

**Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates
136 North Main Street, Suite 4
Concord, NH 03301
603-224-6555**

January 2, 2008

To: Mr. Don Lane, Chair
Bow Business Development Commission, and

Mr. Bill Klubben
Community Development Director
Town of Bow, New Hampshire

From: Jeff Taylor, President
Jeffrey H. Taylor & Associates

Re: Summary Report, Economic Development Visioning Sessions

This document will serve as a summary report for the three visioning sessions held in the Town of Bow during the fall of 2007, and should also serve as a beginning point for future efforts.

These discussions took several turns away from the originally anticipated course. It was originally thought that this process could assist the Business Development Commission in sharing information with the public, and getting feedback from the public, feedback that would allow the Commission to understand what the community's vision for economic development was. It was hoped by some that that vision might be consistent with the efforts undertaken to date by the Commission to develop plans for the installation of municipal utilities in the Route 3A corridor. Such plans had been previously approved by a Town Meeting vote, and were thought to be the key to attracting higher value development in the Corridor, development that would yield a stronger tax base for the community.

That end may yet be achieved. Suffice it to say, however, that, through no fault of any single party, there has been a breakdown in communications between the Town's officials, agents, and committees and many of the existing businesses in the Route 3A Corridor. The net result has been an undermining of the confidence of many business owners in the Corridor that the project will yield the anticipated results. Some business owners expressed concern that the proposed utility project may actually weaken the financial viability of the businesses that are already there.

The following paragraphs summarize the discussions at each of the three sessions. A detailed record of each follows as attachments to this memorandum.

September 24, 2007

This was a structured listening session attended by approximately 50 people. The meeting opened with a presentation by Mr. Don Zizzi for Northeastern University reporting on the Town of Bow's strengths and weaknesses relative to economic development, as compared with other communities.

There then followed a general discussion about the goals for an economic development program.

People frequently cited the need to build a stronger tax base.
Assisting existing businesses was cited as a goal.
There was a wariness about the proposed water and/or sewer project.

Concerns were expressed about how much developable land is actually in the Route 3A Corridor.

There were a variety of suggestions about improving communications, including better use of the Town's website, and reaching out to existing businesses.

There was a recognition that if people want the Business Development Commission to do more, there may be a need to appropriate more resources for it to use.

The meeting concluded with the sense that this was the beginning of a conversation, not the end of one.

October 17, 2007

The first part of this session was a refinement of issues and topics raised at the first session in September.

There was a sense that the Business Development Commission should seek to strengthen Bow as a community. Building the tax base is important, as are supporting existing businesses and seeking new ones, but there was a general sense that the broader community impact should be kept in mind at each juncture.

With respect to its approach, it was suggested that the Commission be proactive, responsive, and responsible to both existing and new businesses.

Specific actions were identified in the areas of Administrative improvements and Communications improvements that could be undertaken.

There was also a long discussion about a variety of approaches to water and/or sewer improvements in the Route 3A Corridor.

The meeting concluded with a Visioning session, asking participants to explain what successful economic development might look like in the Route 3A Corridor in twenty years. In point of fact, the installation of utilities will have such a determining effect, it was difficult to achieve a single vision for this area until a final decision about whether or not to proceed with the utility installation has been made.

November 14, 2007

This meeting was intended to again attempt to resolve what the community's vision for the Route 3A Corridor truly is. The utility installation remains such a divisive issue, it was agreed by those present that the best use of people's time might be to simply identify the issues that people would like more information on before deciding whether the water and/or sewer installation is something they would support.

Some of the concerns relate to details:

How much developable land is available?

Have the owners of those properties been met with?

Will existing property owners have to tie into new utilities?

Will new residential development be permitted here?

Is the proposed plan consistent with the Town Meeting Warrant?

The broader issues relate to communications and return on investment:

There is a sense that all Town boards are not moving in the same direction.

There is a desire amongst the existing businesses to have more information about plans that are being considered.

While it is understood that there are no guarantees in the development business, there is a strong interest in seeing information about the likelihood that the Town can anticipate receiving sufficient new tax revenue to offset the additional capital expense of the utility project.

Moving Forward

As was discussed at the Business Development Commission's meeting on December 19, many of the questions raised at the November 14 session are deserving of answers. Some can never have complete answers, but more information can perhaps be gathered to reduce concerns to a minimum.

As a starting point, the following actions are recommended:

Convene an all boards meeting involving the Selectmen, the Planning Board, the Conservation Commission, and the Business Development Commission, at a minimum. The goal of the session would simply be information sharing, letting each board outline current issues, plans, and concerns it will be working on for the upcoming year.

Open up lines of communication with existing businesses in the community. This might be a full business visitation program, or, at a minimum, a series of open forums where businesses are invited to the Commission to explain their current concerns relative to zoning, development activities, or anything else that relates to the interaction of municipal and private concerns.

Start to gather current information about potential development scenarios in the Route 3A Corridor, the likelihood of each, and the return on the cost of the capital outlay that would be necessary to stimulate each level of development.

As noted above, the current situation has been arrived at somewhat inadvertently, with various parties moving forward in a manner that seemed like the best course of action at the time. There has certainly been no malicious intent on anyone's part. But, as this process has demonstrated, there has been a breakdown in communications between the Commission and at least some of the existing businesses, and that will need to be repaired before further actions are taken. As noted in the October session, the overall goal for the Business Development Commission should be to strengthen the Town of Bow through economic development. Repairing the lines of communication with the existing business community should be the first step in that effort.

**Town of Bow
Listening Session
September 24, 2007
Bow High School Cafeteria**

Goals for Economic Development?

- Stabilization
- Assist existing businesses to achieve their growth possibility and other opportunities for growth
- Industry adds to quality
- Types of business – more diverse make-up, i.e. bank, grocery
- Self sufficient as community
- Be equal in growth opportunity for small and large businesses
- Search for other geographical opportunity
- Search for new opportunity for capability
- Define mission vs stepping stone
- Maximize Bow's existing capital infrastructure

Pro-active vs Re-active

- Good decisions for small business owner vs risky decision
- Assess existing infrastructure vs creating new possibilities
- Water and sewer – sore subject
- Public discussion or whether it is sound or risky decision - \$12 million bond in 2002 – residential impact? What is pay off to residents if we add business
- Do we need to separate water and sewer, i.e. need for sprinkler system in warehouse – build infrastructure first
- Limited number of large parcels
- BDC needs to be responsive, i.e. communicate with community
- One is not more important than other – mutually exclusive?
- Doing inventory of business, creating business brochures to better communicate with prospective businesses
- Be responsive – definition should be clarified
- In master plan, it is proactive, page 293 of BDC
- Pro-active means putting dollars behind it - \$1500 doesn't cut it – not pro-active
- Define businesses that made inquiries regarding Bow's capability of water and/or sewer – how many left – develop list – inquire of developers and engineers – identify businesses if possible.
- Define acreage that is available inventory. What is Bow's potential marketable inventory?
- Invite business owners personally to these meetings. More partnering with local business and BDC on possibilities
- Put available information on Town's web site, i.e. Bill's statistics

Business Development Program Strategies/Actions

- FAQ additions on web site
- BDC alerts
- Enhance Bow's quality of life
- New business not undercutting existing businesses
- Wildlife Action Plan – Merrimack River corridor vs Industrial Zone
- FERC hydro-relicensing – define impact on Bow's businesses
- Atlantic salmon grant affecting Bow's Merrimack
- TIF
- Make Bow's citizens aware of this effort or be able to add to it
- Use this session as information for further outreach
- Use this as a beginning, allow open item for further blog (commdevel@bow-nh.gov)
- Re-consider timeline for meetings

**An Economic Vision for Bow
Bow Business Development Commission
October 17, 2007**

Background

On September 24, the Bow Development Commission hosted an open forum with the community's residents and businesses to discuss its current and future activities. The forum was attended by approximately 50 individuals, and others have submitted comments since. It was then the subject of further public discussion at a second forum on October 17. The following is a summary of all of the direction and input received to date.

Goals for a Bow Economic Development Program

There should be multiple sub-goals, but the over-arching goal should be to strengthen the Town of Bow as a community through economic development. To that end, the Bow Development Commission should:

Work to build a stronger non-residential tax base, so as to stabilize the existing tax rate as much as possible;

Explore opportunities both to assist existing businesses in Bow and to attract others from away who may be interested in re-locating or expanding to our community;

Seek new businesses that will round out the mix of existing retail and other establishments, so that citizens could conduct more of their business in town, rather than having to travel to other communities for even basic needs (grocery, hardware, medical, banking, etc.);

Seek and work with businesses that will provide a variety of economic opportunity, from unskilled, to semi-skilled, to highly skilled, to professional and managerial levels.

Continue to evaluate the need and opportunity for additional water and/or sewer infrastructure in the Route 3-A Corridor.

There was recognition that, with limited resources available, there will be a need not only to keep all of these goals in mind, but also to prioritize the activities that will be necessary to achieve them.

Approach

In undertaking activities to achieve these goals, the strong directive from the community was that the Bow Development Commission should be pro-active. It should be responsive to the needs and interests of existing businesses, to those of potential new businesses, and to those of the citizens at large. Finally, it should be responsible, acting in ways that balance the achievement of

the goals above while still retaining the character and natural resources of the community as they exist today.

To the extent that lines of communication could be improved between the community's existing businesses and other elements of Town Government, the Bow Development Commission was urged to be an agent or catalyst to see those lines improved.

Finally, there was recognition among those assembled that in order to do all of these with a volunteer board, there will need to be additional resources provided in the form of staff and other support services.

Strategies/Actions

There were a wide variety of potential actions suggested for the Bow Development Commission. With limited staff, time, and resources, these will necessarily need to be prioritized. For discussion purposes, they have been grouped under three separate headings:

Administrative Actions

The Northeastern/CURP identified a number of project review processes where Bow appeared to lag behind other communities. These should be investigated, evaluated, and corrected where practical and prudent.

There was a sense among those gathered that some elements of the Town's regulatory framework (zoning, sub-division, etc.) are unduly restrictive, and that these could be revised without unduly compromising the underlying goals of those regulations: to provide a healthy, safe community that retains Bow's rural environment.

Communications

There is a strong sense among some of the existing businesses that Bow is not a business-friendly community in which to work. Correcting this, whether it is perception or reality, is the key to any business development program, whether it is focused on existing or new businesses.

Suggestions as to how to improve this included:

- A business visitation program

- A review of local ordinances and regulations

- An improved website, with answers to Frequently Asked Question posted

- The establishment of a list of land that is currently available for development

- Meetings with private landowners concerning potential development and/or re-development of their lands

- Developing a marketing program, but only after developing stronger working relations between the Town and local businesses

Establishing a community TV channel to cover local meetings

Significant concerns were expressed by some present that, among developers, business owners, and others, there is a concern regarding the consistency of local regulatory boards. Rightly or wrongly, there is a perception that small projects frequently are reviewed with considerable rigor, while larger ones are perceived to avoid this strict level of review.

It was recognized that sometimes projects which appear similar at first glance may have certain elements that warrant different levels of review.

It was further recognized that different boards have different responsibilities, and may approach seemingly similar projects from a different perspective with a different outcome. However, there was agreement that all should be trying to serve the best interests of the community and its citizens as a whole.

It was suggested that it might be useful to hold an annual “All Boards Meeting”, perhaps in April and led by the Town Moderator or some other independent party. The likely attendees would be the Board of Selectmen, the Planning Board, the Zoning Board, the Conservation Commission, and the Development Commission (at a minimum).

The purpose of the meeting would be for each group to lay out its major goals for the coming year, and to discuss any issues that are outside of its immediate jurisdiction, but which have an impact on its operations and which it would ask other boards to be sensitive to.

The outcome of such a session could be as simple as information sharing, or it could be as complex as two boards establishing a taskforce to work together on a particular issue of mutual concern.

Infrastructure

There was a strong sense among those present that the Selectmen and the Development Commission should continue to evaluate the potential that water and sewer lines could provide for increased business opportunities in the Route 3-A Corridor, but that the utilities’ extension should be discussed as separate issues and not *automatically* linked one with the other.

There was a further sense that there should be no long-term capital commitments made by the Town until there had been further public discussion about the potential risks and rewards of such an investment.

There was a recognition that the aquifer that lies beneath the Route 3-A corridor is a rare resource, and that the Town should continue to pursue a withdrawal permit for up to 1 million gallons per day so as to control the use of that resource.

Other Elements

Some suggested that the Development Commission should represent the community during any FERC re-licensing procedures regarding the PSNH power plant. Upon reflection, it was agreed that the Development Commission should be aware of some of the impacts that actions in this area could have on sensitive lands, but actually working to protect them would be better left to another group.

Also, that the Commission should be evaluating the possibility of creating a Tax Increment Financing District along the Route 3-A corridor.

Other Concerns

As the Development Commission becomes involved in the details of undertaking these many tasks, it needs to keep reminding itself of the overarching goal of strengthening Bow as a community.

It needs to reflect on the rural nature and good environmental quality present in the community, and be alert to activity that would add undue traffic, noise, and risk to the natural environment.

Visioning Exercise

In a visioning exercise (attached) participants were asked to break away from today, and to look into the future. They were asked to imagine that it was the year 2030 and that they were on a drive down Route 3-A from the Grappone Auto Dealerships in Bow Junction southerly towards the Hooksett town line. They were asked to imagine that all of the issues noted above had been resolved, and that the efforts of the Bow Development Commission were widely viewed as a success. These future drivers were asked to describe what they saw, what success looked like from three different perspectives:

What did things look like physically?

What had happened to employment, to the tax base, and to area's finances?

Finally, what were the levels of communication and cooperation, both here and within the community as a whole?

Some saw additional auto dealerships, perhaps intermixed with warehouses, distribution centers, and construction headquarters.

There was a view of better landscaping along the Route 3-A corridor, and perhaps extending all the way down to the river.

There was a willingness to see planned development and a reconfiguration of the street network where there was sufficient space to accommodate it.

Others hoped that this corridor might include some cluster of retail services, from banking to groceries to a post office.

Some praised the degree to which I-93 had isolated the community from any business impacts along Route 3-A, while others expressed concern that this barrier is part of what prevents better communication between the businesses and the citizenry as a whole.

It was suggested that there might be areas developed as work force housing here. Still others noted that housing here might suppress business development, and perhaps those businesses would be looking for sites west of I-93. Some thought that would be a good idea.

Others expressed concern about the ability of this two lane highway to carry the traffic it was likely to see, and the need to be planning for its widening to four lanes with signals.

In the end, it appears that bringing the infrastructure discussion to a close, deciding fully and finally whether to extend water and/or sewer into the Route 3-A Corridor is critical to any substantive discussion about a future vision of the area. The presence of one or both of these utilities is critical to calculating the allowable density of development, and no reasonable vision can be developed until that issue has been fully explored and resolved by the community.

An Economic Vision for Bow: The Details

It is the year 2030. You are just pulling onto Route 3-A from the Worldwide Headquarters of The Grappone Companies, an international network of automobile dealerships. The former family-owned company has gone public and is now listed on the New York, London, and Tokyo stock exchanges.

You are doing a test drive of a brand new Toyota Prius, whose body is made of tightly woven corn stalks, and whose hybrid engine now gets 100 miles to the gallon. You turn on the radio, and Laura Knoy is doing her 2000th and final program on NH Public Radio. As you head south, the longest serving NH commissioner ever, George Bald of the Department of Resources and Economic Development, is praising the highly successful efforts that have been undertaken by the Bow Development Commission over the last two dozen years.

As you drive along, it is clear to you that Commissioner Bald is correct, because:

You see an array of fully developed lots fronting on Route 3-A, most of which have easy access directly onto Route 3-A.

Or

You see that the BDC has been successful in working with private landowners, and in a cooperative venture involving public and private partners, has reassembled the smaller parcels that existed in 2007 into an array of larger parcels that now contain many high paying businesses with a variety of economic opportunities, new streets with fewer curb cuts on Route 3-A, all yielding a much needed new tax base;

Or

The physical changes are not as significant as you might have thought, but regularly you see a sign on newly developed properties that reads “Another successful project developed for the Citizens of Bow by the Bow Development Commission, in cooperation with the Route 3-A Business Owners Association”.

Or

What is it that you see that warrants this praise from Commissioner Bald? What does success in this area really LOOK like? Big businesses? Little businesses? High tech? Modest tech? A mix of all of these? Better spirit? What does success look like here?

Bow Business Development Commission
Record of Meeting
November 14, 2007

Rather than engage in another visioning session, it was agreed by the three dozen residents and business owners gathered that a better use of everyone's time would be to frame a series of questions that they would want additional information on before they endorsed the Town proceeding with the installation of water and/or sewer infrastructure in the Route 3-A Corridor. What follows is a list of those questions.

- What would be the return on the Town's investment in this new infrastructure? Would there be a reasonable likelihood that the taxes on new development would off-set the additional expenses within a reasonable timeframe?
- Would the existing businesses (and homes) be required to hook into the new systems once they were in place? If so, what would that cost likely be?
- With respect to timing, how long is it reasonable to expect a potential business to wait for the installation of water and/or sewer before making a siting decision?
- With respect to the new well, what are the details with respect to the required protection area? What activities can occur there? Will all of that land be owned by the Town? How much developable land will be available once the protection zone is established?
- Is the new well in? Response: The well has been installed. The Town is in the process of securing a permit from the State which will outline the details of activities to be allowed in the protected area.
- Is it true that one of the monitoring wells in the area has been determined to contain MTBE contamination? Response: Yes, but that the source is being treated and the situation corrected.
- Can this project be phased? Response: The intent is to install both water and sewer lines, but to activate only the water lines initially, deferring until later the installation of sewer pumping stations and other expensive infrastructure that would be needed to activate that line.
- Is the proposed \$12.5 million price tag for both water and sewer? Response: Yes, with 40% of that figure associated with the water line(s) and 60% of it associated with the sewer line(s) and related infrastructure.
- Are there any current plans for residential development in the Route 3-A Corridor? What would be the impact of those developments on the schools and on the tax base. Would it be single family or multi-family development?

- Has the Development Commission conducted discussions with the owners of undeveloped (or under developed) lands in the Route 3-A Corridor to determine their long-term interests? What are they?
- Would it not have been easier to connect to the Concord Water System? Response: The City of Concord, for a variety of reasons, has chosen only to provide water to a limited number of residences in the Bow Mills area for humanitarian relief.
- What will be the traffic impacts on Route 3-A of denser development? Response: Town staff and others indicated that it will have to be managed with turning lanes, internal roads, and traffic management. The State's position is that it will not add lanes to the highway when I-93 is immediately adjacent to it as an alternative route.
- It was suggested that an examination of Route 3 in Bedford would be a good case study to see what happens to a narrow highway corridor with water and sewer when traffic was not managed.
- A question was raised as to whether a new exit from I-93 might be installed to serve the Route 3-A Corridor. Response: The consensus was that it would not be practical. It was further stated that the access from I-93 is thought to be adequate for commercial traffic, but perhaps not adequate for retail or office traffic.
- Is there, or can there be prepared, a list of businesses who looked at the Route 3-A Corridor but declined to pursue it because of the lack of utilities? Response: It was pointed out that it will be a partial list at best, as many businesses are felt to drop the corridor from consideration immediately because of the lack of utilities. It was agreed that at least a partial list might be developed through conversations with DRED.
- Questions were raised as to the exact wording of the Town Meeting warrant that authorized the \$12.5 million utility bond. Concerns were expressed that phasing and/or the current proposed configuration might not be consistent with that language.
- When could this project conceivably go to bid? Response: Construction documents are being prepared that could be put out to bid during the winter of '07/'08.
- Can there be some new, transitional zoning developed for this area, zoning that might have standards along Route 3-A that would be different than those along the Merrimack River?
- What is the actual availability of large parcels for further development? Concerns were expressed for lands near Johnson Road, as well as for other areas in the Corridor.
- What is the competition for development in other communities? It was felt that many parcels in Concord and Hooksett are already built out, which might enhance the attractiveness of land in Bow.

Overall, it was felt that the Development Commission and staff should work to respond to as many of these questions as practical prior to issuing any construction contracts.

###

After that evening's session, Community Development Director Bill Klubben distributed a series of questions that had previously been submitted by Rick Hiland. Although Bill did distribute those to the Development Commission on November 15, for completeness sake they are repeated here as a record of the meeting of November 14.

1. Was the \$12.5 million Bond (Plan "A") originally intended for the entire Rt3A corridor (Plan "B") as the current vision now being presented to the Bow residents/taxpayers in the "An Economic Development Vision for Bow" in these visioning sessions shows? Why exactly is it being changed to encompass the Rt3A corridor?
2. The Sewer & Water (Plan "A") was originally intended for the Bow Business Development District (BDD) formed in 2002 at the same time the original Bond was sold & voted by the taxpayers/voters of Bow to begin the development of an economic strategy in place at the time. Was the entire Rt3A corridor originally included in the BDD?
3. Currently, is there any change in the plans of the large landowners in the original Bow Business Development District (BDD) at the southeastern end of Bow who were not interested in developing their lands previously as part of the original strategy plan (Plan "A") about which the current Bond was sold to the voters? What went wrong with this original strategy (Plan "A")? Was it thinking that, "if we build it, they will come"?
4. In the area of town north of the BDD along the new RT3A corridor (Plan "B") where the current discussion/strategy/vision of installing the sewer & water is based, and not counting the BDD zone, wetlands, ledge, set-backs & other un-buildable acreage etc, exactly how many uninhabited buildable acres of developable land are there available in this new area?
5. More importantly, how many acres of real buildable/developable land are on the new proposed the core sewer & water system in this new Rt3A Corridor (Plan "B")?
6. Of these new available buildable acres, how many are large parcels? Identify these large parcels and buildable acreage of each? Are they currently available for sale/development? How many are small parcels? Categorize by size and potential?
7. Figuring the development and build-out of these available buildable acres in (Plan "B"), what will this development add to our current tax base? How long into the future will it take for this build out to benefit Bow from our investment in Sewer & Water? In other words what is the expected return on investment to the taxpayers and over how many years?

8. What will the cost be per acre before and after sewer & water compared to the cost per acre in Hooksett or Concord or surrounding areas and will Bow be price competitive in the economic development market place especially after the latest revaluation figures are approved?
9. Will multi-family housing or low-cost housing under the guise of work force housing be allowed or restricted from the new project area on the Rt3A corridor (Plan "B") as it was in the BDD?
10. If multi-family housing or low-cost housing is allowed and not restricted, what will the impact be on our school system and other Town services if allowed? Does this defeat the original purpose of our economic development strategy?
11. If multi-family housing or low-cost housing in the form of housing developments or apartment houses start popping up on some of the smaller parcels of land in this new Rt3A corridor plan/vision, because these are now easier & cheaper for developers to buy & build for profit, will this defeat the original intent of our economic development plan to increase our tax base thus reducing or at least stabilize our tax rates into the future? What additional costs to the taxpayers will this type of economic development and work force housing cost in the form of increases in Fire, Police, Rescue, DPW, Town staffing, Recreation and school system? Could this be a double edged sword?
12. How much money has been expended to date on the sewer and water project? Is what is left of the current \$12.5 bond enough money to completely build the sewer & water systems to make this worthwhile? If not, how much more money from business and residential taxpayers will it take to complete this new project vision to a point where it will benefit the Bow tax base, tax rates and future valuations? How will this additional money if needed affect our current and future tax rates?
13. Besides the increases in property taxes (land value increase, bond costs, increased Town operating expenses, etc.) on local business, what will this new strategy cost the local existing businesses in this Rt3A corridor whether they need sewer & water or not? Will each land owner have to contribute to this project in this vision area (Plan "B")? Will these additional costs drive existing small businesses away? Have you/will you seriously evaluate this?
14. Is there any current discussion on the development of southern most lands west of the highway as recommended in the RKG Report as being the biggest benefit to increasing the tax base as expressed in their full Report and Executive Summary in 2001?
15. What exactly will the proposed/estimated annual maintenance expenditures of the Sewer & Water Project be on the annual municipal budget in addition to the debt service of the bond principal & interest once it is installed and on the tax rolls? Water Department? Sewer Department? Additional Town personnel/employees and benefits? Additional Town equipment? Annual tax rate impact? Will this lead to bigger more expensive Town government?

16. Can the Consultants that the BBDC have retained to assist in these visioning sessions give real pertinent examples of other similar towns/communities that are similar in size and have similar amounts of small tracts of land to develop? Can they supply examples of the results after these same towns/communities installed sewer & water systems and started their economic development visioning process? What were the effects on their tax bases and tax rates as a result? How long into the future did it take for them to realize their investments? What affects did multi-family housing or low-cost housing have on these communities from economic development?
17. Since we have not seen much if any of this \$12.5 Million bond yet in our taxes, what impact will this bond have when finally issued/sold have on our taxes in dollars per thousand? How are we currently paying for the approximately \$1.5 Million worth of work that is currently going on?
18. If the results of these questions, after knowing all of the pro's and con's of this latest new strategy/vision (Plan "B"), point toward the fact that we may or may not get a beneficial return on our investment within a reasonable time frame into the future and/or the cost to construct has increased significantly, what is Plan "C"?

Considering the fact that the original strategy (Plan "A") for the Sewer & Water system was to serve the BDD, and that there has been much discussion recently about this new vision and having it serve the entire Rt3A Corridor area (Plan "B") instead for some time now from reading various BBDC meeting minutes on the Town Web site, I would assume there must have been questions asked by our current members of the Select Board and the BBDC that warrant the change of strategy, vision, plan & area involved, investment & return on investment to the taxpayer for this new endeavor and therefore I would hope and assume that you have the answers to most all of these questions for these upcoming vision sessions since no one had the answers at this past Town Meeting.

The original intent of this Sewer & Water Project/Bond (Plan "A") was to increase tax base thus stabilizing future tax rates. These are all good questions that need answers before I and many other voters/taxpayers can support any new change of plan/strategy/vision for the \$12.5 million Sewer and Water Project. We need to be sure that we are doing this for the right reasons and if this is a new revised plan/strategy/vision (Plan "B") then it must pass muster on its own merits.

Sincerely,

Rick Hiland
Bow Resident/Taxpayer/Business Owner