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INTRODUCTION

In January 2014, the CIP (Capital Improvement Program) Committee conducted a self-audit of processes completed for the 2014 - 2020 CIP Plan. The audit goal was to ensure compliance, and identify how current procedures can be improved upon for inclusion in the Hooksett CIP Committee Handbook.

The CIP Committee members are: Chair David Rogers, Vice-Chair Marc Miville, Joanne McHugh, and Steven Peterson.

A CIP Committee 2014-2015 Self-Audit Report was completed in February 2014. This report includes information from the following sources:

- CIP Plan FY ending 2015 through 2020 – Exhibit A
- Hooksett Town Charter (Section 5.7 pg. 15) – Exhibit B
- Chapter V. – Capital Improvements Programming within The Planning Board in New Hampshire – A Handbook for Local Officials – Exhibit C
- Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates, Inc. (Jordan Institute) audit of the Hooksett Master Plan – Exhibit D
SELF-AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE

1) Was there a "paper trail" of the preparation of the CIP maintained during the process to document compliance with the RSAs?

Answer: Yes, to include agendas, minutes, and the self-audit report. The department presentations were also more data-driven than in previous years.

2) Has the Planning Board adopted a Master Plan?

Answer: Yes. It was last revised in 2004. The CIP Committee has asked that the Master Plan revision continue with gradual updates, chapter by chapter.

3) Did the local legislative body authorize the Planning Board or CIP Committee to prepare and amend a CIP?

Answer: Yes, in compliance with RSAs and the Town Charter.

4) Does the CIP classify projects according to their urgency and need and include a recommended time sequence for implementation?

Answer: Yes; however, the CIP Plan is subject to the urgency of what is presented to the Committee at that time. Items that are classified as non-urgent in one year, may become urgent the next. The Committee tries to plan according to department needs, but there are concerns about approving funding in the year of purchase. If a department is unable to purchase what they need in that year, it could alter the whole CIP Plan, which may cause problems in the future.

5) Was the program based on information submitted by municipal departments and agencies, the school board, and others contracted by the Planning Board or CIP Committee?

Answer: Yes.

6) Does the CIP take into account public facility needs indicated by prospective development as shown in the Master Plan or those permitted by land use controls?
Answer: Yes; additionally, there are other Town Committees and Advisory Boards in place to address these issues.

7) Did the Planning Board or CIP Committee solicit public input at a properly noticed public hearing in the same manner required for the Master Plan adoption?

Answer: Yes, proper notice was posted on the Town website and at the Library and Town Hall.

8) Following the public hearing, did the Planning Board or CIP Committee vote to adopt the CIP?


9) Did the Planning Board or CIP Committee transmit its current year capital budget recommendations to the executive officer(s) of the city or town and to the Budget Committee, School Board, and special purpose districts or precincts whose capital needs are addressed in the CIP?

Answer: Yes, it was presented to Town Council on 12/11/13, to School Board on 12/17/13, and to Budget Committee on 1/30/14.

10) If the answer to any of these questions (1-9 above) is no, the capital improvements programming and implementation process is incomplete. The board or committee should add any missing information or documentation to bring the CIP to a successful conclusion.

Answer: The CIP Committee completed the charge of the CIP Plan and CIP self-audit successfully and as required.
CIP COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS
TO THE PLANNING BOARD

1) The Committee recommends limiting how much money to spread out per year, per request.

2) The Committee respectfully recommends that Department Heads refrain from editing their submitted CIP Plan during their presentation, as this skews the numbers of the Plan as a whole.
EXHIBIT A

CIP PLAN FY
2014 - 2020
TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Capital Improvement Program
FY 2014-2020

Adopted by Planning Board on December 2, 2013
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ton Dump with Flow (Highway)</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,415,433</td>
<td>1,415,433</td>
<td>415,433</td>
<td>415,433</td>
<td>415,433</td>
<td>415,433</td>
<td>415,433</td>
<td>415,433</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 ton Pickup with Flow (Highway)</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4 ton Pickup with Flow (Highway)</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Facilities Development Reserve Fund</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>45,238</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling - Trash Bins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Tractor (Special Revenue) 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Yard Live Bottom Trailer 1999</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Trailer (Special Revenue) 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Yard Live Bottom Trailer (Special Revenue) 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skid Steer Loader Bobcat (Special Revenue) 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freightliner Tractor (Special Revenue) 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickup with Flat (Special Revenue) 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Yard Automated Collection Truck NEW TO FLEET 2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Town Requests</strong></td>
<td>440,433</td>
<td>306,609</td>
<td>1,222,739</td>
<td>970,124</td>
<td>982,374</td>
<td>790,290</td>
<td>822,510</td>
<td>5,956,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Districts future projected needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HVAC Upgrades 2013-14</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>34,000</th>
<th>34,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Upgrade at Memorial 2016-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Replacement and Raising at Undertill 2014-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>95,500</td>
<td>95,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Field Expansion at Cawley 2016-17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator for Undertill 2015-16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total School Requests</strong></td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>95,500</td>
<td>252,500</td>
<td>252,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sewer Fund future projected needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Replacement Funds</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sewer Requests</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Central Water Precinct future projected needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not submit</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Central Water Precinct</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Village Water Precinct future projected needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did not submit</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Village Water Precinct</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total All Requests Total Cost**

| 840,433 | 1,902,669 | 1,430,239 | 1,253,024 | 914,374 | 1,691,036 | 980,510 | 6,185,119 |

**Off-setting Revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambulance Fund</th>
<th>200,000</th>
<th>200,000</th>
<th>200,000</th>
<th>400,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Impact Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Disposal Fund</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total off-setting Revenues</strong></td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>475,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total CIP Request Net Cost (Taxation)**

| 460,433 | 545,669 | 968,239 | 975,624 | 864,874 | 906,859 | 770,510 | 4,575,119 |

Total Project
Town of Hooksett

Project Summary
CIP Plan FY 2014-2019

"*" are recommended notations to be added under the warrant article on the ballot

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Revaluation Capital Reserve Fund: Total project cost is on-going. This project is to set aside funds for the next update in 2018. The 2009 revaluation cost was $161,230.50, the not-to-exceed cost for 2013 is $137,300, and the estimated cost in 2018 is $149,703. *Every five years the Town is required to reappraise all property values for assessment equity property tax purposes per NH State Constitution Article 6.

➢ Town Administrator – Recommends funding $30,000 in 2014-15.

Community Development

Master Plan Capital Reserve Fund: Total project cost is $60,000. There is $16,600 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. The fund is to provide a trust account, to be added to every year, that will allow the Town to update its Master Plan in a manner compliant with *RSA 674:3 “Master Plan Preparation”, which states in Sec II that revisions to the plan are recommended every 5-10 years. The Master Plan was last updated in 2004. Several areas of the plan are outdated. The following chapters have recently been updated: Economic Development and Energy. The update of the plan is critical to the long-term development of the Town. The Planning Board, ZBA, Conservation Commission, and Town Council need clear, accurate information upon which to base their decisions. Period studies that bring this new information into the Master Plan create an atmosphere of good planning, informed decision making, and provide critical data for the voter.

➢ CIP Committee – Recommends funding over five years at $10,000 in years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18; $8,400 in year 2018-19; and $5,000 in year 2019-20.

Feasibility Study for Southern Leg of Parkway Fund: Total project cost is $150,000. There is $60,479 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is 2017-18. The purpose of the Parkway was to relieve the heavy traffic congestion on Route 3 from Industrial Park Drive south to the I-93 interchange. This project has been a recommendation of the Master Plan since 1971 and has been the subject of a number of public hearings. This study will answer many questions about the ability of this road segment to receive the necessary State environmental permits and to determine the path (corridor) more precisely, and to help us determine the costs of land acquisition and construction. It’s conceived to be a controlled access highway with limited curb cuts; its purpose is to take through traffic off Route 3, making it easier for customers to access the many businesses along Route 3. SNHU also needs to know how to plan for their development and how to utilize this new road, as well as N River Rd. NHDOT is in the process
of widening a portion of the Route 3 Corridor. It may be wise to wait and see if the Parkway is still needed at the conclusion of this widening project.

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $89,521 in year 2019-20.

**Parcel Digital Recompiilation:** Total project cost is $90,795. There is $24,218 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The GIS system parcels do not align with the orthos (aerial imagery), making it very difficult to determine exact locations of boundaries, structures, water bodies, etc. This project would include recompilation of the existing parcel layer to the ortho image base map. The roads would be realigned to fit the parcels by matching the physical evidence on the image base.

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $33,385 in years 2016-17 and 2017-18.

**Replacement of Code Enforcement Vehicle:** Total project cost is $27,500. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The fund is to replace a 2002 Ford Ranger 4WD with a Ford Explorer 4WD-6CYL. The Ford Ranger is used on a daily basis by the Code Enforcement Officer. The vehicle currently has 72,000 miles; however, they are all city miles.

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $13,750 in years 2015-16 and 2016-17.

**Conservation Commission**

**Maintenance and Improvements to Town-Owned Conservation Lands:** Total project cost is ongoing. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. The fund is to begin to plan for maintenance, improvements, and developments that may be needed for all of the conservation lands/easements currently held by the Town. Over the past few years, the Commission has continued its pursuit of acquiring land to conserve for future residents to enjoy, consistent with the mandates of the Master Plan. The conservation easements, pertaining to such property, require the Town to maintain the property and make repairs or improvements as necessary. In order to meet this legal obligation, it is necessary for us to create a capital reserve fund to ensure that the Town will be prepared for any planned or unexpected maintenance issues that may arise. Over the last 3 years alone, the Commission has acquired over 700 acres of land that we would like to see used for passive recreational purposes. This year, the Commission added 120 acres that consisted of approximately ¾ mile of undisturbed Merrimack River frontage. *The stewardship of the Town's Conservation properties includes the requirement of maintaining existing trails and the right to develop new trails.*

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $10,000 in 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20.

**Fire-Rescue**

**Fire Apparatus Capital Reserve Fund:** Total project cost is ongoing. There is $100,500 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. The fund is for the future replacement of the following fire department vehicles: all engines, tankers, ladders, foresteries, boats, staff cars, and the gator off road vehicle.

- **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $50,000 in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $50,000 in each of the six (6) years (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

**Boat #2**: Total project cost is $32,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. The fund is to replace a 2005 Mercury water rescue boat.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $32,000 in 2018-19.

**Car #1**: Total project cost is $50,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2017-18. The fund is to replace a 2007 Chevy Tahoe with a new command style 4x4 vehicle.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $50,000 in 2017-18.

**Car #2**: Total project cost is $50,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The fund is to replace a 2005 Ford Expedition SSV Command vehicle with a new command style 4x4 vehicle.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $50,000 in 2015-16.

**Car #3**: Total project cost is $50,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2017-18. The fund is to replace a 2005 Ford Expedition with a new command vehicle. Currently, Fire Prevention uses this vehicle daily.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $50,000 in 2016-17.

**Utility #1**: Total project cost is $50,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. The fund is to replace a 2008 Ford F350 pickup plow truck, which plows our fire stations, driveways and all cisterns and dry fire hydrants.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $50,000 in 2018-19.

**Rescue #1**: Total project cost is $200,000. There is $163,544 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is 2014-15. The fund is to replace a 2007 Rescue/Ambulance vehicle with a newer vehicle. This vehicle currently serves as the backup ambulance to our current first due ambulance. When this vehicle is replaced, our Rescue #2 will become our backup ambulance.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $200,000 in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $200,000 in 2014-15.

**Rescue #2**: Total project cost is $200,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. The fund is to replace a 2009 International ambulance with a newer vehicle. This vehicle will then serve as the backup ambulance.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
➢ **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $200,000 in 2016-17.

**SCBA Replacement Capital Reserve Fund**: Total project cost is $300,000. There is $133,573 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is 2020. The project is to establish a fund to replace all of our air packs in 15 years. The current air packs were purchased in 2005.
➢ **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $20,000 in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** - Recommends funding $20,000 in each of the six (6) years (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

**Fire Station #3 at Exit 10 leased from Manchester (20 year lease):** Total project cost is $1,000,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The fund is to lease purchase a portion of the Manchester Hackett Hill Fire Station to protect our new growth in this area of town where response times need to be improved. This fire station would not only protect exit 10, but all areas west of the Merrimack River along with the south end of Hooksett.
- **Town Administrator** - Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** - Recommends funding $50,000 in each of the five (5) years (2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

**Fire Engine for Station #3 – Impact fees & taxation 5 year/4.5% lease:** Total project cost is $400,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The fund is to purchase a new fire engine to respond out of the new Fire Station #3 located at exit 10 off Route 3A. This Fire Station project keeps getting pushed back year to year due to not having adequate land for a Fire Station. This land was supposed to be donated to the town back when exit 10 was developed. The fire station has been needed since 2000. This piece of apparatus will be housed out of the new facility protecting Exit 10, Hackett Hill and South Hooksett. The longer this fire station keeps getting pushed back, the increase of the risk of this growing part of the community.
- **Town Administrator** - Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** - Recommends funding $400,000 in 2015-16.

**Police**

**Vehicle Replacement Fund (2 Cars per Year):** Total project cost is Ongoing. This fund will allow the department to purchase 2 police vehicles per year, establishing a comprehensive emergency vehicle replacement program, as outlined in the PSSG audit report calling for a better vehicle management program. This will also allow us to reduce excess vehicles in the fleet. This program lets us take delivery of two vehicles at once, keeping the emergency vehicles at optimum readiness. It includes the cost of both vehicles and all emergency equipment, police radio, graphics, extended bumper to bumper warranty and installation. With a regular replacement and maintenance plan in place, the cars can be repurposed once they reach fairly high mileage by reassigning them to detectives, administration functions and/or other Town departments in need of vehicles.
- **Town Administrator** - N/A

**Public Works**

**Drainage Upgrade Capital Reserve Fund:** Total project cost is ongoing. There is $100,500 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. Various areas throughout town have drainage that has begun to deteriorate and fail. These failures are due to aging pipes, pipes that have outlived their expected lifespan, increased storm runoff due to growth in town, and more storms with a higher volume of water. These pipes were not installed to handle the amount of
water that they are taking on. This fund is for updating the drainage to larger pipes, which will handle both the increased volume of water and anticipated growth.

- **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $50,000 in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $50,000 in each of the six (6) years (2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

**Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund (Formerly Plow Dump Truck Capital Reserve Fund):** Total project cost is ongoing. There is $160,801 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. A proposed change to this fund is to change it from only plow dump trucks to a fund for all DPW vehicles. The reserve fund will assist in being able to slowly upgrade vehicles as needed. This fund would also lessen the burden on tax payers by planning for the purchase. The town is continuing to grow and we will need to address that growth. This vehicle fund is needed because, by statute, DPW is not allowed to purchase vehicles with Town impact fees.

- **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $100,000 in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $100,000 in each of the six (6) years (2014-15, 2015-16, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

**1 Ton Pickup with Utility Body and Bucket (Highway: New to Fleet):** Total project cost is $90,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. This one new vehicle will replace two pickup trucks that were scrapped in 2010 and have not yet been replaced. This truck is important as we have to address the federal regulation changes by 2013 referred to as MUTCD. This truck will be dedicated to ensuring that we are addressing these federal regulations. This truck will hold all of the tools and equipment needed to repair, replace, and maintain all of the signage in town. The bucket part will be used for tree trimming, with the ability to go up 25’ which saves money on services that we currently pay now. These services include hiring tree removal companies, rental of bucket trucks to put up and remove banners on flag poles and putting up and taking down tree lights.

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $90,000 in 2015-16.

**Sidewalk Plow (5 year lease at 4.5%):** Total project cost is $156,600. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The new sidewalk plow will be added to the fleet and eventually replace the 1996 sidewalk plow that the town currently has. This sidewalk plow will not only plow, but it will also take care of roadside mowing, assisting in fall and spring clean-up of roadside swales that are not large projects. This piece of equipment will save on hiring a contractor to move the roadsides of the town. Currently, we only have one sidewalk machine and cannot ensure that we will get to all sidewalks between storms. Having a second machine will help in getting to more of the sidewalks than we currently are able to. This will help address sidewalk safety concerns that arise during the winter months.

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $31,320 in each of the five (5) years (2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

**Rubber Tire Excavator (7 year lease at 4.5%):** Total project cost is $290,031. Estimated year of purchase is 2014-15. The purchase would address the contracted services for excavators that we have had to incur over the last few years. With this piece of equipment, the
DPW will be able to address the repairs that are so desperately needed in regards to drainage upgrades and catch basins. The town currently cannot repair a 9' deep catch basin without renting an excavator and we cannot upgrade current drainage pipes to 36" diameter, because we do not have a machine that can handle these jobs. We are forced to hire a contractor or rent equipment. The town has major drainage issues that need to be addressed and with this piece of equipment the DPW will be able to address it within the department without any additional costs. This additional piece of equipment will ensure that the DPW can address all of the deep trench projects that will be coming our way as the town continues to grow and the infrastructure continues to deteriorate with age. With the attachments we will be able to complete swale cleaning of brush and saplings. These areas continue to grow and we can only do very little each year as this is extremely labor intensive.


**Front Loader (Highway)**: Total project cost is $200,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. Fund is to replace a 2001 loader, which is used to load salt, plow schools, and put back corners in the winter. In the summer, it is used to assist with pipe work and ground crews to help with materials begin loaded and spread on site.

- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $100,000 in each of the years 2015-16 and 2016-17.

**3/4 Ton Pickup with Plow (Highway)**: Total project cost is $34,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. Replace a 1995 pickup.

- **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $34,000 in year 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $34,000 in year 2014-15.

**3/4 Ton Pickup with Plow (Highway)**: Total project cost is $34,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. Replace a 1998 pickup.

**Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.**

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – N/A

**3/4 Ton Pickup with Plow (Highway)**: Total project cost is $40,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. Replace an existing pickup.

**Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.**

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – N/A

**3/4 Ton Pickup with Plow (Highway)**: Total project cost is $34,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. Replace a 2001 pickup.

**Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.**

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – N/A
3/4 Ton Crew Cab (Highway): Total project cost is $60,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. Replace a 2008 crew cab.

Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.

- Town Administrator - N/A
- CIP Committee - N/A

1 Ton Dump Truck with Plow (Highway): Total project cost is $60,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. Replace a 2005 dump truck.

Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.

- Town Administrator - N/A
- CIP Committee - N/A

1 Ton Dump Truck with Plow (Highway): Total project cost is $60,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. Replace a 2001 dump truck.

Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.

- Town Administrator - N/A
- CIP Committee - N/A

Lee Boy Roller (Highway): Total project cost is $45,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. Replace a 2004 roller.

- Town Administrator - Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- CIP Committee - Recommends funding $45,000 in year 2018-19.

Parks and Recreation Facilities Development Reserve Fund: Total project cost is ongoing. There is $46,238 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. The town continues to grow and we are forced to deal with aging structures, building updates, and additional recreation areas that will need to be addressed. We have put together a listing of items that will need to be addressed within the next five years. Since addressing the lighting at Donati, our next project will be building updates on the Parks & Rec building. *The Parks & Rec Division has outgrown the building and needs more space to work out of and store the equipment they use daily. This building has not been updated in over 15 years while the division has grown. We are still in the process of putting plans together to *put a permanent bathroom facility to be located at Donati park (could cost in excess of $75,000). This would eliminate the need for port-a-potties and address the growth at Donati with all of the special events that the park has been hosting in recent years.

- Town Administrator - Recommends funding of $15,000 in 2014-15

3/4 Ton Pickup with Plow (Parks & Rec): Total project cost is $40,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. Replace an existing truck.

Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.

- Town Administrator - N/A
- CIP Committee - N/A

1 Ton 4x4 Crew Cab with Plow (Parks & Rec): Total project cost is $50,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. Replace an existing 4x4 crew cab.
Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.
➢ Town Administrator – N/A
➢ CIP Committee – N/A

1 Ton 4x4 Crew Cab with Plow (Parks & Rec): Total project cost is $50,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. Replace an existing 4x4 crew cab.

Funding to come from proposed Public Works Vehicle Capital Reserve Fund.
➢ Town Administrator – N/A
➢ CIP Committee – N/A

Town Building Maintenance Capital Reserve Fund: Total project cost is ongoing. There is $353,582 in account now. Estimated year of purchase is as needed. This fund assists the Maintenance Department in addressing the needs of town buildings. Over the past year we utilized this fund for masonry work and some window installation replacement at the Safety Center to address all of the leaking issues. During this budget cycle we will be expending $160,000 on roof replacement at the town hall, which has numerous leaks, as well as continuing to address ongoing issues. We are in the process of getting quotes for the roof replacement and would like to complete it this spring. We are also looking into lighting upgrades and ventilation issues at the Highway Garage for health and safety reasons. This could cost $30,000 or more. *It is imperative that the town keep a minimum of $250,000 in this fund so that there are funds for any major repairs that will need to be addressed in the future. We have $26,000,000 worth of buildings to maintain within the town. I believe a $250,000 minimum in this account is not an unreasonable request.
➢ Town Administrator – Recommends funding of $100,000 in 2014-15.
➢ CIP Committee – Recommends funding $100,000 in year 2014-15 and $75,000 in each of the five (5) years (2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20).

Recycling & Transfer

Automated Collection Equipment Capital Reserve Fund: Total project cost is $940,000. There is $10,015 in there now. Estimated year of purchase is 2022. The fund is to prepare for the future replacement of the trash/recycling collection vehicles. The classification is necessary, *without the future replacement of the collection vehicles and carts, residents would lose the service.*
➢ Town Administrator – Recommends funding of $10,000 in 2014-15.
➢ CIP Committee – Recommends funding $10,000 in each of the years 2013-14 & 2014-15, $20,000 in each of the years 2015-16 & 2016-17, and $30,000 in each of the years 2017-18 & 2018-19.

Peterbilt Tractor (Special Revenue): Total project cost is $120,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. The purpose of this project is to replace a 2001 Peterbilt tractor for hauling material to and from the Recycling and Transfer Department. If we don’t keep up with the fleet, material cannot be hauled.
➢ CIP Committee – Recommends funding $120,000 in year 2016-17.
**100 Yard Live Bottom Trailer:** Total project cost is $60,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. This will replace a 1999 live floor trailer used to haul materials to and from the facility.
- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $60,000 in year 2016-17.

**Dump Trailer (Special Revenue):** Total project cost is $45,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. This will replace the existing 1986 trailer. This piece of equipment is used to haul material to and from the facility, and is also used to help the Public Works Department haul stone, salt and sand.
- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $45,000 in year 2016-17.

**100 Yard Live Bottom Trailer (Special Revenue):** Total project cost is $60,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. This will replace a 2005 100-yard live bottom trailer used to haul material to and from the facility.
- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $60,000 in year 2018-19.

**Skid Steer Loader Bobcat (Special Revenue):** Total project cost is $35,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. This will replace a 2005 Bobcat. The Bobcat is one of the most multi-function pieces of equipment we have with the interchangeable buckets, forks and sweepers.
- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $35,000 in year 2018-19.

**Freightliner Tractor (Special Revenue):** Total project cost is $120,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2019-20. This will replace a 2005 Freightliner Tractor. It was originally scheduled to be replaced in 2018-19, but with the new collection program we are using the trucks less, saving vehicle wear.
- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $120,000 in year 2019-20.

**3/4 Ton Pickup with Plow (Special Revenue):** Total project cost is $40,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2019-20. This will replace a 2008 3/4 ton pickup and plow.
- **Town Administrator** – Does not recommend funding in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $40,000 in year 2019-20.

**14 Yard Automated Collection Truck (New to Fleet):** Total project cost is $180,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2014-15. This is to purchase an additional automated collection truck (smaller) to use as a backup and to use for some of the smaller, harder to access areas in Town. It will enhance our present program by allowing us to eliminate an older collection truck that we presently use as a backup. We could trade in the old 2000 Peterbilt, but the trade value would not be very high.
- **Town Administrator** – Recommends funding $180,000 in 2014-15.
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $180,000 in year 2014-15.

*School District*
**HVAC Upgrades:** Total project cost is $34,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2013-14. The current HVAC system is 10 years old and will no longer be supported as of December 2015. The existing controller and some of the remote interface modules, installed in 2003, are no longer being made and a failure may result in no control until parts are found.

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $34,000 in year 2014-15

**Kindergarten Upgrade at Memorial:** Total project cost is $508,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2018-19. The goal of the School Board is to convert Underhill and Memorial in K-5 schools in order to reduce the number of transitions our students experience.

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $127,000 in years 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.

**Roof Replacement and Reseaming at Underhill:** Total project cost is $382,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2014-15. The roof on the Underhill school is 20+ years old and needs to be replaced. This will help with the reliability of the roof and also will keep repair costs to a minimum.

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $95,500 in years 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19.

**Sports Field Expansion at Cawley:** Total project cost is $120,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2016-17. Currently the Track & Field, Field Hockey, and Lacrosse programs use the soccer field at Cawley Middle School. Dedicated areas with specialized equipment are desirable for these programs. This project would also add electrical power and electrical scoreboards to the baseball field and the soccer field.

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $30,000 in years 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20.

**Generator for Underhill:** Total project cost is $85,000. Estimated year of purchase is 2015-16. The Fred C. Underhill School is the only school in the district that does not currently have a generator. If the school had a generator, it would allow usage as an emergency shelter.

- **Town Administrator** – N/A
- **CIP Committee** – Recommends funding $85,000 in year 2014-15.

**Hooksett Sewer Fund**

The Hooksett Sewer Department raises funds for their capital replacement through user fees. The CIP uses the information from the Sewer's CIP to level out peak years for the taxpayers. The Sewer Commission did not submit a Capital Improvement Plan for this year.

**Hooksett Central Water Precinct**

The Hooksett Central Water Precinct raises funds for their capital replacement through user fees. The CIP uses the information from the Hooksett Central Water Precinct's CIP to level out peak years for the taxpayers. The water precinct did not submit a Capital Improvement Plan for this year.
**Hookset Village Water Precinct**

The Hookset Village Water Precinct raises funds for their capital replacement through user fees. The CIP uses the information from the Hookset Village Water Precinct's CIP to level out peak years for the taxpayers. The water precinct did not submit a Capital Improvement Plan for this year.

Respectfully submitted,

2014-2015 CIP Committee members:

*David Rogers, Chair*
*Marc Miville, Vice Chair*
*Joanne McHugh*
*Steven Peterson*
EXHIBIT B

HOOKSETT TOWN CHARTER
(Section 5.7, page 15)
pursuant to a budget appropriation. The Administrator, with the approval of the Council, may transfer any unexpended balance or any portion thereof from any appropriation within one department to any appropriation within any other department. The transfer of appropriations shall comply with RSA 32:10.

Sec. 5.7. Capital Improvement Plan.

A. The Town Administrator, after consultation with the Planning Board, shall prepare and submit to the Council a capital improvement plan at least one (1) month prior to the final date for submission of the budget. All town departments and agencies (including school district and water precincts) shall participate in preparing input for the capital improvement plan. The capital improvement program shall include:

1. A clear summary of its contents.

2. A list of all capital improvements which are proposed to be undertaken during at least the next six (6) fiscal years, including, but not limited to equipment, sewer, roads, sidewalks, bicycle paths or lanes, public open spaces and recreation facilities, new police and/or fire stations, and other new public facilities and major items of equipment, with appropriate supporting information as to the necessity for such improvements.

3. Cost estimates, methods of financing and recommended time schedule for each such improvement.

4. The estimated annual cost of operating and maintaining the facilities to be constructed or acquired.

B. The capital improvement plan shall be based on a period of not less than six (6) years and shall include reference to or be influenced by, where appropriate, the Town Master/Comprehensive Plan.

C. The above information may be revised and extended each year with regard to capital improvements still pending or in process of construction or acquisition.

D. The Town Council and Town Planning Board shall meet annually in preparation for and review of the capital improvement plan in a manner determined from time to time by the Town Council.

E. A summary of the updated capital improvement plan with estimated costs shall be included in the town report and such portions of the year's costs, as the Council deems appropriate, included in the town budget.
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THE PURPOSE OF THIS CHAPTER

This chapter is a guide to the preparation of capital improvements programs for local planning boards and towns in New Hampshire. A number of the state’s cities have implemented ongoing, sophisticated processes of identifying and scheduling capital improvements. This chapter is intended as a "self-help" guide primarily for planning boards and/or capital improvements planning committees of smaller communities who want to prepare a capital improvements program which meets New Hampshire statutory requirements and which is consistent with generally accepted planning practice.

In many communities, the combined talents of planning board members and other local residents comprise the basic skills and resources needed to prepare a capital improvements program without professional assistance. This chapter addresses their need for an organizational framework and sample forms to expedite the process by which voluntary boards and committees can prepare a capital improvements program tailored to unique local needs. Planning boards and/or CIP committees should feel free to develop their own approach and format for capital improvements programming, or to adapt the forms provided in this chapter to local needs.

Throughout the chapter, an attempt has been made to distinguish between those elements and procedures of capital improvements programming which are mandated by the New Hampshire statutes, and those which are recommended practices. For the smallest communities having few capital investment needs, a simplified process addressing minimum statutory requirements will be sufficient. In most cases, however, a capital improvements programming process should follow all recommended steps and procedures, especially where growth management or impact fee ordinances are to be implemented.

WHY PREPARE A CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM?

The capital improvements program, known by the acronym CIP, is a valuable part of the community planning process. The capital improvements program links local infrastructure investments with master plan goals, land use ordinances, and economic development. A capital improvements program bridges the gap between planning and spending, between the visions of the master plan and the fiscal realities of improving and expanding community facilities.

Among the many incentives of a capital improvements programming effort are the following benefits to the community:

**PRESERVING PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE**

Providing the basic services which ensure citizen health and safety is a fundamental responsibility of local government. Programs of regular facility maintenance, upgrades and expansion of government services to meet minimum federal, state and local standards are essential to any community. The cumulative effect of deferring major maintenance expenditures and basic improvement of essential services is often an expensive series of stopgap measures which fail to address comprehensive long-term needs.
IDENTIFYING "SCATTERED AND PREMATURE" DEVELOPMENT

New Hampshire statutes allow planning boards to adopt subdivision regulations which provide against scattered or premature subdivision of land. The capital improvements program is one measure which a planning board may use to judge whether a development is scattered or premature based on an absence of essential public services, where the development could require excessive public expenditures to supply these services. The CIP may provide information needed for planning board policies requiring the provision of capital facilities or services by developers of property in unserviced areas.

SUPPORTING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Communities having sound fiscal health and high quality facilities and services are attractive to business and industry. New corporate investment and reinvestment in a community may be influenced by improvements which enhance the quality of life for the chief executives and managers in a company, and for their area is labor force. Private decisions which bring jobs to an area and new tax base to a community are based not only on the availability of water and sewer utilities, but also upon the quality of community schools, public safety facilities, recreation opportunities, and other services.

STEPS IN THE PROCESS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAMMING

The process of getting started in a capital improvements program illustrated in this chapter comprises a series of nine successive steps and a number of worksheets leading to a completed CIP. These steps form the remaining sections of this chapter:

- **Step 1. Organize for the CIP process**
  - Recommended

- **Step 2. Define capital projects**
  - Recommended

- **Step 3. Perform a fiscal analysis**
  - Recommended

- **Step 4. Review the master plan**
  - Mandatory

- **Step 5. Communicate with departments**
  - Mandatory

- **Step 6. Review proposed capital projects**
  - Mandatory

- **Step 7. Prepare a 6-year project schedule**
  - Mandatory

- **Step 8. Adopt and implement the CIP**
  - Recommended; mandatory to support growth management and impact fees

- **Step 9. Update the CP**
  - Recommended

By following each of the nine steps, and using or modifying the model forms provided, the planning board can more efficiently complete the CIP, and will generate a versatile document in the process. If schedules are followed and tasks are delegated to diligent participants, the CIP will yield many of the benefits cited above, will build citizen confidence in the value of long-term planning, and will promote public involvement in the budgetary process. Like the master plan, the CIP is not a static document, but an ongoing process. Once established, updating the CIP should become a routine annual practice for the planning board and related agencies.
It is recommended that the planning board or CIP committee designate one of its members, town staff or other volunteer to be the central coordinator in charge of the CIP process. That person should then serve as the primary contact for all CIP activities, ensuring that the planning board or committee's role is properly executed. The designee should maintain a file of all correspondence and meetings related to the CIP to document the process and prevent its fragmentation.

Develop a Schedule of Tasks and Completion Dates

The level of interest in capital improvements programming will rapidly deteriorate without strong leadership, assignment of tasks, and scheduling. Exhibit VI-1 provides a sample CIP planning schedule for outlining major events or actions in the CIP process, the date targeted for completion of that event or action, and the responsible party or lead person assigned to carry out the task. Discussion of such a schedule of events or actions should be accompanied by an organizational meeting involving the planning board or CIP committee and department heads so that all have a clear understanding of the rationale for the CIP process. By participating in the development of a CIP, each department may benefit from improvements in the quality of the facilities they operate and the services they provide.

**EXHIBIT VI-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM PLANNING SCHEDULE**

| Town Meeting Authorization Granted to Planning Board to Adopt CIP |
| Planning Board Appoints CIP Subcommittee to Prepare CIP |

### Meeting 1
- Define Capital Improvements
- Develop Project/Purchase Application
- Develop Cover Letter to Boards/Departments
- Designate Your Coordinator

*Homework* Solicit Applications

Develop Project Spread Sheet of All Applications Received

### Meeting 2
- Review Applications Received
- Schedule Interviews
- Schedule Remaining Committee Meetings

### Meeting 3
- Hold Interviews
- Determine Project Prioritization Process
- Vote on Process for Prioritizing Projects

*Homework* Develop Structure of the CIP (Table of Contents)

  - Write Introduction Chapter
  - Write Appendix Chapter

### Meeting 4
- Hold Interviews
- Review CIP Structure (Table of Contents)
- Review Introduction and Appendix Chapters

*Homework* Collect Information for Financial Analysis and Write Chapter

### Meeting 5
- Hold Interviews
- Review Financial Analysis Chapter

*Homework* Collect Information for Road Management Plan and Write Chapter

### Meeting 6
- Complete Interviews
- Prioritize the Projects

*Homework* Develop Municipal Improvements Schedule

  - Develop School Improvements Schedule
  - Write Project Ranking Chapter
  - Write Summary of Projects Chapter
STEP 2. DEFINE CAPITAL PROJECTS

Criteria for Capital Costs

A clear local working definition of capital projects is needed to provide necessary guidance to department heads and others in identifying past and future capital projects and costs. Most definitions of capital projects are based on criteria related to one or more of the following:

- Large gross dollar amount of expenditure;
- Extended useful life of facility or equipment;
- Infrequent recurrence of the expenditure;
- Bonded debt needed for financing;
- Involves real property acquisition or development;
- Expands utility systems; and/or
- Creates or expands a public building.

A simple definition of capital improvements, appropriate to a very small town, might include projects involving:

Any expenditure for a project or facility having a useful life of at least 5 years and requiring a gross expenditure of at least $5,000.

For larger communities, a more complex definition might be appropriate, defining a capital project as that which is:

An expenditure for a project or facility having a useful life of at least 5 years and requiring a gross expenditure of at least $50,000.

The above are hypothetical sample definitions. Whatever definition is selected should fit within the community's view of a "major expenditure" in the context of the size of the annual budget, and should include the types of projects which have potential for conflict, overlap, or potential influence on the pattern of growth and development. Different threshold criteria might be applied to municipal government versus school district and public utility capital costs. School and public works capital expenditures are often of a large scale, usually financed by long term bonds.
STEP 3. PREPARE A FISCAL ANALYSIS

A fiscal analysis of municipal and school capital expenditures and revenues is a recommended but optional task in the CIP process. The fiscal analysis will help the planning board or CIP committee develop a more complete understanding of the structure of local costs and revenues, while creating a capital spending history, and may reveal the need for coordination or targets for potential cost savings. This step will become essential if the CIP is intended to support an impact fee ordinance.

The major components of a fiscal analysis should include:

- Review of the history of capital expenditures (capital reserves, expendable trusts, capital leases, bond projects);
- Identification of the source of revenue applied to capital expenditures;
- Computation of the typical level of capital spending as a proportion of total expenditures in past years;
- Review of growth in the tax base and the net tax expense of municipal and school services;
- Forecasts of future tax revenue availability;
- Recommendations for a target amount of annual capital expenditure for general planning purposes; and
- Review of statutory debt limits for capital projects.

Review Past Capital Expenditures and Dedicated Revenues

Municipal Capital Projects

Having defined capital projects in Step 2, the next step is to develop a 6-year history of capital expenditures and the sources of revenue which were applied to specific capital costs on an annualized basis. The structure of such an analysis is illustrated by the worksheet in Exhibit VI-3.

Municipal Capital Expenditures. Exhibit VI-3 is designed for the recording of a 10-year history of capital expenditures by department. These expenditures may be identified by utilizing the working definition of capital cost, and extracting actual capital expenditures from town and school district reports. The gross amount of the expenditure for each year should be entered in the appropriate row and column. Appropriations to capital reserve accounts and principal and interest payments on long-term debt should also be included.

Revenues Dedicated to Capital Projects. Directly below the expenditure entries should appear bond proceeds, capital reserve withdrawals, and other non-current-year property tax dollars which were applied directly to the capital expenditures listed above. Total capital outlay less total dedicated revenues equals the net capital expense borne
## Exhibit VI-3: Ten-Year History of Capital Expenditures for Municipal Government Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$647,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$501,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Streets</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$94,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$142,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$554,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer &amp; Sewage Treatment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply &amp; Treatment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations to Capital Reserves</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal &amp; Interest - Bonded Debt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$151,000</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>$207,000</td>
<td>$302,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$355,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$133,000</td>
<td>$1,084,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenues Applied to Project Costs (excluding current year property taxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$182,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Reserve Withdrawal</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$243,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fee Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIA/LU, Change Tax/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AVAILABLE REVENUES</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET ANNUAL CAPITAL EXPENSE (Funded by Current Year Property Tax)</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$469,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$426,000</td>
<td>$1,666,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASSESSMENT VALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50,000,000</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$72,000,000</td>
<td>$78,000,000</td>
<td>$81,000,000</td>
<td>$84,000,000</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$86,000,000</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
<td>$230,000,000</td>
<td>$1,666,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAX RATE IMPACT FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS

| Compute:                           | $0.62  | $0.95  | $0.62  | $0.76  | $0.74  | $0.63  | $0.76  | $5.87  | $1.33  | $1.85  |

(Not Annual Capital Expense/(Assessed Valuation/1,000)) = Tax Rate Impact Per Thousand Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL MUNICIPAL TAX RATE (Excludes County &amp; School Rates)</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$5.60</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tax Rate for Capital Projects/Total Tax Rate) = Capital Project Impact as % of Total
### Exhibit VI-4: Municipal Share of School District Capital Costs (Long-Term Debt)

#### School District Bonded Capital Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yr. Issued</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td><strong>Payments:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>State Guaranteed</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>State Non-Guaranteed</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Construct Addition</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### State Building Aid Reimbursement to District

- At 30% of annual Principal
- $21,300 + $21,300 + $19,800 + $19,800 + $18,600 + $16,800 + $8,700 + $8,700 + $100,200 + $100,200 = $334,000

#### Local Assessed Valuation

- On Which Taxes Are Raised
- $65,000,000
- $50,000,000
- $68,000,000
- $72,000,000
- $78,000,000
- $81,000,000
- $84,000,000
- $65,000,000
- $210,000,000
- $230,000,000

#### School Tax Rate for Capital Projects

- Computed: $1.50 + $1.55 + $1.23 + $1.11 + $0.88 + $0.30 + $0.48 + $2.02 + $2.50 + $2.21
- Net Annual Capital Expense/(Assessed Valuation x $1,000) = Tax Rate Impact Per Thousand Valuation

#### Total School Tax Rate

- Excluding Municipal and County Rates
- $35.50 + $37.70 + $40.50 + $39.00 + $39.00 + $42.00 + $46.00 + $47.00 + $17.80 + $19.00
- 10-Yr. Avg.

#### Capital Project Share of School Taxes

- Computed: 4.2% + 4.2% + 3.0% + 2.9% + 2.3% + 1.9% + 1.0% + 6.0% + 14.7% + 11.6% + 6.2%
# Exhibit VI-5: History of Operating Expenditures by Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollars</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>$216,000</td>
<td>$214,000</td>
<td>$218,000</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
<td>$323,000</td>
<td>$342,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$442,000</td>
<td>$248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>$124,000</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$199,000</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>$53,500</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,500</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$84,600</td>
<td>$87,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>-44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Streets</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$154,000</td>
<td>$156,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$191,000</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$237,000</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>$90,500</td>
<td>$64,500</td>
<td>$111,000</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$89,500</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$109,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests - Tax Anticipation</td>
<td>$5,100</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Department</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Department</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OPERATING COSTS**:
- Municipal Services: $302,000
- School District Assessment: $250,000
- County Tax Assessment: $100,000
- Total Operating Costs: $750,000

**TOTAL OPERATING COSTS**: $750,000
Forecast Future Operating Costs

Future Municipal Expenditures

There are a number of ways to project future operating expenditures for the municipality. It is recommended that forecasts be done on a department-by-department basis for two reasons: (1) changes in the cost of services may differ radically by department; and (2) some costs remain relatively fixed over time while others vary with growth.

For example, a community which has been growing primarily along existing highways may experience increases in school, government and public safety costs, but not in highway maintenance. Also, changes in the cost of administration, including legal and insurance costs, may show a range of fluctuating costs unrelated to the rate of growth in personnel or the rate of inflation. The annual changes determined from analysis of Exhibit VI-6 data, for the past 10 years, may be used as a guide to project future operating expenditures, developed with the increases being computed by one of several methods:

- Average annual lump sum dollar increases;
- Average annual percentage changes;
- Changes based on base-year per capita or per-housing unit costs, applied to the projected residential growth of the community; and
- Projections prepared independently by the chief fiscal officer(s), the budget committee, or the departments.

These forecasts should then be entered as estimated dollar amounts on the worksheet of Exhibit VI-7.

Programmed Municipal Debt Service

After annual operating costs have been projected, future scheduled principal and interest payments to debt service for existing facilities should be entered. Future bonded debt schedules may be obtained from the municipal offices, and are often found in the annual financial audit within a town or school district annual report.

The forecast of total municipal expenditures (excluding new capital items) is then determined by the sum of the projected operating costs and programmed debt service, and entered on the Exhibit VI-7 worksheet.

School District Expenditures

The local share of school operating costs may also be forecast based on the historical changes evident from Exhibit VI-6, or based on interviews with school officials. Once these projections are made, amounts should be added in the next row representing the local share of programmed school district debt service (after allowing for offsetting state aid to the district for capital costs). The total of projected local shares of school operating costs and programmed debt should be equivalent to the projected local appropriation to the school district, without the addition of any new capital projects.
## Exhibit VI-7: Forecast of Future Operating Expenditures and Debt Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 2007</th>
<th>Year 2 2008</th>
<th>Year 3 2009</th>
<th>Year 4 2010</th>
<th>Year 5 2011</th>
<th>Year 6 2012</th>
<th>Year 7 2013</th>
<th>Year 8 2014</th>
<th>Year 9 2015</th>
<th>Year 10 2016</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Change</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td>$870,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$930,000</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
<td>$1,020,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$570,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways and Streets</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Welfare</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Tax Anticipation</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING COSTS-MUNICIPAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Above Departments)</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
<td>$1,660,000</td>
<td>$1,810,000</td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
<td>$2,110,000</td>
<td>$2,260,000</td>
<td>$2,410,000</td>
<td>$2,560,000</td>
<td>$2,710,000</td>
<td>$2,860,000</td>
<td>$3,010,000</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEBT SERVICE-MUNICIPAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Long-Term Bonded Debt - Committed)</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MUNICIPAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Operating &amp; Debt)</td>
<td>$1,665,000</td>
<td>$1,960,000</td>
<td>$2,160,000</td>
<td>$2,360,000</td>
<td>$2,560,000</td>
<td>$2,760,000</td>
<td>$2,960,000</td>
<td>$3,160,000</td>
<td>$3,360,000</td>
<td>$3,560,000</td>
<td>$3,760,000</td>
<td>$2,025,000</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL SHARE OF SCHOOL OPERATING COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excluding Debt Service Costs)</td>
<td>$4,110,000</td>
<td>$4,550,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,550,000</td>
<td>$6,100,000</td>
<td>$6,650,000</td>
<td>$7,200,000</td>
<td>$7,750,000</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
<td>$8,850,000</td>
<td>$9,400,000</td>
<td>$2,650,000</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL SHARE OF SCHOOL DEBT SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Long-Term Bonded Debt - Committed)</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td>$960,000</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
<td>$1,560,000</td>
<td>$1,680,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL SHARE OF SCHOOL COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total Local Bonded Debt Interest)</td>
<td>$1,590,000</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
<td>$1,910,000</td>
<td>$2,070,000</td>
<td>$2,230,000</td>
<td>$2,390,000</td>
<td>$2,550,000</td>
<td>$2,710,000</td>
<td>$2,870,000</td>
<td>$3,030,000</td>
<td>$3,190,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE (Assume 5% Increase) Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY TAX ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>$4,640,000</td>
<td>$4,880,000</td>
<td>$5,120,000</td>
<td>$5,360,000</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
<td>$5,840,000</td>
<td>$6,080,000</td>
<td>$6,320,000</td>
<td>$6,560,000</td>
<td>$6,800,000</td>
<td>$7,040,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING COSTS AND DEBT SERVICE COMMITMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excluding Debt Service Costs)</td>
<td>$8,340,000</td>
<td>$9,090,000</td>
<td>$9,840,000</td>
<td>$10,590,000</td>
<td>$11,340,000</td>
<td>$12,090,000</td>
<td>$12,840,000</td>
<td>$13,590,000</td>
<td>$14,340,000</td>
<td>$15,090,000</td>
<td>$15,840,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit VI-8: Forecast of Future Revenues and Funds Available for New Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Avg. Annual Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Property Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Services @ 5% growth per year</td>
<td>$1,183,185</td>
<td>$1,242,344</td>
<td>$1,304,482</td>
<td>$1,369,689</td>
<td>$1,438,169</td>
<td>$1,510,077</td>
<td>$1,585,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Building Aid or other school funding programs</strong></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Property Revenues</strong></td>
<td>$1,183,185</td>
<td>$1,242,344</td>
<td>$1,304,482</td>
<td>$1,369,689</td>
<td>$1,438,169</td>
<td>$1,510,077</td>
<td>$1,585,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Town/School/County Operating and Debt Service</strong></td>
<td>$6,600,200</td>
<td>$7,472,350</td>
<td>$8,002,363</td>
<td>$8,429,381</td>
<td>$8,699,350</td>
<td>$9,386,317</td>
<td>$9,752,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes Needed</td>
<td>$2,417,015</td>
<td>$2,664,900</td>
<td>$2,920,960</td>
<td>$3,294,960</td>
<td>$3,720,161</td>
<td>$4,170,440</td>
<td>$4,662,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Taxes Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast of Net Assessed Valuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated - Assumes 3% growth per year</td>
<td>$250,418,182</td>
<td>$257,930,727</td>
<td>$265,654,849</td>
<td>$273,873,659</td>
<td>$281,947,870</td>
<td>$290,303,305</td>
<td>$299,012,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate Needed to support cost (Estimate of Acceptable Rate)</td>
<td>$21.63</td>
<td>$23.96</td>
<td>$24.92</td>
<td>$25.53</td>
<td>$25.89</td>
<td>$26.11</td>
<td>$26.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual Tax Rate</strong></td>
<td>$25.26</td>
<td>$26.14</td>
<td>$27.06</td>
<td>$28.01</td>
<td>$28.99</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$31.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Budget Taxes Available</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Add Property and Non-Property Tax Revenues)</td>
<td>$3.63</td>
<td>$2.28</td>
<td>$2.14</td>
<td>$2.48</td>
<td>$3.10</td>
<td>$2.89</td>
<td>$3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Available to Fund New Capital Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Operating Cont. + Debt Service + Total Key.)</td>
<td>$306,849,14</td>
<td>$356,009,714</td>
<td>$375,063,792</td>
<td>$397,094,594</td>
<td>$417,679,897</td>
<td>$435,803,599</td>
<td>$454,797,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilities

Public utilities, primarily water and sewer services, are among the more direct capital investments which shape the pattern of growth. They are fundamental to preserving public health and safety and are important foundations for economic development. Often, utilities represent sizeable investments in future capacity, especially for water or sewage treatment facilities. Even where these utilities are funded by independent precincts or districts, it is important that they be involved in a capital improvements programming process. Regardless of how they are funded, these services are of central importance to the planning board role in assuring adequate facility capacity to support existing and anticipated development.

Recreation

The recreation section of the master plan (sometimes contained within the community facilities section) often details the local pattern of demand on recreation facilities. The future development of such facilities often involves a lengthy process of site identification and acquisition, perhaps years prior to construction. A strategic parcel acquisition may be identified for action within the 6-year CIP to enable future construction of recreation facilities at a yet-to-be determined date.

Transportation

The transportation section of the master plan may indicate major highway construction or reconstruction needs and priorities for the community. Intersection or signalization improvements which will involve public funds should be identified in this section, as well as priority needs for bridge replacement or construction.

Economic Development

Some master plans contain an economic development or economic base chapter detailing strategies for expanding the tax base or the number of jobs in the community. This section may include recommendations for specific long-term capital investments that support economic development goals. These items may include a range of projects including direct investments in water and sewer line extensions, highway construction or industrial park development. The measures recommended in the master plan may also involve more indirect investments in community facilities, such as development of better school facilities.

Conservation and Preservation

While not commonly viewed as capital improvements or infrastructure investments, the acquisition of and conservation easements or historic preservation projects, may be of strategic importance in the capital improvements planning process. Opportunities for acquisition of land or easements may be available only for a limited time; desirable parcels which are in the path of development may be targeted as priorities for public acquisition.

Community Surveys

Master plans are often accompanied or preceded by citizen surveys through which satisfaction with particular community services and facilities is measured. The public perception and rating of community
# Exhibit VI-9: Relationship of CIP to the Master Plan Goals/Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Recommendation from the Master Plan</th>
<th>Project Included in CIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Preservation</td>
<td>Fire Truck Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt and Snow Plow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highway Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Control System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Signal Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Intersection Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalk Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Recreation and Conservation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreational Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This table was developed from an example provided in The Town of Peterborough’s Capital Improvements Program 2006-2011.
It will be useful to ask that the chief executive officer(s) of the community send an independent cover letter (See Exhibit VI-10) to municipal departments, emphasizing the importance of their response to the capital improvements programming process. Some department heads, especially in smaller communities, are reluctant to propose expensive, long-term capital improvements, believing that they should defer these judgments to the Board of Selectmen. Municipal departments and officials may also be skeptical of the capacity of the CIP to produce results, leading them to participate only passively in the process.

The recommended way to gain support for the process and avoid unnecessary delay in preparing the CIP is to initiate effective communication from the beginning of the organizational process. Recommended steps for this process include:

- Hold initial "brainstorming" sessions and organizational meetings to talk to department heads about capital improvements needs. Include the board of selectmen, fiscal officers, and budget committee.
- Review with department heads the community facility recommendations of the most recent master plan to determine if they remain current or if other needs have developed since the adoption of the plan.
- Arrive at an agreement on an appropriate working definition of a capital improvements project.
- Explain the nature of the CIP as a non-binding planning document, which will be updated periodically. Advise the department's chief executive that the CIP is an advisory document only.
- Provide "Project Request Forms" accompanied by a target date for response. Without a clear date for a return of the forms or a follow-up meeting, the CIP process can easily break down at this point. The coordinator of the CIP process should be diligent in making follow-up calls or issuing reminder memos to department heads requesting responses to the request for capital projects.

Exhibit VI-10 is a sample transmittal memorandum requesting municipal departments and agencies to submit capital improvements project proposals to the planning board or CIP committee. Exhibit VI-11 is a sample project worksheet and submission form for use by the departments in responding to the planning board or CIP committee request for a list of capital projects. It is recommended that a separate sheet be filed for each prospective project. The basic elements of the Exhibit VI-11 project proposal form are:

- Project title and short description;
- Statement of the primary effect of the project;
- Description of project service area, indicating the number of persons benefiting;
- Project description and rationale as well as narrative justification with the need for the project. (All of the above items will assist in prioritizing the projects later);
- Cost estimate of improvement with component costs listed as appropriate;
- Statement of potential impact on operating or maintenance cost with the need for personnel as a result of the improvement; and
- Statement of estimated or known sources of funding or proposed funding of the project.
EXHIBIT VI-10: SAMPLE MEMO REQUESTING CAPITAL PROJECT PROPOSALS

Date: ____________________________

To: Board of Selectmen
   Police Department
   Highway Superintendent
   Conservation Commission
   Town Administrator
   Fire Department
   Library
   Solid Waste Committee
   Recreation Commission
   School Board
   Water Department
   Sewer Department

From: ____________________________ Chairman, Planning Board [or CIP Committee]

Re: ____________________________
   Capital Improvements Projects for [years covered by CIP]
   Response Requested By [______ date ________]

The preparation of a Capital Improvements Program (CIP) has been initiated by the ____________________________ Planning Board [or CIP Committee], as authorized by the Town Meeting. Your list of specific capital projects envisioned for the planning period is needed for the CIP.

New Hampshire RSA §74:7 requires, as part of the CIP process, that municipal departments and related authorities and agencies transmit a statement of all capital projects they intend to undertake during the term of the CIP upon request of the Planning Board [or CIP Committee]. The statute also requires communication between the Planning Board [or CIP Committee] and the School Board in preparing the CIP.

The attached forms provide worksheets to assist in your response. Also attached to this memo is a list of long-term capital expenditure needs identified in the Community Facilities section of the Master Plan.

Please provide your recommendations for specific capital projects to be undertaken over the next 6 years, and cost estimates where possible. For the purpose of this CIP "capital projects" have been defined as those projects outside normal operations and maintenance, and having the following characteristics:

1. A gross cost of at least $_______; and
2. A useful life of at least _______ years; and
3. Is non-recurring (not an annual budget item); or
4. Any project requiring bond financing.

If the project is eligible for any federal or state grants, matching funds, or loans, please indicate this on the form. One summary sheet should be completed per project, with separate sheets added for explanation where necessary.

Please note that the CIP is an advisory document only; the inclusion of any particular project on your list or its listing in the CIP does not commit the town to that expenditure.

Please submit project information on the forms provided, adding explanations where necessary, by [insert date for return of forms] to the Planning Board Office [or other].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Funding</th>
<th>Form Prepared By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant from:</td>
<td>(Show type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant from:</td>
<td>(Show type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan from:</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation/bequest/private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User fees &amp; charges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital reserve withdrawal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact fee account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General obligation bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>(Date Prepared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Class III Desirable**

Needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of service.

**Class IV Deferable**

Can be placed on hold until after 6-year period, but supports community development goals.

**Class V Premature**

Needs more research, planning, and coordination.

**Class VI Infeasible**

Contrary to land use planning or community development goals.

---

2. **Point System**

Depending upon the size of the community and the number of capital projects proposed, a numerical scoring system may be appropriate to rank projects. A specific number of points scaled, for example, from 5 (high score) to 0 (low score) could be awarded to a project for each of several review criteria used by the planning board or committee. The total score for a project would be the sum of its score on each of the criteria, illustrated by the following example:

---

**Example of Point Score System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Point Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresses an emergency or public safety need</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrects a deficiency in service or facility</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides capacity needed for future growth</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in long-term cost savings</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports job development/increased tax base</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further the goals of the master plan</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverages the non-property tax revenues</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching funds available for limited time</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Score =** Sum of above scores

The initial class assignment or the total point score of a project should be entered into a worksheet similar to that shown as Exhibit VI-11. The list can then be sorted and re-drafted in priority order.
### Exhibit VI-12: Listing of Projects Submitted for Review in Capital Improvements Program (Con't)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Silver Sands Campground</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Facility Development at Campground</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Paths</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$551,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color Copier</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Outside Sign</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Computer &amp; Chairs</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Sink/Stovetop</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIBRARY</td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeological/Engineering</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubota Loader/backhoe</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded Debt: Well &amp; Main Construction</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL WATER DEPARTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection System TV Collection</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded Debt: Pump Station</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SEWER DEPARTMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td>$205,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** This List of Projects was developed and provided by Central NH Regional Planning Commission, but changed to fit this particular example.
the sequence of capital projects within fiscal constraints, or suggest alternative funding means such as capital reserves, bonded indebtedness, user fees, special districts, or other strategies to even out the potential property tax impacts of various combinations of capital improvements. Electronic spreadsheet software is especially useful for testing different scenarios and assumptions about the potential property tax impact of the 6-year capital improvements schedule. A computer-based schedule will make annual updates of the CIP an easier task in future years.

For long-term projects requiring debt financing, principal and interest payments should be scheduled out over the capital planning period to illustrate annual cost impacts. Similarly, appropriations to capital reserves for future projects should be part of the annual cost picture, while withdrawals from accumulated capital reserve accounts may be shown as a dedicated revenue source.

**Estimate the Tax Impact of Capital Projects**

Once all CIP expenditures and dedicated revenues are entered in *Exhibit VI-12* and *VI-13*, a calculation may be made at the bottom of *Exhibit VI-13* by subtracting total available dedicated revenues from total annualized project costs to determine:

- Net annual property tax cost to the community;
- Property tax rate needed to support capital projects;
- Consistency of these amounts with targets for acceptable levels of capital spending; and
- The need to re-schedule proposed capital improvements within the 6-year period to meet fiscal goals.

The planning board or CIP committee should review how well the total annualized tax impacts of capital spending fit within its overall fiscal goals and within the urgency of need classifications established in Step 6.

**Adjust the Six Year Schedule**

Depending upon the potential tax rate impacts, the board may wish to adjust the 6-year schedule, considering:

- Are there projects which can be shifted to later years of the CIP or deferred without negative effects on the community?
- Will there be any significant operating and maintenance cost impacts of running new or improved facilities that will increase or reduce operating costs and available revenues?

Draft capital project schedules should be reviewed with departments, municipal staff, and with the general public at information sessions prior to finalizing the recommended 6-year schedule.

In small communities with relatively few projects and minimal problems in attaining fiscal stability, minimum CIP requirements may be met simply by identifying the capital projects that are required, their relative urgency and need in priority order, and the year in which they are proposed to be implemented, without a detailed cost
## Exhibit VI-13: Schedule of Capital Improvements Projects and Annualized Costs (Con't)

### Solid Waste (Recycling)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Fork Lift</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL SOLID WASTE</strong></td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parks, Recreation, Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Existing Bond</th>
<th>New Bond</th>
<th>Existing Cost</th>
<th>New Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Silver Sands Campground</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Facility Development at Campground</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL RECREATION &amp; CONSERVATION</strong></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Computer, Scanner, Digital Camera</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Outside Sign</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Water Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogeological Engineering</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish Backhoe</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded Debt: Well &amp; Main Construction</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL WATER DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sewer Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection: TV Collection</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonded Debt: Pump Station</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL SEWER DEPARTMENT</strong></td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Town Capital Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TOWN CAPITAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School Capital Costs: Local Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Addition (2008)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Assessed Valuation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax Rate Impact of New Debt and Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
<td>$4,429,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should demonstrate that the capital improvements in the CIP have allowed for expansion of facilities to accommodate a reasonable share of the growth of the region.

**Growth Management: Interim Regulation:** "In unusual circumstances requiring prompt attention and for the purpose of developing or altering a growth management process under RSA 674:22, or a master plan or capital improvements program, a city, town, or county .... may adopt an ordinance imposing interim regulations upon development as provided in this section." (RSA 674:23) It is clear that in unusual circumstances, presumably those in which a large scale development or rapid pace of development could threaten to overwhelm community services, a community may invoke interim regulations for growth management to allow it time to prepare and adopt an appropriate capital improvements program.

**Scattered or Premature Subdivision:** The planning board may adopt subdivision regulations which may: "Provide against such scattered or premature subdivision of land as would involve danger or injury to health, safety, or prosperity by reason of the lack of water supply, drainage, transportation, schools, fire protection, or other public services, or necessitate the excessive expenditure of public funds for the supply of such services." (RSA 674:36, II (a))

While this statute does not explicitly tie subdivision review to the CIP process, an adopted capital improvements program may become an important reference document for determining the extent of capital improvements and local expenditures which are reasonable for the community to undertake in any given year, and may indicate the level of annual expenditures which could be considered "excessive." Since the CIP establishes a plan to service anticipated growth in accordance with an acceptable fiscal policy, the CIP is a reasonable basis for setting policies or criteria for developer funding of facilities or services as a condition of subdivision approval.

**Implement the Capital Improvements Program**

**Transmit the Annual Capital Budget**

For the 6-year capital improvements program to have an actual effect on municipal expenditures, a direct connection must be made between long-term community planning and the annual budgeting process. When a planning board or CIP committee has prepared a capital improvements program, it is required to transmit its recommendations for the current year to the mayor [interpreted to include chief executive officer or selectmen as well] and the budget committee [for towns operating under the Municipal Finance Act] for consideration in the annual budget.

Often, the principal rationale for developing a 6-year capital improvements program has been to meet statutory prerequisites for the implementation of land use regulatory measures. Such programs lack the commitment to an ongoing CIP process, and are soon forgotten.

The preparation of the CIP must be followed by annual capital project recommendations for inclusion in the budget. One person [from the planning board or CIP committee should be designated to see that there is an annual transmittal of recommendations to the appropriate authority to keep the capital improvements program functional and valid. Exhibit VI-14 provides a format for the presentation of annual capital budget recommendations by the planning board or CIP committee.
Conduct a CIP "Self-Audit"

It is recommended that a "paper trail" of the preparation of the CIP be maintained during the process to document compliance with the RSAs. While a capital improvements program is an unlikely object for direct legal challenge, impact fees or growth management ordinances based on the CIP are more likely targets. A challenge to the validity of such ordinances may lead to a review of the procedures and content of the CIP as a foundation planning document.

As a final check on its CIP process, the planning board can conduct its own "self-audit" checklist of compliance with the minimum statutory requirements, and consistency with recommended planning practice, by reviewing the following:

- Has the planning board adopted a master plan?
- Did the local legislative body authorize the planning board or CIP committee to prepare and amend a CIP?
- Does the CIP classify projects according to their urgency and need and include a recommended time sequence for implementation?
- Was the program based on information submitted by municipal departments and agencies, the school board, and others contacted by the planning board or CIP committee?
- Does the CIP take into account public facility needs indicated by prospective development as shown in the master plan or those permitted by land use controls?
- Did the planning board or CIP committee solicit public input at a properly-noticed public hearing in the same manner required for master plan adoption?
- Following the public hearing, did the planning board or CIP committee vote to adopt the CIP?
- Did the planning board or CIP committee transmit its current year capital budget recommendations to the executive officer(s) of the city or town and to the budget committee, school board, and special purpose districts or precincts whose capital needs are addressed in the CIP?

If the answer to any of these questions is no, the capital improvements programming and implementation process is incomplete. The board or committee should add any missing information or documentation to bring the CIP to a successful conclusion.

**STEP 9. UPDATE THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM**

An update of the CIP should be conducted annually and should involve repeating Steps Two to Nine to reflect new information, policies and proposed projects. The Planning Board or CIP Committee should review and revise the entire program as necessary to reflect its most recent determination of the need for equipment, maintenance of equipment, the town's social and environmental conditions, the development or revision of
EXHIBIT D

MASTER PLAN AND LAND USE REGULATION AUDIT
(Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates, Inc.)
Introduction

The purpose of conducting an audit of a community’s planning documents and land use regulations is to ensure that the Future Land Use Plan and associated recommendations are actually being implemented by the existing regulations. If there are disconnections in this relationship, it is important to address them before it is too late and the community is no longer working toward its desired vision.

Jeffrey H. Taylor and Associates conducted a review and comparison of the 2004 Hooksett Master Plan and the existing Hooksett Land Use Regulations. The overall finding is that there are some topics where the specifics of the land use regulations do not serve the policy statements of the Master Plan. This is a critical point. If the regulations do not assist with the implementation of the Vision in the Master Plan, that Vision is not likely to be achieved.

The community is currently participating in a “3 Infrastructure” (3i) planning process with the Jordan Institute. The benefit of conducting this audit early on in the 3i Process is that the findings can be considered along with the new mapping, buildout analysis, and land use scenario building that is underway. This process will lead to the identification of model ordinance language and voluntary practices for Hooksett to pursue. The enclosed items cannot all be addressed at once, and will need to be reviewed and prioritized by representatives of the community as part of this process.

Regional Context

Hooksett, New Hampshire has significant economic, ecological, and recreational resources that present the town with special constraints and opportunities. The town borders Manchester, the state’s largest city, to the south. Its access to interstate transportation, which includes three exits off I-93, is extraordinary for the region. Hooksett has land on both sides of the Merrimack River and, in the northeastern area of town, abuts the largest unfragmented land remaining in southeastern New Hampshire. Hooksett also contains significant water supply lands, sand and gravel deposits, and wildlife habitat of statewide importance.

Being both commercially attractive and resource-rich is a great asset to Hooksett – and presents a critical challenge to Hooksett’s leaders and residents. This audit is one tool for helping Hooksett understand the implications of its setting and help to maximize the benefits its location and resource base provide.
Section 1.0 Major Audit Findings

Some of the major items that appear to need attention in the near future are:

a. The community should consider shifting density from the rural areas to the more urban and suburban areas to meet the Master Plan Vision.

b. Drafting new zoning district language with clear purpose statements for each zone. This would include the new districts articulated in the Master Plan.

c. Because traffic congestion is one of the biggest concerns in the Master Plan, focusing on issues that have transportation impacts is an important step:
   i. Zoning for development nodes on Route 3-A;
   ii. Access Management regulations; and
   iii. Transportation Demand Management with major employers in Hooksett.

d. If Hooksett can not buy all of the identified open space then leveraging protection with cluster regulations is another technique, but the existing regulations should be revised.

e. Decide how, and to what extent, Natural Resources should be protected. The Natural Services Network map will be able to assist with this effort.

f. Resolve the potential conflicts between the identified Economic Development Areas and Hooksett's priority open spaces and critical natural resources which in some cases are located on the same parcels.

g. Coordinate future sewer line extensions, and other infrastructure changes through the land use boards to ensure it supports the Future Land Use Plan and Vision.

h. This promotion of the Village will be impossible without some identification of a new bridge corridor, and then reinforcing that with some acquisition and/or official map language is important.

Section 2.0 Hooksett Master Plan - 2004

The current Master Plan (2004) recognizes that there are still some good recommendations from the 1971 Plan that have not been implemented. This is often the case with municipal plans. The community needs to ensure that the larger policy recommendations are reinforced by appropriate land use regulations.
The 1989 Master Plan proposed a long range land use plan for Hooksett that was based on the then existing land use activities and the constraints and opportunities of the natural features. It was the Town's desire to strike a balance between the competing needs of protection and utilization of the Town's natural resources, while recognizing the need to accommodate growth to finance Town services effectively. Elements of this Vision are still apparent in the 2004 Plan, and have even been expanded on to promote a Vision of Hooksett as a sustainable community. These Vision elements closely match the basic characteristics of the 3i approach.

...a long range land use plan for Hooksett based on the existing land use activities, the constraints and opportunities of the natural features, and the desire to strike a balance between the competing needs of protection and utilization of the Town's natural resources...

Hooksett, NH Master Plan 1989

The following priorities identified in the 2004 Master Plan provide a starting point for revisions to the Hooksett land use regulations. These are the items that the land use regulations should be helping the community to achieve. Starting on Page 4 the key recommendations from the 2004 Master Plan are followed by questions and/or comments on their status and some comments and/or recommendations based on this review.

2.1 Hooksett Vision Statements - 2004

**Working Landscape and the Natural Environment -** Streams, rivers, walking trails, working farms, forests, clean air, historic buildings and bridges; wildlife, and open land help determine a community's personality and contribute to the everyday pleasures of community life. A sustainable community recognizes the importance of these assets and takes appropriate measures to assure their continuance.

**Economic Vitality -** A sustainable community includes a variety of businesses, industries, and institutions which are environmentally sound, financially viable, provide reasonable wages and benefits to workers, and provide those workers with opportunities to develop their skills.

**Growth and Development -** Local control of businesses is important to the economic health of a community. The more often money circulates within the community before leaving, the more the community benefits.

2.2 Key Issues from the Vision

Communities consist of three infrastructures (3i) - built, green, and social. They include roads and buildings, the ecological features that provide critical natural
services, and the places and events where people congregate. That characteristics of each infrastructure, and the balance between the three, create a town’s character.

Through zoning and other regulations, residents choose what they want the three infrastructures to look like and how they should balance. When you’re thinking about what your town will be like in the future, it might be useful to consider town assets and goals in terms of the three infrastructures.

We have organized key issues from Hooksett’s Vision (as stated in the 2004 Master Plan) by infrastructure. Of course many overlap, and others fall outside the three infrastructures. This design will just help you start thinking about the town in terms of its three critical components.

A 3i Look at Hooksett’s Master Plan Vision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Built</strong></th>
<th><strong>Green</strong></th>
<th><strong>Social</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Long-term highway improvement plan</td>
<td>• “Strive to preserve the natural environment.”</td>
<td>• Town center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve traffic circulation</td>
<td>• Reevaluate zoning for increased buffer zones on new development</td>
<td>• Community center(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure adequate infrastructure for growth</td>
<td>• Consider aesthetic preservation techniques¹ such as:</td>
<td>• Recreation (e.g. riverwalk, bike trails)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Balance residential, commercial, &amp; industrial growth</td>
<td>• Preserving trees and natural habitat</td>
<td>• Heritage &amp; history appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reevaluate zoning for mixed use zones, proximity to interchanges, and strip zoning</td>
<td>• Obtaining conservation easements</td>
<td>• Access to river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce residential and commercial sprawl</td>
<td>• Protecting the riverfront</td>
<td>• Preserve &amp; develop non-motorized trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Separate through traffic from destination traffic; develop/encourage alternate routes</td>
<td>• Acquiring additional green space</td>
<td>• Build a strong social/recreation foundation to strengthen economic vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage public transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide for sidewalks, paths, and streetlights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize traffic safety hazards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹“Aesthetic preservation” implies that natural habitat is only valuable because it looks nice. It also, however, provides critical services such as flood storage and water supply protection. If you preserve the functionality of natural habitat, the aesthetic value will follow!
Other issues raised in the Vision include:

- Create, implement and fund Master Plan (to be refreshed in a timely fashion).
- Establish information centers.
- Strive to improve the school system to attract high-end employers.
- Make the development process business-friendly.

### 2.3 Hooksett Community Profile

A Community Profile was conducted in Hooksett in 2001, and it also contributed to this Vision. Some key recommendations that resulted from that effort include the following, also organized by the 3i approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Built</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Control the timing of residential growth</td>
<td>- Promote open space conservation to create unfragmented wildlife habitat</td>
<td>- Encourage developers to provide recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote economic development in specific geographic areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preserve the walkable attributes and human scale of Hooksett Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide housing for a diverse population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Community Profile also recommended that several studies be completed. The studies highlighted in yellow are being addressed during 3i Process:

- How to fund the services required to meet the needs of new growth;
- How to determine the optimal population that the resources will allow;
- How to deal with anticipated long-term transportation issues, such as a new bridge crossing;
- How to prioritize and protect open space;
- How to plan for future recreational needs and areas;
- How to determine how to keep Hooksett’s Zoning Ordinance and other land use regulations relevant, updated, and able to accomplish the goals of this Master Plan (Audit);
- How to best encourage economic development that is compatible with the character of the community;
- How to address the rapid rate of growth effectively; and
- How to maintain access to (and from) the community’s roadways for the benefit of both the public and local businesses.

### 2.4 Key Recommendations from the 2004 Master Plan
The Master Plan recommendations below have been organized under their primary subject area, but it is important to remember that most of these also have implications for other aspects of the community.

Note - Comments generated during the audit process have been included in separate text boxes below the applicable recommendations.

**Land Use**

- **The Region:** Not only should Hooksett become more proactive in reaching out to the larger region and influencing how regional decisions are made, but also Hooksett must be mindful of how its own decisions are now and will influence land use matters generally in our regional area.

- **Hooksett Village:**
  In the existing neighborhoods, work cooperatively with residents to create a Village Mixed Use zone to allow a range of shopping, services, and zoning requirements that are consistent with the desired character of the Village. In the existing neighborhoods, work cooperatively with residents to create an Office/Business Park zone to allow the development of a suburban style office park on the CIGNA property along Route 3.

More Specifically:

- Hooksett Village can be the heartbeat or spiritual heart of the community, the place that people identify with when they think of Hooksett.
- The “Village” should have a well-defined sense of place.
- Distinct edges to the Village and well-defined gateways should be hallmarks of the Village.
- Hooksett Village can serve a variety of roles. The Village can be an attractive, enjoyable place to live, work, and visit. It can continue to be the center of community affairs. Key public and community facilities are located in the Village.
- The Village can also be a residential center with livable, walkable residential neighborhoods where people know their neighbors and feel safe and “at home”.
- Convenient access to small, local shops and services so that residents can meet some of their day-to-day needs within the Village.
- Open space and green areas along the river can be retained and enhanced.
- Most of the Hooksett Village area has a pedestrian scale – things are close together—and it should remain so.
- A mix of uses should be encouraged. “Hooksett Village can re-emerge as a community center in our town—it can evolve into a true New England village, but one that meets the needs of the 21st Century.”
- The Village Design Study recommends essentially that the existing residential zoning in the Village has dimensional requirements (area, frontage, and setbacks) that are simply too large for the neighborhoods, and recommends that these requirements be reduced to bring the residential lots more into conformity with new zoning districts.
The Future Land Use Plan suggests that the Village be designated as three land use categories:
- Village Residential District
- Village Mixed Use District
- Office/Business Park District

Status: The Village Residential and Village Mixed Use designations are not currently reflected in the zoning ordinance, but changes are being proposed in May of 2007. The Office/Business Park designation discussed for the CIGNA property is similar to the current Mixed Use District 1, but this change has not been made in the zoning.

Comments/Recommendations: Based on these recommendations from the Master Plan, the identified districts should be developed with clear district descriptions, along with appropriate use and dimensional standards that would reinforce the items articulated above. There are also some non-regulatory policies and projects that need to be initiated, including retention of municipal and community oriented land uses in the Village, the development of gateways, protection of riverfront areas, and increasing access to the river.

* Location of Intensive Land Uses With Access to Major Arterial Highways: The more intensive land use activities should be developed in reasonable proximity to the major transportation corridors and the municipal services support systems. The Town is seeing considerably intense retail development at Exit 10 and anticipates dramatic development at the northeastern extent of Route 3. Care must be taken to maximize access management and to preserve restricted access on new highways.

Status: The existing zoning appears to be attempting to fulfill this recommendation. Most of the higher intensity uses appear to be zoned for areas along Route 3 and Route 3A and in close proximity to Interstate 93.

Comments/Recommendations: Unfortunately, this type of development generally results in areas that do not include residential development in the mix of uses and are typically automobile-oriented. A recommendation would be to develop and adopt some clear access management regulations that will assist in meeting this objective.

* Keeping Intensive Land Uses Off Route 3-A: It is the Town's intent to retain intensive land uses on the eastern—Route 3—side of the community; it is also the Town's intent to take active steps to ensure that lands on Route 3-A (on the west side) do not become as intensively used as Route 3. It is very likely, however, that over time nonresidential development will migrate to areas along Route 3-A. As this occurs, it is recommended that the Town make the kind of wise transportation decisions that will
allow these uses to function with much less traffic congestion than has occurred on Route 3. It would be appropriate to try to determine ahead of time where signal lights may be needed, and therefore where to implement access management techniques.

**Comments/Recommendations:** Some of the undeveloped land along Route 3-A is zoned for Commercial and Industrial uses. The intent of the current regulations is to reduce the opportunity for strip development. The physical constraints within this corridor also play a role. Non-residential development that does occur could form nodes that include a greater mix of uses in order to reduce trips, or could be located adjacent to residential districts. On larger parcels development could be facilitated by a new Open Space Cluster Regulation that would protect natural resources, assist with access management objectives, and reduce the strip commercial development effect. The adoption of access management regulations would also be beneficial.

**Potential New Industrial Sites:**
- Industrial Valley, Off Industrial Park Drive;
- Land around GE Engine Plant, Route 3;
- Eastpoint Drive Area, Off Bypass 28;
- Brax Industries Site, Off Route 3;
- MS&G Quarry Site, East of Route 3.

**Comments/Recommendations:** If there is going to be an effort to attract industrial uses to these areas, it would be worth considering increasing the mix of uses within these areas (and adjacent to them) in an attempt to reduce transportation requirements for residents and employees.

**Sewer Infrastructure:** The Sewer Commission should periodically conduct a joint meeting with the Planning Board to discuss future sewer needs of the town.

**Status:** Has this type of coordination ever occurred?

**Comments/Recommendations:** This type of coordination is significant to future land use planning in Hooksett. The extension of such infrastructure without coordination will create a sprawl development pattern that undermines the vision and Future Land Use Plans for Hooksett.
Other items:

-The Parkway (a north-south alternate route envisioned to relieve traffic on US Route 3) should have a limited number of access points, thus favoring mobility over land access.

Will there be a corresponding land use plan for the Parkway? This is an opportunity to coordinate land use and transportation to better meet the Vision.

-Evaluate and promote appropriate zoning ordinance revisions. Including:
1. Linkage fees (Requires developers to provide low and moderate income housing, day care, or social activity centers or funds) to help promote commercial community development.

This is a very interesting form of innovative Zoning. Is a version of this regulation being discussed now?

2. Promote cluster zoning as an incentive for infrastructure improvements.

How is this intended to be an incentive? The existing version lacks incentives, and only addresses residential developments.

Transportation

- Increase in traffic counts town-wide and congestion on route 3 have been identified in the Master Plan as the community’s most important land use problems.

- Encouraging Mass Transit: Without question, people are as of yet unwilling to abandon their automobiles for an alternate form of transportation. Mass transit planning, however, should be encouraged not only for the short trips to Manchester or Concord, but also from the central New Hampshire area to Boston. Also without question, the Town of Hooksett cannot move in this direction alone, but teamed up with other municipalities we can have a positive influence in moving toward this future transportation solution. Exploring the possibility of extending public transit routes into Hooksett from Manchester should be investigated now.
Status: Are there any transit stops in Hooksett currently? Is any progress being made to establish this service?

Comments/Recommendations: If the community would like to establish regional transit opportunities, land use pattern is also important. Shuttles and buses are most efficient when servicing higher density nodes. It is also important for the community to think about how residents and employees will get to these transit lines or stops. Will driving be necessary, or will sidewalks and pathways provide access within the developed areas and from adjacent lower density developments? Requiring developments in key locations throughout the community to incorporate transit stops into their development plans will also be important.

- **Roadway improvements:** The Town may need to create a relationship with the NH Department of Transportation (DOT) to determine appropriate funding mechanisms. Although it is most often the Town that has approved the developments along a roadway, the DOT retains jurisdiction over state roadways for safety, mobility, and capacity.

  Comments/Recommendations: The Town of Hooksett should communicate with the NH Department of Transportation and establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) related to roadway access. This would formalize the existing relationship with the NHDOT to ensure that the Planning Board’s desires relative to roadway access for pending projects continue to be discussed and understood prior to awarding a permit. This process allows for better land use and transportation coordination, and will assist the community in meeting its Access Management objectives.

- Good transportation planning needs to consider the needs of those without access to transportation – to do otherwise would be shortsighted and could lead to serious consequences for a small but growing segment of the population.

  Comments/Recommendations: This consideration requires that land use and transportation decisions be considered together. Many of the higher density areas in the zoning ordinance and Future Land Use Map are stretched along the main transportation corridors. The Future Land Use Plan should address this concern so that the population has reasonable transportation alternatives, and does not become isolated from goods, services, or each other.

- The Town should work cooperatively with the NHDOT to create bike routes, intermodal connections between roadways, sidewalks, and trails, and establish vehicle parking lots as needed near intersections with trails.
Status: Are any projects in the works currently?

Comments/Recommendations: A comprehensive transportation plan should be created to illustrate the future locations for these routes, sidewalks and paths. This will enable the community to pursue funds for the construction of these facilities, and to require future developments to assist in their construction. The Development Regulations should include a provision that gives clear authority to the Planning Board to require developers to assist with the construction of this infrastructure or connect their developments to it to increase transportation options.

- Sidewalk and drainage in new roads and subdivisions:
  - The Master Plan does recommend that closed systems be considered in the more urban or concentrated sections of Hooksett, with open systems in more remote outlying sections.
  - Grass strips, wide enough to allow for the planting of street trees should be installed between the sidewalk and the street where possible, for both safety and beautification reasons.

Comments/Recommendations: These design criteria need to be articulated in the Development Regulations, and could go a step further to include Low Impact Development (LID) techniques that reduce the amount of stormwater leaving the site, increase the amount of groundwater recharge on site, and meet safety and aesthetic considerations.

Economic Development

- Mission: The mission of Hooksett’s economic development effort is to advocate public policy that promotes balanced and sustainable economic growth, enhances and protects the environment, fosters effective transportation systems, and balances resources through sound management of development.

- Potential Economic Development Areas: Hooksett should consider six locations for Economic Development Areas in the following locations:
  1. Exit 10
  2. Exit 11
  3. Hooksett Village Area
  4. Route 3 North (Hooksett Road)
  5. Route 3 South
  6. Route 28 Bypass
Comments/Recommendations: Characterize each EDA in terms of its size, infrastructure, zoning, etc. using a process similar to the one used during the Hooksett Village Design Charrette. It is also important that the future zoning for these areas and the Economic Development objectives are compatible.

**Education**

Potential New School Sites: To accommodate school children from anticipated development at Head’s Pond (650 homes), University Heights (400 homes), and expansion of the Granite Hill development (372 approved, space for another 400+/-), three new school sites have been mapped. These 1,822 new homes could generate over 1,000 school children; therefore the Planning Board anticipates two (2) school locations in the north/central area of town owned by MS&G; this area is shown as “undesignated” on MS&G’s mixed use (MUDS) zone master plan, however we anticipate a large number of homes in that area, hence the location of a third school. These future school sites should be large enough to accommodate ample recreational space.

Comments/Recommendations: Locating future schools and development areas together, or at least adjacent to one another with direct transportation links, will reduce transportation needs to the facilities and make them important Community Centers. This strategy has positive implications for the school budgets, nearby residential areas, and the environment.

- Sidewalks should be constructed around and leading to both school facilities and bus stops whenever possible.

Comments/Recommendations: Promotion of a Safe Routes to School program can increase the percentage of students and staff that are walking/biking to school. Such an effort may also help identify critical sidewalk and pathway connections that are missing. This should be incorporated into the community’s transportation plans. Developers should be required to help improve these facilities, and should not be allowed to fragment them.

**Natural Resources**

- Mission - To identify Hooksett’s major natural resources, establish conservation and preservation priorities and recommend an action plan to accomplish these priorities.
The Town of Hooksett and its citizens must decide how and to what extent they wish to preserve existing natural resources so that they will be available not only to this generation but also to future generations as well.

Comments/Recommendations: If this has not happened yet, then the 3i Project is an opportunity to do so!

- Explore all possible avenues to fund the preservation of Hooksett's key natural resource assets. Many options are available to the community to preserve sensitive areas. The use of conservation easements, 100% use of the Land Use Change Tax, outright purchase and other available options should be pursued.

Status: Are there any efforts underway in the community to secure funds for these initiatives?

Comments/Recommendations: If the community is concerned about protecting key natural resources within Hooksett, some resource-specific regulations or design requirements should be developed and adopted within the land use regulations to assist in achieving this goal.

- The Town and the Hooksett Village Water Precinct should work in close cooperation on creating a new wellhead protection plan. Existing and proposed wellhead sites should be adequately protected from contamination through the control of land uses within the wellhead areas. It is further recommended that the Town work cooperatively with the Hooksett Village Water Precinct, the Central Hooksett Water Precinct, and Manchester Water Works on the overall protection of our aquifers through the Water Resource Management and Protection Plan update process.

Status: This planning process is underway.

Comments/Recommendations: Amendments should be made to the Groundwater Resource Conservation District regulations based on the revised Wellhead Protection Plan and the information presented during the 3i Project. It is also recommended that the Town develop and adopt regulations that promote Low Impact Development (LID) techniques that preserve or enhance the filtering of stormwater and groundwater recharge on site.

- As soon as possible, the location for an additional water source on the east side of the Merrimack River should be explored. The Town and Hooksett Village Precinct should work together to develop wellhead protection measures for this area.
Status: Has a location been identified?

Comments/Recommendations: Once a location is identified it is important to ensure that the land uses and intensity of development permitted by the zoning on the surrounding parcels is compatible.

- Hooksett identified – twenty-one Prime Wetlands as a priority for natural resource protection.

Status: The Town’s twenty-one Prime Wetlands have been incorporated into a Wetlands Conservation Overlay District.

Comments/Recommendations: This designation provides a greater level of protection, but does not ensure the preservation of these resources or their critical upland areas.

- The natural features that set themselves apart for special attention are Pinnacle Pond, Quimby Mountain, the community’s prime wetlands, and the large unfragmented area in the northeast portion of the community.

Status: Are there protection efforts underway for these resources?

Comments/Recommendations: It is important to consider how Pinnacle Pond and Quimby Mountain, and properties adjacent to these resources are zoned. What about listing the Merrimack River as a resource that deserves special attention?

- In the fall of 2003, students from the Natural Resource Department at the University of New Hampshire completed a project that identified priority lands for conservation efforts.

Comments/Recommendations: The importance of these priority areas is not reflected in zoning. These areas are still zoned the same as adjacent parcels. The Town should consider developing some new zoning for these priority areas to reduce future development in these areas while encouraging or requiring the use of innovative land use techniques, such as Open Space Cluster Developments. This will help meet many of the conservation goals if the properties cannot be protected outright.

- One important potential project that the people of Hooksett should consider is preserving unfragmented open space in as much of its current shape and size as is desirable.
- There is a vast tract of consolidated, undeveloped, mostly unfragmented open space in the northeast quadrant of Hooksett.
- The second block of unfragmented, undeveloped property in Hooksett, which merits consideration, is the block of undeveloped woodland in the northwest quadrant of the town, west of I-93.

**Comments/Recommendations:** These large unfragmented areas of the community will not remain this way under the existing zoning. The existing zoning does not appear to meet the visions for these areas. Lower density requirements are needed within these zones (10+/acre density) along with the encouragement or requirement of innovative land use techniques (Clustering, Mandatory Cluster in some situations, Transfer of Development Rights, etc.), and strategic land conservation initiatives.

- Identify specific (critically important) wildlife habitat.

**Comments/Recommendations:** The 3i Process should be able to provide some direction on this issue for the Town to address in the land use regulations and future land use plans. The 2004 master plan does not include many details related to the various natural resources found in Hooksett, and their role as wildlife habitat. It is primarily focused on the large unfragmented blocks, prime wetlands and wellhead protection areas. One possibility for the Development Regulations would be to require developers to identify natural resources, critical habitat areas and wildlife corridors on future development sites for review with the Planning Board prior to site design.

**Housing**

- Promote Housing Initiatives: If the Town of Hooksett is to promote economic development, then we must advocate for housing that will accommodate all income categories.

  **A. Assist Residents with Limited Financial Means to Obtain Affordable Housing.**

  In 2000, 33% of renters in Hooksett reported housing costs greater than 30% of their total gross income. The Town should demonstrate its willingness to accept its fair share of the region's affordable, or workforce, housing units.

**Comments/Recommendations:** How does Hooksett intend to do this? The Community should consider regulatory routes like inclusionary or incentive zoning. The NH Housing Finance Authority document *Housing Solutions for New Hampshire* identifies other techniques for encouraging or requiring affordable housing units that Hooksett may be interested in considering.
B. Consider Instituting Growth Management Measures. This could be accomplished through the adoption of a growth management ordinance or other innovative land use controls as specified under RSA 674:21, 22, and 36. The Planning Board should assess and balance community and regional needs to determine the timing and specifics of any type of growth management strategy.

Comments/Recommendations: It is important to remember that this is at best a short-term approach that buys time while infrastructure shortfalls are addresses. This is not a strategy for sending growth away.

C. Amend the Cluster Development Ordinance. An amended ordinance should assist in the provision of affordable housing through the reduction of utility and infrastructure costs, and the reduction of long-term maintenance costs. However, no cluster development should be approved unless the following criteria are met:

a. The development area (inclusive of all non-buildable land such as wetlands) must be equal to, or greater than, the minimum acreage which would be required if the land was to be developed as a standard single-family residential neighborhood. If a wetlands adjustment for non-buildable acreage is considered for a single, non-clustered residence, then this must also be applied to the entire cluster development.

b. The character of the existing neighborhood in which the cluster development is to be located must be maintained. This may require some landscaping, planting of trees to act as a natural barrier, or that the placement of the clustered homes be set away from the existing road frontage in order to maintain such character. All units built under the cluster development regulation within 100 feet of an existing road (pre-development), must meet the setback requirements of that zone and a separation between each of the dwelling units equal to 75% of the frontage requirement of that zone.

Comments/Recommendations: The Cluster Development Ordinance needs attention. Specific suggestions can be found in Section 2.0 of this Audit. The community could take this tool a step further and make it mandatory in certain areas, or offer bonus units and other incentives to make it a more attractive option to developers.

D. Maintain the Quality of the Neighborhood Environment. Limit the adverse impact of such impacts as annoyance, disturbance, or endangering the comfort, repose, health, peace, or safety of others; adopt and/or amend the noise and disorderly conduct ordinance as necessary.

E. Explore Smart Growth Techniques. In order to increase the well being of all residents, and to foster affordable housing production, consider inclusionary zoning, linkage fees, infill policies, and establishment of a local housing fund to spur activities that address these issues.
Comments/Recommendations: Accessory Apartments are another smart growth technique for providing affordable housing units.

Section 3.0 Identified Regulatory Disconnections and Opportunities

The following findings have been organized under the regulation they relate to, and specifically address existing disconnections identified in the Hooksett Land Use Regulations to date.

3.1 Zoning Ordinance:

Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates conducted an independent review of the Zoning Ordinance, and our comments are identified below.

Policy Changes:

- Low Density Residential District – Will the minimum lot size of two acres here lead you to the community’s vision for this portion of town? The requirements in the current district are much more oriented to suburban styled development.

- Home Occupations – Why not allow the use to be carried out in a secondary structure?

- Medium Density Residential – Dimensional requirements of ¾ of an acre to 1.5 acres and 150 feet of frontage may create a very suburban development pattern. This pattern is often more costly for providing transportation and town services.

- High Density Residential – Although this is a very small district, why not allow small neighborhood stores or other small commercial uses that create more of a “mixed use” environment?

- High Density Residential – Why require 200 feet of frontage if the lot can meet all the other requirements?

- District Density – The community should consider shifting density from the rural areas to the more urban and suburban areas to meet the Master Plan Vision.

- Commercial Districts:
  - No opportunities for residential uses? Even in upper stories older (or new) buildings?
  - The buffer requirements for this district are less than those for a cluster.
- Industrial Districts - Having a greater mix of uses to service these districts and surrounding areas would be a more comprehensive approach.

- Mixed Use District 1:
  - Really needs a clear district description. This does not seem to be a true mixed use district. No residential uses are allowed. Each use needs to be on its own one acre lot?
  - Shouldn’t the structures be allowed to be closer than 35 feet from the road? Are you trying to create or allow a village atmosphere here?

- Mixed Use District 2:
  - Great Statement of Intent! Just one property though?
  - Why limit the % of the property that can be developed for each of the three allowed types of uses?
  - A larger % of open space is required in this district than in the clusters.
  - The master plan idea is a good one. Why not require this for the other MU Districts?

- Mixed Use District 3 - really needs a clear district description. This does not seem to be a true mixed use district. No residential uses are allowed. Each use needs to be on its own two acre lot with 200 feet of frontage? This may create more of a sprawl effect.

- Mixed Use District 4 - really needs a clear district description. This does not seem to be a true mixed use district. No residential uses are allowed. Each use needs to be on its own two acre lot? This may create more of a sprawl effect.

- Mixed Use District 5 – Similar in structure and complexity to MU2, but covering a huge area of the community. The Future Land Use Map appears to result in a significant change in this area to just residential.

- Elderly, Older Person, and Handicapped Housing:
  - Great provision for calculating lot area. By subtracting the very poorly drained soils, wetlands, and slopes greater than 20% from the calculation of minimum lot size you take the first step toward protecting those resources. Could this be required for lot size calculations town-wide? Could it be a start for implementing the Natural Services Network map?
  - This form of housing development is not allowed within the identified floodplains. Why not exclude all forms of housing, or all uses requiring structures from the floodplain?
  - Good requirements for sidewalks and paths within the development and for accessing the public roadway or other adjacent paths.

- Cluster Housing:
  - Why only allow clustering for residential? Could be a good tool for non-residential uses too.
- Lots of flexibility for design with no minimum dimensional requirements.
- Do you envision using density incentives for using this approach?
- Why limit the number of bedrooms per unit? Might just deter developers from making use of this tool.
- Are road widths reduced within cluster developments?
- The minimum open space requirement of 25% seems very small, and allowing up to 50% of that area to be composed of wetlands and waterbodies might work against the positive land protection efforts this tool could provide. At a minimum a higher % of open space should be required. Incentives can even be offered for doing so.
- Why does this use need to be buffered from adjacent properties? Is it that objectionable? This provision often results in “wasting” the open space that has been set aside, and not actually protecting natural resources on the site.
- The open space can’t be designated as “current use” land. This may be another disincentive for using the cluster alternative.

- Home Occupations – Why prohibit these in cluster housing developments? Many such uses could exist without anyone knowing. You could allow them as a conditional use or with performance guidelines to ensure that they will not impact neighbors or the character of the neighborhood. This is significant in a community that is trying to reduce traffic congestion and increase the number of locally owned businesses.

- Parking:
  - Has Hooksett ever considered setting parking maximums? This can help reduce the amount of impervious surfaces on the site.
  - Alternative surfaces should be allowed and even encouraged. The UNH Stormwater Center is a great resource for information on this topic.

- Conversion of Existing Buildings – why a minimum of 750 square feet for each unit? Seems larger than necessary.

- Accessory Apartments – Nice clear purpose statements. Why not allow these in more districts?

- The existing natural resource overlays (Wetlands and Groundwater) may not adequately protect the critical natural resources discussed in the Master Plan and identified on the Natural Services Network map.

- Groundwater Resource Conservation District – Seems to be a great tool that is implementing a Master Plan goal. Maybe it can be improved on over time.

**Administrative Changes:**

- Each of the zoning districts should begin with a District Description that clearly illustrates the vision and characteristics of that portion of town. The dimensional
and use requirements should then reinforce that vision. These descriptions should be based on the Master Plan.

- Using tables to display dimensional requirements and permitted uses is more user-friendly.

3.2 General Development Regulations:

Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates conducted an independent review of the General Development Regulations, and our comments are identified below.

- These regulations currently include a very comprehensive Purpose statement that spells out the need for these regulations. Including:
  - Wise development of areas in harmony with the Master Plan of the Community - Preventing pollution of air, brooks, streams, ponds, lakes and groundwater supplies.
  - Roadway Requirements—The design, width, and location of new roads is determined based on the proposed use, site conditions, and surrounding uses. This is much better than one standard, but the addition of a table with some guidance on road types and the range of design requirements would be helpful.
  - The provision for the potential connection of cul-de-sacs is very important from a transportation perspective.
  - It is good to see a 10% limit on Driveway slopes.
  - Erosion Prevention Plan—This appears to be very comprehensive.
  - Drainage Design and Runoff Control—Would it be possible to build in some Low Impact Development alternatives? This could include the use of pervious materials, rain gardens, and even “green” roofs to clean stormwater and recharge the groundwater on site.

3.3 Subdivision Regulations:

Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates conducted an independent review of the Subdivision Regulations, and our comments are identified below.

- Is a preliminary conceptual meeting required?
- Consider developing environmental performance standards to guide the design of subdivisions.
- Develop new guidelines for Open Space Cluster Developments based on the comments/suggestions in Section 3.1 of this report.
3.4 Site Plan Review:

Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates conducted an independent review of the Site Plan Review Regulations, and our comments are identified below.

- Storm drainage plans, and walkways and driveways – This is a good place to incorporate Low Impact Design (LID) stormwater practices.
- Landscape Design Criteria – This is an opportunity to put in support for native species requirements and for leaving naturally vegetated areas as is, so that they require little or no watering/maintenance.
- 3.14 Natural Features – Much more detail is needed here. This guidance could be structured several different ways, but it must be clear that the process needs to begin with an inventory of the site features and a review of this information with the Boards.

Summary

This Master Plan and Land Use Regulation Audit should serve as an implementation tool for the Town of Hooksett. Our suggestion would be to address and prioritize these issues during the 3i Process. The Audit highlights the fact that the Zoning Ordinance does not match the Vision and Recommendations articulated in the 2004 Master Plan, and this needs to be addressed to better guide future development and conservation initiatives in Hooksett. Once the 3i process is complete the Town Council should convene an annual long range planning session with the Planning Board, Zoning Board, Conservation Commission, Budget Committee, and others to evaluate where Hooksett is headed and to review the implementation priorities for the community.

Based on the Master Plan vision of a sustainable community, here are some other initiatives for Hooksett to consider:

- Become a member of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) program Cities for Climate Protection (CCP), and work to adopt policies and implement measures to achieve quantifiable reductions in local greenhouse gas emissions, improve air quality, and enhance livability and sustainability in Hooksett. Other New Hampshire communities (Keene, Nashua, Portsmouth, etc.) are already participating in order to reduce their impact on climate change, and to conserve tax dollars.
- Visit Clean Air Cool Planet’s website (http://www.cleanair-coolplanet.org/for-communities/toolkit_home.php) and view their “Community Toolkit” for relevant municipal examples from the Northeast.