

Community Preservation Committee

May 11, 2009

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Bulman, Ms. Ivas, Mr. Leavitt, Mr. Limbacher, Mr. McKain, Mr. Scott, Mr. Trafton, Mr. Wood, Mr. Snow (arrived 7:12 P.M.)

OTHERS: Ms. Barbara Lydon, representing PATH, Mr. Al Bangert, Head of the Scituate DPW

Call to order 7:05 P.M.

MOTION by Mr. Leavitt, SECOND by Mr. Trafton and UNANIMOUSLY VOTED 8-0 to accept the agenda as submitted.

7:06 PATH – Mr. Bangert informed the members that the DPW takes responsibility for any building of infrastructure, and the monies that are appropriated to ensure that proper permitting and engineering practices are put into place. Mr. Bangert explained that they are near the end of the engineering money that was allocated for the design phase. The design phase is roughly 75% complete for the entire path. Mr. Bangert stated it was his understanding that the project was funded in such a way that before any further work can go forward the CPC committee must review and sign off on the fact that the project meets the intent of the funding which is that of a multi-purpose path feasible from N. Scituate to Hatherly Road. He went on to explain because record data on property ownership was not well established they had to extend the engineering contract to do additional survey work and title searches from Wigwam to Hatherly. Mr. Bangert brought a plan showing the path in its entirety. He also brought alternative ideas for using wooden walkways over areas of wetlands where there are existing reasons why they wouldn't want to intrude with making the road wider.

Mr. Bulman confirmed that the committee originally approved a path that was going to be 8 feet wide from N. Scituate to Hatherly Rd. Phase I was engineering, phase II was construction N. Scituate to Hollett, phase III which wasn't funded (hopefully grant funded later) was Hollett St. to Hatherly Rd. He reiterated the board's concerns that there were substantial sections of the path that fell to 3.5 to 5 feet wide. However, at the last meeting of the CPC all board members were in agreement that a 6 foot wide path would be OK. The reason the board was interested in using a wooden walkway, etc. was to try and keep those areas where the width fell to 3.5 feet closer to 5-6 feet.

Mr. Bangert said that there were other alternatives besides building bridges because in the area from N. Scituate Village to Border St. the Town owns 40-45 feet of width. The road today uses 25-32 feet of that. So he feels that there can absolutely be an additional 8 foot width of pathway with a 2 foot separation from the travel lanes of cars without going into wetlands. Mr. Bangert also went on to say that one of the preeminent aspects of the project is improving the passage way through that area whether it is bike or pedestrian by slowing down the traffic. The best way to slow down the traffic is to create a sense of a narrower corridor. Today the road at its narrowest is 25 feet wide, but the predominant link of it is 32 feet wide. This project narrows the entire road from the Village to Hatherly Rd. to 21 feet. That meets MA highway design standards. Mr. Bangert went over that plans section by section with the members. He stated that the cheapest way to narrow the road is to bring the sides in. You could move the road over a little bit but then the crown is not in the center and that would not be a good design standard as traffic tends to follow the crown. The engineer narrowed the road in and kept the center line crown in the center position.

Mr. Bulman questioned Mr. Bangert on the feasibility of the project. Even though Mr. Bangert said that the project was feasible, Mr. Bulman said part of the mission was the economic feasibility given the budget PATH has. Mr. Bangert said that there was no way it could be built for less than \$500,000. He further went on to say that the reason the project had to go out to bid was because contractors are eager to work there is a lot of competition. The project would be put out to bid in sections. Mr. Bulman's suggestion was to put the whole project out to bid from N. Scituate to Hollett St. without any of the bridges and put the bridges in as alternates. Mr. Bangert has reservations about that. Mr. Bulman, speaking for himself, says he sees that as a fatal flaw because if he isn't sure there will be enough money to complete the project all the way to Hollett St. he would not vote for it.

Ms. Lydon updated the board members on the meeting she had with the DOT regarding the application for the grant. They have moved from the pre-application phase to the final application phase. Although things seem to be going favorably no one is expecting to see money for another two years. Ms. Lydon said during the application process PATH needed a "good" cost estimate and they were told by Horsley Whitten \$990,000. She stated that it's .7 miles to get to from the Village to Hollett St. and .7 miles from Hollett St. to Hatherly Rd. Therefore you're talking about \$500,000 to complete the first leg. They have already spent \$50,000 in engineering, and if you take away bridging and get some discounts from the contracts she is optimistic that the project can still come in for \$550,000.

It was decided that the project would be bid to Hollett St. with bridges as alternates. Ms. Lydon also informed the members that Ms. Fitzmorris (principal of Hatherly School) had received the school grant for the sidewalk on Hollett St. so that even if the project only goes as far as Hollett St. there will be connectivity and that is important.

There will be no vote until CPC sees the bids, because CPC needs to know that the project can be completed within the budget and if it can't be then CPC needs to know that there are other sources of funding that will allow completion of the project.

In Mr. Bangert's opinion he thinks it's best to permit only to Hollett St. because permits do not last forever. Mr. Bulman said if you have an order of conditions they last for three years and you can get a three year extension.

Mr. Limbacher questioned the number Mr. Bangert was using with regard to the sections of the path that were not 8 feet wide. Mr. Bangert believed it to be 900 feet but when Ms. Lydon presented it before it was significantly higher. There seems to be a discrepancy of 1500 feet in the number Horsley Whitten provided. Some figures appear to take into consideration the friendly easements while others do not. There was discussion between the members and Mr. Bangert as to how the numbers were arrived at. In the end it was decided that Horsley Whitten would provide the CPC with documentation showing that the area in question is actually 8 foot in width.

Mr. Bangert confirmed that he would find out why Horsley Whitten had one thing in March and now that they have completed all the survey work and developed a plan with the survey on it why there is a difference. Mr. Limbacher suggested that if Horsley Whitten could provide a matrix like they did before that would be ideal.

The next steps will be to clarify the 1500 feet because that will answer the design questions all the way to Hatherly Rd. and then go to bid. Mr. Bulman suggested that even though the bridges may now not be necessary it would still be good to include them. Mr. Bangert said that design standards

would have to be provided for the bridges and that would result in additional design costs, money he would rather spend if it wasn't necessary.

There was more discussion about reducing the overall width of the trail to 6 feet in order to give it more continuity, to make it more economically feasible and makes the project more favorable when applying for the phase III grant.

MOTION by Mr. Bulman to ask the applicant to provide for a redesign of the path from N. Scituate to Hatherly Rd. to accommodate a maximum 6 foot wide path and to maximize the separation between the path and the roadway with a treatment other than pavement, SECOND by Mr. Leavitt and VOTED 8-0-1.

MOTION by Mr. Bulman subsequent to getting confirmation from Horsley Whitten that the 1495 foot section between Wigmam Lane and Hatherly Road accommodates the design path of at least 6 feet the board can authorize the applicant to go forward with the bidding and construction of phase II with the design standards set forth, SECOND by Mr. Leavitt and UNANIMOUSLY VOTED 9-0.

8:20 – Acceptance of Minutes not all of the members have reviewed them so we will hold acceptance until the next meeting.

8:25 – General Business

Re-application for at large members are due May 19th.

Mr. Bulman asked the members if they had any suggestions for changes to the application process.

Mr. Bulman would like to move forward on project updates. He suggested that perhaps each member of the board could take on a project and work with the applicant in a similar manner as was done with the last round of projects. A first letter inquiring into the status of the project and a second letter having the applicants sign off on completion of the project.

By request of the board members Mr. Bulman will draw up a rough draft for the Purchase and Sale of the Hennessey Land.

8:50 – MOTION by Ms. Ivas, SECOND by Mr. Limbacher and UNANIMOUSLY VOTED 9-0 to adjourn.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen S. Crowell