

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

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

October 30, 2012

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

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Tom Walsh called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

ATTENDANCE

Chair Tom Walsh (Planning Board Rep.), Vice-Chair Marc Miville (Budget Committee Rep.), Donald Winterton (Planning Board Rep.), and Robert Duhaime, (Planning Board Rep.).

Excused: Dana Argo (School Board Rep.).

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/23/12

M. Miville motioned to defer the approval of the minutes of 10/23/12 to the next CIP Committee Meeting (11/7/12). Seconded by D. Winterton.

Vote unanimously in favor.

T. Walsh: Jo Ann Duffy (Town Planner) will be helping us with the CIP Plan this year vs. Christine Soucie (Finance Director).

CIP SPREADSHEET ITEMS

J. Duffy: I have some hand-outs for you tonight. I made an adjustment to the spreadsheet from what the Finance Dept. submitted to you last week. The old sheet had roof replacement and reseaming at Underhill, and the same for Memorial and Cawley. It should say roof replacement at Underhill and roof reseaming at Memorial and Cawley. Tom and I met and we determined which items are maintenance and which items belonged in the CIP. Roof replacement would be a CIP item. Roof reseaming and repaving are maintenance. You can take care of those during your deliberations.

CIP HANDBOOK RECOMMENDATIONS

J. Duffy: For changes to the CIP Handbook, you recommend that maintenance should be in the CIP request when they give their presentation, but not part of the CIP plan. That will go to the Planning Board on November 5th. Regardless of the price tag, if it is maintenance, it doesn't go on the CIP plan. One suggestion is to say instead of repaving they had "reclaiming" in parking lots. I believe Marc said what if voters would like for one school to pass, but not another. That is good for voting, but that will have more warrant articles, and the Council has frowned upon that in the past. You could have one CIP item with a breakdown.

M. Miville: The warrant article would be one lump sum, but it would be broken down for transparency. At last year's CIP, we were concerned with having two CIP purposes into one warrant article.

T. Walsh: And now there is a concern for too many warrant articles.

J. Duffy: Another recommendation you had was that the departments should spread their CIP cost out (i.e. a department comes in with a lump sum and has the CIP Committee spread it out). They (departments) don't have to spread it out over all the 6 yrs., but they shouldn't ask you (CIP Committee) do to their work.

J. Duffy: Another recommendation you had was to delete the section of the handbook for acquisition of land. I have copies of RSA 36-A:4&5 for the Conservation Commission authority to purchase land. I recommend you leave this section of the handbook in and put a statement at the end "except for conservation land per RSA 36-A:4&5". I would also add "if timing not feasible", I would think the Conservation Commission should go through the CIP process if feasible.

D. Shankle: I think the Conservation Commission's concern is timing. Whenever they get a grant, they don't want this (CIP) process to hold them up.

R. Duhaime: The Master Plan has conservation requests for acquiring land. We should keep them in the CIP process.

T. Walsh: The language that Jo Ann added, that should take care of it.

M. Miville: This Committee can consider land purchases and the Conservation Commission has their own process. They can still participate in the CIP, as long as they are following their process too (to include RSA 36-A:4&5).

J. Duffy: RSA 674:7 II talks about CIP Plan "Whenever the planning board or the capital improvement program committee is authorized and directed to prepare a capital improvements program, every municipal department, authority or agency, and every affected school district board, department or agency, shall upon transmit to the board or committee a statement of all capital projects it proposes to undertake during the term of the program . . ." I know sewer and water haven't submitted. I would be

proactive next year to have them include their items. Their items have a town-wide impact and how it all fits in together. Them being in a bubble doesn't help anyone.

M. Miville: If they have nothing to offer, sewer and water should at least submit a letter that they have nothing to offer. What projects would they have to affect CIP?

J. Duffy: An example is the replacement of piping. That should be coordinated with DPW for roadway paving, so that everyone knows the timing of these projects. Not knowing may result in a roadway getting paved by DPW, and then sewer or water tearing it up to replace a pipe. Then DPW would have to repave.

R. Duahime: Our sewer fees went up after a large bond expansion. We are talking 6 yrs. out. They (sewer and water) should bring it to us next year. In the past, they haven't cooperated at all.

D. Winterton: Is it the responsibility of this committee to coordinate those submissions?

J. Duffy: It is not so much this committee is responsible, but you need to bring it to the attention of the Town Council and Planning Board.

D. Winterton: I would hope that it is not just this committee that would bring up those projects.

J. Duffy: The water precincts did an independent study a few years ago. That was the last thing we have seen from them. It is difficult to know what projects they have. I heard the Village Water Precinct is looking to put in new wells. There is no communication with them. It is good to have a CIP plan on paper at least 5 yrs. out.

M. Miville: If the sewer commission provides a plan to CIP Committee, is it part of the bottom line?

J. Duffy: Sewer is a department; water is advisory.

D. Shankle: The more cooperation we get from them, it is better in the long run. One reason to start at the CIP level is that it feeds up to the Planning Board that then feeds into the Master Plan. I know you are looking at money, but if you look at zoning, sewer and water matters too. Not knowing what sewer and water is doing in the next 5 yrs., makes it difficult for the Planning Board to determine what areas they should look at to put in commercial. The Planning Board would also want to know where the lines stop and will not continue. We can't make long term plans without them telling us.

T. Walsh: CIP is the way to go; probably the only way.

M. Miville: There should be a contact to sewer and water precincts to see if they have anything for us to review this CIP year; submitted by our Nov 20th meeting.

J. Duffy: The Economic Development Committee has stated that more areas with sewer will increase our retail and office space. We are working with sewer now to expand sewer to the exit 10 area. Walmart would front the fee and then other developers would pay them back. I know sewer is strapped for cash, because of the disc issue. I know they say sewer won't affect anyone, but when they come in for a bond, ultimately the Town is liable. Other people not on sewer may not go with that bond, because they are not using it.

M. Miville motioned for Dr. Shankle to contact the Sewer Commission to determine if they have CIP items to submit this year for the 6 yr. plan (submitted by our Nov 20th meeting). Seconded by D. Winterton.

J. Duffy: I think you could also reach out to water too.

***M. Miville motioned to amend the above motion to read "Dr. Shankle to contact the Sewer Commission and water precincts to determine if they have CIP items to submit this year for the 6 yr. plan (submitted by our Nov 20th meeting). Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Duffy: Impact fees include: Safety (Fire & Police), Recreation, Traffic/Roadway, and schools. I know impact fees don't pertain to what you are doing, but I thought some of the CIP items may be funded by impact fees. These fees are assessed by the Planning Board and collected by the Building Dept.

D. Winterton: Jo Ann, do you know if some of these impact fees are going to expire?

J. Duffy: There is \$40,000+ that expires next month, but I believe this is being earmarked for a project Leo (DPW) is doing. \$8,483.06 was refunded for recreation. \$11,240 was refunded for schools. \$1,051 was refunded for police.

D. Winterton: Reading the RSA on how to distribute impact fees, it stated we couldn't use impact fees until the voters used the funds for that project. There are positives and negatives of impact fees. There is the use of funds for projects that impact growth. Use budget funds, before the use of impact fees.

D. Shankle: I don't think we have used it (impact fees) for anything other than growth. \$44,000 is for the College Park sidewalk project, and recreation impact fees were for the Peterbrook fields. Then there is the proposed GE traffic light. These are all related to growth or expansion. Impact fees can't be used for maintenance. Legislation passed last year, that Jo Ann worked on with Senator Boutin, to use impact fees on state roads. This has a big impact for Hooksett, because many of our roads are state roads.

J. Duffy: Also there is the Hackett Hill Rd. and Rte. 3A intersection that we are using impact fees. Bruce Mayberry completed a study for Parks & Recreation. \$500,000+- the town had via donations, volunteer time, and then could use impact fee money.

M. Miville: Last year there was a warrant article for a 2-3 phase study. If the voters did not approve, we lose the impact fees you are talking about.

J. Duffy: We did a study on the intersections (12 in town). Then the state roads impact fee use came along. We thought it better to do a larger project (main road) to assist with state monies to get bigger improvements done. There is \$30,000+ in the capital reserve fund not used.

M. Miville: Does the \$30,000 expire soon?

J. Duffy: Another handout is the state guidebook for CIP. The committee is not just looking at the bottom line, but is also anticipating demands for growth. This process improves communication in town. For example if the Fire Dept. wants to build a new station, and public works wants a large expense item at the same time, the committee works together so both are not at the same time. The committee avoids an undo tax increase. You help with impact fees, because we can't have impact fees unless you have a CIP plan. Today's committee is more sophisticated than before. It used to just be with a few members of the Planning Board. The Economic Development Committee has stated when businesses come in, they look at infrastructure. You do have an important role and step in the process. There is a wealth of information out there on CIP. If you have any questions along the way, don't hesitate to contact me.

T. Walsh: There is also the recommendation to have attendance written into the handbook. If you missed three (3) meetings, you are not allowed to vote on the final plan. Does anyone remember the conversation?

M. Miville: I don't know if we came to a conclusion on that. Whether it is the amount of total meetings or consecutive meetings? Every board varies. I don't know what the CIP Committee has decided; I don't think it's consecutive. The Planning Board has expressed some concern that if a member of a CIP Committee misses two (2) or more out of seven (7) meetings that they are supposed to attend, that they show a concern to that. I know at this last Planning Board meeting in September, where they approved nominations for this particular committee right here, and turned down a potential nominee who openly expressed that he was missing the first two (2) meetings and they said that he shouldn't be on this committee.

J. Duffy: The Planning Board has a set of rules you can't have three (3) unexcused.

M. Miville: At a Town Council meeting, I asked of Dr. Shankle, as to what the distinction is between excused and unexcused absences. As the Budget Committee chairman, generally speaking if someone calls before the meeting they are excused. If they don't call and don't show up, that's unexcused. That's how I usually do it. Other

boards or members who are supposed to be on the committee, who never show up, and they're recorded as unexcused absences, the Budget Committee can't take action on that, or they don't take action on that. Because they're supposed to be there per RSA and the charter, but they don't attend, so what we did instead is change our by-laws to take them off of the quorum. At the time that was the solution. What this committee decides to do, I don't think we finalized that. We should have it in our by-laws or self-audit for future consideration.

T. Walsh: Roof seaming and reseaming is not a CIP item, but roof replacement is. Mr. Argo referred to page 9 of the handbook for "refurbishing" of CIP items. Routine maintenance is not a CIP.

M. Miville: The School Board looks at it as an "extension of the project", and that's what the Planning Board needs to determine.

D. Shankle: From an accounting point-of-view, it is a CIP item if it extends the useful life. An example is roof replacement, that is a CIP item. If you just fix it, than it is not a CIP item.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

J. Duffy: The request from Community Development is #2 Master Plan Capital Reserve Fund. This item is \$60,000; \$12,031 in years 2014-15, 2015-16, and 2016-17 and \$5,000 in years 2017-18 & 2018-19. There is \$16,601 in there now. For the Master Plan, hopefully by the end of this year the Planning Board will adopt the Economic Development chapter. The existing Village chapter will be replaced with the grant for the Neighborhood Heritage District. We have an updated Open Space Plan. We have been doing chapters at a time. I am going through the process of taking out the recommendations we have done. Dr. Shankle suggested we push this out a year.

M. Miville: You don't need funding for all the work on those three (3) things you just mentioned? So you are doing this piecemeal?

J. Duffy: We have one grant, and the others are already paid for.

D. Shankle: How much did open space cost?

J. Duffy: \$5,000 for Open Space, and \$10,000 for Economic Development.

D. Shankle: All together we spent \$30,000.

J. Duffy: \$16,601 hasn't been touched yet.

M. Miville: The \$30,000 you just did, that is not part of the \$16,000. Why not have another \$10,000 this year?

J. Duffy: I requested it, however Dr. Shankle took it out.

D. Winterton: \$36,000 over 3 years, wouldn't that be the same as \$9,000 over 4 yrs.?

M. Miville: And we can do that; that is why we are here.

R. Duhaime: The Master Plan has not been updated since 2004. It must be updated every 10 yrs. I have been on the Planning Board and haven't seen a lot of work done to update it.

T. Walsh: Dr. Shankle has said in the past he wants as much in-house done as possible. Jo Ann is going through the Master Plan without using CIP funds.

J. Duffy: It has been slow with growth, and not a lot has changed from the 2004 Master Plan. Hooksett's population has only increased by 1,800. There is no residential development. Things have been so slow, and that is why it is not critical we take the entire Master Plan and throw it out and start over. That is why we are doing a chapter at a time. The Planning Board will need to make a decision soon on the process, and that is why I am going over the chapters now.

R. Duhaime: There is no inventory from the 2004 Master Plan on what has been done.

J. Duffy: You will be surprised how much has been done.

M. Miville: Last year you said 70% of the Master Plan is completed. I would be curious what 30% is left.

D. Winterton: If the Master Plan has a 2004, and we update it piecemeal by chapter, how do we take 10 yrs. from that?

M. Miville: It is a rolling live document.

D. Winterton: How do we count the 10 yrs.?

J. Duffy: 5-7 yr. Master Plan update is the recommendation by the Office of Energy and Planning. Most towns have updated their Master Plan. It costs \$50,000-80,000 for other towns to update their plan.

M. Miville: \$60,000 in your CIP is for the overall Master Plan. Now since you are piecemealing, do you no longer need the whole \$60,000? I see holes here to get in \$9,000 here and there to see what the voters think.

J. Duffy: We have been fortunate to use SNHPC grants. \$60,000 may not be needed, however engineers and consultant firms are quite expensive.

T. Walsh: Even if you didn't need \$60,000 for this CIP, it is in the reserve for the next Master Plan update.

D. Shankle: In some places their Master Plan doesn't match up. This town has stepped into its Master Plan well. The residential section makes sense. MS&G has a long-term plan for their area. The importance of the Master Plan is for towns to come up with where they want to go. Hooksett has nice residential areas. A recent magazine article stated Hooksett is a nice place to live. Hooksett's exits are developing nicely. I don't run into an issue with the 2004 Master Plan not working.

M. Miville: 70% completion of the 2004 Master Plan is commendable.

J. Duffy: The plan was put together by the residents of the community with consultants in the end.

R. Duhaime: When was the last Master Plan before 2004?

J. Duffy: 1987.

R. Duhaime: Public input was a big part of it.

M. Miville: There is also the cost for resident charettes.

J. Duffy: The request from Community Development is #3 Feasibility Study for Southern leg of Parkway (N/S Hwy Fees Study). This item is \$150,000; \$100,000 in year 2016-17. This item has been in here since the 1970s. It is just a study at this point. In 2004 it was \$150,000. We haven't spent any time on it. It is just a place holder at this point. The Planning Board didn't want to eliminate it in case it may happen. When the proposed parkway was put in, Rte. 3 had traffic jams every day. With more roadway widening, now it is not much of a problem. If you did put in a parkway, it would serve the industrial park and valley to keep some of the trucks off Rte. 3. Businesses along Hooksett Road are against the parkway, because they believe it would take traffic away from their businesses.

T. Walsh: From I-93 to Brox, a parkway would be an opportunity for industrial growth.

M. Miville: SNHU is also interested in that roadway.

J. Duffy: SNHU was afraid North River Road was separating their property and was in favor of the parkway to make North River Road a private SNHU roadway. However, I was recently told they are fine with North River Road as it is now.

D. Shankle: One of the things SNHU has done for a long time is to set aside land for a by-pass. I am not sure if they still are putting it on their new development. Ownership issues have changed since then. I recommend we push it out, until there is a decision on the parkway.

D. Winterton: What would happen to the money if we pulled it out of the CIP plan?

J. Duffy: It goes back into the general fund.

D. Shankle: There would be a vote to eliminate the CIP fund and put it into the general fund.

R. Duhaime: MS&G owns a lot of land along the parkway. They should step up for the parkway project the same as SNHU. It is just like TIFT district. There is a lot of potential for economic development and to get truck traffic off Rte. 3.

J. Duffy: The parkway is designed as a limited access roadway without a lot of curb cuts.

M. Miville: That is a contradiction though, because with curb cuts there is more development.

FIRE-RESCUE

T. Walsh: Last year we went through all the Fire-Rescue items. Three (3) of the items are for this year. Rather than go through the whole plan for 6 yrs., does anybody have specific questions or would you like him to go through line by line?

Dean Jore, Asst. Fire Chief: The requests from Fire-Rescue are:

#5 Fire Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund. This item is Ongoing; \$50,000 in each of the six years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19). We have \$50,075. We want to level off as best as possible for the cost to purchase fire apparatus. It is not projected that we use those funds for a few years; it is on-going.

R. Duhaime: \$50,000 apparatus fund per year, it lists everything you could purchase.

D. Jore: Break this out a few more years and move to early years. I am all for that.

#6 Boat #1. This item is \$28,000 in year 2014-15.

#7 Boat #2. This item is \$32,000 in year 2016-17.

T. Walsh: The boats we on last year's CIP, then we were told they would be paid out of the operating budget. Now this year's CIP says they will be funded through taxation.

D. Jore: Boat #1 is a 1988 and was purchased just to put us on the water, but it is not specific to our needs. It is not good to operate in a water rescue. We should replace it. We were fortunate to get a boat #2 that did meet our needs. Boat #2 is something to look at to replace, but not critical. Soon or later it will be 30 or 40 yrs. old. Boat #1 does not provide the abilities for water rescue and the like. It hauls equipment up and down the river.

M. Miville: They pushed it out a year. Is this the boat with the wheels?

D. Jore: The front hitch has wheels on it to move it around.

M. Miville: The CIP criteria are \$50,000+, or a boat with wheels, or motorized equipment for 3 yrs. or better.

R. Duhaime: We don't have Christine here, but why wasn't it broken down?

M. Miville: You (Fire-Rescue) are OK if we spread this out?

D. Jore: It is a step in the right direction.

T. Walsh: There are classifications not to separate out.

#8 Car #1. This item is \$50,000 in year 2017-18.

#9 Car #2. This item is \$50,000 in year 2015-16.

#10 Car #3. This item is \$50,000 in year 2017-18.

#11 Car #5. This item is \$30,000 in year 2013-14. This year we want to replace car #5. It is a 1999 Chevy Tahoe. It has required a lot of maintenance and it is only a 2-door to make it less user friendly. We want to replace with something more economical. It is used by the fire prevention bureau.

M. Miville: Last year you indicated this vehicle had over 100,000 miles. That is why there is an urgency to get it replaced this year.

D. Jore: And we replaced the transmission again.

R. Duhaime: Will you be looking for something more economical vs. a Ford Expedition?

D. Jore: We want to find a vehicle that will do better gas mileage.

R. Duhaime: What equipment do you put in there?

D. Jore: It could be just hand tools. At one point we were looking at a van, but that was not ideal. We need something to carry tools.

R. Duhaime: When I think of command vehicles I think of the three (3) chiefs. Other vehicles are \$50,000.

D. Jore: Car #5 is a command vehicle and also a tool hauler for the inspection bureau. The other command vehicles have more electronics, radios, and lights. We need to replace car #4 to make better gas mileage.

R. Duhaime: Departments are trending up.

D. Jore: The Chief didn't share any particular model. He does like Chevy vehicles.

D. Jore: Radios, lights, sirens, and key release systems can cost a lot to outfit and are very wearing on a vehicle.

M. Miville: It is a 1999 vehicle and time for an upgrade.

D. Jore: It will run going down the road, but repairs costs more and more.

#12 Utility #1. This item is \$50,000 in year 2018-19.

#13 Rescue #1. This item is \$250,000 in year 2016-17.

#14 Rescue #2. This item is \$275,000 in year 2018-19. Rescue #1 is an older reserved capacity vehicle to be used in the example when Rescue #2 is being serviced. Rescue #2 is newer and used more often, and that is why #2 needs to be replaced sooner. Rescue #1, I would spread out over the years.

M. Miville: Last year Rescue #1 was in 2017-18. This year it is a lump sum and pushed up a year to 2016-17. What are your urgency needs on Rescue #1 and #2.

D. Jore: Move Rescue #1 to 2015-16 and spread it out. Have Rescue #2 in 2016-17.

M. Miville: The proposed year is the year you want to purchase.

T. Walsh: Are Rescue #1 & #2 out of a special revenue fund?

D. Jore: I believe that is correct.

M. Miville: Is the funding out of the ambulance fund?

R. Duhaime: Will both of them be replaced?

D. Jore: Yes funded out of the ambulance fund. The intent of the fund is to replace those rescue vehicles. I am not sure if Rescue #1 would be replaced first. It is run on a reserve. Rescue #2 is putting on many more miles, but it is more economical to run. I could see Rescue #2 being the first to be replaced.

D. Winterton: Both ambulances were purchased through impact fees. Can we get the impact fees over to CIP? No, because we can't use impact fees, because these are replacements.

M. Miville: Right because it is not for growth. They already have them (Rescue #1 & #2).

#15 SCBA Replacement Capital Reserve Fund. This item is \$300,000; \$20,000 in each of the six years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19). SCBA (self-contained breathing apparatus) are the packs to include regulators, harnesses, and masks, along with bottles for air tanks. This is another large amount to level off costs when the time comes to replace all of them. We may replace due to standards changing or every 15 yrs. Every few years NFPA has safety improvements, and we try to catch-up with them. 2005 is the last time we purchased packs.

M. Miville: This item is \$300,000 with a current balance \$122,660. In 2020 you will have enough to replace your equipment with more state of the art equipment.

#16 Fire Station #3 at Exit 10 leased from Manchester (20 year lease). This item is \$3,036,700; \$50,000 each year in years 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 & 2018-19.

D. Winterton: Mr. Chair, I would like to talk about the fire station. The Chief made a presentation to the Town Council and it looks like it will be a CIP item. We need to get ahead of it (large CIP item) rather than chase it.

D. Jore: We haven't settled whether we will build our own fire station or combine one with Manchester. For economics there is little difference; same policy if combined station. There was a study done a couple of years ago to determine if the right location to put a station is at exit 10. The study said yes exit 10, and the study listed a combined station with Manchester as an option. If you are looking for hard numbers, I don't have that, because it is still being pursued. Exit 10 and Exit 9 are our higher run times; longer to get there. There was a fatal fire there (exit 10 area) a few years ago, and that spurred the interest for another station. Is there anything in particular you are looking for the station?

D. Winterton: I would like to know how negotiations might start and who will be involved. Manchester services their area, and they drive through Hooksett.

T. Walsh: If you enter into a contract, I know leases are allowed per the CIP. What if the lease failed?

D. Shankle: For a long-term lease, if it didn't pass, we could get out of it.

M. Miville: It would have to be a lease. On a warrant article no means no. The exit 10 land is no longer available to us through that property owner. Now we are talking about sharing land with Manchester at Hackett Hill. Exit 10 is not Hackett Hill, however the notion is in this general area.

D. Jore: Hackett Hill and exit 10 areas are one in the same. The area at Quality Drive, I don't know if that has been eliminated. There are other locations that were looked at. Nothing was being pursued to include the shared station with Manchester, but then there was some interest that resurfaced with the new Town Council. Hooksett Fire Chief Williams has been speaking with Manchester Fire Chief Burkish. We are keeping this item in our CIP as it has been recommended through consultation.

M. Miville: Having it in the CIP is for a proposal only. We are talking about Hackett Hill vs. exit 10.

D. Jore: I wouldn't say we are limited to just Hackett Hill.

D. Winterton: There is the capital proposal and also trailing maintenance costs. You propose an additional twelve (12) personnel. The trailing maintenance would be helpful to know.

M. Miville: That information is in the back of the Fire-Rescue CIP packet. They have separated maintenance from the project. There is also the initial fire engine purchase to support that proposed fire station.

D. Jore: You are right, that is the Manchester fire station on Hackett Hill they are looking at in the CIP and not exit 10.

#17 Fire Engine for Station #3 – Impact Fees & Taxation. This item is \$375,000 in year 2014-15.

ASSESSING

Cheryl Akstin, Town Appraiser: The request from Assessing is #1 Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund. This item is on-going; \$30,000 in each in each of the six years (2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19). We only have \$44,003 in there now and the revaluation is next year. We will put the remainder in our budget as a default to cover the cost. This item is a requirement of the state law.

M. Miville: Whoever we choose from the bids (\$93,000-\$96,000) you will have the remainder in your budget.

C. Akstin: We will use the \$44,003 in there now.

D. Shankle: \$30,000 in the CIP in each of the 6 yrs. is for the next revaluation.

T. Walsh: Does this always get defeated by the voters?

C. Akstin: I think the voters think if it doesn't get voted in it won't happen. Christine and I discussed that. We should save funds now and educate the voters and maybe it wouldn't get defeated.

R. Duhaime: Your bids are not to exceed \$137,300.

C. Akstin: That is based on bids we just received.

M. Miville: We are bidding on the high side just in case. There is \$30,000 this year and years thereafter for a 2018 revaluation.

D. Shankle: Besides my issues with revaluations, the state is not clear. Although legislation requires us to put it in, it gets defeated. It is not clear on what goes into a default budget. If it is a regular budget, but it doesn't include this and it becomes a default budget, then this is not in there. We are under an order to do it this year even if people don't pass the budget. Instead we are putting in \$30,000 per year for the next revaluation. We will pull out \$90,000 for this revaluation. It is not fair to have voters think they have a choice on revaluation when they don't. We have to do it. That is how the system works.

TOWNWIDE COMPUTER UPGRADING

M. Miville: The town computer system fund in last year's CIP, we got the software, but it was ongoing computer upgrading. It is not in this year's CIP?

D. Shankle: That is correct. We may be budgeting for specific pieces for the upgrading, but it doesn't make sense to put in a partial reserve fund.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

*D. Winterton motioned to adjourn at 7:45pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
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 2nd floor room 204 @ 6:00pm on Wednesday, November 7, 2012 with presentation by: 1) Transfer & Recycle Station.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick
Planning Coordinator