

**OFFICE OF SELECTMEN  
6 HOLLAND STREET  
PO BOX 139  
MOULTONBOROUGH, NH 03254**

Selectmen's Work Session

March 24, 2011

**MINUTES**

Selectmen: Selectmen: Joel R. Mudgett, Chairman, Edward J. Charest, James F. Gray, Betsey L. Patten, Russell C. Wakefield; Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator.

Joel called the meeting to Order at 4:00 P.M.

1. School Resource Officer: There had been some concerns expressed over the number of times the SRO was being withdrawn from the Schools. The Chief had prepared a report showing the specifics and the reasons for using her on other tasks and asked if there were any questions on it. All said they had seen the report. There were no questions raised by their review. The Chair did ask that a letter be sent to the schools explaining there would be a regular pattern of absences (i.e. training and the like) and asking them to contact the Board if they had any concerns.
2. Lateral Transfer: After a brief discussion the Board confirmed that they would use the \$75,000 added to the budget at the Town Meeting for an added Police Officer. The Chief said he had someone in an adjoining Town interested in a lateral transfer which could save time and – possibly – costs over an advertising process. The Chair asked what would be involved in the background check and was told it would be a Physical Agility Test (PAT) and background. After a brief discussion the consensus was a polygraph exam would be used as well. With this agreed the consensus was to go forward with the Chief's suggestions. Carter asked when this might be completed and the Chief said he thought he could get it done in three weeks.
3. Recreation Advisory Board (RAB): The RAB had written to the Board to see how it wanted to proceed on the proposal within the Charting A Course report to expand their role to weigh in on the facilities needed to support the programming of the Recreation Department. Russ thinks there are too many committees as it is and asking them to look at facilities is just too much. He felt there were others that can look at this such as the Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) and the Capital Improvement Program Committee (CIPC). Joel suggested that this should be deferred until after the BRC report is received. Celeste Burns, Clerk of the RAB said they are trying to make sure they are carrying out their mission. Joel repeated he thought it was the best thing to wait for the BRC and that was the consensus. He did point out that the Board does have an application for one of the alternate positions and this might be placed upon the 3/31 agenda.
4. Cemetery Policy: There had been some events which had caused the Board to request a full review of the current Cemetery Policy. Scott Kinmond reviewed the very few and very vague conditions currently in the Policy on the Sale of Cemetery lots and the need to expand those. He had assembled a working group of Richard Kennedy, Peter Wright, and Bruce Worthen as well as information collected from surrounding communities. He proceeded to give a brief overview of the mark-up of a proposed new policy. Carter referred to Section 8 and said the use of the phrase "...reasonable hours..." raises the potential for an enforcement problem as courts may see that as too vague. There was a general discussion as to what would constitute an enforceable set of hours and 7 am to 9 pm seemed to have consensus support. The proposal would be revised to account for this and formatting and a public hearing set as soon as possible.

The Nilson letter concerning Shannon Cemetery raised questions as to whether or not we have a plot plan (survey) and can identify if a monument in question (and/or others) are beyond their approved bounds. Scott advised we do have a survey, but there may be many monuments outside of their limits. He advised that it could take “great expense” to sort it all out. Joel asked specifically about the monument at Shannon Cemetery that was in question and was advised it was hard to determine as there are no corner markers and the location of the stones do vary by lot. Betsey felt we needed to begin to identify these monuments that are outside their lots as we might just have further conflicts. Joel said he was more concerned about the row as it was hard to hold the offender responsible if not all in that row were on their lots. The consensus was to request that Scott carry out an in-house survey as the snow melts and weather permits. Once this was done the Board could do a visual inspection and decide how to proceed. The question was raised if more than one lot is purchased does that extinguish the public right of way between them. The consensus was to submit this matter to Town Counsel for review and an opinion.

5. Memorial Day Parade: Sally Carver asked if the Board wants her to manage the event. She described how Bruce Garry had been the mainstay of the organizing, but he was now deployed. Although she does know some of the participants, where to obtain the veterans list, and the like she doesn't know the people for the Color Guard. Joel suggested that as the Chair of this Board, he would like her to continue with this program. He thought that everything they do in the program is fine, but we just need to double check the lock-up of the Town Hall. Betsey suggested Kathy Garry might be able to connect Sally to the Color Guard members. The consensus was – and Sally agreed – to have her manage the event.
6. Fuel Surcharge: Carter reviewed that we had previously abolished the old “surcharge” system for the plowing and roadside mowing contracts and adjusted the base rates. However, price swings on fuel continue to be a concern to our vendors. The options were to try and set a base rate at the beginning of each year and hope nothing goes wrong mid-season (i.e. events in Libya and Japan which happened at the end of plowing season, but could have wreaked havoc if it had happened mid-season) or to have a fuel surcharge that floated (as opposed to a fixed percentage of the old system). Scott explained that the fuel surcharge had been added, “...but it never came back down when fuel did.” Carter distributed a proposed surcharge clause which followed the model of the recent Ambulance contract. Scott explained how he came up with the hourly use for each piece of equipment. Russ felt it's a cumbersome process and suggested we have a flat rate and then pay for fuel on a weekly basis to make sure we are getting the down swing and the upswing so the Town is not overpaying. Regarding the roadside mowers, he said that he sees the same people sitting in the same spot and it doesn't appear that they have moved. Russ said he doesn't want them to get paid this extra money. Scott said that to do a fixed price contract you'd need to have a full set of specifications and someone to manage it and he was not sure we would save anything. Betsey thought the approach was a reasonable one and that it was predictable for us and our vendors. Russ asked to keep the door open to visit this bidding approach and Scott spoke on the administrative aspects of those numerous weekly resets. The consensus was that Joel would do some research and advise Carter on an acceptable hourly rate. The staff would then wrap up a draft contract for submission to the BoS.
7. Milfoil Herbicide Treatment: Peter Jensen reviewed an incident last year in which, within a few days before the treatment of the waters with the herbicide which attacks milfoil, we received several objections (3) from persons who said they used their water intakes in Lake Winnepesaukee for their drinking and cooking purposes. The state subsequently informed us that we could have gone ahead and treated the water. The purpose of their policy is to clearly establish ahead of time what we will do if some in a proposed treatment area object before

treatment after we have the permit in hand. The consensus was to schedule this for a public hearing as well.

8. Boat Launch Fee: Carter spoke to the matter of a possible boat launch fee that the Board has considered to generate some revenue toward the cost of repairs. As was discussed in the recent budget sessions we did not have enough data from which to make a reasonable projection as to how much could be raised from a boat launch fee (11/19/10). The matter had been reduced to two questions: 1) Does the launch vehicle have a Town WMF/Beach sticker; 2) if not, would they go elsewhere if a \$10 fee was charged. It was anticipated that this data collection would be done in conjunction with the Lake Host program this coming summer. There was some opposition from the Milfoil Committee to carrying out the data collection and Carter asked the Board to affirm the Board's direction on this so he could advise the Milfoil Committee. Russ spoke to a similar type of survey done back in the early 2000's. Although the survey was not completed on a full time basis he felt they had a handle on the number of users. Russ also said he believed that the bulk of the damage to the launches was by power loading from the fishing tournament participants. There was a considerable discussion on banning tournaments, their economic spin-off, the possibility that some users would simply move on to other launches if we began to charge and the high repair costs of the launches. Carter explained that a count of just the number of boats and if they were "sticker holders" would give him much of the information that he needed. However, the Board would have to keep in mind that the "slippage" estimate (how many people would go elsewhere if a fee were charged) would be only as reliable as the assumptions used at the time the estimate was prepared if the second of the two questions was not posed directly. All seemed to understand this and the consensus was to ask the Milfoil Committee to simply keep track of how many of the launched vehicles were observed to have a Moultonborough WMF/Beach sticker.
9. Master Plan Implementation Committee (MPIC): Carter distributed a memo from the MPIC requesting the status of various items. He reviewed possible answers based upon previous discussions of the Board. After review, particularly with respect to asking the Planning Board to include in its subdivision regulations a requirement to install conduits to accept future cable service, the consensus was that the draft suggestions were fine. Carter is to put them into memo form to the MPIC and appropriate parties. There was a question from the audience if the Board had given any consideration to having someone tape these meetings. Russ noted they had approached the schools previously and they weren't really interested.
10. FY 2011 Budget Amendment #1: With the decision as to how to use the \$75k added to the budget, Carter reviewed the need to move \$28,500 from labor services to the insurance and uniform lines in the Fire Department and to allocate the 1.5% COLA from the Contingency to the various departments. He asked if the Board wished to have any of the departments which would not have their staff in place for the full year (Police and Fire were mentioned as examples) to absorb the COLA within their budget allocations. The Board did not. He did also point out that if the State budget passes as proposed by the Governor there was a possibility we might need to cover a shortfall of roughly \$35,000 in the Police and Fire pensions being shifted onto us.

There being no further business the Chair adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

---

Approved

---

Date  
Respectfully Submitted  
Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator