

**OFFICIAL**  
**TOWN COUNCIL MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Thursday, March 5, 2009**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman D. Dickson called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

**PRESENT:** William "Bill" Gahara, James Gorton, Paul Loiselle (excused), George Longfellow (excused), Michael Pischetola (excused), David Ross, Patricia Rueppel, Nancy VanScoy, Chairman David Dickson, Carol Granfield (Town Administrator), Christine Soucie (Finance Director)

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Fire Union Warrant Article

Original Warrant Article as approved on February 18, 2009:

***To see if the Town will vote to approve the cost item included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Town of Hooksett and the Hooksett Permanent Firefighters Association Local 3264, IAFF which calls for the following increases in salaries and benefits at the current staffing level:***

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Taxes</u>	<u>Benefits</u>
2009-10	\$48,412	\$1,053	\$54,441
2010-11	\$87,283	\$1,624	\$61,326

Amended Warrant Article:

***To see if the Town will vote to approve the cost item included in the collective bargaining agreement reached between the Town of Hooksett and the Hooksett Permanent Firefighters Association Local 3264, IAFF which calls for the following increases in salaries and benefits at the current staffing level:***

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Taxes</u>	<u>Benefits</u>
2009-10	\$48,412	\$1,053	\$54,441
2010-11	\$38,871	\$ 571	\$ 6,885

C. Granfield gave an overview of the Fire Union Warrant. She stated that the verbiage adopted is exactly the same. This is just to clarify the table to make it consistent with the School District Warrant Article so the voters will understand it. No numbers are being changed; it just needed to be clarified.

***D. Ross moved to amend the warrant article. Motion seconded by W. Gahara.***

J. Gorton asked for an explanation of the change.

C. Soucie explained that in the original article, the \$87,283 was the increase from today's cost. That is how much it is going to cost in two years from today's cost. If you add the \$48,412 and the \$38,871 together you get \$87,283. And historically they have shown the increase over the prior year and not the increase over the base year, or today's rate.

**Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

Sewer Warrant Article

Original Warrant Article as approved on February 18, 2009:

***To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate \$9,444,200 (Nine Million Four Hundred Forty Four Thousand Two Hundred Dollars) for the purpose of constructing the upgrades of the Hooksett Wastewater Treatment facility and Compost facility. This amount to be funded by a***

**Grant from the State of New Hampshire through the stimulus package being funded by the Federal Government in the amount of \$7,083,150 (75%) and to authorize the issuance of not more than the remaining \$2,361,050 (25%) of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act RSA 33 and to authorize the Town Council to issue and negotiate such bond or notes and determine the rate of interest thereon. Repayment of the bond amount will come from sewer system development and user fees. (Passage requires a 3/5 ballot vote). This article is contingent on the stimulus grant and if the Grant is not received, this article will be null and void.**

Amended Warrant Article:

**To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$6,224,375 (Six Million Two Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Three Hundred Seventy Five Dollars) for the purpose of construction, replacement, and expansion of a portion of the Wastewater Treatment plant, and to authorize the issuance up to \$6,224,375 of bonds or notes in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Finance Act RSA 33, and to authorize the Town Council to issue and negotiate such bonds or notes and determine the rate of interest thereon; furthermore to authorize Town Council to enter into a grant agreement with the State Revolving Loan Program whereas 50% of this bond\note will be repaid by the State of New Hampshire through the Federal STIMULUS package and balance of not more than 50% will be paid for by sewer system development fees and sewer ratepayers. No money is to be raised by taxation. (3/5 ballot vote required) This article is contingent on the Federal Stimulus grant and if the grant is not received, this article will be null and void.**

Bruce Kudrick, Sewer Superintendent: We received information from DES that it was going to be a 50-50 deal. The original warrant article had upgrades of the treatment plant and composting facility. You have better shot if you just include the treatment plant. With the help of Christine and DRA we were able to come up with the amended warrant article, just for the treatment plant. 50% has to be raised by the users. This will amount to a raise of \$5.40 for 90,000 gallons users and less if you use less gallons. We will have the final numbers at the hearing.

C. Granfield: I did verify that another public hearing is not necessary. At this stage it's not an issue.

**W. Gahara moved to approve the revised warrant article. Motion seconded by N. VanScoy.**

J. Gorton: What's the capacity now?

B. Kudrick: 1.1 million gallons with the upgrade we will gain another 200,000 gallons. We were hoping to go to 2.2 and double the size of the plant.

J. Gorton: What I am asking is about the gallons being pre-sold to a developer in town, who in turn sold what he has bought to other developers and that really concerns me because I would rather see the town making the money at an increased rate than to see a developer come in and get it at 10 cents a gallon and then sell it at 25 cents a gallon.

B. Kudrick: It happened a number of years ago. His project fell through. He contacted another developer and bought capacity from them. Everyone who had bought capacity are either utilizing it or holding it.

J. Gorton: There was an article in the Union Leader about a 135-house approved development will have sewer. How can this be when the person who pre-bought capacity turned around and sold it to other developers? If you pre-sell whoever bought it is now in charge of allocating capacity. I think its wrong.

N. VanScoy: It did seem that this pre-selling is a big concern. I don't know if there's a way to set limits. The Sewer Commission has to set those limits. Either limit how long you will own it. Sold capacity may not be developed for 10 years. Can there be limitations of how long to own this before they sell it back to the Town?

B. Kudrick explained pre-sold capacity couldn't be sold back to the Town as the money has already been spent.

N. VanScoy: Is it legal to put limitations on who the capacity is being sold to?

B. Kudrick: 25% is commercial and 75% is residential. Whoever comes in first as long as the gallon is there. We were trying to expand the treatment plant so we wouldn't have to charge the rate users and the taxpayers.

D. Ross: Some are buying the capacity but they're not paying the rate. Maybe there should be some stipulation to add some type of surcharge after some time. Once they buy the gallons they pay nothing more.

**Roll call vote carried unanimously.**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

Evelyn F. Horn  
Administrative Assistant

Nancy VanScoy  
Town Council Secretary