

CIP COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, October 29, 2013

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting called to order at 6:05 pm.

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Marc Miville, David Rogers, Steve Peterson, Joanne McHugh, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)

Staff: Christine Soucie (Director of Finance), JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Carolyn Cronin (Asst. Town Planner)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

VOTE ON CIP CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

M. Miville nominated D. Rogers as chair of the CIP committee.

M. Miville: Normally, it should be a planning board member but does not have to be.

D. Rogers: I haven't been on this committee before but I don't mind.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Rogers nominated M. Miville as vice chair.

Vote unanimously in favor.

DISCUSS PROCESS AND REVIEW SCHEDULE AND AGENDA REVIEW

D. Rogers: The schedule is reduced from previous years. I will not be here next Tues. due to a prior commitment. Are there any questions or issues with the proposed schedule? At this point we move on to Administration and Assessing.

PRESENTATIONS

a. Administration & Assessing

Dr. Shankle: The only thing is the revaluation capital reserve fund. We are trying to continue to put money away for future payments. 2 things (my recommendations) are based on Town Council asked me to keep down the number of warrant articles because there was an issue last year and #2 not to start any new projects. They don't want to cut things but don't want to expand. The only thing as far as Administration and Assessing is revaluation.

M. Miville: Normally costs \$150 - 160,000 every 5 years – on the 5th year it gets paid (\$30,000/year).

J. McHugh: Anything from the state with regard to property tax? Has anything come up from state level with regard to doing anything otherwise? I suspect a lot of communities have the same issue.

Dr. Shankle: It's a Constitutional mandate – every 5 years.

J. McHugh: I wonder if some communities had complained that not every year you pass warrant articles and have to take the money out of the existing budgets and wondered what the discussion was. I'm of the opinion to speak to legislators in our community and see if they can affect change if there is a state mandate.

Dr. Shankle: We can try that here. In previous towns, I have had the state Senator come in and sit with the head of the DRA – if the community doesn't do it every 5 years, the state will come in and bill the town for it. This is an assessor's job security. They cared more once we had statewide property tax for schools. Before that we could slide 10-15 years and the selectmen

could keep it controlled. When the state needed to equalize it across the state, they haven't budgeted on the 5 year thing. At some point there should be consideration of the timing of the market.

M. Miville: The revaluation fund is currently at a \$44,002.00 balance.

C. Soucie: That will be spent this year so it will be 0.

b. Community Development

i. Master Plan Reserve Fund

J. Duffy: I have requested 4 items – Master plan reserve fund has \$16,600 current balance; master plan last update was 2004 (adopted in 2005). 2 chapters have been updated – Economic Development and Energy. Hooksett Village is separate chapter on its own. We are working on neighborhood heritage district so that we will hold off on that. Community Facilities, Conservation and Natural Resources, Open Space and Recreation, Transportation, Education, Housing and Population and Existing Future Land Use need updating. We would ask for help from Conservation Commission, SAU, and Rec Commission on some. Others we need to get lots of public input. We haven't started anything other than those 2 chapters since 2004. We are trying to put together a reserve account to do something. Depending on what route we take (hire consultant) – \$125,000+; if we do piece by piece it will take longer but cost less money. Town Administrator recommended 0.

Dr. Shankle: There is \$16,600 in there now; I don't think we should hire a consultant. We should gather info piece by piece and see where we end up. We should put this in a separate warrant article but it doesn't seem like a good year to do it. We should use the money we have sitting there.

J. McHugh: Is there some part, as the Town Administrator suggests, you can do with \$16,600?

J. Duffy: Yes, we can start some of these chapters. We would go to the planning board and have a workshop and see what chapters they want to tackle.

J. McHugh: Can you use impact fees for a study?

J. Duffy: Not for that kind of study.

S. Peterson: The \$60,000 came from where? How did you come to that?

J. Duffy: Taking what other towns used when they hired a consultant but using less since we probably wouldn't hire a consultant – we took an average of other towns.

M. Miville: Master plan (last year) was almost completed, about 70% done. I recall that...how far along are we from 2004?

J. Duffy: 2004 was completed in 2005.

M. Miville: How much is completed?

J. Duffy: Closer to 80-85%. Many of the items have been accomplished.

ii. Feasibility Study for Southern Leg of Parkway:

J. Duffy: That has been pushed out many years – included in master plan 20 years ago – not sure if it still feasible. Study cost \$150,000 at that time; we left it at that number. I believe it was discussed and David Campbell is coming to the planning board in November to discuss whether that parkway should be eliminated.

M. Miville: This is a preliminary study to see if we want to do a parkway?

J. Duffy: To see if it's feasible. The land is not owned by the town.

S. Peterson: Parkway – where would that be?

J. Duffy: By SNHU behind the new development and loops around towards Alice Ave and eventually crosses over by Manchester Sand plant (opposite side of street) and up to Heads pond area. The Heads Pond Development were supposed to dedicate a deeded Right Of Way to the town within 15 yrs. There are endangered species living in that area; Fish and Game and DES said the likelihood of development is low.

D. Rogers: David Campbell is coming to the Planning Board.

J. Duffy: He is focusing on south end of parkway. Everyone knew the north section probably would never happen. Now he has an interested party purchasing land in the industrial valley and the parkway goes through that area.

J. McHugh: With regard to either SNHU or State – has that been on the radar given fact of traffic?

J. Duffy: We have heard nothing from state; SNHU engineer told me that they designed their campus around it and they are not focusing on the parkway at all. They do not want to pay for it to be built.

Dr. Shankle: It was originally designed to be a bypass to Rte. 3.

J. Duffy: A lot of businesses are not doing well on Rte. 3 because of the shift to 3-A.

M. Miville: Construction has mitigated a lot of that.

J. Duffy: In the 10-year plan there is proposal to do more Rte. 3 widening at some point in time.

M. Miville: This plan was pushed out to the last year just to keep it on the plan.

J. Duffy: Planning Board asked me to do that. They wanted to keep it there until they decided for sure what would happen to it.

M. Miville: Why are we loading it up all of a sudden?

J. Duffy: I think it's the same as last year.

M. Miville: Is there a logical reason?

J. Duffy: No. If you want to move it out that's fine.

M. Miville: We need to level out the bottom line.

J. Duffy: This was the request but you moved it last year.

M. Miville: Consensus on the committee last year was to eliminate entirely and return funds to general fund but the planning board didn't agree with it.

J. Duffy: Currently \$60,000 in this fund.

iii. Parcel Digital Recompile

J. Duffy: We have a GIS program. When we first put it together there are many sections where the parcel lines don't match where the road is. Everything needs to shift over. I requested this last year and Dr. Shankle removed it. I hoped we could get a spot for this sometime in the future.

M. Miville: What are we trying to do with the \$67,000?

J. Duffy: The company that does our GIS would realign our parcels so things would go where they are supposed to go.

S. Peterson: That's a lot of money.

J. McHugh: Does that affect the way you do business and does this pose a problem for you?

C. Cronin: This is the online app so this is the GIS available to town. Bldg. dept. and community development uses this app a lot, if someone needs a plot plan. The whole system is not like this, just isolated areas. We can't help them if they want to see property lines. The public uses this as well as the staff.

M. Miville: Is it the program that is faulty?

J. Duffy: When they first did this they took tax maps (not accurate, less \$) and lay on the info from the state with regard to roads. We talk every year about fixing it.

J. McHugh: There would be no recourse from them?

J. Duffy: No that is what the town chose to use. Now that the software is being used regularly we need to look at ways to fix it in future.

S. Peterson: Is GIS the sole provider?

J. Duffy: The company we use to do our tax maps and that does this program for us is CAI.

S. Peterson: Was this put out to bid?

J. Duffy: Not a bid, but RFP was done a few years ago.

D. Rogers: The number is \$90,000 to do this?

J. Duffy: I got that number last year. I don't know how they go about doing it.

C. Cronin: I think it would be an easy fix if the whole town was off, but it's only certain areas.

J. Duffy: The other problem is property bounds have been surveyed and we get info from developers and provide to people that do tax maps. Sometimes they have a hard time fitting things in. Some towns spend an enormous amount of money to do the research for all the deeds and base tax maps on that. It is extremely expensive and our tax maps are not based on deeds. Newer things are based on deeds, but not the old and that is why they are off.

Dr. Shankle: They took flat maps and put them on a round world.

M. Miville: Recommending it in the next 2 years?

J. Duffy: Something we would like to have done. If it spreads out over more than 2 years, that's fine.

D. Rogers: Once this is done, it's done?

Dr. Shankle: We would have to update it regularly with new development.

J. Duffy: They look now at the ones that don't line up. The rest is not that bad.

J. McHugh: \$90,000 is based on the whole thing. How much less if you didn't do the whole thing?

Dr. Shankle: It would start to get worse as other places shift.

D. Rogers: It would have to be done comprehensively as it would affect the entire map.

J. McHugh: In areas where you have large subdivisions, when it was divided as opposed to tax maps from years ago they are probably better than they were then.

D. Rogers: It's never 100% on target by nature of property being divided. We want it more accurate than it is now.

M. Miville: \$90,000 is to correct flaws now but there will be future flaws as we go, is that correct?

D. Rogers: Accuracy is greater because subdivision is surveyed as new construction. Maybe not 100% but better than the existing tax map.

Dr. Shankle: We are using it more and I think over time this might make sense but it will never take the place of a survey. People can't use it to determine property lines. As we use more and more is when you start doing overlays (water, sewer lines, and drainage). In a year when we are trying to cut back, there hasn't been a lot of outcry. I didn't recommend because I didn't think this was a good year to do it.

S. Peterson: Once you pay money to get the maps aligned you would own the software?

J. Duffy: This online software is owned by CAI.

S. Peterson: After alignment you can plot in property; if software is available can you drop in plots after it's all set up?

J. Duffy: We don't have that piece but it's available for a cost. The company does the updates because we don't have the software here.

M. Miville: Is the software cheaper than \$90,000?

J. Duffy: No.

D. Rogers: It is somewhere between a tax map and survey in terms of accuracy?

J. Duffy: When they line up, you can measure the distance from the road; bldg. inspector will measure where a shed was but it's not useful when they don't line up.

C. Cronin: Residents can measure at home.

M. Miville: There is a \$24,218 balance. Can you use that right now?

J. Duffy: We can ask them to focus in on certain areas; they charge \$85/hour.

iv. Replacement of Code Enforcement Vehicle

J. Duffy: Code enforcement officer vehicle is currently a 2002 Ford Ranger with 73,000 miles; put in money so the truck can be replaced in 2016. Numbers came from the state bid as a Ford Explorer, stripped down model. I asked Leo for the condition of vehicle. He checked with Mario and the truck should get about 2 more years. I also got the maintenance records over the last year. Both Leo and Matt told me it's not so much the mileage, but that it's just sitting out there not getting much use.

M. Miville: On the vehicle, it qualifies for CIP but I'm wondering if this is the kind of thing we should consider putting in the budget?

J. McHugh: It's something they need – can we consider putting it in the operating budget? Is it needed this year or are you agreeable to the Town Administrator's recommendation on waiting 2 years?

J. Duffy: I put in \$13,750 for 2014-2015 and the following year with the intention of purchasing it. I was under the impression all vehicles had to go through CIP.

M. Miville: It's a criteria but is not required.

Dr. Shankle: 2 things – I do want to get vehicles we need in the budget. When Public Works needs vehicles they have a capital reserve fund. I suggested we increase the capital reserve fund and create a capital reserve fund for PW vehicles in general. We can increase it to 100 instead of 80 and let him decide how it's spent. I'm trying to give more control to the people who use them.

M. Miville: My only caveat is the higher the number goes the more propensities for the voters to vote against it. You can spread it out over more warrant articles to reduce.

Dr. Shankle: They are passing warrant articles but not budget.

J. McHugh: That's why I was thinking the code enforcement vehicle should be in the operating budget. We can review from the beginning of CIP to see what the intention was. People understood criteria but don't understand that some things can go in operating budget.

C. Soucie: Some things have to go in warrant articles but after that it's Council's decision to figure out if they use a warrant article or put in the budget.

J. Duffy: Definition of CIP projects – *To address the growth of the community and improve delivery of services to the citizens, the purchase, lease, construction, rehabilitation, or replacement of: Equipment purchase, lease, replacement, or refurbishing supporting the above. In addition, the following items, that are not subject to the above limits, are included in the CIP: The purchase or lease of wheeled vehicles, or motorized equipment, having an expected life of at least three (3) years.* That's why I thought it should be in the CIP.

M. Miville: It's a criteria, not a requirement. It's allowable, not necessary.

J. McHugh: I thought if you needed it for operating, it belonged in the operating budget unless items over \$50,000.

Dr. Shankle: If people keep voting down the budget it will start to have an impact.

J. McHugh: I watched one Councilor zero out every warrant article that was CIP to try to diminish what he thought was the tax impact not realizing that the following year and subsequent years, that had to be recalculated and the amounts increased.

M. Miville: They didn't realize it was a six-year plan, not just a one-year plan.

c. Conservation Commission

i. Maintenance and Improvements to town owned Conservation Lands

C. Cronin: I never heard anything back asking them to confirm the schedule, but I can reach out again to see if they want a different date.

M. Miville: It has been on the last 2 years and voted down last 2 years for \$10,000 each year. This is for supplemental things beyond commission obligations to make places more usable. Mr. Couture said it was a state requirement that they have such monies. Specific wording in notes from voters' guide...Stewardship of the towns conservation properties includes the requirement to maintain existing trails and the right to develop new trails. Supplemental to the town purchases.

Dr. Shankle: I think it would be easier to see if there was a plan and they knew what they were going to do with it. They have a huge amount of property in NE corner of town. They will need money but it will be easier to get it passed if they had a master plan for conservation commission.

J. McHugh: Is Kiwanis doing some work for them?

Dr. Shankle: As far as I know...there was an issue at one point. Public Works is helping maintain but this is more about new and expansion of trails.

D. Rogers: They got a fair amount of community involvement with the Pinnacle project.

Dr. Shankle: The new sign is huge!

C. Soucie: They got that through Parks and Rec impact fees.

D. Rogers: Next week is Public Works and Parks and Rec.

C. Cronin: Yes, everyone else on this list is confirmed.

***J. McHugh motioned to adjourn at 6:50 p.m. Seconded by S. Peterson.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney
Recording Clerk