



## **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**City Hall Annex  
33 Wakefield Street,  
Rochester, New Hampshire 03867-1917  
(603) 335-1338 - Fax (603) 330-0023  
Web Site: [www.rochesternh.gov](http://www.rochesternh.gov)**

**Planning Board  
Conservation Commission  
Historic District Commission  
Arts and Culture Commission**

March 12, 2024; Revised, (Typos only) April 16, 2014

Katie Ambrose, City Manager  
Rochester City Hall, 31 Wakefield Street  
Rochester NH 03867

Dear Ms. Ambrose,

The Rochester PB is pleased to submit this list of Ranked Capital Improvement Projects. AS you are aware, State Statute sets out the jurisdiction and purpose of a CIP program in RSA 674:5 – 8. The City's CIP program serves as a cornerstone of the City's long term planning program. It connects the City's Capital asset and infrastructure needs to the City's Land Use Master Plan and allows a measured growth footprint that does not unduly impact the City's capacity or financial systems. Although the cost of the project was not considered in the criteria, cost was a data point the CIP had for review in order to identify the scale of the CIP request. For example, a \$200,000 utility system upgrade is at a wholly different scale then a \$2,000,000 utility upgrade of the same system.

The CIP Committee, made up of 3 Council appointees, 3 Planning Board appointees and 2 City Manager appointees met 7 times over the months of January and February to hear presentations from Department Heads as well as discuss scoring criteria. The Committee then scored all 95 submittals to the program based on 9 criteria. These criteria included the following:

1. Is part of the goals and objectives in the City's Master Plan
2. Addresses a Public Health or Safety issue
3. Improves the efficiency of existing services
4. Addresses a current deficiency or lack of service
5. Preserves or builds on a previous capital investment or current project
6. Reduces future operating costs or increases future revenues
7. Supports efforts to promote Economic Vitality
8. Responds to a Federal or State requirement
9. Eligible for outside funding sources with limited time and/or availability

After the scoring was complete Planning staff summed all scores across members to come up with a final score for each of the 95 projects. These final scores were then ranked in order of highest value to lowest value. The highest value score represented the projects which, in the opinion of the Committee scored most highly in relation to the criteria.

Please note, there were a few projects, highlighted in yellow, that for some reason or another were skipped by members of the Committee. In order to fit those projects in the ranked list appropriately, a scaling system was implemented to place them in order appropriately, despite the lower score resulting from less CIP Members providing a score. You will see those projects placed in the ranking order, but having a score not in keeping with the sequential order.

Also important to note, is that both the CIP Committee and the Planning Board chose to keep the ranking exactly as the scoring dictated and did not elevate any project to a higher ranking based on committee opinion, rather than scored ranking.

Cheers,



Mark Collopy  
Planning Board Chairman  
City of Rochester



Shanna B. Saunders  
Director, Planning and Development  
City of Rochester