

CLASS V ROADS STUDY COMMITTEE  
TUESDAY, March 5th, 2018  
08:30 AM  
TOWN OFFICE CONFERENCE ROOM  
Approved

Present: Mike Smith (arrived at 845), Bill Malcolm, Sue MacKenzie, Kevin Sahr, Karen Henry, Ernst Kling

**Agenda**

Minutes from 2-20-18

Develop more detailed descriptions of Project Manager responsibilities.

The meeting was called to order at 830 am.

The minutes from 2-20-18 were approved.

Discussion about the Project Managers.

Sue gave some background information to Ernst regarding the River Road bypass/relocation project. And, that there are some demands from Mr. Tensen and Mr. Roby regarding the donation of their land for the purposes of re-routing River Road. They have been contacting Right Angle Engineering with concerns.

Further, the enthused project managers were trying to interact with Right Angle in an effort to get up to speed on each project. Erin Darrow of Right Angle was somewhat overwhelmed with all of the interactions. Hence, Sue asked the new Project Managers to wait until this meeting before proceeding further with their work with their respective projects. (At this time the three Road Committee Project Managers (PMs) are Karen – 393 Dorchester Highway Grant, Bill – Baker 1 Culvert Replacement and Frank – Hewes Brook bridge over River Road.)

The main purpose of this meeting is to determine how to better define the roles of the Project Managers so that we work effectively on the respective projects.

Ernst asked about the need for engineering design on projects such as the 393 Dorchester Road culvert. Some discussion followed and Sue pointed out the DES requires a stamped engineering design.

Bill pointed out that it is important for the PMs to have authority and responsibilities that are clearly defined and in writing, but he is concerned that there might not be a culture within the Town Government to issue such responsibilities to individuals outside of the Select Board. Mike and Bill pointed out that a past University of New Hampshire report provided a framework for doing and analysis of necessary roads repair and maintenance project. Bill pointed out that the PMs need a credential for interacting with the engineer and the responsibilities and authorities to execute the task.

Some of the discussion focused on landowner interactions. Bill pointed out that PM-landowner interactions could include producing a written document of all landowner concerns. Sue pointed out that DES won't issue permits on projects that impact land unless the landowner agrees to the proposed project. Karen commented that it doesn't seem appropriate that landowners are contacting the engineer. Bill pointed out that this is something that the PM could do. Bill suggested that the Select Board designate this responsibility to the PM.

Some of the discussion led to the uniquely awkward (and somewhat confusing) circumstance of handing off all projects to the individual project managers at this time. Sue agreed to meet with individual PMs to bring them up to date on each project.

Kevin spent some time describing how the PM process will work, pointing out that landowner engagement may have to be a shared responsibility between the PM and the Select Board. Bill pointed out that the process being proposed by Kevin provides a framework for the roles and responsibilities of the PM.

There was more discussion regarding landowners' interaction with design engineers on projects. And, we discussed that the Select Board should be the first point of contact for landowners' concerns.

Although we have voted on the concept of having Project Managers at the last meeting, we are now working on the specific details of how it will work. Bill asked that the details of the PM roles and responsibilities be written down and presented to the Select Board.

Sue asked that the blanks in the current draft PM description be filled in with the Baker 1 Project for presentation to the Select Board, and Kevin agreed to do that.

There was more general discussion on how the PMs will best interact with engineers hired by the Town, and there was general agreement that project specific approaches would be better than a fixed approach.

Karen volunteered to try to put the 393 Dorchester project into the framework provided in the Draft PM process.

The Committee agreed that Project Manager is a good name for the managers of projects. Further, we agreed to provide review comments to Kevin on the job description. Sue pointed out that if this process becomes well established, it will likely be carried into the future.

The meeting was adjourned at 930.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Henry