

---

---

**MEMORANDUM – OFFICE OF THE TOWN ADMINISTRATOR**

---

---

**TO:** SelectBoard  
**FROM:** Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator *Carter*  
**RE:** States Landing Road Work & Facility Planning  
**DATE:** 05/23/13  
**CC:** D. Kuethe; S. Kinmond



---

As you may know, we held the Neighborhood Work Party & Meeting on this past Saturday the 18<sup>th</sup> of May. As you can see from the attached meeting notes you now have several decisions to make relative to proceeding. In simplest terms they all boil down to now making a decision as to the future of the facility as we outlined in our FY 2013 proposal.

- **Which of the several roadway options do you wish to advise the Road Agent you desire him to follow:**
  - A. Continue on with the States Landing work stopping just east of the intersection with Castle Shores Road; or
  - B. Move the monies back to Old Route 109 stopping south of the Route 109/25 intersection. This will require neighborhood meetings. This project was dropped after the first set of budget estimates became available. The intersection redesign was also dropped awaiting a decision on what type of intersection was desired (T versus Roundabout).
- **Do we await a study of Moultonborough Bay before proceeding with dredging planning?**

We had wanted to determine what is causing the siltation and nutrient problem at States Landing and address that before undertaking a dredging program (or at least have a better sense of what its life span was). As we have briefed you, our several efforts to secure study dollars have failed. Future prospects do not look any better.

- **Are you agreeable to backfilling the DPW budget, if need be, with up to \$5k for the recommended tree removals (see state Forester & Arborist report)?**
- **Do you wish to approach Suissevale to explore possible town use and/or acquisition of their lands along States Landing as outlined in the meeting notes?**
- **How do you wish to respond to the questions about the sale of decals and private piggybacking on any dredging applications and activities?**

---

---

**MEMORANDUM – OFFICE OF THE TOWN ADMINISTRATOR**

---

---

**TO:** States Landing File  
**FROM:** Carter Terenzini, Town Administrator *Carter*  
**RE:** 05/18/13 Work Party & Neighborhood Meeting  
**DATE:** 05/21/13  
**CC:** D. Kuethe



---

We had 25+/- folks show up beginning at 9 a.m. I gave a brief greeting, all introduced themselves to their neighbors and Donna gave out work tasks. Doug Greiner, the Landscape Architect, proceeded from work group to work group conversing about each person's hopes for the site. Chief Wetherbee joined us about 10:15 a.m. and proceeded from work group to work group conversing about the police department and his approach to policing. Jon Tolman and Russ Wakefield fired up the grills and cooked lunch for all.

About 12:15p Chief W. spoke to the group about neighborhood policing, the speed data recorder that would be spotted in the area soon and how he uses the collected data in enforcement. With Scott Kinmond required to be at a prior commitment, Carter made a presentation on the road plans as follows:

Castle Shores Rd (CSR) from States Landing (SL) to Windswept.

1. Return to gravel;
2. Treat annually with magnesium chloride for dust control treatment

SL to just west of Castle Shore Road (so we can include that into park work);

1. Replacement of drainage pipes (DPW)
2. Reclaiming of asphalt (Paving Contractor)
3. Grade, Pave 21' wide (currently 24') Base & Top.
4. Gravel shoulders

Conversation with the group:

- 1.) There was universal dislike of the idea of returning CSR to gravel and little confidence in the idea that the magnesium chloride treatments would be effective in keeping the dust down; I have asked Scott to estimate paving to at least Greyhound to address the five homes closest to the road.]
- 2.) As one means of reducing speeds (See #3 Below) folks generally object to the soft turning movements at the intersection of CSR and States. They would like to see it

(returned some would tell you) to a T intersection. At a minimum they would like to see stop signs (and don't believe we can't simply install them) at a midpoint (SL) like this. [Note: If we do install them we must be prepared for many drivers simply blow through them creating an added call for enforcement).

[Note: There are three utility poles in the general area two of which we may be able to slip between otherwise we need to swing south on CSR or even relocate a pole. I suspect the geometry may also be problematic as well as the further we have to swing CSR south the more parkland we eat up but.... I suspect the trade-off to them will be worth it given #3 below.]

- 3.) There was a general disbelief expressed that reducing the roadway widths would reduce speeding and a continuing concern over the "many" walkers and bicyclists [As a person who lives in this general area and is often on SL or CSR in either model I truthfully just don't see them but that may be the time of day I am out and about];

I spoke about how this does in fact reduce speeds but they are non-believers. They believe walkers and bicyclists will still walk in the roadway. I spoke to how speed bumps do not work and why we dismissed speed humps (pointing out they could be installed in the future if the Chief's enforcement efforts did not produce results). I spoke to looking at a wider pavement in order to have a dedicated walking/cyclist lane but.... they were not believers in that either and several spoke about a separate free standing sidewalk. (Again I simply do not see all these walkers and cyclists they speak of).

- 4.) There was a suggestion that we cut "rumble" strips in the roadway at key areas (perhaps as one approached the suggested stop signs or sharper turns). Chief Wetherbee pointing out those do generate noise and sometimes complaints from residences abutting them
- 5.) There was a complaint about the mailboxes in the RoW as you first turn onto SL given folks who are effectively parked in the travel lane to collect their mail (w/a suggestion it be relocated perhaps to some Suissevale land)
- 6.) In discussing the boat trailer parking along SL and an effort to move it there was a recognition it could not simply be moved up the road (as it would most likely be objectionable to those residents as it is now to the residents across from the park). There was a suggestion we try and find (Suissevale) lands along SL to provide an off-site parking for that and boat trailers they hope will be displaced by any development of the Town's SL facility. (Exhibit A)

Carter informed the group that he had submitted three requests to the Capital Improvements committee for the boat launch (\$200k), dredging (\$200k) and an all purpose request for the park itself (\$75k) as "placeholders until more definitive numbers could be developed. He said that the results of the day's events would be presented to the BoS to determine how they wished to proceed.

Doug Greiner gave a presentation on his site review as to opportunities and constraints and then an initial concept in reaction to what he had heard from the various working groups throughout the morning (Exhibit B). The general items were a reworking of the boat launch and drainage into the lake (incorporating some of the NH Lakes work), providing a loading and off-loading dock for boaters, dredging of the swimming area to address the damage done over time by the rerouting of Shannon Brook (recognizing the dredging would have a lifespan and perhaps need to be done again) picnic areas, barbecue pits, volleyball and pathways. He said the “Dog Park” was something that was mentioned and would be worked out – if it were to remain at all – in the design work. He showed some parking (w/boat trailers) remaining along SL and a secondary area offset into the park. There was lengthy discussion of the space this took, possible relocation of some of that (see above in the roadway comments) and the need to preserve space for beach/picnic users. There was also a comment about the needs of the Taylor (????) family if boat trailers were restricted and the obligation of the Town to be in the “marina” business.

During the presentation Carter spoke about the state Forester/Arborist’s recommendation to remove 14 trees (possibly this year but it had not been planned for in the budget - \$5k+/- needed per Scott K) to be able to plant the replacement trees next spring. He also spoke to how the recommendation had been to leave many of the trees as is with them being pruned or removed as they fell. The belief was that they were in sound enough condition to do that as they would only drop/shed in storms when people would have likely vacated the area. Certain types of ground cover (low brush) had also been recommended to define areas where people should not be (as well as a recommendation to keep parking off the areas where it further compacted tree roots.)

In response to a question from Carter most folks seemed to be in agreement that Doug’s presentation was in keeping with the vision they had for revitalizing the facility. Carter wrapped up with a scheduled on when he would be presenting to the BoS and posting the material(s) from today and the presentation to the BoS on the web.

Follow-Up questions after the main group broke up:

- 1.) Would we make decals of the Town of Moultonborough seal available for sale (for use on boats and the like)?; and
- 2.) Did the rangeway on Clark’s Landing have potential as a boat launch? [Note: I did inspect it and report that the change in elevation is roughly 25 feet (from 530’ to 505’) over the 350’ length for a grade change of roughly 7.25%. That is steeper than one would like to for such a facility. While the rangeway is 50’ in width I believe the grades pose a challenge to adequate turnaround space nor is there a suitable area for any parking. In short, without acquisition of adjacent lands, I do not believe this can be made suitable for the launching of trailered boats.
- 3.) If we proceeded with dredging could an abutting property owner, at their expense, become part of the permitting and actual construction contract?

**From:** Scott Kinmond [mailto:skinmond@moultonboroughnh.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:10 AM  
**To:** 'Carter Terenzini'  
**Cc:** 'Leonard Wetherbee'; 'Ray Korber'; 'Donna Kuethe'; 'Douglas Greiner'  
**Subject:** RE: SL & CSR Road Work

Carter,

I reviewed your email last evening and I have listed my comments and options as I see them from my position:

Please know that it is my personal opinion that the BOS needs to look at the States Landing Facility as a development project, meaning that they need to develop a plan to address all concerns, starting out in the lake as the area will not or is not usable if the items in phase #1 item #1 are not corrected.

Phase #1:

1.) address sedimentation issues with Shannon Brook, dredging of the water front (Beach & Boat Ramp) 2.) redefining the beach water front, Boat Ramp, storm water run-off mitigation, 3.) parking areas for beach patrons & user, boat launch parking for vehicles and trailers, 4.) and then development of the back land green space.

Phase #2 –

1.) Castle Shores Road & States Landing intersection redesign for a “T” intersection and 2.) then proper Road layout/permitting for the Town portion of Castle Shores to be properly paved to a 18’ road width with gravel shoulders.

I see the 2013 Road Program Options as such:

Option #1: States Landing Road modified (4575’)

1. Adjust mailboxes to USPO code & Town Policy (Look to relocate)
2. Replace current drainage
3. Reclaim current pavement from Rt 109S to just northeast of Castle Shores Road.
4. Repave base and top at 21’, with gravel packed shoulders.
5. Highway Markings with single center line.

Option #2: Alternate project area- Old Rt 109 (3800’)

1. Replace current drainage
2. Reclaim current pavement from Rt 109S to Just south of the intersection of Rt 25 (Morrill Res.)
3. Repave base and top at 21’, with gravel packed shoulders
4. Highway markings – double center line

Either option will work for me, may take another neighborhood meeting for the Old 109 folks.

Let me know.

Scott

Scott D. Kinmond, Highway/Road Agent  
Director of Public Works