

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, April 23, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:34 pm.

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Adam Jennings, Nancy Comai, Donald Winterton, David Ross, James Levesque. Todd Lizotte, Susan Orr, Chairman James Sullivan

Missed: Robert Duhaime, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

a. Hooksett Youth Achiever of the Month

D. Winterton: We could award this every day but today we award this to a student from Londonderry HS. We've had students from Central, West, Bow, and now Londonderry. When we started this award, we said it would go to someone special. We've had a golfer, a cancer survivor, engineering student, all sorts of wonderful people. Today we have a versatile student. She plays volleyball, basketball, softball, is a member of the track and field team, and a member of a ski team. She is a member of her church youth group, works as a server for the community kitchen, she is known as the person to call if you need your garden tended, mail brought in and pets tended to while you are away. She is an innovator – member of the first pilot Best Buddies program at Londonderry HS. This is a wonderful achievement from our very special Hooksett Youth Achiever of the Month, Kathleen Murphy.

Presentation of certificate and pin.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Public: April 9, 2014

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the public minutes of April 9, 2014 with edits. Seconded by J. Levesque.

Vote unanimously in favor. N. Comai abstained due to prior absence.

b. Non-public: None

AGENDA OVERVIEW

Chair Sullivan provided an overview of tonight's agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

a. \$200 donation to Town for Town Hall Preservation project.

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the consent agenda. Seconded by A. Jennings.

D. Ross: Is this an anonymous donation?

J. Sullivan: This is an individual donor who prefers to remain anonymous.

Vote unanimously in favor.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT (Donna Fitzpatrick, Administrative Services Coordinator)

D. Riley, 25 Harvest Dr, Town Moderator: Election is May 13. Polling is open from 6 am to 7 pm. I would encourage your presence during the day. Town elections are a little different from state elections, as you are not obligated to be there but you should be there. State elections proclaim it a duty for you to be there. If at least one of you could be there throughout the entire day, that would be great. I need 3 Council signatures to seal the ballots at the end of the day. Two other things: I'm on the ballot this year and I want to make it clear about what the statute says about me participating. It does not allow me to touch a marked ballot. It does allow me to be inside the ropes and perform all other duties. I intend to be inside the ropes. The other item is a carryover. We previously talked about having a Council rep to the Board of Elections. I can't remember how that turned out.

T. Lizotte: I think I volunteered to do that but I don't think we voted on it.

Consensus to allow Councilor Lizotte to represent the Council at the Board of Elections.

D. Riley: If you are on the ballot, you will not be allowed inside the ropes.

T. Lizotte: Is there a meeting coming up I need to attend?

D. Riley: Not at this time, but there will be in September and prior to the November general election.

- Hooksett Landing Development (owner of Goodwill plaza) has a purchase and sales agreement on the site so we no longer have to worry about litigation.
- Old Home Day is Sept 20; last year the town booth was a great success

T. Lizotte: I think the booth was a great idea and I would recommend we do it again.

N. Comai: I'm behind it 100%.

Consensus to have a town booth at 2014 Old Home Day.

- Councilor Winterton's accomplishments with HYA will be highlighted.
- April 26 – Hooksett Earth Day clean up. It's hosted by Recycle & Transfer, Conservation Commission and Community Development from 9-11am at Lambert's Park. No registration required. 8am – 1pm at the transfer station there will be kids touch a truck, shredding, raffles and prizes available.
- Monday, May 12 there will be a Hooksett Chamber of Commerce sign ordinance meeting.
- Yesterday, the governor came to Hooksett for the Riverfront project. We had reps from town officials, state, forestry divisions.
- Last week I went to a workshop on the ACA. I've given you resources/websites to provide as additional information as some key things that have changed:
 - 2015 ACA penalties become effective. We have 124 FT employees as of today. If we do not offer the essential coverage requirement and one of the FT employees goes to the marketplace, we will incur a \$2,000 fine for every individual we don't offer coverage to. Example: 2016 and on – 95% (30 employees) that is 94 employees at \$2,000 equals \$188,000 penalty. The next piece is the affordability. We cannot charge any more than 9.5% of household income. Of our 124 FT employees, if 5 do not believe it's affordable and get approved through the exchange, it's a \$3,000 per employee penalty. This is only for a single plan, not 2-person or family.
 - 2018 – Cadillac Plan: 40% excise tax. The annual limit for a single plan is \$10,200. If we exceed that it's a 40% penalty.
 - Transitional Insurance Program Fee: pay \$63 per person for employees, retirees and dependents. 2015 - \$44 per person; 2016 – even less.
 - Even if the third party pays on our behalf, they will pass that cost onto to the town in the end.
 - Suggested looking at HMO's vs. POS.
 - All municipalities in state with HealthTrust – 47% on Matthew Thornton; .5% in Hooksett. POS plan – 27% statewide; 70% in Hooksett; 65+ plan – 22% statewide; 33% in Hooksett.

N. Comai: That was a lot of information and I have confidence that you are on top of it but I'd like to wrap my arms around it a little better. Perhaps in the future you could have a workshop and educate us further on all of this for planning, budgets, etc.

D. Winterton: There was a meeting scheduled a couple months ago that was cancelled (HealthTrust was coming here). Is that going to be re-scheduled?

D. Fitzpatrick: I can bring that up to Dr. Shankle and move forward with something for us.

Consensus for Town Administrator to look into a workshop for educating employees/staff on ACA rules.

T. Lizotte: I would suggest a Council-only discussion because a calculation I think needs to be made but there are some questions we have to ask to establish base lines. I don't think it's a good idea to do this in front of the employees.

J. Sullivan: I'll work with the Town Administrator to put this on an upcoming agenda.

D. Winterton: Christine is going to look at insurance consulting. I think we have \$2000 in our budget and I know she was going to put out RFQ's for that. It might be good to have a consultant come in too.

PUBLIC INPUT: 15 Minutes

None

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

None

SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS

a. Tom Walsh for Sign Committee to discuss sign ordinance

Tom Walsh, Berry Hill Rd, Planning Board member: This discussion has been going on for years. Currently we have 3 ordinances. Over time, they all began looking like the performance zone. Over the years, planning and zoning have been getting a lot of variance requests. We looked at it and found out that we have been approving over 90% of the waivers. Sign committee was made up of members from PB, ED, and the public was invited as well. We started by merging the 3 existing ordinances into one. Once that was done, we started with a public hearing and went line by line on each one. Sign companies and staff were a huge help. We had a lot of info from the US Sign Council to back up changes that were made. A lot stayed the same but the significant changes made will address a lot of the concerns the business community had. The allowance is now 20' tall and 32 sq. ft. It was all based on the data from the US Sign Council and what is best for Hooksett. There were people on the committee that came from both sides of this and all the decisions were unanimous. It's not just for business, but for public safety. It's good for businesses and economic development. A big reason some tenants moved in was because the signs were grandfathered in. I hope you all support it.

D. Winterton: As a member of the committee, I want to thank Chairman Walsh as well as staff in Community Development who did a wonderful job. Being on the Planning Board and listening to some situations businesses were put in, Bass Pro Shops would have (1) 32' sign. If the voters approve this, we will be a more business-friendly community. I'd ask the members of the Board and the public to support this.

T. Walsh: The new ordinance is based on the size of the building. It's a well thought-out proposal.

J. Sullivan: Is this a ballot issue?

T. Walsh: Yes, and Article 6 goes with it.

D. Ross: It says the fee for permits should be established by Town Council with recommendation of the Hooksett Planning Board (article J).

T. Walsh: I believe that is the way it was and did not change.

D. Ross: On the examples (KFC/Taco Bell sign) has it been cleared to use their sign?

T. Walsh: That is a good question. We have to check with staff on that.

D. Ross: It could be misconstrued as favoritism and we don't want to step on any toes.

J. Levesque: This change would be greatly appreciated by the Zoning Board. Bass Pro had quite a bit of signage but now that it's up and in place it looks well. Market Basket signage worked out well. I think a little leniency will make it easier for ZBA to do its job and be fairer to businesses that want to come to town.

T. Walsh: The majority of those were waiver requests, but both boards had been approving.

D. Winterton: One of the charges being on the committee is not eliminating the request for variances or waivers but to reduce the number to a reasonable number.

J. Levesque: ZBA faces the problem of issuing variances, and if the company goes out of business, the sign becomes part of the property. Can we look into them taking the sign with them and starting from zero? I think that would be very helpful to the applicants.

T. Walsh: I'm sure it's covered by statutes but I'll take a look into it.

b. Kathie Northrup re proclamation for 10th annual Hooksett Heritage Day

K. Northrup: I'm here to ask Council to sign the proclamation to declare May 10 Hooksett Heritage Day. It will include the same groups as last year, and at 2:00 I will be conducting a walking tour. It's a nice day to celebrate the history of the town.

J. Sullivan: "Embark, inspire, engage" is the theme. She is asking May 10 to be proclaimed as Hooksett Heritage Day.

***T. Lizotte motioned to allow the chair to declare May 10 Hooksett Heritage Day on behalf of Town Council. Seconded by J. Levesque.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

D. Ross: May I ask that a copy be sent to the local newspaper?

J. Sullivan: Yes, along with press releases.

OLD BUSINESS

a. 14 – 031 Discussion of Main Street Bridge Project

J. Sullivan: At our last meeting the 2 reps came and spoke on the two options. One way would be to fully close the bridge and the other is allowing one-way traffic, only Northbound. They would like a decision by our next meeting. We received a letter from Karen Lessard of the Hooksett School District: *"I am writing this letter in response to a conversation I had with Dean Shankle on Thursday April 17, 2014 regarding the work that is being discussed for the Main Street Bridge. It is my understanding from that conversation there are two options being explored (which is different than what was discussed at the meeting I attended on March 12th). The first is closing the bridge completely and getting the work done over the summer so that the buses are not impacted at all, the second is only allowing north bound traffic to flow over the bridge. As I stated at the March 12th meeting closing the bridge to just one lane will create delays to eight of our bus routes. If the bridge were closed to south bound traffic we would have to re-route some of our buses and if this were to occur in the middle of the school year that would be problematic. The best option for the school district would be the summer closure as long as we knew for certain that the bridge would be open for the start of the school year. If that were not possible the next best option would be to have the bridge open during construction to both lanes with reduced width, next would be to allow traffic to flow in both directions with one lane using a traffic control signal. The option to only allow traffic in one direction would have the most impact on us and therefore would be the least desirable for the school district."* Do either the police chief or fire chief wish to comment? I know Chief Bartlett was at our last meeting. Do you have any additional information?

Chief Bartlett: My purpose to come before you was to advise you of concerns I saw. Those concerns haven't changed but until we have a decision, I'll have to make operational changes as to how we provide coverage for the west side of town.

Asst Chief Dean Jore: I mirror Chief Bartlett's sentiments. Complete closure will seriously impact our response time. If Station 1 goes across the street and there is another call up the street, the central station would have to respond and the time would be extended. At the very least we'd request that an emergency vehicle only lane be maintained to uphold public safety. If that is not possible, the impact to our budget will be significant. We'd rather avoid that and just having an emergency lane makes a lot of difference to us.

N. Comai: It's my understanding that one option provided to us was leaving both lanes open but the width would present an issue. That's a subjective comment in my opinion. Was it an option to keep both sides open?

J. Sullivan: The first time they appeared they discussed that option. At their second appearance, they stated that would no longer be a viable option. The current 2 options are to fully close the bridge for 7 ½ weeks or having one-way traffic (northbound) for 13 weeks. They would have some temporary signals for emergency vehicles and buses.

D. Ross: I'm totally opposed to closing the bridge. We need to have the ability to get emergency vehicles across that bridge. I'd request that each of the department heads draft a letter addressing concerns and even including a cost to the town during this process, and how long it would take to respond to an emergency. I have no intention of voting in favor of closing the bridge. The state can find somewhere else to save money.

Consensus to request Fire and Police departments draft a letter expressing the safety and financial concerns as a result of closing the bridge to save the state money. Send copies to Council.

Chief Bartlett: If it's the Board's wishes, I can draft a letter including financial impact that may be incurred if the bridge were to close.

T. Lizotte: If the bridge fell down and was gone, we'd still have a situation to overcome. There are reasons we have mutual aid. We have multiple data to understand when there are peak times. Our taxes go to the state so can we augment our police force with state police or surrounding towns to get extra coverage. I have a fear the state might just say it's going to be closed. I'd rather have us think outside the box instead of dealing in absolutes. I'd like to come up with a solution to both scenarios.

J. Sullivan: The information we are asking for would be helpful in assisting us with a decision.

Chief Bartlett: Regarding mutual aid, if the bridge collapsed, that would be a perfect situation to call on surrounding towns. This is a planned event so I don't believe they would augment our police force for the long term. Mutual aid is for immediate services or help, not for a planned situation. In my opinion it's not impossible. If the DOT closes it, I will have to make operational changes that will have a fiscal impact. We will not jeopardize public safety at any time.

Asst Chief Jore: Our mutual aid will ensure somebody gets there but our primary concern is response times. We've already started considering alternate plans and we will address that in our letter. Our concern is quick arrival. Mutual aid cannot guarantee response times that we have promised to the citizens of Hooksett. Services will be provided; we want to continue what we are currently providing.

S. Orr: I don't remember DOT saying that regardless of our recommendation they are going to do what they wanted. I thought they were going to respect whatever decision we make.

T. Lizotte: I'm not saying it was a threat, but they said they can precisely shut the bridge down for the summer and save money. That is the recommendation from the top. The other recommendation - I got the impression that option could be more than 13 ½ weeks. They emphasized the money side of this and I just want to prepare for the scenario that it's going to be shut down.

J. Sullivan: I don't think they said they would not consider our advice.

S. Orr: I think the letter is a good idea and we should include some cost figures in there because the state needs to be respectful of the fiscal impact. I think it's also important to put the safety issue in there as well. If we have it in writing that we forewarned them of these issues, which could protect us from any potential lawsuit against the town by showing that we had a different recommendation than what the state decided to do.

D. Winterton: Would it be more appropriate for each department to submit the letter to the Town Administrator and he forward it to the DOT with a cover letter?

J. Sullivan: I'd think both departments would coordinate with their front office.

T. Lizotte: We have no authority over these departments, but we can offer our suggestions.

J. Sullivan: Would it be alright with you if both of these departments sent a letter to you?

D. Fitzpatrick: Absolutely.

J. Sullivan: If we can quickly gather all the information we need, we can make our final decision at our next meeting.

A Jennings: Regarding the protective screening, it appears that they are going to install it whether we want them to or not.

J. Sullivan: That is one area we might not be able to budge.

T. Lizotte motioned to waive rules to allow Tom Walsh to speak. Seconded by D. Winterton. Vote unanimously in favor.

T. Walsh: I have already scheduled a meeting with DOT; I want to make sure that we are going forward with no screen and having 2 directions at the same time is what we would prefer. That is our artery, basically. Before I go up there, I just want to be sure.

J. Sullivan: We haven't decided which option we would be in favor of.

S. Orr: I think one of the options that resonated strongly with everyone was one-way controlled by signals. In my opinion that was still a pretty viable option.

D. Winterton: The backup traffic would be difficult to manage if it was one lane with lights. He also indicated State police could not help in terms of enforcement. I don't think we should direct Rep. Walsh with any set guidelines. I think if he has a discussion with front office people, he should express the dissatisfaction with this Council that we feel our input has not been listened to.

J. Sullivan: One other issue on the traffic is you have to allow the last car through the light before the other traffic could proceed.

T. Walsh: I'm of the opinion there is nothing wrong with a 9 1/2' lane. If they are worrying about cost, they can save some of that on the screening. Sen. Boutin has already put a call in to the commissioner as well. Just to let you know we are working on it from the other end.

J. Levesque: With all the programmable things, I don't see why they can't work around the light cycles. It's very feasible.

J. Sullivan: Please contact Dr. Shankle with any questions or comments.

b. 14 – 033 Discussion of Amendment to alarm ordinance

Chief Bartlett: What we have proposed are changes to the existing ordinance. Over the last few months, looking at the way we do business, we are finding deficiencies in the ordinance, and also in the manner we can enforce the ordinance. I think the biggest changes are: initial fee of \$25 for application for permit on annual basis. Another is to regulate the fine schedule and make some changes and to give us the ability to have teeth in holding those that are in violation accountable by allowing us to summons them to court or by allowing the HPD to issue a no response letter to a business or resident for numerous false alarms. I think it's going to cover us by ensuring that the false alarms we respond to decrease. Some preliminary analysis work on responses since January: we spent 28 hrs, 7 min on business alarms and 15 hrs, 40 min on false residential alarms – just over 43 man hours responding to false alarms. If an ordinance is in place to hold these folks accountable, they will contact alarm companies, who should make sure the system is functioning properly.

J. Sullivan: This requires us to move to adopt the changes and then move to public hearing.

N. Comai motioned to adopt these changes to the ordinance.

J. Sullivan: Now this goes to public hearing, then we have a formal vote at the following meeting. We would be able to amend the proposal beyond what the HPD is recommending. This is just beginning the process.

T. Lizotte: The last process didn't do that. We went through the process but never amended it. I was under the impression that once the motion was made on the prior one that followed with public hearing discussions and then a vote. Several iterations came back from the department head but I feel this is different.

J. Sullivan: Section 3.6a of the Town Charter doesn't say we can amend it.

D. Fitzpatrick: I'd just like to bring up that there could be amendments made at the public hearing. A Councilor may recuse himself and speak in public as a business owner.

J. Sullivan: We can change a proposal after public hearing, correct?

D. Fitzpatrick: I will check but it's similar to zoning amendments.

J. Sullivan: We have a Councilor who wants to begin the process but we want to clear this up first. I'd like to ask the Councilor to remove the motion so we can get clarification and proceed at our next meeting if it is amendable.

D. Ross: When it comes to voting to move this forward, I would have to recuse myself. I'd like to engage and make this better and I'm well aware of how many municipalities do this and what works and what doesn't. I'd like to offer suggestions to the chief now and he can use them or not.

J. Sullivan: I think we need clarification and we should hold off on moving this forward so we can proceed correctly.

S. Orr: It seems to me that the process we used for the last issue we addressed did that process. We had a chance to review and make suggestion for changes. The department head incorporated our changes. We want to present what we think is a final version to the public. At what point in this phase...so this is different than a regular motion? You are saying the process is different, and we don't even need a second?

J. Sullivan: According to the charter, yes.

T. Lizotte: Unless the public wants to make some changes.

J. Sullivan: Since we don't know that answer, I'd like to hold off.

N. Comai: In reading the staff report from Dr. Shankle, it states as his recommendation to discuss and if any Councilor wishes, move forward to begin the normal process. I think Dr. Shankle read this and is asking us to discuss. To make this body happy I will remove my prior motion and hope we don't spend 45 hours on something that someone has already spent 45 hours on.

J. Levesque: If anyone has concerns, make your changes before our next meeting, send them to Donna and we will have a revised copy at our next meeting.

J. Sullivan: That is what we want to do – maximize Council input and adhere to the Charter. Donna is going to get clarification on that. In the meantime, if you have any suggestions, you can forward them to anyone. I'm not sure how to proceed at this point.

D. Ross: My suggestions are simple and will take 3 minutes. The charges for false alarms need to be in a different fashion. The third alarm is when the first bill comes. The next alarm doubles and the next one doubles again. The alarm company works for the homeowner and you work for the homeowner. I believe the police interacting with the alarm company will make more work for you. The other suggestion

is charging homeowner a fee for permit. I don't see the necessity of that in the sense that if you get a call, they are already in violation of this ordinance. The permitting process and record keeping will just create a headache for you. The fines will make people move, that's how you get them in line. I think everything else about it is great.

J. Sullivan: We do have to move this down another 2 weeks until we get clarification on making changes after the public hearing. I think we should table this until our next meeting.

J. Levesque motioned to table adopting the proposed alarm ordinance until the next meeting. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Vote unanimously in favor.

c. 14 – 034 Discussion of pawn shop ordinance

J. Sullivan: I think we need to table this one as well, that would be my suggestion because we are going to run into the same situation. Since there is no motion, we should proceed.

Chief Bartlett: We do not currently have an ordinance for pawn brokers and second hand dealers. I'm looking to establish an ordinance that is going to regulate these businesses because a lot of time they deal in items that have been procured in illicit manners. Unless we have a specific process in place as well as electronic filing system we deem necessary that could be cross checked to any police department that subscribes to that. We looked at towns and cities that have ordinances regulating business practices of pawn brokers and second hand dealers. They have the ability to regulate this and have a better hand in what they are selling. I think it's important and will do a lot for the community by discouraging stolen items being sold. Any legitimate business wants to have those regulations.

N. Comai motioned to table discussion on the pawn shop ordinance until the next meeting to allow Councilors to enter input. Seconded by J. Sullivan.

Roll Call

S. Orr – No

A. Jennings – No

N. Comai – Yes

D. Winterton – No

D. Ross – No

J. Levesque – Yes

T. Lizotte – No

J. Sullivan – Yes

Motion Fails 3-5.

D. Winterton: On the definition of second hand dealer, if someone purchases an unclaimed storage unit and that person sells it at a yard sale, are they a second hand dealer?

Chief: I don't believe so as that is abandoned property.

D. Winterton: If I picked up a DVD player at a yard sale for \$5 and re-sell it at my yard sale for \$25 am I a second hand dealer?

Chief: No. I am referring to anyone who operates a business or storefront.

D. Winterton: I think the ordinance is great but I want to make sure that it doesn't include people we don't want it to include.

Chief: We've had a good thought process regarding that. There is an exclusion section that specifically excludes specific items that still needs to be added. If we put this exclusion section in, it will allay any concerns that people who think that same way may have.

S. Orr: Did you consult other town ordinances for the verbiage?

Sgt. Bouchard: I gathered ordinances from different surrounding towns: Manchester, Bedford, Goffstown and we tailored it to how we thought it would fit Hooksett the best.

T. Lizotte: We have a consignment store. Does that fall under the same thing? The other thing is clothes – second hand baby clothes. Are we going to have people log clothes?

Chief: That's what I'm hoping your input will provide. We think this is a good start but more heads are better than one. I don't believe those types of stores fall under this ordinance.

Sgt. Bouchard: The consignment shops would be included so you would be able to trace coins, stamps, etc.

T. Lizotte: Is there a way to narrow this to stuff that has more tangible value? Coins, electronics, CD's?

Chief: We can exclude certain things if that is the wishes of the Council. It is problematic – we had a theft case in town that resulted in a significant amount of metal being sold to a pawn shop. We can exclude certain businesses if you wish, but I think anything can be stolen and pawned.

T. Lizotte: If you could, just bracket the items that don't have a lot of value. Is there an auditing component?

Sgt. Bouchard: Yes we have the option to spot check at any time to make sure they are reporting to us as they are supposed to and if they aren't they are subject to losing their license.

A. Jennings: Could they take one picture of a lot of clothes instead of individual items? Are there any RSA's or state guidance regarding the online tracking system? It seems like it will cost the shop owners a significant amount of money.

Sgt. Bouchard: We're not looking to include baby clothes or high chairs or that kind of stuff.

Capt. Daigle: There are 2 RSA's that apply.

D. Ross: I'm fully in favor of this ordinance. As far as how to eliminate so many articles, you might want to put a monetary threshold on that. You're typically looking for items valued at more than \$50. That might be a way to streamline it instead of having a list of excluded items. That is just a suggestion in that regard.

Capt. Daigle: We thought it was covered in Section 5.

D. Ross: That goes to Mr. Jennings' point about cost to the shop owner.

Sgt. Bouchard: The risk with putting a monetary value limit is that they will offer \$49.99 instead of \$50 to get around that.

Capt. Daigle: And who determines the value? I think that a lot of communities shied away from that for that reason.

Sgt. Bouchard: I attended training on what it entails for them to report. Once they are set up, they are provided free training and it's very quick and easy. They need a photo of the item, seller and some data entry.

T. Lizotte: I think it looks good.

S. Orr: We've suggested some amendments. Do we have to wait until they come back with the amendments to move it? My inclination is to wait until they make the amendments to make a motion.

J. Sullivan: Correct. We will not make a motion to move this at this time. Once we get clarification, we can motion to move to public hearing.

**J. Sullivan motioned to table until 5/14/14. Seconded by S. Orr.
Vote unanimously in favor.**

NEW BUSINESS

- a. 14 – 035 Impact Fees for South Bow Road

J. Levesque motioned to table until 5/14/14. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Vote unanimously in favor.

- b. 14 – 036 Citizen of the Year

J. Sullivan motioned to authorize Chair to sign proclamation to be given to David Dickson on May 10, 2014. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Vote unanimously in favor.

- c. 14 – 037 Approval of Street Names

D. Ross: In the past the Council is the last signature. I see only one signature on this.

D. Fitzpatrick: All signatures are there, one on each page.

T. Lizotte motioned to approve the street names Churchill Drive and Old Mill Lane. Seconded by N. Comai.

Vote unanimously in favor.

- d. 14 – 038 Conservation Commission: Clay Pond Stewardship Plan

D. Fitzpatrick: Steve Couture will discuss 14-038 and 14-039.

S. Couture, Conservation Commission Chair: We had a nice Earth Day event at the Merrimack River front property. It consists of 135 acres, ¾ mile shorefront property, and has the last active cornfield in Hooksett. We received funding from LCHIP from the state and that is one of the reasons the governor came. Just wanted to mention Donna and the Chief of Police and DPW who worked quickly to organize this event. We had a good turnout and the governor enjoyed the property a little more after the event.

J. Sullivan: Thank you and the commission and to all those involved.

S. Couture: Stewardship Plan is that step to manage. We received 4 bids, narrowed it down to 2, did another review and made our selection. They happen to also have submitted the low bid. We'd like to move forward with Moosewood.

D. Ross motioned to approve maintenance plan with Moosewood. Seconded by S. Orr.

S. Orr: If price wasn't the main reason can you explain what made you select them?

S. Couture: There focus on trails was pretty strong.

S. Orr: There is a trail that connects Dube Pond to Heads Pond. Will that be expanded?

S. Couture: There is an abandoned railroad track but that is not within the property we are developing.

D. Ross: The focus on the trail expertise is important – that is one of the driving factors in place for many years and part of the master plan.

T. Lizotte: When will this be completed?

S. Couture: We have to ask for a revised timeline. The original deadline was late fall/early winter of this year. If you approve tonight, we will have our first meeting next week.

T. Lizotte: Conservation Commission meeting or a subcommittee?

S. Couture: A smaller group of us that is going to work with them on a regular basis.

Roll Call –

T. Lizotte- Yes

S. Orr – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

N. Comai – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

D. Ross – Yes
J. Levesque – Yes
J. Sullivan - Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

e. 14 – 039 Conservation Commission: Summit View Open Space Easement
S. Couture: We reviewed the changes in the email from Steve Buckley and were satisfied with those. The Conservation Commission supported this and this was part of the open space required for the conservation subdivision.

N. Comai motioned to accept the open space quit claim deed as amended. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

D. Ross: Note 4 – “*may be well radii from the developed lots that will encumber the Open Space.*” I didn’t see that in the plan.

S. Couture: The well rating identifies space and didn’t raise my concern. Point of clarification – it’s not an easement; it’s a quit claim deed.

Vote unanimously in favor.

f. 14 – 040 Sale of Tax Deeded property back to former owner
D. Fitzpatrick: Kim Blichmann, Tax collector and Dave Scarpetti is the realtor.

T. Lizotte motioned to authorize the Town Administrator to sign the quitclaim deed so he can do it at closing when he receives the funds. Seconded by D. Winterton.

J. Sullivan: The tax collector confirmed that the wording of the motion was satisfactory.

D. Scarpetti, Realtor representing Iris Labrie: This property is scheduled to close shortly. The town attorney and Iris’ attorney have been working together to get the required paperwork completed. It might be pushed to May 1 due to the amount of procedures.

Roll Call-

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

Vote unanimously in favor.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Jennings: Nothing to report

S. Orr – Nothing to report

N. Comai: Municipal Records Committee moving forward with the potential of 95% completed record retention policy. It was brought to department heads for input and the next round of feedback is on June 3. The next goal is to be at 99.9% by June 11 for review at that Town Council meeting. Todd Rainier is doing a wonderful job. We are pretty much in compliance. I’m proud of that group – it was a huge undertaking in a short amount of time.

J. Sullivan: Heritage commission – Heritage Day May 18; working with Old town Hall to coordinate fundraising efforts on souvenir items and profits will be given to them as allowed.

D. Winterton: Planning Board met Monday and approved of a connector road at W. Alice – gated at both ends. SNHU is getting ready with what they may do in the future. There was a lot of concern from neighbors. We made sure properly that even if the neighbor was not a proper abutter, they would be notified as if they were a proper abutter. SNHU was in agreement and it all worked out.

D. Ross: Nothing to report

J. Levesque: Recycle met and we are paying \$14/ton for recycle and \$65/ton for trash. Chronicle will broadcast the story they did on Wednesday, April 30 on channel 9 at 7 pm. They received a check for \$1500 for recycled cardboard. She will come to you in the future about an ordinance regarding recycling cardboard instead of putting it in the trash. Open House this Saturday – shredder truck will be on site to shred for free.

T. Lizotte: Nothing to report except I look forward to being a liaison to the Election Board. Baseball season is upon us. There is a jamboree on May 4. Opening Day is May 10. I'd like to see a lot of people come out and support us.

J. Levesque: Mr. Schroeder on Transfer Committee wanted everyone to know about railroad show coming up on April 27 at Cawley Middle School.

PUBLIC INPUT

None

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.

NH RSA 91-A:3 II (d) Consideration of the acquisition, sale, or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community.

J. Sullivan motioned to enter non-public session at 9:00pm. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Roll call

D. Ross - Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

T. Lizotte – Yes

S. Orr - Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

N. Comai - Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

J. Sullivan - Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting at 9:30pm to 9:45pm. Seconded by T Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting at 9:45pm to 10:00pm. Seconded by T Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.

T. Lizotte motioned to extend the meeting at 10:00pm to 10:15pm. Seconded by D. Winterton. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Winterton motioned to exit non-public at 10:10pm. Seconded by S. Orr. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Winterton motioned to seal the non-public minutes of 4/23/14. Seconded by T. Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.

T. Lizotte motioned to adjourn at 10:13pm. Seconded by N. Comai. Vote unanimously in favor.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney