

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

February 04, 2013

6:00 p.m.

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Shea, Craig, Greazzo
Alderman Gamache was absent

Messrs: F. McNeill, T. White, D. Preece, K. Sheppard, N. Campasano,
K. O'Maley, L. LaFreniere, T. Flemming, T. Arnold

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Summary of sewer abatement requests submitted by Fred McNeill, Chief Engineer.
(Note: Applications and backup documentation is attached.)

Alderman Shea moved to approve this item. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Roy stated Fred, if I could ask you to come up, I have a couple of questions. I've looked over all of these and the third one, which is the second #1, which is for 40 Sullivan Street; I think I read that there was a bill that was supplied. Did you get a bill for that? It said that there was a broken water heater and in my notes I wrote down 'the bill from the plumber' because it isn't in our notes and material.

Mr. Fred McNeill, EPD Director, asked this was at 112 Oak Street?

Chairman Roy replied no. This was at 40 Sullivan Street; a broken hot water heater.

Mr. McNeill replied yes, I think we got a bill as back-up to document the broken hot water heater.

Chairman Roy asked are you sure of that, because that's what I wanted to see. If there was a broken hot water heater, I don't have a problem with it. I just didn't see any documentation to that effect.

Mr. McNeill replied I don't believe it's provided in this package. I can see if we have that back-up back at the office.

Chairman Roy asked you do have it?

Mr. McNeill replied I'm not sure. I will check.

Chairman Roy stated the next one is 456 North Adam Street. I can understand that they bought the house and they didn't realize that the deduct meter was in but not connected properly, but that was in 2008. And I look at these bills of \$240 and \$537 and I would have thought that they would have come forward long before this knowing that they had a problem. It just kind of raises a flag for me.

Mr. McNeill responded I agree with that, however, it did meet the policy that we established in 2011, that is what the decision was based on to grant the abatement.

Chairman Roy asked did they have that situation rectified already? Do you know that they had that deduct meter hooked up correctly?

Mr. McNeill replied I believe they have. I can follow up and confirm that.

Chairman Roy stated would you please. I would appreciate that. Also, I think the best one for me was 1364 Chestnut Street; they installed the sprinkler system but they made a conscious decision not put in a deduct meter because of what their contractor said, and now that they have realized that their decision was a bad decision, they want us to bail them out.

Mr. McNeill responded yes, to a certain extent.

Chairman Roy stated after your explanations I can go along with all but that one. I'm not personally going to vote for 1364 Chestnut Street.

Mr. McNeill stated just so you know, with our past sewer bills that went out we've tried to increase the communication on the deduct meters, and you'll see a flyer inside your next invoice alerting the customers of that. Again, we're trying to get that word out.

Chairman Roy stated thank you.

Alderman Shea stated one of my judgments concerning this is due to the fact that when we discussed this, I believe that there was some sort of an agreement that the people would review these at your particular level and once they were reviewed by them, it was up to us to just kind of say okay, as long as they are reviewed we would not have any kind of a direct input. I appreciate the chairman doing that, but again, these all were reviewed I assume.

Mr. McNeill responded that is correct, Alderman Shea. They were reviewed by our office and the highway commission reviews them also, but ultimately the responsibility still lies with the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Shea asked so if we decide to concur with the alderman's judgment concerning that, we can say we don't recommend it and that would not be something that would violate that particular policy?

Mr. McNeill replied no, not the policy that we developed. It would not.

Alderman Craig stated a few years ago we didn't have a policy so we put one in place. It was my understanding that in doing so we would follow the requirements as stated and one of those was what kept happening was people didn't have a deduct meter and then they would come back again and again and again. Now we have said we give them an opportunity if they didn't have one, they get one chance.

Mr. McNeill responded that is correct.

Alderman Craig stated and so that is how I'm viewing the Chestnut Street option. That is one of the things that we discussed. But they do not have an opportunity to come back again with an excuse of I don't have a deduct meter so I deserve a rebate. That is why I'll be approving this.

Mr. McNeill responded because we have no jurisdiction enforcement to have them install a deduct meter, it is a recommendation on our part for cost savings.

*Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to approve the abatement requests.
The motion carried with **Alderman Greazzo** voting in opposition.*

*Aldermen Roy and Greazzo voted in opposition to grant a rebate for
1364 Chestnut Street. The motion failed.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Request from Mayor Gatsas to create a special account within CIP to accept the donation from MembersFirst Credit Union for underwriting and printing costs of the City newsletter.

*On motion of **Alderman Greazzo**, duly seconded by **Alderman Shea**, it was voted to approve this item.*

Chairman Roy addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission requesting a prioritized list of projects for Manchester for possible inclusion in the FY 2015 - FY 2024 Ten-Year Plan.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**, it was voted to discuss this item.*

City Clerk Matthew Normand stated there is also a handout before the committee that was passed out tonight.

Chairman Roy stated thank you for coming. Could you explain this please.

Mr. Tim White, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, stated thank you for the opportunity to address the committee. Kevin Sheppard from Highway has asked me to come and speak with you about the ten-year plan process. We're currently beginning the development of the FY 2015 - FY 2024 ten-year highway plan. The ten-year highway plan currently is developed on a two year cycle according to state law. The planning commission is going to be involved in the development of the next version of the plan along with our member communities, including the City of Manchester. Funding for transportation at the state and local level now is obviously a challenge. The DOT has let us know that their priorities for the development of the next ten-year plan are going to be maintaining the existing transportation infrastructure as well as addressing the red listed bridges that are in the state right now. Obviously the state's highest priority in terms of an individual project is the widening of the I93 corridor. I believe you all have a copy of our handout. If you could turn to the second page, I will just briefly explain the two-year cycle for the ten-year highway plan shown on the second page of the handout. If you go down to the bottom of the page under the heading implementation, it says after adoption by the legislature, metropolitan planning organizations incorporate approved projects into their transportation improvement program and the STP is updated. Basically last October we completed a regional air quality conformity determination as part of our responsibility as the metropolitan planning organization for the greater Manchester area. That means that we updated our transportation improvement program, our air quality analysis and our long-range plan. The first four years of the ten-year plan essentially consists of our regional TIP, which is the projects that are ready for implementation. The current version of the TIP is the FY 2013 - FY 2016 version of the transportation improvement program, and that basically represents the end of the cycle. As I said, we're just beginning a new cycle, so if you follow the arrows on that page all the way up to the top lefthand corner, basically that's where we are starting again. We're starting a new cycle and there's a project

solicitation letter that was sent out to the Mayor's Office that was dated January 11th. Basically what we are requesting is a list of prioritized projects from the City; we're also requesting the same list from our other member communities, as well as the Manchester Transit Authority and Manchester-Boston Regional Airport. Once we have received those prioritized lists, those particular projects will be reviewed by our technical advisory committee along with representation from our member communities, including the City of Manchester, that also has a couple of votes on our technical advisory committee. We're currently developing a methodology to rank those projects in hopes of coming up with a regional ranking, which we are supposed to be sending to the State by April 1st. At the same time, the rest of the regional planning commissions and MPOs in the state will also be sending a similar list to the DOT. The DOT will use that input to develop what will become the first draft of the new ten-year highway plan. The next time there will be an opportunity for significant public input into that plan will be this coming fall when the governor's advisory commission on intermodal transportation will hold a series of meetings to discuss that first draft of the ten-year highway plan. The next page of the handout just provides a little bit of local input in terms of some of the projects that are currently in the ten-year plan right now in the City of Manchester, some additional projects that are included in our long range plan, as well as one of the state listed bridges that's in the DOT system. Very briefly, some of those projects are Manchester 16099: there is currently money in the ten-year plan right now for engineering a planning study of exits 6 and 7 on I293. Manchester 14048: this is the rehabilitation of a bridge over Black Brook between exits 6 and 7 on I293. That project has currently been postponed pending completion of the exit 6 and 7 planning study. That is followed by red listed bridges on I293 at exit 4 that the DOT is currently addressing, followed by two bridge rehabilitation projects. Portsmouth-Manchester 20222: this is a project implementing a new bus service between Portsmouth, downtown Manchester, and Manchester-Boston Regional Airport. The four projects in the following list are

projects which represent other local priorities which are not included in the ten-year highway plan; they are projects which are currently in our long range transportation plan, and as I mentioned, there is one state red list bridge located in the city. So in terms of this particular upcoming ten-year plan cycle, I've mentioned that the DOT is going to be stating as their priority to maintain the existing transportation infrastructure and continuing to address those red listed bridges that they have in the program right now. The planning commission, through our technical advisory committee, including the City of Manchester, is going to be developing the ranking criteria for all of the projects that are submitted, and then they will also participate in the actual ranking of the projects that will eventually be sent to the DOT. That is a very, very brief outline of the process. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions anyone has at this time. Thank you again, aldermen.

Alderman Shea stated this is actually directed to David Preece. David, on February 7, 2011, you came before the board and this is almost two years later. My question is, in selecting different types of priorities, do you have a list that may be at the top of the list for say 2013 or 2014, however something comes along and pushes that particular item lower, and how do you people work in order to get certain types of projects to the point where they may be actualized. Could you explain a little bit about that?

Mr. David Preece, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission Director, responded those are all good questions. What we're asking each of our municipalities to do in this next month is to take a look at all of their projects to make sure that they are the most important projects that they would like to submit for the ten-year plan. If there is another project that is not on the list that would supplement a project that's currently on, you can recommend that that project be added to the ten-year list and that one of the projects that is currently on can be

taken off. Now, how we go about breaking that, as Tim mentioned, we are in the process now of coming up with a regional ranking system in which we will propose that to the technical advisory committee this month and it will literally be adopted by the MPO at their meeting on the 26th of February. We will then use that ranking system to rank all the projects that are within our region based on the criteria that has been adopted, and then we will submit that to the State on April 1st or soon after, and they will take a look at our rankings and then make a call based on the amount of money that is available and the other pressing needs that are facing the state.

Alderman Shea stated thank you.

Alderman Craig stated we have a couple of lists in front of us and both of them are different, and then in the letter that you sent us it said that the prior list from the City of Manchester had 16 projects on it. Can we get a copy of that? What we don't know is what projects we had submitted, and then who is the best person or is it all of the department heads who need to get together to review this list and then modify it?

Mr. Preece replied the list that was included in the presentation that the planning commission put together is basically just a list of the projects that are included in the ten-year plan right now. They aren't prioritized. And we also included the projects that are currently in our long range plan, which represent other local priorities that currently aren't included in the ten-year plan.

Alderman Craig asked so what is referenced here is these don't equal 16 projects, so that is just my question. What has been taken off and is it because they've been accomplished?

Mr. Preece replied the 16 projects that are included in the letter, I'd have to go back and check, but that probably includes projects that were from the Manchester Transit Authority, the transit projects, as well as the airport projects. They were probably included in that 16 that are referred to in the letter.

Alderman Craig asked is that what you're looking for from us again?

Mr. Preece replied we would probably be looking for input on road and bridge projects from the Planning Department and Public Works. We have a separate solicitation process that we usually undertake with the Manchester Transit Authority for their transit projects, as well as with the airport for their airport infrastructure. So there is kind of three processes working there at once.

Alderman Craig stated in my ward there's been talk of a rotary coming where it is 80% funded by the State on Campbell Street, and I was wondering if that could be considered or if this is not appropriate. I'd like your feedback.

Mr. Preece replied the City can certainly reestablish it's priorities for projects that the DOT is currently implementing and the City is currently implementing. I would think that because that project is currently being implemented by the State and the City, you might not want to include it in the list of projects that you'd like to see entered into the next version of the ten-year plan. It is so close to being implemented.

Alderman Craig stated it's on a list but we don't have funding for it from the City side.

Mr. Preece stated it's a 20% match, and that is going to be the hang-up because all of these projects require a 20% match.

Chairman Roy stated my question is to Kevin Sheppard. Kevin, you gave us a list here tonight that has six projects listed on the top, but on the bottom you've got three potential locations to be added. Should we do that now and then forward it to the full board so that they can have their say on this or what would you like?

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, replied Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission has asked that we get this back, I believe, by the beginning of March some time so they have arranged an opportunity to meet one more time for this committee before it goes out. But it would have to be reported to that first meeting directly out of this committee to the board.

Chairman Roy stated which I'd rather not do if we don't have to.

Alderman Craig stated I'd like to look at this and to talk about if anything can be added.

Chairman Roy stated my thought was that we could talk about this tonight, Kevin could work on it, and we could report this out two weeks from now and have that final document for the aldermen. But if the committee prefers we can wait until next month, that will be on the 4th but then we'll be reporting it out the next night, which is the 5th so that we can meet their March 8th deadline. If that's what the committee wants, I have no problems with it.

Alderman Craig stated I guess my only comment is that I would like the rotary considered, and if it is an opportunity to try to get this done, and Kevin, I would rely on your feedback, whatever you think.

Mr. Sheppard responded if you'd like, if you want to pass this through tonight, I can add those three projects at the bottom. I'd probably move them to the top list probably as 5, 6, and 7 trying to put the Manchester projects ahead of the state turnpike projects. Not that that, as Mr. Preece said earlier, Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission through the transportation advisory committee will be prioritizing all of the cities and towns and then it goes to the state and then goes back into a basket and gets re-prioritized once again. I'm sure at the local level our priorities will mean something and hopefully at the state level they will as well. I can follow-up with and speak to David Preece a little bit further about the question on that round-about on Campbell Street to see if there is a possibility of doing that. The other thing I'd be concerned about is I believe the ten-year plan deals a lot of times with state routes or areas outside of urban compacts, but I'd have to verify or talk to Dave a little bit more about that. But if you're okay, if we feel it's okay to add it or not to add it, then that would be the decision we'd make, David and I, or if you want it back to the committee before then or I could discuss it with you as well before we finalize it.

Chairman Roy stated we can essentially move on this tonight giving you direction that you need to put this together so that it can get to the board meeting in two weeks.

Mr. Sheppard replied sure.

Chairman Roy stated and you can address that round-about situation as well.

Mr. Sheppard replied sure, and I'll get that to the City Clerk's Office before the agenda for the next meeting.

Alderman Shea stated this is just a comment. Hasn't this Campbell Street situation been on the books since Alderman Roy was on the board, and that goes back I don't know how many years. I would tend to think at least four or five years. So maybe that should be something that's on it. I don't know if the City can work with the State about a matching fund for that, but I think it should receive some sort of consideration and priority.

Mr. Sheppard stated it's an expensive project and we do have some state funding for a piece of that project but not for the full project. I'll follow-up with Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission.

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to direct Mr. Sheppard to complete the list and get it to the full board in two weeks.

Chairman Roy addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Timothy Soucy, Public Health Director, requesting the board's approval of an arrangement which allows the Catholic Medical Center to receive ventilators and associated equipment from NH DHHS.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from Fire Chief James Burkush requesting approval to accept grant funds for a Fire Station Alerting System.

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

Mr. Nick Campasano, Deputy Chief Manchester Fire Department, stated the grant request that you have in front of you is for funding to replace our existing station alerting system. This system is installed in all of the stations throughout the city, and it provides audio, visual, alerting to the stations when our computerized dispatch sends a unit out, it turns on the lights, it opens up the speakers, provides a printout, a tearsheet for the personnel to grab, which has the address. That system, which is now 15 years old, was not designed for a digital fiber optic network. It is copper based, old technology, and this grant would allow us to replace the entire system.

Alderman Shea stated thank you for the explanation because I think that if we're going to get a new computer system, it is important that we update all of the different stations. I know in discussing with you, the understanding if one did look carefully at this, was that you're just replacing the fire station alerting system just at the new station, however, that's not the case. It is all of the different fire stations.

Mr. Campasano stated this would replace all of the units in all of the stations, as well as in the dispatch center.

Alderman Shea stated and then the other component is that to fulfill the bond issue it requires a \$24,100 match, which obviously would be available in the bonding that we set aside for Hackett Hill.

Mr. Campasano replied correct. There is an 80% - 20% split, a 20% match. Chief Burkush is requesting that. That money comes from the Hackett Hill station construction bond.

Alderman Shea stated thank you.

Alderman Greazzo asked deputy chief, is that something that was already sort of built into the bonding for that station? Upgrades on your alert system?

Mr. Campasano replied I don't believe that was the original. At the time that grant was not approved.

Alderman Greazzo asked is this going to be additional funding that we're going to be bonding or is this already covered?

Mr. Campasano replied no. Kevin can explain this.

Mr. Kevin O'Maley, Chief Facilities Officer, stated on the Hackett Hill project, I don't know if you know all of the details, but when we bid this out, we got very favorable bidding. The lowest bidder was 10% lower than the next lowest bidder, so we put those additional funds into project contingency that we've been using for things as they have been going along, and we're doing a pretty good with the project contingency, so we would take that \$24,000 out of that project for that reason.

Alderman Greazzo asked how much to you expect to have in reserve once the project is completed?

Mr. O'Maley replied it would be just a guess at this stage of the game but probably anywhere from \$20,000 to \$40,000, and that would be after we take out the request for the fire station alerting system.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting acceptance and reallocation of funds in the amount of \$381,851 for CIP project #612210 - Neighborhood Stabilization Program I.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting acceptance and reallocation of funds in the amount of \$12,500 for CIP project #810413 - Odd Fellows Improvements Project.

Alderman Craig moved to approve this item. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated I have a question for Leon. When do we hope that the occupancy of Odd Fellows will take place?

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Planning and Community Development Director, replied the project is under construction.

Alderman Shea asked are we 90% there?

Mr. LaFreniere replied we anticipate that the MCRC, which is approximately 60% of the building, will be ready for occupancy on March 9th and the remainder of the building within two weeks of that time. By the end of March this building will be completed and ready to occupy.

Alderman Shea asked and that will be in accordance with what the federal guidelines have said that we should be in by the first part of March or in March?

Mr. LaFreniere replied yes. Our benchmark is that we have the building 51% ready to occupy by March 9th, and we will exceed that.

Alderman Shea asked and all of the different people that said they were going to go into the Odd Fellows have agreed to go into it?

Mr. LaFreniere replied the key tenants have all agreed. We're still negotiating some of the smaller spaces, but we currently have more interest in the space than we have space available.

Alderman Shea asked would it be possible say at our February meeting, or the first part of March meeting, that you could let the committee know as to who is going to be in there so that there is some definitiveness to this particular project?

Mr. LaFreniere replied certainly.

Alderman Shea stated okay, thank you.

Chairman Roy called for a vote on the motion to approve this item. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Roy addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting a transfer of funds and a name change to bring the CIP into alignment with the Substantial Amendment and HUD's focus on Rapid Rehousing.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting to change the terms of assistance for the Lead Hazard Control Program.

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

Alderman Craig stated thank you for your letter, and as I was reading it I was thinking about what do other communities do, so it was helpful that you went through that. My only concern with changing it the way that you have suggested would be how you then determine who can take advantage of this. Will it be a

first come, first serve type of opportunity, will you limit it to so many units per landlord now? Have you thought about that?

Mr. LaFreniere replied with me is Todd Flemming from my office, and I know you know Todd and he is the program director for the Lead Hazard reduction grant. And on my right our program manager is Claude Rounds, who has been working with us for the last couple of months in assisting us with trying to get the program on track, and that is 100% of Claude's efforts at this point.

Mr. Todd Flemming, Senior Planner, stated I'll speak to that a little bit. With the program right now we have different priorities within our program guidelines. The number one priority would be if there is a poisoned child within a particular property; that is our number one priority of the program. The way it is right now is that when an application comes in, there is a lot of intake as far as verifying the incomes of the tenants in those units, and as soon as that is done, the project starts. We do a lead inspection and then we go through with the procuring contractor. Right now it is pretty much based on the pipeline that we have; it's on a first come, first serve basis. I think we've done 78 units now or proposing the total units to be completed and cleared would be 250 units, which we still have quite a few to go. If we get into a situation where our pipeline gets flooded with applicants, at that time we would start looking at where the different applicants fall within the priorities that are identified in our program guidelines. We have the ability to make changes as we go along based on what's happening. There are no hard and fast requirements from HUD when it comes to those issues.

Alderman Craig stated thank you for that explanation. I guess if we were to proceed with this, I would think you would have many more takers. My concern is that there are landlords in this city, or property owners, who own a number of apartments. So feasibly there could be one or two landlords who take advantage

of this, and I would prefer that we spread this among them, and obviously if there is a child who has been poisoned, that would be the priority. But I think that this should be available equally to everyone within the community, and that is my concern.

Mr. Flemming responded within past programs we've had, within our program guidelines, where owners are basically... There had been a per owner limit of how much money they can get through the program. But as the letter states, it's kind of a balancing act of us trying to meet our quarterly benchmarks and keep HUD happy that we're performing in accordance with our grant agreement so that comes into play. We have to look at it as we go along in the program.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I would add that the problem that you described is one that we need to be sensitive to, and frankly it would be not a bad problem to have right now because we're trying to anticipate ways that we can increase participation. With that said, we do have the ability, as Todd has referred, to make adjustments as we go along. I would propose that if we start to see an increase or a substantially increased level of participation or level of interest in the program, we can come back with different types of guidelines that could serve to regulate that sort of participation. There is an owner match that's part of this, and that, in and of itself, is somewhat self-regulating because we've found that that has had a significant influence on the people who want to participate in the program. So your point is well taken and it is something that we can and will react to if we see the levels of participation increase to that point. Our effort here with our active management having somebody looking at the intakes as they come in in real time on our payroll here, is to make sure that the program is administered in such a way that we get the best bang for our buck, that we're getting the most units cleared and we're getting the units cleared that represent the highest level of hazard to the citizens. We will definitely keep an eye on that.

Alderman Shea stated I realize, maybe my figures are wrong so you can correct me, it just says that you've received three grants totalling \$6,643,111, that's the total amount, and you have spent now \$3.9 million and repaired 78 units. If you add 78 and 78, that's 156, and that is not enough money to repair 250. If you get more requests and you do not have the money for it, what happens in that case?

Mr. Flemming replied just some clarification. The current grant that we have is \$3.9 million total and we haven't expended that amount.

Alderman Shea stated oh, you haven't.

Mr. Flemming replied no. I would say at this point we've expended right around \$1.1 million.

Alderman Shea asked for the 78 units?

Mr. Flemming replied right, and there are other things in there.

Mr. LaFreniere stated and the previous grants have already been expended, we're beyond those, and in each of those grants we met all our benchmarks. So we were successful and cleared the number of units that were part of our program parameters. As Todd has explained, we're a third of the way into this latest grant round.

Alderman Shea stated thank you. I was just kind of confused there.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this item, with Alderman Greazzo voting in opposition.

Chairman Roy addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Request for lien subordination totaling \$56,480 for 211 Douglas Street property.

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

Chairman Roy stated on this lien subordination; I believe the individual is looking to refinance. They're going to continue the lien in the second position, which it is now, and they're not taking any money out of the loan.

Mr. LaFreniere responded that is correct, which is the parameters that the committee has found appropriate in the past.

Chairman Roy stated I just wanted to make sure that it was straight in my mind. Thank you.

Alderman Shea stated I have a question for the city solicitor. I'm assuming you have reviewed this.

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, replied I looked at the documentation provided with the agenda this afternoon, and it would appear that it is within the Planning Department's guidelines, so to speak, and in line with past actions by this committee. We wouldn't have an objection.

Alderman Shea asked you have no objections? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Arnold replied yes.

Alderman Shea asked and he's reviewed it with you in terms of it.

Mr. LaFreniere replied yes.

Alderman Shea asked and it concurs with what we have discussed with other kinds of situations?

Mr. LaFreniere replied with previous practice and policy.

Alderman Shea asked can we assume that we're going to get one of these each meeting because it seems that the last few meetings we've had these? Is there something that is available for information for these?

Mr. LaFreniere replied it's hard to say. But what's been driving these, and the reason you have been seeing so many of them, is because of the favorable interest rates for permanent financing. The ones that you've seen for people other than this particular company, are typically because they have refinanced their property and are taking advantage of the lower rate. That is the typical situation. In the case of this company, when they go in, they do a significant rehab, of which the lead remediation is only a small portion, usually with construction financing and then they convert that to a lower rate, permanent financing after the building is completed. So that is why this company has come in for several of them, and their intent is to hold the properties and not take additional equity out but just to convert to permanent financing.

Alderman Shea asked can we expect additional requests in this vein, because I think we've been seeing these now the last few meetings.

Mr. LaFreniere responded you have, and I think that as long as the interest rates stay favorable or keep going down and people can take advantage of a lower interest rate, we may continue to see them. I can't really say that this is a phenomenon that's going to continue or not. It really kind of depends on the market.

Alderman Shea stated thank you.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. LaFreniere, will they still be in the same position once they refinance?

Mr. LaFreniere replied yes.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Discussion relative to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I would have offered up the status of the Odd Fellows building but we have already done that. I think that is all there is, and I'll come back to the next meeting with how the tenant configuration is coming along.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, 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 prominent initial "M".

Clerk of Committee