

“DRAFT”

Carroll County Delegation Minutes

May 18, 2009 - 9:00 A.M.

County Administration Building

Present: Reps. Ahlgren, Bridgham, Bucu, Butler, Knox, McConkey, Patten, Roberts,

Scala, Stevens, Umberger; Commissioners Sorensen, Solomon and Albee;

(absent: Reps. Chandler, Fleck and Wiley)

Chair Rep. Patten opened the meeting of the Carroll County Delegation at 9:00 a.m.

Chair Rep. Patten opens the floor for public input.

There is no public input.

Chair Rep. Patten closed public input session.

Ann P. Aiton, Register of Deeds for Carroll County Registry of Deeds presented a request for \$2,000.00 for rental of a document scanner to scan 7,217 writs of attachments recorded from 1967 to January 1, 2007 into the computer system.

The rental fee for the scanner would be \$250.00 per month. Ms. Aiton stated to the Delegation that the anticipated length of time to complete this project could be anywhere from four (4) months to the end of this year (2009). If the project is completed earlier than anticipated, the Registry would not use the total amount requested.

MOTION: Rep. Stevens moves to approve rental of a document scanner for the Carroll County Registry of Deeds not to exceed \$2,000.00 - to be debited to the surcharge account #4120.97, seconded by Rep. Knox. *All in Favor. Motion Carries.*

Cyndi Paulin, Director and Lori Lenart, Assistant Director, of the new Carroll County Collaborative, gave a brief presentation to the Delegation and Commissioners.

The Collaborative was formed approximately one year ago to address the need for a more formalized structure to organize and foster collaboration services to youth and families. This program is funded by the Annette P. Schmitt Foundation. The Collaborative is not looking for funding at this time from Carroll County. The Collaborative is a separate non-profit under the Tri-County Community Action Program.

Chair Rep. Patten advised the Commissioners have hired a new farm manager, Certified Correctional Officer, William DeWitt.

Chair Rep. Patten asked the Delegation for a recommendation to review the County's quarterly report page by page. The overall quarterly budget is at 23%. Rep. Umberger does not feel the necessity to review the budget page by page based on the fact that it currently appears to be under 25%.

Chair Rep. Patten advised that the Jail Revenue income is at 31%.

Rep. Stevens stated that the jail income was up approximately 51%.

Chair Rep. Patten asked that the Delegation vote to approve the 2009 “draft” minutes posted on the Carroll County website as follows:

1/12/09; 2/02/09; 2/09/09; 3/16/09; 3/23/09; 3/25/09 – (Concord); and 4/27/09.

MOTION: Rep. Butler moves to approve the 2009 “draft” minutes as stated, seconded by Rep. Roberts. *All in Favor.* **Motion Carries.**

Commissioner Sorensen advised the Delegation that three separate meetings have been scheduled for June 1st – Conway (Gibson Center); June 8th - Wakefield Town Hall; and June 15th - Moultonborough Town Hall @ 7:00 p.m. to discuss and describe the proposed Mountain View Nursing Home Project. Rep. Umberger stressed to the Delegation and the Commissioners the importance of including public input at these meetings. Rep. Patten suggested the notice should be revised to state that these are Commissioner Meetings and the Building Committee will be present at all three meetings supporting the process of going forward with public input.

MOTION: Rep. Stevens moves to approve the Delegations’ support to move forward with the process of public hearings relative to the Mountain View Nursing Home Project, seconded by Rep. Roberts. *All in Favor.* **Motion Carries.**

Rep. Butler suggested moving the CON process along as quickly as possible. Chair Rep. Patten confirmed the importance of the public input prior to voting.

Commissioner Albee reintroduced EGA Architect, Gerry Menke to the Delegation and advised that Menke would bring the Delegation “up to speed” and re-review some of the changes to the proposed nursing home structure plans presented to the Building Committee on May 11, 2009. The proposed revisions for the nursing home’s floor plan(s) - are based on the goal that the floor plans should be as “residential” as possible. Mr. Menke explained one of the changes to the proposed nursing home was to take some of the private rooms (which all had private bathrooms and get into shared bathrooms). Mr. Menke also reviewed the “neighborhood concept.” The main drive behind the “neighborhood concept” is that a number of rooms have their primary living areas immediately outside the residents’ rooms. In Menke’s opinion – travel distance being kept short tends to keep the residents “mobile”. Commissioner Sorensen asked about a “pitched roof” concept. Chair Rep. Patten mentioned about bad problems in the past with “flat roofs”. Mr. Menke added that modification of some private rooms to semi-private rooms – with a “non-traditional” floor plan would save 1,300 square feet overall in the entire building. Stephen Humphreys further explained that changing rooms from private to semi-private would potentially be estimated at a savings of approximately \$500,000.00. The savings is not generated from the square footage – but from the decrease in the cost of the number of bathrooms themselves.

Sandi McKenzie briefly discussed issues why private rooms would be more beneficial and profitable. Ms. McKenzie advised the Delegation that after speaking with a marketing consultant and keeping track of admissions – 85% of

the candidates looking to be placed in a nursing home are seeking “private rooms”. Ms. McKenzie further stated that gender, availability and profitability are all issues to be considered. Representative Umberger stated her concerns that the County is not being supplied with sufficient “dollars” from the State or the Federal Government to support private rooms for candidates the County is paying for and how much of a burden the proposed nursing home will be to the tax payer(s). Chair Rep. Patten confirms the importance of bringing all of the issues to the table for discussion. Rep. Bucu reminded the Delegation that the exercise at hand is to “cut costs” relating to the proposed nursing home. Rep. Bucu asked Mr. Menke if he considered eliminating some of the roof angles while maintaining private rooms and “squaring off” the design of the rooms. Rep. Ahlgren suggested taking two private rooms and consolidating them with a shared bath - and two (2) separate entrances.

Chair Rep. Patten advised the Delegation that the question remains as to whether or not the proposed nursing home should have more semi-private room(s) with shared bathrooms. Rep. Ahlgren stated that the real issue is how much money is being spent for the project - and if that amount is palatable. He stated that reducing the number of bathrooms to reduce the project by \$500,000.00 is not the only solution to the 24 million dollars that the whole project is estimated to cost. There are more reductions necessary to bring the project down. Rep. Ahlgren further advised that currently - Carroll County is “right in the middle of the road” per capita tax rate. He stated that the nursing home project will take Carroll County from “the middle of the road” to being one of the highest per capita tax rate(s) in the State of New Hampshire. Rep. Knox asked if a nursing home in Merrimack and Grafton were built with private rooms or a mix? Rep. Roberts advised that it was his understanding that the Merrimack nursing home consisted of all semi-private rooms with shared bathrooms and no shower. Commissioner Sorenson advised that the Grafton administrator would prefer all “private” rooms because of their marketability.

Rep. McConkey advised that the calculated breakdown of building costs for the proposed nursing home – currently at \$275.00 square foot for 83,000 square feet – brings the project in at 23 million dollars. His concern and the delegations questions are based on whether or not the County can afford to build a 23 million dollar facility. Rep. McConkey is also concerned as to whether or not the County has proposed to build “too large” a facility. He also thinks that the operational costs will be greater than what is anticipated at this time. Rep. McConkey stated that the Delegation should consider looking at the total project as opposed to “trimming” small amounts of money out of the project. Rep. Roberts stated he agreed there were still numbers that needed to be “refined and re-defined” – but part of what the Delegation needed to look at as well – is what the cost of this facility is going to mean to the taxpayer. He further stated that this was also part of the reason for the public hearing(s).

Rep. Butler stated that the question of the additional cost for private baths versus semi-private baths is important to present at the public hearings. Rep. McConkey further discussed the progression of the cost to build the proposed nursing home and the cost to remove the current nursing home facility.

Randy Remick reviewed the Project Budget Worksheet for the proposed nursing home with the Delegation members. The proposed nursing home project is an 83,000 square foot two-story facility. The only thing not considered in the current worksheet is the exclusion of staffing impact and a comparison of utility costs and addressing the existing facility. The budget included (30) categories of remarks and budget as of 5/15/09 - such as figures for bond and legal costs for selling the bond; county attorney's fees; builder's risk insurance, pre-design services; architectural and engineering fees; construction costs, etc. Rep. McConkey asked if Remick had a dollar number for Line Item # 23 relating to the proposed telephone system. Rep. McConkey also stated that in his opinion - the Owner's Contingency line should be in the neighborhood of 15 - 20%. He felt that \$800,000 is a much greater dollar number than what he had expected to see. Mr. Remick advised that the contingency was set at a fairly "routine" range. Rep. McConkey stated that the removal of the existing nursing home building should be discussed. Commissioner Sorensen advised that figures would be available in the near future for partial and total removal of the existing building. Chair Rep. Patten advised the building committee recently discussed whether or not the existing nursing home building could be used for an assisted living facility. They chose to put that "off of the table" - as the existing building is found to have asbestos issues.

Rep. Chair Patten reminded the Delegation and Commissioners that they are not "locked in" to the \$23 million. Rep. Ahlgren asked when Mr. Remick expected to provide the Delegation with dollar amounts for the two (2) remaining items: increased utility costs and the cost to staff the proposed nursing home facility. Commissioner Albee stated that the larger question would be the tax rate increase amount. Based on the proposed cost of \$23 million - the tax rate increase would be 18.9 cents per \$1,000. If the cost dropped to \$17 million - the tax rate increase would be 14.9 cents per \$1,000. Commissioner Albee advised that construction of any building at all will result in a tax rate increase - and the tax rate difference between a \$17 million building and a \$23 million dollar building is quite "minimal". Commissioner Albee spoke about private rooms generating more revenue. Rep. Ahlgren stated his concern that the increased cost of operation may exceed the increased revenues - based on Rep. McConkey's point - "Are we building too big a facility?"

Sandi McKenzie stated that additional revenues will be generated from the Café and Store - which in her opinion - will be a "money making" proposition. In turn - this revenue will offset the additional staffing costs. Sandi also briefly discussed the projected proposal for additional staffing and on Chair Patten's request - Sandi also reviewed the historical projected financial statements for the Delegation. The 2009 occupancy revenue figure for fiscal year ending 12/31/09 was based on 100 beds. The 2010 occupancy revenue figure for fiscal year ending 12/31/10 was based on 103 beds. The private pay rate for Mountain View Nursing Home presently is at \$245.00 per day. These rates will increase approximately 2% for 2010 and 2011 and further increasing in 2012 and forward approximately 5%.

Commissioner Albee confirmed that the projected bond rate will be 18

cents per thousand. Rep. Butler advised that Rep. Wiley has begun to move ahead and organize a 501C3 – non-profit status. It is hoped that this will help to raise significant dollars to help offset some of the proposed construction. Ms. McKenzie advised that currently the nursing home does not have any VA beds. There may be a possibility that the County will get a few VA beds at the proposed nursing home. This would assist with increasing future revenue.

Rep. Umberger spoke of her concern relating to the projected operating costs for the proposed building. Sandi McKenzie stated that in looking at the all of the job descriptions in the neighborhood concept it is her hope that the new building will allow the staff to be more efficient. Randy Remick stated the new building will be far more efficient relative to utility costs per square foot. Rep. Albee spoke to the Delegation briefly regarding how volunteers should be attracted to the new facility - which should hopefully keep the operational costs down. Chair Rep. Patten stressed to the Delegation that upcoming public hearings should be geared to not only provide the public with the necessary information but also allow the public to be able to understand and compare that information. Commissioner Albee provided the Delegation with a question relating to 501C3 dollars raised and where and how those monies will be allocated. Chair Rep. Patten further stated that in her opinion - fund raising monies should be allocated specifically for the project they were raised.

MOTION: Rep. Stevens moves to go into convention, seconded by Rep. Butler. A vote was taken, all in favor. **Motion Carries.**

IN CONVENTION

Rep. Umberger stated she wanted to make sure everyone understood the process relative to how the Delegation will proceed with the proposed nursing home project. Rep. Umberger felt that the “time – line” is important for the Delegation to know when they are required to make decisions. Chair Rep. Patten advised that she would like to have the second quarter review on August 17, 2009. Commissioner Albee advised that the final deadline for the bond application is October 2, 2009. Chair Rep. Patten advised that a municipal bond bank had set a bond rate currently at a 6% rate for 20 years.

MOTION: Rep. Knox moves to ratify the Delegation minutes; ratify not to exceed \$2,000.00 for the Registry of Deeds; and ratify to support the process of conducting several public town meetings relating to the proposed building of the new nursing facility, seconded by Rep. Umberger. A vote was taken, all in favor. **Motion Carries.**

MOTION: Rep. Stevens moves to come out of convention, seconded by Rep. Knox. A vote was taken, all in favor. A vote was taken, all in favor. **Motion Carries.**

OUT OF CONVENTION

Chair Rep. Patten advised that the next Delegation meeting will be scheduled for August 17, 2009.

Chair Rep. Patten opens the floor for public input.

David Babson stated that he did not think the potential staffing for the proposed nursing home should be taken “lightly”. Mr. Babson further stated during the time he was a delegate member when the new correctional facility was

being proposed - the delegation was advised that there would be absolutely no requirement for additional staff members. Once the facility was built – the first year – three additional employees were requested; the second year six new employees were requested – but actually they required twelve or fifteen. Mr. Babson hopes the Delegation will not “look the other way” and say the issue of how many people will be needed to staff the new facility “really is not important”.

Maureen Spencer stated she wanted to thank the Delegation for remembering to include the public in the discussions.

MOTION: Rep. Umberger moves to adjourn, seconded by Rep. Roberts. A vote was taken, all in favor. **Motion Carries.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,