

3/26/96 CIP

1

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

March 26, 1996

6:30 PM

Chairman Robert called the meeting to order.

Clerk Johnson called the roll.

PRESENT: Ald. Robert, Wihby, Reiniger, Clancy, Domainque

MESSRS.: Assistant Solicitor Arnold, R. Houle, W. Jabjiniak,
C. Johnson, R. MacKenzie, J. Taylor, R. Girard

Chairman Robert indicated he would address agenda items out-of-sequence this evening.

Chairman Robert addressed item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Nike Speltz, Program Officer, Norwin S. and Elizabeth N. Bean Foundation, advising that the City Clerk's Office has been awarded grant funds in the amount of \$6,000.00 to support fees of a trained archivist and other expenses associated with a review of the 150 years of records of the City of Manchester.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Wihby, it was voted to approve acceptance of grant award.

Chairman Robert addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Hugh Moran, Personnel Director, requesting two parking spaces in the vicinity of City Hall Annex once District Court has vacated the premises.

Chairman Robert stated the request was part of a needs assessment currently being conducted by the Mayor's Office and the Public Building Services Department and recommended that the Committee refer it to Mr. Houle with the pending needs assessment.

Ald. Clancy stated the request was for parking spaces so employees would not have to pay \$30 or so in the garages and suggested if it were four spaces that were available they should be divided up.

Chairman Robert suggested that the request from this department be forwarded to Mr. Houle with other such requests to see who would need them the most.

3/26/96 CIP

2

Ald. Clancy stated he had been told they were promised from the previous Board to get two spaces.

Ald. Wihby stated that was untrue; that a procedure had been set up previously where spaces would be given to those with most seniority and moved that it be forwarded to Dick Houle along with the requests from the City Solicitor's and Ordinance Violations asking for a spot also. Ald. Domainque duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Robert addressed item 8 of the agenda:

1992 Budget Authorization:

8.30331 Building and Facilities Reserve Program -
Revision #2

On motion of Ald. Wihby, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve the 1992 budget authorization.

Ald. Domainque in reference to \$700,000 for land acquisition asked if that was for purchase of more property.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that was for the previous authorization noting there had been some thought about buying some additional property in the City but what was being proposed now was under the proposed section noting those funds would be going towards construction improvements of City Hall and the Annex.

Chairman Robert addressed item 9 of the agenda:

1996 Budget Authorizations:

2.20505 Youth Smoking Prevention - Revision #1-Closeout
8.30340 ADA Compliance/City Hall/Annex Renovations -
Revision #2

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Domainque, it was voted to approve the 1996 budget authorizations.

Chairman Robert addressed item 10 of the agenda:

A Resolution amending the 1996 Community Improvement Program by adding Pediatrician Collaborative - \$4,995.60 NH Dept. of Education.

Ald. Domainque asked if it was a flat grant or was the City contributing any money towards it at all.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied it was a flat grant from the State.

On motion of Ald. Wihby, duly seconded by Ald. Domainque, it was voted to recommend that the amending resolution be approved.

3/26/96 CIP

3

Chairman Robert addressed item 11 of the agenda:

A Resolution amending the 1996 Community Improvement Program by increasing 1996 CIP 4.20104 Juvenile Jail Removal - \$7,756.00 (increasing the budget from \$55,000 to \$62,756), and related budget authorization.

On motion of Ald. Reiniger, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to recommend that the amending resolution and budget authorization be approved.

Chairman Robert addressed item 12 of the agenda:

A Resolution amending the 1996 Community Improvement Program by adding 1996 2.20710 HIV Education Services - \$90,722, and related budget authorization.

On motion of Ald. Wihby, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to recommend that the amending resolution and budget authorization be approved. Ald. Robert was duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Robert addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Jay Taylor, Industrial Agent, submitting a draft Request for Proposals for 88 Lowell Street.

Mr. Taylor stated the Committee had requested he and Dick Houle to proceed with working toward the disposition of the property at 88 Lowell Street indicating that was the result of their collaborative efforts to put together an RFP and was for the Committee's information; that he had taken the liberty of communicating with Clerk Johnson of the Corporation, Amoskeag Industries to advise them of what the City was doing as they did have a reverter waiver opportunity on the property if and when the City decided to dispose of it and to ask them in advance for their cooperation when the City would get ready to dispose of such property; that on page 2 of the draft RFP there was a listing of items which they felt were appropriate which needed to be addressed in the proposals; that they would proceed with it and report back to the Committee with proposals and a recommendation.

Ald. Reiniger moved that the property be disposed of in accordance with the draft request for proposals. Ald. Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Ald. Wihby stated when the RFP's were returned the City was not stuck with something if Amoskeag Industries said no.

3/26/96 CIP

4

Mr. Taylor replied that would be the intent; that they could refuse to take any action on any RFP's received if there was good reason to do so; that it was his understanding that the reverter stated if the building ceased to be used for a public purpose that it would revert back, so as long as the City was using it for some public purpose, whatever that might be, it didn't revert and asked Assistant Solicitor Arnold if he had actually seen the reverter language.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold replied it was not currently being used but was still owned by the City.

Mr. Taylor stated Amoskeag Industries had always been cooperative in working with the City on the requests noting there had been a number of them in the past, so he didn't expect to have problems.

Ald. Wihby asked if they were planning on advertising in the newspaper to notify those individuals who had shown an interest.

Mr. Taylor replied they would contact those who had submitted requests relative to consideration on the property.

Chairman Robert addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from the Special Building Committee relative to the rehabilitation of City Hall and City Hall Annex.

Mr. Houle stated a Request for Proposals from architects had been conducted for rehabilitation of City Hall and City Hall Annex; that they were looking at keeping the same departments in the two buildings and perhaps adding the Planning Department which was predicated on the fact that District Court had effectively moved out and would maintain possession of the property until the last day of March; that as part of the study they were asking the architect to take a look at all of the previous studies, interview the department heads and determine their space needs and assist in developing space standards noting the space standards were important so that hopefully they would bring them into the Committee and space would be allocated on specific standards for various types of work; that they were talking about development of space plans and phased multi-year work program so that some people would be able to move into the second floor of the Annex once that space had been rehabbed and completed with minimal disruption to current municipal operations; that they were asking that the Committee authorize a Special Building Committee to assist it made up of Bob MacKenzie, himself, Armand Gaudreault, Walter Stiles, and Leo Bernier be added to the group because of their work with the fund raising for the buildings; that as a Special Building Committee they would bring back to the Committee on CIP space plans for their approval as to how they see the project moving forward and would also bring the conceptual design, the rough layout as to how they would see the

3/26/96 CIP

5

building looking and would also bring the construction contracts for approval and if there were any variations in the project after that they would come back to the Committee and that was how they saw the Special Building Committee interacting with the Committee on CIP; that they received three proposals: one from AG Architects, PC (\$412,700); one from Corzilius Matuszewski Krause Architects, PA (\$290,000); and Lavallee/Brensinger Professional Association (\$258,500); that the Committee was recommending that the contract for architectural services be awarded to Lavallee/Brensinger.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he had made a presentation to the former Committee on Lands & Buildings last fall which Committee authorized the staff to continue working on it noting that was why that were at that particular point; that he did have information but it was up to the Committee as to what specifically they wished him to report on.

Mr. Houle commented with prior action there would now be \$1.5 million for the \$2.5 to \$3 million project and that a good portion of the funding was in place to move forward with the project.

Ald. Clancy asked what they had in mind relative to which departments would be placed there.

Mr. MacKenzie replied there were currently a number of departments which were severely overcrowded (i.e., City Clerk's Office, City Solicitor's Office); that there were facilities which were not very good noting it did not leave a very good impression; that they would like to rehab City Hall and were working on a one-stop shopping concept so if customers came to the City they could go to one place rather than bounced around from department-to-department to pay bills, etc.; that they also had issues which would probably come back to the Committee such as the Aldermanic Chambers which appeared to be pretty crowded at times and one option they had looked at was putting the Chambers back on the top floor where it had been originally and having larger space for the public to come into; that, however, did have a lot of implications which would start moving departments around if they chose to go with that option; that they also looked at the option of bringing in departments that lease into the building, but they would have more information for the Committee once the architect had completed the preliminary space plan.

Ald. Wihby noted there had been a space plan done previously and noted they would be paying these big bucks to have it done again.

Mr. Houle replied the big bucks in that aspect was not for the space plan; that the architect would be charged with reviewing all of the prior studies and to meet with each department head once more and probably to meet with the Special Building Committee on several occasions; that \$2 to \$2.5 million would be spent on improvements and did not see a lot of money being spent

3/26/96 CIP

6

for space; that all of the studies had been included as part of the request for proposals; that Lavallee/Brensinger had been intimately involved with most of the plans and had been as they were the architects for the NYNEX Building and they previously had submitted a proposal to the City for a new City Hall Annex and had used an earlier space plan and thought they helped in their lower price but did not see a great deal of money being spent on a space study per se.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Wihby, it was voted establish the Special Building Committee and to advise that a contract in the amount of \$258,500 would be awarded to the firm of Lavallee/Brensinger PA for the rehabilitation of City Hall and City Hall Annex.

Chairman Robert addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning, providing an informational update on the Enterprise Community Program.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he had kept the former Committee on CIP updated on what was called the Enterprise Community Program which was a \$3 million federal grant over five years to improve conditions in the central area of the City; that there was an Advisory Board made up of local businessmen and residents of the area which was giving guidance on the projects; that the first major part of the project was a Community Policing Program funded from it, had been implemented, and had been very effective to date; that they were now in the process of taking care of some of the jobs related parts of the Enterprise Community Program one of them being the Incubator Program and another being Summerbridge; that he would probably be providing information to the Committee every couple of months or so.

Ald. Reiniger asked what some of the locations being explored were.

Mr. MacKenzie replied they hadn't pinned down any specific locations; that they would like to define what services would go in there, what type of activities, what type of information as they may want to gear it towards job training, jobs available and then they would go out to request proposals as to what entities might be able to provide those services; that there had been a series of meetings with the residents which would be on-going for the next month to see what they were looking towards for the facility.

Ald. Clancy in reference to jobs noted the inner-city kids looked as though they could use jobs, but there were quite a few who could use the money and if they could get some sort of a job would be much appreciated, so if they could find any type of jobs for these individuals he was sure they'd be able to get some good

3/26/96 CIP

7

kids who could work there; that the Policing Program was working out real well.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Robert, it was voted to receive and file the communication from Mr. MacKenzie.

Chairman Robert stated it had come to the attention of the Mayor's Office that the County was not willing to go after or pursue replacement costs indicating the City lacked the leverage to force the issue and felt they would have to decide what to do with the money that was received (\$107,000).

Chairman Robert addressed item 15 of the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Mayor Wieczorek to the Hillsborough County Commissioners requesting that the County pursue replacement costs for the Pine Island 4-H Center.

Ald. Domainque inquired of the Chairman which item he wished to discuss first; that the community from Mayor Wieczorek was pretty clear noting they had tried their best to try and communicate to the County that the City needed the replacement coverage and the County Commissioners had determined that they were not going after it.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Wihby, it was voted to receive and file the copy of a communication from Mayor Wieczorek to the Hillsborough County Commissioners.

Chairman Robert addressed item 16 of the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Kathleen Giacomponello to Mayor Wieczorek in response to his letter dated March 12, 1996, advising that the County after considering all of the factors involved have determined that they would not reconsider their position to seek replacement value of the Pine Island 4-H Center.

Ald. Domainque in reference to the letter dated March 14th indicated she was very disturbed by the tone of the letter and the fact that in going over the letter paragraph-by-paragraph there were several contradictions that did not reflect the position of the City and knew so because she had sat in on one of the meetings the letter had made reference to and the people who were in attendance at the February 21st meeting were representatives of Parks and Recreation, Mr. Arnold, County Commissioner Pappas, Kathy Giacomponello and no less than three times in that meeting she informed the people present that while she was a sitting Aldermen she did not represent the majority of either the Committee that would do it nor did she represent the entire will of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen; that she believed

3/26/96 CIP

8

that Parks and Recreation had also made a similar statement that they could not represent the authority of the Board and despite that the County Commissioners decided, took a vote on someone's recommendation to send back \$107,000, but the contradictions in the letter were rampant; that the County never actively pursued the replacement costs for the Pine Island 4-H Center without tying the replacement costs to a 99-year lease, they never independently on behalf of anyone pursued replacement costs on that policy, they did not write to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen until January 26th and prior to that all the dates seen referred to discussions, not written communications; that the current Board did not take office until January 2nd with their first full Board meeting being held on January 16th and the first meeting of this Committee did not take place until February 6th, so the Committee did not have a copy of the communication until the first Board meeting on January 16th and subsequent to that the first Committee meeting.

Ald. Domainque moved that the Committee sit down and map out a response to the letter identifying the accuracy of what actually took place on the Board's part and send it to the Commissioners because this letter was coming from the Business Manager, not the Commissioners and wanted to make the Commissioners aware certainly as a member of the Board and this Committee noting those programs were very important and the City had been waiting to hear from the County on their commitment to the 4-H Program with funding; that they had referred to their budget but there was no indication that they had communicated to the City that they intended to keep it in their budget; that there had been an awful lot of talk and very little commitment on the part of the County and wished to pursue it by sending them a communication outlining the City's chronology of events as they took place and the City's desire to see them respond with their commitment to the programs before they could move forward.

Ald. Reiniger duly seconded the motion.

Ald. Wihby stated that the County was saying that on November 28th they had a meeting with somebody and asked does anybody know who they met with on November 28th and why didn't that person come to the City then or send a communication to the Aldermen then.

Mr. Girard stated that was a question Mayor Wieczorek had when he read the letter noting they still did not have an answer to it and aside from the contradictions that Ald. Domainque had brought up and the inconsistencies and the timelines; that to their knowledge in the Mayor's Office there were several; that the one thing that the Mayor wished the Committee to know what that in the first paragraph the Mayor's Office did not know who that "City Official" was as it had not been disclosed and the other thing was that the Mayor had mentioned at the last Committee meeting that he was going to ask the County Commission for all of the communications that were allegedly sent and knew the Mayor

3/26/96 CIP

9

had followed that up with Commissioner Pappas noting they had not yet received anything; that they did recover all of the communications that Parks and Recreation had on file regarding the matter and to say that the County sent several would be something of a huge overstatement because he thought there were two including the one with the 99-year lease; that he could not recall the first one exactly but it was basically to inform the City that there was a fire; that the Mayor had several concerns relative to the County's response noting they had indicated a complete lack of willingness to pursue replacement costs; that Parks and Recreation had questioned the County's commitment to the program at all noting he did not want to speak on behalf of Parks and Recreation but believed Mr. Ludwig had mentioned such at a prior meeting and at that point the Mayor did not think that there was any other real option with the County other than what Ald. Domainque had suggested in trying to recover the demolition costs which they believed they had agreed to take care of to take the building down and secure the site for the City and reiterated that the Mayor was not pleased with the letter at all.

Chairman Robert in reference to demolition costs asked Mr. Girard if the Mayor's Office would pursue it.

Mr. Girard believed the Mayor had already held a discussion with the County and thought that in a recent newspaper story a County office and believed it to be Commissioner Pappas, but was not sure that the County had committed to demolition costs; that apparently the trick was if demolition costs are accepted and the building is knocked down you would really forego any possibility of replacement costs and apparently the insurance company would write that check so fast it would make heads spin, so they could wash their hands of the whole situation.

Chairman Robert asked was he then to believe that the Mayor's Office was working on it; that if the Committee wished he would relay the Committee's wishes to the Mayor so he could pursue it to have it brought to a conclusion as soon as possible, pursuing demolition costs that is.

Ald. Domainque stated she had no problem with that, however, with the motion on the floor she thought something should still be put in writing counteracting that particular correspondence if only for the need to be factual because their claim all the way through the letter was that the City had put nothing in writing to them and thought at least if the City formally took that action they at least had an idea as to where the City was coming from as well; that in looking at page 2, paragraph 4 of the letter the County acknowledged that they advised Commissioner Allen of the need for formal action of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and yet further down in the last paragraph they acknowledged the fact that they sent the \$107,000 check having as she had stated earlier been advised that the Board had to take a formal action to receive it, they went ahead and sent it without formal action of the Board which was a clear contradiction.

3/26/96 CIP

10

Chairman Robert stated he would have no problem with the letter so long as the main focus of it would be to try and save the programs that are over there and asked who would write the letter.

Ald. Wihby suggested Ald. Domainque and the Mayor's Office.

Mr. Girard stated if the Committee wouldn't mind waiting until after the Mayor proposed his budget to the Board he would be more than happy to assist in that endeavor.

Ald. Domainque stated so long as the City would not be holding up the County again and putting ourselves in a position of being accused of being unresponsive.

Ald. Domainque proposed that she would draft a letter and have the Mayor's Office take a look at it.

Ald. Clancy suggested the Mayor get in touch with the Building Commissioner, Armand Gaudreault, as he had jurisdiction over demolition of buildings and thought he might have ways of having the building torn down.

Chairman Robert called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 17 of the agenda:

Communication from Carolyn Gargas, Chair, Hillsborough County Cooperative Extension Advisory Council, advising that they intend to exercise their option to terminate their lease with the City of the Pine Island facility located at 2849 Brown Avenue within thirty (30) days of receipt of the letter.

Ald. Domainque moved to receive and file the communication from Carolyn Gargas and stated she had called and talked with Carolyn asking her why her letter seemed to indicate that they were uncertain that they even had a beneficial relationship with the City noted her response was that she had received word as a member of the Cooperative Extension Council that the City had no intention or had little intention of replacing the building and did not know where that communication was coming from but clearly noted the communication had to be fine tuned between the County and the UNH Extension and the City of Manchester.

Ald. Reiniger duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

3/26/96 CIP

11

Chairman Robert addressed item 13(4) of the agenda:

(4) Request for discussion of policy on return of properties to former owners. (See enclosed communication from City Clerk's office.)

Chairman Robert addressed item 13(1) of the agenda:

Reports from SPOT Team regarding:

(1) So. Mammoth Road (Atty. Kennedy for J. King and Ronald Doucet requests)

Note: Recommendation of staff is to declare surplus to City needs and dispose through public auction. Two requests from adjacent property owners have been received, one of which was owner of the property together with two other parties. (See communication from Planning.)

Chairman Robert addressed item 13(2) of the agenda:

(2) Wolf Park/Wheelock Street Property

Note: Recommendation of staff is to deny request for exchange of property on Hanover Street. (See enclosed communication from City Clerk's Office.)

Chairman Robert addressed item 13(3) of the agenda:

(3) 397 Spruce Street, request of Beverly Foshier

Note: Recommendation of staff is to table this item. The subject property, while taken through tax deed, is not clearly the City's parcel due to FDIC, Banc One and a new mortgagee involvement. At present, if the mortgagee elects to pay the taxes, the property will not be available for sale by City; if the mortgagee elects not to pay the taxes the property can then be sold as surplus through public sale.

Clerk Johnson stated item 13(4) dealt with a policy issue which had been raised by the SPOT Team; that historically the City has had requests for return of properties which were taken for a lack of taxes paid; that traditionally the City had returned in many instances at the cost of the taxes as if they'd been paid and all the expenses of conveying the property back to property owners; that they had happened typically in cases where there was a residence that someone had been living in and they lost it or the husband or parent died or somebody was suppose to have been paying in the family and it got fouled up, the City took it and somebody came back indicating they'd like to get it back; that there were requests before the Committee this evening to return a

3/26/96 CIP

12

property to an owner or actually one of three owners that originally had the property; that the issue came up because of the fact that economic times had changed and there was an action by the Board as late as last year not to return a piece of property that was taken via tax deed because it was felt that the City could not be the bank and in essence if you're taking the property, you shouldn't be handing it right back to somebody, they should have paid the taxes when they were due; that it was obviously a human issue and it was something that the Committee did not feel comfortable making those sorts of decisions; that there were differences as pointed out with specific property being requested this evening on the agenda but the Team was not sure how the Committee felt in terms of the requests they would anticipate coming in because with the number of tax deeded properties that had been taken back by the City the issue would come back again and again during the course of the next couple of years and while the Team knew what the thinking of the Lands & Buildings Committee was in prior years they were unsure what the Committee was feeling at this point in time, so they wanted to raise that issue with the Committee; that obviously each case would be a case-by-case basis and it could be while the Committee might feel it the Team could recommend something different for X, Y, or Z reasons but they wanted to bring it to the forefront for discussion; that the staff recommendation was if the property was owned by the City, while human issues needed to be looked at and if it was a residence then they would probably want to look at that issue in general terms it probably should be placed up for public sale which was in the best interest of the City overall reiterating the Team was not sure how the Committee felt about it.

Ald. Wihby stated if there wasn't a public auction then things could look "fishy", favoritism or things of that nature; that if it was a residence they could perhaps look at it differently, but if it were a piece of land he didn't know how something could be sold without having an auction.

Ald. Domainque asked if there had been previously established policy(ies) from either the Board itself or the Committee on Lands & Buildings as to how long the City would wait before taking action on a piece of property; that in reference to a letter from Attorney Kennedy he referred to real estate taxes not being paid dating back to 1991 and that the City took over the property in 1994 noting a two-year period of time had elapsed.

Clerk Johnson replied there had been no official policy of the City in any of those instances; that there had been situations where the Board had acted to allow conveyance of the property back to the owners; that there were very few requests presented to the Board in years past and the economic conditions were quite different then than they obviously had been in the last few years and thought that was part of the basis of the recommendation of the staff as well; that the City had taken many more properties in the last couple of years than it ever did in the past for

3/26/96 CIP

13

obvious reasons but there was no official policy noting each case was looked at on a case-by-case basis and in most cases there was obviously some family ties to the property.

Ald. Domainque stated in the absence of a time frame, a piece of property would either stay with the City until such time as it was determined to release it for back taxes paid or that the taxes would be paid and the person would request the City to give back the property, in other words the City would not have, until last year, offer it for auction.

Clerk Johnson replied the City had acquired numerous properties over the years noting those properties had not been reviewed for disposition unless a request was received.

Ald. Clancy stated he had attended an auction last year noting the City had made out pretty well; that if someone wanted the building they could place a bid on the property and it was fair to everybody, advertise the auction.

Ald. Reiniger recalled having seen an Ordinance that in order for an owner to buy back property needed to pay fees and back taxes.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold stated he did not believe there was; that there were provisions for deeding taxes prior to the tax deed and would have to research it further to answer the question firmly noting he would.

Ald. Reiniger stated he felt uncomfortable with the City viewing it as a major windfall for itself in that someone ran into hard luck and lost their job and couldn't pay their taxes and all of a sudden they had the money, it was their property and if they wished to step forward and pay the City what the City was owed noted he felt uncomfortable having the City say we have a chance to sell it and make money - that was not what the City should be doing.

Clerk Johnson stated the other issue which had arisen at the staff team meeting in terms of precedence was would the City really want to set a precedence of saying to people, yes you can come back to the City and get your property back if you don't pay taxes or establish it as a regular policy of the City noted staff did not think that was in the best interest either.

Ald. Reiniger stated perhaps a time limit could be set.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the standard procedure was if the City got property tax deeded it was suppose to go through public sale and that historically or what they had been doing recently was through auction; that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen could, by special ordinance, dispose of properties other ways and they could dispose of it in that regard if somebody had a family homestead that they had paid taxes on and what to redeem it thought the Board had considered that in the past, but the normal

3/26/96 CIP

14

process was public sale and that was what the staff had been gearing towards as there were a lot of tax deeded properties in the City and they had been trying to get it back onto the tax rolls.

Chairman Robert asked would they want to send it through the regular process or did they want to do something special.

Ald. Clancy moved that it be sold at auction. Ald. Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Ald. Domainque asked what they were addressing as she believed the Committee had been dealing with policy question and not individual properties noting she had heard that there was no written policy as to how they actually did or not.

Chairman Robert stated he was not sure if the Committee would be able to get one but knew there was an ordinance and asked if the Committee wanted to become familiar with the ordinances pertaining to it prior to addressing the other requests, did the Committee wish to develop an idea as to how the Committee wanted to handle such items.

Ald. Wihby stated in the past the Committee had looked at all of the properties and it had been addressed in the budget process asking the Tax Collector what was out there and would have some of the Assessors go out with two or three others placing values on the properties and had tried different approaches such as receiving bids, minimum bids, auctions and thought the policy they had had was that the City would go out and let the SPOT Team decide noting he had no problems with their recommendations and the properties had to be reviewed on a one-by-one basis and did not want to set a certain policy but anytime that property is sold he did not think that items such as 13(1) would have to go out to bid because otherwise there would be concerns on both sides and did not know if there were any ordinances in the City.

Ald. Reiniger stated he felt more comfortable hearing about the State Statutory requirements for redemption of property and also more information about the existing ordinances.

Chairman Robert agreed stating it made a lot of sense and asked the members of the Committee if they wished more time to study it and perhaps carry over this evening's agenda items to another meeting and asked Assistant Solicitor Arnold if he could review it quickly.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold stated next week would give him plenty of time; that there was the City Surplus Property Ordinance which stated there was the public auction or could be disposed of otherwise with a finding of just cause; that there was also a State Statute RSA 80:80 which provided that where property had been tax deeded that it was to be disposed of by auction or sealed bid or similar mechanism or the City, by ordinance, could

3/26/96 CIP

15

dispose of it in some other manner other than public auction or sealed bids noting he would do further research into redemption rights subsequent to a tax deed and report back to the Committee by the next meeting.

Ald. Reiniger moved to refer to the City Solicitor's Office review of the laws of redemption of property and report back to the Committee.

Chairman Robert stated he would feel more comfortable if the Committee were more thoroughly familiar with the laws prior to moving forward and then be in a position to be able to make value judgments.

On motion of Ald. Reiniger, duly seconded by Ald. Domainque, it was voted to table item 13(1), 13(3), and 13(4).

On motion of Ald. Wihby, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to recommend that a request by Danais Realty Group on behalf of Thornton & Thornton, PA for exchange of property on Hanover Street be denied.

Mr. Girard interjected he knew the Committee was pushing into another Committee meeting, however, there was another tabled item which needed to be addressed this evening stating he was happy to say it could be cleared off of the agenda (#22) regarding the School to Work and Serve America Programs; that the Mayor had been able to work with Superintendent Bernard and had a much better understanding of the money; that there was also a letter from the Superintendent regarding the programs which indicated they were not seed money and that in the future when the federal funds would be gone it would not fall to the property taxpayers to support it and based on that assurance which the Superintendent had given the Mayor would like to have the item taken off the table and approved this evening.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Wihby, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion.

A Resolution amending the 1996 Community Improvement Program by adding Serve America FY 96 - \$3,000 and School to Work FY 96 - \$80,000.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Wihby, it was voted to recommend that the resolution be approved.

Discussion of land on James Pollock Drive.

This item was not addressed.

3/26/96 CIP
16

TABLED ITEMS

Request of the Building Commissioner to demolish the Pine Island 4-H Center.
(Tabled 12/5/95 in Committee on Lands & Buildings)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Jay Taylor, Industrial Agent, requesting the Mayor be authorized to execute a Confirmatory Option to Purchase (Right of First Refusal) satisfactory to Blue Cross, subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.
(Tabled 2/27/96)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Toni Pappas, Chairman, Hillsborough County Board of Commissioners relative to the Pine Island 4-H Center.
(Tabled 2/27/96)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Kathleen Giacomponello, Business Manager, Hillsborough County, advising of payment in the amount of \$107,000 which represents the settlement on the Pine Island facility as a result of the fire that occurred on October 21, 1995; and further expressing concern relative to liability issues directly attributable to the burnt-out structure and discussions relative to the money being isolated for future use at the Pine Island site.
(Tabled 3/12/96)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Leo R. Bernier, City Clerk, requesting to utilize space formerly occupied by District Court for use by the City Clerk's Office and the Charter Commission.
(Tabled 3/12/96)

This item remained on the table.

Discussion regarding 9.9 percent EPD billings.
(Tabled 2/6/96)

This item remained on the table.

3/26/96 CIP

17

There being no further business to come before the Committee on Community Improvement Program, on motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Wihby, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.



Clerk of Committee

