

**Official  
As of 11/13/12**

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

**October 23, 2012**

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Tom Walsh called the meeting to order at 6:02pm

**ATTENDANCE**

Chair Tom Walsh (Planning Board Rep.), Vice-Chair Marc Miville (Budget Committee Rep.), Donald Winterton (Planning Board Rep.), Dana Argo (School Board Rep.), and Robert Duhaime, (Planning Board Rep.) arrived 6:50pm.

**REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT**

Excused: Christine Soucie, Finance Director.

T. Walsh: We are videotaping the meeting this evening. I ask the committee members to speak into the microphones.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 02/06/12 & 10/16/12**

*M. Miville motioned to approve the minutes of 02/06/12. Seconded by T. Walsh.  
Vote 2 in favor. D. Argo and D. Winterton abstain.*

*M. Miville motioned to approve the minutes of 10/16/12 with edit on pg. 3 by T. Walsh.  
Seconded by D. Winterton.  
Vote 3 in favor. D. Argo abstains.*

T. Walsh: Presenters should sit at the presenter's table.

**SCHOOLS**

Dana Argo, Schools: I believe the school district is in good shape. We have been very lucky over the past few years. The taxpayers of Hooksett have been very generous to the

school district. We have submitted a plan (CIP), and barring any unforeseen events, none of these items are urgent/emergency type.

D. Argo: The request from **Schools** is **#47 HVAC Upgrades**. We have \$188,000 for HVAC in year 2013-2014. This is to replace an obsolete system. Example is modifications and upgrades to the building additions at the Memorial school several years ago. The new sections of that school have new equipment, however the existing and renovated sections had the vintage HVAC system. Because of its age, we need to look at it and plan for the future. The controls in the buildings have their spots; one area cool and another area warm. We need to raise the temperature to accommodate the cool spots. We have been told that having a more remote control system would be helpful. Example is on snow days. The system is planned to come on say at 6:30am, but no one will be in the school because they can't get there. The system would heat the building, when no one would be there. This CIP item is for efficiency and planning for older equipment that has a life expectancy.

T. Walsh: Do we want Dana to present the school's CIP items one-by-one and we comment after each one or have him present the whole CIP plan now and then we comment at the end of his presentation?

Committee consensus: Have full presentation now, then committee can provide comments.

D. Argo: The request from **Schools** is **#48 Kindergarten Upgrade at Memorial**. This item is \$508,000. It is a 6 yr. plan with \$85,000 in each of the first five years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18) and \$83,000 in the sixth year (2018-19). This is 21<sup>st</sup> century learning more toward the neighborhood type schools. There are changes that students go through now K-2, 3-5, & 6-8. These change years impact some students as a "big" change. K-5 at both Underhill and Memorial schools is the educational atmosphere initiative. It has been pushed out to the end of the plan years. We would like to do it, but we know times are difficult right now, and it is not the time to pull the trigger on that initiative. The \$508,000 is a fairly constant cost across the board.

D. Argo: The request from **Schools** is **#49 Roof Replacement and Reseaming at Underhill**. This item is \$382,000; \$191,000 in each of the first two years (2013-14, 2014-15). If we were asked 3-4 yrs. ago this item was at an emergency status, but now there has been significant maintenance. These band aids result in no leaks. We do see a life expectancy and experts say the roof won't last much longer.

D. Argo: D. Argo: The request from **Schools** is **#50 Roof Replacement and Reseaming at Memorial**. This item is \$35,000; \$17,500 in each of the first two years (2013-14, 2014-15). When the roof was redone, part of the plan was to maintain it to extend the life of that roof.

D. Argo: D. Argo: The request from Schools is #51 Roof Replacement and Reseaming at Cawley. This item is \$58,000; \$29,000 in each of the first two years (2013-14, 2014-15). It is the same as above for the timeframe for the two building upgrades.

D. Argo: The request from Schools is #52 Paving at Memorial. This item is \$32,350; \$6,470 in each of the first five years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18). This parking lot maintenance was recommended to extend the life of that pavement. We need to reseal and reline the parking lot. No issues now; we just want to extend its life. Same time period.

D. Argo: The request from Schools is #53 Paving at Cawley. This item is \$32,350; \$6,470 in each of the first five years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18). Same as above, no issues now; we just want to extend its life.

D. Argo: The request from Schools is #54 Sports Field Expansion at Cawley. This item is \$120,000; \$30,000 in each of the first four years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17). I have been in town 20 yrs. The fields are always an issue here for availability. It is always an advantage to expand. The intent is always to add fields for the youth of the town.

D. Argo: The request from Schools is #55 Generator for Underhill. This item is \$80,000; \$25,000 in each of the first two years (2013-14, 2014-15) and \$30,000 the third year (2015-16). This is to purchase and install a generator at Underhill. The other two schools (Memorial and Cawley) have back-up power for emergency shelters. In this day and age with family situations the way they are, schools are not just a place to go in an emergency. Whether school is in session or not, youths need somewhere to go when there is no school, because their parents are working. They need someplace warm and to get a hot meal.

D. Argo: Those are the school district CIP items. I don't want to downplay them or have you think it is just our wish list. The school district is in good shape. We have submitted a plan to keep moving in a positive direction.

### **CIP Committee comments . . .**

D. Winterton: I have a general question. I am new to this committee. Are we at a \$50,000 minimum limit on CIP items Mr. Chair? If they don't make \$50,000, are they proper CIP items?

T. Walsh: Our recommendations to the Planning Board for CIP Handbook changes not only include the amount if the CIP item, but also maintenance. I don't know if it (maintenance) is necessarily a CIP item.

D. Argo: I respect your view; however maintenance is a capital item, because it is an extension of the life of that (capital) item. Reseaming is not replacing a roof (new purchase), but extending the life of the capital purchase.

M. Miville: In last week's CIP Committee conversation, it was determined that maintenance items are not part of the CIP criteria.

T. Walsh: It is part of our other business tonight to go through the list of CIP Handbook recommendations to the Planning Board. Part of the statute (RSA 674:6 Purpose and Description) contains "The program may also contain the estimated cost of each project and indicate probable operating and maintenance costs and probable revenues . . ."

M. Miville: Implementation of a project is not maintenance. Carrying out the project is not maintenance.

D. Winterton: For a CIP project an example is new athletic fields. What is the cost to maintain those fields? Having a new roof, the maintenance over the next 20 yrs. is minimal. New field maintenance is ongoing to include mowing, striping, weeding, etc. Maintenance would be in an operating budget.

D. Fitzpatrick: May I remind the committee that you are not voting tonight. In other business tonight, we will discuss the CIP Handbook recommendations to include maintenance. Dana can then join the committee (vs. remaining at the presenter's table) for further discussion on the recommendations.

M. Miville: Dana, as the department name on your CIP submission you have "school district". Has the School Board seen these proposals and voted on them or do proposals go through administration?

D. Argo: The School Board approved the plan and allowed the Business Administrator to disburse the funds over the 6 yrs.

M. Miville: I was at the School Board meeting that day, and there was some confusion by the Board members. I spoke at their public input on the CIP process. A couple of Board members told me afterward that they were still unclear on these plans. They should understand, approve, and submit the plan. Does it say school district or School Board? How much does the Board have input on these? At their last meeting, they were looking at last year's CIP plan.

D. Argo: The CIP plan has the same items as last year's plan. We (School Board) voted for when the project is to be implemented, and allowed the Business Administrator to disburse the funds.

M. Miville: So the Board saw the big picture. In looking at last year's CIP plan, it is the same items, but not spread out. This year's CIP plan is remarkably different. I am expressing my concern, because the implementation has changed drastically from this year to next year. The total school CIP of \$578,440 for years 2013-2014 is over 1/3 of the total CIP plan for all departments for that year. If none of these items are urgent, then why do they all start funding this year?

M. Miville: 3 or 4 of them can be moved over.

T. Walsh: Most of the articles are the same thing.

D. Argo: We did not have peaks and valleys in our goals.

M. Miville: In 2013-14 your total is \$578,440.

T. Walsh: HVAC?

M. Miville: HVAC is lump summed this year at \$188,000. Why not spread it out \$60,000+ for 3 years? If it is not urgent, why lump sum it?

D. Argo: Not knowing the entire plan when we spread schools out, will that cause an issue in another year?

T. Walsh: My question on your CIP plan is did the urgency change from last year? Is that why HVAC was lump summed this year?

M. Miville: In 2015/2016, have extra monies in those years on the initial bottom line totals.

T. Walsh: It might be premature to bottom line funds for schools, when we have many other presentations.

M. Miville: \$188,000 is for the HVAC computer controls. You are not replacing the entire system.

D. Argo: Correct.

T. Walsh: For the kindergarten item, refresh my memory.

D. Argo: Now Underhill is grades K-2, Memorial is grades 3-5, and Cawley is grades 6-8.

T. Walsh: And the goal is to have Underhill and Memorial K-5 grades at both schools.

M. Miville: The \$508,000 is because the kindergarten rooms are bigger at 1,000 sq. ft., need to be reconfigured by taking down walls and installing bathrooms.

D. Winterton: If this is done, is there a savings at Memorial school? I assume the classroom sizes at Underhill meet the state kindergarten requirements now.

D. Argo: At Underhill, yes it meets state requirements.

D. Winterton: Is there excess capacity at Underhill now?

T. Walsh: How many kids are enrolled in kindergarten now?

D. Argo: We wouldn't have an excess of rooms.

T. Walsh: The kindergarten at Underhill is handling the capacity for enrollment. By creating a second kindergarten with more teachers, you essentially create two ½ size classes. You would be splitting up what you have now at Underhill.

D. Argo: This K-5 proposal is philosophical vs. due to capacity.

T. Walsh: In other words, you would have two kindergarten classes enrolled with 15 kids at each school vs. 30 at one school.

D. Winterton: It's someone's education philosophy for neighborhood schools K-5. My question, if funding is not approved to renovate the kindergarten classroom at Memorial, does that philosophy stop the whole scenario for K-5 at both schools?

D. Argo: The issue is not the number of classrooms, it is the size of the kindergarten room at Memorial.

D. Winterton: Is it possible to maintain the kindergarten at Underhill, then have grades 1-5 at both schools? Then you wouldn't be expending ½ million dollars.

D. Argo: I don't know how that would work.

T. Walsh: Based on philosophy, we can talk about that at another date. It was a lump sum for 2017-18. Now it is broken down \$85,000 each year. The voters can decide on the philosophy.

M. Miville: To Mr. Winterton's point, if all the kindergarten classes can fit at Underhill, why spend ½ million on something not needed for capacity? I understand the philosophy that the school district is trying to eliminate that extra transition from one school to another.

D. Argo: Statistics show a correlation for transitions.

D. Winterton: The last point I want to make is when I come to vote, I would like to see data if grades K-1 transition is traumatic vs. grades 2-3. I would like to know that data. There are a lot of schools in the state that didn't have kindergarten.

M. Miville: Transition for grades 2-3, 5-6, I would like to see that data for CIP deliberations. For budgets it is already determined that it is to be data driven and not perspectives or opinions.

T. Walsh: The replacement of the roof at Underhill, the urgency changed from 2015-16 last year to 2014-15 this year.

M. Miville: The \$191,000 for this year and next year was pushed up a year from last year's CIP. Can we add another year to that? That is how it was last year.

D. Argo: If water in the building was a problem, but now it is not so I would say spread it out more. Do you want me to take the CIP spreadsheet back and spread the schools out? I don't mind taking it back. Now I have the entire plan, and you can see peaks and valleys for me to resubmit.

T. Walsh: I am comfortable if this committee spreads it out.

M. Miville: I would like the School Board to see this, spread it out, come up with their perspective, and bring it back to this committee.

D. Argo: The next School Board meeting is on November 6<sup>th</sup>. I will bring it to the Board.

T. Walsh: Reseaming of the Memorial roof?

D. Argo: Interpretation, I would look at if we had leaks. We are repairing leaks for an extension of a capital investment and life of that capital investment. I agree with the dollar figure. Some come in under \$50,000 and are discussed.

T. Walsh: That is for a future conversation with the CIP Handbook upgrades. Last year this was not an issue, because you lumped them together and the totals were in excess of \$50,000.

M. Miville: As part of our self-audit last year, we requested that they spread-out their CIP plan items and they have accommodated it.

D. Argo: It is the same conversation on the Cawley roof.

T. Walsh: Preventive maintenance, the issue to qualify for CIP: 1) dollar amount \$50,000+, and 2) maintenance costs.

D. Argo: It is an expansion to the life of the capital investment.

T. Walsh: Expansion of sports fields is \$30,000 for 4 yrs.

D. Winterton: Are there times that teams would like to practice, but can't because of full fields?

D. Argo: There is flexibility here for spreading out over the years.

D. Argo: I will get the schools' CIP plan to the Business Administrator to realign. I will then submit to the School Board for our next meeting, so we can see a more even plan with the entire town CIP plan.

M. Miville: There is the need vs. want for fields.

T. Walsh: For the generator, can we move as need be on the spreadsheet?

D. Argo: Yes.

M. Miville: The other generators in the other schools (Memorial and Cawley) were procured through grants. Is this something we can look into (a grant for a generator for Underhill) instead of a CIP item?

D. Argo: We are always submitting grant requests. The school administration is very proactive with grant writing. I will ask them.

R. Duhaime: Sorry I am late (arrived 6:50pm). The money for Cawley, you did sections of the roof already?

D. Argo: You mean Underhill. Yes there has been extensive maintenance on that roof. We had numerous leaks several years ago. This is for planning. We did repairs, but the roof is nearing its life expectancy. Now it is in good shape. There are no issues right now.

### **CIP DEPARTMENT PRESENTATION SCHEDULE**

D. Fitzpatrick: Mr. Chair, the following departments have inquired if they can be removed from our CIP Committee Schedule to present their CIP plan, because it is the same as last year:

- October 30<sup>th</sup> = Community Development & Planning Department
- November 7<sup>th</sup> = Police Department

***M. Miville motioned to amend the CIP Committee Schedule FY 2013-2014 to remove:***

- **October 30<sup>th</sup> = Community Development & Planning Department**
- **November 7<sup>th</sup> = Police Department**

***Seconded by D. Winterton.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

M. Miville: I can describe the above CIP plans to Mr. Winterton as a new member of this committee and to others as needed.

### **CIP HANDBOOK PROPOSED CHANGES**

T. Walsh: We have a list in front of us of CIP Handbook recommendations from our self-audit last year:

#### **CIP Handbook proposed changes:**

- 1) Pg. 8 1. “estimated total costs, probable operating and maintenance costs, and probable revenues of each project” (Pg. 3 of 3 of the CIP worksheet for departments to complete includes “operations, maintenance, and support costs)  
**Recommendation:** add language to handbook that above is for CIP Committee discussion purposes only and not included as dollar amounts in CIP Plan.
- 2) Pg. 9 1. “acquisition, or lease, of land or interests in land for public purposes”  
**Recommendation:** delete language in handbook
- 3) Pg. 9 2. “the purchase or lease of wheeled vehicles, or motorized equipment, having an expected life of at least three (3) years, provided a department”  
**Recommendation:** delete language in handbook (keep “maintains a written vehicle plan and submits same to the CIP Committee”)
- 4) Pg. 12 “Department Project Submissions and Briefing”  
**Recommendation:** add language “Departments should submit their CIP plan spread-out for the 6 year CIP period” and “Departments should submit their CIP Plan for each separate type of cost, so there will be separate warrant articles on the ballot” (~~i.e. schools have each of the three (3) schools on their own line item (Underhill, Memorial and Cawley)~~), and to separate the projects within each school (~~i.e. paving Underhill~~)

D. Fitzpatrick: Mr. Chair, the Finance Director and I had a conversation today on maintenance. She was going to recommend that the two \$32,350 paving items be removed from the schools’ CIP plan because they are maintenance items. Since she is not here tonight, I don’t want to speak formally for her.

D. Argo: Interpretation is what is maintenance? Our projects were separated as requested. Reseaming is an extension of a capital investment and is one project for multiple schools. We did separate it, and now it lowered the costs below \$50,000. It would be an extension of the life of the pavement.

M. Miville: Integrity of a proposal is not the same as projects miles away from each other.

D. Argo: We could debate this all night, but it is one paving school item.

**Recommendation #1:**

*D. Winterton motioned for the Planning Board to define maintenance costs as “items that are not discussed in the original CIP are not CIP items to be discussed in the future and should be in the departments operating budget.”*

R. Duhaime: Departments who are behind on their budget, now try to get the item on the CIP. It is a negotiation on our part, whether we discuss the item or not.

T. Walsh: The CIP Committee is an ADHOC subcommittee of the Planning Board.

D. Winterton: Going forward, there should be clear definitions so everybody's job is easier and clearer.

M. Miville: That is why we have a subcommittee. Based on the advice of the Finance Director, no proposals for maintenance should be on the CIP. For big ticket proposals, we should not consider maintenance as part of the CIP. No CIP maintenance proposal that is supplemental to the original CIP proposal should be used for CIP.

T. Walsh: Is cost (\$50,000+) where the line is drawn as to whether it goes to CIP or not?

M. Miville: There is the roof replacement and seaming at Underhill for \$58,000. It is over the \$50,000, but maintenance.

T. Walsh: We asked the schools to separate out their CIP items. Most likely they will be contracted at the same time. I don't know which way to go. I will stick with my first opinion to get the Planning Board opinion.

D. Winterton; The definition of a CIP per CIP Handbook pg. 9  
> "purchase or lease of wheeled vehicles, or motorized equipment . . .  
> Routine or recurring expenses or obligations for services to the community or maintenance of Town assets which are the mission and normal duties of a Department are **not** capital improvement projects, even when their individual or combined cost or obligation is at least fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) and /or five (5) years.

D. Winterton: Therefore, a new roof fits in there, but paving doesn't fit in there.

R. Duhaim: Each department that comes in we need to determine if it is going to affect the tax rate. We would have loved several years ago to put funds in for a roof. Now they can't put a huge expenditure in their maintenance budget. We break down to include maintenance to budget for how will affect the tax rate. Everyone is different. It is a 6 yr. plan now, so it is not such a big increase.

D. Argo: If you look at Marc's definition, town paving in my opinion is a CIP item. If this is not voted positively, then there is no repaving of our roads. What we are doing here, there is gray interpretation. We are putting it to the voters. Our operating budget is line by line, but the voters vote on the entire budget. Here for CIP it will be broken down by each vote for the voters.

D. Winterton: From owning many condos, I have a line for roofing. \$20,000 yearly for 20 years in an operating budget.

T. Walsh: To Dana's point, the voters could vote it down as a CIP article vs. in their budget.

M. Miville: If it is in their budget, then they get scrutiny from the Budget Committee who can lower or cut the amounts. School last year put in items in the CIP and budget, and then took out from one area. Is it a CIP or does it have to be in their operating budget?

R. Duhaime: Don, I agree with what you are saying. Have a balance in the trust fund for a roof for an emergency. For highway CIP there is a truck fund vs. every individual truck on the CIP. The money is put in for their department and they decide how you use it (which truck they need at that time).

*Seconded by M. Miville.*

M. Miville: I have a concern with the strategy of having an item in both CIP and the budget. Proposals need to be comprehensive and complete and not spread out to other proposals.

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

**Recommendation #2:**

T. Walsh: How did this come about?

M. Miville: We never did get a Town attorney opinion. It should be brought to the attention of the Planning Board. For the purchase of conservation land by the Conservation Commission, that is governed by state statute.

R. Duhaime: But the Master Plan has land purchases in it and we should be using that document for our deliberations.

M. Miville: The Master Plan does not supersede state statute. Why isn't the Conservation Commission questioning a land purchase for a new fire station?

T. Walsh: The Conservation Commission governs their land purchases.

M. Miville: Dr. Shankle should bring to the Planning Board at their next meeting for conservation land purchases, if we take out that section of the CIP handbook, are we in conflict with the state statute. Also if taken out, how does this affect Town land purchases (i.e. new fire station land).

**Recommendation #3:**

D. Fitzpatrick: This came up as a result of the two Fire Dept. motorized boats in last year's CIP.

M. Miville: We should leave it in for our CIP Handbook for now, and remove it as a recommendation. It may impact other vehicles.

**Recommendation #4:**

M. Miville: The example of the schools should be omitted and leave the rest of the language in.

***D. Winterton motioned to:***

- *send recommendations #1 & #4 above to the Planning Board for their next meeting on November 5<sup>th</sup> to review and adopt*
- *to defer recommendation #2 above to Dr. Shankle for further research and discussion with the Planning Board at their meeting of November 5<sup>th</sup>*
- *to remove recommendation #3 above*

***Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

***M. Miville motioned to adjourn at 7:45pm. Seconded by D. Argo.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair T. Walsh declared the meeting adjourned at 7:45pm. The next CIP Committee Meeting is at the Hooksett Town Hall Chambers room 105 @ 6:00pm on Tuesday, October 30, 2012 with presentation by:

- 1) Jo Ann Duffy, Town Planner – CIP Handbook recommendations & CIP spreadsheet items
- 2) Fire Department
- 3) Administration & Assessing Departments

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick  
Planning Coordinator