

TOWN COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 28, 2015

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL – ATTENDANCE

Donald Winterton, Nancy Comai (left at 9:30 pm), Timothy Tsantoulis, James Levesque, Adam Jennings, Marc Miville, David Ross, Chair James Sullivan, Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr. (Town Administrator)
Missed: Robert Duhaime

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

SPECIAL RECOGNITIONS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. Public: October 14, 2015

M. Miville: As Council Secretary, I have reviewed the votes tallied and confirm they are accurate.

A. Jennings motioned to accept the public minutes of October 14, 2015 with edits. Seconded by T. Tsantoulis.

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

AGENDA OVERVIEW

Chair Sullivan provided an overview of tonight's agenda.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. Public Hearing for Amendment to Other Ordinance #00-31 Solid Waste – Disposal Fees for Electronics

J. Sullivan: *"The Hooksett Town Council will be holding a public hearing on Wednesday, October 28, 2015 at 6:30pm at the Hooksett Town Hall – Council Chambers, 35 Main Street, Hooksett, NH. The purpose of the public hearing is to adopt a proposed fee change to Ordinance #00-31 Solid Waste. This notice is per Chapter 231:132-a of the NH Revised Statutes annotated, and section 3.6 of the Hooksett Town Charter. The full text of the proposed ordinance change is on file with the Town Clerk and via www.hooksett.org for your inspection. Questions should be directed to the Office of the Town Clerk at 485-9534."* On behalf of Council I declare this public hearing open. We have our Public Works Director, Diane Boyce. Then we will open it up to Council questions and the public.

D. Boyce: We are asking for a small increase in electronics fees. They are skyrocketing on our end for the disposal. This might not address the entire amount we need, but we don't want to see more electronics on the side of the road. We're getting quite a few now. We haven't raised rates since 2006.

J. Sullivan: Nothing else has changed other than fees?

D. Boyce: No.

A. Jennings: How much in tonnage per month do you take in?

D. Boyce: About 3.5 tons a month; we started at 8 or 9 30-yard boxes a year and we are up to about 15 boxes a year. We are taking in quite a bit.

J. Sullivan: Seeing no public comment, we will close this hearing after our second public input and vote at our next meeting per our process.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Donations for the 10/30/15 Hooksett Public Works Haunted Woods & Hayride Event
- b. Donation of Playground Equipment valued at \$1,799.00 from the Roy Family to the Hooksett Public Works Dept.
- c. Landscape Surety Release \$11,610.00 to Heritage Family Federal Credit Union

- d. Sidewalk Bond Release \$17,500.00 to Walmart c/o Asset Management Consultants
- e. Grant reimbursement \$1,411.82 from NH Dept. of Safety/NH Bureau of EMS to the Hooksett Fire-Rescue Dept.

J. Sullivan: Heather Roy is here; thank you very much to the Roy family for their generous donation of playground equipment.

D. Ross motioned to accept item "b" of the consent agenda. Seconded by J. Sullivan.

D. Ross: I'm not sure if there is going to be any further recognition beyond what happens tonight, but perhaps there should be.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Ross motioned to accept item "a" of the consent agenda. Seconded by D. Winterton.

D. Ross: It seems like an open-ended acceptance. Have we done something like this before? It seems like we are accepting something in the dark. It says what it is for, they hayride and event; maybe we should define what it is consisting of? I don't want to set a bad precedent of accepting donations that are open-ended.

Dr. Shankle: I am pretty strict about departments not using things that are donated until you accept them. This event is on the 30th and you don't meet again until November 18, so all these things are sitting there and can't get distributed. We are letting you know that we are going to accept it and we want to use it when it comes in rather than wait until your next meeting. If it was cash, it wouldn't be an issue, but these are things we are using on the 30th.

D. Boyce: Yes, it consists of hot dogs, popcorn, lights, and those kinds of items coming in as we speak. If Council wants us to list things we can come back with the items that were donated for the event.

D. Ross amended the motion to include "non-cash donations."

T. Tsantoulis: Why do we need to specify things that people donate to the town? Any situation where we are looking at a time constraint, I don't know if we need to tie our hands with making it too complex.

J. Sullivan: Is this motion meeting the requirements of RSA 91-B:3?

Dr. Shankle: In terms of the exact dollar value, it's going to be hard to put a dollar value on things like popcorn. I don't like the idea of taking it, having the event this Friday from 6-9pm and then coming back after. If you want us to bring it back after, we certainly can do that. Whatever you want us to do we will do. This motion will meet the requirements of that RSA.

D. Ross: My concern again is the order of things, where we are accepting things we haven't received yet. Specifying non-cash donations makes me feel more comfortable. No one should be allowed to accept cash donations until they come here first.

M. Miville: As a member of the Oversight Committee, we went over this with Mrs. Boyce. There is a policy in the department where she logs everything by the citizen who is donating things. That information comes to us and that log is maintained at the DPW. I think she is doing her due diligence to record this.

N. Comai: Thank you for bringing it up, but we trust that she is logging everything. We have bigger things to move on to. And we really appreciate the donations.

Vote unanimously in favor of amendment.
Vote unanimously in favor of amended motion.

N. Comai: So you will accept cash donations, but you cannot use them until it comes back to the Council.

D. Winterton motioned to approve consent agenda items "c, d, e." Seconded by A. Jennings.

D. Ross: On the sidewalk bond release – this is money we had Wal-Mart purchase a bond with in lieu of potential future installation of sidewalks? This is why some of these things should be handled as separate items. I don't agree with this bundling of large items, especially non-related items.

J. Sullivan: You have the option to remove items from the consent agenda. It might make it more cumbersome but it's an opportunity for you to consider things individually.

D. Ross: With this sidewalk bond release, it indicates there is no plan and we are not going to be installing any sidewalks?

Dr. Shankle: Yes. I spoke to the Town Planner and that is why I concur. She said there is no intention of putting in a sidewalk up there. There is nobody in Hooksett that would walk to Wal-Mart.

M. Miville: As of today, there have been no discussions of sidewalks in the Wal-Mart area. Are we giving up on the discussions of sidewalks because Wal-Mart is pushing back or the town just decided not to have sidewalks in that area?

Dr. Shankle: We have held the bond longer than we should have. At this point there are no sidewalks down there to connect to. If there were, they would probably be coming out of Manchester anyway. JoAnne said there were no plans for sidewalks there; Wal-Mart has asked for their money back.

M. Miville: So there is consensus that neither side wants to participate?

Dr. Shankle: Diane, did you talk to the Planning Board about this? JoAnne said it made sense to release it. Do you know if the Planning Board discussed it?

D. Boyce: I didn't talk to the Planning Board, but I looked into some old files. It was just in case we decided to go that way. There have been no discussions in the town since 2007.

D. Ross: The concern was there wasn't any kind of promise or representation made to Wal-Mart that there would be a sidewalk and this was their part of it?

D. Boyce: No I think it was something the previous DPW director put in, just in case. Wal-Mart doesn't expect anything.

Vote unanimously in favor.

TOWN ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

- We are in the process of working on S. Bow Road. We are in the middle of paving and finishing the road, and it turns out they are going to do an overrun on the cost estimate. We said no because it's more than what Council approved and we need to bring it back to the Council. This is new from Monday. We need you to amend the contract with Pike Industries – increase of \$14,425 from the paving line to complete the work on S. Bow Rd. (See Attachment "A") If we hold this until the next meeting, they won't be able to pave anymore and it's half paved now.

D. Boyce: There was a little oversight in the original specs that went out. There was some handwork that needed to be done on the driveways, there was a little bit of conveying that we were close to going over. There is still \$100,000 worth of work to be done. We need this amendment right away. They are planning on finishing next week and it really needs to be done – guardrails, line striping, and safety for the road. It was a little bit of Pike, a little of the engineering that was done in the beginning and a little bit the message being conveyed that we were going over.

Dr. Shankle: I just want to point out this was before we had our current town engineer.

N. Comai: In the discussion portion of the staff report it states the total amount over is \$31,924.50.

D. Boyce: It is. They made some adjustments - some of the loam they added to complete the job, they are going to bump it down to their cost; the other part is they can reduce the topcoat for the asphalt from 1.5" to 1.25", and save \$13,000.

N. Comai: Does our engineer concur with that statement? That is my concern.

D. Boyce: He absolutely does.

T. Tsantoulis: Who is primarily responsible for the oversight?

D. Boyce: All parties involved. I think Pike knew they were going over and they believe they conveyed that message to their engineer and it goes back to the original design that was put out there. The road was raised because of the water issues. It was more of the work that had to be done on the sides of the road that increased the cost to level out the side of the road.

T. Tsantoulis: Do you feel they have been working in good faith to mitigate the issue and didn't do anything underhanded?

D. Boyce: I don't believe that at all. I think it was a little bit of all of them.

N. Comai: I don't believe the other bids that came in were a difference of \$14,000; by continuing on this path, I don't think we have shorted anybody else.

D. Boyce: I'm 100% confident on that. There were a lot of issues with the driveways and that had to be addressed with the residents. We had to raise the road quite a bit and there were a couple driveway issues we had to address.

M. Miville: I recall the Budget Committee adding money to the paving line; is that going to short us on any other project this year? It's only \$14,000 but is it going to short us on another street?

D. Boyce: Sure, it will short us. The paving line needs to increase; the paving in this town is way behind and needs to be addressed.

M. Miville: In previous years, we were averaging around \$240,000, \$225,000 I remember one year, and the Budget Committee increased it to \$300,000 this year.

Dr. Shankle: In terms of how much paving we have to do next year depends on what kind of winter we have this year.

M. Miville: As I recall, that's why the Budget Committee increased it because of the bad winter we had last year.

D. Ross: My concern is these jobs are put out to bid, and the purpose of the bid process is for companies to come in and bid how much they can do the job for. It sounds to me like an error, that I don't consider to be on our part. They knew what they were getting into; they knew what the road looked like. How far apart were the bids on this particular job?

D. Boyce: They were going by the original specs that were put out, so you will see some difference there. Bisbee Construction at \$477,000; Advance Paving at \$513,000; Pike Industries at \$471,000; Continental Paving at \$470,000. The reason we didn't accept their bid is because they couldn't do it this year and after we opened the bids, they changed their mind and said yes they could, but that wasn't good practice. Connie's Septic at \$668,000.

D. Ross: It sounds like the bids were awful close and this is going beyond someone else's bid; and that's not fair to the other bidder. We have specs designed by people who know more than we do. For them as a company to decide on 1.25" instead of 1.5", I have a problem with that. That seems to be changing an industry standard just to save a few bucks, I don't like that and I think it's wrong. If Pike can't absorb \$31,000 on a \$500,000 job that they underbid, that's their problem in my opinion. I don't think we should let them get out of doing what they said they were going to do.

Dr. Shankle: Their position, and the town engineer concurs, is that the bid we put out wasn't adequate for the job that needed to be done. They said we should talk to the engineer that did the original bid. Everybody bid on what we put out. No matter which company we chose, at this point they would be coming back and saying we bid on this but it's not the right thing to do the job. That's one reason we got a town engineer so we won't be using outside engineers to do those sort of things for us.

D. Winterton: Does that mean we might have recourse against the outside engineering firm that didn't properly engineer the project?

Dr. Shankle: I don't know, but we can look into that.

J. Sullivan: The reason for the increase is because the specs originally bid on were incorrect?

Dr. Shankle: According to Pike and the town engineer, they weren't adequate for the job.

J. Sullivan: If the bids were correct, would they be obligated to complete the task?

Dr. Shankle: We wouldn't be here if what they bid on was correct in the first place and if the town engineer said they didn't need to do it, but he agrees that it needs to be done. Normally we are more conservative; we'd rather ask you for more money and have some left than cut it so close. I'm hoping this will never happen again now that Jim is on staff as Town Engineer.

D. Boyce: We talked about putting contingencies in to the contracts because we are going to be putting out a lot more paving bids.

J. Sullivan: If the motion fails, will they finish it minus the \$14,000 extra work?

D. Boyce: Most of the work except the final coat, striping and guardrails is done; it needs to be completed to make the road safe.

D. Ross: Who changed the spec? Did they make the decision on their own or did we direct them to do this?

D. Boyce: I believe there were some conversations between the engineer and Pike.

D. Ross: Just conversations, not official directives that changed what they were getting themselves into. Pretty standard in any contract is as long as the overruns don't exceed 10% you eat it. If it is more than 10% then you re-negotiate. We are looking at \$31,000 on a \$471,000 contract.

N. Comai: The specs were incorrect.

D. Ross: They changed it, we didn't.

J. Levesque: The road work itself, was that done by Pike too?

D. Boyce: Yes.

J. Levesque: There were quite a few driveways that had to be tapered quite a ways. I think it's a combination of a lot of things.

N. Comai: If you look into it and find the engineer can come up with what we paid them to do the original work and they say they can eat some of it then you put it back in the till.

D. Boyce: I believe we only paid him \$15,000 to do the entire spec anyway.

M. Miville: A "no" vote stops the work tomorrow so they won't finish. I say let them finish and work out any negotiations we have to. The next time Pike submits a bid, we have to make sure they are bidding on everything that needs to be done.

Dr. Shankle: They know how unhappy I am with them about this. They should have come to us for change orders and they didn't and they know I am unhappy about that but we need to get the job done.

T. Tsantoulis: If Pike didn't correct the driveways now, wouldn't we be responsible for that later on? How much time and money would that add up to?

D. Boyce: Correct. I'd think that cost would be pretty similar.

M. Miville: Is there anything in the contract that says any cost overruns are incurred by the bidder? If it goes over bid, who pays for that?

Dr. Shankle: They stop; they will eat what they have done already and not do any more work.

J. Sullivan: So that is something you will look into, to see if there can be some action taken?

Dr. Shankle: I looked over the contract and that needs some work too.

D. Boyce: The contract was done by an outside engineer.

N. Comai motioned to support the contract amendment in the amount of \$14,425 to complete the job. Seconded by M. Miville.

Roll Call -

M. Miville – Yes

D. Ross – No

J. Levesque – Yes

A Jennings – Yes

N. Comai – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

T. Tsantoulis – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote 7-1 in favor.

- The Haunted Trail is this Friday from 6-9pm.
- James King attended Culvert Maintaining Recertification Training, part of the Road Scholar program; he is one of the highway guys.
- We got a letter from the fire chief from a person who was in an accident; they acknowledged Dennis Desrochers who was off duty and assisted all parties involved.
- Letter from Doris Sorel – Hooksett Garden Club has a committee that works at the intersection of Route 3-A and Main St; 10/20 Michael Sorel and crew fertilized trees at the point and pruned dead branches. Research needed on the problem with this tree.
- There is a process on charter amendments, and you voted to move ahead with changes to the town meeting; I received a letter from Jay Hodes agreeing with our suggested changes. Town Clerk has to send it to the Secretary of State.
- We talked about bidding out the town attorney contract; we did an RFP and got 3 bids back. I'd like to interview all 3 of them. I have staff people that are going to be part of the interviews, but if any of the Councilors would like to be involved that would be nice.

Consensus to have D. Winterton, M. Miville and D. Ross attend, if schedules permit.

- I'm not asking for any action because it's not on the agenda, but my proposal for the police/fire consolidation, a committee has come up a couple times. I'm not opposed to that. I'd like to see a committee that first looks at the administrative processes and procedures and set up of police and fire now and then go over the proposal in detail. Then they come back to Council with recommendations. I believe that what I am suggesting is a cost-effective, efficient manner of change. If the public isn't sold on it yet, I'm glad to have the public get sold on it because I think it's a good idea.

J. Sullivan: If we want to ask questions, it needs to be brought off the table.

D. Ross motioned to establish an ad hoc committee to study this proposal, consisting of Councilors, members of either department as well as some interested parties in the public.

D. Ross: There are some former Councilors who have expressed some concern over this and would be happy to serve and advise. I think moving carefully on this kind of thing is really important.

J. Sullivan: My understanding of the motion that was made last time was to table it. It's not on the agenda, and before we start to discuss anything, it needs to be removed from the table to allow him to do that. If we don't, I don't think we should be talking about it. I believe your intention is part of the whole process.

D. Ross: It's totally different.

J. Sullivan: I believe it's a violation of the table. I'm asking for a motion to remove it from the table. I will not entertain that motion until we remove it from the table. If you don't agree with my thoughts, then you can make a motion to overrule me.

D. Ross: You can't have two motions on the table.

J. Sullivan: I am declaring your motion out of order because it has been tabled. We have a process; anything regarding this I think it's important to do that. Once it's off the table, I'll ask Mr. Ross for that motion.

M. Miville: According to Robert's Rules, we have to remove it off the table at the next session, even if we table it right after that.

J. Sullivan: As Chair, I have some authority. If you don't agree with my decision, you can override it. If we start changing the process, we lose all credibility and any decision we make is going to be tainted. I'm requesting it be removed from the table. There has been no second to that motion. I'm inclined to entertain Mr. Ross's suggestion but we have to remove it to be discussed.

J. Levesque: If we remove it from the table, can the original motion be voted on or can it be re-tabled?

J. Sullivan: It would need to be re-tabled. Our intention was to have it placed on the agenda because we requested public comments and questions submitted up until last Friday. Dr. Shankle requested we don't put it on the agenda until he had time to make sure he had a 100% clear answer. I'm just asking you to follow the rules.

M. Miville motioned to remove the item off the table for discussion. Seconded by D. Winterton. Vote 5-3 in favor.

J. Sullivan: The motion was made to direct Dr. Shankle to proceed. It's removed from the table, so we can discuss it now.

N. Comai: Since I was not at the last meeting, and I did review the minutes and the tape, what I didn't hear from the public was anything new that hadn't been considered by the Board. The only thing that made me think is the associate Town Administrator which, in my opinion, is not the direction we would take. This Board is the authority on the administrative side of things and we would not put the public in danger in any sense. This Board, I believe, gave Dr. Shankle the green light to move forward. It sounds like we are waffling because a few people didn't like the idea. I believe this is the way to go; if we have to make tweaks and changes along the way we certainly can. To keep squashing things because we are afraid, is, in my opinion, a waffling situation. This Board has made some great decisions, and we have brought this town leaps and bounds ahead. If we have to re-table this, I'd be happy to make that motion.

J. Sullivan: I want to follow the rules to accommodate everyone's motion. The current motion on the floor would need to be removed to address Mr. Ross's request.

M. Miville motioned to table the current motion. Seconded by N. Comai. Vote 7-1 in favor.

J. Sullivan: Let me clarify. The Town Administrator has the authority to propose administrative changes. There was a motion made at the last meeting regarding allowing him to move ahead with the consolidation of the police and fire department beginning with the recruitment of a public safety director. The motion Mr. Ross would like to offer is a continuation of that, so I think it's germane to the situation. I'm going to declare that out of order unless Council wants to overrule me.

Dr. Shankle: You need to take that motion off the table, vote it down and then have a discussion on the subject then you can entertain a new motion.

M. Miville: My understanding is that is a new discussion; to move forward is off the table. This is a vote to establish a committee. It's not part of the previous motion; it's an additional part of the process. The previous motion was the actual vote.

J. Sullivan: My intention is to allow that to happen, but I think this is the best procedural way to do that.

T. Tsantoulis: We need to understand that we have a Chair of this Council and in times of discord, we need to listen to the Chair and abide by his ruling.

J. Sullivan: There is a will from the public to have more public input and advice and consideration. We will put it off until our next meeting. I think we should follow the process and accommodate the wishes of these members who decided to serve. We should not have re-tabled it, that's why I voted no. And have your motion voted down or have Mr. Winterton remove the motion and the new topic at hand brought up by Mr. Ross would be allowed.

J. Sullivan motioned to remove the article from the table.

M. Miville: You were not on the prevailing side. Process-wise, you cannot make that motion.

M. Miville motioned to remove it from the table again. Seconded by J. Sullivan.

J. Sullivan: It's not on the agenda but according to Robert's Rules, it had to be removed from the table or it would have been in violation.

Vote 5-2 in favor. T. Tsantoulis abstained.

J. Sullivan: Mr. Winterton, would you like to remove your motion from the 10/14 meeting?

D. Winterton: Not really. I support public input and committees looking into the operational side of police and fire. We are looking into an administrative consolidation of police and fire. I'd be in favor of a committee as long as their charge is to look at the operational aspects of police and fire departments rather than go on a Google hunt for places that say do it or don't do it. They should examine what happens in Hooksett, not any other towns. I think if we pass that motion we should freeze current positions in place so we can see if our operational aspects today are how we want them to be. Part of my original motion was to put the organizations back to what they are today, after 3 years. I'd consider removing my motion, based on the fact that my next motion would be on the charge of the committee. The charge would be to examine operational procedures and reports from both police and fire departments.

D. Winterton removed the motion from 10/14 to allow the Town Administrator to move forward to consider positions for public safety director and a deputy public safety director/fire chief and deputy public safety director/police chief.

J. Levesque: Can you remove it without the second being here? You are talking about procedure and that's the procedure.

J. Sullivan: We use Robert's Rules as a guide; with your experience, can that motion still be removed if the person who seconded is not here? The only way to solve this is leave it there and vote no. We can still bring it up again.

A. Jennings: We can appeal the decision of the Chair and override the decision that it's not the same thing, re-table this and vote in the subcommittee to report back to us so we can make that decision.

D. Winterton: Since I cannot remove my motion, I will call the question.

J. Sullivan: It requires a majority.

Majority is declared.

J. Sullivan: We are calling the question on the motion from last week "to allow the Town Administrator to move ahead with the consolidation of the police and fire department by beginning recruitment for the Public Safety Director, Fire Chief and Police Chief, based on three-year contracts." We called the question and there is a roll call requested.

N. Comai: An affirmative vote does what and a negative vote does what?

J. Sullivan: Yes means that Mr. Winterton's motion to proceed without any committee will pass.

M. Miville: This item is not on the agenda. Whether it was tabled or not, it was based on the point last week that the Town Administrator was coming back with answers. That has not been accomplished yet. The no vote would put it on the next agenda.

J. Sullivan: We haven't voted on the reorganization, this is just another avenue to explore with more public input.

M. Miville: The next motion would have to be altered because it would be the same motion again.

D. Winterton: Unless we have a vote for reconsideration.

J. Sullivan: Motion would be to create a committee to look at it to allow us to review their findings and vote. We tabled it; in order to talk about it, since it's off the table, everything starts from scratch. We are accommodating your request and following the process.

J. Levesque: This issue was not on the agenda; we are discussing something and voting on something that is not on the agenda. I think we should vote this thing down as a service to the community. Then we can go along with Mr. Ross's idea and discuss that at our next meeting. If we vote in the affirmative, then we are doing a grave injustice to the people of Hooksett because it was not on the agenda.

J. Sullivan: If a topic is tabled, it will be on the next agenda automatically. We told everyone it would be on the agenda at that meeting. It was on the original agenda and Dr. Shankle wanted to remove it because there were a couple questions he wasn't prepared to answer. I was going to ask that we remove it from the table and right after that place it back on the table so we could follow through and tell the voters and adhere to the process.

Dr. Shankle: I knew I wasn't going to be ready with the answers to the questions. I was trying to do people a favor by not putting it on the agenda so they wouldn't keep running out to every meeting if we weren't really ready to discuss it.

J. Sullivan: Yes establishes a next step; a no allows further discussion.

Dr. Shankle: I knew there were a lot of questions about money. I wanted to be able to get the numbers on the table; 75% of the questions I got were about that. I can't get that answer if we don't move forward with this next step.

Roll Call –

T. Tsantoulis – No

D. Ross – No

A. Jennings – No

J. Levesque – No

D. Winterton – No
M. Miville – No
N. Comai – No
J. Sullivan – No
Motion fails 0-8.

D. Winterton motioned to establish an ad hoc committee at the discretion of the Chair to include no more than 7 citizens of Hooksett to examine operational aspects of police and fire in Hooksett, NH and to have the Town Administrator freeze positions in both departments until that report comes back. Seconded by A. Jennings.

D. Winterton: I don't want a Google search on what other towns do; I want to know what happens in Hooksett, operationally, and if this is something the departments can function under.

A. Jennings: The committee has a good jump off point with the questions submitted to Dr. Shankle.

M. Miville: I think Councilor Winterton established a charge for the committee within his motion.

D. Ross: My concern is freezing positions. I think that's wrong; that has nothing to do with establishing a committee. We currently have 2 operating departments; if they need to fill a position, who are we to stop them from doing that? My second concern is limiting participation; they aren't going to be voting on anything. But I'm dead set against freezing positions.

N. Comai: We have an Administrator who has done his research; we have history, we have what is going on in the two departments, we have the potential for effective change. Having a committee is fine; they can't be charged with any personnel discussions. We are the committee that creates this administrative movement. I believe a committee is moving us in a backward motion. We were looking for input from the public on things we haven't thought of. I'm not sure that is where the committee is going to take us.

J. Sullivan: The scope of the committee is reflected in the motion, but we need to have a deadline. We want to keep them on task. Someone should make an amendment to establish a deadline. If I am to select these members, I will appoint at least 2 Councilors. We have the authority to establish subcommittees. We can't have a committee of whoever wants to come, that's why we need to have a number. That's why I'd suggest a deadline in the amendment. It's been pointed out that in the past there have been ad hoc committees. I'm not saying this isn't a good use of an ad hoc committee. We could have had an ad hoc committee to look into whether we should have a public works director; we need to be careful of that. For every action we take, we could say we need public input. I don't want to stretch the process, but we need to give it due consideration. If every action results in a public committee, we won't get anything done. We have to be careful about why this and not that? No one would consider any cross-training; the Public Safety Director is administrative. I have some information that I will share with the committee. Do you have a suggestion on how long that should take?

Dr. Shankle: It depends on the people; if they can get together however quickly probably 3 times – once a week for 3 weeks I'd think they could gather enough information to understand where I am coming from.

J. Sullivan: If I can establish that committee by the beginning of next week; we have a meeting November 18, but I think we should make it the first meeting in December.

D. Winterton amended the motion to have the committee report back by the Dec. 2 meeting for discussion and take any action at the Dec. 16 meeting. Seconded by A. Jennings.

J. Levesque: If you are appointing a committee, why don't you collect some names and at the next meeting we will vote on them.

J. Sullivan: It's not up to Council to decide; according to the motion, it's up to me to decide.

M. Miville: Would this committee be privy to non-public information?

J. Sullivan: Dr. Shankle is indicating no.

Dr. Shankle: I think it's important for them to look at the 2 departments first, and I think we can move to what I am thinking without getting into that. I will be there at the meetings along with police and fire staff.

Roll Call-

N. Comai – No

D. Ross - No

A. Jennings – Yes

M. Miville – No

T. Tsantoulis – No

J. Levesque – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

J. Sullivan - Yes

Motion fails 4-4

J. Levesque: Did anything come about with the unsightly things around town?

Dr. Shankle: Nobody brought me anything new; we are looking into them. Unless it falls under the state statute regarding a junkyard, we can't do anything. We are looking into one place that isn't a business, it's in a residential area and it becomes a business, so that gives us a little bit of leverage.

M. Miville: Is the safety committee complete with examining the 2 stated roads we were looking and are we going to put that on an agenda?

Dr. Shankle: Chief Bartlett has indicated we will be able to put it on the agenda for the next meeting, November 18.

PUBLIC INPUT: 15 MINUTES

Michael Sorel, 54 Cross Rd: I want the record to show that I had no knowledge my name was going to be read into the record earlier. I am not a member of the Hooksett Garden Club, but I am married to the chair of that subcommittee. At her direction, I do certain things. That aside, I'm prompted to speak to the Council about this proposed Public Safety Director. I listened to the people who spoke and I spoke. I'd like to bring to the attention to the Council that this government in Hooksett has had a long, successful history of committees, serving the Town Council and/or the Board of Selectmen and/or the School Board. Let me point out a few from memory: Wage Salary and Fringe Benefit Committee; 16 North Main St. Building Renovation; Town Council form of government because the Board of Selectman appointed a committee of citizens to do research on whether we should stay a Board of Selectmen or move to a Town Council; 35 Main St Committee did a lot of work; Cabela's report saved the town from becoming a contingent liability because they wanted to own the bonds. We came to realize that if we didn't structure it properly, the town would be subject to a contingent liability. Charter changes; new Town Administrator hire – there were 2 committees. The first one sorted through the initial applications and the second one was to submit final recommendations; Underhill School addition committee. There are often 3 sides to an issue; subcommittees often see a side that no one else does. I totally agree with Dr. Shankle and Mr. Winterton's comments this evening. The written charge to that committee is important to the success of that committee. It should be well thought out and should not be done quickly. They need to know what the Council wants of them; if there are questions, they go back to the charge so they stay on task. If you are going to appoint a citizen's ad hoc committee, and I strongly advise and request that you do so. It's going to take a week or so to put a good charge together. Allow those citizens to go out and do some good work. There are a lot of people on both sides of this issue.

J. Sullivan: We voted on this suggestion, and it failed.

M. Sorel: It can be voted on in the future. Let me give you some names: Mrs. McHugh, Paul Loiselle, David Dickson, Mike DeBenedetto, Susan Doyon, Tabitha Jennings, Bill Gahara, Mary Farwell, Gerald Carney, Molly Callahan, Tom Barrett, Matt Barrett. There are many other qualified people. Some people will say they don't have time. I strongly request that you consider at your next meeting, putting together a committee. I think it would be beneficial to Dr. Shankle, Council, and ultimately to the town of Hooksett.

NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

SCHEDULED APPOINTMENTS

a. William "Bill" Bald, Risk-Ex, Town Group Health Insurance Bid Presentation
(See Attachment "B" for presentation)

M. Bose: We have a 30-day opt-out agreement with Health Trust; if no decision is made tonight, you will have to meet on November 4 to address this. Donna can notify the unions on October 29, they can vote on November 5 and report back for the opt-out by November 6 which falls in line with the 30-day opt-out clause should we switch to NHIT.

B. Bald: Domestic partner rider, the committee feels is important to add. The other piece is your current opt-out is \$2,400 annually; they are recommending increasing that to a flat \$5,000 annually. It's less expensive than insurance premiums and encourages them to go on a spousal plan if available.

M. Bose: Dental would need to be addressed to be included on the domestic partner rider.

B. Bald: If you do it for one, you do it for both. Dental did not go out to bid and the committee recommended keeping it with Health Trust. Claims pooling, (which is how loss ratio affects your pricing) with Health Trust, any claims above \$100,000 gets pooled, the amount with NH Interlocal is \$50,000.

N. Comai: I don't understand what shopping/employee engagement means.

B. Bald: Incentives on non-emergency type care to use lower-cost providers.

N. Comai: Insurable eligibility; you are eligible if you are an employee of the town?

B. Bald: Affordable Care Act defines full time as anyone working 30 or more hours; the other piece is domestic partner.

Dr. Shankle: The domestic rider shouldn't be an issue anymore; anyone can get legally married now. Why should we pay for someone's girlfriend?

Valerie Lamy: The committee's logic is that it's a progressive move for the town; it's not for a new relationship. They have to swear under oath that it's a committed, monogamous relationship. It would be a progressive move in attracting new employees.

D. Winterton: Who checks the monogamy?

B. Bald: The people sign an oath.

D. Winterton: As a steward of the town's pocketbook, I would be in favor if they paid 100% of the premiums. I lived with the same male for 7 years; I would have signed this for \$25,000 in health benefits.

D. Ross: I realize this is becoming a trend because they have legalized same-sex marriage, and they are providing equal rights. When you just have to self-declare, I'm enough of a realist to know that we are opening up a box we don't want to open. We are opening ourselves up to a potential cost to the citizens based on someone deciding to say they are or aren't. A family plan is meant for a family. I don't like the domestic partner rider.

N. Comai: Something recently happened at my company which is to sign an affidavit if there are any smokers in the house. I'd like to suggest adding an additional cost to anyone that smokes. If you sign it and it's found that you do, it's possible termination.

B. Bald: We are seeing a trend in the commercial market similar to that. Some employers use that as an incentive. It is something available to you; I believe you can charge up to 15% more for a smoker.

J. Sullivan: Is there a recommendation from the committee to go with which one?

M. Bose: The recommendation is switch to NH Inerlocal as well as add the domestic partner rider and increase the annual opt-out stipend from \$2,500 to \$5,000.

D. Winterton: Have you surveyed town employees as to how many might take the opt-out? Is the additional \$2,500 enough for the town to make that commitment? If they have already opted out, that has been enough incentive for them. Second question is, are these figures different than the current plan we have today?

B. Bald: Yes, Health Trust increase is 4.6% for POS, 4.8% for HMO and 4.7% for HSA; NH Interlocal works out to be a reduction.

A. Jennings: What is our risk for lowering our claims pool threshold from \$150,000 to \$50,000?

Rick Jones, Deputy Administrator, NH Interlocal Trust: You are a relatively small group; in any given year you can have one, none or several large claims. Anything above \$50,000 we figure into your experience; anything above is averaged across the entire group. In general, the lower the number the more protection it provides you.

D. Winterton: When we learn about how much the town contributes to the HSA, and we only have 6 people, does it make sense to continue to offer that as an option?

B. Bald: As a product offering, I think it makes sense for younger, healthier employees as a way to put money aside. The buy-out increase survey results were 12 said very likely, 14 said somewhat likely, 63 said not very likely, 17 didn't know. I'd say the survey was inconclusive. It was not completed by all employees so it might be a little skewed.

J. Sullivan: Going with NH Interlocal, the chances to hit the ceiling to kick in the Cadillac Tax is reduced with this option?

B. Bald: If your rates increase 7%/year beginning in 2017, it may give you another year or two before the Cadillac Tax kicks in. Currently the tax for 2018 applies for single premiums above \$10,200 and family premiums above \$27,500.

D. Ross motioned to accept the bid from NH Interlocal to be the new insurance carrier for town employees. Seconded by T. Tsantoulis.

D. Winterton: I'd like to know how much we are contributing to the HSA before I approve it as part of the plan.

A. Jennings: Savings from POS plan is \$550/month; even if we gave the employee \$1,000 we are still saving \$500/month over 10 months.

D. Winterton: I don't think this vote ties us to any contribution to the HSA.

B. Bald: We are only talking about insurance programs, not any HAS contributions.

D. Winterton: And we are not talking about employee contributions, which have been somewhat agreed on, but are open to interpretation if the unions don't like this.

Vote unanimously in favor.

D. Winterton motioned to add a domestic partner rider to the health insurance policy. Seconded by N. Comai.

D. Winterton: I will vote against my motion; in 2015 with the ability for people to marry another person that this is not necessary and it could be costly to this town.

M. Miville: Do the domestic partners have to be legally married?

B. Bald: The wording suggested by the committee is "monogamous relationship for 12 months" then they can add a partner and his/her dependents. If you are married, you are eligible to go on the plan.

D. Ross: My concern is you can have a single mom living with someone for 12 months and then get insurance for her and her dependents. We can't expose our taxpayers to that risk.

Roll Call -

A. Jennings – No
J. Levesque – No
D. Ross – No
M. Miville – No
D. Winterton – No
T. Tsantoulis – No
N. Comai – No
J. Sullivan - No

Motion fails 0-8

D. Ross motioned to accept the increased opt-out stipend from \$2,400 to \$5,000 annually. Seconded by J. Sullivan.

D. Ross: It's a lot less money for the town and it's a nice chunk of change for someone.

D. Winterton: I wish we would have a better handle on the future. Health insurance in the non-public arena is getting more and more expensive. This would be an attractive plan for any family that is eligible, to get on. We just gave 28 people a raise of \$2,600 probably about \$70,000 that we have just increased in our budget hoping we don't lose any of those 28 people.

N. Comai: If by chance, we have so many people that do opt-out, does that change the rates?

R. Jones: We are not concerned about people opting out; we are looking at about a 50/50 split. You just don't want to be paying people money who are on the exchange. There are complications with that.

D. Winterton: What are the complications?

R. Jones: If you pay employees extra money to go on the exchange, it's a penalty of \$100/employee/day. You can do it with retirees, but not employees.

D. Winterton: They want businesses to insure employees; they know the insurance exchange isn't good.

R. Jones: The IRS wants you to pay for your employees.

B. Bald: A lot of employers request they sign off that they have other coverage from an employer's plan.

Vote unanimously in favor.

b. Kathie Northrup – Town Hall Preservation Committee and Heritage Commission

K. Northrup: We have made considerable progress on this project in the last couple of years. (See Attachment "C")

J. Sullivan: I serve on that committee and we appreciate the help from staff.

N. Comai: When do you envision an event to be held at the Old Town Hall?

K. Northrup: Dr. Shankle is shooting before the anniversary of the town. I don't know, but I don't think 5 years is unreasonable. It's a small venue, and you have to scale the events to that size.

J. Sullivan: The next step would be the bathrooms and after that you could have some type of event; then the next step would be some type of kitchen facility.

Matt Lavoie, Code Enforcement Officer: Once you have the bathrooms completed, the fire department would need to issue an assembly permit.

Dr. Shankle: We are moving forward and still making progress.

K. Northrup: *(See Attachment "D")* If you have anything in mind that we should be doing, please let us know.

J. Sullivan: I serve with her on this committee too and she does 99% of the work. Hooksett has so much heritage and we are trying to preserve a lot of things.

M. Miville: I want to commend Kathie for her yeoman's work and dedication to an aspect of town that she devotes her time for and contributes greatly to the education of our town.

***M. Miville motioned to enter handouts received from Kathie Northrup into the record as part of the minutes. Seconded by D. Winterton.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

***D. Ross motioned to extend meeting to 9:45pm. Seconded by J. Sullivan.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

OLD BUSINESS

- a. 15-080 Berry Hill Roadway Bond – HOA Indemnification

J. Sullivan: We have no report, so this will be addressed on a future agenda.

- b. 15-069 Building Permit/Mechanical Permit Fees

***D. Ross motioned to adopt the fees as presented. Seconded by J. Levesque.
Vote 5-1 in favor.***

J. Sullivan: Councilor Jennings just stepped out for a minute, but we still have a quorum.

NEW BUSINESS

- a. 15-081 Budget Schedule 2015-2016

Dr. Shankle: The 1/9/16 meeting is the Saturday to discuss budgets, and last year you didn't want to do the Saturday meeting. If you don't want to do it on a Saturday, we will fit in somewhere.

***D. Winterton motioned to remove the Council budget workshop on 1/9/16 from the calendar.
Seconded by M. Miville.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

- b. 15-082 Town Group Health Insurance Bid

Dr. Shankle: We already took care of this.

- c. 15-083 Town Assessor Bid

Dr. Shankle: We will pass over that.

- d. 15-084 Town Legal Services Bid

Dr. Shankle: We will pass over this also.

- e. 15-085 Purchase of New Patrol PC Mobile Computer from Impact Fees

Chief Bartlett: With the addition of 3 new officers, I'd like to put another computer in one of the emergency vehicles. Should we be down a cruiser, it would be good for someone to not have to go back to the station and task the dispatcher with these requests. I'm looking to use impact fees because it's a growth issue. I think it's an appropriate expenditure for this type of purchase.

M. Miville: How much money is in that fund?

Chief Bartlett: Almost \$85,000.

J. Sullivan motioned to allow the police chief to purchase one new Patrol PC Generation 3 fixed mount mobile computer equipped with all necessary software, keyboard and laser scanner for \$4,339 with funds to come from appropriate impact fees. Seconded by A. Jennings.

A. Jennings: When do you expect the 3 police officers to be ready to go?

Chief Bartlett: We have 2 that are certified and out there currently. We had 3 in the academy and lost one. Those 2 graduate in December, so early spring they will be on their own.

A. Jennings: How long will it take to install this computer?

Chief Bartlett: In a matter of weeks; it won't take a long time. It's just a tablet and keyboard that gets put on the mount that is there.

Roll Call -

M. Miville – Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

D. Ross – Yes

T. Tsantoulis – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

f. 15-086 Dedicate the Balance and Future Impact Fee Account towards Police Dispatch and Holding Construction

Chief Bartlett: This process is for moving dispatch center from back to front of the building for better customer service. This includes construction as well as looking at other aspects to retrofit the back of the building to facilitate with the growth of the department. We have outgrown our locker facilities. Additionally, we are looking to create a safer environment in the holding facility. We have a wood booking counter and glass panels, and I'm not happy with the way it was initially set up. The cells are pretty nice, but the cell doors are just industrial steel doors with a deadbolt. We have had issues in the past where keys have broken off in the locks, and someone inside had kicked in the door so much we had to have the fire department help us with that. A rep from our property liability company, Travelers Insurance, came in and commented on some of the unsafe nature of some issues within our booking facility. I think if we can globalize this construction project and address everything at the same time, it will be prudent. Earmarking the impact fee balance is going to stop us from having to send back those fees for not utilizing them. The town attorney thought this was a great use as growth for the town. SMP Architectural Firm is the same company that worked on Station 1. Their construction management fee estimate was \$33,580 and a fee during construction if it proceeds of \$11,000, so that will eat up some of the \$82,000. We'll have to look at other funding as we move forward. I thought this was an appropriate place to start.

D. Winterton: Any ballpark on what your entire project might cost?

Chief Bartlett: I don't know. They haven't worked up any design, or moving utilities at this point.

D. Winterton: Are there any federal grants flying around?

Chief: Not that I'm aware of but I can check.

D. Ross: I'm all for earmarking it however we can legitimately do it. As far as awarding the construction management contract, I would hope that will go out to bid. That is a lot of money for a project that is relatively small.

Chief Bartlett: This was brought to your attention just as a highlight of what the management are going to entail; it will go out to bid.

D. Ross: I think it would be good to have a design buildout outfit bid on this; that way it's all one operation.

J. Sullivan: A bid process would be required according to the procedures we have.

J. Levesque: After the design is done, could overseeing the project be done by our town engineer?

Chief Bartlett: I don't know what his qualifications are.

Dr. Shankle: It depends on the level of architectural planning; he could probably do some of it. A lot isn't going to be that complicated.

J. Levesque: It would save the town a lot of money.

T. Tsantoulis: It's my understanding this would be ongoing. Are you able to function during the construction?

Chief Bartlett: I envision it happening in phases. The dispatch room would be first; we would operate on a mobile radio for however long it would take for the radio company come in.

T. Tsantoulis: I was more concerned with the holding area. That's an area that could potentially put the town in a lawsuit. We have to maintain a safe place for indigents.

Chief Bartlett: I am concerned about that safe place. We have to make a contingency plan; that may mean setting up a temporary booking facility and not have a holding facility. That might mean making arrangements with a neighboring town or with the Merrimack County Sheriff's office. During the construction, we wouldn't want prisoners in and out of there with tools and whatnot.

M. Miville: If you are spending all the money, you don't foresee anything coming up in the future that this money would be better spent on?

Chief Bartlett: I'm looking at globalization. That includes a dispatch move, larger locker room, holding facility, A/V improvements and a supervisor's office.

M. Miville: Dispatch is going into the media room in the front of the building?

Chief Bartlett: Correct. I'd like to see a window there so any future media would be in the training room.

M. Miville: How do you accumulate impact fees?

Chief Bartlett: They are from impact fees from buildings.

***D. Ross motioned to extend the meeting to 10:00pm. Seconded by J. Sullivan.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

J. Sullivan motioned to allow police chief to use \$82,000 in the police impact fee line to begin the process of construction management and cost estimation for the police department construction project for making improvements to the holding facility, video system, dispatch center move and locker room workspace improvements. Seconded by A. Jennings.

Roll Call-

D. Ross – Yes

D. Winterton – Yes

J. Levesque – Yes

A. Jennings – Yes

M. Miville – Yes

T. Tsantoulis – Yes

J. Sullivan – Yes

Vote unanimously in favor.

g. 15-087 Newsletter

A. Jennings motioned to allow the town newsletter to be inserted along with the November 2015 tax bill. Seconded by D. Ross.

K. Rosengren: I send a notice out to staff with a deadline for submissions. If we have any extra space I open it up to other events in town. If we have enough material, I submit it to you for inclusion in tax bills.

M. Miville: The only thing I'd recommend is the Business Retention Program. If you can squeeze something in great; if not, that's fine.

K. Rosengren: If we can get a write up by the end of the week that would be OK.

D. Ross: Maybe next time Council should put something in there.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Dr. Shankle: I think as far as getting something on the Business Retention, JoAnne sent me something to put in the *Banner* so you can get that blurb from JoAnne.

M. Miville: We are struggling to get businesses to participate.

h. 15-088 Street Name Approval – Bowtie Lane

J. Levesque motioned to approve the street name Bowtie Lane. Seconded by D. Winterton.

Dr. Shankle: It's off Evelyn, which is off Whitehall. There are 2 lots back there and they are going to put another one back there.

J. Sullivan: There is no need for a public input session since there are currently no people on it.

Vote unanimously in favor.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS

T. Tsantoulis: There is nothing to bring to Berry Hill; they are looking for action a little quicker than we are going to provide.

D. Ross: Conservation had an informational meeting on 10/26 on the Riverfront Trail project; I could not attend but I understand that the presentation was put together well by JoCarol Woodburn. Helicopter video and stills by Phil Fitanides have been spreading the word around Bear Paw and their membership.

M. Miville: Budget Committee has a meeting on Nov. 12. We are looking at the school board's current budget and adjustments. Proposed budget is \$1.928M increase; goes up 6.7% before anyone looks at it.

D. Winterton: Planning Board had a workshop on the master plan on 10/26; I was unable to attend. Union negotiations with fire on 11/4 (next Wednesday).

J. Levesque: Transfer met last night; the price of recycle went up a little but is still about ½ what we paid to get rid of trash. Still some positions open – 1 in transfer and several in highway. The highway department got the new 10-wheeler and chose the operator who I think is a good choice.

PUBLIC INPUT

J. Sullivan: Seeing no further public input, I am going to close the public hearing on the amendment to Ordinance #00-31 - Disposal Fees for Electronics.

**D. Ross motioned to adjourn at 10:05pm. Seconded by J. Levesque.
Vote unanimously in favor.**

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Tiffany Verney
Recording Clerk

Staff Report
Bid "Overage" for South Bow Rd and Auburn Rd Paving

October 28, 2015

Background: The Department of Public Works this spring went through a major reorganization. In order to move forward to use money that was designated for paving, an engineer was hired to draw up plans and specs for South Bow Road and Auburn Road, two of the worst roads as far as needing maintenance. On June 24, 2015, Pike Industries was awarded the bid for the South Bow Road Reconstruction and the repaving of Auburn Road. The bid was \$471,917.50.

Discussion: Last week, Pike Industries came forward and discussed the roads and the work that still needed to be done. There is a considerable amount of money that will be over the bid. The total amount of work will amount to \$503,842. The overage is due to the elevation of the road requiring more asphalt, additional work done on the sides of the slopes and the underestimating of hand paving required for driveways. The total amount over is \$31,924.50. The base of the road is now in great shape. Pike Industries has offered the following solution: They have reduced the cost amount of the additional loam that was placed from \$18.00sf to \$9.00sf (saving \$4,500), subtracting ¼" of final coat of asphalt (saving \$13,000). The contract change would be in the amount of \$14,425.00.

Issue: The Council needs to support the contract amendment in the amount of \$14,425 to complete the job.

Fiscal Impact: \$14,425 would have to be expended from the 2015-2016 Paving Line (which is \$300,000)

Recommendation: I recommend the Council support the contract amendment in the amount of \$14,425 to complete the work on South Bow Rd.

Town Administrator Recommendation:


Dean E. Shankle, Jr., Ph.D.
Town Administrator

Town of Hooksett

Health Insurance RFP Review


October 28, 2015

William Bald, CRM, CIC, MBA
RISK-ex Global, LLC




Process Overview

- Request for Proposals Issued 9/23/15 with a Due Date 10/22/15:
- Respondents:
 - HealthTrust/Anthem (Current)
 - NH Interlocal Trust/Harvard
 - CGI/ Harvard & Anthem (Electronic Submission Only)




Rate Comparison

POINT OF SERVICE	HealthTrust	NH Interlocal
Single	\$825 19	\$754 60
2 Person	\$1,650 38	\$1,509 10
Family	\$2,228 02	\$2,037 30
HMO	HealthTrust	NH Interlocal
Single	\$765 15	\$695 05
2 Person	\$1,530 29	\$1,391 10
Family	\$2,065 89	\$1,995 26
HSA	HealthTrust	NH Interlocal
Single	\$601 79	\$553 01
2 Person	\$1,203 59	\$1,104 90
Family	\$1,624 84	\$1,487 36



Consolidated Financial Comparison

	HealthTrust	NH Interlocal
POS (36 Single, 26 2-Person, 48 Family)	\$2,174,544.72	\$1,988,421.60
HMO (3 Single, 2 2-Person, 3 Family)	\$138,644.70	\$126,277.56
HSA (1 Single, 0 2-Person, 5 Family)	\$104,711.88	\$95,877.72
Total Premium (RFP Census)	\$2,417,901.30	\$2,210,576.88
*Employees Pay 12% of Premium (10% Fire)		
PROJECTED SAVINGS	N/A	\$207,324.42



COMPARISON - REFERRED POS IN-NETWORK BENEFITS

PLAN TYPE	HealthTrust - Referral Network	NH Interlocal - Referral Network
NETWORK	New England	National
DEFERABLE	Yes	Yes
COFOFAY	\$15	\$15
PREVENTIVE CARE	\$0	\$0
HOSPITAL HEALTH COST	\$10	\$10
HOSPITAL SERVICES DEDUCTIBLE - Employee/Family	\$0	\$0
EMERGENCY ROOM/URGENT CARE	\$1000	\$1000
HOSPITAL OUT OF POCKET MAXIMUM AMOUNT	\$10,000	\$10,000
HOSPITAL & LAB - CAT W/O PFT	\$0	\$0
PHYSICIAN SERVICES	\$100/visit - 12 Months	\$100/visit - 12 Months
OBSTETRIC CARE	\$0 - 25 Weeks	\$10 - Unlimited Weeks
DEFERABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$100 Deductible After 20%	\$0
HOSPITAL SURGICAL CENTER (ASC)	\$0	\$0
PHYSICIAN	\$0	\$0
PHYSICAL THERAPIST/DIAGNOSIS	\$0 - 60 Weeks	\$0 - Unlimited Weeks
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	\$0 - 2000/Year	\$1000/Year
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	Not Covered	\$10 - 20 Weeks
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	Not Covered	Less 3 Months of the Year
EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PLAN	Not Covered	Not Covered
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	\$100 to \$1000	\$100 to \$1000
DEFERABLE YEAR	Calendar	Calendar
MAX ANNUAL PREMIUM	\$15,000/Year	\$15,000/Year

COMPARISON - HMO

PLAN TYPE	HealthTrust - HMO	NH Interlocal - HMO
NETWORK	New England	National
DEFERABLE	Yes	Yes
COFOFAY	\$15	\$15
PREVENTIVE CARE	\$0	\$0
HOSPITAL HEALTH COST	\$10	\$10
HOSPITAL SERVICES DEDUCTIBLE - Employee/Family	\$2000/FY	\$2000/FY
EMERGENCY ROOM/URGENT CARE	\$1000	\$1000
HOSPITAL OUT OF POCKET MAXIMUM AMOUNT	\$10,000	\$10,000
HOSPITAL & LAB - CAT W/O PFT	\$0	\$0
PHYSICIAN SERVICES	\$100/visit - 12 Months	\$100/visit - 12 Months
OBSTETRIC CARE	\$10 - 12 Weeks	\$10 - 12 Weeks
DEFERABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$100 Deductible After 20%	\$100 Deductible After 20%
HOSPITAL SURGICAL CENTER (ASC)	Hospital Services Deductible	Hospital Services Deductible
PHYSICIAN	Hospital Services Deductible	Hospital Services Deductible
PHYSICAL THERAPIST/DIAGNOSIS	\$10 - 60 Weeks	\$10 - 25 Weeks PT/25 Weeks Speech
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	\$10 - 2000/Year	\$1000/Year
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	Not Covered	\$10 - 20 Weeks
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	Not Covered	Less 3 Months of the Year
EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PLAN	Not Covered	Not Covered
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	\$100 to \$1000	\$100 to \$1000
DEFERABLE YEAR	Calendar	Calendar
MAX ANNUAL PREMIUM	\$15,000/Year	\$15,000/Year

COMPARISON - HSA IN-NETWORK

PLAN TYPE	HealthTrust - HSA	NH Interlocal - HSA
NETWORK	New England	National
DEFERABLE	Yes	Yes
COFOFAY	\$15	\$15
PREVENTIVE CARE	\$0	\$0
HOSPITAL HEALTH COST	\$10	\$10
HOSPITAL SERVICES DEDUCTIBLE - Employee/Family	\$0	\$0
EMERGENCY ROOM/URGENT CARE	\$1000	\$1000
HOSPITAL OUT OF POCKET MAXIMUM AMOUNT	\$10,000	\$10,000
HOSPITAL & LAB - CAT W/O PFT	\$0	\$0
PHYSICIAN SERVICES	\$100/visit - 12 Months	\$100/visit - 12 Months
OBSTETRIC CARE	\$0 - 25 Weeks	\$10 - Unlimited Weeks
DEFERABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	\$100 Deductible After 20%	\$0
HOSPITAL SURGICAL CENTER (ASC)	\$0	\$0
PHYSICIAN	\$0	\$0
PHYSICAL THERAPIST/DIAGNOSIS	\$0 - 60 Weeks	\$0 - Unlimited Weeks
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	\$0 - 2000/Year	\$1000/Year
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	Not Covered	\$10 - 20 Weeks
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	Not Covered	Less 3 Months of the Year
EMPLOYEE ASSISTANCE PLAN	Not Covered	Not Covered
PHYSICIAN VISIT BENEVOLENCE	\$100 to \$1000	\$100 to \$1000
DEFERABLE YEAR	Calendar	Calendar
MAX ANNUAL PREMIUM	\$15,000/Year	\$15,000/Year

Medicare Supplement Comparison

	HealthTrust - Medcomp III	NH Interlocal - MD60
Part A Coverage	\$0	\$0
Part B Coverage	\$0	\$5
Prescription Drug Coverage	\$10/\$20/\$45	\$0/\$25/\$40
Monthly Premium	\$494.35	\$474.05

Alternative Plan Designs

	HealthTrust (POS) \$20/\$0	NH Interlocal (POS) \$15/\$500
Single	\$781.23	\$710.68
2 Person	\$1,582.45	\$1,423.23
Family	\$2,136.31	\$1,922.40

	HealthTrust (Access Blue) \$15/\$500	NH Interlocal (HMO) \$15/\$500
Single	\$725.63	\$662.79
2 Person	\$1,451.27	\$1,325.31
Family	\$1,959.21	\$1,800.88



HealthTrust

Town of Hoossett
Proposed Rates & Benefit Options
Rate Year 06/01/2016 - 05/31/2016

Plan	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate	Rate
POS	\$781.23	\$710.68	\$725.63	\$662.79				
Access Blue	\$1,582.45	\$1,423.23	\$1,451.27	\$1,325.31				

1. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016.
2. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016.
3. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016.
4. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016.
5. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016. Rates are based on a 20% increase in rates for 2016.

NH Interlocal Options

NEW HAMPSHIRE
INTERLOCAL TRUST
Town of Hoossett
Alternative Rates (Effective from 01/01/2016-12/31/2016)

NEW HAMPSHIRE
INTERLOCAL TRUST
Town of Hoossett
Alternative Rates (Effective from 01/01/2016-12/31/2016)

Super HMO \$15 (M0134506)	POS \$15-\$500 (M0134549)	HMO \$15-\$500 (M0134504)
\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)	\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)	\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)
\$0/\$10/\$40/\$60 Metal (90 Days)	\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)	\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)
Single \$ 699.27	Single \$ 710.68	Single \$ 662.79
2-Person \$ 1,399.43	2-Person \$ 1,423.23	2-Person \$ 1,325.31
Family \$ 1,896.53	Family \$ 1,922.40	Family \$ 1,800.88

Super HMO \$25-\$500 (M0139319)	HMO \$15-\$500 (M0134504)
\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)	\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)
\$0/\$10/\$40/\$60 Metal (90 Days)	\$0/\$10/\$20/\$30 Metal (90 Days)
Single \$ 658.91	Single \$ 662.79
2-Person \$ 1,318.77	2-Person \$ 1,325.31
Family \$ 1,787.42	Family \$ 1,764.73



Questions

William Bald
(603) 520-0083
william.bald@risk-ex.com



TOWN HALL PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
Status Report to Council
2013 to date (October 2015) and ongoing

The Town Hall Preservation Committee was originally formed in 2009 and met through 2011 with varying membership. There were no meetings called in 2012. The group reformed in 2013; this report will cover that time frame.

The charge of the committee is to stabilize, preserve and maintain the building historically known as the Hooksett Town Hall located at 16 Main Street. After reviewing various sources of public input and deliberations of prior committees, a plan was developed—the second floor in the main building will be removed, and both the main hall and the 1937 addition will be rehabilitated and made available for public use once again.

Rehabilitation

- ▶ The Department of Public Works began careful deconstruction of certain interior walls and finishes on the second floor after the committee met on site with staff from the NH Division of Historical Resources and received guidance that the 1961 and 1976 renovations which created the second floor did not have historical value. Similar work also occurred on the first floor in the main building. Preparation for the start of the tin ceiling work continues.
- ▶ Work continued and was completed on the barrier-free access to the Arah W. Prescott Historical Library and side door of the old town hall. The sketch of this ramp configuration was reviewed by the NH Division of Historical Resources.
- ▶ A hazardous materials inspection was done and two problem areas identified and abated.
- ▶ A structural engineering firm completed a pro bono inspection and further testing was done after certain finishes were removed to expose structural elements. A written report detailed a few items for further note, but overall they found the building to be in good condition.
- ▶ Spent considerable time discussing "vision" items—those things we'd like to see done or for which we'd like expert advice/recommendations. This prepared us for defining the scope of work when meeting with preservation architects. Also contacted potential users or types of users for input on design, necessary elements, etc.
- ▶ Contracted with UK Architects of Hanover, an experienced preservation architectural firm, to provide preliminary schematic drawings and cost estimates by an independent cost estimator.

Outreach

- ▶ Held open houses/tours at the hall on Heritage Days in May 2014 and 2015. Great opportunities to visit with residents and allow them to view progress made. Photo displays and schematic plans were shown.
- ▶ Participated in Old Home Day in September 2014 and 2015; Robie's Open House August 2015.

Fund-Raising/Grants

- ▶ The Heritage Commission added travel mugs, t-shirts, and Cat's Meow collectibles of old Town Hall and Mount Saint Mary's to its merchandise line. Proceeds will go to the Town Hall Preservation Project.
- ▶ Historical Society and Heritage Commission sponsored third Town Family Feud in June 2014 which benefitted the Town Hall Preservation Project.
- ▶ Applied for and was approved for a \$10,000 grant under the State's Conservation (Moose) License Plate Program to repair the existing tin ceiling on the second floor. Contracted with Milestone Engineering & Construction, Inc. of Concord to complete the work.
- ▶ Applied for Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP) funding for restoration of the large windows on the north and east sides of the building.
- ▶ Applied for NH Preservation Alliance grant for a building assessment which will provide a prioritized and descriptive list of the building's character-defining features and assist in future phasing of the project.

HOOKSETT HERITAGE COMMISSION

Status Report to Council

May 2013 to date (Oct 2015) and ongoing

Hooksett Heritage Day/NH History Week

- ▶ Cosponsored with Historical Society, Robie's Country Store Historic Preservation Corp., and Head School Society the 9th through 11th annual Hooksett Heritage Days in May 2013-2015. HC participation: walking tours and co-hosting at old town hall.
- ▶ Participated in 3rd, 4th, and 5th annual NH History Week in October 2013-2015 with Historical Society, Library, Head School Society, Robie's Country Store Historic Preservation Corp. and Lions Club. HC events: dedication of Veterans' Park, dedication of historic marker at Mount Saint Mary's, and dedication of historic marker at Hooksett Airport.
- ▶ Participated in Old Home Day 2014, 2015

Head School

- ▶ Head School Society continues to offer their living history experience. During this reporting period, welcomed over 950 scholars and other visitors.
- ▶ Obtained volunteer services of an arborist to check the silver maples on the southern boundary of Head Cemetery and the catalpa trees around the school.

Fund-Raising

- ▶ Added travel mugs, t-shirts, and Cat's Meow collectibles of old Town Hall and Mount Saint Mary's to our merchandise line. Proceeds will go to the Town Hall Preservation Project.
- ▶ Second Town Family Feud June 2013 to benefit the Veterans' Park project
- ▶ Third Town Family Feud June 2014 to benefit Town Hall Preservation Project

Demo Permit Applications

- ▶ Considered five demo permit applications

Historic Marker Program

- ▶ Completed the research and installed 7th, 8th, and 9th historic roadside markers—Mount Saint Mary's, Lincoln Park, Hooksett Airport

Veterans' Park

- ▶ Finished this project; it consumed much of our time in 2013. About 170 people attended the dedication ceremony held on October 6, 2013. It was moved to the Legion because of inclement weather. One attendee wrote: "I don't think the rain had any effect on the spirit and the pride that filled the room yesterday. As both a citizen of Hooksett and a veteran, THANKS!" Another said: "It was a distinct honor and privilege to have been a part of this dedication. As a twenty-two year veteran, I was very proud of the program that you put together."
- ▶ Assisted in design of POW/MIA granite chair for Veterans' Park.

Education/Other

- ▶ Participated in the process regarding the future of the Lilac Bridge after it was found to have severe structural problems.
- ▶ Participated in an Osler Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) two-part program in May 2015 with the Head School Society schoolmarms titled "Live and Learn: Become an 1840s Scholar." The commission presented Part 1 of the program covering the rehabilitation of the Head School building.
- ▶ Co-sponsored a program in September 2015 with the Library: "On This Spot Once Stood . . . Remembering the Architectural Heritage of NH." Humanities Council program. Included information about Hooksett's historic marker program.

ONGOING PROJECTS

Hope to reprint several smaller histories into one consolidated history book
Continue conversion of oral history videos to DVDs; work on reviewing transcripts
Continue verifying names of files and scanning of thousands of photos