

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, June 11, 2014

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sullivan called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm.

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Nancy Comai (via phone until 9:30 pm), Robert Duhaime, Donald Winterton, David Ross, James Levesque, Todd Lizotte, Chairman James Sullivan, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)
Missed: Adam Jennings, Susan Orr

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Public: May 28, 2014

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the public minutes of May 28, 2014 with edits. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Vote unanimously in favor. D. Ross abstained due to prior absence.

b. Non-public: May 28, 2014

J. Levesque motioned to accept the non-public minutes of May 28, 2014. Seconded by T. Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor. D. Ross abstained due to prior absence.

AGENDA OVERVIEW

Chair Sullivan provided an overview of tonight's agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Acceptance of donations to Police Department for Bicycle Rodeo: (Target \$25, gift card; Walmart \$75 gift card; Hannaford \$65, 2 cases of apples; BJ's 25, gift card; Cowabunga's \$300, passes; Market Basket \$50, water and snacks; Kmart \$100, helmets and bike.)

Dr. Shankle: There is an update to the consent agenda dated 6/9/14 from Chief Bartlett itemizing the donations received for the Bicycle Rodeo that was held on June 7.

T. Lizotte motioned to accept the consent agenda with the addendum sheet. Seconded by J. Levesque.

Vote unanimously in favor.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- Bike rodeo with Hooksett PD was held on June 7
- Garden Club members are here to discuss patriotic ceremony
- UNH Technology Transfer Center does a lot of training with the Highway Department. They have a Roads Scholar Program and we received a letter from them congratulation Doug Urquhart on reaching level 3 of 4 in this program.
- International Association of Assessing Officers - Lee Ann Moynihan went to class on Income Approach to Valuation and passed.
- Town has been getting good publicity – Fire Department program with schools (Hands on CPR) got good press and received emails from other departments that were impressed.

PUBLIC INPUT: 15 Minutes

None

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

a. Steve Couture: Conservation Commission (reappointment)

D. Ross motioned to nominate Steve Couture to Conservation Commission.

b. Muamer Durkovic: Planning Board – alternate until 2016; ED Advisory (new)

D. Winterton motioned to nominate Muamer Durkovic to the Planning Board as an alternate until 2016.

D. Winterton motioned to nominate Muamer Durkovic to Economic Development Committee.

c. Ivan Gult: (ED) Advisory (new)

D. Winterton motioned to nominate Ivan Gult to Economic Development Committee.

d. Frank Kotowski: Planning Board (reappointment); ED Advisory (new)

J. Levesque motioned to nominate Frank Kotowski to the Planning Board.

D. Winterton motioned to nominate Frank Kotowski to Economic Development Committee.

e. Sean McDonald: Recycling Advisory (reappointment)

J. Levesque motioned to nominate Sean McDonald to the Recycling Committee.

f. Michael J. Simoneau: Zoning Board (reappointment)

J. Levesque motioned to nominate Michael J. Simoneau to Zoning Board.

g. JoCarol (Gau) Woodburn: Conservation Com from alternate to full

D. Ross motioned to nominate JoCarol (Gau) Woodburn to Conservation Commission from alternate to full member.

Dr. Shankle: We received a nomination form from Tom Walsh for the Planning Board.

D. Winterton motioned to nominate Tom Walsh to Planning Board.

J Sullivan: We have some open positions we are still accepting applications for: Conservation Commission alternate (1), Economic Development (1), Heritage Commission (2 full members; 2 alternates), Parks and Rec (2), Planning Board alternates (2), Recycling & Transfer (1); Southern NH Planning Commission (1), Town Hall Preservation Committee (4), ZBA (2 full members; 1 alternate). If interested, please contact Administration.

SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS

a. Hooksett Garden Club

Doris Sorel (Immediate Past President), Betty Parnell (Co-Chair), Karrassaann Taylor (Current President), Tina Paquette (Co-chair)

D. Sorel: The first year of our joint venture with Parks and Rec, we were able to place 7 flower boxes on the Memorial Bridge. The second and third year of this joint venture was successful in achieving the goal of creating a true "bridge of flowers." Additionally we were able to have them on the bridge in time for the Memorial Day festivities each year. Earlier this year, as one of the co-chairs of the bridge of flowers committee, I was informed by the DPW director that the Parks & Rec department would no longer do any watering of any flowers that we would plant on the Memorial Bridge. I reported this to the executive board of the Hooksett garden club and also the general membership. With the decision of the town to no longer water any flowers placed on the bridge, it was obvious to the executive board and the general membership that this decision effectively would kill this joint venture beautification project. We were both surprised and saddened but had to face the reality that without regular watering any flowers placed there would die. We provide you with this information so that you may better understand why there are no flowers on the Memorial Bridge this year. We have also been informed that there will be no top dressing of new mulch at the point garden this year from the town. Last year Mrs. Paquette and I approached the Council and received your permission to do a new joint venture beautification project-the safety center complex sign on Route 3, Hooksett Road. The HGC was successful in planting perennial plants and with the assistance and cooperation of Parks and Rec, 6 juniper yews were planted around the base of the sign. We were informed that Parks & Rec would provide and apply top soil and grass seed around the base to complete the project. Last week, Mrs. Paquette planted additional perennial plants in the flower bed (box). She noted no top soil or grass seed had yet been applied to complete this project. We are pleased to provide you with this comprehensive report this evening. All of our other beautification projects around the town are alive and well. We are very pleased and proud that the town of Hooksett has chosen a photo of one of the HGC beautification projects that is on every page of the town web site. We are also proud and pleased to share with you that the HGC won a national award for small garden containers from the NH Federation of Garden Clubs Inc. and most importantly from the National Garden Club of America Association for small garden containers for the Memorial Bridge of flowers joint venture beautification project.

T. Paquette: We feel like the rug was pulled from under us when we were told we couldn't put the boxes up. We'd like the Council to revisit that. It's still not too late to put boxes up.

J. Sullivan: Maybe we can ask Dr. Shankle to look into that and provide additional information.

Dr. Shankle: This is the first I'm hearing of this.

D. Sorel: When I first heard about it, I was disappointed and needed time to figure out how to handle this.

J. Sullivan: Thank you for the update; it's nice to know what you have been up to.

T. Paquette: We understand there are new Councilors and we weren't sure they were aware of what the Hooksett Garden Club has done in the last 15 years.

Consensus to allow Dr. Shankle to look into this situation and work out a mutually beneficial solution.

J. Levesque: Can I ask Dr. Shankle to send an email to Garden Club members and Councilors when he has something to report?

Dr. Shankle: Who is my contact at the Hooksett Garden Club?

D. Sorel: You can contact me via email or Ms. Taylor as she is the new president.

R. Duhaime: I think if we can get Leo here at the next meeting to get this solved as soon as possible, as it's getting late in the season.

D. Sorel: We have quite an investment in boxes, flowers, and we don't want to lose that. We've had a lot of calls asking where the flowers are. I think this project merits continuation.

D. Winterton: I'd like to thank the Garden Club for coming in and making us aware of this. We were reminded at our last meeting that we should thank the volunteers in Hooksett and I miss the flowers on the bridge too.

T. Lizotte: There are major budget shortfalls due to plowing and we are working under a default, but I think we need to send a letter to all groups that the first point of contact should be the Town Administrator, not Parks and Rec or DPW. We need to make sure we contact the Administrator to orchestrate that. With the two default budgets, it's gotten worse and worse as there are minimal resources and time.

OLD BUSINESS

a. 14 – 033 Discussion of changes to Alarm Ordinance

J. Sullivan: I call the public hearing to order on changes to Residential and Business, Robbery and Panic Alarms Ordinance #00-27.

b. 14 – 034 Discussion of Pawn Shop Ordinance

J. Sullivan: I call the public hearing to order on changes to Pawn Shop Ordinance #2014-1.

Seeing no comments, we will close the hearings after the second public input session.

NEW BUSINESS

a. 14 – 046 Scarpetti Edgewater Drive Proposal

Paul Scarpetti: We have been before the Planning Board, Conservation Commission. We took that input and I think we've refined it to the benefit to the town.

Jennifer McCourt, McCourt Engineering Associates: Joe Rickart has researched the right of way. The project is located at paved end of Edgewater Dr. and goes to town of Bow. There is a Class 6 right of way; the Scarpetti piece and the tax map shows lot 6 on the Edgewater side. The Scarpetti's also own lot 8 and 9. In the research, neither the town nor the surveyor could come up with a deed that dedicated this parcel to the town. Current public perception of this land – there is a gate and can be walked, but most walk along the gravel drive that is on Scarpetti property. Our proposal is to create a cul de sac at the end of the Class 5 road to town's standards and dedicate it to the town. In the center we would provide 8 parking spaces. We spoke to DPW director and he thought it was easier to plow since they are in the center. There is direct access to the shoreline. We are putting in 6 lots and a private road going all the way up and a path continuing up to the Bow town line. We are proposing a picnic area with tables; the public will be allowed to walk along here as they have previously, but now there will be a paved road

along the river. We are trying to improve access to public rights by the use of a maintained road. We have been to Conservation Commission and they did a walk; they've seen the area and we have also been to the Planning Board and no real concerns, that I am aware of, were raised.

Dr. Shankle: The bottom line is what you need to decide this evening – they are asking that the Class 6 road going through there be discontinued; deed any land between Class 6 road and river; in exchange the town would get an improved path and a small park. Are you willing to discontinue the Class 6 road and give them the land?

R. Duhaime: I'm familiar with this road. We are giving up riverfront property but have no riverfront access. I think we have mentioned that the town has no access to this water. Bow has a ramp so I know there could be some access. Without river access, there is no benefit to the town.

P. Scarpetti: The town has access to a boat launch on the other side of the river. We did the cul de sac with parking for the kayaks. We also talked about a dock on that side near the cul de sac.

Richard Uchida (Hinckley Allen): I understand the document is being reviewed by the town attorney. I think Dr. Shankle hit the nail on the head. The Class 6 road would go away to the extent there is any town land between the Class 6 road and river would be deeded over to the Scarpettis. There is no existing deed of that property. On the northern end, there is a small parcel deeded to the Scarpettis (lot 9). The driveway would contain access rights and also utility rights so if the town needed to extend utilities in that area, there is a reservation of utility access rights. This legitimizes access for the residents that do use the property now. There would not be hunting, alcohol, illegal drugs, etc. We would maintain the property, not the town. We have heard about access to the river and having access for the kayaks is something we thought the cul de sac design would accommodate.

Dr. Shankle: This property is going to end up as what?

P. Scarpetti: A detached condo association and this would be part of the bylaws of the condo association.

R. Uchida: The condo open space would be subject to the terms of the easement and could not be eliminated, modified or amended without approval of the town.

P. Scarpetti: We are enhancing the property; there is very little property owned by the town along that area. We just want to legitimize what people are already doing.

J. Sullivan: Currently what is the access to the river from the property that the town owns?

P. Scarpetti: There is no access. You can walk down to the river.

J. Sullivan: You can get a canoe down there.

P. Scarpetti: We would be willing to do something so they can pull up to it if they had a power boat. We can't build a launch without approval from the state.

J. McCourt: Normal water levels are 9'-15' below the bank. Part of putting a dock would be putting stairs as it's difficult to traverse. To put a launch there, after knowing the shoreline protection rules, it's not conducive to put a motorized launch there.

R. Duhaime: I asked you what the square footage is of the easement, if the road does continue and how much land are we giving you?

Joe Rickert: There are 2 tax lots that the town owns. We researched those lots back to the late 1700's and never found a deed to the town. There is a right of way road. If you take that premise, and we can't find a deed to the east side of Edgewater Dr., if there are no abutters then the party on the remaining side would own the land underneath it. That would put the ownership of all land on the Scarpettis. There is a 2-rod right of way encumbered as a public road. We laid out the proposed road and at the request of Dr. Shankle, we laid the out center line of the old Edgewater Dr. as we established it and the west edge of it.

80% or 90% is on the westerly half of the remaining Edgewater Dr. right of way. There is a premise the town owns tax lot 6 which we can't find the deed on. We are asking for a release of the public right of way and a quitclaim deed of lot 6; in return the town would get a dedicated right of way over the path and portage rights by the cul de sac. It's not easy to measure because you have erosion and too many other variables. Rather than try to reestablish this whole thing, to do this mutual agreement which eliminates the need to reinvent the wheel and move forward.

R. Duhaime: There is an easement through this property at the front of your property.

J. Rickert: On a normal road, the east side isn't eroding into the river. You have a 2-rod easement, but prior to 1948 you don't get a prescriptive easement. Any areas of erosion reduce the width of the town right of way. The town no longer has a 2-rod right of way.

R. Duhaime: Bow has given up this easement. If we are giving up a certain amount of easement (river access you don't have now), I don't want to go the whole length of the property. The only thing the town is interested in is the first lot on this design where the town can access. The rest of it is yours.

J. Sullivan: Looking at the proposal, if you remove the cul de sac, what exists now without the 6 lots? Who owns the first lot?

J. McCourt: The Scarpettis. Lot 6 we don't know who owns that. The Scarpettis own to the center of the right of way underneath the easement. What we are trying to do with the cul de sac and providing river access/dock/parking is what we were constructing.

J. Sullivan: The cul de sac is the only access to water?

J. McCourt: They could still walk down the steep slope. They don't have access on lot 1 and lots 2-6.

P. Scarpetti: The town has 3700' feet of frontage right now. We'd only be inhibiting 1000' so the town would still have access to 2700'.

N. Comai: There is the issue of the missing deed and lot of unknown owner. Can we get to the bottom of that before proceeding?

Dr. Shankle: We have looked into it; no one has paid taxes on it.

J. Rickert: We found no tax collector deed; we have not found that it was taken for non-payment of taxes. There is a right of way for road use and you say that allows the public to put a dock or boat in, that isn't considered normal road use.

P. Scarpetti: We've owned the land over 10 years and have maintained it. What's left of the town easement is overgrown and can't be used.

T. Lizotte: If we go down this road to have 6 taxable lots built, we get a better quality pathway in which you can only port a boat down the slope. It's basic access, but is it a fair trade? I'm leaning toward that. I'd like to see what kind of covenants are in there if the property gets sold before anything gets created. Next is timing of road – when will that be built? 6 taxable lots become waterfront lots and I understand it's a pathway to nowhere but I'm trying to look at this as taxable lots.

J. Sullivan: Do you have any comments on his thoughts on timing and any provisions on the sale of the property before it is completed?

T. Lizotte: What constitutes a path?

R. Uchida: We have these protections built into the document already.

J. Levesque: The area between the first lot and the group lot of 5, why is the road in the middle? Wouldn't it be better against the western part of the property? There would be more open space for the town to have for the picnic area.

J. McCourt: There are wetlands we have to avoid.

J. Levesque: Bicycles – what if the 5 houses get together to say they don't want that?

R. Uchida: It's a perpetual easement; they cannot change that without the town's approval.

J. Levesque: What constitutes a Class 6 road?

R. Uchida: The town has no obligation to maintain the road.

J. Levesque: Can the new road be a Class 6 road?

R. Uchida: That's possible. We thought you would want us to be obligated to maintain it.

J. Levesque: How wide is the road going to be?

P. Scarpetti: The road is 18' wide and paved. The town of Bow still has a right of way – R. H. White has encroached on it. Councilor Ross talked about the Heritage Trail up to Concord because they still have the Class 6 road.

J. McCourt: Regarding moving the road, we are in the shoreline protection and all that area is trees. We are cutting 3 or 4 trees where we proposed the road. I don't know if I could get a permit to move the road any further.

D. Winterton: Would the site plan have to go back to the Planning Board?

J. McCourt: Yes.

D. Winterton: We could approve this today and the Planning Board could make additional changes?

Dr. Shankle: You can't approve the land swap today because we have to go through a process.

D. Winterton: How is it currently taxed? Is it in current use?

P. Scarpetti: We are paying regular taxes on it.

D. Winterton: So there is no land to come out of current use to benefit the Conservation Commission but the 6 lots would have impact fees.

J. McCourt: Yes.

D. Winterton: How are we currently taxed?

P. Scarpetti: Broad land.

D. Ross: The Class 6 road – giving it up is in question whether we can. The ownership on lot 6 is a moot issue as no one has challenged the town on it. Have you talked to the Parks and Rec Committee? We are trading ownership of land for easements. I think there might be a better way to sweeten the deal. Lot 6 is going to make the other lots more valuable than they would be otherwise. I'm not ready to make a fully committed decision until we're certain we can.

J. McCourt: The Class 6 road is an easement and you would be gaining ownership of the cul de sac area and the parking.

J. Sullivan: Currently the Class 6 road we don't maintain; it would be transferred to you and you would maintain it and access would be improved.

D. Ross: They are asking us to discontinue the Class 6 road and we would get an easement.

Dr. Shankle: There are a lot of things to be unpacked for this to happen. There is limited use of property and a Class 6 road goes through there. Council needs to look at what is there now and what will be there after he takes it over and decide which would be in the best interest of the town, and we can move toward that.

T. Lizotte: I'd like the board to consider a straw poll as we sit now.

R. Duhaime: Mr. Scarpetti won't have trouble selling these lots adding access to the river. If we are giving up the road, why do we want an easement to access the picnic area at the back of his property? We are better off cutting our losses and swapping land – some improvements have to be done to put the subdivision in anyway. It has to benefit the citizens of Hooksett. Right now we have all the access to the river. Maintenance of condo docs, attorneys, I thought we would do an even swap. Why are we keeping this right of way to a picnic table on the other end?

P. Scarpetti: If you walk the land, it's very beautiful. You'd lose over 3000' of walking area. If we figure the amount of land, there is over 11 acres and we are taking out 6 acres. We are giving the town much more land than the little strip along the river.

R. Duhaime: We are running into issues with the Pinnacle. I don't see the benefit.

J. Levesque: If we give up the right of way in front of lot 1 and in front of the 5 lots and we still hold ownership where there are no houses and trade for the right of way up to the Bow line.

Dr. Shankle: I understand what Councilor Duhaime is saying and I think the Conservation Commission is interested in keeping some walking path through there. Discontinuing the Class 6 road, I think getting rid of it and not having access would be more difficult. I think that would complicate things.

J. Sullivan: We need to give them direction on whether we are inclined to give pursue an agreement with their proposal or not. That goes back to your straw poll.

J. Rickert: There is talk of giving up a right of way; giving up is not the proper term. You are releasing public rights of the roadway. It's a Class 6 road because it hasn't been used in X years. If you flip the scenario and take municipality out of it and the tax record says John Smith owns it with no deed and no evidence of occupation, the process would be the applicant would do some adverse use/adverse possession action but you can't do that with a municipality per statute. There is not a lot of land there; if I had to put a number on it I'd say 10,000-15,000 sq ft.

Dr. Shankle: The biggest issue is whether you are willing to discontinue the Class 6 road. If so, we can work out details. If not, then I don't know there is any place else they can go with it.

D. Ross: They have been before Conservation and I see it as an improvement in both revenue for the town as well as the area itself. The discontinuance of a Class 6 road is something I want to make sure we can do. I think there needs to be a contingency to protect us. The question of swapping ownership for easement, I think it needs to be more advantageous to the town.

D. Winterton motioned to continue to proceed and have Town Administrator direct the town attorney to confirm if the town can legally discontinue a Class 6 road. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

D. Winterton: They will become very valuable lots and generate a lot of tax revenue for the town. And we will maintain 2700' of riverfront. The town has just acquired substantial portions of riverfront through the Conservation Commission. We will have significant high end housing which is attractive to the town. I'd like to see this continue.

J. Levesque: I still think we should maintain ownership of the Class 6 road that is not in front of the houses. Give them a section of riverfront in front of lot 1 and the other group of lots.

J. Sullivan: We want to make sure what we have stays perpetually.

T. Lizotte: If we discontinue the road, we split the difference. Discontinuing just increases the amount of space we don't have toward the river. Next piece would be conveying in a quitclaim deed that parcel after the fact.

Dr. Shankle: Us not having a deed on that property, any court would turn it over to them. If we want to hold on to that, we'd ask them to quitclaim the land to us. If we start with the discontinuation of the road, there are other things you might want and you want them to come back with another proposal. I will find out and make sure to clarify the aspect of discontinuing the Class 6 road and then we'll know how to go forward.

R. Duhaime: You can talk about statutes, RSA's, easements, roads...we are here for the interest in the town of Hooksett. This easement has value. What do you want? There is some benefit – I want him to develop this property, but you won't get another chance on this. Once the Heritage Trail goes in, people won't visit this side to see a picnic area and dead end.

D. Winterton amended the prior motion to include asking the Town Administrator to see if the town can discontinue portions of the Class 6 road. Amended motion seconded by T. Lizotte.

R. Uchida: You can do that legally, but would that be desirable to you?

R. Duhaime: Is it desirable? Good question. He doesn't have to put a town road in but this isn't about whether we give up the road, but what are we getting? What does the town of Hooksett want?

J. Sullivan: What happens if the road doesn't meet the standards of the Fire Department?

P. Scarpetti: We are trying to keep a residential feel. Do you want a main road going down there? The whole thing would change. I'm trying to do this to help the town.

J. Sullivan: This isn't a final vote, just to see what we can do legally.

Vote unanimously in favor of the amended motion.

Vote unanimously in favor of the original motion.

Dr. Shankle: I will turn this over to the attorney to make sure we are moving on this. Council has given some input to the petitioners. Do you want them to bring back a different proposal?

T. Lizotte: I think any time we facilitate a development there is a benefit to taxpayers and town. It looks like we need to have Dr. Shankle give us the square footage from riverfront up (+/- 10%) to give us frame of reference of a tangible benefit. I would say Mr. and Mrs. Scarpetti mull that over and present us another avenue. I'm leaning toward this proposal myself, but Mr. Duhaime makes a compelling argument.

D. Winterton: Can I ask the applicant for a visual of what stairs and a dock might look like? That could be helpful.

J. Sullivan: We have a Class 6 road that is not maintained. I'd like a road that is easier to access. I think this is an improvement over what exists and allows the town to maintain access without having to maintain it.

N. Comai: There are so many moving parts and in order to make an informed decision I need to wrap my arms around it.

R. Uchida: Dr. Shankle suggested we may want to come back with a different proposal. We are happy to provide the visual on the stairs and dock and we can formally make that part of our proposal. I didn't hear anything else we ought to be thinking about.

R. Duhaime: The picnic area, moving the road, eliminating lot 1. You can add the 6th lot at the back of the property. I had a different vision.

T. Lizotte: I think Mr. Duhaime made a compelling argument about giving us more on the front end if it's workable and should be considered by the applicant.

J. Sullivan: Why is the cul de sac in that location?

J. McCourt: The number of lots is according to town zoning ordinances for the density. The northern area is treed right now. We were trying to provide a buffer for those people. I think if you base it on the square footage of lot 6, it will be a lot smaller than what lot 1 is.

P. Scarpetti: We can move them up to be all together.

T. Lizotte: My impression is we are not maintaining anything, it's all maintained by the condo covenants. On the premise of your idea, we would then create a situation where we would have to maintain it. It would be a town park we would have to maintain and there would be a cost associated with that.

D. Ross: In the same vein, trading possession for an easement wouldn't be a plus for the town. The town needs to have access all the way across. My suggestion is to present something that would allow us to defend our actions. What we are saying is based on what we are seeing here.

N. Comai: On page 2 of the agreement, "quitclaim covenants" has been stricken out. On p. 14, there is a quitclaim deed (exhibit C).

R. Uchida: there are 2 parts - the first is the conveyancing of the town strip (exhibit C, page 14) – it calls for a quitclaim deed, not warranty deed. Part B of 2, says Scarpettis give an easement deed with warranty covenants (exhibit B, page 10). 2a is quitclaim deed and 2b is warranty deed. We made that change at the request of the Planning Board.

N. Comai: The conceptual development (exhibit D) is empty. I think that would help the Council.

Dr. Shankle: The first thing is the square footage and is there some reason that some part of this along the frontage can't stay with the ownership of the town? If it matters to you, just explain why it matters.

b. 14 – 047 Police Chief to discuss purchasing cruisers with funds from this year's budget
Chief Bartlett: I'm looking to use funds I anticipate will be leftover in this fiscal budget to purchase 2 new cruisers to get the replacement/repair process going based on the PSSG audit. I'm looking to replace (2) 2008 Crown Victorias. One has 94,000+ miles and the other has 97,000+ miles and they are struggling. I'm requesting I be allowed to expend funds in the current budget to purchase 2 Ford Explorer SUV's and the equipment. Computers will come out of the current vehicles. We will put these in the emergency fleet and retire the 2 Crown Victorias.

R. Duhaime motioned to approve the purchase of two new police vehicles in the amount of \$73,001.98 from encumbrances. Seconded by J. Levesque.

T. Lizotte: Tax payers just approved a budget that had 2 vehicles in it. My inclination is not to vote for encumbrances in regards to this. We purchased a cruiser out of the budget last year. Can you deal with just 1 vehicle? And as it is PSSG's recommendation, I'm a little less inclined to vote for it. I'd say I'd be willing to vote for 1 vehicle based on the cars you have. Are you in dire need, or can you do with 1 instead of 2?

Chief: I'll take what I can get. I'm looking at replacing tired vehicles in anticipation of repairs. I want to get newer cars into the fleet quicker so the older cars can be repurposed to non-emergency vehicles. I won't be able to repurpose these 2008's much longer.

T. Lizotte: In regards to the balance left in the budget, you are looking to encumber \$237,000 out of the \$300,000?

C. Soucie: After encumbering the \$237,000 we are still estimating a balance of \$300,000 so around \$537,000.

T. Lizotte: We have paid reduced taxes minimally over the last 3 years. There are 2 in the budget that passed. If we needed 4, we should have requested 4. I will not vote for 2 but you'd have my vote for 1.

N. Comai: Have you contemplated replacing a Crown Vic with a Crown Vic? Why are we replacing with SUV's?

Chief: They don't make Crown Victoria styles anymore, as of 2011. With that, they introduced the Ford Explorer Interceptor 4-door sedan and the Ford Explorer police utility package. All the equipment the Crown Victorias have in them are not in line with any of the newer vehicles – none of it fits in the newer cars. The light systems on the Crown Vics are the old strobe style lights that have multiple power packs. Newer lights have programmable LED's. It will be \$830 to replace power packs.

N. Comai: I understand that this is to begin the replace and repurpose program. Will the Crown Vics be repurposed?

Chief: We would send these vehicles to the DPW and the mechanic would utilize any parts he can to repair any Crown Vics the town has. My plan would be once an emergency vehicle gets to a point in mileage and usage and a new vehicle can be purchased, we would take some equipment off the vehicle and repurpose it to a non-emergency administrative vehicle within the police department.

D. Winterton: If we approve this and you get 2 new ones in the budget and you got one last year, you would have 5 in 13 months. What would the usage be then?

Chief: We have 2 Interceptor sedans, one is 2012 and the other is 2013. Those are running at 22,000 and 39,000 miles. When those 3 vehicles reach 60,000 or 70,000 they will be repurposed to the detective side. The new vehicles will be put into emergency response. Detectives put maybe 4500 miles a year on these vehicles. When they get to 75,000 or 80,000 miles then we send to the highway department. Always having fresh new vehicles for emergency response is my vision.

D. Ross: Based on this pattern of replacement per year, how many would you need to purchase per year to keep this flow going based on the current usage?

Chief: We run 7 black and whites and 7 detective cars. I'm looking to reduce by 1 or 2 to get to 13 cars. I anticipate some being repurposed at Town Hall or Highway Dept. If we do 2 per year we can do that.

D. Ross: Why do we need more than 2 this year?

Chief: I'd buy 2 this year and 2 next fiscal year. I currently have none in the budget.

T. Lizotte amended the original motion to encumber \$28,064.25 for one vehicle. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

T. Lizotte: We have 2 in the budget passed by the voters, but I think one is a good compromise.

R. Duhaime: I would still rather see it go through CIP instead of encumbrances.

Chief: I went to the CIP looking for 2 vehicles but they put it in the budget. There were no vehicles in the prior year budget, but we bought one.

Vote 5-2 in favor of amendment.

Roll Call

N. Comai – Yes
R. Duhaime – Yes
D. Winterton – Yes
D. Ross – Yes
J. Levesque – No
T. Lizotte – Yes
J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote 6-2 in favor of amended motion.

c. 14 – 048 Finance Director re end of year issues including encumbrances

Dr. Shankle: We are not looking for a vote tonight, but at the next meeting.

C. Soucie: Items 1, 2, 3 are current town contracts. As we move through June things will happen. Brox said they can do all the paving in June so no encumbering. Community Development software paid a 50% deposit in June so that will be reduced. Encumbrance takes money from this budget year and moves it into the next budget year to pay for the remaining contract.

J. Sullivan: We will have an updated list of numbers at our June 25 meeting.

Dr. Shankle: We wanted to show you because there was some concern last time. There will be transfers later. We tried to keep the number of encumbrances down.

T. Lizotte: HR software and Community Development software purchases are more to increase efficiencies within departments and that directly creates less need for more personnel. This type of thing is a good investment in terms of shielding us from lawsuits.

C. Soucie: There was limited software in Community Development and no software in HR so both will be increasing efficiencies greatly.

d. 14 – 049 Project Coordinator to discuss to give Performance Management Overview

K. Rosengren: I've been working on this since last fall. We finished FY 2012-2013 ICMA survey. Reporting was conducted for 16 areas and tied in results from the National Citizen survey. These measures are not statistically valid but more for guidance. The difference between the 2 data sets is Fiscal Year differences between towns. I've been working with Community Development and Public Works departments. Community Development already tracks the length of time for a project to be approved. Public Works tracking of the number of hours per project would be valuable moving forward. An objective for Community Development would be improving education and transparency and the appearance of Hooksett as a result of feedback from the Code Enforcement section of the national survey. Public Works objectives – improving quality and quantity of Parks and Rec programming; again that was a result of the CPM 101 feedback and the national citizen survey. We are identifying where efficiencies can be made such as Community Development software and merging filing systems. Public Works talked about utilizing time clocks to aid in recording of number of hours per project and better reporting of materials tracking. Where will funds come from to support these objectives? In future budget processes, we will be accounting for these objectives. Moving forward, results will be reviewed with departments and a performance management process should be conducted with staff which identifies additional measures; continue to measure performance and align with metrics; and make future adjustments in the management process.

R. Duhaime: We mentioned that with Councilor Jennings at the last meeting. I'm looking forward to seeing those recommendations. Do you have a timeline or any pattern you will follow?

K. Rosengren: That depends on the committee. I imagine the flow would be department by department.

R. Duhaime: You'll be able to see trends year over year.

K. Rosengren: Many municipalities produce a trending graph and their goal is to see where they measure up and we look forward to getting to that level.

Dr. Shankle: We knew we needed new software as we saw what information we didn't have. Once the software is in place we'll be able to speed up the process. We hope the subcommittee will make sure we gathers the necessary info needed during the budget process.

T. Lizotte: Great work Katie. Regarding the charge to follow the lead of the department – Katie has gotten further than we thought we were at. I don't think we want to disrupt the flow of what Katie has been doing. The subcommittee should be observational and take the lead from Administration and designated staff.

e. 14 – 050 Charge for Council departmental oversight subcommittee

T. Lizotte: I think everything is in line but I'd add under membership that the Town Administrator or designee(s) as needed.

J. Sullivan motioned to approve the subcommittee (3 Council members and one alternate) charge and amend Membership Section to say "Town Administrator or designee(s)" under membership section. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

D. Winterton: I think we had 3 Council members and an alternate.

D. Ross: Is there any conflict where it says department heads will be welcomed participants? I'd like clarity on the roles of the subcommittee so we aren't interfering with any managerial aspects of the Administrator's job.

Dr. Shankle: The one change I asked Councilor Jennings to make is under purpose. It originally said "departments" where it says "policies." I think if you stay focused on policies, you'll be OK.

D. Ross: When you have Councilors and department heads that could be a misconception. We don't want to interfere with the Town Administrator.

Dr. Shankle: I think it's important for the committee if we are going to work with the data we have they can sit with the people who know the department policies. There will be more clear-cut efficiencies, as long as everyone understands their roles.

N. Comai: My guess is the subcommittee could be charged with one project at a time approved by Council and Town Administrator and have a list of objectives and goals; everyone would be more comfortable with that.

Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Sullivan motioned to extend the meeting from 9:30 pm to 9:45 pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime. Vote 6-1 in favor.

R. Duhaime: I want to understand the policies. I don't want to get into the nitty gritty. I'll be more educated on how they do things. We are looking at efficiencies to save money for tax payers.

T. Lizotte: The charter deals with directives but I can ask any department a question. The charge stipulates bringing it to the board.

f. 14 – 051 Discussion of ambulance collection policy and billing rates

Deputy Chief Hoisington and Asst. Chief Jore

Asst. Chief Jore: We have increased Medicaid/Medicare rates and addressed the uncollected funds. The 2014 rates bring us more in line with surrounding communities.

T. Lizotte: On page 5, "will" is a strong word. Can we change it to "may consider?"

T. Lizotte motioned to change page 5 to read "When all collection procedures are exhausted, The Hooksett Town Council may consider writing off any uncollected debt." Seconded by J. Sullivan. Vote unanimously in favor.

R. Duhaime: The payment plan you had drawn up, was that added?

Deputy Chief Hoisington: That has always been the policy in the hardship paperwork.

D. Winterton: Do we have to vote to change this and do we have to vote every year?

J. Sullivan: The wording says it will adjust annually so by voting it in this year, I'd say it would not require a vote.

D. Winterton: What if Medicare fees go down but private pay doesn't follow? Is Medicare plus the only way people set rates?

Asst. Chief Jore: Yes, that seems to be typical. They choose the percentage. Medicare fees get adjusted and that was the reason for the wording so it would stay in line with current Medicare costs.

D. Winterton: Dr. Shankle mentioned we may want a public hearing. Can you talk to that?

Dr. Shankle: I don't think there is a requirement but at the very least I'd wait until the next meeting for a vote.

J. Levesque: If my house burns down, I don't get a bill. If I have a medical emergency and you show up do you accept what the insurance pays or do you bill extra? If you are a resident and you are out of town you are on your own?

Dr. Shankle: The intent is to get what we can from the insurance company and let the residents off the hook for the rest.

D. Ross: Public hearing is a great idea. I don't see a problem with these rates.

D. Winterton: On the yellow flow chart, if the patient refuses treatment or does not require services, no bill is issued. If you go there and provide some service and the patient refuses, does he get a bill?

Deputy Chief Hoisington: Only if there is a transport. If there is no transport, there is no bill.

J. Sullivan: If you defibrillate and they deny transport, there is no charge?

Deputy Chief Hoisington: Correct.

D. Winterton: If you provide a service, they don't get billed unless they get a ride? Is that a law?

Deputy Chief Hoisington: It's insurance.

D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting for 10 minutes. Seconded by T. Lizotte. Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Ross motioned to move to public hearing with amended wording. Seconded by J. Levesque. Vote unanimously in favor.

g. 14 – 052 Discussion of District Court Lease

Dr. Shankle: They are looking for a 4-year lease with minimal increases; I talked to Leo and we do well on this.

R. Duhaime motioned to authorize the Town Administrator to sign the lease as proposed by the state. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

D. Winterton: On page 16, exhibit B, it says we assume janitorial services such as daily vacuuming, mopping, cleaning, etc.

Dr. Shankle: Yes, we do that.

D. Ross: In section 8.9, my concern would be there may need to be significant repair to the fire alarm system.

Dr. Shankle: If you want to hold off, I can find out for the next meeting.

D. Ross: We are responsible for maintenance costs and it could be significant.

T. Lizotte motioned to table the motion to 6/25/14 meeting. Seconded by J. Sullivan.

Vote unanimously in favor.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

R. Duhaime: SNHPC: Discussion on energy – estimates the New England Grid needs the power of 3 Northern Passes and 2 gas pipe lines to replace retiring power plants; plan by SNHPC got plan of the year for model for equipment-sharing program.

J. Sullivan: Heritage Commission is hosting Family Feud tomorrow at 5:30 pm; games begin at 6:30.

D. Winterton: Planning Board meeting was canceled. Nothing to report for Economic Development or Hooksett Youth Achiever.

D. Ross: Conservation Commission did not meet due to error in posting. We lost our recording secretary – Jodi Pinard no longer has time for the duties.

J. Levesque: Board of Assessors met and a lot of adjustments were made as properties are getting older and values are going down. ZBA met and there was only one continuation of an applicant – rents a building from John Kelly and wants to get a variance to do inspections/repairs. They are not supposed to do any repairs involving any fluids. They reached out to the Town Administrator for advice and one of the abutters showed up and brought up the applicant was a renter and only the owner can apply for a variance. They voided the variance request. He may come back with the owner or a Power of Attorney letter but right now the issue is dead. It's a groundwater protection area so they should not be doing repairs. The garage next door does repairs but is grandfathered in eventually and the Performance Zone will take over.

J. Sullivan: Who gives the license to do inspection? State?

J. Levesque: He went to the state to get the permit and was told he had to be approved by the town first.

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

R. Duhaime: I was on the Planning Board when that got approved and he knew there was no outside storage vehicles approved on that site. We put all these conditions on the plan so it wouldn't be a used car lot.

J. Sullivan: Dr. Shankle is making a note to have the code enforcement officer look into that issue.

T. Lizotte: Saturday is championship day for Hooksett Little League; has there been any discussion on the traffic issue?

Chief Bartlett: it doesn't appear that there is going to be a procession or large gathering for Mrs. Robie. I don't anticipate any traffic problem but I'll confirm tomorrow.

R. Duhaime: I got permission from Cigna to use that as overflow parking. The church members are parking at Holy Rosary but I don't know if anyone let HYAA know not to park there. I don't know if we can do anything to help the coordination.

Chief: There aren't going to be lines of cars, I don't think.

R. Duhaime: As they leave the cemetery, they will pull into Veterans Drive all at once.

Dr. Shankle: They are coming in from both ends. We'll make sure it's taken care of.

J. Sullivan: For the Veterans Park dedication, we got approval to park on the lawn, so that might be an option for additional parking.

PUBLIC INPUT

None

J. Sullivan: On behalf of Council I'd like to close the public hearing on the alarm ordinance and also close the public hearing on the pawn shop ordinance.

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 10:10 pm. Seconded by T. Lizotte.

Roll Call

T. Lizotte – Yes

R. Duhaime – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

D. Ross – Yes

J. Levesque - Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

***D. Winterton motioned to seal the non-public minutes of 6/11/14. Seconded by T. Lizotte.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to exit non-public at 10:26 pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to adjourn at 10:26 pm. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney