

**Official**  
**As of 08/01/11**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD,  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, CONSERVATION  
COMMISSION, AND TOWN COUNCIL**

**MRI SURVEY DISCUSSION**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING**  
**Monday, June 27, 2011**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

Chair John Gryval called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

**ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD**

Chair John Gryval, Martin Cannata, Jack Mudge, Dick Marshall, Doug Urquhart, and Yervant Nahikian.

Excused: Vice-Chair Robert Duhaime, Town Administrator, Carol Granfield, Frank Kotowski, and Brendan Perry.

Absent: Tom Walsh.

**ATTENDANCE – TOWN COUNCIL**

Councilor Nancy VanScoy, Councilor James Levesque, and Councilor Nancy Comai (Councilors arrived @ 6:30pm).

**ATTENDANCE – ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (ZBA)**

Chair Chris Pearson, Phil Denbow, Richard Bairam, and Michael Simoneau.

**ATTENDANCE – CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

Cindy Robertson.

**ATTENDANCE -TOWN OF HOOKSETT STAFF**

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy, Code Enforcement Officer, Peter Rowell, Building Dept. Administrative Assistant, Lee Ann Moynihan, and Planning Coordinator, Donna Fitzpatrick.

J. Gryval: We will start with introductions from members of the Boards, Commission, Council, and staff. It has been a year that the MRI survey has been on the table and it has caused more controversy (contact the Community Development Dept. for a copy of the survey).

**Timeline**

6/23/10 – MRI Contract to include Exit 11 & review of land use services  
9/21/10 – MRI Survey distributed to Planning Board, ZBA & Conservation Commission  
10/7/10 – Planning Board Chair & Vice-Chair request to Mr. Jutton to meet with Planning Board members to discuss MRI Survey  
10/16/10 – Town Administrator memo to PB, ZBA & ConCom that survey should be completed  
4/1/11 – Mr. Jutton memo (also referred to as report) to Town Administrator on results of MRI Survey and interviews with staff  
4/20/11 – Planning Board Chair & other PB members appeared before the Town Council to voice concerns of MRI Survey and memo  
5/9/11 Outside professional findings  
5/19/11 – Town Administrator cancelled MRI Survey Discussion meeting scheduled with Mr. Jutton on 5/23/11. Mr. Jutton was looking for payment to appear at this meeting.

J. Gryval: When the Planning Board wrote to Mr. Jutton and asked him to sit down with the Board and discuss his survey, he never responded to us. In October when we received the memo from Carol to complete the survey, the Planning Board still didn't fill it out because we wanted to discuss the survey questions with Mr. Jutton. Then when the 4/1/11 MRI (Jutton) Memo came out, I expected to see a "final report", something more professional. In the past 5 yrs MRI has been paid \$150,000 for services from taxpayer dollars and they (Jutton) couldn't sit down with us for an hour to go over the survey questions? Only 8 of 28 (Planning Board, ZBA & Conservation Commission) filled out the survey. I think the whole thing should have been handled by the Town Administrator. This is something that should have been done in-house. The survey was one sided. It referred to general questions (ie What Board/Committee you serve). The members who did fill out the survey, was it to rate the ZBA, Conservation Commission, or Planning staff? I thought the questions were directed to the Planning staff. The 4/1/11 MRI memo (report) condemned the Planning staff . . . referred to 2<sup>nd</sup> page top paragraph "unprofessional and unsophisticated".

D. Marshall: MRI did not spend enough time dealing with staff and the relationship with Boards and Committees. The questionnaire, after the 1-5 general questions, #6 asked about satisfaction. I had a difficult time sorting out the questions (ie "materials provided in prep for meeting" – from who and what materials). The survey is confusing. Carol made a definitive point to this Board that Jo Ann & Donna are not Planning Board staff but rather they are Town staff. The Town Planner is the advisor to the Planning Board and provides major input to the Planning Board, ZBA and Conservation Commission. The Planning Board has the authority to hold hearings, get public input, write the Master Plan, etc. If they are not the Planning Board staff, then whose staff are they? Stantec is the engineering advisor to this Board and paid for by fees from the applicant. That is why it was important to meet with Don Jutton to discuss the MRI survey questions. Are we dealing with staff, applicants, or the engineering consultant? I went through the questions and responded; question #6 "materials provided in prep for meeting" I am satisfied with our Planning staff and neutral with others. Question #4 was most frustrating; engineers, developers, and owners who don't take the time to read or conform

decide do their own thing. It is challenging for day-to-day development that is occurring. We (Planning Board) have regulations and either you conform or don't. The ZBA has a more difficult time because they have more to look at that we don't. The Conservation Commission keeps us in line with the Master Plan and does a tremendous job to maintain our conservation policy.

J. Gryval: The Planning staff was singled-out in this survey for questions, not the Conservation Commission or ZBA staff.

M. Cannata: I answered a number of questionnaires in my career, however this one I rejected. I sent my own letter to Mr. Jutton and then spoke with him. I asked him if staff were aware of the questionnaire to the land use Boards/Committees and he said no; knowing that I was even less inclined to answer the survey. The tone of the questions was negative and suggests a secondary agenda. The questions asked could have been taken care of within the Town itself (HR and Town Administrator). That is why I did not want to be a part of the questionnaire and I really don't want to comment on any of these questions.

J. Gryval: 4/1/11 Jutton memo (report) to Carol, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph . . . "Given the lack of professional credentials" . . . "Office of Community Development with a well-qualified director" . . . "one clerical/administrative position might be eliminated". It makes you wonder what they had in mind for the restructure.

J. Mudge: From the get go this survey and everything after that was a waste of time and resources by the Town. It is the cost and anguish that these guys have had to go through. It should have been done in-house or get someone in who can handle it. It got in the papers and looked like a food fight. The employees we have here are valuable and I have dealt with both departments.

J. Gryval: Not knowing which position would be eliminated in the 4/1/11 MRI memo (report) is hard. I wish the Council would end this.

C. Pearson: I was not one of the eight to fill-out the survey either. I was very unclear and then when I read the 4/1/11 MRI memo (report) I still don't know what the questions are getting at. I was hoping tonight to get this clarified. It would have been nice if MRI (Jutton) had come to a meeting and explained it clearly to us.

J. Gryval: I sent him (Jutton) a letter and invited him to come to a meeting to explain the survey questions to us. He never responded. Then he was supposed to come to a meeting on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, however that was cancelled by Carol on May 19<sup>th</sup> because Jutton wanted to be paid and the Town Council did not want to pay him.

D. Marshall: This information is sitting in the hands of the Town Council. What does the Council expect or want out of this? Maybe we need to send a letter to the Council from the three of us (Planning Board, ZBA & Conservation Commission) has a vote of our staff confidence. The Council is under pressure from developers that they don't like how

we (land use Boards/Committees) do our business. We have rules and regulations and we apply them. The Council doesn't seem to understand that. The mistakes we make now . . . this Town will pay for 5-10 yrs from now (ie poor drainage, streets). The ZBA has rules and regulations they have to adhere to also. The Conservation Commission is trying to protect some areas. If the Council doesn't like the rules and regulations, then they should request to change them and have it go before the voters. I don't think the Council understands how planning is done. Once a Planning Board member is appointed they act free and clear from politics and go by rules and regulations. There is question #6 on the MRI survey "communication between our board/committee & Town Council". The Council needs a better understanding of the roles of the Planning Board, ZBA, and Conservation Commission.

J. Duffy: Last week Steve Couture was not appointed to the Conservation Commission.

C. Robertson: Steve's appointment will be back on the Council's July 13<sup>th</sup> agenda.

Y. Nahikian: What type of other services has MRI provided to Town for \$150,000, so that I can understand why this MRI survey was initiated?

D. Marshall: The original intent of contracting with MRI at that point in time was for development at Exit 11. They wanted to streamline the process for Cabela's to go to the Planning Board. Between State agencies and others, Cabela's never made it to the Planning Board. It was not this Board that was stalling Cabela's. If you question Cabela's, they thought the Planning Board was ready to work with them.

M. Cannata: We don't know what the Town Council at the time was told by whom and why this had to be done or why "x" number of dollars was needed to do it. We were never told why. The point still remains; what was the Council told that they approved "x" dollars for this?

J. Mudge: Some of that money (\$150,000) was commissions paid to MRI to bring certain people to get hired here; probably 60% of the total.

J. Gryval: He (Jutton) still should have met with us. Peter & Lee Ann any comments?

L. Moynihan: Reports have been submitted. I am not sure what your end result is here tonight. Are we starting the whole process over? I thought MRI was done with this unless we paid them more money.

D. Marshall: I think the Planning Board should send a letter to the Town Council indicating confidence with staff and that we take issue with the 4/1/11 MRI memo (report) "unqualified and unsophisticated" and want to express this to the governing body.

J. Gryval: We are satisfied with staff and keep things as they are and if there is anything it should be taken care of in-house.

L. Moynihan: There was also a subsequent report to the 4/1/11 MRI memo (report) from two other Town members.

M. Cannata: They were two outsiders coming in evaluating an issue; if there even is an issue.

D. Marshall: One of them was the Town Planner from Salem and where does Jutton come from? Salem. This casts a shadow again on this whole thing.

J. Mudge: The other person they brought in is a consultant on the MRI website.

M. Cannata: When we say staff, who are we referring to?

D. Marshall: I consider the Town Planner as part of staff associated with the Planning Board. I am sure there are those that will disagree. When you look at their (Jo Ann & Donna) relationship to the Board, they are staff.

M. Cannata: We also rely on the CEO and Building Dept.

C. Pearson: Could we find out if MRI is still working on this?

N. VanScoy (arrived at 6:30PM): My understanding of tonight's meeting was that you were going to discuss the MRI survey that some members of the Planning Board and other Boards didn't respond to. If the question is if the contract and survey with MRI are still on-going? The answer is no.

J. Gryval: We did go over the survey questions tonight before you arrived. We thought our planning staff was singled out from the survey questions and the results of the survey.

D. Marshall: It's everything; the survey and the results.

Y. Nahikian: Why was the survey initiated?

N. VanScoy: Because additional staff was requested in both departments and we needed to look at this. It was also the relationship between the Building Dept. and Community Development Dept. AND Town staff and Boards working together. We are continuing to review what we have received. Continuing to ask the same question of the Town Council is picking at old wounds. It has been brought to the Town Council's attention that people are not happy how this was handled.

J. Gryval: We tried to get a meeting with Mr. Jutton for him to discuss the survey questions.

N. VanScoy: We didn't want to pay additional funds to get him here.

J. Gryval: He (Jutton) could have spent an hour with us to straighten this out after causing the controversy.

N. VanScoy: It could be said the controversy could have started here. MRI did what they were contracted to do.

J. Gryval: I think they did a lousy job.

N. VanScoy: This is not what you are here to discuss tonight. You are not happy with MRI report. MRI did not make the decision you wanted, but it is up to the Council to make the decision. We are going over this again and again and it is not help anything.

J. Gryval: Why was the planning staff singled out?

N. VanScoy: You chose not to complete the survey, because you did not like the questions. However, we are not coming up with another survey.

J. Gryval: We then were to meet May 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss the survey questions with MRI, but it was cancelled because the Council did not want to pay MRI to come to this meeting.

N. VanScoy: MRI is done because we got nothing out of the survey, because not enough information was gathered. MRI interviewed staff and the Town Administrator. I would like to see this meeting end with a positive result. Everybody come to a consensus to send letter to Council.

D. Marshall: I would have liked to have met with Jutton to clarify the survey so I could answer it.

N. VanScoy: We (Council) have gotten the message.

M. Cannata: Before you came in Nancy, we made an attempt to arrive at a letter of support of staff as we identify staff to be. We are not particularly happy with the survey and results.

J. Gryval: Does the ZBA want to be involved in a joint letter to the Council?

C. Pearson: About our own staff.

P. Rowell: I have been involved in a couple of studies from other municipalities. I look at those studies as positive input to do a better job. The 4/1/11 MRI memo (report) was broader in scope. My function may be part of the Fire Dept. The other report from the two Town members had some good points to incorporate into our daily tasks. Hopefully something positive will come out of this to improve my job performance. I wish there was more depth to look into our departments for process. I take reports as positive in nature.

C. Pearson: I evaluate people all the time and establish time tables and goals. I don't know where this report (4/1/11 MRI) sits now and where it is going to go.

P. Rowell: The Council initiated the report.

M. Cannata: Workplace reviews that take place (periodic, evaluations, counseling); I am hearing nothing to help staff be more productive and to achieve in the process.

P. Rowell: We have Town-wide annual evaluations/professional job evaluation.

N. VanScoy: This is not an evaluation or study of individual employees. We were asking about departments. If we asked how Jo Ann or Donna did their jobs, all of this would be in a Town Council non-public meeting.

J. Gryval: "neither office is professional and sophisticated"; we will draft a letter in support of our staff. The ZBA and Conservation Commission are welcome to be included in one letter of support for staff. Steve Couture is not present tonight, here are his comments:

1. Context for review: When we receive a plan set for review and comment, it would be helpful to have information relevant to the timing of review by the ZBA and PB and any minutes for ZBA/PB meetings where the project was discussed. Often we have to ask the applicant where they are in their review by the PB/ZBA. It seems like providing the Conservation Commission with the next steps required for the applicant and any background information would be very helpful in our consideration of projects.
2. Ordinance review and update: There are certain ordinances where the Conservation Commission (Floodplain for example) could be the lead on updating ordinances. As the PB is the "keeper" of the ordinances, I think it would simply take a discussion with the PB and Town Staff to see how the Conservation Commission could be of assistance in this regards.
3. Subdivision Review: It seem like it would be helpful to have a joint ZBA/ConCom/PB review of development proposals if they meet a certain scale. This would make it easier for the applicant and for the boards. Of course the logistics of this is what would be difficult, but if promoted this as a mechanism that would help developers expedite the process, we may be able to keep it to a quarterly joint meeting (if necessary).
4. Incentives: I think we need to incorporate/develop a streamlined development process that includes the highest environmental standards. The applicant would agree to meet the higher standards and in return they would be granted an expedited review and approval process.

J. Gryval: Also, Phil Fitanides is not present tonight, here are his comments: I will not participate in this Worthless, Meaningless survey, Nor would I advise my colleagues to do so. I find nothing in the Town of Hooksett's Charter that delegates any authority to anyone to waste the taxpayers money in formulating and sending this piece of trash - how much are we paying MRI for this worthless Crap, where is the authority to intrude or

create a "Cloud" on anyone's thinking that participate faithfully in any of these Public and Non-Public Meetings.

J. Gryval: I would like to thank you all for attending tonight's meeting.

*J. Mudge motioned to adjourn at 7:00pm. Seconded by N. VanScoy.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair John Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 7:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,  
Planning Coordinator