

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM MEETING
July 25, 2022

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: Steve Breault, Joe Green, Bob Slater, Jeff Penta and Jake Butler.**

6
7 **Staff Present: Peter Curro, SAU Business Administrator, Amy Kizak, GIS**
8 **Manager/Comprehensive Planner**

9
10 **CALL TO ORDER**

11
12 Chairman Breault called the Capital Improvement Program Committee meeting to order.

13
14 J. Penta made a motion to ratify the vote of the June 13, 2022, meeting. [redacted] seconded. The motion
15 passed, 3-0-2, with J. Green and J. Butler abstaining.

16
17 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

18
19 Chairman Breault made a motion to approve the minutes from the kick-off meeting on June 13,
20 2022, as presented. [redacted] seconded the motion. The motion was granted, 3-0-2 with J. Green and
21 J. Butler abstaining.

22
23 **PROJECT OVERVIEW/PRESENTATIONS**

24
25 Peter Curro, SAU Business Administrator, addressed the committee. P. Curro informed the
26 committee that the School District underwent a comprehensive project of evaluating/assessing all
27 the school buildings in town. He noted that they hired Trident, as a program consultant, and
28 brought on Lavallee Bresinger Architects, as the architect. He explained that they went through all
29 the buildings and presented a comprehensive assessment such as the age of the buildings,
30 mechanical safety, fire code, building code, etc. He added that they included any improvements
31 that the administration or teachers feel are necessary to continue to make Londonderry a vibrant
32 and comprehensive program.

33
34 Dan Black, Interim school Superintendent, addressed the Committee. D. Black stated that parts of
35 the school buildings are old, as stated in the plan, and now they have to really think about a long-
36 term plan. He noted that the needs of the schools are different than when the buildings were
37 constructed. He commented that the School Board has yet to figure out what their priorities are
38 yet. He mentioned that he believes this process will be longer than six-years and may be as long
39 as 20-years. He said that it will take a while to address all the needs of the six school buildings.
40 He added that they are leasing the school administration building on Kitty Hawk Lane. He pointed
41 out that they are running out of space at Moose Hill, which will be driving some of the decision
42 making. He remarked that if anything is going to break in the buildings in the next year to five

43 years, they want to get ahead of it. He pointed out that the student needs are different from when
44 these buildings were constructed as well.

45
46 Eric LeBlanc, Project Architect, from Lavallee Bresinger Architects, 155 Dow Street, #400,
47 Manchester, NH, addressed the Board. E. LeBlanc gave the Committee an overview of their role
48 in the process, stating that they started with Task One, which was to evaluate the existing
49 conditions of all the school buildings. He said that they evaluated the mechanical systems, exterior
50 wall systems, physical spaces themselves, etc. He went on noting that Task Two was to involve
51 educators and administrative staff to figure out how the buildings are being used and what is
52 missing from the buildings that is detrimental to the curriculum. He commented that Task Three
53 was the integration of Task One and Task Two, which is to figure out the needs of each of the
54 buildings and combine it with the programming needs, to come up with a concept for each building.
55 He said that Task Four is to work on prioritizing the projects and what the long-term plan is, noting
56 that this has not been determined yet. He remarked that Task Five would be refining the idea once
57 a conceptual design has been determined. He stated that Task Six is getting district wide and
58 community engagement and Task Seven would be the preparation for final build out. He explained
59 that they score each building from 10 to 100, where 10 means it is at the end of its service life and
60 is due for failure and 100 means the system is relatively new. He went on stating that anywhere in
61 the 40 to 60 range means the building is in the midspan of its service life.

62
63 He started off with the high school. He told the Committee that the oldest part of the high school,
64 which was built in 1971, has many very old systems, noting the envelope is beginning to fall apart
65 and the mechanical systems, such as the roof top units are very old. He complimented the facilities
66 staff for extending the life of many pieces of mechanical equipment that typically last 25 to 30
67 years. He pointed out that when you start getting past 30 years it is very difficult to source parts
68 for the systems, and that means spending more money maintaining the older systems than if there
69 was a new fuel efficient system in place. He mentioned that they did not find any of the buildings
70 to have imminent life safety issues, but noted that the building is wood framed, which is not
71 allowed by building code now. He remarked that it will cost more to try and modify this building
72 than to tear it down and start fresh. P. Curro remarked that the plywood floor is the reason that the
73 high school footprint cannot be expanded any larger than is recommended and is becoming
74 rubbery. E. Leblanc mentioned that the buildings that were designed and built before 1991, usually
75 have many accessibility issues. He pointed out that highest issue that came up after meeting with
76 staff was a lack of auditorium or large person gathering area. He added that special education
77 space, modernizing the cafeteria and kitchen, and small group rooms or learning rooms were also
78 issues noted about the high school. He reviewed the square footage of the high school with what
79 they proposed to meet the Department of Education's (DOE) compliance to right-sizing the
80 classrooms, noting a delta of 75,000 SF. He explained how they would approach each phase of
81 construction with the Committee. He noted that the price of the project he has listed today, which
82 is \$9 million, would be if the process began today and construction was completed in a few years.
83 He added that they are architects, not estimators or contractors, so these are very conceptual
84 designs. J. Green asked if the field would be displaced as part of this project and if the cost of this
85 was included. E. LeBlanc replied that they factored in field displacement, parking and all the site
86 issues as well in their \$9 million estimate. B. Slater asked if the estimate reflects the DOE
87 requirements for square footage. E. LeBlanc replied that is correct. J. Penta asked if the report

88 includes any roadway management plans or growth management. E. LeBlanc replied that he is
89 unsure if there is an updated demographic report. P. Curro stated that the demographics were
90 projected two years out.

91
92 He went on to the middle school, noting the original building was constructed in 1982. He said
93 that if they were to renovate parts of a 1982 building, the energy code requires them to add
94 installation to the roof, which might entail structural upgrades to the rest of the building. He noted
95 that the 1997 building at the middle school is in relatively good condition and some systems are in
96 the middle part of their life. He added that the library should be modernized, the cafeteria is
97 undersized for the population, and they should reconfigure the entrance to the kitchen. He reviewed
98 the square footage of the middle school, noting to meet DOE compliance and other improvements
99 there is a delta of 25,000 SF. He explained the construction proposal with the Committee. He
100 reiterated that if this project started now and construction continued over the next couple of years,
101 the estimated cost is \$51 million.

102
103 He went on to Matthew Thornton elementary school stating that this is the oldest building in the
104 district from 1949. He commented that it is no surprise that a lot of things such as the interior
105 finishes, envelope, window systems, and the roof need repair. He said that any structural upgrades
106 to this building would be very challenging to meet current code. He stated that the 1985 building
107 here fairs better as it has been well maintained. He reviewed the current square footage of the
108 building, noting there is delta of 16,000 SF to meet DOE compliance and upgrades. He explained
109 the proposal to the Committee and noted that estimated cost is \$32 million.

110
111 He went on to North School noting the buildings were constructed in the 1960's. He mentioned
112 that a lot of these buildings are bad at efficient energy costs. He pointed out that there were some
113 additions from 1990s and 2006 which faired very well. He commented that they are proposing a
114 new kitchen, adding staff restrooms and offices, as well as small group one-on-one intervention
115 spaces. He noted that there is a delta of 22,000 SF. He explained the construction proposal to the
116 Committee noting that the estimate is \$19 million. P. Curro added that this school might need more
117 classrooms added in five years due to the projected enrollment in the area.

118
119 He went on to South School stating it was constructed in 1978. He pointed out that a lot of this
120 building has classrooms in the interior, so they do not have direct sunlight or great ventilation. He
121 remarked that this does not meet modern structural code. He stated that the additions were
122 constructed in 1996 and 2008, which are in great shape for their age. He said that there would be
123 a lot of programming needs, a new kitchen, a stem lab, small group rooms, larger sensory rooms
124 and more classrooms. He reviewed the square footage of the current building noting they have a
125 difference of 23,000 SF. He explained the construction proposal to the Committee noting that the
126 estimate is \$57 million because it would be a completely new building.

127
128 He concluded with Moose Hill School, noting is one of the newer buildings in the district that has
129 not had any additions, but portables have been added as needed. He commented that this building
130 is in great condition and really well maintained even though it was built in 2000. He pointed out
131 that excluding full-day kindergarten, this building is undersized. He mentioned that if they did go
132 to full-day kindergarten they would need permanent locations for the kitchen, cafeteria, multi-

133 purpose room, art and music rooms, additional special education rooms, and additional classrooms.
134 He remarked that the existing building is almost 35,000 SF and they would need to almost double
135 the size of this building to meet the DOE standards and to accommodate full-day kindergarten.

136
137 D. Black summarized that through this exercise they learned that the average age of the school
138 buildings is 40-years and the population has doubled. He said that there are about \$40 million in
139 updates for mechanical upgrades. He commented that the challenge today is to try and educate in
140 older buildings. He stated that there were a lot of needs and wants identified by staff, and now they
141 have to figure out how to prioritize this. He remarked that it was difficult to watch Matthew
142 Thornton School have leaks this winter.

143
144 P. Curro explained that the entire debt schedule for the school district expires in 2029, which can
145 be viewed both positively and negatively. He went on stating that investors might view this
146 negatively because the school has not been investing in the infrastructure on a periodic basis. He
147 mentioned that the available debt of the school district as of June 21, 2022, was \$357 million. He
148 reviewed the difference between authorized bonds/notes and issuance bonds/notes with the
149 Committee.

150
151 Chairman Breault asked for the next part of the presentation. A. Kizak explained that the
152 Committee can now go through the table and give each project a score. She noted that they will
153 see what score the School District gave to each project as well. J. Penta asked to hear the
154 justification of the School District scoring. Chairman Breault asked why all four boxes are selected
155 on the Capital Project Request Form under “Primary Effect of the Project is to” when it only says
156 to check one. P. Curro voiced his opinion that if he had to pick one it would be “Improve quality
157 of existing facilities or equipment.” He explained that he checked all four boxes as there is a part
158 A and part B, of which part A is expanding the classrooms to meet the existing enrollment and
159 part B is to add a whole program.

160
161 Chairman Breault opened up the discussion to the public.

162
163 Tony DeFrancesco, One Cheshire Court, addressed the Committee. T. DeFrancesco commented
164 that he thought there was a logistics issue and asked who scored the Capital Project Request Form.
165 P. Curro replied that the school administration scored it. T. DeFrancesco pointed out that the
166 School Board has not reacted to any part of the report yet. P. Curro replied that is correct. T.
167 DeFrancesco said that he does not know how this Committee can rank order something that is less
168 than a wish list. P. Curro remarked that the process has always been that the school administration
169 always provides the initial scoring to the CIP Committee and the Committee can agree or not. He
170 went on noting that once the Committee puts their stamp on it, the document is recommended to
171 the Planning Board for a workshop meeting and public hearing. A. Kizak pointed out that the CIP
172 Plan is a planning document. She said that the projects proposed are for planning purposes and
173 does not mean that they will be constructed, but rather this is the projection of what could happen
174 in the next five or six years, so the Town can plan ahead. She said that the CIP Committee is made
175 up of a number of different members from different Boards or Committees and the CIP document
176 is advisory only. She noted that the CIP process is done every year. J. Butler expressed his opinion
177 that he believes the School Board needs to prioritize these before this Committee gives their

178 recommendation. D. Black mentioned that this is on the School Board agenda for August 18, 2022,
179 and he thought it would take at least four to six weeks to get through the process. Chairman Breault
180 asked the Committee if the School Board's decision would affect their ranking. J. Green replied
181 that he would like to hear the School Board's input, and maybe the schedule of how the CIP is
182 done could be revised, to make sure there is time for the School Board to review this before it
183 comes to this Committee. Chairman Breault agreed that he would like to see the input of the School
184 Board as well and asked if there was enough information to move forward this evening. A. Kizak
185 reiterated that this is an advisory document and the Committee can move forward tonight with
186 their scoring. P. Curro stated that the workshop meeting with the Planning Board is on September
187 14, 2022, and the School Board's rankings can be provided then. Chairman Breault asked again
188 why the School Board could not vote separately and then the Planning Board would get all three
189 recommendations.

190
191 John Farrell, Chair of Town Council, addressed the Committee. J. Farrell pointed out that he ran
192 the CIP Committee for 15 years and expressed his opinion that if this document was in front of
193 him this evening, he would rank them in years four to six. He commented that the document is not
194 final until the Planning Board receives it and pointed out that the Planning Board can change
195 everything if they wanted to. Chairman Breault asked why the School Board would not have a
196 ranking column for the Planning Board. J. Farrell responded that the Planning Board can make
197 that decision, but this Committee works under the rules they have been given. He said that if the
198 Planning Board votes to add another column, it is totally under their purview. Chairman Breault
199 asked if this Committee can recommend another column for the School Board to the Planning
200 Board. J. Farrell replied that he would recommend this Committee work their way through the
201 process tonight and through Staff let the Chairman of the Planning Board know that this is the
202 position of the Committee. J. Green asked if this has been the way the document has been received,
203 without School Board input. J. Farrell replied the answer is both yes and no. He explained that
204 there have been projects on the town end that never made it to the Town Council. He remarked
205 that he thought since it is such a large amount of money for school projects that there should be
206 input from the School Board. B. Slater mentioned that there is a magnitude of \$300 million, of
207 which the School District has never done this in the Town before, and this is a concern. P. Curro
208 said that it would be a good start to figure out the logistics and where to start. He voiced his opinion
209 that the Moose Hill project would be the first choice, then the middle school, high school and
210 elementary schools. He pointed out then when doing the bonds, all three elementary schools should
211 be together and be upgraded at the same time. J. Penta voiced his concern that the only mention of
212 this proposed \$300 million project was at the School Board meeting and now it is before this
213 Committee. He said that now this Committee is being asked to prioritize something that the School
214 Board has not assessed. He mentioned that he did not see anything in this packet as to why these
215 projects are scored the way they are. P. Curro agreed with J. Penta noting that the first meeting at
216 the Planning Board is a workshop and then they will have a public hearing.

217
218 Ray Breslin, Three Gary Drive, addressed the Committee. R. Breslin thanked everyone on the
219 Committee for trying to get a firm grasp on the issues. He noted that these are major projects for
220 the Town to take on and wanted the public included. He offered that the parents of school-age
221 children should be included to decide which project should be addressed first, such as kindergarten
222 or the high school. Chairman Breault and J. Green agreed with R. Breslin. J. Green mentioned that

223 the school administration is not elected by the residents, but the School Board is, so they have
224 accountability to the residents that elected them.

225
226 Tony DeFrancesco, One Cheshire Court, addressed the Committee again. T. DeFrancesco said that
227 if you score it out four to six years, it gives time for public input with all the Committees that
228 discuss this.

229
230 Ray Breslin, Three Gary Drive, addressed the Committee again. R. Breslin pointed out that the
231 cost presented this evening is if the projects started today, but wondered what will happen in the
232 next four to six years regarding cost.

233
234 Chairman Breault asked how the scoring is done. A. Kizak replied that the Committee will fill out
235 the spreadsheet that is up on the screen with their scores. J. Green noted that Moose Hill is only a
236 priority because of full-time kindergarten, but the town does not know if the residents want full-
237 time kindergarten. B. Slater pointed out that Moose Hill is broken down into two phases. A. Kizak
238 asked if it would be helpful if P. Curro gave a quick synopsis of what was submitted before them.
239 Chairman Breault replied that he would like to hear about each one and why it was ranked that
240 way before they vote.

241
242 P. Curro started off with Moose Hill that was ranked priority 1, noting the project is broken down
243 into part A and part B. He commented that right now Moose Hill is out of classroom space and
244 needs to be addressed. Chairman Breault asked if Moose Hill is a driver as it feeds the rest of the
245 schools. P. Curro replied it is a possibility, but from an administration standpoint, they need more
246 space there now. B. Slater remarked that the Kindergarten Committee is still months away from
247 any decision on full-day kindergarten, but the first phase of the Moose Hill project is for four
248 additional classrooms and two special education classrooms. Chairman Breault asked about the
249 rationale being needed immediately for public health or safety. P. Curro replied that in his opinion
250 the forms are skewed towards municipal government, which is to protect public health and safety,
251 but that is not the mission of the School District. He added that the mission of the School District
252 is curriculum, education and school safety. He mentioned that he has asked for many years to get
253 a form that allows the school the same kind of scoring, but for now he told the Committee that
254 whenever he saw public health and safety, he substitutes education and curriculum. Chairman
255 Breault mentioned that he has a problem between safety and education, as he believes that safety
256 is everyone's main concern. He said that he does not want to comingle it with education. P. Curro
257 reiterated that there is no spot for education on the forms, so he has to make a correlation between
258 the mission of the town and mission of the school. A. Kizak explained that the form is from the
259 Planning Board, so any suggestions to modify this would be taken to the Planning Board. She
260 noted that the Planning Board is open to suggestions on how to modify this. P. Curro stated that
261 the cost is \$30 million for the Moose Hill project. Chairman Breault asked why there was no
262 number for "Impact on Operating & Main. Costs." P. Curro replied that he did not want to put a
263 number there without knowing if it is right. J. Penta asked if the scoring of this project of a one,
264 meant it was an urgent need. P. Curro responded that it is the number one priority of the School
265 Board based on conversations with them. He added that urgent need would be the first phase of
266 the Moose Hill project and then full-day kindergarten would be one less than urgent. Chairman
267 Breault asked if the first phase of the Moose Hill project was \$9 million. P. Curro replied that is

268 correct. J. Penta asked if it would be acceptable to break the Moose Hill project down to part A
269 and part B. P. Curro replied that he could update it this way and get it to A. Kizak at the beginning
270 of next week. Chairman Breault asked if scoring a five meant it was important to get it
271 implemented in the next six months or year. P. Curro replied the next year to three years. J. Green
272 asked why matching funds available for a limited time was scored a three. P. Curro replied that it
273 could be building aide. The Committee moved to scoring, Exhibit 1, which is attached hereto. A.
274 Kizak told the Committee that she would update the spreadsheet for Moose Hill to have part A and
275 part B. P. Curro reviewed his new numbers for part B of Moose Hill with the Committee.

276
277 Chairman Breault asked which project is next. P. Curro pointed out that he put the high school and
278 middle school together and then the three elementary schools together. He thought the high school
279 would be next given the plywood floor. He said that this allows the bonds to be authorized for the
280 projects. J. Green commented that the would separate the high school and middle school, but agrees
281 with keeping the three elementary schools grouped together. A. Kizak asked if the Committee
282 wanted her to separate out the high school and middle school. The Committee replied that was
283 correct. The Committee moved to scoring, Exhibit 1, which is attached hereto. A. Kizak stated that
284 they still need to assign anticipated construction year and because some of them scored a five, they
285 may need to be pushed out further. P. Curro commented that he would put kindergarten in year
286 2025-2026. The Committee reviewed the dates, Exhibit 1, which is attached hereto. A. Kizak told
287 the Committee she would look into whether or not they have to have dates for some projects that
288 are five and farther out.

289
290 A. Kizak told the Committee that the Planning Board workshop is scheduled for September 14,
291 2022, and the public hearing October 5, 2022. She explained that she will write the report and
292 email it to the Committee for their comment and review. She said then it is presented to the
293 Planning Board at the workshop meeting. J. Penta asked the School District to email the Chair of
294 the Planning Board, Arthur Rugg, with the forms and comments. A. Kizak replied to email her
295 with the form and comments and she would circulate it.

296
297 **ADJOURNMENT**

298
299 **S. Breault made a motion to adjourn at 8:26 PM. [REDACTED] seconded the motion. The**
300 **motion passed, 5-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

301
302
303 **Minutes Typed by:**
304 **Approved: 11/28/22**

Beth Morrison

Date: 07/28/22

Project Priority and Scoring Summary

Project	Department	Cost	Placement in 2023-2028 CIP	2021 CIP Committee Score	2022 Dept Score	2022 CIP Committee Score	CIP Committee Priority Assignment	CIP Committee Placement in 24-29 CIP FY
Moose Hill 1A - 6 Rooms	School District	\$8,950,000	Priority 2 AE 2024 Const 2025	21	25	24	2	Priority 2 AE 2024 Const 2025
Moose Hill 1B -Full Day K	School District	\$20,900,000	Priority 2 AE 2024 Const 2025	21	19	14	5	Priority 5 Const TBD
Middle School	School District	\$50,600,000	N/A	N/A	14	14	5	Priority 5 Const TBD
High School	School District	\$98,750,000	N/A	N/A	17	17	3	Priority 3 Const 2028
Elementary School Project	School District	\$127,000,000	N/A	N/A	22	17	3	Priority 3 Const 2028
SAU Project	School District	\$4,500,000	Priority 4 AE 2028 Const 2029	18	19	7	2	Priority 2 Const 2027

- 1 - Urgent**
- 2 - Necessary**
- 3 - Desirable**
- 4 - Deferrable**
- 5 - Premature**
- 6 - Inconsistent**

Cannot be Delayed; Needed immediately for health & safety

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

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

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

Needs more research, planning & coordination

Contrary to land use planning or community development goals.

Department:

Project Name

School District

Moose Hill 1A - 6 Rooms

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	5
5	5
5	5
4	4
3	3
0	0
3	2
25	24

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:

Project Name

School District

Moose Hill 1B -Full Day K

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	2
4	2
2	2
4	3
3	3
0	0
2	2
19	14

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

5

- 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

Middle School

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	3
4	4
2	2
3	3
0	0
0	0
2	2
14	14

Total

CIP Priority Assignment

5

- 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

High School

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
3	3
3	3
0	0
0	0
2	2
17	17

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
Elementary School Project

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	4
5	4
4	3
0	0
0	0
3	2
22	17

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
SAU Project

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
5	0
5	0
4	4
0	0
0	0
0	0
19	7

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