

FORM C

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIF

(May be filled out by CIP Committee to summarize Project Information)

A. IDENTIFICATION & CODING INFORMATION

1. Date: 4/14/2014
 2. Project Name: Recreation Dept. Building
 3. Program: _____ 4. Department: Recreati

B. EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (000'S)

Cost Elements	\$ Total	2014	2014-15	Total 6 Years	2016	2017	2018	Year 4 FY	Year 5 FY
1. Planning Design & Supervision		17,500.00	TBD	TBD					
2. Land					TBD				
3. Site Improvements & Utilities					TBD	TBD			
4. Construction						TBD			
5. Furniture & Equipment						TBD	TBD		
6. Total						TBD			

C. FUNDING SCHEDULES (000'S)

GO Bonds: _____
 State Aid: _____
 General Fund: _____
 Capital Reserve: _____
 Grant Funding: _____

D. DESCRIPTION & JUSTIFICATION

See attached

E. ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (000'S)

F. MAP Reference Code

Program Costs: Staff _____
 Other _____
 Facility Costs: Maint. _____
 Other _____
 Debt Service _____
 Total Costs _____
 Other Revenue _____
 or Cost Savings _____

Capital Project Request Form A Attachments

Alternatives Considered

Alternatives have been exhaustively considered and researched by Recreation Dept. staff, by two different Recreation Dept. Strategic Plan Committees and by the independent Blue Ribbon Commission on Community Services and Facilities. Many of these are included in the BRC's Final Report – the appropriate excerpt of which is attached.

Justification and Useful Life

We have a lack of adequate gym and program space for programs offered by the Recreation Dept. and growing demands for improved, additional recreation programs for all ages. This has been an ongoing situation first identified in the 1980's. We are limited by lack of facility space in our abilities to provide quality programs and meet the needs and demands of the community. The Blue Ribbon Commission on Community Services and Facilities took an unbiased look at the Recreation Dept. and concluded that a building, with gym, program space, storage and Recreation Dept. offices, was needed for the Recreation Dept. This would also free-up the current building the Recreation Dept. is housed in for VNS and Human Services Departments as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission.

At the 2014 Town Meeting – Article 13 passed in the affirmative by a significant margin. The Article committed \$17,500.00 for a site study ...”in follow up of the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon commission on Community Services and Facilities, that the Town should “pursue development of a facility that includes an indoor gymnasium, Recreation Department office, program and storage space that be on existing school land or property adjacent to school facilities.”

At the 2013 Town Meeting – Article 10 passed in the affirmative by a wide margin. Article 10 reads “To see if the Town will vote that it is the “Sense of the Meeting” that, as recommended by the Blue Ribbon Commission on Community Services and Facilities, the Town should “...pursue development of a facility that includes an indoor gymnasium, Recreation Department office, program and storage space that would be on existing school land or property adjacent to school facilities.”

Recommendations for such a building have been on the radar screen since first mentioned in the 1982 Master Plan. It has been addressed and recommended in the 1991 Master Plan, several “community center committees” in the 1980's and 1990's. In the 1990's a warrant article at the Town Meeting to purchase the old Troop E building for use as a community center was narrowly defeated due to concerns over the septic system, not the need for the facility. The Town's original Building Needs Committee included a building for the Recreation Dept. to be constructed and completed in 2004. The need for gym space, program space, storage space and office space was recognized in that process. That Building Needs Committee had put the construction and additions to town buildings on a plan that included the construction of the current Town Hall, Public Safety Building, Library (expansion) and Recreation Dept. The Recreation Dept. was “bumped” due to environmental concerns that needed to be addressed at the landfill. It was promised to only be “put on hold”. The other buildings recommended in the Building plan, including the addition on the library have been built. There have been two Recreation Strategic Plan Committees comprised of Moultonborough citizens and both recommended the construction of a building that includes gym, programming space etc.. The first strategic plan was completed in 2001, the second in 2007. The 2007 plan was included as an addendum in the most recent Master Plan.

The Recreation Dept. inherited the old town hall in 2003 and renovated the building using volunteers and through fundraising – not tax dollars. The intent was not to replace the need for a building that includes a gym, but was to allow for additional space for a growing recreation program and to meet the increased needs of a changing community. According to their final report the Blue Ribbon “Commission would like to acknowledge the good job the Recreation Department does with developing and adjusting programming given current space limitations and the necessary use of multiple facilities.”

The “useful life” of this facility would be in excess of 50 years with proper maintenance and upkeep although modifications and or additions may be needed to meet the needs of the community.

Operating Costs – There will be an impact on operating, maintenance and staff costs. However, there will also be a significant increase in revenue and more revenue producing programs.

Commission Recommendations

Need: Develop an indoor gymnasium for use by the Recreation Department on or adjacent to existing school land.

Timetable for Implementation: 24 – 36 months

Analysis: After review of existing town and school facilities, town and school sports and recreation programs and potential future recreational needs for the community; the BRC believes that the indoor gymnasium space available to the citizens of Moultonborough is insufficient to serve the needs of the community. To address this need, the BRC recommends that the town pursue development of a facility that includes an indoor gymnasium, Recreation Department office, program and storage space that would be on existing school land or property adjacent to school facilities.

To a large extent, recommendation of the facility would be to satisfy existing needs; however, the Commission believes that this type of indoor facility could be developed in a manner that addresses future program needs. The BRC believes this can be completed with one project, and does not see a need for a multi-phased project.

The Commission heard testimony and considered significant information relative to the current use of town and school facilities, the Recreation Departments existing indoor and outdoor programming, the School District's past and current athletic programs and the current arrangements for sharing indoor facilities.

The BRC considered the possibility of locating the Recreation Department within the schools. This approach would be consistent with the BRC's opinion that a facility on or adjacent to school land would best serve the needs of the citizens. However, it is clear that the Recreation Department could not be adequately housed within existing school facilities. The Commission's tour of school facilities showed that school facilities are at or near capacity and moving the Recreation Department (office space, storage and program space) to school facilities would not provide long term benefit without investment in new building space by the school district.

The Commission also reviewed the potential for student population reductions at the schools in the coming years, and whether this could provide additional space for use by the Recreation Department. As presented by the school superintendent, information developed by the Demographics Study Task Force does suggest lower enrollment in Moultonborough schools, estimates of future student populations are an inexact science and, in fact, have proven to be wrong in recent years (Attachment #C)

It should also be acknowledged that slight decreases in student populations do not necessarily create unused space within the schools. Generally, these small enrollment reductions result in less students per class, but do not necessarily open facility space because the number of educational programs remain the same (i.e. – a particular Latin class is reduced from 12 to 10 students, but the Latin class is still offered and requires facility space).

The Commission also reviewed the construction of a new gymnasium at Camp Tecumseh to see if needs could be addressed through that facility. This facility was designed to meet the seasonal needs of the camp and, because the facility lacks heat, insulation and room for spectators, it would not address any of the Recreation Department's needs without significant investment in the facility. There is also the difficulty of traveling to this facility due to its distance from most of the town.

The Commission believes the town and school district should be applauded for their ability to fully utilize existing facilities to address growing needs associated with school and recreation programs; however, over time, the current sharing arrangement has had a negative impact on the Recreation Department's ability to support existing programs due to preference rightly being given to school athletic programs.

Athletic program offerings at Moultonborough Academy (MA) have grown significantly since the high school's opening in 1980. In 1980, MA operated 11 athletic programs for students from grades 7-12, and during 2010-11 school year the high school is operating 32 athletic programs. While not all of these programs require indoor gymnasium space, significant growth in middle school and freshman sports programs have consumed available time at the Moultonborough Central School (MCS) gymnasium.

Due to the current facility sharing arrangement, the Recreation Department's youth basketball program's practice time is largely relegated to the MCS multi-purpose room. While this room remains a well functioning room for the school and community, it is unsafe for many recreational uses and presents a concern for the Recreation Department and parents. The close proximity of walls, the presence of a stage and other obstructions, including dining tables; present limitations to the use of this room for sporting activities.

The Recreation Department has taken steps to limit the potential hazards of this room, including "coning off" the ends of the basketball court to create a safety zone. While necessary, these steps further limit the use of the room and have direct impacts on children's ability to practice and play sports in this room.

The BRC did consider alterations to this room that might make it more useful in addressing the Recreation Department needs, such as removal of the stage and different storage options for tables. The BRC's opinion is that the cost of these changes, inconvenience of moving

equipment daily to maintain the multiple uses of the room, and the potential programming impacts on other types of school's non-athletic programs outweigh the short term benefits that would be derived.

The lack of indoor gymnasium space also presents scheduling problems that does impact programs. Recreation Department teams generally get one hour per week for practice but this schedule is regularly impacted by weather and, due to the lack of facility space, practice times cannot be made up. Further, parents raised concerns to the Commission about late night practices disrupting family schedules and presenting unreasonable impacts on students ages 7-12 years of age.

The Commission was also presented with information and testimony about the limitations presented to summer programs due to a lack of indoor facilities. The Recreation Department's summer programs run daily during the week at three locations (Playground Drive, MA and MCS) for children ages 6 to 12 years of age.

The lack of sufficient indoor space makes the operation of these programs unpredictable due to weather. While these programs are generally half-day programs, working parents and families rely on the stable operation of these programs in order to make necessary child care arrangements for their children. Unexpected changes in the operation or scheduling of these programs can impact parents work schedules and can put an unexpected burden on some families.

This indoor gymnasium facility should be developed in a manner that would serve two of the three summer programs in the event of inclement weather. Given the significant space that would be needed and the age differential in the programs, the third program should be serviced through utilization of school facilities.

The Commission did explore the potential use of the existing school gymnasium facilities to support the Recreation Department's summer programs; however, the need for gymnasium maintenance greatly limits the ability to use these facilities for summer programming on a regular basis. That said, the potential use of school facilities to support part of the Recreation Department's summer programs should be explored. The Commission believes that coordinated planning, between the Recreation Department and the school Athletic Department, of when annual maintenance to both the MCS and MA gymnasiums will take place could allow for the use of these facilities for part of the summer months.

The Commission believes that an additional gymnasium with adequate dividers, diverse equipment, and a full day schedule of programming will support most of the Recreation Departments needs for the coming years. This includes expected growth of adult programs, maintenance of existing programs and expansion of youth offerings.

FORM C

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(May be filled out by CIP Committee to summarize Project Information)

A. IDENTIFICATION & CODING INFORMATION

1. **Date:** 4/14/2014

2. **Project Name:** Pathway Phase III

3. **Program:** _____

4. **Department:** Recreation

B. EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (000'S)

Cost Elements	\$ Total	Thru FY	Est. FY	Total 6 Years	2016	2017	Year 3 FY	Year 4 FY	Year 5 FY	Year 6 FY
1. Planning Design & Supervision					55,000.00					
2. Land										
3. Site Improvements & Utilities										
4. Construction						600,000.00				
5. Furniture & Equipment										
6. Total										

C. FUNDING SCHEDULES (000'S)

GO Bonds: _____

State Aid: _____

General Fund: \$ _____ 6

Capital Reserve: _____

Grant Funding: MAP 21 Funding to be bulk of construction and engineering

D. DESCRIPTION & JUSTIFICATION

See attached

E. ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (000'S)

F. MAP Reference Code:

Program Costs: Staff _____

Other _____

Facility Costs: Maint. _____

Other _____

Debt Service _____

Total Costs _____

Other Revenue _____

or Cost Savings _____

Phase III Moultonborough Pathway

Description: This request is for design and engineering and construction of Phase III of the Moultonborough Pathway. The key funding mechanism for this project will be federal transportation dollars – formerly the TE program (transportation enhancements). At this point all enhancements are being proposed to come under a federal program called MAP 21 and full funding of these federal programs is in question (due to run out in September). In the past grant cycles have been on two year cycles – with funds appropriated 2-4 years after approval. It is important to get Phase III on the radar screen for the Capital Improvement Program. The intent is not to begin Phase III until all repairs/retro-fit work is completed on Phase II, but to begin the process of seeking out grant funding.

The goal would be for the engineering phase to be in 2016, grant applications in 2016 or 2017 with construction to follow based on the acceptance of grant funding, funding available, and grant cycles.

Justification: Phase III would connect Phase I and II. The intent of Phase III is the same as the other two phases – safe passage for walkers, cyclists and drivers on the Neck Rd; and as a true enhancement project reduce car traffic on the Neck Rd. Both Phase I and II are successful ; phase II in spite of its issues sees regular foot traffic.

Costs – Phase III will, like the other two phases, become a town facility and, as such, the responsibility for maintenance and regular repairs will be the responsibility of the town. I do not have any estimation of what those costs will be.

Engineering and Construction Costs – At this time I would not have an up to date cost estimate for either the engineering or for construction. However, for purposes of holding a place on this I have used the last estimate we had for Phase III – this figure should be considered “realistic” but not definite. The estimate of engineering cost is based on the estimate of construction. The grant funding formula estimated for this is based on the Transportation Enhancement Funding formula used in Phase I and Phase II. If this grant funding continues at all – it is currently slated to end in September 2014, but much lobbying is being done to continue this under an umbrella legislation called MAP 21, Using the same type of formulas as we did for Phase I and II, we would estimate that the taxation portion of the grant match to be approximately \$66,000.00

Alternatives Considered: The only alternative is to leave Phase I and Phase II as separate sections and not connect them, putting walkers, cyclists and drivers at risk. We have considered breaking Phase III in to two phases III a and III b, however, if the federal funding is only available every two years, with the funds taking a minimum of an additional two years to be released and there is a lot of competition for the funds, therefore splitting Phase III into two phases would be impractical.

Net Effects on Operating Costs:

During the repair phase there is increased costs for DPW as their staff will be handling this phase. Information regarding this should be supplied by DPW. Once repairs are complete, this project should translate to a reduction in operating costs by significantly reducing maintenance costs.

Net Effect on Municipal Income – By phasing this project this should have a minimal impact. The members of the Moultonborough Pathway Association have also agreed to provide some funding if needed, but this amount is unknown at this time.

Donna Kuethe

From: Scott Kinmond <skinmond@moultonboroughnh.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 1:28 PM
To: 'Kathleen Barger'
Cc: 'Donna Kuethe'
Subject: Pathway Estimates

Kathy & Donna,

I reviewed and measured the segments of the pathway which I would rank as areas which would be the next to address relative to maintenance and safety. These areas are within the curved sections of Moultonborough Neck Rd.

Westerly side of Moultonborough Neck Rd.
(Sta. 84.00 to 94.50- HEB Plan)
1050' x \$35.00 per LF= \$36,750.00

Easterly Side of Moultonborough Neck Rd.
(Sta. 77.00 to 101.00- HEB Plan)
2400' x \$35.00 per LF=\$84,000.00

Total cost for both sides: \$120,750.00

This area was selected due to safety and maintenance concerns. The area is adjacent to a road segment which has a "S" curve.

Safety concerns: The curve sections allow for drivers to drift/drive off the pavement onto the soft/gravel shoulder area. This could potentially then lead an over correction and then possibly causing the vehicle to skid out of control and or cross or encroach upon the adjacent pathway and or the oncoming traffic. These types of driving occurrence have historically caused the shoulder area to become rutted along the pavements edge and magnifies the problem. This type of vehicle operation coupled with impairment by drugs, alcohol, and or driver distraction or inattention has led to the MV Accident deaths of 3 individuals in the past 10 yrs. (Verify with Chief Wetherbee) (photo area)

Maintenance concerns: The drainage from Moultonborough Neck Road, drains into the gravel shoulder panels on the low side of the super elevated sections, and the pathway elevations are too high to allow for proper sheet draining to occur. This causes the shoulder which is in the inside corner to be impregnated with the water, coupled with the traffic, hence causes rutting and erosion. This causes the edge of the roadway to become cracked and broken piece to become loose, with the gravel then spills into the pathway. (add photos of rutting next to roadway)

I hope this will help the committee's evaluation of how to proceed with the future pathway repairs.

Let me know if you need anything further.

Scott

Scott D. Kinmond, Highway/Road Agent
Director of Public works
Town of Moultonborough
P.O. Box 139

FORM A

CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST

Excluding Equipment

Department & Activity Recreation States Landing		Date Prepared 4/14/14
Contact Person Donna Kuethe		Phone Number 476-8868
1. Project Title States Landing Project	2. Purpose of Project Request Form (Check One) <input type="checkbox"/> Add a new item to the program <input type="checkbox"/> Delete an item in a year already a part the program <input type="checkbox"/> Modify a project already in the adopted program	
3. Department Priority (2) 95 2015		
4. Location States Landing Beach		
5, Description - See attached		
5.a. Describe Alternatives Considered: See attached		
6. Justification & Useful Life - see attached		
7. Cost & Recommended Sources of Financing		
BUDGET FY	TOTAL*	RECOMMENDED SOURCES OF FINANCING
Program year FY 2015	75,772.50	Taxation
Program year FY 2016	220,000.00	Eligible for LWCF grant - Taxation
Program year FY 2016	45,000.00	Taxation Eligible for LWCF Grant
Program year FY 2017	89,000.00	Taxation - Eligible for LWCF Gran
Program year FY 2018	45,000.00	Taxation - Eligible for LWCF Grant
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Total 6 years	475,000.00	_____
After Sixth Year	_____	_____
If adjusted for inflation, indicate adjustment percentage here: _____		
*Interest cost not included.		
8. Net Effects on Operating Costs (+/-)	9. Net Effect on Municipal Income (+/-)	
Direct Costs - see attached	taxes (+)	
personnel: number _____	other income _____	
\$ amount _____	Subtotal _____	
purchase of service _____	gain from sale of	
materials & supplies _____	replaceable assets _____	
equipment purchases _____	Total _____	
utilities _____		
other _____		
Subtotal () _____		
Indirect Operating Costs - see attached	10. Submitting Authority	
fringe benefits _____	Submitted by _____ Date _____	
general admin. Costs _____	Donna Kuethe 4/14/14	
other _____	Position _____	
Subtotal () _____	Recreation Director	
Total Operating Cost _____	Signature _____	
Debt Service (P&I) _____	11. Reserved	
Total Operating Cost _____		

FORM C

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(May be filled out by CIP Committee to summarize Project Information)

A. IDENTIFICATION & CODING INFORMATION

1. Date: 4/14/2014

2. Project Name: States Landing

3. Program: _____

4. Department: Recreation

B. EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (000'S)

Cost Elements	\$ Total	Fy 2014	Est. FY	Total Years	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Beyond 6 Years
1. Planning Design & Supervision	\$ 5,000.00			\$ 80,775.00	\$ 75,774.00						
2. Land											
3. Site Improvements & Utilities	\$ 20,000.00					\$ 265,000.00	89,000.00	45,000.00			
4. Construction											
5. Furniture & Equipment											
6. Total											

C. FUNDING SCHEDULES (000'S)

GO Bonds: _____

State Aid: _____

General Fund: See attached

Capital Reserve: _____

Grant Funding: See attached

D. DESCRIPTION & JUSTIFICATION

See Attached

E. ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (000'S)

F. MAP Reference Code:

Program Costs: Staff _____

Other _____

Facility Costs: Maint. _____

Other _____

Debt Service _____

Total Costs _____

Other Revenue _____

or Cost Savings _____

Capital Project Request Form A Attachments

Project Description: This is a multi-phased project with a rough estimate of the following occurring: Design and Engineering – 2015; Dredging Swim Area and Boat Launch 2016; Parking Area – 2016; Creating half of the Park and further parking 2017; Finish the park area 2018.

Alternatives Considered: A recommendation to do an engineering study to determine the future of the States Landing Swimming Area was included in the 2007 Recreation Dept. Strategic Plan. This study had been proposed by the Recreation Dept. in the past several budget years, but did not make it through the budget process.

During the Strategic Plan process many alternatives were considered including selling the property, not continuing to maintain it as a swimming area and to move towards only a park area with no swimming area; to turn the beach area in to a canoe/kayak launch.

Justification and Useful Life: States Landing is a 6.2 acre park with 279 feet of beachfront. There is also a public boat launch. The use of the beach has declined year by year as a result of aquatic growth and mucky lake conditions. The swimming area has been treated two times (successfully) for milfoil, but other problems have increased over time. The swimming area has been reduced greatly and docks and rafts removed. In 2009 the decision was made to no longer guard the beach due to an average of less than 9 swimmers per day.

However, the interest in this facility and the recognition of its potential as a prime recreation area has remained a priority for the Recreation Department. The Recreation Dept. has continued through the years to hear from residents in the vicinity of the beach requesting more attention be paid to the area.

In January 2013 a “Neighborhood Meeting” was held with between 35-50 people in attendance where we brainstormed ideas for the future of the area. See attachment. It was apparent from that meeting that the beach was very important to many residents.

We have enlisted the state arborist and representative from NH Cooperative Extension to identify and recommend trees on the property that may need to be removed and for how best to protect those that remain.

On May 11, 2013 a very successful States Landing “Clean Up Green Up Day” was held with approximately 25-30 people in attendance. The day started with work – clearing brush, raking, picking up trash, cutting branches etc. Landscape Architect, Doug Greiner, talked with the workers and had done a lot of preliminary work. At lunch he presented some ideas on the future of the area. Police Chief Wetherbee and TA, Carter Terenzini all spoke to the group as well. We had a barbecue.

At the 2014 Town Meeting Article 16 passed in the affirmative which designated \$25,000.00 for improvements at the States landing Park and Beach Facility/

Another Clean-up Day will be held on May 31, 2014.

While this project has moved forward since last year this project remains in its infancy, I have limited information on costs and project break out. I have estimated the project phasing and some costs. There will be more information available after May 31st and as we proceed. the presentation by Doug Greiner at the Clean Up Green Up day. I have ranked this with a high priority and have it tied with another project.

There is significant back up material about the States Landing Project available on the Town’s website. \

Funding – Much of this project will be eligible for Land and Water Conservation Grant Funding. However, the amount that will be available through this federal grant source is unknown at this time – as is the future of the grant. Based on the most recent grant funding available, I anticipate that the bulk of this project will be funded through taxation.

Direct and Indirect Costs – There will be additional Operating Costs associated with the beach and park as the facility is improved including bringing lifeguards back on the beach, more maintenance etc. however, these are not known at this time and cannot be estimated.

“Neighborhood Meeting” States Landing Beach

1/19/13

This “Neighborhood” meeting was called to address the issues at States Landing Beach. There are three major areas of concern – the boat launch, the beach/swimming area, and land area.

Comments/Suggestions/Concerns – As expressed by those in attendance

Been here since the 1940’s – didn’t have the issues it does today. There was a change in the direction of Shannon Brook which dumped the sediment in closer to the shore than in the deep water as it had before.

The town created some of the problems by dumping sand to cover up the cement pilings from a pier that used to be located off of the area.

Shannon Brook used to be navigable further upstream and was deeper; changes to the brook caused silt infiltration and the flow and depth of the brook; brook run off used to go out further so the run off went into deep water. There used to be a sand bar beyond the area States Landing Beach area.

Balmoral poured sand in the area in order to create their beach.

The width of Shannon Brook has been widened.

The lower use of the beach has diminished the maintenance and upkeep of the beach. The town has put its resources in to other areas, some of which do not get much use; these could be allocated towards States Landing Beach.

We could possibly add the beautification or upkeep of States Landing Beach to the Adopt a Spot Program.

We don’t want to ever lose this beach. There are dead trees and branches that need to be removed.

Don’t sell the beach.

Don’t give up the beach or the access to the water and land – ever.

I drive to Long Island for swimming lessons and I live 500 yards from States Landing Beach. There are no guards on duty.

Swimming area was reduced in size due to aquatic weed issues – two milfoil treatments, muck has remained – area had to be made smaller, usage dwindled, lessons and guards cancelled due to low numbers of patrons.

Beach has eroded and is forgotten, but our taxes have not been reduced.

An additional 100 feet could be opened up (with permitting).

Long Island has had areas opened and improved on but nothing has been done at States Landing. The deterioration of the area has escalated. The biggest problem was the redirection of the brook. There was a big storm three years ago and there was frustration that the area remained roped off for a long time.

I'm very grateful you're looking in to this. We go to Lee's Mill to launch our boat.

We'd like to see the area cleaned up for a park.

I'd be concerned with a large increase in usage if the area is improved a lot.

NH Lakes has been contacted and is involved in some improvements.

Part of States Landing Rd. and Castle Shores Rd. are on the plan for reconstruction.

If the road is narrowed it will cause issues with parking (boat trailers)

We should take some land to expand the parking – there is a long line up to launch.

We're at a point where if we don't do something soon the deterioration it will escalate so much to make it cost prohibitive.

If we build it and use it – people will come.

There should be an abatement for the flow of the water to redirect the silt run off. We should look at other communities who may have had similar issues. We can't make it worse for those who have lost their waterfront. We need buffer zones to minimize the effects of storms.

As a new resident I'm shocked to hear how good it used to be. We don't have to go all the way back to how it used to be – any improvement will be good.

I'm not a neighbor but do kayak there – needed clarification – are there two Shannon Brooks?

Shannon Brook meanders until it takes a hard left to Balmoral.

We need to try to figure out what's coming down Shannon Brook. What can we do upstream that will last. We need to get in to check the depth. We need to know how long any improvements made to the swimming area will last to make decisions on the property and apply best management practices for the future of the facility.

The beach was a huge selling point when we bought our property. We need to try to dredge to bring the beach back. We need the water (improvement) first to attract people. It will bring back a sense of community.

Improvements will take some of the pressure off of Lee's Mills.

We thought the beach was beautiful until we went to see it close up

If you dredge it – they will come. Parking (limited) will take care of the increased usage.

It is a beautiful area – a gem.

We purchased our house because of the beach.

It is a gem, but it is not being used.

If we could bring it back, we'd use it.

We live in Suissevale but would use States Landing Beach.

There was a boat dock at the launch but that was short lived. Some people can't access a boat from the water.

The boat dock was short lived because of its proximity to the swimming area.

If the boat dock was put on the other side of the beach that would work better so you'd put the boat in, motor over to the other side and pick up passengers.

At Long Island there is not much parking but we make it work and the PD tickets those without stickers at LI.

There was no mowing done at States Landing until complaints were made.

Less and less resources go to States Landing. It is a gem that shouldn't go away.

If we change to gravel at the boat launch people will get stuck; have cement blocks like at Lee's Mills and that will solve the issues. People have been power loading. We need more trailer parking. DPW doesn't give the area attention. The culvert needs to be changed so rainwater doesn't run down to the lake.

Wetland permitting is going to be an issue.

We could have an awareness/clean-up day. (Those in attendance were asked who would participate in a clean-up day – almost all hands went up).

The Fire Dept. could do a controlled burn. Mosquitos are an issue there. They're not as bad when there have been controlled burns.

The longer you let it go – the worse it is going to be

There is a lot we can do (as volunteers).

We need speed bumps or dips and PD enforcement on the roads around States Landing.

There are a lot of damaged trees that need to be addressed.

There is a state arborist at UNH and he is free. He can make the determination on the trees.

We need to use the resources through the state.

Keep it as States Landing Beach not States Landing Swamp.

We need to address the causes of the problems at the beach before we can address the solutions.

The area is about memories. Anything is possible if we work together.

Speed limits need to be enforced.

Scott Kinmond will be contacted about traffic calming and engineering in the area.

It was very considerate to schedule this on a Saturday.

Thanks for this forum.

There are issues with people lining up to launch their boats – blocking in residents in the area; they're loud and disrespectful early in the morning.

Put a stonewall at the end to change Shannon Brook to cut the corner; change the overflow.

There will be a follow-up meeting in the next few months.

FORM A CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST

A

Department & Activity Recreation Dept. Ballfield		Date Prepared 4/14/14
Contact Person Donna Kuethe		Phone Number 476-8868
1. Project Title Design Engineering ballfield	2. Purpose of Project Request Form (Check One) <input type="checkbox"/> Add a new item to the program <input type="checkbox"/> Delete an item in a year already a part the program <input type="checkbox"/> Modify a project already in the adopted program	
Department Priority 3 (60)		
4. Location - Recreation Area on Playground Dr.		
5. Description - This request is for the rehabilitation of the youth baseball/adult-youth softball field at PG		
5.a. Describe Alternatives Considered: see attached		
6. Justification & Useful Life - see attached		
7. Cost & Recommended Sources of Financing		
BUDGET FY	TOTAL*	RECOMMENDED SOURCES OF FINANCING
Program year FY 2015	35,000.00	Taxation
Program year FY 2016	300,000.00	Taxation & grant funding
Program year FY 2016	85,000.00	Taxation & Fundraising
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Total Six Years	420,000.00	_____
After Sixth Year	_____	_____
If adjusted for inflation, indicate adjustment percentage here: _____		
*Interest cost not included.		
8. Net Effects on Operating Costs (+/-)		9. Net Effect on Municipal Income (+/-)
Direct Costs		taxes _____ (+)
personnel: number _____	_____	other income _____
\$ amount _____	_____	Subtotal _____
purchase of service _____	_____	gain from sale of _____
materials & supplies _____	_____	replaceable assets _____
equipment purchases _____	_____	Total _____
utilities _____	_____	
other _____	_____	
Subtotal () _____	_____	
Indirect Operating Costs		10. Submitting Authority
fringe benefits _____	_____	Submitted by _____ Date _____
general admin. Costs _____	_____	Donna Kuethe
other _____	_____	Position
Subtotal () _____	_____	Recreation Director
Total Operating Cost _____	_____	Signature _____
Debt Service (P&I) _____	_____	11. Reserved
Total Operating Cost _____	_____	

FORM C
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION
(May be filled out by CIP Committee to summarize Project Information)

A. IDENTIFICATION & CODING INFORMATION

1. Date: 4/14/2014
2. Project Name: Rehab baseball/softball field
3. Program: _____
4. Department: Recreation

B. EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (000'S)

Cost Elements	\$ Total	Fy	FY	Total 6 Years	2015	2016	Year 3 FY	Year 4 FY	Year 5 FY	Year 6 FY	Beyond 6 Years
1. Planning Design & Supervision					35,000.00						
2. Land											
3. Site Improvements & Utilities						85,000.00					
4. Construction						300,000.00					
5. Furniture & Equipment											
6. Total				420,000.00							

C. FUNDING SCHEDULES (000'S)

GO Bonds: _____
State Aid: _____
General Fund: Taxation
Capital Reserve: _____
Grant Funding: LWCF Grant

D. DESCRIPTION & JUSTIFICATION

See Attached

E. ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (000'S)

F. MAP Reference Code:

Program Costs: Staff No impact
Other _____
Facility Costs: Maint. No new impact
Other _____
Debt Service _____
Total Costs _____
Other Revenue _____
or Cost Savings _____

Capital Project Request Form A Attachments

Project Description – This request is for design and engineering for the baseball/softball field.

Alternatives Considered

As part of the 2007 Recreation Dept. Strategic Plan the recommendation was to build a new softball/baseball field at the Rte. 109 property. This project was not supported by the 2008 Town Meeting. However, even in the Strategy the proposal at Rte. 109 was for an additional field – not to replace this field. The rehab of this field was included in the Strategic Plan.

Justification and Useful Life

Like the soccer field, drainage has been an issue on the softball field. The field needs to be re-constructed to rebuild drainage, level the field and re-surface the infield. The evidence of the damage due to drainage issues is found in the deep right field area – it has actually sunk in the past several years – which is evidenced by the sloping. Although not quite as drastic as the condition of the soccer field, we are delayed in being able to use the field in the spring, and after rain. As part of the re-construction we need to bring a water source to the field, so that we can adequately maintain the infield. Ironically, on a field that has problems that does not drain adequately, we also have issues where the infield surface becomes too hard and dusty. This may be addressed during the construction of the soccer field. The area between the infield and outfield, and infield “out of play” area needs to be leveled and realigned – we deal with an unsafe “lip” between the grass and infield areas. This has been re-cut several times, but we can’t continue to do so as that area can only be so large. As part of this rehab we would rehab the warning track that runs along the outfield fence.

Field maintenance is key to the useful life of this facility. The current field was constructed in 1976-77. It has served the town well in spite of issues. With proper drainage and regular maintenance this field should last for 50+ years. Regular maintenance should include resting the field on occasion.

Reconstruct the baseball/softball field at the Moultonborough Recreation Area on Playground Drive:

This field is used for youth softball and baseball, adult softball, Recreation Dept. summer programs, youth soccer, soccer camp etc. In addition, this field is open to the public and is used for family outings, activities not organized by or scheduled by the recreation dept. and sees heavy usage on a regular basis.

Field originally constructed in 1976 – opened in 1977. Drainage issues addressed in mid-1980's, infield "skinned" in early 2000's, regular repairs and maintenance have occurred – aeration, re-mix of infield mix, re-cut grass "lips", but there have been no major reconstruction or rehabilitation efforts since the construction. To my recollection the field has never been unused for a season to regenerate.

This facility is a federally funded Land and Water Conservation Project and as such we have a responsibility for stewardship – we are inspected.

Drainage has been an ongoing issue on the field since the beginning and a major rehabilitation to address these issues is overdue

Both right and left fields have sunk due to the wet areas

Out of play areas need to be leveled and re-seeded

The "lip" between the grass and infield areas needs to be re-cut and leveled

Warning track has grown in and is in need of repair

Need improved on deck and warm up areas for players

Included in this is Request is to install athletic lights on the field:

We are limited by daylight for the use of the field

Installing lights would allow for additional usage – especially for adult programs

Unmet need – additional games for current programs, additional adult programs and leagues and expanded schedules, host additional events

Currently pay the town of Meredith over \$800.00/year to use Prescott Field (with lights) for regular adult softball season and Jamboree

There has been some money raised by the adult softball league to go towards the installation of lights

Anticipated electrical costs for lights – \$3,500.00 (based on Meredith expenditures)

Rehab Baseball/Softball Field

Description & Justification - Rehab the softball/baseball field on Playground Drive, to repair, drainage, level the field and re-surface the infield. The right field area has been affected by wet areas and lack of proper drainage. It has dropped significantly in the past several years. After a normal winter we are delayed in being able to use the field in the spring, and it's recovery after rain can be slow. The area between the infield and outfield, and infield "out of play" area needs to be leveled and realigned – we deal with a potentially hazardous "lip" between the grass and infield areas. This has been re-cut several times but continuing to do so interferes with the legal layout of the athletic field. As part of the re-construction we need to bring a water source to the field, so that we can adequately maintain the infield. Ironically, on a field that has "wet issues" we also have problems when the infield surface becomes too hard and dusty. As part of this project would be to also rehab the warning track that runs along the outfield fence. The warning track was installed in 2004 by volunteer labor. It is optimal for safety in adult softball. The warning track has grown in and needs to be cleared and re-cut. In addition, though submitted separately this request proposes installing sport lighting to the field as part of the project. We have limited field space and have an active and growing adult softball league – we use fields in other towns and pay to use Prescott Park (lights) in Meredith to accommodate our league schedule. We traditionally do not start adult softball until the youth baseball and softball season is completed due to lack of field space, although the demand is to begin in the spring. We also would include irrigation. The water source is now available to do so since the reconstruction of the soccer field included irrigation.

This field was constructed in 1976. Drainage issues and other issues have occurred and been addressed piecemeal. We have gotten a tremendous amount of use from the field and it is time for rehabilitation. With proper rehabilitation, irrigation and maintenance the useful life of this rehab should be in excess of 20 years.

Alternatives Considered As part of the 2007 Recreation Dept. Strategic Plan, there was a proposal to build a new softball/baseball field at the Rte. 109 property and install lights on that field. That does not appear to be a possibility at this time and the need was for an additional field – not to replace this field. The strategic plan also provided for the rehab of this field. The strategic plan was included in the master plan as an addendum. Without the rehab of the field we will continue to do the best we can with the facility – knowing that we lose play days due to a wet field. The field will continue to deteriorate especially on the right and left field areas. We will continue to do the best we can to reduce the potential safety issues with stop gap measures.

FORM A

CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST

Excluding Equipment

Department & Activity Recreation (on behalf of Pathway Association) Date Prepared 4_14_14		
Contact Person Donna Kuethe (Kathy Barger Pathway) Phone Number 476-8868		
1. Project Title Phase III Pathway	2. Purpose of Project Request Form (Check One) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add a new item to the program <input type="checkbox"/> Delete an item in a year already a part the program <input type="checkbox"/> Modify a project already in the adopted program	
3. Department Priority - 5 (weight tbd)		
4. Location Moultonborough Neck Rd.		
5. Description - See Attached		
5. a. Alternatives Considered - see attached		
6. Justification & Useful Life - see attached		
7. Cost & Recommended Sources of Financing		
BUDGET FY	TOTAL*	RECOMMENDED SOURCES OF FINANCING
Program year FY 2016	TBD	Federal grants, Pathway Assoc., taxation
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
Program year FY _____	_____	_____
TOTAL SIX YEARS	_____	_____
After Sixth Year	_____	_____
If adjusted for inflation, indicate adjustment percentage here: _____		
*Interest cost not included.		
8. Net Effects on Operating Costs (+/-)	9. Net Effect on Municipal Income (+/-)	
Direct Costs - TBD	taxes (+ - minimum)	
personnel: number _____	other income _____	
\$ amount _____	Subtotal _____	
purchase of service _____	gain from sale of _____	
materials & supplies _____	replaceable assets _____	
equipment purchases _____	Total _____	
utilities _____		
other _____		
Subtotal () _____		
Indirect Operating Costs	10. Submitting Authority	
fringe benefits _____	Submitted by _____ Date _____	
general admin. Costs _____	Donna Kuethe 4/14/14	
other _____	Position _____	
Subtotal () _____	Recreation Director	
Total Operating Cost _____	Signature <i>Donna Kuethe</i>	
Debt Service (P&I) _____	11. Reserved	
Total Operating Cost _____		

Phase III Moultonborough Pathway

Description: This request is for design and engineering and construction of Phase III of the Moultonborough Pathway. The key funding mechanism for this project will be federal transportation dollars – formerly the TE program (transportation enhancements). At this point all enhancements are being proposed to come under a federal program called MAP 21 and full funding of these federal programs is in question (due to run out in September). In the past grant cycles have been on two year cycles – with funds appropriated 2-4 years after approval. It is important to get Phase III on the radar screen for the Capital Improvement Program. The intent is not to begin Phase III until all repairs/retro-fit work is completed on Phase II.

The goal would be for the engineering phase to be in 2016, grant applications in 2016 or 2017 with construction to follow based on the acceptance of grant funding, funding available, and grant cycles.

Justification: Phase III would connect Phase I and II. The intent of Phase III is the same as the other two phases – safe passage for walkers, cyclists and drivers on the Neck Rd; and as a true enhancement project reduce car traffic on the Neck Rd. Both Phase I and II are successful ; phase II in spite of its issues sees regular foot traffic.

Alternatives Considered: The only alternative is to leave Phase I and Phase II as separate sections and not connect them, putting walkers, cyclists and drivers at risk. We have considered breaking Phase III in to two phases III a and III b, however, if the federal funding is only available every two years, with the funds taking a minimum of an additional two years to be released and there is a lot of competition for the funds, therefore splitting Phase III into two phases would be impractical.

Costs estimates are not available at this time. If as in the past, the federal funding would be the bulk of the cost of the construction, with the town's taxation commitment and fundraising commitment (Pathway Association) to be 20% (combined) of the total grant (construction costs).

November 15, 2011

Moultonborough Pathway Time Line

1995 – 2011

SIXTEEN YEARS OF WORK BY VOLUNTEERS AND STAFF
GENEROUS GIFTS FROM INDIVIDUALS
15 YEARS OF PATHWAY ROAD RACES
RAFFLES FOR PAINTINGS, MAGIC CHEF PARTIES, T SHIRT SALES
THRIVENT FOUNDATION MATCHING GIFTS

1995 First Committee Meeting

Raised \$1,000 to hire Anne Lusk of Stowe, VT who spoke at a public meeting at Town Hall about the benefits of a trail

1997 Grant submitted to DOT for Transportation Enhancement Program for Phase I.

1998 Denied funds

1999 Re-submitted grant and received award

2001 Additional 4,000 feet added and completed from Town Beach to Harilla Landing as part of DOT Re-construction Project

2003 Construction of Phase I from Jo Jo's Country Store to Town beach completed May 2004 Official opening/ribbon cutting for Phase I

2003 Grant submitted to DOT for Phase II and denied

2005 Grant re-submitted and awarded DOT funds for Phase II

2007 Phase II completed

July 2007 Phase II Official opening ribbon cutting for Phase II

Although heavily used, complaints of rocks and washout are many. The path and road are separated by a strip of small rocks that fly up on the path, causing bikes to blow tires and become a hindrance to walkers. It is an ongoing maintenance nightmare for public works.

Concerns brought to public/Selectmen's meetings – July 5, 2007, Aug. 2, 2007, Aug. 27, 2007, Sept. 11, 2008 and Oct. 9, 2008. Numerous complaints, concern for liability, unsatisfactory overall are ongoing.

Attempts to fix the problems with various natural vegetation and with smaller rocks and cement (2007, 2008, 2009) have been fruitless.

2009 - Submitted TE application to fix Phase II and begin Phase III, but were denied.

Fall 2009 - volunteers and recreation dept. staff walked and measured the running feet of Phase II -

Volunteers and town officials realized that any additional fundraising for Phase III would not be realistic until Phase II was fixed!

Pathway Committee worked with DPW Director and DPW to allow changes to Pathway by Moultonborough DPW.

Spring 2013 - Pathway Committee and DPW met and identified key areas of Phase II that need to be changed for safety and maintenance issues

Spring/Summer 2013 - First Phase of Phase II changes completed

March 2014 - Town Meeting Petition Warrant Article passes in the affirmative to dedicate \$60,375.00 to Phase II.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

2005-2006 Round Application Form for Candidate Projects

Send completed applications to:

Kimon Koulet, Executive Director
Lakes Region Planning Commission
Humiston Building
103 Main Street, Suite 3
Meredith, NH 03253-9287
279-8171 279-0200

1. Applicant Name and Address

Town of Moultonborough
6 Holland Street
P.O. Box 139
Moultonborough, NH 03254

2. Name, Address and Telephone # of Contact Person

Charles E. Connell, Town Administrator
Town of Moultonborough
6 Holland St.
P.O. Box 139
Moultonborough, NH 03254
(603) 476-2347

3. Sponsoring Regional Planning Commission

Lakes Region Planning Commission
103 Main Street, Suite 3
Meredith, New Hampshire 03253
Telephone (603) 279-8171

4. Project Description: (Name, purpose, need, location, and project details. Include a map of project location). *Projects must be ADA compliant, in order to be eligible for funding*

This project is Phase III of the Moultonborough Pathway. The Moultonborough Pathway is a multi-phase project. The intent of this project is to alleviate traffic and traffic problems along the heavily traveled Moultonborough Neck Road. The Pathway provides a safe artery and an alternative to driving. Our second goal is to provide a safe environment for walkers and cyclists as an alternative travel mode to using their cars.

Phase I of the project, an approved enhancement project included in the State of New Hampshire Ten Year Transportation Improvement as State Project #13497 and Federal Project #STP-TE-X-000 (415), was completed in the fall of 2003 and officially opened and dedicated on May 29, 2004. Phase II, an approved enhancement project included in the State of New Hampshire Ten Year Transportation Improvement as State Project # 14414 and Federal Project # X-A000 (354). Phase III connects Phase I and Phase II to complete the Pathway.

In our initial plans, Phase III would connect the other two phases in a straight line along Moultonborough Neck Rd. However, upon further study, this creates some difficult and expensive problems, the most daunting of which is a significant amount of granite ledge which would need to be removed for construction. While this may be possible, the more practical approach, we have discovered, is to take the pathway off of Neck Rd. The route of the Pathway would now run 1823 feet of 4 ft. paved shoulders on both sides of Kona Rd. then extend 7470 ft. of independent multi used path along the far end of Fish and Game property, then extend 4322 feet of paved independent multi-use path – 8ft-10 ft. width along the rangeway to return to Moultonborough Neck Rd. While this adds approximately 6,000 feet to the project, it is in reality more practical and cost effective.

Since we are early in the planning process, we have just begun dialogues with Fish and Game as to whether or not this route is feasible and whether the pathway is compatible with the Fish and Game land. We are hoping that this works out to the benefit of both organizations. If our plans for the Pathway are not compatible with Fish and Game, then we would pursue our original plan for the Pathway to link Phase I and Phase II in a direct line. While adding ? feet of Pathway may seem as if this would create a more costly project, the granite removal and blasting would actually increase the cost of the Pathway.

In addition to solving many logistic problems by moving the Pathway off of Moultonborough Neck Rd., it also varies our project. Phase I is a combination of widened shoulders and off road path. Phase II will be 4' wide shoulders on either side of the Neck Rd, Phase III would be a hard surfaced pathway, tucked away from the main road. While we recognize that the most direct route would take us along the Neck Rd., again the difficulties in going along the road will be relieved by taking the more indirect route.

The Need for the Project

The Moultonborough Neck area represents more than 5,000 year round and seasonal residence, a dozen commercial and private marinas, several seasonal campgrounds, three summer resident camps and scores of small businesses. In addition there is a year round, inter-religious conference center serving family retreats, special camps, team building outings for organizations and a very active schedule of Elder Hostels.

On any given day, from the first day in May to the last day in October, more than 7,000 cars travel along Moultonborough Neck Road. On the weekends, that number doubles. More than 25,000 summer visitors reside on Moultonborough Neck during this busiest part of the year. During this same period, Geneva Point Center, Camp Winnaukee, Camp Robindel and Camp Tecumseh draw over 10,000 visitors to the area. Each year sees a marked increase in the number of residents and visitors. In addition to the increase in the increase in vehicular traffic this presents these folks actively pursue fitness activities-such as walking, jogging and biking. They present a corresponding increase in foot and bicycle traffic along the Neck Rd.

Commercial activities along the Neck Road produce a significant increase in customer cars, delivery trucks, large commercial transportation for boats and other vehicles. A very large part of the

town's population commutes daily along the Neck Road to shop or work, accessing State Route 25 by way of the Neck Road, which is the only way to access Route 25 and the only way off of Moultonborough Neck Rd and Long Island. A popular town beach is on one end of the Neck Road and the Town's Recreation Area and Playground is on the other. Travel between these two popular destinations generates high traffic volume.

In the Phase III section of the Neck Road, the road is narrow with no shoulder. Therefore, cyclists and pedestrians must walk or ride in the road. The speed limit on the road is 40 m.p.h. but few observe this. As mentioned earlier, the road is a heavily traveled thoroughfare. All factors taken together, the Neck Road presents a challenge – and a threat – to alternative mode users and motorists alike, as traffic must cross the median to avoid walkers and cyclists on the side of the road.

b. **History of the Moultonborough Pathway**

The Moultonborough Pathway originated from citizen demand for safe alternative modes of travel. People who live on Moultonborough Neck want a safe alternative to driving to their destinations. There is a very real concern for the safety of people who must travel the Neck Road. Residents came together and formed the Moultonborough Pathway Committee, which later became the Moultonborough Pathway Association – a 501 c3 organization. They agreed to search for solutions to the many problems created by the unnerving interaction between drivers and joggers, cyclists and walkers.

The Moultonborough Pathway received TE 21 funding for Phase I of the Moultonborough Pathway in 1999. This 2 ½ mile stretch was completed in the fall of 2003 and officially opened with a dedication ceremony on May 29, 2004. On any given day, year round, Moultonborough residents and visitors taking advantage of the Pathway to walk or cycle to their destinations.

In the summer of 2001, we extended the Pathway by approximately 15,000 feet, or nearly 3 miles. The Town and NHDOT reconstructed almost 5,000 feet of Long Island Road beginning at the Town's Long Island Beach. A 4,000 foot section of the road reconstruction project included a five foot pathway to provide foot and bicycle access as an alternative to car traffic.

The community documented the need for this alternative travel mode along the Neck Road in its most recent Master Plan (Transportation; page VII-4, section 3). The Pathway will connect to NH Route 25 to meet that need along the 10 mile length of Moultonborough Neck Road.

In 2003, Phase II was awarded TE 21 funding, with funding scheduled to be released on October 1st 2005. We will be sending out RFP's for engineering later in the summer.

In addition to federal funding, the Committee has raised and spent over \$50,000 in preliminary engineering, consulting and related work.

The Moultonborough Pathway coincides with two established regional initiatives. The Lakes Region Planning Commission included the Moultonborough Pathway in its long range plan under the heading, "Bike Routes/Multi-Use Trails" in its Regional Transportation Plan for the Lakes Region – 1997 (see Appendix 2). The Moultonborough Pathway will someday tie into the trail that the LRPC says will encircle Lake Winnepesaukee (see the concept displayed in Appendix 3). It will connect Moultonborough to other Lakes Region communities as an established part of the LRPC's regional pedestrian/bicycle trail system.

The Moultonborough Pathway will someday run from NH Route 25 to the end of Long Island at Harilla Landing. We will blend together easements that cross private property, Department of Transportation (DOT) and public utility rights-of-way, wide shoulders and existing trails into a year-round, multi-purpose alternative mode of transportation.

The Moultonborough Pathway will someday present approximately 65,000 feet (more than 12) miles of safe, attractive and enjoyable alternative to car travel. It will be diverse in nature, from wide shoulders on either side of the road, to an off road pathway winding through some of the most beautiful parts of the town. It will be between 6 and 12 feet wide. It will be of hard surface construction. This Pathway will encourage diverse use of the trail by pedestrians and cyclists, and those in wheelchairs, with strollers, etc. This will also permit better multi-seasonal use by foot, snowshoes and skis.

c. **Support**

Support for the Moultonborough Pathway is strong and wide spread. Consider the following:

At three annual Town Meetings, the Moultonborough Pathway received resounding votes in favor of the project and in favor of funding the match. All articles passed with tremendous support and virtually no opposition.

Moultonborough's Board of Selectmen unanimously and continually support the project (see Appendix).

The Moultonborough Pathway Committee successfully raised the funds required to pay for all preliminary engineering, consulting services and incidental expenses for the project – including project shortfalls – a sum well over \$50,000.00

The Moultonborough Pathway Association has secured the matches for both Phase I and Phase II of the project and is on their way to raising the match for Phase III.

In its initial stages, the Moultonborough Pathway Committee surveyed residents living directly on Moultonborough Neck Road. From 139 surveys, only four received mildly unfavorable comments.

Successful fundraising activities continue, including a raffle, which has been held three times and an original painting by a local, professional artist is donated and raffled.

The annual 5k and 10k road race and walk has been held every year since 1999 and has proven to be a successful fundraiser for the project.

A local bookstore sponsored several authors who added their personal support for the Pathway including, Barbara Siegert who rode her biked across America at age 60.

Over the years, several other special events have been held to garner support for the project, including group bike rides and a cookbook sale.

The Moultonborough Pathway Committee members are sought out and accept speaking engagements throughout the area to highlight the project, garner support and keep the public informed of the progress on the Pathway. Committee members are frequently invitees and always well received. They speak at area homeowner's association meetings, church and civic organization and anywhere else requested.

5. Are you interested in Municipally Managing the Project?

Yes x No

6. Project Status

We have Phase I completed and Phase II will be underway beginning this fall with the release of TE funds on October 1, 2005 of engineering.

We have preliminary plans made of Phase III.

We met with the DOT committee for Natural Resources with some questions regarding Phase II and also brought up questions concerning Phase III and entering onto Fish and Game. We have begun the dialogue with Fish and Game concerning the location of the Pathway on their property. We have a back-up plan if this not a conducive arrangement for both the Pathway and Fish and Game.

The Committee has a reasonable and achievable fundraising campaign for Phase III and are well on their way to implementing the campaign.

The Board of Selectmen continue to embrace the project and support warrant articles on its behalf.

7. Project Cost Estimate

a. Planning/Design/Engineering	\$55,000
b. Right of Way	0.00
c. Construction	\$607,584
Total	\$662,584

8. Funding Source

a. Project Sponsor (20% Min.)	\$132,500
Federal (80% Max)	\$530,084
Total	\$662,584

Project cost estimates were developed using the NHDOT Manual for the Development of Projects (May 2001). Estimating costs were inflated 10% to cover an inflation rate of approximately 2.5% per year.

Source of Funds: (Indicate how matching funds will be obtained)

We will raise 66,250.00 through a warrant article at the 2006 Moultonborough Town Meeting. The remaining money will be raised by the Moultonborough Pathway Committee/Association through continued fundraising efforts such as: Donation jars, raffles, the annual "Fund" Run and most importantly through a Pledge Campaign. (See Appendix for schedule of gifts). We have been successful in these efforts for the past two phases and are expecting to continue that success.

b. Who will maintain the completed project?

The Pathway will belong to the Town of Moultonborough and as such, will be responsible for the maintenance of the completed project. This, again, is working well with Phase I, and will continue with Phase II and III. In addition, we are utilizing volunteer members of the Pathway committee to perform duties such as litter patrol on the Pathway.

c. Mandatory

Project Location Map attached x

d. Mandatory

Matching commitment letter attached x

(9) Provide status of your previously approved TE projects

The status of Phase I and Phase II of the Moultonborough Pathway is as follows: Phase I completed in the fall of 2003, officially dedicated on May 29, 2004. Phase I is being used and maintained. We are waiting for the release of funds expected on October 1, 2005 for Phase II.

FORM B

CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASE OR MAJOR RENTAL

Department & Activity Recreation Dept. Bus Date Prepared 4/14/2014
 Contact Person Donna Kuethe Phone Number 476-8868

1. Project Title & Reference No.

Purchase Coach Bus

		Per Unit	Total
2. Form of Acquisition (check appropriate) Purchase	Purchase price or annual rental	\$ 25,000.00	25,000.00
	Plus: Installation or other costs	\$ n/a	n/a
3. Number of Units Requested - 1	Less: Trade-in or other discount	\$ n/a	n/a
	Net purchase cost or annual rental	\$ 25,000.00	25,000.00

5. Purpose of Expenditure (check appropriate)

Schedule replacement
 Present equipment obsolete
 Replace worn-out equipment
 Reduce personnel time
 Expanded service
 New operation
 Increased safety
 Improve procedures, records, etc.

6. Number of Similar Items in Inventory 0

7. Estimated Use of Requested Item(s)

<u>12</u> Months per year	Estimated useful
<u>25</u> Weeks per year	life in years
varies Days per week	<u>8</u>
varies Hours per day	

5a. Describe Alternatives Considered:
 see attached

8. Replaced Item(s)

Item	Make	Age	Maint Costs	Prior Year's	
				Breakdowns	Rental Costs
A.					
B.					
C.					
D.					
E.					

9. Recommended Disposition of Replacement Item(s) n/a
 Possible used by other agencies Trade-in Sale

10. Submitting Authority

Submitted by: Donna Kuethe Date: 4/14/2014
 Position: Recreation Director

11. Reserved

Coach Bus

Description

This bus would allow us to offer more trips to seniors, families and teens. Seniors must have a coach bus for our trips – and we have to contract with coach lines that are very expensive. Because of our location many companies either will not bid on our trips, or the expense is greatly inflated due to the amount of travel needed to get to us. The one company that we had been using because of its lower cost, just greatly inflated it's costs to us. Our staff spends hours trying to get bids from bus companies for our trips - we spend between 3-5 hours per trip offered only in dealing with the bus companies. Our average cost for contracting with coach bus companies is \$1150.00 – 1200.00/trip. In order to re-coup the cost of the bus we have to price our trips out of the acceptable range of many of those who we are trying to reach by providing our trips. In addition we have to set what are sometimes unrealistic attendance goals for our trips in order to make our trips pay for themselves. Most coach buses seat between 47-55 passengers. We rarely fill the bus. A realistic estimate for us is an average of approximately 28 people. We would rather run a trip twice – or encourage people to sign up early and run a wait list than to be worried about the fact that we don't have as many people as we'd like to make a trip cost effective.

In addition our summer teen program is a trip based program, where the participants choose which trips they wish to participate in. While we have in excess of 60 youth registered the majority of the trips are between 15-25 participants. We could utilize the coach bus for the majority of our teen trips (3x/wk) and then still use school buses for the trips that have a larger number of participants.

We have some programs that by design (O.A.R) are geared to smaller groups. We have a difficulty providing transportation.

Alternatives Considered – We have worked at partnering with other communities to partner with them for trips and have done so to some success. However, it is not always possible to do so because of the location and various other factors.

Cost Savings Over time purchasing this bus would save money – and allow us to offer more trips and more frequently. It would reduce staff time – and frustration.

In the 2007 Recreation Dept. Strategic Plan and Feasibility Study, which was included as an addendum to the master plan, the following recommendation was made, “Purchase a used van for senior and other transportation.” The recommended year for that purchase was 2011.

Justification –

The intent of purchasing a 20 passenger coach bus is to save money which would in turn allow us to provide additional services.

In the 2012 Recreation Dept. Budget we budgeted 29,145.00 for transportation

Of that approximately \$21,910.00 was budgeted on trips for adults/seniors; teens and families.

Using the cost estimate formula provided by a bus company via Town Administrator of \$2.00/mile to operate, the estimated cost savings is \$14,317.00 for these 4 programs

The transportation line would then be 14,828.00.00.

We would use current staff as drivers. They would need to get CDL licenses which would add approximately 180.00 to the budget.

A 20 passenger coach bus would be used for these trips: Adults/Seniors, Families and Teens.

We would continue to contract with the school bus company for RECKing Crew and Happy Camper summer trips

By moving Revenue Producing Programs to being funded by the Revolving Fund, the goal is that within the next five years for those programs to be self-sufficient. One of our challenges in achieving this goal is the cost of buses.

For adult/senior trips and family trips we have to fill the bus with 46 participants in order to re-coup our costs. We are continually faced with a dilemma when we get between 25-30 signed up – do we run the trip at a “loss” or do we disappoint those that look forward to these trips.

We were given the charge of providing more senior and adult programs, one of the ways that we have been most successful in this endeavor is providing trips. We are hampered because of our location – many bus coach bus companies will not bid, those that do have to add so much on to their charge that it then makes it difficult for us to provide trips that are affordable for our participants.

We spend approximately 5 hours of staff time/coach bus trip, researching, contacting, comparing, contracting and follow-up to lease buses. This translate to approximately \$825.00/year in staff costs (and much aggravation)

With a smaller bus we’d keep our trips to under 20 participants which is what we’d prefer to have as our goal participation level, and we’d be able to offer the trips more affordably for participants.

For the teen program our average attendance is 18 (year round and summer)

The purchase of a 15 passenger coach van was included as a recommendation in the 2007 strategic plan, which was included as an addendum in the master plan

Revenue Expectations

The revenue from the trips would offset the cost of operating the bus. Revenue would be determined/trip but the operating cost of the bus would be figured in to the cost for the participants.

FORM B

CAPITAL PROJECT REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT PURCHASE OR MAJOR RENTAL

Department & Activity Recreation Play Equipment Date Prepared 4/14/2014
 Contact Person Donna Kuethe Phone Number 476-8868

1. Project Title & Reference No.

Purchase Play Equipment - 2017

2. Form of Acquisition (check appropriate)

Purchase

3. Number of Units Requested - 1

5. Purpose of Expenditure (check appropriate)

- Schedule replacement
- Present equipment obsolete
- Replace worn-out equipment
- Reduce personnel time
- Expanded service
- New operation
- Increased safety
- Improve procedures, records, etc.

5a. Describe Alternatives Considered:

see attached

4. Cost

		Per Unit	Total
Purchase price or annual rental	\$	75,000.00	75,000.00
Plus: Installation or other costs	\$	volunteers -0	volunteers - 0
Less: Trade-in or other discount	\$	n/a	n/a
Net purchase cost or annual rental	\$	75,000.00	75,000.00

6. Number of Similar Items in Inventory 1

7. Estimated Use of Requested Item(s)

<u>8</u> Months per year	Estimated useful
<u>32</u> Weeks per year	life in years
<u>7</u> Days per week	<u>25 +</u>
varies _____ Hours per day	

8. Replaced Item(s)

Item	Make	Age	Maint Costs	Prior Year's	
				Breakdowns	Rental Costs
A. Play Equipment (LS '90)		24	varies		
B.					
C.					
D.					
E.					

9. Recommended Disposition of Replacement Item(s)

- Possible used by other agencies Trade-in Sale

10. Submitting Authority

Submitted by: Donna Kuethe Date: 4/14/2014

Position: Recreation Director

11. Reserved

June 18, 2014

Moultonborough Pathway Time Line 1995-2014

NINETEEN YEARS OF WORK BY VOLUNTEERS AND STAFF
GENEROUS GIFTS FROM INDIVIDUALS
16 YEARS OF PATHWAY ROAD RACES WITH AN AVERAGE OF 60 RUNNERS PER
YEAR
RAFFLES FOR PAINTINGS, MAGIC CHEF PARTIES, T SHIRT SALES
THRIVENT FOUNDATION MATCHING GIFTS

1995 First Committee Meeting- raised an initial \$1,000 to hire Anne Lusk of Stowe, VT who spoke at a public meeting at Town Hall about the benefits of a trail/pathway

1997 Grant submitted to DOT for Transportation Enhancement Program for Phase 1

1998 Denied funds

1999 Re-submitted grant and received award

2001 Additional 4,000 feet added and completed from town Beach to Harilla Landing as part of DOT Re-construction Project

2003 Construction of Phase 1 from JoJo's Store to Town Beach completed

2003 Grant submitted to DOT for Phase 11 and denied

2004 May official opening/ribbon cutting for Phase 1

2005 Grant re-submitted and awarded DOT funds for Phase 11

2007 Phase 11 completed. Official opening and ribbon cutting in July

Although heavily used, complaints of rocks and washout were numerous. The design of the path and road were separated by a strip of small rocks that fly up on the path, causing bikes to blow tires and become a hindrance to walkers. Ongoing maintenance nightmare for public works as well as safety issues for walkers and cyclists

Concerns brought to public/ Selectmen's meetings July 5, August 2, August 27, 2007 and September 11 and October 9, 2008. Numerous complaints, concern for liability feet of Phase 11

2007, 08, 09 Attempts to fix problems with various natural vegetation and with smaller rocks have been fruitless

2009 Submitted TE grant to fix Phase II and begin Phase III but were denied

2009 (Fall) – volunteers and recreation dept. staff walked and measures the running feet of Phase II

November 2011- finally had DOT meeting to discuss corrective measures and were assured that DOT and Public Works would arrive at a solution

August 2012 Pathway volunteers, Donna Kuethe, Jon Tollman, Carter Terenzini, DOT Mark Morrill, DOT Commissioner Clement and Associate Commissioner Brillhart walked Phase I to illustrate the repaving errors and hazards to the Pathway. These were then corrected by DOT that fall.

Then we drove Phase II with Commissioner Clement to note the dangerous spots and the unsatisfactory design. Commissioner Clement said DOT was “committed to correcting our issues and working with you on Phase III.”

Spring 2013 – Christmas tree hill repaired

Fall 2013- Informally discussed the repair schedule with Select Board members who advised to submit a Warrant Article by petition to accelerate repair schedule from 4-5 years to 2 years. (More cost effective)

2014 Recommended by Select Board and passed Town Meeting

Moultonborough Pathway Costs for Phases I and II

PHASE I	FEDERAL GRANT	\$280,000.00
	PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS	\$ 35,000.00
	Businesses/individuals	
	TOWN CONTRIBUTIONS	\$ 35,000.00
	TOTAL	\$350,000.00
PHASE II	FEDERAL GRANT	\$400,000.00
	PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS	\$ 50,000.00
	Businesses/individuals	
	TOWN CONTRIBUTIONS	\$ 50,000.00

In addition, the Town has put money aside to repair the Pathway. \$75,000 was lost to the Pathway, because the money was not spent when town was trying to arrive at a solution with DOT.

1997 The late Ray Burton whole-heartedly supported the concept of the Pathway down Moultonborough Neck, and subsequently helped the committee get the critical meeting with Commissioner Clemment.

In response to the email you forwarded to me regarding the CIPC request for more information – I had a conversation with Kathy Barger, co-chair of the Pathway Association. The “committee” hopes to “buy” i the retrofit of the entire Phase II of the Moultonborough Pathway, to eliminate safety issues and minimize maintenance as well as improve the aesthetic issues that have plagued this Phase since it’s completion in 2007. This has been consistent with the message that the Association has received from past Boards of Selectmen. The Association members need to explore further whether or not it is feasible, practical and acceptable (DOT) and by the rules of the road to have a “one side of the road” pathway that includes bicycle traffic. The clarification/question that those committed to the project are questioning is whether one side of the road as a wide shoulder presents an issue for cyclists – in one direction they will be either forced off the Pathway so they can follow the rules of the road and ride with the traffic, or will be riding against the traffic; further how wide would it have to be to accommodate cyclists. However, one side of the road or both sides of the road, the money needs to continue to be designated for this endeavor.

The Pathway Association would love to have it done in one or two large projects rather than piecemeal in the 37,500 allotments that must be requested each year. The Pathway Association has also offered to continue to fundraise and assist with this endeavor.

Please remember that 75,000 – that was voted at two town meetings and designated for this project disappeared into the “General Fund”.

The Town owns and must maintain the Pathway. At a meeting on July 15th with members of the Pathway Association, Town Administrator and DPW director, Scott Kinmond, Town Administrator Terenzini stated that the repair of Phase II will be completed when DPW’s only maintenance needs will be to sweep the path 2x/year.

The questions as to how much this project will cost – total or how many feet of the pathway can be retrofitted with \$37,500.00 is not one that either the Recreation Director or Pathway Association members are able to answer. However, the Pathway Association members who have been doggedly working on this project since 1995 – are concerned that at the rate of 37,500.00/year – Phase II will take a tremendous length of time to “fix”. In the meantime, the statement had been made by past BoS members that there will be no move forward on Phase III until Phase II is fixed. Please remember that the concept for Phase II was one that all had knowledge of and embraced – the then Town Administrator, DOT, Pathway Association members, Selectmen etc. - the flaw was in the engineering and surfaces that met DOT specs.

With only allocating \$37,500/year, what gets done next IS Scott’s call as the Pathway Association would have no knowledge of how much can be accomplished with that amount of money. The Association members were under the impression from Scott that the section known as the “S” Curves would be next on the list of repairs to be done.

In the meantime Kathy is exploring the one side of the road vs both sides of the road option.

The Association members will remain in touch with Scott.

Phase II Donors to Moultonborough Pathway

Individuals:

**Karen and Ray Abramson
Odell and Mary Jo Bailey
Kathy and Carter Barger
Sally Bates
Suzanne and Phil Boulter
Debra Phelps and Timothy Boyer
Jacqueline and Brett Browchuk
Ann and Edgar Canty
Barbara and Louis Cardi
Pamela Haggerty and James Carr
Patricia Cassidy
Athalie Cogswell
Mary and Peter Connolly
Janet and Fred Cramer
Barbara and Stephen Dellinsky
Barbara and Jerry Donovan
Margaret and William Drummey
Bea and Antony Edgar
Lillian and Edward Fassino
Terry Wetzler Finn and Steve Finn
Nancy and James Goss
Charlotte and Delbert Gregory
Mary Jane and Joseph Grimes
Anna and Paul Hargedon
Marie and Cary Hatton
Elizabeth and George Heinrich
Joan and John Henderson
Sally Carver and Gerry Hopkins
Meg and Howard Jacobs
Judith and Joseph Jarnutowski
Alice Keefe
Pamela and RM Kerns
Kathe and Bob Lewis
Jane and Nicholas Lourtis
Donna and Marc Kozin
Donna Kuethe
Nancy and Frederick Lingel
Cynthia and David Loker**

Major Donors:

**The Dorothy and Hollis
Caswell Family Foundation
Meredith Rotary Club
Celia Judge**

**Michelle and Robert MacInnis
H. Jean Malone
Maslin Family
Phoebe Matz
Lucy McClellan
Mary McGowan
Deborah and Harry Metzger
Joan Yudkin and Marvin Mishlin
Hannalore and Gordon Munson
Joanne and Edward O'Connor
Elizabeth and Gary O'Neil
Victor and Jane Parsonnet
Elizabeth and Vincent Pisacreta
Phyllis and Jordan Prouty
Betty and Robert Purdy
Barbara and Roy Putnam
Robert G. Raymond
Claudette and Alexander Roca
Marion Roche
Brenda and Leo Smith
Carol and Paul Smith
Audrey and Stephen Spaulding
Elizabeth Spaulding
Emilie and Richard Spaulding
Martha Lee Spaulding
Ambassador and Mrs. Paul Speltz
Eugene Speltz
Nike and Devid Speltz
William Stapleton
Marcia and Phil Steckler
Ellie and Jim Stoddard
Belinda and Randy Stumberg
Cynthia and James Tenner
Marianne and Dennis Tompkins
Pat Thomas
Kristine and Joseph Trustey
Jean and Paul Varley
Helen and Robert Watkinson
Mary Bidgood Wilson and Kenneth Wilson**

**Baygulls
Bayswater Book Company
Bright Horizons Family Solutions
Fitness Edge
Fran Cook & Co.
Holland Hill Studio**

Memorial gifts for Kirk Halstead

Odell and Mary Jo Bailey
P. O. Box 397
Center Harbor, NH 03226
or 18 Cross Street
Dover, MA 02030

RM and Pamela Kerns
9801 Vixen Lane
Huntersville, NC 28078

Elizabeth and Vincent Pisacreta
8 Penbrook Circle
Andover, MA 01810

Delbert and Charlotte Gregory
1916 Seville Blvd. Apt 1912
Naples, FL 3109-3363

Jon, Kristy, Jake and Luke Maslin
50 Woodmere Drive
Summit, NJ 09-7901

Meg and Howard Jacobs
70 Undercliff Terrace South
West Orange, NJ 07052

Skiffington Homes, Inc.
P.O.Box 166
Center Harbor, NH 03226

William and Margaret Drummey
11 Acorn Drive
Andover, MA 01810

Lucy McClellan
6308 S. Rosebury Ave, Unit 1W
Saint Louis, MO 63105

Harborside Association
PO Box 1515
Center Harbor], NH 03226
Attn. William Sharkey

Debra Phelps and Timothy Boyer
21008 Bedelia Way
Germantown, MD 20876

James Carr and Pamela Haggerty
Curve Street
Wellesley, MA 02482

Marion T. Roche
Box 581
Moultonborough, NH 03254

Elizabeth and Gary O'Neil
370 Lincoln St.
Lexington, MA 02421

Donna Kuethe
336 Intervale Rd., Unit E3
Gilford, NH 03249-7436

Belinda and Randy Stumberg
516 Riverwood Rd/
Belton, TX 76513

Alice Keefe
Box 1181
Center Harbor, NH 03226

H. Jean Melone
PO Box 327
Center Harbor, NH 03226

Nicholas and Jane Kourtis
21 Surrey Lane
Needham, MA 02492

James and Nancy Goss
PO Box 1102
Moultonborough, NH 03254

Stanley Ludwick name on check
But from entire crew at Baygulls

Robert and Helen Watkinson
52 Wyman Trail

Moultonborough 03254

Edward and Joanne O'Connor
35 Black Point Road
Moultonboro, NH 03254

Bright Horizons Family Solutions
200 Talcott Ave. South
Watertown, MA 02472

FORM C

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(May be filled out by CIP Committee to summarize Project Information)

A. IDENTIFICATION & CODING INFORMATION

1. Date: 4/14/2014

2. Project Name: Recreation Dept. Building

3. Program: _____

4. Department: Recreation

B. EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (000'S)

Cost Elements	\$ Total	2014	2015	Total 6 Years	2016	2017	2018	Year 4 FY	Year 5 FY	Year 6 FY	Beyond 6 Years
1. Planning Design & Supervision		17,500.00	50k	TBD							
2. Land											
3. Site Improvements & Utilities											
4. Construction					315k	315k	315 k	315k	315k	315k	315k
5. Furniture & Equipment											
6. Total											

C. FUNDING SCHEDULES (000'S)

GO Bonds: _____

State Aid: _____

General Fund: _____

Capital Reserve: _____

Grant Funding: _____

D. DESCRIPTION & JUSTIFICATION

See attached

E. ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (000'S)

F. MAP Reference Code:

Program Costs: Staff _____

Other _____

Facility Costs: Maint. _____

Other _____

Debt Service _____

Total Costs _____

Other Revenue _____

or Cost Savings _____

