

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

Selectmen's Work Session

June 28, 2012

MINUTES

Present: Selectmen: Joel R. Mudgett, Chair, Edward J. Charest, Betsey L. Patten, Jonathan W. Tolman, Russell C. Wakefield; Town Administrator: Carter Terenzini.

I. Call to Order: The Chair called the meeting to Order at 4:04 P.M.

1. **CIPC Review of Various Topics:** Peter Jensen said they would like to go through a list of items and hoped to get some sense of direction. At this point Richard Brown, the CIPC Chair arrived and picked up from Mr. Jensen.
 - a) The Development of a Capital Asset Management Plan had been recommended as part of the 2011 report. Although the response from the Board seemed favorable there had been no formal decision. Jon asked if in fact there had been any formal decision and there had not. Betsey had a concern over the time this would take the Department Heads. Mr. Brown felt there was no additional work and suggested that since we are looking at a new computer program the data entry needed would just become part of the normal process. He went on to say that he believed it would actually make the Department Heads' work easier by giving them the data needed to justify their requests. He also said this would be phased in. Mr. Jensen said nothing would preclude them from moving faster. Betsey asked Heidi Davis about the software that was needed and Mr. Brown said we didn't need a specific program, but could use Excel or Access. The consensus seemed to be one of agreement with Betsey, noting that how would we ask the Department Heads to do this remains yet to be decided.
 - b) How Much Money Per Year? This question revolved around how much money was to be planned for each year. The CIPC Chair suggested perhaps the BoS could give guidance annually early on in the process. Jon asked if we (the CIPC) would get a philosophical direction; if things (the economy) get better, can we do a bit more? The Town Administrator said he was a bit confused as it seemed to him this was settled policy. As a result of the Town Fellow's work on Trust Funds, the Selectmen had settled on the framework for the next five years. It was based upon the Board's directing that it wanted to eventually use the Trust Funds for full funding of capital items; all funds in annually and withdrawals as needed. The amount of annual funding was based upon series of vehicle/building inventories with an Annual Required Contribution (ARC's) calculated based upon that. The philosophy had been to (a) increase the ARC's over the coming years, (b) withdraw from the Trust Funds only to the extent the bottom line balance at year end was growing, and (c) keep all capital and contributions to no more than a 5% increase over the 2011 year (including the annual 3% increase to the Road Program). Russ agreed, but said we did need to look at it annually. The TA said that we do; we look at it in the final development of the budget, but that it should not be revisited in whole each year without it being shaped by a long term guiding philosophy. Mr. Brown said there was no need to settle it today as the CIPC just wanted to throw these things out.

- c) Criteria for Planning Equipment Replacement: How does the Town want to plan for the life cycle of equipment? Shall we use the manufacturer's recommendation or a cost analysis? Russ thought the Asset Management Plan would shape and direct that.
- d) Land Purchases: Mr. Brown asked if there was some particular guidance the BoS wanted to give to the CIPC regarding land purchases. At present, if there isn't a specific "need" the CIPC has to ask why we are acquiring land as the Town is not a "land bank." Betsey spoke to the recent dedication of a portion of the Land Use Change Tax for conservation and that sometimes these appraisals come up quickly as there was a need to keep negotiations confidential. There was general discussion of how conservation easements can be used versus an outright purchase.
- e) K-9: What is the future of the program as a replacement vehicle is being planned and yet would not be needed if the program is discontinued. Joel replied that Town's people voted for this so we'd have to have a discussion with them.
- f) Records Retention: We may not be storing records properly and we need a gatekeeper who knows the rules to ensure we are doing this correctly. Betsey thought many of those requirements applied to the Town Clerk and other issues might be looser. Bruce pointed out that many records needed to be kept forever and his project was to merge multiple copies from multiple offices into a single map/lot file.
- g) Lions Club: The CIPC thinks someone needs to take an active management responsibility for the property, noting that the lease expires four years into the six year CIP. Russ suggested the Board get a site assessment and inspection report to document the current status of the facility.
- h) Recreation Department: Are these things we want to support from a capital perspective. Mr. Brown noted that it's not up to them to make that philosophical decision and there are a lot of things that came up in their discussions as to the level of services that are provided. Alan Ballard, CIPC member, said more discussion is needed on this particular issue and not just services, but the level of payment, and should they be self-supporting. He added that they'd like to see more participants pay for services. Joel replied that they are working on that, noting the monitoring of trips. Betsey spoke to the evolution of the revolving fund so that it covers the variable expenses of the Department. Mr. Jensen asked do you support expansion or level services. Joel felt that it is OK to expand services, but he would like to see some of it coming from fees. Josh Bartlett, CIPC member said lots of towns provide a lot of these services, but not funded by taxpayers. He added it is useful to know who is using these services and when. Mr. Bartlett felt that if folks are using the skating rink without the Town's facilities permit, they should be charged a fee. Russ asked if "we" (CIPC) are confusing a discussion of facilities with that of policy or philosophy. Mr. Brown replied that the CIPC needs some guidance as what the Selectmen will support as to programs. Jon asked (as a CIPC member), the CIPC can rank these capital issues without knowing the philosophy. Mr. Bartlett suggested that we turn many of the programs over to others and go out of the tax supported paid business. Ed felt that such a decision is ultimately up to Town.
- i) States Landing: Mr. Brown said this is an asset the Town really hasn't made a decision on.
- j) Public Safety Building Issue: Mr. Brown said there has been an ongoing discussion about the roof, settling slab and parking lot, and who has to pay and possibly the pursuit of these contractors if the job wasn't done properly. He said they were awaiting a report from the Town Engineer.

2. **Cottage Road**: The Town Administrator reviewed how it had been found, in a review of the Tax Deed list, that this land was actually a gift to the Town. The original suggestion had been to

place an asterisk on it in the property lists that note it is one of these Town parcels being retained and then survey it. Planner, Bruce Woodruff showed the survey and noted that all or a portion might be a Town road by virtue of its existing for 20 years prior to 1968. After a lengthy discussion of the merits of selling or holding the land(s), the consensus was to hold a decision until Town Counsel, the Planner, Highway Agent, and TA can meet and review and report back.

3. **CSS:** Bruce reviewed the changes the Selectmen had asked for at their last work session, a change the Planning Board (after some discussion) had asked for, which was to spell out RSMS (Road Surface Management System). The consensus was to put it into final formatting and have the TA set and advertise a date for a public hearing.
4. **Proposed Demolition Permit:** The Town Planner reviewed two items that he'd been working on. The first was that a demolition permit be required before someone could proceed to demolish a structure. In this instance, disconnecting utilities, removing hazardous waste and the like could be verified before someone proceeded with demolition. The second item, which was not before the Board, need not be adopted in order for the permit itself to have merit. This was for a demolition delay ordinance which would allow the Heritage Commission to work with property owners on buildings deemed of significance before they were demolished. The Town Administrator suggested that the particulars of the proposed Demolition Permit form was not ready for prime time and spoke of some ways to improve it to keep it from being too burdensome on people. After considerable discussion about the merits of the concept and concerns about its connecting to a Demolition Delay Ordinance, the TA asked if it was the philosophy of the Board to support such a permit, and if so, the staff could bring something back that was more workable. If not, the staff would not expend any further time on these efforts. The Chair polled the Board to see if there was support for the demolition permit: Jon – No; Betsey – No; Russ – No; Ed – Yes; Joel – No. The consensus was to not require a Demolition Permit.

- II. **Non-Public Session:** Ed Made the Motion for the Selectmen to go into Non-Public Session per 91-A:3 II (a) and (c) and only to reconvene for the purposes of adjournment. Betsey seconded. A Roll call was taken: Jon – Aye; Betsey – Aye; Ed – Aye; Russ – Aye, Joel – Aye. The Selectmen went into Non-Public Session at 6:25 p.m.

The Board exited Non-Public Session at 6:40 p.m. having voted by a vote of 2/3 or greater of the members present to not disclose the minutes and decisions reached therein to the public, as divulgence of the information discussed likely would affect adversely the reputation of any person other than a member of the public body itself, until - in the opinion of a majority of the members - the aforesaid circumstances no longer apply.

There being no further business the Chair adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Approved

Date
Respectfully Submitted
Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator