

PRESENT: Bayard, Acting Chairman; Flanders; Granfield; Touhey; Finer; Bliss; Edgar, Town Planner; Harvey, Clerk

Bill Bayard, Acting Chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 25, 2005, AS PRESENTED. Voted unanimously.

### APPLICATION SUBMISSIONS

1. **MARVIN P. KENISTON d/b/a KENGAR REALTY LLC** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment for a change of use from retail and storage space to 2 dwelling units, Tax Map U06, Lot 4, located at 147 Main Street in the Central Business District.

Applicant proposes to convert (2) existing commercial spaces to: (1) one-bedroom, first floor studio apartment (approximately 700 sq. ft.) and (1) three-bedroom, second floor apartment (approximately 1200 sq. ft.). The site has been used for various commercial uses and combinations of uses since 1986. The adjacent lot is also owned by the applicant, which is used as a multi-family building. The lots are subject to a reciprocal access easement. The application, site plan and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend the application be accept as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION OF MARVIN P. KENISTON d/b/a KENGAR REALTY LLC FOR A PROPOSED SITE PLAN AMENDMENT. Voted unanimously.

2. **BKK PARTNERSHIP** – Architectural Design Review of proposed modifications to an existing commercial building, Tax Map U06, Lot 40A, located at 73 Main Street in the Central Business District.

Applicant proposes to construct a “reverse pitch” asphalt shingle roof on an existing storefront façade on Main Street. Recently, a mansard style roof was removed as a maintenance item. Application, building elevation and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATION FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR BKK PARTNERSHIP. Voted unanimously.

3. **RAYMOND CRAM, JR.** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed storage building on Tax Map S15, Lot 77, located on Jenness Hill Road in the Central Business District.

Applicant proposes to construct a 25' x 30' building for a welding shop. Recently, the Planning Board granted conditional Site Plan approval for the proposed shop. Application, elevation drawing and abutters list are on file. Filing fees have been paid. Recommend application be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR RAYMOND CRAM, JR. Voted unanimously.

4. **MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC.** – Proposed Site Plan Amendment to construct a 32' x 48' storage building with related site improvements, Tax Map S23, Lot 54, located at 29 Foundry Avenue in the Business & Industry District.

5. **MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC.** – Architectural Design Review of a proposed storage building on Tax Map S23, Lot 54, located at 29 Foundry Avenue in the Business & Industry District.

Applicant proposes to construct a 32' x 48' storage building located to the rear of the existing facility on Foundry Avenue. The existing facility includes several small businesses. Applications for site plan review and architectural design review have been filed. Filing fees have been paid. Applicant has submitted a site plan as an element of a NHDES and Town of Meredith approved septic plan prepared by Ames Associates. Although not a formal survey, it does appear to be more accurate than the plan of record that is on file with the Planning Department. The proposal meets all setback criteria. For these reasons, applicant has asked that the Board waive requirements to create a new site plan. Recommend the waiver be granted and the applications be accepted as complete for purposes of proceeding to public hearing.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE ACCEPT THE APPLICATIONS OF MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC. Voted unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS****1. PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED 2006 - 2015 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

Peter Brothers, Chairman, CIP Committee: Looking back a little bit, it seems strange that we've been involved in this process for 7 years. Bob was on that original Committee along with a couple of the rest of us. We've come a long way and, of course, we followed the authority under the RSA's and under the auspice of the Planning Board and Meredith Capital Improvements Program is here for cycle 2005 and making our final recommendations and some overall statements and we are willing to answer any questions that you or the public may have as a follow up. First of all, I would like to start off by acknowledging the time, the effort and who the members were this year of that Advisory Committee. Myself as Chair, Bill Bayard was the Vice Chairman as the Planning Board representative, Lou Kahn was the Planning Board alternate representative, Frank Michel, Board of Selectmen rep., Jack Carty, School Board rep. Then we had three citizens at large, Mark Flanders, Miller Lovett and Tony Candage. I would like to also acknowledge that as a Committee, the resources of the Town in terms of the Finance Officer, Brenda Vittner and John in the Planning Department were invaluable to us as so many organizations and committees function with a great deal of knowledge in supplying formulas and the computers to work some of our models out and come up with the final recommendations. With that, I think what I would like to do, it's probably old hat for many of you, but I'm going to briefly turn it over to John Edgar and he's going to go through the cycle itself and explain where we are in that process. John Edgar – I would briefly like to touch base on the cycle that we go through on an annual basis and the reason for that is it's important to understand what we've been dealing with this particular spring and how it relates to our recommendations. This has been, very definitely, an unusual year in that we've had a lot of different requests. Basically, the process is that once we've completed the Town Meeting cycle, the first step is that the CIP group gets together in the spring and holds an informational meeting. Usually, they are not very well attended, but it's the first opportunity for the public to interface with the Committee in terms of what they think is working or not working or if they have ideas for projects. The Committee then proceeds to meet throughout the Spring and pretty much the Spring is dedicated for meetings with project sponsors. They can be just about anybody sponsoring a project. As a practical matter, they are predominantly Department Heads that are identifying needs for various improvement projects within their respective responsibilities. So we go through a series of meetings in the spring where the sponsors are required to fill out an Identification Form which addresses about a dozen or so questions trying to

get at what the need is, the timeliness of it and the cost and so forth and the point of view of the Department Heads so we do that pretty much during May & June, vacation schedules and the like in the summer kind of forces us into a hiatus and then we pick it back up in the fall in September and early October to get any last minute updates on projects as well as trying to synthesize the whole thing and do something that's meaningful and then at that point, the committee goes into a deliberative mode where they try to work by consensus working through all of the different projects that have been identified and pretty much on a consensus basis trying to work through what would be a good structure to the program. We are at this stage right now where we're actually having a hearing in front of the Planning Board. The CIP operates as an advisory subcommittee to the Planning Board under the statute and then upon its adoption the CIP document is then forwarded to the folks responsible for the budget and then the professional administrators at the Town and School level and as part of that process, it obviously involves the elected officials who ultimately will be promulgating their respective budgets. We then go through the budget process at the Town and School level where there's more of an opportunity to have dialogue on capital improvements and then effectively, the budget is formatted in the context of a bond and it goes to the Town Meeting and ultimately the Town Meeting decides whether or not fund the capital improvements. So we start at a discussion stage to go through this process, it ultimately concludes with folks at Town and School Meeting and when the dust settles, we begin the concept again and go through this on an annual basis. That allows us to constantly refine what we're doing, make adjustments to course directions as we need to based upon the information that is at hand so this is briefly what the cycle is, it's touched on in the report. There's a narrative section in the report. We will come back to this when we get into some of the more substantive recommendations. The report document itself has two distinctive components. The first 12 pages are narrative and as you look at the second page in from the cover page, this section just kind of guides you through the Appendices of all the spreadsheets that are attached here that include the scheduling of projects and the analysis. There's a section or two in here dealing with what a CIP is and I just want to speak briefly to that because it's important to understand what a Capital Improvement Program is and it's equally important to understand what it's not. A Capital Improvement Program, first and foremost, really is a forecasting tool of capital needs. The statutes refer to this very specifically as a tool for the aiding and development of budgets. It requires that it be done on a minimum of a 6-year window and for the last 6 or 7 years that's what we've been doing, but it's meant to identify capital needs and then project those out in some kind of a reasonable fashion factoring in all the different needs of the community. It's not a budget. There is no legal and hard fast way, there's no legal significance to this other than the fact that we're creating a tool, a guidance document where 8 folks in an invited capacity and then working back through you folks have created an analysis of capital needs in the community and then trying to organize those in such a way as to then hand off to Carol and the

elected folks and their counterparts at the school level and to present that as a tool for their use and consideration as they discharge their responsibilities as professional administrators and elected officials so it's creating in essence a forecasting tool that schedules out what we understand to be the capital needs in the community to be. The sections will get into that in a little more detail, but effectively that's what it is and what it isn't. It's not a budget process. The budget process happens up here. The budget process is 110% the responsibility of others and not the Planning Board and not the Advisory Committee. This is a forecasting tool looking at capital needs. In the big scheme of things, our capital needs represent about 11% of total appropriations. In the big scheme of things it's a chunk, but there's 80-90% of other issues that the folks who do the budgets have to take into consideration. There's a brief discussion of the evaluation and prioritization of projects. There's also a discussion on program capacity. One of the self-imposed aspects of this project that's been the case since it's inception, is to try to establish a financial benchmark, a framework within which the CIP should exist and that's primarily to make sure that when we present to others for their use at the school, there's some level of fiscal constraint so it's not just an unorganized list of projects, but one of the objectives is to try to look at how we can organize the financial implications of all these projects and so in part towards that end the community's been looking at a framework or we refer to it in the document as capacity of the program. There's discussion in the text about that and how some of the benchmarks have been calculated in the past. In rough terms, in recent years, we've been looking at about a million eight in the CIP and somewhere in the order of 40% of that is debt service. Clearly, there's a lot more spending than just capital items, but you get a rough idea of what the boilerplates are and the overall spending between the Town and School. I think it's in the report at somewhere around 7-8% on a combined annual average basis between the Town and the School so that when we end up with recommendations, we are in some kind of grounded sense of reality. There's a lot of discussion as to whether or not and it's rhetorically published in the report as to whether or not if the capacity is too low, are we effectively meeting our capital needs with the 1.8 million benchmark which represents an issue relative to unnecessarily or inappropriately constraining the program so that question is out there and there's a pretty substantial discussion in the text about looking at that issue of a self-imposed constraint and what that benchmark should be. The long and short of it for now for this particular amendment cycle, the community decided to use the 1.8 alone and once we get into some of the projects, you realize what the pressures are on that 1.8 million dollar framework and I'm sure I can't speak for all the committee but I know there's a lot of discussion about revisiting that in future cycles and the likelihood of us taking a hard look at that 1.8 million figure is probably crucial. There are a few figures in the report, we just put some contextual data in there and we looked at a 20-year schedule of tax base growth. We also were briefed by the School Board on enrollment issues and you have the school enrollment reduction in the report

as well. Although the Town continues to grow in terms of its total population, the school enrollment does not grow in a corresponding way. In fact, the enrollment projections at least as they were perceived in the spring suggest declining enrollments. So you have a growing population, but a decline in school enrollment so with that it would suggest that our demographic characteristics of our population growth do not come with kids. It's important that we keep a real close eye on the enrollment data because we are a small district and it wouldn't take a whole heck of a lot to change that dramatically. I'm going to go through a highlighting of about a dozen significant recommendations that need to be shared with everybody. We do have a series of spreadsheets; one is just a schedule listing the projects in Appendix A, the total somewhere in the order of 18-19 million dollars worth of stuff. That's everything from infrastructure to building replacements. Appendix B effectively are the recommendations in spreadsheet fashion, it's covered in pages 8-12 in the narrative and detailed out year- for-year in spreadsheet fashion and where we have revenues to offset the cost so hopefully we can reflect on what the actual cost to the taxpayers would be. Appendix C is debt service, both existing and proposed. You'll see in there that we've identified all the debt that we're carrying and we've identified those recommendations that represent additional long-term debt to the community. Appendix D is kind of a summary spreadsheet that just provides a lot of historical data in terms of project costs and debt service, etc. Appendix E is an accounting of Trust Funds in terms of what they are, their purpose and when they were established. In areas in the narrative where we identify some graphic information in terms of tax rate, tax base, enrollment data, I would like to spend the presentation just highlighting about a dozen or so of the key recommendations that are contained in Section VIII in the narrative. Peter Brothers – There's a little bit of a prelude to the actual recommendations which we're going to highlight. Taking a look back at some of our earlier meetings in the spring and then picked up in the fall, there has been a number of significant reports that have been commissioned by the Town and have become available in whole or part, which have had a significant impact on our decision-making process in the CIP. First of all and probably foremost, it missed our last cycle last year because it came out in December of '04 and then we picked it up as a result of some of our early meetings this spring, but that's the report from the Space Needs Study Committee. It has some significant capital items that were identified in that that needed attention and the #1 priority that was addressed at that time was the Police Station and the terms of need for that building. In its own words, it basically stated that it was an urgent need and then they went through and made a second observation in terms of the Fire Station and that was established as their #2 priority behind the Police and the next significant one was the DPW garage and buildings as a third priority. As a result of that, there has been some significant activity by the Police Building Committee. A number of individuals in this room are on that and probably can speak to the details better than I, but the point is that's been formed, they are looking at costs, what type of building, what's going to

be included in it and getting architectural and engineering work to the various stages towards completion. That Committee is still at this point providing information to the Selectmen and to the rest of the Committee. Another one that's come into place very quickly as a result of that is the Fire Department Building Committee and they've been working too now for several years in analyzing the opportunities that they have for expansion. I guess it's been determined at this point that the site itself that it's currently on is a logical choice and they have been proceeding with different engineering and surveying to confirm that. That will be updated I presume just like the Police building to us in our next cycle as they get towards their final goals and information. There is a second Fire Department Committee, the Apparatus and Equipment Committee, which has also been working and as you know on the radar, we had a fire pumper that had been requested to be replaced on the Fire Department's equipment replacement schedule and that was originally asked for in 2007 and there was a ladder truck which we have substantially made some contributions to the Expendable Trust Fund for that and with the report coming out for the priority of the Police Station, it appears that the Fire Building Committee and the Apparatus Committee have been looking at that and got revised to us this year in September which looked at deferring the timeframe on the ladder truck until such time as there was a home to house that so you will hear about our recommendations in that regard shortly. The Water System evaluation, actually my understanding is that there have been two studies that have been commissioned, one has been completed and that's the water study report and the sewer report is in some process of infancy at this point, but the indication is that's probably going to have significant impacts on some capital projects in the future both in terms of water and sewer. They specifically mention some key areas which basically is all inclusive in the system but they are looking at treatment capacity, storage capacity, distribution and then building redundancy into the system and so our Committee recognizes that as soon as more of this information becomes available to us that the various departments will be providing us with requests. A little bit further note, we've received updated project costs from both the DPW and Water and Sewer for a lot of the project forms that have been in there before and I think it's somewhat, shall we say, characteristic of a very busy economy. The updated costs that came in were significantly higher than even what we had had at a prior year or two years ago updated figures. Some of that obviously is a result of a strong construction industry and the size of some of the projects. A good example of that is Water and Sewer put one scheduled project out to bid and received one bid and it was almost two times what had been reasonably allocated so that's presented us with some issues as well in addition to... A lot of these projects are basically \_\_\_\_\_ so they are not done with department personnel. You may not have the staff or the ability or the equipment or it may not be efficient, so to some degree, you have to go out to bid with recognized contractors who can accomplish that so one of the things that we got together and the Town Manager came back to us early this fall was with a

recommendation which seems to make some sense that we might bundle three or four different projects together. For instance, let's say a million dollars versus something less than that and the thought was that we could get them done in a timely fashion and probably the competitiveness of the job if big enough would warrant and maybe absorb some of the cost of the debt service on the bond, but it would put us in a better position to have the projects bid at a right price and completed within a reasonable timeframe. John alluded to the updated debt service. I think in the book it said 44%, but I think we revamped the final figures closer to 42, but it's important to note that as a community, we chose in our CIP Committee to include debt service. Sometimes in other communities, they have not looked or not included that and as a result of that, it's not a real true reflection of what your costs may be over time. We did do what I call a fairly significant improvement. Like anything else, the interest rates were very desirable so this year, the Finance Director and some others refinanced some of the debt that we had outstanding and even though we were able to shorten the term and get a much more favorable interest rate, our payments in the next few years may be a little bit higher than what we did have, but the big benefit is going to come from a much shorter term so we will have capacity down the road available to us at a quicker pace to look at future bond issues. Also, looking at that too, we have also added, this is the first year of the Community Center debt and the Conservation Commission bond of \$4 million dollars came on the books and entered into the debt service and as a result of that so that we could see further out, we, as John had, the requirement was a six year window for our capital improvement projections, we did extend that to a 10-year window after a fair amount of discussion so we're actually looking at making a recommendation of years 2006 to 2015 and one of the goals was so we could end up seeing when some of that debt might be coming off and it's an early sign that there may be some capacity available to us in our deliberation and scheduling of both current and future projects in terms of being able to find what I call the dollar capacity. John Edgar – As Peter suggested, we've had a lot coming at us in terms of all these different reports and the works from different committees so I think largely, out of necessity, it's prudent to look beyond six years, but I think that we just have a lot of stuff that we've had to wrestle around with. There are four bond issues that are being looked at as needed items. As a practical matter, the 10-year window out of necessity allows us a little more flexibility. In my view, one of the reasons why all of this is under the planning statutes is because the Capital Improvement Program to my way of thinking is kind of a link between the Master Plan and the budget process. The Master Plan identifies a lot of community goals. It identifies infrastructure issues, it identifies facility issues, character of life, quality of life issues, open space, conservation priorities and so forth, but it feels as though they are at a very general level and the other spectrum is appropriations and actually goes into the budget process and vote in favor or against actual budget items. What the CIP does in my view is a link in between the two to try to organize community priorities that have been identified and continue to



be identified and try to organize them in a responsible fashion and then complete that budget process in an organized way so in that context of it being initially under the planning statutes and the relationship of the Master Plan, it's important that the CIP reflects a balance of things and when you go through these recommendations you'll see that we're dealing with everything from buildings to pipes to open space and I think the Committee's done a good job in terms of trying to come up with a balancing act that reflects appropriate levels of recommended funding for recreation, open space, utilities, road projects, capital equipment, etc. so there's an awful lot to take into account and at the end of the day it needs to be fairly balanced so that we can address a lot of the competing needs of the community. Towards that end, there are about a dozen recommendations that we wanted to highlight for the Board and the public. These are going down on a by department basis. The first one that Peter eluded to is the Police Station. We had received the initial recommendation to accept the facility back when the Space Needs Committee was completing its work at the end of '04. That was updated this spring to work that had been done prior to the Police Station Committee was looking at a 1.9 million dollar facility and after a lot of discussion, the Committee has recommended that we continue the planning work of the committee, try to receive and update in '06 when the scope and cost of the building is nailed down. At this point, to recommend a 2 million dollar bond issue for consideration by the voters in '07, the debt would come on line in '08. If we make some assumptions in terms of a 5 ½% interest rate over a 20-year term that represents about \$167,000 in debt service that would begin in '08. Peter Brothers – I think it's important to point this out because I know there's been some questions on this specific recommendation, but part of what I call the core mission of the CIP Committee, what we typically are looking for and feel as a requirement, is if we have a request that's, let's say in this case it's in the first year of our plan, the year 2006 which is the way it came through from the Police Department and with the Town Manager. When we had that information available to us, it was not that we didn't follow the need of the Space Needs Committee report which certainly clearly put that out there, but also one of the requirements is that we didn't have in our opinion as a consensus of the group, specific enough information to make that as a firm recommendation and we feel we have an obligation particularly in what I call the next out year to have some specificity to the request, identify the site, the benefits, the costs, the ability to implement, all the types of criteria that you would particularly want if you were going to a bond issue proposal which in this case would be March of 2006. Included in with that, obviously I think is the ability to get the information out to the public and to get that support. My experience has been with the Town and School District meetings over the years that I've been actively involved is the better informed they are, the more they are on track, the more there is a pattern of understanding and desire for a project and a good example of that is the Community Center. That clearly had been talked about for 35 to 50 years that I know of, even though we didn't have the specifics and we didn't make a specific

recommendation that year, we did allow what we call the excess CIP reserves which was enough believe it or not, about \$320,000 to cover the bond issue under the assumption that it was going to go and it did so but in this particular case, we just think it's key if it's going to follow that part of the process and be used very quickly that it has the detail and the numbers pinned down so that we could provide it with a recommendation. There's no debate here as to the need, it's more a question of when. I look at it and if you look at our plan, it's not that we're saying we don't recommend it, we're just recommending that it be postponed a year so that those details, those costs can be identified and hopefully we could have a successful Town vote, so that's really the rationale right now. It also illustrates the conundrum of sorts when we have special committees working on a certain timeline and the timeline of this group to complete its work in September in anticipation of an October or in this case a November public hearing. The recommendations were based upon the information that was available to the committee at that time. As a practical matter, the Committee that Bob, Miller and Carol sat on, the Police Station Committee continues to work and continues to refine its efforts and that will continue on it's own track. The purpose of the CIP also is to create a tool based upon information at the time and then that tool is used by others as others exercise their responsibilities as professionals and other elected officials and that process obviously hasn't completed itself yet. The Committee's still working and whether the Selectmen decide to move forward in Town Meeting or not, it will be a decision that they'll make based upon information that they have as part of their part in this process and that I think also explains the various roles and the importance of the flexibility and so that is pretty much where the Committee left it. They did recommend a 2 million-bond issue, they just recommended that the planning continue with an update in the Spring for consideration at the following Town Meeting. As I indicated, my assumption is that I've indicated that the annual debt payment is about \$167,000 per year on the 2 million dollar bond issue. The second priority in the Space Needs Committee report, they actually had about six major items, but the first three are the three big ones. The second priority in the Space Needs report was the Fire Station and there are two recommendations relative to that. The first is that there should be an additional payment in the existing Expendable Trust Fund that would allow this Department to continue and hopefully continue its planning process. As Peter indicated during an existing conditions survey and they are starting to work up different building options at the downtown station site, if \$75,000 in additional funds could get them up into a level of funding that would be consistent with what has been allocated for the Community Center and the Police Station project for architectural. Following the recommendation on the Police Station, the Committee had recommended that there be an update in 2006 and that a 1 ½ million dollar bond issue be considered in '08. Debt would come on line in '09 and here again using the same assumptions on term and rate, we're looking at about \$127,000 a year in debt service. With respect to the recommendations of the Equipment Committee, there's a 30-year pumper in

the Town's inventory that is on the Department's replacement schedule and the Fire Department came back with a revised recommendation and that would be to defer the acquisition of the aerial ladder until such time the fire station is completed. The alternative would be to house an aerial ladder at the Chemung Station and it's utility would be almost negated because of it's distance away from the downtown. So towards that end, the Department has recommended and the Committee has concurred that we would replace the 30-year pumper and utility truck in the current inventory. That project has been identified in the past and treated as a \$25,000 replacement item. They have recommended going with what the Chief has described as a program design on a commercial chasis being something more, in my terms maybe something more than an off the shelf fire truck as opposed to something that's custom designed and that's what brings that cost down and it has been recommended that we use existing equipment replacement funds for that purpose. The effect of that would mean then we have to continue to allocate additional funds to a Expendable Trust Fund to complete the aerial ladder acquisition at such time that we have the fire station issue resolved. With respect to general government, there's only one item that's on the table at this point and that's the replacement of the Wicwas Dam. This is the outfall of Lake Wicwas on Meredith Center Road. It's sort of an odd duck in that it's a State road, but it's an odd situation where the Town has to partner to get it resolved. We have I think in last year's budget, the Committee has recommended that the Town's portion of the reconstruction is \$200,000 to be allocated in '07 and that would be matched with approximately \$150,000 from the NH Department of Transportation as a revenue offset. There are a series of projects that we refer to as joint projects and these projects necessitate coordination primarily between the Department of Public Works on the road and drainage side and the Department of Water and Sewer relative to whatever respective utilities that would be in the road. As Peter had indicated, we have a project on High Street and Waukewan Avenue that's been partially funded over two years. When we had the second half of funding in place this year, we went out to bid and one bid came back and it was at least double what had been allowed in terms of what had been appropriated at that point so it caused everybody to take a real hard look at the smaller projects, the \$100,000 projects, and are we able to demand enough attention in the market to get people to competitively bid on the project. In light of that, we have had recommendations from the Town Manager. There were three projects that have been described as a bundle and those would be the High and Waukewan Avenue project, which is sewer, water and drainage up around the Swazey Park area and the Water Street/Red Gate Lane road and utility improvements. This is one the biggest issues we should have in water distribution system in that area. It's basically a failed line for all practical purposes. It's one of the highest priorities in that study that Peter had mentioned as well as some utility and road improvements on Stevens Avenue so the result of all of that, the CIP recommends that these 3 projects be bid as one and that would necessitate

that we complete the engineering, some of it has been engineered but not all of it so there would be some additional engineering costs in '06 and the project estimate at this point is about \$1,000,000 for the three combined projects. That would be considered for authorization in '07, the debt would come on line in '08, the term would be slightly less than the buildings, it would be a 15-year term and that debt service was approximately \$117,000. With respect to the highways and the DPW, here again this also was bundled. There are three DPW portions of each of those projects. The most significant, longer-range project that's been identified by that Department and its outgrowth stems back to the Space Needs Committee and that would be replacement of the DPW garage. That's the third of the three big priorities and the Committee has recommended it would start about 2010 to earmark money for an Expendable Trust Fund and here again would allow the planning and architectural work to bid on that down the road and that at this juncture represent a bond issue somewhere around 2013. It's in the ballpark of a 4 ½ million dollar project and if we set aside \$100,000 for each of those three years beginning in 2010, that would get us down to approximately a 4.2 million balance in very rough terms that would begin in 2014 and debt service would be approximately \$351,000 a year. With respect to the water and sewer, as Peter had mentioned, a big part of what's driving this project stems from the water study that was prepared by the SEA Consulting firm. The projects that are included in the bundle are some of the highest prioritized projects in terms of main replacements. There are also a series of other projects that you'll see in Schedule B in the Appendices of some other smaller projects. One thing that is a priority for '06 is looking at some additional land in and around the vicinity of the Water Treatment Plant to allow for future expansion of the Treatment Plant. That's is a priority for '06. One of the other recommendations relative to water and sewer is to create a Water System Improvement Expendable Trust Fund. That would primarily, but not exclusively, be looking at a second tower. One of the deficiencies or one of the needs that was identified in the consulting report was the need for additional storage capacity in the future and the Department and the Selectmen are working on a lot of different aspects relative to this study at present so it's premature for us to know exactly where the tower should be and what it's capacity needs to be. There are still some other pieces that have to fall into place so it's not clear enough exactly what we would need so I believe the Committee felt that if we know that the need is out there, as well as other water system improvements, then the idea would be to set up a general Expendable Trust Fund to begin to address those issues. One other thing that runs through water and sewer analysis is what we call a revenue offset. When you anticipate grant money or other monies that would offset what the taxpayer has to pay for, we try to identify that and historically the Water and Sewer utilities have picked up portions of debt service for their projects. It is my understanding that historically that's been around 50% of the debt service that's attributed to the utility by some of our bigger projects like Plymouth Street and Pleasant Street construction projects. For the

purpose of this analysis, we've assumed a 40% contribution from the Water and Sewer Department. The 40% is not based on any scientific analysis, it's a number that we've used for purposes of analysis. The Selectmen are in the process of evaluating the rate structure for the water utility for a number of reasons which include conservation incentives as well as future capital investment so that issue's a little bit on the table at the moment in terms of what the ability of the water utility would be to meet their proportionate share of the actual cost of the utilities. For purposes of analysis, we are assuming 40% revenues. Shifting gears a little bit, the Conservation Commission has made a request to consider increasing the level of funding for the Expendable Trust Fund that's been dedicated for purposes of open space protection. The CIP Committee has concurred with that recommendation and that recommendation will increase the total trust fund payment to \$75,000 per year, which is currently \$25,000 so that would be a \$50,000 increase per year for the Expendable Trust Fund for that purpose. Here again, I bring the Board's attention back to a lot of the discussion in the Master Plan as we grow how do we balance growth with conservation and we've had very good successes in the last couple years and the Conservation Commission made a strong case as the necessity to continue in a positive fashion towards that objective of additional open space acquisitions. Effectively, the two big projects that we had recently all but depleted the Expendable Trust Fund. There are other funds that are available towards conservation purposes, as you may recall, there was a vote at Town Meeting last year to increase the cap that we allow land use change tax to be dedicated to the Commission and that was voted on favorably. Here again, it's not a guaranteed level either because it's a function of what happens in terms of current use penalties. There's a couple different funds that have been used in the past, one is under the direct control of the Conservation Commission and the one I'm eluding to here, the \$75,000 per year is under the control of the Selectmen and effectively for any large projects that happen, not only that have to go to Town Meeting, but effectively it necessitates that the Conservation Commission and Board of Selectmen work collaboratively in terms of agreeing what the priorities are and how this fund can \_\_\_\_\_. One fund is probably not in itself sufficient to complete the project. The Parks & Recreation Department has submitted a proposal to construct restrooms at the Lake Waukegan public beach. The initial estimate was \$114,000. The project had been identified in a different venue and that being the recently published Management Plan for Lake Waukegan and it had been recommended that restroom facilities, if you're going to have swimming in a public water supply, at least provide a legitimate opportunity for people to use the restrooms, change, shower, whatever the case may be. The Committee had recommended a \$40,000 level of funding and that would allow the Department to use that \$40,000 to hopefully leverage grant money that may become available through the Land and Water Conservation Fund to offset some of the Town's costs. So they are currently exploring the amount of funding and the CIP recommendation is substantially less if it does not cover

the initial project costs \_\_\_\_\_. With respect to the Inter-Lakes School District who's participated throughout this process, there are three recommendations. One is to increase the level of funding in their Expendable Trust Fund. They have an Expendable Trust Fund set-aside for the Plant Improvements, roof repairs, boiler replacements, things of that sort and they have requested and the CIP has recommended that the annual allocation be increased. Meredith's share of the allocation is increased to \$52,000 on an annual basis. In terms of actual projects, the School Board is currently looking at auditorium renovations that deal with several different areas. There are four elements of the project currently under review by the School Board and that would include seating renovations in the auditorium, lighting improvements, sound system improvements and modifications to the lobby. The initial cost estimate that was presented to the CIP Committee is \$500,000. Meredith's share of that initial cost would be \$346,000. The project may be eligible for School Building Aid at the rate of a 45% offset; Meredith's net cost of that original offset with the assumption that the building aid comes through would be \$190,575. The School Board through the Superintendent has also advised the CIP Committee that it continues to review the scope of the project and depending on the outcome of that review, that project cost may be reduced. Updated figures and scope of the project will be available to the CIP Committee in the next CIP cycle. Meredith's net share of the initial estimate for School District Meeting 2006 which would be our next appropriate cycle and it would be for the school year of '06-'07. Their second project which is one that's been bantered around for years and that is the reconstruction of the athletic fields. They have this time around combined upper and lower field improvement projects into one project and the cost of the combined project has been estimated at about \$355,000. Meredith's share of that would be about \$246,000. The project also may be eligible for School Building Aid and with that factored in, Meredith's net share would be \$135,000. There again, we expect updated figures for the next cycle and it's been recommended that Meredith's net share of the allocation in 2008 and it's basically School District Meeting '07 for the school year '07-'08. Mr. Chairman, that's a brief summary of some of the highlights and as you can see as I eluded to in my covered correspondence to you, it's been a very challenging year, we have an awful lot on the table and an awful lot in the balance. We have worked for the most part within the million eight threshold, analysis is in the data, the first six years, I think four of the first six years we either met or slightly exceeded that threshold unlike prior years and the difference is simply that we have an awful lot before us and the Committee has \_\_\_\_\_ their deliberative process to try to balance these, recognizing that it is an annual amendment process and certainly we would like to move forward with these recommendations for consideration by others and then pick it up again in the spring. Bayard – I would like to second your comment about how challenging it was. You say it's not a budget process, but I think we may have been a little closer to a budget process than we have in past years because there wasn't enough money to do what we wanted to

do and I'm beginning to have a little more appreciation perhaps for Selectmen and it was quite interesting. John Granfield – First of all, I would, of course, recognize and thank all those members, yourself John, Peter, Frank and those that worked on it with all the competing needs and it's just a really tough job. That being said, I would like to comment that it really troubles me that the Police Department isn't in this year and a couple things that you said I'd like to comment on why I think it can be in this year and why I think it should be this year. Those that know me, that's my experience, 30 years in policing. I've built 3 or 4 police stations, designed them and been sued for inadequate ones so I know from what I say. We all know it's a facility that needs to be replaced, but I think the thing we need to be very cognizant of that elevates the urgency from next year to this year and that is the liability that we have here. I'll be quick about it but I want to be sure that everybody recognize that. I'll just touch on some of the things. There is no prisoner holding here. It's not uncommon on Friday nights or Saturday nights for your PD to arrest several people. If one of them happens to be a juvenile we're even in more trouble. We have a room back here where they have a couple of bars and that's just rails against the wall that they handcuff them to. If you have a juvenile, you can't put them with adults and often times you're going to arrest an 18 year old and a 17 year old, I mean they hang together. They are only a couple of months difference in age, but from Court and law standpoint, they are miles apart in what you have to do with them. If you put the adult back there, guess where you put the juvenile. Look behind our Town Manager there and you'll see on the wall, that's what they've got. That's where the juvenile goes, the adults back there. It doesn't take a whole lot of imagination if you're not using a lot of people to watch them, they are right next to a couple windows. I'm not saying they are going to escape, but I've seen it happen, they'll put their fist through it, they're caught, and they are going to sue the Town. You've got a juvenile and a juvenile sues the Town, it makes 1.9 million dollars for this building look cheap, believe me. I've been there, done that. I just don't want to see the Town have to go through that so I think that's the urgency and I could name a lot of other things, but I don't want to take up all of the time. That's the urgency I think warrants elevating it from next year to this year. The second thing, Peter, I would like to comment on, I think and I'll let Bob and the Space Needs Committee speak to this, I think that the Town is in a good position to go forward. Not that you were when you were doing your thing because everything is done kind of \_\_\_ step, but I think now we're at the point where we could amend this after we hear from Bob and find out that we have enough information to go forward. Also, I do think that by waiting until next year, our selling is going to be more difficult because on the street there is the word that we need a new Police Department and we need it badly in the town. I think if we postpone and go to next year, people are going to think that maybe we didn't need it that bad. I think that it's time. I think if this Planning Board recommends it and it moves forward, that is not at all going to hurt the selling, in my opinion, it's going to enhance it because it's going to show the critical need and I think that the Town is far enough

along to have a good plan to move forward with it and to sell it and I would really look for an amendment to this by this Planning Board to have this happen in this fiscal year. Bliss – I would also like to echo that I think the Board did a tremendous job and one afternoon I did go on the Town web site and read through the minutes and it looks like there were many interesting meetings. Also, I like the format of the way our pamphlets were put back. You can see the years, it's a lot simpler for the average person to read and understand. I also have a few things, being on the CIP in the past, I still do have a problem with so much money going to Conservation. I do realize its part of the Master Plan and at Town Meeting a lot of people did speak loud and clear. I also think, unfortunately, you don't see the people that need affordable housing at Town Meetings speaking out as well and as we up our tax dollars, affordable housing gets further and further away. My other comment is, I believe the State has made major cuts in L-Chip too so I think the State is moving that way, not that I want to follow the State, but some of that's happening too. My other comment is on the Inter-Lakes School District and the auditorium renovations. I'm just curious if there was any discussion on what the Summer Theater is paying for rent now and is it comparable to them to be able to monopolize the theatre for the summer and then come back 10 years later and say, it's getting rough in there, we need to fix it. I would like to see also the summer theater put some type of money towards that. I will make just one further comment on John's comment while I do think that there is a great need for the Police Station, I think just like John had mentioned, we've waited 35 years for a Community Center and I think rushing into it should not be an option and I think just as we did with the Community Center when we went to the CIP with that, once it got to the Board of Selectmen and to their role they had decided to do it anyway so I would not favor an amendment by this Board. Flanders – Several things. I believe that the Police Department is an urgent need that should be addressed in this cycle. I disagree that in September we didn't have all the specific details as to exact things, but we did have a CIP recommendation or Project ID Form and we had the total amount of money to be expended. The Committee is working hard, we will have all the details by the end of the year, and the committee is geared up to go into an information mode to get the information out to the public. Did we get along for 35 years without a Community Center? Absolutely. Was anybody's life at risk because we didn't have it? No, it wasn't. Is somebody's life at risk because of this Police Station? Absolutely, and I think that changes the whole picture. I was involved in the beginning when we set up the CIP process, our goal stated in the purpose in the beginning was not to count pencils or erasers, but look and see how things would fit together so we could meet the capital needs without having a significant impact causing a spike in the tax rate. I sat in on the CIP meetings. At one of the last sessions, I think it was Miller that brought it up and Brenda was sitting there with her computer and they were plugging things in and out to see how it would impact the whole thing. By plugging in the Police Station in '06 instead of '07, it has "0" impact in '06. It accelerates the first bond



payment from '08 to '07 and that still was doable within the parameters of the projected amounts. Would you agree with that statement, Peter? Peter Brothers – I think John and I indicated that the difference basically is about \$167,000 this year versus the following year. Flanders – It's not this year, the first bond payment is '07. Brothers – But I think the difference really is, Bob, our process has the CIP getting information that is more concrete than what we had. Last night I understand there was a conversation at the Selectmen's meeting about dropping off the Court or reducing the size so I mean it's still not defined at this point and in relationship to where we are as of October 12<sup>th</sup> when we made our final recommendations, we just didn't feel we were in a position to have enough information to make it a recommendation and to be able to live with what we considered the need to have a project that's going to be built next year, shall we say without detail and our process, I think, is critical. What the Selectmen will do or the School District will do with it from that point forward, is entirely their prerogative, just like, for instance, the Planning Board has the right to modify this tonight. We don't have any authority, we are just making our recommendations, we're trying to follow the path that we have been given and the charge and this is where the difficult decision comes into play. They have that right to modify it and if they chose to do so, the world isn't going to end. We'll come back to our cycle next year, like this year and we'll take a look at what's been done in terms of approval of CIP items at the School District and the Town and we'll modify whatever we need to, to make it happen. Part of the process is, in my mind, to try to do the best you can with the information you have available and I just didn't see us as a Committee to be able to make a recommendation to accept that for this year. We still said, let's put it on the schedule, let's let it run for the following year when that can be defined. We haven't said no, we're just not recommending it in the year in which it's been requested for those reasons. That can certainly be changed. Ed Touhey – I think the CIP group has certainly pointed out that this may be premature with the Police Station that you may not have the specifics that you feel you're comfortable with. Certainly, John has had plenty of experience in law enforcement and points out the example given here for the holding of a juvenile, but I would like to ask John, the deficiencies that you see here that could potentially put the Town in a libelous position, could they be rectified for a short-term basis, for example, instead of securing a prisoner to that back wall, secure a prisoner to this wall where this is not glass? One other thing, what other modifications might be able to be made to this facility to buy us one year?. Bayard – Could I have some of it more directed through the Board if you would. Maybe we could stay with the Police for the moment and then Pam did have a couple of questions, I'd like hers answered also. Granfield – I only gave one example. Let me start right off by saying you have an excellent and I say this with experience again, excellent Police Department. I think they are doing everything they can with this facility. I took the liberty to make sure I had a tour of it before I spoke over the last several weeks and they have done a couple of things. They have tried to put in a sliding gate and again if you do

get sued, that helps, you say what you've done with what you've got, but the problem is there are so many, in trying not to take too much time. I didn't want to make it look like a litany or that I was trying to go overboard. Just to give you an example what can't be fixed. No one now has their cruisers parked with any security. They are out back here with no security. That's not something you can fix that easy without expending again quite a bit of money if you're going to put a security fence around it and that. The officer's POV's are exposed. Again, things happen with this. At a place I was involved in an individual came because he had gotten a ticket and he put gas rags into the filler next to cruisers, lit them and we lost five cruisers in one night. That's not to say somebody couldn't climb a fence or couldn't do something, but again you try your best to do that. Additionally, the officer's POV's, it's not unheard of, someone gets a ticket, they know where all this is, it doesn't take anything from down here, you see how dark it is when you go out here, slice tires and do things and one of the things that I found with officers, you have excellent officer quality here. We pay about the same as every other jurisdiction like us in the area. A lot of things that bring officers to a place when the money is about the same are the work environments. You have a good work environment here at the Town, the Chief and that, but then they look at other things and those are the kind of things that could change good officer's minds about where they want to be so that's why I say this urgency level is ratcheted up and I think it's important that we understand this and I think the \$186,000 or whatever that it would cost by bringing this forward is just a very, very small amount of money to pay to reduce sooner a level, even if something happens in the interim, you can say we've already got this voted and I've seen this happen and this is going to happen on this timetable. That will also reduce your liability, so I think it's really critical and I just want to answer Peter one thing, you know I don't fault you for what your recommendation is, you know as you went along there's a time thing, what I'm saying is there's more information now that I think changes it to where this Board could do something that you didn't have the ability to recommend so I want to be sure, does that answer your question? Brothers – A little bit of response to that. We had much of the same conversation that you're having right now picking up on Mr. Touhey's comments. We asked exactly the same questions. What could be done in the interim from the point that's identified as critical to when it actually gets built to mitigate some of those liability issues similar to those deficiencies and so our discussion was not in a vacuum by any means? Part of the dialogue that we had is we have the project sponsors and the Town Manager come in and present to us and it's a dialogue and we had those very conversations to see what we could do to mitigate them or at least substantially reduce them between now and when that project is completed. It was not done in a vacuum, it was done asking those questions and I think that any point regardless of where we go tonight, my understanding is that some immediate steps had been taken to adjust and work towards some of those deficiencies within the facility we have and that's part of the solution as well. Bliss – My part is to the process. Yes, there may have been some

information come up as we've all gone through this process, there is a deadline for that information and I don't think we as a Board should step over that deadline. What's going to happen next year and I'm not saying this isn't an important issue and it is an emergency, but I think we need to draw the line. They have been able to talk about it all summer. I was on that Committee for 3 or 4 years, I think we need to stick with the deadline knowing that it is going to the Selectmen and it's going through the next set of cycles and the budget cycles and leave it at that. Bayard – The other thing I would like to make a couple of comments on as far as the auditorium, yes it was discussed at length about the Summer Theatre and other issues were brought up also, but I think the Summer Theatre in particular was discussed. They are going to talk with them some. There is some concern about how much we could ask from them and still be competitive. There are other facilities in the area that would love to have the Summer Theatre at their facility so... Edgar – One thing that the Superintendent and Jack Carty, after a lot of discussion about the Summer Theatre and looking at their structure in terms of what they pay and things like that, is that first and foremost it's a community facility and I think making a case that the needs are not necessarily being driven by the Summer Theatre, that there are needs for this facility in the context of this being a school facility first and community facility second. As we chased that tail, we were reminded by the school as they view them are present regardless of the Summer Theatre and not being driven by the Summer Theatre. Bayard – And I will add one comment about the conservation of open space and this perhaps more my opinion on this to some extent than each individual member. It was something we looked at. There were some questions about what would be the appropriate level. I think obviously there's a very strong case that could be made that it's in the Town Master Plan and there's a concern about it, it's not like the Police Department, it is a need. I kind of come down and this is somewhat a change of point of view that we get an awful good value for our money from this. We've done very well. When you step beyond what you absolutely have to need, snowplow, police, fire, the things that you go beyond that and it's like for yourself when the things that you do beyond food and shelter. You want to make sure you get value for what you're getting and I really do think that we have gotten value. I think that for conservation, \$75,000 is not going to buy big parcels of conservation, but what it will buy you is people that offer easements and things of that nature, this helps to pay for their survey work, some of the legal work, easement work. Sometimes there are fairly large tracts of land and that is something I really don't think the landowner that's offering this property should have to pay a whole lot of money to offer something for free to the Town. Yes, I think it is a very, as far as the exact level, I think it is something people are going to question because it is not in the category of absolute need. That's just my own opinion on that. Frank Michel – I just have a couple of quick comments. I've been on the CIP for a couple years and to sort of kind of counter balance what John's said and I think he was passionate in what he said, but if this gets approved at Town Meeting before the Police have their cars secure or the

juveniles in the right holding cell, it's still 18 months to 2 years so as the Selectmen, we asked Kevin Morrow, the Chief, to come up with an interim plan and I'm not going to come up with this phrase, but John Edgar pointed out quite a while that we still have to manage our risks notwithstanding where we are today. So regardless of when this gets approved, we still have to have an interim plan that plugs up every hole that you've alluded to and we've said you need trailers. Let's stop the Court today and make this an office and holding cells. We brainstormed because it's critical to cover the Town with respect to liability so with that said, we need to continue to move forward but at the same time manage our risks as we do so. My constructive criticism of the CIP process this year and it's been said, even today Chairman Brothers, who puts in countless hours with John and Brenda and is really the engine that runs the whole program, where I personally and humbly believe we went off the path was when we started to micro manage. He just said tonight, we didn't have enough detail on what it looked like, there were not enough specifics and what I'm afraid is we wandered off the path, and we started to become a design review, a critical think tank on what the Town needs instead of plugging in 2 million dollars and saying will it work? We did it the last year with respect to the Community Center. I think there's been a timely Project ID for 2 million for a year and a half so the Police Station has touched the bases that it should have and quite frankly, it's a hot potato and this Selectman does not know whether to go forward this year or next year and that's the wisdom of the elected officials. Where I come down on this is, quite frankly, I think it has to be looked at in the context of a total picture and I am a CIP voting member and I chose to, and on several occasions I was chastised for it, abstaining, because why vote for something this year or that year and when it's ultimately going to end up on our three laps so I just hope that the Committee takes a step back and this is the CIP at this point. We don't pick out the color of fire trucks, we don't ask Mike Faller for his equipment what he's buying, we don't ask the school how many computers they are getting or what brand their getting and all of a sudden when it's a Police Station, we want to know what it looks like, where it is, how big it is and I think we've wandered off the path so with that said, that's a constructive criticism and I think quite frankly that as a Selectman with the ultimate responsibility to bring it forth, I need to look at it in the total context of the budget because and I was sharing it with John and Bob at the Selectmen's meeting last night that I just walked through an 18,000 sq. ft. building that the paint isn't even being applied yet at the Community Center and I'm more concerned with the budget impact of maintenance and I do believe the Town has the ability to do a project in a timely fashion on budget, but I'll reserve my position on that, but I just think that this Committee wandered off the path a bit and I heard it again tonight and I heard it with this Board about the specifics of the facility and I think if you step back, it's plugging in numbers, priorities and advising the Selectmen who will then advise the Town. Miller Lovett – I would like to speak to two issues, one if the Police Station and the other one's the Water & Sewer as a priority. For the Police Station I speak as Co-Chairman of the

Space Needs Committee, a member of CIP and a member of the Police Station Committee. I think the CIP is a wonderful process and as a member of the Committee I struggled, I didn't fight, but I struggled to get the Police Station an earlier time and yet I totally respect the process, I was heard, a decision was made and it's refreshing to hear the possibility that the Planning Board will reconsider this. The second issue is the Water & Sewer Department. As I said, I was Co-Chairman of the Space Needs Committee and wrote the section on the Water & Sewer Department which was incomplete, not deliberately but it was in the report it was incomplete. Because the Committee requested of the Selectmen that the responsibility for prioritizing debt be dropped out of the charge to the Space Needs Committee and the reason we did that was that we at the time didn't have enough information. We suspected that it could become #1 if we put down lowering the problem; we suspected it might not be #1 and so we were relieved of the task of setting that as a priority. We recognize that there are a number of problems with the water system, the purification system, future requirements at the Federal and State levels about the need for a water tower and so forth. I think it was during the time of the Space Needs Committee the water system plan was initiated. I don't know whether it was in process before the Space Needs Committee or whether it grew out of the Space Needs Committee to have more information. What I want to point out is it would appear to me now the water and sewer is the highest priority from the point of view of the amount of money it's going to take over the next 5 to 10 years maybe longer to solve all the problems. I'm talking about 8-10 million dollars maybe more to solve all the problems. I think we know now that probably it is not an emergency about to happen which we thought there might be on the Space Needs Committee and the Capital Improvements Committee is making some initial setting aside of funds for the future. It's going to be big money so in that sense, it's going to be a ruling priority in the next 5 to 10 years. Of what was said here tonight, nothing contradictory, it was reflected but I think you need to see clearly how important that whole matter's going to be for the next decade. Bayard – I certainly agree with you, it's going to be expensive. There will be quite a bit of money that will have to be devoted toward water and sewer. Peter Miller, Selectman – There are a couple things I would like to comment on, first the Police Station second the recommended allocation to conservation and then third, the method by which program capacity is calculated. With regard to the Police Station, both John and Peter remind us that the Selectmen's calendar is different than that of the CIP Committee. The Selectmen will be doing their most intense project work the last three days of the month so we will have the benefit of six or seven weeks or so of information relative to the Police Station that the CIP Committee did not. Based on information that was shared with the Board quite recently, it looks to me like the picture is coming together in terms of specificity of information. That was the main hold on recommending that coming to the voters in '06. I think that obstacle is not going to be there when the Board of Selectmen takes the matter up and hypothetically speaking, it's possible that the Board will

recommend this go to the voters in '06. I'm wondering how that's going to, hypothetically speaking, how that looks when it's put in the Town Report or put in the warrant articles, the recommendations listed in the warrant article "Not Recommended by the CIP Committee", but recommended by the Selectmen. I think that's where the populous can begin to get confused so thinking this through listening to this discussion, I find myself wishing to an extent that knowing we have these discrepancies that the CIP Committee has been silent on this issue so that the voters are not going to be looking at these kinds of... I hope that you will consider that in terms of whatever decision you make on this particular issue. When it gets to the conservation allocation to the ETF, I simply like to say let's all try to be cognizant of what we appreciate about Meredith, why we're here, if you born here and raised here, why you chose to stay here. If you moved here, why we made that decision. The natural aspect of Meredith is a huge part of our quality of life. What we're trying to do with allocations to conservation funds is to preserve the most precious land bank elements of our natural environment. I personally would hate to be faced with down the road is what I see communities in Massachusetts and southern New Hampshire are experiencing, they lost their best and most precious natural land to development and they are scrambling now and they are paying more than top dollar, they are paying ridiculous amounts of money for land which by Meredith's standards has minor natural value. We here in Meredith still have the opportunity to conserve some of our best land. We can't do it as extensively as we could have 10 years ago and we know with the land market being what it is, that's what you have to do except in those various times when people give property to the Town which hasn't happened very often, probably a few times in the last 25 years. Let's hope that we're never in a situation where we have to pay exorbitant sums for poltry pieces of property because that's all that left. Let's get it done while it's still there to be had. With regard to how capacity is calculated, the Committee established a benchmark in 2003 utilizing the data available in 2003. I gather what you folks did was you looked back five years, you looked at appropriations and you looked at what had been spent on capital projects, you calculated a percentage and you applied that to what the appropriation is and that established your benchmark, right? I'll tell you what my problem is with that, it's backward looking, using historic precedents but with capital expenditures you are trying to anticipate future needs. I have a problem with using historic data to try to anticipate the future, the needs that are more or less talked into existence by \_\_\_\_\_. I would like to see and perhaps I should attend the meetings more faithfully next year. I deliberately stayed away this year because I didn't want you folks to be top heavy with Selectmen. I think there has to be a better way to calculate the capacity. Even though there was a potential to expand capacity based on where the Committee chose to stay at the previous year's level. That's something I have an issue with \_\_\_\_\_. It seems to me that if the increase in the tax base due to infrastructure is not a factor in the equation, it seems to me there's some very valuable data there because that is an index of growth and the kind

of pressure that growth creates on services, on the physical plants of the Town, the entire infrastructure, I think that somehow that has to be brought into to the formula so you've noted the tax base increased by about 30 million in the past 12 months, I'm not sure what 12-month period that is whether that's August of '04 to August of '05, by 30 million. We know that the Town didn't tweak property values this year because of the reval in progress and that 30 million essentially is in construction and that is a significant statement about what is happening in our Town, 2.3% roughly of the total tax base. Again, I strongly encourage you to rethink the formulas to somehow include that information. Growth in valuation means construction. Bayard – I would like to comment on that. We did look at it some and I think we definitely feel that we need to revisit it in the future partly because just the capital needs are exceeding the level that we're authorizing or that we're recommending using, the level we're suggesting. I think in the future when we set a level of 1 million 870 thousand, we don't anticipate, we plug that in for 10 years. We're not saying that we think that's going to stick for 10 years, we're not even sure it's going to stick for next year, but we focused a lot on, at least as far as those dollars go, that first year on somewhat how much flexibility we have in the future. I do want to point out that last year, the actual expenditures were \$1,657,165 so it is over \$200,000 more than what was in the budget last year. Percentage wise, it was a rather large increase given the needs and all, it was fully appropriate and there's some discussion obviously is whether the Police Station fits in. You guys would have to make your decisions on whether other things get moved around so I think we did look at it, I think we did bump it some, I think we're going to be looking at bumping it some more next time and I think it's partly need driven also. Edgar – I think it's a perfectly fair observation in terms of \_\_\_\_\_. We have struggled with it in the early years and when we had initially started to talk about tying into the tax base, the concern was about how the appreciation component of the tax base \_\_\_\_\_. There are reliable ways of zeroing in on growth on the formula basis and that can be well articulated and certainly have somebody look at it, but I think part of the thinking was that if you look at the historical trend in growth, the growth in our operating budget, the growth in the pressure of our schools, that reflects the increase in our road budgets, our equipment and that purple line up there on that growth is another way of reflecting indicators of growth. That purple line, all that historical data up there is another way of aggregating the effects of growth as its expressed in combined appropriations, both experienced in the school and all the operating departments so I think even though it does look back to look at some averaging, we did some averaging, then we did project it forward for the next year so it's a fair constructive criticism and I appreciate it and I think we're always looking for new ways to try to improve and refine this process. We are very enthusiastic about looking at new ways to try and establish a reasonable framework, but we did feel that by looking at the pressures on overall spending is in and of itself an indication of some of the growth pressures that we are experiencing. Brothers – Again, maybe not to belabor

the point, but to, shall we say, confirm, I've been doing this for 7 years now and every single year the capacity issue, how it should be adjusted, what might drive that takes anywhere from one meeting to a meeting and a half for us to get into sync. What's really driven this this year and recognized last year was when somebody early on released some of the preliminary information on capital needs that it was indeed a very, very difficult year and the ensuing years over the short term for the next 3-6, there was very little excess capacity available using the current formula. The historical information I think is nothing more than one way of quantifying it historically so it's dependable to some degree, it's not perfect, I haven't found a perfect one yet and we're always open to what I call good solid suggestions as to how we may do that. One of the objectives is to try to present it in a fashion that the public would not only understand, but also support and pay and personally I always felt it's critical to try to at least maintain a percentage... Our appropriations are going up, to me that's an indication of some of the growth. It's not a perfect model and I don't know where statistically that's available, but it's a way of not losing ground and having capital items not get included. It's also being sensitive that if we truly, next year or this year after identifying some of these projects, if we said the need is there and we fund it accordingly, there is going to be the financial constraint. That has to be able to be absorbed as Bill explained and has to be able to be supported so we're always looking for new ways to set that glass ceiling at a level that we can fund as much of our needs as we possibly can, both existing and anticipated but not doing that at a faster level than the public or budgets will support. It's a great comment, it's a great point and honestly as a result of this, if anybody else in the next couple weeks can come up with some ideas where we can get some information or set some boundaries and try to pursue them and be discussed next year at the CIP. Edgar – Another way of looking at that data to reinforce the concern, there was a lot of discussion, Miller brought up to the table a lot of observations that would suggest that we're playing so much catch up just to allow us to address the capital needs. Another point of view would be if there's no constraint and we just put it all out there, it may not be fiscally irresponsible in terms of the impacts Pam's eluded and if that be the case, how reasonable is the tool. Is it a tool for you or just a glorified wish list so the notion of constraint is really not a literal constraint, but it's to get these recommendations in some kind of a ballpark, that is something we can work with so we don't come in asking, looking at 5 million and knowing there's no chance that would ever happen. That would be unrealistic and if we came in with half a million, that wouldn't even cover the debt service. So there's got to be a way to establish a framework. But if it wasn't constrained and if it didn't have some umbrella to it, I think we would really lose an awful of its value as a meaningful tool for you guys. If you look at that purple line, 7.9% of annual average growth in appropriations, the green bar there, the capital improvement costs, if you take that as a percent of total, the operative costs go up but if we hold fairly constant at a million eight or a million six whatever the case may be, the CIP as a percent of total goes down as your gross



appropriations are going up and so as we continue to grow as a community, at least it's reflected in line with appropriations. Peter Miller – I appreciate the thoughts. One of the reasons that I'm suggesting that the growth in value and valuation due to new construction is that that is true growth of the tax base as opposed to increases with tax base that might begin to see revaluation of existing properties and as new construction swells the tax base, it spreads the burden of cost of capital expenditures over a broader base. If you were and I know you don't, but to make a point, if your current capacity is fixed and didn't change, then we have a tax base that was expanding pretty significantly, then the cost per hundred thousand of taxpayers property value would diminish, it wouldn't hold steady so by factoring this in, it gives you another way of holding steady. I'm sure that there's a way it can be done, but again I do have some issue with using an historic precedent because you can get an acceleration and I think we've seen it in Meredith in the past 18 or so months and makes the historic precedent less meaningful. Of course, we don't know what the next 18 months is going to bring, whether the past 18 months is a good predictor of that, but again we're trying to anticipate growth, we're trying to anticipate the budgets of growth and I think that in the evolution of a small town like Meredith, growth reaches a critical mass and the infrastructure is outmoded, the physical plant is outmoded, we don't have sufficient staff, but then we need a different way of figuring capital expenditures. Whether or not they're realities is a matter of debate, that's another subject. Bayard – I think that's definitely something we need to look at in the future. If there are any issues, Frank do you have an issue on this because I would like move toward a motion. Michel – Just a quick comment on what Peter said because having been part of the committee, there is no perfect model because if you take a cabin on Pinnacle Park Road and knock it down which is one house and rebuild it with a mcmansion that technically is new growth, net gain zero so whatever theory you come up with, it has to be the gut instinct, you have to factor it all in and the beauty of this Peter, fortunately or unfortunately, is that this is an advisory tool that they present to us. None of this is cast in stone and I think that one of your best comments tonight and you have many, was the fact that it wasn't technically recommended by, it was approved but not this year and that sends a mixed message quite frankly between the CIP and your theory on the calendars aren't always in sync is another very valid point, but so you just can't go on new construction. What is new construction, it's replacing old with new. A majority of the time there's a real balance so you just have to take it all into perspective and wish everyone luck. Bayard – I think we've covered most of the questions on the report itself and some of the issues on how it was dealt, how to deal with the future and that and I would like to bring it back to the Board for any further discussion or a motion. Granfield – Mr. Chairman, a comment and then a motion. I think we've had a good dialogue tonight. I think it's done exactly what it should, we had an excellent report and then we were able to get different opinions from our Selectmen and our public and ourselves and I think we're obligated to put that all together. I don't think the timeframe is that we either accept the report or

reject the report because of any timeframe; I think we're here today and that's why a Board sits and has a public hearing so they can get more than just the Committee's report. That being said, I'd like to make a motion THAT WE ACCEPT THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT TO PASS ON TO THE SELECTMEN WITH ONE AMENDMENT AND THAT IS THAT THE RECOMMENDATION FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BE PLACED AT 2006 INSTEAD OF 2007. Motion seconded by Flanders.

Bliss – I would personally rather see us just try to amend the motion to put the motion to add the amend first and see if that goes and see what happens with that before we do the whole Capital Improvement Plan. Flanders – That's how you have to do it by Parliamentary Procedure. The first vote is only going to be on the amendment. Bliss – That wasn't the way I understood the motion. Bayard – Is that the way you would like to have it? Granfield – I was just trying to do it the right way so let me do it the right way. I thought it sounded pretty good. Bayard – If we deny it, it kind of... Granfield – But I thought you could then have a motion to, but I don't want it denied, you're missing the point. So you want a motion to amend before we accept so let me get this right here.

Granfield – I WOULD MAKE A MOTION TO AMEND THE REPORT TO CHANGE THE POLICE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION FROM 2007 TO 2006. Flanders seconded.

Flanders – I think this is very appropriate. If you look back at history when we went forward with the Community Center, the CIP, we didn't have as much information on that as we've got now and they didn't make a recommendation, they didn't support it or recommend that it be postponed. We're going to have all the information in place and firm bid numbers before Town meeting ever happens. The Committee is on track to go into an informational mode that will make this information readily available to the public. To have this come forward on the warrant and have it not recommended by the CIP I think is detrimental to the potential that it will pass although I think there's very broad based public support for the Police Department. In other communities, when they bring a prisoner into the parking lot and take him out of the back of the car, they drive into a \_\_\_\_\_ port, the officer gets out of his car, he takes his weapon and puts it in a secure safe and then he opens the back door and gets the guy out of the car and brings him into a secure area for booking. None of those facilities exist here and it creates a tremendous liability. This Department right now is about 3,300 sq. ft. and we need about 9,100 sq. ft. Now postponing another year is going to add to the cost because of inflation and it's going to put people and our officers at risk for a longer period of time than is necessary and for all those reasons I think that we should move forward in the year 2006. Bliss – Just a quick follow-up, I don't think we as a Board should make a recommendation just to agree with another Board to get something passed through Town Meeting. I think the CIP spent a lot of time

and we may need certain things, we've heard the comments from Mr. Michel as far as the Town does seem to be working with what they have now and I really feel we should wait another year until there's more information. Bayard – I don't think I can support the motion. I think we had problems with the Community Center and it was partly because it hadn't really gone through the process well and I think we had even a little more definition of that at the time when we made that decision. Will there be enough definition for the Selectmen at that point to make a decision, perhaps so, and I mean they also have the benefit of making political and a more larger budget picture decision. I don't think we had dollars or really a defined project to say anything and I don't think I can support the motion, but on the other hand, I would understand if the Selectmen chose not to go forward with our recommendation and perhaps push it forward one year. Touhey – I would just like to point out that it would appear that if we kept this schedule, Mr. Chairman, for the bond issues that we're going to be going to the Town for a bond issue of two million dollars in 2007 and then the following year, going to the Town for a bond issue of 1.5 million dollars in 2008. That's a double whammy, where if the Police Department project were to be moved up as the amendment suggests, we would at least have one year without a major bond issue. Do I understand that correctly? I would assume that the Police bond issue would then be voted in 2006. There would be no major bond issue in 2007 and the Fire Department bond issue would be in 2008. Edgar – We would have some utility bonding coming up. Touhey – That's in there anyway. Edgar – Your observation, Ed, obviously if you move something to 2006 that wasn't scheduled in 2006, you are creating separation. Flanders – I would just like to reiterate the comment that we did run this on Brenda's computer at the request of the CIP Committee and it had no impact on the 2006 tax year so we're not creating a problem if we do this. Edgar – The question is you would be picking up the debt in '07. Flanders – The other thing too is anyone that's at all close to the construction trades; inflation of materials has been horrendous especially since the hurricanes and so forth. PVC pipe which there's a ton of conduit in these buildings has over doubled in price since Katrina so the longer we wait, it's a 2 million dollar project this year, you wait until next year, it may be a 2.4 or 2.5 million dollar project. Bliss - Can we call the question please? I would like to vote. The vote was a tie. The motion does not carry, it's as if you didn't vote. You're starting fresh.

Finer – MR. CHAIRMAN, I MAKE A MOTION WE APPROVE THE CIP PROGRAM 2005 RECOMMENDATIONS AS PRESENTED TO US TONIGHT. Bliss seconded. The vote was a tie. The motion does not carry.

Bayard – As a compromise, I would recommend that we, seeing that I would like to see something passed tonight, I would like to see a motion to the effect that we do something similar to what we did with the Community Center that we do not make a particular recommendation as to the specific year but that we do recommend that the Police Station go forward within the next couple of

years at least. Finer – I made my motion initially based on the fact that Town Meeting has a history of overriding what anybody recommends and that we should support our committee for what we've asked them to do because the Selectmen can change it, the Town can override the Selectmen any time they want to, they've proven that time and time again and I think if we're going to ask a Committee to do something and they come back to us with it, we should support them on that. Bayard – I'm in full agreement with you, but apparently half the Board is not and unless someone wants to change their mind, I would suggest that we look for a compromise on this issue.

Granfield moved, MR. CHAIRMAN, AS FAR AS THE POLICE DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION GOES, THAT WE DO NOT SUGGEST ONE OR THE OTHER YEARS, WE SAY IN 2006 OR 2007 AS THE INFORMATION MAY DIRECT THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN AT THE TIME OF THEIR DECISION. Touhey seconded. Voted 6-0 in favor.

Bliss – I have a question as far as clarification. I don't really understand what you're saying. You're saying the same thing; you're just putting years in there. Granfield – Both years, 2006 or 2007, both years are in there in my motion so there's no firm commitment to either year which sort of balances our vote. Bliss – Mr. Chairman, if I could ask that because the CIP has done so much work to it, I would like Mr. Brothers input on that. He was at the meeting and he knows... Brothers – I've got to be honest with you, this is probably the first opportunity we've had for this kind of dialogue. I've respected everything that's been said both by myself and by others. There have been good key points. I don't think there's any easy way out of this and I'm not going to, shall we say, partake in that part of the circus. But I think a couple things have been valid, I think we tried it one way, we tried it the other so what remains I think is to either accept it or reject it and then allow the Selectmen, the School District and the others who have the ultimate responsibility to make that decision. I think what we're trying to do is to get an answer to make it easier for the Selectmen and I'm not sure they are really asking for that either. The endorsement by the CIP I think in the past has been easier because the needs have been fairly clear and there's been enough capacity to do it. We are faced with basically the first time around where there are some difficult choices to be made, but I find what's interesting is we have individuals who are both going to make the ultimate decision, people who have been on those other committees and then there are some of you that haven't had the benefit of getting the conversation one way or the other and you are being asked to vote. That I can't make any easier for you than what's there. We'll live with the results just like the Selectmen and the School District will live with the results and make their decision when it's appropriate. I can't make it any easier for you. Bayard – I think I'm going to allow Butch to make a comment since he hasn't said anything yet. Butch Keniston – Just a quick comment, with all the work and effort that goes into a Capital Improvements Program, I just would hate to see the Planning Board

reject the findings of this Committee. We've heard some discussion about the public's perception of whether something is endorsed or whether it's recommended by this Board or that Board and how it fits into what goes on at Town Meeting and with warrant articles and such things. To me, to have spent that kind of time and effort and have the Planning Board flatly reject the report would just be a shame. Finer – There was discussion earlier this evening did we want to have stuff recommended by the Selectmen and recommended by the CIP. I don't think that's really a requirement for Town Meeting. If it results in good dialogue like this at Town meeting, that's not a bad thing. It may make it run a little longer, but there will be a lot of open discussion on it and I don't think that's a bad thing and I think we should make a decision and I would like to see us approve it as presented. Flanders – I think it might be clearer if the motion was something like we recognize that the Police Department is a high priority and if more information is available for the Board of Selectmen, we would support it in either year. Something along that line because I think that's accurate. The CIP Committee recognized there was high priority so doing it that way, I mean, my main source of indigestion is this is the first time that the CIP has gotten into micro-managing in my opinion. When Mike Faller comes in for a road grader, we don't ask him how many horsepower it's got, how wide the \_\_\_\_\_ board is, what color it is and... Bayard – Bob, we've been through that and I can respond to that and we could be here all night. I think I'd like to stick to the particular motion we have there unless it's suggested to be changed. Granfield – Just before we vote to make sure it's the same as my motion, what I was trying to do is recognize the split Board here and put the two years in and just say it can go in either year based upon further information that the Board may get. That's all I was trying to do. Edgar – What we could do to clarify the record if you will is add an element to the narrative that explains tonight's procedures. Effectively, that there was inability to develop a consensus on '07 or '06 and as a result of that the Board, should you go that way, voted relative to that recognizing there is a consensus that it's a high priority project, however, given the lack of consensus on the year, the Board voted not to recommend a particular year subject to the Selectmen reviewing more information as it becomes available so at least the record's clear that (1) it is considered a high priority project, and (2) that there was not a consensus among the Planning Board as to '06 or '07 and for that reason it is not given a specific year for recommendation in the plan. At least the clarity of the intent of this vote, I think is important because you're not going to see that, just a spreadsheet with a bunch of zeros. Bliss – And I do think that will also be reflected in the minutes because that has been mentioned here a bunch of times that we're going to accept it as it is and then it's going to the Selectmen. Just like a couple years ago when the Community Center was on line and we had done one thing as a CIP Committee and when it went to the Selectmen, they bumped it up into the next mode, so I really think we're spending a lot of time on something's that very important, but it's holding the whole process down. Touhey – I just want to say that this is fantastic work that's done by the CIP and we just have a

difference of opinion of a year in the entire report and I appreciate all the time, effort and work that's gone into it and I'm thankful that we can come up with a motion that I can support and at least put forth the feeling of urgency on the part of perhaps half the committee here that the Police Station is an extreme priority. Bayard, with that compliment, I would like to close this and see if we can take a vote.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE ACCEPT THE CIP WITH THE AMENDMENT. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

**CONVEX, LLC (WINNISQUAM HEIGHTS)** – Continuation of a Public Hearing held on October 25, 2005, for a proposed Minor Subdivision of Tax Map R29, Lot 2D, into three (3) lots (3.6 ac., 8.36 ac. and 9.58 ac.) located on Batchelder Hill Road in the Forestry/Rural District.

We presented this to the Board previously so I'll forego a lot of the details about the lot sizes and density. The areas of prime concern by the Board last time were the length of the driveways, the widths and the grade. Since that time, I revised the plans slightly. Lot 1 is being serviced by a driveway that comes off Batchelder Hill Road and is entirely on its own lot. Lot 2 and Lot 3 are serviced by a common driveway which enters off Batchelder Hill Road comes up to a fork in the driveway, the access to Lot 2 goes off to the right, the access to Lot 3 comes up to the left. We were asked to provide some rudimentary information of the grades and what happened was Mr. Jackson went out; he physically located the driveways in the field. We went out and mapped the driveways and did some grade information and produced these two grades, they are slightly different scale so we can't compare them, and essentially we moved the intersection of the driveway down to here and the driveway access for Lot 3 goes up like that and the access for 2 goes here. Subsequent to that last meeting, we had a meeting with Chief Palm. John Edgar and myself went over some details about the driveways. The Town of Meredith does not have an ordinance that deals with driveways. If you pull a driveway permit from the Town of Meredith, the DPW looks at the intersection at the road, has some comments about paving the aprons, drainage things, how the roadway comes in at an angle, but basically from there on, you're on you own. If you want to build a steep driveway, you can build a steep driveway. The Town's trying to get a handle and may come up with some recommendations for some changes to the Subdivision Regulations or Zoning Ordinance dealing with lengths of driveways and steepness of driveways. So we had this discussion with Chief Palm and what it basically comes down to in his mind, there are three components to his concerns. One of which is the width and stability of the driveway if you're driving an emergency vehicle. The second of which is an area sufficiently wide enough for an emergency vehicle to pull off the side of the road so another emergency vehicle can get by and can piggyback their hose system. They can go maybe 800 feet with a hose and they would like to be able to piggyback those if they can. Chief Palm

looked down at the plan that we have here and we basically went over some of the information that I had constructed and he said that he would recommend that there be a turnout just beyond the intersection of the two driveways that would be sufficiently large enough for emergency vehicles to pull to the side so that adapted as a component to the plan, we are going to have a plan note that says construct turnout for emergency vehicles. The other component was a turnaround at the end of each driveway so when the vehicles got up in there, you could turn it around and essentially what that amounts to is a hammerhead turnaround. You can turn an emergency vehicle around in a hammerhead turnaround in this configuration quite easily and both times that you get up to the house sites, you're on very flat terrain so we've shown the note and we've shown a turnaround at each terminus of the driveway to construct a hammerhead turnaround for emergency vehicles and utility vehicles, such as gas trucks, propane trucks that may have to go up to these houses so that provides that stability. The typical driveway cross section here shows the driveway 11 feet wide with 2 foot shoulders which is called 15 feet wide and that buildable box, the whole 15 feet has to be stable enough to drive a vehicle on. In other words, you don't construct 11 feet stable and then the 2 foot shoulders going out off the edge so it's a 15 foot drivable surface. The grades that are in excess of 15% would be paved. Less than that is up to the owner to decide whether they want to pave it. You can see here that I've shown, I'm not the engineer I'm not allowed to show much specific detail and cross sectioning and all that jazz, but we went out and we took a base of the intersection of the driveway here and we ran a traverse off and located both driveways and took some grade information so we start at the intersection as a base of "0" and just show the increments of 10' over here, they go up 10' and then they go across 100' and you can see that the driveway that's going up to Lot 2 and is the steeper of the two and approximately in its worst case which is about 150' from the intersection to about 500 feet would be about 18%. That would be a section that would have to be paved because it's in excess of 15%. The other point which is here, the first 100 feet or so is pretty flat and then it goes and you can stick a line in there and it's approximately about 15% grade at its worst so that would not be what one would consider to be an exorbitant steep driveway. One of the things that happens in here when you look at the contours, there are some subtleties that don't show up on 5 foot contours, for instance, when there's logging roads that have been constructed in there, you can use the existing pocket that the logging road goes up until it turns and we've done that in a couple of instances. The turning radiuses, minimum centerline radius is 50 feet, that's kind of a gentle turn, you don't get these wild hairpin turns going in. That was another criteria that was identified by Chief Palm. The other criteria of importance to him is a drivable width of 13' 6" vertical clearance. We tend to just think of the box that we drive our cars in, emergency vehicles are quite a bit higher so there can't be any overhanging branches so that would be another area that would have to be taken into consideration in constructing the driveway. The Chief would actually have to sign off on the final

specifications for three of the items, one of which would be the structural box. Mr. Jackson contacted another engineer that he has work for him who came up with this 8" bank with 6" crushed as a box that would be supportive of the types of vehicles Chief Palm was talking about. (4) Is the vertical clearance, making sure there are no overhanging branches and (5) is the turnout platform provided where the common drives intersect so he would sign off on those items as being the items that were the most critical to him in terms of the driveways so I believe we've met the criteria since the Town really doesn't have an ordinance, we've sort of come up with this interim plan to meet with the Chief to go over his concerns and try to show a little bit of additional information as to what we're talking about here, keeping in mind that it is self controlling to some extent since you're not going to build a driveway in the steepest place to get to where you want to go because you're ultimately going to have to sell this lot to somebody and you want to make sure the driveway isn't so frightening that they are not going to drive up there. When you get out there and walk around, neither one of these driveways is what would be considered to be Pinnacle Parkish in nature. They certainly don't pose any type a threat and it does alleviate the concerns of the Chief and that was primarily the Board's concern the last time we were in. One other thing that came up was there was a communication from Mike Faller and Mike Faller is recommending as you can see in the Staff Review that the owner be required to pave the entire frontage of his property on Batchelder Hill Road to the tune of about \$9,000 and that's an item that from the development perspective here, we're really asking for two extra lots. We have an existing lot of record that we would pull a permit and build a house and so we're really increasing the number of lots on the road by two not by three because we already have one so to request that the owner contribute \$9,000 worth of pavement to Batchelder Hill Road for this particular stretch here seems in our minds a bit exorbitant in terms of the amount of traffic trips per day that this simple subdivision is adding. If the Board should have any questions about that, I know John has a little bit more information on that than I do. That's pretty much our update to where we stood. We believe we've met all of the concerns that the Board had and the concerns that the Chief had. He's happy with the situation. Edgar – Just to review some of the other standard conditions of a project like this. We have DES approval for the wetlands crossing is required. The ZBA approval and DES approval should be referenced on the final plan. We typically like to see the electrical service being shown where it's coming off the road and onto the property. In this particular case, there is a likelihood it will run along the driveway locations and possibly on the properties and I would like to try to anticipate that on the plan. As indicated, Mike has viewed the two driveway locations for permitting requirements. These driveway permits are required to be cross-referenced on the final plan. Lots 2 and 3 are subject to a common driveway. The plan should reflect the easement requirement and draft deeds should be submitted for staff review just to see that there's language in anticipation of shared maintenance responsibilities. With respect to the road, Mike is concerned



about the traffic that is experienced on Batchelder Hill Road which is a gravel road. Using a trip generation rate of 10 trips per day from these total lots and as Carl has correctly indicated, we are anticipating a net gain of two over and above what could be accomplished without a public hearing. We are respectively looking at 20 to 30 trips per day, which is associated with typical single-family development. Mike felt that would just compound the difficulties he experiences from a maintenance point of view on Batchelder Hill Road. Mike has recommended the applicant be required to pave approximately 600' of frontage, which is basically the frontage of the subdivision. Mike's estimate for 2" binder pavement 22' wide with paved aprons is \$9,000.00. Mike has indicated that the Town would grade and prep the road at no additional cost. I noted for the Board's attention two things: one is that the lower portion of Batchelder Hill Road towards Lake Winnisquam was recently paved in 2002 or 2003 vis-à-vis a grant with the Department of Environmental Services. Additional gravel and paving of Batchelder Hill Road for a distance of 5,175' has been recommended in the CIP for the year 2008 to the tune of \$250,000. I can appreciate where Mike's trying to go and that is obviously anticipating some level of impact from this project to try and have the developer pay some share of paving the road. The thing to be cautious about in this particular area is the fact that requiring developers to contribute funds is an exaction. We're basically taking the money out of somebody's pocket and we've got to be careful on how we do it. If there are safety concerns that's a little bit different ballgame and the portionality of what you're requiring someone to pay versus what the Town of Meredith might pay is a little less critical. You are not obligated to send more traffic into a hazardous intersection. In a case like this, where you're talking about trying to address longer term maintenance costs, it's not as clear as if you had a safety issue. The general rule of thumb in an exaction situation is that what you are pulling out of somebody's pocket has to be what the lawyers would refer to as a rational nexus test and that is there has to be an appropriate relationship and balance between the need that's being created by the subdivision, the need for the pavement in relationship to what benefit their deriving from it. There needs to be some kind of relationship between the need and benefit that's proportionate. The difficulty in a case like this is that we just have an unquantified level of background that is contributing to the need to pave the road. So what is this project's proportionate share of traffic impact to the road is a difficult thing to attempt to quantify. If this was entry level and we were dealing with a real big project where this stuff gets studied, in this case we don't have that kind of background information to look at how this project proportionately relates to all the other traffic. It's very difficult at my level to try to determine what, if any, is an appropriate contribution toward the paving of the road. Bayard – It said there was a pavement improvement, how far is it to that, just a ballpark figure. Edgar – A few hundred feet. Bayard – So we'd have paved, unpaved, and then paved. Flanders – My question was similar, I wanted to know how close the pavement got to this project. If we're going to end up with a paved section and then a gap and then pavement, that kind of flies in the face of common

sense to some degree in my opinion. There's no question that the number of trips is going to cause additional maintenance on that dirt portion, but we're asking him to pay for paving all his frontage, there's going to be a gap between that and the pavement to begin with, it seems like that's a little overboard. I think something somewhere in the middle might be more appropriate. Edgar – The only project that we even come close is a slightly larger project over on Collins Brook Road. The developer contributed to the upgrade along the frontage largely a function of visibility and safety. Johnson – Keep in mind, the Board would be increasing by 67% the amount of taxable revenue on this property. Bayard – From the looks of it, we don't have a sight line problem, I mean you don't extend the road out forever. I am not familiar with the quality of the road out there, obviously it's not in pristine shape or we wouldn't be paving it. Edgar – In the scheme of roads out in Chemung, this is brand new. This was built in the 80's and it's plenty wide. The sense is that the road is doing what it was intended to do and that is to provide a connector between Black Brook Road, i.e., Winnisquam and everything to the West of right there and so people are using the road for its intended purpose. The difficulty is it's gravel and with the kind of volume we're experiencing, the travel speeds, we just have a lot of that washboarding so it's a constant problem for the DPW to maintain a higher speed, higher volume gravel road and so the Department has recommended and we have now endorsed it as a road project for 2008. Certainly, the hot topping will pick up the speed, but it will certainly lessen some of the ongoing maintenance issues. Finer - If I lived out there, I wouldn't be making 10 trips a day, I don't see this adding that many. I would plan my trips into Town and do it once or twice. Johnson – The issue has come up on another project that is coming up on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November. The 10 trips per day is the national average and that's taking into consideration Chemung and Los Angeles. I live up on Highland which is much closer to Town and I don't make 10 trips a day. As we move away from urban areas, traffic trips per day generally decrease. Bayard – I appreciate his thought on it and I think it's probably appropriate in some cases and I certainly don't want to set a precedent saying that we never going to do this again because it's only two additional lots, but I think in this specific case, I don't see the need for it. Bliss – As we move on, did we hear all of John's comments. Edgar – With respect to items 1-8 on Page 75 are as Carl indicated that was the outgrowth of the last Planning Board meeting and our meeting with the Fire Chief. It is very fair to say that the Chief was very happy with this response on the part of the applicant. One maximum grade that we had done a quick check call was 27% we're down to 15-16%. They have defined a location and are definitely showing a willingness to work out these issues to our satisfaction. Bliss - Hearing closed at 10:00 p.m.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, THAT WE APPROVE A PROPOSED MINOR SUBDIVISION FOR CONVEX, LLC, ON TAX MAP R29, LOT 2D, INTO THREE (3) LOTS (3.6 AC., 8.36 AC., AND 9.58 AC.) LOCATED ON BATCHELDER HILL ROAD IN THE FORESTRY/RURAL DISTRICT WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- (1) A NHDES APPROVAL IS REQUIRED FOR THE WETLAND CROSSING AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS, AS WELL AS THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION GRANTED BY THE ZBA.
- (2) FINAL PLANS SHALL SHOW WHERE THE ELECTRICITY, CABLE AND TELEPHONE UTILITIES WILL BE ACCESSED FROM AND ANY POSSIBLE ON-SITE EASEMENTS AS APPLICABLE.
- (3) DPW DRIVEWAY PERMITS ARE REQUIRED AND SHALL BE CROSS-REFERENCED ON FINAL PLANS.
- (4) LOTS 2 AND 3 ARE SUBJECT TO A COMMON DRIVEWAY, PLANS SHALL REFLECT EASEMENT LOCATION. DRAFT DEEDS SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF REVIEW.
- (5) A DRIVEWAY TYPICAL CROSS SECTION WILL BE PROVIDED INDICATING A 11' TRAVEL LANE WITH 2' SHOULDERS.
- (6) THE STRUCTURAL BOX OF THE DRIVEWAY WILL EXTEND THRU THE SHOULDERS. APPLICANT'S ENGINEER WILL RECOMMEND A BOX THAT WILL HAVE SUFFICIENT INTEGRITY TO SUPPORT THE REQUIRED WEIGHT LOAD FOR EMERGENCY RESPONSE EQUIPMENT AND THE BOX WILL BE INDICATED IN THE TYPICAL CROSS SECTION.
- (7) A 50' MINIMUM RADIUS CURVE HAS BEEN INCORPORATED IN THE REVISED DRIVEWAY ALIGNMENT AS INDICATED ON THE FINAL PLAN.
- (8) A VERTICAL CLEARANCE REQUIREMENT OF 13' 6" WILL BE NOTED.
- (9) A TURNOUT PLATFORM WILL BE PROVIDED WHERE THE COMMON DRIVES INTERSECT AND NOTED ON THE PLAN.
- (10) THE END OF EACH DRIVEWAY AT THE HOUSE SITE WOULD HAVE SUFFICIENT TURNAROUND CAPABILITY AND BE NOTED ON THE PLAN.
- (11) DURING CONSTRUCTION OF THE DRIVES, THE OWNER WOULD MAKE A REASONABLE ATTEMPT TO FURTHER REDUCE THE FINISHED GRADES TO 15% MAXIMUM WHERE AND IF POSSIBLE. THE FIRE CHIEF WILL SIGN OFF ON FINAL SPECIFICATIONS REGARDING NOS. 6, 8 AND 9 ABOVE.
- (12) THE PROPOSED COMMON DRIVEWAY WILL NECESSITATE AN EASEMENT ACROSS LOT 2, BENEFITING LOT 3. A DRAFT EASEMENT SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR STAFF REVIEW WITH SHARED MAINTENANCE PROVISIONS. FINAL PLANS SHALL INDICATE THE EASEMENT LOCATION.

- (13) WRITTEN EVIDENCE THAT THE CORNERS AND ANGLE POINTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE SUBDIVISION HAVE BEEN SET SHALL BE PROVIDED PRIOR TO RECORDING OF THE MYLAR.

Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

4. **MARVIN P. KENISTON d/b/a KENGAR REALTY LLC:** (Butch Keniston)

Applicant is proposing a Site Plan Amendment for a change of use from retail and storage space to two dwelling units. (1) One-bedroom first floor studio apartment and (2) a three-bedrooms second floor apartment. A density variance was granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on October 13, 2005. Existing conditions on the site will remain, no outside changes to the building are proposed. The only difference in the plan that I gave you as opposed to the ones the Board already had, there were some old notations on the plan that I had Harry remove, those being some on-street parking which doesn't exist. The original plan was drafted in 1987 so it was 18 years old. This property was rezoned to Central Business a few years ago. The parking summary on the plan is incorrect. Twenty-four (24) spaces are required, 22 are proposed. The difference is that the Community Action Program office by ordinance would normally require 7 spaces. We are representing that 5 spaces are sufficient based on the fact that they have been there 3 years and never had 5 people in the parking lot. Parking has never spilled out into the street. There are cross easements on this property for shared parking with the other building. The other building is all apartments. This building would be mixed use. This works well with the tenants for parking. The mixed uses are consistent with the objectives in the Master Plan, in that the the upper levels are used for housing. The studio apartment may be geared for a handicap person. I'm not sure that I'm going to do that yet, I haven't gotten into it entirely to find out about what the design criteria requires. If that ws to happen, two handicap spaces will be added instead of moving the one that's there. Edgar – Variance needs to be noted on the final plan. What parking goes with the other building? Edgar – What is in the other building on that parking summary that's on the wall so that we have it by lot and we can kind of zero in what's going on in this building? Keniston – The other building at 143 Main Street consists of five apartments, 4 two-bedroom and 1 one-bedroom; 9 spaces, 10 are shown on that side of the parking lot which is a floater because of the cross easements. The balance of the use is my construction office, warehouse space, which is essentially a garage bay, the CAP offices, and then the proposed apartments are a one-bedroom and a three-bedroom, waiver of two spaces. Signage information provided. Effectively the conversion of the residential use does not affect the signage. Hearing closed at 10:09 p.m.

Finer Moved, Bliss seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR A CHANGE OF USE FROM RETAIL AND STORAGE

SPACE FOR KENGAR REALTY, LLC TO TWO (2) DWELLING UNITS ON TAX MAP U06, LOT 4, LOCATED AT 147 MAIN STREET IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, CONDITIONED ON THE FINAL PLAN SHALL CROSS-REFERENCE THE ZBA VARIANCE, THAT WE GRANT A WAIVER OF TWO PARKING SPACES, AND SHOULD THE LOWER APARTMENT BECOME HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE, THE APPLICANT BE ALLOWED TO MODIFY HIS PARKING LAYOUT ACCORDINGLY AND SUBJECT TO THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

4. **BKK PARTNERSHIP:** (Butch Keniston)

Applicant proposes to construct a "reverse pitch" asphalt shingle roof on an existing storefront façade on Main Street. Architectural review modifications are being made to the front of the building. The mansard roof, which was put on the building back in the 60's had rotted out and was removed as a maintenance item. This proposal is intended to collect roof runoff and will return the building to a more "original" appearance.

Finer moved, Bliss seconded, THAT THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW FOR PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING, TAX MAP U06, LOT 40A, LOCATED AT 73 MAIN STREET IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, BE APPROVED SINCE THE APPLICANT HAS DEMONSTRATED THAT THE PROPOSED DESIGN IS IN SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

5. **RAYMOND CRAM, JR.:** (Rep. Lori Cram)

Applicants are proposing a 25' x 30' building which was approved by the Board on November 8, 2005. They are now applying for architectural review of the proposed building. The structure will be tan with hunter green trim and the building has been modified to look more like a barn. Property is in a wooded setting on a low volume road. The fuel tank and furnace will be at the back of the building. No outside lighting has been proposed on the building and no site lighting is being proposed. The driveway permit has been amended to reflect the commercial use. Hearing closed at 10:20 p.m.

Bliss moved, Finer seconded, I MOVE THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF A PROPOSED WELDING SHOP LOCATED ON JENNESS HILL ROAD IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

6. **MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC.** (Rep. Mike Pelczar)
7. **MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC.**

Applicant has submitted a site plan as an element of a NHDES and Town of Meredith approved septic plan prepared by Ames Associates. Although not a formal survey, it does appear to be more accurate than the plan of record that is on file with the Planning Department. The proposal meets all setback criteria. For these reasons, applicant has asked that the Board waive requirements to create a new site plan. Applicant proposes to construct a 32' x 48' storage building located to the rear of the existing facility on Foundry Avenue. The existing facility includes several small businesses. A new septic plan has been prepared and the leachfield is being moved to the back of the lot. Tenants are trying to expand and make more room. The proposed storage building will have metal siding and will look like a Morton building. An accessory structure is permitted in the district. The proposed storage building will be used to house and protect equipment. No floor drains are proposed. There is a motion sensor light located at the rear of the building. Wetlands have been mapped in accordance with the septic plan. Access to the building will be via the existing driveway. Hearing closed at 10:28 p.m.

Finer moved, Granfield seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT WITH RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS FOR MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC., TAX MAP S23, LOT 54, LOCATED IN THE BUSINESS & INDUSTRY DISTRICT WITH THE CONDITIONS THAT THERE BE NO FLOOR DRAINS AND THE BOARD RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REVIEW AND AMEND. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Finer moved, Touhey seconded, THAT WE APPROVE THE ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW OF A PROPOSED STORAGE BUILDING FOR MICHAEL AND JOSEPH PELCZAR d/b/a INTER-LAKES BUILDERS, INC., AS THE DESIGN DEMONSTRATES SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA SET FORTH IN THE ORDINANCE. Voted 6-0 in favor of the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Lee Harvey  
Administrative Assistant  
Planning/Zoning Department

MEREDITH PLANNING BOARD

NOVEMBER 8, 2005

The minutes were reviewed and approved at a regular meeting of the Planning Board held on \_\_\_\_\_.

---

William Bayard, Secretary