

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM MEETING
July 22, 2019

1
2 The Capital Improvement Program meeting was held at 6:00 P.M. in Moose Hill Council
3 Chambers, Town Hall, 268B Mammoth Road, and Londonderry.
4

5 **PRESENT: John Farrell, Rick Brideau, Mary Wing Soares, Christine Patton, Nancy**
6 **Hendricks**

7
8 **Staff Present: Peter Curro, SAU Business Administrator, Amy Kizak, GIS**
9 **Manager/Comprehensive Planner and Colleen Mailloux, Town Planner**

10
11 **CALL TO ORDER**

12
13 J. Farrell called the Capital Improvement Program Committee meeting to order.
14

15 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

16
17 R. Brideau made a motion to approve the minutes from the kick-off meeting on June 17, 2019 as
18 presented. M. Soares seconded the motion. The motion was granted, 3-0-1, with N. Hendricks
19 abstaining. The Chair voted in the affirmative.
20

21 **PROJECT OVERVIEW/PRESENTATIONS**

22
23 J. Farrell stated that there are only projects from the School District this evening.
24

25 Peter Curro, SAU Business Administrator, addressed the committee. P. Curro said that he has
26 Superintendent Scott Laliberte, Nancy Hendricks, Chair of School Board, Dan Lekas, Vice-Chair
27 of School Board and Jenn Ganem, School Board member with him this evening. He said that the
28 first projects he would present are auditorium, SAU office and the high school gym. He stated that
29 these projects are ranked six years out and would be completed once the more high-ranking
30 projects are completed. He noted that the high school gym when it was built was never finished
31 and reviewed the plans with the Committee. He told the Committee that he is going to primarily
32 focus on the years 2022 and 2024, which is Moose Hill and the elementary schools lack of capacity.
33 He explained that the current elementary schools do not have the functional capacity given the
34 parameters of the School Board, class size, programs and state law that it once had, even with the
35 total number of students lower than what it used to be. He said that North and South School can
36 take in 100 more students and the Planning Department has predicted 100 new students over the
37 next two years with all the new construction and then all three elementary schools will be maxed
38 out. He told the Committee that Moose Hill already has two portables and if nothing is done two
39 more might be needed in March of 2021. He pointed out that the debt service of the School District
40 runs out in 2030.
41

42 J. Farrell clarified that both the auditorium, high school and SAU office were out five to six years
43 and would not be presented tonight. P. Curro responded that was correct. J. Farrell clarified that
44 there was a quorum of the School Board at the meeting tonight, but they are not talking,
45 collaborating or having a meeting tonight.

46
47 P. Curro said that the two projects being presented tonight are addressing the space needs of Moose
48 Hill and the elementary schools. He said the first project of 38 million dollars is trying to address
49 what can be done with Moose Hill and the elementary schools. He stated that at this time, they
50 cannot say if it would be a new elementary school or additions to the current schools and the
51 Facility Study Committee is going to be working on this. He explained the second project is
52 addressing district wide renovations for the elementary schools and the middle school, which is 15
53 million dollars.

54
55 J. Farrell opened up the discussion to the public.

56
57 John Wilson, Tranquil Drive, addressed the Committee. J. Wilson commented that the auditorium
58 discussion has been going on for many years and building with desperation. He suggested that he
59 believes an auditorium is now an obsolete concept and should be talking about an audio/visual
60 production laboratory. P. Curro said that he believes if the auditorium were to pass it would be a
61 more flexible, multi-purpose building for the performing arts, as well as having the ability for a
62 large gathering for a public speaker. J. Wilson asked what the time frame is for these projects. J.
63 Farrell responded that P. Curro is asking for 53 million dollars sometime in the next two to three
64 years and then the other 17 million dollars sometime in the three to six year period. J. Wilson said
65 that he did not see any future plans for a purpose built senior center and believes the current senior
66 center is at capacity. He said that the senior center should be built in a geographical location to
67 help with the transportation problem for elderly and disabled people. J. Farrell responded that
68 someone has been hired to work on transportation and said the senior center issue should be passed
69 along the Planning Board. Town Planner Mailloux explained that every year when the Capital
70 Improvement Plan (CIP) is updated, worksheets go out to all department heads, all boards and all
71 commissions in town to review what projects they might anticipate in the next six years. She said
72 that this year the only projects that came back to look at were the School Board projects. She said
73 she would pass along his concern to Cathy Blash, Director of Senior Affairs.

74
75 Jonathan Kipp, 9 Evert Street, addressed the Committee. J. Kipp asked how the 38 million dollars
76 was calculated, if the School Board does not know exactly what will be needed yet. P. Curro
77 responded that there have been several combinations of what new space could be added and they
78 all come to 35 to 38 million dollars. He asked if the calculations were based on square footage. P.
79 Curro stated that they were, as well as having full day kindergarten.

80
81 N. Hendricks asked if Superintendent Laliberte could speak to what functional capacity means and
82 the special requirements of the LEEP program. Superintendent Laliberte explained that LEEP has
83 different class size requirements, as it serves students with disabilities in the community, and
84 cannot be any larger than 12 students. He said that there is another group of children with less
85 severe needs whose class size is 16 students.

86
87 Tony DeFrancesco, One Cheshire Court, addressed the Committee. T. DeFrancesco said that he
88 does not believe the 38 million is going to be enough. He also pointed out that with the new laws,
89 a child with disabilities cannot be isolated to a special needs classroom and must be integrated
90 with regularly abled children, which in turn doubles the population of Moose Hill. He said that
91 Moose Hill was built for kindergarten and now also has a preschool. He pointed out that public
92 school classrooms are among the most expensive per square foot.

93
94 J. Farrell asked how many free standing kindergartens there are in the state. N. Hendricks answered
95 there are three. J. Farrell asked if anyone has talked to those districts about how they are using
96 their buildings. P. Curro said he has not, but is going to be part of the functional study the School
97 Board is going to do. J. Farrell said that in 2007 and 2008 there were 221,000 children in school
98 in the state of New Hampshire and today there is 193,000, noting a 12% decrease. He said that in
99 2008 there were 5,413 in Londonderry schools and 4,249 today, noting a 21.5% decrease. He said
100 when the gym was built and added on to the high school, it was done with a 6,300 person capacity.
101 M. Soares said the functional capacity of a building is different now than it was when the gym was
102 presented to the voters. J. Farrell said that there are 33 definitions of functional capacity and
103 pointed out one that states if the curriculum puts technology in the hands of student as soon as they
104 walk through the door of the district, the space needs are less. M. Soares said she is looking at
105 functional capacity that is defined by our school district and especially as it relates to special needs.
106 J. Farrell asked where someone can find the functional capacity definition that is being used by
107 the district. Superintendent Laliberte responded that the capacity of a physical space would be
108 defined by the purpose of that space and the limitations of that purpose. He said this definition is
109 in the report from the Facility Study Committee from last year that is on the website. J. Farrell said
110 that in 2008 and 2009 there were 103 children in preschool and 310 children in kindergarten for a
111 total of 413. He said that today there are 142 children in preschool and 223 in the kindergarten for
112 a total of 365. P. Curro responded that the requirements for the special needs students from 2008
113 to 2020 has drastically changed. He said the special education in-house program takes up seven
114 classrooms in the elementary grades, totaling about 375 children. He said that you cannot just work
115 with the numbers, but have to go to the schools and assess the classrooms. J. Farrell said that given
116 his calculations, there are 33.6% of children in elementary school are in the special needs program.
117 M. Soares clarified that the seven classrooms can hold 22 students, but do not as those are being
118 utilized by the special needs classrooms. J. Farrell asked how many students are in the special
119 needs program. N. Hendricks told J. Farrell that she can get this information to him as they do not
120 have it on hand tonight. J. Farrell tried to review the numbers, noting that per his calculations they
121 have lost a third of their space because of functional capacity. P. Curro said that 375 seats were
122 lost because of the special education program. J. Farrell told P. Curro that he is trying to present
123 the voters with numbers as to why the School Board is asking for 38 million dollars.

124
125 John Wilson, Tranquil Lane, addressed the Committee again. J. Wilson said that as a taxpayer, he
126 is interested in what the tax rate is going to be. He said that he might put a chart together that
127 explains what this project will do to the debt service and tax revenues. J. Farrell said it sounded
128 like J. Wilson was suggesting a tax cap. J. Wilson was not sure. He asked how accurate the CIP
129 plans have been. J. Farrell said about 40%.

Project Priority and Scoring Summary

Project	Department	Cost	Placement in 2020-2025 CIP	2018 CIP Committee Score	2019 Dept Score	2019 CIP Committee Score	CIP Committee Priority Assignment	CIP Committee Placement in 21-26 CIP FY
Kindergarten & Elementary School Space	School District1	\$38,000,000	N/A	N/A	23	1	2	
District Wide Building Renovations & Additions	School District2	\$15,000,000	Priority 2 AE 2023 Const 2024	25	18	1	2	
Auditorium Construction	School District3	\$10,000,000	Priority 4 AE 2024 Const 2025	19	17	3	3	
HS Gym Renovation & Turf Field	School District4	\$3,000,000	N/A	N/A	14	1	3	
New SAU Office	School District5	\$4,000,000	N/A	N/A	11	18	4	

1 - Urgent

Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety

2 - Necessary

Needed within 3 years to maintain basic level & quality of community services

3 - Desirable

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

4 - Deferrable

Can be placed on hold until after 6 year scope of current CIP, but supports community development goals.

5 - Premature

Needs more research, planning & coordination

6 - Inconsistent

Contrary to land use planning or community development goals.

Department:
School District

Project Name
**Full Time Kindergarten &
Elementary Space**

Evaluation Criteria (0-very low to 5-very high)

Addresses an emergency of public safety need
Addresses a deficiency in service or facility
Provides capacity needed to serve existing population
or future growth
Results in long-term cost savings
Supports job development/increased tax base
Leverages the non-property tax revenues
Matching funds available for a limited time

Department Score	Committee Score
5	4
5	5
5	4
3	3
4	4
0	0
1	1
23	21

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

2

- 1 - Urgent - Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety
- 2 - Necessary - Needed within 3 years to maintain basic level & quality of community services
- 3 - Desirable - Needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of services
- 4 - Deferrable - Can be placed on hold until after 6 year scope of current CIP, but supports community development goals
- 5 - Premature - Needs more research, planning & coordination
- 6 - Inconsistent - Contrary to land use planning or community development goals

Department:
School District

Project Name
District -Wide School Renovations

Evaluation Criteria (0-very low to 5-very high)

Addresses an emergency of public safety need
Addresses a deficiency in service or facility
Provides capacity needed to serve existing population or future growth
Results in long-term cost savings
Supports job development/increased tax base
Leverages the non-property tax revenues
Matching funds available for a limited time

Department Score	Committee Score
4	4
5	5
4	4
4	4
0	0
0	0
1	1
18	18

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

2

- 1 - Urgent - Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety
- 2 - Necessary - Needed within 3 years to maintain basic level & quality of community services
- 3 - Desirable - Needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of services
- 4 - Deferrable - Can be placed on hold until after 6 year scope of current CIP, but supports community development goals
- 5 - Premature - Needs more research, planning & coordination
- 6 - Inconsistent - Contrary to land use planning or community development goals

Department:
School District

Project Name
Auditorium

Evaluation Criteria (0-very low to 5-very high)

Addresses an emergency of public safety need
Addresses a deficiency in service or facility
Provides capacity needed to serve existing population
or future growth
Results in long-term cost savings
Supports job development/increased tax base
Leverages the non-property tax revenues
Matching funds available for a limited time

Department Score	Committee Score
3	2
5	5
5	5
0	0
2	3
0	0
2	3
17	18

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

3

- 1 - Urgent - Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety
- 2 - Necessary - Needed within 3 years to maintain basic level & quality of community services
- 3 - Desirable - Needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of services
- 4 - Deferrable - Can be placed on hold until after 6 year scope of current CIP, but supports community development goals
- 5 - Premature - Needs more research, planning & coordination
- 6 - Inconsistent - Contrary to land use planning or community development goals

Department:
School District

Project Name
Finish HS Gym & Turf Field

Evaluation Criteria (0-very low to 5-very high)

Addresses an emergency of public safety need
Addresses a deficiency in service or facility
Provides capacity needed to serve existing population
or future growth
Results in long-term cost savings
Supports job development/increased tax base
Leverages the non-property tax revenues
Matching funds available for a limited time

Department Score	Committee Score
2	2
4	4
5	4
2	3
0	0
0	0
1	1
14	14

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

3

- 1 - Urgent - Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety
- 2 - Necessary - Needed within 3 years to maintain basic level & quality of community services
- 3 - Desirable - Needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of services
- 4 - Deferrable - Can be placed on hold until after 6 year scope of current CIP, but supports community development goals
- 5 - Premature - Needs more research, planning & coordination
- 6 - Inconsistent - Contrary to land use planning or community development goals

Department:

Project Name

School District

SAU Building

Evaluation Criteria (0-very low to 5-very high)

- Addresses an emergency of public safety need
- Addresses a deficiency in service or facility
- Provides capacity needed to serve existing population or future growth
- Results in long-term cost savings
- Supports job development/increased tax base
- Leverages the non-property tax revenues
- Matching funds available for a limited time

Department Score	Committee Score
5	3
1	3
5	3
0	0
0	0
0	0
0	0
11	9

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

4

- 1 - Urgent - Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety
- 2 - Necessary - Needed within 3 years to maintain basic level & quality of community services
- 3 - Desirable - Needed within 4-6 years to improve quality or level of services
- 4 - Deferrable - Can be placed on hold until after 6 year scope of current CIP, but supports community development goals
- 5 - Premature - Needs more research, planning & coordination
- 6 - Inconsistent - Contrary to land use planning or community development goals