	City of Auburn, Maine
	"Maine's City of Opportunity"
	Office of Planning and Development
To:	Auburn Planning Board
From:	Douglas M. Greene, AICP, RLA; City Planner DMG-
Date:	May 8, 2015
RE:	May 12 Planning Board Meeting

This month you'll be taking action on a Special Exception application at 204 Minot Avenue and a Preliminary Subdivision application for Woodbury Heights Subdivision, Phase 2.

Also in your packet is a summary spreadsheet for the FY16 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The Planning Board Code of Ordinance lists under Sec. 2-475. **Jurisdiction and authority** "In addition to the jurisdiction conferred on it by other provisions of state law and the ordinances of the city and in accordance therewith, the planning board shall have the following jurisdiction and authority:

(7) To offer its recommendations to the city council with regard to the compatibility of the city manager's proposed capital improvements program with the comprehensive plan.

Please come to the meeting with any comments you might have regarding this. I will be sending additional files relating to the FY 16 CIP via email.



AUBURN PLANNING BOARD MEETING

May 12, 2015 Agenda

6:00 P.M. - City Council Chambers (Auburn Hall)

1. ROLL CALL

2. MINUTES:

- A. Review and approval request of the March 10, 2015 meeting minutes
- B. Review and approval request of the April 14, 2015 meeting minutes

3. OLD BUSINESS:

A. None

4. NEW BUSINESS - PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. Jason Courbron, Land Use Consultant, an agent for John Vallieres, is seeking approval for a change in use from a gas station/service station to a used car auto sales/service station for property located at 204 Minot Avenue, pursuant to Chapter 60, Article 1 (Zoning in General) Section 60-3 (a, b) Purpose; Article XVI Administration and Enforcement, Division 2, Site Plan Review and Division 3, Special Exception.
- B. George Bouchles, Surveyor, and agent for Bouffard and McFarland Builders, is seeking approval for a major subdivision of 5 additional lots (lots 6-10), subsequent to 5 lots that were approved by the Planning Board at their March 10, 2015 meeting, for a property located at 113 Woodbury Road, pursuant to Chapter 60, Division 4 Subdivision; Sections 1359 and 1361, Subdivision of the Auburn Code of Ordinances.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT:

6. MISCELLANEOUS:

A. Planning Board recommendations to the city council with regard to the compatibility of the city manager's proposed capital improvements program with the comprehensive plan.

ADJOURNMENT:

Next scheduled meeting is on June 9, 2015 6 p.m. Council Chambers

City of Auburn, Maine

"Maine's City of Opportunity"

Office of Planning & Development

PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

To: Auburn Planning Board

From: Douglas M. Greene; AICP, RLA City Planner

Re: 204 Minot Avenue, Special Exception and Site Plan Review, Use Car Lot and Service Station

Date: May 12, 2015

I. PROPOSAL- Jason Courbron, Land Use Consultant, an agent for John Vallieres, is seeking approval to convert an old gas station into a used car auto sales/service station for property located at 204 Minot Avenue, pursuant to Chapter 60, Article 1 (Zoning in General) Section 60-3 (a, b) Purpose; Article XVI Administration and Enforcement, Division 2, Site Plan Review (Section 60-1277) and Division 3, Special Exception (Section 60-1336).

THE SITE- The property at 204 Minot Avenue is a narrow lot, bounded by Minot Ave. to the west, High Street to the south and Central Maine Railroad Right of Way to the north and east. It is currently an abandoned gas station/ service station. The Minot Avenue frontage is 230 feet in length and has 3 access drives with the High Street frontage being 78 feet in width with 1 access drive. The 10,018 sf. lot is predominately pavement or building with 9,536 sf. of impervious surface.

ZONING - The property is zoned General Business (GB) to which auto sales and auto repair is a special exception/site plan review and requires approval from the Planning Board.

- II. DEPARTMENT REVIEW- This plan was reviewed by the Plan Review Committee on April 23, 2015
 - a. Police- The Police Department expressed traffic safety concerns for the High Street entrance, especially given the close proximity to the railroad tracks.
 - b. Auburn Water and Sewer- At the Plan Review meeting of 4/23/15 it was mentioned that there are sewer limitations.
 - c. Fire Department- David O'Connell- Fire Prevention Officer, said, The size of the parking lot is too small for fire apparatus to enter and would have to block off Minot Avenue, if they had to respond.

- d. Engineering-The application material indicates the applicant intends to reduce the number and size of curb cuts into the property. This needs to be done with granite curbing and the adjacent sidewalk built up to match curb grade. Estimate approximately 80 LF of curbing needed. All work within the right of way will require bonding and an inspection fee to ensure the work is done properly.
- e. Planning and Development-. The Planning Staff has reviewed this request for the following items and include staff comments in the next section, III. Planning Board Action.
 - Compliance with the 2010 Comprehensive Plan.
 - Special Exception
 - Site Plan Review

III. PLANNING BOARD ACTION-

A. THE 2010 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - FUTURE LAND USE PLAN- 204 Minot Ave.

General Background- On page 73, Future Land Use is described in general terms, "The Future Land Use Plan <u>shows graphically how the City's land use policies apply to the land</u> <u>area of the community, and where and how growth and development should and should not be</u> <u>accommodated over the next decade</u>. The Future Land Use Plan is not a zoning map. It is intended to show, in a general sense, the desired pattern of future land use and development. The intention is that this Future Land Use Plan will guide near-term revisions to the City's zoning ordinance and maps to assure that the City's land use regulations are consistent with the policies set forth in this *Comprehensive Plan*. In addition, by designating transitional districts, the Future Land Use Plan is designed to guide future zoning changes when the circumstances become appropriate.

Organization of the Future Land Use Plan- (See map 1)

a. **Basic Growth Categories-** "For the purpose of the Future Land Use Plan, three basic growth categories are used based upon the standards set out by the state and the desired level of future development in the City. (page 74)

1. GROWTH AREAS – Areas where the City wants growth and development to occur. The anticipation is that most residential and non-redevelopment over the next ten years will occur in these growth areas.

 LIMITED GROWTH AREAS – Areas that are either essentially fully developed and therefore have limited development potential or that have vacant or under-utilized land where the City's desires a limited amount of growth and development over the next ten years.
 <u>RESTRICTED OR NON-GROWTH AREAS – Areas that are either unsuitable for</u> development or in which the City desires to see little or no growth and development over the next ten years. This particular property was discussed during the Comprehensive Plan process as being unsuitable for redevelopment due its small size and narrow shape.

b. Future Land Use Types- (See map 2)

The three categories of growth, limited growth, and restricted or non-growth specify where the City wants to accommodate growth and development and where it wants to discourage or

prohibit it. They do not specify how that development should or should not occur. <u>To do that</u>, <u>the Future Land Use Plan distinguishes among four types of areas based on the character of the</u> <u>area and the way in which development should (or should not) occur</u>. (Page 76)

- Type A- Development Areas
- Type B- Transition Area/Reuse/Development Areas- Developed areas where the City's policy is to encourage the type of use and/or pattern of development to change overtime. <u>New development, redevelopment, or the reuse of existing land and</u> <u>buildings that moves the area toward the desired future use is encouraged</u>. Some transition areas designated in the Future Land Use Plan identify the desired future use of the area, but the City's zoning may not be changed until a future point in time when development is appropriate – in a sense these are "planned future transition areas". The City's use of the term transition area differs from the way this term is use by the state in the Growth Management Law.
- Type C- Conservation/Stabilization Areas
- Type D- Protection/Reserve Areas

c. Future Land Use Plan Designation for 204 Minot Ave. (See map 3)

The property at 204 Minot Ave. is located in the <u>Gateway Transition District (GT)</u>. The <u>Gateway Transition District</u> is described on page 107 as follows:

RESTRICTED/NON-GROWTH AREAS (Basic Growth Category)

TYPE B: TRANSITION/REUSE/REDEVELOPMENT AREAS DESIGNATION: OPEN SPACE/CONSERVATION

Gateway Transition District (GT)

Objective – Establish attractive, green gateways to the downtown area through a combination of regulation and acquisition (see Figures 2.3 and 2.4). Within these areas, the City should limit new development and redevelopment, while acquiring property from willing sellers for fair market value. Once blocks of land are acquired, they should be redeveloped as public open space to create attractive, welcoming entrances to the in town area of the City. **Allowed Uses** – Existing developed properties within the Gateway Transition District should be allowed to continue to be used for their current use and be maintained. Existing nonresidential properties should be permitted to be expanded within strict limits. New development or redevelopment for residential or <u>commercial purposes should not be permitted</u>. After the existing buildings are removed, the allowed uses in the Gateway Transition District for new activity should be limited to recreational and open space uses, and facilities for providing public access to the river.

Development Standards – The standards for the Gateway Transition District should allow for the expansion of the gross floor area of existing nonresidential uses by up to ten (10) percent to allow for maintenance of the current use, but expansion of residential uses should not be permitted.

STAFF COMMENTS: While the 2010 Comprehensive Plan is not regulatory document, it is a guide to land use and future zoning directions. In the case 204 Minot Ave., it's designation as Gateway Transition District in the Future Land Use Plan includes numerous community backed policy directives to become a green, welcoming gateway into the downtown and to not allow commercial redevelopment. A substantial amount of private and public investment in the Minot Avenue corridor has taken place. For example; Agreens exterior renovation, Mechanics Savings Bank redevelopment, including TIF funded streetscape and sidewalk improvements and TIF

funding for the South Goff Street connection to Minot Avenue. The property at 204 Minot Avenue has been considered to be abandoned for over 5 years and redevelopment should not be permitted.

B. SPECIAL EXCEPTION-

Sec. 60-1335. Approval required.

The planning board may approve for development those land uses listed as special exceptions under the terms of the zoning ordinance. The determinations of the board shall be in harmony with the expressed intent of the zoning ordinance and with the expressed major purpose of the city master development plan. Special exceptions shall be allowed only when they will substantially serve public convenience and welfare and will not involve dangers to health or safety.

STAFF COMMENTS: It is the Staff's opinion that this special exception application does not meet the expressed major purpose of the City Master Development Plan (Comprehensive Plan). The 2010 Comprehensive Plan executive summary on page xi, states, "Enhance the gateways into the City (Washington Street, Riverside Drive, Minot Ave.) including improved standards for development along these roads."

Sec. 60-1336. Conditions.

- (a) As conditions prerequisite to the granting of any special exceptions, the board shall require evidence of the following:
 - (1) That the special exception sought fulfills the specific requirements, if any, set forth in the zoning ordinance relative to such exception.
 - (2) That the special exception sought will neither create nor aggravate a traffic hazard, a fire hazard or any other safety hazard.
 - (3) That the special exception sought will not block or hamper the master development plan pattern of highway circulation or of planned major public or semipublic land acquisition.
 - (4) That the exception sought will not alter the essential characteristics of the neighborhood and will not tend to depreciate the value of property adjoining and neighboring the property under application.
 - (5) That reasonable provisions have been made for adequate land space, lot width, lot area, stormwater management in accordance with section 60-1301(14), green space, driveway layout, road access, off-street parking, landscaping, building separation, sewage disposal, water supply, fire safety, and where applicable, a plan or contract for perpetual maintenance of all the common green space and clustered off-street parking areas to ensure all such areas will be maintained in a satisfactory manner.
 - (6) That the standards imposed are, in all cases, at least as stringent as those elsewhere imposed by the city building code and by the provisions of this chapter.
 - (7) That essential city services which will be required for the project are presently available or can be made available without disrupting the city's master development plan.
- STAFF COMMENTS: It is the Staff's opinion that granting the Special Exception will create a traffic hazard, will block or hamper the Master Plan Development Plan's recommended acquisition of 204 Minot Avenue as per condition 3 and will not allow for required landscaping due to the inadequate land space (small non-conforming lot size).

C. SITE PLAN REVIEW-

Sec. 60-1276. - Purpose.

The purpose of site plan review is to ensure that the design and layout of certain developments permitted by special exceptions, or other developments noted herein, will constitute suitable development and will not result in a detriment to city, neighborhood or the environment.

Sec. 60-1277. - Objective.

In considering a site plan, the planning board shall make findings that the development has made provisions for:

(1) Protection of adjacent areas against detrimental or offensive uses on the site by provision of adequate surface water drainage, buffers against artificial and reflected light, sight, sound, dust and vibration; and preservation of light and air;

(2) Convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement within the site and in relation to adjacent areas;

- (3) Adequacy of the methods of disposal for wastes; and
- (4) Protection of environment features on the site and in adjacent areas.

Sec. 60-1304. - Same—Public hearing; findings.

The planning board shall, within 30 days of receipt of a completed application, hold a public hearing. Notice of a hearing shall be given in the manner provided for in division 3 of article XVII of this chapter. The planning board will take final action on the site plan within 60 days of receiving a completed application, or within such other time limit as may be mutually agreed to. Such final action shall consist of either:

- (1) A finding and determination that the proposed project will constitute a suitable development and will not result in a detriment to the neighborhood or the environment; or
- (2) A written denial of the application stating the reasons for such denial, upon a finding that:
 - a. The provisions for vehicular loading, unloading and parking and for vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site and onto adjacent public streets will create hazards to safety.
 - b. The bulk, location or operation of proposed buildings and structures will be detrimental to and adversely affect the use and values of existing development in the neighborhood or the health or safety of persons residing or working therein.
 - c. The provisions for on-site landscaping are inadequate to screen neighboring properties from unsightly features of the development.
 - d. The site plan does not adequately provide for the soil and drainage problems which the development may give rise to in accordance with section 60-1301(14).
 - e. The provisions for exterior lighting create safety hazards for motorists traveling on adjacent streets, or are inadequate for the safety or occupants or users of the site, or will create a nuisance affecting adjacent properties.
 - f. The proposed development will unduly burden off-site sewer drainage or water systems.
 - g. The proposed development will create a fire hazard by failing to provide adequate access to the site, or to buildings on the site, for emergency vehicles.
 - h. The proposed development violates provisions of the zoning regulations applicable to the site or other applicable laws, regulations or ordinances.
 - i. The proposed development will unduly impact the ability to provide municipal services.

Sec. 60-1305. - Same—Subject to conditions, modification, restrictions, etc.

Approval may be made subject to conditions, modifications and restrictions as the planning board may deem necessary; and any construction, reconstruction, alteration or addition shall be carried on only

in conformity to such conditions, modifications or restrictions and in conformity with the application and site plan.

STAFF COMMENTS: The Staff reports the following concerns regarding the Site Plan.

- 1. Angled parking is in the wrong direction of traffic flow on south side lot.
- 2. Curbing at entrances needs to be replaced.
- 3. Need specific landscape plan information.
- 4. As per Chapter 60-607- (13, d) Off Street Parking- requires a 10 foot landscape buffer in any front yard adjacent to a street right of way.
- 5. Fire Department has concerns about the inability of fire apparatus to get into the site and consequently block traffic on Minot Ave.
- 6. The driveway spacing on High Street (40 feet) and the Minot Ave. driveway closest to the High and Minot intersection (90 feet) does not meet the driveway spacing requirement of Chapter 60-800 of 105 feet for a 25 mph highway speed.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION- The Staff recommends **DISAPPROVAL** and makes the following findings for the Special Exception application for an Auto Sales and Auto Repair Use the following reasons:

- 1. Granting the Special Exception will block or hamper the Master Plan Development Plan's (2010 Comprehensive Plan) recommended acquisition of 204 Minot Avenue as a gateway to downtown Auburn.
- 2. The inadequate land space (small non-conforming lot size) does not allow for required 10 foot landscaping buffer along the Minot Avenue road frontage.
- 3. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan included a Future Land Use Category of Gateway Transition whose objective is, "Establish, attractive green gateways to the downtown area through a combination of new development and acquisition. Within these areas, the City should limit new development and redevelopment, while acquiring property from willing sellers for fair market value."
- 4. The property at 204 Minot Ave. is located in the Gateway Transition District in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Designations, which is listed as a Restricted or Non-Growth area in the organization of the Future Land Use Plan.
- 5. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan also describes the Gateway Transition District as a Transition Area/Reuse/Development area, which states "New development, redevelopment, or the reuse of existing land and buildings that moves the area toward the desired future use is encouraged."
- 6. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan also designates the Gateway Transition Area as an Open Space/Conservation Area.
- 7. The property at 204 Minot Ave. is a documented as vacant and its former use as a gas station and auto service station has been abandoned. (See attached letter dated 4/2/10)
- 8. The property owner was notified by staff of the Gateway Transition Land Use Designation prior to purchasing.
- 9. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan further states in "allowable uses" in The Gateway Transition Area that "New development <u>or redevelopment for</u> residential or <u>commercial</u> <u>purposes should not be permitted</u>.

- A. With regards to the applicant's compliance to the Site Plan Ordinance, Chapter 60-60-1277, Should the Planning Board approve the Special Exception application, the Staff recommends **Postponement** until the applicant addresses the following conditions:
 - 1. Angled parking is in the wrong direction of traffic flow on south side lot.
 - 2. Curbing at entrances needs to be replaced.
 - 3. Need specific landscape plan information.
 - 4. As per Chapter 60-607- (13,d) Off Street Parking- requires a 10 foot landscape buffer in any front yard adjacent to a street right of way.
 - 5. Fire Department has concerns about the inability of fire apparatus to get into the site and consequently block traffic on Minot Ave.
 - 6. The driveway spacing on High Street (40 feet) and the Minot Ave. driveway closest to the High and Minot intersection (90 feet) does not meet the driveway spacing requirement of Chapter 60-800 of 105 feet for a 25 mph highway speed.
 - 7. Restricted and or Non-Growth Area.

Application is not in harmony with the Master Development Plan (Comprehensive Plan)

Douglas M. Greene, A.I.C.P., R.L.A.

Douglas M. Greene, A.I.C.P., R.L.A. City Planner

DRAFT MOTIONS:

The Planning Board makes a motion of **DISAPPROVAL** with the following findings for the Special Exception application for an Auto Sales and Auto Repair Use the following reasons:

- 1. Granting the Special Exception will block or hamper the Master Plan Development Plan's (2010 Comprehensive Plan) recommended acquisition of 204 Minot Avenue as a gateway to downtown Auburn.
- 2. The inadequate land space (small non-conforming lot size) does not allow for required 10 foot landscaping buffer along the Minot Avenue road frontage.
- 3. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan included a Future Land Use Category of Gateway Transition whose objective is, "Establish, attractive green gateways to the downtown area through a combination of new development and acquisition. Within these areas, the City should limit new development and redevelopment, while acquiring property from willing sellers for fair market value."
- 4. The property at 204 Minot Ave. is located in the Gateway Transition District in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Designations, which is listed as a Restricted or Non-Growth area in the organization of the Future Land Use Plan.
- 5. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan also describes the Gateway Transition District as a Transition Area/Reuse/Development area, which states "New development, redevelopment, or the reuse of existing land and buildings that moves the area toward the desired future use is encouraged."
- 6. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan also designates the Gateway Transition Area as an Open Space/Conservation Area.
- 7. The property at 204 Minot Ave. is a documented as vacant and its former use as a gas station and auto service station has been abandoned. (See attached letter dated 4/2/10)
- 8. The property owner was notified by staff of the Gateway Transition Land Use Designation prior to purchasing.
- 9. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan further states in "allowable uses" in The Gateway Transition Area that "New development <u>or redevelopment for</u> residential or <u>commercial</u> <u>purposes should not be permitted</u>.

With regards to the applicant's compliance to the Site Plan Ordinance, Chapter 60-60-1277, should the Planning Board approve the Special Exception application, the Staff recommends a the following conditions be addressed:

- 1. Angled parking is in the wrong direction of traffic flow on south side lot.
- 2. Curbing at entrances need to be replaced.
- 3. Add specific landscape plan information.
- 4. As per Chapter 60-607- (13,d) Off Street Parking- requires a 10 foot landscape buffer in any front yard adjacent to a street right of way.
- 5. Fire Department has concerns about the inability of fire apparatus to get into the site and consequently block traffic on Minot Ave.
- 6. The driveway spacing on High Street (40 feet) and the Minot Ave. driveway closest to the High and Minot intersection (90 feet) does not meet the driveway spacing requirement of Chapter 60-800 of 105 feet for a 25 mph highway speed.



MAPI



Approved 4/19/2011

MAP 2

City of Auburn Comprehensive Plan - 2010



Approved 4/19/2011

77

MAP 3





City of Auburn Comprehensive Plan - 2010

Chapter 2: Future Land Use Plan

Attached letter from 4/2/10 City of Auburn, Maine "Maine's City of Opportunity" Office of Planning & Permitting NOTICE OF VIOLATION / ORDER TO CORRECT April 2, 2010 VIA FIRST CLASS AND CERTIFIED MAIL **RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED** Leemilts Petroleum, Inc. C/O Getty Petroleum Mkt., Inc. ATTN: Ms. Pat Butler 1500 Hempstead Turnpike East Meadow, NY 11554 RE: Getty Gas Station / 204 Minot Avenue – Auburn Maine / Property ID # 230-159.

Dear Ms. Butler:

I am writing in regard to the above referenced property herein after referred to as "the Property." As you know, the Getty Gas Station / store at the above referenced property has been closed and vacant since approximately 2003. The ground sign for the former business still remain on the property in a damaged and deteriorating condition. When the store closed the advertizing panels were removed and the signage area was covered by a tarp. The tarp has experienced significant deterioration, has exposed the sign to the elements and is exceptionally unsightly. The signs are also in violation of Chapter 29, Section 4.2.A.8 and 4.2.A.10 which reads as follows:

- 8. No sign which advertises or calls attention to any products, businesses or activities which are no longer sold or carried on shall remain on the premises for more than six months after the product, business or activity has ceased being sold or carried on.
- 10. Signs legally erected before the adoption of this Ordinance which do not conform to the provision of this Ordinance may continue to be maintained, provided, however, that no such sign shall be permitted if it is, after the adoption of this Ordinance, enlarged, reworded (other than in the case of theater or cinema signs or signs with automatic or manually changing messages), redesigned or altered in any way excluding repainting in a different color, except to conform to the requirements of this Ordinance; and provided further that any such sign which has deteriorated to such an extent that the cost of restoration would exceed thirty-five percent of the replacement cost of the sign at the time of restoration shall not be repaired, rebuilt or altered except to conform to the requirements of this Ordinance with respect to any sign which:

60 Court Street • Suite 104 • Auburn, ME 04210 (207) 333-6600 Voice • (207) 333-6601 Automated • (207) 333-6625 Fax www.auburnmaine.org

- a. Shall have been abandoned for at least 12 consecutive months;
- b. Advertises or calls attention to any products, businesses or activities which are no longer sold or carried on, whether generally or at the particular premises; or
- c. Shall not have been repaired or properly maintained within thirty (30) days after notice to that effect has been given by the municipal officer charged with enforcement.

Therefore, in accordance with Chapter 29, Section 4.2.A.8 and 4.2.A.10 you are hereby ordered to remove the sign related to the former business from the property by not later than May 2, 2010. Failure to comply with the above will leave the City no alternative but to take legal action.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 333-6600 Extension # 1156 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

David C.M. Galbraith Director of Planning, Permitting and Code Enforcement

CC: Property File

"Vallieres Auto Sales and Service"

204 Minot Avenue, Auburn Tax Map 230, Lot 159

Prepared For: John Vallieres 18 Vallieres Lane Durham, Me 04222

April 10, 2015

Prepared By:



528 River Road · Greene, ME 04236-4103 · P. (207) 946-4480 · F. (207) 946-4483 * contact@surveyworksinc.com · www.surveyworksinc.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Application Letter

Agent Authorization Letter

Estimate of Project Cost

Banking Summary of Funds Available

Development Review Check List

Development Review Application

Special Exception Narrative

Sign Permit Application

Commercial Building Permit

Source Deed & Tax Assessors Information Card

Current Site/Building Photo

Auburn Parcel Map with Locations of Like Businesses

Preliminary Plan Reduction

SurveyWorks, Incorporated Land Use Consultants www.surveyworksinc.com

April 13, 2015

Douglas Greene, City Planner Planning & Permitting Department City of Auburn 60 Court Street Auburn, ME 04210

RE: Vallieres Auto Sales and Service 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn – Map 230, Lot 159

Mr. Greene,

SurveyWorks, Inc. is pleased to represent Mr. John Vallieres in this application for Special Exception/Site Plan permitting. The site located at 204 Minot Avenue in Auburn was, for many years, the Getty Gas/ Service Station. The site is a flat site with no restrictive geological features. The total area of the existing building and lot is 9,536'±.

Mr. Vallieres is proposing a change of use of the existing 1,215 square foot building from a gas/service station to a used auto sales/service station. The westerly 1/3 of the building will be used as an office and sales department, while the easterly 2/3 of the building will contain 2 bays for servicing vehicles. In addition, the proposal calls for a net reduction of impervious areas with some pavement and gravel being removed and landscaped to add green space. Except for the added green space, the proposal calls for no significant changes to the site other than a reduction in curb cuts for enhanced traffic safety.

We will be available at the planning board meeting scheduled May 12, 2015 to answer in more detail any of your questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Courbron, Project Manager

February 5, 2015

SurveyWorks, Inc. 528 River Road Greene, ME 04236

RE: <u>Agent Authorization for John Vallieres Auto Outlet</u> 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn, Maine.

To whom it may concern:

I hereby authorize SurveyWorks, Inc. to act on my behalf as my agent in the processing of any required application, and to furnish, upon request, supplemental information in support of this application. I have also retained SurveyWorks, Inc. to act as my agent at any and all Planning Board meetings related to this project.

SurveyWorks, Inc. authorization ends December 31, 2015.

Sincerely, John Vallieres

Estimated cost to complete project: 204 Minot Avenue

Interior office	\$3,200.00
Pavement of back of property	\$7,500.00
Replace retaining wall	\$1,500.00
Plant green area for City of Auburn	\$1,000.00
Misc. items	\$2,000.00

\$15,200.00

Please see the attached copy of my bank statement as proof that I have the funds available to complete this pr

tothe latheres

CyberBranch

Account Summary

Options	Edit 🔀 2 Holds				0360
Actions	Account	Туре	Number	Available	Balance
Deposit Ac	counts				
	O PRIME SHARE	Savings	XXXXXX0625-S00	\$230.97	\$2,263.14
	CLASSIC CHECKING	Checking	XXXXXX0625-S71	\$17,467.67	\$17,467.67
			Deposit Acc	ounts – Sub Total:	\$19,730.81
Loans and	Credit Cards				
iii († ⊡	SHARE SECURED make payment – due 4/15/2016	Loan	XXXXXX0625-L11		\$7.17
© ★ 🖂	SHARE SECURED VISA make payment – due 4/25/2015	Credit	XXXXXX0625-L80	\$11.23	\$1,973.77
			Loans and Credit (- Cards – Sub Total:	\$1,980.94
Account Su	ummary Total				
			ŀ	All Accounts Total:	\$17,749.87

800-750-0959 | Fax: (207) 330-4099 Routing and Transit number — 211287463

Five County Credit Union Home Learn about SSL Certificates Federally Insured By NCUA



Additional coverage up to \$250,000 provided by Excess Share Insurance Corporation, a licensed insurance company.



- Current time is 4/2/2015 11:48:01 AM - 0 - W1 -



Development Review Checklist City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement



<u>THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS REQUIRED WHERE APPLICABLE TO BE</u> <u>SUBMITTED FOR AN APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETE</u>

PROJECT NAME: Vallieres Auto Sales and Service

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS and PARCEL #: 204 Minot Avenue - Map 230 Lot 159

Required Information		Check Su	bmitted	Applie Ordin	
Site Plan		Applicant	Staff	Lewiston	Auburn
	Owner's Names/Address		Х		
Auto Outlet	Names of Development	*	Х		
	Professionally Prepared Plan		Х		
	Tax Map or Street/Parcel Number		X		
	Zoning of Property		X		
	Distance to Property Lines	*	Х		
	Boundaries of Abutting land		X		
Add to zone note	Show Setbacks, Yards and Buffers	*			
	Airport Area of Influence (Auburn only)		N/A		
	Parking Space Calcs		Х		
	Drive Openings/Locations		Х		
	Subdivision Restrictions		N/A		
Describe in building	Proposed Use	*	x		
	PB/BOA/Other Restrictions		N/A		
Make Appointment	Fire Department Review	* To be pro	vided by	Planning D	epartmer
	Open Space/Lot Coverage		N/A		-
	Lot Layout (Lewiston only)		N/A		
	Existing Building (s)				
	Existing Streets, etc.				
	Existing Driveways, etc.				
	Proposed Building(s)				
	Proposed Driveways				
_andscape Plan					
	Greenspace Requirements		Х		
	Setbacks to Parking		N/A		
	Buffer Requirements		N/A		
	Street Tree Requirements		N/A		
	Screened Dumpsters		N/A		
	Additional Design Guidelines		N/A		
	Planting Schedule		N/A		

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department - 60 Court Street, Suite 104 -Auburn, ME 04210-Tel. (207)333-6601

City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement - 27 Pine Street-Lewiston, ME 04240-7201 -Tel. (207)513-3125

1

Required Information		Check Su	ıbmitted	Appli Ordin	
Site Plan		Applicant	Staff	Lewiston	Auburn
Stormwater & Erosion Control Plan					
See attached narrative. We	Compliance w/ chapter 500		N/A		
are increasing the pervious	Show Existing Surface Drainage		N/A		
area. There are no additiona			N/A		
proposed site improvements	Location of Catch Basins, etc.		N/A		
increasing stormwater and	Drainage Calculations		N/A		
erosion control	Erosion Control Measures		N/A		
	Maine Construction General Permit		N/A		
	Bonding and Inspection Fees	*To be pro	vided by	Planning I	epartmer
	Post-Construction Stormwater Plan		N/A		
	Inspection/monitoring requirements		N/A		
	Third Party Inspections (Lewiston only)		N/A		
Lighting Plan					
See narrative	Full cut-off fixtures		Х		
	Meets Parking Lot Requirements		Х		
Traffic Information					
	Access Management		Х		
	Signage		Х		
Ask Eric	PCE - Trips in Peak Hour				
	Vehicular Movements		N/A		
	Safety Concerns		N/A		
	Pedestrian Circulation		N/A		
	Police Traffic		N/A		
	Engineering Traffic		N/A		
Utility Plan					
	Water		Existing		
Need letters from John	Adequacy of Water Supply		Existing		
	Water main extension agreement		N/A		
	Sewer		Existing		
	Available city capacity		Existing		
	Electric		Existing		
	Natural Gas		Existing		
	Cable/Phone		Existing		
Natural Resources					
	Shoreland Zone		N/A		
	Flood Plain		N/A		
	Wetlands or Streams		N/A		
	Urban Impaired Stream		N/A		
	Phosphorus Check		N/A		
	Aquifer/Groundwater Protection		N/A		
	Applicable State Permits	Х			

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department - 60 Court Street, Suite 104 -Auburn, ME 04210-Tel. (207)333-6601

2

City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement - 27 Pine Street-Lewiston, ME 04240-7201 -Tel. (207)513-3125

Required Information		Check Su	ıbmitted	Applic Ordina	
0% 84					
Site Plan		Applicant	Staff	Lewiston	Auburn
	No Name Pond Watershed (Lewiston only)		N/A		
	Lake Auburn Watershed (Auburn only)		N/A		
	Taylor Pond Watershed (Auburn only)		N/A		
Right Title or Interest					
	Verify		Х		
	Document Existing Easements, Covenants, etc.		х		
Technical & Financial					
Capacity					
	Cost Est./Financial Capacity	х			
	Performance Guarantee	*To be det	ermined	by Planning	Board
State Subdivision Law					
	Verify/Check		N/A		
	Covenants/Deed Restrictions		N/A		
	Offers of Conveyance to City		N/A		
	Association Documents		N/A		
	Location of Proposed Streets & Sidewalks		N/A		
	Proposed Lot Lines, etc.		N/A		
	Data to Determine Lots, etc.		N/A		
	Subdivision Lots/Blocks		N/A		
	Specified Dedication of Land		N/A		
Additional Subdivision Standards					
	Single-Family Cluster (Lewiston only)		N/A		
	Multi-Unit Residential Development (Lewiston only)		N/A		
	Mobile Home Parks		N/A		
	Private Commercial or Industrial Subdivisions (Lewiston only)		N/A		
	PUD (Auburn only)		N/A		
A JPEG or PDF of the proposed site plan					
Final sets of the approved plans shall be submitted digitally to the City, on a CD or DVD, in AutoCAD format R 14 or greater, along with PDF mages of the plans for archiving					

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department - 60 Court Street, Suite 104 -Auburn, ME 04210-Tel. (207)333-6601

3

City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement - 27 Pine Street-Lewiston, ME 04240-7201 -Tel. (207)513-3125



Development Review Application

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement



PROJECT NAME:____Auto Outlet

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS: 204 Minot Avenue

PARCEL ID#: Map 230 Lot 159

REVIEW TYPE:

Site Plan ⊠ Subdivision □ Site Plan Amendment □ Subdivision Amendment □

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Convert an old gas station into a used car dealership

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Applicant	Property Owner
Name: SurveyWorks, Inc.	Name: John Vallieres
Address: 528 River Road, Greene	Address: 18 Vallieres Lane, Durham
Zip Code 04236	Zip Code 04222
Work #: 946-4480	Work #:
Cell #:	Cell #: 240-7350
Fax #: 946-4483	Fax #:
Home #:	Home #:
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com	Email: john.vallieres@yahoo.com
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com	
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com Project Representative	Other professional representatives for the
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com Project Representative Name: George A. Courbron	Other professional representatives for the project (surveyors, engineers, etc.),
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com Project Representative Name: George A. Courbron Address: 528 River Road, Greene	Other professional representatives for the project (surveyors, engineers, etc.), Name:
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com Project Representative Name: George A. Courbron Address: 528 River Road, Greene Zip Code 04236	Other professional representatives for the project (surveyors, engineers, etc.), Name: Address:
Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com Project Representative Name: George A. Courbron Address: 528 River Road, Greene Zip Code 04236 Work #: 946-4480	Other professional representatives for the project (surveyors, engineers, etc.), Name: Address: Zip Code
	Other professional representatives for the project (surveyors, engineers, etc.), Name: Address: Zip Code Work #:

Email:

Email: contact@surveyworksinc.com

PROJECT DATA

The following information is required where applicable, in order complete the application

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA/RATIO

Existing Total Impervious Area	9536.2±	sq. ft.
Proposed Total Paved Area	4614.0±	sq. ft.
Proposed Total Impervious Area	623.1±	sq. ft.
Proposed Impervious Net Change	8913.1±	sq. ft.
Impervious surface ratio existing	100	% of lot area
Impervious surface ratio proposed	93	% of lot area
BUILDING AREA/LOT		
COVERAGE		
Existing Building Footprint	1215	sq. ft.
Proposed Building Footprint	1215	sq. ft.
Proposed Building Footprint Net change	0	sq. ft.
Existing Total Building Floor Area	1215	sq. ft.
Proposed Total Building Floor Area	1215	sq. ft.
Proposed Building Floor Area Net Change	0	sq. ft
New Building	no	_(yes or no)
Building Area/Lot coverage existing	13	_% of lot area
Building Area/Lot coverage proposed	13	% of lot area
ZONING	General Business	
Existing	N/A	_
Proposed, if applicable		-
LAND USE		
Existing	Commercial	_
Proposed	Commercial	
RESIDENTIAL, IF APPLICABLE	27.12	
Existing Number of Residential Units	N/A	_
Proposed Number of Residential Units	N/A	_
Subdivision, Proposed Number of Lots	N/A	_
PARKING SPACES		
Existing Number of Parking Spaces	0	
Proposed Number of Parking Spaces	4	
Number of Handicapped Parking Spaces	1	
Proposed Total Parking Spaces		_

ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT

DELEGATED REVIEW AUTHORITY CHECKLIST

SITE LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Existing Impervious Area	9536.2	sq. ft.
Proposed Disturbed Area	4000	sq. ft.
Proposed Impervious Area	9536.2	sq. ft.
1 If the proposed disturbance is greater than and same	then the ann line at all	

1. If the proposed disturbance is greater than one acre, then the applicant shall apply for a Maine Construction General Permit (MCGP) with MDEP.

- 2. If the proposed impervious area is greater than one acre including any impervious area crated since 11/16/05, then the applicant shall apply for a MDEP Stormwater Management Permit, Chapter 500, with the City.
- 3. If total impervious area (including structures, pavement, etc) is greater than 3 acres since 1971 but less than 7 acres, then the applicant shall apply for a Site Location of Development Permit with the City. If more than 7 acres then the application shall be made to MDEP unless determined otherwise.
- 4. If the development is a subdivision of more than 20 acres but less than 100 acres then the applicant shall apply for a Site Location of Development Permit with the City. If more than 100 acres then the application shall be made to MDEP unless determined otherwise.

TRAFFIC ESTIMATE

Total traffic estimated in the peak hour-existing (Since July 1, 1997)

____passenger car equivalents (PCE)

Total traffic estimated in the peak hour-proposed (Since July 1, 1997)_____passenger car equivalents (PCE) If the proposed increase in traffic exceeds 100 one-way trips in the peak hour then a traffic movement permit will be required.

uired/Allowed	Provided		
10000 sq ft /	9536.2± sq ft		
100' /	297.92'		
25' /	2'		
35' /	0'		
25' /	95' <u>+</u>		
45' /	15' <u>+</u>		
Sales & Services/	Used Car Dealership		
ace/per <u>squa</u>	re feet of floor area		
	/		
	/	/	
6.010			
NOIf yes, watersl	ned name		
	100' / 25' / 35' / 25' / 45' / e Sales & Services / pace/ per	100' / 297.92' 25' / 2' 35' / 0' 25' / 95'± 45' / 15'± e Sales & Services / Used Car Dealership pace/ persquare feet of floor area /	100' / 297.92' 25' / 2' 35' / 0' 25' / 95'± 45' / 15'± e Sales & Services / Used Car Dealership pace/persquare feet of floor area /

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMISSION

Submissions shall include fifteen (15) complete packets containing the following materials:

- Full size plans containing the information found in the attached sample plan checklist.
- 2. Application form that is completed and signed.
- 3. Cover letter stating the nature of the project.
- 4. All written submittals including evidence of right, title and interest.
- 5. Copy of the checklist completed for the proposal listing the material contained in the submitted application.

Refer to the application checklist for a detailed list of submittal requirements.

L/A's development review process and requirements have been made similar for convenience and to encourage development. Each Citys ordinances are available online at their prospective websites:

<u>Auburn:</u> www.auburnmaine.org under City Departments/ Planning and Permitting/Land Use Division/Zoning Ordinance <u>Lewiston:</u> http://www.ci.lewiston.me.us/clerk/ordinances.htm</u> Refer to Appendix A of the Code of Ordiances

I hereby certify that I am the Owner of record of the named property, or that the owner of record authorizes the proposed work and that I have been authorized by the owner to make this application as his/her authorized agent. I agree to conform to all applicable laws of this jurisdiction. In addition, I certify that the City's authorized representative shall have the authority to enter all areas covered by this permit at any reasonable hour to enforce the provisions of the codes applicable to this permit.

This application is for development review <u>only</u>; a Performance Guarantee, Inspection Fee, Building Permit Application and other associated fees and permits will be required prior to construction.

110
115
10

DATE: 3/17/2015

TO: Auburn Planning Board

Below is a brief narrative explaining how the **Special Exception** application at <u>204 Minot Avenue</u> will meet the guidelines of Chapter 60, Section 1336 of the Auburn Zoning Ordinance

Sec. 60-1336. Conditions.

- (a) As conditions prerequisite to the granting of any special exceptions, the board shall require evidence of the following:
 - (1) That the special exception sought fulfills the specific requirements, if any, set forth in the zoning ordinance relative to such exception.

(Answer): All of the specific requirements of the General Business District have been met or are not applicable due to the fact that, besides new pavement, no new structures or additions are to be part of this project.

(2). That the special exception sought will neither create nor aggravate a traffic hazard, a fire hazard or any other safety hazard.

(Answer): All chemical hazards have been eliminated with the removal of all underground and above ground pumps, petroleum storage tanks prior to purchasing the property. This proposed change of use is not adding any more traffic or any new hazards than had previously been part of this site. The change of use will actually lessen the amount of traffic to and from this site as compared to when the site was being used as a gas station. Additionally, for many years people have consistently used the High Street entrance of this site as a cut through to avoid waiting at the light to turn onto Minot Avenue. With the change of on-site traffic flow and the reduction of curb cuts, the ability to cut through would no longer be available, reducing potential accidents. Please also note that this change of use is consistent with other businesses in the area, as shown on the Auburn Parcel Map showing locations of similar businesses at the end of this application request, and will not draw additional traffic.

(3) That the special exception sought will not block or hamper the master development plan pattern of highway circulation or of planned major public or semipublic land acquisition.

(Answer): As part of this project, we are creating green spaces that will be in the view of the people entering this section of the city. The master development plan states what the lot should look like and that it should be viewed as a visual welcoming to the down town portion of Auburn. We feel we can achieve this and still use the existing building and parking area for a business that is much more appealing than its previous use.

(4) That the exception sought will not alter the essential characteristics of the neighborhood and will not tend to depreciate the value of property adjoining and neighboring the property under application.

(Answer): This change of use will not alter the characteristics of the neighborhood except for the landscaping needed to meet the needs of the master development plan. These changes will only better the neighborhood with the city's plan in mind.

(5) That reasonable provisions have been made for adequate land space, lot width, lot area, stormwater management in accordance with section 60-1301(14), green space, driveway layout, road access, off-street parking, landscaping, building separation, sewage disposal, water supply, fire safety, and where applicable, a plan or contract for perpetual maintenance of all the common green space and clustered off-street parking areas to ensure all such areas will be maintained in a satisfactory manner.

(Answer): This lot is an existing lot of record and has been for a very long time. With no new changes in lot configuration, the reduction of impervious areas, and no change in the use or location of utilities, this project is ensuring that all will be maintained in a satisfactory manner, better than its previous use.

(6) That the standards imposed are, in all cases, at least as stringent as those elsewhere imposed by the city building code and by the provisions of this chapter.

(Answer): All standards of this project are as stringent as those standards elsewhere imposed. Special exceptions are made due to the fact that this is a grandfathered lot and any variances needed are due to existing features that may or may not meet current code, namely entry ways and setbacks to the project which have been in existence and used for fifty years. All other aspects of this change of use do adhere to the City of auburn Land Use and Building Codes.

(7) That essential city services which will be required for the project are presently available or can be made available without disrupting the city's master development plan.

(Answer): All essential city services are already in existence from the site's previous use and if any changes are to be made they would be minor and not disrupt the City of Auburn's Master Development Plan.



CITY OF AUBURN SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION

2. Location of building (if any) 4. D Property Owner: John Vallieres Owner Address of Sign: 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn Instal Business Name: Auto Outlet Instal	e: <u>GB</u> Fee:
1. Lot size and shape 3. Lot 2. Location of building (if any) 4. D Property Owner: John Vallieres Owner Address of Sign: 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn Install Business Name: Auto Outlet Install	ocation of sign. Distance of sign from side lines & road travel way
2. Location of building (if any) 4. D Property Owner: John Vallieres Owner Address of Sign: 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn Instal Business Name: Auto Outlet Instal	Distance of sign from side lines & road travel way
Property Owner: John Vallieres Owner Address of Sign: 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn Instal Business Name: Auto Outlet Instal	
Address of Sign: 204 Minot Avenue, Auburn Instal Business Name: Auto Outlet Instal	ner Address: 18 Vallieres Lane, Durham, ME
Business Name: Auto Outlet Instal	
	ller:
	Iller Phone #:
Business Owner: John Vallieres Busin	ness Phone #:
Business Mailing Address:	
Please attach a sketch or rendering of each sign.	
TYPE OF SIGN A	ND DIMENSIONS
Permit Fee for Each Sign = (Sign area in square feet x \$	(50.50) + \$25 per sign. (Rounded up to nearest dollar)
Wall Sign(s): Number of signs: 3 Dimensions of Sign 1: 3 x 5 Dimensions of Sign 2: 2 x 4 Method of Support: 1. metal post 2 & 3. A	
Dimensions of Sign 1: <u>3</u> x <u>5</u>	Dimensions of Sign 3: 3×6
Dimensions of Sign 2: 2×4	Dimensions of Sign 4: x
Method of Support: <u>1. metal post</u> 2 & 3. A	Anchored to the building
Are any of the signs: Projecting Roof Illumin	nated <u>1</u> Reflective <u>2 & 3</u> Non-illuminated
**Note: For electrified signs, the Sign Permit will	
obtained by a licen	nsed electrician.
Ground Sign(s): Number of signs:	Dimensions of Sign 6: x
Dimensions of Sign 5: x	Dimensions of Sign 7: x
Method of Support:	
Projecting Sign: Height from under side of sign to grou	und
Ground Sign: Overall height of sign	
Height under sign to ground	
Roof Sign: Height of sign Height from under side of sign to roof	
VALUE O	
Value of Sign 1:Sign 2:	_Sign 3:Sign 4:
Sign 5:Sign 6:Sig	gn 7:TOTAL:
** Note: If the above property is not owned by the	e applicant the signature of the property owned
must be obtained prior t	
Signatures: OWNER	APPLICANT
RMR 3.22.13	



60 Court Street Auburn, Maine 04210 Tel: (207) 333-6601 ext. 1158 Fax: (207) 333-6625



Permit No: CB-6135-2013

Work Class: Alterations Status: Issued

Expiration Date: 12/05/2014

Permit Information					
Job Address		Parcel:	230159000	Square Feet:	0
204 MINOT AV		District:	City of Auburn	Valuation:	\$ 2,500.00
AUBURN, ME 0421	0	Issue Date:	12/5/2013		
escription of Work	- Mar 1944 -		an constants for any first martine description from the transformer for the property stands for the international		
Opening up & remodel	ing office				
Additional Info	e fan men en fan fin de fin die fin die fan de weeren en weeren fan die fan de sen en weeren.				
Front Setback: 25.00	Rear Setback: 35.00	Side Setback: 25.00	Shoreside Setback: 0.00		
Contacts Type Owner	Contact Name John Vallieres		Address 18 Vallieres Ln Durham, ME 04222		Business Phone
Contractors	Contact Name	an an ana amin' sa anna Analais a an	Address	an a	Business Phone
Type Contractor	Contact Name		Address		Business Filone
ermit Conditions					
	neet the standards of MU Edition, and NFPA 101, 3		State of Maine Internal	COMMENTS	
All Property Line Setba	acks shall be met				
Invoice Number: Commercial Alteratio Invoice Total:		Invoice Nun Check 505 So Commercia		spections	

IMPORTANT: APPLICATION IS HEREBY MADE TO THE BUILDING OFFICIAL FOR A PERMIT SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS SET FORTH ON THIS APPLICATION AND THE FOLLOWING:

Approved By

Invoice Fees Paid:

lust

ely Doustout

\$43.00 \$43.00

The City's approved plans and permit inspection card must remain on the job site for use by City inspection personnel. 1.

Fe

SHORT FORM QUITCLAIM DEED WITH COVENANT

LEEMILT'S PETROLEUM, INC., A New York Corporation, having a place of business at 125 Jericho Turnpike, Ste 103, Jericho, NY 11753, for consideration paid, grants to **John M. Vallieres** whose mailing address is 18 Vallieres Lane, Durham, ME 04222, with Quitclaim Covenant, the premises located in the City of Auburn, County of Androscoggin and State of Maine, as described on **EXHIBIT A** attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Meaning and intending to convey the same premises as conveyed in a deed from David Brewster dated October 28, 1986, and recorded in the Androscoggin County Registry of Deeds in Book 2005, Page 297 on October 29, 1986.

Grantee is purchasing the premises in its "AS IS WHERE IS" condition and shall assume all responsibility and liability with respect to the condition of the premises and shall comply with all environmental laws, rules and regulations. Grantee shall be responsible for and shall defend, indemnify and hold Grantor and its parent and affiliated companies and their successors and assigns harmless from and against all claims, actions, losses, demands, judgments, damages or liabilities (including, without limitation, reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements), injuries, fines, payments, administrative orders, consent agreements, penalties, cost and expenses of any kind whatsoever brought with respect to any and all environmental conditions and contamination on, under or related to the premises and from Grantee's failure to comply with or to remediate the premises in accordance with all applicable laws, rules and regulations, including, without limitation, with respect to the use of underground storage tanks on the premises and for any contamination related to or emanating from such underground storage tanks or their associated piping, lines and motor fuel dispensing systems, and their compliance with applicable laws. The foregoing obligations and indemnity of the Grantee shall be deemed a covenant running with the land and shall be binding on the Grantee, its successors and assigns, and any subsequent purchasers or owners of the premises.

Grantee agrees that the premises shall not be used, in whole or in part, (i) as an automobile service station, petroleum station, gasoline station or for the purpose of conducting or carrying on the business of selling, offering for sale, storage, handling, distributing or dealing in petroleum, gasoline, motor vehicle fuel, diesel fuel, kerosene, benzol, naphtha, greases, lubricating oils, or any fuel used for internal combustion engines, or lubricants in any form, or other petroleum or petroleum-related products customarily associated with service stations (provided however that may sell, store, and use motor vehicle fuel and lubricants in limited amounts which are customary in connection with the operation of automobile repair facilities of similar size), or (ii) for a period of thirty (30) years following the date hereof, for residences of any type, places of worship, bed and breakfast facilities, rooming houses, hospitals, nursing homes or similar geriatric facilities, child care, playground or recreational area, schools (or any similar use which is intended to house, educate or provide care for children, the elderly or the infirm), agricultural uses, or the construction or installation of any water wells for drinking or food processing. These covenants and use restrictions shall bind the Grantee, its successors and assigns, future owners of

the premises and the premises itself, and shall be deemed covenants running with the land and each portion thereof.

IN WITNESS whereof, the said LEEMILT'S PETROLEUM, INC. has caused this instrument to be executed by $\underline{\text{JOShua DiCLOV}}_{\text{duly authorized, this 25Th}}$ day of September , 2012.

-10X

LEEMILT'S PETROLEUM, INC.

Bv Its:

STATE OF NEW YORK County of Nassau, ss.

ptember 25_,2012

8ËÄL

Then personally appeared the above-named \underline{Joshua} \underline{DiClen} in his/her capacity as $\underline{Sr} \cdot \underline{VicePresident}$ of LEEMILT'S PETROLEUM, INC., and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his/her free act and deed in said capacity and the free act and deed of said corporation.

Before me iliné

Notary Public

CHRISTINE FITTER Notary Public, State of New York No. 4948579 Qualified in Sumoik County Certified in Nassau County Commission Expires March 20, 20

Printed Name

EXHIBIT A

A certain parcel of land and buildings situated in the City of Auburn, in the County of Androscoggin and State of Maine, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point of intersection, at or near Valuation Station $191.1 \pm$ and twelve (12) feet westerly of the present location of the westerly rail of the main track and right-of-way of the Railroad as shown on Valuation Section V-2, Sheet 23 of Federal Valuation Survey Plan of June 30, 1916 (said Valuation Plans are on file in the office of the Chief Engineer, Maine Central Railroad Company, Administration Building, Rigby Road West, P.O. Box 9701, Portland, Maine 04104). Said point being on the northerly sideline of High Street, so-called;

Thence southwesterly along the northerly sideline of said High Street a distance of seventy-eight (78) feet, more or less, to a point of intersection with the easterly sideline of Minot Street, so-called;

Thence northwesterly along the easterly sideline of said Minot Street a distance of ninety (90) feet, more or less, to a point;

Thence continuing northerly along the easterly sideline of said Minot Street a distance of one hundred fifty (150) feet, more or less, to a point;

Thence easterly at right angles to said Minot Street, on a line a distance of forty (40) feet, more or less, to a point, said point lying twelve (12) feet westerly of the present location of the westerly rail of the main line track and right-of-way of the Railroad as previously described;

Thence southerly on a line always twelve (12) feet from and parallel to said westerly rail a distance of two hundred (200) feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, meaning and intending to convey 10,000 square feet, more or less.

Excepting and reserving, however, those parcels of land affected by certain Layouts and Takings as set forth in instruments recorded in the Androscoggin County Registry of Deeds in Book 2077, Page 313, and Book 2466, Page 193.

. 1

ANDROSCOGGIN COUNTY TINA M CHOUINARD REGISTER OF DEEDS

. ..

Unofficial Property Record Card - Auburn, ME

	(General Property	Data			
Parcel ID 23	0-159	Acc	ount Number 23015	9000		
Prior Parcel ID						
Property Owner VALLIERES JOHN M		Property Location 204 MINOT AV				
			Property Use AUTO			
Mailing Address 18	VALLIERES LN	Most Recent Sale Date 9/25/2012				
		Leg	al Reference 8501-1	55		
City DU	JRHAM	Grantor LEEMILTS PETROLEUM INC,				
Mailing State M	E Zip 04222	Sale Price 39,600				
ParcelZoning		Land Area 0.230 acres				
	Curr	ent Property Ass	essment			
Card 1 Value Building Value	48,800 Xt	ra Features 6,000	Land Value 91,700	Total Value 146,500		
Card 1 Value Building Value Value	48,800 Xt	Building Descrip		Total Value 146,500		
Card 1 Value Building Value Building Style COM		value		Total Value 146,500 Flooring Type N/A		
Value		Building Descrip				
Building Style COM		Building Descrip		Flooring Type N/A		
Building Style COM # of Living Units 0	Μ	Foundation Type SLAB Frame Type MASONRY	tion	Flooring Type N/A Basement Floor N/A		
Building Style COM # of Living Units 0 Year Built 1960	M	Foundation Type SLAB Frame Type MASONRY Roof Structure FLAT	tion	Flooring Type N/A Basement Floor N/A Heating Type FORCED H/A		
Building Style COM # of Living Units 0 Year Built 1960 Building Grade AVER	M	Foundation Type SLAB Frame Type MASONRY Roof Structure FLAT Roof Cover TAR+GRAV	rel ck	Flooring Type N/A Basement Floor N/A Heating Type FORCED H/A Heating Fuel OIL		
Building Style COM # of Living Units 0 Year Built 1960 Building Grade AVER Building Condition Avera	M	Foundation Type SLAB Frame Type MASONRY Roof Structure FLAT Roof Cover TAR+GRAV Siding CONC BLO	rel ck	Flooring Type N/A Basement Floor N/A Heating Type FORCED H/A Heating Fuel OIL Air Conditioning 0%		

sale was an auction 2012

Narrative Description of Property

This property contains 0.230 acres of land mainly classified as AUTO with a(n) COMM style building, built about 1960 , having CONC BLOCK exterior and TAR+GRAVEL roof cover, with 0 unit(s), 0 room(s), 0 bedroom(s), 0 bath(s), 0 half bath(s).



Disclaimer: This information is believed to be correct but is subject to change and is not warranteed.



SHTONS April 3, 2015 WINBERLEY WY MAN OF DR 2 Parcels BRIARCU 5 Mananda NUNSIASIASIA NV THESENH N ONVERSED A \mathbb{P} HAMPION T L OURIS N ON DAD 179 High Street 150 Minot Avenue 204 Minot Avenue 8 GOODRICH 2 SINNNOS 2 NY NY OLEAHS Nº 3015TUH SHANAN HILLSIDEAV URRY ST ED FARM HI NY NO BISSIN SSHAW ALIBURN HIS IPUTI HAZELST Т Map Map Мар VATNU 1001 Contraction KENNEDYAV 230 Lot 230 Lot 230 Lot (1Ad M 153804) 157 -160 159 ROEST 15 NOSIGWW DRAAR RY 15 83TH I T Webster Trading Company (also Budget Rentals) Coastal John Vallieres - Formerly SOUTH G RoG 0 15 F Trading and Pawn WASHINGTON ST.NORTH VA TONIM R HUTCHINGST MYRTLEST SPRING DRUMMOND ACADEMYS PLEASAN HIGH a Getty Gas U, INE'S MOR SOINAHO HITS HIN NIAM MAINST LAUREL AV Station MILLER'ST MAI LS ANDRAN NIVW HLDOS MILL

чыров G I I T 8 9 54 Washington St 81 Minot Avenue \sim Washington St Washington S T North North North I Map – Мар T Ι 230 Lot Мар Map 230 Lot 220 Lot 220 Lot 99 171 - East Coast Auto Sales 94 -84 Godin's Auto Sales I Hart's Classics, Scott Thayer Auto Sales Inc (used Car dealership)

Auburn Parcel Map

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, TomTom, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community






City of Auburn, Maine

"Maine's City of Opportunity"

Office of Planning & Development

PLANNING BOARD STAFF REPORT

To: Auburn Planning Board

From: Douglas M. Greene; AICP, RLA City Planner

Re: Woodbury Heights Subdivision- Phase 2- Major Subdivision

Date: May 12, 2015

I. PROPOSAL-

George Bouchles, Surveyor, and agent for Bouffard and McFarland Builders, is seeking approval of a major subdivision of 5 additional lots (lots 6-10), subsequent to 5 lots that were approved by the Planning Board at their March 10, 2015 meeting for a property located at 113 Woodbury Road, pursuant to Chapter 60, Division 4 Subdivision; Sections 1359 and 1361, Subdivision of the Auburn Code of Ordinances.

This property had a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment approved by the Planning Board and City Council to change its Future Land Use from Agriculture/Rural to Low Density Residential. The property is entirely zoned Low Density Rural Residential (LDRR).

All the 5 proposed lots (lots 6-10) are located along Woodbury Road. A 60 foot future right of way (with tapers- 100 foot wide at Woodbury Road) space has been reserved midway along Woodbury Road for a possible future road, which could serve the interior part of the site and potentially connect to Danville Corners Road.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION-

The 57 acre property has road frontage on Danville Corner Road and Woodbury Road. Danville Corner Road is straight, improved road while Woodbury Road is a lesser quality road with portions being gravel and parts paved. There are steeper slopes on the rear western portion of the property, a cleared former pasture in the center and the rest of the property being wooded. A petroleum pipeline transects the property as well. Currently, based on the first phase approval and recording of 5 lots, a home on lot 1 is under construction on 2 other driveways have been permitted.

II. DEPARTMENT REVIEW-

This plan was reviewed by the Plan Review Committee on April 23, 2015.

- a. <u>Police</u>- No comments were received from Police.
- b. <u>Auburn Water and Sewer District</u>- John Storer, Director of the Auburn Water and Sewer District had no concerns.
- c. Fire Department- David O'Connell, Fire Safety Inspector-
 - "Main Road into complex will need to be graded appropriately for fire apparatus to enter, depending on the way the road is laid out; turning radius will need to be looked at so the trucks can turn around."
- d. Engineering-
 - Drive Opening Permits and Fill Permits will be required for development on each lot.
 - The land to be retained by the owners would appear to be a non-conforming lot, lacking the required frontage on an accepted street.
- e. <u>Lewiston Auburn Airport</u>- A portion of the property is included in an "Area of Approach for Aircraft". Rick Lanman, LA Airport Manager requested that the applicant complete FAA Form 7640 to ensure compliance with FAA regulations.
- f. <u>Planning and Development</u>- The Planning and Development Department has the following comments:
 - The 24.62 acre, internal lot labeled "Land to be Retained by Owners" does not meet the Low Density Rural Residential District street frontage requirement of 250 feet. The applicant should resolve this issue when a Final Subdivision Plan is submitted.
 - Application Comments-
 - Section 1 Cover Letter Re: lists plan as "Minor Subdivision Plan". Change to "Major".
 - Section 8- Correct "All lots will be located on <u>Woodbury Road</u>."
- III. PLANNING BOARD ACTION- the Planning Board is being asked to review this <u>Preliminary Subdivision Plan</u> application using Chapter 60- Sections 1359, 1361 and 1365 Division 4 Subdivision, of the Auburn Code of Ordinances. A Preliminary Subdivision Plan, if recommended for approval, will then require the filing of a Final Subdivision plan.
 - A. Sec. 60-1359. (Subdivision) Guidelines.

When reviewing any subdivision for approval, the planning board shall consider the following criteria, and before granting either approval or denial, shall determine that the proposed subdivision:

- (1) Will not result in undue water, air or noise pollution. In making this determination it shall at least consider:
 - a. The elevation of land above sea level and its relation to the floodplains, the nature of soils and subsoils and their ability to adequately support waste disposal;

- b. The slope of the land and its effect on effluents;
- c. The availability of streams for disposal of effluents; and
- d. The applicable state and local health and water resources regulations, including stormwater management requirements in accordance with section 60-1301(14);
- (2) Has sufficient water available for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the subdivision;
- (3) Will not cause an unreasonable burden on an existing water supply, if one is to be utilized;
- (4) Will not cause unreasonable soil erosion or reduction in the capacity of the land to hold water so that a dangerous or unhealthy condition may result;
- (5) Will not cause unreasonable highway or public road congestion or unsafe conditions with respect to use of the highways or public roads existing or proposed;
- (6) Will provide for adequate sewage waste disposal;
- (7) Will not cause an unreasonable burden on the ability of a municipality to dispose of solid waste and sewage if municipal services are to be utilized;
- (8) Will not have an undue adverse effect on the scenic or natural beauty of the area, aesthetics, historic sites or rare and irreplaceable natural areas;
- (9) Is in conformance with a duly adopted subdivision regulation or ordinance, comprehensive plan, development plan, or land use plan, if any; (See Staff comments and condition # 3)
- (10) Is funded by a subdivider has adequate financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of this section;
- (11) Will not adversely affect the character of the surrounding neighborhood and will not tend to depreciate the value of property adjoining the neighboring property under application;
- (12) Has provisions for on-site landscaping that are adequate to screen neighboring properties from unsightly features of the development;
- (13) Will not create a fire hazard and has provided adequate access to the site for emergency vehicles;
- (14) Will not, alone or in conjunction with existing activities, adversely affect the quality or quantity of groundwater;
- (15) Does not have long-term cumulative effects of the proposed subdivision will that unreasonably increase a great pond phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision.

The Staff's finds that the Application submitted for Woodbury Heights, Major Subdivision needs to address criteria # 9 as set forth in Section 60-1359.

B. Sec. 60-1361. - Major Preliminary Subdivision.

- (a) The application for approval of the preliminary plan shall be accompanied by a fee in the amount per lot, up to 100 lots, provided in the city fee schedule, payable by check to the city.
- (b) The applicant shall secure approval from the tax assessor for a lot numbering sequence that is compatible with the existing system.
- (c) The subdivider, or his duly authorized representative shall attend the meeting of the planning board to discuss the preliminary plan.

- (d) Upon receiving an application, the planning department shall issue to the applicant a dated receipt. Upon receiving an application, the planning department shall notify by mail all abutting property owners of the proposed subdivision, specifying the location of the proposed subdivision and a general description of the project.
- (e) The planning board shall within 30 days of receiving the completed application, hold a public hearing on the preliminary plan. The city shall publish a public hearing notice in conformance with section 60-1474. Abutters shall also be specifically notified of this hearing by the municipality. Failure of any petitioner or property owner to receive such mailed notice of such a zoning hearing shall not necessitate another hearing and shall not constitute grounds for objections by such petitioner or property owner and shall not invalidate any recommendation by the planning board.
- (f) When granting preliminary approval to the preliminary plan, the planning board shall state the conditions of such approval, if any, with respect to:
- (1) The specific changes which it will require in the final plan;
- (2) The character and extent of the required improvements for which waivers may have been requested and which in its opinion may be waived without jeopardy to the public health, safety and general welfare.
- (g) <u>Preliminary approval of a preliminary plan shall not constitute approval of the final plan</u>, but rather it shall be deemed an expression of approval of the design submitted on the preliminary plan as a guide to the preparation of the final plan. The final plan shall be submitted for approval of the planning board and for recording upon fulfillment of the requirements of these standards and the conditions of the preliminary approval, if any. Prior to approval of the final subdivision plan, the planning board may require additional changes as a result of new information obtained at the public hearing. The board by majority vote may determine if a public hearing is necessary at this time for final plan review.

The Staff's finds that the Application submitted for Woodbury Heights, Major Preliminary Subdivision meets the criteria set forth in Section 60-1361.

C. Sec. 60-1365. - General Requirements.

In reviewing applications for the subdivision of land, the board shall consider the following general requirements. In all instances the burden of proof shall be upon the persons proposing the subdivision.

- (1) Subdivision plan shall conform to the comprehensive plan. Any proposed subdivision shall be in conformity with the comprehensive plan of the city and with the provisions of all pertinent state and local codes and ordinances. (See Staff comments and condition # 3)
- (2) Preservation of natural and historic features. The board may require that a proposed subdivision design include a landscape plan that will show the preservation of existing trees and vegetation, graded contours, streams and the preservation of scenic, historic or environmentally desirable areas. The street and lot layout shall be adapted to the topography. Extensive grading and filling shall be avoided as far as possible.
- (3) Lots.
 - a. The lot size, width, depth, shape and orientation and the minimum building setback lines shall be appropriate for the location of the subdivision and for the type of development and use contemplated. (See Staff comments and condition # 3)
 - b. Depth and width of properties reserved or laid out for all purposes shall be adequate to provide for off-street parking and service facilities for vehicles required by the type of use and development contemplated.

The Staff's finds that the Application submitted for Woodbury Heights, Minor Subdivision needs to address the criteria (1 and 3a) set forth in Section 60-1365.

IV. STAFF RECOMMENDATION-

> The Staff recommends APPROVAL of the Preliminary Subdivision for Woodbury Heights, Lots 6-10 with the finding that it meets the requirements of Chapter 60, Sections 1359, 1361 and 1365 of the Auburn Zoning Ordinance.

This recommendation of **APPROVAL** is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant shall secure approval from the tax assessor for a lot numbering sequence to ensure compatibility with the existing tax system. The numbering system will not be construed to indicate anything more than identification of parcels for taxation purposes.
- 2. The applicant shall, within six months after the approval of the preliminary plan file a final plan with the Planning Board.
- 3. The applicant shall address the lot requirements for the 24.62 acre remaining lot at the time of the Final Subdivision Plan.

Douglas M. Greene, A.I.C.P., R.L.A.

City Planner

"WOODBURY HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION - PHASE 2" A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION

SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

PREPARED FOR B&M DEVELOPERS, INC.

DATED: April 10, 2015



prepared by



191 Madison Street – Auburn, ME 04210 office-207-689-3232 cell–207-240-5567 e-mail – gsb@cadmasterr.com

CAD Drafting, Land Surveying and Septic Design

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(in order of presentation)

SECTION 1 Cover Letter

SECTION 2

City of Auburn Development Review Application Development Review Checklist

> SECTION 3 Proof of Ownership (source deed)

SECTION 4

Site Maps

(portions of) Maine Atlas & Gazetteer Map City of Auburn Tax Map U.S.G.S. Topographic Map Flood Insurance Rate Map Web Survey Soils Map

SECTION 5

Preliminary Soils Report and Soils Log

SECTION 6 Wetlands Report

SECTION 7

Supportive Documentation Letter from Well Drilling Letter of Financial Capacity

SECTION 8

Preliminary Stormwater Report

SECTION 9 Plan Reductions



CADmaster

 191 Madison Street
 - Auburn, ME 04210

 office-207-689-3232
 cell-207-240-5567

 e-mail – gsb@cadmasterr.com

 CAD Drafting, Land Surveying and Septic Design

April 10, 2015

Auburn Planning Board City of Auburn 60 Court Street Auburn, Maine 04210

"Woodbury Heights - Phase 2" - 5 Lot Residential Subdivision RE: Danville Corner Road & Woodbury Road Auburn, Maine **Minor Subdivision Application**

Dear Planning Board Members:

On behalf of Mr. Gary McFarland & Mr. Reggie Bouffard, please find attached an application for a Major Subdivision Application and supportive documentation for review and approvals of a five (5) lot residential subdivision to be located on the Woodbury Road in the City of Auburn.

Briefly, Mr. McFarland and Mr. Bouffard c/o B&M Developers, Inc. propose to subdivide a portion of a 57.39 acre parcel of land they jointly own located on the Danville Corner Road and the Woodbury Road (municipal tax map no. 110, lot no. 9), into five (5) residential house lots. The proposed development parcels will be divided into five (5) lots ranging in size from 2.20 acres to 6.59 acres with the land to be retained by owners consisting of 24.62 acres. The proposed subdivision will not require the construction of any new roads and all the lots will be serviced by on-site drilled wells and subsurface waste water disposal system.

I trust the following information will be sufficient for review and approval of the enclosed Subdivision Application.

I look forward to meeting with the Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting to discuss the enclosed application.

Respectfully submitted, CADmaster Drafting, Land Surveying and Septic Design

Goog Bauchte

George Bouchles, PLS 2295, LSE 338



Development Review Application

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement



PROJECT NAME: Woodbury Heights - Phase 2

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS: 113 Woodbury Road

PARCEL ID#: Map 110, Lot 009

REVIEW TYPE:

Site Plan Subdivision Site Plan Amendment □ Subdivision Amendment □

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: <u>B&M Developers, Inc. is proposing to create a 5 Lot Residential</u> <u>Subdivison to be located on the Woodbury Road. Each lot will be serviced by on-site</u> <u>individual Subsurface Waste Water Disposal System and Drilled Wells. No extension</u> <u>of Municipal Services (i.e., road construction, water or septic sewer mains, etc.) are</u> <u>proposed at this time.</u>

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Applicant: B&M Developers, Inc.
Name: Gary McFarland, Reggie Bouffard
Address: 195 Center Street - Auburn, ME
Zip Code: 04210
Work #: 783-6224
Cell #: 576-0573 (Gary)
Fax #: 783-4994
Home #: n/a
Email: bmhouse@al.com

Property Owner: B&M Developers, Inc.
Name:Gary McFarland, Reggie Bouffard
Address:195 Center Street - Auburn, ME
Zip Code: 04210
Work #: 783-6224
Cell #: 576-0669 (Reggie)
Fax #: 783-4994
Home #: n/a
E 11 11 C 10 1

Email: rkbouffard@aol.com

Project Representative
Name: George Bouchles, PLS 2295
Address: 191 Madison Street - Auburn, ME
Zip Code: 04210
Work #: 786-3232
Cell #: 240-5567
Fax #: 786-3232
Home #: n/a
Email: gsb@cadmasterr.com

Other professional representatives for project (surveyors, engineers, etc.),	the_
Name: Vaughn Smith, C.S.S. # 290	
Address:1006 Hallowell RdWest Gard	iner
Zip Code: 04345	
Work #: 724-5635	
Cell #: 441-3887	
Fax #: n/a	
Home #: n/a	
Email:s	

PROJECT DATA

The following information is required where applicable, in order complete the application

IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA/RATIO

min Bitt 10000 bertines interit interit		
Existing Total Impervious Area	0	sq. ft.
Proposed Total Paved Area	0	sq. ft.
Proposed Total Impervious Area	0	sq. ft.
Proposed Impervious Net Change	0	sq. ft.
Impervious surface ratio existing	0	% of lot area
Impervious surface ratio proposed	0	% of lot area
BUILDING AREA/LOT		
COVERAGE		
Existing Building Footprint	N/A	sq. ft.
Proposed Building Footprint	N/A	sq. ft.
Proposed Building Footprint Net change	N/A	sq. ft.
Existing Total Building Floor Area	N/A	sq. ft.
Proposed Total Building Floor Area	N/A	sq. ft.
Proposed Building Floor Area Net Change	N/A	sq. ft
New Building	N/A	(yes or no)
Building Area/Lot coverage existing	N/A	% of lot area
Building Area/Lot coverage proposed	N/A	% of lot area
ZONING		
Existing		
Proposed, if applicable		
LAND USE		
Existing		
Proposed		
RESIDENTIAL, IF APPLICABLE		
Existing Number of Residential Units		
Proposed Number of Residential Units		,
Subdivision, Proposed Number of Lots		
PARKING SPACES		
Existing Number of Parking Spaces		
Proposed Number of Parking Spaces		
Number of Handicapped Parking Spaces		<u> </u>
Proposed Total Parking Spaces		
roposed rotar raining opaces		N

ESTIMATED COST OF PROJECT

DELEGATED REVIEW AUTHORITY CHECKLIST

SITE LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Existing Impervious Area	0	sq. ft.
Proposed Disturbed Area	0	sq. ft.
Proposed Impervious Area	0	sq. ft.

- 1. If the proposed disturbance is greater than one acre, then the applicant shall apply for a Maine Construction General Permit (MCGP) with MDEP.
- 2. If the proposed impervious area is greater than one acre including any impervious area crated since 11/16/05, then the applicant shall apply for a MDEP Stormwater Management Permit, Chapter 500, with the City.
- 3. If total impervious area (including structures, pavement, etc) is greater than 3 acres since 1971 but less than 7 acres, then the applicant shall apply for a Site Location of Development Permit with the City. If more than 7 acres then the application shall be made to MDEP unless determined otherwise.
- 4. If the development is a subdivision of more than 20 acres but less than 100 acres then the applicant shall apply for a Site Location of Development Permit with the City. If more than 100 acres then the application shall be made to MDEP unless determined otherwise.

TRAFFIC ESTIMATE

Total traffic estimated in the peak hour-existing (Since July 1, 1997)

_____0 ____passenger car equivalents (PCE)

Total traffic estimated in the peak hour-proposed (Since July 1, 1997) 27_____passenger car equivalents (PCE) If the proposed increase in traffic exceeds 100 one-way trips in the peak hour then a traffic movement permit will be required.

1

Zoning Summary

	ow Density Rural Residence Districtzoning cres / square feet(sf).	district.
Regulations	<u>Required/Allowed</u> <u>Provided</u>	
Min Lot Area	43,560 sq. ft/	
Street Frontage	250 ft/	
Min Front Yard	25 ft/	
Min Rear Yard	25 ft/	
Min Side Yard	15 ft/	
Max. Building Height	35 ft. /	
Use Designation	Residential/	
Parking Requirement	1 space/ per N/A square feet of floor area	
Total Parking:	N/A/	
Overlay zoning districts_(if any):	N/A/	/
Urban impaired stream watershed?	YES/NO If yes, watershed nameN	'A

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMISSION_

Submissions shall include fifteen (15) complete packets containing the following materials:

- 1. 5 Full size plans_and 10 smaller (no larger than 11" x 17") plans containing the information found in the attached sample plan checklist.
- Application form that is completed and signed_by the property owner or designated representative.
 (NOTE: All applications will be reviewed by staff and any incomplete application will be not be accepted until all deficiencies are corrected.
- 3. Cover letter stating the nature of the project.
- 4. All written submittals including evidence of right, title and interest.
- 5. Copy of the checklist completed for the proposal listing the material contained in the submitted application.

Refer to the application checklist for a detailed list of submittal requirements.

L/A's development review process and requirements have been made similar for convenience and to encourage development. Each Citys ordinances are available online at their prospective websites:

<u>Auburn:</u> www.auburnmaine.org under City Departments/ Planning and Permitting/Land Use Division/<u>Zoning Ordinance</u> <u>Lewiston:</u> http://www.ci.lewiston.me.us/clerk/ordinances.htm</u> Refer to Appendix A of the Code of Ordiances

I hereby certify that I am the Owner of record of the named property, or that the owner of record authorizes the proposed work and that I have been authorized by the owner to make this application as his/her authorized agent. I agree to conform to all applicable laws of this jurisdiction. In addition, I certify that the City's authorized representative shall have the authority to enter all areas covered by this permit at any reasonable hour to enforce the provisions of the codes applicable to this permit.

This application is for development review <u>only</u>; a Performance Guarantee, Inspection Fee, Building Permit Application and other associated fees and permits will be required prior to construction.

Signature of Applicant:	Date:	
Alla	4 5-6-15	



Development Review Checklist

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement



<u>THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS REQUIRED WHERE APPLICABLE TO BE</u> <u>SUBMITTED FOR AN APPLICATION TO BE COMPLETE</u>

PROJECT NAME: WOODBURY HEIGHTS - PHASE 2

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS- _WOODBURY ROAD

PARCEL #:- MAP 110, LOT 9

Required Information		Check Sul	omitted	Applio Ordin		
Site Plan		Applicant	Staff	Lewiston	Aubu	rn
	Owner's Names/Address	X				
	Names of Development	X				
	Professionally Prepared Plan	X				
	Tax Map or Street/Parcel Number	X	-			
	Zoning of Property	X				
	Distance to Property Lines	X				
×	Boundaries of Abutting land	X				Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 ch
-	Show Setbacks, Yards and Buffers	X	_		4	Formatted Table
	Airport Area of Influence (Auburn only)	_				Formatted: Indent: First line: 0 ch
	Parking Space Calcs					
	Drive Openings/Locations			_		
	Subdivision Restrictions	=			11	
	Proposed Use					
	PB/BOA/Other Restrictions	=				
	Fire Department Review	=	-			
	Open Space/Lot Coverage	:				
	Lot Layout (Lewiston only)				1	
	Existing Building (s)	-				
	Existing Streets, etc.	-		_		
	Existing Driveways, etc.			1		
	Proposed Building(s)					
	Proposed Driveways					
Landscape Plan						
	Greenspace Requirements				-	
	Setbacks to Parking	=				
	Buffer Requirements	-				
	Street Tree Requirements	-				
	Screened Dumpsters	-	_			
	Additional Design Guidelines			_		-

Auburn, ME 04210-Tel. (207)333-6601

City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement - 27 Pine Street-Lewiston, ME 04240-7201 -Tel. (207)513-3125

	Planting Schedule	=			
Stormwater & Erosion Control Plan		_			
	Compliance w/ chapter 500	-	-	-	
	Show Existing Surface		1	+	-
	Drainage	-			
	Direction of Flow	-		-	
	Location of Catch				
	Basins, etc.	-			
	Drainage Calculations	-			
	Erosion Control Measures	-			1.1
	Maine Construction General Permit	-		-	
	Bonding and Inspection Fees	-			
	Post-Construction Stormwater Plan			_	
	Inspection/monitoring requirements	-			
	Third Party Inspections (Lewiston				1
	only)	-			
Lighting Plan		-			1.00
	Full cut-off fixtures	=			
	Meets Parking Lot Requirements	-			1.1.1.1
Traffic Information	v . 1	-			
	Access Management	-			
	Signage				
	PCE - Trips in Peak Hour	-			
	Vehicular Movements	-			
	Safety Concerns		-		
	Pedestrian Circulation	-			
	Police Traffic	-	-		
	Engineering Traffic				1
Utility Plan					1.1.1
	Water	-		-	
	Adequacy of Water Supply			_	
	Water main extension				
	agreement				
	Sewer		_	-	
	Available city capacity		- *		-
	Electric			- Come of Second	
	Natural Gas				-
	Cable/Phone				
Natural Resources	Cable/Filone	<u>X</u>			
Vatural Resources	Charaland Zana				
	Shoreland Zone				1. A. A.
	Flood Plain				
	Wetlands or Streams	<u>X</u>			
	Urban Impaired Stream				
	Phosphorus Check	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
	Aquifer/Groundwater Protection	<u>X</u>			
	Applicable State Permits	<u> </u>			
	No Name Pond Watershed (Lewiston only)	_			

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department - 60 Court Street, Suite 104 -Auburn, ME 04210-Tel. (207)333-6601

2

City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement - 27 Pine Street-Lewiston, ME 04240-7201 -Tel. (207)513-3125

	Lake Auburn Watershed (Auburn				
	only)	-		1	
	Taylor Pond Watershed (Auburn				
	only)				
Right Title or Interest		X	_		
	Verify			D	
	Document Existing				
	Easements, Covenants, etc.	X			
Technical & Financial Capacity		_	_		
-	Cost Est./Financial Capacity	X			
	Performance Guarantee	-		1	
State Subdivision Law					
	Verify/Check	X			e - 2.
	Covenants/Deed Restrictions	-	-		
	Offers of Conveyance to City	-		_	
	Association Documents	-			
	Location of Proposed Streets &	-			
	Sidewalks	-			•
	Proposed Lot Lines, etc.	X			
	Data to Determine Lots, etc.	X			
	Subdivision Lots/Blocks	X			
	Specified Dedication of Land	=			6 - 21
Additional Subdivision Standards					
×	Single-Family Cluster (Lewiston only)	-			
	Multi-Unit Residential Development (Lewiston only)	=			
	Mobile Home Parks	-		-	
	Private Commercial or Industrial Subdivisions (Lewiston only)	=			
	PUD (Auburn only)	-			1
A jpeg or pdf of the proposed site plan		x			
Final sets of the approved plans shall be submitted digitally to the City, on a CD or DVD, n AutoCAD format R 14 or greater, along with PDF images of the plans for					
archiving		x			

City of Auburn Planning and Permitting Department - 60 Court Street, Suite 104 -Auburn, ME 04210-Tel. (207)333-6601

3

City of Lewiston Department of Planning and Code Enforcement - 27 Pine Street-Lewiston, ME 04240-7201 -Tel. (207)513-3125

Warranty Deed

Inez Buck of Auburn, Androscoggin County, Maine, Nancy D. McNeill of Portland, Cumberland County, Maine and Judith D. Davis (f/k/a Judith D. Davis-Kovats) of The Villages, Sumter County, Florida, for consideration paid, grant to B & M Developers, Inc., a Maine corporation with a mailing address of 195 Center Street, Auburn, Androscoggin County, Maine, with Warranty Covenants, certain lots or parcels of land, with any buildings thereon, situated in Auburn, Androscoggin County, Maine, bounded and described as follows, to wit:

Parcel 1: A certain lot or parcel of land situated in said Auburn, and being all and the same premises conveyed to Sarah B. Martin and Jarius Martin by Daniel Guptil and Alpheus Rollins as will appear by their deed of warranty dated June 13, 1881, and recorded in the Androscoggin County Registry of Deeds in Book 103, Page 516.

Also a certain other parcel of land situated in said Auburn containing thirty (30) acres, more or less, and being all and the same premises described in a certain deed of quitclaim from Samuel A. Robinson to Jarius Martin dated June 11, 1881, and recorded in said Registry in Book 102, Page 205, and which parcel is also described in another deed from Joseph F. Hammond, Administrator with the Will annexed of the Estate of Clarissa A. Smith to said Jarius Martin dated June 13, 1881, and recorded in said Registry in Book 104, Page 254, to all of which deeds and their respective records, reference is hereby made for a further description and identification of the premises hereby conveyed.

Parcel 2: A certain lot or parcel of land abutting the northerly line of Woodbury Hill Road (also referred to as Woodbury Road and Old Danville Road) in the City of Auburn, County of Androscoggin, State of Maine, more particularly described as follows:

All of the following described land which lies northerly of said Woodbury Hill Road as now laid out:

The land described in a deed from Shirley D. Schneider to Gilman R. Drinkwater et al. dated August 27, 1974, recorded in the Androscoggin County Registry of Deeds in Book 1121, Page 82.

Parcel 3: A certain lot or parcel of land being essentially triangular in shape and located on the northwesterly side of the Woodbury Road in Auburn, County of Androscoggin, State of Maine, and being also described as Lot 15 on Tax Map 2C on the Assessor's maps.

For source of title to the above described premises, reference should be made to (a) a Release Deed of Distribution from Nancy D. McNeill and Judith D. Davis-Kovats, Co-Personal Representatives of the Estate of Ruth A. Davis to Nancy D. McNeill and Judith D. Davis-Kovats as tenants in common dated March 9, 1995 and recorded in said Registry in Book 3393, Page 111; (b) a Release Deed from Roy C. Buck and Inez D.

Buck to Roy C. Buck, Inez D. Buck, Nancy D. McNeill and Judith D. Davis-Kovats, the latter two as Co-Personal Representatives of the Estate of Ruth A. Davis dated February 8, 1995 recorded in said Registry in Book 3384, Page 143; and (c) a Warranty Deed from Ruth S. Drinkwater to Ruth A. Davis, Inez D. Buck and Roy C. Buck dated November 10, 1992 recorded in said Registry in Book 2952, Page 348. In addition to the above, Roy Buck died on May 14, 1999 evidenced by Inheritance Tax Discharge recorded in said Registry in Book 4363, Pages 8 and 9, and Ruth Davis died on September 3, 1994, whose probate is on file in the Androscoggin County Registry of Probate under Docket #94-427.

In Witness Whereof, the Grantors have set their hands and seals effective this 15th day of September, 2014.

Witness

70 SOTTA

Witness

20-1

Comm.

:"

Blanc Witness

State of Florida

Dunty of

Inez Buck

Nancy D. McNei

September 12, 2014

Then personally appeared the above-named Judith D. Davis (f/k/a Judith D. Davis-Kovats) scknowledged the foregoing instrument to be her free act and deed.



Before me,

Notary Public: Victur K Breslin My Commission Expires: Oct 20, 2017

of Maine roscoggin, SS.

September 15, 2014

Then personally appeared the above-named Inez Buck and Nancy D. McNeill and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be their free act and deed.

Before me,

K. Alexander Visbaras, Attorney-At-Law

:odh: 11:\Clients\B&M Builders\113 Woodbury Road Aubum\Deed

ANDROSCOGGIN COUNTY TINA M CHOUINARD REGISTER OF DEEDS

LOCATION MAP Ron EL ET 200 S 13 Auburn Ŷ Littlefield X South 11 RD BkAND ADAS Destuci io BEECH WITHAN S MAIN kumford RĐ wiston Rowes Cord R P Municipal Marstons Corner B C Lewiston 8 6 Junction MALPH TUNK 04 KITTY HAWK ORWILLE ON Exit 12 1005 pr WE THAM 00 FOSTER Woodbury Hill õ RD Song õ 122 Broid Danville 18 RA 為 Marry 1 River MAINE TURNEDIKE ALESONG 202 Megdow 100 RD Peacock R. alpa Hill ON CO RAR 142 pper Po 8 Roya Gloucester B CKET Laurat 1.11 Cobbs Pou Past To prepared by SOURCE : DELORME "MAINE ATLAS & GAZETTEER" CADmaster Drafting (NOT TO SCALE) & Septic Design

SCALE : NOT TO SCALE SOURCE : CITY OF AUBURN TAX MAP NO. 110



prepared by CADmaster Drafting & Septic Design

TAX MAP



U.S.G.S. CONTOUR MAP ARROSCOR ABBILL 20 0 INTERCHANGE BM 237 MAINE Toligate Danville Corner -500-0 0 AW 486 0 0 0 HOODS 100 Danville BM 209 0 PIPELINE Claypits X MAIN ×51D NOT TO SCALE prepared by CADmaster Drafting SOURCE : AUBURN

(1.5 MINUTE QUADRANGLES)



& Septic Design





SOILS MAP





prepared by CAD master Drafting & Septic Design

ontact Us Subscribe Archived Soil Surv Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map		Survey Status Glossar	Download S			Shopping Ca	art (Free)			AA
View Soil Information By Use: All Uses	~					10.00	and the state of the	dd to Sh	opping	Cart (
Intro to Soils Suitabilities and	Limitations	for Use	intable Version	Option	alities	Ecolog	ical Site Assessmen			Repor
		Re	port Options							
Search	8	Soil Map			Title Cor Cou	unties, Maine	Androscoggin and Saga	adanoc		
Soil Reports	8			tle (optio		Lustom Subtitle	Name: (none defined)		_	
Open All C	lose All		6	14		WOODBURY	IEIGHTS			all.
AOI Inventory	08						N Annalahy	1) in	-	
Component Description (Nontechnical)		1. 14		27				Cancel	View	
Component Legend	_			100		The states		er C		
provide the second s	Soil Report			E.	AB40		$7 \sim$			
Options	08	100	and the second			JX \ \		22	THE A	1-
Include Minor Soils 🗹		S A		102	19	K Conce 1	11/100	X		- Com
View Description View S	Soil Report	y e		Bat	XX	1// (4	11 al	C A	1	
DescripciÃ ³ n de la Unidad de Mapa		E.		X	Buc	Marce Pr	XX	$\langle \rangle$		X
DescripciÃ ³ n de la Unidad de Mapa (Breve, Generada)					X.		545	No		
Map Unit Description		a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a		699	\mathbb{N}	MAS	S	5		
Map Unit Description (Brief)		A States		BUB	1	a star	Children Children			
				NSch-	and the second	and a second and a second			s Petro	
Map Unit Description (Brief, Generated)			$\langle 1 \rangle$	L						
Map Unit Description (Brief, Generated)	Criteria			Lo						
Map Unit Description (Brief, Generated) Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary	Criteria	Identify	100011	L.						×
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and	Criteria	Identify Layer	Attrib	ute Nar			Attribute Value	e		×
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary	Criteria	Identify Layer Location	Attrib Latitude, Lo	ngitude		44.03011°, -70 427.7		e		×
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary	Criteria	Identify Layer	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres)	ngitude)		427.7			ent slo	~
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names	Criteria	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI)	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy	ngitude) Ime mbol		427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC	.26053°		ent slo	~
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development		Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI)	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na	ngitude) Ime mbol Y		427.7 Belgrade very fi	.26053°		ent slo	~
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials	Ø @	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soll Map Unit Polygons	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke	ngitude) Ime mbol y Area Sy	rmbol	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818	.26053°		ent slo	~
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning	0 © 0 ©	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI)	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soll Survey	ngitude) me mbol y Area Sy p Unit S	mbol ymbol	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818 ME606	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to :		ent slo	pes
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning	0 0 0 0	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soll Map Unit Polygons	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soll Survey National Map Date(s) Phot	ngitude) me mbol y Area Sy p Unit S	mbol ymbol	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to :		ent slo,	pes
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications	0 8 0 8 0 8	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soll Survey National Map Date(s) Phol nt Legend	ngitude) me mbol y Area Sy p Unit S tographe	mbol ymbol ed	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010—A	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to :		ent slop	pes
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management	00 00 00 00 00 00 00	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soll Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Soil Survey National Map Date(s) Phot At Legend Sagadahoc C	ngitude) me mbol y Area Sy p Unit S tographe	rmbol ymbol ed s, Main	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010—A	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to 1	15 perce	ent sloj	pes Ø
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soll Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and S Map unit symbol a	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soll Survey National Map Date(s) Phol Date(s) Phol Sagadahoc C Sagadahoc C	ngitude mbol y Area Sy p Unit S tographe ountie Pct. of	rmbol ymbol ed s, Main	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010-4	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to tug 29, 2010 Component	15 perce	t. slop	pes Ø
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development anitary Facilities	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons Soil Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and S Map unit symbol a name	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soil Survey National Map Date(s) Phot At Legend Sagadahoc C and Map unit acres e 9,084	ngitude me mbol y Area Sy o Unit S tographe ountie Pct. of map	rmbol ymbol ed s, Main	427.7 Belgrade very fi BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010-4	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to tug 29, 2010 Component	15 perce	t. slop	pes (a) pe
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development anitary Facilities bil Chemical Properties	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soll Map Unit Polygons Soll Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and S Map unit symbol a name	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soil Survey National Map Date(s) Phot At Legend Sagadahoc C and Map unit acres e 9,084	ngitude) mme mbol y Area Sy o Unit S tographu ount S Pct. of map unit	mbol ymbol ed s, Maine Col	427.7 Belgrade very fr BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010–4 e mponent name	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to kug 29, 2010 Component kind	15 perce Pc Low	tt. slop RV	pes (S) pe High
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development anitary Facilities oil Chemical Properties oil Erosion	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons Soil Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and S Map unit symbol a name BgB—Belgrade very finn sandy loam, 2 to 8 per	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soil Survey . National Map Date(s) Phot Date(s) Phot Date(s) Phot Sagadahoc C und Map unit acres e 9,084 cent	ngitude) mme mbol y Area Sy o Unit S tographu ount S Pct. of map unit	rmbol ymbol ed s, Main	427.7 Belgrade very fr BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010–4 e mponent name	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to tug 29, 2010 Component	15 perce	t. slop	pes (S) pe High
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development onstruction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development anitary Facilities bil Chemical Properties bil Erosion bil Physical Properties	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and S Map unit symbol a name BgB—Belgrade very finn sandy loam, 2 to 8 per slopes	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soll Survey National Map Date(s) Phol Date(s) Phol Date(s) Phol Sagadahoc C Sagadahoc C und Map unit acres e 9,084 ccent	ngitude) mme mbol y Area Sy o Unit S tographu ount S Pct. of map unit	mbol ymbol ed s, Maine Col	427.7 Belgrade very fr BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010–4 e mponent name	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to kug 29, 2010 Component kind	15 perce Pc Low	tt. slop RV	(2) (2) Pe High
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names fullding Site Development forstruction Materials fisaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development anitary Facilities foil Chemical Properties foil Erosion foil Physical Properties foil Qualities and Features		Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and S Map unit symbol a name BgB—Belgrade very fini- sandy loam, 2 to 8 per slopes BgC—Belgrade very fini- sandy loam, 8 to 15 per slopes	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soll Survey National Map Date(s) Phot Date(s) Phot Date(s) Phot At Legend Sagadahoc C Sagadahoc C	ngitude) mme mbol y Area Sy o Unit S tographi ounits of map unit	mbol ymbol ed s, Maine Col	427.7 Belgrade very fr BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010—A e mponent name	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to kug 29, 2010 Component kind	15 perce Po Low 2.0	tt. slop RV	pes (2) pe High 8.0
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Data Summary Survey Area Map Unit Symbols and Names uilding Site Development construction Materials isaster Recovery Planning and Classifications and Management ecreational Development anitary Facilities oil Chemical Properties oil Chemical Properties oil Physical Properties oil Physical Properties oil Qualities and Features egetative Productivity	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and 3 Map unit symbol a name BgB—Belgrade very fini sandy loam, 2 to 8 per slopes BgC—Belgrade very fini sandy loam, 8 to 15 per sandy loam, 8 to 15 per	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soil Survey National Map Date(s) Phot At Legend Sagadahoc Co unit acres e 9,084 cent 2,816 ercent , 0 to 20,042	ngitude) mme mbol y Area Sy o Unit S tographi ounits of map unit	mbol ymbol ed s, Main Cor Belgrade	427.7 Belgrade very fr BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010—A e mponent name	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to Mug 29, 2010 Component kind Series	15 perce Po Low 2.0	rt. slog RV 5.0	pes (2) pe High 8.0
Selected Soil Interpretation Description and Summary Selected Soil Interpretations Survey Area Data Summary	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	Identify Layer Location Area of Interest (AOI) Soil Map Unit Polygons Aerial Photography Report — Componer Androscoggin and 3 Map unit symbol a name BgB—Belgrade very fint sandy loam, 2 to 8 per slopes BgC—Belgrade very fint sandy loam, 8 to 15 per slopes BuB2—Buxton silt loam	Attrib Latitude, Lo Area (acres) Map Unit Na Map Unit Sy Map Unit Sy Map Unit Ke Soil Survey National Map Date(s) Phot At Legend Sagadahoc C Sagadahoc C Sagadahoc C and Map unit acres e 9,084 e 2,816 ercent , 0 to 20,042 ed	ngitude) mme mbol y Area Sy to Unit S tographn ounit 85 85	mbol ymbol ed s, Main Cor Belgrade	427.7 Belgrade very fr BgC 284818 ME606 9kcp Jun 20, 2010—A e mponent name	.26053° ne sandy loam, 8 to Mug 29, 2010 Component kind Series	15 perce Po Low 2.0	rt. slog RV 5.0	pes (2) pe High 8.0

CfB—Charlton fine sandy loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	5,457						
		89	Chariton	Series	3.0	6.0	8.0
CfC2—Charlton fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes, eroded	4,772						
		85	Charlton	Series	8.0	12.0	15.0
ChC—Charlton very stony fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	35 <mark>,</mark> 167						
		86	Charlton	Series	8.0	12.0	15.0
ChD—Charlton very stony fine sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	8,031						
		85	Charlton	Series	15.0	20.0	25.0
HfC2—Hartland very fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percen slopes, eroded	6,767 t						
		85	Hartland	Series	8.0	12.0	15.0
HfD2—Hartland very fine sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes, eroded	2,371						
		85	Hartland	Series	15.0	20.0	25.0
HrB—Hollis fine sandy loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	9,660	85	Hollis	Series	0.0	4.0	8.0
HrC—Hollis fine sandy loam,	38,819	55		001100	0.0	U	0.0
8 to 15 percent slopes							
	10	83	Hollis	Series	8.0	12.0	15.0
HrD—Hollis fine sandy loam, 15 to 45 percent slopes	6,967	85	Hollis	Series	15.0	30.0	45.0
HsB—Hollis very rocky fine	4,783	05	noms	Series	15.0	30.0	45.0
sandy loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	4,703			and a			
	25 026	85	Hollis	Series	0.0	4.0	8.0
HsC—Hollis very rocky fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	35,936						
		85	Hollis	Series	8.0	12.0	15.0
HsD—Hollis very rocky fine sandy loam, 15 to 45 percent slopes	11,029						
		85	Hollis	Series	15.0	30.0	45.0
e-Leicester very stony fine sandy loam	12,008	05	1-1				
k—Charles silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, occasionally	5,729	85	Leicester	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
flooded			2		. .		
Md_Mado land learning	1 240	85	Charles	Series	0.0	1.0	2.0
4d—Made land, loamy materials	1,348						
		91	Made land	Miscellaneous area	0.0	18.0	35.0
NkC2—Merrimac fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent	1,263			area			
slopes, eroded		85	Merrimac	Series	• •	12.0	15.0
IgB—Ninigret fine sandy Ioam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	15,653			26163	0.0	12.0	13.0
		85	Ninigret	Series	0.0	4.0	8.0
5cA—Scantic silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	26,473	95	Scantic	Carles	0.0	2.0	2.0
SxB—Sutton loam, 0 to 8	7,362	65	Scantic	Series	0.0	2.0	3.0
percent slopes	1,302						
		85 9	Sutton	Series	0.0	4.0	8.0
yB—Sutton very stony	26,343						11

utton	Series 8.0	12.0 15.
utton	Series 8.0	12.0 15.
	50103 0.0	4.0 8.
utton	Series 0.0	4.0 8
ut	ton	ton Series 0.0

FOIA | Accessibility Statement | Privacy Policy | Non-Discrimination Statement | Information Quality | USA.gov | White House



CADmaster

 191 Madison Street
 - Auburn, ME 04210

 office-207-689-3232
 cell-207-240-5567

 e-mail – gsb@cadmasterr.com

 CAD Drafting, Land Surveying and Septic Design

April 10, 2015

Mr. Gary McFarland Mr. Reggie Bouffard c/o B&M Developers, Inc. 195 Center Street Auburn, Maine 04210

RE: Preliminary Soils Investigation Report "Woodbury Heights - Phase 2" - (5 Lot Residential Subdivision) Danville Corner & Woodbury Roads Auburn, Maine

Dear Mr. McFarland & Mr. Bouffard:

At your request, preliminary Site/Soils Investigations were performed on five (5) lots of a proposed five (5) lot subdivision you propose to create from a portion of a 57.39 acre parcel of land you own on the Danville Corner Road and the Woodbury Road in the City of Auburn, Maine. The portion of the property you propose to subdivide is shown on a plan entitled "Subdivison Plan - Woodbury Heights - Phase 2" prepared by George S. Bouchles, PLS 2295 and depicts five (5) proposed residential house lots ranging in area from 2.20 acres to 6.59 acres with a 24.62 acre parcel to be retained by you.

The purpose of the preliminary investigation was to determine suitability for on-site Subsurface Waste Water Disposal Systems to accommodate a four (4) bedroom single family dwelling on each of the lots in accordance with the current Maine Subsurface Waste Water Disposal Rules (SWWDR), dated January 1, 1998, and as amended.

Date of Investigation: April 2, 2015

Method of Investigation: Dutch Auger test pits

Method of Ground Control: Test pits were located in relationship to boundary information observed in the field and boundary information as shown on the above referenced plan as well as existing survey control stations in relationship to proposed lot lines also shown on the above referenced plan.

Findings: The site is, for the most part, tree covered with a mix of hardwood and softwood as well as an open field near the middle of the property. The terrain is generally sloping down from the Danville Corner Road with a field bisecting the parcel and steep slopes on the back side of said field.

Test pit results for the proposed five (5) lots tested indicate the underlying Parent Material to be of a "Basal Glacial Till" type material, and designated as 3C & 3D, soils as defined in the current SWWDR referred to above.

Soil textures for these test pits consisted of approximately 1 to 2 inches of humus containing decaying leaves, twigs and sticks at the surface. The next 4 to 6 inches consisted of a brown to light brown fine sandy loam textured soils with roots present and angular rocks were observed. The next 10 to 20 inches consisted of a light yellowish brown fine sandy loam textured soils with roots present and angular rock fragments observed. The remainder of the profile consisted of a light yellowish brown to light olive gray fine sandy loam textured soil with no roots visible, angular rock fragments were still present with the soil textures being firm and difficult to excavate.

Pit depths were limited to 12 inches below the observed seasonal high water table or to refusal.

Recommendations: It is my recommendation that, based upon results of the test pits evaluated and site conditions observed, there is suitable soils and sufficient area for the five (5) new single-family dwelling sites proposed.

Test Pit Summary

Test	Preliminary	Mottling	Restrictive	Bedrock/	' System Size
Pit no.	Soil		Layer	Refusal	Type Recomm.
6	3 C	-18"	-20"	none	Enviro-Septic 13×50
7	3 C	-18"	-20"	none	Enviro-Septic 13×50
8	3 C	-16"	-18"	none	Enviro-Septic 10×50
9	3 C	-15"	-17"	none	Enviro-Septic 10×50
10	3 D	-14"	-16"	none	Enviro-Septic 10×50

The site and soils information contained within this report is preliminary and intended for the purpose of review and planning purposes only. Prior to the issuance of any municipal permits, a full site and soils evaluation of each lot will be required, and a complete design of the proposed subsurface waste water disposal system and location must be delineated on the State supplied HHE-200 soils design forms.

I trust the enclosed information will satisfy your immediate needs. Should you have any questions, feel free to give me a call.

> Respectfully yours, CADmaster Drafting & Septic Design

Goog Bauchte

George S. Bouchles, LSE 338





January 7, 2015

B & M Developers, Inc. 195 Center Street Auburn, ME 04210

RE: Wetland Delineation Report, Danville Corner Road and Woodbury Road, Auburn, Maine

Dear Sirs:

Per your request, the wetland/upland boundary was delineated at the above mentioned property, and plotted on to a plan by surveyor George Bouchles. There is one fairly large wetland that bisects the parcel and several small "fingers" of wetland associated with small drainageways. Overall, the subject parcel slopes moderately from the eastern corner, near the junction of Danville Corner Road and Woodbury Road, to the westerly and southwesterly boundaries. The soils on this site consist of a moderate textured glacial till with a hardpan. Thus, surface water infiltrates the surface runs laterally and breaks out in the lower slopes and drainageways.

Near the middle of the subject parcel, there is a natural "saddle", where the slopes are gentle or have a slight depression. This area collects surface water and creates a forested wetland. This wetland starts near a culvert off Woodbury Road and runs to across the property and ends near the northernly corner of the property as drainageways that run down and split off a former skidder trail. Just off Woodbury Road and behind a field, the wetland has mature trees and pit and mound topography. As it moves toward Danville Corner Road, it spills over the gentle slopes and divides into smaller, defined drainageways that collect and exit in the northwest corner at the end of the property. From the mature stand of Maple, Hemlock, Birch and Pine it transitions to alder Maple, Dogwood, winterberry and ferns associated with the drainageways.

The other wetlands on the property are small narrow fingers of forested wetlands that extend from the southerly property line and run upslope in small drainageways.

1006 Hallowell/Litchfield Road, West Gardiner, ME 04345 • 207-724-5635

Plant species observed within these wetlands include and are not limited to: Cinnamon Fern (Osmunda c.), Sensitive Fern (Onoclea sensibilis), Bullrush (Juncus sp.), Carex sp.(crinita and lurida noted), Sphagnum sp., Scirpus sp., Aster sp., Gray and yellow Birch, Speckled Alder, Poplar sp., Red Maple, White Pine, and Hemlock.

This wetland delineation was conducted in the month of December under some mild winter conditions. The hydrophytic vegetation was not as evident but still present and observable. The hydrology and soils observations were typical. Hence, there may be some slight inaccuracies in the wetland/upland boundary but well within a reasonable tolerance. Again, please refer to plan prepared by George Bouchles.

I hope this information is sufficient for your current needs, please feel free to contact me for further assistance.

MIMINI//// A SOL SCIE EOFM Respectfully submitted, VAUGHN SMITH ASSOCIATES Vaughn L. Smith C.S.S. #290

C&R Pump and Well 301 Litchfield Road Bowdoin ME 04287

February 9, 2015

Reference: Woodbury Heights Subdivision 113 Woodbury Road Auburn ME

On behalf of Bouffard McFarland Builders, based on previous wells drilled in the area, we feel that there is an adequate supply of potable water that is reasonably accessible at the above mentioned location.

Bret Bowley President C&R Well and Pump

Androscoggin

February 9, 2015

City of Auburn Attn: Planning Board 60 Court Street Auburn, ME 04210

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to inform you that B & M Developers, Inc. has the borrowing capacity through our financial institution to complete Phase I and Phase II of the project under consideration at Woodbury Heights. Should you have any questions, please contact me directly at 207-376-3604 or via email at tfrautten@androscogginbank.com.

Respectfully,

Travis J. Frautten Assistant Vice President


STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

Woodbury Heights Subdivision – Phase II Auburn, Maine

The following Stormwater Management Plan has been prepared for B & M Developers, Inc. to evaluate stormwater runoff and erosion control for the second phase of the Woodbury Heights Subdivision. The second phase features the creation of five additional residential lots. The first phase was permitted earlier this year and resulted in the creation of 5 lots.

Existing Conditions

The original development parcel was approximately 57.4 acres and is located northwest of the intersection of Danville Corner Road and Woodbury Road in Auburn, Maine. The first phase of development included five lots on approximately 14.08 Acres and contained approximately 43.32 acres of retained land. The retained portion of the site is an undeveloped forest that is located south-southwest of Danville Corner Road and north of Woodbury Road Baker Road (see attached Aerial Map). The parcel is bisected by a forested wetland system that flows from the midpoint of the original parcel along Woodbury Road to the northernmost property corner adjacent to Danville Corner Road. The area within 200' of either side of the wetland system generally contains slopes that are typically between 4%-6%. The remainder of the site features typical slopes between 8%-15%. The northeastern half of the site drains to the wetland system. The remainder of the property drains to a brook that is located just downstream of the western property. Both outlet points eventually drain to the Royal River. A copy of a composite U.S.G.S. Quadrangle Map (Lewiston & Minot) is attached to this submittal.

Proposed Development

The applicants propose to create a second phase of development that includes five additional lots on approximately 18.7 acres and will retain the remaining 24.62 acres. All five lots will be located along Danville Corner Road. No new infrastructure is proposed. There are no proposed wetland impacts from this development.

The lots will be surrounded by wooded stormwater buffers that were designed to meet MDEP Chapter 500 requirements. The extensive buffers will ensure that existing drainage patterns are preserved to the maximum extent possible by both keeping the water spread out over the development area and encouraging runoff to be non-channelized. The buffers will help to control the peak rate of runoff of the post development condition while providing a high degree of water quality treatment.

The applicants intend to selectively cut trees within the buffer during development to provide views of Mt. Washington for some of the lots. They will limit the disturbance to the ground cover to preserve the functionality of the buffer areas.

P.O. Box 339 • New Gloucester, ME • 04260 • Phone 926-5111 • Email: info@terradynconsultants.com

Flooding

The development area is not located within an area of flood hazard according to the Federal Insurance Rate Maps 23001C0317E & 23001C0320E. See attached maps.

Onsite Soils

The soils were delineated from the Androscoggin County Medium Intensity Soil Survey as shown on the Soil Data Viewer on the NRCS website (See attached map). The soil survey reports the watershed soils are varied across the project site, but the development is generally located over hydrologic group (HSG) C soils. All stormwater buffers were sized for HSG C soils.

Summary

Based on the results of this evaluation, the proposed stormwater design is not expected to cause flooding, erosion or other significant adverse effects downstream of the site.





SHEET DESCRIPTION			JOB NO.	SHEET
		P.O. Box 339	1505	4
VOODBURY HEIGHTS SUBDIVISION		111 Elderberry Lane New Gloucester, ME 04260	DATE	1
PREPARED FOR	TERRADYN	Office: (207) 926-5111	2/9/2015	OF
B&M DEVELOPERS, INC	CONSULTANTS, LLC	Fax: (207) 221-1317 www.terradynconsultants.com	SCALE	
195 CENTER STREET AUBURN, MAINE 04210	Civil Engineering - Land Planning - St	ormwater Design - Environmental Permitting	1"=500'	1





vdrologic Soil Group—Androscoggin and Sagadahoc Counties, M. (B&M Property)	ine
--	-----



2/9/2015 Page 2 of 4

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey

Hydrologic Soil Group

Map unit symbol	Map unit name	Rating	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
BgB	Belgrade very fine sandy loam, 2 to 8 percent slopes	с	0.5	0.4%
BgC	Belgrade very fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	С	27.8	20.0%
CfB	Charlton fine sandy Ioam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	A	23.3	16.8%
CfC2	Charlton fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes, eroded	A	0.3	0.2%
ChC	Charlton very stony fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	A	25.7	18.6%
ChD	Charlton very stony fine sandy loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	A	14.5	10.5%
HrB	Hollis fine sandy loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	D	6.6	4.8%
HrC	Hollis fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	D	8.4	6.0%
HrD	Hollis fine sandy loam, 15 to 45 percent slopes	D	1.7	1.3%
HsB	Hollis very rocky fine sandy loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	D	0.9	0.6%
_e	Leicester very stony fine sandy loam	C/D	0.5	0.3%
ScA	Scantic silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	D	6.5	4.7%
БуВ	Sutton very stony loam, 0 to 8 percent slopes	C	21.9	15.8%
otals for Area of Intere	est		138.5	100.0%



Description

Hydrologic soil groups are based on estimates of runoff potential. Soils are assigned to one of four groups according to the rate of water infiltration when the soils are not protected by vegetation, are thoroughly wet, and receive precipitation from long-duration storms.

The soils in the United States are assigned to four groups (A, B, C, and D) and three dual classes (A/D, B/D, and C/D). The groups are defined as follows:

Group A. Soils having a high infiltration rate (low runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist mainly of deep, well drained to excessively drained sands or gravelly sands. These soils have a high rate of water transmission.

Group B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of moderately deep or deep, moderately well drained or well drained soils that have moderately fine texture to moderately coarse texture. These soils have a moderate rate of water transmission.

Group C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of soils having a layer that impedes the downward movement of water or soils of moderately fine texture or fine texture. These soils have a slow rate of water transmission.

Group D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate (high runoff potential) when thoroughly wet. These consist chiefly of clays that have a high shrink-swell potential, soils that have a high water table, soils that have a claypan or clay layer at or near the surface, and soils that are shallow over nearly impervious material. These soils have a very slow rate of water transmission.

If a soil is assigned to a dual hydrologic group (A/D, B/D, or C/D), the first letter is for drained areas and the second is for undrained areas. Only the soils that in their natural condition are in group D are assigned to dual classes.

Rating Options

Aggregation Method: Dominant Condition Component Percent Cutoff: None Specified Tie-break Rule: Higher







Auburn Planning Board

Date: May 12, 2015

Project: Woodbury Heights Preliminary Subdivision Plan Phase 2

The Project:

Back in March 2015, the Planning Board approved a 5 lot, minor subdivision at property located at 113 Woodbury Road.



The 56.6 acre property is zoned Low Density Rural Residential



On February 2nd the City Council amended the Future Land Use for this Property from Agricultural/Rural to Low Density Residential.





The property has over 1,000 feet of improved road frontage On Danville Corners Road.



The property also has frontage on Woodbury Road, a road with varying levels of improvements, part gravel and part lesser quality pavement.



Bouffard and McFarland Developers are proposing 5 new lots (lots 6-10), which is a major subdivision. The first step in approving a major subdivision plan, a 2 month process. The initial submission is as a Preliminary Subdivision Plan.



LOCATION MAP

689.3232 cell-24().55



Staff Review and Comments:

The Staff's main concern at the Preliminary Subdivision Stage is the remaining 24.62 acre lot which does not meet the minimum frontage requirement of 250 feet in the Rural Residential Zone.



Questions?

CITY OF AUBURN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FY 15 - 16 Only

	FY 15 - 1	6 Only			Onentine			_			
					Operating Manager			Bong	ded Manager		lanager nmendedO
	Description	Opera	ating		ommendation		Bonded		mmendation		ther
AUBURN-	EWISTON AIRPORT (Auburn's Share)	Open	iting .				Donaca				
	Small Community Air Service Development Grant Match					\$	50,000	\$	50,000		
	Landside Parking Lot					\$	350,000				
	Terminal Aircraft Parking Apron					\$	15,500			\$	15,500
	TOTAL AUBURN-LEWISTON AIRPORT	\$	-	\$	-	\$	415,500	\$	50,000	\$	15,500
ECONOMI	C DEVELOPMENT					÷	1 500 000				
	South Goff Extension to Elm St Minot Ave Corridor Analysis and Design					\$ \$	1,500,000 120,000				
	TOTAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	\$		Ś	-	\$	1,620,000	\$	-	Ś	-
FACILITIES		T		Ŧ		Ŧ	_,,	Ŧ		+	
	Natural Gas Conversion/HVAC and Efficiency Upgrades-Center St Fire Station					\$	95,000	\$	95,000		
	Security Cameras-PS Garage	\$	24,000	\$	24,000						
	Central Fire-Mechanical Systems Efficiency Upgrades					\$	65,000	\$	65,000		
	Engine 2-Insulation and Unit Heater Upgrade	\$	15,000	ć	20,000						
	Replace Card Access System Components Phase II TOTAL FACILITIES	\$ \$	20,000 59,000	\$ \$	20,000 44,000	\$	160,000	Ś	160,000	\$	
FIRE	TOTAL PACILITIES	2	39,000	Ş	44,000	Ş	100,000	Ş	100,000	2	
	Vehicle Replacement					\$	56,000			\$	56,000
	Replace expired SCBA cylinders	\$	10,000	\$	10,000						
	Engineering Study					\$	20,000				
	TOTAL FIRE	\$	10,000	\$	10,000	\$	76,000	\$	-	\$	56,000
GFTV (Aut											
	Video Production Equipment-Auburn Hall TOTAL LA911	\$ \$		ć		Ś		ć		\$ \$	29,000
	urn's share)	Ş		ş	-	Ş		ş	-	ş	29,000
LATE (AUD	Bus Replacement	Ś	-							Ś	40,000
	TOTAL LA911	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$	-	\$	40,000
<u>LA911 (A</u> u	burn's share)									<u> </u>	.,
	Radio Replacement Project					\$	1,025,000				
	TOTAL LA911	\$	-	\$	-	\$	1,025,000	\$	-	\$	-
LIBRARY											
	Masonry Repair	e e	35.000	~	47.000	\$	123,802	\$	60,000		
	Carpet Replacement New Insight Server	\$ \$	25,000 2,500	\$ \$	17,000 2,500						
	TOTAL LIBRARY	\$ \$	2,500	ې \$	19,500	Ś	123,802	\$	60,000	Ś	-
PLANNING	6 & DEVELOPMENT	7	27,500	Ý	15,500	Ŷ	125,002	Ý	00,000	~	
	Traffic Signal Upgrades/Replacements: Lake Auburn/Center	\$	33,154								
	Festival Plaza Lighting-Energy reduction & Clock repair	\$	8,580								
	Municipal Fire Alarm System-Electrical Shop	\$	16,050	\$	16,050						
	TOTAL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	\$	57,784	\$	16,050	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
POLICE											
	Vehicle Replacement		232,000	\$	79,000						
	Mobile Radio Replacement Radar Replacement	\$ \$	39,500 30,000								
	Police Headquarters: Engineering Study	Ŷ	50,000			\$	20,000				
	Radar Trailer	\$	28,000			Ŧ					
	TOTAL POLICE	\$	329,500	\$	79,000	\$	20,000	\$	-	\$	-
PUBLIC SE											
Engi	neering										
	Reconstruction Reclamation/Resurfacing					\$ \$	2,000,000 3,000,000	\$ \$	1,000,000 1,000,000		
	Major Drainage					ې Ś	1,000,000	ې \$	500,000		
	MDOT Match					Ş	1,100,000	\$	700,000		
	Retaining Walls					\$	800,000	*	,		
	Sidewalks					\$	200,000	\$	200,000		
	Bridge Maintenance										
	l Engineering	\$	-	\$	-	\$	8,100,000	\$	3,400,000	\$	
Park											
	Replace Playground & Street Furniture					\$ ¢	40,000 93,000		40,000		
Toto	Renovation of Baseball Fields I Parks	\$		s		\$ \$	93,000 133,000	\$ \$	93,000 133,000	\$	
	ic Works	Ý		Ý	-	4	133,000	Ť.	133,000	Ý	
	Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal)					\$	255,000	\$	255,000		
	Purchase Leaf Vacuum					\$	60,000				
	Purchase Vehicle Lifts					\$	40,000				
	Purchase Paint Machine	\$	15,000								
	Replace One Ton Trucks (parks and roadway maintenance)					\$	130,000	\$	130,000		
	Replace backhoe bucket loader (drainage and roadway maintenance)	s	10,000			\$	275,000	\$	137,500		
	Purchase Zero Turn Mower Purchase All-terrain Utility Vehicle	\$ \$	10,000 8,000								
	Replace bucket truck (trimming and cutting urban forest)	Ŷ	0,000			\$	175,000				
	Replace tracked excavator (drainage/roadway maintenance)					\$	450,000	\$	225,000		
	Replace asphalt reclaimer (pothole patching and paving)					\$	35,000			\$	35,000
	Replace tractor for hauling heavy equipment					\$	50,000	\$	50,000		
	I Public Works	\$	33,000	\$	-	\$	1,470,000	\$	797,500	\$	35,000
PWI	Facilities										
	Vehicle Washing Addition					Ş	925,000				115.000
Toto	Salt Brine Maker I PW Facilities	\$		\$		\$ \$	115,000 1,040,000	\$		\$ \$	115,000 115,000
1010	TPW Facilities TOTAL PUBLIC SERVICES	\$	33,000		-	\$ \$		\$ \$	4,330,500	\$ \$	150,000
RECREATIO		·					.,,		,,		.,
	Replace Windows & Asbestos Abatmenet-Hasty					\$	75,000	\$	75,000		
	TOTAL RECREATION	Ś	-	\$	-	\$	75,000	\$	75,000	\$	-
										1	
SCHOOL D	EPARTMENT										
SCHOOL D	EPARTMENT Various Projects (see attached list)			ć		Ş	6,181,838	Ş	1,024,500	\$	475,500
<u>SCHOOL D</u>	EPARTMENT	\$	-	\$ \$	- 168,550	\$ \$	6,181,838 6,181,838 20,440,140	\$ \$	1,024,500 1,024,500 5,700,000		475,500 475,500 766,000

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS		FY16	Priority Listing	
AMS				
Classroom & Library Furniture Replacement	\$	216,500	4	Last Phase
Fire Alarm Replacement	\$	384,842	1 & 2	Phase I
Interior Door Replacement/ADA hardware-140				
doors	\$	189,748	1	Phase I
TOTAL	\$	791,090		
East Auburn				
Remove Asbesto Floor tile-old section	\$	28,500	1 & 2	
Repoint Chimney	\$	20,500	2	
Repair damaged plaster wall- drywall- ceilings- 1954 wing	\$	47,200	2 & 1	
TOTAL	\$	96,200		
Fairview				
Replace Interior doors/ADA Hardware-1950	l I			1
wings	\$	205,250	1 & 2	
Replace 1996 Classroom Carpets- w/ VCT	\$	115,360	2	
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel		10.000		
system	\$	48,000	2	
TOTAL	\$	368,610		
Sherwood Heights				
Renewal Exit Signage & Emergency Lights	\$	31,500	1	
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel system	\$	48,000	2	
TOTAL	\$	79,500		
Support Services Building				
One Ton P/U with Plow (replace 2003 3/4 ton	¢	42,000	2	
Dodge) TOTAL	\$	42,000	2	
	\$	42,000		
Technology				
Seecondary Teachers/MaCBOOKS	\$	100,000	4	
TOTAL	\$	100,000		
Walton Elementary				
Renewal Emergency Lights	\$	22,600	1&2	
TOTAL	\$	22,600		
GRAND TOTAL CIP	\$	1,500,000		
Priority 1 - Life Safety Issues				
Priority 2- Facility & Equipment Renewal				
Priority 3- Energy Renewal				
Priority 4- Instructional Equipment Renewal				

City of Auburn, Maine 2015-2016 CIP Budget



Jill Eastman Finance Director

City of Auburn, Maine

"Maine's City of Opportunity"

Office of the City Manager

Date: March 2, 2015

To: Mayor Jonathan P. LaBonte and Members of the City Council

From: Howard Kroll, Acting City Manager Jill Eastman, Finance Director Denis D'Auteuil, Acting Assistant City Manager

RE: Proposed FY 2016 Capital Improvement Program

Dear Mayor and Councilors:

The proposed FY 2016 Auburn Capital Improvement Program is hereby submitted for your review in accordance with the provisions of the City Charter.

2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Introduction

The Capital Improvement Plan ("CIP") for Auburn for fiscal year 2016 is enclosed. This year a new approach and more information are included so as to be compliant with the Charter. In approaching this years' CIP staff took a ten year view of needs. Some departments are better suited to forecast that far and some are not. The expectation is looking longer-term will bring stability over time to requests. Finally, the initial presentation of the CIP includes all needs of the City to sustain operations.

As usual the CIP includes a spreadsheet for FY 2016 by expenditure and department, including the intended source of funds. And a more detailed sheet of expenditures planned for this year.

Charter Requirements

- 1. A clear general summary of its contents;
- 2. Identification of the long-term goals of the community;
- 3. A list of all capital improvements and other capital expenditures which are proposed to be undertaken during the fiscal years next ensuing, with appropriate supporting information as to the necessity of each;
- 4. Cost estimates and recommended time schedules for each improvement or other capital expenditures;
- 5. Method of financing upon which each capital expenditure is to be reliant; 60 Court Street • Auburn, ME 04210

(207) 333-6600 Voice • (207) 333-6601 Automated • (207) 333-6621 Fax www.auburnmaine.org

- 6. The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the facilities to be constructed or acquired;
- 7. A commentary on how the plan addresses the sustainability of the community and the region of which it is a part; and
- 8. Methods to measure outcomes and performance of the capital plan related to the long-term goals of the community.

Long-term Goals

The City Council has identified 4 general goals for the City. The goals of the City of Auburn focus on these 4 general areas: (These are in no particular order of importance.)

- 1. Economic Development
- 2. Education
- 3. Citizen Engagement
- 4. Strong Neighborhoods.

The City Council also acknowledges that there is a general category that serves as a "catch-all" for items outside of these 4 areas.

Consensus of the Council also requires that we remain aware of the overall cost of services and taxes. That approach admits that there must be a limit to the amount of spending and debt service the City may afford. This leads me to suggest that the CIP also has a final, general goal, "to assure that the assets of the City are maintained in a fiscally responsible manner." Following this approach recognizes that neglect or underfunding the capital needs of the City results in long-term increased costs.

Cost and Schedule

Please see attached spreadsheet at the end of the memo.

Status

CIP - Fund 3000									
CURRENT STATUS OF BONDED	PROJECTS								
FY 14-15					EV 45				
Description	Dent	Orderland	- 6	Builterd	FY 15	Tabal Farr	For some to some of	Unexpended	N 1-4
Description	Dept	Original	Transfei		To Date	Total Exp	Encumbered	(Over exp)	Notes
		Budget		Budget	2/18/2015				
2013 GO BONDS (FY 13-14)	A aluacius	CC 128 00		CC 138 00	45 422 21	45 422 24		20.005.00	
Contingency	Admin	66,128.00	-	66,128.00	45,432.31	45,432.31		20,695.69	
Major Drainage	Eng	60,000.00		60,000.00	21,145.55	21,145.55	38,902.88	(48.43)	In progress, Est Comp 6/15
Road Reconstruction	Eng	1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00	847,526.82	847,526.82		152,473.18	In progress, Est Comp 6/15
									In progress, Est
Reclamation/Resurfacing	Eng	1,250,000.00		1,250,000.00	832,025.57	832,025.57	195,015.98	222,958.45	Comp 8/15
Bridge Repairs	Eng	125,000.00		125,000.00		-		125,000.00	
MDOT Match	Eng	500,000.00		500,000.00	227,976.32	227,976.32		272,023.68	
Traffic Signal Poles	Electrical	10,736.00		10,736.00	1,190.00	1,190.00		-	Est Comp 9/14
Municipal Street Light Purchase	Electrical	750,000.00		750,000.00		-		750,000.00	
Street Light Poles	Electrical	25,000.00		25,000.00		-			Est Comp 6/15
Replace HPS Fixture	Electrical	26,000.00		26,000.00		-			Est Comp 6/15
Parks-Playground Equip	PS	38,000.00		38,000.00		-		38,000.00	Est Comp 6/15
				-		-		-	
Subtotal 2013 Bonds		3,850,864.00	-	3,850,864.00	1,975,296.57	1,975,296.57	233,918.86	1,641,648.57	
2013 GO BONDS (FY 14-15)									
Contingency	Admin	51,518.00		51,518.00		-		51,518.00	
									Pd from Bond
Bond Issuance Costs	Admin	-		-	55,637.00	55,637.00		(55,637.00)	
Library Building Improvements	Admin	47,167.00		47,167.00		-		-	Est 6/30/15
Dangerous Building Demolition	P&P	150,000.00		150,000.00	2,120.32	2,120.32		147,879.68	
Comp Plan Property Acquisition	P&P	350,000.00		350,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00		340,000.00	
Generator-S Main Fire Station	Fire	15,000.00		15,000.00		-		15,000.00	
Repurpose Ingersoll	Rec	250,000.00		250,000.00	43,336.57	43,336.57		206,663.43	
Festival Plaza Canopies	PS	35,000.00		35,000.00	-	-		35,000.00	
Major Drainage	Eng	100,000.00		100,000.00	104.65	104.65	20,574.79	79,320.56	
Softball Field Repairs	PS -	60,000.00		60,000.00	35,555.25	35,555.25	24,444.75	-	
Road Reconstruction	Eng	900,000.00		900,000.00	41,546.49	41,546.49	126 522 24	858,453.51	
Reclamation/Resurfacing	Eng	900,000.00		900,000.00	84,989.69	84,989.69	126,533.31	688,477.00	
Sidewalks Bridge Boneire	Eng	150,000.00		150,000.00		-		150,000.00	
Bridge Repairs	Eng	75,000.00		75,000.00		-		75,000.00	
MDOT Match	Eng	1,100,000.00		1,100,000.00		-		1,100,000.00	
Retaining Walls	Eng PS	100,000.00		100,000.00	75 705 00	-	85,576.00	100,000.00 18,639.00	
7 Yard Plow Trucks	PS PS	180,000.00		180,000.00	75,785.00	75,785.00	,		
12 Yard Plow Truck	PS PS	235,000.00		235,000.00	103,611.00	103,611.00	93,134.00	38,255.00	
Street Sweeper		236,250.00		236,250.00		-	177,285.00	58,965.00	
Side Dump Body/Hydraulic Lift	PS	38,700.00		38,700.00	F12 464 02	-		38,700.00	
School Department	Educ	2,081,365.00		2,081,365.00	513,461.82	513,461.82		1,567,903.18	Efficiency 1 1
		420 000 00		120 000 00	02 522 66	02 522 55	77.004.00	(20 507 63)	Efficiency ME
Energy Efficiency Projects	PS	120,000.00		120,000.00	82,522.68	82,522.68	77,064.32	(39,587.00)	Kebate
Heating Oil Tank Conversion	PS	25,000.00		25,000.00	1 0 10 5 5 5	-	1,017.00	23,983.00	
Subtotal 2014 Bonds		7,200,000.00		7,200,000.00	1,048,670.47	1,048,670.47	605,629.17	5,545,700.36	

Outcomes and Performance

PERFORMANCE MEASURES			
MEASURE	GOALS	FY 2013	FY 2014
Bond Funding Management	100% of all items funded in prior year are started (meaning done, out to bid, or pending)	54%	54.5%
Bond Rating	Bonds were secured and the City sustained its current bond rating	Aa3	Aa3

Sustainability

Sustainability has two concepts that must be acknowledged. The first is the core principal that assets are maintained such that they do not deteriorate to the point of being destroyed or beyond repair. The second concept identifies that the City of Auburn can only afford to sustain a certain annual expense. The job of the staff and Council is to strike that balance the best way possible.

The following chart shows the amount of debt issued and retired over the last ten years and includes a future projection with emphasis on reducing the total outstanding debt of the City.

	Debt Se	ervice Analysis	5	
	Outstanding			Outstanding
	Debt at Beginning	Debt	Debt	Debt at End of
	of Fiscal Year	Issued	Retirement	Fiscal Year
FY 05-06	\$63,248,668	\$13,291,307	\$7,552,775	\$68,987,200
FY 06-07	\$68,987,200	\$13,000,000	\$8,612,399	\$73,374,801
FY 07-08	\$73,374,801	\$6,000,000	\$8,489,239	\$70,885,562
FY 08-09	\$70,885,562	\$6,430,000	\$8,895,484	\$68,420,078
FY 09-10	\$68,420,078	\$6,500,000	\$8,575,483	\$66,344,595
FY 10-11	\$66,344,595	\$8,344,565	\$8,535,485	\$66,153,675
FY 11-12	\$66,153,675	\$4,500,000	\$8,816,077	\$61,837,598
FY 12-13	\$61,837,598	\$5,600,000	\$8,421,077	\$59,016,521
FY 13-14	\$59,016,521	\$5,625,000	\$8,368,864	\$56,272,657
FY 14-15	\$56,272,657	\$6,800,000	\$8,455,732	\$54,616,925
FY 15-16	\$54,616,925	\$5,700,000	\$8,684,488	\$51,632,437
FY 16-17	\$51,632,437	\$5,500,000	\$8,739,866	\$48,392,571
FY 17-18	\$48,392,571	\$5,500,000	\$8,414,866	\$45,477,705
FY 18-19	\$45,477,705	\$5,500,000	\$8,279,866	\$42,697,839
FY 19-20	\$42,697,839	\$5,500,000	\$8,207,974	\$39,989,865

Since FY 07 the City has reduced the total outstanding debt by <u>\$18,757,876</u>. It is my goal to keep the debt service payments at 12% - 14% of the total operating budget as recommended by our bond advisors. This is the range that bond rating agencies look favorably on, less than this the bond rating agencies feel that the City in not addressing their infrastructure needs and more than this makes them concerned about the ability to repay the debt. These efforts in conjunction with other sound management policies should continue to support or improve the bond rating.

Our goal should be to become less dependent on long term bonding, maintain the stability of our undesignated fund balance and ultimately improve our bond rating.

On the above chart I am recommending that we cap our borrowing to a combined school-municipal annual total of **<u>\$5,500,000</u>**.

This figure is based on a number of factors that I feel are important to the financial stability of the City. They are as follows:

*Commit to retiring \$2,000,000+ annually more than we are borrowing; and

*Commit to a short term goal of no more than <u>\$40,000,000</u> in outstanding debt.

With my recommendation we will achieve this in 5 years. Outstanding debt of less than \$40,000,000 is easily obtainable and can prepare the City for future major capital projects that may require a considerable amount of debt and a City wide referendum.

This will improve our bond rating if we work together!

Below is a table that shows what the City of Auburn's legal debt limitation is. This statutory analysis needs to be reviewed with the understanding of the City's capacity to meet debt service payments.

CITY OF AUBURN, MAINE Legal Debt Management Last Ten Years Computation of Legal Debt Margin June 30, 2014

Total State Valuation Legal Debt Limitation:			\$ 1,926,200,000			
15% of State Va	luation		288,930,000			
Debt Applicable to Debt L	imitation:		Bonded Gene	ral	Obligation De	ebt
	Legal N	<i>l</i> aximum	Dollar		As a Pe	rcent of State
Purpose	Percentage	Amount	Amount		Legal Maximum	Valuation
Municipal & School	15.0%	\$ 288,930,000			0.00%	0.00%
	Margin for Addit	tional Borrowing:	\$ 288,930,000			

The most significant impact to the City of Auburn being sustainable is investment in road infrastructure. Auburn's local roads currently have zero funding in the operating budget and the \$48.1 million recommended in engineering is part of ten year plan that will reconstruct or reclaim only 10% of the roads over the next 10 years. That results in 90% of Auburn roads seeing no pavement or construction.

In order to become sustainable Auburn must strategically budget more operating funds for surface maintenance. Surface maintenance would entail dragging shimming a road and then placing a surface coat of pavement approximately 3.4" to 1" thick. This type of work will sustain roads while reconstruction or reclamation projects are scheduled. Additionally maintenance funds utilized for the next ten years can be used after the ten years to protect and sustain the reconstruction and reclamation projects done today.

City Engineer Dan Goyette has shared that a maintenance program that would stabilize the remaining 90% of local roads would require \$1,000,000 per year. Due to both staff capacity and financial availability this is too much to add to the operating budget in one year. In addition the City cannot afford the full funding of \$48.1 million in road construction bonding and sustain the remaining capital assets.

Overall, the City of Auburn can only sustain a total general obligation debt service of \$5-\$7 million per year, totaling approximately \$70 million. We will work to reduce the cities dependence on bonding over the next 5 years.

Description		FY16	L	FY17		FY18		FY19		FY20
AUBURN-LEWISTON AIRPORT										
Small Community Air Service Development Grant Match	\$	50,000								
Landside Parking Lot	\$	350,000								
Terminal Aircraft Parking Apron	\$	15,500								
TOTAL AUBURN-LEWISTON AIRPORT	\$	415,500	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT										
South Goff Extension to Elm St	\$	1,500,000								
Minot Ave Corridor Analysis and Design	\$	120,000								
TOTAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	\$	1,620,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	
FACILITIES										
Natural Gas Conversion/HVAC and Efficiency Upgrades-Center St Fire Station	\$	95,000								
Security Cameras-PS Garage	\$	24,000								
Central Fire-Mechanical Systems Efficiency Upgrades	\$	65,000								
Engine 2-Insulation and Unit Heater Upgrade	\$	15,000								
Replace Card Access System Components Phase II	\$	20,000								
TOTAL FACILITIES	\$	219,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	
FIRE										
Vehicle Replacement	\$	56,000	\$	26,000	¢	300,000				
Replace expired SCBA cylinders	\$	10,000	\$	10,000	\$	10,000	\$	10,000		
Fire Apparatus Replacement	Ş	10,000	Ş	10,000	Ş	10,000	Ş	10,000		
Ambulance replacement									ć	150,00
Engineering Study	\$	20,000							Ş	150,00
	Ş	20,000	\$	20,000						
Underground tank removal			ې \$		ć 1	,000,000				
Building Improvements				80,000	ŞΙ	.,000,000				
Reclaim & Repave entire yard at Central			\$	186,000			ć	05 000		
Replace the breathing air cascade system	_						\$	95,000	<i>~</i>	25.00
Replace rescue boat									\$	25,00
Renovation of training facility TOTAL FIRE	Ś	86,000	ć	322,000	¢ 1	,310,000	ć	105,000	ć	175,00
	\$	86,000	Ş	322,000	21	,310,000	Ş	105,000	Ş	175,00
LATC (Auburn's share)										
Bus Replacement	\$	40,000	\$	40,000	\$	40,000				
TOTAL LATC	\$	40,000	\$	40,000	\$	40,000	\$	-	\$	
LA911 (Auburn's share)	~	1 025 000								
Radio Replacement Project TOTAL LA911		1,025,000 1,025,000	ć		ć		ć		ć	
	Ş	1,025,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	
LIBRARY										
Masonry Repair	\$	123,802		39,895			1			

	Description		FY16		FY17		FY18		FY19		FY20
	Carpet Replacement	\$	25,000	\$	27,208						
	New Insight Server	\$	2,500								
	Furniture Replacement			\$	9,808	\$	9,808	\$	9,808		
	Elevator Curcuitry Equipment										
	Recaulk Windows			\$	26,150	\$	26,150				
	Waterproof new building					\$	16,500				
TOTAL LIB		\$	151,302	\$	103,061	\$	52,458	\$	9,808	\$	-
	6 & DEVELOPMENT										
r LAMMING	Traffic Signal Upgrades/Replacements:										
	Lake Auburn/Center	\$	33,154								
	Exit 75	Ş	55,154	\$	6,000						
	Loop-Kmart South			\$ \$	8,000						
	Loop-Walmart			Ş	8,000	\$	12,000				
						\$ \$		ć	15 000	ć	15 000
	To be determined			\$	25,000	Ş	15,000	\$	15,000	\$	15,000
	Greenway Signage	ć	0 5 0 0	Ş	25,000						
	Festival Plaza Lighting-Energy reduction & Clock repair	\$	8,580			ć	25.000				
	Electrical Vehicle-Replacement					\$	25,000				
	Bucket Truck-Replacement			~	400.000	<i>.</i>	100.000	<i>.</i>	400.000		
	Comprehensive Plan Property Acquisiton Program		46.050	\$	400,000	\$	400,000	Ş	400,000		
	Municipal Fire Alarm System-Electrical Shop	\$	16,050								
	Roadway Lighting:										
	Moulton Field			\$	7,000						
	Cable Locator-Replacement			\$	5,000						
	Dangerous Building Demolition			\$	150,000						
	Street Lights:										
	Upgrade Existing to LED			\$	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000	\$	50,000
	Fire Alarm Upgrades										
TOTAL PLA	ANNING & DEVELOPMENT	\$	57,784	\$	651,000	\$	502,000	\$	465,000	\$	65,000
POLICE											
	Vehicle Replacement	\$	232,000	\$	141,000	\$	155,500	\$	127,000	\$	139,500
	Mobile Radio Replacement	\$	39,500								
	Mobile Camera System Replacement					\$	90,000				
	Mobile Data Terminal Replacement					\$	89,000				
	Portable Radio Replacement					\$	30,000	\$	30,000	\$	30,000
	Radar Replacement	\$	30,000								
	Police Headquarters:										
	Engineering Study	\$	20,000								
	Renovation and Expansion (1 Minot Ave)				TBD						
	Message Sign Trailer			\$	23,000						
	Radar Trailer	\$	28,000		.,						
	ATV Equipment		-,	\$	30,000						
				Ŷ	50,000						

Description		FY16		FY17		FY18		FY19		FY20
Evidence Locker Replacement			\$	50,000						
TOTAL POLICE	\$	349,500	\$	244,000	\$	364,500	\$	157,000	\$	169,500
PUBLIC SERVICES									l	
Engineering										
Reconstruction	\$	2,000,000		,000,000	\$	1,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000
Reclamation/Resurfacing	\$	3,000,000	\$1	,750,000	\$	2,500,000	\$	2,000,000	\$2	2,000,000
Major Drainage	\$	1,000,000	\$ 1	,000,000	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,000,000	\$ 3	1,000,000
MDOT Match	\$	1,100,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	\$	300,000
Retaining Walls	\$	800,000	\$	850,000	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$	100,000
Sidewalks	\$	200,000		200,000	\$	200,000	\$		\$	100,000
Bridge Maintenance	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	-	\$	100,000	\$	-
Total Engineering	\$	8,100,000	\$6	,200,000	\$	5,100,000	\$	6,700,000	\$6	6,500,000
									l	
Parks									ł	
Headstone Repair-Oak Hill Cemetery		TBD								
Replace Playground & Street Furniture	\$	40,000				TBD		TBD		TBD
Renovation of Baseball Fields	\$	93,000								
Renovation of Softball Fields		TBD								
Renovate Moulton Park								TBD		
Replace Artwork-Main St Art Wall										TBD
Renovate Gateway										
Total Parks	\$	133,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	
Public Works										
Replace 7 yard plow trucks (plowing/sanding and roadway maintenance)			ć	540,000			\$	360,000	ł	
Replace 12 yard plow trucks (plowing/sanding and roadway maintenance)			Ş	540,000	\$	235,000	Ş	500,000		
Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal)	\$	255,000			ې \$	255,000				
Replace Street Sweeper (sand and debris removal from roadways)	ç	233,000			\$,				
Purchase Leaf Vacuum	\$	60,000			Ş	230,000				
Purchase Vehicle Lifts	\$	40,000								
Purchase Paint Machine	\$	40,000								
Replace One Ton Trucks (parks and roadway maintenance)	\$	130,000			\$	62,000	\$	62,000	\$	124,000
Replace Pickups (parks and roadway maintenance)	ç	130,000	\$	32,000	ې \$	-	ې \$	32,000	ې \$	67,000
Replace backhoe bucket loader (drainage and roadway maintenance)	\$	275,000	Ş	52,000	Ş	67,000	Ş	52,000	Ş	67,000
Purchase Zero Turn Mower	ې \$	10,000								
	\$	8,000								
Purchase All-terrain Utility Vehicle Replace skid steers (roadway maintenance and trench restoration)	Ş	8,000	\$	50,000						
				,						
Replace Fleet Service vehicle			\$ \$	48,000 25,000						
Replace vehicle (roadway inspections)	A	175 000	Ş	25,000						
Replace bucket truck (trimming and cutting urban forest)	\$	175,000								
Replace tracked excavator (drainage/roadway maintenance)	\$	450,000	ć	250.000						
Replace multi-use tractor (sidewalk maintenance and mowing)			\$	350,000						

Description		FY16	FY17		FY18		FY19	FY20
Replace asphalt reclaimer (pothole patching and paving)	\$	35,000						
Replace road grader (roadway maintenance and snow plowing)					\$ 300,000			
Replace Snowblower					\$ 115,000			
Replace lift truck (moving equipment and materials at PW facility)					\$ 30,000			
Replace vehicle (engineering inspections)						\$	25,000	
Replace catch basin cleaning/storm drain flushing truck						\$	375,000	
Replace tractor used for hauling heavy equipment	\$	50,000						
Replace trailer mounted sign								
Replace wood chipper (disposal of brush from tree/brush cutting)								
Total Public Works	\$	1,503,000	\$ 1,045,0	00	\$ 1,300,000	\$	854,000	\$ 191,0
PW Facilities								
Vehicle Washing Addition	\$	925,000						
Salt Brine Maker	\$	115,000						
Building Expansion/Upgrade			TBD					
Total PW Facilities	\$	1,040,000	\$	-	\$-	\$	-	\$
AL PUBLIC SERVICES	\$	10,776,000	\$ 7,245,0	00	\$ 6,400,000	\$ 7	7,554,000	\$ 6,691,0
REATION	ć	330,000						
Repurpose Ingersoll Arena	\$					ć	C 000	
Asbestos Abatement	\$	50,000				\$	6,000	
Replace Windows-Hasty	\$	25,000	ć 50.0	000				
Renovate Restrooms @ Hasty			\$ 50,0					
Stove Replacement			\$ 7,0					
Replace Basketball Scoreboard			\$ 8,0	000				-
Replace 15 Passenger Van								TBD
Lighting Upgrade				_	ć 11.000			TBD
Basketball Backboards					\$ 14,000	6	60.000	
Replace Doors-Hasty						\$	68,000	
Replace Office Furniture								
Renovate Office								
Regional Field Complex								
Supplemental Parking								
Land Acquisition								
Repoint Brick					A			
Install A/C Dehumidification-Hasty					\$ 50,000			
4X4 Pickup Truck w/Plow								
AL RECREATION	Ś	405,000	\$ 65,0	000	\$ 64,000	\$	74,000	\$

TOTAL CIP

\$ 15,145,086 \$ 8,670,061 \$ 8,732,958 \$ 8,364,808 \$ 7,100,500

CITY OF AUBURN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FY 15 - 16 Only

	Description		Operating		Bonded		Other	Corr
UBURN-LI	EWISTON AIRPORT (Auburn's Share)						-	
	Small Community Air Service Development Grant Match			\$	50,000			
	Landside Parking Lot			\$	350,000			
				Ś				
	Terminal Aircraft Parking Apron				15,500			
	TOTAL AUBURN-LEWISTON AIRPORT	\$	-	\$	415,500	\$	-	
CONOMIC	<u>C DEVELOPMENT</u>							
	South Goff Extension to Elm St			\$	1,500,000			
	Minot Ave Corridor Analysis and Design			\$	120,000			
	TOTAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	\$	-	\$	1,620,000	\$	-	
ACILITIES		Ŷ		Ŷ	1,020,000	Ŷ		
				~	05 000			
	Natural Gas Conversion/HVAC and Efficiency Upgrades-Center St Fire Station			\$	95,000			
	Security Cameras-PS Garage			\$	24,000			
	Central Fire-Mechanical Systems Efficiency Upgrades			\$	65,000			
	Engine 2-Insulation and Unit Heater Upgrade	\$	15,000					
	Replace Card Access System Components Phase II	\$	20,000					
	TOTAL FACILITIES	\$	35,000	\$	184,000	\$	-	
105	TOTAL PACIENTES	Ş	33,000	Ş	184,000	Ş	-	
IRE								
	Vehicle Replacement			\$	56,000			
	Replace expired SCBA cylinders	\$	10,000					
	Engineering Study	1		\$	20,000			
	TOTAL FIRE	\$	10,000	\$	76,000	\$	_	
ATC (Aub	urn's share)	1 T	20,000	ŕ	. 0,000	1		
		Ś				ć	40.000	
	Bus Replacement	Ŧ	-	-		\$	40,000	
	TOTAL LA911	\$	-	\$	-	\$	40,000	
A911 (Aub	burn's share)							
	Radio Replacement Project			\$	1,025,000			
	TOTAL LA911	\$	-	\$	1,025,000	\$	-	
IBRARY		Ċ		Ċ	,,			
	Masonry Repair			\$	123,802			
				Ş	123,802			
	Carpet Replacement	\$	25,000					
	New Insight Server	\$	2,500					
	TOTAL LIBRARY	\$	27,500	\$	123,802	\$	-	
PLANNING	& DEVELOPMENT							
	Traffic Signal Upgrades/Replacements:							
		ć	22.154					
	Lake Auburn/Center	\$	33,154					
	Festival Plaza Lighting-Energy reduction & Clock repair	\$	8,580					
	Municipal Fire Alarm System-Electrical Shop	\$	16,050					
	TOTAL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	\$	57,784	\$	-	\$	-	
OLICE			· · ·					
	Vehicle Replacement	\$	232,000					
	Mobile Radio Replacement	\$	39,500					
	Radar Replacement	\$	30,000					
	Police Headquarters:							
	Engineering Study			\$	20,000			
	Radar Trailer	ć	28,000	Ŷ	20,000			
		ې د		~	20.000	<i>c</i>		
	TOTAL POLICE	\$	329,500	\$	20,000	\$	-	
PUBLIC SER		1						
Engin	neering	1						
	Reconstruction	1		\$	2,000,000			
	Reclamation/Resurfacing	1		\$	3,000,000			
	-	1			1,000,000			
	Major Drainage	1		\$				
	MDOT Match	1		\$	1,100,000			
	Retaining Walls	1		\$	800,000			
	Sidewalks	1		\$	200,000			
	Bridge Maintenance	1		· ·				
	Engineering	\$		\$	8,100,000	ć		
rotar		د ا	-	ب	8,100,000	Ŷ	-	
. .		1						
Parks	Replace Playground & Street Furniture	1		\$	40,000			
		1		\$	93,000			
	Renovation of Baseball Fields							1
	Renovation of Baseball Fields	Ś	-	Ś		Ś	-	
Total	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks	\$	-	\$	133,000	\$	-	
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works	\$	-		133,000	\$	-	
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal)	\$	-	\$	133,000 255,000	\$	-	
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works	\$	-		133,000	\$	-	
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal)	\$		\$	133,000 255,000	\$		
Total Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal) Purchase Leaf Vacuum Purchase Vehicle Lifts		-	\$ \$	133,000 255,000 60,000	\$		
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal) Purchase Leaf Vacuum Purchase Vehicle Lifts Purchase Paint Machine	\$ \$	- 15,000	\$ \$ \$	133,000 255,000 60,000 40,000	\$		
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal) Purchase Leaf Vacuum Purchase Vehicle Lifts Purchase Paint Machine Replace One Ton Trucks (parks and roadway maintenance)		- 15,000	\$ \$ \$ \$	133,000 255,000 60,000 40,000 130,000	\$		
<i>Total</i> Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal) Purchase Leaf Vacuum Purchase Vehicle Lifts Purchase Paint Machine		- 15,000	\$ \$ \$	133,000 255,000 60,000 40,000	\$		
Total Public	Renovation of Baseball Fields Parks c Works Replace front end loader (loading materials and snow removal) Purchase Leaf Vacuum Purchase Vehicle Lifts Purchase Paint Machine Replace One Ton Trucks (parks and roadway maintenance)		- 15,000 10,000	\$ \$ \$ \$	133,000 255,000 60,000 40,000 130,000	\$		
CITY OF AUBURN CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FY 15 - 16 Only

Description		Operating		Bonded	Other	Est Completior
Replace bucket truck (trimming and cutting urban forest)		operating	\$	175,000	01	
Replace tracked excavator (drainage/roadway maintenance)			Ś	450,000		
Replace asphalt reclaimer (pothole patching and paving)			Ś	35,000		
Replace tractor for hauling heavy equipment			Ś	50,000		
Total Public Works	Ś	33,000	\$	1,470,000	\$.	
PW Facilities		,	ŕ	,,		1
Vehicle Washing Addition			Ś	925,000		
Salt Brine Maker			Ś	115,000		
Total PW Facilities	\$	-	\$	1,040,000	\$.	
TOTAL PUBLIC SERVICES	\$	33,000	\$	10,743,000	\$.	
ECREATION						
Repurpose Ingersoll Arena			\$	330,000		
Asbestos Abatment			\$	50,000		
Replace Windows-Hasty			\$	25,000		
TOTAL RECREATION	\$	-	\$	405,000	\$.	
TOTAL CIP	\$	492,784	\$	14,612,302	\$ 40,000	,



City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

FiscalYear: Priority:										
•	Small Community A Expanded service	mall Community Air Service Development Grant Match xpanded service								
Department:	Auburn-Lewiston A	uburn-Lewiston Airport								
		unds the lacal share obligated with award of 2011 US Department of Transportation Small ommunity Air Service Grant.								
Location:	Auburn Lewiston Airpo	rt								
Justification:	monies will be used to	In an effort to provide local connectivity to the National Air Transportation System, the grant monies will be used to provide a viable Air Taxi Service using non-mainline air transportation providers. Initially the service will be unscheduled but is expected to become scheduled as demand increases.								
Useful Life:	Yrs									
Cost FY 2016 \$50,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$50,000			

Cost breakdown and funding source(s)

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Other		2016	100.00%	\$50,000	Current Revenues



City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Small Community Air Service Development Grant Match

Department: Auburn-Lewiston Airport

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	

CITY OF AUBURN FY16- FY17 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Priority: Fiscal Year: Auburn-Lewiston Airport

Project Title: FY 16 - CIP - Small Community Air Service Development Grant Match

2016

Department: Airport

Project Description: Funds the local share obligated with award of 2011 US Department of Transportation Small Community Air Service Development Grant.

Project Location: Airport

Project Justification: In an effort to provide local connectivity to the National Air Transportation System, the grant monies will be used to provide a viable Air Taxi Service using non-mainline air transportation providers. Initially the service will be unscheduled but is expected to become scheduled as demand increases.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source	Proposed Fiscal Year Schedule		
	Cost	Check On	e	Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	50%
Acquisition:			G.O. Bond		FY15	
Construction:			Reserve		FY15	
Other: Grant Match	\$ 50,00	00	Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost:	\$ 700,00	00	Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:	Grant Award Do	cument	Other City of Lewiston		FY15	50%

Impact on Operating Costs: The impacts on operations through this action are not completely known until an air taxi operator is contracted. It is anticipated that cost impacts will not be substantial.

Other related City Projects: Downtown Bus Service, Passenger Rail Service

Alternatives/impacts if the project is not funded or completed: Funding of Grant Match is intregal to the acceptance of the Small Community Air Service Development Grant. The grant was awarded in 2011 but the change in leadership at the airport has put off action until this fiscal year.



Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport 80 Airport Drive + Auburn, Maine 04210

October 20, 2011

Aloha Ley Associate Director, W86-310 U.S. Department of Transportation Small Community Air Service Development Program 1200 New Jersey Ave., S.E. Washington, D.C. 20590

Re: Grant Award and Agreement with the US Department of Transportation under the Small Community Air Service Development Program, Docket: DOT-OST-2011-0119.

Dear Ms. Ley:

As requested, enclosed is one (1) fully executed original of the above referenced Grant Agreement.

If you need any additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Richard Cloutier, C.M. Airport Director

GRANT AWARD AND AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND AUBURN-LEWISTON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, ACTING FOR THE COMMUNITY OF AUBURN, MAINE, UNDER THE SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport (hereinafter referred to as the Sponsor), on behalf of the community of Auburn, Maine, has applied for a Grant under the Small Community Air Service Development Program; now THEREFORE, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), acting for the UNITED STATES, presents this Grant Award and Agreement to the Sponsor for a grant of up to \$600,000 to assist in the Sponsor's efforts to address the air service needs of the community. Unless otherwise defined in this Grant Agreement, capitalized terms shall have the meanings assigned to such terms in Section E hereof.

THIS GRANT AWARD AND AGREEMENT IS MADE ON AND SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

A. GENERAL CONDITIONS

- 1. The maximum obligation of the United States payable under this Grant Agreement shall be \$600,000.
- 2. Payment of the United States' share of the agreed project costs will be made pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of such regulations and procedures as DOT may prescribe. Final determination of the United States' share may be based upon a final review of the total amount of agreed project costs and settlement will be made for adjustments to the United States' share of costs.
- 3. The Sponsor shall carry out and complete the Project without undue delays and in accordance with the terms hereof and pursuant to any regulations and procedures as DOT may prescribe.
- 4. This Grant Award constitutes an obligation of federal funding. This Grant Award shall expire and the United States shall not be obligated to pay any part of the costs of the project unless the Sponsor signs this Grant Agreement on or before **October 30, 2011**, or such subsequent date as may be prescribed in writing by DOT. If the Sponsor makes any substantive changes to this Grant Agreement, such changes shall constitute amendments to this Grant Award and Agreement and further action on the part of DOT is required in order for DOT to accept such amendments to the initial Grant Award obligation. If not signed and returned to DOT without modification by the Recipient on or before October 30, 2011, DOT may unilaterally terminate this Grant Award and Agreement.
- 5. The Sponsor shall take all steps, including litigation, if necessary, to recover Federal funds when DOT determines, after consultation with the Sponsor, that such funds have been spent fraudulently, wastefully, or in violation of Federal

laws, or misused in any manner in any project upon which Federal funds have been expended. For the purposes of this Grant Agreement, the term "Federal funds" means funds however used or disbursed by the Sponsor that were originally paid pursuant to this Grant Agreement.

- 6. The Sponsor shall retain all documents relevant to the Grant Award for a period of three years after completion of all projects undertaken pursuant to the Grant Agreement and receipt of final reimbursement from the U.S. Treasury, whichever is later. It shall furnish DOT, upon request, all documents and records pertaining to the determination of the amount of the Federal share or to any settlement, litigation, negotiation, or other efforts taken to recover such funds. All settlements or other final positions of the Sponsor, in court or otherwise, involving the recovery of such Federal share shall be approved in advance by DOT.
- 7. The United States shall not be responsible or liable for damage to property or injury to persons that may arise from, or be incident to, compliance with this Grant Agreement.
- 8. The Sponsor shall ensure compliance with Federal regulations requiring conduct of a Federally-approved audit of any expenditure of funds of \$500,000 or more in a year in Federal awards.
- 9. The provisions of 49 CFR Part 18.36 (DOT's procurement standards for grants) will apply to the extent that the Sponsor procures property and services in carrying out the approved grant project(s).

B. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

- 1. Subject to the terms set forth in this Grant Agreement, DOT reserves the right to terminate the Grant Agreement, and DOT's obligations hereunder, on 90 days' prior written notice, unless otherwise agreed between the Sponsor and DOT, if any of the following occurs:
 - a. The Sponsor fails to provide the local contribution as provided in its application, or alternatives approved by DOT;
 - b. The Sponsor does not meet the conditions and obligations specified under this Grant Agreement;
 - c. DOT determines that termination is in the public interest.
- 2. Either party may seek to amend or modify this Grant Agreement on 30 days' prior written notice to the other party. The Grant Agreement will be amended or modified only on mutual written agreement by both parties.
- 3. At any time, on 30 days' prior written notice, the Sponsor may request termination of this Grant Agreement.
- 4. Subject to the terms set forth in this Grant Agreement, and unless otherwise agreed between the Sponsor and DOT, this Grant Agreement will expire on December 31, 2014.

C. PROPOSAL SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

1. <u>Legal Sponsor</u>: Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport, designated by the community of Auburn, Maine, as the legal Sponsor under the Small Community Air Service Development Program, shall administer the Grant according to the conditions set forth in this Grant Agreement.

Sponsor Contact: Rick Cloutier Airport Manager Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport 80 Airport Drive Auburn, ME 04210 Phone: 207-786-0631 Fax: (207) 782-3024 Email: manager@flytome.com

- 2. Project Goals and Objectives
 - To obtain service to Boston or another East Coast hub, including Washington Dulles, Newark, Philadelphia, New York Kennedy, or New York LaGuardia, allowing first-time local access to the national air transportation system and capturing a high percentage of the projected passengers from the Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport catchment area.

3. Funding

a.	Total Project Cash Costs:	\$700,000
	Federal Share:	\$600,000
	Local Share:	\$100,000

- b. Payment by DOT shall not exceed \$600,000 for the Total Project Cash Costs, which include a revenue guarantee and/or start-up cost abatements to support air service to Boston or another East Coast hub. The Local Share will provide for marketing of the new service.
- c. The Sponsor shall pay the costs associated with the Project prior to seeking reimbursement from DOT. If the Sponsor is seeking private contributions to complete the Local Share, the Sponsor is responsible for ensuring that the full Local Share is provided.
- d. To seek reimbursement from DOT, the Sponsor shall submit documentary evidence of all expenditures associated with the Project set forth in paragraph b. above, and included in the Total Project Cash Costs set forth in paragraph a. above (those to be covered by the local and/or state contribution, as well as those covered by the Federal contribution) on a monthly basis. DOT will reimburse the Sponsor on a monthly basis for 85.71 percent of all valid expenditures submitted (Federal share of total project costs set forth in paragraph a. above), subject to paragraph f.

below. All reimbursement requests to DOT shall include sufficient documentation to justify reimbursement of the Sponsor, including invoices and proof of payment of the invoice.

- e. Payment of the final 10 percent of the Federal funding for the project will be made after receipt by DOT of the final report set forth in Section C.4. below.
- f. No reimbursement by DOT will be made until the Sponsor has provided DOT with a copy of the revenue guarantee/subsidy/financial incentive agreement, including the cost and revenue bases for the compensation required.
- g. At the sole option of DOT, funding may terminate 12 months after the Execution of this Grant Agreement if the Sponsor is unable to execute an agreement with an air carrier for air service at Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport, unless otherwise agreed between the Sponsor and DOT.
- h. At the sole option of DOT, funding may terminate within three months after execution of an agreement with an air carrier for service at the community if the marketing program to support the service has not been *developed and implemented*, unless otherwise agreed between the Sponsor and the DOT.
- i. At the sole option of DOT, funding under this Grant Agreement may terminate if no air service by an air carrier has commenced within 18 months after the Execution of this Grant Agreement, unless otherwise agreed between the Sponsor and DOT.
- j. If during the revenue guarantee/subsidy/carrier incentive period, the carrier stops providing the agreed-upon service, DOT will only provide reimbursement to the Grantee for actual service provided by the carrier under the agreement.
- k. The Sponsor shall ensure that the funds provided by DOT are not misappropriated or misdirected to any other account, need, project, line-item, or the like.
- 1. All requests for reimbursement must be made by the Grantee within 60 calendar days after the date of expiration (see Section B.4) of this Grant Agreement.
- m. All expenses for this Project must be incurred by the date of expiration of this Grant Agreement (see Section B.4), unless otherwise agreed between the Sponsor and DOT.
- n. Should this Grant Agreement be terminated prior to the expiration date provided herein, DOT reserves the right to require that the Sponsor return to DOT any of the funds reimbursed for expenses subsequently deemed ineligible.
- 4. Reports
 - a. Project reports, including progress on milestones as set forth in paragraph
 b. below, shall be reported to DOT on a quarterly basis, with reports due
 to DOT as follows: January 15 for the First Quarter, April 15 for the

Second Quarter, July 15 for the Third Quarter, and October 15 for the Fourth Quarter. **The first project report is due on January 15, 2012.**

- b. Project reports shall include the following: (i) brief narrative detailing the status of the grant project and the progress being made towards the goals and objectives described in Section C.2.; (ii) status report on the hiring of any consultants in conjunction with implementation of the authorized grant project; (iii) status report on contract negotiations with airlines, including any subsidy/revenue guarantee agreements; and (vi) status report on contract negotiations with other third parties.
- c. Final report (in a format to be provided by DOT) of the Sponsor's assessment of the project shall be made to DOT within three months after expiration of this Grant Agreement or conclusion of the grant project, whichever occurs earlier.
- 5. Sponsor Obligations
 - a. The Sponsor shall, within 15 calendar days after their execution, provide DOT with a copy of all agreements executed between the Sponsor and any consultants, air carriers, or other parties with respect to the Project. The Sponsor shall, within 15 calendar days after execution, also provide DOT with notice of any amendment to, or termination of such agreements. The Sponsor shall ensure that all agreements entered into with third parties regarding this grant are consistent with this Grant Agreement and the documents incorporated by reference into the Grant Agreement, and any amendments or modifications executed, pursuant to Section B.
 - b. The Sponsor shall provide evidence on a quarterly basis as set forth in Section C.4. above, to demonstrate the progress that it has made toward securing the third party in-kind contributions per Section C.3.a. above and as described in its application, or alternative third party in-kind contributions approved by DOT.
 - c. The Sponsor shall ensure that the obligations set forth in this Grant Agreement are met. Failure to do so may result in termination of the Grant Agreement by DOT.

D. ASSURANCES

The Sponsor shall execute the attached assurances and certifications (Assurances) in conjunction with its signing of this Grant Agreement and shall ensure compliance by the Grant Recipient with these Assurances and any amendments or modifications thereto.

E. **DEFINITIONS**

Agreement: Any written or oral contract, obligation, commitment, or understanding between the Sponsor and/or all parties identified in the community's Grant Application.

Application or Grant Application: The complete document submitted by the community/sponsor to DOT in Docket OST-2011-0119, including any amendments.

Carrier or Air Carrier or Airline: A citizen of the United States undertaking, by any means, directly or indirectly to provide air transportation, including commuter air carriers and air taxi operators.

Community: All parties identified in the Grant Application as participating in the approved Grant Project, including the designated Legal Sponsor.

DOT: United States Department of Transportation.

Execution of Grant Agreement: Signing of the written Grant Agreement by DOT.

Federal Share: Federal funds authorized for use by the grant recipient in implementing the approved grant project.

Grant Agreement: The written agreement between DOT and the Sponsor for the Grant Project under the Small Community Air Service Development Program and DOT Order 2011-7-1, incorporating by reference, except to the extent otherwise inconsistent with the terms of the written agreement, the original application filed with Grants.gov on August 2, 2011, in Docket OST-2011-0119, including any amendments, as well as any material submitted in the Docket as Confidential Material.

Grant Recipient/Grantee: Community entity/entities receiving the SCASDP grant, including the Sponsor.

Local Share: Public, community, state, or private funds described in the Grant Application for use in implementing the Grant Project, excluding third party inkind contributions.

Party: DOT and/or the Sponsor, as the context indicates.

Project or Grant Project: The authorized use of Federal and/or local funds to fulfill the goals and objectives detailed in the Grant Agreement.

Proposal: Project defined by the community in its Grant Application.

Quarter or Quarterly: Calendar quarter. Reports or other information required for submission on a quarterly basis are due no later than 15 calendar days after the close of the calendar quarter.

Small Community Air Service Development Program (SCASDP): A grant-inaid financial assistance program originally established under the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR-21), P.L. 106-181, as amended by Vision 100—The Century in Aviation Reauthorization Act, P.L. 108-176, and codified in 49 U.S.C. 41743.

Sponsor Obligations: Material responsibilities of the Sponsor under this Grant Agreement and those documents incorporated by reference into the Grant Agreement as set forth above (Definition of Grant Agreement).

Sponsor or Legal Sponsor: The designated representative of the Grantee to administer and oversee implementation of the Grant Agreement and fulfillment of the authorized grant project.

In-Kind/Third Party In-Kind Contribution: Property or services that benefit a federally-assisted project or program and that are contributed by non-Federal third parties without charge to the Grantee or a cost-type contractor under the Grant Agreement.

Total Project Cash Costs: Sum of the Federal and local cash shares contributed toward completion of the Grant Project, excluding third party in-kind contributions.

GRANT AWARD

This Grant Award is made in accordance with 49 U.S.C. § 41743 and is subject to the terms and conditions of this Grant Agreement and the Assurances attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Executed this 29th day of September, 2011.

(SEAL)

United States Department of Transportation

Coliat

Aloha Ley Associate Director Small Community Air Service Development Program

ACCEPTANCE

The undersigned Sponsor agrees to accomplish each element of the Project in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Grant Agreement and the Assurances attached hereto and incorporated herein.

Executed this 6 day of OCTOBER, 2011.

Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport Auburn, Maine

(SEAL)

By: Ruch Court Signature of Sponsor's Designated Official Representative

Richard Clatter

Au Purt Directur Title

Attest: Title: Admir

CERTIFICATE OF SPONSOR'S ATTORNEY

I, WILLIAM M. WELCH, FOR BEAUSTER, acting as Attorney for the Sponsor do hereby certify: That in my opinion the Sponsor is empowered to enter into the foregoing Grant Agreement under the laws of the State (or Commonwealth) of MAINE Further, I have examined the foregoing Grant Agreement, and the actions taken by said Sponsor relating thereto, and find that the acceptance thereof by said Sponsor and Sponsor's official representative has been duly authorized and that the execution thereof is in all respects due and proper and in accordance with the laws of the said State (or Commonwealth) and Title 49 U.S.C. In addition, for grants involving projects to be carried out on property not owned by the Sponsor or where Sponsor may make payments to others, there are no legal impediments that will prevent full performance by the Sponsor. Further, it is my opinion that the said Grant Agreement, including the Assurances, constitutes a legal and binding obligation of the Sponsor in accordance with the terms thereof.

Signature of Sponsor's Attorney

WILLIAM M. WELCH Printed or Typed Name

<u>OCTUBER 11, 2011</u> Date (207) 774-1200

Attachments

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TITLE VI ASSURANCE (Implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended)

ASSURANCE CONCERNING NONDISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF DISABILITY IN FEDERALLY-ASSISTED PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES RECEIVING OR BENEFITING FROM FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(Implementing the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and the Air Carrier Access Act of 1986)

49 CFR Parts 21 and 27 and 14 CFR Parts 271 and 382

AUDICIPAL AN PONT (the Grant Recipient) HEREBY AGREES THAT, (Name of Grant Recipient)

I. As a condition to receiving any Federal financial assistance from the Department of Transportation, it will comply: with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2000d--42 U.S.C. 2000d-4; all requirements imposed by or pursuant to: Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 21, Nondiscrimination in Federally-Assisted Programs of the Department of Transportation--Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and other pertinent directives so that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the Recipient receives Federal financial assistance from the Department of Transportation. This assurance is required by Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, section 21.7(a) and Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, section 271.9(c).

II. As a condition to receiving any Federal financial assistance from the Department of Transportation, it will comply with: section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (29 U.S.C. 794); the Air Carrier Access Act of 1986 (49 U.S.C. 1374(c)); and all requirements imposed by or pursuant to Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 27, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Receiving or Benefiting from Federal Financial Assistance, Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 382, Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Air Travel; and other pertinent directives so that no otherwise qualified person with a disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be discriminated against by reason of such handicap in the provision of air transportation, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program for which the Recipient receives Federal financial assistance

from the Department of Transportation. This assurance is required by Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, section 27.9 and Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 271.9(c) and 382.9.

III. It will promptly take any measures necessary to effectuate this Grant Agreement. The Recipient further agrees that it shall take reasonable actions to guarantee that it, its contractors and subcontractors subject to the Department of Transportation regulations cited above, transferees, and successors in interest will comply with all requirements imposed or pursuant to the statutes and Department of Transportation regulations cited above, other pertinent directives, and the above assurances.

IV. These assurances obligate the Recipient for the period during which Federal financial assistance is extended. The Recipient agrees that the United States has a right to seek judicial enforcement with regard to any matter arising under the statutes and Department of Transportation regulations cited above, other pertinent directives, and the above assurances.

V. These assurances are given for the purpose of obtaining Federal grant assistance under the Small Community Air Service Development Program and are binding on the Recipient, contractors, subcontractors, transferees, successors in interest, and all other participants receiving Federal grant assistance in the Small Community Air Service Development Program. The person or persons whose signatures appear below are authorized to sign this Grant Agreement on behalf of the Grant Recipient.

VI. In addition to these assurances, the Recipient agrees to file: a summary of all complaints filed against it within the past year that allege violation(s) by the Recipient of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, or the Air Carrier Access Act of 1986; or a statement that there have been no complaints filed against it. The summary should include the date the complaint was filed, the nature of the complaint, the status or outcome of the complaint (*i.e.*, whether it is still pending or how it was resolved).

Date

By: Airport Manager Richard Cloutier

Auburn - Lewiston Legal Name of Grant Recipient

Signature of Authorized Official

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OFFICE OF AVIATION ANALYSIS

CERTIFICATION REGARDING INFLUENCING ACTIVITIES

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Influencing Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

Signature

Date

ALCROAT DISEC Title

Auborn-Lewiston Municipal AirPort Grant Recipient

10/6/11

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION **OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OFFICE OF AVIATION ANALYSIS**

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS IN THE PERFORMANCE OF SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE PURSUANT TO GRANT AWARD UNDER THE SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A. The grant recipient certifies that it will, or will continue, to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grant recipient's workplace, and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an ongoing drug-free awareness program to inform employees about-

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace:

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

- (3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and
- (4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of work supported by the grant award be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment supported by the grant award, the employee will--

(1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and

(2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency in writing, within ten calendar days after receiving notice under paragraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to the Office of Aviation Analysis. Notice shall include the order number of the grant award;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 days of receiving notice under paragraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted--

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f).

B. The grant recipient may, but is not required to, insert in the space provided below the site for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant.

Places of Performance (street address, city, county, state, zip code). For the provision of air service pursuant to the grant award, workplaces include outstations, maintenance sites, headquarters office locations, training sites and any other worksites where work is performed that is supported by the grant award.

Check [] if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Grant Recipient Signature

10 16/11

SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

GRANT ASSURANCES

Certification. The Grantee hereby assures and certifies, with respect to this grant, that it will comply with all applicable Federal laws, regulations, executive orders, policies, guidelines, and requirements as they relate to the application, acceptance, and use of Federal funds for this project, including, but not limited to the following::

1. General Federal Requirements.

Federal Legislation

- a. Davis-Bacon Act 40 U.S.C. 276(a), et seq.
- b. Federal Fair Labor Standards Act 29 U.S.C. 201, et seq. Airport Assurances (9/99)
- c. Hatch Act 5 U.S.C. 1501, et seq.
- d. Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, 42 U.S.C. 4601, et seq.
- e. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 Section 106 16 U.S.C. 470(f).
- f. Archeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 16 U.S.C. 469a through 469c.
- g. Native Americans Grave Repatriation Act 25 U.S.C. 3001, et seq.
- h. Clean Air Act, P.L. 90-148, as amended.
- i. Coastal Zone Management Act, P.L. 92-583, as amended.
- j. Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 Section 102(a) 42 U.S.C. 4012a.1
- k. Age Discrimination Act of 1975 42 U.S.C. 6101, et seq.
- 1. American Indian Religious Freedom Act, P.L. 95-341, as amended.
- m. Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 -42 U.S.C. 4151, et seq.
- n. Power Plant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 Section 403 42 U.S.C.8373.
- o. Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act 40 U.S.C. 327, et seq.
- p. Copeland Anti-kickback Act 18 U.S.C. 874.
- q. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 42 U.S.C. 4321, et seq.
- r. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, P.L. 90-542, as amended.
- s. Single Audit Act of 1984 31 U.S.C. 7501, et seq.
- t. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, as amended.

Executive Orders

Executive Order 13513 – Text Messaging While Driving (see attached clause entitled "Financial Assistance Policy to Ban Text Messaging While Driving")

Executive Order 11246 - Equal Employment Opportunity Executive Order 11990 - Protection of Wetlands Executive Order 11998 – Flood Plain Management Executive Order 12372 - Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.

Executive Order 12898 - Environmental Justice

Federal Regulations

a. 14 CFR Part 13 - Investigative and Enforcement Procedures.

b. 14 CFR Part 16 - Rules of Practice For Federally Assisted Airport Enforcement Proceedings.

c. 29 CFR Part 1 - Procedures for predetermination of wage rates.

d. 29 CFR Part 3 - Contractors and subcontractors on public building or public work financed in whole or part by loans or grants from the United States.

e. 29 CFR Part 5 - Labor standards provisions applicable to contracts covering federally financed and assisted construction (also labor standards provisions applicable to non-construction contracts subject to the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act).

f. 41 CFR Part 60 - Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Equal Employment Opportunity, Department of Labor (Federal and federally assisted contracting requirements).

g. 49 CFR Part 18 - Uniform administrative requirements for grants and cooperative agreements to state and local governments.

h. 49 CFR Part 23 - Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprise in Airport Concessions.

i. 49 CFR Part 24 - Uniform relocation assistance and real property acquisition for Federal and federally assisted programs.

j. 49 CFR Part 26 – Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Department of Transportation Programs.

k. 49 CFR Part 30 - Denial of public works contracts to suppliers of goods and services of countries that deny procurement market access to U.S. contractors.

Office of Management and Budget Circulars

a. A-87 - Cost Principles Applicable to Grants and Contracts with State and Local Governments.

b. A-133 - Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations

c. A-102 - Grants and Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments.

d. Any other applicable OMB Circular based upon the specific grant recipient.

The Sponsor shall ensure that any use of airport funds in conjunction with this project comply fully with all regulations and policies of the Federal Aviation Administration for use of those funds. Specific assurances required to be included in grant agreements by any of the above laws, regulations, or circulars are incorporated by reference in the grant agreement.

2. Responsibility and Authority of the Grantee.

It has legal authority to apply for the grant, and to finance and carry out the proposed project; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.

3. Funds Availability. It has sufficient funds available for that portion of the project costs that are not to be paid by the United States. It has sufficient funds available to assure operation and maintenance of items funded under the grant agreement that it will own or control.

4. Preserving Rights and Powers.

a. It will not take or permit any action that would operate to deprive it of any of the rights and powers necessary to perform any or all of the terms, conditions, and assurances in the grant agreement without the written approval of the DOT, and will act promptly to acquire, extinguish, or modify any outstanding rights or claims of right of others that would interfere with such performance by the sponsor. This shall be done in a manner acceptable to the DOT.

5. Accounting System, Audit, and Record Keeping Requirements.

a. It shall keep all project accounts and records that fully disclose the amount and disposition by the recipient of the proceeds of the grant, the total cost of the project in connection with which the grant is given or used, and the amount or nature of that portion of the cost of the project supplied by other sources, and such other financial records pertinent to the project. The accounts and records shall be kept in accordance with an accounting system that will facilitate an effective audit in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984 (31 U.S.C. 7501-7507).

b. It shall make available to the DOT and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, for the purpose of audit and examination, any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to the grant. The DOT may require that a recipient conduct an appropriate audit. In any case in which an independent audit is made of the accounts of a sponsor relating to the disposition of the proceeds of a grant or relating to the project in connection with which the grant was given or used, it shall file a certified copy of such audit with the Comptroller General of the United States not later than six (6) months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made.

6. Minimum Wage Rates. It shall include, in all contracts in excess of \$2,000 for work on any projects funded under this grant agreement that involve labor, provisions establishing minimum rates of wages, to be predetermined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.), which contractors shall pay to skilled and unskilled labor, and such minimum rates shall be stated in the invitation for bids and shall be included in proposals or bids for the work.

7. Economic Nondiscrimination. In any agreement, contract, lease, or other arrangement under any project funded under this grant agreement and for which a right or privilege at the airport is granted to any person, firm, or corporation to conduct or to engage in any aeronautical activity for furnishing services to the public at the airport, the Grantee will insert and enforce provisions requiring the contractor to (1) furnish said services on a reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory, basis to all users thereof, and (2) charge reasonable, and not unjustly discriminatory discounts, rebates, or other similar types of price reductions to volume purchasers.

8. Engineering and Design Services. It will award each contract or sub-contract for program management, construction management, planning studies, feasibility studies, architectural services, preliminary engineering, design, engineering, surveying, mapping, or related services with respect to the project in the same manner as a contract for architectural and engineering services is negotiated under Title IX of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 1101-1104) or an equivalent qualifications-based requirement prescribed for or by the Grantee.

10. Relocation and Real Property Acquisition. (1) It will be guided in acquiring real property, to the greatest extent practicable under State law, by the land acquisition policies in Subpart B of 49 CFR Part 24 and will pay or reimburse property owners for necessary expenses as specified in Subpart B. (2) It will provide a relocation assistance program offering the services described in Subpart C and fair and reasonable relocation payments and assistance to displaced persons as required in Subpart D and E of 49 CFR Part 24. (3) It will make available within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, comparable replacement dwellings to displaced persons in accordance with Subpart E of 49 CFR Part 24.

11. Buy America. In accordance with DOT annual appropriations restrictions, funds provided under this award must be expended consistent with Sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act"). In accepting this award, the Grantee agrees to comply with such provisions and to review the provisions of the Act to ensure that all expenditures made under this award are consistent with such Act.

Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Air port Grant Recipient Am Clout

Signature of Authorized Grant Recipient Official

11

Date

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS -- PRIMARY COVERED TRANSACTIONS

2 C.F.R. Part 1200, 49 C.F.R. Part 32

Instructions for Certification

1. By signing and submitting this proposal, the prospective primary participant is providing the certification set out below.

2. The inability of a person to provide the certification required below will not necessarily result in denial of participation in this covered transaction. The prospective participant shall submit an explanation of why it cannot provide the certification set out below. The certification or explanation will be considered in connection with the department or agency's determination whether to enter into this transaction. However, failure of the prospective primary participant to furnish a certification or an explanation shall disqualify such person from participation in this transaction.

3. The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when the department or agency determined to enter into this transaction. If it is later determined that the prospective primary participant knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

4. The prospective primary participant shall provide immediate written notice to the department or agency to which this proposal is submitted if at any time the prospective primary participant learns that its certification was erroneous when submitted or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

5. The terms covered transaction, debarred, suspended, ineligible, lower tier covered transaction, participant, person, primary covered transaction, principal, proposal, and voluntarily excluded, as used in this clause, have the meanings set out in the Definitions and Coverage sections of the rules implementing Executive Order 12549. You may contact the department or agency to which this proposal is being submitted for assistance in obtaining a copy of those regulations.

6. The prospective primary participant agrees by submitting this proposal that, should the proposed covered transaction be entered into, it shall not knowingly enter into any lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this covered transaction, unless authorized by the department or agency entering into this transaction.

7. The prospective primary participant further agrees by submitting this proposal that it will include the clause titled "Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion -- Lower Tier Covered Transaction," provided by the department or agency entering into this covered transaction, without modification, in all lower tier covered transactions and in all solicitations for lower tier covered transactions.

8. A participant in a covered transaction may rely upon a certification of a prospective participant in a lower tier covered transaction that it is not proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, debarred, suspended, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from the covered

transaction, unless it knows that the certification is erroneous. A participant may decide the method and frequency by which it determines the eligibility of its principals. Each participant may, but is not required to, check the List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non-procurement Programs.

9. Nothing contained in the foregoing shall be construed to require establishment of a system of records in order to render in good faith the certification required by this clause. The knowledge and information of a participant is not required to exceed that which is normally possessed by a prudent person in the ordinary course of business dealings.

10. Except for transactions authorized under paragraph 6 of these instructions, if a participant in a covered transaction knowingly enters into a lower tier covered transaction with a person who is proposed for debarment under 48 CFR part 9, subpart 9.4, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction, in addition to other remedies available to the Federal Government, the department or agency may terminate this transaction for cause or default.

Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters --Primary Covered Transactions

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

Name

Accfort Director

Auburn - Lewiston MUNICIPAL AUGUST

Affiliation

Date

Title

BERNSTEIN SHUR

COUNSELORS AT LAW

207-774-1200 main 207-774-1127 facsimile bernsteinshur.com

100 Middle Street PO Box 9729 Portland, ME 04104-5029

William M. Welch wwelch@bernsteinshur.com

October 11, 2011

Via FedEx: (207) 786-0631 Richard Cloutier, Airport Manager Auburn Lewiston Municipal Airport 80 Airport Drive Auburn, ME 04210

Re: Grant Award and Agreement with the US Department of Transportation ("DOT") made pursuant to DOT Order 2011-7-1 under the Small Community Air Service Development Program, Docket: DOT-OST-2011-0119

Dear Rick:

As requested, enclosed for your files please find two (2) fully executed duplicate <u>originals</u> of the above-referenced Grant Agreement with the Certificate of Sponsor's Attorney section completed, dated and signed.

Please feel free to give me a call if you have any questions or need additional information.

Very truly yours, William M. Welch

Enclosure





1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Washington, DC 20590

Re: Small Community Air Service Development Program Grant Award

This is in reference to the grant award made to your community by Order 2011-7-1 under the Small Community Air Service Development Program, Docket: DOT-OST-2011-0119.

Enclosed are two copies of the final Grant Award and Agreement issued in response to your application.

Please have your attorney certify that the acceptance complies with state and local laws and constitutes a legal and binding obligation on the part of the sponsor.

Please sign all sections of <u>both</u> copies of the Grant Agreement (except the Lower Tier Certification -- the last two pages of each Grant Agreement package, which you should keep but not sign). <u>Return one fully-signed copy of the Grant Agreement to</u> the following address via overnight express delivery on or before October 30, 2011.

Aloha Ley Associate Director, W86-310 U.S. Department of Transportation Small Community Air Service Development Program 1200 New Jersey Ave., S.E. Washington, D.C. 20590

Enclosures



City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	High						
Project Title:	Airport Terminal F	Parking Lot					
Project Purpose:	Deteriorated Structure	е					
Department:	Auburn-Lewiston	Airport					
Project Description:	Realign and reconstrue	ct airport terminal p	parking lot				
Location:	Auburn Lewiston Airpo	ort					
Justification:	Landside passenger te The current available p season that alternate lot and allow the airpo terminal area.	parking is at capacit parking has to be te	y during most work mporarily construc	king days and over ted. This would ov	crowded during pe erhaul the parking	eak	
Useful Life:	30 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Construction		2016	50.00%	\$350,000	G.O. Bond
Construction		2016	50.00%	\$350,000	City of Lewiston



City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Airport Terminal Parking LotDepartment:Auburn-Lewiston Airport

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	

CITY OF AUBURN FY16- FY17 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Priority: Fiscal Year:

2016



Project Title: FY 16 - CIP - Airport Landside Parking Lot

Department: Airport

Project Description: Realign and Reconstruct Airport Terminal Parking Lot

Project Location: Automobile Parking Lot that serves the new passenger terminal.

Project Justification: Landside passenger terminal parking has not been enhanced or upgraded for more than 40 years. The current available parking is at capacity during most working days and overcrowded during peak season that alternate parking has to be temporarily constructed. This would overhaul the parking lot and allow the airport to monitorize part of the parking to cover the cost of maintaining the terminal area.

Cost Estimate		Proposed Funding Source	•	Proposed Fiscal Year Schedule	
	Cost	Check One	Check One	Percent	
Planning/Engineering:	\$ 117,000	Current Revenues	FY15		
Acquisition:		G.O. Bond	FY15	100%	
Construction:	\$ 583,000	Reserve	FY15		
Other:		Special	FY15		
		Assessment/Fee	FY15		
Total Estimated Cost:	\$ 700,000	Grant (identify)	FY15		
Source of Estimate:	Airport Engineer	Other (identify)	FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs: This project would help offset future maintenance cost to the terminal parking lot.

Other related City Projects:

Alternatives/impacts if the project is not funded or completed: The parking will continue to be a problem and a revenue stream missed.

FY 2016 Lewiston Capital Improvement Program Project Description Form



Project Description:

Realign and Reconstruct Airport Terminal Parking Lot so that it conforms with current codes and modern safety standards.

Consistency with the Comprehensive or Strategic Plans or other related planning documents:

This project is part of the Airport's 2006 Master Plan and is shown on the airport's airport layout plan.

Justification for project implementation/construction and segments, if applicable:

Landside passenger terminal parking has not been enhanced or upgraded for more than 40 years. The current available parking is at capacity during most working days and overcrowded during peak season that alternate parking has to be temporarily constructed. This would overhaul the parking lot and supports better use of the airport terminal. Additionally, part of the project is code-attainment work in the form of trash storage faculties for the restaurant and for other users, facilities for hazardous materials disposal. Overall this project will provide the airport sponsor's community with safer, more user-friendly parking that can help to support the airport, if portions of the airport parking are monetized to cover the cost of maintaining the terminal area.

Future maintenance costs if known, including contracts and special service requirements:

Painting and cleaning of parking lot can be accomplished through airport operational budget. The costs are being explored.

How were cost estimates obtained and expenditure commitment:

Designs and Engineer Estimates are currently being prepared by airport's consultant and will be included as soon as they are available.

		FUNDING	SOURCES				
Source	Amount						
City Operating Budget							
City Bond Issue	350,000						
Federal/State Funding	0 A	gency:		Approval Received?		Yes No.	
Other Agency/Municipality	350,000 A	gency:	City of Auburn	Approval Received?		Yes (No)	
Total Project Costs	700,000					- 0	
	IMPLEMEN		CHEDULE (Fisca	l Years)			
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Future	_
Total Project Cost	700,000						
Non-City Share	350,000						
City Share	350.000		0 0) 0		0	0

Attach on separate page(s)/sheet additional information (if needed)



APPENDIX D - ESTIMATE OF ENGINEERING COSTS

TERMINAL BUILDING PARKING LOT DESIGN

at Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport Auburn, Maine Hoyle Tanner Project # NEG014.01

ARTICLE I - Project Administration	\$4,600.00
ARTICLE II - NEPA Determination	\$50,200.00
ARTICLE III - Environmental Permits	\$29,400.00
ARTICLE IV - Data Collection	\$11,400.00
ARTICLE V - Design	\$22,300.00

\$117,900.00



City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Very High											
Project Title:	Reconstruct Terminal Aircraft Parking Apron Deteriorated Structure											
Department:	Auburn-Lewiston Airport											
	Construction of aircraft parking apron in front of the Airport's Passenger Terminal for safer traffic flows around the passenger terminal. Also includes reconstruction of connecting aircraft parking apron so that terminal's pavement weight bearing characteristics equal the runway/taxiway system.											
Location:	Auburn Lewiston Airpo	Auburn Lewiston Airport										
Justification:	Aircraft Traffic flow around the passenger terminal is the primary reason for the construction of the ramp space shown as new construction. Removing to connectors limit access to the taxiway, reducing the risk of conflicting traffic and incursion on the taxiway. It also prevents any direct access to the main runway, which is a FAA Safety Imitative. Providing space for turbine-powered corporate traffic to park a more appropriate distance from the main terminal building enhances the manuverability of the larger aircraft that use the airport and similtaniously prevents thousands of pounds of jet wash (turbine engine exhaust) from being pointed at the windows of the terminal, potentially blowing the broken glass into the building. Additionally, the additional aircraft apron allows smaller aircraft to operate in a different direction for service and parking than the corporate traffic preventing possible incursions and collision. Reconstruction of the more than 30 year old pavement currently in place in front of the main terminal will increase the weight-bearing capability and bring the pavement into FAA standards for aircraft movement area pavements.											
Useful Life:	20 Yrs											
Cost FY 201 \$15,500		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost					
Cost breakdown	and funding source(s)											
Cost Type	Enter	Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Sou	rce					
Other			2016	100.00%	\$15,500	Current Revenues						



City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Reconstruct Terminal Aircraft Parking Apron

Department: Auburn-Lewiston Airport

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	

CITY OF AUBURN FY16 - FY17 Capital Improvement Program **Project Description Worksheet**

Priority: Fiscal Year: 2016



Project Title: FY 16 - CIP - Construction and Reconstruction for Terminal Aircraft Parking Apron

1

Department: Airport

Project Description: Construction of aircraft parking apron in front of the Airport's Passenger Terminal for safer traffic flows around the passenger terminal. Also includes reconstruction of connecting aircraft parking apron so that terminal's pavement weight bearing characteristics equal the runway/taxiway system.

Project Location: This part of the project will overhaul the aircraft parking apron directly in front of the new passenger terminal.

Project Justification: Aircraft Traffic flow around the passenger terminal is the primary reason for the construction of the ramp space shown as new construction. Removing to connectors limit access to the taxiway, reducing the risk of conflicting traffic and incursion on the taxiway. It also prevents any direct access to the main runway, which is a FAA Safety Imitative. Providing space for turbine-powered corporate traffic to park a more appropriate distance from the main terminal building enhances the manuverability of the larger aircraft that use the airport and similtaniously prevents thousands of pounds of jet wash (turbine engine exhaust) from being pointed at the windows of the terminal, potentially blowing the broken glass into the building. Additionally, the additional aircraft apron allows smaller aircraft to operate in a different direction for service and parking than the corporate traffic preventing possible incursions and collision. Reconstruction of the more than 30 year old pavement currently in place in front of the main terminal will increase the weight-bearing capability and bring the pavement into FAA standards for aircraft movement area pavements.

Cost Estimate				Proposed Funding Source	Proposed Fiscal Yea Schedule	
		Cost	Check One	Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:	\$	207,370		Current Revenues	FY16	2.5%
Acquisition:				G.O. Bond	FY16	
Construction:	\$	327,000		Reserve	FY16	
Other:				Special	FY16	
				Assessment/Fee	FY16	
Total Estimated Cost:	\$	620,000 Airport		Grant (identify) Federal/ State	FY16	95%
Source of Estimate:	E	ngineer		Other (identify) City of Lewiston	FY16	2.50%

Impact on Operating Costs: The loss of use of this pavement will increase the need for passenger to terminal transportation and will cost the airport approximately \$3000 per month in rental fees to provide.

Other related City Projects:

Alternatives/impacts if the project is not funded or completed: The loss of use of this ramp would make the new terminal ineffective. This would minimize the first impression of business and tourist visitors who attempt to use the airport as a gateway to this region.



Hoyle, Tanner Associates, Inc.			150 Dow Street Manchester, NH 03101-1227 Tel 603-669-5555 Fax 603-669-4168		AUBURN-LEWISTON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT AUBURN, MAINE	EXHIBIT
ASSOCI	ales, III	C.	Web Page: www.	hoyletanner.com	ALP PEN & INK CHANGE	1
снкр. ву ERM	dr. by JLC	des. by MTO	DATE: 8/12/2014	scale: 1"=200'		
AIRPORTS DIVISION, NEW ENGLAND REGION SPONSOR PROJECT READINESS FORM AND VERIFICATION

Airport Name/Associated CityStateFiscal YearDUNS NumberAuburn-Lewiston Municipal AirportME20150936319350000										
	uburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport	0936319	3500	00						
	m filled out by (Name, Title)	o . ·	, T							
Μ	atthew O'Brien, Airport Engineer; Hoyle, Tanner &	& Associa	ates, Inc.							
Pro	ject Title and Description									
т	ERMINAL APRON REHABILITATION (APPRO	X 3 000	SV)							
	ND EXPANSION (APPROX. 2,200 SY)	JA. 3,000	51)							
Δ	$(D \perp M \cap Sion (M \cap KOA, 2,200 S \cap))$									
	oject Sketch: Please attach a drawing (8.5" X 11" prefermososed project.	ed, Black &	& White) that sl	nows the so	ope o	f the				
	PART I – CHECKLIST	г			N/A	Yes	See Part III			
1.	Do you have adequate financing to fund the local matching s		\boxtimes							
 Have all grants older than four years been closed? If not, please advise as to why and estimate when it will be closed. (provide response in Part III) 						\square				
3.	3. Will this project have Force Account work? If yes, attach justification for approval to this document.									
4. Does this project require and FAA Airspace Determination? If yes, please include OE/AAA study number if a study was completed.						\square				
5.	Has there been an environmental finding for this project? (PReview)	lease fill ou	t Part IV: Enviro	nmental			\square			
6.	Have all environmental permits been obtained? If not, identified date they will be obtained (provide response in Part III)	fy outstandi	ng permits and	anticipated			\square			
7.	If this project involves construction, has the ground within the disturbed by construction?	e project wo	ork area been p	reviously		\square				
8.	Civil Rights Requirements: Did you coordinate your DBE pro Rights (applicable to sponsors with more than \$250,000 in g			of Civil			\square			
	Date Submitted: Date Approved:									
9.	Will this project affect FAA Navaids or equipment? Please sp	pecify (prov	ide response in	Part III)	\boxtimes					
10	Will a reimbursable Agreement be required?				\square					
РА	PART II – DESCRIPTION, JUSTIFICATION AND COST ESTIMATE OF WORK ITEMS: (Include a description of each item, a brief									

statement supporting the need for each item, e.g. age of equipment or pavement being replaced, and the most recent total project cost estimate. Also define the extent of the work, i.e. length or area of pavement work, acres/number of parcels acquired, etc.)

New Terminal Apron Expansion between two existing aprons to improve aircraft circulation at the terminal building. Existing terminal apron has exceeded its 20-year design life and requires rehabilitation. Anticipated project cost is approximately \$540,000.

AIRPORTS DIVISION, NEW ENGLAND REGION SPONSOR PROJECT READINESS FORM AND VERIFICATION

PART III - EXPLANATION OF CHECKLIST ITEMS (Use additional pages as needed)

#4 2014-ANE-752-NRA filed

#5 - Project is Categorically Excluded. Determination to be acquired.

#6 - Maine Site Location of Development to be acquired.

#8 - DBE plan update to be included in this scope of work

PART IV – ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The following environmental review was conducted (check one only, and fill in blanks as required):

Categorical Exclusion (CATEX): this determination was made because the action was listed in FAA Order 1050.1E, paragraph 310e, and the Extraordinary Circumstances defined in paragraph 304 of that Order did not apply. As stated in FAA Order 5050.4B (Par 607 a), the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) NEPA's implementing regulations do not require documentation for categorically excluded actions.

Environmental Assessment (EA): this assessment was completed and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was made on . A copy of the EA/FONSI has been provided to FAA.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): this work was completed and a Record of Decision (ROD) that approved the project was prepared and signed on . A copy of the EIS/ROD has been provided to FAA.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Section 106

Under the NHPA, the paragraph checked below applies:

This type of "undertaking" has **no potential to cause effects** to historic properties (eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places). Section 106 is completed.

This type of undertaking could affect historic properties, but **no historic properties** are present or **no effects** are found. A "Finding" has been issued in conformance with 36CFR 800.11(d). OR Historic properties have been identified and could be affected, but there historic properties are **not adversely affected**. A "Finding" has been issued in conformance with 36CFR 800.11(e). Coordination with the SHPO and/or Tribes was completed. See details (below).

Historic properties have been identified, which may be **adversely affected**. Additional consultation and execution of an MOA is required, to detail the mitigation. See details (below).

FAA Concurrence:

Date: TBD

Details (Attach a separate page if needed):

Coordination with SHPO to be completed. Airport has known historic sites on property. Proposed site has been previously disturbed and does not provide any historic significance.

SPONSOR OR DESIGNEE SIGNATURE (IF DESIGNEE, COMPANY NAME:

Name: RICK LANMAN, AAE ACE

Signature:

Title: MANGER, AUBURN LEWISTON AIRPORT

Date: 11/6/14



Project Costs							
	Expansion Only	Expansion and Complete Reconstruction					
Engineering Costs	207,370.00	207,370.00					
Construction -							
New	327,000.00	327,000.00					
Replace		602,000.00					
Total Cost	534,370.00	1,136,370.00					

Entitlement/Local Match								
Airport Improvement Program (90%)	State 5% share Reimbursement	Sponsor Share (5%)						
600,000.00			FAA					
	30,000.00		State of Maine					
		30,000.00	Local Sponsors					
600,000.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	Total					

Note: Consultant fee for just the Apron Expansion will be less due to the length of construction required

APPENDIX D - ESTIMATE OF ENGINEERING COSTS

REHABILITATE TERMINAL APRON

at Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport Auburn, Maine

ARTICLE I - Project Administration	Lump Sum + Reimbursable
ARTICLE II - Planning	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
ARTICLE III - Environmental Permits	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
ARTICLE IV - Data Collection	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
ARTICLE V - Design	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
ARTICLE VI - Advertising and Bidding	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
Article VII - Construction Administration	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
Article VIII - Resident Engineering	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
Article IX - Testing	Actual Cost + Fixed Fee
ARTICLE X - Project Closeout	Lump Sum + Reimbursable

TOTAL \$207,370.00



AIP No. Hoyle Tanner Project No.

0307xx

Project Engineer: Date of Estimate: Checked by:

MTO 10/25/2013 NEG

ENGINEER'S CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

Airport: Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport Project: **Expand Terminal Apron**

Phase: 2014 CIP Planning Estimate

Add Alt #2 Item No.	Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Cost		
	Mobilization	LS	1	\$29,750.00	\$29,750.00		
P-152-1	Unclassified Excavation	CY	3,400	\$5.00	\$17,000.00		
	Remove Existing Drainage Pipes	LF	300	\$15.00	\$4,500.00		
	Remove Existing Drainage Structures	EA	2	\$400.00	\$800.00		
P-154-1	Subbase Course	CY	2,700	\$25.00	\$67,500.00		
P-156-1	Temporary Seeding	SY	1.000	\$0.25	\$250.00		
P-156-2	Erosion Control Blanket	SY	1,000	\$4.00	\$4,000.00		
P-156-5	Inlet Protection	EA	2	\$350.00	\$700.00		
P-209-1	Crushed Aggregate Base Course	CY	450	\$35.00	\$15,750.00		
P-401-1	Airport Bituminous Concrete	TON	650	\$130.00	\$84,500.00		
P-602-1	Bituminous Prime Coat	GAL	900	\$5.00	\$4,500.00		
P-603-1	Bituminous Tack Coat	GAL	400	\$5.00	\$2,000.00		
P-620-1	Temporary Pavement Painting	SF	100	\$1.00	\$100.00		
P-620-2	Permanent Pavement Painting	SF	100	\$1.00	\$100.00		
D-701-1	12" RCP Dainage Pipe	LF	300	\$45.00	\$13,500.00		
D-705-1	6" Solid Underdrain Pipe	LF	100	\$24.00	\$2,400.00		
D-705-2	6" Perforated Underdrain Pipe	LF	600	\$24.00	\$14,400.00		
D-705-4	Underdrain Cleanout	EA	3	\$400.00	\$1,200.00		
D-751-1	Drainage Structure (4'), H20 Loading	EA	3	\$4,000.00	\$12,000.00		
L-110-1	Install New 4" 2-Way Encased Duct	LF	200	\$40.00	\$8,000.00		
L-110-2	Install New Duct Marker	EA	2	\$150.00	\$300.00		
T-901-1	Seeding	SY	1,000	\$0.50	\$500.00		
T-905-1	Topsoil (4" Deep)	SY	1,000	\$4.00	\$4,000.00		
M-001-1	Sawed Control Joint	LF	250	\$8.00	\$2,000.00		
M-002-1	Stormwater Management	LS	1	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00		
M-006-1	Geotextile	SY	2,500	\$5.00	\$12,500.00		
Estimated Total Construction Cost - Base Bid \$327,000.00							

\$327,000.00



AIP No. Hoyle Tanner Project No.

0307xx

Project Engineer: Date of Estimate: Checked by: MTO 10/21/2013 NEG

ENGINEER'S CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

Airport:Auburn-Lewiston Municipal AirportProject:Rehabilitate & Expand Terminal Apron - Partial Depth ReconstructionPhase:2014 CIP Planning Estimate

Add Alt #2 Unit Unit Cost Description Quantity Cost Item No. LS \$58,603.00 \$58,603.00 G-001-1 Mobilization 1 P-152-1 Unclassified Excavation CY 4,300 \$5.00 \$21,500.00 P-152-2 Remove Bituminous Pavement SY 3.800 \$1.00 \$3.800.00 P-152-4 LF Remove Existing Drainage Pipes 800 \$19.00 \$15,200.00 P-152-5 Remove Existing Drainage Structures EA 2 \$400.00 \$800.00 P-154-1 Subbase Course CY 2,800 \$25.00 \$70,000.00 P-156-1 **Temporary Seeding** SY 1,300 \$0.25 \$325.00 1,200 P-156-2 Erosion Control Blanket SY \$4,800.00 \$4.00 P-156-5 \$350.00 \$1,400.00 Inlet Protection EA 4 P-209-1 **Crushed Aggregate Base Course** CY 1,100 \$45.00 \$49,500.00 P-401-1 Airport Bituminous Concrete TON 1,600 \$130.00 \$208,000.00 P-602-1 Bituminous Prime Coat GAL 2,200 \$5.00 \$11,000.00 P-603-1 Bituminous Tack Coat GAL 1,000 \$6.00 \$6,000.00 SF P-620-1 Temporary Pavement Painting 3.100 \$1.00 \$3.100.00 P-620-2 Permanent Pavement Painting SF 3,100 \$3,100.00 \$1.00 D-701-1 12" RCP Dainage Pipe LF 300 \$43.00 \$12,900.00 D-705-1 6" Solid Underdrain Pipe LF 100 \$24.00 \$2,400.00 6" Perforated Underdrain Pipe LF D-705-2 700 \$24.00 \$16,800.00 D-705-4 Underdrain Cleanout EA 6 \$400.00 \$2,400.00 D-751-1 Drainage Structure (4'), H20 Loading EA 3 \$4,000.00 \$12,000.00 L-110-1 Install New 4" 2-Way Encased Duct LF 450 \$35.00 \$15,750.00 L-110-2 Install New Duct Marker EA 4 \$150.00 \$600.00 T-901-1 Seeding SY 1,300 \$0.35 \$455.00 T-905-1 Topsoil (4" Deep) SY 1,300 \$4.00 \$5,200.00 Sawed Control Joint M-001-1 LF 600 \$10.00 \$6,000.00 \$100,000.00 M-002-1 Stormwater Management LS \$100,000.00 1 M-006-1 Geotextile SY 2,600 \$5.00 \$13,000.00

Estimated Total Construction Cost - Base Bid

\$645,000.00

SCOPE OF WORK

TERMINAL APRON REHABILITATION (APPROX. 3,900 SY) AND EXPANSION (APPROX. 2,200 SY)

AUBURN-LEWISTON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT AUBURN, MAINE

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes the partial rehabilitation of the existing terminal apron and the expansion of the existing terminal apron to connect to the west itinerant apron. Stub taxiways from the aprons to the parallel taxiway will be reconfigured to improve aircraft flow.

All of the above will hereinafter be referred to as the PROJECT. Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport is hereinafter referred to as the SPONSOR. Hoyle, Tanner and Associates, Inc. is hereinafter referred to as the CONSULTANT.

II. SCOPE OF SERVICES

ARTICLE I - PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

The Consultant shall provide project administration services as required and as requested by the Owner during the design and construction periods. The Consultant's services under this paragraph shall include:

- 1) Prepare for an attend Pre-design Conference with the Sponsor, MaineDOT and FAA at Auburn-Lewiston Municipal Airport.
- 2) Preparation of Contract documents and supporting back-up documentation required in connection with the Project, including General Consultant Agreement, and Individual Project Contract.
- 3) Review fee with Sponsor and Negotiate IFE process. Revise scope and as necessary to reflect the changes.
- 4) Request Survey and geotechnical services; provide sketch of work limits; negotiate prices; draft and execute subconsultant agreements.
- 5) Prepare DBE plan for submission to the FAA utilizing MaineDOT methodology for determining DBE goals.
- 6) Preparation of forms and supporting backup material required in connection with obtaining the Federal grants.
- 7) Preparation and provide assistance with forms and supporting documentation required by the Owner to obtain partial grant payments from the FAA and MaineDOT under each grant.
- 8) As reasonably requested, provide assistance with any other administrative-type work required by the Owner in connection with the Project.

ARTICLE II – PLANNING

Prior to beginning the following articles of work, the Consultant shall provide planning services to acquire project approval from FAA. The Consultant's services under this paragraph shall include:

- 1) Produce project sketch in AutoCAD Civil 3D 2013.
- 2) Provide Itemized Planning-level cost estimate for each Apron expansion and Terminal Apron rehabilitation.
- 3) Develop Notice of Proposed Construction narrative. Coordinate with Sponsor, and submit 7460 via FAA OE/AAA website.
- 4) Review and Coordinate with Sponsor and FAA for apron expansion and taxiway layout to acquire an approved "Pen and Ink" change of the ALP. Update Ultimate ALP showing new configuration. Draft detailed exhibit identifying proposed change for ALP for review by FAA.
- 5) Review deeds provided by Airport to establish clearing easement boundaries based on recorded deeds to determine rights for obstruction clearing due to recent night operation restriction by the FAA. Conduct further deed research via online Androscoggin County Registry of Deeds to provide supplement information. Provide exhibit detailing limits of known easements and areas of concern along the Runway 22 approach end and meet with Airport to review findings. Update Exhibit A based on findings from deed research. Provide documentation of findings to Airport to present to Attorney for further investigation of clearing rights. Provide a Google Earth representation to Airport for presentation purposes. Fee is actual time spent on task: 60hrs by CADD Tech.

ARTICLE III – ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS

According to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), NEPA review must be completed prior to implementation of a project. It is anticipated that the Project will qualify as a Categorical Exclusion (CatEx). The Consultant's services under this paragraph shall include:

- 1) Review existing agency letters for known extraordinary circumstances.
- 2) Review FAA Order 1050.1E and draft a Request for CatEx Determination Letter.
- 3) Address FAA comments. Provide additional information and sketches.
- 4) Whereas this site is known for protected bird species and is archaeologically significant, a Cat Ex may not be applicable depending on the agency's comments. In that event, an Environmental Assessment will be required, but is not included under this scope of work because it is not anticipated at this time.

Maine DEP Site Location of Development Permit Amendment is expected as part of this project due to the addition of impervious surfaces that are not exempt. A Natural Resource Protection Act Permits is NOT anticipated as this project is not adjacent to and does not impact any wetlands. For project schedule purposes, the MaineDEP's goal is to provide a decision within 90 days of application acceptance, but maintains review period of 120 days if need be. The Consultant's services under this paragraph shall include:

- 5) Coordinate with and review previous stormwater applications submitted by Sebago Technics to determine available stormwater treatment capacity.
- 6) Environmental Coordinator and Project Manager to prepare for and attend meeting

(1) at Maine DEP in Augusta, Maine.

- 7) Coordinate with Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, Maine Natural Areas Program, and Maine Historic Preservation Commission. Address Agency concerns for historic significance and state-listed species habitat. Provide additional information as requested.
- 8) Acquire Class D soil survey by Natural Resources Conservation Service of the USDA.
- 9) Develop a Pre-Development Drainage Plan.
- 10) Develop a Post-Development Drainage Plan.
- 11) Model Pre and Post Development Drainage in HydroCAD.
- 12) Analyze and size stormater treatment devices in accordance with Maine State Chapter 500 Stormwater law. Revise grading to reflect BMP size. Revise HydroCAD Model to reflect changes to grading surface drainage. Reiterative process. Update Post-Development Drainage plan.
- 13) Model and Analyze existing and proposed capacity in StormCAD.
- 14) Draft a Stormwater Management written report addressing project description, means and methodology, predevelopment conditions, post development conditions, General Standards BMP requirements with supporting hand calculations demonstrating compliance, and develop maintenance plan and sample log.
- 15) Draft an Erosion and Sedimentation Control written report addressing soil types procedural measures; structural measures; temporary non-structure measures; permanent non-structure measures; winter construction measures; seed mixture and application; and bmp maintenance requirements.
- 16) Develop List of Abutters from City of Auburn GIS webpage. Draft and send abutter notifications with certified mail.
- 17) Coordinate Notice in local newspaper.
- 18) Prepare the Site Location of Development Act (SLODA) permit application for DEP.
- 19) Address DEP Comments. Demonstrate that previous permit conditions have been met.

Any local permits and review boards are not included in this scope of work.

ARTICLE IV - DATA COLLECTION

The Consultant shall review existing data available and contract with subconsultants to acquire additional information as necessary. The Consultant and its Subconsultants (Electrical, Surveying and Geotechnical) will provide technical expertise in the following areas:

A. Existing Data:

The Consultant's services under this paragraph shall include:

- 1) Research digital asbuilt drawings, LIDAR data, coordinate with Heburt Construction and Sebago Technics for their digital asbuilt data; and other readily available information to determine the quality and accuracy of the topography and drainage in the vicinity of the project. Non-digital information will require digitization and is not included in this scope.
- 2) Research historical boring logs in the vicinity to determine level in investigation required for this project.

B. <u>Topographic Survey:</u>

The Consultant shall contract with, oversee in the field and assist the Subconsultant with topographic survey and incorporate data. Note, for this design survey, the Consultant will NOT conduct the survey in accordance with FAA Advisory Circulars 150/5300-16, 150/5300-17, 150/5300-18 latest edition; as agreed to by FAA and MaineDOT.

- Task 1Determine topographic elevations as shown in Figure 1.1 for the terminal apron.Maximum distance between shots will be 25 feet.
- Task 2 Survey drainage, telephone and electrical structures, centerline and edges of taxiways, access roads, benchmarks, soil borings, taxiway edge lights, airfield signs, treeline, buildings, etc, within the areas listed in the above tasks. Determine inverts of drainage and sewer structures as well as type of pipe, pipe sizes, and direction of flow (total structures unknown).
- Task 3 Establish horizontal and vertical control within the project area for use during construction.

C. <u>Geotechnical Services:</u>

The Consultant shall contract with, oversee in the field and assist the Subconsultant with subsurface investigation and incorporate data.

The Subconsultant shall:

- Task 1Obtain soil borings at locations shown on Figure 1.2 for the terminal apron to a
depth of 10 ft. or bedrock, for a total of 6 soil borings. Provide boring logs.
- Task 2 Recover split spoon samples at 5-foot intervals or change in strata and record depth of asphalt or topsoil and include results in boring logs.
- Task 3 Perform the following tests on the soil samples, and classify soils per the Unified Soil Classification (USC) system:
 - <u>Sieve/hydrometer Analysis</u>: Six (6) total
 - <u>Atterberg Limits</u>: Only if fine graded soils are encountered.

California Bearing Ratio (CBR) test will not be performed. The project will be designed based on existing nearby CBR data.

Consultant shall be onsite while geotech is performing work, and will provide boring layout.

D. <u>Electrical Services:</u>

The electrical Subconsultant shall perform the following tasks:

Task 1Provide electrical sketches, wiring diagrams and specifications for modifications to
the existing airfield lighting necessitated by the apron rehabilitation.

ARTICLE V - DESIGN

The Consultant shall undertake designs of the various improvements included in the Project. Design Submissions will be made at the Permitting (60%) and Final Design (100%) stages.

- Task 1 This task shall include the Permitting (60%) of the rehabilitation and expansion of the terminal apron:
 - 1) Develop Digital Terrain Models of existing conditions.
 - 2) Develop existing condition xrefs based on new survey data and electronic submittals from Sponsor. Xrefs will include base plan, drainage, marking, electrical, contours, survey control, property line, tree line, and wetlands.
 - 3) Develop pavement loading conditions and model them in FAArfield Software.
 - Develop typical sections for the new pavement and rehabilitation area using Limited Frost Protection Method. Alternative analysis is not included in the scope of work.
 - 5) Develop new pavement geometry to meet the FAA Airport Design Manual, AC 150/5300-13A Change 1 for design aircraft currently utilizing the aircraft operation area (AOA) and incorporating aircraft that are reasonably foreseeable to use the AOA in the future.
 - 6) Develop new drainage layout and design meeting the standards of 150/5320-5D, *Surface Drainage Design.*
 - 7) Analyze grades and existing drainage associated with terminal building to determine cause of flooding in spring. Develop design solution to terminal building to prevent further flooding.
 - 8) Develop new electrical layout to meet the standards and requirements of 150/5340-30G, Design and Installation Details for Airport Visual Aids. QC on existing circuits by electrical engineering subconsultant.
 - 9) Develop the extent of demolition, incorporating item eligibility for AIP and impacts to aircraft operations.
 - 10) Design proposed elevations that meet 150/5300-13A Change 1 for longitudinal grade limitations and Develop digital terrain model for proposed grade elevations.
 - 11) Design erosion control measures meeting the 2003 Maine Erosion and Sedimentation Control BMP Manual.
 - 12) Develop new marking layout in accordance with standard dimensions clearances and fillets specified in AC 150/5340-1L, Standards for Airport Markings.
 - 13) Conduct conflict analysis with crossing infrastructure (electrical conduit, underdrain, etc.). Develop conflict resolution and update drainage and electrical design.
 - 14) Prepare for and meet with local Fire Marshal and meet applicable NFPA requirements to the extent practicable.
 - 15) Draft a preliminary construction safety and phasing plan and written narrative.
 - 16) Preparation of all necessary, design drawings, sketches, computations, etc. Plans include:
 - Title Sheet
 - General Plan and Airfield Survey Control
 - Construction Safety and Phasing Plan
 - Erosion and Sediment Control Plan

- DRAFT
- Demolition Plan
- Geometry Plan
- Typical Section and Pavement Details
- Grading and Drainage Plan and Details
- Marking Plan and Details
- Electrical Plan and Details
- Boring Logs
- 17) Develop a Table of Contents for the project specifications.
- 18) Develop engineer's preliminary estimate of probable construction costs to the extent practicable at this level of design.
- 19) PDF submission of design drawings to the Sponsor, the FAA, and MaineDOT for review and comments.
- 20) Quality Assurance and Quality Control will be implemented on each task by the review of the Chief Engineer. Length of review time will be dependent upon amount of information to review and source for complications.
- Task 2 This task shall include the Final Design (100%) of the rehabilitation and expansion of the terminal apron:
 - 1) Coordination of all work with the Sponsor, the FAA, and MaineDOT, including attendance of one (1) design meetings
 - 2) Update Digital Terrain Model of existing conditions.
 - 3) Update pavement geometry to reflect client review comments.
 - 4) Update electrical layout to reflect client review and subconsultant review comments.
 - 5) Update the extent of demolition.
 - 6) Update proposed grading.

13)

- 7) Update digital terrain model for proposed grade elevations.
- 8) Update new drainage layout and design.
- 9) Update erosion control measures to account for grading and drainage revisions.
- 10) Update marking layout to account for geometry revisions.
- 11) Conduct conflict analysis with crossing infrastructure (electrical conduit, underdrain, etc.). Develop conflict resolution.
- 12) Finalize the construction safety and phasing plan
 - Submit 7460 Notifications on to the OE/AAA website for the following items:
 - i. Construction notice for Safety Plan
 - ii. Construction notice for Equipment
- 14) Preparation as necessary of, design drawings, sketches, computations, etc. Plans include:
 - Title Sheet
 - General Notes, Drawing Index and Legend
 - General Plan and Airfield Survey Control
 - Construction Safety and Phasing Plan
 - Erosion and Sediment Control Plan and Details
 - Demolition Plan
 - Geometry Plan
 - Typical Section and Pavement Details
 - Grading and Drainage Plan and Details
 - Drainage Profiles



- Spot Grading Plan
- Marking Plan and Details
- Electrical Plan and Details
- Boring Logs
- 15) Prepare General and Technical specifications in accordance with 150/5370-10G Standards for Specifying Construction of Airport.
- 16) Develop engineer's final estimate of probable construction costs.
- 17) PDF submission of design drawings to the Sponsor, the FAA, and MaineDOT for review and comments.
- 18) Quality Assurance and Quality Control will be implemented on each task by the review of the Chief Engineer. Length of review time will be dependent upon amount of information to review and source for complications.

ARTICLE V - ADVERTISING, BIDDING, & ARRANGEMENT FOR CONSTRUCTION

The CONSULTANT's work under this paragraph will include:

- 1) Assist with public advertising.
- 2) Print and distribute bid documents and collect document fees. It is assumed that the document fees cover the cost of reproduction and mailing for the sold sets and are not included in the reimbursable costs.
- 3) Prepare for and Attend Pre-bid Conference. Both Construction Manager and Project Engineer attend. Acts as a project hand-off meeting.
- 4) Review bidder questions and issue addenda to bid documents, if necessary.
- 5) Attend Bid Opening.
- 6) Analyze and Tabulate Bids.
- 7) Check Contractor References.
- 8) Recommend to the SPONSOR the award or rejection of bids.

ARTICLE VI - CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION

At this point, Hoyle, Tanner estimates the construction performance period will be 6 weeks. This is subject to change and an updated scope and fee will be provided to reflect the changes in the future. The CONSULTANT's work under this paragraph will include:

- 1) Prepare contract documents, obtain approvals, Issue Notice of Award and Notice to Proceed. Print and distribute.
- 2) Conform sets of drawings and specifications to incorporate addenda, print and distribute.
- 3) Prepare for and direct a pre-construction conference.
- 4) Consult and advise with the SPONSOR during construction.
- 5) Provide consultation and advice to the RESIDENT ENGINEER (assume 4 hours per week for CM and 1 hour per week for Project Manager).
- 6) Review and analyze laboratory, shop drawings, submittals, and test reports and certificates for materials and equipment.
- 7) Attend job meetings, make observations of work in progress, and provide appropriate reports to the SPONSOR (does not include resident engineering).
- 8) Review and approve periodic estimates submitted by the RESIDENT ENGINEER for partial and final payments to the CONTRACTOR.
- 9) Prepare and negotiate change-orders and Supplemental Agreements.

- 10) Organize and direct pre-paving conference.
- 11) Review and coordinate acceptance tests required by specifications.
- 12) Attend the final construction inspection and prepare a report on any deficiencies, corrective actions required, etc. as determined at said review.

Article IV (A & B) - Resident Engineering and Control & Testing of Materials

The CONSULTANT's Resident Engineer shall perform the following tasks:

- 1) Undertake a pre-field review of the plans and specifications in order to familiarize him with the PROJECT documents and PROJECT work site.
- 2) Administer and/or assist with the layout of the construction by the CONTRACTOR.
- 3) Review and approve requests for monthly and final payments to CONTRACTORS.
- 4) Prepare daily reports covering the work in progress, delays to construction, unusual events, visitors to the work site, and record daily contract quantities.
- 5) Coordinate the construction activity with the SPONSOR.
- 6) Provide "as built" information for preparation of "as built" drawings of the completed PROJECT.
- 7) Arrange for, conduct, or witness field, laboratory, or shop tests for construction materials as required by the plans and specifications.
- 8) Determine the suitability of materials brought to the site to be used in the construction.
- 9) Interpret the contract plans and specifications and monitor the construction activities to assure compliance with the intent of the design.
- 10) Measure, compute, or monitor quantities of work performed and quantities of materials in-place for partial and final payments to the contractors; and maintain diaries and other project records to document the work.
- 11) Attend Final Inspection.
- 12) Undertake post-field work as necessary in order to close out the PROJECT.

The CONSULTANT will arrange for, observe, and/or undertake all necessary work to provide for the proper control and testing of construction materials. The CONSULTANT's work under this paragraph shall include contracting with and coordinating the work of the testing firm. This work will include as necessary:

- 1) Review of the contractor's job mix formula for Hot Mix Airport Pavement (P-401) shall be part of the FAA's portion of the project.
- 2) Attendance of the FAA required pre-paving meeting.
- 3) Provide on-site observation of P-401 plant laboratory testing, depth testing and cores for laboratory test during paving days.
- 4) Provide on-site compaction testing of earthwork and pavement base and sub-base during these operations.
- 5) Provide testing for samples of the base, sub-base and embankment materials for test as required by the specifications.

ARTICLE VI – PROJECT CLOSEOUT

Upon completion of the project, the Consultant shall prepare and submit the final reimbursement report to the Owner, and the final project report for distribution to the FAA and MaineDOT.

1) Coordination with Airport and FAA.

- 2) Prepare, Print, & Distribute FAA final project reports to the Airport and FAA including electronic and hard copy deliverables of the project graphics (plans), design report, geotechnical report and other data/reports as needed.
- 3) Coordinate with Printroom for final closeout documents.
- 4) Retain project records file.
- 5) Provide assistance with other project closeout requirements, as necessary

ARTICLE VII - PROJECT SCHEDULE

The Consultant shall complete the services outlined in Articles I through VI as follows:

- → Receive Notice to Proceed
- → Data Collection
- → Preliminary Design Submission (60%)
- Environmental Permit Submission
- → Final Design Submission (100%)
- → Environmental Permits (90 days)
- → Advertise for Bids
- → Open Bids
- → AIP Grant Application
- Start Construction
- → End Construction
- → Closeout Project

September 2014 September 2014 November 2014 February 2015 February 2015 March 2015 May 1st 2015 September 2015 October 2015 June 2016









FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Very High						
-	South Goff St Exte	nsion to Elm St					
Project Purpose:	Street Improvement						
Department:	Economic Develop	oment					
Project Description:	Extend South Goff St to	o Elm St.					
Location:	South Goff St						
Justification:							
Useful Life:	30 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	

Cost Ty	/pe E	Inter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Constr	uction		2016	100.00%	\$1,500,000	G.O. Bond



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:South Goff St Extension to Elm StDepartment:Economic Development

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost Cost of Service: Materials & Supplies:	Subtotal Gain from saile of replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



Priority: Ve								
-	ery High							
Project Title: N	/linot Avenue Cor	ridor Analysis a	nd Design					
Project Purpose: In	icreased Safety							
Department: E	conomic Develop	ment						
	Analyze and design Minot Ave corridor fix, from Court Street to High and Academy, including South Goff and Elm Street.							
Location: M	1inot Ave Corridor							
Justification: To	o develop a better tra	affic and implement	tation plan for this	corridor.				
Useful Life:	30 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$120,000	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost	

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Planning/Engineerin	g	2016	100.00%	\$120,000	G.O. Bond



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Minot Avenue Corridor Analysis and Design

Department: Economic Development

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Very High									
Project Title: Project Purpose:		latural Gas Conversion/ HVAC Efficiency Upgrades_Center St. Fire Station nprove efficiency								
Department:	Facilities									
Project Description:	Convert primary fuel source from #2 Oil to Natural Gas. Complete system upgrades for failed or failing existing equipment. Unitil has agreed to bring gas to the building at no cost to the City.									
Location:	Center Street Fire Static	on								
Justification:	The moritorium on Center St. ends in 2015 allowing Natural Gas to be brought to the building. The conversion along with equipment upgrades will increase overall efficiency, and occupant comfort. The current building ventilation system has failed and is in need of replacement.									
Useful Life:	20 Yrs									
Cost FY 2016 \$95,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$95,000			



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Natural Gas Conversion/ HVAC Efficiency Upgrades_Center St. Fire Station

Department: Facilities

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:								
Project Title: Project Purpose:	Security Cameras New Operation	-						
Department:	Facilities							
Project Description:	Install security camera	nstall security cameras at the Highway garage and Fuel Island.						
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	Noodbury Brackett Municipal Building						
Justification:	Gasoline will be moved from the location at 1 Minot ave to the Public Services Fuel Island in 2015. This move will require 24 hour access to the facility by the Police Department increasing the need for added security. Cameras will also assist in loss prevention and potential workers comp. claims.							
Useful Life:	10 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$24,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$24,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016 Project Title: Security Cameras Department: Facilities

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:								
-	_	ntral Fire_Mechanical & Lighting Systems Efficiency Upgrades						
Department:	Facilities							
Project Description:	Complete mechanical	omplete mechanical and lighting system upgrades for existing equipment.						
Location:	Cental Fire Station	ental Fire Station						
Justification:	or is failing. This has r	Most of the HVAC and Lighting in the building is original or over 25 years old. Much of it has failed or is failing. This has resulted in increased energy consumption as well as reduced occupant comfort. Several Efficiency Maine Lighting incentives would help to offset the cost of the lighting.						
Useful Life:	20 Yrs							
Cost FY 2010 \$65,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$65,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Central Fire_ Mechanical & Lighting Systems Efficiency Upgrades

Department: Facilities

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016	.016						
Priority:	Medium	edium						
Project Title:	Engine #2 Efficience	y Upgrades_Uni	t heater replace	ement				
Project Purpose:	Improve efficiency							
Department:	Facilities							
Project Description:		ncrease insulation in the attic and perform airsealing measures. Replace existing unit heater in the ruck bay.						
Location:	South Main St Fire Stat	tion						
Justification:	to 48. The result will b increase in occupant co	Current attic insulation is estimated to have an R-value of 6, the project would increase the R-value to 48. The result will be a reduction in operating expenses from energy consumption and an increase in occupant comfort. The unit heater in the truck bays, is now beyond its estimated useful life, is in efficient, and struggles to keep up with the temp in the space.						
Useful Life:	25 Yrs							
Cost FY 2010	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$15,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Engine #2 Efficiency Upgrades_Unit heater replacement

Department: Facilities

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016	016						
Priority:	Medium							
Project Title:	Replace Card Acces	ss System Compo	onants Phase II					
Project Purpose:	Increased Safety							
Department:	Facilities							
Project Description:	Replace Failing compon	eplace Failing componants to the Card Access system, and increase security.						
Location:	Auburn Hall							
Justification:	original and is failing in Phase will allow remote	he Card access system provides security to various areas of City Hall. The current system is riginal and is failing increasing, maintenance costs, staff time, and potential security issues. This hase will allow remote access and ability to lockdown in emergency situtions. Phase 1 of the eplacement was completed in 2014.						
Useful Life:	10 Yrs	10 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$20,000	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$20,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Replace Card Access System Componants Phase II

Department: Facilities

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Medium				R.	the state of the state	
Project Title:	Battalion Chief's V	ehicle					
Project Purpose:	Vehicle Replacement						
Department:	Fire						
Project Description:	Replace a 2004 Ford Excursion the Battalion Chief's command vehicle						Altropy Control of Con
Location:	Cental Fire Station						
Justification:	The Battalion Chiefs utilize this vehicle to conduct their daily functions. It also serves as initial command post for fire or other incidents that it responds to. It is a communications platform, carrying several permanently mounted and portable radios. It is capable of serving as a mobile weather station and reference library in the event the best way to manage a situation must be researched. A vehicle of this type is a critical component of our operation and is directly related to firefighter and fire ground safety.						
Useful Life:	10 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$56,000	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Acquisition		2016	100.00%	\$56,000	Current Revenues



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Battalion Chief's VehicleDepartment:Fire

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016							
Project Title: Project Purpose:	SCBA tanks Replace worn-out equipment							
Department:	Fire							
Project Description:	SCBA tank replacement							
Location:	All Fire Stations							
Justification:	We utilize self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) when making entry into environments that are filled with smoke, low oxygen, or toxic gases. This device provides breathing air delivered from a cylinder worn on the firefighters back. These cylinders have a fifteen year life span before federal regulation requires they be decommissioned. Many of our cylinders are nearing that expiration date and will need to be removed from service. We requesting funding to purchase ten cylinders a year over five years with FY15 being the first one.							
Useful Life:	15 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$10,000		Cost FY 2018: \$10,000	Cost FY 2019: \$10,000	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$40,000	


Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:SCBA tanks

Department: Fire

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:								
Project Title: Project Purpose:	Public safety facili	ty engineering s	tudy					
Department:	Fire							
Project Description:	Engineering study to co	onstruct a public sa	fety facility.					
Location:								
Justification:								
Useful Life:	Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$20,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$20,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Public safety facility engineering studyDepartment:Fire

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016								
Priority:	High								
Project Title:	Motorola Radio Re	eplacement Proj	ect						
Project Purpose:	Present Equipment ob	solete							
Department:	LA 911								
•	made and are increasir system expands techno internet protocol). Proj Public Works and the A	Existing radio infrastructure is in year 18 of 15 to 20 year life cycle. Replacement parts are no longer made and are increasingly difficult to locate. Motorola will stop supporting the system in FY16. New system expands technology capabilities to anticipated modalities of communication (radio over internet protocol). Project may be implemented in phases. Currently working with Public Safety, Public Works and the Auburn/Lewiston Airport to identify existing gaps, potential growth so the system advances in a coordinated, interoperative fashion.							
Location:	LA911								
Justification:	: As the existing radio system reaches its end of service life, one can anticipate a degradation in quality of service, greater repair time and fewer technicians trained in repairing systems of this age.								
Useful Life:	20 Yrs								
Cost FY 2016	Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost		
\$2,050,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0			

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Acquisition		2016	50.00%	\$1,025,000	G.O. Bond
Acquisition		2016	50.00%	\$1,025,000	Other-City of Lewiston



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Motorola Radio Replacement ProjectDepartment:LA 911

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	

FY 2016 Lewiston Capital Improvement Program Project Description Form

Project Title:	Motorola Radio Replacement Project for FY16						
Operational Funding Division:	LA911	Project Name:	FY16 Radio Replacement				
Est. Total Cost FY 2016:	2,050,000	Est. Total Cost FY 2016-2020	2,050,000				
City Share FY 2016:	1,025,000	City Share FY 2016-2020:	1,025,000				

Project Description:

Existing radio infrastructure is in year 19 of 15 to 20 year life cycle. Replacement parts no longer made and are difficult to locate. Motorola will stop supporting the system this fiscal year. New system expands technology capabilities to anticipated modalities of communication (radio over internet protocol). Project may be implemented in phases but those phases have have yet to be determined based on the potential for emergency funding due to building repairs.

Consistency with the Comprehensive or Strategic Plans or other related planning documents:

Replacement of the existing radio infrastructure, which links all of the cities' public safety law enforcement and fire responders, as well as partnering police and fire mutual aid agencies, will ensure the basic communication system of mobile and portable radios will continue to operate reliably and safety, serving both the responders and the communities. Working with partners in public works and the Aub-Lew airport to ensure comms compatibility.

Justification for project implementation/construction and segments, if applicable:

As the existing radio system reaches its end of service life, one can anticipate a degradation in quality of service, greater repair time and fewer technicians trained in repairing systems of this age. Motorola has stopped making replacement parts for this equipment.

Future maintenance costs if known, including contracts and special service requirements:

Unknown at this time. The Center continues to with Motorola to determine the best possible implementation schedule.

How were cost estimates obtained and expenditure commitment:

Motorola quote attached.

		FUNDING S	OURCES				
Source	Amount						
City Operating Budget	1,025,000						
City Bond Issue							
Federal/State Funding	A	gency:		Approval I		Yes	No
Other Agency/Municipality		gency:	Auburn	Approval I	Received?	Yes	No
Total Project Costs	2,050,000						
	IMPLEMEN 2016	TATION SCH 2017	EDULE (Fisca 2018	al Years) 2019	2020		Future
Total Project Cost	2,050,000						
Non-City Share	1,025,000						
City Share	1,025,000	()	0	0	0	0

Attach on separate page(s)/sheet additional information (if needed)



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Very High						
Project Title:	Masony Repair, Y	ear 3					
roject Purpose:	Deteriorated Structur	e					
Department:	Auburn Public Lib	rary					
	The old section of the year of 5-year plan.	library needs to hav	ve all mortar joints	replaced for the sc	outh elevation. Th	ird	
Location:	Auburn Public Library						
	Durability should be a filtration of any kind.	pprox. 50 years if th	ne building is subse	quently kept in goo	od repair - no wat	er	
Useful Life:	30+ Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$123,802	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$123,802

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other		FY Percent		Proposed Finance Source
Construction		2015	100.00%	\$42,167	G.O. Bond



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Masony Repair, Year 3Department:Auburn Public Library

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016									
Priority:	High									
Project Title:	Carpet Replaceme	arpet Replacement, Year 1								
Project Purpose:	Replace worn-out equi	Replace worn-out equipment								
Department:	Auburn Public Libra	Auburn Public Library								
•	carpen is showing signi	Carpet in building was new with the 2006 renovation. The building is very heavily used and the Carpen is showing significant wear and staining. Patching has been done as needed. Will rotate Peplacement throughout building using a 4-year plan.								
Location:	Auburn Public Library									
Justification:	Maintain building as a public minimized.	Maintain building as a public space. As prioritized, costs can be contained and inconvenience to the public minimized.								
Useful Life:	10 Yrs									
Cost FY 2016 \$25,000		Cost FY 2018: \$28,000	Cost FY 2019: \$10,000	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$90,208			

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Acquisition		2015	100.00%	\$26,783	G.O. Bond



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Carpet Replacement, Year 1Department:Auburn Public Library

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:								
-	Insight Server Replace worn-out equ	ipment						
Department:	Auburn Public Libr	rary						
Project Description:	Shared with Auburn Ha	all to maintain HVA	C system.					
Location:	Auburn Hall							
Justification:	Replace obsolete syste	em.						
Useful Life:	10 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$2,500	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$2,500	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Insight ServerDepartment:Auburn Public Library

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



\$33,154	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,154
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
Useful Life:	20 Yrs						
Justification: This intersection is over 25 years old. The signal faces are 8" and should be 12". The equipment is rusting from the inside out and we have had many maintenance calls to this location. The electrical has failed on numerous occasions.							
Location:	: Center Street/Lake Auburn Ave						
Project Description:	Project Replace signal controller, signal heads, pedestrian heads and cableing. ription:						
Department:	t: Planning & Permitting-Electrical Divis						
Project Title: Project Purpose:		Traffic Equipment Replacement ncreased Safety					
		Devices					
Priority:	Very High						

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Acquisition		2016	100.00%	\$33 <i>,</i> 154	Current Revenues



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Traffic Equipment ReplacementDepartment:Planning & Permitting-Electrical Divisi

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Medium						
Project Title:	Festival Plaza Ligh	ting					
Project Purpose:	Improve efficiency						
Department:	Planning & Permit	ting-Electrical Div	vis				
Project Description:	Replace 15 existing HII	D lighting fixtures witl	h lower wattage I	LED fixtures			
Location:	Festival Plaza						
Justification:	Reduction of energy a	nd maintenance costs	5				
Useful Life:	Yrs						
Cost FY 2010	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$6,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,400
Cost breakdown	and funding source(s)					
Cost Type	Enter	Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Sour	ce
Acquisition			2016	100.00%	\$6,400	Current Revenues	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Festival Plaza LightingDepartment:Planning & Permitting-Electrical Divisi

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



Priority: Medium Project Title: Festival Plaza Clock Repairs Project Purpose: Present Equipment obsolete	
Project Purpose: Present Equipment obsolete	
Department: Planning & Permitting-Electrical Divis	
Project The clock in Festival Plaza is inoperative and needs replacement parts. Description:	
Location: Festival Plaza	
Justification: Inaccurate time on clock faces	
Useful Life: 15 Yrs	
Cost FY 2016 Cost FY 2017: Cost FY 2018: Cost FY 2019: Cost FY 2020: Cost FY 2021: Cost after 6 years: Total Cost \$2,180 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$0 \$2,180	

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Acquisition		2016	100.00%	\$2,180	Current Revenues



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Festival Plaza Clock RepairsDepartment:Planning & Permitting-Electrical Divisi

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016									
Priority:	Very High	/ery High								
Project Title:	Municipal Fire Ala	rm Upgrade								
Project Purpose:	Replace worn-out equ	ipment								
Department:	Planning & Permit	ting-Electrical D	ivis							
Project Description:	Upgrade the receiver/t	Jpgrade the receiver/transmitter for the municipal fire alarm system. This is an installed price.								
Location:	Electrical Building									
Justification:	The video analog recording display for the equipment has failed. The unit is over 20 years old and requires upgrading. This unit transmits all building alarms to the 911 Call Center for fire and security purposes. The City has no spare parts for this system.									
Useful Life:	20 Yrs									
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost			
\$16,050	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$16,050			

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Acquisition		2016	100.00%	\$16,050	Current Revenues



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Municipal Fire Alarm UpgradeDepartment:Planning & Permitting-Electrical Divisi

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:	Very High							
Project Title:	FY 16 PD 1 - CIP - F	leet Replaceme	nt					
Project Purpose:	Vehicle Replacement							
Department:	Police							
Project Description:	Scheduled Vehicle Rep	lacement						
Location:	Auburn Hall							
Justification:	The department has established a three year life cycle for the patrol fleet and a five to seven year life cycle for support vehicles. In FY15, the request was reduced to one vehicle, forcing the department to extend the service life to a fourth year for the patrol fleet. This has increased vehicle repair costs significantly while drasticaly reducing trade-in value. To maintain a three year life cycle, the department will trade-out one 2007 vehicle, three 2012 vehicles and two 2013 vehicles. The department will purchase six police vehicles. The six vehicles include the three vehicles cut from FY15 CIP.							
Useful Life:	<5 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$232,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$232,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:FY 16 PD 1 - CIP - Fleet ReplacementDepartment:Police

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Very High									
-	FY 16 PD 2 - CIP - N Present Equipment obs	Y 16 PD 2 - CIP - Mobile Radio Replacement								
Department:	Police									
Project Description:	Mobile Radio Replacem	nent								
Location:	Auburn Hall									
Justification:	The current mobile radios are currently over 12 years old. The current model used is no longer in production, therefore servicing the radios is impossible as parts are no longer available for them nor are they covered by service contracts. This is year three of a three year replacement project. The 7 new mobile radios have a service life of ten years.									
Useful Life:	10 Yrs									
Cost FY 2016 \$39,500		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$39,500			



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: FY 16 PD 2 - CIP - Mobile Radio Replacement

Department: Police

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Very High								
-		Y 16 PD 3 -CIP- Mobile Radar Unit Replacement resent Equipment obsolete							
Department:	Police								
Project Description:	Mobile Radar Unit Rep	lacement							
Location:	Auburn Hall								
Justification:	The current radar units in the patrol vehicles have reached the end of their useful service life. These fifteen units are critical to our traffic safety efforts. This request was not funded in FY15, thus extending the service life of the units, which has led to increased repair costs.								
Useful Life:	10 Yrs								
Cost FY 2010 \$30,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$30,000		



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: FY 16 PD 3 -CIP- Mobile Radar Unit Replacement

Department: Police

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:										
Project Title: Project Purpose:		16 PD 5 - CIP - Public Safety Building Engineering Study Dital Planning								
Department:	Police									
Project Description:	This project will begin	an engineering stud	y for a Public Safet	ty Headquarters Bu	ilding.					
Location:	Auburn Hall									
Justification:	The City's Public Safety Departments are in need of infrastructure upgrades. Police Headquarters at Auburn Hall will soon exceed its space capacity. Auburn Fire Central Station is in needs of structural upgrades to ensure the structural integrity of the building. Research has shown that a combined public safety headquarters can lead to increased efficiency for first responders as well as office support staff. This engineering study will create a conceptual design for a Public Safety Headquarters building that will replace the existing Fire and Police Headquarters buildings. This is a joint request is by both Police & Fire totaling \$40,000.									
Useful Life:	<5 Yrs									
Cost FY 2016 \$20,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$20,000			



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: FY 16 PD 5 - CIP - Public Safety Building Engineering Study

Department: Police

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:									
	FY 16 PD 4 - CIP - S	/ 16 PD 4 - CIP - Speed Trailer							
Department:	Police	blice							
Project Description:	Two Speed Measuring	wo Speed Measuring Trailers Purchase							
Location:	Auburn Hall								
Justification:	traffic calming efforts t a large sign along with	The community's demand for the speed trailer is increasing. The trailer plays a vital role in our traffic calming efforts throughout the city. The trailer has the capability to display vehicle speeds on a large sign along with programmable safety messages. Two additional trailers are going to be required to meet the increased demand for traffic calming throughout the city.							
Useful Life:	10 Yrs								
Cost FY 2016 \$28,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$28,000		



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:FY 16 PD 4 - CIP - Speed TrailerDepartment:Police

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Very High							
•	Reconstruction							
	Street Improvement							
Department:	Public Services-Eng	gineering						
•	preconstruction steps compile construction b includes: installation c new road base, paving	nis program involves the full depth reconstruction of both rural and urban roadways. The reconstruction steps include: roadway survey and design, procure easements and permits, impile construction bid documents, and award of construction contract. The construction work cludes: installation of drainage system, excavation of existing roadway materials, placement of ew road base, paving, curbing, sidewalks, matching existing properties to new roadway, and final irface restoration. Each streets level of reconstruction varies based upon condition and usage.						
Location:	Hasty Armory							
Justification:	Streets designated are those that have deteriorated beyond resurfacing and whose subbase materials are not adequate for reclaiming (generally due to an abundant amount of utility trenches or poor initial construction) or require horizontal/vertical alignment changes to provide a safe and maintainable roadway based on current standards. Reconstruction is the most costly of all the street improvement programs and is therefore usually targeted at those streets that are in the worst condition. However, this program provides the longest life expectancy with the least amount of future maintenance costs of all other street improvement programs. The identified streets have undergone separation by the Sewer District and will complete work in the neighborhood.							
Useful Life:	25 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:ReconstructionDepartment:Public Services-Engineering

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:	Very High							
Project Title:	Reclaim/Resurface	2						
Project Purpose:	Street Improvement							
Department:	Public Services-Eng	gineering						
Project Description:	This program includes reclaiming (grinding) the existing pavement structure and underlying gravel base material, drainage improvements, and re-grading the roadway to a proper profile. Reclaiming results in a substantially lower cost compared to full depth reconstruction. Gravel may be added to the roadway and drainage improvements are made.							
Location:	Ingersoll Arena							
Justification:	The reclamation process provides an alternative to conventional reconstruction at generally half the cost. It provides a stronger roadway base by utilizing the existing distressed pavement layer as an aggregate for the new gravel base layer.							
Useful Life:	20 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Reclaim/ResurfaceDepartment:Public Services-Engineering

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Very High					NPDES Guilty Program	1 mil
-	Major Drainage						
Project Purpose:	Federal Mandate						
Department:	Public Services-Eng	gineering					
Project Description:	Implementation of a 5- stormwater regulation infrastructure.			-		ES)	
Location:	Various						
Justification:	Necessary to comply w throughout the City.	vith Federal NPDES	mandates and prov	ide adequate drair	nage systems		
Useful Life:	20 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$1,000,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$1,000,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Major DrainageDepartment:Public Services-Engineering

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	


FiscalYear:							
Priority:	Very High						
Project Title:	Maine DOT Match						
Project Purpose:	Street Improvement						
Department:	Public Services-Eng	gineering					
Project Description:	This program provides for surface transportation improvements through the partnership of federal, state, and local planning organizations (MPO'S) under the guidelines of the Transportation Enhancement (TE) program. The program design provides for "a continuous, comprehensive and cooperative transportation plan" for the Lewiston-Auburn urbanized area. This match is to fund the City's share of project costs. In addition, this money funds the City portion of Municipal Partnership Initiave projects which the MDOT contributes 50% of the construction cost.						
Location:	Center Street/Lake Aul	Center Street/Lake Auburn Ave					
Justification:	Local share funding fo	r various projects.					
Useful Life:	20 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$1,100,000	6 Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$1,100,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Maine DOT MatchDepartment:Public Services-Engineering

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Very High	/ery High					
Project Title:	Retaining Walls						
Project Purpose:	Deteriorated Structure						
Department:	Public Services-Eng	ineering					
	This program involves the reconstruction of existing retaining walls that currently are in disrepair but are supporting various urban roadways. The preconstruction steps include: survey and design, procure easements and permits, compile construction bid documents, and award of construction contract. The construction work includes: dismantling of existing retaining walls, installation of new retaining wall superstructure, installation of drainage systems, excavation of existing roadway materials, placement of new road base, paving, curbing, sidewalks, matching existing properties to new roadway, and final surface restoration. Each projects level of reconstruction varies based upon condition and usage.						
Location:	Beacon Ave						
Justification:	Retaining walls designated to be replaced are those that have deteriorated beyond repair and have mounting maintenance needs. Reconstruction of these retaining walls will provide the longest life expectancy with the least amount of future maintenance costs. Any additional utility work that may be required in the vicinity of the retaining wall will be incorporated into the project to avoid the need to revisit the area with construction in the future.						
Useful Life:	30 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$800,000	5 Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$800,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Retaining WallsDepartment:Public Services-Engineering

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Very High	Very High					
Project Title:							
Project Purpose:	Street Improvement						
Department:	Public Services-En	gineering					
Project Description:	maintenance of existin	This program identifies the community's need for new sidewalks and the rehabilitation and naintenance of existing sidewalks. This will provide funding to enhance sidewalks identified in the lowntown bike ped improvement plan.					
Location:	Various						
Justification:	The City of Auburn has approximately 56 miles of sidewalks that are meant to provide safe pedestrian accessibility. As with the City's road infrastructure, a combination of resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction must be used to continually improve and maintain sidewalks. Recent emphasis on walking as alternative transportation and wellness requires an increased commitment to improving and maintaining pedestrian mobility as an overall betterment to the community.						
Useful Life:	20 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016		Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:SidewalksDepartment:Public Services-Engineering

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016					the second second		
Priority:	High	igh						
Project Title:	(2) Loader/Backho	es						
Project Purpose:	Equipment Replaceme	Equipment Replacement						
Department:	Public Services-Pu	blic Works						
	These two units work smaller jobs. An example is catch basin installs and rebuilds. Driveway culverts and snow removal.							
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building							
Justification:	This is a replacement f for repairs and the rep		=	n. They have subs	tantial down time		08/12/2014	
Useful Life:	Yrs							
Cost FY 2010	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$275,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$275,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:(2) Loader/BackhoesDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016					CANN IN F	
Priority:	Medium					21144	
Project Title:	Leaf Vacuum						
Project Purpose:	Improve efficiency					and the second sec	
Department:	Public Services-Pa	rks					
	A tow behind leaf vacu		-		acuum picks up an	d	
Description:	shreds the leaves before	re sending them int	o the back of the tr	uck.		a second	
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	unicipal Building					
Justification:	With the demand for r	-	-	=		the support of the second statement of the second stat	
	the gutter lines and sto work. This unit is much	-		nachine to keep up	o with the volume	of	
Useful Life:	15 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$60,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Leaf VacuumDepartment:Public Services-Parks

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Medium					Te	and the A
-	Portable Lift System	m					
Project Purpose:	New Equipment						
Department:	Public Services-Pul	blic Works					
Project Description:	A set of 4 electric hydraulic lifts. They can be ussed on all types of vehicles						
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building					Ale	
Justification:	The department currer time.	ntly has 6 units and	this would allow us	to service two vel	nicles a thte same	- 6 W THE	
Useful Life:	10 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$40,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$40,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Portable Lift SystemDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						(***)	
Priority:	High	gh						
Project Title:	Traffic Paint Mach	ine					Jan Start St	
Project Purpose:	Improve efficiency							
Department:	Public Services-Public Works							
•	A single operator/one man operation self propelled striper. This unit has an airless paint system with a manual or a skipline controller and forward carriage design. Hand spray capability can be used for crosswalk and symbol marking.							
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						North Party and	
Justification:	This would allow us to purchase a unit for a replacement of the unit we currently have. Downtime is becoming a problem, and parts are becoming an issue. We would like a new unit due to the increase in painting being required by PS allowing staff to complete more of the work in house. This will allow us to be able to complete the striping work quicker.							
Useful Life:	10 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$15,000	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$15,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Traffic Paint MachineDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016					and the second second	* +
Priority:	High				Z STA		
Project Title:	(2) One Ton Trucks						
Project Purpose:	Equipment Replacement	nt					
Department:	Public Services-Pub	olic Works					80
Project Description:	4X4 One ton pickup trucks fully geared to plow with a dump body.						
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						
Justification:	This would replace 2 or fully geared up to plow versatile units.			-			08/20/2014
Useful Life:	10 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$130,000	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$130,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:(2) One Ton TrucksDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016					Sec. 2	
Priority:	High						
Project Title:	Loader						
Project Purpose:	Equipment Replaceme	ent					
Department:	Public Services-Public Works						baar baar
Project Description:	A new 34000 pound wheeled loader with an acs bucket.						
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						CS AND
Justification:	This is a replacement f	or unit 44. It is a 19	91 and is the unit th	nat drives the large	e snow blower.		
Useful Life:	20 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016		Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	,	Total Cost
\$255,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$255,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016 Project Title: Loader

Department: Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear: Priority:	2016 Medium					ſ	
Project Title:	Zero Turn Mower						
Project Purpose:	New Equipment					1	
Department:	Public Services-Pa	rks					
Project Description:	A 27 horsepower, 60"	A 27 horsepower, 60" deck zero turn mower.					
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						S 50
Justification:	An additional zero turr	n mower to increase	the efficiency of t	he crew.			
Useful Life:	10 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	5 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$10,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Zero Turn MowerDepartment:Public Services-Parks

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:	Medium	edium						
Project Title:	Utility Vehicle						A TIT	
Project Purpose:	New vehicle					/		
Department:	Public Services-Pa	rks				00		
Project Description:	A 4X4 side by side utlit	4X4 side by side utlity vehicle with a rear bed.						
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	/oodbury Brackett Municipal Building						
Justification:	The vehicle will be used to inspect and maintain Mt Apatite, our 325 acre wooded park with 4 miles of trails. It will also help to maintain our river walk system, and in our parks and ball field areas where a pickup truck is too heavy to drive on the fields.							
Useful Life:	10 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$8,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Utility VehicleDepartment:Public Services-Parks

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:	Medium							
Project Title:	75' Bucket Truck					1.3 1 CA CONT	· ····································	-
Project Purpose:	Equipment Replaceme	nt						
Department:	Public Services-Pul	blic Works				- ADDISED PERAIS WYDERS	-	
	This is the arborist bucket truck that is used for tree work, as well as to hang banners, holiday lights and various other work as required.							
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	unicipal Building						
Justification:	This is a replacement for the current 1998 bucket truck. Motor vehicle law requires that these type of vehicles are rebuilt or replace after 20 years of service. The amount of work and costs associated with a rebuild are such that a replacement of the vehicle makes fiduciary sense.						08/13/2014	
Useful Life:	Yrs							
Cost FY 2016 \$175,000	Cost FY 2017: \$0	Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$175,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:75' Bucket TruckDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	High					Sec. 1	
Project Title:	(2) Excavators					1	
Project Purpose:	Equipment Replaceme	nt					
Department:	Public Services-Pul	blic Works					
	16 ton tracked excavat			nammer, one a thu	mb, both will have	a 📊	
Description:	digging bucket and arti	culating clean up bi	JCKET.			1- 1- 7	
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	unicipal Building					
Justification:	This a replacement for jobs and ditching. The					The second se	08/12/201
	have. Allowing us to ci						
	growing substantially.						
Useful Life:	Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$450,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$450,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:(2) ExcavatorsDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Medium						
Project Title:	Hot Box Pavement	t Reclaimer				and the second se	
Project Purpose:	New Equipment						FALCON
Department:	Public Services-Pu	blic Works					
Project Description:	Hot box reclaimers are available in a trailer sty thermostat maintains l via an over-night heate	/le mounting. The h hot mix temperatur	ot box will allow PS	to haul heated as	phalt while the	ed	
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building					
Justification:	This is a second unit w also allow us to use as asphalt has a much lo	phalt at \$75 a ton v	ersus cold patch at			II	
Useful Life:	10 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$35,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$35,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Hot Box Pavement ReclaimerDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	High						
Project Title:	35 Ton Trailer						
Project Purpose:	Equipment Replaceme	ent					
Department:	Public Services-Pu	blic Works				The series	
	35 Ton low boy trailer that are used to transport the excavators and various other equipment to job sites and back to the shop in the event that somehting breaks down.					00000	
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						
Justification:	This is to replace the 1 unusable.	986 unit that had to	be taken out of se	rvice. Metal fatigu	e has made this u	nit	12/17/2014
Useful Life:	Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$50,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$50,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:35 Ton TrailerDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:	High	High						
Project Title:	Truck Wash							
Project Purpose:	New Equipment							
Department:	Public Services-Pul	blic Works						
Project Description:	An automated, water r	An automated, water recyling unit that would allow for an efficient and thorough vehicle cleaning.						
Location:	Woodbury Brackett M	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						
Justification:	Significant increase in the life of equipment due to winter operations. The wash could also be rented out to other entities.							
Useful Life:	20 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$925,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$925,000	



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Truck WashDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Medium					-	
Project Title:	Brine Unit and Dro	op Tanks					1 1 1 i
Project Purpose:	New Equipment						····· ····
Department:	Public Services-Pu	blic Works				· ·	COULDE THE REAL OF
Project Description:	Automated brine maki tiny crevices on roadw pavement.	-					
Location:	Woodbury Brackett Municipal Building						
Justification:	This unit has the poter effectively. It will cut of save approximately 20	down on the amount	t of Liquid calcium	chloride and salt w	ve use. The unit w	11	
Useful Life:	15 Yrs						
Cost FY 2016 \$115,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021: \$0	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost \$115,000



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Brine Unit and Drop TanksDepartment:Public Services-Public Works

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



Construction

City of Auburn, Maine FY2016 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

FiscalYear: Priority:							
-	Repurpose Ingerson	Repurpose Ingersoll xpanded service					
Department:	Recreation						
Project Description:	Balance needed to cor	nplete indoor turf fa	acility.				
Location:	Ingersoll Arena						
Justification:							
Useful Life:	20 Yrs						
Cost FY 2010 \$330,000		Cost FY 2018: \$0	Cost FY 2019: \$0	Cost FY 2020: \$0	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years: \$0	Total Cost
Cost breakdown	and funding source(s)					
Cost Type	Enter	Cost Type if Othe	r FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Sou	irce

100.00%

\$410,000 G.O. Bond

2016



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Repurpose IngersollDepartment:Recreation

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	


FiscalYear:	2016						
Priority:	Very High						
Project Title:	Asbestos Abatem	ent					
roject Purpose:	Increased Safety						
Department:	Recreation						
	Continue and complet and install new floorin		abatement. Reinsul	late areas after ask	oestos is removed		
Location:	Hasty Armory						
Justification:	There are areas of the This request is the bal	•				d.	
Useful Life:	30+ Yrs						
Cost FY 2016	Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost
\$50,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,000

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Construction		2016	100.00%	\$37,500	G.O. Bond



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear:2016Project Title:Asbestos AbatementDepartment:Recreation

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	



FiscalYear:	2016							
Priority:	Very High							
Project Title:	Window Replacen	nent-Balance ne	eded to comple	ete				
Project Purpose:	Improve efficiency							
Department:	Recreation							
Project Description:	Replace windows at Ha	asty Memorial Armo	ory					
Location:	Hasty Armory							
Justification:	The project was put ou \$25,000 is needed. Wi but 25K is need to cor	ndows on two side	s of the building wil					
Useful Life:	20 Yrs							
Cost FY 2016	6 Cost FY 2017:	Cost FY 2018:	Cost FY 2019:	Cost FY 2020:	Cost FY 2021:	Cost after 6 years:	Total Cost	
\$25,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,000	
Cost breakdown a	and funding source(s	1						

Cost breakdown and funding source(s)

Cost Type	Enter Cost Type if Other	FY	Percent	Cost	Proposed Finance Source
Constructio	n	2016	100.00%	\$35,000	G.O. Bond



Effects on Operating Costs and Income

FiscalYear: 2016

Project Title: Window Replacement-Balance needed to complete

Department: Recreation

Net Effects on Operating costs (+-)	Net Effect on Municipal Income (+-)
Direct Costs	Taxes:
Number of Personnel:	Other Income:
Personnel Cost	Subtotal
Cost of Service:	Gain from saile of
Materials & Supplies:	replaced assets
Utilities:	Total
Other:	
Subtotal	
Indirect Costs	
Fringe benefits:	
General Admin.:	
Other:	
Subtotal	
Total Direct & Indirect Cost	
Debt Service:	
Total Operating Cost	

AUBURN SCHOOL DEPT





2016 Capital Improvement Projects Report

Table of Contents

Introduction

Proposed FY 2016 Capital Improvement Program

Goal 1 – Maintain Facilities

CIP FY 2016 - 2025 McCormick Facilities Report - Cost to Buildings AMS ELHS Franklin Fairview Sherwood Heights Walton RETC/SOS Industry Ave & District Inventory

Goal 2 – Increase Efficiencies to Reduce Costs

Siemens Measurement and Verification Year-3 Savings Report VFA Asset Details Report

Goal 3 – Replace and/or Renovate ELHS to Address Deficiencies Outlined by NEASC & VFA

2016 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Introduction

The Capital Improvement Plan for the Auburn School Department ("CIP") for fiscal year 2016 and future years is enclosed. The documents include a ten-year spreadsheet that accounts for the needs at each school department site. Other documents are the projects for FY 16 organized by site and includes the intended source of funds. In addition, there is a section devoted to the need for a new high school.

Long-term Goals

The Auburn School Department has many capital needs in its future. The data supplied represents the department's needs over the next five years. The needs attempt to address the department's three long-term goals:

- 1. To maintain school facilities in accordance with health and safety regulations and structural upgrades within the limits of available funds.
 - The school department was approved for its FY15 budget to spend \$3,512,020 in Facilities Maintenance. These funds meet basic needs such as repairs and maintenance, supplies and equipment and utilities costs.
 - For FY16 Capital Improvements, the school department has identified safety needs totaling \$745,500 and identified security needs totaling \$309,300.
 - All school buildings except Edward Little High School now have HVAC system. HVAC systems improve air quality and improve the quality of the learning environments.
 - The department is committed to removing asbestos and hazardous materials. The FY 16 Capital Improvement identifies two projects totaling \$175,500.
 - Due to increase in enrollment at Park Avenue, which was built for 350 and is now at 390. There is a need for the additional two classrooms that were framed in the original project design.
 - The discussion of closing an elementary school was noted in the last Master Facilities plan (2008) and during recent budget discussions due to possible budget reductions. The CIP plan identifies a possible addition at Washburn School or East Auburn School.
 - In addition to elementary needs, the department has discussed the desire to move the sixth grade to Auburn Middle School, which would require a wing to be added to the middle school in the future.
- 2. To increase energy efficiencies to reduce annual costs.
 - The school department signed a Performance Contract with Siemens in 2007. The contract guaranteed cost savings that would pay for the contract with Siemens. Some areas addressed in the Siemens' contract were lighting retrofits, lighting sensors, boiler replacements, and building envelops.
 - All buildings, except East Auburn School and portion of Support Services, has been converted to Natural gas, which has provided a savings in the department's energy costs.
 - For the FY16 Capital Improvement, the school department has identified efficiency projects, which include replacing exterior doors, windows and a new electrical entrance, totaling \$3,309,650

To replace and/or renovate the Edward Little High School facility to address the deficiencies outlined in the 2009 New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) Accreditation report and the last FVA Capital Assessment Management Report.

- In the 2008 Master Facilities report Edward Little High School was identified as the highest facility need in the school department.
- Currently, Edward Little High School is sixteenth on the State Funded Construction list. There are twelve projects that have moved forward on the list and the school department is hopeful that within two years state funds will be available
- Edward Little High School was placed on academic probation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), mostly due to the condition of the facilities. It had been in a "warning" status since 2006 and on actual probation since April 16th, 2009. NEASC is a commonly accepted accreditation institution that sets standards for school districts to align educational outcomes for graduates that are preparing for post-secondary attendance or for the job market.
- Accreditation looks at the overall condition of the facility to determine how it enhances learning in terms of comfort, safety, and an appropriate educational learning and living environment. It also looks at the programs that are offered. There are 41 major facility related deficiencies in the NEASC report (2009). Many of them are related to the facility's size. It simply is not large enough to properly serve the student population. Due to classrooms being overcrowded, classes and materials are offered in inappropriate places. Some programs simply cannot be offered due to lack of suitable space. Then there are identified infrastructure issues such as an outdated heating system, poor air quality, recurring mold issues, a severely undersized cafeteria, small locker rooms, and outdated library and media resources, to name a few.
- Edward Little has made some progress in addressing accreditation but remains on probation today. Even if Edward Little were able to address the relatively minor curriculum related deficiencies, it cannot address the significant ones as they are building infrastructure related and requires the renovation of the entire facility and the addition of 66,000 new square feet.
- This fall NEASC visited Edward Little High School for a full accreditation review and a report will be issued this spring.
- For the FY16 Capital Improvement, the school department has identified projects totaling \$2,976,000.

These are a representation of the needs that are further explained in the materials provided in the CIP school booklet.

Cost and Schedule

The cost and schedule of projects is outlined on the ten-year CIP. Each year, the school department prioritizes the projects identified for a specific year based on the City Council approved CIP bonds and school allocation. When projects are not funded those items remain on the chart and the chart is revised each year. The school department also seeks other funding sources such as Qualified Zone Academy Bonds (QZAB) and Revolving Renovation Funds.

Maintenance on Operations

The Auburn School Department has a strong maintenance department even though often there is more work to do than hours in the day. There are five workers that daily address the needs of the departments 11 facility sites. The building custodians complete daily work orders that are tracked to ensure requests are addressed. The Support Service Director oversees the facilities work to make sure that health and safety issues are quickly addressed. The director monitors the work of the maintenance staff, custodial staff, contracted services and facility projects.

Outcomes and Performance

- 1. To maintain school facilities in accordance with health and safety regulations and structural upgrades within the limits of available funds.
 - The states Capital Assessment Management Program, often referenced to VFA, has been eliminated at the end of Fy14 fiscal year, as tool to assist Maine School Districts in managing their facilities. We are exploring alternative to the CAM software that will afford similar management collection and monitoring of the School's \$95 million dollar building assets. This information informs the CIP plan.
 - The school department chart showing the completion of projects, cost of project and date of completion.
- 2. To increase energy efficiencies to reduce annual costs.
 - The Siemens' annual executive reports detail the department's savings. The information is provided in the CIP booklet.
- 3. To replace and/or renovate the Edward Little High School facility to address the deficiencies outlined in the 2009 New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) Accreditation report and the last FVA Capital Assessment Management Report.
 - State funding becoming available for the ELHS project..
 - Edward Little H.S. is fully accreditation and not on probation.

Sustainability

The Auburn School Department will continue to rely on City Bonds, QZAB and Revolving Renovation funds and General Funds to support its facility needs due ensuring the school department is being fiscally responsible to the taxpayers of Auburn.

GOAL 1

To maintain school facilities in

accordance with

health and safety regulations

and

structural upgrades

within the limits of available funds.

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
AMS	1110			1110	1120			1120		1120	TOTOLE
Additional 6th Grade Classrooms-wing											\$5,200,000
Classroom Furniture Replacement	\$216,500	\$-									
Fire Alarm Replacement	\$461,000										
Classroom [27] & 2 Hallways-Carpet Replacements with VCT											
Interior Door Replacement/ADA hardware-140											
doors	\$231,400										
Exterior Door Replacement/Security Access Card Readers-12 doors	\$125,100										
Replacement of Freezers-refrigerant motors for Kitchen											
Fire Separation-Corridor walls	\$63,900										
Security/Surveillance Equipment upgrade/enhancement	\$-			\$205,434							
Bathroom Partitions-new fixtures		\$197,820		,							
Classroom Casework-27 rooms			\$590,490								
Library Casework		\$180,017									
Laboratory Casework		\$199,700									
Renewal Corridor Lockers	\$309,000	\$-									
Roof Ladder-safety cage	\$70,000										
Security - Upgrade											
Hydraulic Passenger Elevator- Renewal						\$128,830					
Toilet Partitions					\$134,864						
Public Address System								\$151,259			
Wet Sprinkler System-upgrade & new pump		\$738,808									
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel											
system							\$279,290				
Exterior Kitchen w/security access doors	\$13,700										
Gym Floor Replacement									\$80,935	1	
Chain Link Fence Lighting		1								\$400,146	
Renewal- Glass display Cases									\$19,888		

TOTAL

\$1,490,600 \$1,316,345 \$590,490 \$205,434 \$134,864 \$128,830 \$279,290 \$151,259 \$100,823 \$400,146 \$5,200,000

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
ELHS											
ADA Accessibility / [6] B & G Bathrooms				\$1,188,000							
A & B Wing Roofing & Structural Upgrade		\$530,054									
C &D Wing Roofing & Structural Upgrade						\$274,127					
E Wing Roofing & Structural Upgrade			\$176,800								
Gym & Foyer Roofing & Structural Upgrade				\$432,900							
Bathroom Refurbishing- 3 boys-3girlrs	\$-	\$-									
Lighting Fixtures Renewal-T8/T5- LED	\$-						\$564,706	\$212,423			
Asbestos Removal 7 Classrooms and Hallway											
A&B Wing, Main Office, Guidance Area											
Parking Lot and Roadway-Renewal		\$410,200									
Resurface Gym circle & drive		\$135,000									
Music Equipment/Instruments	\$32,000										
PC Computer Lab upgrades (41units)											
Resurface Front Entrance		\$295,000									
Major School Construction (replace ELHS)											
Local Only- Bifurcation Phases- Site											
Development/New Construction		\$9,553,000	\$51,905,000								
Tennis Court Lights		\$53,000	\$53,000	\$53,000							
Tennis Court Reconstruction	\$-	\$301,000									
New Electrical Entrance	\$481,000										
Track/Soccer Field Lighting			\$160,000		\$160,000						
Exterior Security Lighting- LED	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-							
Interior Handrail Replacement - ADA			\$166,000	\$166,000	\$166,000						
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel											
system							\$279,290				
Exterior Doors (33)	\$354,000										
Security/Surveillance Equipment											
upgrade/enhancement	\$111,000										
New Windows & Exterior Envelop- Will											
required PCB Assessment	\$1,998,000	\$3,030,160									
Cellular Window Treatments			\$80,000								
Resurface/Renewal Running Track		\$150,000									
Parking Lots - Increase & Reorg for Student,											
Staff & Parent Parking		\$400,000	\$-								
New Heating and Ventilation & Controls		\$-	\$4,182,300								
Addition - Cafeteria, Auditorium, Library				\$6,000,000							

\$2,976,000 \$14,857,414 \$56,723,100 \$7,839,900 \$326,000 \$274,127 \$843,996 \$212,423 \$- \$- \$-

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
East Auburn											
Parking Lot Repaving											
Remove Asbestos Floor tile-old section	\$28,500										
Repoint Chimney	\$20,500										
Repair damaged plaster wall- drywall- ceilings- 1954 wing	\$47,200										
Renew14 interior wood doors-frame/ADA hardware			\$34,140								
Renewal Asphalt Shingles			, .							\$28,153	
Renewal single-ply Membrane- 2 sections	1						T		ľ	\$129,653	
Renewal Lighting Fixtures	1				\$31,797		T		l	, -	
Telephone Upgrade	1					\$59,180	T		l		
Security Surveillance Renewal	1						\$60,189				
Carpet Renewal	1						,		\$69,615		
Phase II Addition			\$-								\$3,300,000
Public Address System									\$26,110		
Pneumatic Controls -DDC								\$400,000			
Asphalt Shingles-Renewal									\$185,000		
Lighting							\$250,000				
Single Ply Roofing Membrane Renewal										\$160,000	
Carpets Replacement w/VCT entire school		\$250,000									
TOTAL	\$96,200	\$250,000	\$34,140	\$-	\$31,797	\$59,180	\$310,189	\$400,000	\$280,725	\$317,806	\$3,300,000
LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Washburn											
Phase II Addition/Gym, Classrooms, Cafeteria											\$3,000,000
Replace interior wood doors-metal frames-lever											
hrdwr			\$68,291								
Replace Rear Fence	\$48,300										
						1	# CO 200	1			1

\$69,208

\$69,208 \$-

\$-

\$3,000,000

\$-

\$43,077

\$43,077

Lighting Fixtures Renewal-T8 DDE System renewal

\$120,000 **\$168,300 \$-**

\$68,291

\$-

\$-

Play Space Resurfacing TOTAL

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Fairview								•			
Exterior brick work- porous surfaces- sealant		\$77,769									
Student Bathrooms ADA - B & G											
Replace Interior doors/ADA Hardware-1950											
wings	\$205,250										
Replace 1996 Classroom Carpets- w/ VCT	\$115,360										
Substructure Repair 1951 wing	\$175,840										
Stage Curtains Replacement	\$-										
Lighting Fixtures Renewal T8&T5		\$245,055	\$222,512								
Security System Upgrade Main/97 addition		,	,	\$61,603	\$114,890						
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel				, ,							
system	\$48,000										
Ceramic Tile Renewal						\$109,987					
Theater & Stage Equipment Renewal		\$42,718									
Single-ply Membrane-97 addition							\$235,512				
Exhaust System- General building							\$52,718				
Central AHU-VAV System w/distribution			ſ	1				\$776,040			
Gym Equipment Renewal		\$35,710						· · ·			
Single Ply Roofing Membrane		· · · · ·					\$458,600				
Student Lockers										\$437,209	
Aluminum Windows Renewal									\$265,072		
									, <u>,</u>		
TOTAL	\$544,450	\$401,252	\$222,512	\$61,603	\$114,890	\$109,987	\$746,830	\$776,040	\$265,072	\$437,209	\$-
LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Park Ave		1		-	-	1	1	1			ſ
Security Surveillance upgrades-Cameras	\$25,000										
Vinyl Sheet goods-Renewal		\$40,656									
Two Additional Classrooms											\$400,000
Window Shades	\$44,478										
Emergency Battery Backup		\$37,539									
Exit Signs		\$32,073									
Replace Sheet Vinyl Goods w/tile		\$40,655	\$-								
Security/Surveillance Equipment											
upgrade/enhancement			\$78,985								
Public Address System Renewal									\$96,415		
Fence Chain Link									ψ30,τι3	\$49,376	
	I	1			<u> </u>	1	1	_ I	<u> </u>	φτ3,370	<u> </u>
Total	\$69,478	\$150,923	\$78,985	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$96,415	\$49,376	\$400,000

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Sherwood Heights											
Exterior Security lighting - Phase II											
Renewal Exit Signage & Emergency Lights	\$31,500										i
Fire Alarm Upgrades-1968 Section		\$148,874									
Stage Curtains Replacement											
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel											1
system	\$48,000										1
Theater & Stage Equipment		\$39,432									1
Ceramic Tile Renewal 97 addition							\$250,000				
Lighting Fixtures Renewal T8&T5			\$197,934	\$268,845							1
DDE System renewal			\$154,460								1
Single-ply Membrane-97 addition						\$458,337					
Carpet Renewal 97 addition w/VCT					\$128,520						
Central AHU-VAV System w/Distribution						\$1,232,131					
Wheelchair Lift Renewal							\$47,188				
Replace Original Exterior Doors-upper-lower entrances		\$43,100									
Roof Renewal A & B Wing					\$150,000	\$150,000					
Single-ply Membrane Renewal -97 addition							\$437,209				
Carpets Renewal - 3 pods								\$360,000			
Student Lockers Renewal									\$45,000		

TOTAL

\$79,500 \$231,406 \$352,395 \$268,845 \$278,520 \$1,840,468 \$734,397 \$360,000 \$45,000 \$- \$-

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Walton Elementary											
Renewal Stage Floor	\$18,810										
Refurbish Bathrooms[Primary/Faculty]	\$138,300										
Student Wall Lockers renewal	\$115,500										
Renewal Emergency Lights	\$22,600										
Exterior Lighting Renewal					\$49,755						
New Walk-in refrigerator/Replacement											
Walton Field Fence	\$52,500										
Roofing Renewal - Cafeteria		\$200,000									
System Security Surveillance Upgrade-Network Components			\$49,755								
Lighting Fixtures Renewal T8											
Kitchen-Cabinets-Counter-Sink/Quarry Tiles			\$140,657								
Fire Alarm Upgrades-1934&67 Sections		\$261,000									
Lighting Renewal Classrooms									\$325,000		
TOTAL	\$347,710	\$461,000	\$190,412	\$-	\$49,755	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Franklin School	-							-			
Floor & Ceiling Tiles Removal - Hazardous											
Materials	\$147,000										
Parking Lot Resurfacing		\$42,000									
Exterior Security Lighting											
New Fire Alarm system-NFPA	\$76,000										
Renewal lighting Fixtures- LED			\$100,357								
Carpeting Renewal w/VCT and Asbestos removal		\$207,634									
New Elevator- ADA Compliance				\$223,200							
TOTAL	\$223,000	\$249,634	\$100,357	\$223,200	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Technology											
Elementary Teachers/MacBooks								\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$300,000
Secondary Teachers/MaCBOOKS	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		\$100,000
		•	•								
TOTAL	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$400,000

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
RETC/SOS											
Exterior Parking Lot/Security Lighting											
Renew Concrete Window Sills	\$30,000										
New DDC Controls System- Renewal					\$56,545						
Single-ply Membrane renewal						\$72,059					
Lighting Fixtures Renewal-T8			\$109,394	\$69,208							
Perimeter Heat System-Fin Tube/unit Heaters				\$146,830							
Parking Lot Expansion/resurfacing			\$90,848								
Total	\$-	\$-	\$90,848	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FUTURE
Support Services Building			1110	1110	1120			1120		1120	1010HL
System Security Surveillance Upgrade-Network											
Components	\$34,600					\$16,930					
Emergency Lighting-Exit Signs	<i></i>	\$13,630									
One Ton P/U (replace 2002 1/2 ton) for											
Sanding			\$48,000								
Upgrade fire Alarm System											
Renewal 2 Exterior Steel Doors	\$10,000										
Parking Lot Resurfacing/Drainage Improvements							\$261,600				
One Ton P/U with Plow (replace 2003 3/4 ton											
Dodge)	\$42,000										
One Ton Truck With Plow (replace 2004 1 ton GMC)		\$48,000									
One Ton Truck With Plow (replace 2005 1 1/2	1	\$ 10,000		1				1			1
ton GMC)					\$50,000						
One Ton Truck With Plow (replace 2006 1 ton					,						1
Ford)			\$52,000								
One Ton P/U With Plow (replace 2008 3/4 ton											
Ford)				\$45,000							
Floor Finishers/Strippers/Buffers/Vacuums											
Lighting Fixtures Renewal T8			\$88,342	\$116,742							
District Lunch Walk-in Freezers & Refrigerator-											
Motors Replacement											
TOTAL	\$86,600		\$188,342	\$161,742	\$50,000	\$16,930	\$261,600	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-

GRAND TOTAL CIP

\$6,181,838 \$18,017,975 \$58,739,872 \$8,860,724 \$1,085,826 \$2,572,598 \$3,345,509 \$1,999,722 \$888,035 \$1,304,537 **\$12,300,000**

McCormick Facilities Management



"Vestigia Nulla Retrorsum" – "No Steps Backward"

The Auburn School Department is at what many deem to be a critical juncture in regards to the delivery of educational programs to the many varied learners and taxpayer interests of the Auburn community.

Some historical perspective:

<u>Resident population</u>: The City of Auburn, settled in 1736, has benefited from steady growth since its incorporation in 1842. Since 1850, when the US Census Bureau performed its first national census, the resident population of Auburn has experienced double digit growth in each of the census ten year periods for the ensuing 100 years until the 1970 report when it saw its first decline. The population has remained statistically stable since 1960 and is currently at 23,055 residents according to the 2010 census.

In the opinion of McCormick Consultants, there appears to be sustained economic activity in the greater Lewiston-Auburn area. Currently, some have indicated that a "renaissance" is occurring. Without question, the two cities are experiencing growth as measured by differing barometers that is greater than the rest of the state and the national average, even during the latest economic downturn. It is predicted that this growth will continue and just as likely that this growth will, at the very least, lead to constant educational space needs over the next 20 years.

<u>Births:</u> Resident birth history is a succinct method to determine future school enrollments. Auburn resident births have been reasonably steady over the last three decades ranging from a high of 331 in 1990 and reaching a low of 236 in 1997. [Graph#1]

Since 1990, the average of resident births is 279. Over the last five years, resident births have increased slightly to an average of 285. There is a perception that births have increased recently, which is confirmed. However, when reviewing birth data over the last 30 years, we observed repeating 3-5 year cycles where the births reach a high for a certain period and then retreat slightly some 3-5 years later. Auburn has experienced six such cycles since 1990. When compared to the 30 year average, the latest five year trend is six births per year above the 30 year average, thus confirming the perception of increased birth rates. It will be interesting to see if the cycle repeats itself as the latest spurt is now in its third year.



In the opinion of McCormick Consultants, today's base of 280 annual births plus a minimum 0.5% (one half of one percent) annual increase should be anticipated and used for school facility planning purposes for the next 10 & 20 years. This annual increase would add 14 new students per grade at year 10, and 29 new students per grade at year 20. Total school district enrollment would increase by 188 at year 10, and 385 at year 20. [Graph #2]



At this projected rate of growth, and using a 20-1 student to teacher ratio, 10 additional classroom spaces would be required 10 years from now and 10 more classrooms 20 years from now. A total of 20 additional properly sized and configured classrooms will be needed than exist today.

<u>Student population</u>: The attending student population, overtime, has similarly mirrored the resident population and birth history in that it has been statistically stable. Since 1990, total student population ranged from a high of 4,258 in 1992 to a low of 3,454 in 2005. The average over this time period is 3,820. In 2011, the enrollment is only 4% below the 21 year average. [Graph #3]

According to available records dating back to 1983, the largest district student population was in 1983 when 4,311 students were enrolled. Enrollments began to drop after 1983. Even though the general population has statistically remained steady, the student population has increased back to 3,668 students this year, showing slight increases in each of the last five years.

It is important to note that during the years of greatest enrollments, the district had 6 more school buildings than it does today.

Analysis of the enrollment data is somewhat complicated by the fact that until 2000, the communities of Mechanics Falls, Minot, and Poland attended Edward Little for grades 10-12 and 9th grade at Walton School. Approximately 400 students left over the ensuing years when the Poland Community High School was constructed. Of interest, however, is that the latest 21-year enrollment

average is the same as the last year these communities attended Edward Little.

Some of the student enrollment growth is due to the addition of new school offerings (prekindergarten), an "in migration" of students from closed private schools, "in migration" of formerly home schooled students, and slight birth increases. It should be noted that currently, only 150 of the potential 280 pre-kindergarten students attend the public schools due to space limitations and school policy.

In the opinion of McCormick Consultants, the Auburn School Department will, at a minimum, maintain the current student enrollment with at least a 0.5% (one half of one percent) annual increase over the next 20 years. Should the School Department decide to enroll all eligible PK students, and/or increase offerings to other "nontraditional" learners such as worker retraining, adult education, or postsecondary degree programs, a 5-8% increase could be experienced over the same 20 year period. [Graph#4]





History has shown that Auburn has grown and prospered over time. Though there have indeed been some "tough" times, all studied indicators show that Auburn will continue to grow.

Consultant's Conclusion: The current Auburn School Department facilities are not capable of providing sufficient appropriate learning spaces now and into the future. The community of Auburn should plan ways to expand educational spaces to best provide learning for all of its residents. It can afford

to, and must do so, if it wants to continue to survive and thrive.

<u>Capital Renewal Investment:</u> Capital re-investment to keep buildings in good operating order is essential. Without it, buildings will inevitably fall into disrepair or unacceptable conditions in terms of safety, comfort, and a good place for learning to take place. Capital renewal often takes last place in a school budget. Understanding capital renewal may not be obvious to some because it tends to get deferred until something catastrophic occurs like a roof leaking or a boiler no longer operational.

Beginning in 1998, Auburn has been able to fund capital renewal annually at a greater amount than in previous years and has upheld it since then. The annual amount expended has averaged \$1,239,941. Even though this amount seems like a large number, and it is, it has not been enough to keep the buildings from falling further behind. Based on replacement value of the buildings, Auburn should have been spending \$1,720,000 over the same time period. This indicates that there was a large deficit prior to the

lumbe



new expenditures. Based on today's current replacement value of the districts building inventory, the district should be spending \$2,100,000 [Graph #5].



Basically, this suggests that the district is falling behind at a rate of nearly \$1,000,000 per year. At this rate, the capital needs will never get caught up as there is \$56 million of deferred renewals now and \$33 million more looking forward 20 years. [Graph#6]

Edward Little:



There has been a high school in Auburn since 1834 when the Lewiston Falls Academy was constructed on the corner of Academy and High Streets. It became known as Edward Little in 1849 as a result of the support given to it by one of its

incorporators, a fellow named Edward Little, for his forward vision and support for education. The school was expanded twice over the next 110 years to

accommodate population increases and newer educational teaching trends of the day. In 1874, ownership of the school was transferred from a chartered corporate entity to the City of Auburn. A condition of the transfer was that it forever be named Edward Little.





With the continued population growth in the area, and the baby boom that was beginning to develop in the 1950's, the Great Falls location was no longer able to provide adequate space and was outdated. The current Edward Little building on the Auburn Heights location was constructed and occupied in 1961. Once again, the overcrowding, facility condition, and changes in instructional techniques prompted the need for a new facility.

According to reports, the "proposed" originally designed Edward Little was never constructed. After three defeated referendums, a compromise in the size and cost was reached. It did not include enough classroom space or a gym, the cafeteria was too small, and other attributes normally found in schools were left out. The school was constructed for \$1.9 million. Four years after the main building was constructed, a gymnasium was added. In 1998, a classroom wing was added.



A long term facility master plan and vision perhaps could have aided the community to make decisions that would have avoided the later construction projects and perhaps diminished the impact of the current accreditation situation.

<u>Accreditation</u>: Edward Little High School has been placed on academic probation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), mostly due to the condition of the facilities. It has been in a "warning" status since 2006 and on actual probation since April 16th, 2009. NEASC is a commonly accepted accreditation institution that sets standards for school districts to align educational outcomes for graduates that are preparing for post-secondary attendance or for the job market.

Accreditation looks at the overall condition of the facility to determine how it enhances learning in terms of comfort, safety, and an appropriate educational learning and living environment. It also looks at the programs that are offered.

There are 41 major facility related deficiencies in the NEASC report (2009). Many of them are related to the facility's size. It simply is not large enough to properly serve the student population. Due to classrooms being overcrowded, classes and materials are offered in inappropriate places. Some programs simply cannot be offered due to lack of suitable space. Then there are identified infrastructure issues such as an outdated heating system, poor air quality, recurring mold issues, a severely undersized cafeteria, small locker rooms, and outdated library and media resources, to name a few.

Edward Little has made some progress in addressing accreditation but remains on probation today. Even if Edward Little were able to address the relatively minor curriculum related deficiencies, it cannot address the significant ones as they are building infrastructure related and requires the renovation of the entire facility and the addition of 66,000 new square feet, at a recently estimated cost of \$49 million. The same report estimated the cost of an entirely new high school to be \$61 million (not including site acquisition and development costs).

Of course Edward Little is not the only concern facing the School Committee.

- $\frac{39}{7}$ Some of the other buildings are old, and are in poor or declining condition.
- 7 There is \$56 million of identified deferred capital renewal needs ("catch up") in the district.

- [#] The future cost of keeping the buildings over the next 20 years ("keep up") is another \$33 million.
- ³ Total capital cost to "catch up" and "keep up" for the next 20 years is \$89 million.
- Failure to provide appropriate capital renewal on an annual basis will surely cause the buildings condition to continue to decline.
- $\frac{39}{7}$ Energy and maintenance costs are higher than newer buildings.
- ³/₇ Educational dollars are harder and harder to come by. The District must find means to use available dollars more efficiently.
- The district applied for construction funding assistance from the MeDOE last year and was not successful.
- All of the schools are at size capacity for the number of students attending them. There are instances of student-teachers ratios greater than the desired ratio of 20-1. There simply is no room for enrollment growth without compromising the quality of teaching.
- Some of the school buildings are not organized acceptably to deliver education for today's standards.
- $\frac{39}{7}$ There are inequities within the elementary buildings in terms of offerings due to space.
- ³[§] Most of the buildings are not designed for learning in terms of the future, some of which we don't even know yet, or techniques that cannot be employed due to configurations.
- $\frac{39}{7}$ The buildings do not support the Vision 2020 for the future of education for the Auburn community.

Process:

<u>Community stakeholders and process</u>: On August 17, 2011, the Auburn School Committee voted to employ McCormick Facilities Management to assist it in updating its long-term strategic facility plan. A voluntary committee representing community stakeholders with an interest in Auburn education was solicited to meet with representatives of the Auburn School Department and McCormick Facilities Management. This committee met six times in the subsequent months, completed reviews of much statistical data, conducted research, participated in two public hearings, placed documents on the school's website, and utilized technology such as Googledocs and email for shared communications to carry out its mission.

The committee was asked to formulate their vision for education in the future. What would they like to offer in terms of education for learners that represents state of the art teaching and learning techniques and the infrastructure needed to support it? What vision can they perceive to provide quality education in the 21st century? They were asked to think out of the box as to what facilities should be like to provide 21st learning, devoid of emotion, politics, and special interests. How could costs be contained in light of diminishing funding?

It is important to note that the Auburn School Department has had an actionable long-term facilities plan since at least 1980. As with any long-term plan, it must be reviewed and adjusted periodically. Things change. Building conditions change, finances change, and more significantly, the need to educate learners continually changes. As such, long-term plans must change to keep pace.

It may appear that this nine week overall process has been too short for such a significant outcome. This effort would not have been possible without previous committee efforts and the significant amount of data that already exists. This process was only possible in this time frame because of the good work of previous stakeholder committees, School Board members, and volumes of data that exists.

However, there is a point of much more substantial importance that must be understood by all. This abbreviated process is only the beginning of a much longer one that needs to occur. This phase was to involve the community in early discussions to gauge the interests of the community to determine

how it would like to move forward in regards to caring for the school facilities AND with providing educational facilities for the future. This first step of the process was to assist the Board to determine what, if any, new ideas may come about as a result of the committee's deliberations in light of the failed funding assistance sought by the Board from MeDOE last year.

The work of this committee is now over with the delivery of this report. A new committee should be formed immediately to continue the planning and to determine a way to implement the recommendations of this committee.

Clearly, addressing accreditation and the needs of Edward Little is of the utmost importance to the community. A clear understanding of the accreditation needs must be achieved. It simply is not just the expenditure of a few dollars. According to the work of Harriman Associates for the major capital application last year, renovating and adding 66,000 square feet of new space is needed to satisfy NEASC. The cost was estimated to be \$49 million. If this scenario is chosen, it would still be an old renovated school with some new space and would not be particularly well arranged for future education delivery methods. Constructing an all new facility was estimated to cost \$61 million (not including site acquisition costs) and be located on a site to be determined.

Edward Little should be the springboard to lead future efforts for developing new facilities that best serve the educational needs of Auburn. What to do about Edward Little must first be decided before any other capital plans are implemented. If a single campus is desired over time, it must begin by addressing the needs of the high school. Whatever decision is reached for Edward Little will impact all other facility decisions for the following 30-40 years, at which point all other activities will likely necessarily be stopped.

Recommendations:

McCormick Facility Management Consultants is suggesting that a new community facility stakeholders committee be formed immediately; January 2012 at the latest.

The following is a possible timeline for the newly formed committee:

- The committee should represent a good cross section of community. It should include residents, city council members, and school committee members. It should include school administrators and staff as ex-officio members.
- The committee should meet regularly: at least monthly.
- ³/₁₇ Likely, the services of an outside consultant will be required to assist with the technical aspects and group facilitation, and should be employed.
- P Campus options should be developed and thoroughly explored.
- At least three public hearings should be conducted to seek input and distribute its work to date to the public at large.
- A non-binding straw poll vote should be held in November 2012.
- Based on the public input and straw poll results, the committee could move forward to implement the strategic vision. If the support is not there, then they could continue to develop plans until community support is achieved.

If this time frame were successful, the earliest students would be graduating from a new high school would likely be 2015. This is four more years of graduating students from a probationary accredited school!

Vision 2020 was a guiding document. Potential components of a facility vision were suggested. Community feedback was solicited. Data concerning folks, facilities, and finance were analyzed. At least a dozen possible solutions were considered, with five identified for in-depth review.

Based on the discussions, public hearings, and input from many, the following is the recommendation of this committee:

Create a "Comprehensive campus for community & life-long learning". The concept is that over time, all Auburn public education would take place on a single campus. It would not be one large building housing the entire student population but likely would have several buildings serving different grade levels and educational needs.

The new campus could have a performing arts auditorium, ice arena, all athletic fields at one location, and many features that the school department and community currently do not have.

This recommendation would likely be performed in steps, or phases. The possible steps have been tentatively identified in the following. Each step is a go/no-go step. Work continues as each step is successfully accomplished. If not successful, the process stops.

Phase 1

Site/Concept Committee

- 1. Review and follow the steps as outlined in the State of Maine Board of Education-Chapter 61, Rules for Major School Construction Projects.
- 2. Begin discussions to determine where land can be acquired and at what cost, with sufficient acreage for a single campus concept.

Phase 1 1-7 years

- 3. Design the campus in concept only for community discussion and cost estimating.
- 4. Secure tentative funding commitments.
- 5. Secure any necessary permits and approvals.
- 6. Design and construct a new high school.
- 7. Include planning to expand the middle school to accommodate grade 6.

Additional Phases (after Phase 1)

Phase 2 7-12 years

8. Determine elementary needs.

Phase 3 12-20 years

9. Determine other district needs.

This time line represents a 20-year time frame to get to a single campus. If at any time during the 20-year time line, conditions change, the plan can change. If the student population reverses or economic conditions change, then the plan can be put on hold or adjusted. The remaining buildings will still be in the school departments' inventory during this time and can be utilized until they are no longer needed.

This is truly a long term vision. It addresses so many current needs in the district. It creates much efficiency which will reduce operating costs as compared to not doing anything. It allows for flexibility and expandability. It can start and stop anytime to accommodate changing educational needs along the way.

Consultant's conclusions:

The community of Auburn and its School Department are at a time and place where something must be done to some, if not most, of its school buildings. Edward Little High School is on probationary status by its accreditation services provider. All of the elementary buildings except Park Avenue do not provide all of the appropriate spaces for today's desired curriculum. Some of the elementary buildings cannot teach certain programs such as creative or performing arts, physical education, or music for lack of suitable instructional space. The elementary schools do not all offer the same programs, which is inequitable. The Middle School is not a true middle school as it consists only of grades 7-8 and not 6-8. There are no available rooms for any increase in student population. The District has a hefty deferred capital renewal

for its aged buildings of nearly \$56 million dollars. Additionally, another \$33 million will need to be expended over the next 20 years to keep the buildings in acceptable condition. Most of the buildings are not energy or operationally efficient.

To be certain, there are many issues to be addressed.

The challenge is to figure out how to resolve the many issues and needs with finances seemingly more difficult to obtain.

The 120 year old model for education still being utilized today is no longer viable. The days of neighborhood schools are outdated. It matters little what size the school is but more what the school offers and how its programs are delivered. How the school building performs in terms of comfort, safety,

air quality, lighting, and other factors are far more important than size. How teachers are prepared and the tools they have to work with are what matters most.

Tomorrow's schools need to be flexible and expandable. They must provide for changing technology with little effort. Appropriate spaces for each program must be available for each age group, ability, and curriculum of the day. Kids need room to do their projects and store them for the next day. Band needs a room where it can make all the noise it wants and not disturb the classrooms next door. Creative art

needs room for paint and clay and kilns and storage of works in progress. Performing arts need a place to

build props and store them as well as dressing rooms and play rehearsal space. All schools should have gymnasiums with high ceilings so students can shoot a basketball and play games and exercise. Modern laboratories are needed to conduct actual experiments in real time, not just read about them from a book. Libraries and media centers need to have computers and fast broadband for downloading research materials. Learners of all ages need a place to learn and better themselves as lifelong learners.

Lastly, the importance of technology cannot be stressed enough. Every part of our lives today is impacted by technology. Technology will be even more prevalent in the coming years, in learning as well as living.

The Auburn School Department cannot address all of its needs simultaneously in the wake of so many insufficiencies. Simply addressing the deferred capital needs alone is more than the district can afford. At its current rate of capital expenditures, it will never get caught up. And if only its current building needs are addressed, then modernization will not be able to occur. If the student population expands, the district will have to find space somewhere to accommodate them.

The creation of a single campus for learning is becoming very common across the nation and in our own state. Reducing redundancies and keeping schools nearby is good for kids, parents, staff, and the taxpayer. Young children will look forward to going to the same campus each year. They will take pride in it. All learners will have the same opportunity to broaden their horizons. Operational costs will be reduced and over time, less expensive, than caring for the current aged facilities, some nearly 100 years old.

The community has an opportunity <u>now</u> to create something unique and forward thinking in terms of providing education and training for all of its residents well into the future.

Auburn can afford it; it is a matter of priorities. And what matters more than providing an outstanding education for your children and all learners in the district?

"Vestigia Nulla Retrorsum" – "No Steps Backward"



CITY OF AUBURN FY15 - FY16 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Classroom furniture

Project Location: AMS

Project Justification: This is phase II of classroom furniture renewal. Furniture is 38 years old and chairs are showing metal fatigue.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Fisca Year Schedule			
	Cost	Check One	Source	Check One	30	Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:	\$216,500	V	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY16	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$216,500		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Alternatives/impacts if the project is not funded or completed: It is a matter of safety for students and staff. Aging and failing equipment. Whatever furniture is salvageable, we will offer for sale via City's auction for disposal.



O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

Proposed Budget Classroom and Instructional Furniture Equipment AMS Auburn, Maine

1/17/14

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

433,000

Administrative Cost & Reserve

Advertising & Legal Cost	1,000	
Bid Contingency	18,000	
Construction Contingency	18,000	
Subtotal		37,000
Fees & Services		
Engineering	36,000	
Subtotal		26,000
Subtotal		36,000
Construction		
New Classroom desks/chairs		
Staff desks/chairs	360,000	
New instructional tables/chairs		
Furnishings for Music, Art,		

Subtotal

360,000

CITY OF AUBURN FY15 - FY16 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Priority:

Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Fire Alarm Renewal

Project Location: AMS Entire School

Project Justification: Current system is 35 years old and replacement parts are obsolete. Our VFA system has noted this as a school deficiency and already beyond renewal time.

Cost Estimate		Proposed Fisc Year				
			Source		Sc	hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		\checkmark	G.O. Bond	v	FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY16	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$461,000		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Alternatives/impacts if the project is not funded or completed:

P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

Proposed Budget FY16 For New Fire Alarm Auburn Middle School Auburn, Maine

January 9, 2014

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

ortheast uilding onsultants

N B

INC

461,000

Administrative Cost and Reserve

)0
00
0
)

CITY OF AUBURN FY15 - FY16 Capital Improvement Program Project Description Worksheet

Priority: Fiscal Year: Fy15-16

Project Title: FY 15 - CIP -

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Interior Doors Renewal

Project Location: AMS Entire Classrooms Entrances

Project Justification: Current doors do not meet life and safety code or school security protocol. It would also allow for ADS door hardware to be installed and lockable doors.

Cost Estimate		Proposed Funding			Proposed Fis Year	
			Source		Sc	hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond		FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY15	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost:	\$231,400		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Alternatives/impacts if the project is not funded or completed:

P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

Proposed Budget FY16 For New Interior Doors and ADA Hardware Auburn Middle School Auburn, Maine

January 9, 2014

231,400

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

N ortheast B uilding C onsultants

INC

Advertising & Legal Cost Bid Contingency Construction Contingency	1,000 9,500	9,000	
Subtotal			20,000
Fees and Services			
Engineering Fees		19,000	
Subtotal			19,000
Construction			
Removal and disposal of Existing Doors and hardware (140 doors)	7,000		
New Interior Wood Doors (140 doors), ADA Hardware and double cylinders	168,000		
New Master keyed System		9,500	
Painting (3 coats per doors)		7,900	
Subtotal			192,400

P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

Proposed Budget FY16 For New Exterior Doors with Security Card Access Auburn Middle School Auburn, Maine

January 9, 2014

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

ortheast uilding onsultants

B

INC

125,100

Administrative Cost and Reserve

Advertising & Legal Cost Bid Contingency Construction Contingency	5,000	1,000	5,000	
Subtotal				11,000
Fees and Services				
Engineering Fees			10,000	
Subtotal				10,000
Construction				
Demolition and Disposal 12 Exterior Door openings		6,000		
New Exterior HM Doors, Frames and Hardware		61,000		
Security Access Card Readers		33,000		
Painting		4,100		
Subtotal				104,100
P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

Proposed Budget FY16 For New Exterior Kitchen Door Auburn Middle School Auburn, Maine

January 9, 2014

13,700

16,300

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

Subtotal

ortheast

uilding onsultants

Administrative Cost and ReserveContingency1,300Subtotal1,300Fees and Services1,300Engineering Fees1,300Subtotal1,300Construction1,300Demolition, New Door, frame,
Hardware, Card Reader & Painting13,700

Priority:

Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Fire Separation Corridor Walls

Project Location: AMS West & East Wing

Project Justification: Current hallwall walls do not meet current life and safety code. Our VFA has identified this as a deficiency and should be addressed.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source		-	osed Fiscal Year hedule
	Cost	Check One	Jource	Check One	50	Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		v	G.O. Bond	v	FY15	10%
Construction:			Reserve		FY16	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$6,900		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

Proposed Budget FY16 For Fire Separation above Corridor Walls Auburn Middle School Auburn, Maine

January 9, 2014

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

ortheast uilding onsultants

N B

INC

63,900

Administrative Cost and Reserve

Advertising & Legal Cost Bid Contingency	2,600	1,000		
Construction Contingency			2,600	
Subtotal				6,200
Fees and Services				
Engineering Fees			5,200	
Subtotal				5,200
Construction				
Remove and Install Corridor Ceilin	ngs	9,300		
New Drywall Separation		43,200		
Subtotal				52,500

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Corridor Lockers - Renewal

Project Location: AMS

Project Justification: Student lockers are 34 years old and have exceeded their life expectancy

Cost Estimate			- ,	sed Fiscal Year hedule		
	Cost	Check One	Source	Check One	30	Percent
Planning/Engineering:	\$25,000		Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:	\$273,900	V	G.O. Bond	v	FY16	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY16	
Other:	\$11,000		Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$309,900		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

N ortheast uilding onsultants INC. P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350) Tel: 207.592.8905 Fax: 866. Proposed Budget Student Wall Lockers	817.8271 mcole@NBCinc.biz	
	Renewal		
	AMS		
	Auburn, Maine		
	1/17/14		
TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED			248,800
Administrative Cost & Reserve			
Advertising & Legal Cost	1,000		
Bid Contingency	10,500		
Construction Contingency	10,500		
Subtotal		22,000	
Fees & Services			
Engineering	16,800		
Subtotal		16,800	
Construction			
Remove and dispose of wall lockers Install new student wall lockers	210,000		

Subtotal

210,000

Proposed Budget FY16 For New Roof Hatch and OSHA Approved Ladder Auburn Middle School Auburn, Maine

P.O. Box 268, Litchfield, Maine 04350 | Tel: 207.592.8905 | Fax: 866.817.8271 | mcole@NBCinc.biz

January 9, 2014

TOTAL FUNDS REQUIRED

N ortheast B uilding C onsultants

INC

Administrative Cost and Reserve

Advertising & Legal Cost Bid Contingency Construction Contingency	3,500	1,000	3,500	
Subtotal				8,000
Fees and Services				
Engineering Fees			7,000	
Subtotal				7,000
Construction				
Demolition, New Roof Hatch, OSHA – Ladder, Roof Repairs and Painting		70,000		
Subtotal				70,000

85,000

FRANKLIN

Priority: Fiscal Year: Fy15-16

Project Title: FY 15 - CIP -

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Interior Carpet Renewal with VCT

Project Location: Franklin School

Project Justification: Current carpets are 30 years old and showing wear and tripping hazards. Asbestos tiles will require abatement before new material is laid. Renewal carpets with VCT material and afford students and staff with better air quality and remove tripping hazards.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source		-	osed Fiscal Year hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond		FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY15	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost:	\$147,000		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Priority: Fiscal Year: Fy15-16

Project Title: FY 15 - CIP -

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: New Fire Alarm System

Project Location: Franklin School

Project Justification: This building is sprinkler within but no fire alarm. A new fire alarm would be tied into 911 for alert notification in case of fire/smoke.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding		•	osed Fiscal Year
			Source		Sc	hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond		FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY15	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost:	\$76,000		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

FAIRVIEW

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: 1997 Wing Carpet Replacement

Project Location: Fairview School

Project Justification: These carpets are 18 years old and showing wear and tipping hazards. We would replace carpets with VCT for ambient environment cleaning issue.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source		-	osed Fiscal Year hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		v	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY16	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$115,360		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Interior Walls 1954 Wing Renewal

Project Location: Fairview School

Project Justification: Current doors do not meet life and safety code and school security protocal. It would also allow for ADS door hardward to be installed and lockable doors in 1954 Wing of building.

Cost Estimate		Proposed Funding Source					
	Cost	Check One	Jource	Check One	<u> </u>	hedule Percent	
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15		
Acquisition:		v	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%	
Construction:			Reserve		FY16		
Other:			Special		FY15		
			Assessment/Fee		FY15		
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$205,200		Grant (identify)		FY15		
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

SHERWOOD Heights

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: New Telephone & Intercom System

Project Location: Sherwood Heights

Project Justification: Network Server and connectivity to Auburn Syntrex Phone System. Installing new telephone/intercom system will assist in meeting our school security needs and lessen Sherwood Heights long distance phone charges, too.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source				
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent	
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15		
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	v	FY15	100%	
Construction:			Reserve		FY16		
Other:			Special		FY15		
			Assessment/Fee		FY15		
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$48,000		Grant (identify)		FY15		
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

WALTON

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Renewal - Fire Alarm System

Project Location: Walton

Project Justification: The existing antiquated Fire Alarm Sytem was installed and upgraded during the 1967 construction. We have attempted to enhance the fire alarm system over the last 15 years and it is now at point where system is malfunctioning and Norris Inc, our provider who maintains the system, is unable to locate replacement part; whereby parts are no longer being manufactured. Need to upgrade fire alarm to conform with life safety codes.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source			osed Fiscal Year hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:	\$21,000		Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%
Construction:	\$218,000		Reserve		FY16	
Other:	\$22,000		Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$261,000		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Renewal - Student Boys/Girls Bathroom in Primary Wing

Project Location: Walton

Project Justification: Bathrooms are original and require new toilet units and partition. IT would also allow for ceramic tiles to be used on floors and mid-wall section.

Cost Estimate		Proposed Funding Source					
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent	
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15		
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%	
Construction:			Reserve		FY16		
Other:			Special		FY15		
			Assessment/Fee		FY15		
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$138,300		Grant (identify)		FY15		
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Priority:

Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Renewal - Student Wall Lockers

Project Location: Walton

Project Justification: The current wall lockers are 35 years old and parts are no longer available. Contact with several school locker vendors recommended that replacement is only way of making wall lockers safe. Students use these lockers daily.

Cost Estimate		Proposed Funding Source			-	Proposed Fiscal Year Schedule	
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent	
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15		
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%	
Construction:			Reserve		FY16		
Other:			Special		FY15		
			Assessment/Fee		FY15		
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$115,500		Grant (identify)		FY15		
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

WASHBURN

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Playground Surface

Project Location: Washburn School

Project Justification: This is an inner-city school with no soft playspace. Establishing soft playspace for students will allow them to have greeen space for play. Current area is gravel and old asphalt.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source		-	osed Fiscal Year hedule
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15	
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	V	FY15	100%
Construction:			Reserve		FY16	
Other:			Special		FY15	
			Assessment/Fee		FY15	
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$120,000		Grant (identify)		FY15	
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15	

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

EAST AUBURN

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Repoint Chimney

Project Location: East Auburn

Project Justification: Repoint chimney bricks and waterproof. VFA system acknoledges the renewal year for chimney repointing before water issues appears.

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source			Proposed Fiscal Year Schedule	
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent	
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15		
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	v	FY15	100%	
Construction:			Reserve		FY16		
Other:			Special		FY15		
			Assessment/Fee		FY15		
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$20,500		Grant (identify)		FY15		
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

Priority: Fiscal Year:

Project Title: FY 15/16 CIP

0

Department: Auburn School Department

Project Description: Interior Walls Old 1954 Wing Renewal

Project Location: East Auburn

Project Justification: Old 1954 Wing has old plaster walls that was not addressed in 2000 construction. This will remedy the walls with new drywall and include suspended ceilings in 4 classrooms

Cost Estimate			Proposed Funding Source			Proposed Fiscal Year Schedule	
	Cost	Check One		Check One		Percent	
Planning/Engineering:			Current Revenues		FY15		
Acquisition:		V	G.O. Bond	v	FY15	100%	
Construction:			Reserve		FY16		
Other:			Special		FY15		
			Assessment/Fee		FY15		
Total Estimated Cost (annually):	\$47,200		Grant (identify)		FY15		
Source of Estimate:			Other (identify)		FY15		

Impact on Operating Costs:

Other related City Projects:

GOAL 2

To increase energy efficiencies

to reduce annual costs.

SIEMENS

ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACT PERFORMANCE ASSURANCE REPORT

FOR





Performance Year 5: March 2013 – March 2014

Siemens Industry Inc. Scarborough, ME SIEMENS

PERFORMANCE SOLUTIONS AGREEMENT OVERVIEW

Auburn School Department

Client:

Client Contact:	Jude G. Cyr, Business Manager
Contract Date:	April 15, 2011
Siemens Contacts:	Colleen Fissette, Performance Assurance Specialist Email: colleen.fissette@siemens.com
	Thomas Seekins, Account Executive Email: thomas.seekins@siemens.com
	Siemens Industry, Inc. 66 Mussey Road Scarborough, ME 04074 Phone: (207) 885 - 4115
Performance Guarantee Period:	March 13, 2011 to March 12, 2021

Contract Term Length: 10 Years

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary 46

2.	Performance /	Assurance C	Dverview	49

2.1	Measurement and Verification Methods	
2.2.	Guaranteed Savings	
2.3	Utility Rate Structures and Escalation Rates	
2.4	Baseline Utility Data	
2.5	Baseline Operating Data	
2.6	Contracted Baseline Operating Data	

3. Perform	nance Assurance Results 52	
3.1. Summary of	Guaranteed and Verified Energy Savings	
3.2. Option A Sa	vings	
3.2.1. Pe	rformance Year Savings	
3.2.2. Re.	sults by Measure	
3.2.2.1.	Lighting Retrofit	
3.2.2.2.	Lighting Sensors	
3.2.2.3	Boiler Upgrade	
3.2.2.4.	Variable Frequency Drives (VFDs)	
3.3. Option B Say	vings	
3.3.1. Performa	ance Year Savings	
3.3.2 Re.	sults by Measure	
3.3.3.1	Energy Management System (EMS)	
	D Stipulated Savings	
U	ance Year Savings	
	sults by Measure	
3.4.3.1	Building Envelope Improvements	
3.4.3.2.	Plug Load Controls	
3.4.3.3	Electric Summer Domestic Hot Water Heater	
3.4.3.4.	Air Handler Unit (AHU) Replacement	
4. Emissio	ons Reduction 63	

5. Appendix 63

5.1	Combustion Efficiency Results for Year 164

1. Executive Summary

Performance Year 5: March 13, 2013 – March 12, 2014

Siemens Industry (Siemens) is pleased to provide the Auburn School Department with this Year 5 energy savings guarantee report. This report details the energy performance of the implemented project by comparing realized energy and cost savings for this annual period to the contract guaranteed savings. Your Energy Performance Contract with Siemens guaranteed **\$221,057** in annual cost savings. Total Year 5 cost savings for this annual period amounted to **\$428,883** and consisted of **\$364,759** in Measured and Verified Savings, **\$11,699** in Stipulated Energy Savings, and **\$52,424** in Stipulated Operational Savings. Total Year 5 savings are **\$207,826** in excess of the guaranteed savings for this performance period. The excess in savings is largely due to the fuel switch from oil to natural gas and the increase in cost of fuel oil.

Table 1. Summary of total realized and guaranteed cost savings for the Auburn SchoolDepartment.

Performance Year	Measured and Verified Savings	Stipulated Savings	Total Realized Savings	Operational Savings	Total Year-5 Savings	Annual Guaranteed Savings	Deviation from Plan
1	\$154,160	\$11,727		\$46,578	\$213,917	\$196,406	\$17,511
2	\$156,993	\$12,079		\$47,975	\$218,542	\$202,298	\$16,244
3	\$161,641	\$12,441		\$49,415	\$224,053	\$208,368	\$15,685
4	\$424,224	\$12 <i>,</i> 814		\$50,897	\$475,121	\$214,618	\$260,503
5	\$364,759	\$11,699	\$376,459	\$52,424	\$428,883	\$221,057	\$207,826
6				\$53,997		\$227,689	
7				\$55,617		\$234,519	
8				\$57,285		\$241,555	
9				\$59,004		\$248,802	
10				\$60,774		\$256,266	
YTD Totals	\$1,261,778	\$60,761	\$376,459	\$533,966	\$1,560,516	\$2,251,576	\$517,770



Figure 1. Year 5 Annual Realized and Guaranteed Cost Savings.

			Natural Gas	Propane
Performance	Electric Energy	#2 Fuel Oil	Saved	Saved
Year	Saved (kWh/yr)	Saved (gal/yr)	(Therms/yr)	(gal/yr)
Year-1	719,515	112,576	(110,264)	264
Year-2	719,515	112,290	(111,129)	264
Year-3	719,515	112,290	(111,129)	264
Year-4	719,515	125,759	(124,619)	264
Year-5	719,515	138,206	(146,145)	(399)
Total	3,597,576	601,121	(603,286)	657

Table 2. Year-to-Date Realized Savings (Units).

*Note: The lighting penalty at the Bus Garage was converted from Oil to Propane.

 Table 3. Performance Year 5 Realized Energy Savings by facility improvement measure (FIM).

Facility Improvement Measure	Electric Energy Saved (kWh/yr)	Natural Gas Saved (Therms <i>l</i> yr)	#2 Fuel Oil Saved (gal/yr)	Propane Saved (gal/yr)
Lighting Retrofit	532,637	(8,242)	(219)	(663)
Lighting Sensors	103,558			
Boiler Upgrade		(155,262)	138,223	
EMS Upgrade	29,257	12,614	0	
VFD for the HW pumps	22,816			
Building Envelope Improvements		4,346	202	
Plugload Controller	24,322			
Install Electric Summer DHW Heater	(469)	399		
AHU Replacement	7,393			264
Total	719,515	(146,145)	138,206	(399)

A change in fuel types at the Auburn Middle School and Bust Garage resulted in an increase in fuel savings and a decrease in Natural Gas savings during this annual period. During year 4 of performance the Auburn Middle School used Fuel Oil for 6 months before switching to Natural Gas. Also the Bus Garage no longer uses Fuel Oil and now uses Propane. The energy savings calculations have been updated to reflect the change in fuel types and will remain this way for the remaining years of performance.

2. Performance Assurance Overview

This section of the report provides an overview of the methodology and parameters used to measure and verify savings for this report and are based on the signed contract between the Auburn School Department and Siemens Industry, Inc.

2.1 Measurement and Verification Methods

Realized savings were calculated using the methodology described in Exhibit C of the energy performance. There are four guarantee options to measure and verify savings: Option A - Measured Capacity, Option B - Measured Consumption, Option C - Main Meter Comparison, and Option D - Stipulated.

Option A - Measured Capacity. This approach is intended for Facility Improvement Measures where a one-time measurement for specific equipment or systems instantaneous baseline energy use, and a one-time measurement for specific equipment or systems instantaneous post-implementation (Post) energy use can be measured. Baseline and Post energy consumption is calculated by multiplying the measured end use instantaneous capacity (i.e. -kW, Gal/hr, BTU/hr) by stipulated hours of operation for each mode of operation (i.e. -hours, week, month). The calculations for energy consumption will be defined in the Measurement and Verification article of this Exhibit C. The work sequence required for data collection, evaluation, and reporting will be defined in the Measurement and Verification article of this Exhibit A.

Option B - Measured Consumption. This approach is intended for Facility Improvement Measures where continuous periodic measurements for specific equipment or systems baseline energy use, and continuous periodic measurements for that equipment or systems post-implementation (Post) energy use can be measured. The calculations for energy consumption will be defined in the Measurement and Verification article of this Exhibit C. Periodic inspections and consumption measurements of the equipment or systems will be necessary to verify the on-going efficient operation of the equipment and saving attainment. The predetermined schedule for data collection, evaluation, and reporting will be defined in the Performance Assurance Technical Support Program article of this Exhibit A.

Option C - Main Meter Comparison. This approach is intended for measurements of the whole-facility or specific meter baseline energy use, and measurements of whole-facility or specific meter post-implementation (Post) energy use can be measured. The methodology to establish baseline and Post parameter identification, modeling approach and baseline or model adjustments will be defined in the Measurement and Verification article of this Exhibit C. Periodic inspections of baseline energy usage, operating practices, and facility and equipment, and meter measurements of the will be necessary to verify the on-going efficient operation of the equipment, systems, practices and facility, and saving attainment. The predetermined schedule for data collection, evaluation, and reporting will be defined in the Performance Assurance Technical Support Program article of this Exhibit A.

Option D - Stipulated. This approach is intended for Facility Improvement Measures where the end use capacity or operational efficiency; demand, energy consumption or power level; or manufacturer's measurements, industry standard efficiencies or operating hours are known in advance, and used in a calculation or analysis method that will stipulate the outcome. Both CLIENT and SIEMENS agree to the stipulated inputs and outcome(s) of the analysis methodology. Based on the established analytical methodology the savings stipulated will be achieved upon completion of the Facility Improvement Measures Work and that no further measurements or calculations will need to be performed. The methodology and calculations to establish savings value will be defined in the Measurement and Verification article of this Exhibit C.

2.2. Guaranteed Savings

Guaranteed cost savings are shown below in Table 4.

Table 4. Guaranteed Annual Energy Cost Savings for Year 5.

		Total		
	M&V	Cost	Operational	Guaranteed
Facility Improvement Measure	Option	Savings	Savings	Savings
Lighting Retrofit	А	\$65,465	\$19,221	\$84,687
Lighting Sensors	А	\$15 <i>,</i> 496		\$15,496
Boiler Upgrade	А	\$48 <i>,</i> 947	\$27,012	\$75,959
EMS Upgrade	В	\$22,109	\$6,190	\$28,300
VFD for the HW pumps	А	\$3 <i>,</i> 416		\$3,416
Building Envelope Improvements	D	\$7,282		\$7,282
Plugload Controller	D	\$3,603		\$3 <i>,</i> 603
Install Electric Summer DHW Heater	D	\$555		\$555
AHU Replacement	D	\$1,759		\$1,759
Total		\$168,633	\$52,424	\$221,057

2.3 Utility Rate Structures and Escalation Rates

Utility rates used to calculate dollar savings for this report are based on the utility rate in effect for the predominant bill or the utility rate in effect for the corresponding period of the Baseline period, whichever is greater. An escalation rate of 3% is applied annually to the floor rate and compared to the utility rate in effect for this performance period. The greater of the two is applied to the actual utility savings occurring during this annual period. Table 5 summarizes the rates used for Performance Year 5.

Table 5. Summary of Utility Rates for Performance Year 5

	Contract Escalated	Actual Year 5	Year 5 Reported
All Location	Rates	Rates	Rates
Electric Consumption (\$/kWh)	\$0.1576	\$0.1229	\$0.1576
Fuel Oil (\$ <i>/</i> Gal)	\$2.18	\$3.18	\$3.18
Propane (\$/Gal)	\$2.25	\$1.92	\$2.25

Table 6. Actual Natural Gas Rates,Performance Year 5

	Year 5
Location	2013-2014
Auburn Middle School	\$ 1.07
Edward Little High School	\$ 1.36
Fairview Elementary	\$ 1.29
Sherwood Heights	\$ 1.28
Walton Elementary	\$ 1.19
Washburn Elementary	\$ 2.18
Franklin Main Bldg	\$ 1.71

2.4 Baseline Utility Data

The annual period selected as the Baseline period starts March 2006 and ends February 2007. Tables 7 outlines the utility consumption that occurred during the Baseline period.

Location	Electricity (kWH)	Fuel Oil (Gal)	Propane (Gal)
Bus Garage	248,230	9,481	
East Auburn	102,400	6,933	5,501
Fairview Elementary	326,320	37,874	
Franklin Alternative	38,500	7,632	
High School	892,502	70,524	10,362
Merrill Hill	29,617	5,833	
Middle School	548,620	30,486	
Sherwood Heights	367,200	30,485	
Walton Elementary	180,000	39,378	
Washburn	125,525		
Total	2,858,914	238,626	15,863

Table 7. Electric Baseline Consumption (March 2006 - February 2007)

2.5 Baseline Operating Data

The operating practices during the Baseline period are used to determine the guaranteed savings based on the efficiency improvements after implementing the facility improvement measures, these parameters are shown in Table 8.

Units	Occupied	Unoccupied
High School	72	72
Middle School	72	72
Sherwood Heights	72	72
Walton Elementary	72	72

Table 8. Baseline Operating Schedules

2.6 Contracted Baseline Operating Data

The guaranteed savings from the facility improvement measures provided under this contract are based on implementation of the following schedules and set points shown in Tables 8.

Table 9. Post Implementation schedule

Units	Occupied	Unoccupied
High School	72	65
Middle School	72	65
Sherwood Heights	72	65
Walton Elementary	72	65

3. Performance Assurance Results

3.1. Summary of Guaranteed and Verified Energy Savings

Total realized annual energy savings for this performance year were **\$428,883** and were comprised of **\$342,553** of Option A, **\$22,207** in Option B, **\$11,699** in Option D savings, **\$52,424** in stipulated Operational Savings, respectively. Total



realized annual savings are in excess of the annual guaranteed energy savings of **\$221,057** by **\$207,826.** The following sections detail the Option A, B, and D savings.

Figure 2. Realized and Guaranteed Annual Cost Savings for Year 5.

3.2. Option A Savings

3.2.1. Performance Year Savings

Option A savings are verified based on one-time measurements taken after substantial completion of each facility improvement measure and the estimated savings are included as ongoing realized savings in each subsequent performance year. The table below summarizes Option A savings realized during the current performance year and shows that total Option A savings amount to \$342,553 which is \$209,228 above the guaranteed Option A savings (\$133,324).

Description of FIM	Electric Energy Savings (kWh/yr)	Natural Gas Savings (Therms/yr)	Fuel Oil Savings (Gal/yr)	Propane Savings (Gal/yr)	Verified \$ Saved per year	Guaranteed \$ per year	Excess/ Shortfall \$
Lighting Retrofit	532,637	(8,242)	(219)	(663)	\$70,565	\$65,465	\$5,099
Lighting Sensors	103 <i>,</i> 558				\$16,318	\$15,496	\$822
Boiler Upgrade		(155,262)	138,223		\$252,075	\$48,947	\$203,128
VFD for the HW pumps	22,816				\$3,595	\$3,416	\$179
Total Option A Savings	659,011	-163,504	138,004	(663)	\$342,553	\$133,324	\$209,228

Table 10. Summary of Option A Savings for Performance Year 5

*Note: The lighting heating penalty at the bus garage has been changed from oil to propane.

A significant increase in realized cost savings, resulting especially from the boiler upgrades, is the result of incorporating actual Year 5 utility rates, during which oil costs were significantly higher than the baseline oil rates outlined in Article 2.3 of this document. A comparison of realized cost savings under actual and escalated baseline rates is shown below in Table 11.

Description of FIM	\$ Saved per	\$ Saved Escalated Utility	Guaranteed
Description of FIM Lighting Retrofit	Contract \$70,565	Rates \$71,284	\$ per year \$65,465
Lighting Sensors	\$16,318	\$16,318	\$15,496
Boiler Upgrade	\$252 <i>,</i> 075	\$113,653	\$48,947
VFD for the HW pumps	\$3 <i>,</i> 595	\$3 <i>,</i> 595	\$3,416
Total Option A Savings	\$342,553	\$204,850	\$133,324

Table 11. Utility Rate Savings Comparison.

3.2.2. Results by Measure

3.2.2.1. Lighting Retrofit

Energy savings resulting from the lighting retrofit were verified based upon a one-time measurement of the lighting power capacity under existing conditions, a one-time measurement of the lighting power capacity upon completion of the lighting retrofit project and agreed-upon annual operating hours. A representative sample of each lighting-fixture type was used to determine pre-retrofit and post-retrofit kW. The following tables detail the savings results from the lighting and controls retrofit.

The heating penalties have been adjusted to reflect the fuel used at each location.

Table 12. Annual Savings Associated with the Lighting Retrofit

Description of FIM	Electric Energy Savings (kWh/yr)	Heating Penalty, Natual Gas	Heating Penalty, Gal Fuel Oil	Heating Penalty, Gal Propane	Verified \$ Saved per year	Guaranteed Excess/ \$ per year Shortfall \$
Lighting Retrofit	532,637	(8,532)	(219)	(663)	\$70,565	\$65,465 \$5,099
Bus Garage	34,190			(663)	\$3,894	
East Auburn Community School	18,330		(219)		\$2,191	
*Fairview Elementary	55,492	(986)			\$7,469	
*Franklin Alternative	16,337	(290)			\$2,077	
*Edward Little High School	129,459	(2,301)			\$17,274	
*Auburn Middle School	109,467	(1,945)			\$15,171	
*Sherwood Heights	101,544	(1,805)			\$13,696	
*Walton Elementary	41,899	(745)			\$5,712	
*Washburn	25,919	(461)			\$3 <i>,</i> 080	

*Locations indicated have been converted from Fuel Oil to Natural Gas

3.2.2.2. Lighting Sensors

Energy savings resulting from lighting sensors were verified using spot measurements of a 10% sample of baseline and post-installation fixture types or fixture circuits to establish demand. Baseline and post-installation annual operating hours are stipulated.

Table 13. Annual Savings Associated with the Lighting Sensors.

	Electric		
	Energy	Verified \$	
	Savings	Saved per	Guaranteed
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	year	\$peryear
Lighting Sensors	103,558	\$16,318	\$15,496
Bus Garage	7,301	\$1,150	
East Auburn Community School	3,312	\$522	
Fairview Elementary	7,241	\$1,141	
Franklin Alternative	1,678	\$264	
Edward Little High School	40,778	\$6,425	
Auburn Middle School	18,853	\$2,971	
Sherwood Heights	12,587	\$1,983	
Walton Elementary	7,536	\$1,187	
Washburn	4,272	\$673	

3.2.2.3 Boiler Upgrade

Siemens replaced existing boilers at Fairview Elementary School, Sherwood Heights Elementary School, Walton Elementary School, and Auburn Middle School with new high efficient equivalents. Energy savings is based on an increase in efficiency from existing (71%) and a measured combustion efficiency for each location performed during the year one performance period. Since final completion was signed all four schools have been converted from Fuel oil to Natural Gas. Increased cost savings results due to the drop in natural gas rates and the increase in fuel oil rates.

Location	Existing	Proposed	Measured
Fairview Elementary	71%	85%	88.8%
Auburn Middle School	71%	85%	88.8%
Sherwood Heights	72%	85%	86.1%
Walton Elementary	71%	85%	85.6%

Table 14. Combustion Efficiency Results

 Table 15. Annual Savings Associated with the Boiler Upgrades.

	Fuel Oil	Natural Gas	Verified \$		
	Savings	Savings	Saved per	Guaranteed \$	Excess/
Description of FIM	(Gal/yr)	(Therms/yr)	year	per year	Shortfall \$
Boiler Upgrade	138,223	(155,262)	\$252,075	\$48,947	\$203,128
Fairview Elementary	37,874	(41,392)	\$67,109	\$15,026	
Auburn Middle School	30,486	(33,946)	\$60,844	\$9 <i>,</i> 693	
Sherwood Heights	30,485	(35,190)	\$52,158	\$9,733	
Walton Elementary	39,378	(44,734)	\$71,964	\$13,070	

3.2.2.4. Variable Frequency Drives (VFDs)

Siemens replaced constant speed motor controllers with variable speed drive motors at Fairview Elementary School, Franklin Alternative School, Edward Little High School, and Auburn Middle School's hot water pumps.

	Electric Energy	Verified \$		
	Savings	Saved per	Guaranteed	Excess/
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	year	\$ per year	Shortfall \$
VFD for the HW pumps	22,816	\$3 <i>,</i> 595	\$3,416	\$179
Fairview Elementary	8,306	\$1,309		
Middle School	14,510	\$2,286		

Table 16. Savings Associated with the VFDs

3.3. Option B Savings

3.3.1. Performance Year Savings

Realized Option B savings amounted to **\$22,207** which is **\$97** in excess of Year 5 guaranteed Option B savings of **\$22,109**. These realized savings are calculated each year based on measurements and methods outlined in Exhibit C of the performance contract.

Table 17. Summary of Option B Savings for Performance Year 5						
	Electric					
	Energy		Verified \$			
	Savings	Natural Gas	Saved per	Guaranteed	Excess/	
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	(therms/yr)	year	\$ per year	Shortfall \$	
EMS Upgrade	29,257	12,614	\$22,207	\$22,109	\$97	

The Option B energy and cost savings have been updated to reflect the fuel switch associated with the boiler burner upgrade. As described in Article 2.3 of this document contract utility rates were used to calculate cost savings. Table 18 demonstrates the savings comparison between using contract rates and escalated rates.

Table 18. Utility Rate Savings Comparison

	\$ Saved	\$ Saved	
	per	Escalated	
	Contract	Utility	Guaranteed
Description of FIM	Rates	Rates	\$ peryear
EMS Upgrade	\$22,207	\$19,906	\$22,109

3.3.2 Results by Measure

3.3.3.1 Energy Management System (EMS)

Siemens expanded the existing EMS and provided programming to allow for implementation of energy savings control strategies at Auburn Middle School, Sherwood Heights Elementary School, and Walton Elementary School. The optimization of the EMS resulted in electric, fuel oil, and natural gas savings. The control strategies are described below.

Night Setback: Sherwood Heights, Walton Elementary

At the location listed above the heating and ventilating equipment was automatically space temperature set points were setback during unoccupied periods by the EMS system. The night setback reduces electrical energy consumption by replacing or eliminating operation of the supply and exhaust fans when areas are unoccupied. A one month trend analysis was done of Sherwood Heights and Walton Elementary space temperature and set point. Space temperature set points were found as purposed, 70 during occupied periods and 65 during unoccupied periods, shown in Figure 3 and 4.



Figure 3. Walton Elementary School Night Setback, November 2013



Figure 4. Sherwood Heights Elementary, Night Setback March 2013

	Electric		
	Energy		Verified \$
	Savings	Natural Gas	Saved per
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	(Therms/yr)	year
Night Setback			
Sherwood Elementary	22,459	4,406	\$9,165
Walton Elementary	6,799	7,120	\$9,579

Table 19. Savings Associated with Night Setback

Hot Water Reset: Auburn Middle School

Thermal energy savings results from implementation of hot water supply temperature set point reset by varying the hot water supply temperature set point based on outdoor air temperature. The supply temperature set point will be at a minimum of 120°F and at a maximum of 160°F. To verify the hot water reset strategy one month of trend analysis was done. Figure 5 demonstrates how the Hot Water Reset performed during the month of December 2013.



Figure 5. Hot Water Reset, Auburn Middle School December 2013

		Verified \$
	Natural Gas	Saved per
Description of FIM	(Therms/yr)	year
Hot Water Reset		
Auburn Middle School	1,087	\$3,462

3.4. Option D Stipulated Savings

Realized Option D savings amounted to **\$11,699** and are based on the predicted savings calculated in the detailed energy audit as agreed upon in the performance contract.

3.4.1. Performance Year Savings

Description of FIM	Electric Energy Savings (kWh/yr)	Fuel Oil Savings (gallons/yr)	Natural Gas Savings (therms/yr)	Propane Savings (Gal/yr)	Verified \$ Saved per year	Guaranteed \$ per year	Excess/ Shortfall \$
Building Envelope Improvements		202	4,346		\$5,704	\$7,282	(\$1,578)
Plugload Controller	24,322				\$3,832	\$3,603	\$230
Install Electric Summer DHW Heater	(469)		399		\$403	\$555	(\$151)
AHU Replacement	7,393			264	\$1,759	\$1,759	\$0
Total Option D Savings	31,246	202	4,745	264	\$11,699	\$13,199	(\$1,499)

Table 21. Summary of Option D Savings for Performance Year 5

The Option D energy and cost savings have been updated to reflect the fuel switch associated with the boiler burner upgrades. Although energy savings are stipulated the resultant cost savings is lower than guaranteed due to the decrease in actual fuel cost associated with the use of natural gas. As described in article 2.3 of this document contract utility rates were used to calculate cost savings. Table 22 demonstrates the savings comparison between using contract rates and escalated rates.

	Table 22: Othity Rate Comparison						
	\$ Saved per Contract	\$ Saved Escalated Utility	Guaranteed				
Description of FIM	Rates	Rates	\$ per year				
Building Envelope Improvements	\$5,704	\$5 <i>,</i> 502	\$7,282				
Plugload Controller	\$3,832	\$3 <i>,</i> 832	\$3,603				
Install Electric Summer DHW Heater	\$403	\$403	\$555				
AHU Replacement	\$1,759	\$1,759	\$1,759				
Total Option D Savings	\$11,699	\$11,497	\$13,199				

Table 22. Utility Rate Comparison

3.4.2 Results by Measure

3.4.3.1 Building Envelope Improvements

To control air leakage Siemens' sealed gaps, cracks, and holes using appropriate materials and systems in doors, windows, and roofs as described in Exhibit A of the performance contract.

Description of FIM	Fuel Oil (gallons/yr)	Natural Gas (therms/yr)	Verified \$ Saved per year	Guaranteed \$ per year	Excess/ Shortfall \$
Building Envelope Improvements	202	4,346	\$5,704	\$7,282	(\$1,578)
East Auburn Community School	202		\$643		
Fairview Elementary		823	\$1,064		
Sherwood Heights		564	\$720		
Walton Elementary		929	\$1,110		
Auburn Middle School		2,030	\$2,168		

Table 22. Savings Associated with Building Envelope

3.4.3.2. Plug Load Controls

Siemens installed vending machine occupancy controllers to manage the power consumption of the vending machines. Utilizing a Passive Infrared sensor, the VMOC completely powers down a vending machine when the area surrounding it is unoccupied. Once powered down, the VMOC monitors the room's temperature and automatically re-power the vending machine at one to three hour intervals to ensure that the product stays cold.

Schools	Soda Machines	Snack Machines
Edward Little HS	8	0
Auburn Middle School	3	1
East Auburn Community School	1	0
Sherwood Elementary	0	0
Fairview Elementary	2	0
Franklin Elementary	1	0
Walton Elementary	1	1
Total	16	2

Table 23. Plug Load Controller locations

Table 24. Savings Associated with Plug Load Controls

	Electric			
	Energy	Verified	Guarante	Excess/
	Savings	\$ Saved	ed\$per	Shortfall
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	per year	year	\$
Plugload Controller	24,322	\$3,832	\$3,603	\$230
East Auburn Community School	1,454	\$229		
Fairview Elementary	2,907	\$458		
Franklin Alternative	1,808	\$285		
Walton Elementary	1,808	\$285		
Edward Little High School	11,629	\$1,832		
Auburn Middle School	4,715	\$743		

3.4.3.3 Electric Summer Domestic Hot Water Heater

Siemens installed a dedicated Summer Domestic Hot Water Heater to eliminate the use of the heating boilers.

Table 25. Savings	Associated with	the Electric Summer	Domestic Hot	Water Heater
-------------------	-----------------	---------------------	---------------------	--------------

	Electric				
	Energy		Verified		
	Savings	Natural Gas	\$ Saved	Guaranteed	Excess/
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	(therms/yr)	per year	\$ peryear	Shortfall \$
Install Electric Summer DHW Heater Walton Elementary	(469)	399	\$403	\$555	(\$151)

3.4.3.4. Air Handler Unit (AHU) Replacement

Siemens replaced the existing duct heaters with a high efficient condensing furnace.

	Electric				
	Energy	Propane	Verified \$		Excess/
	Savings	Savings	Saved per	Guaranteed \$	Shortfall
Description of FIM	(kWh/yr)	(Gal/vr)	Voar	per year	ć
	((()))))	(001/91)	year	peryear	Ş
AHU Replacement	7,393	264	\$1,759	\$1,759	\$0

4. Emissions Reduction

The following table converts the energy savings (electric, fuel oil, propane, etc.) into pounds of carbon dioxide that would have been released into the atmosphere if this project was not performed. These values are then converted into everyday examples to illustrate how this performance contract has decreased the carbon footprint of the Auburn School Department. For example, from the table below, the realized energy savings avoided the equivalent of the **carbon dioxide emission of 184.4 cars in Year 5**.



5. Appendix

5.1 **Combustion Efficiency Results for Year 1**

Boilor H 2 Sherwood Ele	Sheened the Boilon # ;
BACHARACH, INC.	BACHARACH, INC.
PCA 25	PCA 25
SN: KN1099	SN: KN1099
TIME 12:48:17 pm	TIME 12:48:24 pm
DATE 02/09/2010	DATE 02/09/2010
FUEL	FUEL
NATGAS	NATGAS
STACK-TEMP 223 F AMBTEMP 82.5 % O2 5.2 % CO2 8.9 % CO 0 ppm Ø% COR 0 ppm Ø% COR 0 ppm EFFICIENCY 86.9 % EX. AIR 29.48 %	STACK-TEMP 229 °F AMBTEMP 82.5 °F G2 5.1 % CO2 8.9 % CO 0 ppm O% COR CO 0 ppm EFFICIENCY 88.7 % EX. AIR 28.73
DRAFT -0.08 WC	DRAFT -9, 10 WC

COMMENTS:

COMMENTS:

Boikn H 1 Farmin BACHARACH, INC. PCA 25 SN: KN1099 the set and any first and an even of an even of the set TIME 02:16:48 pm DATE 02/09/2010 FUEL OIL NO. 2 STACK-TEMP 259 'F AMB.-TEMP 81.0 °F 02 6.4 % C02 10.8 % CO 0 ppm 0% COR CO 0 pp EFFICIENCY 89.2 % 0 ppm EX. AIR 40.92 DRAFT -0.05 WC Hul ON

COMMENTS:

WALTON Elen BACHARACH, INC. PCA 25 SN: KN1099 Boilen HZ TIME 01:32:52 pm DATE 02/09/2010

> FUEL NATGAS

STACK-TEMP 253 °F AMB.-TEMP 83.0 °F 02 3.5 % C02 9.8 % CO 0 ppm 0% COR CO 0 ppm EFFICIENCY 86.4 % EX. AIR 17.90

DRAFT -0.07 WC una 1/1/2 COMMENTS:

FUEL NATGAS STACK-TEMP 248 °F AMB. -TEMP 83.0 °F 02 5.2 % CO2 8.9 % CO 0 ppm 0 ppm 0% COR CO EFFICIENCY 86.2 %

BACHARACH, INC.

TIME 01:34:00 pm

DATE 02/09/2010

N: KN1099 301/06 4 1

PCA 25

EX. AIR 29.48 DRAFT \$ 11 WC

WA How Eley

COMMENTS:

....

Boilen # 1 TIME 02:44:58 pm DATE 02/09/2010 FUEL. 0fL NO. 2 STACK-TEMP 254 °F AMB.-TEMP 76.5 °F 02 5.4 % C02 11.6 % CO

0% COR CO

EX. AIR

COMMENTS:

AMB.-TEMP 73.0 °F 0 ppm 02 0 ppm C02 EFFICIENCY 89.5 % CO 0% COR CO 32.30 EFFICIENCY 88.1 % EX. AIR 27.64

Boil. #

SN: KN1099 Middlesc

BACHARACH, INC.

TIME 03:00:00 pm

DATE 02/09/2010

FUEL

OIL NO. 2

STACK-TEMP 312 °F

4.8 %

12.0 %

-0.12 WC

0 ppm

0 ppm

-0.08 WC DRAFT 60 Weled F not

nos Walita

LOCATION/CIP PROJECTS		FY16	Priority Listing	
AMS				
Classroom & Library Furniture Replacement	\$	216,500	4	Last Phase
Fire Alarm Replacement	\$	384,842	1 & 2	Phase I
Interior Door Replacement/ADA hardware-140			_	
doors	\$	189,748	1	Phase I
TOTAL	\$	791,090		
East Auburn				
Remove Asbesto Floor tile-old section	\$	28,500	1 & 2	
Repoint Chimney	\$	20,500	2	
Repair damaged plaster wall- drywall- ceilings-				
1954 wing	\$	47,200	2 & 1	
TOTAL	\$	96,200		
Fairview				
Replace Interior doors/ADA Hardware-1950				
wings	\$	205,250	1 & 2	
Replace 1996 Classroom Carpets- w/ VCT	\$	115,360	2	
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel				
system	\$	48,000	2	
TOTAL	\$	368,610		
Sherwood Heights				
Renewal Exit Signage & Emergency Lights	\$	31,500	1	
Telephone Upgrade- Network server/Mitel		10.000	0	
system	\$	48,000	2	
TOTAL	\$	79,500		
Support Services Building				
One Ton P/U with Plow (replace 2003 3/4 ton	¢	42,000	2	
Dodge) TOTAL	\$ \$	42,000 42,000	2	
	Þ	42,000		
Technology				
Seecondary Teachers/MaCBOOKS	\$	100,000	4	
TOTAL	\$	100,000		
Walton Elementary	¢	22 (22	100	
Renewal Emergency Lights TOTAL	\$ \$	22,600	1&2	
	Э	22,600		
GRAND TOTAL CIP	\$	1,500,000		
Priority 1 - Life Safety Issues				
Priority 2- Facility & Equipment Renewal				
Priority 3- Energy Renewal				
Priority 4- Instructional Equipment Renewal				