

**TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, March 12, 2014**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:35 pm.

**ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE**

Chairman James Sullivan, Donald Winterton, David Ross (8:20 pm), Todd Lizotte, Adam Jennings, Susan Orr, Robert Duhaime, James Levesque, Nancy Comai, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

a. Swearing in of Firefighter

J. Sullivan: Cassie Chamberlain comes to us from the Nottingham, NH Fire Dept. She completed her training in 2007, is an Advanced EMT and has her Associates degree in Fire Safety. She is also a staff Fire Instructor at the NH Fire Academy.

*Chief Williams and Asst. Chief Jore swear in Cassie Chamberlain.*

b. Public Hearing on Main Street Bridge

J. Sullivan: David Scott, In-house Design Chief, Bureau of Bridge Design, NH DOT

D. Scott: Jason Tremblay, senior project engineer for project is also with me tonight. The purpose of the project is the rehab of the bridge over the Merrimack River. This is a public information meeting to inform you of the project. We hope to advertise in the fall of this year and begin construction in the spring/summer/fall of next year. There is the potential for significant pedestrian and motor vehicle traffic. Jason will mention alternatives for traffic control. We are also looking for community input. You can contact me via email or phone with any questions or comments. *“The Bureau of Environment of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation has the responsibility of investigating the potential impacts that our projects will have the surrounding natural, cultural, and social environments. Identifying key resources early in the project development process enables the Department to avoid or minimize impacts as design proceeds. In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Department is in the process of reviewing the project area to determine if there are historical or archaeological resources within the area that would be impacted by the construction of this project. Historic properties can include buildings and structures fifty years or older as well as archaeological sites. In complement to this review, we are asking that if anyone has concerns about historical and/or archaeological resources in or immediately adjacent to the project area, they bring them to our attention tonight or contact Jon Evans, the Environmental Manager assigned to the project at 603-271-3226. Section 106 regulations offer owners of historic properties directly affected by the project or agencies that possess a direct interest in the historical resources, and opportunity to become more involved in an advisory role during project development. They may become what are known as Consulting Parties to the Section 106 process. Those interested should indicate so in writing to the Federal Highway Administration. Jon Evans can be contacted for more information on becoming a Consulting Party. In regard to potential impacts to other resources, this project is not expected to involve substantial impacts to noise levels, air quality, hazardous materials, or floodplains. As part of the project, the Department will secure all necessary environmental permits prior to construction, taking into consideration erosion and sediment controls.*

This bridge was built in 1976.

J. Tremblay: The bridge is located on Main St, over the Merrimack River, Riverside St and B&M Railroad. It is approx. 675 feet long, 42 feet wide, with 2 12-foot travel lanes, 2 5-foot shoulders, and a 5-foot sidewalk. It is a concrete deck on steel girders and is on a horizontal and vertical curve. The scope of work is to remove pavement membrane on the existing deck. We will check for deterioration and do partial and full deck repairs. Joint in north and south side showing age and those would be replaced. There are areas that go over Riverside St and the railroad. We would put up screening to protect those areas that aren't over the river. 2 approaches on the north end of the bridge will be replaced as well. This is on a state owned right of way so no private property will be affected. Water will not be impacted but we may have to work around an electrical conduit on the sidewalk. No impact to wetlands so no permits are needed. Traffic control is the main thing. We are trying to maintain the bridge with 2 lanes of traffic. With 34' between curves, the lanes were not desirable. We tried to remove the sidewalk and would only gain a couple feet and the cost/time would increase. Another option is to close the bridge

entirely but the detours seemed too long and unacceptable. The last option was to put a 14' lane in phase 1 and one in phase 2 to only allow southbound traffic and detour the northbound traffic (or vice versa) or alternate traffic with signals. There is a potential during peak travel hours to back up traffic. In the second phase, the sidewalk would be impacted so no pedestrian access during that phase. The construction duration is longer than if we shut the entire bridge down but not as long as doing it in 3 phases. This option is \$1.4M and takes one construction season (April to October). We are thinking about this option as the most feasible but it's still open for discussion.

D. Scott: With traffic on phase 1, you still have sidewalk access. When we move to phase 2, the sidewalk will be temporarily closed as contractors are replacing the expansion joints.

David Hess: The preference would be to have single lanes with traffic in both directions. I think that is most optimal in terms of convenience. I realize the traffic situation could be difficult as well as turning from Main onto the connector road, but I assume you could figure some way to work that out. I suspect that would be the preference of the Hooksett people.

Tom Walsh: I do agree; that is probably the second best choice. I share your concern with the signals. Why is the 34' not desirable?

D. Scott: The first alternative (don't take off sidewalk), the lane was only 9 ½ feet wide with traffic in both directions. You'd be likely to lose mirrors on big trucks. I wouldn't want to try that here.

T. Walsh: Screening – I'm concerned about the aesthetics. Are you looking at screens with big curves, and is that only over Riverside St or the whole bridge?

D. Scott: It would be 9.5' tall and only over Riverside St and the railroad tracks, not the whole bridge. We have not overlooked there is a fire station there. We will put temporary signals there.

T. Rainier: My property is off Merrimack St and there is a tremendous amount of traffic in the morning going toward 3A and coming back over the bridge in the evening. That's the artery to Allenstown and Pembroke. Has there been consideration of a sign in Allenstown at 28 and 3 saying bridge construction and advising delays and encouraging them to go to 93 and for the returning traffic? Main St and College Park Dr is pretty hectic right now. Seeing it every day those are my suggestions.

D. Scott: We expect an extensive sign package. We haven't formalized anything but we have that in our plan.

J. Tremblay: There are 6500 vehicles north and south bound each day, so approximately 13,000 per day.

Chief Williams: With Station 1, we do travel that bridge frequently.

D. Scott: It's an octagon system. We haven't worked out the location of the lights yet.

Chief Williams: So we can control them north and south? As long as at least one lane is open.

T. Praisol: I share concerns with regards to screens. Have there been problems in the past? I wonder if it's necessary.

D. Scott: Screens on the non-sidewalk side will prevent plows from knocking snow onto Riverside St. I haven't had a town say they don't want that. If you'd put that in a letter, we would be happy to consider it.

Carrie Hyde: Timing – fall of next year? So April 2015 would be when it closes and go through October?

D. Scott: Yes, it will impact school bus traffic.

C. Hyde: The traffic on the east side of the bridge will go into College park Dr. That is huge around 8 am weekdays. The sidewalk closure in the second phase - during the summer months, a lot of kids use that to go from the west side to the east side because that is where the playground is. You might want to make it so that the sidewalk is not closed during the summer months (June through August). The

screens, if the town puts them up, you want to put them on the river. Kids jump off the bridge into the river so you might want to put them along the whole length of the bridge to keep kids from doing that. If you alternate traffic on both sides, divert big rigs to help alleviate traffic on 3A going across the river. Traffic will get backed up on 3A in the evenings, coming from the south. If you were able to do the 2 lanes (9.5') you could do it if you divert the big rigs (dump trucks, etc.) It's not often school busses come by at the same time. Some people have capped it at the school bus weight and nothing over.

D. Scott: We considered shutting the big rigs out of the equation and we have no confidence we would be able to keep them out of the flow.

Doris Sorel, Hooksett Garden Club: We have a beautification program and we have put up flower boxes on the bridge. Will screening prevent us from doing that? We only put them on the non-sidewalk side.

D. Scott: We will have to consider that. We did not think of that. We can get in touch with you.

Karen Lessard: I would reiterate what Mr. Hess said that it would be better to not close off any traffic and use lights. 8 busses cross the bridge in the a.m. and p.m. so it would be a massive undertaking.

D. Hess: You don't think you could control large rigs going across the bridge. Signage about local trucks only is pretty effective. Why wouldn't you think signage wouldn't be adhered to?

D. Scott: Just from prior experience.

C. Hyde: Regarding the big rigs, it should work if you put signs far enough on 3A and 28. Even putting signs on the highways letting them know the bridge is closed to large trucks. If you put that size is an issue, they won't chance it. Most of them will communicate amongst themselves to keep them from doing that.

T. Walsh: If you were to restrict the size, I think the 2-lane, 2-direction would work. Regarding screens...it would save a ton of money to not do it and it's also part of our historic district. I think those screens will take away from it.

N. Comai: Reiterating signage should do it.

S. Orr: I understand the value of screens in some locations. Since I've lived here we haven't had any issues with snow or mischievous kids. That area of town is historical; I understand safety, but considering where the bridge is and what we are trying to do regarding preservation, I would vote for no screening. In terms of that being our historical center, I would say no to the screening.

R. Duhaime: The connector road has brought more traffic into this bridge. DOT has handed over Manchester St to the city of Concord. If they start construction on Manchester St that would impact us even more...maybe that should be coordinated. All the construction on DW Highway should be done before this starts. Hooksett has never asked for a waiver of toll booths but it forces a lot of traffic on our local roads and causes heavy traffic on all the side roads. If you were to give a discount to surrounding towns, you would encourage them to take tolls and avoid the traffic in Hooksett. 38 years with no fence, I have heard of nothing negative. I don't think putting a screen on that bridge would make you a lot of friends.

J. Levesque: When we were doing the 93 project, there were all kinds of questions but it worked like clockwork. Local people will find alternate routes. As far as the sidewalk, is it possible to put jersey barriers in the middle of the bridge and they could walk down the middle?

D. Scott: With the lane configuration, there isn't enough room for that.

J. Levesque: If we got the weigh station to be open, we'd make more money on tolls.

T. Lizotte: What is the purpose of screens? Debris?

D. Scott: To keep kids from throwing things over the rail and the snow falling over the other side onto Riverside St.

T. Lizotte: Where do we stand with the light on Hackett Hill? Is that going to come up?

J. Sullivan: They are looking at coming off the tolls and putting lights there. I'm not sure of timing. So you might want to check on that.

D. Winterton: I also think we shouldn't spend a lot of money to fix a problem we don't have. I'd hope you would devise a plan to keep it open both ways. Is it legal for them to go over a signed bridge? I'd think with proper signage and enforcement, I don't want the 99% of people to suffer for the 1% of people doing something illegal. I'd think if it's a state project, we could have some state troopers around. Even if we had lights and flaggers during high volume times that that could be arranged. I'd hope we could leave it open both ways. If trucks are the problem, let's deal with the problem.

R. Duhaime: Are state employees doing the job?

D. Scott: No this is going to be a contractor.

T. Walsh: Staging – have you thought about that? Across the street from the store and fire station is the tree we decorate for Christmas.

D. Scott: I was unaware the state owned that land. It's up to the contractor to find his own staging area.

C. Hyde: The timing of the signal lights turning off 3A going east toward the bridge so the light will let the cars off 3A going to Main St so there won't be a pile up (if it goes to one lane). I think that would help so the lights would turn green at the same time. If a light ends up at Hackett Hill, you might be able to trigger that one. The other thing is we have an old railroad bridge – could we make that a pedestrian bridge? They could walk across the old bridge. Who owns the Lilac Bridge? The town?

J. Sullivan: Yes, the sewer line is under that.

D. Scott: We'd appreciate a formal response from the town that will help us go forward with the front office. The other thing is we have a municipal work zone agreement. There are some towns that have ordinances that say when there is work done on town roads, town police are responsible for traffic control. It's DOT's understanding that DOT is responsible. We will call in town resources if necessary. We'd ask the town to sign an agreement saying we are on the same page. I'll leave it with the Town Administrator and if you have further questions, you can contact me.

J. Sullivan: [DScott@dot.state.nh.us](mailto:DScott@dot.state.nh.us). Thank you very much for coming.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

a. Public: 02/26/2014

***T. Lizotte motioned to approve the public minutes with edits. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote unanimously in favor.***

b. Non-public: 02/26/2014

***J. Levesque motioned to approve the non-public minutes. Seconded by T. Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.***

#### **AGENDA OVERVIEW**

Chair Sullivan provided an overview of tonight's agenda.

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

a. Letter of credit release: Ritchie Brothers \$445,913.55

b. Check release: GE Aviation \$25,500.10

c. Donation from Heritage Commission: \$500

***T. Lizotte motioned to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by N. Comai. Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

- Sewer bill continuing to move along; minor changes in house and going back to Senate; hoping for signature by end of March
- Meeting with Mr. Scarpetti on Friday re: land along the river
- Looking at new software for community development that will help us get a better handle on what permits are being done and when. Any property in town will start to get a history of what is being done.
- Joanne and I met with Rep from UNH Cooperative Extension to work on community input project.
- Starting to work on getting the word out on the budget.
- The Hooksett Community Development Department has a Facebook page – this will be updated and give people a chance to have input.

### **PUBLIC INPUT: 15 Minutes**

David Hess: I wanted to let you know the Conservation Commission has received a total of \$130,000 and \$150,000 in grants from third parties to go toward the Merrimack riverfront project. This reduces our funding to approximately \$170,000. We have leveraged \$1 of town funds into \$3 of funds from other sources.

### **NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS**

- a. Planning Board Alternate: Michael DiBitetto Expiration 6/15
- b. Planning Board Alternate: Muamer Durakovic Expiration 6/14

J. Sullivan: We have a letter that the Planning Board has recommended both of them.

***D. Winterton motioned to nominate Michael DiBitetto and Muamer Durakovic to the Planning Board as alternates with an expiration date of 6/15 and 6/14 respectively. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

J. Sullivan: We will appoint at our next meeting.

***D. Winterton motioned to waive the rules because there is an important meeting coming up that requires a quorum. Seconded by T. Lizotte.***

T. Lizotte: I think it's more than justified.

D. Winterton: There are no alternates right now.

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

***J. Levesque motioned to appoint both to the Planning Board in alternate positions. Seconded by A. Jennings.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Winterton: I'd like to congratulate them both and remind them they need to be sworn in before Monday's meeting at the Town Administrator's Office.

### **SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS**

- a. TF Moran Engineering: Hackett Hill Road Improvements

Nick Golon: We are working with DOT and town of Hooksett on the Hackett Hill Rd. intersection, and I want to give an update on the process, solicit feedback from Council and the public and move toward design alternatives. The Rte-3A/Hackett Hill Rd. intersection has heavy commuter volumes and a high crash rate. The project would address capacity and safety issues at this intersection. As part of the evaluation, we had a meeting with DOT to discuss appropriate options. Looking at the existing intersection, there are some components that make it difficult to redesign. As you come off the toll both, the sight line is fairly limited. There are also environmental considerations – the Merrimack River is on the other side of 3A. The geometry to the existing intersection and topographical features, there is a tremendous slope on all sides. Proximity of adjacent driveways of the farm stand has been a sticking

point. Is there an opportunity to relocate it on Hackett Hill Rd? We have come to a determination that the driveway can be relocated via an expedited means. If there is a steady flow of traffic, you are sitting there for a considerable amount of time. We considered a roundabout and how it could potentially fit. Signaling this intersection – 2 eastbound left hand turns and 2 northbound routes – adding more turning lanes on Hackett Hill and additional thru lanes on 3A. We took the roundabout design with 2-lanes and made it 1 lane. It takes up a lot of real estate. Trying to push it back up the hill can become problematic. We were able to find a geometric fit but with tremendous difficulty. We also evaluated the previous option to have a single lane on the south and 2 on the north. It's a balancing act of capacity and volume. We'd like to remedy both of those as much as possible. You are increasing cue length with signals. We looked at endangered species in the roundabout and modification of signaled section. There was another set of revisions requested by DOT to take out the existing rebuilt intersection and revising the center section to abutting property owners. We also looked at a new plan, concept A-7. Leave geometry essentially the same, with a small widening of the right hand turn and add one northbound thru lane. You could make a left off 3A and the driveway would be entirely relocated onto Hackett Hill. Several positives and negatives – you are not fixing capacity issues by not adding lanes. The three designs are A-5, A-6 and A7. A-6 is the roundabout, is the most expensive, takes the most amount of area and impacts abutters. Is it feasible? Yes. But it seems difficult to be successful from a construction standpoint. The level of service is good, but practicality doesn't seem appropriate with constructability and cost. The A-5 concept provides excellent levels of service; costs less than roundabout but still more expensive than what we have determined to be the most desirable option. The option of 2 northbound thru lanes, dedicated left hand turn lane for Hackett Hill, and a dedicated thru lane southbound. In order to pursue this design, you would need culvert extensions on both sides. Those can be very expensive. We are still in the design phase and it appears it can be repaired and extended instead of fully replaced. This is our breadwinner from service standpoint, but cost isn't the most efficient. A-7 leaves Hackett Hill Rd in its existing configuration. There would be a left and right turn lane on 3A and dedicated turn lane off Hackett Hill Rd and only requires culvert extension on one side and significantly less land to be purchased. The level of service is favorable for all but eastbound left hand turn. You are talking about going from 30 seconds of delay to 100 seconds of delay. With any signal configurations, there is the potential to see cueing. We see some cues extending southerly. Our only concern is potential of spill back from Main St. We want to make sure this won't create any negative impact on what we are trying to do. We are suggesting moving forward with this design. It's about \$600,000 less than roundabout and \$200-\$300,000 less than full scale lane additions. It will provide safety and capacity benefits but not to the same extent of adding thru lanes.

R. Duhaime: Head's Pond and DW highway traffic study – funneling. It shortens the cue but every intersection after that will fail. They all funnel from 2 lanes to 1 lane and there is less time for anyone else to sneak in. I don't think a traffic light will improve the situation. A lot of this is impact money so it will not cost the state as much. If one car would allow a car to go the roundabout might work. The other thing is a roundabout slows traffic on 3A. Cueing will not work – there is not enough length to time lights to not end up with a back-up heading into the village. We pay our tolls and still sit in traffic. I prefer the roundabout. As long as we use the state land, there should be surplus sand to be sold.

N. Golon: The southwest and northwest quadrants are owned by someone else so there would need to be coordination with them. We think we have resolved that. Providing access from the roundabout gave us a little issue. It becomes very difficult to build this option. It's an undertaking, just to signalize the intersection. We are trying to weigh all the pros and cons. If we put in the roundabout and it works smoothly, we still have to take into account what is happening at the Main St intersection. They will be cued all the way back into the intersection. A light will provide minimal additional cueing.

R. Duhaime: You'd have to put a stop sign on the Hackett Hill end like at the Massabesic Circle.

T. Lizotte: We came up with a simple light. As far as going forward, we have the money and I guess the light is what we are going to get.

R. Duhaime: This problem isn't going away. The state will have to spend money but there will be future capital from some of the state land that is there. We're going to pay for this and the state will gain in the long run.

N. Golon: Future build out is included with the traffic study.

J. Levesque: I've lived on Hackett Hill for 35 years and seen quite a change in traffic. Anything will help. Sometimes it's backed up to the toll booth. Coming north getting on to Hackett Hill, you only have one lane to cross. It's almost impossible to cross 2 lanes. Most local people go down to Cross Rd and get out that way. We need to do something, it gets worse every year.

N. Golon: We wanted to get a feel for what this group was leaning toward. We felt concept A-7 best fits the bill.

S. Orr: It's hard to make an informed decision when there are no hard numbers, there are just vague statements. The roundabout makes the most sense, but it's the most costly.

N. Golon: One of the biggest concerns with the roundabout is how it gets constructed and how costly that can become.

S. Orr: We need to consider the long term. Traffic has increased in the last 10 or 15 years and I assume that will continue. We need to consider seriously a fix that will work long term. I'm not sure adding a turning lane is a long term solution to that intersection. We need to figure what is the safest and best investment.

D. Winterton: Is A-7 a project or band aid?

N. Golon: It's a project. One of the resolutions we need to come up with is a safety issue. You are now providing an appropriate amount of time for someone to turn off Hackett Hill Rd.

D. Winterton: If we do this and in 5 years from now, is there a step 2 to A-7 to get us to A-5?

N. Golon: There is some level of master planning. We haven't fully mapped that out; if this seems like a reasonable solution to safety issue and some improved capacity, is there opportunity to further improve this? I think that does exist. Regarding long term evaluation – I think some additional coordination needs to be done to optimize the two lights to work together (Main St). I realize the geometry of that intersection is very small. Issues at that intersection will worsen the ability of this intersection to work appropriately. Will what is happening on Main St be detrimental to this intersection?

R. Duhaime: There were no improvements to the Main St intersection when we were talking to Cabela's. They were spending all this money to make all these improvements because they were going to get the tolls. I don't see how a light without choreographing with another light is going to make sense.

Nick: Funneling – once they go through the intersection, they merge back together and follow their path.

R. Duhaime: You are stacking traffic either way.

J. Sullivan: Is it this board's decision?

N. Golon: Your recommendations go to DOT and are weighed.

S. Orr: What is the separation of responsibility financially for this project? What's the percentage?

Dr. Shankle: I don't know but if you don't want the project done, you can say you don't want to spend any money.

N. Golon: You pay 1/3 and DOT pays 2/3 of cost.

Dr. Shankle: I don't think we have enough money for the roundabout.

N. Golon: It's about \$1.5M for roundabout and \$900,000 with what we are recommending. We want your feedback and will apply it to our design and present to the state.

J. Sullivan: A lot of the issues we thought 3A had were more prudent than the hourglass.

T. Lizotte: We all understand that T.F. Moran works for us. We say we want A-7, state tells us A-5 or we pay for it ourselves. Do we want the light and hope the ramifications are not there? Put a tie in with the light at the Main St intersection.

R. Duhaime: We are paying for engineering. It's not benefitting the town of Hooksett, but the state. If we can get our state reps to help us that would be good. They have been sending trucks down our local roads...there is no discount for us dealing with traffic. We get a large amount of traffic that we have to deal with on a daily basis. We are divided by a river that has a few bridges and 3 highways going through it. They are forcing traffic through town to avoid the toll and now we are going to help the state save money? Exit 10 was a TIFT district. We waived all taxes on that for several years to pay for improvements and state granted a limited access highway ramp when they sold surplus property for the state budget.

***T. Lizotte motioned to extend the discussion by 5 minutes. Seconded by N. Comai.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

T. Lizotte: Mr. Duhaime brought up a good point and I'm more inclined to support turning this back over to the state.

***Consensus to allow resident to speak.***

Gene McCarthy: 23 Barberry, Hooksett. This is an important issue and I have never seen any public notice of this. Has it been on any Planning Board or Town Council meetings?

Dr. Shankle: We've talked about this for the last few years. The hourglass was higher priority but this Council has talked about this several times.

G McCarthy: I've been waiting to hear about this publicly. I came to hear about the bridge and saw this on the agenda. I don't know that this has been publicized to the public.

J. Sullivan: We can always increase public input and we did follow proper procedure in posting. We have to gauge when we maximize public input for one issue over another.

T. Lizotte: We have discussed this several times but this is the first time we have seen plans.

Dr. Shankle: If you looked at the staff report, this was about getting \$8,000 so TF Moran can move forward.

G. McCarthy: I'm a highway engineer and pursued this project. I'm not here as a professional, but a resident who drives this often. I hope you put this off to get more input. I personally think it would be a travesty to put a light here. I don't think it's in the best interest of the town to continue putting up signals here. Cost is a big issue. Roundabout is the solution. It's a difficult site and does cause some issues, but to do something in the interim for less money we should be looking ahead at doing it right. The signal will be there forever. Going back is going to be problematic. It will be a problem with the Main St signal; you have to do something in the interim to make that function. Put a roundabout there too. Slow traffic down.

Dr. Shankle: Let's say this is no build or light. Where do we go with that? Will you rather see nothing happen as opposed to a light?

J. Sullivan: We need to bring this back up in the future to discuss because we don't want to make a decision now.

N. Golon: We do need to have a public meeting in order to move forward.

J. Sullivan: We should have a more defined public meeting.



Dr. Shankle: You are here to get change orders to finish the work and it came to you to approve the money.

D. Winterton: Does this \$8200 come out of impact fees?

Dr. Shankle: Yes.

***D. Winterton motioned to approve 2 change orders to the TF Moran contract. Change order #1 in the amount of \$4,482 includes additional alternative analysis and endangered species evaluation. Change order #2 in the amount of \$3,891 includes additional alternative refinement. Seconded by T. Lizotte.***

N. Comai: With the changes, how does the endangered species get affected if we put the light in vs. the roundabout?

N. Golon: It's needed regardless of what you choose.

### **Roll Call**

S. Orr – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

N. Comai – Yes

R. Duhaime – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

D. Ross - Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

### **15 MINUTE RECESS**

### **OLD BUSINESS**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

a. 14 – 022 2014 Tax Deeding: Tax Collector

Kim Blichmann, Tax Collector: I'm here to provide an overview of the process coming up this year. We issue tax deeds every year. I submit a list to Council to be reviewed and those properties will be inspected for environmental concerns or impacts to the town. Then on my tax deed date, I will be given directions to tax deed the property at Council's direction or tax deed waivers will be signed. 2010 tax liens are eligible to be deeded on May 28 and 2011 tax liens will be deeded on Aug 27. I'll be coming to you for 2 separate years that are eligible to be deeded. Unpaid taxes for prior year go to deed the following year. In 2014, I will be executing a tax lien on 2013 and 2 years and a day from my tax lien is when it becomes eligible for tax collector deed. Currently for 2010 we have 73 parcels that are eligible as of right now; for 2011 we have 110 parcels as of today.

N. Comai: Can I suggest that you put in the paper the general steps you just mentioned to allow the tax payers to know what that is since last year was the first year we actually enforced it. We don't want 73 units in front of us. We can nip it in the bud and educate the public to the process.

D. Winterton: The 73 and 110 are separate properties?

K. Blichmann: Some of them do overlap. They will have already been reviewed in 2010 so won't be looked at again for 2011.

T. Lizotte: How many parcels do we tax in the entire town?

K. Blichmann: I don't know. I think we send out over 6000 bills.

T. Lizotte: When we talk about 73 out of 6000, just bear in mind that it sounds like a pretty good tax paying compliance.

S. Orr: Seems smaller than what we dealt with when we first did this. What is your process?

K. Blichmann: I send out a notice of delinquency, required by law, whether current or old taxes. It does note that if it is not paid by 5/28 it's eligible for tax collectors deed. Then I'll send out a notice of intent to tax lien the current 2013 outstanding property taxes and that has the same verbiage about the upcoming tax collectors deed. Minimum of 30 days prior to tax collectors deed I send out another notice explaining the process saying if the amount is not paid by whichever date, it's eligible for tax collectors deed.

S. Orr: Do you define deeding to the tax payers?

K. Blichmann: The forms are standard from the system. There is a slight definition that could be clearer but I'm restricted by what I can put on that form. Along with what Ms. Comai said about putting it in the paper will help people understand.

Dr. Shankle: We started out last year with a big number and a lot of people did come in. I contacted every person last year and hope to do that again this year. There is an issue regarding tax deeding that Kim is scheduled to talk to you about in non-public.

b. 14 – 023 Quarterly Report: Finance Director, Christine Soucie

C. Soucie: When you look at the total operating budget, we are 50% spent which is consistent. The budgets for each of the fiscal years have gone like a roller coaster. In 11-12, budget was \$14M; Petersbrook property was in there and we were still paying on the Safety Center. 12-13, it was \$13.8M because those 2 were removed. This year we are up to \$14.2M due to the revaluation and NH retirement (every 2 years has a change in their rates to employer.) On the revenue side, we are consistent again. 59% collected (We get a large chunk of meals and rooms revenue that comes in December). Admin department is trending at 74% where it should be. Fire rescue is 51% spent, where they should be. I talked to the Chief and he feels he is going to be on budget this year, as he does every year. Police is 44% spent. I talked to that Chief and he will be on budget also. Public Works is 45% spent. As of 2/28 they are at 68% spent. There was a huge increase from December 31 to Feb 28. I talked to DPW director and we are watching his budget closely. He has a little flexibility in his paving line. Recycling & Transfer is 40% spent; they are coming in under budget as expected. Motor vehicles revenue is up again, second year in a row. There were an additional 448 new vehicles over last year. Interest and penalties is a little low because we haven't done the lien process. Building permits 85% collected, and should meet that budget. State revenue is on target. Ambulance – calls for service are level; expenditures are level at \$185,000 for each of the 2 years. The total collected is 78%, 82% in the prior year and 74% in the current year which averages to about 78%. Uncollected total is \$281,000. There is a process that collection people go through. Once it meets a certain threshold, it moves on to the collection agency. We haven't had very much luck with the collection agency.

N. Comai: Could you reiterate the last statement?

C. Soucie: They go to collections but what is going is harder to collect. No insurance, no addresses for people. It's hard to collect from those people. We are not receiving a lot of money from collections.

N. Comai: The collection agency is doing the job for us, but we can't collect from these people.

C. Soucie: For clarification, we have a billing agency that is collecting the 78%. What they can't collect moves over to the collection agency.

T. Lizotte: Are there numbers for ambulance for 2011?

C. Soucie: I don't have them. Prior to this for the first 6 months, the fire chief would probably have them, then Tri-Tech after that.

T. Lizotte: Gross commitments, contractual allowances. What is that?

C. Soucie: What Medicare won't pay.

R. Duhaime: I'm looking at professional services down \$5000, medical supplies down \$22,000 to \$14,000 and \$5000 more in OT.

C. Soucie: The bottom line is level.

T. Lizotte: Calls for service – 1447 calls. That is a good number of calls every day. I'm trying to look at that from the standpoint that we need to know when those calls are. The OT line is interesting. We need a little more breakdown. I'd like to revisit this as there is revenue being generated that is isolated from the general fund.

D. Ross: It was intended to be isolated. Jan 2012 is when they started the special revenue fund so there won't be any numbers prior. There will be some equipment they overbought and some things they under bought. I think there are some growing pains here. I'd say it's operating quite well, based on what we talked about when this first began.

C. Soucie: The Chief is thinking about replacing an ambulance in the next budget cycle.

D. Ross: On the OT, I think the staffing levels were not changed as a result of this service. They were utilizing the existing employees.

T. Lizotte: One of the things we talked about is a new fire station. A significant number of calls were ambulance calls. House fires were minimal, false alarms were significant. It was supposed to be self-funding. We pay \$185,000/year but it doesn't carry personnel. It's isolated.

c. 14 – 024 Budget Transfers: Finance Director

C. Soucie: We are reallocating health insurance lines between departments. Smaller departments had staff changes and the increase of 17% for second 6 months of the fiscal year. We are requesting \$60,000 be moved from Code Enforcement, Police Department, Parks and Rec, Recycling and Transfer and tax office to cover the shorted departments at the top.

**T. Lizotte motioned to approve the transfer of \$60,000 from health insurance lines which have available funds to cover shortfalls in other health insurance lines. Seconded by S. Orr. Vote unanimously in favor.**

C. Soucie: The motion earlier about the use of impact fees, I wasn't sure if it said to use the impact fees.

D. Ross: I don't think we can use impact fees for planning, but construction only.

C. Soucie: I would have to check into it. I don't know about using it for design.

Dr. Shankle: We've done it in the past.

C. Soucie: We have done it with the fire station.

**D. Winterton motioned to amend previous motion to add funding will come from roadway impact fees. Seconded by T. Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.**

C. Soucie: There were some questions about how donations are reported?

D. Ross: I think it was a suggestion as to where this money was deposited regarding fire department or police department. Does it go into general fund or a separate fund?

C. Soucie: It goes into the general fund as deferred revenue outside of budget. When a donation is received for a specific purchase, when the department purchases it, the revenue is reported in the general fund so the revenue and expense are both there and there is no tax impact. If it's a donation to thank you, the chief will determine what it gets spent on so they hold on to it until there is a specific need.

D. Winterton: Have you requested consultants for upcoming health contract?

C. Soucie: The contract is up in December. We would start the process in June or July. Now we are doing property liability and workers' comp. We should have quotes back by April.

d. 14 – 025 Street Name approval

**S. Orr motioned to approve the proposed name of Hollow Drive at the location of 99 Mammoth Road, Hooksett. Seconded by J. Levesque.**

**Vote unanimously in favor.**

### **SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS**

T. Lizotte: The budget went through last week without too much public input. Budget committee chairman motioned to add stipends but was voted down because of timing. This stipend issue should be brought up again.

J. Levesque: Board of Assessors met and granted a few abatements and denied a few. ZBA met and Lilac Park asked for extension to next month. They approved the project but need to have a site plan. We met with applicant from SNHU regarding wetlands crossing which is going to have a site walk and a buffer impact on a wetland.

D. Ross: Conservation Committee met and SNHU was discussed. We examined plans and the road didn't present any concerns. Second single sheet plan was incomplete with drainage so we held off on that. Properties on Merrimack River – Bailey property is closed and we have 6.1 acres of cornfield. ARM grant submitted, anticipate receiving \$150,000; we received \$131,200 from Society of NH Forests. Commissioner Hess presented preliminary plan proposals for trails that are occupying his property along the Merrimack. Kiwanis members would like to partner with town in creation and maintenance of trails. Edgewater Dr – something we are holding back and waiting for a legal opinion. There is some confusion if the town can give up that right of way even if we vote to give it up. We need to check with counsel. Event we are trying to put together with SNHU will be in the fall – there were no openings at SNHU. Summit View showed updated plans with elimination of strip and was well received. On the maintenance proposals for Clay Pond we got a 4<sup>th</sup> response. We've chosen 2 to continue with to bring to Council

D. Winterton: Hooksett Youth Achiever meeting will be held Friday morning and will be announced at our next meeting. Planning Board worked with sign for the Lilac project. We sent it back to ZBA. We were in favor originally but they have to come back with a site plan. We had a session with the project that abuts Bow in terms of lots in Hooksett vs. Bow and consistency of development. Their discussion ended abruptly and Joanne has corresponded with them. We did have public hearings for zoning amendments but because of timing we weren't able to make any changes. There is a second public hearing on Monday.

J. Sullivan: Old Town Hall still waiting for hazmat report; nothing for Heritage Commission.

N. Comai: Records retention committee met and Todd is moving things forward. Scope of work is building a policy and moving it into the next stage and task town employees to follow the policy. Next meeting is April 23. It is still in draft mode but it's moving relatively quickly.

S. Orr: Nothing to report.

R. Duhaime: Sewer commission meeting – Planning Board needs to have a copy of the sewer map on the wall to know where the sewer is in town. They are still negotiating the sewer line with rest area. There are no charges for water line. We sell water to Pennichuck Water Works. When you add water to a commercial property, the water line is being sold. Moving ahead on the north rest area; got approval for a temporary lunch truck (restaurant not open until Feb 2015); liquor store opens in Nov. SNHPC meeting was comments from other towns about development and growth issues. New Boston and Deerfield have limited commercial aspects and are mostly residential. Deerfield cell tower was to help with Candia.

A. Jennings: Nothing to report.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

**NON-PUBLIC SESSION**

**NH RSA 91-A:3 II (a)** The dismissal, promotion, or compensation of any public employee or the disciplining of such employee, or the investigation of any charges against him or her,

**NH RSA 91-A:3 II (c)** Matters which, if discussed in public, would likely affect adversely the reputation of any person, other than a member of the public body itself.

***J. Sullivan motioned to enter non-public session at 9:14pm. Seconded by T. Lizotte.***

**Roll call**

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

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

***S. Orr motioned to extend the meeting at 9:30pm to 9:40pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to exit non-public at 9:40pm. Seconded by S. Orr.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to seal the non-public minutes of 3/12/14. Seconded by S. Orr.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to adjourn at 9:40pm. Seconded by S. Orr.***

***Vote unanimously in favor.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney