

City of Rochester CIP Committee
Thursday, February 29, 2024
City Hall Council Chambers
31 Wakefield Street, Rochester, NH 03867
(These minutes were approved on , 2024)

Members Present

Sheila Colson
Don Hamann
Dan Fitzpatrick
Dave Walker
Rick Healy
Peter Bruckner

Members Absent

Keith Fitts, *excused*
James Hayden, *excused*

Staff: Shanna B. Saunders, *Director of Planning & Development*

(These are the legal minutes of the meeting and are in the format of an overview of the meeting. A recording of the meeting, as well as the meeting's minutes can be found on the Planning Boards Webpage at <https://www.rochesternh.gov/capital-improvements-program-committee>. Paper minutes may be copied at the Planning & Development Office for a fee.)

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

II. Roll Call

Director of Planning and Development, Shanna Saunders, conducted the roll call.

III. Communications from the Chair

There were no communications from the Chair.

IV. Approval of Minutes

A. February 15, 2024

A motion was made by Mr. Hamann to approve the minutes from February 15, 2024, and seconded by Mr. Fitzpatrick. The motion carried unanimously.

V. Other Business

A. CIP Committee Review of final Scoring/Ranking

Ms. Saunders explained how the scores were calculated and how the rankings were put in order based on the calculations. Ms. Saunders explained four of the outlying project scores and stated that a few of the members did not input a score in the space for the criteria.

Ms. Saunders read an email from Mr. Fitts regarding his suggestion on this meeting's proceeding. Mr. Fitts stated that he recommends that the ranking sheet be submitted for further review as is, with a memo explaining the importance of certain proposed projects.

Mr. Bruckner recommended that the ranking sheet include a line of where the funded projects end. Ms. Saunders explained that because the CIP Committee is a new process there is no basis to form that line, but in next year's review, a budget line can be added.

Mr. Hamann stated that the CIP Committee was instructed to not look at the costs of projects. Ms. Saunders confirmed that the role of the CIP Committee was to review the presented projects and score them based on the nine CIP criteria.

Mr. Bruckner stated his concern with the criteria that specified the link to the City's Master Plan. Ms. Saunders explained that the Master Plan Criteria is specified in State Statute.

Ms. Saunders explained how the review process will continue through the Planning Board, City Manager and staff, and then finally on to the Council for Final Decision.

Mr. Fitzpatrick stated his concerns with recommending the currently ranked projects without reviewing the funding requirement of those projects.

Ms. Colson stated that she felt that some projects did not meet criteria but should still be considered high in ranking importance. Mr. Walker stated that the CIP Committee can move a project up in ranking or draft a letter explaining the importance of a project that may not have scored as high on the criteria.

Ms. Saunders stated that criteria can be edited or added for the future years' review and explained where the criteria were drawn from for review.

Mr. Healey recommended that the cost requirements be removed from the CIP book unless included as a criterion.

Mr. Healey stated that he felt that priority should be weight inclusive do to the importance of "mandatory" projects.

Mr. Walker stated that "mandatory" projects could be removed because they will be done as a requirement. Mr. Healey stated that he agreed with Mr. Walker's statement.

Ms. Saunders explained the CIP form and the history and complications of the form.

Mr. Healey stated that he felt everything fits within the Master Plan and that there should be an edit to the Master Plan criteria.

Mr. Hamann stated that he struggled with the scoring of IT projects because they did not follow the criteria but were important projects to the City. Mr. Hamann also recommended that IT should explain the importance of their projects.

Mr. Bruckner stated his support of IT projects being ranked higher in importance.

Mr. Hamann recommended that the current ranking sheet be submitted to the Planning Board for further consideration.

Mr. Fitzpatrick agreed to submit the ranking sheet to the Planning Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Hamann to submit the ranking sheet to the Planning Board as is and seconded by Mr. Fitzpatrick. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Saunders thanked the CIP Committee members for their time and efforts in this review process.

Ms. Colson stated that she felt the process was important and was intrigued by the review of the projects and felt that the information was informative.

VI. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Hamann to adjourn the meeting and seconded by Mr. Fitzpatrick. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaclyn Millard,
Administrative Assistant II

and

Shanna B. Saunders,
Director of Planning & Development