

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

January 7, 2013

7:30 p.m.

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting to order.

Mayor Gatsas called for the pledge of allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Ludwig.

A moment of silence was observed.

Mayor Gatsas stated please keep Hugh Dewey-O'Neil, Kevin Sheppard and Senator John King and their families in our prayers, that would be greatly appreciated.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Craig, Ludwig, Long, Roy, Osborne, Corriveau, O'Neil,
Levasseur, Shea, Katsiantonis, Shaw, Greazzo, Gamache, Arnold

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 3-17)

Mayor Gatsas advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

Accept BMA minutes

4. Minutes of a meeting held on October 16, 2012 (BMA), and November 8, 2012 (Special BMA).

Approve under supervision of the Department of Highways

5. Pole Petition:

11-1398 (1) Norton Avenue

Information to be Received and Filed

6. Communication from Xfinity regarding price adjustment information and a price adjustment correction.

7. Communication from CarePlus Ambulance Service, Inc.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

9. Request from Attorney Susan Manchester, Sheehan, Phinney, Bass & Green, for approval of the Wellington Hill amendment to the Purchase and Sale Agreement.

10. Communication from Mayor Gatsas requesting closing Hanover Street from the Citizens Bank alley entry to Elm Street on Thursdays for the Farmer's Market.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS/ENROLLMENT & REVENUE ADMINISTRATION

- 11.** Advising that it has accepted the following Finance Department reports:
- Accounts Receivable over 90 days
 - Aging Report
 - Outstanding Receivables

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Arnold who was absent)

- 12.** Advising that it has accepted the City's Monthly Financial Reports (unaudited) for the first five months of fiscal year 2013.

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Arnold who was absent)

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

- 13.** Recommending that the City donate the 1871 Amoskeag Steamer to the Manchester Historical Association.

(Unanimous vote)

- 14.** Recommending that Relay for Life be permitted to use Livingston Park for an event to be held on Friday, June 14, 2013 through Saturday, June 15, 2013.

(Unanimous vote)

- 15.** Recommending that Section VIII and Section XII C (2) be deleted from the Welfare Department General Assistance Guidelines.

(Unanimous vote)

- 16.** Advising that the communication from the Board of School Committee regarding a stipend reduction has been received and filed.

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Greazzo who voted in opposition)

*HAVING DULY READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF
ALDERMAN O'NEIL, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN LUDWIG, IT WAS
VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.*

**COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT & REVENUE
ADMINISTRATION**

- 8.** Communication from Mayor Gatsas requesting approval of the attached travel schedule/itinerary for Mark Brewer, Airport Director.

Alderman Craig stated this is a communication. It would be going to committee, but requesting approval for the travel schedule for Mark Brewer. My question about this is, as far as I know, we haven't rescinded the travel policy. If we are sending this to committee, I would suggest that we look at the whole travel policy versus travel for one individual.

Mayor Gatsas stated if that is the wish of the board I don't have a problem, but I think that travel in all other departments has been moving well. There is not as many of them anywhere else. If the board wants to do that, I certainly don't have a problem with that. They are all time sensitive.

Alderman Craig stated I have not heard that there has been an issue with Mr. Brewer and his travel. You have said it, but we have heard nothing contrary to that. If there is an issue with travel, I have heard that there is not either, so either we could receive and file this or I would suggest that we look at the travel policy as a whole.

Mayor Gatsas stated well that's fine. As I was very clear with the board at the last meeting when we decided to approve a trip to Hawaii, I said that all other trips would be approved by the board for that department head. Certainly, I understand

where you are at. I think it should go to committee and I think the committee should rule on it. They do approve it anyways in the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration. They see all travel requests after the fact.

Alderman Craig stated right, and there has never been an issue. I would move to receive and file.

Alderman Craig moved to receive and file this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Levasseur.

Alderman Levasseur stated currently, you just approve it, right? That is the mayor's authority.

Mayor Gatsas responded either approve it or not approve it. I didn't approve the last one with the trip to Hawaii. This board did approve it. There were an awful lot of trips, as you can see, on the sheet in front of you, and I think there should be discussion about it at the committee level.

Alderman Levasseur stated as a comment, I have no problem with the current policy, as it is now. I'm not sure it is the will of the board to change the policy, unless that is what you wanted to do by sending it to the committee.

Mayor Gatsas stated I sent it to committee because I believe that either I have the authority of all or none, but obviously at the last meeting I was overruled and this board wanted to make sure that they approved that trip. As I said to them that evening, I would be sending the balance of that travel request back to the board and that is what I have done.

Alderman Shea stated this is number eight, Your Honor, and this is a referral to committee.

Mayor Gatsas stated yes, it is.

Alderman Shea stated I think that, traditionally, we have referred items to committees. It can be discussed there. I really think that we are beginning to take things off as referrals to committees and deciding them at the full board, before they are referred to committees. Again, I am in favor of referring it to a committee. If the committee wants to, I hate to use this term, but kill it at that level, that is up to them. I think in deference, when we refer something to a committee, we are doing something that we have followed for many years and now we are starting to take things off and deciding them before they are even referred to committee. I would be in favor of referring it to committee to follow tradition.

Alderman Craig stated and I did pull this off only because we haven't rescinded the policy and we are taking one individual off, which to me, doesn't seem fair. The process is one where there are checks and balances so if this board doesn't agree with the mayor, then we do have an opportunity to overrule that. We haven't heard that there is an issue with the policy and if we are fine with it, let's follow the policy and move forward which is why I would suggest that we receive and file this.

Alderman O'Neil stated based on the mayor's comments this evening and previously, the mayor has issues with the director's travel that we are going to be taking up, every month... If that is what the board wishes to do, that's fine. I plan on supporting everything that is on this matrix while I am here. I don't know how

this will affect others at the airport on their required travel. If the board is willing to take it up each time it is denied, that's fine with me.

Alderman Shea stated that doesn't preclude, Your Honor, anyone from taking anything off at any time and we could be discussing things that are being referred to committee. We are setting precedents all the time now. Why are we referring things to committee if I decide to take items eight or nine off too? It doesn't make sense to me to refer something to committee and then not refer it to the committee. There must have been some sort of reason why we were referring it to a committee. I think we are establishing a bad precedent when we decide that we have a referral and we decide them at this level. That is my opinion. I would like to follow through.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to receive and file this item. The motion carried with Aldermen O'Neil, Roy and Shea voting in opposition.

Mayor Gatsas vetoed the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked is this roll call on the vote?

Mayor Gatsas replied a roll call on the vote just to make sure because I vetoed it and I think there are some people who aren't sure if there were enough votes to override the veto.

Alderman Shea stated a no vote is not to receive and file.

Alderman Osborne stated this department is a self sufficient department anyways. Isn't it?

Mayor Gatsas replied yes, it is.

Alderman Osborne asked so why are we questioning his flights or whatever he is doing?

Mayor Gatsas replied again, because I thought that the travel was excessive.

Alderman Osborne stated but again, it is a self-sufficient...

Mayor Gatsas interjected this board has the ability to do that. If they want to take it into committee and approve every one of those travel requests they can.

Alderman Osborne stated it looks like we are micro-managing his department and the airport when it is a self sufficient department. Why should we worry so much? We should be worrying more about our own, I guess. I don't have any problem with it.

Alderman Shea stated what I am not trying to do is do anything regarding micromanaging. All I am saying is that we should refer things to committees if they are listed as being referred to committees, rather than deciding them at the board. That is all I'm saying. If the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration wants to do something, that should be their prerogative and if they decide to receive and file it at that level that's fine. I think we are establishing a bad precedent, that's what I'm saying because we can start referring anything we want to this committee and if there are enough votes, we decided that without necessarily following a process that we have established as a Board of Mayor and Aldermen. That is my comment. I think we are doing that now and I think it is going to be open house and people are going to decide anytime they want to take something off the referral committee. That is separate from what we

normally do when we report back to committees. Again, that is why I am objecting to this particular item. I will vote no.

Alderman Levasseur stated the policy right now is that you make the determination whether or not to approve travel time. If it goes back to the committee, we will be deciding whether or not to change that policy from you being able to make that decision or a committee making that decision. I'm voting no because I want to keep it the same way and allow you to continue to make that decision. I don't know how many times you are going to overrule or say no to someone having travel time, I don't see this as being a major issue that we need to change the policy on. I know one time you decided not to and then they have the ability to come to the board and ask us whether or not we will approve it. I don't really want to go back to committee to discuss it. I'm in favor of keeping the policy. I think you are doing a fine job whether you approve or not approve and I don't think it is a major issue. I'm voting no because I don't want it to go to committee to have to change a policy that I think is working fine. That is why I am voting no.

Alderman Shea stated in recent weeks when the chief of police appeared before us, something was taken off the referral and decided at the board meeting and there were a lot of problems. If that had gone to a committee at that time, there would have been fewer problems in my opinion. That is why I think we should follow the procedure that has been set up. Again, it is up to the board here to decide what they want to do, but that is why I think it is important that we refer things to committees.

Alderman Shaw asked could you please explain what receive and file will do to this? If we receive and file it here, what does that mean?

Mayor Gatsas replied I think I have been pretty clear with the letter. The letter states that all travel for the airport director would go through this board so that they can approve it and go to the committee. If the committee wants to approve it in one swipe and approve all the travel on that committee for the airport director it would be up to this board, if they want to do that. What I am telling you is that receive and file leaves it right back with me. If we are looking to play a game with this, then we can leave it with me and I will continue to say no and those requests will come back to you folks and you can then decide what you want to do or you can decide what you want to do or if you want to decide them all at once.

Alderman Shaw asked if we receive and file then the issue goes to committee?

Mayor Gatsas replied no, if we receive and file it, it goes back to me. The airport approval travel would come back to me.

Alderman Craig stated in terms of games, that's what I feel like is in front of us now, because you are taking one person out of the mix. You are not talking about approving all airport travel. That is a question. Is this all airport?

Mayor Gatsas stated all airport travel has been cancelled to this date.

Alderman Craig stated but you are only asking us here to look at Mr. Brewer's travel and approve that.

Mayor Gatsas stated correct, because you overruled my position on not allowing the trip to Hawaii.

Alderman Craig stated imagine that. Now, we overruled it and the next meeting is you are not going to take my word; you all have to approve this. That to me is a game. We have a process and a policy that is working. Government is one where there are checks and balances. If you decide to cancel all travel then people have an opportunity to come to us and we can change that. Why wouldn't we leave the process and the policy as it is?

Mayor Gatsas replied because I think I was pretty clear two weeks ago or last week when we had this discussion. We have a motion for a roll call. Any other discussion on it?

Alderman Levasseur asked are there any times when they need to go on a trip where they need 24 or 48 hours notice whereas it would take two weeks before it would come to a committee for us to have to deal with that issue? I think the main reason why I like it being in the mayor's position is because you can approve it instantaneously if there is an emergency situation or they need to travel right away so they don't have to come to city hall or come to a committee and be slowed down by a process or we have to do a telephone poll. I think that is the reason why...

Mayor Gatsas interjected if there is an emergency, I will take care of it.

Alderman Levasseur stated but you wouldn't if the policy changed.

Mayor Gatsas stated there is no policy change. This is just for the airport director.

Alderman Levasseur asked isn't the airport director the one who would know they need to fly right away or get out of the city?

Mayor Gatsas responded if you take a look at the correspondence that I gave you, every one of those is predated commitments.

Alderman Levasseur stated I'm just wondering if there have been any times where there was an approval where you needed only 24 or 48 hour notice.

Mayor Gatsas stated there might have been one for the Fire Department for taking a look at the construction of a fire truck. That might have been one. I can't think of another one.

Alderman Shea stated I want to make myself clear, Your Honor. My concern is not with the item. I could care less about the item itself. My concern is about the process that we are beginning to use, whether I agree or disagree with you requesting approval that is a non sequitur, that does not follow. What concerns me is that we are starting to do things that are unprecedented on the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. We are taking things off of a referral to a committee and bringing it to what we would call reports of committees. That is what my objection is. It has nothing to do with the item; it has all to do with the process that we are now using.

Alderman Shea requested a roll call vote on the motion to receive and file.

Aldermen Shea, Katsiantonis, Greazzo, Roy, Corriveau and O'Neil voted nay.

Aldermen Shaw, Gamache, Arnold, Craig, Ludwig, Long, Osborne and Levasseur voted yea. The motion carried.

Mayor Gatsas vetoed the motion.

***Alderman Arnold** moved to override the mayor's veto. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**.*

Alderman Arnold, Craig, Ludwig, Long, Osborne, O'Neil, Levasseur, Shaw and Gamache voted yea. Alderman Roy, Corriveau, Shea, Katsiantonis and Greazzo noted nay. The motion failed.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Katsiantonis**, it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration. Aldermen Craig, Shaw and Arnold voted in opposition.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JOB CREATION/JOB RETENTION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- 17.** Advising that the "How to Open a Business in Manchester" has been accepted.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Roy stated I just wanted to make sure I got this straight. The way I read this, the "How to Open a Business in Manchester" has been accepted and this is going to go through as an ordinance or a rule in the City. As I was reading the cover letter, they were looking for input prior to finalization of the document. I just wanted to make sure this isn't going to be set in stone and the Planning and Community Development Department can change this in the future. We don't want this to be set in stone because it is going to be dynamic and they have to be able to change it when they have to change it. I just wanted that clarification.

Alderman Arnold stated I thank Alderman Roy for this inquiry because we did discuss that issue specifically at the committee level and it was my understanding, and I will defer to other members of the committee if they want to correct me, that

we didn't want to adopt this so that it was set in stone, but rather we wanted to give the Planning and Community Development Department the opportunity and the flexibility to modify it as they saw necessary. We made the recommendation coming out of committee to accept it and I don't know that we used the term adopt it to give it the force of a regulation, but we wanted it accepted so that we could make sure that it is available to prospective business owners or anyone who is looking to expand or anyone who wants to come pick it up, members of the public. Does that clarify?

Alderman Roy replied yes, it does. That's perfect.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Arnold, it was voted to accept this item.

REGULAR BUSINESS

18. Nomination(s) to be presented by Mayor Gatsas, if available.

Board of Trustees of Trust Funds

Attorney S. William Dahar to fulfill a vacancy as a member, term to expire January 1, 2016

Office of Youth Services Advisory Board

Bonnie St. Jean to succeed herself as a member, term to expire January 1, 2016

Gary Hunter to succeed himself as a member, term to expire January 1, 2016

Senior Services Commission

Pat Schoch to succeed herself as a member, term to expire January 1, 2016

Mayor Gatsas stated these nominations will layover until the next meeting of the board pursuant to Rule 20 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

19. Confirmation of David Paris as Water Works Director.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve the confirmation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I had the chance to speak with Dave this weekend. We had a very good discussion. Besides talking about some of the football games, we did talk about the status of the system, the water system, the deputy director's position, labor relations and probably most importantly the water rates. I learned some very important information regarding the water rates and the impact that it has on the finances of the department and maybe at some point, we can have Director Paris in to talk to us about it.

20. Confirmations to be presented by Mayor Gatsas:

Arts Commission

Jessica Chambers to fulfill a vacancy, term to expire December 1, 2015.

Highway Commission

Raymond Hebert to succeed himself as a member, term to expire January 15, 2016.

Senior Services Commission

Barbara Morrill to succeed herself as a member, term to expire January 1, 2016.

George Tosatti to succeed Jim Eddinger as a member, term to expire January 1, 2015.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to approve the confirmations.

21. Communication from Tom Clark, City Solicitor, requesting approval of the Seventh Amendment to the Declaration of Brady Sullivan Millworks Condominium.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Long stated I went through the contract. I'm not a contract guy. What I am wondering is if the unit is currently in the fee stricture that it was when we bought it? I know we are changing some common area. I'm wondering if in this two-tier scenario, was that common area part of our total price? Was part of that common area part of the total price that we paid for that? Is that included in our condo fee?

Mayor Gatsas replied that is not part of the \$2.09. It is part of the \$.49 a square foot.

Alderman Long asked it wasn't included in the overall cost?

Mayor Gatsas replied it was not.

Alderman Long asked is there a reduction in the condo fee for this two-tier scenario?

Mayor Gatsas replied no.

Alderman Long asked was there an increase?

Mayor Gatsas replied I think the increase is \$.49 a square foot for the second tier, I believe.

Alderman Long stated so \$.49 for the second tier. Thank you.

Alderman Arnold asked do we know what the total cost difference is?

Mayor Gatsas asked is it here before you?

Alderman Arnold replied it could be and I overlooked it.

Mayor Gatsas asked is there anyone in the audience who can address it?

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated I don't know what the additional cost would be, if any. I believe, and I'm relying on my memory, but at the time this was sent to us by Brady Sullivan, they said there wouldn't be any additional fee increase. As I say, I am relying on my memory and I couldn't answer the question what the increase would be if there is any.

Alderman Arnold stated for my own clarification, the last time we had a discussion about an amendment to the condo declaration it was this item. This isn't a separate one or another one that they have brought forward?

Mr. Arnold replied I don't recall, quite frankly. I believe there was a different amendment before that didn't involve any cost differential, but there was a form on necessity for approval so I think that this one is likely different than that, if that is what you are referring to.

Alderman Arnold stated it is. That is what I was getting at, Tom, that is if is different than the last time we had an amended declaration in front of us, I would want to get some idea as to exactly what the cost is. I don't know, Mayor, if you

know how the School District absorbs these costs; where they are paid for out of. I think the line of thought that Alderman Long was going down, if it wasn't budgeted for when we entered into the deal, where does the money come from to pay for it now as additional common area comes up. I would be interested in knowing the answer to that.

Alderman Long stated on page 21-8 it says no increase over the prior year. From what I am understanding here, if the SAU is looking to utilize this undeveloped unit, then there would be a \$.49 per square foot charge for this. I know they are using it now for storage.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think that there is a conversion of unit 60, 20,000 square feet, which is storage now and that goes to the \$.49 square foot level and then I think it is divided amongst the users in the building.

Mr. Robert Gagne, Assessor, stated I wasn't involved in this, but just to bring clarification, since the City owns the unit in that complex, every time there is an amendment the City is going to be asked to sign off on it. The number 60 that is being converted from a unit to common space has nothing to do with the City's unit; it is just space in the building somewhere that they are converting to common area. It is a separate issue that they have with the fees. It has nothing to do with that unit 60 being turned into common area, they are just changing the way they pay fee. There is still a lot of space in that building that is unfinished that they own and they are reducing the price for unfinished price because it is not using a lot of services. That is my reading of that amendment.

Alderman Arnold asked you are saying, Bob, that there is a cost savings?

Mr. Gagne replied there is no impact to the City.

Alderman Arnold asked there is no impact whatsoever.

Mr. Gagne stated the fee didn't change. My reading is that the fee to the finished unit, the City's unit being a finished unit, is the same this year as it was last year.

Alderman Shea stated this is just a point for my own information. I notice that this is dated a certain day in 2012. When an agreement is reached, does this change the date or do they have this? In other words, if you look on page 21-3 at the bottom, this seventh amendment that is a declaration is executed this day of 2012. We are now in 2013. Are we predating this?

Mayor Gatsas replied no, they did it on December 10th. We got it here at city hall on December 20th so the first time that it is going to a meeting is tonight.

Alderman Shea asked when it is executed there will be another date?

Mayor Gatsas replied that coincides, it just doesn't affect what the School District will be paying.

Alderman Shea stated not being a lawyer, I would like to know.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Roy**, it was voted to approve the Seventh Amendment to the Declaration of Brady Sullivan Millworks Condominium.*

- 22.** Request from Fred McNeill, Chief Engineer, for approval of a temporary construction easement with NHDOT.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve this item.

- 23.** Request for a transfer of funds from contingency for demolition of 333-335 Central Street.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Long stated there are three bids so it is from \$29,000 to \$73,000. The appropriation... I spoke with Leon and they have to go over both bids. They do have the bids. I believe the Planning Department can do their due diligence in doing that. I would ask my colleagues to go with the \$46,000 in case the \$29,000 doesn't have everything covered. It would be coming out of the one time account.

Alderman O'Neil stated what I was going to ask is if contingency is the appropriate place or is the one time account the appropriate place for the funds. I personally think it does. We are barely into the winter and hitting contingency. Does the motion including coming out of the one time account?

Alderman Long replied yes, that is my motion.

Mayor Gatsas stated we should understand, just for clarification purposes, that is a lien, it could be there for two or three years and I'm not too sure that the one time account is the place to be drawing this from. Everyone has a different opinion.

Alderman Greazzo stated Your Honor, I don't think we should be spending any money to demolish someone's property for them. I'm curious to find out if he has collected fire insurance, I would also like to find out information on the other properties that he owns in the city that I believe that he is not paying taxes on, if we are going to wind up in possession of this property, I might be interested in spending some money and cleaning it up, but all the liability resides with the property owner and not the City so I don't think we should be spending our money to tear down something that this individual is required to take care of himself.

Mayor Gatsas I know there are a couple of people who are waving their hands, but I'm not too sure... Leon, have you had an opportunity to speak with these individual? It is not an open discussion on this item so maybe what we can do is table it to let Leon have a conversation before and then let him come back before us. I don't mean to table it for the rest of the night, but just table it so he can have a conversation with the folks and we can bring it back up.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to table this item until later in the meeting.

24. Communication from Dr. Brennan, Superintendent of Schools, requesting authorization to use \$35,000 from the athletic expendable trust fund to pay for the Academic Audit of the district.

Alderman Levasseur moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Craig.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't think that is all that he requested. I think there is another \$5,000 that was requested in here. Is it in the letter? Does it say \$40,000? What we are doing is approving him to do \$40,000. The other \$5,000 comes from the folks who put money in their tax bills.

Alderman Craig stated but we only have to approve the \$35,000, correct?

Mayor Gatsas replied I think we have to approve the whole thing according to the letter, if I remember what the motion was.

Alderman Roy stated no, it just asks for the \$35,000 and then it says they also plan on using the \$5,000.

Alderman Craig stated they are using money out of the trust.

Alderman O'Neil asked Your Honor, can you give a two line summary of what this is doing? Not the action of the money, but what this audit is going to do?

Mayor Gatsas replied it is an academic audit where they are going to come in and audit the entire district. There is an outside audit firm that they put into place to do the work.

Alderman O'Neil asked what can you do with the results?

Mayor Gatsas replied that is a good question, Alderman, but I don't know because I didn't vote for it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have had School Board members approach me on this issue and I am going to support it because they asked, but I don't know if this money could be used for a teacher, but it is getting close to hiring a teacher. For \$40,000 I hope they get something out of it.

Mayor Gatsas stated there are a couple of athletics fields... If you remember the drainage at West Memorial is pretty tough around that track. I understand what people want to do and I certainly applaud them, but there is the one at Livingston that has problems in the track up there and I'm not too sure that this is the best way to spend the money that is in that account.

Alderman Shaw stated I think that an academic audit would give the incoming superintendent a good idea of just exactly what is going on and what he is faced with here in the City. I think it would give an opportunity for a combined effort to really see where our weaknesses are, where our strengths are and then work from there. It is a good starting point. I think that any person who would come in as superintendent, one of the first questions they would probably ask is where are we academically. I think that this would be an excellent idea.

Alderman Craig stated just to add on to that, combined with the strategic plan that is in process right now, I think it will be invaluable in terms of moving the School District forward. It is also my understanding that it is part of the superintendent's responsibility to initiate these audits and we haven't had one in many years. I think it is time that we move forward with it.

Alderman Shea stated I have never heard of an academic audit, but certainly it is helpful. In deference to my colleague here, it may be a woman who is taking over. It is the age of the woman, we all know that. I would say that if it is stressing academics, that is certainly beneficial to all because there are certain programs in

place that I don't agree with and hopefully they will change that, the inconsistency that exists now between the elementary, middle and high schools. It is very disturbing in terms of how you set up a program. If that is going to be impacted, that is certainly position. If it is going to just stress the financial aspects of the school system that probably won't be academic, that will be an audit that we can conduct within the confines of our own administration at the School District. Naturally it is going to be helpful if it is academic and that is where I think the stress should be in education, academics. Too much stress is on other things.

Alderman Levasseur stated this is only an academic; it is nothing to do with financial at all? There is no looking over the books, looking over the spending or anything like that?

Mayor Gatsas replied it says academic audit.

Alderman Levasseur stated so basically we are going to have someone from outside of the state tell us that our classes are too big, we spend too much money or we don't have enough tax money. I think we already know what the problems are. I thought this was going to be more of an audit on a financial basis to make sure that money is being appropriated in the right place. I think we already know what the problems are. I just wonder if an academic audit comes in... I think we already had an audit from the State last spring and they pretty much told us what we didn't think our classes were capable of doing and I know you got them to bend a little bit and rewrite some of the statements they made, but is an academic audit going to change the way we do anything going forward? We have already had six votes and I think there were unanimous on your board for six things that you want to change in the next year or so. If they come in and do an academic audit, is that going to change anything that we are going to do with where you are

already heading or where they want to head on the School Board anyway? What was the voted of the School Board on this item? Was is unanimous?

Mayor Gatsas replied I can't tell you if it was unanimous or not.

Alderman Levasseur asked an academic audit is going to tell us what?

Alderman Roy stated you voted against it so it wasn't unanimous.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't know if I voted against it or if I abstained. That is why I can't tell you what the vote was.

Alderman Levasseur asked an academic audit is going to tell us what? We already know what the problems are. We are told every other meeting by the people who come in front of us. They think we are underfunded, drastically is what I hear all the time. We have new negotiations coming in, we have new contracts coming in, there is going to be more money available, hopefully, to hire more teachers to solve the problems that we know are there. Are they going to tell us that we don't have enough art classes or enough sciences classes or math classes or there are too many or there aren't enough of these types of teachers? That is what we have a superintendent for.

Alderman Shaw stated an academic audit is strictly subject matter; what programs are being taught, where they are being taught, are the programs working, what is being taught in the different areas, what subjects are being offered. It is all academic, how is it being taught. They do this all over the country and it has nothing to do with finances, it has nothing to do with saying that you aren't doing this right or that right or you have too many kids in a class. It is strictly academic,

strictly to see the subject matter. It is that type of a study. It is done very often in districts all over the country.

Alderman Levasseur asked is there a copy of the RFP that went out with specifics as to what they will be doing? Are they going to come in here for five, six, ten days, two months? Are they going to be sitting in classrooms? What is \$40,000 buying us? Are we going to get a report that slams us and makes us look even worse to people who are trying to move in or move out of the City? This is a big deal if we are going to do something like this. We should pretty much know exactly what we are getting for our money and what they are doing with that money and what that report is going to generate. If it is going to tell me that we need more English teachers or more algebra teachers or more diversity in our arts, I think that our teachers and our principles and our superintendent and our School Board are pretty much responsible enough to tell us what we are doing wrong, what we are doing well, or what we are doing right. To spend \$40,000 to have some outsiders come in here and tell us what we already know are the issues, doesn't seem to make much sense. If it was a financial audit that would probably bend me in that direction, but can't we just teach them basic things like math, science, and reading and take care of those basic things. I don't know why we need someone else from Pennsylvania or wherever this is coming from to tell us what our strengths or weaknesses are. I know we all want classes with 20 kids in them, but that is not going to happen unless we get movement on the other side. Until that happens, we are going to have these issues.

Alderman Shea stated we could discuss this ad finitum, but maybe if we vote it up or down that is okay with me. We all have one vote so if we don't support it we vote no, if we support it we vote yes.

Alderman Roy stated they already went out to RFP, they already chose the firm. What was their plan if we vote this down? Where were they going to get the money? Do we know that? I would guess that they have some money somewhere. Who goes out for a RFP and selects a vendor if you don't have the money already? I'm lost here. We went out to a RFP subject to funding. The fire trucks? No, that is not what we did. We have the money in our emergency vehicle fund.

Mayor Gatsas stated that fund has been there for four years. We set that up four years ago to understand... I don't think this board is going to stop bonding \$3 million for the vehicles that we said we were going to do. We have done this in the past; we did it in the past about preordering a fire vehicle because we knew we were moving forward. This is not anywhere to being the same thing.

Alderman Roy stated it is the MER, I misspoke. It is the mechanical equipment replacement fund that we did set up four or five years ago so that money is there. I looked at the number before, but I'm reading this now wondering how you go out for RFP and pick somebody if you don't have the money? It doesn't make any sense to me. They had no plan? They were just hoping that we were going to say okay.

Alderman Corriveau stated I assume like many of the aldermen here, I have been approached by some of the School Board members and I think Alderman Shaw has articulated the reasons for this audit and many of the aspects it would entail much better than I could, but I really do believe that this is going to be a tool of many tools that the School Board can use going forward to examine our educational successes, deficiencies and what our priorities should be going forward. They make education policy in this city. This board does not; the new joint committee does not. That doesn't mean that we don't have an important role,

obviously. I think when the school committee begins approaching us with a strategic plan through the new joint committee, through several different initiatives that they will require funding for, I think that will be an appropriate time to delve into some of these issues, but as of right now, the way I see this is that the School Committee is saying that we need this. They voted for it. They said we need this. They said here is who we would like to have it done by; here is what this audit will do. I assume this is the best way that they thought they could pay for it. I'm not going to second-guess their vote. I can't speak to the condition of athletic fields or how this money would otherwise be spent, but I do think that our authorization here is appropriate.

Alderman Long asked where did the conversation of this academic audit come from? Did it come from the superintendent search? Did it come from the strategic plan?

Mayor Gatsas replied it came from the board.

Alderman Long asked it came from the board with respect to what?

Mayor Gatsas replied doing an academic audit. We did the superintendent search. We did the strategic long term plan and we did an academic audit.

Alderman Long stated I could understand where this would be beneficial to a superintendent. This would cut to the chase and also on a strategic plan this would be beneficial. I was wondering where this came from. Did someone just say let's debate an academic audit or was there something that they wanted this for?

Mayor Gatsas stated I think that was one of the items, as we are going through what we were looking to do, that came up. We had talked about an academic audit and there were some School Board members who said we had talked about it for many years, but never done one. It was an idea. I think that the \$5,000 that they were spending and I understand that this board doesn't have a say in it, but I think the folks who sent their money in, when they sent money additionally with their taxes, was sent directly to the School District and I'm not too sure it was about an academic audit, but it was enhancing what the schools could spend.

Alderman Craig stated as someone who did mail a check in, I would be thrilled if they used my money toward an academic audit because I do feel that that goes directly back to helping students.

Alderman Arnold stated I agree with what Alderman Long just said about this being a useful tool for the next superintendent, but I also think that it will be a useful metric for policy makers. I'm sure that I'm not the only elected official who holds office, either on this board or the School Board, who thinks that not all the challenges we face as a School District are centered around funding issues. I would think this study, this audit, would provide us with yet another metric to see how we measure up on a host of other areas. I appreciate where Alderman Levasseur is coming from with the financial focus and I share that concern as well, but now we have this academic audit and I support and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Alderman Levasseur stated I tend to agree with Alderman O'Neil that this money should go towards a teacher for the remaining four or five months. They know what they need at the School District. They already told us last year when they came in with a tax cap budget and a wants budget. This year they voted to send us two budgets, a tax cap budget and a wants budget. They already know what they

need and what they want academically. The other issue is, and I may need my memory refreshed, but it seems to me, after watching the School Board operate over the last ten or 12 years, every April or May it seems like they need money for bats, baseballs or shirts, they are a little underfunded on some of their athletics when the springtime comes around and they say they are shy money for uniforms and such. This money is \$40,000, and it is probably money that they are going to need a lot more in the spring. It is also a little bit of a cushion for them coming into the spring. If they are taking their money from these little accounts and they are spending that \$5,000 that people sent in to help the School District... I don't know how many people are going to be too thrilled about an audit where they would rather have money go to a computer or a laptop or a teacher or another paraprofessional. If they had a whole wealth of money over there and they had their own contingency fund and they had some surplus money that would be one thing, but it looks to me like they are digging deep for money and I would rather they kept that money until the spring. If they want to do an audit and we come through the winter without too bad of a snow storm issue, and there is extra money in contingency, I could see us in two, three or four months saying that we could do the academic audit in April or so. Money is extremely tight. Obviously it is very tight because they are taking this out of a very deep well. I think it would be prudent, if they saved that money, for the next couple of months, and waited on this issue to see what happens going further down the road with what is going to happen with their budget. Obviously, they really don't have a lot of money if they are digging this deep and taking \$5,000 out of the money that was sent to them from the taxpayers as an extra stipend with their taxes. I would vote that we be cautious and wait a couple more months to authorize an academic audit to see how we are financially in another couple of months.

Alderman Shea stated this request has come from the Curriculum and Instruction Committee of the School Board. I think they know more about what the needs of the School District might be than sitting aldermen know about what they know. In order for us to bring this to fruition, Your Honor, let's call the question and we can vote either yes or no. If we support it, yes, if we don't support it, no.

Alderman Katsiantonis stated I agree with Alderman Shea. Is that \$35,000 their money? Is that correct?

Mayor Gatsas replied that's correct.

Alderman Katsiantonis stated so I don't know why we are arguing. It is their money. They are the school department. Let them handle it themselves. If they fail, then blame them. I don't know why we keep stepping on their feet on how they are going to run the school department. They are in charge. The people voted for them to be a board. Let them be in charge. Let them handle it and if they fail and do something wrong, let them blame them.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to approve the request. The motion carried with Alderman Levasseur voting in opposition.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove item 23 from the table.

- 23.** Request for a transfer of funds from contingency for demolition of 333-335 Central Street.

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Planning and Community Development Director, stated I have spoken with Mr. Delling and Ms. Mandeville and they are former tenants of the building and have suffered the similar frustrations to the City, with the lack of response from the former property owner. We have talked about some of the steps that they might take, but they are in a difficult spot because of rent that they paid that they didn't get the benefit of.

Mayor Gatsas stated there is basically nothing that we can do.

Mr. LaFreniere stated not at this time, on that issue.

Mayor Gatsas stated the discussion is before us on the transfer of funds from contingency for demolition. I think there was a motion to move it from the economic development fund. Was there a second?

***Alderman Long** moved to approve the request to transfer funds from the one-time account for the demolition of 333-335 Central Street. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**.*

Mayor Gatsas asked Mr. Sanders, can you tell me if you think that that is something that you would recommend, as the finance officer?

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, replied yes, I am comfortable with the decision, if that is the decision of the aldermen, and it is really based on three things. One, we have \$1 million left in the contingency account as of this point. As the aldermen know, from the last forecast, we have about \$700,000 overspending on the severance line item. The winter is still in front of us. I think we will need the \$1 million that we have in contingency. I would also say that there is a reasonable likelihood of reimbursement, maybe not immediately, but

overtime, it will get reimbursed to the one-time account. I think the nature of expenses, even though they are not economic development expenses in the normal sense, there is an aspect of tearing this building down that is economic development, I assume, and it is also a capital improvement of the site and it would be a capital expenditure, which are also talked about in the resolutions. For the modest amount, be it \$46,000 or \$29,000, I would be supportive of it.

Mayor Gatsas asked Leon, can you tell me how much the tax lien is on it? Do you know? And the sewage lien? I think this is the one that has a \$37,000 sewage lien, if memory serves me right.

Mr. LaFreniere replied I believe that is accurate on the sewer lien. I'm not sure on the taxes.

Mayor Gatsas stated is there \$67,000 or more.

Mr. LaFreniere stated it is something like that. It was a total of \$130,000 or something like that.

Mayor Gatsas stated so another \$30,000 on top of it, I'm not too sure there would be a replenishment of the economic development fund.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. LaFreniere, can you tell me how many other properties are owned by this individual and if there are any other outstanding monies owed to the City?

Mr. LaFreniere replied I believe that the entity that owns this property is a LLC and does own other properties in the city and is in arrears for property taxes on those other properties as well.

Alderman Greazzo asked Solicitor Arnold, are we taking any legal action against this LLC for their liens that are outstanding?

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, replied the property taxes, of course, would be collected through the ordinance course and in accordance with State statute. We are pursuing court action to recoup or I should say first of all, get authorization for the City to tear the building down. We will continue with that process to seek recoupment of the City's costs which are collected as taxes. We are also looking at the point to whether there is insurance on the building and if there is insurance on the building that has not be dispersed, we will notify the insurance company that the City inserts a lien on those insurance procedures for the cost of demolition.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. LaFreniere, how many other properties in the City do we have in the situation where they are delinquent on taxes, sewage, water that have potential liens against them?

Mr. LaFreniere replied I'm not sure I would be able to provide that information.

Alderman Greazzo asked is that something that Mr. Gagne can answer for us?

Mr. LaFreniere replied or the tax collector perhaps. It is in that vain. I can certainly get that information for you.

Alderman Greazzo stated Your Honor, I would like to get an answer to that question because I know we have plenty of people who have outstanding tax bills and sewer bills and I know that you have brought forward a measure to turn off their water if they are not paying their sewer bill. I think we need to figure out a

way to make sure there is a way for the people who own us large amounts of money who never pay us because we don't go after them legally, we should start collecting that data and actually going after them and getting reimbursed. This just calls attention to it. I'm not really a big fan of spending the money to tear down this gentleman's property, but Mr. LaFreniere has included in his letter that he would be putting a lien on the property and I would also ask Mr. Arnold to put liens on the other properties that have outstanding tax payments.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think those already have liens on them. I think the tax collector places them. I was just corrected; the taxes owed on this one property are \$48,000.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. Arnold, what is the process if after the lien has been placed and we want to get paid, what is the timeframe? Do we have to wait a certain period of time or can we ask for it to be put up for auction?

Mr. Arnold replied as I said the cost of demolition is collected as taxes. They would be billed and in the ordinary course, if they are not paid, it would go through the tax collection or the tax deeding process provided for by statute.

Alderman Greazzo asked is there a mechanism, in that statute, to get paid or do we just wait indefinitely?

Mr. Arnold replied it takes some time, but the statute provides that...

Alderman Greazzo interjected how much time?

Mr. Arnold replied I believe with taxes you place the lien, if the lien is not paid for two years and you tax deed the property, the City tax deeds the property to itself. At that point, we can put the property out for public auction. We have done any number of things with tax deeded properties, selling it to abutters or that type of thing. There is a process in place that does take some time. I would note that the statute does provide that that lien extend to all the properties owned by the person, or in this case the entity so that we would have liens on the other properties. As I also stated, we are pursuing whether there is insurance on this building or not. We might be able to notify the insurance company that we are inserting a lien, which might get collected a little faster.

Alderman Osborne stated this puzzles me a little bit. The building definitely has to come down; there is no doubt about that, one way or another. Seeing as it is in my ward... Looking at these different bids that you have here to demolish, what is the big difference between these prices, from \$74,000 to \$30,000 to \$45,000? Why is there so much of a difference between these three bids? Is one of them just demolishing it and not taking it away?

Mr. LaFreniere replied the bids are required to meet our standards that we set forth, which is to remove the building and all the hazardous materials that may be contained therein and fill the foundation and loam and seed the site. They all are bidding on the same thing. The problem that we often face with fire damage buildings and conditions like this where we do not have possession of the property is we cannot authorize the contractors to go in and do a survey to determine what hazardous materials may exist. It may well be that some of these contractors have done more due diligence and made a more conservative estimation of what they might run into for hazardous materials and put a higher price in as a result and other think that they can do it for a cheaper price. I would use the opportunity of

your question to inform the board that it would be our intent to take the lowest qualified bidder. Because there is a fairly large discrepancy between the prices, we need to make sure that the lowest price is qualified so we would take the lowest qualified based on our assessment once we have the funding in place.

Alderman Osborne stated we are talking over twice the amount.

Mr. LaFreniere stated that does happen with these projects. Some of them do come in with a fairly wide range. This is not as straightforward as construction activities where everyone is putting the same materials into a building, there is a certain amount of speculation as to what the costs are going to be to remove the building and dispose of the hazardous materials. I think that is where the discrepancy lies.

Alderman Osborne stated I can see one of them coming from Lowell, Massachusetts, to here the \$46,000. Which one do you think is qualified?

Mr. LaFreniere replied I think we need to make that assessment after we have a chance to fully review the proposals and review the qualifications of the individual contractors.

Alderman Craig asked how long has the tax lien been on this property?

Mr. LaFreniere replied again, that is not something that I have tracked specifically. I can get that information for you. I don't know if the tax collector is here and has that information. The clerk may have it.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think the taxes have been owed since 2008. I think there is a process that has to be followed by the City and there must be some sort of redemption or a portion of it that has been redeemed.

City Clerk Matthew Normand stated on all four properties there are taxes owed back to 2008 that this individual has. I believe there is a lag time of three years. I think there is a three-year window, where if no payments are made, the City can go in and lien that property?

Alderman Craig asked so can we go in and foreclose on those properties?

Mayor Gatsas replied no, then you have to hold it for two years once it is deeded to the City because of whatever the timeframe is for taxes, they still have two years after that to recover the property come back in and pay you for it, whatever those liens may be and they can get the property back.

Alderman Craig stated I think it would be helpful to find out what the timing is on that or what the process is that has been followed. I just wanted to confirm that the lien that we have on the taxes and the demolition costs will be first paid if they pay anything so it will be before the mortgage payment. Is that correct in terms of order?

Mr. LaFreniere replied the tax lien will take precedent over any outstanding mortgage.

Mayor Gatsas stated and then the sewer lien and then this. The City is going to be into this property for about \$115,000.

Alderman Craig stated today.

Mayor Gatsas stated it keeps ticking. I'm not too sure if that is what the value of the land is.

Alderman Craig asked have we, as a City, considered outsourcing these types of situations where there are entities that will actively go after landlords or people who are not paying their bills and attach things so that they are more likely to pay. Have we considered that? Is that something that we do?

Mr. LaFreniere replied I believe we do that now in terms of the Finance Department utilizing the services of a collection agency for outstanding fees that are not tax related and then there is process for tax liens that is followed by the tax collector.

Alderman Craig asked so they do outsource?

Mr. LaFreniere replied I believe the Finance Department does outsource...

Alderman Craig interjected I'm talking specifically tax.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think you have to remember, Alderman Craig, that if someone comes in and there is \$50,000 that the individual owes, someone is going to come in and say to you, they are not going to give you \$50,000, they probably won't give you \$40,000 and they might not even give you \$30,000 because someone has to sit there and hold it for the time period that is available to the owner to reimburse themselves of those funds. They may come back in three years from now and say to the person yes, we are going to come in and we are paying the lien and they walk away with the property and the guy who gave you the money gets nothing. It is not easy.

Alderman Craig stated obviously it is not easy, I just feel like we could potentially be more aggressive in some of our collection efforts and I just want to make sure that we are looking at every option available.

Mayor Gatsas stated I agree and I think the State laws that are out there tell us how aggressive we can be, especially on property taxes. Maybe we can get the legislation changed.

Alderman Long asked on the aging summary, Leon, there is CGL four times owing \$7,356. Are those four different properties? Or is it one property? It is CE, which is the Planning and Community Development Department.

Mr. LaFreniere replied I don't have the report.

Mayor Gatsas stated yes, they have four different properties.

Alderman Long stated there are four different customer IDs so I'm assuming is it multiple properties.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I believe it would probably be four different properties.

Alderman Long asked for the solicitor, is there some way that we could include a resident who has been hurt? If they paid two months rent or whatever, is there something that we could include or do they have to go their own route?

Mr. Arnold replied as part of the City process, no, I don't believe so, Alderman.

Alderman Long stated you don't believe so, so there is a possibility.

Mr. Arnold stated Alderman, I do not know of any process where the City in collecting the charges or the monies owed to it can assert a claim on behalf of a building tenant.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't see, for one second, where the City of Manchester is going to get a dime back on this property. It seems like you have actually been very aggressive in tearing this building down. Is there another building on the lot that didn't get touched by the fire or was it one building and it got wiped out?

Mr. LaFreniere replied there are two buildings and they were both heavily damaged by the fire.

Alderman Levasseur stated so both of them are heavily damaged. Why can't we sell the property, as is, and the person who buys the property assumes the demolition and we don't have to put any money up front ourselves?

Mr. LaFreniere replied we don't own the property.

Alderman Levasseur asked if we don't own the property what gives us the right to demolish it?

Mr. LaFreniere replied a court order.

Alderman Levasseur stated if the other party that owns the property is not in the process of doing anything about it, whether it be through insurance or taking any kind of responsibility or any kind of action towards the demolition or the fixing up

of that property do we have no redress under that inactivity? It is obvious they are not coming back. They are not going to do anything with that property.

Mayor Gatsas stated there is a first mortgage holder on it.

Alderman Levasseur stated but the first mortgage holder is actually not a bank, it is an individual who gave this person money. They are not doing anything to come in and fix the property or demolish the property because...

Mayor Gatsas stated they didn't even force them to have insurance to cover his interest.

Alderman Levasseur stated I hear that there is talk going on as to whether we should check whether or not there is insurance. If there is insurance I would hate to have us go forward, put forward some money and then have this debate about what account it is going to come out of if in fact there is insurance. Why are in a rush to get this thing torn down? I'm glad we are, but it seems like there are a lot of properties that have been abandoned in the city... I think there are 140 of them. Why this one in particular? Is there a special issue that I am not aware of?

Mr. LaFreniere replied we took an action to file with the district court under RSA 155:B which allows us to petition the court to remove hazardous and blighted buildings where the owners are nonresponsive and that is the case here, the owner is completely nonresponsive. As part of the process to get the court order, not only was the owner, but all mortgage holders were also notified, all parties were nonresponsive and we have not been able to determine that there is any insurance. It appears that there is no insurance, but if there was, we would certainly pursue that. Through notification through the Solicitor's Office, we were typically pursuing this option. The reason we petitioned the court in this case was

because the fire rendered the building in a very hazardous state. I'm concerned that it remains a hazard to the neighborhood and it remains a hazard to the public because of the potential for starting another fire or a building collapse because the building has been compromised so significantly structurally. That is the reason we are pursuing this action.

Alderman Levasseur stated why I am going through this process of the questions I am asking is to lead to this next question. If in fact we have verifiable documentation and obviously a court order that proves that they are nonresponsive can we then create an ordinance that states that if they are nonresponsive after you go through a, b and c and then we can go forward with a foreclosure? Is that a State issue? Tom, do you know anything about that? Is it a State statute that controls the foreclosure and we don't have any power as a City to do something about that if we go through processes as we have already done?

Mr. Arnold replied State statute sets forth the procedure for dealing with a hazardous building. Yes, the short answer to you, Alderman, you would preempt from passing an ordinance dealing with that same subject. It is a relatively comprehensive statute that sets forth the procedure and how it is dealt with.

Alderman Levasseur stated the process is going to be we are going to clean it up, make it a safe area and then long do we have wait before we can actually start the foreclosure proceeding because I don't believe that that land is going to be worth... I hear lots selling in the \$60,000 range. This is going to cost us about \$135,000. We are never going to get that money back. Is there another plan going forward?

Mayor Gatsas replied there is no date that anyone can give you because the RSAs deal with us taking it by taxes and that gives them two years to come in and reclaim the property. All we are doing is tearing down a building and hoping that we are going to have an opportunity.

Alderman Levasseur asked we are still going to be subordinate to the original mortgage holder once we have this lien on it?

Mayor Gatsas replied no, we are in the first position for the sewer bill, the demolition and the tax.

Alderman Levasseur asked if we do go and sell the property then we will at least get the first part of that funding? If we sell it for \$100,000 we will get the full \$100,000 upfront? Correct?

Mr. Arnold replied yes.

Alderman Levasseur stated that gives us a little bit of hope that we will get some money back. Which fund are we taking it out of?

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to approve the request to transfer funds from the Economic development fund for the demolition of 333-335 Central Street. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

28. Report(s) of the Committee on Community Improvement, if available.

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Fire Chief be authorized to accept funds in the amount of \$102,346 from the New Hampshire Department of Safety for a Homeland Security grant for Wide Area Digital Network (West Side Fiber Ring).

(Unanimous vote)

*On motion of **Alderman Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Ludwig**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations.*

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Fire Chief be authorized to accept funds in the amount of \$600,000 from the New Hampshire Department of Safety for a Homeland Security grant for a Unified Command Vehicle.

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Greazzo who voted in opposition)

Alderman Greazzo stated in committee we were told that there were nine of these throughout the state. That is \$5.5 million. I'm not convinced that we actually need this. We already have a plethora of vehicles that show up on scene, above and beyond State vehicles that show up on scene. I have taken a look at what the vehicle is. It is basically an up fitted motor home for meeting space and a central command. We haven't needed it so far and I don't see that we need it now. We can take the money; it is whatever considered free money from the federal government. To the tune of \$600,000 we will get a piece of equipment that we will use once, twice, maybe three times a year, if that. I think that is about it. We are already functioning with this. If we don't start to refuse all this money that keeps coming to us, we are just going to put our country further and further in debt. It is great that they want to send us \$600,000 and it is great that they want to

send eight other communities in the state \$600,000 and they want to do that times the other states in the country that adds up to a lot of money and it is not something that I think we necessarily need. It would be great to have, but we are already communicating. I think that Alderman Craig brought up in committee was the flood at Door's Pond. I don't think we need a \$600,000 vehicle for people to have a meeting outside of the rain. For what? That is why I opposed it. I don't oppose the Fire Department going after these things for things that they need, but I don't necessary think that this is something that they need. This is nothing against the Fire Department, it is everything against the amount of money that this country spends on things that we just don't need.

Alderman Shea stated I asked the fire chief if it was necessary to have this vehicle, in order to improve public safety, and he indicated that it was and that is why I voted yes for this. He also indicated that there are other communities that can share in this particular item. He indicated that it would be useful, it would be helpful and it would add to the Fire Department. I voted yes.

*On motion of **Alderman Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Ludwig**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations. The motion carried with **Alderman Greazzo** voting in opposition.*

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Police Department to retain the vehicle scheduled to be replaced as part of the 2013 vehicle replacement plan and keep the new vehicle slated for the Legal Division be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

*On motion of **Alderman Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations.*

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from the Director of Planning & Community Development for various CIP project extensions be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

*On motion of **Alderman Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Ludwig**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations.*

*On motion of **Alderman Ludwig**, duly seconded by **Alderman Roy**, it was voted to recess the meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.*

***Mayor Gatsas** called the meeting back to order.*

27. Report(s) of the Committee on Finance, if available.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2013 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the FY 2013 CIP 412413 Unified Command Vehicle.”

“Amending the FY 2013 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Two Thousand Three Hundred Forty Six Thousand Dollars (\$102,346) for the FY 2013 CIP 412413 Wide Area Digital Network (West Side Fiber Ring).”

ought to pass and be enrolled.

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Greazzo who voted in opposition)

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to waive readings by titles only.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations. The motion carried with Alderman Greazzo voting in opposition to the Unified Command Vehicle.

29. Report(s) of the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance, if available.

The Committee on Human Resources/Insurance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the communication from the Public Works Director for a change in his current complement as follows:

- Addition of one Financial Analyst I
- Elimination of one Business Service Officer

be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Katsiantonis, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations.

30. Report(s) of the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic, if available.

There were no reports.

31. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2013 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the FY 2013 CIP 412413 Unified Command Vehicle.”

“Amending the FY 2013 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Two Thousand Three Hundred Forty Six Thousand Dollars (\$102,346) for the FY 2013 CIP 412413 Wide Area Digital Network (West Side Fiber Ring)

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Roy**, it was voted that the resolutions ought to pass and be enrolled. The motion carried with Alderman Greazzo voting in opposition to the Unified Command Vehicle.*

Mayor Gatsas stated I have one announcement. I received the first mentor volunteer for the project that we have started at the School District for professionals in the city volunteering their time or being mentors in the VLAC classrooms so we can do some distance learning. We have the first one in and hopefully others will follow.

Alderman O’Neil stated I would like to congratulate the new Hooksett police chief, Peter Bartlett, who I believe was sworn in tonight. He is a former Manchester police lieutenant. He was president of the supervisors union. I know I speak for the entire Board of Mayor and Aldermen wishing Chief Bartlett all the success. Also congratulate Brian O’Neill from the airport for successfully completing his certification program. Well done, Brian. We had talked about moving the meeting to January 22nd, but I learned after I met with most of you in the back that at least one alderman has made plans based on the fact that he

thought we were meeting on the 15th. With that said, I would like to suggest that we stay with the 15th. No one seemed to have a problem in the backroom with it whether it was the 15th or the 22nd. We will try to get the committees on that week so the following week we don't have much going on. One alderman already set up plans based on that. Finally, the Saint Patrick's Parade Committee is having a breakfast this Saturday at the Wild Rover Pub from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Come on down, have something to eat and help support the Saint Patrick's Day Parade Committee.

Alderman Roy asked are we going to have anything to do here next week? Then there is going to be a five week lag between the next one.

Alderman O'Neil stated but legally next week is the week. It is the third Tuesday.

Alderman Roy stated I understand that. Legally, last week was the week for this one. I get it. I'm just thinking about spacing and the fact that there is going to be nothing to discuss next week.

Alderman Arnold stated Mayor, the consultant for the IT package; are they coming in at the next meeting?

Mayor Gatsas replied BerryDunn, yes. They met with the appropriate people. They met again with Innoprise and had a conversation. They will be here at the next meeting to deliver their message to the board.

Alderman Arnold asked so if we are changing it to the 15th...

Mayor Gatsas interjected we are not changing it. The 15th is the day.

Alderman Arnold stated that's fine. Thank you very much for the clarification.

Alderman Levasseur asked so are we not moving it to the 22nd?

Mayor Gatsas replied my belief is that Alderman O'Neil has talked to people and someone has already made plans for the 22nd.

- 32. A motion is in order to recess the meeting to discuss strategy or negotiations with respect to collective bargaining pursuant to the provisions of RSA 91-A:2 I(a).**

The board did not recess the meeting.

TABLED ITEM

- 33. Petition to release and discharge a portion of Hayward North Back Street.**
(Note: Tabled 4/03/2012)

This item remained on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Arnold, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

City Clerk