

MOULTONBOROUGH, NEW HAMPSHIRE
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM COMMITTEE MINUTES
Draft
Minutes of August 22nd, 2013, Public Hearing

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

Absent: Josh Bartlett; Heidi Davis (Finance Dir.);

Others:

The meeting began at 7:00 PM.

Richard seated Barbara in place of Mr. Bartlett.

Alan moved to approve minutes of the August 5th, 2013 meeting. Jon seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.

Barbara moved to approve minutes of the August 7th, 2013 meeting. Alan seconded the motion and the motion was approved unanimously.

Richard reviewed the draft report and concerns the report intends to communicate. He explained the committee's report would not comment on potential capital expenses that have not yet been brought to the committee (old landfill, sidewalks, etc.) though we did think it was important to note in the report that a review of these potential capital projects is not included. Richard reviewed the Priority/Class codes the committee uses to establish a measure of the committee's reasoning for recommending a request (or not).

Regarding the committee's request for more information for three of the 2014 requests, Barbara asked if the committee was in receipt of any additional information. The committee was not.

Richard reviewed the section of the report that summarizes the relation between the Master Plan and each capital request.

Richard reviewed the separate appendices to the report. The committee decided to include the current year's capital expense total in the 6-year plan charts for comparative purposes.

Richard opened the hearing to the public.

Paul Punturieri referred to the appendix B list of 2014 which showed a Scored ranking of 3 and a Priority code rank of 4 and asked how that could occur. Peter distributed an alternative for the appendix B that shows the scored ranks and Priority codes for all items in the six year plan with the 2014 requests highlighted in yellow. Peter suggested the

committee should use this approach instead as it shows the entire plan instead of just a portion. The committee agreed to include the six year view. The committee also asked Bruce to remind the appropriate department heads that more information was needed for the committee to complete its recommendation process for three 2014 requests.

Paul asked what the town would get in exchange for an engineering expenditure of \$45,000. Richard explained the cost estimate was based on what the expenses were for similar engineering work for the soccer field.

Paul expressed concern for the out-year forecast that showed significant spending spikes and suggested the BoS might look to find other ways to reduce the budget using as example perhaps reducing the road projects expenditure in a year with a large increase in other areas. Peter expressed a concern that in the current year there were roughly eight new requests for capital expenditures out of post-new-request total of 48. He was concerned that similar numbers of new requests during the next few years could seriously impede efforts to control capital spending. Richard commented on the detailed review of road expense need performed by the road agent and then BoS.

Rec Director, Donna Kuethe, asked about the request for more information about the request to retrofit the neck pathway. Bruce explained that request went to the DPW director. Donna then asked about the request for the feasibility study for construction of the gym w/program rooms, etc. She didn't think she had been told there was more needed for that request. Donna was told that request did not have a priority code of 4 (needs more info) and she clarified she was speaking to the language written in the report. She was further told the committee would like to see a feasibility study designed as described by the town administrator at prior meeting and that the committee had not yet seen such a description documented so it could be reviewed by the committee. The committee clarified that the feasibility study request was ranked with priority code 3 but the actual gym project was ranked with priority code 4 because the committee did not have enough information to recommend it or not; that information should come from the feasibility study.

Peter distributed an example of the information that had been included in the prior year under each chart showing 6-year plan recommendation scenarios. He asked if the rest of the committee thought it was useful enough to include again this year. The committee consensus was it is useful.

Donna asked what the committee meant in the comments about the request for rehab of the baseball field that said "Alternatives to engineering design and reconstruction have not been presented". Richard said the committee was referring to alternatives such as filling the low spots with loam to level out the field, which some members thought that might enable the town to defer the larger expense of rebuilding the entire field. Donna responded that over many years such temporary fixes had been attempted with temporary results.

Peter committed to completing the initial response from department heads to the Committee's Asset Management Plan recommendation.

The committee discussed the request to repair the slab at the Public Safety Building. Jon committed to getting an update for the Aug. 27 meeting.

Jon pointed out it was important to recognize the committee's report acknowledged that "Submittals by the Department Heads are markedly improved in terms of depth of request, rationale and supporting data."

Peter made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Alan seconded and the motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Jensen,
Capital Improvements Program Committee

The following is included for informational purposes only and may change:

Our upcoming meeting schedule is:

- Tuesday, August 27th, 2013, 7:00 AM in Town Hall – public hearing 2.