

DRAFT

**MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 2005
DURHAM TOWN HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS
TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
7:00 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Malcolm Sandberg; Arthur Grant; Neil Niman; Gerald Needell; Annmarie Harris; Karl Van Asselt; Peter Smith; Mark Morong

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Kraus

OTHERS PRESENT: Todd Selig, Town Administrator

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Agenda

Councilor Grant MOVED to approve the Agenda as submitted. The motion was SECONDED by Councilor Smith, and PASSED unanimously 9-0.

Chair Sandberg noted that this was the first Council meeting of the year, and wished everyone a happy new year.

III. Approval of Minutes

November 8th, 2004

Councilor Morong MOVED to approve the November 8th, 2004 minutes as submitted. The motion was SECONDED by Councilor Smith.

Page 9, 8th paragraph, should read “..if the percentage of fund balance dropped to 6%..”

Page 12, 6th full paragraph should read “Chair Grant suggested that...”.

Also, 7th paragraph should read “Chairman Grant declared...”

Councilor Needell MOVED to adopt the amendments to the November 8th, 2004 minutes. The motion was SECONDED by Councilor Morong, and PASSED 6-0-2, with Councilor Harris and Chair Sandberg abstaining because of their absence from the November 8, 2004 meeting.

The minutes as amended PASSED 6-0-2, with Councilor Harris and Chair Sandberg abstaining because of their absence from the November 8, 2004 meeting.

IV. Report of Administrator

Administrator Selig said the Town had secured protection of the field along Newmarket Road, working with the Rockingham Land Trust, and noted that the Conservation Commission had approved this in May of 2004, and the Council had approved it in June. He said the total cost was \$140,000, 50% of which would be paid for by the Rockingham Land Trust, and 50% of which would be paid by the Conservation Commission's current use land use change tax.

Administrator Selig said the Zoning Rewrite Committee had completed review of the nonresidential portions of the Zoning Ordinance. He said public hearings on this would be held on January 5th, January 12th, and January 19th, and explained that the Planning Board would then make its final changes to the Ordinance based on input received at these hearings. He said these changes would then be forwarded to the Council for review.

V. Councilors Comments

Councilor Smith said the Oyster River School District was holding a budget hearing on January 11th, 2004 at 7 pm. He noted that at some past hearings, few people had been present besides the Board and staff, and urged people to take an interest in the process, especially considering the tax implications.

Councilor Harris asked if there was a proposed increase in school taxes, and Councilor Smith said he would find this out at the meeting.

There was discussion about the window of opportunity for citizens to place their names on the ballot for Town Council.

VI. Public Comments

Bill Skinner of the Durham Great Bay Rotary Club introduced a UNH graduate student that the Rotary Club was sponsoring. He noted she was studying environmental sciences, and said he had brought her to the meeting to introduce her to how a wonderful small town like Durham conducted its business.

Chair Sandberg welcomed her to Durham, on behalf of the Council.

Bill Drapeau, 4 Sullivan Falls Road, said he was present to speak about the Packers Falls Bridge project. He said the project was almost five years old, and appeared to have been flawed from the start. He reviewed the history of the project, and noted that residents had been assured that the work on the bridge would be aesthetically pleasing. He said Town staff had met with residents in 2003, residents were told the bridge would be closed 6-8 weeks, and it was closed 13 weeks. He said they asked at that time what the changes in the bridge would look like, and were told by Mr. Lynch that it would look like the Scammel Bridge. He said the result was not even close.

Mr. Drapeau said this was not a neighborhood issue, and said it meant something to citizens throughout the Town who believed in government, and believed the bridge was ugly and in error. He said it appeared that no one wanted to own up to the problem, and said the Council

should choose Option 1, so one of the most scenic areas in Town would be there for future generations.

Phyllis Heilbronner, 51 Mill Pond Road, said the issue was not only that this had been an unattractive attempt to fix a problem. She said a mistake, probably an honest one, had been made, and said the cost to each individual to fix the mistake was very little, to create something that in perpetuity would be much better than what was there now.

Jim Jelmberg, 29 Park Court, said the Town needed to bite the bullet and replace the railings, in order to prevent accidents and lawsuits, and urged the Council to support the use of contingency funding to support Option 1. He said the scenic vista that had been lost was important, and was a Town issue.

Mara Witzling, 168 Packers Falls Road, spoke in support of Option 1. She said she ran over that bridge every day, and said it was painful not to be able to see the river. She said she was an art historian, and noted that cathedrals and other structures built in the past impacted peoples' lives in the present. She said what was being built today was Durham's legacy to the future, and noted citizens had been concerned about this legacy when the bridge structure was planned. She said the bridge had not come out as expected, and said there was no excuse to leave it as an eyesore for the future.

Sally Hochgraf, 9 Old Landing Road, said she shared the desires of others to correct the mistakes on the bridge. She noted the beautiful work that had been done on the Route 108 bridge, and said that this existed because the workers and caring residents had worked together. She said it would be a disgrace if the current condition of the Packers Falls Bridge was left standing, and said it would be a compliment to the Council if the repair work were done. She said the Packers Falls Bridge Committee had come up with a solution, and said she would be willing to pay her fair share to see that the improvements were made.

John Lannamann, 156 Packers Falls Road, thanked the Council for its work on behalf of the Town, and spoke in favor of Option 1. He noted the imagery conjured up by the title of Rachel Carson's 1962 book, *Silent Spring*. He said it had been a year since the completion of the work on the bridge, and said Carson's concerns about the environment could be extended to the built environment. He said much about the environment surrounding the Bridge had gone unnoticed this past year, the ice flows in January, the swollen streams banks in spring, etc., because the changes to the bridge had separated people from the environment. He said he still remembered these things, but wondered if his son would remember them. Mr. Lannamann said that by correcting the design of the Bridge, the Town had the opportunity to reconnect with the environment surrounding it.

Paul Schlie, 95 Mill Road, said unfortunately he would take a different position. He said although it would have been nice if the aesthetic concerns had been voiced earlier, prior to the expenses being born, at this point, the structure was as it was. He said the Town had had the opportunity to review construction plans before the construction was done. He said it was unfortunate that the result was not as aesthetic as would have been desired, but said Town funds should not be used to reconstruct the bridge. He said if there were errors in the plans, maybe the Town would learn from this.

Judy Chandler, 17 Meadow Road, said she remembered the Bridge as a kid, and said she would like her kids to be able to experience it as well. She read a letter from resident Diana Woods that noted her disappointment with the work done on the Bridge, and asked the Council to honor the intent of those in the community who believed this was one of Durham's treasures, and who believed that the Town should return what had inadvertently been taken away.

Richard Dewey, 191 Packers Falls Road, said the issue was not just about the Bridge, but the institutions of government. He said when a mistake like this was made, it was either because of ignorance or corruption, and said it tested whether elected officials could meet the needs of the people.

Julian Smith, 246 Packers Falls Road, said he was present as a member of the Packers Falls Bridge Committee, but also as a neighbor of the Bridge. He said he knew the area of the Bridge very well, noting that he had bathed his child in the river years back, had lost his wedding ring there, and had spent the summer trying to find it. Mr. Smith also read a memo from Matt Lowe of Hoyle Tanner that ironically said his firm had recently won an award for the design of the concrete bridge.

Martin Lee, 17 Faculty Road, said he was shocked when he saw the ugliness of the work done on the Bridge. He said it had been hard to believe that such a thing could have happened, and said at first he thought this must have been required by the State. He said he later realized this was not the case, and said it was a cruel irony that this had happened in Durham, a town that was so aware and discriminating about the environment. He said the results of this project had started to make him feel insecure about other projects, and said that from a fundamental point of view, he hoped the mistakes could be corrected, so faith in the public works process could be restored.

Scott Hovey, 41 Canney Road, noted that a previous Council was assured that the citizens' concerns had been heard concerning the height of the rails, etc., and he asked the Council where the accountability of town government was when things went wrong. He noted that he was not a tree hugger, but said this work had simply been done wrong. He encouraged the Council to support what the previous Council thought it was getting concerning the Bridge.

Virginia Stuart, 3 Falls Way, said this was not a neighborhood issue. She said she did not live in that neighborhood, but had appreciated the Packers Falls Bridge area, while living in various other parts of Town. She said that while some of the ideas being talked about sounded idealistic, the question was whether the Town could afford to pay for them. She said that if the unexpended contingency funds were used, the average cost per household would be \$2.45, the cost of a cup of coffee or a plain bagel. Ms. Stewart urged the Council to support Option 1.

Diana Carroll, 54 Canney Road, said she lived on the other side of Town. She noted the beautiful work that had been done on the Route 108 Bridge, and said she would like to thank those who had done this work. She said this work had improved the quality of life for those people who crossed the bridge, and said she hoped the proposed renovations to the Packers Falls Bridge would allow people to say the same things about this work. She said it was

important to see the big picture, - that the Bridge would be there longer than the Town's citizens would be there. She said she had no idea what the Town had paid in taxes for the Route 108 Bridge, but said it certainly seemed to have been worth it.

David Watt, 6 Sullivan Falls Road, said he had formerly served as Chair of the Planning Board. He said the project represented a cautionary tale, noting that the work on the Bridge was not simply done, but was done with the complicity of Town boards and the Public Works Department. He said the Town needed to question how this had happened, and noted that in part it had arisen because the project had not been examined with nearly the degree of skepticism as would have been the case if it had been done by a private developer.

Henry Smith, 93 Packers Falls Road, thanked the Councilors for their many hours of service. He said he had lived in this area for several years, and said that although it was unfortunate that the Town must spend more money to fix the Bridge, he believed it must be fixed, noting that what was there at present was troubling to the community. He said the work was an embarrassment, and an assault on aesthetic sensibilities, and said the Council needed to correct the mistake. Mr. Smith said that Option 1 would enhance the natural beauty of the area, while Option 2 would create a 100-foot eyesore. He said it didn't make sense to spend money on something people didn't want, and noted that if Option 2 were chosen, Durham households would only save \$0.82.

Katie Paine, 51 Durham Point Road, noted that she had been on the Town Council when this issue was in front of it. She stressed that she did not want to increase taxes, but said that she personally was embarrassed by what had happened. She said that although the proposed work would increase her taxes by more than would be the case for the average Durham household, it was important to do this for future generations.

Wesley Smith, 26 Woodridge Road, said he was glad that they all lived in a democratic society. He noted that nine months had now been spent agonizing over this bridge, and proposed that all of the people who wanted the changes should come up with the money for this work, instead of taking the money for this out of the tax roles. He said that at present it was a functional bridge, and said the aesthetics issue had gotten out of hand. He noted that the Oyster River Hockey Association had raised voluntary funds for their work, and asked why this couldn't be done for the bridge repairs.

Dennis Meadows, 34 Laurel Lane, said aesthetics were very important, and noted that he had previously taken visitors over to the Bridge to show them the falls, but wouldn't do that now. He said the current bridge was not safe, and said if it was left in its current form there would be an accident. He said under those circumstances it would be reasonable to hold the Town liable, and said that in the process of making the Bridge look better, they could make it safer. He said he had managed various groups during his career, and when he or others had made mistakes, they had fixed them. He said he didn't think that any one present would claim a mistake had not been made, and said he hoped that although the current Council had inherited the problem, it would decide to fix it.

Don Brautigam, 122 Packers Falls Road, said he agreed with everything that had been said, and noted that the bridge project had gone on for a great number of weeks. He said that

the railings had gone up in the last few weeks, and noted that the work done on the bridge for the most part was done quite well. He said it was unfortunate that the last couple of weeks had put such a bad name on the project, but said it needed to be fixed.

Holly Harris, 154 Packers Falls Road, noted that Durham residents prided themselves on being educated, and had educated their children to leave things better than they had been found. She asked what people would be able to tell their children if the bridge was left as it was.

Lisa MacFarlane, 6 Sullivan Falls Road, said she lived in the area of the Bridge. She said she was proud of her Town, and of the people who volunteered locally, and urged the Council to choose Option 1. She said this was not a safe intersection, and said this was therefore a Town safety issue and responsibility. She noted that in the darkness, one could not see around the corner, and also said the street light and the headlights of oncoming cars were sometimes hard to distinguish. She said when a mistake was made, it was a Town issue, and said that how to be accountable was a critical question, and related to confidence in local government. She said she was very impressed by the patience and consideration shown by the Council, and said she hoped it would vote for Option 1.

Dudley Dudley, 25 Woodman Road, read a letter signed by 160 residents of Durham which asked that the Council choose Option 1. She said to an outsider, it might seem like an inordinate amount of time had been spent on this issue. But she said that to those who knew Durham, this was not unusual, and was something that citizens had come to expect. She said the citizens expected careful consideration of all the key factors, especially issues such as quality of life and enhancement of a sense of community, noting portions of the most recent Master Plan, which had spoken about these things. She also said that conservation of natural resources was the Town's second top priority in terms of tax dollars, noting that the Town's people had supported the land conservation bond two years ago.

She said the Bridge was the oldest rib arch bridge in New Hampshire, and said the original intention, and assurance to citizens, was that this site would be honored. She said that as Councilor Kraus had stated, areas like Packers Falls were the Town's cathedrals. She urged the Council to support Option 1, and said the decision made that evening would affect Durham for generations.

Bill Hall, Smith Park Lane, said the work on the bridge would cost households more than 10 times more than was quoted, and said the figures were misleading. He said the current situation was not the first time the Town had made a mistake like this, and provided details concerning other projects, such as the lamplight in the sidewalk, describing it as an insane performance. He also provided details concerning the fact that he had come before the Council regarding water billing by UNH for water the Town did not use. He said this was what it cost the Town when people didn't pay attention.

VII. Unanimous Consent Agenda

Shall the Town Council approve and sign the Warrant for the March 8, 2005 election?

Councilor Smith MOVED to approve the Unanimous Consent Agenda item. The motion was SECONDED by Councilor Grant, and it PASSED unanimously 8-0.

Chair Sandberg declared a 20-minute recess at 8:15 PM.

VIII. Unfinished Business

Endorse one of three options outlined by the Packers Falls Bridge Committee with respect to modifications to the Packers Falls Bridge and direct the Administrator to execute the draft agreement between the Town of Durham and Hoyle Tanner Engineers to reflect the specific design specifications of the selected option, as presented to the Council on January 3, 2005.

Chair Sandberg explained that Town staff and the Packers Falls Bridge Committee would make a presentation, and said that after this, there would be an opportunity for the Council to ask questions and clarify outstanding issues in order to make a responsible decision on this issue. He outlined the process that would be followed, and said Councilors would have the opportunity to shape the motions that were proposed. He said ideally, this issue would be completed by the end of the meeting.

Administrator Selig provided historical and other information concerning the Packers Falls Bridge issue, information that he also provided in a written Council Communication. He said that after months of negotiations with Hoyle Tanner, a tentative agreement had been arrived at, in which Hoyle Tanner agreed to contribute \$7,500 plus engineering services toward modifications that the Council approved with respect to the Bridge.

He noted one of the concerns of the Council early on was how to avoid arriving at a major construction result like this in the future, and said the June 10th, 2004 report had provided recommendations concerning this. He said there would be additional discussion on this report, moving forward.

Administrator Selig noted he had specifically asked for a range of options concerning possible changes to the Bridge, and briefly described the three proposed options. He said Option 1 would remove all the existing approach rails and guardrails, and replace them with an anodized aluminum rail. He said Option 2 was nearly identical to Option 1, but said the difference was that on the McGowan side, the existing black w-rail would remain. He explained that Option 3 would only address the pedestrian railing, and the replacement, a metal railing, would be much easier to see through. He said Option 1 had been endorsed by the Packers Falls Bridge Committee.

He said \$50,000 in 2004 contingency funding had been encumbered into 2005 for the specific purpose of addressing issues of the bridge if the Council chose to use them. He said in addition, there were remaining funds from the original bridge project, as well as promised funds from the Lamprey River Advisory Committee and funding from Hoyle Tanner. He stressed that the pricing on the various options were cost estimates only, and said the actual bid numbers could come in lower or higher. He also noted Councilors might have other options than the 3 options, and said Town Engineer Bob Levesque was there to consider possible costs of these options.

Administrator Selig noted that in addition to aesthetic considerations, there were safety issues, many of which were perceived problems, and said these issues could be discussed with Mr. Levesque. He also said the Council was being asked to endorse the agreement with Hoyle Tanner, and said at that time, this was the best agreement possible.

Administrator Selig said Mr. Levesque would provide additional details on the 3 Options, and also said that Packers Falls Bridge Committee member Dick Lord was present to show photographic renderings of the possible changes to the bridge. He also noted that members of the Committee were present to answer specific questions from Councilors, and said he was hopeful it would be a constructive discussion.

Mr. Levesque next spoke about proposed Options 1, 2 and 3, which were reflected in photographs in a slide presentation. He described Option 1 in detail.

Councilor Harris noted the difference Option 1 made in being able to see down the road.

Mr. Levesque described the dead spot where it had been difficult to see anything. He said the concrete rail reduced the site distance, and made the bridge fall below the ASHTO standards. He said the proposed railings were the same as those on the Oyster River Bridge, and said this was proposed for the entire length of the bridge area. He said that at the edge of where the concrete structures presently were, there would be 23 feet of transition zone to get to the standard w-rail height, and blend it into the ground. He said this particular design was no longer approved by NHDOT, but said in his opinion, for this site, this would be a safe application. He noted the speed limit there was relatively low, and there was an intersection so people slowed down anyway.

Councilor Smith discussed where the barrel end would typically be, as required by NHDOT, so there would be a cushioning effect. There was discussion about this, and Mr. Levesque noted that in Exeter, the pedestrian metal railing wrapped around much like a barrel, so there would be a cushioning effect if someone hit the rail.

Councilor Smith confirmed that that the proposed design would not meet the current NHDOT standard. He also asked whether, on the upriver side, at the Durham end of the bridge, the rail ended in a similar fashion.

There was detailed discussion about this. Mr. Levesque said what was proposed was to transition to the guardrail height, but after 23 feet, the rail would make a loop and cross the sidewalk, which would alleviate the sloping effect, and the ability to ride up on.

Mr. Lord noted the difference between Option 1 and 2 concerning the southwest extension of the bridge near the McGowan property.

Councilor Smith asked if the NHDOT position regarding the upriver, Newmarket side was the same as for the Durham, down river side.

Mr. Levesque said it was the same for any sloped rail, and provided details on this.

Councilor Harris asked Mr. Levesque whether the proposed design was safe in this circumstance.

Mr. Levesque said in this particular application, the slope was there, and provided details on this. He said it was a practical application, even though it was not approved by NHDOT.

Mr. Levesque said that Option 2 made the same transition at the end of the concrete structure, but said that instead of going into a 2 rail system, it went into the w-rail, which would allow 100 feet of existing rail to stay in place. He demonstrate how this looked, and noted that the wood would be removed. He said that visibility was still reduced with this option because there was no space between the rails.

Councilor Harris asked if the two rail vehicular system on the left side was the same height all the way across the bridge.

Mr. Levesque said it was the standard 27” height, and across the bridge itself went up to 30” plus the additional 7 inches, which was the minimum required by state. He provided additional details on the design.

Councilor Smith noted that the rail on the outside was sufficient for protecting pedestrians, but was not sufficient to protect cars. He said the inside rail would protect vehicles.

Mr. Levesque provided details on Option 3.

Chair Sandberg said the abrupt end of the pedestrian rail seems stark, and asked why there was a different pedestrian rail in Option 1 as compared to Option 3. There was detailed discussion about this, and the cost aspects of it.

Administrator Selig asked how many feet from the end of the actual cantilevered walkway the pedestrian walkway extended.

Mr. Levesque said it currently extended 24 feet, but he proposed that it should extend 30 feet.

Chair Sandberg asked what the difference in cost was between the less expensive and more expensive pedestrian rail, and Mr. Levesque said it was \$8,700.

Councilor Smith asked several additional questions about the railings design, including the extent to which it provided vehicle protection, and there was discussion about this.

Councilor Needell said the length of the rail was 30 feet, but asked what the lengths of the segments of the rail were, and was told they were 6 ft apart over the bridge. He asked additional questions about the rail segments, including whether the railing system could be bent so it could follow the sidewalk.

Mr. Levesque said this could be done, and there was additional discussion about this.

Councilor Needell asked Mr. Levesque to comment on the fact that the design would not meet NHDOT standards.

Mr. Levesque said he could only speak to the fact that just because the system didn't meet NHDOT standards, there were a lot of other existing applications that didn't meet the standards either, such as the Oyster River Bridge. He said he didn't know what the implications of this were.

Councilor Needell said if someone hit the trash can end, which was to NHDOT standards, liability for the Town would not be an issue, and asked if the proposed design was put in place, if that would change the picture.

Mr. Levesque said the Town wouldn't be able to say the bridge work was built to standards.

Councilor Grant asked whether, since this was a State bridge, the State had to approve it. He noted the State had paid for 80% of the improvements.

Administrator Selig said that from the perspective of the State, the project was closed out, so any changes made were at 100% at the Town's cost. He said the State wouldn't participate in modifications, and wouldn't request a refund.

Councilor Grant asked if as part of the 80%, the State insisted on what the specifications should be, and signed off on the bridge as it stood today with the concrete walls. etc. He asked whether, in dramatically changing the top structure, the State would review the work again to say whether or not it met its standards.

There was discussion about this. Mr. Levesque said he felt the State would say the same thing he was telling the Council. He said it might come up with some alternative applications, which were safer, but would not be as aesthetic.

Administrator Selig said when the Town undertook to modify the bridge structure itself, it could modify it basically any way it wanted to, as long as it understood that this wouldn't meet the standards in place.

Mr. Levesque said the State was willing to participate as long as the Town understood the design did not meet State standards.

Councilor Smith said the issue was that the State was imposing regulations to the extent that a Town wanted to utilize its money, but didn't assert that it had any regulatory power over how a road should be designed so it was safe. He said the legislature had not provided for this.

Concerning the safety issue, Councilor Smith said his understanding was that the barrel ends were developed by engineers, as compared to the railing simply going into the ground, because otherwise a car going at a specified speed that hit the rail would be launched, as though the rail was a ramp. He said the barrel, on the other hand, would stop the car at that point. He said he assumed that from an engineering standpoint, the launch factor depended

on the speed and angle of the rail. He asked what the launch capacity was if cars were obeying the present 35 mph speed limit at that location.

Mr. Levesque said he didn't see it as a real safety issue at that location, and provided details on this. He said that if a car was going more than 35 mph, it probably couldn't make the corner anyway. He said at that particular intersection, there shouldn't be enough speed to make this application detrimental.

Councilor Grant said he was extremely troubled that they were talking about redesign of a bridge that would now not meet State standards. He noted that the Scammel Bridge had a concrete barrier, with a railing on top of it. He said he wasn't especially concerned with the pedestrian rail, but said there needed to be some State review for the center rail of the bridge.

Mr. Levesque provided clarification that the railing itself met NHDOT standards, and said he was only talking about the termination ends. He said that was why the height grew to 37 inches, and said the railing was crash tested. He said the only part that didn't meet the standard was the last 10 feet of transition, where the railing dipped into the ground. He provided additional details on these transition zones.

Councilor Grant said he was still concerned, noting that the agreement Hoyle Tanner wanted the Town to approve had disclaimed any liability for the approach rails and the termination ends. He noted that the agreement said the Town would take responsibility for the "substandard approach rails", and asked whether this was what the Town wanted to build, if it was substandard.

Councilor Harris asked for clarification from Mr. Levesque that this design was similar to what existed on the Oyster River Bridge, where the speed was greater. She also noted there was the option of reducing the speed to 20 mph from Dewey's Corner to beyond the bridge, to alleviate concerns about safety. She said this had been talked about at great length during the site visit, and Mr. Levesque had been asked multiple times if this would be a safe system, and had said several times that it would be.

Councilor Niman asked Administrator Selig if this was the liability issue he had referred to at the previous Council meeting, and was told it was. Councilor Niman also note that in the original bridge design, the concrete rail transitions into the w-rails, and asked what the rationale was for a double w-rail, and whether it could be a single w-rail.

Mr. Levesque said it could be, with an aluminum rail. He said the reason for the transition to the two w-rails was because of the concrete. He said a car would hit the first w-rail, would ride up to the second one, and so wouldn't hit the concrete abutment, which wouldn't move. He said it was a transition zone for impact. He said it was a different situation with the metal rail, noting that in this case, the whole rail would move, so the double w structure wasn't needed.

Councilor Smith asked Mr. Levesque for a briefing regarding what was called preferred Option 1.

Mr. Levesque said during the site walk, a question was asked as to what would happen if the Council chose Option 1 with the w-rail, and decided if didn't like it, and wanted to put the aluminum rail in. He provided technical and financial details on this option.

Mr. Lord said there seemed to be a lot of concern regarding whether they could meet the standard with blended rail into the ground. He said it was a modular system, and said there were several examples in the area of this kind of system. He provided details on one in Newmarket. He then described a design approach that might solve the problem.

Mr. Levesque said it would probably meet the standard, but was not sure how it would look visually.

Chair Sandberg asked if was unusual for a community to make a modification that didn't quite meet NHDOT standards but did meet general engineering practices regarding guard rails.

Mr. Levesque said that across the country, people were going crazy concerning box rail design, and said a key problem was that there were no crash tests for many alternative designs.

Chair Sandberg asked if, in his professional opinion, Mr. Levesque believed the proposed design was adequate for the application, and Mr. Levesque said yes.

Councilor Needell noted that the cost impact of deciding whether or not to be NHDOT compliant was minimal, and asked if it therefore made sense to pass on this issue of how to terminate the guard rails that evening, in order to allow more time to understand what they were getting into.

Mr. Levesque said the cost difference was minimal, and might be approximately \$500.

Chair Sandberg noted that if the Council approved Option 1, Mr. Levesque could come back to the Council with details on the design it would actually be installing, in the spring.

Mr. Levesque noted that the actual design, including the termination of the end of the rail would be developed with Hoyle Tanner.

Councilor Niman said the cost estimate for cutting the concrete was almost twice the cost of the bid received previously from a company in 2004, and asked why this was.

Mr. Levesque said he felt more comfortable using the State average bid guidelines, and said the point was to give a reasonable number for this.

Councilor Harris noted a recent project, Woodridge Field, had come in at half of what was estimated.

Chair Sandberg asked if the Council needed more information in order to make a determination.

Councilor Needell asked if removal of the rail would be done in house, and Mr. Levesque said it would.

Councilor Needell asked if there were any concerns about being able to handle this work in house, and Public Works Director Mike Lynch said there were no concerns about this.

Chair Sandberg thanked members of the Packers Falls Bridge Committee for the many hours they had spent on this issue.

Chair recognized Councilor Harris to offer a motion, since she was the Council's representative to the Packers Falls Bridge Committee. He said this motion could be subject to amendments.

Councilor Harris MOVED that the Durham Town Council hereby endorses Option 1, as recommended by the Packers Falls Bridge Committee and directs the Administrator to execute the draft Agreement between the Town of Durham and Hoyle Tanner Engineers to reflect the specific design specifications for Option 1 as presented to the Council on January 3, 2005. Councilor Smith SECONDED the motion.

Councilor Harris said the Council had received a petition with signatures from more than 500 citizens of Durham, which supported Option 1, and noted that 60 of the signatures were from valued past and present members of Town boards and committees. She said there had been large turnouts of positive testimonials at Council meetings, and the Town had received over 50 thoughtful letters from citizens favoring Option 1. She said the Lamprey River Advisory Committee and the Conservation Commission were also in support of this proposal.

Councilor Harris said the citizens were well aware there would be significant costs to renovate the bridge, and said the average house valued at \$330,000, would pay \$4.12 per year if the contingency fund was not applied to the project, and \$2.47 if it was applied. She said she believed she represented the wish of the majority of Durham citizens who loved the outdoors, and treasured the wild and scenic Lamprey River, and who had expressed their willingness to restore the bridge for now and future generations to enjoy. Councilor Harris said that, as Councilor Kraus had said on June 7th, places like Packers Falls were the cathedrals of Durham, and she asked the Council to endorse Option 1.

Councilor Smith said he planned to offer a series of amendments, but first wanted to discuss the basic issues. He said he was not interested in being too specific at this point, and said he did not want the Council to make this matter more difficult for the future. But he said he needed greater specificity concerning Option 1 in the Motion before them.

Chair Sandberg noted the motion was for the Council to endorse Option 1, not recommend it.

Councilor Smith noted in the last few weeks, including at the site walk, there had been discussion on where exactly the railing would end, on the upstream, Newmarket side. He said there had been similar discussions concerning the downstream side, and said some changes had been suggested. He said that based on discussion with Mr. Levesque, he

believed those suggested changes were incorporated, and said he would like him to explain these before he would vote to endorse this.

Councilor Smith said he was also concerned that this motion or any other motion to follow should provide specific direction with respect to funding. He said they although they did not know the precise cost, he wanted a cost figure put in any motion the Council voted on. He also said he wanted the motion to have provisions for specifying that the first out money, cash and in kind, would be the Hoyle Tanner contribution. He said the second out money should come from the \$15,000 from the Lamprey River Advisory Committee, assuming the Council met the condition of the Committee that all 3 railings would be altered. He said the third out money should be the un-encumbering of the \$50,000 contingency fund money, and the fourth out money, at the discretion of the Town Administrator, should be the other sums he had listed, subject to bonding, as compared to cash and in kind matters mentioned first.

Councilor Smith said the nub of the motion was that the Town should expend a substantial amount of money to make corrections. He said when someone sat on the Council, it becomes more difficult to spend other people's money than to spend one's own money. He said he intended to support the motion with the appropriate wording, not because he liked it. He said he would do this because in the end, for whatever the reasons were, important errors had been made on the bridge, with respect to important values. He said he respected those who didn't take the same view concerning the value of aesthetics, noting that society as a whole didn't put value on this. He said he wanted people who spoke against the repairs to know that he was not unsympathetic to their views.

Councilor Needell said he too had struggled tremendously with the issue. He said he would love to see the bridge corrected through Option 1, but said he had wrestled with how to pay for this, and the responsibility of the Council concerning spending taxpayer money. He said a piece that was not part of the motion was what the Council intended to spend, and said the true costs, and the tax impact, wouldn't be known until much further down the road. He asked if there was a mechanism for private donations for the bridge repairs, to offset the tax impact.

Administrator Selig said residents could do this, but said the question would be whether enough money could be raised in that manner. In answer to a question from Chair Sandberg regarding the process going forward, Mr. Selig provided details on this. He said the Town would provide Hoyle Tanner with a detailed description of what it wanted, and Hoyle Tanner would develop a design that the Packers Falls Bridge Committee and the Public Works Department would then review. He said feedback would be then be provided to Hoyle Tanner, and the firm would submit final drawings. He said the project would then be put out to bid, and after review, the Council would award the bid. Administrator Selig also provided details on what would happen, financially speaking, once the Town had exact numbers on what the project would cost.

Chair Sandberg said the issue before the Council was whether it wanted to endorse, in concept, Option 1, or some other option. He said a possible amendment would be to insert the words, "in concept, Option 1, at an estimated cost of.....", and then direct staff to go on to the next step in the process of getting Option 1 moving.

Administrator Selig explained that it had been challenging to come up with some finite plans for the Council to consider because there were so many options possible.

Councilor Needell said it was important that there was an opportunity for people to offset this cost. He said it was not a requirement, and it was not the neighborhood that should be doing this. But he said if some of the many people who had spoken out about the Bridge would like to step forward, to help offset concerns of some citizens about the financial impacts of the Bridge repairs, he would encourage them to do so.

Councilor Niman said he would like to amend the motion, and substitute an alternate motion in its place. He said he would recommend that the Council endorse Modification A, contained in a letter from Public Works Director Mike Lynch dated February 4, 2004.

Councilor Niman MOVED to amend the motion, and to move that the Town Council endorse the following modifications to the Packers Falls Bridge: the first modification includes modifying the bridge rail to lower the height by cutting off and recapping the existing concrete rail; and modifying the metal w-beam guard rail by removing all guard rails on the downstream side (east) to within twenty-five (25) feet on both bridge ends (north and south) at a cost estimated on February 4, 2004 as \$43,825.00. Councilor Van Asselt SECONDED the motion.

Councilor Niman said he agreed with Councilor Smith that there were two considerations, aesthetics and cost. He said as someone who lived in the area of the bridge, the aesthetics of the spot was very important to him. He said they went there over the summer, and said he liked the look of the rails, from the river, and said this was very important to them. He said his fear was that the pedestrian rail as proposed, would spoil the look of the bridge from the river, given the wonderful arch that was restored. He said he was not anxious to endorse anything that would potentially detract from the view of the bridge from the river.

He also said the design he was endorsing was a financially responsible way to correct some of the mistakes that had been made. He said the primary mistake in his opinion was that the concrete rails were too high and out of proportion, and said the reason why the concrete bridge looked dreadful to some people was because of this. He said Modification A would correct the primary aesthetic fault. He said he would love to get rid of the w-rail, noting it was ugly, but said if the amount of it could be reduced, he was willing to live with it in order to approach this in a financially sound way.

Chair Sandberg asked Administrator Selig if the letter from February 4th, 2004 had been considered by the Committee.

Administrator Selig said the Committee had discussed a number of alternatives, including this one, but said that because of the construction of the rails and the massiveness of them, the Committee felt it would be more prudent to remove them altogether.

Councilor Smith asked if the second page of the letter provided any more detail on the proposal, and there was discussion about this.

Councilor Harris said she didn't remember the Packers Falls Bridge Committee reviewing this idea, and asked that Beth Olshansky, Chair of the Committee, be asked about this

Ms. Olshansky said the Committee had considered this idea, and decided that cutting of the bridge involved great expense, to get a result that wasn't aesthetic, and didn't solve all the safety issues. She said lowering the rails would be safer, but said even if one could see the top of a vehicle during the day, the concrete and w-rail blocked the headlights at night, so there would still be a safety problem. She said the second issue was aesthetic, in that the concrete rail, the wood and the metal rails didn't work together.

Councilor Smith asked if the Committee had any visual images to show the option Councilor Niman was endorsing, and Ms. Olshansky said it did not because the Committee had not considered it to be an option.

Councilor Needell asked if there was any photographic renderings looking up at the Bridge from the water, for Option 1, and Mr. Lord said there was not.

Councilor Van Asselt said he had seconded the motion because he had come to the meeting not interested in spending much money on this. He said it seemed on first blush that the idea put forward by Councilor Niman achieved the goal of lowering the railings, so one could see the view of the river, and said the idea would also address the concerns about increased taxes. He said if these numbers were solid, they could not only cut down the railing, but could put in the pedestrian rail, all with just the money from the contingency fund. He said this was worth pursuing, but said he was not sure how to get there, at the late hour of the meeting.

Councilor Van Asselt MOVED to suspend the adjournment rule of 10:00 pm. Councilor Needell SECONDED the motion, and it PASSED 7-1, with Councilor Grant voting against it.

Chair Sandberg noted that the detail in the amendment to the motion might not be satisfactory for some Councilors, in which case the Council could move to postpone voting on it, pending review. He provided additional details on the process.

Councilor Van Asselt said he wasn't sure there were any fewer questions concerning the motion on Option 1 than there were for Councilor Niman's motion, but said he was not averse to postponing voting, and looking at the proposal further.

Councilor Smith said he was prepared to amend the original motion that evening, noting he hadn't wanted to do this until there was further discussion.

Councilor Needell said it was important to realize that this was the first time the Council had discussed the Packers Falls Bridge issue for quite some time, noting it had purposely held off discussion until some other matters were cleared up. He said it was therefore not inappropriate to have something like Councilor Niman's proposal brought up at this point, and said he was not prepared to dismiss or endorse the proposal. He said a major change was proposed, but said he would not be averse to learning more about it.

Chair Sandberg said one of the ways the Council functioned was to ask the Town Administrator to do research, and to sometimes form committees to do research. He said if members of the Council wished to push Modification A, etc., he would hope they would encourage the Packers Falls Committee to at least research and present it, so there would be detail in the proposal comparable to what was contained in Options 1, 2 and 3. He provided additional detail on how they could proceed.

Ms. Olshansky said it had just been brought to her attention that Modification A involved only cutting the pedestrian rail, which was why the cost was so low, and would leave the 45 inch rail on the roadside, which would block the view of the river.

Chair Sandberg asked Public Works Director Mike Lynch to describe the proposal he had made the previous February.

Mr. Lynch said the proposal was part of brainstorming on other possible alternatives to cutting down the rails completely. He said it was not in detail, and was not an engineering plan. He said it included cutting down all three rails, and said the thought was to get it down to a 36-42 inches in height, and then basically to form up the top of the rail system and re-pour a cap across the top. He said it was a fairly simple design, and noted the rest of the work was removal of the guard rail.

Administrator Selig said this proposal one of the pieces of information provided the previous February, and said if the Council wanted to move forward to look at this, a great deal more time would be needed to engineer it fully. He said the other options were basically ready to send out to bid. He noted the Committee had talked at great length about whether to maintain the concrete look, and opted not to go with it.

Councilor Smith said the figures in Modification A, as compared to preferred Option 1 in the 12/28 packet, were substantially different, in terms of the unit costs, and asked why this was the case.

Administrator Selig said the newer costs were based on the State bid numbers, which were considered more reliable.

Councilor Harris said she recalled that when the Council had discussed the possibility of maintain some concrete, some pictures were taken, noting she had brought some in for the Council. She said comparisons were made of what one would see through the concrete railings, even if they were cut down somewhat, vs. the metal double rail. She said the visibility was substantially different, so just cutting down the height of the concrete didn't solve the dilemma of tiny slits in the concrete, so the sight of the river was lost. Councilor Harris said she believed that was why the Committee had excluded this option as a possibility.

Councilor Needell asked if there was any confidence in the figures for concrete capping.

Chair Sandberg asked Mr. Lynch for his perspective on this.

Mr. Lynch provided details on how the figures had been developed.

Councilor Needell said his main question was whether the proposed idea would meet engineering standards.

Mr. Levesque said lowering the rails would make them non-crash tested, and said the Town would therefore have to take on the responsibility for this, much like for the termination rails. He said that logically, one would think the rails would be safe, but said they would not meet NHDOT standards.

Councilor Smith asked what Mr. Levesque's understanding was of how much would be cut off the top for Modification A.

Mr. Levesque said they were looking at bringing it down from 57 inches to 42 inches, and lowering the other rail to 34 inches. He noted again that it would no longer meet State standards because it had been modified and was therefore not crash-tested, but said it was not the height decrease itself that would be a problem.

Administrator Selig noted that a main reason this project had gone awry was that everyone had envisioned the view of the bridge from the river, and not the view of the river from the bridge. He said Councilor Niman's point was therefore an excellent one. He noted that the Committee had talked about this.

Councilor Harris said she disagreed. She said she had been a member of the Council that had done the original agreement of the idea of a historically represented bridge. She said it happened that the picture offered to the Council was from the river looking up, but said this was not the sole consideration by the public when aesthetic issues were discussed. She said the aesthetic appeal from the bridge, down the river, and the trails along the side of the river were definitely a part of the discussion.

Chair Sandberg said he would vote against this motion, and would encourage fellow Councilors to do so as well. He said that leaving the vertical posts as they were at present would not solve the sight line issues, and also said the narrowness of the posts was not addressed, so that the only thing addressed was the vertical component. He said the proposal didn't begin to address the concerns raised by members of the public. He said he had voted against this proposal previously because it was an ugly design. He said the current proposal was an inappropriate step, was wasteful of the Council's time, and was counter to the interests of the citizens who had spent so much time and interest on this project. He said he was emphatically against the motion.

The motion to amend the primary motion FAILED 6-2, with Councilors Van Asselt and Niman voting for it.

Councilor Grant MOVED to postpone deliberation and action on the original motion before the Council until the following week. Councilor Van Asselt SECONDED the motion.

Councilor Grant said substantial questions had been raised that evening, and also said the items raised by Councilor Smith needed to be included in the motion. He said there needed to be greater specificity in the motion. He said he also would like assurances in the motion, to the extent possible, that NHDOT requirements would be met. He said he personally could not vote to approve an engineering plan that did not meet these requirements.

Administrator Selig note the Items on the agenda for January 10th, and said they would eat up all of the time for that meeting. He agreed that the hour was late, but said talking about this issue the following week would bump the other items off the agenda.

Councilor Harris said she would oppose Councilor Grant's motion, because she had heard from Councilor Smith that he believe he could modify the original motion succinctly, to the Council's satisfaction. She said she hoped, given the amount of time that had already been spent on this issue in multiple public hearings, etc., that the Council could at least in concept endorse one of the Options that evening. She encouraged other Councilors to wait for Councilor Smith to offer his amendment.

Chair Sandberg said he also would vote against this motion, noting he believe the Council could be succinct, and move forward with a conceptual plan.

The motion to postpone FAILED 2-6, with Councilors Grant and Van Asselt voting for the motion.

The original motion read as follows:

Councilor Harris MOVED that the Durham Town Council hereby endorses Option 1, as recommended by the Packers Falls Bridge Committee, and directs the Administrator to execute the draft Agreement between the Town of Durham and Hoyle Tanner Engineers to reflect the specific design specifications for Option 1 as presented to the Council on January 3, 2005. Councilor Smith SECONDED the motion.

Councilor Smith MOVED to amend the original motion, - that the Durham Town Council hereby endorses Option 1, as recommended by the Packers Falls Bridge Committee, as further amended by the schematic plan marked with an X, and which has been prepared by the Town Engineer, dated 1/03/05, and directs the Town Administrator to execute the draft Agreement between the Town of Durham and Hoyle Tanner Engineers to reflect the specific design specifications for Option 1 as presented to the Council on January 3, 2005. Councilor Needell SECONDED Councilor Smith's motion.

Councilor Grant left the meeting at this time.

Councilor Smith said he simply wanted, at that time, that there be enough specificity so the Town Administrator would know what he was to do, and the Council would know what it was recommending.

Chair Sandberg asked if Councilor Smith would be interested in inserting the words "in concept" into the motion, so the Council would not be too specific at that point.

Councilor Smith said he had no problem with doing this as long as his other words were included.

Administrator Selig said it was important for the Council to realize it would have only one opportunity to tell Hoyle Tanner what it wanted, so this was more than just a concept.

Councilor Smith said he had agreed to include the words “in concept” because he saw no harm in them, because he believed his other wording suggestions accomplished what Administrator Selig said he needed.

Councilor Van Asselt asked what exactly he was voting on if he voted in favor of this motion, something in concept, or something more specific.

Chair Sandberg said his understanding was that when the Council approved something in concept, it was favoring one option over others. He said the proposal had numbers attached to it, and was similar to approving the Budget, in that there would be future opportunity to vote more specifically on funding aspects of the proposal.

Administrator Selig said voting for this motion would mean Option 1 was a go, and the agreement would be amended to reflect the specifics in the plan with the X on it. He said a design would be developed to reflect this plan, and said if the Council wished at that point, there could be further discussion on the design. But he said the modifications from that point on could only be minimal, such as modifying the termination points at the end of the railings.

Councilor Van Asselt asked if by voting yes on the motion, it meant the Town would go ahead with a \$131,000 change at Packers Falls.

Administrator Selig said a formal vote to go ahead with funding would come when the Council was asked to approve the bid that was chosen. He said at that time, the exact cost for the project would be known, and the funding sources would be identified. He said it would be his expectation that if the Council went ahead with Option 1 at the present meeting, it would be willing to fund the project when it came back in a few months. He noted that the Council at that time could decide it did not like the proposed funding plan, and could recommend amending the Capital budget. He said the vote at present would be to move forward with Option 1, and to support the cost in some way.

Councilor Needell noted the Council was presently considering whether to vote on an amendment to the original motion.

Councilor Smith referred to his earlier recommendation concerning the funding stream for the project, and said he would feel differently about the project if this were not followed. He also said he would feel differently if the \$13,000 savings from closing the bridge while the work was done was put back into the cost of repairing the bridge. He asked if Administrator Selig wanted the Council to hold off on any discussions on these matters.

Administrator Selig said in his mind, the \$13,000 in savings from closing the Bridge was included in the Option 1 that was being recommended.

It was agreed that wording concerning the road closing should be considered as a separate amendment.

Councilor Smith's motion to amend the original motion PASSED 5-2, with Councilor Niman and Van Asselt voting against it.

Councilor Smith MOVED to make a second amendment to the original motion, that it is the Council's intention that the total amount of the project not exceed \$131,020. The motion was SECONDED by Councilor Harris.

Councilor Smith said he understood that this was a cautious figure, not a firm figure. He said if it turned out to be a small amount more, this wouldn't change his position, but said if it was substantially more, the Council would have to re-think its position.

Councilor Needell said he would oppose this because the implication of it would be that they were making the decision that evening to close the road. He said he wasn't prepared to make that decision at that point. He said the \$13,000 savings was not sufficient for him to decide to close the road, and also said it would not impact whether he voted for or against Option 1. He said he would prefer not to accept that limitation at the moment.

Councilor Smith said in terms of possible inconvenience to people in the area, this had been polled, and he said he was assuming, from the Town's perspective, that it was an acceptable proposal.

Administrator Selig said it was acceptable concerning Town operations, and said the important issue was the possible impact on the neighborhood. He said residents were comfortable with the longer closure, and said his own perspective was that everyone had to shoulder the impact of the repairs to the bridge, and said closing the bridge, although inconvenient, was a way to drive down the cost.

Councilor Needell said his concern was the safety issues. He said he would like to hear from the Fire Department that this was acceptable to them, noting the reason for closing the bridge would be strictly monetary.

There was discussion about this, and Mr. Lynch noted the closure envisioned would be of much shorter duration because the amount of work required was less.

Councilor Needell asked if there was a way to close the bridge so that emergency vehicles could still have access to the bride, and Mr. Lynch said there was not. Councilor Needell said it was only for financial reasons that the bridge would be closed, and said he was not comfortable with the risk of doing so.

Councilor Harris said the Packers Falls Bridge Committee had addressed the question of closing the bridge, and on behalf of the Council, and had come to the conclusion that this would be a worthwhile savings, and would be adequately safe.

Councilor Smith said he would be happy to withdraw his motion if Administrator Selig gave any indication that he was uncomfortable with this.

Councilor Morong said he was opposed to the motion because he didn't see the point of putting a dollar amount on it at present.

Chair Sandberg noted that Option 1 already included monetary provisions, although noting that the Council would revisit the costs, once the bids came in.

Councilor Smith said the problem was that in the latest document, dated 12/28/04, Option 1 was \$144,020, and Alternate Option 1 was \$131,020.

Administrator Selig said Durham would work with the Town of Newmarket to cover that end of the Packers Falls Road during the construction periodic, so it should not be problematic. He said that was why he was comfortable with the idea of closing the bridge.

Chair Sandberg provided clarification that Councilor Smith was endorsing Option 1 at the \$131,020 level, not at \$144,020, and said that was the purpose of his motion.

The motion to amend FAILED 3-4, with Councilors Niman, Needell, Van Asselt and Morong voting it.

Councilor Morong said he wanted citizens to know how he felt about this whole issue. He said he was convinced that the residents of Durham had been assured that the bridge repairs would be aesthetically pleasing, and said he was quite sure that they were not, from any angle. He said he was convinced from the site walk that this was not a safe bridge. He said from a contractor's point of view, when he made mistakes or his subcontractors made mistakes, he had to swallow hard and accept responsibility, and said this was what should happen with the current situation with the bridge. He noted a positive idea that had come out that evening was to possibly raise some funds privately for the bridge repairs, and said this idea should be pursued, to help take away some of the sting for taxpayers.

Councilor Van Asselt said he would vote against the motion, and said he hoped others would respect his right to disagree. He said the bridge effort had been given a spin, and isolated from other projects, and said if the costs of it, along with other proposed projects in Town were totaled, there was suddenly a large budget, which meant large property taxes. He said he saw this as another project that increased property taxes, and said he was not prepared to raise taxes.

He also said a cost analysis were done, he wasn't sure the bridge project would rank very high on his list. He said that was a fair question to ask, when looking at all the possible projects, and said the amount proposed was too much for him. He said he wished there was an in-between option, and said he respected what others had to say. He said he had a history with the bridge, and cared about it, just as others did, but said he was against another \$131,000 in property taxes. He said if someone could give him another option, he would be glad to work on it. But he said he had to say no to the motion to go ahead with Option 1.

Councilor Needell said he was very sympathetic to concerns about the incremental costs of everything the Council did. He said he had struggled mightily concerning this project, but said he took the opposite view concerning the final impact of this project. He said he had wanted to vote against it from the philosophical perspective that it wasn't fair for the Council to impose this on the taxpayers. But he said there had been the constant reminder that this was a poorly done project, and that the process had broken down. He said he was not ready to drive over that bridge and regret that the Council hadn't taken the opportunity to fix it, and said for that reason it was worth the expenditure, and he was willing to take responsibility for it.

Councilor Smith said he had spent a great deal of time going through documentation concerning the project. He said he was absolutely convinced that very careful inspection of them demonstrated that the Town was intimately involved in making major mistakes. He said that was why he looked forward to recommendations from Administrator Selig, so these mistakes wouldn't happen again. He also noted that he did not buy into the analysis that said that the bridge repairs would cost no more than a donut and a cup of coffee for each taxpayer. He said one could not say this responsibly when one sat on the Council, because the costs added up.

The original motion PASSED 5-2, with Councilors Niman and Van Asselt voting against it.

Councilor Smith said that given the hour, he would not pursue a further motion on the order of funding, but said before all was said and done, his ultimate support for the project would be based on the order of funding he had recommended.

IX. Adjournment

Councilor Van Asselt MOVED to adjourn the meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Councilor Smith, and PASSED unanimously.

The meeting ADJOURNED at 11:00 PM.

Victoria Parmele, Minute Taker