / Fax (603) 432-7362
www.WindhamNewHampshire.com
Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
Meeting Minutes
July 25, 2012

The regular meeting of the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) was called to order at 7:34pm, on July 25th, by Chairman Rob Gustafson at the Community Development Department.

Present

Rob Gustafson, Chair 2012
Bruce Anderson, School Board Representative
Ruth-Ellen Post, Planning Board Representative
Bruce Breton, Board of Selectmen Representative
Jennifer Simmons, Citizen Member
Carolyn Webber, Planning Board Representative
Neelima Gogumalla, Citizen Member

Excused

Stephanie Wimmer, Vice Chair, School Board Representative
Elizabeth Wood, Staff Advisor

- I. Chairman Rob Gustafson introduced the members of the board and reviewed the agenda. Mr. Gustafson also suggested assigning departments, to each member, so they can create a portion of the final report. The following assignments were made:

Fire Department – Ruth-Ellen Post
Police Department – Bruce Breton
Highway – Jennifer Simmons
Searles Historic Committee – Carolyn Webber
School District – Stephanie Wimmer
Recreation Committee – Jennifer Simmons
Solid Waste Management – Bruce Breton
IT/GIS Department – Neelima Gogumalla

II. **Solid Waste Management Department CIP Presentation**

By: David Poulson and Dennis Senabaldi

Proposal: To put forward a CIP 2013 outlay request for the purchase of a wheel loader for the Transfer Station. This is a replacement request of the 2006 JCB wheel loader. The total project cost will be \$80,000.

Justification: The loader is a vital piece of equipment at the Transfer Station. Without a loader, the waste streams cannot be moved or loaded into trailers. The recommended replacement timeframe for a loader is estimated at 8 years. The action plan is to purchase another matching loader to the 2009 Takeuchi to reduce O&M costs (i.e., parts, service, maintenance items, etc.) and inventory costs.

Discussion:

Mr. Gustafson asked for clarification on the useful life of the 2006 JCB Wheel Loader. The project request form states that the loader should be replaced every 8 years and the one to be replaced is only 7 years old.

Mr. Poulson responded that in the year 2013, the loader will be 8 years old. He told the board that the industry recommends replacing loaders every 5 years. He stated that it is better to replace the loader sooner than later as it will lower O&M expenses. The loader is running 6-8 hours per day. After 5 years, a loader has usually depreciated by 2/3 of its value. The current loader has approximately 4,000 hours on it. If the primary loader were to break down, the Transfer Station would need the second loader to run at 100%. If the loader could not handle the work load, the Transfer Station would have to close. The highway loader will not fit in the Transfer Station's work space.

Ms. Gogumalla asked what would happen to the 2006 JCB Wheel Loader if it were to be replaced.

Mr. Poulson said that the highway agent may have an interest in it or it could be sold. He stated that it is more valuable as a re-sale vs. a trade. The re-sale may be able to get \$20,000 for it. In the end, it is up to the Selectmen to decide what gets done with it.

Mr. Anderson asked about the idle time of the loader since it is now being used to load metal.

Mr. Poulson responded that there is no quantification on significant hours. Standards are different for every use based on age and condition.

Ms. Post asked about the current condition of the loader. She wondered if there were any specific problems.

Mr. Poulson stated that as the loader gets older, the maintenance and costs increase. The loader would have just as many problems if it sat still. Maintenance is approximately \$100 per hour plus travel expenses.

Mr. Senabaldi also stated that the loader has had hydraulic issues, the solenoids are going, and the air cleaner is being held on by elastics. He also said that the loader has had tire issues, which cost \$1,800 to replace, and the recent cost to service it was \$630. It is not as efficient as other machines.

Mr. Poulson said it is important to turn over equipment at the right time to save money and to avoid service disruptions. There are also safety issues.

Ms. Webber asked for a dollar amount on the costs spent for repairs.

Mr. Poulson said that he could obtain the numbers from Dana Call.

Mr. Breton stated that costs may not be high now, but as the product ages the costs will increase.

Ms. Webber questioned if the request were to buy a loader identical to the 2009 loader.

Mr. Senabaldi responded that ideal scenario would be to purchase an identical loader as it would reduce costs.

Ms. Gogumalla asked when the Transfer Station plans on replacing the 2009 loader.

Mr. Poulson stated that the 2009 loader would not need to be replaced for another 4-5 years.

Mr. Gustafson wondered if the \$80,000 amount was on the higher side to complete the purchase of a new loader. In 2009, the price of the loader was \$65,000.

Mr. Poulson stated that \$80,000 would be a worst case scenario. It may be closer to \$70,000.

Mr. Gustafson stated that if loaders were going to need to be replaced every 4 years, then perhaps the capital gets looked at and a plan is derived for 8 years out.

Mr. Senabaldi said that the Transfer Station trailers were leased through the budget and bundled under the general budget as the threshold is now lower.

Ms. Post wondered if the 2006 wheel loader were sold outright for \$20,000 than could the proceeds go towards the purchase of the new loader, decreasing the amount needed to \$60,000.

Mr. Senabaldi said that the Transfer Station would still need to ask/appropriate for the full amount of the loader.

Mr. Breton stated that grants/re-sales can not be factored in. The proceeds go back into the fund balance.

Mr. Senabaldi said at the current time the two loaders' attachments are not compatible. Also, the 2006 loader has a closed cab and is not ideal for the work environment (for health reasons, i.e, dust, heat, etc.) in which it is working.

Mr. Gustafson requested a copy of the repair history costs from Mr. Poulson. He would also like for the board to have copies of the capital asset sheets.

III. IT/GIS Department CIP Presentation

By: Eric DeLong

Proposal: A mass replacement of 50 workstations and 2 servers with 50+/- workstations and 3 servers. One server would be for police (IMC/Files), one for administration (files/printers), and one for Vision/GIS. The amount requested is \$75,000.

Justification: A bulk purchase would provide for better pricing and part of the savings goes toward better performance which equates to a longer life cycle (looking for a minimum 5 year life cycle out of workstations). There would be three primary software packages (with 1 alone and 2 together on a single server). The two systems sharing a server results in a significant performance drop and substantially more frequent service interruptions.

Discussion:

Mr. DeLong told the board that having the same PCs would make support easier. He said that the lifecycle, for the products, is approximately 5-7 years without any serious complaints. Mr. DeLong also stated that leasing vs. buying outright may be an option.

Mr. Breton suggested that Mr. DeLong get copies of the Town of Windham - Network Assessment to the board. Mr. Breton said that he read, in the assessment, that the systems should be replaced every 3 years and that the servers should be located offsite.

Mr. DeLong responded by saying that in a perfect world the systems would be replaced every 3 years. He also stated that the current servers are located in a safe environment. They are in a controlled room and precautions have been taken to keep them protected. He said that in a virtual environment it is basically like putting all your eggs in one basket and he doesn't want to do that.

Ms. Webber asked if it would be possible to stagger the purchase.

Mr. DeLong said that by staggering you would lose purchasing power. He also stated that virtualization works better with 100 workstations vs. the 50 he is requesting. He said that the town's current police database is very strong, taking ¼ second to obtain information. If the town were to switch over to virtualization it may take 50 seconds to obtain information.

Mr. Gustafson asked if there were offsite backups.

Mr. DeLong responded yes. He also said that as soon as he had concrete numbers, from his next meeting, than he forward on the memos.

Ms. Gogumalla asked if software was included in the \$75,000 figure and what would happen to the current workstations.

Mr. DeLong responded that the software is included and that the current workstations would go to the public and some to officers, sergeants at the police station as they are currently sharing workstations.

IV. Review Departments' responses to CIP Request for Proposals

The following departments will not be submitting applications:

- Tax Department
- Assessing Department
- Cemetery Trustees
- Senior Center
- Town Clerk's Department
- Planning Board
- Windham Economic Development Committee
- Community Development Department

The following departments have not yet responded:

- Administration
- Board of Selectmen
- Library
- Maintenance
- Housing Authority
- Rail Trail Alliance
- Cable

Ms. Webber told the board that the Heritage Commission will not be submitting a request.

Ms. Gogumalla told the board that the request, from the Local Energy Committee, has been submitted.

Mr. Gustafson requested an update from the Library on past CIP funds. He wondered if the Library had been painted yet. Ms. Webber and Ms. Simmons stated that the library had been painted in 2011. Staff should follow up with Carl Heidenblad.

Mr. Gustafson questioned whether any departments had been left off the list. Mr. Breton suggested adding Searles School and Chapel. The selectmen recently held a workshop at the Searles School and Chapel. He stated that there may be some new expenses from the School and Chapel. Ms. Wood should contact Marion Dinsmore.

V. Review and accept the June 12th Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve the minutes by Ms. Gogumalla and seconded by Ms. Webber.

– Vote 5-0-2 (Mr. Breton and Mr. Anderson)

VI. Review of Future CIP Presentations:

- Fire Department – August 8th
- Police Department – August 8th
- Highway – August 22nd
- Searles Historic Committee – August 22nd
- School District – TBD
- Recreation Committee – TBD

Mr. Anderson stated that the School District will be submitting their request in the 2 next weeks.

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 8:40 p.m. by Neelima Gogumalla and seconded by Bruce Anderson. Vote: 7-0

The next general meeting will be at 7:30 p.m. on August 8, 2012 in the Community Development Department Meeting Room.

Minutes submitted by: Jennifer Simmons

Approved by: [Type name here]