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This reuse assessment is prepared for informational purposes only. Vita Nuova has relied upon outside sources for information and data presented in this report. Although all best efforts were used to confirm information and complete this report, no representation or warranties are made as to the timeliness, accuracy or completeness of the information contained herein or that the actual results will conform to any projections or recommendations contained herein. All areas are approximate. Any reliance upon this material shall be without any liability or obligation on the part of Vita Nuova, LLC.
I. Executive Summary

The Commission to Evaluate Long-Term Uses of Lakes Region Facility (the Commission) was established by the New Hampshire State Legislature to assess the short- and long-term uses of the Lakes Region Facility in Laconia. To this end, the Commission is determining and recommending the disposition, redevelopment or sale of the property, in part or in whole, whichever is in the best interest of the residents of New Hampshire.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has provided funding and technical support to assist the Commission in fulfilling its appointed task. The Lakes Region Facility is a pilot project for the implementation of the Process for Risk Evaluation, Property Analysis and Reuse Decisions (PREPARED) Workbook. The PREPARED Workbook is designed for government officials facilitating the cleanup and revitalization of contaminated properties. PREPARED is a multi-phase process through which information is gathered and evaluated relative to potential land use decisions. This pilot project supported the initial phase of the process. Specifically, this phase involved gathering and evaluating information immediately available, developing preliminary land use options, and identifying next steps in the evaluation process. This phase is not intended to result in a final decision, nor is the information provided sufficient to make final land use decisions.

Project Intent

The intent of this project is to assist the Commission in implementing the PREPARED Workbook as a mechanism for making informed decisions regarding the future use of the Lakes Region Facility.

The PREPARED Workbook is designed for government officials facilitating the cleanup and revitalization of potentially contaminated properties. The focus of the Workbook is on properties that are complicated by concerns regarding the environmental conditions and other issues. Specifically, the PREPARED Workbook:

1. Outlines a risk management framework for evaluating actions that can bring about the cleanup and redevelopment of contaminated properties.
2. Discusses some key considerations in the evaluation process and the preparation of a redevelopment strategy.
3. Provides general information and references to other sources of information relevant to the evaluation and the redevelopment process.
4. Provides worksheets that can be used to guide the evaluation process.

Lakes Region Facility Reuse Assessment and Stakeholder Strategy

The following project approach was agreed to by the Commission, EPA, SRA and Vita Nuova, LLC:

- Lakes Region Facility Reuse Subcommittee, with assistance from SRA/Vita Nuova, completes the PREPARED Worksheet #1, which outlines the project goals.

- SRA/Vita Nuova conducts a reuse assessment on the property, which includes an opportunity and constraints analysis and a market analysis.

- During the same period, the Lakes Region Planning Commission’s (LRPC) environmental consultant, Credere Associates, completes a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment on the property.

- Stakeholder interviews are completed to obtain input from interested parties and a public community meeting is held to solicit input regarding reuse options at the subject property.
Following completion of the stakeholder process, SRA/Vita Nuova’s design team develops three (3) land use scenarios based upon the information gathered.

The land use scenarios are analyzed using the PREPARED Workbook to determine potential property recovery actions.

The results of PREPARED are presented in this report.

Risk Management Process and Outcomes

The reuse assessment—including the opportunities and constraints analysis, market assessment and stakeholder interviews—identified several potential options for reuse. Vita Nuova developed three land use scenarios to represent the combination of uses that could be incorporated into the future use of the Lakes Region Facility. While these are not the only possible combinations of uses, the following three scenarios represent potentially viable options for the subject property. The land use options were drawn from the research conducted by SRA/Vita team, public input and interviews with state agencies. While they are not exhaustive, they are illustrative of the reuse options for the site.

Scenario A: State Control/State Use

Parcel A would remain under the ownership and control of the State of New Hampshire. Parcel A would be divided between the New Hampshire National Guard and the Community College. Long-term land use agreements would be established with the two primary users.

- Under this land use scenario, the southwestern portion of the site could be utilized by the National Guard.
- The Community College would occupy the remainder of the property. The Community College could sublease portions of the property to organizations with products or services synergistic with the college’s curriculum.
- The existing Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association/NH Emergency 911 Center would be integrated into the land uses. Other state agencies (e.g., New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services (DES) and New Hampshire Department of Administrative Services (DAS)) could use individual buildings for other uses identified in this assessment.

Parcels B and C are identified for sale or disposition under this scenario.

Public agency interest and needs could be determined through an Expression of Interest (EOI) or similar process that provides a flexible method of identifying interest in the property.

Scenario B: State Ownership/Public Uses

Parcel A would remain under the ownership or control of the State of New Hampshire. The Community College would serve as the primary agency controlling the property.

- Under this land use scenario, the southwestern portion of the site could be utilized by the Community College.
- A portion of the property would be made available, via long-term land lease, to the City of Laconia, nonprofit or for-profit organizations for agricultural and recreation uses.
• The Community College could sublease portions of the property to organizations with product or services synergistic with the college’s curriculum.

• The existing Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association/NH Emergency 911 Center would be integrated into the land uses. Other state agencies (e.g., DES and DAS) could use individual buildings as identified in this assessment.

Parcels B and C are identified for sale or disposition under this scenario.

Public and private interest could be determined through an EOI or similar process that provides a flexible method of identifying interest in the property.

**Scenario C: Disposition for Development**

This scenario calls for private market redevelopment of all three parcels. Depending on market interest, the property could potentially be reused for a combination of commercial, residential and recreational uses.

• Under this land use scenario, the southwestern portion of the site could be utilized for commercial, office or incubator space.

• The ability to retain the existing Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association/NH Emergency 911 Center would be dependent on market interest.

• Depending on market interest, the remainder of the property is likely to be reused for residential or mixed uses.

• A possible public-private partnership could allow some public uses on the property.

• Private market interest could be determined through an EOI or similar process that provides a flexible method of identifying private sector interest in the property.

To bring about a desired reuse, the Commission or state may need to involve itself in some manner. The PREPARED Workbook refers to the potential actions generally available to government agencies as *property recovery actions*. Using the PREPARED worksheets, this process identified a number of potential property recovery actions that the Commission and/or state can use to facilitate redevelopment of the subject property. These actions may include some combination of the following:

• Filling the data gaps
• Performing abatement work in existing buildings
• Performing any required environmental remediation onsite
• Demolishing obsolete buildings
• Indemnifying future owners
• Adjusting property valuation to reflect conditions

**Next Steps**

The PREPARED Workbook identified gaps in information that could have a significant impact on the reuse potential of the subject property. Issues requiring additional work include:

• Phase 2 Environmental Investigation
• Building Conditions Assessment
• Structural
• Asbestos, lead, mold and other materials
• Historical significance
• Infrastructure Capacity Analysis
  – Roads
  – Sewer
  – Water
  – Power
  – IT (cable, high speed internet)

To move the reuse process forward, the Commission may consider creating an oversight body to manage the redevelopment process. The Commission may also consider an EOI process to identify the level of market interest in the property. An EOI process allows the flexibility needed to prequalify viable entities and seek mixed-use options. An EOI process could be open to qualified local, state and federal agencies, nonprofits, institutions or private companies.

PREPARED is intended to be an iterative process. As additional information is obtained, the property recovery actions and risk analysis can be updated.
II. Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has provided funding and technical support to implement the Process for Risk Evaluation, Property Analysis and Reuse Decisions (PREPARED) Workbook at the Lakes Region Facility in Laconia, New Hampshire. The PREPARED Workbook is designed for government officials facilitating the cleanup and revitalization of potentially contaminated properties. The focus of the PREPARED Workbook is on properties that are difficult to develop due to concerns regarding the environmental conditions. Specifically, the PREPARED Workbook:

(1) Outlines a risk management framework for evaluating actions that can bring about the cleanup and redevelopment of contaminated properties.

(2) Discusses some key considerations in the evaluation process and the preparation of a redevelopment strategy.

(3) Provides general information and references to other sources of information relevant to the evaluation and the redevelopment process.

(4) Provides worksheets that can be used to guide the evaluation process.

Project Participants

The following organizations were involved in the implementation of the PREPARED Workbook for the Lakes Region Facility:

- Commission to Evaluate Long-Term Uses of Lakes Region Facility
- City of Laconia, New Hampshire
- Lakes Region Planning Commission
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- SRA International, Inc.
- Vita Nuova, LLC
- Credere Associates, LLC
III. Preliminary Reuse Assessment

Purpose

Vita Nuova, LLC was retained by SRA International, on behalf of EPA, to assist the Lakes Region Facility Commission in developing a preliminary reuse and market analysis of the former Lakes Region Facility in Laconia, New Hampshire.

The scope of this assessment includes three tax parcels owned by the State of New Hampshire. The three parcels total approximately 230 acres once associated with the New Hampshire School for the Feebleminded. This preliminary reuse assessment includes an analysis of the site and its assets in relationship to its local and regional setting.

This report presents a compilation of research and data relative to the Lake Region Facility property and the greater Laconia, New Hampshire market. It includes information on the region and its real estate market, the physical characteristics of the site, and the opportunities and constraints associated with it.

Property Characteristics

The subject of this reuse assessment is the former Lakes Region Facility in Laconia, New Hampshire. This assessment includes three separate tax parcels, hereinafter referred to as the subject property.

A. Subject Property

The subject property is located northwest of New Hampshire State Route 106 in the City of Laconia, New Hampshire.

1. Address/Location

![Property Location Map](image-url)
This assessment includes three tax parcels. The City of Laconia Assessor Property Records identifies the three parcels under the ownership of The State of New Hampshire Department of Corrections. According to the online property cards maintained by Vision Appraisal\(^1\), the parcels of the subject property are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Tax Parcel ID</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>318-142-1</td>
<td>Meredith Center Road</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>332-404-1</td>
<td>Old North Main Street</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>292-153-3</td>
<td>Meredith Center Road</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Parcel Description**

According to the online tax maps hosted by the City of Laconia Assessing Department\(^2\), Parcel A consists of 212 acres and includes 25 buildings on the property. Parcels B and C are both vacant.

\(^1\) [http://data.visionappraisal.com/LaconiaNH/findpid.asp#closest](http://data.visionappraisal.com/LaconiaNH/findpid.asp#closest), viewed April 13, 2010
\(^2\) [http://www.mapsonline.net/laconianh/](http://www.mapsonline.net/laconianh/), viewed April 13, 2010
3. Topography

The subject property is generally characterized by level and gently sloping topography along with isolated areas of steep grades. The center of Parcel A, where a majority of the buildings are located, has minimal slopes. From this plateau, the property gently slopes towards the southeast and Opechee Bay, and towards the southwest and Lake Winnisquam.
4. Surrounding Land Uses

The subject property is located in a sparsely developed area north of the downtown section of Laconia. The property is surrounded by large tracts of open space and recreation land.

The subject property is bordered to the west by Ahern State Park\(^3\). Ahern State Park is a 128-acre park situated on the shore of Lake Winnisquam. The park has 3,500 linear feet of shoreline and is open for swimming, biking, fishing and hiking. The park was originally part of the Lakes Region Facility property and was transferred to the New Hampshire Division of Parks and Recreation in November 1994.

Opechee Bay State property is located on the southeast side of Route 106 north of Old North Main Street. The property is approximately 48 acres in size and managed by the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development.\(^4\)

Huston-Morgan State Forest is located on the north of the subject property in Laconia. The forest is approximately 156 acres and also managed by the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development.\(^5\) Four other state forests are located north of the subject property in Laconia. These forests total an additional 500 acres of forested and protected land.

Residential communities are located east and southeast of the subject property along the banks of Opechee Bay. Properties north of the subject property are sparsely populated.

**B. Local Statutes and Regulations**

The property is subject to various municipal and state statutes and regulations.

1. **Zoning**

According to the Zoning Map of Laconia, New Hampshire, dated April 1, 2008\(^6\), the subject property is located in multiple land use zones:

- A majority of Parcel A is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS). Portions of Parcel A with frontage along Meredith Center Road are zoned Residential Rural Corridor (RR2).
- Parcel B is zoned RS.
- Parcel C is primarily zoned RR2 with a small portion of the property zoned Residential Rural District (RR1).

The zoning regulations for the City of Laconia were adopted by the City Council as Ch. 48 of the Public Ordinances of 1975, amended in its entirety December 26, 1995 and effective January 1, 1996. According to the zoning ordinance the following district descriptions apply to the subject property:

**Residential Single-Family (RS) District.** The Residential Single-Family District shall be designed to establish and maintain attractive areas used solely for single-family residences and closely related supporting facilities such as schools and churches.

**Residential Rural (RR1) District.** The Residential Rural District shall be designed to accommodate residential uses in what is commonly recognized as being a rural environment. Generally, the property included within this district will not have sewer and water facilities available. Agriculture, open space and other low-intensity uses shall also be permitted. [Amended 10-14-1997 by Ord. No. 10.97.10]

**Residential Rural Corridor (RR2) District.** The Residential Rural Corridor District is intended to recognize the historic, scenic and agricultural values of the areas associated with Parade, Meredith Center and White Oaks Roads. Further, public health and safety considerations will be enhanced by allocating for onsite sewer and water systems since the majority of these areas are not served by municipal water and sewer. This district is defined as the area extending 400 feet from either side of the center line of the right-of-way of the above-mentioned roadways, excluding those areas in the Commercial Resort District.

2. **Wetlands, Watercourses and Floodplain**

---

9 Ibid
10 Ibid
According to a Stream Geomorphic Assessment, conducted by Bear Creek Environmental, Inc., dated October 13, 2009, an unnamed tributary above Parade Road drains from wetland headwaters in Huston Morgan State Forest. The brooks and its tributaries flow in a southerly direction crossing through the main parcel of the subject property near its frontage along Meredith Center Road.¹¹

According to the same report, there are wetlands associated with the brooks and tributaries located on the north side of Meredith Center Road. No wetlands were identified on the subject property.

¹¹ Stream Geomorphic Assessment, Bear Creek Environmental, Inc., October 13, 2009.
3. Stormwater

Section 235-44 of the city’s Zoning Code addresses erosion and sedimentation pre- and post-construction and requires all construction and development to comply with the state’s Stormwater Management, Erosion, and Sedimentation Control Handbook for Urban and Developing Areas in New Hampshire. The City of Laconia is exploring implementation of a comprehensive stormwater strategy for the city.

4. Historic Resources

According to project representatives and based upon the age of the subject buildings, a Section 106 Historic Preservation review of the project will be conducted.

C. Existing Conditions

1. Site Access

Parcel A is accessed from State Route 106 (North Main Street), a secondary state-owned north-south route that runs through Merrimack and Belknap Counties. Right Way Path is a privately owned roadway that also runs north south through Parcel A. Parcel A has frontage along NH Route 106, Meredith Center Road, and Eastman Road in Laconia.

Ahern State Park, a separate state-owned property outside the scope of this report, is also accessed from Right Way Path.

Parcel B is accessed from Old North Main Street at its northern intersection with Route 106/North Main Street. Parcel B has frontage along Route 106 and Old North Main Street.

Parcel C is located along Meredith Center Road north of its intersection with Eastman Road. Meredith Center Road is a city-owned secondary road accessed from Route 106.

The New Hampshire Department of Transportation (DOT) evaluated Route 106 for congestion and condition. Route 106 is characterized as a moderately congested roadway with a grade of C and D for level of service.\(^\text{12}\)

2. Traffic Counts

According to the 2007 City of Laconia Master Plan, the following represent the average annual traffic counts in Laconia from 1994-2003. The intersection of Parade Road South of Elm Street is located at the eastern boundary of Parcel A. In 2003, the average annual daily traffic count for this intersection was 11,000 cars. The following Table was provided in the 2007 City of Laconia Master Plan:

---

Table 1: Annual Average Daily Traffic Counts in Laconia from 1994-2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Center RD West of Parade RD</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 107 (Union Ave) North of Bridge St</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Ave South of Winter St</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court St South of Bay St</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 3 East of Scenic Rd (Weirs Beach)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>14000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parade Rd South of Elm St</td>
<td>9700</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 3 &amp; NH 11 ByPass at Belmont TL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8300</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 3 South of White Oaks Rd</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main St North of Pleasant St</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>16000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>17000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parade Rd at Meredith TL</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6900</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 11A East of Union Ave</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7400</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>7300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Main St East of Parade Rd</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>15000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 107 East of NH 106 (South Main St)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 3 &amp; NH 11 ByPass Between NH 106 &amp; 107</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>13000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the Laconia Master Plan states, summer, winter and weekend traffic volumes can be quite different. The State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation posts traffic volume reports on its website. A Bureau of Planning Traffic Section Traffic Report for the Town: Laconia dated February 18, 2010, includes average annual traffic counts at specific locations from 2002 to 2009. The following locations included in the February 18, 2010 report are in close proximity to the subject property:

Table 2: DOT Bureau of Traffic Report for Locations in Close Proximity to the Subject Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Proximity</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH 106 South of Elm Street</td>
<td>Frontage along Parcel A</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 106 North of Pleasant St</td>
<td>South of subject property</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH 106 at Meredith Town Line</td>
<td>Significantly north of subject property</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elm St East of Parade</td>
<td>East of intersection with subject property</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic counts suggest that a majority of the vehicular traffic is located south of the subject site, close to the downtown. Land use maps indicate higher density development south of the subject property, which is consistent with traffic patterns. The lower traffic counts on NH Route 106 north of the subject property reflect the relatively lower densities along this main connector between downtown Laconia and Meredith.

---

3. **Onsite Circulation**

Vehicular circulation on Parcel A follows a network of privately owned roads within the Lakes Region Facility. The roadways are in fair to good condition; however, they may not conform to current standards for town-owned roadways. As previously stated, access to Ahern State Park is on a gravel road from Right Way Path, the main interior roadway.

4. **Utilities**

Parcel A is serviced by public sewer. The existing Lakes Region Facility has a system of cast iron wastewater piping. Historically, ground infiltration issues existed due to deteriorating piping. According to facility documentation, repairs to onsite waste piping occurred in 2009. Wastewater is treated at the Franklin Wastewater-Winnipesaukee River Basin Project, which services the cities of Franklin and Laconia, and the towns of Belmont, Northfield, Tilton and Meredith. The Winnisquam treatment facility is located on the western side of Lake Winnisquam.

A pump station located in Ahern State Park was built to eliminate the direct discharge to the lake from the Lakes Region Facility. A sewer line carries wastewater from the pump station to the nearest available sewer collection system on Shore Drive that conveys the collected wastewater for treatment, ultimately in Franklin.

Water service is provided to the site by Laconia Water Works. A pump house on Parcel A pumps water from the city to two large storage tanks on the property. Water is then distributed by gravity to the entire campus. Distribution piping is reported to be in poor condition.

Rainwater is shed off building roofing systems by gutter and downspout. According to information provided by the New Hampshire Department of Administrative Services (DAS) and visual inspection, stormwater is collected on the campus in a stormwater collection system that discharges into Lake Winnisquam. Some segments of the stormwater system experience ground water infiltration due to poor condition.

Electricity is supplied by Public Service of New Hampshire. The Lakes Region Facility is fed from a 15KV leg of a 34.5 KV line. Most buildings are served through designated transformers, with the exception of the smaller buildings. There are no reported problems with the underground distribution system.

5. **Easements**

A legal title search should be conducted on the property to identify all legal easements prior to implementation of redevelopment plans.

6. **Property Improvements**

Parcel C is currently vacant. Parcel B is vacant with the exception of a pump house operated by the City of Laconia.

According to City of Laconia assessment property cards, Parcel A includes 25 buildings (Property Card 318-142-1) that are mostly considered to be in average condition. Several
are one-story buildings and a few are two- and three-story buildings. Four of the buildings have associated outbuildings. Estimated building values range from $84,100 to $5,043,100.

According to DAS’s records, there are 26 buildings in varying conditions. The following buildings are currently occupied and in use:

1. Dwinell – Lakes Region Mutal Fire Aid, Emergency 911 and Lakes Region Dispatch
2. Physician’s Cottage – H&HS (Mentally Challenged Sexual Offenders)
3. Superintendent/Doctor’s Cottage – H&HS (Mentally Challenged Sexual Offenders)
4. Support Buildings – Boiler House, Maintenance Shop, Barn and Warehouse
5. Dube Building – Lakes Region Community Services

Dube Building is occupied by Lakes Region Community Services (LRCS), a nonprofit 501(c)3 organization. LRCS offers programs and support, including Early Intervention, Respite, Childcare Resource and Referral, Transition Support, Family Support Services, Day Support, and HomeAssist eldercare program. The main office of LRCS was located on the subject property. Additional offices are located in downtown Laconia, Plymouth and Tilton. The Dwinell Building is occupied by the Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association (LRMFAA). According to the LRMFAA website, the group moved its operations to the building in 2000.¹⁸

Dube Building and Dwinell Building are used by the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) as a receiving facility under the Bureau of Developmental Services. Currently, the buildings are used to house mentally challenged sexual offenders under the supervision of DHHS.

Several other buildings are used onsite for storage of equipment and supplies. In addition, the City of Laconia uses the Warehouse building to store equipment.

In July 2009, DAS evaluated the condition of each of the buildings when it assumed responsibility for the property.

The following summary of the evaluation report was provided by DAS for this reuse assessment:

**Occupied**

**Dwinell** - Built 1958, 17,615 square feet (Sqft)
Occupied by Safety - E-911 Call Center; had major overhaul.

**Physician’s Cottage** - Built 1952, 2438 Sqft
Training and office space for the Designated Receiving Facility; general condition is good replacing windows, roof and siding.

**Superintendents/Doctors Cottage** - Built 1948, 2,488 Sqft
Residential facility for the Designated Receiving Facility (DRF); general condition is good; replacing windows, roof and siding.

**Warehouse** - Built 1950, 11,440 Sqft
Building structurally sound; being used for storage and by New Hampshire Department of Fish and Game for game storage; has had one south side of roof replaced and needs north side replaced.

**Good condition**

**Administration** - Built 1967, 11,654 Sqft
Used by Corrections for administrative staff; some roof leaks, generally good condition.

**Carpentry Shop** - Built 1963, 2,808 Sqft
Building in very good structural shape; own heating system and water supply used by maintenance.

**Dube** - Built 1969, 22,685 Sqft
Pros: Building in generally good condition, boiler system has been installed.  
Cons: Roof is in fair condition; not handicap accessible from first floor to lower level; some water supply and drainage plumbing needs replacement; needs some electrical upgrade; no HVAC.

**Murphy Wing** - Built 1963, 6,860 Sqft
Used for inmate care; generally in good shape with some roof leaks.

**Peterson** - Built 1971, 10,891 Sqft
Occupied by Corrections until closure; had a major upgrade in the last three years; has been prepared for installation of a boiler for heat and hot water.

**Quinby** - Built 1905, 32,965 Sqft
Used by Corrections as dining facility for Corrections inmates; generally in good condition.

**Rice** - Built 1954, 7,797 Sqft
Used by Corrections as inmate housing; structurally sound with some roof leaks; has ground water infiltration in utility area.

**Speare** - Built 1954, 7,797 Sqft
Used by Corrections as inmate housing; structurally sound with some roof leaks; has ground water infiltration in boiler area.
**Toll** – Built 1975, 51,468 Sqft
Pros: newer building, very large (52,000+ sq ft); has updated infrastructure (LAN, electrical), pool and gym.
Cons: No sprinkler system; will require boiler system installed; has some minor roof leaks and rotted fascia boards.

**Disrepair**

**King** – Built 1964, 11,124 Sqft
Used as inmate housing; structurally sound with some roof leaks, some mold and water damage (bathrooms). Could be reused with renovation.

**Maintenance/Laundry** – Built 1909, 6,516 Sqft
Has roof leaks and flashing damage; sprinkler system shutdown.

**Powell** – Built 1962, 15,590 Sqft
Pros: Newer facility with upgraded electrical (was used for electrician certification course); some areas have central air conditioning; handicap accessible.
Cons: Building not properly maintained, severe roof leak on northeast side – mold is present, multiple levels, will require boiler system to be installed.

**Spaulding** – Built 1915, 12,146 Sqft
Occupied by the Multiple Offender Program; has had heating system leaks in the past that caused degradation of some structural members making some rooms unsafe; insufficient electrical, overloaded circuits; bathrooms in need of major repair.

**Major Disrepair**

**Baker** – Built 1927, 15,000 Sqft
Never occupied by Corrections; roof has failed and major structural damage caused by water infiltration—basement floor heaved up to 6" and heavy mold infestation; in major disrepair.

**Blood** – Built 1942, 18,970 Sqft
Vacated by Corrections about six years ago; roof leaks, water damage and mold infestation.

**Boiler House/ Pipe Shop** – Built 1905, 3,374 Sqft
Roof leaks, ground water seepage; no other possible reuse without considerable rework.

**Felker** – Built 1913, 14,185 Sqft
Never occupied by Corrections; roof failed with water infiltration and heavy mold infestation; in major disrepair.

**Floyd** – Built 1907, 12,907 Sqft
Never occupied by Corrections; roof damage, water leaks, structural damage and mold infestation.

**Greenhouse** – Built 1941
Overall condition is poor; greenhouse glass mostly gone; workhouse is fair; basement of workhouse floods and may have environmental hazards.
**Keyes** - Built 1917, 16,153 Sqft
Vacated by Corrections about five years ago; roof leaks, water damage and mold infestation.

**Murphy** - Built 1935, 17,327 Sqft
Used as inmate space; roof leaks, floors damaged by inmates, holes in floor and weakened throughout, roof in poor condition some leaks, and sprinkler system not shutdown properly - froze and broke.

**Maintenance Garage** - Built 1952, 5,600 Sqft
Severe concrete deck degradation and the floor may fail; upper floor not to be used for housing vehicles or heavy loads; underground gas storage tank had failed and ground water being monitored.

**Miscellaneous Improvements**

**Water Tower/Altitude House**

**Barn**
Currently used for miscellaneous storage of materials.

**Storage Shed**
Building in Fair condition; presently being used by Laconia Recreation Department for equipment storage.

**Other Miscellaneous Storage Sheds**
Unheated space good for cold storage.

Based upon the above information provided by DAS, the following conditions exist:

- Occupied buildings – 5
- Buildings in good condition – 8
- Buildings in disrepair – 4
- Buildings currently in major disrepair – 9
7. **Building and Facility Systems**

Two backup generators exist on Parcel A. A 75KW 208V backup generator is located in the Quinby Building, while a 70KW 208V generator is located in the boiler room. The generator in the Quinby building is in fair condition and the boiler room generator is in poor condition.
Most buildings on the campus have limited Internet access. Due to the facility's previous use as a prison, Internet access is limited primarily to guard stations and where rehabilitation efforts have taken place to expand access. The only buildings that do not have Internet access are: Baker, Blood, Felker and Keyes.

There are three 1,000 gallon storage tanks that provide liquefied petroleum (LP) gas for cooking equipment and generators.

The boiler plant building houses a 500 horsepower(HP) boiler and two 250 HP boilers, which run on #6 fuel oil stored in two 12,000 gallon storage tanks buried in a concrete vault. The boilers generate steam heat for distribution to the majority of facility. A few buildings on the property had independent heating systems or systems installed and operated since the boilers were shut down. These include the Dube, Dwinell, Speare and Carpentry buildings. The Peterson building was prepped for an independent heating system, but the boiler was never installed.

The boiler house has been mothballed and is not operational at this time. Overall, the mechanical systems in the facility are in poor condition. There is no redundancy with the system and there are mechanical issues with existing boiler systems. The maintenance staff indicated that there are significant issues related to condensate through the underground piping distribution. They reported the need to add 80% to 85% makeup water due to leaks in the system.

With the exception of the Toll building and the boiler house, the entire campus is protected by an automatic sprinkler system. Each building is tied into the main fire alarm system located in the Administration building. Each building has deficiencies in the fire alarm device types and locations and most applications do not meet current codes and standards. Staff reported that replacement parts for the sprinkler system are difficult to obtain. Most building sprinkler systems have been mothballed for preservation during sub-freezing temperatures.

Air conditioning on the facility is limited and only present when handled by small residential window units.

Each building on the facility ties into a central phone system located at the Administration building.

**D. Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder engagement was a key aspect of this reuse assessment process. Stakeholders were interviewed and a community meeting was held. The purpose of this broad outreach was to understand community interests and concerns while communicating the opportunities and constraints related to reuse and disposition of the subject property. The following is a summary of the information gathered during this phase.

1. **New Hampshire State Agencies**

   Interviews were conducted with representatives of several State of New Hampshire agencies. Below is a summary of the key input received. A full description of the stakeholder interviews is included in **Appendix B**.
• Currently DRED leases a portion of the property at the Lakes Region Facility to local farmers. Most of the field leases are for beginner farmers with limited resources.

• Ahern State Park is the abutting property. DRED is currently working with the city of Laconia to transfer park management to the city. According to DRED, Ahern State Park is a good distance from other state parks so it can be difficult for DRED to maintain it.

• Department of Safety occupies the LRMFAA facility on the property. It took approximately one year to convert the building, at a cost of approximately $1.1 million. In addition, another $1 million in infrastructure improvements were made to support the communications needs, including microwave, broadband and VOIP. A $0.57 surcharge on New Hampshire phone bills, both land line and cellular, fund the improvements and operations. Relocating the Department of Safety’s operations would likely cost somewhere in the range of $2.5 to $4 million.

• A portion of the property is currently used by DHHS as a “Designated Receiving Facility” (DRF) for the Bureau of Developmental Services. DHHS previously had an additional presence at the Lakes Region Facility, but those uses were closed in February 2010 and moved to another facility. There has been some talk at the state level about relocating the DRF to another area or facility. This use does not need to be in Laconia. However, citizens generally do not want these types of services in their community. There is generally significant backlash from communities and, therefore, DHHS would need ample notice in order to relocate.

• The Lakes Region Community College previously submitted a plan to relocate the college to the Lakes Region Facility campus along with a conference center. The Community College continues to be interested in exploring the concept. In addition, the college would be interested in being co-located with businesses and services that could provide worker training consistent with the Community College’s curriculum and programs.

• The New Hampshire National Guard is interested in the facility as an optional Readiness Center and/or Training Facility. A Readiness Center is much like an armory of the past where equipment and materials are stored. The Training Facility would be used to train National Guard personnel in urban combat and other tactics. This would also be used to train the Military Police. These uses are considered highly compatible with the Department of Safety’s current facility.

• The New Hampshire Geological Survey has a current need to store data and samples under the Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program.

• DAS is interested in using a portion of the property as a secondary site for critical emergency operations. This use could be combined with other uses. In addition, DAS considers the Lakes Region Facility a possible location for a DHHS district office.

• Department of Corrections (DOC) indicated that it has a need for additional facilities for a women’s prison, minimum security housing and halfway housing. The Lakes Region Facility is not under consideration at this time.

2. **City of Laconia and Belknap County Boards and Commissions**

Shanna B. Saunders, Director of Planning and Zoning for the City of Laconia, held meetings and interviews with representatives of the City of Laconia and Belknap County, including
elected officials and municipal staff. Below is a summary of the input received from these city and county agencies, provided by Ms. Saunders. A full description of the stakeholder interviews is included in Appendix B.

Additional Historic Information
- Possible deed restrictions exist regarding land use
- Extensive wetlands may exist on property along Meredith Center Road
- Potential incinerator onsite in area of solid waste dump
- City Parks and Recreation Department uses garage areas for storage of maintenance vehicles, mowers, fencing, etc.
- City may have long-term leases on two smaller parcels
- A water pump station is located on Old North Main - Parcel B; two water towers exist on site - Parcel A
- Property was a farm prior to the state school

Redevelopment Challenges
- Providing a use or partnership of uses that is diversified economically and stable
- There is no municipal/regional person dedicated to the cause
- State should participate in cleanup of environmental issues
- City should partner with state on both cleanup and reuse
- Gateway type property - need to keep aesthetic values
- Laconia is concerned about the state’s top down approach to development of the prison; city officials would like more input

Redevelopment Opportunities
- Fantastic views
- Commercial uses
- Parcel serves as a gateway
- Proximity to Ahern State Park is a positive
- Opportunity to retain public ownership over a beautiful piece of public land

Potential Municipal Uses
- Fire station
- Substation for police
- Continued use for storage of maintenance vehicles
- Additional playing fields and recreational uses

Potential Non-Municipal Uses
- Lakes Region Community College relocation
- Combination outdoor retail with corporate offices
- Resort style casino
- Brewery
- Small business incubator
- National Guard

Uses Considered Incompatible or a Detriment
- Another prison
- Big box retail development
- Retail or resort use that competes with downtown and the Weirs
- Exclusively gated or high density residential
3. Businesses, Community Groups and Other Individuals

Shanna B. Saunders, Director of Planning and Zoning for the City of Laconia, met with several local groups during July and August 2010 to gather input regarding the future use of the Lakes Region Facility. Ms. Saunders met with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, the Main Street Business Owners Association, Belknap County Economic Development Council, and the grassroots group called Back to Farming at the Laconia State School. The summary below, provided by Ms. Saunders, highlights the various input received from these groups and individuals. A full description of the stakeholder interviews is included in Appendix C.

Additional Historic Information
- History of frequent algal blooms at Ahern State Park swim areas allegedly from prison property runoff and or sewage leaks
- Potential incinerator onsite in area of solid waste dump
- Property was farm prior to state school and was used heavily for farming as a state school

Redevelopment Challenges
- No direct tie to interstate and Laconia traffic corridors are at overcapacity
- Little room to expand due to urban infrastructure and water boundaries
- Providing a use or partnership of uses that is economically diverse and stable
- There is no municipal/regional person dedicated to the cause
- State should participate in cleanup of environmental issues
- City should partner with state on both cleanup and reuse
- Gateway type property – need to keep aesthetic values
- The Laconia business community is concerned about the state’s top down approach to development of the prison; city officials would like more input

Redevelopment Opportunities
- Area's natural resource value is very high
- Area acts as land bridge between Opechee Bay and Paugus Bay, and site contains high-value agricultural soils
- Fantastic views of lakes and mountains
- Big box/commercial use may help diversify tax base – Laconia has no large-scale commercial right now
- Returning the parcel to the tax rolls as commercial property could be beneficial for Laconia
- Parcel still retains its natural beauty today – redevelopment must preserve the lake and natural beauty
- Proximity to Ahern State Park is a positive and could partner well with many uses

Potential Public Uses
- Dog park
- Playing fields
- Public golf course

Potential State or Private Sector Uses
- Lakes Region Community College Relocation
- Arts complex
- Amateur sports complex
- Campground
- Sustainable agriculture resource center
• Large corporate campus

**Uses Considered Incompatible or a Detriment**
• Another prison
• Municipal campus
• Big box
• Manufacturing
• Retail or resort use
• Exclusively gated or high density residential

4. **Community Input Session**

The Commission to Evaluate Long-Term Uses of the Lakes Region Facility held a public meeting to discuss the future reuse of the Lakes Region Facility on August 24, 2010 in Laconia. The public meeting included a brief presentation about the property and the reuse process being used, followed by an open session to share potential reuse ideas. Full documentation of the public information meeting is included in **Appendix C**.

5. **Additional Community Input**

Throughout the course of this project, the PREPARED team received input from individual members of the community. The input is included in **Appendix D**.
Regional Analysis

The subject property is located in the City of Laconia, Belknap County, New Hampshire. Laconia’s 2008 population was estimated to be 17,065 persons, with a median age of 38.8 years.

According to the 2007 City of Laconia Master Plan, Laconia is the Belknap County seat and a regional center for professional, medical and governmental services.19

A. Local Demographics

According to the City of Laconia Master Plan, the city’s demographics identify key issues and opportunities influencing economic development in the city20:

- Population in Laconia is projected to increase from 16,770 residents to 17,250 by 2025.
- As of 2000, 52% of Laconia’s residents had moved into their homes since 1995.
- From 1990 to 2000, the average household size in Laconia fell from 2.49 persons to 2.32 persons.
- As of 2000, 82% of Laconia residents over the age of 25 had high school diplomas and 20% had college degrees.
- The median household income in 2000 reached $37,800, up 30% from the 1990 level of $29,100.
- The percent of the population over age 45 is dramatically increasing, and the population under age 34 is decreasing.
- The total land area in current use in Laconia was reduced by 50% between 2002 and 2005.
- 9% of residents are considered to live below the poverty line.

According to the 2009 Annual Report of Development in the Lakes Region, prepared by the Lakes Region Planning Commission, New Hampshire’s population is growing faster than all other New England states.21


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1980 Census</th>
<th>2007 Estimate</th>
<th>Population Increase</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Percent Increase Per Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5,737,037</td>
<td>6,449,755</td>
<td>712,718</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3,107,576</td>
<td>3,502,309</td>
<td>394,733</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,124,660</td>
<td>1,317,207</td>
<td>192,547</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>920,610</td>
<td>1,315,928</td>
<td>395,218</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>947,154</td>
<td>1,057,832</td>
<td>110,678</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>511,456</td>
<td>621,254</td>
<td>109,798</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,348,493</td>
<td>14,264,185</td>
<td>1,915,692</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGES</td>
<td>2,088,082</td>
<td>2,377,364</td>
<td>289,282</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau

The largest population increases have occurred in the southern and southeastern areas of the state. Belknap County experienced the third highest growth rate of the ten statewide counties. In 1950,

20 Ibid, page VIII.
Laconia accounted for 55% of the total population in Belknap County. Today, Laconia’s population represents just 28% of the county. Surrounding towns, such as Meredith, Alton and Gilford, have grown at a significantly faster pace than Laconia.  

Demographic trends between 1990 and 2000 suggest the city’s population is aging. This may present several challenges related to economic development. 

The 2000 Census showed a significant change in the population of Laconia. As of 2000, 52% of the city’s residents had moved into the city within the past five years. Eleven percent (11%) of these new residents came from outside of New Hampshire. Studies suggest that the large number of rental units in Laconia account for a large part of this influx of new residents. School enrollment records also suggest an increasing transient population.

According to the Final Report: Laconia Smart Growth Implementation Assistance, the median household income in Laconia increased $4,000 between 2000 and 2006, reaching approximately $41,000. This is lower than the 2006 median household income of $50,000 in Belknap County. As of 2007, 8.9% of city residents were living below the poverty level, higher than the state average of 6.7%.

B. Local Economy

The Final Report: Laconia Smart Growth Implementation Assistance identified three key neighborhood centers that drive Laconia’s economy. These centers are downtown Laconia, Weirs Beach and Lakeport.

Lakeport has evolved from its roots as a neighborhood with industrial character. It is now poised to develop as a niche for water sports and boating for residents and visitors.

With its small beach and long boardwalk, Weirs Beach has a wonderful physical relationship to Lake Winnipesaukee. As a result, Weirs Beach has been a family-friendly lakefront resort for over 50 years.

Downtown Laconia has many features of a classic New England downtown district. It has distinctive architecture and several nicely restored historic buildings. Property owners and organizations are interested in working with each other and the city to improve the area. Much of Laconia’s historic downtown core remains intact, with a genuine Main Street and a critical mass of civic and renovated mill buildings. Laconia is well-positioned to take advantage of these aspects of downtown and help spur further reinvestment.

The total civilian labor force as of 2008 is estimated at 8,329. Approximately 1,521 persons are employed in the government sector, 6,339 persons in service providing industries and 2,183 persons in goods producing industries.

The New Hampshire Economic & Labor Market Information Bureau published the following table identifying Laconia’s largest businesses as of 2009:

23 Ibid, page 3.
24 Ibid, pages 3 and 8.
The City of Laconia has a fairly robust manufacturing base. Unlike most communities, the city added manufacturing jobs through early 2000. However, that trend has reversed in recent years and the city and county have lost manufacturing jobs in the last decade.\textsuperscript{28}

In the 2007 Master Plan, the Belknap County Economic Development Council projected that retail trade and hospitality industries would have the largest job growth. Those projections may not have been realized given the economic downturn. The following graph was presented in the 2007 Master Plan.\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{C. Local Natural Resources}

Laconia’s forests include softwoods, hardwoods and mixed stands. A majority of Laconia’s forests are owned and managed by DRED. Three (3) tree farms totaling 281 acres are located in Laconia.\textsuperscript{30}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Largest Businesses}\textsuperscript{27} & \textbf{Product/Service} & \textbf{Employees} \\
\hline
Aavid Engineering Corp. & Semiconductor heat sinks & 620 \\
NH Ball Bearings, Inc. & Spherical bearings & 478 \\
Lewis & Sanders, Inc. & Metal tubular assemblies & 130 \\
Wilcom Products, Inc & Telecommunications test equipment & 85 \\
Baron Machine Co., Inc. & Machine parts, heat treating & 70 \\
Lakes Region General Hospital & Medical care services & NR \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Largest Businesses in Laconia}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{28} \url{http://www.cityoflaconianh.org/index.php/departments/planning-inside/master-plan}, downloaded April 26, 2010, Page 30
\textsuperscript{29} Ibid, Page 32
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid, Page 12.
Agricultural land accounts for a small part of Laconia’s land use. 1991 estimates show only 400 acres in Laconia with soils suitable for farming.\textsuperscript{31}

D. Local Planning

The 2007 City of Laconia Master Plan establishes goals, objectives and actions for land use, economic development, housing, transportation and community facilities.\textsuperscript{32} The Master Plan identifies five economic development goals:

- Revitalize and enhance the Commercial and Economic Aspects of Community Centers, with an emphasis on the Downtown, Lakeport and Weirs sections of the city
- Enhance the city’s attraction as a tourist destination
- Explore new means of raising revenue
- Increase office, industrial/manufacturing and business park development in the city
- Revitalize and enhance the city’s economic development of its waterfront

The Master Plan includes an analysis of the city’s strengths and challenges. The following are the top five in each category:\textsuperscript{33}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The natural environment of the region, especially the lakes</td>
<td>1. Providing truly affordable housing to meet the demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recreational opportunities, including open space areas owned by the state and municipal parks</td>
<td>2. Managing the level of community services that attracts new residents while keeping the tax rate such that existing residents are not priced out of the market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The small town character, including walkable economic centers and friendly residents</td>
<td>3. Maintaining a strong economic base keeping wages at the “living wage” level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The involved citizenry, including volunteer committees, clubs and community groups</td>
<td>4. Providing a well maintained roadway infrastructure that provides sufficient flow yet allows adequate access for businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Healthcare as a driving economic force in Laconia, thanks to the presence of Lakes Region General Hospital</td>
<td>5. Balancing the development along the shorefront and riverfronts with high water quality and aesthetic natural shorelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Regional Economy

The Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC) retained Camoin Associates to conduct an industry cluster analysis for the New Hampshire Lakes Region as part of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS).\textsuperscript{34} This cluster analysis identified potential growth industries, dormant industries and declining industries in the Lakes Region. The following key industries and potential growth clusters were identified:

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, Page 11
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, page 15
\textsuperscript{34} Lakes Region Plan For Sustainable Progress, A Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, February 2009, Appendix 1
As part of the CEDS process, an analysis of the region’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) was conducted. The SWOT was performed primarily through distribution of a survey, followed by analysis of the results, and discussion and prioritization. Based upon this process the following outlines the top five characteristics in each category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural beauty, lakes and mountains</td>
<td>1. Over-reliance on tourism and retail sectors, which typically provide low-wage jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NH Community Technical College partnerships with Lakes Region General Hospital (LRGH) and other local businesses to establish business-specific training programs</td>
<td>2. Lack of affordable housing for workforce; local communities not supportive of workforce housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local and regional economic development councils’ support for business growth</td>
<td>3. Lack of abundant supply of quality employees, highly skilled workers, due to demographic changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Internet access – Belknap is best wired county in the state</td>
<td>4. Lack of support for quality education statewide, local conflicts over support for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Safe and friendly place to raise a family or retire</td>
<td>5. Poor growth management at local level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tap into expertise of significant retiree population in the area</td>
<td>1. Rising cost of living combined with fixed incomes of many seniors could lead to increased poverty among age groups and more demand for public assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Digital age allows people to work remotely, making the Lakes Region a more viable location for a variety of businesses</td>
<td>2. Second home market and influx of affluent retirees could continue to drive up housing costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Growing retiree population creates demand for more health care jobs and cultural and entertainment jobs</td>
<td>3. Continued increase in health care costs and malpractice insurance costs for doctors could be compounded in the region because aging population will require more health care services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conversion of old mill buildings into “cool spaces” for creative businesses</td>
<td>4. Changes in travel market could erode Lakes Region’s tourism economy (i.e., trend of cottages converting to condos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Capture more of Boston Brain Trust and Boston seed capital by targeting businesses that sell to larger companies in Boston area</td>
<td>5. New business activity that could be harmful to the environment could threaten viability of tourism and region’s identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

F.  Regional Planning

LRPC completed the CEDS entitled Lakes Region Plan for Sustainable Progress in February 2009. This Plan addresses the Lakes Region of New Hampshire, including all of Belknap County and portions of Carroll, Grafton, and Merrimack Counties. The CEDS outlined the following objectives:

- Improve the preparation of the workforce by ensuring extensive coordination between educational and training organizations and the needs of business and industry.
- More clearly define where digitization, the Internet, and other future-oriented implications will take our economy so that we can better take advantage of them.
- Strengthen social networks and build engaged communities through planning and creating opportunities for economic growth.
- Help the Lakes Region adjust to energy challenges and changes and the impacts of these decisions on the natural environment and, through conservation efforts, to protect and enhance natural resources.
- Expand affordable housing (more units, more people in them). Help individuals “step up” into homeownership.
- Ensure communication, coordination and collaboration of CEDS sub-committees, stated goals, and project selection.

Real Estate Market Analysis

An analysis of the real estate market was conducted relative to the subject property. Existing studies were reviewed, market data collected, listings of available properties analyzed, and interviews conducted with local real estate professionals.

In August 2005, Laconia, New Hampshire, received technical assistance from the EPA Smart Growth Implementation Assistance Program. The ensuing report was entitled Final Report: Laconia Smart Growth Implementation Assistance.37

As part of the Smart Growth program, Dena Belzer, Economist with Strategic Economics, completed a market analysis for the City of Laconia and the surrounding region. The market analysis identified the five following conclusions:38

- Housing prices in the Laconia area have increased far more rapidly than incomes, making housing affordability an issue of concern for some segments of Laconia’s population.
- The city suffers from retail leakage, and does not capture the full buying power of its residents.
- There are not enough people living in either Lakeport or Weirs Beach to support a significant year-round concentration of retail activity.
- The conversion of weekly rental properties into second homes has led to declining use of seasonal tourist attractions and has changed the nature of visitor-serving businesses in the city.

---

• Bike Week creates competing forces. It provides a highly profitable retail period for some businesses in Weirs Beach, but this freezes key properties in their current uses.

### A. Open Space and Recreation

According to *Lakes Region Plan for Sustainable Progress CEDS*, dated February 2009, 937 acres, or 2.4% of the land area in Laconia is conservation and public lands.\(^{39}\) According to the New Hampshire Conservation Lands Map, approximately 868 acres of open space in Laconia is designated as State Forests, State Parks, and City Parks.

Between 2003 and 2007, conservation and open space in the Lakes Region grew from 97,330 acres to 119,416 acres, or 14.6% of the total land area. Laconia’s current percentage of land (2.4%) designated for conservation is significantly lower than the state’s percentage.

New Hampshire’s Current Use Program encourages landowners to preserve open space by reducing tax liability on large tracts of open space. In 2002, Laconia had 3,984 acres of land in the Current Use Program. By 2005, less than 2,000 acres were in the program.\(^{40}\)

#### Table 4: Acres of Conservation and Public Lands in the Lakes Region by Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Acres Conservation Land*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>2,507</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andover</td>
<td>5,678</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnstead</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Harbor</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effingham</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>2,421</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>2,095</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilford</td>
<td>5,902</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmanton</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Acres Conservation Land*</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>4,043</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holderness</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moultonborough</td>
<td>12,890</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampton</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossipee</td>
<td>8,360</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanbornton</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>22,376</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>13,891</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuftonboro</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfeboro</td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,416</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Updated on June 6, 2007

---

B. Available Land

An online search of available land for sale in Laconia identified over 90 residential parcels currently on the market.\(^1\) Listing prices vary substantially depending on size, location, views and subdivision approvals. The following parcels are currently for sale in Laconia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Road Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$49,900</td>
<td>2.03 Acres</td>
<td>0.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49,995</td>
<td>0.26 Acres</td>
<td>0.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$59,900</td>
<td>0.23 Acres</td>
<td>100.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>5.23 Acres</td>
<td>235.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85,900</td>
<td>5.11 Acres</td>
<td>0.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$89,900</td>
<td>0.36 Acres</td>
<td>128.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$129,500</td>
<td>3.07 Acres</td>
<td>250.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>0.87 Acres</td>
<td>0.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$89,000 - 149,900</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$199,900</td>
<td>0.52 Acre</td>
<td>130.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Road Frontage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$199,900</td>
<td>0.36 Acre</td>
<td>33.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This lot offers easterly view of Lake Winnipesaukee and mountains beyond. The area offers recreational areas, pools, walking trails, tennis, a private beach club and marina. Property is superbly maintained and provides gated entrance. Proximity of nearby airport, ski areas, health care and shopping is excellent. Priced far below assessed value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>2.02 Acres</td>
<td>0.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention Developers and Builders. Here is your opportunity to build in the Lakes Region. This property is approved for a 12 unit condo complex plans and approvals already in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>64.00 Acres</td>
<td>941.00 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64+/− Vacant Acres in Rural Area Yet Close to All Lakes Region Amenities. Sewer Available at Street. Subdivision Possibility. Wetlands in Middle of Parcel. Front and Back of Parcel Is Dry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>78 acres</td>
<td>2,750 and 1,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 acre parcel with 2,750 feet of frontage on Parade Rd and 1,338 feet on Lane Road. City water and sewer nearby, convenient location, and privacy. This land will suit many different development possibilities. Open meadows, acres of forest and views, this is a great opportunity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>67 acres</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 acre parcel with 2,017 feet of road frontage on Parade Rd, 2,900 feet on Meredith Center Rd and 1,700 feet on Lane Rd. With city water and sewer nearby.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews with local real estate agents suggest the current market is active and improving. Preplanned and approved land use plans are more attractive in the market place than raw land without approved site plans.  

**C. Commercial Real Estate Market and Land Uses**

An online search of commercial land for sale in the region identified 23 parcels of land for sale. A majority of the parcels were located outside of Laconia. The following are examples of properties currently on the market, including four in Laconia.

- **2 Crockett Road, Laconia**: 23.13 acre parcel abuts the former Stone House Tavern and Par 3 Golf Course. 900+ feet of frontage on Crockett Road. Located right off Parade Road/Rt.106 between Laconia and Meredith. Some wetlands. $189,000

- **Laconia**: 13 Acres. Laconia City Water and Sewer off Waterford Place in Gilford. Access to Lot from End of Waterford Place Gilford Town Road. Across from Laconia Airport and Just off 3/11 Bypass. Zoned Airport Industrial. $169,000

---

42 Phone interviews with Travis Cole, Kevin Sullivan, Shanna Saunders, July 2010.
Laconia: Commercial opportunity in high traffic area with great visibility, .93 acre commercial building lot and .07 acre lot across the street, city water connection possible. $99,900

1036 Laconia Road, Belmont: Route 106 location. 5.46 acres located between Route 140 and the Laconia By-pass. 225 feet of road frontage. Traffic count 15,000+- cars per day. $220,000

114 Old Lakeshore Road, Gilford: 12.27 acre parcel of commercial land is one of the few large lots remaining in this important airport area. Town sewer, gently slopes, could be subdivided. Additional parcel of 3.43 acres with a house makes up the total acreage. House parcel not to be sold separately. $1,000,000

15 Gilmanton Road / Route 140, Belmont: Almost 3 level, cleared acres with public water and sewer. Ideal location between Concord and Laconia. Minutes from NH Motor Speedway. Great visibility from Rt.106. Traffic count 7,900/day on Rt.140 and 12,000/day on Rt.106. $450,000

256 Laconia Road, Tilton: 1.66 acres in a premier business location just east of all the amenities at Exit 20 off I-93. $299,000

Interviews with local real estate agents suggest the commercial real estate market is active and improving. A majority of the new construction is retail in nature and centered in the core commercial centers in the city. Traffic counts along NH Route 106 are not attractive for retail development and the office market is limited. Excess office space in the downtown limits demand outside the central business district.44

According to the Final Report: Laconia Smart Growth Implementation Assistance,45 Laconia is not capturing the full buying power of its own residents and could support more general merchandise stores. However, retail growth has been limited. Retail establishments in the downtown have struggled and high vacancy rates exist. In Weir Beach, retail activity is dependent on seasonal visitors.

The Master Plan identified two major industrial centers in Laconia, the Laconia-Gilford Industrial Park off of NH Route 107/Laconia By-Pass, and the O'Shea Industrial Park, located off of NH 106 (North Main Street) just south of the subject property.

The CEDS plan identified 16 industrial parks located within the region.

---

44 Phone interviews with Travis Cole, Kevin Sullivan, Shanna Saunders, July 2010.
Table 5: CEDS Identified Industrial Parks within the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Infrastructure Available*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland Industrial Park</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Industrial Park</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belknap Business &amp; Ind. Park</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowm Steel</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Industrial Park</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freudenberg</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freudenberg-NOK &amp; airstrip</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilmanton S&amp;G Industrial Park</td>
<td>Gilford</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laconia Airport Business &amp; Industrial Park</td>
<td>Gilford</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Business Park (Phase 1)</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Business Park (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickerson</td>
<td>Tilton</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Shea Industrial Park</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike Industries</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitten Industrial Park</td>
<td>Gilford</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1990s, the City of Laconia initiated Phase I of the Lakes Business Park at the intersection of Routes 3/11 and 107. Today, four of the five lots are occupied. In 2002, the City of Laconia and Town of Gilford established a joint venture to develop Phase II. Infrastructure is complete and ready for immediate occupancy. The lots include city water and sewer, three phase power, and fiber optic service. Lots are currently on sale and range in size from 2.29 acres to 3.94 acres. Prices range from $82,950 - $236,400.\(^{46}\)

The Route 107 Industrial Park at 484 Province Road, Laconia offers existing industrial space with both drive-in and loading dock access. Space includes 750 Sqft. of finished office. Large overhead doors, high ceilings, skylights, ample parking and sign frontage, plowing included. Rent is $5.00/Sqft. plus utilities.

**D. Residential Market and Land Uses**

According to the 2009 Annual Report of Development in the Lakes Region, Laconia has an estimated 9,398 housing units.\(^{47}\)

---


As the above chart indicates, the number of residential permits issued annually in the Lakes Region rose steadily between 1997 and 2004. Between 2004 and 2006, the number of annual building permits has declined from 1,185 to 623.48 Residential permits in Laconia decreased from approximately 166 in 2004 to 65 in 2007. Laconia lead Belknap County in 2007 permits, however this represented the first time since 2003 that Laconia did not lead the entire Lakes Region in the number of residential permits. Moultonborough, in Carroll County, exceeded Laconia with 75 permits. Approximately 35% of the housing permits issued in Laconia between 2004 and 2007 were for multi-family units.

According to the Final Report: Laconia Smart Growth Implementation Assistance,49 57% of Laconia’s housing units are owner occupied and 43% are rental units, of these 17% are occupied seasonally. Affordable housing is a challenge identified in a majority of the planning studies completed over the past several years. Housing prices in the Laconia area have increased at a faster rate than incomes.

Interviews with local real estate agents suggest the local year-round housing demand is for homes less than $700,000, with a majority of the market demand under $400,000. A number of developments are currently in the pipeline, including over 3,500 condominiums and several large preapproved single family subdivisions.50

Windemere Ridge, located off Parade Road in Laconia, is a high-end 31-lot residential subdivision within close proximity to the subject property. Building lots originally ranged from $60,000 - $200,000 for a two-acre building lot. A few lots remain and are currently on the market for $80,000 - $125,000. Home construction within the subdivision ranges from $400,000 - $500,000, targeting the high end of the local year-round market. The original development plan reportedly called for a retail component, which was removed from the final site plan.

---

50 Phone interviews with Travis Cole, Kevin Sullivan, Shanna Saunders, July 2010.
E. Institutional Market and Land Uses

The subject property has a long history of public ownership and institutional land uses. The State of New Hampshire, as noted below, is a significant land owner in Laconia. In addition, other institutional owners and users are located in Laconia and nearby communities.

The State of New Hampshire Department currently owns four parcels of land in Laconia, the three subject parcels and a fourth parcel located at the northwest corner of Eastman Road and Meredith Center Road. City of Laconia records list the Department of Corrections as the owner of record for these parcels, however they are currently under the control of the Department of Administrative Services.

The State of New Hampshire owns an additional 27 parcels of land within the City of Laconia. Over 800 acres of land is under the management of the State of New Hampshire, Departments of Environmental Services and Resources and Economic Development.

In addition, the State of New Hampshire owns 35 acres of land on NH Route 106 (Belmont Road), which currently houses the Lakes Region Community College. The College offers 23 associate degree programs in Nursing, Fire Technology, Energy Services, Media Arts, Culinary Arts, Automotive, and Marine Technology as well as dozens of certificate programs. First established in 1967, the College has expanded over the years. The most recent expansion was completed in September 2005, with the opening of the Center for Arts and Technology. This building houses Computer Technologies, Electrical Technologies, Fine Arts, Fire Technologies and Graphic Design and Printing Technology. Approximately 1,400 students attend the College each semester.

Laconia Christian School is a college preparatory, Christian day school for students in pre-school through grade 12. The 140-acre campus is located at 1386 Meredith Center Road, approximately three miles north of the subject property.

Numerous private schools, academies and colleges are located within close proximity of Laconia, including Plymouth State University, Plymouth; UNH School of Law (formerly Franklin Pierce) satellite campus in Concord, NH; and the NH Technical Institute, also in Concord.
Opportunities and Constraints Summary

The development potential and value of a property is affected by many factors including location, access and visibility, parcel size and characteristics, infrastructure, as well as the real estate market. In addition, environmental conditions may further affect the development potential.

A. Current Status

Sites with existing long-term leases, tenants or land uses may be of greater interest to some parties, or be deemed as constraints to other interested parties.

- The property is currently owned by the State of New Hampshire.
- DHHS currently occupies a portion of the property and would need notice in order to find suitable location for current programs.
- The Department of Safety (DOS) maintains an Emergency Operations Facility on the property. DOS invested significant money to renovate the building and construct appropriate infrastructure. Relocation would cost between $2.5 - $4 million dollars.
- Portions of the property are reportedly leased to local farmers for agricultural purposes.
- Additional buildings on the property are used for storage by various state agencies and the City of Laconia.
- The New Hampshire National Guard has expressed an interest in using portions of the property for a Readiness Center and Training Facility.
- Other state agencies have expressed an interest in relocating onto the property.

B. Location

Sites located close to interstate highway interchanges and major economic centers have more potential for development. The subject property offers the following assets and constraints relative to its location.

- The property is located in a sparsely populated area of the city.
- The property is surrounded by state park and forests, including Ahern State Park, which share an access road with the property.
- The property is somewhat separate from key tourist destinations within Laconia.

C. Access and Visibility

Sites with direct, high quality road access are more valuable. For commercial and retail uses, visibility from major roadways is critical. The subject property offers these assets and constraints relative to its access and visibility.

- Parcels A and B are directly accessed from NH Route 106.
- Parcels A and B are highly visible along Route 106 with significant road frontage.
- Average Daily Traffic (ADT) on Route 106 is 10,000 vehicles, which is not a significant volume for large retail uses.
  - Traffic counts are significantly lower than downtown traffic counts
  - Traffic counts vary between summer and winter months.
• Parcel A also has significant frontage along Meredith Center Road.
• Parcel B also has frontage along Old North Main Street.
• Parcel C is an isolated parcel located on Meredith Center Road north of Parcel A.

• The property shares an entrance with Ahern State Park off the interior roadway called Right Way Path. This could be a constraint on some future uses.
• Interior roadways may not conform to town standards and could require upgrade for certain uses.

D. Parcel Size and Characteristics

Sites that offer a size, topography and configuration to accommodate particular types of buildings and allow for ample vehicular access are more valuable. The subject property offers the following assets and constraints relative to its size and characteristics.

• Three parcels:
  – Parcel A – 212 acres
  – Parcel B – 10.4 acres
  – Parcel C – 7.8 acres
• Level and gently sloping topography with areas of steep grades
• Areas of open fields, dense vegetation and developed improvements
• Parcel A contains 26 buildings ranging from poor to good condition:
  – Asbestos, lead paint and other hazardous building materials
  – Three buildings currently occupied by LRMFAA, and DOC
• There is sufficient area to accommodate multiple uses on the property.

E. Land Use Policies

Sites that are within areas designated as non-residential and protected from residential encroachment are more desirable for industrial and commercial land uses. Land uses that are supported by local and regional development plans minimize conflicts and attract investors and developers. The following outlines the property’s relationship to current land use policies:

• Zoning Residential: RS, RR1, RR2
• Based upon slopes, wetlands and flood plain, the property contains the following developable acres:
  – Parcel A: 188 acres
  – Parcel B: 10.4 acres
  – Parcel C: 7.8 acres
• The property is likely subject to a Section 106 Historic Preservation Review.

F. Real Estate Market

Sites that are within vibrant growing markets are the most desirable. Further, sites that offer specific features attractive to niche markets can be equally successful. The property’s position in the market presents the following assets and constraints.

• The local real estate market is generally active and improving after two years of decline.
• Land prices vary depending on use and regulatory status:
- Vacant land in the vicinity of subject property is currently on the market for $8,000-$17,000 per acre.
- Building lots located in a high-end single family development east of the subject project are selling for $45,000 per acre.
- Small commercial parcels, less than 5 acres, are selling for $15,000 per acre.

- The retail market is focused along existing commercial corridors. Traffic counts in the vicinity of the subject property do not support significant retail development.

- There is limited demand for office and industrial properties. Excess office property exists in the downtown and office uses are limited to business and professional services supporting the city government and the local population.

- The owner occupied single family housing market is improving, however, large quantities of new development are still approved and in the development pipeline.

- There is a market for existing second homes, ranging in excess of $700,000. Current prices are favorable in the second home market. There is little demand for new second home development, which is viewed as too costly for the market.

- The multi-family investment market is slow, primarily a result of limited capital in the marketplace.

- There appears to be limited potential for private institutional use. However, there is interest on the part of some agencies within state government, as previously noted.
IV. Land Use Concepts

The following land use scenarios were developed based upon the opportunities and constraints analysis and substantial stakeholder input received throughout the process. These scenarios incorporate the land uses that the PREPARED team determined to be the most viable given the opportunities and constraints identified. These are illustrative concepts that depict a viable combination of land uses. Additional combinations are possible.

**Scenario A: State Control/ State Use**

Parcel A would remain under the ownership and control of the State of New Hampshire. Land use of Parcel A would be shared between the New Hampshire National Guard and the Community College.

- Under this land use scenario, the southwestern portion of the site could be utilized by the National Guard.
- The Community College would occupy the remainder of the property. The Community College could sublease portions of the property to organizations with products or services synergistic with the college’s curriculum.
- The existing LRMFAA/NH Emergency 911 Call Center would be integrated into the land uses. Other state agencies (e.g., DES and DAS) could use individual buildings as identified in this assessment.

Parcels B and C are identified for sale or disposition.

**A. Advantages:**

- The users under this scenario are known entities.
- There is general community support for the combination of land uses in this scenario.
- The National Guard has the ability to bring federal resources to the project.

**B. Obstacles to reuse scenario:**

- The cost of facility rehabilitation and/or new construction is significant.
- This scenario would likely require the relocation of the DRF.

**C. Risk mitigation measures:**

- As the owner and primary user of the property, the state can control the timing of actions and the extent of work done on the property.
- Environmental and structural work can be phased.
- Asbestos and lead work would only be triggered by renovation or demolition.
**Scenario B: State Ownership / Public Uses**

Parcel A would remain under the ownership or control of the State of New Hampshire. The Community College would serve as the primary agency controlling the property.

- Under this land use scenario, the southwestern portion of the site could be utilized by the Community College.
- A portion of the property would be made available, via long-term land lease, to the City of Laconia, nonprofit or for-profit organizations for agricultural and recreation uses.
- The Community College could sublease portions of the property to organizations with product or services synergistic with the College’s curriculum.
- The existing LRMFAA/NH Emergency 911 Call Center would be integrated into the land uses. Other state agencies (e.g., DES and DAS) could use individual buildings for as identified in this assessment.

Parcels B and C are identified for sale or disposition.

**A. Advantages:**

- The primary user under this scenario is a known entity.
- There is general community support for the combination of land uses in this scenario.
- This land use accommodates local stakeholder interests.

**B. Obstacles to reuse scenario:**

- The cost of facility rehabilitation and/or new construction is significant.
- State or other funding would be required.
- Sale of the existing Community College buildings may be required.
- Demolition may be needed to accommodate agriculture.
- This scenario would likely require the relocation of the DRF.

**C. Risk mitigation measures:**

- As the owner and primary user of the property, the state can control the timing of actions and the extent of work done on the property.
- Environmental and structural work can be phased.
- Asbestos and lead work would only be triggered by renovation or demolition.
Scenario C: Disposition for Development

This scenario calls for private market redevelopment of the entire parcel. Depending on market interest, the property could potentially be reused for a combination of commercial, residential and recreational uses.

- Under this land use scenario, the southwestern portion of the site could be utilized for commercial, office or incubator space.
- The ability to retain the existing LRMFAA/NH Emergency 911 Call Center would be dependent on market interest.
- Depending on market interest, the remainder of the property is likely to be reused for residential or mixed uses.
- A possible public-private partnership could allow some public uses on the property.
- Private market interest would be determined through an EOI or similar process that provides a flexible method of identifying private sector interest in the property.

A. Advantages:

- There is the potential for local jobs and tax revenues under this scenario.

B. Obstacles to reuse scenario:

- Public incentives would likely be necessary to attract the private market.
- This reuse is dependent on market conditions and responsiveness.
- The state would likely need to mitigate a number of constraints on the property, including environmental conditions.
- Current local zoning could detract interest and restrict reuse.
- The buildings may not be suitable for a market driven reuse.
- This scenario would likely require the relocation of the DRF.
- This scenario could also require the relocation of the E-911 facility depending on market response.

C. Risk mitigation measures:

- The state could invest in remediation and demolition work to help attract private market interest.
- The state could indemnify future owners for environmental conditions related to past use.
- The valuation of the property could be adjusted to account for the significant costs associated with renovation, demolition and remediation.
V. PREPARED Worksheets

A decision-making process typically requires a balancing of costs, risks and benefits. The PREPARED Workbook helps communities understand risks associated with property redevelopment and make informed decisions based upon that knowledge.

SRA/Vita Nuova Team was retained by EPA, to assist The Commission to Evaluate Long-Term Uses of Lakes Region Facility in implementing the PREPARED Workbook at the Lakes Region Facility in Laconia, New Hampshire. The strategy for implementing the PREPARED Workbook was agreed upon with The Commission as follows:

- Establish Project Goals (Worksheet # 1) Based upon input from the Commission
- Conduct Reuse Assessment (Worksheet # 2) Based upon the opportunities and constraints analysis
- Screen Property Recovery Actions (Worksheet # 3) Based upon realistic reuse scenarios
- Due Diligence (Worksheet # 4) Based on Phase I Environmental Site Assessment completed by Credere Associates, LLC
- Identify Redevelopment Obstacles (Worksheet # 5)
- Assess Project Risk (Worksheet # 6)
Worksheet #1: Establishing Project Goals

Project Name/Identifier: Lakes Region Facility

General Property Description

Number of Parcels: Three (3) tax parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Map Parcel Number(s)</th>
<th>Address(es):</th>
<th>Parcel Size (Acres):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>318-142-1</td>
<td>332-404-1 Old No. Main Street</td>
<td>212 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292-153-3</td>
<td>Meredith Center Road</td>
<td>10.4 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292-153-3</td>
<td>332-404-1 Old No. Main Street</td>
<td>7.5 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Zoning:

A majority of the 212 acre parcel is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS). Portions of the parcel with frontage along Meredith Center Road are zoned Residential Rural Corridor (RR2). The parcel on Old No. Main Street is zoned RS. The smaller parcel on Meredith Center Road is zoned Residential Rural District (RR1).

Existing Structures on Parcels (Please list):

According to City of Laconia assessment property cards, Parcel A includes approximately 26 buildings, most considered in average condition. The two smaller parcels are currently vacant.

Current Appraised Value:

No formal appraisal has been completed.

The assessed value of the 212-acre parcel is $23,342,000 according to City of Laconia property cards. The 10.4-acre parcel is assessed at $241,700 and the 7.5-acre parcel is assessed at $125,600.

Brief Description of Past Use (e.g., service station, manufacturing facility, etc.):

The main parcel was first opened in 1903 as the New Hampshire School for the Feeble-minded. It was most recently used by the NH Department of Corrections (DOC) as a correctional facility. Some of the buildings on the property continue to be used by the State of New Hampshire.

Establishing Property Reuse Goals

Key Questions:

- What is the desired outcome of the redevelopment?

  The goal of this process is to assess the short-term and long-term uses of the Lakes Region Facility by determining and recommending the disposition, redevelopment or sale of the property in part or in whole, whichever is in the best interest of the residents of New Hampshire.

- How important is the redevelopment?

- How time critical is the redevelopment?
Other Project Parameters:

- Are there known budgetary or other constraints? Describe.

  The cost of repairing and maintaining the existing buildings and infrastructure on the property resulted in budgetary concerns by the State of New Hampshire. Costs associated with the buildings and infrastructure will play a key role in redevelopment.

- Is this property linked to or part of a larger redevelopment effort? If so, how does that affect the property-specific goals (e.g., timing, budget, necessity, general coordination, etc.)? Describe.

  The City of Laconia considers this property to be one of the most valuable parcels of land in their community. The city will play a key role in redevelopment planning.

- Would the future uses be restricted to current zoning? Describe.

  The RS District is designed to establish and maintain attractive areas used solely for single-family residences and closely related supporting facilities such as schools and churches.

  The RR2 District is intended to recognize the historic, scenic and agricultural values of the areas associated with Parade, Meredith Center and White Oaks Roads. Further, public health and safety considerations will be enhanced by allocating for onsite sewer and water systems since the majority of these areas are not served by municipal water and sewer. This district is defined as the area extending 400 feet from either side of the center line of the right-of-way of the above-mentioned roadways, excluding those areas in the Commercial Resort District.

  The RR1 District is designed to accommodate residential uses in what is commonly recognized as being a rural environment. Generally, the property included within this district will not have sewer and water facilities available. Agriculture, open space and other low-intensity uses shall also be permitted.

  The City is open to exploring changes or variations to the existing zoning based on different well planned, well thought out reuse options.

- Are there other factors that describe property reuse goals? Describe.
Worksheet #2: Reuse Assessment

REUSE SCENARIO A: State Control/State Use; Public Education and Public Safety; and Disposition of Parcels B and C

• What are the potential reuses being considered for the property? Describe. 

Reuse Parcel A to house Community College and National Guard. This would enable the site to remain under state use and control, and could potentially accommodate other state or leased uses. Continue to house Department of Safety existing E 911 uses, and relocate the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Designated Receiving Facility (DRF) (sex offenders).

The New Hampshire National Guard is interested in reusing the facility as an Operational Readiness Center and Training Facility. A Readiness Center is much like an armory of the past where equipment and materials are stored. A Training Facility would be used to train National Guard personnel in urban combat and other tactics. The existing detention facility could be used to train Military Police. These uses are considered highly compatible with the Department of Safety current use (E 911).

Disposition (sell or transfer) parcels B and C. Parcel C is across from ball field and has recreational or residential reuse potential. Parcel B potential commercial or residential reuse.

• Are these uses consistent with the existing municipal master plan, zoning, and other planning documents? Describe. 

The proposed uses for Parcel A are similar to current uses on the property, however a majority of the 212 acre Parcel A is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS) hence, rezoning may need to occur to support this reuse scenario.

Portions of the parcel with frontage along Meredith Center Road are zoned Residential Rural Corridor (RR2) and may need to be rezoned to support this reuse scenario.

Depending on market drivers, parcels B and C may need to be rezoned to facilitate disposition or sale. Currently, Parcel B on Old No. Main Street is zoned RS and the smaller Parcel C on Meredith Center Road is zoned Residential Rural District (RR1).

• Is there general support for these uses from municipal officials? The community? Other key stakeholders? Describe. 

Community is looking for the state to be responsive to their needs and recommendations. (Previously, the recommended reuse as the Community College was supported by the community, but the state sited a prison on the property).

Yes, there is general support for this reuse scenario. The proposed college use is widely supported. However, a few members of the community raised concerns as to whether use by the National Guard is an improvement upon prior use or the highest and best use.

• Has a community needs assessment been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings. 


Yes, per state legislation, a Commission to Evaluate the Long Term Usage of the Lakes Region Facility was established. As part of this process, the Commission found that the Community College has expansion needs and the state has facility needs.

- **Has an opportunities and constraints analysis been conducted that supports the intended uses? Summarize key findings.**

  Site and building conditions may constrain the reuse of Parcel A. As part of the Commission’s process, an assessment of opportunities and constraints for reuse has been conducted. Findings indicate that a portion of the buildings are in disrepair and building systems throughout are in need of upgrade. Potential environmental concerns have been identified by the Phase 1 environmental assessments, and will need further investigation. Data gaps remain and additional analysis will need to be conducted (e.g., historical, environmental and building assessment).

  Parcels B and C do not appear to have significant constraints for this scenario.

- **Has a marketing study been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings.**

  Market information has been assessed to determined adjacent property values and whether or not the local real estate market would support the sale of parcels. Demographic, infrastructure and traffic information has been compiled as well. Findings from the Reuse Assessment indicate that:

  The property's position in the market presents the following assets and constraints.

  - The local real estate market is generally active and improving after two years of decline.
  - Land prices vary depending on use and regulatory status:
    - Vacant land in the vicinity of subject property is currently on the market for $8,000 - $17,000 per acre.
    - Building lots located in a high-end single family development east of the subject project are selling for $45,000 per acre.
    - Small commercial parcels, less than five acres, are selling for $15,000 per acre.
  - The retail market is focused along existing commercial corridors. However, traffic counts in the vicinity of the subject property do not support significant retail development.
  - There is limited demand for office and industrial properties in the area. Excess office property exists in the downtown and office uses are limited to business and professional services supporting the county government and the local population.
  - The owner occupied single family housing market is improving, however, large quantities of new development is still approved and in the development pipeline.
  - There is a market for existing second homes, ranging in excess of $700,000. Current prices are favorable in the second home market. However, there is little demand for new second home development, which is viewed as too costly for the market.
  - The multi-family investment market is slow, primarily a result of limited capital in the marketplace.
  - There appears to be limited potential for institutional use, with the exception of the State of New Hampshire which is a significant land holder in the city.
• **Have any other studies been conducted regarding the reuse of the property? Summarize key findings.**

   No other studies have been conducted, however additional information related to building conditions, historical status of buildings, and environmental conditions is needed.

• **Has an evaluation of the property's suitability for the intended use been done? Are there physical features of the property that would limit future uses (e.g., parcel size, topography, road access, etc.)? Summarize.**

   The majority of the property is developable and the parcel size can accommodate a variety of uses. The topography of the western portion of the property has sloping that may complicate development.

   Existing roads will need to be upgraded or potentially relocated to accommodate build out and additional circulation routes may need to be developed.

   The condition of the existing buildings range from reusable to in need of demolition.

   Parcels B and C are relatively undeveloped, so they can support a variety of reuse scenarios.

• **Are there infrastructure issues that need to be addressed (e.g., access roads, utilities)? Describe.**

   Access roads would need to be expanded to comply with local ordinances and parking areas would need to be evaluated depending on reuse.

   HVAC, stormwater, sewer, and domestic water systems will need to be upgraded depending on reuse needs.

• **Has a preliminary financial feasibility analysis of intended future reuses been performed to determine whether those uses are realistic? Summarize these results.**

   Financial feasibility studies will need to be conducted when the environmental studies, building assessments and historical reviews are completed.

• **Are there interested buyers/developers for the property? What partnering role might they play in assessing, cleaning up or redeveloping the property? Describe.**

   In this scenario, the state retains ownership. The Community College and NH National Guard are interested in redeveloping Parcel A. The NH National Guard’s preference would be to own the land and not for the land to stay under DAS’s control.

   Disposition of parcels B and/or C may leverage some resources for necessary site preparations and improvements.

• **Are there other known or anticipated complicating factors or other considerations relating to the redevelopment? Describe.**

   Environmental investigation, building assessment and historical review have not been fully completed and may complicate redevelopment. The conditions of the buildings indicate significant rehab and some demolition will most likely be necessary. As mentioned above, infrastructure upgrades are necessary as well.
• **Are there significant data gaps that should be prioritized as part of future information gathering efforts? Describe.** [ ]

Significant data gaps include:
- Phase 2 Environmental Investigation
- Buildings: Structural; Asbestos and Lead; and Historical
- Infrastructure (road, sewer, power, water)

• **Is there any other relevant information? Describe.** [ ]

Currently the DRED leases some of the property at the Lakes Region Facility to local farmers. Most of the field leases are for beginner farmers with limited resources.

Department of Safety occupies the Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association (LRMFAA) facility on the property. It took approximately one year to convert the building, at a cost of approximately $1.1 million. In addition, another $1 million dollars in infrastructure improvements were made to support the communications needs, including microwave, broadband and VOIP. Relocating the Department of Safety's operations would likely cost somewhere in the range of $2.5 to $4 million dollars.

A portion of the property is currently used by DHHS as a DRF for the Bureau of Developmental Services. DHHS previously had an additional presence at the Lakes Region Facility, but those uses were closed in February 2010 and moved to another facility. There has been some talk at the state level about relocating the DRF to another area or facility. This use does not need to be in Laconia. However, citizens generally do not want these types of services in their community. There is generally significant backlash from communities and, therefore, DHHS would need ample notice in order to relocate.
REUSE SCENARIO B: State Ownership/Public Uses; Public Education, Recreation and Agricultural Uses; and Disposition of Parcels B and C

• What are the potential reuses being considered for the property? Describe.
  Parcel A: Community College mixed with Possible Agriculture Parks and Recreation Uses.
  This scenario would keep the larger parcel in state control. A large portion of the parcel would be leased under a long-term agreement to the City of Laconia and/or nonprofit organization for agricultural and recreational uses.

  In addition, this scenario would allow the college to lease some buildings for other users, such as synergistic incubator space, U.S. Geological Survey library, equipment storage, etc. This would likely require the Community College to move from its existing buildings in Laconia and sell those buildings.

  Sell/Disposition parcels B and C, which may leverage funds for Parcel A improvements.
  - Parcel C is located across from ballfield and has recreational or residential reuse potential.
  - Parcel B is located on the southeast side of Rt. 106 and has potential commercial or residential reuse potential.

• Are these uses consistent with the existing municipal master plan, zoning, and other planning documents? Describe.
  The proposed uses for Parcel A are similar to current uses on the property. However, because a majority of the 212-acre Parcel A is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS), rezoning may need to occur to support this reuse scenario. Portions of the parcel with frontage along Meredith Center Road are zoned Residential Rural Corridor (RR2) and may need to be rezoned to support this reuse scenario.

  Depending on market drivers, parcels B and C may need to be rezoned to facilitate disposition or sale. Currently, Parcel B on Old No. Main Street is zoned RS and the smaller Parcel C on Meredith Center Road is zoned Residential Rural District (RR1).

• Is there general support for these uses from municipal officials? The community? Other key stakeholders? Describe.
  Yes, there is general support for this reuse scenario. The Community College, the locality and public stakeholders have expressed support for siting the community college, continuation of learning farms and recreational uses.

• Has a community needs assessment been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings.
  Yes, per state legislation, a Commission to Evaluate the Long Term Usage of the Lakes Region Facility was established. As part of this process, the Commission found that the college has expansion needs.

• Has an opportunities and constraints analysis been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings.
  Site and building conditions may constrain the reuse of Parcel A. As part of the Commission’s process, an assessment of opportunities and constraints for reuse has been conducted. Findings indicate that a portion of the buildings are in disrepair and building systems throughout are in need of upgrade. Potential environmental concerns have been identified by the Phase 1 environmental assessments, and
will need further investigation. Data gaps remain and additional analysis will need to be conducted (e.g., historical, environmental and building assessment). Parcels B and C do not appear to have significant constraints for this scenario.

- **Has a marketing study been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings.**

  Market information has been assessed to determine adjacent property values and whether or not the local real estate market would support the sale of parcels. Demographic, infrastructure and traffic information has been compiled as well. Findings from the Reuse Assessment indicate that:

  The property’s position in the market presents the following assets and constraints.
  - The local real estate market is generally active and improving after two years of decline.
  - Land prices vary depending on use and regulatory status
    - Vacant land in the vicinity of subject property is currently on the market for $8,000 - $17,000 per acre.
    - Building lots located in a high-end single family development east of the subject project are selling for $45,000 per acre.
    - Small commercial parcels, less than 5 acres, are selling for $15,000 per acre.
  - The retail market is focused along existing commercial corridors. However, traffic counts in the vicinity of the subject property do not support significant retail development.
  - There is limited demand for office and industrial properties. Excess office property exists in the downtown and office uses are limited to business and professional services supporting the county government and the local population.
  - The owner occupied single family housing market is improving, however, large quantities of new development is still approved and in the development pipeline.
  - There is a market for existing second homes, ranging in excess of $700,000. Current prices are favorable in the second home market. However, there is little demand for new second home development, which is viewed as too costly for the market.
  - The multi-family investment market is slow, primarily a result of limited capital in the marketplace.
  - There appears to be limited potential for institutional use, with the exception of the State of New Hampshire, which is a significant landholder in the city.

- **Have any other studies been conducted regarding the reuse of the property? Summarize key findings.**

  No other recent studies have been conducted; and additional information related to building conditions, historical status of buildings, and environmental conditions is needed. Studies were previously completed prior to the prison being located on the property.

- **Has an evaluation of the property’s suitability for the intended use been done? Summarize.**

  The majority of the property is developable and the parcel size can accommodate a variety of uses. The topography of the western portion of the property has sloping that may complicate development.

  Existing interior roadways on Parcel A will need to be upgraded or potentially relocated to accommodate build out and additional circulation routes may need to be developed.

  The condition of the existing buildings range from reusable to in need of demolition. Initial survey indicates four buildings are occupied; nine are in good condition; four are in disrepair; and nine are in major disrepair.

  Parcels B and C are relatively undeveloped, so they can support a variety of reuse scenarios.
• **Are there infrastructure issues that need to be addressed (e.g., access roads, utilities)?** Describe. [ ]

Interior roadways would need to be expanded to comply with local ordinances and parking areas would need to be evaluated depending on reuse. HVAC, stormwater, sewer and domestic water systems will need to be upgraded depending on reuse needs.

• **Has a preliminary financial feasibility analysis of intended future reuses been performed to determine whether those uses are realistic? Summarize these results.** [ ]

Financial feasibility studies will need to be conducted. Ideally, this would be done when the environmental studies, building assessments and historical reviews are completed.

• **Are there interested buyers/developers for the property? What partnering role might they play in assessing, cleaning up or redeveloping the property? Describe.** [ ]

In this scenario the state retains ownership. The Community College is interested in redeveloping Parcel A. Disposition of the College's existing assets as well as parcels B and/or C may leverage resources for necessary site preparations, improvements and rehab/new construction.

• **Are there other known or anticipated complicating factors or other considerations relating to the redevelopment? Describe.** [ ]

Environmental investigation, building assessment and historical review have not been fully completed and may complicate redevelopment. The conditions of the buildings indicate significant rehab and some demolition will most likely be necessary. As mentioned above, infrastructure upgrades are necessary as well.

• **Are there significant data gaps that should be prioritized as part of future information gathering efforts? Describe.** [ ]

Significant data gaps include:
- Phase 2 Environmental Investigation
- Buildings: Structural; Asbestos and Lead; Historical
- Infrastructure (road, sewer, power, water)

• **Is there any other relevant information? Describe.** [ ]

Currently the DRED leases some of the property at the Lakes Region Facility to local farmers. Most of the field leases are for beginner farmers with limited resources.

Department of Safety occupies the Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association (LRMFAA) facility on the property. It took approximately one year to convert the building, at a cost of approximately $1.1 million. In addition, another $ 1 million in infrastructure improvements were made to support the communications needs, including microwave, broadband and VOIP. Relocating the Department of Safety's operations would likely cost somewhere in the range of $2.5 to $4 million.

A portion of the property is currently used by DHHS as a Designated Receiving Facility (DRF) for the Bureau of Developmental Services. DHHS previously had an additional presence at the Lakes Region Facility, but those uses were closed in February 2010 and moved to another facility. There has been some talk at the state level about relocating the DRF to another area or facility. This use does not need to be in Laconia. However, citizens generally do not want these types of services in their community. There is generally significant backlash from communities and therefore DHHS would need ample notice in order to relocate.
REUSE SCENARIO C: Disposition for Development; State Dispositions Parcels A, B and C for Market Driven Development

• **What are the potential reuses being considered for the property? Describe.**
  Private development of parcels A, B and C would be accomplished through an EOI process. It is likely that the EOI would result in a mixed use of residential and commercial. This approach could accommodate some public land uses.

• **Are these uses consistent with the existing municipal master plan, zoning, and other planning documents? Describe.**
  Because a majority of the 212-acre Parcel A is zoned Residential Single-Family (RS), rezoning may need to occur to support this market-driven reuse scenario. Portions of the parcel with frontage along Meredith Center Road are zoned Residential Rural Corridor (RR2) and may need to be rezoned to support this reuse scenario.

  Depending on market drivers, parcels B and C may need to be rezoned to facilitate disposition or sale. Currently, Parcel B on Old No. Main Street is zoned RS and the smaller Parcel C on Meredith Center Road is zoned Residential Rural District (RR1).

• **Is there general support for these uses from municipal officials? The community? Other key stakeholders? Describe.**
  Community is looking for the state to be responsive to their needs and recommendations. (Previously the community recommended the college and the state sited a prison on the property.) More recently, the state rejected proposal for a women’s prison facility.

  Yes, both in the public meeting and in interviews with city staff, interest in private development was expressed. The commission has expressed that the state would support the sale of the property to private parties to generate capital within the state budget. In the public meeting that took place August 24, 2010, multiple community members expressed interest in seeking out a private company to relocate to the site.

• **Has a community needs assessment been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings.**
  Per state legislation, a Commission to Evaluate the Long Term Usage of the Lakes Region Facility was established and certain needs were identified. However, the Reuse Assessment shows 16 other industrial parks in the region and numerous other housing developments coming on line.

• **Has an opportunities and constraints analysis been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings.**
  Site and building conditions may constrain the reuse of Parcel A. As part of the Commission’s process, an assessment of opportunities and constraints for reuse has been conducted. Findings indicate a portion of buildings are in disrepair and building systems throughout are in need of upgrade. Potential environmental concerns have been identified by the Phase 1 environmental assessments, and will need further investigation. Data gaps remain and additional analysis will need to be conducted (e.g., historical, environmental and building assessment).

  While parcels B and C do not appear to have significant constraints for this scenario, additional environmental information is required.
Has a marketing study been conducted that support the intended uses? Summarize key findings. [ ]

Market information has been assessed to determined adjacent property values and whether or not the local real estate market would support the sale of parcels. Demographic, infrastructure and traffic information has been compiled as well. Findings from the Reuse Assessment indicate that:

The property’s position in the market presents the following assets and constraints.

- The local real estate market is generally active and improving after two years of decline.
- Land prices vary depending on use and regulatory status:
  - Vacant land in the vicinity of subject property is currently on the market for $8,000 - $17,000 per acre.
  - Building lots located in a high-end single family development east of the subject project are selling for $45,000 per acre.
  - Small commercial parcels, less than 5 acres, are selling for $15,000 per acre.
- The retail market is focused along existing commercial corridors. However, traffic counts in the vicinity of the subject property do not support significant retail development.
- There is limited demand for office and industrial properties. Excess office property exists in the downtown and office uses are limited to business and professional services supporting the county government and the local population.
- The owner occupied single family housing market is improving, however, large quantities of new development is still approved and in the development pipeline.
- There is a market for existing second homes, ranging in excess of $700,000. Current prices are favorable in the second home market. However, there is little demand for new second home development, which is viewed as too costly for the market.
- The multi-family investment market is slow, primarily a result of limited capital in the marketplace.
- There appears to be limited potential for institutional use, with the exception of the State of New Hampshire which is a significant land holder in the city.

Have any other studies been conducted regarding the reuse of the property? Summarize key findings. [ ]

No other studies have been conducted. However additional information related to building conditions, historical status of buildings and environmental conditions is needed.

Has an evaluation of the property’s suitability for the intended use been done? Are there physical features of the property that would limit future uses (e.g., parcel size, topography, road access, etc.)? Summarize.

The majority of Parcel A is developable and the parcel size can accommodate a variety of uses. The topography of the western portion of the property has sloping that may complicate development. Existing roads will need to be upgraded or potentially relocated to accommodate build out and additional circulation routes may need to be developed. The condition of the existing buildings on Parcel A range from reusable to in need of demolition. Because parcels B and C are relatively undeveloped, they can support a variety of reuse scenarios.

Are there infrastructure issues that need to be addressed (e.g., access roads, utilities)? Describe. [ ]

For Parcel A, it is likely that interior roadways would need to be expanded to comply with local ordinances and to allow for subdivision. Parking areas would need to be evaluated depending on reuse. HVAC, stormwater, sewer and domestic water systems will need to be upgraded depending on reuse needs. Parcels B and C are readily accessible.
• **Has a preliminary financial feasibility analysis of intended future reuses been performed to determine whether those uses are realistic? Summarize these results. [ ]**

Financial feasibility studies will need to be conducted. These would be best done when the environmental studies, building assessments and historical reviews are completed.

• **Are there interested buyers/developers for the property? What partnering role might they play in assessing, cleaning up or redeveloping the property? Describe. [ ]**

Unknown, an Expression of Interest (EOI) process would identify potential partners.

• **Are there other known or anticipated complicating factors or other considerations relating to the redevelopment? Describe. [ ]**

Environmental investigation, building assessment and historical significance, as well as infrastructure reviews have not been fully completed and may complicate redevelopment. The conditions of the buildings indicate significant rehab and some demolition will be necessary. As mentioned above, infrastructure upgrades are necessary as well. Parcels B and C have no significant buildings and, therefore, less hindrances to development.

• **Are there significant data gaps that should be prioritized as part of future information gathering efforts? Describe. [ ]**

Significant data gaps include:
- Phase 2 Environmental Investigation
- Buildings: Structural, Asbestos and Lead; Historical
- Infrastructure (road, sewer, power, water)

• **Is there any other relevant information? Describe. [ ]**

Currently, the DRED leases some of the property at the Lakes Region Facility to local farmers. Most of the field leases are for beginner farmers with limited resources.

Department of Safety occupies the Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Association (LRMFAA) facility on the property. It took approximately one year to convert the building, at a cost of approximately $1.1 million. In addition, another $1 million in infrastructure improvements were made to support the communications needs, including microwave, broadband and VOIP. Relocating the Department of Safety's operations would likely cost somewhere in the range of $2.5 to $4 million.

A portion of the property is currently used by DHHS as a Designated Receiving Facility (DRF) for the Bureau of Developmental Services. DHHS previously had an additional presence at the Lakes Region Facility, but those uses were closed in February 2010 and moved to another facility. There has been some talk at the state level about relocating the DRF to another area or facility. This use does not need to be in Laconia. However, citizens generally do not want these types of services in their community. There is generally significant backlash from communities and therefore DHHS would need ample notice in order to relocate.
### Worksheet #3: Property Recovery Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Eliminated</th>
<th>Action Under Consideration</th>
<th>Property Recovery Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario A:</strong> State Control/State Use: Public Education and Public Safety; and Disposition of Parcels B and C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retain long-term ownership of Parcel A for state uses; primarily the Community College and National Guard. Transfer parcels B and C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefly summarize the basis for eliminating or keeping this action under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State retention of ownership of the larger Parcel A would enable state to use and/or lease. Retaining ownership of Parcel A allows the state to retain control of mitigation of any environmental issues. Some of the existing uses could be retained, e.g., E-911 facility. The site appears large enough to accommodate the Community College and National Guard. The National Guard may bring resources to the table for improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sell or transfer parcels B and C, which may leverage resources for necessary improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If this option is still under consideration, briefly identify potential key issues (e.g., “deal breakers,” limitations on property reuse, or actions needed to gain control or access to the property) or significant information needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key information needs include Phase 2 environmental investigation; historical, structural and asbestos surveys of buildings; and infrastructure analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State College Board would need to approve; and National Guard funding requires a full National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) assessment prior to funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Award/appropriation of National Guard funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario B:</strong> State Ownership/Public Uses: Public Education, Recreation and Agricultural Uses; and Disposition of Parcels B and C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parcel A: Community College with Possible Agriculture Parks and Recreation Uses. Move college uses to Parcel A and sell existing college buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sell/Disposition parcels B and C; Parcel C is located across from ballfield and has recreational or residential reuse potential; and Parcel B is located on the southeast side of Rt. 106 and has potential commercial or residential reuse potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Eliminated</td>
<td>Action Under Consideration</td>
<td>Property Recovery Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scenario B: State Ownership/Public Uses: Public Education, Recreation and Agricultural Uses; and Disposition of Parcels B and C (continued)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefly summarize the basis for eliminating or keeping this action under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This scenario would keep the larger site in state control and allow for mixed use; the site would be split between college, agricultural and recreational uses. As far as mixed uses; the college can lease buildings to other users, such as an incubator, U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) library and equipment garage; or other. The state could lease recreational space to Town, and a portion made available for agricultural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sale of the college’s existing assets and/or state sale of parcels B and C could help fund improvements, and rehab/new construction at Parcel A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaining ownership of Parcel A allows the state to retain control of mitigation of any environmental issues, and allow for phasing of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This scenario also responds to community interest in locating agriculture facility, nonprofit and recreation use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If this option is still under consideration, briefly identify potential key issues (e.g., “deal breakers,” limitations on property reuse and actions needed to gain control to the property) or significant information needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key information needs include Phase 2 environmental investigation; buildings: structural, lead and asbestos, historical surveys; and infrastructure analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State College Board would need to approve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Scenario C: Disposition for Development: State Dispositions Parcels A, B and C for Market Driven Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under this scenario, all three parcels would undergo disposition for private development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Briefly summarize the basis for eliminating or keeping this action under consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development would be undertaken by private entities, potentially yielding rateables. Reuse will be facilitated by state conducting Phase 2; historical; structural, asbestos and lead assessment prior to EOI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If this option is still under consideration, briefly identify potential key issues (e.g., “deal breakers,” limitations on property reuse and actions needed to gain control to the property) or significant information needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential critical issues include market conditions that may not support private development, as well as the need for the state to mitigate environmental and structural issues. Infrastructure may also be an issue.

**Worksheet #4: Due Diligence**

*Note – The questions in this worksheet are meant to identify an initial list of risks typically found when conducting proper due diligence. If answers to questions require further discussion and strategizing to mitigate (e.g., property or buildings have historical significance), list as a barrier on Worksheet #5.*

**All Appropriate Inquiry [Section 4.7.1]**
- Have all the requirements for All Appropriate Inquiry been met? Yes.

**Property Description**
- Please describe the subject property, including size of property and number of buildings.
  The subject property consists of three parcels of land comprising a total of 229.9 acres located at 1 Right Way Path in Laconia, New Hampshire. The subject property is improved with 31 buildings, six accessory structures, and associated asphalt and concrete-paved parking lots, driveways, and walkways. Unimproved portions of the subject property are covered by gravel roadways, landscaped grass, and forested land.

**Property History [Section 4.7.2]**
- What are the prior land uses and activities?
  Prior to 1903: Agricultural Purposes
  After 1903: Institutional Purposes

- Who were the prior owners and tenants of the property?

  According to historical information, the subject property was initially developed for agricultural purposes. In 1903, the New Hampshire School for the Feeble-Minded began operations at the subject property. The subject property was acquired by the State of New Hampshire in 1915 and the property continued in use as an institution for the mentally challenged until January 31, 1991. Control of the subject property was transferred to the New Hampshire Department of Corrections (NHDOC) in 1991, which converted the facility to a minimum and medium security programming institution. The subject property was reportedly used for these purposes until June 30, 2009. Overlapping uses since 1991 have included State Police training, technical training and education, drug and alcohol rehabilitation, and commercial applications.

- Are redevelopment or reuse plans prepared by other parties for the property available? Yes

  Describe: The previous plans confirm the above property history.

- Are there other factors relevant to property history that should be considered during the redevelopment planning? No
**Current Property Status [Section 4.7.3]**

- What is the ownership status (e.g., private, abandoned, publicly owned, etc.)?
  
  Describe: Publicly Owned (State of NH)

- Is there clear title to the property? Yes To our knowledge, however a title search was not conducted.
  
  - Are there liens on the property (e.g., EPA, state, Mortgage holders, Contractors, Property tax, etc.)? No, not to our knowledge, however a title search was not conducted.
  
  - Can clear title be obtained? Y/N

- What is the current land use of the property? Describe: Currently, the majority of the facility is vacant. Only three of the 31 buildings are occupied. Current tenants/operators include the New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services, New Hampshire Emergency 911 Call Center, Lakes Region Mutual Fire Aid Communications Center, and Lakes Region Community Services Council.

- What is the current zoning and relationship of the property to local master plans and other planning studies? Describe: The subject property is currently located in the single family residential (RS) zoning district though the area may be re-zoned in the future (Laconia Daily Sun, 10/6/10). No existing planning studies are known.

- Are there other factors (e.g., physical condition of structures, access to property, ecological issues) relevant to property status that should be considered during the redevelopment planning? Describe: Though no formal assessment was completed, several of the structures appear to be in poor physical condition.

- Are buildings, structures or areas of the property of historical importance? [Yes, potentially]
  
  Describe: Many of the buildings date back to the early 1900s, although their historic significance is unknown.
  
  - Are there any state or federal historic preservation statutes that may be triggered with redevelopment? Unknown

**Property Appraisal [Section 4.7.4]**

- What is the appraised value of the property? Unknown

- Are there other factors (e.g., limitations or conditions associated with an appraisal, significant variability in appraisals) relevant to property appraisal that should be considered during the redevelopment planning? No

**Regulatory Status [Section 4.7.5]**

- What federal and/or state cleanup statutes are currently applicable to the property?
  
  1. Many, including but not limited to RCRA and TSCA
  2. Many, including but not limited to ENV-OR 600, ENV-WS 400, and ENV-WM-1400

- What federal and/or state cleanup statutes are most likely to drive environmental liability during redevelopment of the property? [ ]

- Have federal- or state-mandated cleanup actions already been or are likely to be conducted at the property? Previously conducted.

Describe: Underground storage tanks were removed in 1992 and 750 tons of contaminated soil were removed from the property. Since that time additional investigations have been conducted and semi annual ground water sampling is currently being conducted to continue to monitor the ground water
conditions in this area. Continued monitoring is being required by the state yet additional cleanup is not currently required.

- Have “potentially responsible parties” been identified for the property? Yes
  
  List: The PRP is assumed to be the State of NH

- Is the municipality already or likely to be a PRP? Not to our knowledge

- Are there other factors (e.g., specific regulatory requirements, permits, violations) relevant to the regulatory status that should be considered during the redevelopment planning? Yes
  
  Describe: According to information reviewed at the NHDES, regulated levels of Escherichia coli (E. coli) have been identified in association with discharge from the stormwater system of the subject property. Personnel familiar with the subject property indicated that this issue is in the process of being resolved in accordance with an agreement with EPA.

Environmental Conditions [Section 4.7.6]

- Is there a known or suspected environmental condition (e.g., Recognized Environmental Condition, De Minimis Environmental Conditions, or ASTM Non-Scope Environmental Conditions) on the property? Yes

This assessment has revealed the following evidence of recognized environmental conditions (REC):

REC-1 – A documented historical release of petroleum products from a former UST removed from outside the Garage has impacted environmental conditions and contributed to contaminant concentrations in ground water which do not meet the currently applicable regulatory standards. This release is currently being managed in accordance with a ground water management permit issued by the NHDES. Active remedial measures have not been requested by NHDES.

REC-2 – Several petroleum USTs and ASTs have been maintained at the subject property since its development. While the majority of tanks have adequate documentation for their former location and removal, the historical record is inconsistent or conflicting in certain instances and sufficient documentation of the subsurface environment surrounding certain tanks is unavailable. In addition, historical documentation indicated evidence of a potentially unregistered and/or abandoned UST located outside the Laundry building and a similarly unknown UST or AST adjacent to the Warehouse building. Therefore, historic and potentially on-going undocumented releases of petroleum products from identified current and/or former USTs and/or ASTs, or unknown USTs and/or ASTs, may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property.

REC-3 – Documented, observed, alleged, and potential unknown surficial disposal and landfilling of waste materials including, but not limited to, containers of pesticides, solid waste, asbestos containing materials (ACM), bulk storage tanks, tires and auto parts, and coal ash has been identified at the subject property. Based on the subject property reconnaissance and records review, at a minimum these activities are reported to have occurred in the area south and southwest of the Garage building, south of the Boiler House, in the vicinity of the Poultry Houses, and north of the Toll building. The disposal of these materials may have caused releases of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances which may have impacted environmental conditions in these areas and others at the subject property. Further, the potential use of pesticides and insecticides at the greenhouse raises the potential for releases of these materials to interior and exterior soils as well as ground water.

REC-4 – A former floor drain reportedly discharged to the ground surface south of the Garage. In addition, a floor drain was observed adjacent to a compromised pool chemical container and pool chemical tanks in the Toll building. These current and/or former floor drains represent a potential
conduit to the environment whereby releases of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances used within the Garage and for the pool chemical system at the Toll building may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property.

REC-5 – Surficial staining and/or associated petroleum odors were observed in association with soil in the area of a portable generator at the North Barn, and concrete in a former electrical room at Quinby, a waste oil accumulation area at the Boiler House, and metal cutting equipment at the Boiler House. These conditions may be indicative of potential historical releases of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances which may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property.

REC-6 – Current and/or former hydraulic elevators in the Blood and Quinby buildings, as well as a former hydraulic lifts in the Garage, may have released petroleum products and/or hazardous substances which may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property.

REC-7 – A sewer treatment “Chlorination Plant” with associated sludge beds is depicted approximately 500 to 750 feet south of the Boiler House smokestack on a 1931 Site Plan which was reviewed at the New Hampshire Department of Archives and Records Management (NHDARM). Former sewer treatment practices in this area may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property.

Credere did not identify de minimis environmental conditions (DMECs) at the property.

ASTM non-scope environmental conditions (NECs) noted during this Phase I ESA include the following:

NEC-1 – Based on the age and condition of the subject property buildings, asbestos, lead-based paint, mold, manufactured PCB bulk products, and PCB-containing excluded products may be present within these structures. These items are known to present a potential hazard to human health, may be regulated for disposal, and have the potential to cause a release of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances which may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property or may impact these conditions in the future. In addition, suspected ACMs were observed in several of the buildings as described in Section 5 of this report. The presence of these materials could impact future redevelopment/subject property use options and would need to be assessed and appropriately abated/managed prior to renovation or demolition of subject property buildings.

NEC-2 – Based on the age of the facility, oil-filled electrical equipment such as transformers, regulators, capacitors, and switchgear have the potential to house PCB-containing and/or PCB-contaminated dielectric fluid. No visual surficial evidence of a release of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances was observed in association with the identified potentially oil-filled electrical equipment. However, staining or any other indication of a potential release of dielectric fluid observed in association with this equipment either during use or at the time of removal from service may be indicative of a release of PCBs. If so, such a release may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property or may impact these conditions in the future.

NEC-3 – Potential universal and/or hazardous waste was observed in several subject property buildings. Certain universal and/or hazardous wastes items are known to present a potential hazard to human health, may be regulated for disposal, and have the potential to cause a release of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances which may have impacted environmental conditions at the subject property or may impact these conditions in the future.

NEC-4 – An extensive steam tunnel system extends from the Boiler House (Building 22) across a significant portion of the subject property to the majority of the onsite buildings. The steam tunnels were not accessible during this assessment but reportedly contain ACM. The presence of ACM-
containing components within the steam tunnels will need to be considered during any reuse planning for the subject property.

- Are there data gaps either identified or indicated in the Environmental Assessments? Yes
  Inadequate information is available from any practically reviewable source concerning the details or environmental conditions associated with current and previous USTs and/or ASTs at the subject property. Based on the lack of documentation, the potential for a release to have occurred from these tanks cannot be dismissed. In addition, though all available information was reviewed, records maintained at the NHDES, other available sources, and observations made during the subject property reconnaissance indicate that certain tank records are inconsistent and/or incomplete. Therefore, aside from the known tanks identified during the performance of the Phase I ESA, the details of any additional current and/or former bulk petroleum storage systems cannot be determined without additional investigation.

- What regulatory oversight has occurred or is occurring for environmental investigations/studies and cleanup? NH DES ground water management permit for previously completed response action relating to former gasoline USTs
- Has the validity of data and other information or conclusions in previous environmental investigations/studies been evaluated? Yes
- Do existing environmental investigations/studies and cleanups address off-site sources of contamination? No
- Have hazardous substances associated with activities on the property been identified on adjacent properties or are hazardous substances expected to migrate beyond the property boundaries? No
- Do existing environmental investigations/studies and cleanups address asbestos, lead-paint and other hazardous materials that were used in the construction of buildings and other structures? No
- Do existing environmental investigations/studies and cleanup address all areas of the property? No
- Are there known or believed to be serious, immediate threats to human health and the environment associated with the environmental conditions identified on the property? Not to our knowledge
- For properties where cleanup has occurred, are the existing activity and land use assumptions and cleanup goals consistent with the planned or intended uses of the property? Not applicable.
- Are there health studies that suggest a possible link between releases from the property and adverse health impacts on humans? Not to our knowledge
  Describe [ ]
- Are long-term cleanup-related treatment systems or other engineering controls in place or planned? Not to our knowledge.
  Describe [ ]
- Are there other factors (e.g., significant additional assessment requirements, restrictions on obtaining additional information) relevant to environmental conditions that should be considered during the redevelopment planning? No
  Describe [ ]

**Environmental Restrictions [Section 4.7.7]**
- Are there environmental restrictions implemented or identified for the property? No
  Describe: None to our knowledge
• Are there other factors (e.g., long-term stewardship requirements, condition of the restriction) relevant to environmental restrictions that should be considered during the redevelopment planning? No

Describe [ ]

Remedial Action
• Has a remedial action plan been developed for the property? No

Describe [ ]
• If so, is the proposed remedial action consistent with the potential future use? Y/N
• Are there other relevant factors relating to remedial action? No

Describe [ ]

Other Information
• List any other information relevant to the property that has been identified through due diligence that should be considered during the redevelopment planning?

The following is a summary of relevant environmental findings concerning the subject property and Credere’s professional opinion concerning these findings:

1. Inadequate information is available from any practically reviewable source concerning the details or environmental conditions associated with current and previous USTs and/or ASTs at the subject property. Based on the lack of documentation, the potential for a release to have occurred from these tanks cannot be dismissed. In addition, though all available information was reviewed, records maintained at the NHDES, other available sources, and observations made during the subject property reconnaissance indicate that certain tank records are inconsistent and/or incomplete. Therefore, aside from the known tanks identified in Section the Phase I report, the details of any additional current and/or former bulk petroleum storage systems cannot be determined without additional investigation.

2. Releases of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances are known to have impacted soil and/or ground water conditions at the subject property. These releases include:
   a. Conditions associated with former USTs and floor drains at the Garage;
   b. Documented and alleged waste disposal and land filling in the vicinity of the Poultry Houses, and north of the Toll building; and
   c. Incidental overfills and releases from the ASTs at the Boiler House.

Additional investigation is required to define environmental conditions in the area of these known releases.

3. Potential releases of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances may have impacted soil and/or ground water conditions at the subject property. These potential releases include:
   a. A damaged abandoned AST in the basement of the Greenhouse;
   b. Reported surficial staining and odor in the area of a portable generator at the North Barn;
   c. Observed surficial staining in the area of former electrical equipment at Quinby, and a waste oil accumulation area and metal cutting equipment at the Boiler House;
   d. Current and/or former hydraulic elevators in the Blood and Quinby buildings and reported former hydraulic lifts in the Garage (including potential releases of PCB-containing hydraulic fluids);
   e. A damaged drum and pool chemicals adjacent to a floor drain at Toll;
   f. Observed surface and potential subsurface disposal of coal ash in the area of the Garage; and
   g. Potential use/disposal of pesticides and insecticides at the Greenhouse.
Additional investigation is required to define environmental conditions in the area of these potential releases.

4. A sewer treatment “Chlorination Plant” with associated sludge beds is depicted approximately 500 to 750 feet south of the Boiler House smokestack on a 1931 Site Plan which was reviewed at the NHDARM. No further information is available concerning this feature. Additional investigation is required to determine if environmental conditions in this area of the subject property have been impacted by a release of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances.

5. Visual surficial evidence of dumping and/or landfilling was observed in the area located south and southwest of the Garage. Items observed to have been discarded in this portion of the subject property included empty ASTs, tires and automobile parts, and building materials. Additional investigation is required to determine if a release of petroleum products and/or hazardous substances has occurred in association with the items noted above.

6. Potential universal and/or hazardous waste was observed in several subject property buildings. Additional investigation is required to identify and inventory these items. Regulated materials should then be managed and properly disposed of.

7. Based on the age and condition of the subject property buildings, there is a potential for asbestos, lead-based paint, mold, and manufactured PCB bulk products, and PCB-containing excluded products to be present within these structures. Additional investigation is required to identify and inventory these items. Regulated materials should then be managed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.

8. Impervious portions of the subject property are serviced by a stormwater drainage system which reportedly discharges to Lake Winnisquam. According to available information, regulated levels of Escherichia coli (E. coli) have been identified in association with discharge from this stormwater system. Personnel familiar with the subject property indicated that this issue is in the process of being resolved in accordance with an agreement with EPA.

9. Three spill sites were identified within the 0.5 mile approximate minimum search distance. Consistent with the reported conditions associated with these releases, it is unlikely that environmental conditions at the subject property have been impacted.

Worksheet Completed By:

Name: Rip Patten, PE  Title: Vice President
Representing: Credere Associates, LLC  Date: October 7, 2010
### Worksheet #5: Identifying and Prioritizing Redevelopment Obstacles

**Property Recovery Action: Scenario A**  
**State Control/State Use: Public Education and Public Safety; and Disposition of Parcels B and C**

- Priority indication relays the degree to which the item is a potential deal breaker. These are priorities that need to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify the redevelopment obstacles or other considerations identified as a result of the due diligence.</th>
<th>Priority*</th>
<th>Identify additional information important to the understanding of the redevelopment obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Buildings Parcel A:  
  1. structural  
  2. lead, asbestos, PCBs  
  3. historic  
Parcel B has a municipal pump station  
Parcel C has no structures | Medium | Structural: Structural integrity and status of building systems needs to be assessed. If college intends to use existing buildings, this may be a high priority. Initial building survey indicates that four (4) are currently occupied; nine (9) are in good condition, four (4) are in disrepair and nine (9) are in major disrepair.  
Lead, Asbestos, PCB: Understanding of these is necessary to inform rehab and demolition planning; assessment is necessary.  
Historic: Section 106 Historic review needs to be conducted and will inform rehab and demolition options.  
By retaining ownership and control of Parcel A, the state can manage the work and generally control abatement of issues. |
| Environmental: Parcels A, B and C | Medium | A thorough understanding of the environmental concerns highlighted by the Phase 1 assessment is necessary to inform reuse options, planning and design.  
Phase II environmental investigations may be necessary to provide further information on the identified REC and NEC on Parcel A to the extent that these issues will impact the implementation of the proposed reuse.  
By retaining ownership and control of Parcel A, the state can manage environmental mitigation, phase work, and generally control abatement of issues.  
Additional detail on potential environmental conditions is needed for parcels B and C. |
| Infrastructure: Parcels A, B and C | Medium | Infrastructure services and capacity need to be evaluated for the specific use. |
**Property Recovery Action: Scenario B**  
State Ownership/Public Uses: Public Education, Recreation and Agricultural Uses; and Disposition of Parcels B and C

- Priority indication relays the degree to which the item is a potential deal breaker. These are priorities that need to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify the redevelopment obstacles or other considerations identified as a result of the due diligence.</th>
<th>Priority*</th>
<th>Identify additional information important to the understanding of the redevelopment obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parcel A Buildings:  
  1. structural  
  2. lead, asbestos, PCBs  
  3. historic  
Parcel B has a municipal pump station  
Parcel C has no structures | Medium | **Structural:** Structural integrity and status of building systems needs to be assessed. If college intends to use existing buildings, this may be a high priority. Initial building survey indicates that four (4) are currently occupied; nine (9) are in good condition, four (4) are in disrepair and nine (9) are in major disrepair.  
**Lead, Asbestos, PCB:** Understanding of these is necessary to inform rehab and demolition planning; assessment is necessary.  
**Historic:** Section 106 Historic review needs to be conducted and will inform rehab and demolition options.  
By retaining ownership and control of Parcel A, the state can manage the work and generally control abatement of issues. |

| Environmental: Parcels A, B and C | Medium | A thorough understanding of the environmental concerns highlighted by the Phase 1 is necessary to inform reuse options, planning and design.  
Phase II environmental investigations may be necessary to provide further information on the identified REC and NEC on Parcel A to the extent that these issues will impact the implementation of the proposed reuse.  
By retaining ownership and control of Parcel A, the state can manage environmental mitigation, phase work and generally control abatement of issues.  
Additional detail on potential environmental conditions is needed for parcels B and C. |

| Infrastructure: Parcels A, B and C | Medium | Infrastructure services and capacity need to be evaluated for the specific use. |
Property Recovery Action Scenario C:  
Disposition for Development: State Dispositions Parcels A, B and C for Market Driven Development

- Priority indication relays the degree to which the item is a potential deal breaker. These are priorities that need to be addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify the redevelopment obstacles or other considerations identified as a result of the due diligence.</th>
<th>Priority*</th>
<th>Identify additional information important to the understanding of the redevelopment obstacles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Parcel A Buildings:**  
  1. structural  
  2. lead, asbestos, PCBs  
  3. historic  
| High | Structural: Structural integrity and status of building systems needs to be assessed. Initial building survey indicates that four (4) are currently occupied; nine (9) are in good condition, four (4) are in disrepair and nine (9) are in major disrepair.  
Lead, Asbestos, PCB: Understanding of these is necessary to inform rehabilitation and/or demolition planning; assessment is necessary.  
Historic: Section 106 Historic review needs to be conducted and will inform rehab and demolition options.  
Structural issues are listed as high priority because transfer of the properties would necessitate responsiveness to these issues, prior to, or as part of sale. |
| **Parcel B has a municipal pump station** |
| **Parcel C has no structures** |

| **Environmental: Parcels A, B and C** | High | A thorough understanding of the environmental concerns highlighted by the Phase 1 is necessary to inform reuse options, planning and design.  
Phase II environmental investigations may be necessary to provide further information on the identified REC and NEC on Parcel A.  
Environmental issues are listed as high priority because transfer of the properties would necessitate responsiveness to these issues, prior to, or as part of sale.  
Additional detail on potential environmental conditions is needed for parcels B and C. |

| **Infrastructure: Parcels A, B and C** | Medium | Infrastructure services and capacity need to be evaluated for the specific use.  
Infrastructure is listed as a medium priority as Parcel A would need infrastructure improvements. |

| **Zoning: Parcel A, B and C** | Medium | Current zoning may limit certain uses for these parcels. Zoning changes may be needed. |
**Worksheet #6: Identifying Potential Risks Associated with Redevelopment Obstacles and Actions to Resolve Information Gaps**

**Property Recovery Action Scenario A:**
State Control/State Use: Public Education and Public Safety; and Disposition of Parcels B and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the redevelopment obstacles (from Worksheet #5)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Identify project risks associated with redevelopment obstacles.</th>
<th>Are actions needed to obtain additional information?</th>
<th>Identify potential actions needed to obtain additional information.</th>
<th>Identify potential risk management tools and approaches needed to implement actions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Conditions on Parcel A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• asbestos, lead, pcb removal / abatement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Structural, environmental and historic assessment of buildings. Building systems (e.g., HVAC) also need to be evaluated.</td>
<td>Remove or abate conditions as appropriate to building disposition</td>
<td>No structures in parcels B and C. Retaining ownership, timing and cost of addressing issues can be tied to build out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase 1 for Parcel A indicates potential petroleum contamination, pesticides, other, and e coli. Unknown environmental conditions on parcels B and C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase 2 Environmental Investigation for Parcel A. Additional information on potential environmental conditions on parcels B and C.</td>
<td>Remedial action By retaining ownership, timing and cost of addressing issues can be tied to build out; including rehab, demo and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Infrastructure upgrades may be necessary for reuse on Parcel A.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Better understanding of sewer, water, power. Road upgrades are likely necessary and additional circulation routes are also likely necessary.</td>
<td>Update infrastructure as appropriate</td>
<td>Redevelopment plans will need to assess infrastructure and plan for any necessary upgrades. Site plan can be integrated with environmental response which may reduce cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Property Recovery Action Scenario B:**  
**State Ownership/Public Uses: Public Education, Recreation and Agricultural Uses; and Disposition of Parcels B and C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the redevelopment obstacles (from Worksheet # 5.)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Identify project risks associated with redevelopment obstacles.</th>
<th>Are actions needed to obtain additional information?</th>
<th>Identify potential actions needed to obtain additional information.</th>
<th>Identify potential risk management tools and approaches needed to implement actions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Conditions on Parcel A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• asbestos, lead, PCB removal / abatement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Structural, environmental and historic assessment of buildings. Building systems also need to be evaluated.</td>
<td>Remove or abate conditions as appropriate to building disposition.</td>
<td>No structures in parcels B and C. Retaining ownership, timing and cost of addressing issues can be tied to build out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase 1 for Parcel A indicates potential petroleum contamination, pesticides, other, and e coli. Unknown environmental conditions on parcels B and C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase 2 Environmental Investigation for parcel A. Additional information on potential environmental conditions on parcels B and C.</td>
<td>Remedial action</td>
<td>By retaining ownership, timing and cost of addressing issues can be tied to build out; including rehab, demo and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Infrastructure upgrades may be necessary for reuse on Parcel A.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Better understanding of sewer, water, power. Road upgrades are likely necessary and additional circulation routes are also likely necessary.</td>
<td>Update infrastructure as appropriate.</td>
<td>Redevelopment plans will need to assess infrastructure and plan for any necessary upgrades. Site plan can be integrated with environmental response which may reduce cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Conditions on Parcel A:  
- High priority issues include: asbestos, lead, PCB removal / abatement, cost of rehab and demolition, historic significance which may affect reuse and rehab cost.  
- Actions needed to obtain additional information include: structural, environmental and historic assessment of buildings. Building systems also need to be evaluated.  
- Potential actions to implement include: removing or abating conditions as appropriate to building disposition.  
- Comments: No structures in parcels B and C. Retaining ownership, timing and cost of addressing issues can be tied to build out.

Environmental:  
- Medium priority issues include: petroleum contamination, pesticides, other, and e coli. Unknown environmental conditions on parcels B and C.  
- Actions needed to obtain additional information include: Phase 2 Environmental Investigation for parcel A. Additional information on potential environmental conditions on parcels B and C.  
- Potential actions to implement include: Remedial action.  
- Comments: By retaining ownership, timing and cost of addressing issues can be tied to build out; including rehab, demo and development.

Infrastructure:  
- Medium priority issues include: infrastructure upgrades may be necessary for reuse on Parcel A.  
- Actions needed to obtain additional information include: better understanding of sewer, water, power. Road upgrades are likely necessary and additional circulation routes are also likely necessary.  
- Potential actions to implement include: update infrastructure as appropriate.  
- Comments: Redevelopment plans will need to assess infrastructure and plan for any necessary upgrades. Site plan can be integrated with environmental response which may reduce cost.
Property Recovery Action Scenario C:
Disposition for Development: State Dispositions Parcels A, B and C for Market Driven Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List the redevelopment obstacles (from Worksheet #5.)</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>I Identify project risks associated with redevelopment obstacles.</th>
<th>Are actions needed to obtain additional information?</th>
<th>I Identify potential actions needed to obtain additional information.</th>
<th>I Identify potential risk management tools and approaches needed to implement actions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Conditions on Parcel A</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>• asbestos, lead, PCB removal / abatement&lt;br&gt;• cost of rehabilitation and demolition&lt;br&gt;• historic significance may affect reuse and rehabilitation cost</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Structural, environmental and historic assessment of buildings.&lt;br&gt;Building systems also need to be evaluated.</td>
<td>Remove or abate conditions as appropriate to building disposition.&lt;br&gt;Transfer responsibility to address building conditions to purchaser.</td>
<td>No structures on parcels B and C. Transfer will accelerate liabilities; issues can be abated through demolition; property devaluation; indemnification; other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Phase 1 for Parcel A indicates potential petroleum contamination, pesticides, other, and e-coli. Unknown environmental conditions on parcels B and C.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Phase 2 Environmental Investigation for Parcel A.&lt;br&gt;Additional information on potential environmental conditions on parcels B and C.</td>
<td>Remedial action.&lt;br&gt;Liability transfer in exchange for price consideration.&lt;br&gt;Indemnification for unknown environmental conditions.</td>
<td>Transfer will accelerate liabilities; issues can be abated through remediation; property devaluation; indemnification; other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Infrastructure upgrades may be necessary for reuse on Parcel A.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Better understanding of sewer, water, power.&lt;br&gt;Upgrades to interior circulation roads are likely necessary.</td>
<td>Update infrastructure as appropriate.</td>
<td>Redevelopment plans will need to assess infrastructure and plan for any necessary upgrades. Site plan can be integrated with environmental response which may reduce cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Zoning changes may be needed to accommodate new uses.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Actions will be based on use proposed by potential redeveloper.</td>
<td>Changes to zoning and planning as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Property Characteristic Maps
Appendix B

Stakeholder Interviews
1. Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)
   Yes. Women's prison, minimum security housing and halfway housing. 2008 Master Plan. No site selected.

2. What are the most challenging long-term trends affecting your agency?
   Population increases. Need for additional bed space. Women’s prison.

3. Are you aware of any space or facility needs that the state may have to address on behalf of the people of New Hampshire in the next 5-10 years that could be resolved by the beneficial reuse of the property?
   Only the Department of Corrections space and facility needs stated above.

4. With 26 buildings situated on more than 227 acres of land in Laconia, could the Lakes Region Facility potentially satisfy any of your agency's short or long-term needs or objectives (e.g., office space, training space, open space, etc.)? If so, please identify?
   Unknown.

5. Outside of your agency's needs for the Lakes Region Facility what are your ideas for the short-term (<5 year) or long-term reuse (5-10 years) of the property?
   None.

6. Would your agency like to be involved in the redevelopment planning for the property?
   Only if the Dept. of Corrections has a direct interest in the redevelopment.

7. Does your agency have any resources, technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?
   No.

8. Are there any resources from other agencies (not currently serving on the Commission), technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?
   Unknown.

9. What challenges would you anticipate with the redevelopment of the property?
   Unknown.

10. What opportunities do you think the redevelopment of the property presents?
    Unknown.

11. Has your agency been involved with similar redevelopment projects in the Lakes Region or elsewhere in NH? If so, please identify and describe.
    No.
12. What challenges were encountered during those projects and what long-term solutions did you implement to ensure successful redevelopment (e.g. environmental, institutional, political, social, financial, legal, etc.).

   N/A

13. Did you conduct a stakeholder input process in those projects? If so, what lessons did you learn from those activities and what stakeholder input did you consider most valuable?

   N/A

14. As part of the redevelopment planning process for the Lakes Region Facility, the Commission will be implementing a stakeholder engagement process. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations on how best to conduct that process or who should be involved?

   No.
Your agency currently uses a portion of the Lakes Region Facility. Can you explain the current use and if your agency has identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) goals for these uses?

A portion of the property is currently used by DHHS as a “Designated Receiving Facility” for the Bureau of Developmental Services. This is the “sex offenders” building located at the top of the hill.

DHHS previously had an additional presence there, but that facility was closed in February 2010 and those services moved to another facility.

Has DHHS ever considered moving the “Designated Receiving Facility” and what is the general feeling of communities when you try to relocate these types of uses?

There has been some talk about relocating the “Designated Receiving Facility” to another area or facility. This use does not need to be in Laconia. It is not a program that is has any greater security needs and DHHS does not need it be more contiguous with the other services that DHHS provides in Concord. Generally, citizens do not want these types of services in their community. There generally is some pretty significant backlash from people in the community.

DHHS has responsibility for other populations that are difficult – developmental disabilities, challenging behaviors, our goal is to have those populations be served by the communities but often members of the community do not want these populations in their communities - “not in my back yard”.

DHHS periodically discusses relocating the “Designated Receiving Facility”. However, there is no sense of urgency to do this.

Are there particular uses property that you could not have within close proximity to this program?

Some of these difficult populations should not be comingled with each other. NH National Guard for example would not be an issue. Perhaps some community uses could be a problem.

With the large amount of acreage would you see that being a problem?

No problem.

Would the Lakes Facility be a place you would think of expansion?

If the property stayed in the DHHS system, expansion is something DHHS could consider. Some of the programs that we have can receive enhanced federal matching funds if they are located in a community. However, if the programs are part of or contiguous to a state institutional facility, the programs would not get the enhanced match.
Do you have a need for other locations?

There are other populations right now, people in state hospitals, that would be out in the community if DHHS had other options. DHHS does not have the funding to be able to relocate them to other facilities.

Would DHHS have an issue if the property was parceled up and had multiple uses?

It would be advantage to have smaller parcels to have these types of programs and facilities. DHHS does not want them in isolated areas, because it is advantageous to the populations to have a certain level of programming in the immediate area. DHHS looks for locations with employment opportunities.

How are your programs funded?

State and federal funding – some of the facilities that DHHS occupies are owned by Department of Administrative Services (DAS), there are others that are owned by the DHHS and would need capital budget items for funding.

For example, the Tobey building on the STA campus is shuttered. In order for DHHS or DAS to use that building, the agency have to come up with the funding to do that. That could be capital budget items or other types of funding. The agency needs the ability to pay the rent and upkeep of buildings.

What kind of timeframe would you need to relocate the existing population and use on from the Lakes Facility to another property?

DHHS would need as much lead time as possible. The capital biennium budget as already been submitted. That is not to say it could not be changed, but the hearings are being held in the Oct-Nov 2010 timeframe. DHHS does not have the ability to move at lightening speeds, the longer lead time we have, the better. Where it involves capital budget, we need the time. When renting properties, the agency has a little more flexibility since it does not involve capital funding.

Do you want to be involved in the Community Outreach Process?

One of the other initiatives was a proposal to take the women’s correctional facility and move that to the youth facility in Manchester and then take the juveniles to the Lakes Region Facility. The facility would have needed to be refurbished to some extent to fit the current conditions of the juveniles. Media coverage needed to dispel the rumors that the Department was driving this effort. You would need to do a community meeting to dispel any rumors to inform people about vitally important to the process but also one that will require a lot of advanced planning. People do not even know what the facility is about.

Women’s correctional facility - I believe that DOC had some funding to do an evaluation for siting a new Women’s correctional facility. It most likely will come up again.

Would DHHS want to have a representative at the Public Meeting in August?

Nancy Rollins might be the appropriate person to attend something.
Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission
State Agency Stakeholders
Input Questions
Response Date: 7/29/10

1. Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)
   a. The NH Department of Environmental Services (DES) does not currently foresee any need for adding either short-term or long-term facilities to its inventory.
   b. Much of DES's current property holdings are related to dams on major rivers and their surroundings.

2. What are the most challenging long-term trends affecting your agency?
   a. Adequate funding continues to be a major challenge to ensure that the agency continues to be able to provide essential services to its customers.
   b. The proper management of growth, implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, protection of water and air quality, and proper management of wastes represent major challenges for the agency moving forward.

3. Are you aware of any space or facility needs that the state may have to address on behalf of the people of New Hampshire in the next 5-10 years that could be resolved by the beneficial reuse of the property?
   a. Investments in our higher education system may well benefit from the reuse of this property (e.g., the UNH system, community college system, secondary school vocational units, etc.)
   b. The state should explore modern agricultural uses of the property to encourage growth of, and enhanced access to, locally-grown foods. Use and availability of locally-grown foods saves energy and transportation costs, while stimulating the local economy by providing jobs and support for local farmers and distributors.

4. With 26 buildings situated on more than 227 acres of land in Laconia, could the Lakes Region Facility potentially satisfy any of your agency's short or long-term needs or objectives (e.g., office space, training space, open space, etc.)? If so, please identify?
   a. As noted above, DES does not foresee a need to use the buildings or grounds for the permanent housing of its programs.
   b. However, there is always a need for training space. Due to its central location, the buildings and property represent an opportunity for possible future use by DES training programs such as wastewater treatment plant operators, solid waste facility operators, underground storage tank system operators, and drinking water system operators. Further, the NHDES Brownfields Program in cooperation with the EPA
Region 1 Brownfields Program looks for suitable meeting/training space for EPA/NHDES Brownfields Grantees on a semi-annual basis. The space could also be used to expand lakes- and rivers-related educational and outreach forums.

5. **Outside of your agency’s needs for the Lakes Region Facility what are your ideas for the short-term (<5 year) or long-term reuse (5-10 years) of the property?**
   a. Short-term reuse will be limited to the number of buildings that can be rehabilitated and made amenable to reuse. Current uses such as the E911 Lakes Region Unit will continue over the short term. Rehabilitation of the buildings and property could be used as a “laboratory” on the proper cleanup and remediation of a Brownfields property.
   b. Long-term - As suggested in prior commission meetings, it might be beneficial to explore the model for redevelopment used by the Pease Development Authority for the Lakes Region Facility. A combination of private investment and public facilities would help to support the long-term viability of the facility’s reuse. Part of the property should be reserved for recreational activities, open space and agricultural pursuits, part should have a mixed-use business-related theme, and part should support public institutions like schools, state/federal offices, and perhaps military functions. One of the most valuable aspects of this property is its central location in the state. Preparation of a master development plan for the facility is essential as a prerequisite to such a future distribution of reuses.

6. **Would your agency like to be involved in the redevelopment planning for the property?**
   a. Yes. DES currently serves on the Lakes Region Commission and pledges to play an active role over the long-term.

7. **Does your agency have any resources, technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?**
   a. Yes. For example, DES’s Brownfields Redevelopment Coordinator is currently very active in the site investigation/remediation activities for the facility. The federal Brownfields program limits the financial participation by DES since it is currently owned by the State.
   b. Other technical assistance from DES could include stormwater management assistance, wetlands delineation and permitting, smart growth guidance, etc.

8. **Are there any resources from other agencies (not currently serving on the Commission), technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?**
   a. The NH Department of Agriculture, Markets & Food could provide technical assistance to the Commission relative to the reuse of agricultural land, local food production, and pesticide use.
   b. The NH Department of Education may assist if one of the reuses pertains to the strategic development a portion of the property as an educational institution.
   c. The NH Department of Justice could assist in reviewing legal documents or proposed agreements with private sector entities during the redevelopment planning process.
   d. The Sweepstakes Commission may also provide input at to whether one of its facilities might be a good fit for the property.
9. What challenges would you anticipate with the redevelopment of the property?
   a. Historical environmental contamination, largely unknown at this time.
   b. Historic preservation requirements for eligible structures and sites
   c. Funding
   d. Traffic and the capacity of local roads and intersections
   e. Discovery of endangered or threatened species of plants, animals, or habitats
   f. The physical condition of many of the buildings

10. What opportunities do you think the redevelopment of the property presents?
    a. Its location in the heart of the Lakes Region is its greatest asset.
    b. Centralized functions that could be advanced by this location include the stockpiling of emergency materials and equipment, educational institutions, office space, research facilities, a business park incubator, recreational area in conjunction with Ahern State Park

11. Has your agency been involved with similar redevelopment projects in the Lakes Region or elsewhere in NH? If so, please identify and describe.
    a. Yes. DES has been involved, usually in conjunction with DRED, on projects at the Pease Tradeport
    b. Business parks in Keene, Lebanon/Hanover, Conway, Nashua, and Manchester, plus numerous Brownfields redevelopment projects in Claremont, Manchester, Laconia, Berlin, and other communities across the state.

12. What challenges were encountered during those projects and what long-term solutions did you implement to ensure successful redevelopment (e.g. environmental, institutional, political, social, financial, legal, etc.).
    a. Challenges included contaminated soil and groundwater, hazardous building materials, and landfilled solid wastes. Solutions included:
    b. Removal and disposal of contaminated soils and buried wastes when appropriate and feasible.
    c. Recordation of institutional controls such as Activity and Use Restrictions and Notices of Groundwater Management Permit to address soil and groundwater contamination and to manage the exposure risk associated with the contamination.
    d. Completion of hazardous building materials surveys and abatement/encapsulation and management of identified materials as appropriate based on the proposed reuse.

13. Did you conduct a stakeholder input process in those projects? If so, what lessons did you learn from those activities and what stakeholder input did you consider most valuable?
    a. Yes. DES’s Brownfields Grants require stakeholder input. We learned that stakeholders appreciate an opportunity to participate and are more accepting of proposed remedial approaches and redevelopment when they are invited to participate or express their concerns and desires. We found their expressions of concern most valuable because it allows us to identify fact based concerns as well as concerns based on erroneous information or misconceptions concerning site conditions and contaminant exposure pathways.
    b. This allows us to develop appropriate presentations and remedial approaches that more directly address public concerns in a proactive rather than reactive manner.
14. As part of the redevelopment planning process for the Lakes Region Facility, the Commission will be implementing a stakeholder engagement process. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations on how best to conduct that process or who should be involved?
   a. Our recommendation is to use a variety of methods to get the information out to the stakeholders (e.g., direct mailing, public notices, brochures, etc.).
   b. A charrette format may also be worth trying in terms of stakeholder participation and solicitation of views without undue emotion attached.
1. Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

The Department of Administrative Services has developed a short term plan for office space in the Concord area primarily within the State House Annex and Data Center. A formal space planning study was completed in 2001 which stated that the State House Annex was underutilized and we have been taking steps to maximize utilization of office space by removing some walls and utilizing systems furniture where possible.

2. What are the most challenging long-term trends affecting your agency?

The lack of funding and resources to provide support for the ever increasing demand for existing and new services.

3. Are you aware of any space or facility needs that the state may have to address on behalf of the people of New Hampshire in the next 5-10 years that could be resolved by the beneficial reuse of the property?

The State made a significant investment in the E-911 facility (Dwinell Building). The State has a need for space on the Laconia Campus for state agencies to utilize in case of a natural or man made disaster. This space could be utilized as a secondary site to continue critical operations. This activity should be located near the existing Dwinell building so that all state agencies can take advantage of the infrastructure. This space would also accommodate any future expansion of the E-911 facility or any additional needs for state office space such as the Laconia Community Services Council or possibly the Health and Human Services District Office

4. With 26 buildings situated on more than 227 acres of land in Laconia, could the Lakes Region Facility potentially satisfy any of your agency’s short or long-term needs or objectives (e.g., office space, training space, open space, etc.)? If so, please identify?

Yes, some of the buildings could serve as a potential site for Continuity of Operations. The Toll building would be an excellent building for that purpose.

5. Outside of your agency’s needs for the Lakes Region Facility what are your ideas for the short-term (<5 year) or long-term reuse (5-10 years) of the property?

I would like to see the State reserve some property on the south side of the campus for current and future state government activities. This would include land that is bordered by Route 106 to the east, Right of Way Path to the North, and a current road that travels east past the garage, and boiler plant. This would include the Dwinell building, the Dube building and the garage. In addition I would like to see the State sell some of
the property for private development to maximize the revenue to the state and provide some area for a business to establish bringing jobs and income to the city of Laconia. The redevelopment of the property should be done so that we preserve green space and the integrity of the adjacent lakes and watershed.

6. Would your agency like to be involved in the redevelopment planning for the property?

Yes, Administrative Services would definitely like to be involved in the redevelopment planning for the property.

7. Does your agency have any resources, technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?

Administrative Services will provide assistance from our facilities personnel assigned to the care of the campus.

8. Are there any resources from other agencies (not currently serving on the Commission), technical and financial, that The Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?

Yes, on a limited basis we could leverage some technical or financial resources as required.

9. What challenges would you anticipate with the redevelopment of the property?

I anticipate challenges in the following areas:
   a. Possible historical limitations for redevelopment
   b. Cost to remediate hazardous waste (mold, asbestos)
   c. Determining a redevelopment strategy that will generate the most income for the state and local government while not overwhelming the water, sewer or transportation infrastructure.

10. What opportunities do you think the redevelopment of the property presents?

   a. Opportunity to generate income for the state and local government through the sale and eventual redevelopment of the property.
   b. Opportunity to preserve a beautiful piece of land that can be utilized by city, state and private groups while preserving the esthetic beauty of the property.

11. Has your agency been involved with similar redevelopment projects in the Lakes Region or elsewhere in NH? If so, please identify and describe.

Our agency is involved with the redevelopment of land and buildings on the New Hampshire Hospital Campus in Concord. The New Hampshire Hospital Campus consists of approximately 100 acres and 33 buildings that formerly housed or supported approximately 2500 patients. The campus is similar to the Laconia Campus in that it was totally self sufficient with their own power plant, water and electrical supply. As patient care has moved from centralized model to decentralized care many of the buildings became vacant and fell into disrepair.

City and state agencies joined together with architects, engineers, historians and planning agencies to develop a master plan and redevelopment plan for the campus. The master plan was completed in 1994, a charrette followed in 2001 and the redevelopment plan was completed in 2004. The redevelopment plan includes a 20 year vision for the campus that takes into consideration the various uses of the campus and provides for patient care, much needed office space and the preservation of green space for everyone to enjoy.
12. What challenges were encountered during those projects and what long-term solutions did you implement to ensure successful redevelopment (e.g. environmental, institutional, political, social, financial, legal, etc.).

We encountered challenges with the following issues:
- Hazardous Waste (mold, asbestos, guano)
- Historically significant facilities and landmarks
- Old water, sewer and transportation infrastructure
- Lack of parking
- Traffic impact of new employees
- Preserving open space
- Multiple uses for the campus
- Pedestrian/traffic issues
- Need for patient care
- Financing for redevelopment of buildings and infrastructure

The key of the project was to involve state, legislative and city personnel in the development of the redevelopment plan from the onset. These individuals were active participants during the entire process. In addition, we had a champion from the legislature (public works committee) that played a major role throughout the process. We involved key legislative personnel with tours of the facilities and obtained their support to redevelop the campus. We renovated approximately 300,000 square feet of vacant run down buildings into beautiful modern office space while maintaining the beauty and significance of the buildings and surrounding property.

We had issues with parking and traffic. We conducted traffic studies to estimate the amount of additional traffic and participated with the City of Concord to install a traffic signal at a busy nearby intersection.

We took into consideration that a limited amount of patients would remain on the campus and we designed walkways and restricted vehicular traffic in those areas to minimize the danger to the patients.

With smart growth principles and affordable renovation prices we were able to easily cost justify relocating state employees from office space in the private sector.

The redevelopment plan includes two parking garages and two parking decks and provisions to minimize traffic flow in and out of the campus.

13. Did you conduct a stakeholder input process in those projects? If so, what lessons did you learn from those activities and what stakeholder input did you consider most valuable?

We had several opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the process including a two day charrette. In addition, we also obtained input from neighbors. The most important lesson that I learned was to involve all the stakeholders in the process especially key legislative representatives.

14. As part of the redevelopment planning process for the Lakes Region Facility, the Commission The Commission will be implementing a stakeholder engagement process. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations on how best to conduct that process or who should be involved?
I would ensure that there is an opportunity for state and local government representatives to participate in the process. I would also recommend that the process include legislative folks from finance and public works committees.
Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

The Lakes Region Community College (LRCC) is located on the southern boarder of Laconia.

Yes, the community college does have an interest. LRCC recently completed a facility master plan. The existing campus is 50 acres, the developed part is about half of that and the undeveloped part is on a steep wooded area where there would be some significant difficulties for development. LRCC’s campus is the smallest in the NH community college system.

LRCC’s goal would be to relocate to the facility, as part of a center for education and the arts. This new campus would involve a location for a 4 year university. LRCC is currently applying for $10 million to expand their Hewit Center and would like to do this expansion in another location. In the LRCC’s vision, this reuse would create a nexus of education in the Laconia area.

The location would be a location for a business incubator, and include a visual and performing arts center. There is obviously a huge amount of synergy between arts and businesses.

Before the prison came in, there was a concept to redevelop the facility into a business and education park – LRCC renovated the Powell building and moved their electrical and graphics and electrical programs. These programs were there for 10 years and LRCC also had a separate program for prisoners. The original idea was to move the community college and swap our existing facility for the Lakes Region Facility site. The governor made the decision that NH needed another prison and the Lakes Region Facility was an ideal location.

The community college still considers this a viable option.

What sources of funding and resources are available to your agency that would be able to finance the rehabilitation of the Lakes Region Facility?

The community college system has proposed $100 million over an eight year period to the state and if that is accepted, $10 million would be for the existing facility. If LRCC could partner with business and school system the community college could make this work together. The funding is primarily for new buildings for existing properties and some renovation.

The key to success on a project like this is the willingness of other institutions contribute and making it a shared space of all other entities. For example, one library could serve three academic institutions and would be more efficient then having three. One, common, library would service all three entities. There is a lot of synergy for the use of the space. LRCC has had conversations with the school district, and gotten very positive feedback.

The Community College is often approached by people in the community that remember the original plan and they think that would be the highest and best use of the property.
The commission is considering parceling out the property. Does the community college have any space requirements or objections to the parceling out of the property?

If the community college were offered a niche on the property – they would need 50-75 acres. If the entire property were parceled out, it depends how it is parceled out as to whether or not the community college would have issues.

Are the current uses of the property problematic for the community college’s reuse ideas for the property and does the community college have any setback requirements?

The community college has no issues with the 911 facility. There are some concerns with the sexual offenders. Mr. Edelstein is not aware of any setbacks that would need to be adopted.

Obviously, it is a beautiful property and we would like to be there. Our overriding concern is that whatever we do with the property that it has a significant economic impact on the Laconia economy.

Currently, the entrance to Ahern State Park is on the Lakes Region Facility property. Would the community college want to relocate that entrance and road as part of its’ reuse ideas?

There is no need to relocate the existing road to the state park. The notion of a state park next to a community college and provides a great opportunity for a community college.
Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission
State Agency Stakeholders
Department of Safety (DOS) - Division of Emergency Services and Communications
Director Bruce Cheney
July 21, 2010

Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

DOS currently has lease for the building that we occupy.

Any need for additional facilities?

DOS would hesitate to say they would need to expand. The one area that they would potential need do an expansion is just for parking 15-25 additional vehicles. The additional parking would be for mobile equipment that DOS currently houses in Concord. We did look at the garage that is on the property, but it is not critical that DOS needs to grow on this property.

There is some other potential interest in the property, are there any uses that you see as ideal or problematic?

DOS has already shared the property with the prison, so they could not think of any other use that would be more difficult. If other companies, agencies, etc. were to relocate to the facility and were using communications equipment (e.g., a private radio station), There is the possibility that their equipment could interfere with DOS’s communications abilities. This could be a problem, but nothing that could not be solved.

Do you have any ideas on future uses for the property?

The Lakes Region Facility would be a great place for educational purposes. Tech colleges would be a great reuse and DOS could recruit from the programs, such as GIS services, database development, etc.

The National Guard would be a good use as well.

What if the state dispositioned the land and DOS needed to move their operations?

It took DOS almost a year to rebuild the facility; and they have approximately $1.1 million in changes to the building that they occupy. There is probably another $1 million in infrastructure improvements, microwave, broadband, VOIP, of which DOS will need even more bandwidth then was anticipated when they moved here. There is $0.57 surcharge on your phone bill both land line and cellular that funds these infrastructure improvements and upkeep. If DOS needed to move, they would be shocked if that surcharge did not get raised. Moving the DOS’s operations would cost in the $2.5 - 4 million range. There would be a large monetary impact.

If DOS moved, the center would not need to be in the Laconia area, but would need the infrastructure to support its' use.
Emergency services are provided from two facilities. DOS can service the entire state from this facility, although services are divided between the two facilities for safety and redundancy. There are 50 employees working at this facility over a 24-hour period.

DOS would really not like to move, unless there are tax reasons that the town or state would want to have. DOS feels they are good neighbor.

*If you had to search for a site for relocation how long do you think it would take?*

It would take 2-3 years to find a new suitable location for DOS's operations. It really is the infrastructure that determines where we can go. Microwave link capabilities are very important.

*Is this a facility that communities generally like to have in the area?*

We are considered critical infrastructure. We do not advertise that we are here.

*Are there any savings or benefits that Laconia gets from your presence?*

No.

*How is the facility funded?*

Both federal and state funds make the facility operational.

*If we were subdividing, are there any buffers, we do not need any substantial setbacks from other uses?*

DOS would only need a minimal space to continue to exist.
Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

DRED anticipates renegotiating the lease on the facility that it currently occupies; therefore DRED does not have any short or long term needs for the Lakes Region Facility.

Does DRED have any thoughts on the roles this Lakes Region Facility property might play in economic development for the Laconia Region?

As you talk to other stakeholders, they may be familiar with the work was done with the Pease Development Authority – Pease International Tradeport 4,000 acres right off Rt. 95 and Spaulding turnpike and was the first base closed as part of the BRAC project. A fair amount of federal funds went into that project and has a lot of positive things going for it. Not sure if there could be a similar amount of funds used for the Lakes Region Facility project. The Pease project was viewed as extremely successful within the state and community.

The State loaned Pease Development over a period of time $25 million and the development authority used this as match to the DOD funding that was allocated for cleanup and redevelopment. When the base was closed there were 4000 serviceman and 400 civilians working on site.

Because there were environmental issues, the federal government was required to do the environmental cleanup. There was not a lot of state funding that was used for environmental cleanup.

The $25 million was always looked as a loan, and it has all been paid back in full at this point.

Are there potential funding sources that could be used at the Lakes Region Facility?

The Lakes Region Facility project would attract some U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) funding, and if EDA funds were used, there would have to be some state match.

Are there any zoning considerations that you would need to involved with if the property were to be rezoned?

Once the state and community agree on a direction for, as an abutting land owner, DRED would need to be included in these discussions. DRED owns Ahern state park and couple of other parcels that the agency leases to farmers.

Is there any desire to expand the leasing of land to farmers?

Most of DRED’s field leases are for beginner farmers. DRED would not look to expand that use. However, we do not think that the community would object to keeping this open space.
Ahern State Park - entrance is on the lakes facility property. If the road needed to be relocated, what process DRED would need to go through to relocate the entrance?

The road relocation would have to go through DRED’s normal relocation process. Our parks department is working with the City of Laconia to take over the management of the Ahern State Park. Ahern State Park is a good distance from any of DRED’s other parks so it can be difficult for DRED to maintain it. The road was constructed using U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) funds, there probably was some federal money put into the construction of that road. If the road would need to be moved, more research needs to be done to determine if USFWS has any other restrictions or processes.

Are there any other financial incentives that are available for the state or town to utilize for the cleanup and redevelopment of the property?

DRED does not have any incentives or funding, possibly a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).

Traffic counts - we seem to have very good data. The traffic counts were lower than expected. Laconia does not have consistent year round traffic counts.

Are there any economic development goals that the state has for the region?

DRED tries to be consistent with what the local communities want and does not want to force things on the community. DRED feels this is a good model to use.

What DRED would want to do, is work closely with the City of Laconia and see if there is a need for office use at this property. This is not a situation where the state says this geographic area should have this type of activity.

In your role, from a resources standpoint if an agency has a need, do you get involved with that?

Yes, DRED does get involved in that. We work closely with other state agencies.

Are there any agencies that we should be talking with that might have a need for a property like this?

Yes, Health and Human Services has a need for some of their programs.

Do you have any other reuse ideas for the property or know of what other agencies are thinking about?

Tech School - The Obama Administration had indicated that there would be funding for two-year technical schools and there may be funding to convert this property into a two-year school. Educational aspect and possibilities are tremendous at this property.

Housing authority - the property could still be a corrections facility.

The training site is interesting, but the war games scenario is not that interesting.
Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission
State Agency Stakeholder Interviews
NH Adjutant General’s Department
Brigadier General Stephen C. Burritt - Deputy Adjutant General
Colonel Jeff Vorse
Lt. Colonel Lewis Multinado
July 7, 2010

Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

There are two potential uses for Army National Guard:

Readiness Center – armory, shortage of 2,000 sq feet state wide - and see an opportunity for the property to fit that need

Training Facility - use for training in urban or built up environment for soldiers, urban combat.
Military Police - train them in the fenced in area (prison area).

Examples of this reuse:
Indiana National Guard redeveloped a school for mentally challenged children into a National Guard unit. State department and FBI run courses at this facility. Remains state property, ultimately the state is responsible for it.

NH Center Strafford – redeveloped a training site and school into a military training facility.

What is the reason for NH National Guard need for additional space?

Most of the armories were built right after WWII, and the NH National Guard has found that there was no vision for the size and complexity of equipment that soldiers are using today. The Guard used to have an armory in Laconia, but in the 70s it was decided the armory was too land bound. Throughout the state the bigger amories were able to survive, until now. Acquiring additional real estate to fit the needs of the soldiers is a real problem. In the 1950’s, 5 acres was sufficient. But now, 20 acres is necessary to be sufficient.

Are you aware of the condition of the buildings and potential financial need to bring the buildings back to a useable state?

The NH National Guard is aware that buildings are in need of infrastructure improvements and other issues including new heating infrastructure, water damage, significant physical modifications and plans to make these viable options.

What would be the NH National Guard’s preference on ownership of the property. Would the Guard want to own or lease the facility?

The NH National Guard’s preference would be to be the host/owner. The Guard does not want to be under another a state organizations control. Being the primary land owner is the preference – this ownership situation would also be important for receiving funding.
Do either of the current uses pose a problem to reuse? (Mentally Challenged Sex Offenders and Regional 911 Dispatch Center)

Not at all, these are not issues. Children would not be an issue as they would always be accompanied by adults.

Are any other departments or use that could not be part of the property due to security limitations?

No, however security protocols would need to be maintained (e.g., distance set backs, etc.)

What kinds of funding are available to the NH National Guard to cleanup and redevelop the Lakes Region Facility?

Funding is readily available - However the state would need to match federal funds in some capacity.

Normally training sites have 100% of federal support

Readiness Center would be 1:1 (50%/50%) federal and state matched funds

Supplemental funding in the DOD budget could be going away soon.

Federal funding comes in through the National Guard Bureau and there is a Cooperative Agreement between national guard bureau and the state. Everything would be purchased by the state and then billed to the government. As far as major construction, the government does fund in excess of $700K but it could take several years to get that money. The Operations and Maintenance budget is much quicker than that.

DOD is going to buy bullets rather than nuts and bolts - War is the priority

Does NH National Guard have specific requirements in regards to the environmental conditions at the property?

1. An environmental conditions assessment of property
2. NEPA action, record check, but could be a full ESA

The Adjutant Generals Department would love to see the assessment findings that Credere is preparing – federal government could not pay for remediation.

Asbestos – is this something required under the ECOP?

These are not show stoppers, but they need to protect their people. Our requirements are no different than any other state agency.

Would the NH National Guard like be in attendance at some of the meetings?

They would like to be there at a minimum for a reference for the public to know. Do not want to cause push back from the community if a couple representatives in uniform were at the public meeting.

Have you worked with the historical preservation and native American offices in the state?

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and National Guard office are each others speed dials.
Pennobscott Indians feel that they have an interest 50 air miles from the border of Maine and New Hampshire. Something that you should look into.

*There are two smaller parcels associated with the property. Are they of interest to you?*

We would be ok with they were not included and something else were done with them.
June 30, 2010

Matt Lahey, Chairman
Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission
The Bellknap Mill
25 Beacon Street East
Laconia, NH 03246

RE: Questionnaire

Dear Mr. Lahey:

This letter is in response to yours dated June 21, 2010. The Department of Safety, Division of Emergency Services and Communications has been a tenant at the Lakes Region Facility for approximately 9 years. Therefore, I have designated Director Bruce Cheney of the Division of Emergency Services and Communications as the Department’s point of contact for the Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission project.

I enclose the Division’s responses to the Input Questionnaire. Per your request, I will also contact your consultants to advise them to coordinate any discussions with the Department of Safety through Director Cheney at:

Division of Emergency Services
110 Smokey Bear Blvd.
Concord, NH 03305
(603) 271-6911
bcheney@e911.nh.gov

I thank you for allowing us to provide input in your study. Should you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Director Cheney.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John J. Barthelmess
Commissioner

Enclosure

Cc: Bruce G. Cheney, Director

TDD ACCESS. RELAY NH 1-800-735-2964
Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission  
State Agency Stakeholders  
Input Questions

1. Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

- The Division of Emergency Services and Communications has been a tenant at the Lakes Region Facility property for approximately 9 years in the buildings formally called the Dwinnell building. At the time the Division took over the building it executed a fifteen year lease through the Legislative Committee that oversees state property. The purpose for leasing the property was to provide the State with a backup and disaster recovery location for the statewide Enhanced 9-1-1 system. The Division invested in excess of $1,000,000.00 in structural and infrastructure improvements including heating system, complete electrical upgrade, asbestos removal, substantial telephony networks, paved parking lot, generator & UPS, a second story on a portion of the building and approximately $400,000.00 worth of Enhanced 9-1-1 hardware and software. Our short term needs include the installation of Broadband and Microwave capabilities to expand the Mapping, Addressing and NH VIEWW Geographic Information Systems capabilities and to provide a fault tolerant redundant link between Concord and Laconia 9-1-1 facilities. Our long term needs include the investment of between half to one million dollars in infrastructure, hardware and software to upgrade the facility to Next Generation 9-1-1.

2. What are the most challenging long-term trends affecting your agency?

- The need for substantial Microwave, fiber optic and next generation broadband capabilities infrastructure.

3. Are you aware of any space or facility needs that the state may have to address on behalf of the people of New Hampshire in the next 5-10 years that could be resolved by the beneficial reuse of the property?

- We believe the Division’s present use of its Communications and GIS facilities at the Lakes Region Facility is the best use of the building now and for the next ten years.

4. With 26 buildings situated on more than 227 acres of land in Laconia, could the Lakes Region Facility potentially satisfy any of your agency’s short or long-term needs or objectives (e.g., office space, training space, open space, etc.)? If so, please identify?

- The Division provides Incident Management trucks and trailers and Mass Causality equipment trailers for Local and County and State agencies during disasters and significant events. Additional indoor service space for those vehicles and trailers as well as parking space for trailers up to 45 feet long would be beneficial. The
Division will need additional parking space for employees' private vehicle as the 9-1-1 facility grows.

5. Outside of your agency’s needs for the Lakes Region Facility what are your ideas for the short-term (<5 year) or long-term reuse (5-10 years) of the property?

- We have no ideas beyond those that directly effect the emergency communications needs of the Division and the citizens of the state who rely on 9-1-1.

6. Would your agency like to be involved in the redevelopment planning for the property?

- Yes!

7. Does your agency have any resources, technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?

- The agency has no financial resources beyond the potential of our future investments being useful for grant matching purposes.

8. Are there any resources from other agencies (not currently serving on the Commission), technical and financial, that the Commission could leverage during the redevelopment planning process?

- The Broadband and Microwave infrastructure we will be bringing to the campus may provide infrastructure for other tenants.

9. What challenges would you anticipate with the redevelopment of the property?

- Since emergency communications is considered critical infrastructure under federal guidelines we question what requirements may be necessary in order to assure the security of the building and its functions should the balance of the facility be redeveloped for commercial uses.

10. What opportunities do you think the redevelopment of the property presents?

- We do not have any ideas

11. Has your agency been involved with similar redevelopment projects in the Lakes Region or elsewhere in NH? If so, please identify and describe.

- Questions #12 through #14 require a positive answer to question #11 and we have not been involved with similar redevelopment projects in the Lakes Region or elsewhere in NH, so we have no input.

12. What challenges were encountered during those projects and what long-term solutions did you implement to ensure successful redevelopment (e.g. environmental, institutional, political, social, financial, legal, etc.).
13. Did you conduct a stakeholder input process in those projects? If so, what lessons did you learn from those activities and what stakeholder input did you consider most valuable?

14. As part of the redevelopment planning process for the Lakes Region Facility, the Commission will be implementing a stakeholder engagement process. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations on how best to conduct that process or who should be involved?
Lakes Region Facility Reuse Commission
State Agency Stakeholders
NH University System
Ed Dupont, Chair - State University Board
8/20/10

Do you remember the plans in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s for the Lakes Region Community College to move locations to the Lakes Region Facility?

Mr. Dupont was a NH legislator until 1992 and remembers the process that the property went through back then with the community college plans to move to the facility.

Has your agency identified any short-term (i.e., <5 years) or long-term (i.e., 5-10 years) property or facility needs to support its future operations? If so, were these needs identified in a formal study or report document? (Please identify)

The NH University system does not have any use for the property at this point. UNH, Plymouth state and Keene state are our major locations and the NH University system does not need a presence in the Laconia area.

Granite State College has gone through a process where they have repositioned themselves as a college for life-long learning. Granite State is a college within the university system, with locations in Concord, Rochester and Conway, Berlin, Manchester, Portsmouth, Claremont, and Littleton. This is a non-traditional system - adult education and of late, a younger group of students coming back to finish their degrees. There is no residential component of this system. The redevelopment of the site would provide the university system with an opportunity to continue partnerships with the Community College and would be able to work with the community college in the future and not need additional space.

The Community College is interested in the property. If LRCC were to pursue their interest, would this influence your interest in locating a granite state college?

Yes, the University system would definitely have interest in exploring a campus in Laconia. This would be a good location to site some online learning.

Dept of Safety is located on the campus and moving it would be a constraint. They did a major infrastructure upgrade and there seems to be some synergy with them and your online capabilities.

Granite state colleges have been growing and are always looking for a good fit for partnerships. Legislatively the University system wants to work closer with the community colleges. Over the past few years, the University system and community college systems have made great progress with transferability among the entities.

We have a community input meeting on August 24, 2010. Do you have any desire to be at the meeting and included in the stakeholder engagement process?

I guess if you think it would be beneficial for the University System to be involved, I would love to be and help out.
What is your long and short-term vision for the property?

USGS provides funding to preserve geological data in the states (National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program). There are grants available for the upkeep of a building to store data samples. This data and samples generally consist of geological cores and boxes to preserve samples, etc. NH currently has need for this type of space and the Lakes Region Facility could help fill that need.

How much space would the NH Geological Survey need for this use?

It is hard to say. Some states have large big box store sized facilities. NH is much smaller. The state currently has several collections and rents commercial space for storage. The current space is approximately 10 x 20, but the state could use double or triple that at a minimum.

What kind of USGS funding could be utilized for this reuse?

$30K in funding but every state could see a gradual increase. There are ways to write in the application for the funding to be used for the upkeep of a building.

Can the funding be used for renovation as well as upkeep?

Not sure, additional research would need to be conducted into the program to make that determine. There is a special needs grant that you could put in for this type of work. Mr. Wunsch did not think the special needs grant is more than $10s of thousands, but they do these grants every year.

Do you know of any money for environmental assessment or building assessment work?

Mr. Wunsch did not know of any funding available for these activities. He thought that the Department of Energy (DOE) might be able to provide funding for assessment activities. The state just got a grant from DOE to build a national geothermal system – assessing maps and all the data to help stakeholders to search for geothermal siting potential. All 50 states are splitting the funding to do this research.

Would NH Geological Survey like to own the space you would occupy or could you lease/have an agreement with DAS?

It would be fine if NH Geological Survey had a long-term agreement with DAS to not move the facility.

Any there any other issues, uses, or needs that NH Geological Survey may have for the property?

If USGS money is involved, the facility would need to be accessible for public use. There would have to be easy public access to the building.

USGS does not have the money to build a repository on the property.
Summary of Local Stakeholder Interviews

Shanna B. Saunders, Director of Planning and Zoning for the City of Laconia conducted several meetings throughout July and August 2010. The purpose of these meetings were to gather facts, information and input regarding the Lake Region Facility from local community leaders, boards, commissions and other stakeholders.

Discussion Points

The following questions were used to guide the local stakeholder interviews and discussions.

2. Do you have any historical information about the property that you feel would be useful to Commission as they move through their process?

3. Are you aware of any property or facility needs that the City of Laconia may have in the next 5-10 years?

4. Has your department or commission identified any short or long-term property goals or objectives?

5. With 26 buildings on more than 212 acres in Laconia, could the Lakes Region Facility potentially satisfy any of the City's short or long-term needs or objectives (e.g., office space, training space, open space, etc.)? If so, please identify?

6. If the answer(s) to any of the above questions (1-3) are yes, has the funding for such property/facilities been identified? If so, what is the funding source(s)?

7. Would your department or commission prefer the property remain under the State's control or do you feel that the State should relinquish its interest in the property for the benefit of the City of Laconia? Please explain why.

8. What benefits would you like the residents of Laconia to gain from the reuse of this property (i.e. open space and recreational lands, new town facilities, jobs, tax revenues)?

9. What land uses do you consider not benefitting the residents of Laconia and why?

10. What are your ideas for short-term (<5 year) or long-term reuse (5-10 years) of the property?

11. Would your department or commission like to be involved in the redevelopment planning for the property?

12. Does your department or commission have any resources, technical and financial, that the Lakes Facility Reuse Commission can leverage during the redevelopment planning process?

13. What challenges would you anticipate with the redevelopment of the property?

14. What opportunities do you think the redevelopment of the property presents?

15. Has your department or commission been involved in similar redevelopment projects in the Lakes Region? If so, please list and explain.

   a. If yes, what challenges were encountered in those projects, what long-term solutions did you implement to ensure successful redevelopment, and what lessons were learned?
16. As part of the planning process, we will be implementing a stakeholder engagement process. Do you have any input on how to conduct that process or who should be involved?

Meetings / Interviews

The following meetings and interviews were held with local stakeholders.

- July 26 – Karen Barker from the Grassroots group “Back to farming at the Laconia State School”
- July 27 – Belknap County Economic Development Council
- July 29 – Belknap County Conservation District
- July 29 – City of Laconia Department Heads including: Fire, Conservation Commission, Public Works, Water, Recreation, Police
- August 3 – Planning Board
- August 9 – Chamber of Commerce
- August 11 – Main Street Business owners
- Week of August 16-20 – City Councilors

Summary of Input

The following is a summary of the input gathered through these meetings. This input has been categorized by theme and content and is not intended to serve as a transcript of the discussions.

Municipal Input

Additional Historic Information
- Possible deed restrictions on use
- Extensive wetlands exist on property along Meredith Center Road
- Potential incinerator on site in area of solid waste dump. Ex-employees remember the smell of omnipresent smoke in the air
- City Parks & Rec Department uses some of the garage areas now for storage of maintenance vehicles, mowers, fencing, etc.
- City may have long term leases on two smaller parcels – research on docs is pending
- Water Pump station located on Old N. Main and Main satellite parcel, interior water distribution system is private. Two water towers exist on site.
- Property was farm prior to State school and was used heavily for farming as a state school, including the keeping of animals, and maple syrup production.

Redevelopment Challenges
- Providing a use or partnership of uses that is diversified economically and stable – meaning not subject to closure every couple decades, yet does not compete with existing businesses, whether downtown merchants or the existing tourism industry in the Weirs.
- Very large, transformative opportunity and there is no municipal/regional person dedicated to the cause.
- Very disappointed in State care of property; State should participate in clean up of environmental issues. City should partner with State on both clean up and reuse.
- Gateway type property – need to keep aesthetic values
- in a very top down approach excluding the City’s input.

Redevelopment Opportunities
- Fantastic views of Lakes and Mountains
- Big box/commercial use may be good to diversify our tax base. We have no large scale commercial right now
• Returning the parcel to the tax rolls as commercial property could be beneficial for Laconia, could create new jobs and could benefit other Laconia businesses because of the required supply chain.
• Parcel still retains its natural beauty today – wonderful Gateway parcel because of open fields re want redevelopment but we must not further “uglify” the lake
• Proximity to Ahearn is a positive and could partner well with many uses.
• This is a beautiful piece of public land – keep it public. The state might never have a piece like this again as they are not in the business of land acquisition

Potential Municipal Uses
• Fire Station - partners well with LRCC’s fire training program which is premier in state, eliminates need for both Lakeport and N. End fire stations, can mix with residential similar to Potomac Yard VA
• Substation for police if residential college campus goes in. Would like to partner with Fire for an obstacle course. Could partner with National Guard.
• Continued use for storage of maintenance vehicles (tractors, mowers, aerator) and construction material (sand, jersey barriers, fencing). Perhaps shared space for Parks and DPW. Partners well with sports complex use or fire station.

Potential Non-Municipal Uses
• Lakes Region Community College (LRCC) Relocation (has fire training program, nursing program, sustainability/agriculture program, marine trades program)
• Campground - only a portion of site, tied to Ahearn
• Outdoor Retail with Corporate offices – BassPro, Cabellas, Etc. – open fields are great for tent, archery, hunting demos, Ahearn waterfront is great for canoe/kayak, fishing demos.
• Resort style Casino
• Brewery - we have both water quantity and quality
• Small business incubator – partners well with LRCC
• National Guard – could partner with LRCC, Police and Fire

Uses Considered Incompatible or a Detriment
• Another prison – no economic benefit
• Big Box – not highest and best use and will pull business away from surrounding towns (competing against ourselves regionally is not positive)
• Retail or resort use that competes with Downtown and the Weirs.
• Residential – it will over burden the market and cost more than the taxes it brings in

Community and Business Groups

Additional Historic Information
• History of frequent algal blooms at Ahern swim areas allegedly from Prison property runoff and or sewage leaks- DES or EPA has investigated and there is a report somewhere
• Potential incinerator on site in area of solid waste dump. Ex-employees remember the smell of omnipresent smoke in the air
• Property was farm prior to State school and was used heavily for farming as a state school, including the keeping of animals, and maple syrup production.

Redevelopment Challenges
• No direct tie to interstate, Laconia Traffic corridors are overcapacity but because of urban infrastructure, and water boundaries there is no room to expand.
• Providing a use or partnership of uses that is diversified economically and stable – meaning not subject to closure every couple decades, yet does not compete with existing businesses, whether downtown merchants or the existing tourism industry in the Weirs.
• Very large, transformative opportunity and there is no municipal/regional person dedicated to the cause.
• Very disappointed in State care of property; State should participate in clean up of environmental issues. City should partner with State on both clean up and reuse.
• Gateway type property - need to keep aesthetic values
• Property is in State hands and no one has forgotten when the Prison was developed in a very top down approach excluding the City’s input.

Redevelopment Opportunities
• Natural resource value of area is very high. Area acts as land bridge between Opechee Bay and Paugus Bay, and site contains high value Agricultural soils
• Fantastic views of Lakes and Mountains
• Big box/commercial use may be good to diversify our tax base. We have no large scale commercial right now
• Returning the parcel to the tax rolls as commercial property could be beneficial for Laconia, could create new jobs and could benefit other Laconia businesses because of the required supply chain.
• Parcel still retains it’s natural beauty today – wonderful Gateway parcel because of open fields re want redevelopment but we must not further “uglify” the lake
• Proximity to Ahearn is a positive and could partner well with many uses.

Potential Municipal Uses
• Dog park – perhaps tie to Ahearn which is used heavily now as a dog walking area
• Playing fields
• Public Golf Course similar to Metro Denver area, partners well with retirement demographic census shows.

Potential Non-Municipal Uses
• Lakes Region Community College (LRCC) Relocation (has fire training program, nursing program, sustainability/agriculture program, marine trades program)
• Arts complex - this would not compete with surrounding towns and would provide public access to beautiful location
• Amateur (focus on kids not professionals) sports complex, tie to Robbie Mills, similar to Round Rock TX, look at success of Meredith ice hockey event in 09.
• Campground - only a portion of site, tied to Ahearn
• Sustainable agriculture resource center – Ag. Soils exist on site, partners well with LRCC
• Large corporate campus – such as Dow Chemical, Raytheon, Harley Davison etc.

Uses Considered Incompatible or a Detriment
• Another prison – no economic benefit
• Municipal campus - keep this in the urban core
• Big Box – not highest and best use and will pull business away from surrounding towns (competing against ourselves regionally is not positive)
• Manufacturing
• Retail or resort use that competes with Downtown and the Weirs.
• Residential – it will over burden the market and cost more than the taxes it brings in
Appendix C

Community Input Meeting
Lakes Region Facility - Laconia, NH
Property Reuse Public Input Meeting

Meeting Agenda

Date / Time: August 24, 2010, 6:00 - 9:00 pm
Location: Laconia Middle School, Multi Purpose Room, 150 McGrath Street, Laconia, NH

6:00-7:00 Doors Open for informal discussions with commission and technical staff

7:00 Introduction and Welcome
    Meeting Purpose
    Matthew Lahey
    Kimon Koulet

7:10 Opportunities & Constraints
    Michael Taylor

7:25 Environmental Conditions
    Jed Steinglass

7:35 Interviews with State Officials
    Peter Mason

7:40 Information from Local Boards & Commissions
    Shanna Saunders

7:50 Facilitated Discussion & Documentation
    Michael Taylor,
    Peter Mason

9:00 Close
7pm – Matt Lahey, Chairman of the Study Committee, opens with a synopsis of the history of the property. It was the state school prior to 1990, when the state opened the prison. In 2009 the site’s use as a prison ended and a legislative study commission was formed to figure out the best, long term use of the property.

Lahey introduced the legislative study commission members who were present. Kimon Koulet spoke next and explained how Lakes Region Planning Commission (LRPC) received an EPA Brownfields Area Wide program grant and at a Brownfields Conference happened to meet Mike Taylor, the President of Vita Nova. From their discussion it was determined that Mike’s draft manual was perfect for a pilot program on this property. Under the Brownfields grant Kimon had hired the Environmental Consulting firm Credere Associates to perform a Phase I Environmental Assessment on the property.

Michael Taylor from Vita Nova explained that they’ve been studying the property with the understanding that public input was key. Mike began with a brief presentation of Vita Nova’s review of the property. He introduced the scope of the work: opportunities and constraints, market analysis, and Phase I environmental assessment.

Michael Taylor continued with the Opportunities and Constraints—the property includes three parcels and no shorefront. The site is highly visible and peak day traffic counts are about 10,000 in peak season. Zoning of the parcel was explained by Shanna B. Saunders. She said that the property is currently zoned as Residential Single Family, however it is perfect situated between Rural Residential and Commercial zoning districts and the city could consider a zoning change or a variance to accommodate the highest and best uses. M. Taylor continued: there are several historic buildings that need attention and are regulated (asbestos, etc). There are 26 buildings total. There are three currently being used: a 911 emergency building, sex offender housing and community services building.

Market Analysis – M. Taylor looked at the market to see what was happening in the country. They looked at comparable prices of nearby land for sale. They summarized the existing real-estate market in Laconia. Prices of surrounding land range anywhere from 8k to 20K per acre.

Environmental – Jed Steinglass from Credere Associates said to complete the Phase 1 Assessment they walked inside the buildings and outside of the property; they reviewed existing documents and documented potential sources of contamination. The results were petroleum storage tanks, lead paint, asbestos, mold, floor drains, and buried or improperly stored hazardous waste, which are all typical. He noted that Phase 1 assessments do not involve physical testing.

Peter Mason of SRA International, Inc., interviewed state agencies and explained the results. The Dept. of Safety just spent a million dollars upgrading the 911 building and would like to stay there. Health and Human Services indicated they can move the sex offender building but will need time. Dept of Corrections still needs a women’s prison, although this site may be off the table right now. Lakes Region Community College is interested in moving onto the property. The National Guard is also interested because they need a new, larger area for a training facility. And Department of Environmental Services (DES) has no need for the site but does need space for training.

Shanna B. Saunders did local interviews. She presented a list of what the community liked about the existing parcel, which included the open space, aesthetic value, proximity to Ahern Park, large area with the potential for multiple uses, and the presence of agricultural soils. She then presented a list of Municipal Dept. concerns and interests, including the site’s potential location for the fire station and community concerns.
including traffic, environmental issues, competition with downtown, possibility of a new prison, and the fact that the city and the state have no staff assigned to this project.

M. Taylor wrapped up the presentation and then opened the meeting to the public.

**Name — Idea/Question — Response**

**Karen Barker**, a Laconia resident — Ms. Barker expressed an interest in agriculture activity for the property. Potential benefits include status enhancement, tourist draw to the area, and a return to agricultural emphasis. Such a use would also provide food security; currently agriculture in the state only provides 4-6 percent of the state’s food needs. Anything we can do to supplement that would be good. She sent some relevant information to Vita Nuova.

NH has small and struggling farms and a food hub could provide help to these farms and lower the age of farmers in the state. “We need to grow farmers.”

There is a limited amount of agricultural land in NH as the state does not have a lot of tillable soil. Ms. Barker showed a map of the parcel with green areas indicating agriculturally suitable land. She said that they do not need the entire parcel, just some of the land and some of the buildings. Agricultural use could be compatible with the other uses mentioned. She mentioned a report that identifies the opportunities and threats to the state’s agriculture capacity.

**Michael Taylor (MT), Facilitator** — What we have seen is over time in our other projects to create synergy between uses.

**David Stamps**, a Laconia resident — Mr. Stamps was a member of the planning board when the prison came in and felt like the state “ripped the carpet out from under Laconia” like if this were to be used as a prison again or National Guard facility. Education should be the primary focus of the reuse of the property. Laconia is really tied to education and the community is educationally oriented. Whatever is done with the property, it needs to preserve the site’s beauty and open space. He suggested a municipal trust that would manage the uses of the property for the good of the public. The state needs to work with the municipality to make this happen.

**Mark Edelstein**, Lakes Region Community College — Dr. Edelstein commented that history repeats itself, as the community has been involved in this discussion for 20 years, and this is the third time that the state and community have engaged in these discussions. Lakes Region Community College (LRCC), then NH Technical College, proposed moving to the state facility. The minority report noted that during these public hearings businesses advocated the technical college as the property’s future use.

Use of the site as a prison began in 1990, and the college submitted another plan. Again, the college had the support of the community and the committee supported a mixed reuse for the property. A new community college would be a “synergistic entity” with a conference center, arts organization, business incubator, and agriculture. A synergistic use of the property would provide the best economic outcome.

**Dave Wunsch**, Laconia resident and State Geologist — Mr. Wunsch’s property abuts some of the pieces of the Lakes Region Facility. The Lakes Region Facility property sits on a hill that separates two watersheds and whatever is done on the parcel will effect both those watersheds. The lakes are among the greatest resources in the lakes region. There is not much riparian zone on the Opechee side. On the other side you do not want non-pervious surfaces to increase runoff; he advised caution. He is leaning toward the educational reuse proposals for this property. In addition, green energy might be an option as geographically the property is an outstanding location for solar photovoltaic potential, wind turbines, or geothermal possibilities. Educational facilities are perfect especially in the off season times. Education is recession proof.
**MT** — I am hearing that the property needs to be developed sustainably.

**Edward Engler**, a member of the Belknap County Economic Development Council — Mr. Engler came from an economic development perspective. He wanted to encourage the members of the committee to recognize what is happening in our region and how old we are getting. From an economic perspective, this is a great opportunity to take a step in the opposite direction. We are becoming more and more a retirement community. There are a lot of people who are not happy with this. With this property, Laconia can find a way to return to a “regular” community. What opportunity does this present for this transformative property? The first thing that should be vetted and crossed off the list is whether the state can attract a large corporate headquarters to the property and bring all the benefits of a nice corporate campus.

Plano, Texas — JC Penney moved out of NYC and brought 5,500 white collar jobs to Plano. Think of the overall impact that a use like this would have on the City of Laconia. Laconia would become branded with the corporation. Department of Resources and Economic Development (DRED) should be tasked to look at this as a possibility.

**MT** — What is the process for the future of the land? The commission.

**George Roberts**, Belknap County Resident — A multi-educational siting would be the best reuse of the property. Mr. Roberts commented that he would not exclude the possibility for student housing on the property as well. He also commented that we should not exclude those community members over the age of 65 from the benefits of an educational reuse; people who have worked through their lives can also utilize a variety of curricula. The best long-term use for the property would be an educational center that would also allow for uses that generated tax revenue.

**Warren Hutchins**, Weirs Beach resident — Mr. Hutchins supports the ways that built the country, creation of business and jobs. We need good paying jobs. He also suggested that a section be reserved for LRCC that can focus on the training needs of the communities.

Land Trust – the amount of land a company could utilize would be determined by the amount of jobs that the company brings to the area. The state now has an asset that could be converted into something that would generate income and serve as a property tax base for the city of Laconia. The entire Lakes Region would benefit from the reuse of the property. The people who would work there would live in a variety of the communities around the lakes region.

**MT** — Keep in mind that some of the buildings will need significant repair costs.

**Bill Contardo**, Laconia resident — There are a lot of people moving into the area that have their own expertise. Look at the long term, not 2 or 10 years. The community should have the ability to draw upon its resources and skills. In addition, there is the possibility to draw a business affiliation through the college and populate this facility. This could all be part of the community college and if you have these incubators here, people will come forward.

**Henry Lipman**, Laconia resident — For the health of the area, the city needs more diversity of business then the direction we are heading. Given the political forces at work, the property should be overseen by a redevelopment authority. For example, Pease Redevelopment Authority and what they did at the Trade Port. A diversity of uses seems like the best approach. Pease is a good example of what can be done. By the time things work their way through the political delays things will change. Step 1 should be to get the property under some authority’s control. This will create flexibility with what is going to be done with the property.
**Tom Barker**, a Laconia resident — Mr. Barker is completely behind the alternative energy and synergistic ideas for the property's reuse. What if part of the farm program involved growing food for the schools? That could happen here. Growing food that could support our school system also has an interpretive benefit in addition to the food benefit. He also addressed the concept of drawing younger residents to Laconia and made the point that what young people look at is the schools and what they have to offer.

**David Evans** — Two brief questions

1. **DOC** — the last proposal was to move the Youth Development Center (YDC) to the property
   a. Need for a new women’s prison? Does that mean that they are seriously considering this property for that use?

   **M. Lahey** talked about two options: the juvenile corrections and a women’s prison; the DOC is looking for available land for both in NH. However, at the moment it appears that the facility is not suitable for juveniles and he has been told that the woman’s prison is off table.

   **Ben Baroody**, a representative from Manchester, said the Commissioner of the Dept. of Corrections doesn’t want the women’s prison to move back to Laconia.

2. Timeframe for when the environmental assessment will be done?

   **Mike Connor (DAS)** — At least a year away from when the legislature will have the money for the Phase II Assessment for the property.

**Warren Clement**, Laconia resident — All these ideas are 5 to 10 years out. He wanted to remind the commission that there are two other parcels that don’t need to be cleaned up, so it makes them easier to develop immediately.

**Elizabeth Obelenus**, a Meredith resident — Ms. Obelenus sells food in Laconia. She suggests that there is a tremendous interest in Laconia for local products. She has worked for the last few years promoting organic farming. She pointed to the fact that there are two large farmers’ markets on Saturdays and both are very successful. She implored the commission not to disturb the farming soil. There will be problems with our food systems and we need additional farm space.

She said farms can exist in the middle of a city. There is a farm in Boston that is the oldest farm in an urban area. Most farmers have two jobs.

“Nubanuset,” is an example of a new development in Peterborough that includes housing with farming, “green” housing. These uses are compatible.

**Dean Anson**, Laconia resident — Mr. Anson encouraged the commission to find money to do the Phase II assessment ASAP. This assessment is critical to estimate how much it will cost to clean up the property. The cost of a Phase II can kill a project and that cleanup cost information is needed. Waiting a year is a bad idea and the commission should go to EPA or another entity to raise the funds for the Phase II.

The City of Laconia (Conservation Commission) performed a natural resource inventory, which indicated that wildlife should be on the list of priorities. The state performed a study that showed that the waters of the state generate $1.5 billion of revenue per year. Whatever is considered, water quality needs to be maintained to preserve this revenue.

With the Community College there is an opportunity for wind and solar energy generation. Community gardens could also use photovoltaic to pump water from the lake for use in the gardens.

Mr. Anson recommended that the commission look at the natural resource inventory and use those recommendations to guide reuse of the property.
The conservation commission looks to residents to create conservation easements; the commission should be looking at doing that here. Show the residents that they are not just being asked to make a contribution, but the state is being asked as well.

**Matt Lahey** — Explained the next steps in the process. So far it has been information gathering and getting input from the community. The Study Committee will take the input it has received, come up with what needs to be done for the environmental assessment, and draft 2-3 potential use scenarios for presentation to the commission and possibly the public in October.

**Tom Goulette**, Belknap County resident — Works for LRCC and commented that the graphics and electrical programs were sited at the Lakes Region Facility, so the college has been there for years. It is virtually impossible for one entity to move in and use all the buildings on the property.

There are three priorities that came out of the process from 1990’s:

1. Education
2. Economic Development
3. Recreation

Additionally, Mr. Goulette talked about the K-16 approach to education. This process will guide students into attending the community college and earning a Bachelor’s degree. A lot of students leave the state for education and do not return. There is a need to keep students in the state. Plymouth State College was interested in moving some programming to LRCC. There are no Bachelor’s programs in Laconia and by bringing them on the campus this would create the opportunity for community college students to further their education and finish their programs.

Business Incubators — The states of North Carolina and Georgia have done a great job partnering Community Colleges and Universities with business incubators. LRCC does not have space to do programs like this. The Lakes Region Facility space would give the community college the opportunity to look at these programs again.

Agriculture — The community college looked at horticulture as a program for the college; currently, the only such program in Southern New Hampshire is at the Thompson School. There is a need for additional agriculture educational programming in the area.

The community college also has an energy program, which is the only such program in the state. They have been asked by the Department of Energy to be a demonstration site for energy efficiency. Mr. Goulette commented that although this is an exciting opportunity, they do not have the space.

**Eileen Cabanel**, Laconia City Manager — Commented that there needs to be some kind of mechanism to safeguard the property as the state is in dire straits (financially) and they are looking to get money any way they can.

She is in favor of the Pease model—setting up a redevelopment authority—so the state can’t come in the middle of the night and make all our ideas go up in smoke.

**Chris Callaghan**, Laconia resident — Said that the property is state owned now, so if one of these new uses came to fruition where should the purchase money go? Does the state get it or the city? M. Lahey explained that at this point there is no use that has been given priority. This meeting tonight is to brainstorm and talk through proposed uses. Some of the uses, such as the college, would mean that the property remains in state hands.
**Sally Holder** — The commission should think outside of the box and make it Green. Winnisquam Lake is important, and we need to keep it clean, as well as Lake Opechee. She suggested getting an authority group together and drawing a line on where not to touch. She thought that a private/public partnership could work, one that offered tax incentives. She said a number of small businesses would be better than one big one.

**Armond Bolduc**, Laconia City Councilor — When the state school was in operation there was a farm that would grow everything they needed and the gardens were marvelous. There were also pigs, sheep, etc. There is the potential to still farm the property and also have another use. He commented that the part of the property that is not fields should be another use.

Farmer Definition: “A man who is outstanding in his field.”

**Carol Grasso**, Laconia resident — Commented that there are so many excellent ideas. The thing she is most concerned about is that this process reminded her of what happened 20 years ago, when the site became a prison. Need to make sure that does not happen again because the property can really be an economic engine. These are all great things that people have mentioned, but we need to protect this property.

**Adam Hosmer**, Laconia resident — Expressed how important this land is to him as a father and a business owner. It is a transformative opportunity. He asked that the Commission please continue to have these discussions with the residents of Laconia.

**Jane Wood**, Laconia resident — Thinks that the agricultural reuse would be an easier way to get started as it is known that the soil is wonderful and less likely to have brownfields-related problems. This would be a good place to get started before moving forward with other reuse options. She also suggested a dog park as a potential use.
Appendix D

Other Community Input
Members of the Laconia Fire Department developed the following Powerpoint presentation regarding their visions for incorporating a new fire station in the property reuse.

**Proposed Creative Re-Use of Lakes Region Facility Site**
Laconia, New Hampshire

**Proposed Site**

Proposal is to create a village setting within a small portion of the site.

The village would incorporate a new Central Fire Station as a local point.

The village would include town house and apartment living with a mixture of small retail and service locations.

The village would develop toward the existing building stockpile over time.

**Proposed Site Buildout**

**Village Concept**

**Similar Re-Use Sites**

Potomac Yards, Alexandria, Virginia
Portsmouth Business District, New Hampshire
Faneuil Hall, Boston, Massachusetts
Weymouth NAS, Weymouth, Massachusetts
Peace Trade Port, Portsmouth, New Hampshire
**Advantages:**

Small, but expandable, beginnings
Cost savings in new fire station construction
Minimal land acquisition costs for fire station
Possible funding support for this project
Eliminate the planned “North End” fire station
Lessen impact of final closure of Lakeport Fire Station
Create moderate to upper scale residential housing and small retail possibilities

**Advantages:**

Housing and retail would develop as needed, reducing vacant developed properties
Retail and service businesses could serve the expanding development and could support other proposed uses, such as a technology center, college, recreational - open space center and residential uses
Good access through Route 166 and development of Meredith Center Road access
Building could be built using LEED standards

**Advantages:**

Close proximity to Ahearn Beach and Robbie Mills Recreation Area.
Good access for fire department equipment to the north and south ends of the city, Parade Road, as well as faster response to Lakeport

**Disadvantage:**

Slight increase in response time to parts of downtown and south end.
Vision for former State School Property – Sustainable Agriculture Resource Center

The former State School property would be an excellent location for a non-profit Sustainable Agriculture Resource Center serving the people of NH. There is a clear need for training workers and the general public in all facets of sustainability practices, from energy conservation to agriculture and beyond. Such a center would offer extensive opportunities for public/non-profit/private collaboration, ensuring support and participation from a broad spectrum of stakeholders including the citizens of NH as a whole.

There are numerous advantages to locating such a center on this campus. They include the following:

Physical plant

Classroom space
Workshop space
Residential space
Dining facilities
Ample parking

The center would require limited building space, aside from farm-related buildings. This use would be compatible with other uses of the property – Community College programs, High school programs, Small-business incubator, and the Enhanced 911 center.

Natural Features

Forest
Pasture
Open fields
Shorefront (Ahern State Park)
Wetlands (Ahern State Park)
Proximity to other state forests along Rte 106, some of which were formerly part of the State School farm system

Central NH Location

Reasonable distance from population centers, Universities
Lakes Region Community College nearby with energy conservation program already in place
Ample pool of potential employees to staff the center and run the physical plant

There is a wide array of services and benefits that would be provided by the center, to the general public as well as farmers and food producers. The following lists include many of these services and benefits, with others yet to be identified.
Support to Local Farmers/Food Producers:

- Help farmers get products to market, storage, distribution network
- Livestock – meat processing capacity needed – need USDA plant in NH
- Saving seeds – seed banks, heirloom plants, locally adapted varieties
- Fuel - connect to a bio mass heating system
- Demo of alternative energy uses on the farm – solar, wind, bio mass
- Farmer’s market—all season
- Livestock housing/pasture land
- Place to store and rent equipment – New and Beginning Farmer’s Group has equipment to loan to members but no storage place
- Regional composting program – similar to Highfields Composting Center in VT
- New Farmer Incubator program – NH Institute for Ag and Forestry currently has program underway in North Conway, wants to expand throughout the state
- Commercial Kitchen for value-added product production
- Cooperative Root Cellar, storage crops for year-round sales
- Agro-Tourism – Pineland Farm is one model

Support to NH Citizens

- Community garden combined with education for folks who want to grow own food
- Food - nutrition education – schools, general public
- Refugee retraining and job development
- Food production to supply local food banks
- Regional food co-op
- Programs could be offered to school children similar to those run by the Appalachian Mountain Club, where the students spend a week in residence studying agricultural practices, woodlot management, or shoreline management.
- Joint management of Ahern State Park, using sustainable forestry and waterfront management processes, educational opportunities for University students, property owners
- Adult education programs could be offered covering a wide array of topics, from organic gardening to do-it-yourself energy efficiency projects to identifying and using local medicinal/edible plants. In time, offerings could be expanded to include all manner of practical arts, such as food preservation, small animal husbandry, fiber arts, welding, plumbing, etc.
- Training in solar system and windmill installations could be offered to expand the pool of trained installers, while the retrofitted buildings could serve as demonstration projects and research sites – opportunity to collaborate with the LR Community College

Opportunities for Collaboration

This is just a beginning list of possible entities that could be brought together in partnership to develop and support the center:

- State of NH – numerous departments could be involved – Agriculture, DRED, Health and Human Services, DES
• Belknap County Conservation District
• Cooperative Extension Service
• City of Laconia
• University of NH, Plymouth State University, Lakes Region Community College
• Prescott Environmental Education Center
• D-Acres Farm
• Solar companies
• Wind Energy companies
• Foundations interested in Sustainable practices
• Lakes Region Planning Commission
• Huot Vocational Center (some program components)
• Winnisquam Regional High School Agriculture program
• 9 Ag. Programs statewide
• Lakes Region Community College (re-locate energy program), develop Permaculture training program
• NRCS
• Northeast Organic Farmers Association- NH
• Small and Beginning Farmers Organization
• 4-H groups
• NH Institute for Agriculture and Forestry
• Food wholesalers
• Maple producer associations
• Other agriculture associations
• Beekeepers
• Future Farmers of America
• Cub, Boy, Girl Scouts
• Lakes Region Chamber of Commerce
• Belknap Independent Business Alliance
• Legislature, Governor’s Council – Ray Burton, Governor Lynch, Senators, Congresspersons
• City Welfare and Social Service agencies
• Governor’s Initiative for Inmates
• Youth at Risk Program
• Local Garden club (Demo Gardens)
• AMC Teen Program
• Belknap County Economic Development Council
• NH Farm Bureau Center for Non-Profits
• Master Gardeners

Potential Allies
Allies will provide support in a variety of ways to promote the concept, though they may not be directly involved in the development of the center

• City of Laconia, Shannah Saunders, Eileen Cabenal, City Council
• Local Town and City Planners
• SPNHF
• Nature Conservancy
• Audubon
• Slow Food Groups in NH – Monadnock, Seacoast
• Global Awareness, Local Action – Wolfeboro
• Plymouth Area Energy Initiative
• Tamworth Sustainability Network
• Local businesses
• Agriculture Commissions
• Sunflower Natural Foods
• NH Farmer’s Market Association
• Eliza Leadbeater Former head of BCEDC
• Gary Hirschberg, CEO of Stonyfield Farms Yogurt
• Local Civic Organizations
• Local restaurants
• Lakes Region General Hospital (LRGH)

Promotion Ideas:

• Channel 9 - Around NH interview
• State must see it as a money maker – slaughter house, jobs, revenue, political and higher use
• Use local access TV
• Venture capitalist – anybody know one?
• Peggy Selig with Laconia High adult ed - Offer this local food movement idea as a fall course at Laconia adult ed.
• Constant update in local press! Writing a summary of every meeting and have it published

Resources to Support Development

• Samuel Pardoe Foundation
• Mooseplate grant
• Unit
• Dept. of Ag.
• Major seed producers
• LCHIP
• Historic Restoration $$
• Glywood out of Cold Spring, NY
• Angel Investors
• Conservation Districts
• Libra Foundation (created Pineland Farm)
• Slow Money Alliance (www.slowmoneyalliance.org)
• Trust for the Public Land
• American Farmlands Trust
• Farm Aid (Willie Nelson’s organization)
Next Steps for Back to the Farm Group:

- Contact Lakes Region Planning Commission, Vita Nuova (consulting firm brought in by EPA) – get them involved
- Contact legislative commission charged with developing plan for site – Matt Lahey is Chair
- Contact Pineland for briefing
- Make presentation to LRPC
- City council – make presentation
- Contact county commissioners
- Contact some potential stakeholders
- Notes from this meeting to legislators, county comm., city council, etc.
- Contact abutters
- Put something into newspaper – ongoing for meetings, need more letters to the editor, spread around the state
- Spread idea via email
- Exhibit in library – model of what it would look like
- Reach out to schools
- Get committee together
- Create an email list - done
- Karen should be speaking with Lorraine Merrill to encourage state.
- Website/email/blog (Dave Stamp free webhosting)
- Hold meetings frequently – suggest once every 3 weeks, people to be there do follow-up, socialize with potlucks (local food)
- Form a board? (need organization soon or an umbrella group)
- Campaign season, meet the candidates

History of State School Farm:
http://www.csni.org/LaconiaStateSchool/TheFarmLSS.pdf

Websites for Sustainable Living Centers:
http://www.ecoearthwalk.ca/  Eastern Ontario, CAN
http://www.farminstitute.org/  Martha’s Vineyard, MA

What Maine did with their old institution: Pineland Farms

www.pinelandfarms.org  Pownal, ME

Pineland first opened in 1908 as the Pownal School for the Feeble-Minded. Begun as an institution to house the mentally retarded, during its early years orphans and other wards of the state were often inappropriately placed at Pineland, as no other public services existed to help them.
In 1953, Peter W. Bowman became superintendent, changed its name to “Pineland Hospital & Training Center” and over the next 18 years Pineland became regarded as a national model for the care of the mentally handicapped. However, political intrusion and budget cuts during the 1970s ushered in a series of administrators poorly equipped to manage and advocate for its residents and their under-paid caretakers. Pineland’s facilities deteriorated and quality care for its residents was largely abandoned. Due to worsening conditions and allegations of abusive treatment, Pineland was placed into federal receivership in 1976.

*When Pineland closed in 1996, the campus had approximately 1600 acres (6.5 km²) and 28 buildings. Much of the area was for farming purposes, and to satisfy needs of the employees and residents. In 2000, all of the farm was purchased by the Portland, Maine-based Libra Foundation. Since then, it has been heavily renovated, and undergone a major transformation, including new business openings, renovations of buildings, and building of recreational sites.*

Today, Pineland stands as a very different place than it was at closing time. The "Visitor's Center," houses a market featuring food produced by Pineland Farms. It's also very convenient for Cross-Country Skiers because it's within short walking distance of the trailhead. A Dutch-Warmblood horse breeding program is run slightly off campus just down State Route 231. Until 2008 a therapeutic riding program was run out of the stable. Below the Visitor's Center is a Cross-Country Ski shop which rentals, day trail passes for 4 dollars, and purchases are available of ski-related equipment. A [YMCA](#) is located in the gymnasium originally built for residents in the 1960s, and many programs (child and adult) take place in some of the buildings. The administrative offices are located across the street from the Visitor's Center. The Libra Foundation renovated much of Pineland's area into Cross-Country ski trails. The trail system is approximately 25 Kilometers long, and is used for multiple purposes in the spring, summer and fall, including:

- **Cross-Country Skiing** (The main sport for these trails; there are groomed tracks for skating and classic techniques in optimal weather.)
- **Orienteering** (Pineland hosted the National Orienteering Championships in 2004.)
- **Cyclo-cross** (A form of bicycle racing which one must jump over barriers and run their bike up inclines throughout various wooded courses.)
- **Trail running**
- **Mountain Biking**

Also, during spring, summer, and fall, Cross-Country ski dryland training takes place on the campus roads using rollerskis, running, and other methods of Nordic training.

The property is a thriving event location hosting corporate meetings, retreats, weddings, picnics, etc. The facilities include a conference center and banquet room as well as a stunning new tented location that is accented with a patio and pergola area perfect for wedding ceremonies and cocktail parties. Pineland Farms also has six beautifully restored farmhouses available to rent through their "Guest Houses at Pineland Farms" program. They range in size from sleeping 4 guests to one that sleeps 21. They are bringing the concept of agritourism to Maine from Italy. There is a wonderful combination of class and beauty in the accommodations aside from the stunning countryside scenery. While you are there you have full access to the farm operations and can enjoy provisions that they produce from the surrounding land.
Dear Commission Members:

Having attended the meeting this past Tuesday evening, I write this not for inclusion in the minutes but to pass along my thoughts. I was pleased to see/hear that a majority of the comments spoke in favor of a green/sustainable/renewable use of the property. That being said, it is likely that it will become a multiple use site unless, of course, Microsoft moves its headquarters to Laconia. Food production, and the opportunity to teach that skill to those in the community, is certainly a logical and productive use. That, however, consumes only (somebody mentioned the percentage) of the property. The definition of multiple use should be one that makes the best use of the land and the buildings in some sort of harmonious relationship. Crops and critters, sure. Beyond that I envision a group of people, similar to those gathered the other night at the school, brainstorming, out loud, some proposed uses...uses that will not only get some of the property back to producing food but also uses that will get a larger percentage of the population involved and supporting the project. Support not just from those writing checks but from the general public, purchasing and making use of the goods and services the property has to offer. Some proposed uses will make sense immediately. Others will evolve over time. Some will make no sense. However, what is important, I feel, is to get as many proposed uses on the table AND as many people involved as possible. There are some GREAT ideas out there, ones that have yet to be brought forth. Ideas brought forth free from the formality of a structured environment such as Tuesday night. Yes, 150 people will produce 150 ideas, all feeling that theirs is the best. The upside is that 5 of those ideas are absolutely amazing. 5 more will become amazing in tandem with other ideas. And yes, some will have their feelings hurt because their idea was passed by, but those people will either come around or, if they feel strongly enough, will continue to pursue their agenda until it becomes a reality. In the process, a sense of community will develop. Remember that? It will require an enormous amount of interest, support, enthusiasm, work and yes, money to make something happen. Take a piece of paper and a few minutes and jot down any/all ideas that come to mind. How about a retail farm stand? A butcher. A restaurant, serving what is produced on the property. Meeting space. Office space. Social services. Summer concerts. Christmas trees. X-country trails. Camping. Large animal shelter. The list goes on and on and on. I encourage you to organize a session, allowing this to happen. I think you'll be amazed at the results and the excitement.

Respectfully submitted,
Dave Evans
Lisa Clutters, President,
Happy Trails Dog Park of the Lakes Region

My name is Lisa Clutters and I am the president of a 501c3 non-profit organization called Happy Tails Dog Park of the Lakes Region. I would like to voice my support for the recreation aspect of possible uses discussed for the Lakes Region Facility.

I would like to see anywhere from 2-5 acres set aside for the creation of an off-leash dog park to promote healthy socialization in our beloved canine companions. I invite anyone who wishes to know more about our organization to contact me and I urge people to make an educated decision by conversing in depth with our group about what Happy Tails’ plans would be if granted permission to oversee the operations of the park, before they dismiss the idea. Thank you.

Additional Input from Lisa Clutters

Dear Shanna:
It was really nice to meet you at the Lakes Region Planning Commission meeting a few weeks back. Our group is encouraged that recreation is on the working list of public interest, especially so for off-leash recreation areas for dogs (dog parks). Please find enclosed our press kit, which we hope will serve as a reference point for your team. We are hoping that if your staff fields any inquiries from the public about dog parks in the Lakes Region or surrounding communities; that they will freely give out our contact information. We are also happy to meet with you and/or your team for a face-to-face meeting. Thank you for your time in reading this.

Sincerely,
Lisa Clutters
President
Laconia Planning & Zoning Director
Shanna Saunders
45 Beacon Street East
Laconia, NH 03246

Re: Laconia Facility Meeting

September 3, 2010

Dear Shanna:

It was really nice to meet you at the Lakes Region Planning Commission meeting a few weeks back. Our group is encouraged that recreation is on the working list of public interest, especially so for off-leash recreation areas for dogs (dog parks). Please find enclosed our press kit, which we hope will serve as a reference point for your team. We are hoping that if your staff fields any inquiries from the public about dog parks in the Lakes Region or surrounding communities; that they will freely give out our contact information. We are also happy to meet with you and/or your team for a face-to-face meeting. Thank you for your time in reading this.

Sincerely,

Lisa Clutters
President

Happy Tails Dog Park of the Lakes Region
Mailing Address: 26 School Street, Belmont, NH 03220
(603) 369-2101- Belmontdogpark@yahoo.com
www.happytailsdogparknh.org
The Lakes Region Facility

“Sustainability”...A Framework for Moving Forward

More and more public and private sector policy makers are embracing “sustainability” concepts in their plans. This is accomplished by incorporating long term thinking about future needs while approaching decision making in a balanced manner based on environmental, economic, social and cultural considerations. “Sustainability” should be a key principle that is used to guide the future outcome of the Lakes Region Facility.

What is “Sustainability”?

Sustainability can mean many different things to different people. Here are a couple of general observations:

- “Sustainability” is a balanced approach to planning that considers people, planet and prosperity. (“People” means community well-being and equity. “Planet” refers to the environment and resource conservation. “Prosperity means economic vitality.

- “Sustainability’ focuses heavily on linkages between environmental, economic and social issues, recognizing that policies or actions in one area have impacts on another.

- “Sustainability” is a process of continuous, on-going improvement, a realignment of community (and business) goals and practices to grow in a more responsible and resilient manner.

- “Sustainability” includes a focus on implementation and accountability.

- Sustainable plans integrate core topics such as land use, housing and transportation with renewable energy, green house gas reductions, smart growth principles, community health and well being, a resilient economy, local food production, waste stream reduction/ recycling.

- In the long run “sustainability” means adapting human activities to the constraints and opportunities of the natural systems we need to support life.

- A “sustainability” approach can lead to improved levels of cooperation among departments and agencies, more creative, cross-sector approaches, greater efficiencies and better results.

- From a public policy perspective, “sustainability” can be defined as the satisfaction of basic economic, social and security needs now and in the future without undermining the natural resource base and environmental quality on which life depends.

- From a business perspective: the goal of “sustainability” can be to increase long-term shareholder and social value, building resilient and adaptive systems, anticipating and managing variability and risk and earning a profit while decreasing industry’s use of materials and reducing negative impacts on the environment.

- Common to both perspectives is the recognition of the need to support a growing economy while reducing the social and economic costs of economic growth. “Sustainable” development reflects NOT a trade-off between business and the environment, rather the synergy between them.
"Sustainability" and the Lakes Region Facility

Although there are many questions yet to answer, most people would probably agree that the campus has a lot of potential. “Sustainability” can be a major guiding principle that helps inform decision in determining what is in the best interest of the residents of New Hampshire at this location. Flexible, sustainability policy objectives can guide the development of alternatives, the screening of alternatives and the actual campus planning all the way through to the implementation of on-the-ground best practices. A flexible, sustainability-based approach could be viewed as a foundation to alternative land use scenarios examined by the Commission.

The premise of sustainability can assist in ultimately determining what the future uses of the campus might include and help address critical questions such as: (1) What could or should be physically located there, short and long term? (2) Why should some uses possibly be located there and others not? (3) What are the synergistic relationships between various potential campus uses, (4) What are the local and regional outcomes and benefits of the various scenarios? (5) Will the preferred alternatives work?

In addition to the facility meeting the needs of the on-campus tenants, it could also function to support broader communities of interest thereby creating a greater state, regional or sub regional benefit. For example:

- A **small business incubator** could be established having an emphasis on businesses that identify with the sustainable principles (i.e. those that relate to sustainable business practices, products, etc.). There would be an opportunity for this incubator to collaborate with a similar effort in the Plymouth area involving the Grafton Economic Development Council and Plymouth State University. On-campus business/job components could also support off-site businesses that identify with sustainable principles and themes, such as processors that support the needs of small agricultural producers.

- Fully examine opportunity to locate **green businesses and industries** that are committed to sustainable practices and objectives including technology development. The opportunities for significant business development and job creation in this regard should be thoroughly explored.

- **Research** guided by our learning institutions could have a presence on the campus, filling research existing gaps, representing a model of collaboration among educational institutions. Additionally, there may be opportunities for this research to support state, regional and private sector needs.

- The historic buildings are as much of an asset and opportunity as they are a constraint. **Adaptive re-use of historic buildings**, exhibits and interpretations can provide cultural opportunities unique to this facility.

- Consolidation of satellite state **offices** could occur on the campus if it made sense to do so.

- **Energy** use and opportunities should be fully examined both from a plant/facilities business plan perspective and from and educational perspective. The site may lend itself to a bio mass facility to heat the campus integrating natural resource and energy sustainability objectives. The site could also attract the interest of local utility companies such as the NH Electric Cooperative and PSNH.

- The facility could include a **Workforce Development and Training Center** shared by campus tenants and their employees as well as outside organizations businesses. Other human resource uses could include leadership development, volunteer recruitment etc.
To the extent that entities having similar missions are located on the campus, there should be **opportunities to improve coordination and efficiency** amongst the service providers.

A focal point could be a facility similar to ECHO in Burlington, VT. ECHO is a center that educates and delights people about **Ecology, Culture, History and Opportunities** for stewardship associated with Lake Champlain and it's watershed (See: [www.echovermont.org](http://www.echovermont.org)). The center would be educational in nature, appeal to people of all ages and backgrounds, create jobs and function as a year-round place of interest for residents and visitors. The Center would also complement the outdoor recreational and educational opportunities at nearby Ahern State Park and State Forests. This facility would be guided by the sustainability premise by virtue of its design and interpretive content in a complementary fashion to the adjacent state park. It is envisioned that many of the stakeholders listed below would have something to contribute and gain from this educational opportunity.

The master plan for the facility could establish broadly stated **sustainability goals for guidance purposes**. These sustainability goals would continue to be refined (to include specific measurements of progress) as the planning and implementation processes take greater shape, form and definition, thereby leading to continuity between policy and outcomes.

This approach does not necessitate a front loaded determination of ownership and control. Rather, it embodies flexibility so that as ideas coalesce, the most appropriate structure of ownership and control could be identified to best fit the plan and its implementation. This flexible approach may also lend itself to a broader array of capital funding sources that will be necessary to redevelop the property.

At the site scale, we have an opportunity to continue to strengthen the local relationship with EPA in terms of the brown fields program and their sustainability initiative. As the facility is developed, re-developed, conserved, and maintained, the best practices in areas such as energy conservation, storm water management, wastewater management, water conservation, agriculture, landscaping, architecture, land conservation and community wellness can be readily incorporated into the site planning.

The question of “What to do with the Lake Region Facility” provides an opportunity for state agencies to fulfill the purposes of RSA 9-B. This statute articulates the General Court’s findings establishing **Smart Growth** state policy including the requirement that state agencies act in ways that encourage smart growth. The Council on Resources and Development (CORD), established under RSA 162-C, is required to report to the general court and the governor on progress by state agencies in coordinating activities that encourage smart growth. In an effort to apply smart growth and sustainability principles to this process, the Council of Resources and Development should be actively engaged.

**Vetting the “Sustainability” Approach**

There are many stakeholders that could assist in fully vetting this approach in concert with the Commission and it’s consultants. Stakeholders are those that:

1. Make the decisions...
2. Provide info pertinent to decision making...
3. Are effected by decisions (positively and negatively)...
4. Could block implementation...

The following list illustrates numerous entities having an interest in sustainable communities and sustainable practices. The list is not intended to be all inclusive rather, illustrative of the breadth of interest in sustainability and the importance of a robust stakeholder engagement element to this process.

- Existing tenants
  - LR Fire Mutual Aid
- NH Bureau of Emergency Communications

- The host community- City of Laconia

- LR Community College
  - Center for Workforce Development
  - Energy Services and Technology Program

- PSU
  - Center for the Environment

- UNH
  - Freshwater Biology Center/ Lay Lakes Monitoring Program
  - Cooperative Extension
  - Small Business Development Center/ Whittemore School of Business

- NH Department of Environmental Services
  - Waste Management Division- Brownsfields Program
  - Wetlands Bureau
  - Watershed Management Bureau
  - Watershed Assistance Section
  - Subsurface Bureau
  - Lakes Program/ Lakes management Advisory Committee
  - Pollution Prevention Program
  - Project WET (Water Education for Teachers)
  - Volunteer Lake Assessment Program (VLAP)
  - Air Resources-NH Climate Action Plan

- NH Department of Resources and Economic Development
  - Division of Economic Development
  - Division of Forests and Lands
  - Division of Parks and Recreation
  - Division of Travel and Tourism Development

- NH Office of Energy and State Planning
  - NH Council of Resources and Development (CORD) statutory responsibilities (i.e. surplus property disposition and benchmarking smart growth progress)

- NHDOT- Lakes Tour Scenic Byway

- Dept. of Safety- boater education, mooring program, marine patrol

- NH Fish and Game
  - Education
  - Non-game Species program
  - Recreation

- NH Dept. of Cultural Resources- Div. Historic Resources

- EPA Region 1- “Supports strategies which result in New England adopting more environmentally sustainable practices” including brown fields, energy, green buildings, pollution prevention, solid waste and recycling, composting, water conservation, etc.
The overall project goal is to determine what to do with the Lakes Region Facility (dispose, redevelop, sell, etc.) from the perspective of what is in the best interest of the residents of New Hampshire. An inclusive, informed decision making process guided by sustainability principles coupled with a commitment to sustainable outcomes is critical to the future of the facility. This can result in a strategy that maximizes the potential benefit of realistic opportunities for our region while best meeting the short and long term interests of the residents of New Hampshire.

Respectfully Submitted,
Comments and Consideration  
As presented by  
Amy Kivimaki  
To  
The Commission to Evaluate the Long Term Use of the Lakes Region facility  
Laconia, New Hampshire

This document was created after attending the meeting held on August 24, 2010 in the Laconia Middle School. We wanted to do my own “brain dump” and put the things we heard on that evening into some logical order. It was a well organized meeting and I came away energized to hopefully contribute to this evaluation. My husband and I have lived on Eastman Shore Rd N. for 12 years and have become familiar with the area and the weather patterns, especially living below the hill side leading up to the property in question.

I can be reached by email at Amy_ Kivimaki@hotmail.com  
Telephone:  Laconia 528-0541  
           Cell 617 967-5976  
           Private 978-263-5855

Constraints
Priorities
Potential

I. Constraints
   A. Topography
      1. Natural
         a. determination of “wetlands” underground and above ground springs that run directly down either side of the hill into Lake Opechee or Lake Winnisquam.  
         b. Protection of erosion into the lakes as witnessed in August of 2008.  
         c. Maintaining the drinking quality of water.
      2. Physical Manmade
         a. Hazardous waste identified  
         b. Complication of present and future human and/or animal waste disposal  
         c. Present and future condition and viability of structures eg. Historical
      3. Money
         a. availability of public and/or private
      4. Cultural
         a. political issues – city, state, county, community. Each held to their own laws and requirements.  
         b. Special interests

II. Priorities
   A. Present condition of the Property
      1. environmental assessment – complete analysis and the time to do this work properly.  
         a. effect on water quality of the lakes  
         b. natural conservation of established wild life habitat.  
         c. topographic assessment of specific future uses.  
         d. historical documentation
      B. Establishing A “Trust and/or Commission” of interested parties.  
         1. showing the state that local interest is important.
2. prioritize – Public use, education, horticulture, economic potential, tourism
C. Definition of what is acceptable public, quasi-public, and private use of the area.
D. Study of other similar projects, nation wide
   1. Jekyll Island in Georgia. Excellent job
E. Needs and Priorities of the State itself.
   1. Voters and tax payers of the State.
   2. Commission needs

III. Potential – Organized by Priority and Constraints
A. Environment assessment – A given amount of time to adequately make reports without fear.
   1. Could we declare the area an education zone for a specific number of years?
      a. Invite all interested schools or organizations eg: New Hampshire Lakes Assoc. to do their own evaluations of different aspects of the area. Educational opportunity for many schools from all over the country, eg., study that spurred the interest in the theater in downtown Laconia.
      b. Even create a contest.
      c. Study to see what the future generation would like to see in the area.
      d. Present CC could expand their curriculum developing what studies could be done using classroom and management classes. Use of local volunteers eg: retired folks into CC
B. This is State Land
   1. Options for public use and the optimal use of Ahern State Park.
C. All the Potential uses presented at the meeting were excellent. As on Jekyll Island, a mixed use approach could encompass education, conservation, horticulture, and economic development.
Comments to LRPC

These are my priorities and some ideas for the proposed site re-use.
1. Multiple uses, perhaps a combination of public-private-academic use, is most interesting and viable. A model may exist from the Pease AF Base experience or Fort Devens in Massachusetts.
2. There must be a strong consensus from our community for a focus and a single recommendation to the State, and sufficient public forums to achieve this.
3. Remediation of the site and future preservation of this site’s environment with respect to our abutting lakes must be a paramount goal throughout the process and the end result. Long-term public access and use (walking trails, etc), linked to Ahern State Park must be guaranteed under any future use, public or private. The site is a public treasure.
4. Some form of economic activity contributing to the tax rolls and long term growth is especially important.

If allocating the land for public use only:
A community public use alone means no direct taxable revenues, although an advantage is that the community is in control of the land and its environmental impact. If other governmental functions are arbitrarily moved there, we need to demand that cleanup and stewardship are part of the plan. Public or quasi-public farming possibly resulting in fertilizers, animal waste, and phosphorous runoff into Lake Winnisquam is a concern to me. Consequently, I am not a supporter of farming activities on this site.

Conservation, a natural science center, and recreation are some options. Public agency usage for training or low-impact activities is possible.

If allocating the land for private use only:
It offers an economic opportunity for development of the site, upgrading of skills (new jobs), employment, introduction of new technologies, and those much-needed tax revenues. Continued private investment is critical to this area as a whole, and remediation of the site’s past environmental sins must be part of the equation, as well as runoff design from non-permeable surfaces vis a vis the lakes.

Possible uses are by companies involved in tourism, recreation, and green technology. A corporate headquarters use has been suggested, but is problematic because the site location makes this unlikely, unless for a small local or regional company. Retired corporate and banking executives living in the area should be invited to participate in land use planning with LRPC and to share their business networks.

If allocating the land for academic use – teaching and research:
A need has been heard for community-based educational needs, i.e., LRCC and NHTC. Other institutions of higher learning which lie within the same driving range that brings the critical mass of visitors and seasonal home owners here include UNH, Dartmouth, MIT, Harvard, Tufts, Northeastern, Boston University, WPI, and many others - all within (<2 hours) driving time.

Possibilities include encouraging these schools to form a Lakes Region campus for environmental or green technology research and study. For the purposes of site planning, an open invitation to
each of these schools (already among the world’s leaders in business, environmental, and technology) to study and recommend use of this land and to participate in land use planning might yield many interesting alternatives.

Overall Environmental Considerations:
This subject is extremely important.
Naturally-occurring water run-off toward Lake Winnisquam and Opechee must be understood. In our short time here (12 years) we are aware of anecdotal evidence that past inattention has caused problems (Lake Winnisquam was once quite polluted we have learned). Even during dry periods, water is naturally present in the drainage ditches on Eastman Shore Rd along the shore front of Lake Winnisquam, apparently from springs, other underground sources, or surface drainage along the hillside. The fresh water source for all these homes, including ours, is private wells. A few years ago, blockage in these drains caused major damage to some homes on the lakeside of Eastman Shore Rd. This event and the constant presence of water in the drainage ditches suggest that run-off is regular and natural, and finds its way to Lake Winnisquam. Bacteria and/or other hazardous materials may also find its way into the lake and therefore this potential must be studied, understood, and mitigated. One danger of transferring functions within the public sector to this site may mean that remediation and control is short-circuited.

The New Hampshire Lakes Association should be a participant in land use planning.

Respectfully submitted,

Larry Kivimaki
176 Eastman Shore Rd. N
Laconia, NH 03246
Proposal

for the use of

Lakes Region Facility

submitted by

Lakes Region Community College

October 2010

Concept: The Lakes Region Center for Education and Sustainability would include a group of complementary institutions providing education; leadership in renewable energy, conservation, and environmental protection; and support for small businesses, the arts, and agriculture. Lakes Region Community College would be the “anchor tenant” establishing a full-service community college campus in renovated buildings that preserve the architectural heritage of the site but model the latest technology for energy efficiency and sustainability.

Other potential components of the Center would include:

- A public or private university offering upper division and graduate courses
- Partnerships and possible joint facility use with local school districts
- A small business incubator, focusing particularly on green industries, the performing and visual arts, tourism, and agriculture
- A demonstration site for alternative energy production including photovoltaic, wind, and geo-thermal
- A demonstration site for best practices in home/business weatherization and energy use
- A demonstration site for sustainable agriculture
- A Regional Conference Center

Rationale: The Lakes region Facility is a unique property due to its location, setting, size and history. The most appropriate use of such a property would be something that preserves the natural beauty of the setting, has a major impact on the economic development of the region, and enhances the cultural and social life of the community. This can best be achieved through the synergy of organizations focused upon increasing the area’s educational, cultural, and economic opportunities and with a shared commitment to model concepts of sustainability and promote them throughout the region. This type of innovative and cooperative approach would be much more likely to have a positively transformative effect upon the region than would any single use or amalgam of disparate, non-complementary uses.
Appendix E
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Credere Associates, LLC performed a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the property referred to as the Lakes Region Facility (the subject property) located at 1 Right Way Path in Laconia, New Hampshire. This Phase I ESA was completed in conformance with the American Society of Testing Materials (ASTM) Standard Practice E 1527-05 for Phase I ESAs, which meets the requirements of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI); Final Rule (40 CFR Part 312).

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Revision 2 for the Lakes Region Facility, 1 Right Way Path Laconia, New Hampshire dated August 26, 2010 and submitted to the Lakes Region Planning Commission is referenced herein.

A copy of the Phase I report was submitted under separate cover.