

MOULTONBOROUGH, NEW HAMPSHIRE  
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM COMMITTEE  
Minutes of January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012, Meeting

Members Present: Richard Brown (Chair); Barbara Rando; Josh Bartlett (Alternate); Alan Ballard (ABC); Peter Jensen (Planning Board); Joel Mudgett (BOS); Heidi Davis (Town Finance Director); Bruce Woodruff (Town Planner)

Others Present: Carter Terenzini (Town Administrator)

Richard called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

Minutes of the October 24<sup>th</sup> 2011, CIPC meeting were reviewed. Peter made the motion to approve the minutes, Alan seconded, and they were unanimously approved.

**Truck Transfer and \$15,000 for modifications**

Richard introduced the first item for review: The DPW is retiring a truck and instead of letting the truck go to auction where the residual values are typically low, it was decided to pursue transferring the truck to the Fire Department to replace an old vehicle (Utility 1) in much poorer condition than the proposed transfer vehicle. The Utility 1 vehicle is 26 years old and has higher estimated annual maintenance overhead than the vehicle to be transferred. Though the vehicle to be transferred is not estimated to be reliable enough to continue in the DPW service, the new service it will perform has much lower frequency of use, lower impact to the vehicle when used and it is estimated the replacement vehicle may serve in its new role for as much as an additional 10 years. The replacement vehicle will also have greater usefulness. It will require about \$15K in modification.

The transfer plan does not replace a purchase in the Capital Plan previously reviewed by the committee; it is instead an addition to the plan. The thinking is this is a better use of the asset for the town and the \$15K will be more than offset by avoiding the high annual maintenance and near term need to replace the current Utility 1 vehicle.

Peter moved that the committee recommend the vehicle transfer and related \$15K modification request be added to the 2012 proposed budget. Alan seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

**Land Potentially Available for Purchase**

Richard introduced the discussion of three parcels of land, identified by the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) in their report section of parcels within ½ mile of the Town Hall cluster. Richard asked Carter to present the reason for the CIP Committee being asked to review the three parcels with the caveat that the committee would like to hear a focus on why the town would want to purchase the properties.

Carter explained the BRC had been asked to find out if any properties within a half mile of Town Hall would be available as for sale, for lease, or by donation. A reason for this was that during the discussion of fields there was a lot of suggesting that this property or that property were available and it was felt the BRC should know with relative certainty what the options truly were. The BRC

got response indicating interest to sell from owners of 13 parcels of land. The BRC looked at the parcels and decided none were appropriate for their purpose(s). So the list was reviewed by the Board of Selectmen (BOS). They asked to have three referred for review to the School committee, three to the Conservation Commission, and a small team of staff went over to look at the Lamprey House to see if it could have its use expanded for some town sponsored functions. The school was not interested in the three parcels presented to them, the town staff decided the Lamprey House would not be a workable solution for town sponsored functions, and the Conservation Commission (ConCom) responded that the three parcels it looked at had conservation value. The BOS was interested in continuing review of three parcels for possible combination of municipal use and conservation use (preservation of Berry Pond, preservation of Rte. 25 scenic vista, potential expansion of Sutherland Park, wetland preservation).

The parcels are:

- a) 44/1 – an 8.9 acre parcel between Rte. 25 and Berry Pond and Sutherland Park with a heated residential structure,
- b) 43/15 – a 0.81 acre parcel abutting Berry Pond, Sutherland Park and abutting the rear of the Life Safety Building lot with an unheated summer residential structure, and
- c) 67/32 – a 7.8 acre parcel that is mostly wetlands abutting school property and has some developable area with a heated home and a heated apartment.

Funds available for such use are approximately \$100,000 from a fund the town has built up for acquiring new lands and the conservation commission currently has about \$40,000. The Planner (Bruce) was asked to look at other opportunities for funding but they are not there right now.

Carter explained that even if some outside source was found that would donate all the money, the BOS could not ask for the town to appropriate large capital amounts without the request first coming to the CIPC.

Richard asked Peter to discuss the Conservation Commission's position on the parcels. Peter responded that the ConCom found conservation value in all three properties and further that the ConCom would support the purchase of parcel 44/1 with \$20,000 of the ConCom fund with conditions that another outside funding source be found to purchase the property (such as LRCT), that the land be placed into conservancy for perpetuity and that the selling price be reasonable.

Carter clarified that the ConCom had two positions; 1) they see value in all three parcels, and 2) they would commit \$20K of their funds for the purchase of parcel 44/1.

Richard asked what other uses these lands would be for besides conservation use. Carter said 44/1 and 44/15 would be looked at for conservation and passive recreation; trails, picnicking, that kind of thing. Carter said 67/32 would be looked at for conservation, passive recreation, ecology classes understanding that there is a portion of it that might make sense for assemblage with SAU lands in the future (maybe 14 or 15 acres that would be developable).

Bruce offered that preserving open space effectively contains the growth in cost of services as studies show the cost of providing services to residential areas are generally higher than the revenue received.

Carter added that if the parcels did not abut property already owned by the town, the other reasons for reviewing the parcels would not be enough to move forward with the review requests.

Josh said he didn't see any urgency in pursuing the properties. Peter said he did not see sufficient reason to purchase the properties. Carter repeated that the properties were thought to have use for assemblage with currently owned properties and for expansion of the conservation and passive recreation of Sutherland Park. Alan said he thought it would be good to put off commenting on the properties until the CIP has more information. Joel said he wasn't sure he would want these to be brought to town meeting but that if the CIP voted to send the requests to the BOS as a low priority, then if some other funding source came forward, the BOS would be able to act on the request. Richard said he didn't see consensus that we should be looking at these properties and suggested the committee table the discussion until we had more information. Alan agreed with the suggestion to table the discussion. Most members saw merit to further discussion of the parcels but only after getting more information. Peter said perhaps the committee could make the recommendation that if some other entity (i.e., like the LRCT or Audubon Society) were to help fund a purchase then the town could pursue such effort. Barbara said she did not see a compelling reason to move forward at this time and she thought perhaps the CIP and ConCom could have a joint public hearing to see if the community would like the parcel purchases to be further pursued.

Carter suggested the committee could say in the memo about the Truck to the BOS that the parcel requests are un-programmed meaning the CIP did not feel it had sufficient information to recommend and then the BOS would have the issue of the parcels in their court.

Alan said he did not think the BOS should be asked to act on the requests as many properties in town are not currently selling at the assessed values.

Alan made a motion to table the discussion because the committee did not have enough information to consider it at this time. Barbara seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

### **Soccer Field Additional Information**

Josh raised an issue saying he thought there were problems with the need to rework the road at Playground Dr. and with the engineer's design calculations for the cost of raising the Old 109 soccer field to an appropriate height. After much discussion Carter said he would bring the engineer to the committee's next meeting to discuss the Old 109 design. Carter explained that the equipment to repair the Playground Dr. field would damage the existing road and that is why there are funds in the project estimate for the road's repair.

Carter said we should review lessons learned from the first year and report on recommendations for the coming year. Richard said he thought the committee did what was asked of them and asked that the BOS let the committee know if there were any areas where the committee did not do what the BOS expected. Peter suggested that the committee start its own review with a review of the statutes that define a CIP. Carter said he would like a few things reviewed; the \$10K low end for capital expenses may be too low; the timing of reporting due didn't work well with the BOS other work schedule requirements and should be moved earlier in the annual cycle; the issue uncovered at this meeting of how long a request should be held before the committee needs to report on it. Bruce added that each request should be linked by the requestor to the Master Plan.

Capital Improvements Program Committee  
January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012

The committee scheduled the next meeting for Thursday, February 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2012 at 1:00 PM.

Joel made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alan seconded and the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Jensen,  
Capital Improvements Program Committee