

Official
As of 02/06/12

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)
COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES**

November 29, 2011

**HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
35 MAIN STREET
(Chambers room 105)**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair N. VanScoy called the meeting to order at 6:08pm.

ATTENDANCE

Chair Nancy VanScoy (Town Council Rep.), Vice-Chair Marc Miville (Budget Committee Rep.), Tom Walsh (Planning Board Rep.), Jim Walter (Conservation Commission Rep.), and Dana Argo (School Board Rep.).

Excused: Steed Celio.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Christine Soucie, Finance Director and Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr., Town Administrator.

Approval of Minutes for 11-15-11 & 11-22-11

J. Walter motioned to approve the minutes of 11-15-11 with edits. Seconded by T. Walsh.

Vote unanimously in favor.

M. Miville motioned to defer the approval of the minutes of 11-22-11 to the meeting of 01-24-12 (CIP Committee Self-Audit). Seconded by T. Walsh.

Vote unanimously in favor.

BUSINESS - CIP PLAN FY ENDING 2013-2018

M. Miville motioned to adopt the CIP spreadsheet format dated 11/23/2011 draft. Seconded by J. Walter.

Vote unanimously in favor.

T. Walsh: At the end of the CIP plan there are steep years, because we moved the \$508,000 for the kindergarten reconfiguration. The Fire Dept. also has room to change with a lease option.

N. VanScoy: Recycling & Transfer has large vehicle purchase, however they have a special revenue fund that may off-set some of these costs.

C. Soucie: A new engine for the new fire station is an issue.

N. VanScoy: We could take out large vehicles that may be taken out another way (i.e. fire vehicle impact fee). There may be other revenue sources available.

J. Walter: I don't know if we really know for sure if they will ever build the fire station. All those costs may be gone.

M. Miville: The Town Council recently motioned that we don't need more than two fire stations.

N. VanScoy: The policy was we can't afford more than two fire stations now.

J. Walter: Those two fire items are big items. If it doesn't happen, then they come off the CIP.

M. Miville: There are three \$100,000+ items for this year coming up that are necessary. I know we are looking at 6 yrs., but I wanted to make you aware of that. For the front loader, she (D. Boyce) did state it is a priority for this year at \$160,000.

C. Soucie: We have revenue for that out of the special revenue fund.

M. Miville: The warrant article should read it is already funded, but we just need a vote.

C. Soucie: It should also be a non-lapsing warrant article. We won't take the money out, until the machine actually dies.

J. Walter: Other than the new fire station and new fire truck for that station, there was one other item that bothered me. It is the \$508,000 for the kindergarten upgrade at Memorial.

C. Soucie: Last year there was not much in it. I tried to spread that out over a couple of years, but it made it lopsided. We could put it out towards the end; Dana said it is a "philosophy". The other two items are replacement of roof and paving.

T. Walsh: Being a "philosophy and policy", is it a capital improvement? I opened up page 9 of the CIP Handbook. Is it a CIP item by definition?

N. VanScoy: To improve delivery of services, that is what the School Board is there to do. They find ways to teach our children. That is my opinion.

M. Miville: It is an infrastructure adjustment. It is no different than improving the safety center.

N. VanScoy: They are saying they are going to need these funds. We are not here to define philosophy of the school system. We are here to level the bottom line. How great is the need to implement that particular philosophy?

D. Argo: It is not a philosophy. We have been tasked to have 21st century neighborhood schools. It is an initiative that has been voted on. We wouldn't request this year or next voting year, because we have two bargaining contracts on the warrant. Dr. Littlefield is definitely the one to give you the details. We were asked to present our plan and this is our plan. The district is in pretty good shape. We are not asking for a \$1,000,000 next year. We have been deferring things because of that. It is a 2010 proposal Dr. Littlefield got. It isn't a present day bid. He will explain the details on what is being done, when he arrives later tonight. The proposal is \$508,000. With bids, it could be less than that. We don't bid things now that are 3 years out. It is a high level proposal.

N. VanScoy: We can revisit the school section once we have Dr. Littlefield here.

M. Miville: I started reexamining years we posted and referred to the minutes, to see if department heads' years matched what we accomplished. I want to focus on getting the right year?

N. VanScoy: There were some years I thought should be changed to level the bottom line.

M. Miville: Did we match their requests? For the backhoe vs. sidewalk plow, Leo moved it out a year. Dale stated in the past that he needed the backhoe.

N. VanScoy: I didn't compare the spreadsheet with the minutes. I went through the sheets in front of us. I was quite reluctant for splits to go years beyond.

M. Miville: It looks OK to me at this point. We pushed out the 2013/14 DPW items (two ½ ton pickups, and backhoe) to 2014/15. I looked at the minutes and DPW. Said it was OK to push out one year.

N. VanScoy: Are there any you found that needed to be reexamined based on the minutes?

C. Soucie: The only thing you changed was DPW. Police is \$50,000 2012/13, \$50,000 2013/14, & \$50,000 2014-15.

M. Miville: I spoke to Captain Daigle and Police Commissioner McHugh. They understood it is what it is (\$50,000, \$50,000, \$50,000). Captain Daigle previously stated he would fight for the \$100,000 2012/13.

C. Soucie: We did not go over out (future) years with DPW Director.

M. Miville: Did I hear correctly that Recycling & Transfer and DPW share a loader?

C. Soucie: DPW's loader is on their last leg, therefore Recycling & Transfer share their's to move salt & sand.

SAU #15 Discussion

Dr. Phil Littlefield, SAU #15 Superintendent: There are two areas of interest: Memorial kindergarten upgrade project and Underhill parking lot improvements.

N. VanScoy: My understanding from Dana is this is part of a larger initiative.

Dr. Littlefield: There are a couple of parts the School Board took action on about 4-5 years ago:

- 1) transportation = if kids at Memorial or Underhill take the bus, we do have a convoluted shuttle (Underhill to Memorial and Memorial to Underhill). The afternoon bus kids are on there for a long time. Both schools serve the entire community.
- 2) the current K-2 configuration and 3-5 configuration is unusual. As soon as kids and families are acclimated to these schools, then they are transitioning. The student achievement for 3rd grade and 6th grade is currently problematic. The Board looked at this and decided that for the long term we should have a "neighborhood school concept" to address transportation issues and student achievement issues; both schools (Underhill & Memorial) would be K-5. This concept would put youngsters in one school for 6 years, then middle school (Cawley), and then high school. This concept would require kindergarten space at Memorial. We asked the architect that did the renovations to Memorial and built Cawley (and most recently did Auburn school) to provide us an estimate for 1,000 sq. ft. kindergarten room with bathroom facilities. We needed to know how to carve two classrooms with these needs. Some options for the design: 1) demo carrying walls, or 2) use option similar to Auburn project June 2010, \$465,000 estimate for removal of walls and plumbing for independent laboratories. This increased 3% 2013/14 to \$508,000 as a soft estimate. For a hard estimate we would have to hire an architect to do design plans. For the Auburn project it cost \$40,000-\$50,000 for the architect and \$28,000 in design fees. He looked at a number of different options. This is the most feasible and cost effective.

J. Walter: I was the biggest one making comments on this item. I agree with your approach, but it was the \$508,000 that concerned me. I didn't realize it included two bathrooms. Even though the amount is still high to me, I can see it now.

Dr. Littlefield: If the classrooms are contiguous, they can share the bathrooms. I see it is high too, but I don't want to state \$300,000 and then have it be \$500,000. Memorial upgrades cost \$400,000.

T. Walsh: I questioned it also. I didn't understand the transportation factor.

M. Miville: We pushed it out further on as a goal. If the School Board, citizens, and Town decide to build a high school, would that switch all the grades upward?

Dr. Littlefield: Great question. I am such a fan of the K-8 configuration. Make believe Cawley could retrofit to a high school, then Memorial and Underhill K-8. It can't happen, because the Underhill site is too tight. The current facilities would not support K-8. In the event this community builds a high school, it would be in addition to the three existing schools.

N. VanScoy: Are you trying to accomplish this project as a one lump sum or spreading it out? Your thoughts? We currently have pushed it out to 2017-2018; 2 years from what was presented to us.

Dr. Littlefield: For the kindergarten project itself, how to split phase I & II? We could access plumbing from the corridor for phase I. Demo and reconstruction could be phase II. I haven't bounced this off the architect yet. I have always stayed away from phasing, because it costs more. For the scope of the project, we wanted to do one phase. What year we do it in is a policy decision by the School Board and not administrative. We are working towards a goal. It will depend on what this community wants to do about a high school. To have it in the CIP for 2017-2018 administratively is not an issue, however from as a policy, I can't speak for the School Board.

N. VanScoy: Administratively?

Dr. Littlefield: My staff and I are planning for it. We are involved in a number of other initiatives for the classroom and learning incentives. 2017-2018 is not that far off.

N. VanScoy: For the HVAC, paving, preventive maintenance, and roof replacement, I would have preferred to have paving Underhill, and preventive maintenance treated separately.

Dr. Littlefield: It is a work in progress. Underhill, when I first came here, had serious water infiltration issues. For the roof life expectancy, we fixed what was needed and know it will need to be replaced in the future. Seaming at Cawley and Memorial is preventive to have the roof last longer. The kindergarten project may not be in the same year as the need for a fire truck. That is why we submit to you to prioritize. I have no problem moving the kindergarten upgrade to 2017-2018, because you are sitting on top of all the community needs.

M. Miville: We had discussion with Dana. We were trying to spread out the lump sums and we wanted to know when you wanted to spread out certain items to avoid tax spikes. Dana offered HVAC for the first 4 yrs., and kindergarten spread out 6 yrs. and beyond. Is that amenable to you?

D. Argo: I separated the operational and educational buckets. The generator has a radar on it as a community resource. HVAC and roofing is a priority.

Dr. Littlefield: I am on board with Dana. Going through this exercise identified our needs before they become emergencies. If the roof was going out to 2017-2018 that may be an issue, because we are living on borrowed time. None of these are emergencies.

C. Soucie: I did try to spread HVAC over 4 yrs., so I tried roof and paving and grouped others at the end of the 6 yrs.

N. VanScoy: Roof replacement for 3 yrs. should be split in 2015-2016.

D. Argo: From a Board perspective, as long as we are in the 6 year plan, I have the Board's support. If we go past the 6 years, then I have to go back to the Board. I agree with Superintendent with what we want to do in one year. Is it bad to have years 5 & 6 large? The Board is striving for it. It is always "now is not the time nor is it the time next year". As long as it stays in the 6 year plan, I am OK.

J. Walter: I would like to have it in the 6th year of the 6 yr. plan.

N. VanScoy: What the CIP committees tends to do is push items to the last couple of years.

M. Miville: Get citizens educated that by spreading out amounts there are less tax spikes.

T. Walsh: For the HVAC upgrade, what is the cost efficiency? How old is the boiler for Underhill? What are the expenses for improvements? How long would the payback be? What is the cost benefit analysis?

Dr. Littlefield: The controls need improvements. It is for the health, safety, and well-being of those that occupy the building. It will save on gallons of oil. It is currently inefficient. We have a global responsibility not to burn as much oil and put in the atmosphere.

M. Miville: What are the controls?

Dr. Littlefield: Thermostats that control temperature for all the rooms. Currently one room can be 90 degrees and they open their windows, and the next room can be cold.

N. VanScoy: If we update the controls (thermostats), will those same upgrades work with the older boiler?

T. Walsh: I would wonder how much is still usable if the boiler failed.

N. VanScoy: I would not want to spend money to make updates, and then something else needs to be replaced.

Dr. Littlefield: I couldn't be more supportive of your CIP goal. As a taxpayer, I need to be able to plan on my tax rate.

M. Miville: For paving it is \$60,000 this year, and \$70,000 next year.

N. VanScoy: Can those be split?

Dr. Littlefield: I am more concerned about the paving at Underhill. It is deteriorating beyond the sealing. I am afraid someone will get hurt. How far out to push it? It is currently a safety issue.

N. VanScoy: Look at funding in a single year?

Dr. Littlefield: Memorial and Cawley are up to speed for a 3 yr. cycle to seal coat to prolong the life. One school a year every year to be done. We could do a parking lot at the same time as other paving projects in Town.

J. Walter: The generator, is that something really necessary for a backup? We have generators in other schools. If it is for keeping schools open during power outages, that is different.

Dr. Littlefield: It is not as necessary as the parking lot. During the most recent emergency, Fire Chief Michael Williams and I were at the shelter for the people. It depends on factors. We would have the ability to shelter in all of our public buildings. I wouldn't hold school if the only source of power was a generator. However I could provide kids with heat, water, and food. Once they (kids) get there, we can't send them home to an empty house. It could also double as a shelter.

J. Walter: It is so close to SNHU, which serves as a shelter.

Dr. Littlefield: It depends on the circumstances. If we were building a school today, we would have an emergency generator. We may come up with another need more important.

D. Argo: All three schools would then have generators. Students could be warm and fed, but could buses and teachers get there?

Dr. Littlefield: A generator would not just be if there was no school. If something happens while there is school and there is a power outage, the plumbing doesn't work.

D. Shankle: Is there an emergency evacuation plan for schools (if no power outage)?

D. Argo: SNHU is a shelter.

Dr. Littlefield: But it costs us as much to implement a plan for transportation vs. buying a generator. SNHU is one of our evacuation sites.

Conservation Land Maintenance Discussion

D. Shankle: For maintenance of conservation land, I didn't consider it a capital improvement. It should be in their budget.

C. Soucie: It is improvements and infrastructure development.

M. Miville: I agree with the Town Administrator and don't feel conservation is a need, but a want and it should be in their budget. But for \$10,000, I left it in there. The other item was the southern parkway leg study. We decided we couldn't remove it, so that is why we left it in there.

N. VanScoy: We had a discussion about zeroing it out the study. Now we are having a conversation if it does belong here.

D. Shankle: If it is in their budget and they don't spend it, where do the funds go?

C. Soucie: If the CIP is recommending a fund for it, there is no true understanding what they will do with it. The CIP process is establishing a capital reserve fund. If it is in their operating budget and they don't spend it, it would go into a general conservation account with no obligation.

D. Shankle: It should be in a capital reserve fund, or it will go back in their budget. There may be types of projects that are more expensive. They will spend on new stuff vs. spending on improvements. They would accumulate money for future projects (i.e. Pinnacle).

M. Miville: Would they need a separate line item in their budget: 1) land purchases, and 2) infrastructure?

C. Soucie: The Conservation Commission has current use funds. They have no budget that they can spend on purchasing land. They have an operating budget for staff and day-to-day operations. Under the RSA, at the end of the year the operating budget must be transferred to another account to spend on anything they want.

M. Miville: They should have a capital reserve fund to target what they need.

D. Shankle: It is for a purpose. An example is the Pinnacle. There is no place else for people to park. They need to make the conservation land accessible.

Continued SAU #15 Discussion

N. VanScoy: Is there any other parking lot in Town to be used more than Walmart? Yes, the schools. The Town is liable for any injuries in those parking lots.

T. Walsh: I agree with the nature of the paving.

M. Miville: Give him \$60,000 for paving this year, and then next year give him funds for maintenance.

D. Argo: Could we vote in theory tonight, and then I can get you the exact numbers?

N. VanScoy: If there is no seaming project, then the need gets bigger.

T. Walsh: When was the last time Cawley was sealed?

D. Argo: It hasn't been done. Memorial and Cawley would be preventive. Underhill is a rehab.

J. Walter: Add \$67,000 to the first year.

C. Soucie: For the school ballot have \$127,000 paving and move the roof replacement funds to next year.

D. Argo: The School Board has two bargaining contracts for the ballot this year. I understand the safety issues for paving, but we also have to get our contracts through. Would we see both of these warrants plus the two contracts go through? As the superintendent said tonight, paving is #1. Roofing is a concern but not immediate.

N. VanScoy: Having \$160,000 for the roof this year, I am not comfortable with it, but it doesn't spike the bottom.

D. Argo: Cawley & Memorial items are preventive. Underhill two projects are a need to do.

J. Walter motioned to adopt the CIP Plan FY Ending 2013-2018 based on the spreadsheet format dated 11/23/2011 with the amendments to line:

> "Paving Underhill & Preventive Maintenance on Memorial & Cawley" to read 2012/13 \$90,000 & 2013/14 \$37,000 AND

> "Roof Replacement at Underhill & Reseaming at Memorial & Cawley" to read 2012/13 \$60,000, 2013/14 \$160,000, 2014/15 \$155,000 & 2015/16 \$100,000

for a total bottom line of year 2012-2013 \$725,531. Seconded by D. Argo.

D. Shankle: The school has two union contracts and the Town has one.

D. Argo: We understand the nature of the CIP plan for 2013-2014 is to be as lean as we can and push things out.

D. Shankle: The more you get in capital reserve funds, after a few years you won't need \$40,000 and \$50,000 every year. \$10,000 may be enough every year for some replacements.

M. Miville: For computers for the Town, I was told \$10,000 was enough. Shouldn't we go higher?

N. VanScoy: We should add a warrant article to cover immediate computer needs in addition to starting capital reserve funds.

D. Shankle: We could have a warrant article for software. At this point, we are OK with the \$10,000.

J. Walter: After the Planning Board meeting, I think we will go down \$100,000 in 201617 for the parkway.

Vote unanimously in favor.

CIP Chair – CIP Participation and Presentations

N. VanScoy: The Town Planner has indicated that since I have resigned from the Town Council, I should no longer attend CIP Committee meetings or participate in CIP presentations. I ask the Town Administrator to make sure we (CIP Committee) have proper representation on the December 5th (Planning Board) and 14th (Town Council) meetings.

D. Shankle: The CIP Committee can choose whoever they want to make presentations (i.e. attorney). It does not have to be a member of this committee or a resident of Town. If the Planning Board has no objection, it is up to this committee.

M. Miville: I am in favor of Nancy presenting the CIP Plan to the Planning Board and Town Council. She was here for deliberations, and chaired this committee. Furthermore back in May at a Town Council meeting discussion, Mr. Sirak stated on occasion that perhaps he would want advisors to him. I asked if other committees can have advisors. I called the LGC, and they said it is appropriate for a chairman to appoint advisors.

M. Miville motioned to recruit and appointment Nancy VanScoy as CIP Committee advisor for CIP Plan presentations at the 12/5/11 Planning Board meeting and 12/14/11 Town Council meeting. Seconded by J. Walter.

T. Walsh: I have no issues with this.

D. Argo: Based on the Town Administrator comments, I don't think we need a motion.

D. Shankle: The advantage of a motion, is that it eliminates any issue at the Planning Board with Nancy presenting.

Vote 4 in favor. N. VanScoy abstains.

OTHER BUSINESS

CIP Committee 2012-2013 Presentation – Planning Board

N. VanScoy: The CIP Committee presentation of the CIP Plan FY Ending 2013-2018 to the Planning Board is scheduled for Monday, December 5, 2011 @ 6:00pm.

CIP Committee 2012-2013 Presentation – Town Council

N. VanScoy: The CIP Committee presentation of the CIP Plan FY Ending 2013-2018 to the Town Council is scheduled for Wednesday, December 14, 2011 @ 6:30pm.

CIP Committee 2012-2013 Self-Audit

N. VanScoy: The CIP Committee will complete a self-audit on January 24, 2012 @ 6:00pm in room 204. All departments who have participated in the process are welcome to submit their comments prior to this date.

N. VanScoy: I would like to thank the committee members for their time and efforts on this year's CIP Committee. You are a very dedicated group.

OTHER BUSINESS

*M. Miville motioned to adjourn at 8:2-pm. Seconded by T. Walsh.
Vote unanimously in favor.*

ADJOURNMENT

Chair N. VanScoy declared the meeting adjourned at 8:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator