

**Town of New Durham  
Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee  
Minutes of the August 21, 2017 Meeting**

1. Call to Order: By Chair Jarvis at 8:31 AM

Present: Theresa Jarvis, Chair & Member At Large  
Bill Meyer, Member At Large.  
Cecile Chase, Board of Selectmen Representative  
Dorothy Veisel, Vice Chair & Planning Board Representative (Left @ 10:50 AM)  
Ellen Phillips, Budget Committee Representative (Arrived 8:55 AM)  
Scott Kinmond, Town Administrator - Committee Staff

2. Minutes: The minutes of July 17, 2017 and August 7, 2017 meetings were reviewed.

**MOTION:** *To approve the minutes of July 17, 2017 as presented.* (Meyer/Chase) Vote: 4-0-0.

**MOTION:** *To approve the minutes of August 7, 2017 as amended.* (Veisel/Meyer) Vote: 4-0-0

3. Review of CIP Committee Priority Ratings

- Committee members independently gave 55+/- items a priority score.
- The TA had collected all scores and presented the average score for each item
- Terry asked that since the Library is replacing carpet in the Children's room and office area and painting the exterior of the building should those scores be changed.
  - There was a general discussion regarding the pros and cons of changing the ratings.
  - The committee decided to keep the original results.
- The only rating that was changed was for Town Buildings Improvement fund. It went from 1.4 to 1.
- The Committee discussed the benefits of the Board of Selectmen putting the request for a Town Buildings and Facilities study out to bid now rather than in the new year. If done now then the 2018 Advisory CIP Committee would have the results to consider in the preparation of the 2018 to 2028 report.
- Cecile did not rate the Boody Farmstead since the Town is not funding it. Terry stated that the Boody Farmstead Committee has requested we recommend a new CRF be established for them.
- Cecile feels since the Town has several historical properties there should be one historical CRF which a Historical Preservation Committee would oversee. The Committee would 1) oversee both projects and 2) determine what project would get what amount of money.
- Both the Boody Farmstead and Meetinghouse are asking for CRFs for maintenance. In addition the Meetinghouse has a CRF for restoration needs.
- Terry feels the Boodey Farmstead is moving faster than the Meetinghouse and they already have a marketing plan.
  - The Meetinghouse project is eligible for LCHIP grants while the Boodey project is not.
  - She doesn't think one oversight committee can move both projects forward at the same time.
- Cecile sees these as two different types of projects. The Meetinghouse is a historical town building while the Boodey Farmstead is a re-creation of a historical building.
- Bill does not believe any organization will give money goes into a fund for both projects.
- Ellen stated that the Meetinghouse has a CRF fund that money can go into and we want to move the project along. The Boodey Farmstead Committee is requesting a CRF for the project.
- Terry reminded the Committee that Boody Farmstead did not ask for a specific amount of money. She had heard George request \$ 50,000 and later \$ 100,000.

## Final Approved 9-1-17

- Dot believes the Meetinghouse Committee has continued to work forward. She feels that they received pushback from prior BOS.
- Scott asked when the Meetinghouse is done will it be a 2 season, 3 season or 4 season building?
  - Will it be a schoolhouse? It needs to get buy in from the town.
  - He has heard many different uses; example: Selectmen's meetings. Depending on the use it may need electricity/power etc. This would bring a new level of expense.
  - The Meetinghouse needs to be evaluated as to what is really wanted for it.
- Discussion that the Meetinghouse Committee needs to develop a vision and a business plan to outline steps to complete.
- Scott stated that the Meetinghouse needs to get buy in from the townspeople. It is eligible for LCHIP grants and other preservation funding while the Boody House is not as even though it is a historically significant building it has been taken down and will be resembled in a different place.
- Cecile stated that while there is money set aside in the Meetinghouse CRF the key is a vision as to how it could be used. We need to know where it is going, the timetable etc.
  - The Boody Farmstead has business aspects to it while the Meetinghouse would be for town functions; example: BOS meetings, swearing in committee members, performing a wedding etc.
  - There is a state Heritage Trail system that both projects could be part of.
- Dot sees the Meetinghouse as a classroom where students can learn about our history.
- Ellen suggested that we may be able to get students that would get credit for working at the Meetinghouse for educational credits.
- Terry feels we need to see a business report showing the plans for the restoration and future uses.
- Dot believes they have the information but it is in various documents. All the information needs to be reviewed and put together.
- Bill stated we need to look at what we received from the Boody Farmstead – which was very impressive. We need the same from the Meetinghouse Committee.
- Scott stated we should not establish any CRFs for maintenance needs as this should be part of the operational budgets. It might be possible to change the purpose of the Meetinghouse CRF to include maintenance.
- Terry feels maintenance issues at both the Meetinghouse and Boody Farmstead should be in the operational budget not a CRF. If a large maintenance issue comes up then the Town Building Improvement ETF could be used.

### 4. Review of recommended CRF & ETF funding levels.

- Scott explained how the various funding figures were determined using different scenarios; example buying trucks versus lease to buy. In the scenario interest rate is 2.5% with the initial payment coming from the CRF and the other coming from the operational budget.
  - Ellen asked if we go to lease purchase do we need to add funds to the Highway Truck CRF. Terry responded over the last two years these were insufficient funding added to the CRF. Until the BOS officially make a change we need to fund the CRF.
- Terry asked about funding of the Road Surface Management System (RSMS) program. Will it need funding in 2018 due to the receipt of additional state funds? Should we be rating it? Recommending funding?
  - Scott stated on average the Town spends \$ 300,000 each year on road maintenance. \$ 200,000 is on reconstruction. Even with that we are falling behind. The amount of money spent each year needs to be increased in order to not fall even further behind.
  - Major capital expenses in the future are Merrymeeting Lake and Middleton Roads both of which need significant work (example: culvert replacement at the lake = \$ 60,000+/-)
  - Strafford Regional Planning Commission (SRPC) are conducting traffic counts on Middleton Road, Kings Highway, Old Bay Road, Bracket Rd and Valley Rd.

## **Final Approved 9-1-17**

- In 2017 costs will be \$ 274,000+/-.
  - \$ 297,734 is needed if all of the TA's recommended fund levels are kept.
  - Meetinghouse Funding: The CRF has \$ 107,940 and a LCHIP grant for \$ 13,000 (\$ 120,940 total). The foundation work will cost \$ 65,000+/- . The remainder of funds will not cover the rest of the work.
    - Cecile and Terry both want to know what is the total cost of the project.
    - Bill stated after the foundation there is truss work and replacement of siding before the interior work can be done.
  - The following changes were made in funding amounts:
    - FD Mule from \$ 1,672 to \$ 1,700
    - HD Trucks from \$ 61,383 to \$ 62,000
    - Library Total from \$ 22,85.71 to \$ 2,500
    - PD and FD Renovations from \$ 5,560 to \$ 5,600.
  - Parks and Recreations: There was extensive discussion about what the funding level should be. Last year's CIP Committee promised funding of \$ 7,500 for this year as the total cost of the project is \$ 15,000. The TA's suggested amount is \$ 1,500.
    - Ellen feels this year's Committee needs to honor the promise that was made by last year's CIP Committee and put the full \$ 7,500 in the CRF.
    - Cecile believes one CIP Committee cannot make a commitment for another CIP Committee and wants to stay with the \$ 1,500.
    - Terry stated the CRF has over \$ 17,000 and if \$ 1,500 is added there will be sufficient funding for the playground project. While issues with the piping were mentioned no other major work is planned for the ballfields.
    - No decision was made.
5. Draft Narrative: All edits – either electronically or written – due to Terry by noon 8/25/17. The final report will be presented to the Planning Board on 9/5/17.
6. Next Meeting: The agenda includes 9/1/17 reviewing the minutes of 8/14/17 and 8/21, funding recommendations and CIP Narrative. The meeting will be 9/1/17 from 8:30 AM – 11:00 AM.
7. Adjourn: MOTION: *To adjourn.* (Meyer/Chase) Vote: 4-0-0. The meeting was adjourned at 11:11 AM

Respectfully Submitted:  
Terry Jarvis