

MOULTONBOROUGH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Minutes of May 31st, 2012, Meeting

Members Present: Richard Brown (Chair); Peter Jensen (Planning Board); Barbara Rando; Alan Ballard (ABC); Bruce Woodruff (Town Planner); Jon Tolman (Selectman); Josh Bartlett (Alternate)

Others Present: Carter Terenzini (Town Administrator); Donna Keuthe (Recreation Director); Scott Kinmond (DPW Director)

Absent: Heidi Davis (Town Finance Director)

Meeting Location: Town Hall

Richard called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Draft minutes of the May 24th, 2012 meeting were discussed. Two changes were made:

1st amendment – page 4 –under *Other Business*;

To add that Barbara noted that the town's floor and walls maintenance/repair dollars are categorized a capital expense but that the school categorizes their floor and walls maintenance/repair dollars as operational expense dollars. She asked that we get clarification from the BOS regarding whether or not the CIPC should treat these expenses the same for both boards and if treated the same which type will they be (capital or operational).

2nd amendment – first paragraph – 2nd sentence under *Other Business*;

Remove 2nd sentence and replace with "Bruce said his view of the pictures support a conclusion that prior to building the Playground drive field area the area was not a wetland, consequently no after-the-fact wetland permit may be needed to build and consequently there should be no need for the town to retroactively apply for a wetlands permit."

On a motion by Alan and second by Barbara, the amended minutes of May 24th, 2012 were approved unanimously.

Follow-up from Prior Meeting:

Richard confirmed with Jon that when the CIPC meets with the BOS on June 28th, we will discuss whether or not similar expenses by the different boards should be treated similarly with regard to their categorization as Capital Expenses or Operational Expenses. Richard also advised that the committee should rely on minutes for other areas of committee concern to be reviewed with the BOS.

Agenda Items:

Review of Project Requests

1. Town Administration (Town Administrator Carter Terenzini; Town Planner Bruce Woodruff)

Land Parcels

Carter reviewed four parcels of land that may be worth procuring by the town. Potential funding sources would be the Land Acquisition Fund (a town fund), the Aquatic Resource Mitigation fund (ARM – a state fund), ConCom fund (Land Use Change Tax – town fund), the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program fund (LCHIP – a state program), and the town's General Fund (town property tax). Carter provided a fund source recommendation in the form of a table showing each category in columns with parcels in rows.

The four parcels are:

- a. A 21 acre parcel abutting DPW Garage and the Playground Drive area, Map 116, Lot 5, Greens Basin Road, that contains both uplands and wetland areas. Owns a deeded right-of-way across the DPW Garage lot for access.

Carter gave four reasons for considering purchase of this parcel:

- i. It would enable the town to eliminate the right-of-way across the DPW Garage lot.
- ii. If the lot were to be developed the town might be the target of problematic complaints (noise, etc.).
- iii. The town could use the upland portion of the lot for possible future land use needs.
- iv. The town could use the wetlands area for possible future conservation needs. One such need might be potentially mitigating wetland disturbance in the Playground drive field reconstruction project should a DES permit require such. Carter said that the Conservation Commission was also interested in a possibly placing the wetlands portion into a conservatorship. Peter was asked to explain the ConCom interest but said though he had been at the meetings where the other three parcels were discussed, he had missed the meeting at which this parcel was discussed and had not yet seen the meeting's minutes.

Carter said the town has not had the parcels valued yet but that using the assessed values as estimates, the funding for this parcel would be; \$10k from the Land Acquisition Fund, \$17k from ARM, and \$40k from the town's General Fund. Carter said he would put purchase of this parcel in the category of "want" vs. "need". He explained that the most significant reason was eliminating the right-of-way through the town's DPW Garage area. He said the town was not aware of any pending development. He said they would be concerned about their ability to maintain the DPW Garage area as a secure facility, and he expressed concern about the right-of-way as they have trucks moving through the area regularly and have significant materials stored there as well. The town does not staff the facility at night or other off-hours. Carter was asked if the right-of-way was the only access to the parcel and he replied he thought so but was not certain – he said he would check.

Alan asked if there was specific wording in the deed about the scope of the right-of-way as that would affect the ability to use the right-of-way for subdivision access vs. single owner access. He said that would affect the ability of the owner to build a road vs. just a driveway and also would affect the potential value of the parcel. Carter said he would check. Peter asked what had caused this to be an issue this year – what had changed from prior years to cause the town to consider the parcel’s purchase since the DPW Garage has been in this location with this right-of-way for many years now. Carter said they were looking at abutting parcels during the process of reviewing the Playground Drive project and saw it. The committee asked several other questions about the request and Carter said he would get answers to what he could.

- b. An 8.9 acre parcel adjacent to Sutherland Park, Map 44, Lot 1, 1091 Whittier Highway, has significant frontage on Berry Pond, has an existing in-use residential structure, and is one of three that came from the Blue Ribbon Commission as being potentially available for purchase and within a half mile of the town offices complex.

Carter gave three reasons for considering purchase of this parcel:

- i. Assemblage to expand Sutherland Park,
- ii. Preservation / ConCom - according to the Natural Resource Inventory completed in 2007 this parcel would be of high priority to conserve and of the three remaining parcels has the highest co-occurrence score. This parcel was the one the ConCom was willing to commit \$20k of its funds towards the purchase of.
- iii. Protect the look of the corridor as you enter into the village. The parcel is zoned commercial and could potentially be used for a commercial business risking the scenic beauty of the area.

Carter’s fund source table suggested \$50k from the Land Acquisition Fund, \$10k from ARM, \$20k from the ConCom fund, \$160k from the town’s General Fund, and \$10k from LCHIP.

Carter was asked if there were any changes to the presentation of the thses last three parcels from the last review by the CIPC. He replied there were no changes.

- c. A 0.81 acre parcel abutting the Life Safety Building and Berry Pond, Map 43, Lot 15, at 34 Berry Pond Way.
 - i. Assemblage with the Life Safety Building property,
 - ii. Preservation / ConCom

Carter’s fund source table suggested \$30k from the Land Acquisition Fund, \$5k from ARM, \$110k from the town’s General Fund, and \$5k from LCHIP. Carter said that converting privately owned property to town owned property reduced the operational and maintenance costs for the town. Josh disagreed that taking a property such as this one with minimal use actually reduced costs. Carter explained studies had shown this to be the case. He said that the two Berry Pond properties were a very visible part of a person’s view of the town and there was likely an aesthetic value to putting

them into conservation that would help attract new people to the town. Richard asked to have the amount of tax revenues for each parcel that would be removed from the property tax rolls should they be purchased by the town.

- d. A 78 acre parcel of which 73 acres are in current use, Map 67, Lot 32, at 10 Orchard Drive. The property abuts school property. The school was asked if they were interested in the parcel and said they were not.
 - i. Assemblage with the Life Safety Building property,
 - ii. Preservation / ConCom
 - iii. Environmental Education / Trails
 - iv. Potential Use for Rec. Dept.

Carter's fund source table suggested \$40k from the Land Acquisition Fund, \$35k from ARM, \$185k from the town's General Fund, and \$25k from LCHIP. Carter said this parcel was the least likely for development – probably only 30% of the parcel is buildable. Carter said the Blue Ribbon Commission had recommended a new gymnasium and this was the best of the four parcels for that possibility. Carter explained the Recreation Revolving fund was not intended for capital uses and rather to help convert the Rec. Dept. programs to becoming self sufficient.

Plan File Cabinets

Bruce presented three requests spread over the three years 2013-2015. The request is to purchase plan file cabinets and related equipment over a three year period with the end result being an organized and secured records archive area that will handle 7500 records. The secured records archive area will be contained within the current "basement" storage area and the project will include organizing and/or relocating the other materials currently stored in this area. Currently we have about 5200 lot records split up and stored in about five different places in the storage area. They are currently not stored in a manner supporting long term archive requirements. The records are not easy to access as the storage method(s) do not support ease of access nor are they consistent methods from one box of records to the next. The project estimates a total \$30k expense to complete and the plan is to expend \$10k per year using existing staff. The planned organization will be parcel based so all documents for a parcel are in the same area ordered consistently. Bruce said the secured area would be fire rated dry wall rather than the wire cage written in the request as the wire cage does not meet the fire protection needs. The committee asked about the scope of the project – were other departments considered. Bruce said he had spoken to the other departments and their needs are included in the floor layout plan, but the request(s) before the CIPC were only for cabinetry needs for the Development Services parcel related records archival, the specific security of these archives and the generic security of the area.

Bud Heinrich asked if the records were all to be eventually stored electronically. Bruce and others explained that the electronic storage of records made retrieval

much easier for residents and businesses but that it does not supplant requirements for paper archival of the same records.

2. Recreation Department (Recreation Director Donna Kuethe; DPW Director Scott Kinmond)

Used 20 Passenger Bus

Donna passed out an analysis that supported the purchase of a used 20 passenger bus and thanked Scott Kinmond for his help in preparing the analysis. Donna said one of the department's challenges was the cost of buses for their programs. It is estimated a used 20 passenger bus can be purchased for roughly \$20k-\$25k and factoring in the cost savings from discontinuing bus rentals, the bus will pay for itself after about 20 trips using an averaged trip savings of \$1,200 per trip (based on 2011 data included in the distributed analysis). Alan noted that it may be difficult to get seniors to use a bus that has no toilet. Donna replied that the trips will be planned with options for stopping to give seniors the option to handle toilet needs. Richard noted that last year the CIPC had asked for all the information that would support Recreation requests and he is satisfied that Donna has provided what she was asked for to support the request. The DPW would manage routine maintenance of the bus.

Expand Zamboni Storage Building – Rec. priority 3

Donna presented her request for expanding the Zamboni Storage building to correct low height of the entranceway for the Zamboni operator, add a warming area for skaters and protected area for viewers, add additional storage area, change the access from building to the ice to make it direct access vs. indirect as it is now. Scott sketched a picture of what the building might look like if the proposal is approved. Donna said the current access causes sand to be dragged out onto the ice and the direct access would eliminate that problem. She said expansion would provide better storage for equipment used to maintain the rink. Donna said she had difficulty getting usage data for the rink as the Rec. Dept. does not staff the rink. She said she was able to get some data from volunteers that showed during open hours the rink usage was roughly between 10 to 60 skaters with an average of about 17 over the usage samples recorded. The committee expressed concern that there may be building code issues for a building that houses both equipment with gas fuel and the public. Scott assured the committee that any design would comply with building codes prior to actual commencement of the work. The committee commented on how this request keeps changing – it was originally \$45k – was reduced to \$11.2k - and is now at \$30k. The committee said they were not sure if the Zamboni would be replaced with another and will seek clarification from the BOS on their future intent for the zamboni which will impact future space needs and also the need to re-orient the building.

Rehab the Softball/Baseball field – Rec. priority 4

Donna said this request was a combination of two prior requests (Rehab the field + add lighting to enable extending use past daylight hours. Donna explained the request had been reduced to about 15% of the original request in the first year (\$35,000) with the balance of the estimated cost spread across the subsequent two years (\$150k each). This would allow the design and engineering work to be completed prior to requesting appropriations at town meeting for the actual construction so that the construction request might be more accurate (lesson learned from the soccer field project). The issues with the current field remain much the same as in previous years albeit with continued deterioration of the problems. The field was built in 1976. The problems are:

- Drainage is poor and causes field use to be canceled more frequently than the dept. would like,
- The right field area is sinking due to excessive standing water,
- The out-of-play areas need leveling,
- The “lip” between the grass and infield areas needs to be re-cut,
- Need a water source at the field for watering in dry weather,
- Warning track is in bad repair – needed primarily for adult uses,
- Need improved “on deck” and “warm-up” areas,
- Since the facility was federally funded and has usage and upkeep “strings” attached, we need to insure proper maintenance,
- Use of the field is limited due to no lighting – this would be an improvement for the adult use requests that cannot currently be met. Donna estimates the use of the field would increase 50% to 75% if lighting is added,
- Lighting would allow town to reduce dependence on other town’s fields.

Donna provided a list of usage showing programs, # of participants, frequency of use, un-met requests, other fields used and fee incurred for the adult softball program’s use of Meredith’s field resource. Donna said that other than minor work in the 1980’s to address drainage, the field has not been rehabbed since it was built. She said the Rec dept. has requests for more leagues they cannot address. Donna was asked about the possibility of sharing use of the school’s fields and responded that the Rec. Dept. already shares the school fields when they can.

Pathway II Repairs – Rec. priority 5

Donna said this request was unchanged from the past other than taking the original \$150k estimate and spreading the work (and cost) across four years. Donna said the town has gotten approvals from the state to move forward with repairs and current activity was just fine tuning of the design.

Pathway III Repairs – Rec. priority 6

Donna said this request was changed by putting the \$35k design and engineering costs into 2015, the matching grant commitment of \$38.5k into 2016, and the remaining \$350k (all grant monies) spread evenly across 2017 and 2018.

Donna explained the \$38.5k match commitment would not actually be appropriated until and unless the grant was approved. Bruce explained the process the grant request had to go through in order to get to a successful award. He explained that part of the process was the commitment had to be approved as a pre-condition of the grant application being considered. Bruce explained the because the commitment amount would not be appropriated until the grant award, the commitment would be voted on every year prior to that to maintain the commitment requirement. Donna confirmed that she would not pursue the request unless the grant was awarded as the cost to taxpayers would be too great. She said the typical portion the town would be responsible for is 20%. The committee asked at what point would the size of the 20% town portion be so large that Donna would not pursue the request. She was not prepared to pick a maximum dollar amount beyond which she would not pursue the request other than the current total estimated project amount.

Feasibility Study for Rec. Dept. Gymnasium – Rec. priority 1

Donna said this is a modified resubmission. She said the revised submission was recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC). Donna distributed BRC recommendation Report. Donna read part of the report. Donna said lack of indoor space for programs is the Rec. Dept.'s #1 priority. She said the lack of indoor space the Rec. Dept. from being able to provide the programs they are asked for and would like to provide. The committee asked what would be in a feasibility study. Bruce replied that it would start out with justifying the purpose, the need, then discuss feasible sites, what the pros and cons would be, what the costs estimates would be, and what the size of the facility would be. The committee asked for the backup information supporting the BRC recommendation. During discussion the committee clarified, they would like to see some specifics that would be asked for in the feasibility study such as what programs needed more indoor facility resource, or for each program the gap between current facility resource and supported resource-need. The issue of declining student population was discussed and Donna responded that the Rec. Dept. runs programs for the entire population (not just youth). Jon said when he was younger there were sufficient resources for recreation programs that can now only be enjoyed outside of the town. Jon identified a few recreation programs that have been discontinued over the years due to lack of facility resource. Donna said that even though school enrollment may be dropping, the demand for programs has increased. Donna said that her experience is the Rec. Dept. is often reviewed by families during their process of looking for the "best" new home location and that part of their decision to move to Moultonborough is influenced by their perception of the breadth of recreation options available.

Cement the Floor of the Ice Rink – Rec. priority 7

Donna explained that a cement floor would hold the ice better. It would make the surface more level. It would make the floor cooler underneath. It would increase the rink's use as it could be used for other activities in the off season

(spring/summer/fall), and it would save time for maintenance personal when flooding and maintaining the rink. She also said it would lengthen the skating days and they would not have to wait for the ground to freeze before making ice.

Other Business:

Bruce noted the inclusion in the committee packet of information appendices for the Fire and Police departments. He also noted inclusion in the packet of an updated Capital Improvement Spreadsheet plan layout. Bruce asked for a description of the six different rankings – Jon said he would provide this. Bruce suggested the spreadsheet could contain a column reflecting the department head's priorities.

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 14th, 2012 at 9:00 AM at Town Hall.

Barbara made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alan seconded and the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Jensen,
Capital Improvements Program Committee