

TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING
THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 2001

The meeting was called to order at 6:30pm.

PRESENT: Chairman R. Dion, S. Sheidow, T. Young, D. Pichette-Volk, P. Rueppel, R. Holley, M. Jolin, P. Ganley, D. Duford, M. Farrell-Town Administrator.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF) AMENDMENT: S. Sheidow moved to put the TIF Amendment on the floor for discussion. Motion seconded by T. Young. **Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

M. Farrell distributed Resolution # 03-01-01 on the TIF Amendment. **(See Attachment #1)**

T. Young moved to adopt Resolution # 03-01-01. Motion seconded by P. Ganley. **(See vote below)**

T. Young explained this is a modification to the TIF District which will include current and future right-of-ways on Route 3A, I-93 on & off ramps, Technology Drive and Quality Drive. When the TIF was created, town and state roads were not included in the District. This amendment will add them in. This is a substantial modification project. If no modifications are done, Hooksett will end up with another Route 3 situation on Route 3A and will have to wait 20-30 years for the State to appropriate adequate funding to improve the road system. This amendment will improve the road system, the on & off ramps, and install lights at intersections, which will be a traffic calming device. This amendment should go to the voters.

D. Duford asked if the motion was to amend the District and then add these changes?

M. Farrell explained the motion is to adopt the Resolution which changes the existing TIF District by including the Right-of-Ways, amending the provisions of the Development Program and the District Financing Plan.

D. Duford stated that in the 1960's, I-93 used to be 293 to Bedford. Public hearings were held to propose that Exit 10 development have a one-way south and a one-way north ramp. Local officials, residents and Duford lobbied to make it a four way cloverleaf intersection. The plan was modified to what is today which is on and off ramps on southbound and northbound lanes. The exit 10 area will develop because it is probably the most desirable intersection in the state and the growth will develop naturally. The TIF is not necessary. Bringing in four major retailers will have 800 – 1000 cars at any time, which is a nuisance. Light manufacturing in that area such as SCI and Great State Beverages are unseen and create a good tax base with little extra traffic. The total TIF cost is 3.6 million for a 15-year bond not 2.6 million as presented and we shouldn't saddle the taxpayers with that expense.

S. Sheidow stated she has concerns of the TIF. Concerns are no sewer; losing ½ million; Town tax money used to fix state roads; increased need for fire, police and ambulance; Alex Vilas told her there are no rooftops in the TIF area which is what larger retailers want; and, large retailers want to be on Route 3.

T. Young stated there is continual traffic growth on Route 3A. SCI has 100-300 vehicles per day and Great State Beverages has 100-200 vehicles per day. You don't see it or feel it as much because they're near the highway and don't have to go through residential areas. Manchester will be cultivating their industrial park near 293 with possible ramps. They're proposing a 12 million dollar upgrade paid by the city. Hooksett's TIF will be supported by the voters if they don't have to pay for anything.

D. Duford disagreed, stating the number of vehicles didn't approach that amount. Great State having about 40 employees and no public traffic. Traffic from SCI and others on Technology Drive do not create a problem because of the staggered volume at any one time. We were told last year that if the TIF for the sewer was not approved, nothing would happen in this area, yet within a short time, Hockey 2000's rink was built and now this proposal is being presented, still without sewer.

<u>Roll call vote:</u>	M. Jolin	yes	T. Young	yes
	P. Ganley	yes	S. Sheidow	yes
	P. Rueppel	no	D. Pichette-Volk	yes
	D. Duford	no	R. Holley	yes
	R. Dion	yes		<u>Roll call vote carried.</u>

TOWN ENGINEER POSITION:

P. Ganley asked if a separate line item for the budget was needed.

M. Farrell answered a line item would be needed for the position with an indicated salary rate plus an additional \$2,856 in the line item to make up the salary and \$4,000 for the benefits and other expenses.

S. Sheidow stated in the past new positions were sent to the voters to approve.

P. Ganley questioned if they could do a warrant article.

T. Young stated if every new proposed position were sent to the voters as a warrant article, the number of warrant articles would be astronomical.

M. Farrell stated the Council only as the authority to create a position. If the full salary is put into the line item, you're appropriating too much money because most of the salary money is in the budget if other positions are shifted around.

S. Sheidow stated the based increase upon the school is \$2.25 and if the Town warrant passes it'll be an increase of \$2.50. Hooksett is going to have a mass exodus of the elderly and low income. If we keep adding money to the budget it'll be voted down.

R. Dion stated that S. Sheidow has previously stated she supported an engineering position.

S. Sheidow answered she does but as a warrant article.

D. Pichette-Volk stated that if the money is in a warrant article and it's voted down you lose the position and the prerogative to add the position. The Budget Committee has already stated that new positions go into the budget and not in warrant articles.

D. Duford stated there's plenty of money in the budget to handle these eventualities. There's not enough work for a full-time engineer.

T. Young disagreed with Duford stating that 1997 had 22 subdivisions, 22 site plans, and 9 lot line adjustments. 1998 had 17 subdivisions, 31 site plans and 8 lot line adjustments. The Planning Board stated at the last Council meeting that so far this year they've had 8 subdivisions, 15 site plans and 1 lot line adjustment. Over the last four years, with all of these subdivisions, site plans and lot line adjustments, that's more than 20 hours per week in engineering as stated previously by Town Engineer Robert Pantel and he must have misunderstood the question when he was asked or never did an actual time study because there is more than enough engineering work for a full-time engineer.

D. Duford stated the comment from R. Pantel was 20% or 12 hours per week and even if Robert had spent 50% of his time on engineering, it still doesn't justify a full-time position.

T. Young moved the engineer position forward as a line item with \$1.00 in the line, the salary of \$55,000, the additional \$2,856 for salary and \$4,000 for other expenses all to be found elsewhere in the budget. Motion seconded by D. Pichette-Volk.

After much discussion of where the town engineer position should be in the budget, the Council decided that the money for the town engineer position could be found from other wage vacancies and the Administrative Code Subcommittee would discuss the position at their next meeting.

D. Pichette-Volk withdrew her second. T. Young withdrew his motion.

The Council decided to reaffirm an earlier straw poll on the town engineer position. See below.

STRAW POLL ON TOWN ENGINEER POSITION:

P. Rueppel – In favor of hiring a part-time engineer not a full-time engineer.

S. Sheidow – In favor of a town engineer as long as it doesn't cost the taxpayers money. If the economy goes down, the position goes as well.

T. Young – In favor of a town engineer because the Planning Board is proposing a fee schedule to offset the cost of the position and the Administrator can find funds in other vacant positions.

D. Pichette-Volk – Supports not adding money to the budget. In favor of a town engineer. Supports enhancing the Planning Board's fee structure without connecting the two issues. They should be independent actions.

R. Dion – Supports the position as long as it doesn't cost the town more money.

R. Holley – Supports the position. There's enough work for a full-time engineer.

M. Jolin – Fully supports a full-time engineer.

P. Ganley – Supports a town engineer.

D. Duford – Supports a part-time engineer in the Planning Department. There's not enough work for a full-time position based on the previous engineer's comments.

FINALIZATION OF THE WARRANT:

Chairman Dion stated that the Town Administrator's wages were approved last week and the budget needs to be adjusted to reflect that.

D. Pichette-Volk moved to amend the Administration Wage line to add \$8,933 with approved amounts for benefits to be distributed to the appropriate allocations. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

S. Sheidow asked if the budget ends up as a default budget, could it be taken out of somewhere else.

M. Farrell answered the increase would be included in a default budget because it's a contractual item. Regular wages are not part of a default budget, but contractual wages and contractual items are.

