

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, November 19, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Donald Winterton, Nancy Comai, Todd Lizotte, James Levesque, Adam Jennings, Robert Duhaime (arrived 6:34 pm), Susan Orr, Chairman James Sullivan, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)
Missed: David Ross

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Public: November 12, 2014

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the public minutes of November 12, 2014. Seconded by D. Winterton.

Vote unanimously in favor. A. Jennings abstained due to prior absence.

b. Non-public: November 12, 2014

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the non-public minutes of November 12, 2014. Seconded by J. Levesque.

Vote unanimously in favor. A. Jennings abstained due to prior absence.

AGENDA OVERVIEW

Chair Sullivan provided an overview of tonight's agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

CONSENT AGENDA

a. Hooksett Permanent Firefighters donation to Family Services approx. \$3,500

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the consent agenda as written. Seconded by N. Comai.

Vote unanimously in favor.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- Tax bills went to printer and should be mailed this Friday. They are due on December 22, 2014.
- Attended a meeting in Concord regarding Lilac Bridge; more to come under Old Business.
- Union negotiations ongoing.
- I went to the school board meeting to get their input on the CIP, and got the CIP voted on. I appreciate them putting me at the beginning of the agenda. I was impressed with the engagement that people had with the school board.

T. Lizotte: The police chief made an appearance to discuss funding of the COPsync program. I'm not sure if this is going to come up in the current budget.

J. Sullivan: If there is an issue at any of the schools, they push a button and within 15 seconds there will be a massive police presence. He indicated getting funds for that.

PUBLIC INPUT: 15 Minutes

None

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

None

SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS

J. Sullivan: The next four items are as required by the Town Charter. Each group comes to Council for an update at least once a year.

a. Trustee of Funds - Claire Lyons, Paul Loiselle, and Christine Soucie

C. Lyons: Henry Roy is also on the Board, but is not here tonight. The Trustees have moved all funds to Mathison & Co (Hampton, NH) as they specifically deal in municipal monies. We were getting good information from him all along about things we should and should not be doing. Previously, the trustees set up an account with a brokerage firm, but not everyone is schooled in finance. One thing that happened was they bought premium bonds which were not appropriate. We invited Mr. Mathison to come in and speak to us. In the beginning, we moved the library and cemetery funds over to them and were very impressed. To move the capital reserve funds over, there was a .5% fee charged. With the other trust funds, the fees came out of the other monies. In the past legislative session, a bill was passed stating the fees could come out of the funds instead of out of their budget. This requires a vote since Hooksett is a charter town. We would like to ask you to do that tonight. Mathison agreed to waive fees until May 31, 2015. At that point, we have to take the funds out, have the departments pay out of their budget, or have the town approve the fees be paid out of the funds.

P. Loiselle: It's a housekeeping issue, it allows the fees to be paid out of the trust fund instead of adding a line item to each department to pay for the fees.

Dr. Shankle: All that needs to happen, is one of you needs to tell the Administration to prepare an ordinance and we can proceed with public hearings and so on.

N. Comai: Can you clarify who the .5% fee is paid to?

C. Lyons: The fee is only waived until May 31, 2015.

N. Comai: Who is the fee paid to?

C. Lyons: Mathison is the administrator; National Trust Advisors does the actual investing. The .5% fee goes to Mathison.

P. Loiselle: The fee is a scale - .5% up to \$5 million then it changes, but we are not that high.

D. Winterton: Is that an annual fee?

C. Lyons: Yes, an annual fee paid quarterly.

D. Winterton: The intent of the new legislation is to have it taken directly from each trust?

P. Loiselle: Yes, it's easier to take it from the fund instead of adding a line item to the budget.

C. Lyons: Right now, on the trust funds, the fee is taken directly from the funds. Currently, we are fee-less on the capital reserve funds until May 31, 2015.

D. Winterton: Before we moved the money, what was our fee schedule and who was it paid to?

C. Lyons: It was at a bank and we paid less than 1%.

D. Winterton: You personally managed the money and we were paying .5% per year to have the money managed professionally and have the administrative work done?

P. Loiselle: Correct. The difference is that CD's were paying fairly well historically, and then they dropped to 1% then to a fraction of a percent. Here we are getting a return of approximately 4-5% (before the fees) which is a significant increase over CD's.

D. Winterton: As long as they are not making ¼% and charging ½% to do it.

C. Lyons: No, that is our job. We have to watch to make sure they stay within their investment guidelines. They do everything we ask and are very helpful.

P. Loiselle: This is a complete online system that is visible at all times. Our contract allows us to terminate for any reason or no reason; it is open-ended.

S. Orr: How does that fee compare to any other brokerage firm that can handle our funds?

C. Lyons: They are all around the same.

P. Loiselle: There are 2 RSA's that have to be adhered to.

R. Duhaime: As you know, we have been building up the capital reserve fund. Do you have a fixed number for the .5% per year for management?

C. Lyons: I don't have that with me. The total amount of money we have with them now is approx. \$3.2 million.

R. Duhaime: So .5% of that is his fee, annually, paid quarterly. If it is over \$5 million, the rate changes?

C. Lyons: Yes, I think it drops to .4% if the town has more than \$5 million. Each fund pays their own portion.

J. Sullivan: If we move to establish an ordinance, we have to have a public hearing, so we would need that information at that time since people may ask that question.

P. Loiselle: It's in the contract.

A. Jennings: Another thing you might want to bring is historic interest rates so we know what the value is of moving instead of staying with the CD's.

N. Comai: Please start the process of drafting an ordinance.

J. Sullivan: Section 3.6 of the Town Charter says an ordinance may be introduced by any member at any regular or special meeting of the Council. That has been done so we will be planning a public input session at a future meeting.

P. Loiselle: They provide the MS-9 and MS-10 reports and they do a fine job.

T. Lizotte: The ordinance takes the form of giving Trustees ability to pay fees out of the funds being managed, not for a specific number?

Dr. Shankle: The RSA sets out specific language and we will follow that language. I have already created a draft.

R. Duhaime: Will we have to pay the fees if this passes?

C. Lyons: No, he has waived the fees on the capital reserve funds until May 31. In closing, I'd like to add that the state runs seminars in June for newly elected people and we have now all attended; we are trying to stay on top of things.

J. Sullivan: We thank you for coming. Christine will let you know when the hearing is so you can come back and answer any questions.

b. Moderator, Don Riley

D. Riley: I want to quickly walk through the salient pieces of the election. We are getting close to a model that is going to work for a long time. I had 7 Councilors participate in this last election; thank you so much for your support. I really appreciate it. Had an issue come up, you were there to help us deal with it. Starting the whole process went back to the Primary. There was a request for a completed checklist after the election in September. The process had been that the Supervisors take the checklist books so they could start the process of entering data into the system, so they were in 3 different places. A request was made of the Town Clerk, and he couldn't comply with the request. The statutes say it has

to be made available immediately. We did some scrambling and the books came back, Todd scanned them and provided the individual with the completed checklist. There were also some issues regarding public information in the checklist which may or may not fit the statute in terms of what you can release. We still don't have a clear answer on that. For now, if someone requests a completed checklist we give it to them. We think we are doing it correctly; I don't think there is any issue (phone numbers are not on the checklist). We changed our process and for this past election, the checklist was scanned before it got to the supervisors so that will not be an issue going forward. We counted 6,485 unmarked ballots in 45 minutes; it is not a lengthy process. Testing of the election ballot machines – one had a problem with a gear that needed to be replaced and we essentially paid for the maintenance contract with that fix, which was rather expensive. We had 2 challengers (one republican and one democrat) who sat there all day and didn't challenge a single thing. They didn't challenge any voters or anyone in the absentee ballot process, which they are entitled to do. Ballot clerks – we had 6 stations set up. We processed 474 voters/hour on the high end and 284 voters/hour which averages 395 voters/hour which is 1 minute per voter at each station; however there is a significant skew since there were long lines at some stations and none at others. We are in the process of reviewing that split based on the data we have. We are doing that now so we can divide the books up in a more appropriate fashion and even it out. We had an audit by the Attorney General's office and they found no significant issues, only 1 minor thing, which I can't remember right now. Absentee ballot processing – we had 286 queued up; started at 9am and finished after 7pm because where there were long lines at the ballot stations, we needed to get in there to check that voter off. It wasn't fair to voters queued up in line to interrupt that so we waited until after we closed the polls. There were 100 voters in line at 7:00 and finally closed at 7:50 after we handled the absentee ballot. In 2.5 hours we did all the post-election processes (counting write-ins, checklist marks, unmarked ballot counting). David Ross deserves a big thank you because he knows how to put the materials away so that we can easily retrieve them for the next time. We learned there needs to be a precise data collection worksheet so when everything is done I have one sheet to work with. We assisted 7 voters, 3 in wheelchairs. That was the first time since I have been moderator we had to use the wheelchair. We had some difficulty with the Cawley School wifi, so we need to coordinate that a little better. Finally, we started November 4 with 8,914 registered voters and finished with 9,278 voters. That governs how many voting booths we have to have. For the state general election and Presidential Primary, we have to have 1 booth per 100 registered voters. We scrambled to have 89 booths this time, and we barely had enough. We will need 93 plus anybody who registers between now and then. We put 5 new booths in and will include 5 more booths in the next budget cycle. We repaired some of the older booths as they were set up. I'm very pleased with the way things are going.

J. Sullivan: The percentage of voters who turned out was what?

D. Riley: 5,144 voters, about 55-60%.

J. Sullivan: Was that higher than the last election?

D. Riley: The last state general election was the Presidential election and I have nothing to compare to. There has been no continuity from the data that was generated which we hope to make a continuous thing. All that data tells us something.

D. Winterton: Congratulations and thank you for the job you do. The efficiency is remarkable and your dedication is fantastic. I have a relative who is a moderator in another community and they discussed how well things went in Hooksett.

D. Riley: Thank you, but it's more than just me, it's a whole group of people including you.

D. Winterton: You said that we are going to have to make an investment because of the increase in the number of registered voters. Can we purge the numbers down so we don't have to make that investment?

D. Riley: We purge every 10 years and we just purged a couple of years ago. I don't know if we can do it sooner. It's a very exhaustive process, but we will look into that.

N. Comai: For the next election, would you say we should do a better job communicating to the community to register early instead of the day of?

D. Riley: It was about 300 on November 4 and 1,000 at the Presidential election.

N. Comai: I'm talking about the 1,000 at the next election, which is Presidential.

D. Riley: We tried that with SNHU; we went there and set up a table. We spent half a day there and only registered 25 people. It doesn't seem to catch anyone's attention until the day of election. That is one bubble and the other is absentee ballots. I firmly believe they are being used to early vote so they don't have to show up and wait in line. Compared to other communities, we are doing a great job keeping the lines moving. I don't know how to deal with absentee ballot situation and with people waiting until Election Day to register.

R. Duhaime: I only had one person who left because they didn't want to wait in line. It was the D-H's and M-P's.

D. Riley: We hope the data collected will tell us how to split the books up or put the best ballot clerks on the busy stations. We had 2 shifts. One thing becoming more apparent to me is on the day of the state election, an assistant moderator is almost becoming mandatory. The time Todd and I spend offline counting absentee ballots, it's hard to keep your eyes on what else is going on.

J. Sullivan: You are reviewing the number of stations to help avoid the longer lines?

D. Riley: I think a better solution would be to get the split right.

J. Sullivan: I'm glad Councilor Winterton mentioned that other communities are looking to Hooksett as a good example of how it should be done.

c. Budget Committee, Marc Miville Chair

M. Miville: I was nominated again this year as Chairman of the Budget Committee. We really haven't started our season yet; we have only had one meeting so far. We have a full Board of 9 elected members: Nicholas Haas, Vice Chair; Tabitha Jennings; Kevin Van Horn; Chris Morneau; John Pieroni; Patrick Gosselin; Steven Peterson; Frank Bizzarro. Each serves a staggered 3-year term. Tabitha, myself and Frank's terms expire after this year. Don Winterton is the Town Council rep; the alternate is David Ross. The water precincts are members of the Budget Committee but have not shown up in years. We record their absence; they know they are required to attend but do not. Our first meeting on Oct. 30 was the administrative meeting. We examined our calendar and have 17 meetings scheduled from now until April. More could be scheduled if necessary. Our next meeting is Dec. 4 to review the school district budget. We approved the budget for the Budget Committee at our last meeting. We had a review from Dr. Littlefield. School Board proposed a budget increase of \$1.3M from the current fiscal year budget. School Board and school administration have reduced that by \$750,000. I thanked the School Board for their review and deliberations; they did due diligence and we thank you for that. Current budget request is \$520,000 over current budget year. The School Board default budget is TBD; I believe at the next School Board meeting you will be discussing that. We are anticipating that total; as it currently stands, that \$520,000 amounts to a 1.7% increase over current year budget before Budget Committee reviews it. I want to remind everyone that the only warrant article that failed that the Budget Committee proposed was the revaluation article – it lost by 1 vote. Just because it failed, doesn't mean it is going away; it still has to happen. My personal view is it needs more citizen education so it is understood. Operating budget was voter approved for this year. It was over default (\$223,000 over) and passed by 15 votes. The town is now operating on that budget which is over the default.

J. Sullivan: We are starting our review of budgets – what is our deadline for submission and the date for the public hearing?

M. Miville: Books have to be ready for the Budget Committee on January 30. The review of the municipal budget starts Feb 5.

Dr. Shankle: Traditionally, the 2 meetings in December are when Council looks at the budget.

M. Miville: Your budget workshop is Jan. 3. This calendar is online under the Budget Committee agenda page.

d. Economic Development Committee

D. Fitzpatrick: I spoke to a member of the Committee; they will not have someone here this evening. Their next meeting is next Tuesday and they have asked if Councilor Winterton can provide an update. Once they reorganize next Tuesday, they would be happy to come back to Council with more detailed information.

D. Winterton: They are still working with UNH Cooperative Extension (Andre Garron) – that will come up under New Business.

OLD BUSINESS

a. 14 – 066 Village/Lilac Bridge Update and Payment Request

Dr. Shankle: We went to a meeting last week in Concord. We went over the different options we could do with the bridge. You instructed us to let them know we wanted to tear it down, but needed approval due to historical significance. We have to proceed with the 106 Process, having to do with historical resources; they were very interested in having public input and after that, Council makes a decision on where they want to go. I'm asking you to have a public hearing as soon as we can. We are still willing to go as quickly as we can; they are asking for things that are taking us time to do. We are moving ahead as quickly as the process will allow and we will continue to do that.

S. Orr: The last word we got, they didn't think it would last another winter. Given that emergency warning, what back up do we have in case it goes?

Dr. Shankle: Sewer has a good back up plan for their part; we would have to take it out of the river. I emphasized to the state that we realize we need to be moving forward but they were adamant we follow the process, so there is nothing more we can do.

T. Lizotte: On the staff report, there was an indication you needed approval from Council to pay the invoice.

Dr. Shankle: That number has to change because we have to go through the 106 Process; Leo will provide you with a new number.

Consensus to proceed with a public hearing as soon as possible.

L. Lessard: This was supposed to be an engineering survey with impact fees to make that a walking bridge. Now it's into an emergency fund, I don't think it's right to use impact fees to pay for this. The money for this should not come from impact monies (\$81,000 was set aside), but should come out of the professional services line item I have. At the end, we will have to make that up from paving line item.

Dr. Shankle: The cleanest way to do this is cancel original contract with CMA that was going to be paid for out of impact money.

T. Lizotte motioned to cancel the CMA Engineering contract awarded on 8/27/14. Seconded by A. Jennings.

N. Comai: You are recommending we cancel the contract with CMA; do we need a new motion to pay for what they have already done?

Dr. Shankle: We have been working under the fact this was an emergency; that's why we started spending this money. We need to get out from under this contract and the money will come out of Leo's budget. There is not going to be another contract because we have to get through the 106 process. Whatever you decided to do going forward, there will be another contract, and I told the state that.

N. Comai: It didn't start as an emergency, it became an emergency.

Dr. Shankle: It started with this contract you are rescinding. Before any work was done on the contract you signed, the state said it was an emergency. We were hoping it would turn into a blended thing, but we have no reason to believe that at this point. We don't want to spend impact fees improperly. If, going forward, you decide to do a walkway, there would have to be a separate project.

J. Sullivan: Will the impact fees still be available at that time?

L. Lessard: Yes, the money had to be allocated and we did that, but the project is on hold.

J. Sullivan: We can still use them because they have been allocated even though the project is delayed.

Roll Call

R. Duhaime – Yes

S. Orr – Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

N. Comai – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

L. Lessard: The CMA invoice, up to the 106 process was for \$96,000. We didn't know, at the time of the staff report, we would have to have the 106 and Army Corps of Engineer project done, so we eliminated the \$23,000 (so your staff report only shows \$72,000). After the meeting last week, the state is requiring the 106 process, so we have to put the historical consultants money back in. The invoice should be \$96,000 so that is what I am asking approval for (up to \$96,000).

N. Comai: \$23,000 for historic consultation is now coming out of impact fees or from your budget?

L. Lessard: Everything is coming out of my budget; nothing is coming from impact fees.

T. Lizotte: Is it an invoice? You said "up to" and an invoice is usually fixed.

L. Lessard: The invoice is now up to \$73,000 that they have already done work for. This invoice is not complete.

T. Lizotte: The motion should be to approve an open invoice with CMA Engineering up to \$96,000?

Dr. Shankle: I'd include "to complete the 106 process" so that doesn't keep sliding.

T. Lizotte motioned to have Town Council direct the Town Administrator to direct the DPW Director to open a working invoice for up to a \$96,000 maximum to complete the 106 process and associated engineering for the Lilac Bridge emergency. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

R. Duhaime: Halfway through the engineering process, it was discovered we wouldn't be able to save the bridge. Some of the engineering was to save the bridge correct?

L. Lessard: All of the engineering was to analyze the breaks the state found on the bridge.

R. Duhaime: The original contract was for what amount?

L. Lessard: It was for \$61,000.

R. Duhaime: How much are we over that?

L. Lessard: Right now we are up to \$73,000. They have done more than the original scope and now have to do the 106 process which is the consultation on a historical bridge. They told me they would go over that amount since what they have to do for the state is more than what they would have done for just the small survey. We talked about that once it was declared an emergency and knew it was going to be over.

R. Duhaime: You must have some hard copies of design plans for that amount of money?

L. Lessard: No, everything is up to the state's process of looking at the bridge and figuring out where and what the defects are.

Dr. Shankle: Just remember that a big chunk of that money was to quickly get ready for the bid to get out.

L. Lessard: The documents we have now are to stabilize and repair the bridge. The bid we received was way over and that is why we canceled that part of it. We only had 1 bid because of the time constraints the state had against it. They have a price for removing it, stabilizing and rebuilding it, taking it down and putting up a utility bridge to hold the sewer, and a walking bridge to hold the sewer line.

J. Sullivan: Is this \$96,000 above what has been spent?

L. Lessard: No, that includes what has been spent. Once this is done we should know which route to take and then it will go out to bid again.

D. Winterton: Is the Sewer Commission paying for any of the engineering cost?

L. Lessard: I met with them on Monday and presented them with their part of the bill – \$6200. They will reimburse us for that amount. The additional fee would be \$4,000 but they have their own contract with CMA so that amount will not be included.

Roll Call

N. Comai – Yes
A. Jennings – Yes
S. Orr – Yes
R. Duhaime – Yes
T. Lizotte – Yes
J. Levesque – Yes
D. Winterton – Yes
J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

NEW BUSINESS

a. 14 – 099 Business Retention and Expansion Program

Dr. Shankle: This is one of the things we talked about at the last meeting that the Economic Development Committee was interested in doing. You have a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding with UNH describing the scope of the program. This would give them direction for most of next year and get more integrated into the business community under a program that has had national success.

N. Comai motioned to authorize the Town Administrator to enter into a contract with UNH Cooperative Extension in the amount of \$1,500 for development of a Business Retention and Expansion Program for the Town of Hooksett. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

S. Orr: We are not hiring UNH Cooperative Extension to do the outreach; we are hiring them to train and mentor the Economic Development Committee to be able to do that?

Dr. Shankle: Yes, they are providing the survey instrument, much the same way they did with the Community Profile event. Members or volunteers for the Economic Development Committee would do the survey.

S. Orr: The staff report says "They will call on businesses and interview the owners to discuss their needs." Who is "they" referring to?

Dr. Shankle: The Economic Development Committee.

S. Orr: Will the Cooperative Extension accompany them on some visits? To what extent does the \$1500 cover mentorship after initial training?

Dr. Shankle: *(Read from Section 1b of the Memorandum of Understanding)* I remember them saying they would possibly go out with them.

S. Orr: I see drafting and development of the research report within 45 days. Is there a time limit on this agreement with the Cooperative Extension as to how long they will work with the Economic Development Committee or as long as it's needed?

Dr. Shankle: As long as needed; it depends on how many volunteers they get to do it. To be statistically valid, they need so many businesses to be visited. It depends on how quickly that can be done. That is up to the committee if they can get the help.

Roll Call

S. Orr - Yes

A. Jennings - Yes

J. Levesque - Yes

R. Duhaime - Yes

D. Winterton - Yes

T. Lizotte - Yes

N. Comai - Yes

J. Sullivan - Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

J. Levesque: ZBA met last night and resolved a few cases. One was a family wanting to build a house on Phyllis Ave. It was a paper street on a subdivision; used as a driveway for the furthest property for the past 20 years. The lot was situated such that the lot in the back had 3 sides and the people in the back would have gained extra land and put the adjacent lot's garage further away. They could do it but to change the lot boundary they needed a variance which was granted. Another issue was regarding a local contractor who was there for a cease and desist order from the Code Enforcement Officer for running a construction business in a residential area. They decided if they didn't overturn it he couldn't run his business there at all. They granted it with the understanding that he can only do the administrative part out of his house. There was a stipulation that he had to let Matt know when he was doing a personal project with business equipment. The Scarpettis returned to ask for a variance for wetlands crossing and a special exception for a wetlands impact. Site walk is Saturday, December 6 at 8:30 am on Edgewater Dr. You are welcome to attend.

N. Comai: Does ZBA have authority to grant something regarding wetlands?

J. Levesque: Conservation has already voted 3-1 in favor of this, so we have to go out and look at it. It's not a wetlands, just an area that gets wet. There are 2 people in opposition – Plourde Sand and Gravel and the last resident on Edgewater Dr. Everyone else is for it. There are going to be 5 two-bedroom houses addressed to empty-nesters. It will be a condo association. They still have to go to the Planning Board.

S. Orr: I want to go back to the construction business in the residential area. I want to make sure I heard you correctly.

J. Levesque: If he brings equipment home to work on his yard, he is allowed to do that.

S. Orr: He can use business equipment for personal use?

J. Levesque: Yes, he just can't store equipment there; he has another location that he works out of.

D. Winterton: Planning Board met Monday and it was only 14 minutes long; we had 3 easy items.

J. Sullivan: Old Town Hall met virtually with the architect and they presented other suggestions for possible layouts; each aspect will be broken out by cost. Once we get that preliminary information we want to have some public input but we may want to have it as part of a Town Council meeting, which will give Council more info also, possibly in January.

K. Rosengren: We get the construction cost estimates in December so probably January/February timeframe.

J. Sullivan: Some thoughts are to provide a kitchen, bathroom, stage – looking to recreate the stage from around 1928 based on research from old town reports. Whatever we do, we will come back for public input.

J. Levesque: The special exception on the Scarpetti property was to allow driveway to impact wetlands of 925 sq ft; special exception to allow a conservation subdivision of 13.62 acres where 20 acres is required.

J. Sullivan: Moose Plate Grant – we are still looking for a tin ceiling restoration company. Hope to get that done by the spring to do some demolition and renovate in stages. We will have more info and a public input session.

N. Comai: Union negotiations are ongoing and moving forward.

S. Orr: Hooksett Youth Achiever outreach – I have yet to compile a mailing list that will be a great outreach; I've asked Donna to complete filling in information that I did not have time to do. It will be comprehensive when complete, and we hope to send out a mailing soon.

R. Duhaime: I missed the sewer meeting but Leo reported on that. I wanted to mention that John Turbyne passed away – he was always civically-minded and will be missed.

J. Sullivan: Yes, he was on Conservation, Budget, Planning, and Robie's Preservation; I was going to offer a moment of silence at our next meeting. There are no services planned. We are losing a lot of good people and we want good people to replace them. Our sympathies go out to his family.

A. Jennings: Nothing to report.

T. Lizotte: Nothing to report.

PUBLIC INPUT

Marc Miville, 42 Main St: I'm also saddened to hear about John Turbyne. I'm not sure if I mentioned that David Ross is the Council alternate for Budget and Amy Boilard is the school representative. For the Economic Development program – you mentioned you were seeking volunteers/nominees on the committee. I'm wondering if you could speak to the procedure to be nominated and/or have volunteers for that program.

J. Sullivan: I don't believe we have established that at this point.

Dr. Shankle: Economic Development is having a meeting next Tuesday and will discuss that.

J. Sullivan: We will let you know once we have an update.

***T. Lizotte motioned to adjourn at 8:15pm. Seconded by J. Levesque.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

NOTE: The Town website www.hooksett.org may have attachments to these Town Council minutes for documents referred to in the minutes, reading file material, and/or ancillary documents that the Town Council Chair has signed as agent to expend as a result of the Council's prior approval of the documents.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney
Recording Clerk



Memorandum of Understanding
Business Retention and Expansion Program

1. UNH Cooperative Extension

We, UNH Cooperative Extension (UNHCE), agree to provide the following information, facilitation, and assistance to enable the town of **Hooksett** to form a Business Retention and Expansion (BR&E) Program Leadership Team and Taskforce, to engage community residents and businesses in this community in a visitation program, which will entail a business survey aimed at identifying issues and concerns, as well as, examine opportunities to strengthen the local business environment. The findings from the visitation survey will be summarized in a report, which will be the basis for the development and implementation of an action plan for the town of **Hooksett**. For its part in the program, UNH Cooperative Extension agrees to provide the following:

- a. Informational materials to guide the community in implementation of the UNHCE BR&E program
- b. Guidance, consultation, and support to the Program Leadership Team and Taskforce to implement the BR&E program, which includes:
 1. Facilitating the development of the Leadership Team and Taskforce.
 2. Training Leadership Team, Taskforce and business visitors on conducting business visitations.
 3. Providing the survey instrument to be used for the business visitations and analyzing and summarizing the survey results
 4. Development and drafting of the research report within 45 days of the completion of the business visitations.
 5. Facilitation of the BR&E retreat and development of the economic development strategy & goals.
 6. Participation in project team meetings on a quarterly basis (as needed).

2. Town of Hooksett

We, the Town Hooksett, agree to the following:

- a. Provide overall organizational support for the creation of the Leadership Team, Taskforce and the recruitment of visitors from the community, survey businesses, and provide completed survey to UNH Cooperative Extension for tabulation.
- b. Provide space for meetings, note taking, all BR&E related mailings, copies and ancillary meeting materials
- c. Maintain communication and active participation with UNH Cooperative Extension throughout all three steps of the Business Retention and Expansion program process.
- d. Ensure that all publicity and promotional materials concerning the Business Retention and Expansion program process contain the following Acknowledgment: **“This Business Retention and Expansion Program event is facilitated by UNH Cooperative Extension in collaboration and sponsorship of the Town of Hooksett and Hooksett Economic Development Committee.**
- e. Submit a check in the amount of **\$1,500** to the UNH Cooperative Extension (i.e. BR&E



materials, travel expenses, report writing, etc.). This fee is due within 30 days of signing this agreement. **Please make out a check payable to the University of New Hampshire (Memo section: UNHCE BR&E Program) and mail it, along with the MOU, to:**

Andre L. Garron, Economic Development Specialist
University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension
204B Nesmith Hall, 131 Main Street
Durham, NH 03824

3. Agreement:

Town of Hooksett
Authorized Representative


Signature

Date

UNH Cooperative Extension
Authorized Representative

Signature

Date