

**TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES  
REGULAR MEETING  
WEDNESDAY, April 25, 2001**

**Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order, by Tom Young, Acting Chairman, at 6:30pm.

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES :**

**April 11, 2001:** P. Ganley moved to approve the minutes. Motion seconded by M. Jolin.

**Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

**TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:**

1. M. Farrell reported that he received a message from K. Andrews that he is spending time taking down signs that are not the proper size according to town ordinance. 2 X 3 feet or six foot square is the town ordinance size. Any size larger, then an application must be in place for a sign permit.
2. Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) letter was received and with fairly accurate numbers and no need to appeal them. Major concerns are vacant land in town, areas of manufactured housing (to high), assessing with pickup vacant land. Raw numbers are 91% equalization, down 98% from last year. 11.05 coefficient dispersion.
3. In a letter, received from Attorney David B. Campbell, of MSG, in reference to the 1400 +/- acre property in Hooksett sited for a proposed 800 housing units and golf course he reviews 12 points. **(Attachment # 1)**.

Point #1- indicates a donation of 102 foot wide easement for the purpose of a public parkway running north and south thru all their land across Route 3 near Industrial Drive and extending as far as Martin's Ferry Road.

Point #4 Potential site- Job Corps – behind Legends' Golf Course, Manchester Sand and Gravel still wishes to donate to the Town, they will be mining it for another two to three years, they want the dirt but not the land. This all ties in with Heads Pond Development and only if the zoning amendments are passed on May 8<sup>th</sup>. Job Cops could take up to six years, so three to five years is not as onerous as it sounds.

4. Update on Tri-Town Ambulance in reference to the Union Leader Article. A meeting was held with the Chairman of the Tri-Town and a tentative agreement was reached. Leadership of Tri-town needs to take agreement to members on May 6<sup>th</sup>. Nina Catano, the Chairman, is optimistic that it will be ratified.
5. On May 7<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 negotiations for the next year's Fire Union Contract will begin. Negotiating subcommittee needs to be activated. R. Perry questioned if three Councilors were necessary.

T. Young asked is there a reduced number of participants. After a brief discussion is was unanimously decided that three-member representation should remain the same.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Chief Howard introduced John DeSilva as the new Deputy Fire Chief.

M. Farrell announced that Chief Howard has a new baby girl.

M. Farrell introduced Tina Paquette as the new Administrative Assistant.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**PROPOSED NFPA 1710 FIRE STANDARDS – STAFFING RESPONSE TIMES.**

M. Farrell explained that the plan is to have four people respond on each engine co. The standard now is three. The exception is Station #1 with a two-person response; all other shifts have three people covering. Four-person response would be very expensive. The requirement is a four-minute response time for Engine Companies and EMS. Chief Howard has worked out a scenario for town impact.

Chief Howard spoke on the Federal Response Time Proposal, which has been in the works for two years. There will be a vote on May 16<sup>th</sup> in Anaheim, California. The Chief's concerns with these proposed standards are:

- Don't feel community should be tied to staffing levels. There is not a major difference in incidents.
- Standard of care – if something goes wrong the potential liability could be very great, could have major impact on our state.
- If we cannot meet the proposed standards it's a neglect and risk. If something goes wrong we are subject to liability.
- \$310,000 impact for vehicles per year, if approved.
- If these standards are approved they will be National Standards.
- Due to increased traffic and growth, the run response time is outdated. What needs to be done is a new response time measurement. Response time is measured by four minutes on the Road, 1 minute for call/dispatch, 1 minute for turnout thus in six minutes first vehicle should be at the site. If additional engines are needed for support it becomes 10 minutes.
- A Severe situation exists with Exit 10 and Hackett Hill with reference to run response time. To improve this situation it could cost \$2.65 million.
- Continued costs of \$550, 000 annually left for operations to maintain a facility with three people per vehicle.
- The good news is we meet minimum staffing levels of four people for EMS that is two people with Tri-Town and two EMS/ Firefighters.
- Run response time can be done, sometimes, in four minutes, some are six and eight minutes
- Costs associated with vehicles, equipment, and personnel to address EMS issues would be \$453,000 per year **(Attachment #2)**

T. Young asked who will be the voters in Anaheim.

Chief Howard responded that some of the voting members are, vendors, Firefighters, labor management, Fire Chiefs, Town Representatives. This proposal is for all Firefighters countrywide. He believes the vote will be close. Chief Howard is not in favor of this action. Some things in it are good but staffing will be a major impact.

Chief Howard said a benefit to our town would be another company, not more people on an existing company as the proposed national standard suggests. He further noted, there is no government support; there are no dollar breaks.

Voters must be present in order to vote. There is no proxy vote. There is no limitation as to how many can vote from each community. They have 72,000 members and expect 38,000 votes.

M. Jolin asked what is Manchester's vote on this.

Chief Howard said he did not have the opportunity to ask. The metropolitan areas may be forced to go to 5 people response instead of 4, but it's not known for sure.

D. Pichette-Volk moved to adopt resolution opposing 1710 & 1720 and send the Hooksett representative to vote. Motion Seconded by P. Ganley. **Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

**COUNCIL MEETING TAPE PROCEDURE:**

M. Farrell distributed handout Chapter 91-A. Access to Public Records and Meetings, (**Attachment #3**)

P. Rueppel stated to have two tapes, one for general usage, one for the office files for transcription.

M. Jolin stated we could make the request for minutes shorter if we choose.

T. Young stated we should do away with tapes as other businesses and committees do.

D. Duford stated minutes must be available after the meeting, the next business day. As read in paragraph two.

M. Farrell stated the minutes are to be available within five business days.

D. Duford read section 91-A:4 paragraph II (**Attachment #3**)

T. Young read 91-A:4 paragraph IV (**Attachment #3**).

M. Jolin said the that 91-A:4 needs to be read as a whole article to get the full meaning of how the records can be made available for public inspection.

D. Pichette-Volk moved to adopt that a two tape system be used to record the minutes, Council Secretary to run second tape for the unofficial copy, Administration keeps "official copy". Motion seconded by P. Rueppel.

D. Pichette-Volk stated that she would prefer to have a tape system in place because otherwise it would put a burden on the secretary.

P. Ganley asked who would record the second tape?

D. Pichette-Volk answered the council secretary would record the second tape.

**Roll call vote on motion:**

M. Jolin	no	
P. Ganly	no	
P. Reppel	yes	
D. Pichet-Volk	yes	
D. Duford	yes	
T. Young	no	<b><u>Motion failed.</u></b>

**SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS**

**Joe Janutowski – Playing Fields Lease:**

M. Farrell presented a letter and draft copy of the lease from Legal Counsel in reference to a proposed. Bart Mayer, legal counsel, suggested whatever the town wants will be incorporated into the lease. Janutowski agreed to donate three and a half acres off Route 3A. He wants to sell the topsoil and donate the proceeds back to HYAA. The Town would, possibly, rent the land from him for \$1 (one dollar). Mr. Janutowski wants to know if it would be possible to get a tax abatement. Last year he paid \$4400 in taxes in this commercial zone location.

P. Rueppel questioned the dollar figure of abatement request from \$4400 to zero dollars.

D. Duford asked if we lease, could we abate for that reason?

M. Farrell said good cause must be shown, Board of Assessors could abate or put \$4400 into Parks & Recreation field budget.

M. Jolin stated abatement is not in the lease. The tenant is responsible for all real estate taxes, as defined in #7. (**Attachment #4**)

M. Farrell stated the process would be to instruct the Board of Assessors to grant an abatement.

T. Young asked what the cost is to build a playing field.

M. Farrell stated there is \$12,000 to be kicked back, from the owner, from the sale of loam to create a field.

D. Duford asked can the owner sell the land at any time? If the property is sold at any time what would happen?.

T. Young asked if the Town would spend any money or is Janutowski bartering?

D. Duford moved to table action on lease agreement until it is rewritten. Motion seconded by P. Ganley.

**Roll Call vote:**

P. Ganley	yes	D. Duford	yes	
P. Rueppel	yes	M. Jolin	yes	
D. Pichette-Volk	yes	T. Young	No	<b><u>Motion carried.</u></b>

**OLD BUSINESS CONTINUED:**  
**COUNCIL TAPE PROCEDURE:**

D. Duford moved that the backup tape be reproduced from the official council tape and be made available for public and the media as soon as possible but not later than the close of the next business day. Motion seconded by M. Jolin.

P. Rueppel moved to amend to purchase another tape machine to make two tapes at the same time. Motioned seconded by D. Pichette-Volk.

**Roll call vote on amendment:**

P. Rueppel	yes	P. Ganley	no	
D. Pichette-Volk	yes	T. Young	no	
M. Jolin	yes	D. Duford	yes	<b><u>Amendment Carried.</u></b>

**Roll call vote on original motion as amended:**

D. Pichette-Volk	yes	P. Ganley	no	
D. Duford	yes	P. Rueppel	yes	
M. Jolin	yes	T. Young	no	<b><u>Motion Carried.</u></b>

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**SCHOOL USAGE DECISION ON TOWN LAND, MAP 26, LOT #2.**

Robert Suprenant, Superintendent of SAU #19 stated that the District plans to access the land from Route 27 or Whitehall Road. Lot 5, was purchased to gain access to Whitehall Road. (**Attachment #5**). Future needs are in the planning stages. Long-term realities are, that we need to position ourselves well and to leave room to consider a high school in the future. Lot 2 will be valuable for future school needs. Map 26, Lot2, was discussed and introduced were the team architect Dan Bisson and three school board members, Becky Burke, Peggy Teravainen and Joann McHugh and Finance Administrator, Sally Waterhouse.

T. Young stated that there are some dry lands and some wetlands and asked if the school would be conducting wetlands engineering on Lot 2.

D. Bisson stated that there are two possible entrances. Study is needed for the best entrance in Lot 2. Further considerations are the wetlands, gas line and water. Getting water to the proposed school land must go to Council for consideration. Playing fields are still in the plans. **(Attachment #5)**.

D. Duford asked if the playing fields would have Town or School controlled supervision.

T. Young stated when the Town owns, the Town pays the maintenance. For clarification, when the School owns, then the School pays the maintenance.

J. McHugh stated for clarification that the Village fields are maintained by Parks and Recreation because they are used when school is closed.

R. Suprenant stated that would be worked out with Parks and Recreation.

Pat Ganley asked if the School Board would be developing the field or just setting aside the land.

D. Bisson stated both. The School District will build the fields.

M. Jolin asked how many fields would be built. The Town has spend \$50,000 and nothing to show for it.

D. Bisson stated that there will be two soccer fields, one baseball field, one softball field, three tennis courts, bathroom facilities, hoops for basketball outside the field, conduit out side, lighting and lighting for future, irrigation system.

D. Pichette-Volk asked if they had set aside Lot 2 for personal use and will the School have the area officially engineered?

R. Suprenant stated they will use it as a base and continue from there.

D. Bisson stated they've talked with D. Hemeon, Parks and Recreation Superintendent, and have taken most of his fields and put them on the plan.

T. Young stated that moving utilities is a key issue. Is Lot 2 a potential use for a Town fire station for the future?

D. Pichette-Volk asked for clarification on building. Is the School first priority and Town needs second priority?

D. Bisson asked if they should come back with more definite plans?

Council consensus was yes.

B. Burke handed out the Space Needs Committee's Selected Survey Results. The survey shows strong support for planning for a high school provision. **(Attachment #6)**.

J. McHugh stated that she sees conflicting opinions on usage of land, for a school vs. Town use.

M. Farrell stated Job Corps will not be going to Map 26, Lot 2 because of reaction at last meeting.

M. Jolin moved that the school have priority for use to study the use for an access road and second priority for the rest of the land. Motion seconded by P. Rueppel.

D. Pichette-Volk	yes	P. Ganley	yes
D. Duford	no	P. Rueppel	yes

M. Jolin no T. Young no

**Tie vote. No decision reached.**

D. Duford stated he would like a wetlands study and mapping to know what's buildable and what's not.

P. Ganley agreed with D. Duford.

M. Farrell stated a wetlands study would be needed before considering a road location.

D. Pichette-Volk stated that this motion doesn't contain a study for Lot 2. We should have a consensus on a wetlands study. The road is subject to exact location. A survey is needed to show where wetlands are located and should be done before road considerations.

Council consensus was for the school to do a study/survey of the drier half of Lot 2.

**PUBLIC INPUT:**

Nancy Winneg, 42 Cross Rd., stated that coming back with a halfway study is an excellent idea.

**NOMINATIONATIONS/APPOINTMENTS:**

**Solid Waste** - D. Duford reported C. Crocetti resigned, and that Mary Ruel should be moved up. Council asked that Crocetti be contacted for a written resignation so that it is on record that he left in good standing.

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:**

**ADMINISTRATIVE CODE** – P. Ganley reported they would like to meet this month.

**AMBULANCE** – D. Pichette-Volk reported that the ambulance survey will be going out in the Council's Newsletter mailing. The data will be collected, tallied and results will be made public in an open forum.

**COUNCIL NEWSLETTER** - D. Pichette-Volk reported that the ambulance survey will be going out in the Council's Newsletter mailing.

**HEAVY EQUIPMENT** – D. Duford reported that a quick meeting was held regarding a backhoe for the Highway Department.

**PLANNING BOARD** – P. Ganley reported that Morrill Road subdivision is postponing a one half million gallon water tank. Impact fees approved.

**ROAD CONNECTOR** – M. Farrell reported meeting with R. Corriveau of Manchester Sand & Gravel to do recalculations. Meeting is set for May 1<sup>st</sup>.

**SOLID WASTE COMMITTEE** – D. Duford reported that they met last week to discuss proposal on tipping fees increases, still looking at pay as you throw program.

**SOUTHERN NH PLANNING** – M. Jolin reported that Route 3 interchange postponed until after the Alice Avenue project.

**TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S CONTRACT** – Dissolved.

**UNION NEGOTIATIONS** – Meeting is scheduled for 1:30 on May 5<sup>th</sup>.

**WAGE SCALE** - Subcommittee dissolved.

T. Young moved to adjourn at 9:30 pm. Motioned seconded by P. Ganley.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Tina M. Paquette  
Administrative Assistant

---

Denise Pichette-Volk  
Town Council Secretary