

## COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

**March 11, 1997  
PM**

**6:30**

In the absence of the Chairman, the Clerk called the meeting to order advising requesting a motion to elect a Chairman Pro-Tem in accordance with Rule 4 of the Board.

Alderman Domaingue moved to elect Alderman Wihby. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

The Clerk called the roll.

**PRESENT:** Ald. Wihby, Ald. Reiniger, Ald. Clancy and Ald. Domaingue

**ABSENT:** Ald. Robert

**MESSRS:** Ald. Pariseau, Ald. Sysyn, Patrick Duffy, Robert MacKenzie, Jay Taylor, Kevin Sheppard, Asst. Solicitor Tom Arnold, Rich Girard and Peter Ramsey

The Chairman addressed item 3 of the agenda:

An amending resolution and budget authorization allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of grant funds by increasing the 1996 CIP 8.20401 Archival Record Retrieval Project - \$35,498 Federal - increasing the budget to \$72,974 (\$5,000 cash, \$32,485 other and \$35,489 Federal).

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to approve item 3.

The Chairman addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Discussion of the issue of tree clearing at the Airport.  
(Note: Patrick Duffy, Fred Testa and Richard Fixler have been requested to attend.)

Chairman Wihby stated that the Clerk had distributed a memo from the Airport Director, which noted that he and the Assistant Director would not be able to be in attendance, but that Mr. Duffy would be present.

Mr. Duffy, stated he is here representing himself and not somebody else as Chairman of the Airport Authority. Unfortunately, the staff members of the Airport were not available to attend this evening, as you have seen from the correspondence dated yesterday that indicated that Fred Testa and Rich Fixler had previous engagements and wouldn't be in attendance. In lieu of having no one here, I felt it would be appropriate for me to come and see if I could get a sense of what the concerns are and respond to those at least. You can see by the correspondence that I would be happy to follow up with a separate meeting or your next scheduled meeting to see if that would be in order to get some of the particulars. I will do my best in terms of answering questions you may have. I think the Committee should be aware that there have been several meetings already with different people, including, I believe, Alderman Domaingue on this matter and that it's a case of having gone through a considerable amount of preparation. I want to see what else seems to be on the mind of the members of the Committee and see what I can do this evening.

Alderman Domaingue stated she would try and be brief. I want to say before I start that of all the people who have been sensitive and responsive to the neighborhood, Mr. Duffy is clearly the person. With him being here tonight it reflects the fact that he has had an ongoing interest and has seen that the neighborhood has a response from the Airport and we very much appreciate that. There is additional tree removal going on in the neighborhoods around where the initial tree clearing took place off of Goffs Falls Road. Those are two neighborhoods that already deal with several issues right now that are making them very sensitive to any additional issues, with those being obviously, Airport noise, they are very near to the Sewage Treatment Plant, they have already had extensive tree cutting, they have had flooding on certain properties subsequent to that initial tree cutting and now we have letters to the property owners within these neighborhoods stating we are going to take out additional trees. I did meet with Mr. Testa, the Mayor and the City Solicitor on the first of March to ascertain just what had been going on with the communication with the neighbors. I had requested initially back in January a list of properties, actually before January in late 1996, a list of properties that would be affected by additional trees coming down, so I would be aware and also advising to alert the Alderman from Ward 9. I met with the Airport Director and I don't know whether the Alderman from Ward 9 has had any communication from the Airport Director, but clearly there are trees that are coming down and the reason that's being used is an ordinance that sits currently on the books for the City of Manchester that is approximately 39

years old. This ordinance says in affect that the City of Manchester can remove any structure within a certain zone around the Airport to the extent of 100,000 feet in no discernible direction, which means any direction, and that means up to 20 miles out from the Airport that they can clear. Obviously, I do not think that its the intent of the Airport to do that, but this is the ordinance upon which they are basing there right to remove these trees in conjunction with an ILS System that is being installed, which we have no problem with that. The problem that has been communicated to me, from my constituents, and I won't speak for Alderman 9, as he can speak for his constituents, is that there seems to be no end to this process and the neighborhoods need a conclusion to this. They need to know when this invasion of there neighborhood, by the Airport, is going to cease. That hasn't been made clear because initially they felt, with the first removal of trees, the devastation along Goffs Falls Road, that would be it and in fact the money ran out from the Federal Government and the tree clearing had ended, but the neighborhood was under the impression ended meant over. Now they are getting letters and additional trees are coming down and the only people whose property are affected are being contacted. There has been no general communication to either neighborhood. Now we have sat here as a Board and approved an addition of a public relations and marketing expert at the Airport for \$52,000 a year and they are doing a wonderful job in marketing the Airport and the foreign trade zone, which recently we got a copy of, but there seems to be no marketing or public relations effort in response to these neighborhoods and as an Alderman I have a very large concern about that. Particularly when your talking about going in on someone's property and saying to them if you don't remove these trees we have by City ordinance, which was passed by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen 39 years ago, the right to come in and invade your property, cut your trees because we have this ordinance to stand by. That's not good public relations in anybody's ward. There are a few issues that we need to have resolved and if we can't get them tonight, then maybe perhaps Mr. Duffy's recommendation that we table this and wait for Mr. Testa to come forward. First of all, we need to have some communication with all the residents of what is going on and what the extent will be. Secondly, the clarification of what the extent of the program is. If this is the final tree clearing or if it will be continued. Third of all, we have had some significant flooding on a couple of properties that are on Westwood Drive and while there has been a temporary resolution this Alderman would like to see a more complete resolution which includes additional plantings of some sort of other shrubbery or flowering shrubs, something that will hold that ground during spring rains and flooding periods and snow melts so that these residents don't continue to have impact on their properties of water running across their lawns, through their basements windows, down their basement walls and out through the sewer outlet in their basement floors as this is what has been happening. I don't think we need to bring this to a legal point, I would rather it didn't and I think all

parties involved would rather it didn't , but at this point in time I have an obligation to represent the people in Ward 8 who are being affected by this and we need some answers Mr. Duffy and we need some permanent resolution to these situations.

Mr. Duffy stated I would like to be able to put some of these in somewhat of a perspective. Again, I do appreciate the interest that's been shown on behalf of the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen, specifically the Aldermen's from Wards 8 and 9 because obviously their proximity to the Airport. We have had, I feel, a much improved working relationship in terms of dealing with your constituents that are neighbors to the Airport. I think its important that for those who have not been familiar with some of the background as to why we have this new ILS on runway 17, which is landing for the south. This comes about as a result of an effort that goes back to the late 80's early 90's when we had and went through a noise abatement program, a part 150 study which its called, its a FAA regulation part 150, that indicated one of the ways to abate some of the noise was to have an instrumental landing to the south. Today, we only have instrumental landing to the north. By moving the traffic and being able to use the instrument approach system to the south, that would in fact assist in not having all the traffic landing and taking off in one single direction, particularly during instrument conditions. The reason for the situation that we are now involved with has to do with putting in an ILS system that is in fact to assist in and approving upon some of the noise conditions and that of course has also been helped through the sound insulation program and a number of others. I would like to point out that the reason for the trees being removed is not in fact because there is an ordinance in place, the reason for it is because of the ILS. The safety requirements under the FAA dictate that trees or any other obstacle cannot penetrate a certain safety area around the ILS glide slope and that's basically what we are talking about. So, yes there were trees removed previously, but that was in anticipation of at that time we had hoped to have the ILS installed, in fact two years ago and were unsuccessful in getting the FAA to fulfill its commitment and finally we are getting that completed this spring. The authorization in doing the tree removal comes underneath this ordinance that Alderman Domaingue cited that has been on the books for quite some time. The ILS is an important part of a total package, if you will, in terms of what we are trying to do in terms of noise abatement around the Airport. The question about when is the end of this process, I guess if trees didn't grow then there would probably be an end to this process, but unfortunately trees do grow and in time trees penetrate these surfaces and either something has to be done and unfortunately that's the condition we find ourselves in now. The intent is not only to remove the trees, but to also replace those trees that are removed with suitable trees, much obviously smaller to be able to grow in a normal process. Hopefully, we are sensitive and certainly the Airport Authority has given instructions to the

Airport management and staff that we expect to see that neighbors in those neighborhoods are dealt with not only in terms of proper contact, but also in terms with trying to put the landscaping back into as a good as condition as possible. We have made a commitment in terms of trying to replace trees with suitable other trees and hopefully not have this problem continuing indefinitely. As far as public announcement is concerned, I guess that perhaps, that I am not aware, that there has been a public announcement, just as you say Alderman Domaingue, that those property owners affected have been notified through the mail and have since been contacted, but as far as a general announcement, I guess that's something that would need to be looked at because again it's not like its everybody there but are just certain ones that are affected by this. You cited a publication that I would like to bring up to this Committee's attention, I should say dealing with the foreign trade zone which we have been promoting out at the Airport. This particular publication is not as a result of Airport funds, by the way. This is a publication that came and was done as part of the Manchester Regional Industrial Foundation which sees an opportunity to continue to promote growth and utilization of the foreign trade zones at the Airport. The flooding problem is most unfortunate and I again, that came about as a result of a number of conditions that I don't need to spend a lot of time belaboring here with this group, but the fact of the matter is it is a temporary solution at the present time and a more permanent solution is to be put in place and we, the Airport staff, is working with the Highway Department to address some of the storm drainage that needs to be put in on Goffs Falls Road, as well as some of the other things that we are doing out there to make sure again that drainage does not spill over onto the affected property. To make a long story short, there is a lot more to telling the whole story about the tree removal and I think there is a considerable amount of detail that is available that Airport staff, I am sure, would be happy to review with this Committee at an appropriate time.

Chairman Wihby recognized Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Pariseau stated that my only concern Pat, is that after Alderman Domaingue mentioned it at last Tuesday's meeting, I received 21 phone calls from concerned neighbors. I think Mr. Testa was here when they discussed Goffs Falls Road where he promised that he would contact the Aldermen and let them know if there was going to be any future tree cuttings per se. We take Fred at his word all to often I think. I wish that he would have at least called me, so sitting here along my esteemed colleague, Domaingue, on a Tuesday night and low and behold she tells me that they're cutting trees in my ward. That's not right. I wish that Fred would have least pick up the phone and made a phone call or have the new guy, the community relations guy, call and it wouldn't hurt to get a blurb in the newspaper outlining the five pieces of property that would be affected in Ward 8, then I wouldn't have people on Frontage Road calling me being concerned about

eliminating the blocking of that Ryder truck area from their homes. Its just a matter of courtesy.

Mr. Duffy stated you make some very valid points, thank you.

Alderman Domaingue stated Mr. Duffy, nobody has been more in agreement in the necessity of that ILS system then I have. There is no question that the safety of those neighborhoods come first. We are not in disagreement on that. When you look at property values, if your a homeowner in either of those neighborhoods, and you look around the character of the neighborhoods which has changed significantly and obviously with more trees to come down will change again. You have homeowners, regardless of whether their trees are being cut on their property, that are going to be very sensitive to what this is going to do to their property values. It needs some TLC in plain English and I don't think that printing a story about it in the newspaper is the TLC these neighborhoods need. I think they need the kind of public relations handout that we were lead to believe would happen back when we began to talk about the affect on neighborhoods, which was a piece of communication that would come in written form and door-to-door to the neighbors that would say you may notice that there are some trees coming down in these neighborhoods, so please don't be alarmed as it is for this purpose. No one is going to argue with the removal of trees for the purpose of safety. I have yet to run into a homeowner who would argue that point, but the Airport seems to go out of its way to cause bad relations with neighborhoods that must live with that Airport and its time that we stopped that process. We need to develop a better rapport with those neighborhoods and we're five years late now. I shouldn't have to run a door-to-door circular through the neighborhood telling people don't be worried this is going to be okay. The Airport is undertaking this effort and the Airport needs to do this and I do except to see some planting along that land, more than the wildflower seeds as you got to hold that earth. Is that something the Airport Authority intends to respond to.

Mr. Duffy stated I think you know first hand that the Airport Authority has always been very sensitive to neighborhoods issues. We, as a group, have made numerous statements in terms and these are directives, I should say for the Airport staff on how they deal with these matters. Sometimes we have been more successful then others and I'm not saying we have been as successful as I would like to see us, but it is something that I think you have personal knowledge of the fact that we do take these matters very seriously.

Alderman Domaingue replied I know you do. I know we pay one director one heck of a large salary and I don't pay you a large salary and the person who came

out to look at the neighborhood and take care of the neighbors concerns when it came to flooding was Pat Duffy, not Fred Testa and I thank you very much.

Mr. Duffy stated thank you and I just see it as part of the responsibilities of responding when issues surface and again I'm disappointed that we don't have others here that could be more specific in terms of responding to some of these issues, but I think from what I hear being said that its perhaps somewhat different then maybe even I had thought about. That even though there are property owners that are affected by it directly in terms of having trees on their specific property, but like any other neighborhood if you're in the neighborhood you're all affected because if you look across to your neighborhoods yard or down the street the trees are coming down, obviously everybody is affected, whether you have trees on your specific property or not and that is certainly a very valid criticism in terms of the kind of notification that these people have received.

Alderman Clancy stated, Pat as far as I'm concerned I've heard from some people who called me up and there is a big lack of communication between the Airport and the constituents down there in Pepperidge Drive. All those little streets down there. One guy went to work and when he came home two trees on his property were cut down and nobody said anything about. At least you could tell the guy that we're cutting the tree down.

Mr. Duffy stated I had been assured and I can't imagine that there was an instance where a tree has been removed from someone's property who has not only received written contact but also has had a face-to-face visit from if not a member of the Airport staff or the contractor who has been involved with it, so I can't imagine anybody having trees removed on their property without that kind of contact as I have personally asked that same question, Alderman Clancy, so I know how sensitive that is.

Alderman Clancy stated the only thing the guy told me was that he was told the trees were going to be cut down, but they didn't say when or where, so when he came home from work the trees were cut down. That's all I can relate to you.

Mr. Duffy stated I would certainly investigate that.

Alderman Clancy stated I appreciate it.

Alderman Reiniger stated Alderman Domaingue, in regards to the letter you sent around recently about the flooding situation and was it related to the tree cutting.

Alderman Domaingue replied yes, well its been related to the original tree cutting and because of that flooding on those properties the homeowners who again were going to have trees removed from their property called me and said wait a minute, if you remove more trees we are going to have more flooding and how do we stop this. That its a valid concern in terms of property owners who maybe paying \$1,000 a month on their mortgage.

Alderman Pariseau stated, Pat, I can assure the people of Frontage Road that their trees are not going to be cut.

Mr. Duffy stated I'm not the one to, you were saying on Frontage Road, is that correct.

Alderman Pariseau stated well the map shows only five pieces of property.

Mr. Duffy replied right.

Alderman Pariseau stated and those are on Kenberma and Devco.

Mr. Duffy in looking at the map with Alderman Pariseau stated these are where the properties and the trees are.

Alderman Pariseau stated this is where Frontage Road is.

Mr. Duffy stated to the best of my knowledge it is not identified.

Alderman Domaingue stated it goes back to my question, are we done with it. Is this the end.

Alderman Pariseau replied if trees grow they are going to cut them down.

Alderman Domaingue stated but within parameters. Obviously Frontage Road is on the outside point.

Mr. Duffy replied I think it is to far back to be affected.

Alderman Pariseau asked could you top them.

Mr. Duffy replied no, not the ones we're talking about, but back on Frontage Road its to far back from the, there's a plane if you will that gradually comes down to the runway and that's what dictates where the trees need to be removed. Topping trees often times destroys the tree, but secondly you have to keep going back and

doing it. Neither one or those are good alternatives. I would just like to point out the property owners have had to go through a great deal as we have addressed noise issues and other issues, however, I do think that the noise abatement program and the sound insulation program has in fact enhanced the properties of many people in this neighborhood and people have responded very positively to that as their homes have been upgraded considerably as a result of the sound insulation.

Alderman Domaingue stated can we at least ask the Airport Authority to respond to what they are going to have for replacement of shrubbery on the open land that is currently vacant.

Alderman Clancy stated what about the drainage problem along Goffs Falls Road.

Alderman Domaingue stated that's going to be resolved, I believe, by a proposal of the Highway Department for Goffs Falls Road which will include drain work which should relieve some of that. That had already been discussed, but my concern right now is that we hold that land and we don't have any additional flooding and the only way that I see to do that would be to have that area fully planted with things that will not interfere with the ILS.

Chairman Wihby thanked Mr. Duffy for coming.

Mr. Duffy stated I made my notes and are you going to, if there is a follow up meeting will we be notified.

Chairman Wihby stated I think as Alderman Domaingue has had some questions she can talk to Fred and when a time comes when she can't get her questions answered then that is when we will want to have you come back again.

Mr. Duffy stated thank you.

The Chairman addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Sysyn requesting the Committee review the issue of the community center under the Enterprise Community funding.

Chairman Wihby stated Bob where is the money, is it already at the Salvation Army and Hope.

Mr. MacKenzie replied no its not. If I could get the Committee's indulgence I would like to do a quick background on what the Enterprise Community is and what the projects are that are ongoing. At this time, Mr. MacKenzie handed out a summary sheet. I think its important to recognize that this has been an important program for a number of reasons, not the least of which its one of the more important economic development programs in the Center City that the City has undertaken in the last several years. We have worked closely with the Economic Development Office and several other City departments and agencies in making sure the Enterprise Community Program is executed. Just to highlight the programs that are basically in place is the Community Policing Program, which you all are familiar with, the Small Business Incubator, which is about to start up. We have a contract with New Hampshire College to do that. The Summerbridge Education Program, Micro-Enterprise Program, Youthbuild Program and the Acquisition Revolving Loan Fund, which the Enterprise Community Board has approved for the contract to Neighborhood Housing Services. The final and the key project and the numbers are a little misaligned for some of these projects, but the keystone of this program which began in 1994 and went through a series of neighborhood meetings to apply for this Enterprise Community Program which in total is about \$2.9 million. The City applied and received a grant and under the grant requirements you had to setup an Advisory Board made up of residents and businesses and that has occurred. I think the Board has shown good judgment in creating these programs. Many of these are great programs for City. They have come to the toughest program to develop and that is the neighborhood center. That in total and this is geared from the original strategy plan that the neighborhood wanted, the largest chunk of money \$1.2 million was geared towards this and that would create a center that would run for at least five years. I know Alderman Sysyn certainly has strong concerns about the program that she would like to address, and she is here and may want to address those specifically. There were two elements she talked about and I would like to address both of them, if I could. The first, was that the center was originally intended for a youth recreation center and I know Alderman Sysyn was involved at that point, but I also recognize that there was a large public information program and there were a lot of people involved when the plan was written in 1994. It was not specifically for youth a recreation center and I do have the original application from that. Youth recreation was mentioned, but it was not the primary focus and I would like to read the primary focus, which came from the strategic plan that was written by John Snow of the Economic Development Office and a number of people. I was involved somewhat as well at the time. There were three primary objectives that came out of all that community program. The number one priority and number one objective was to develop family support programs in a neighborhood family center that would bring several existing social service agencies into a collaborative effort to prepare residents of the community to fill jobs created by this plan. This

center will also be the focal point for information concerning job training and job opportunities. This was from the original plan and was the main objective. It did mention youth recreation in a couple of locations of the plan as something that could go into the center. In 1995 and through 1996 the Enterprise Community Board wanted to make sure that they received all the public input they could get. They started perhaps the most comprehensive grass roots public input campaign in the center city ever. They had dozens of public hearings, focus meetings and interviews with individuals throughout the center city. As a result of that they came up with, basically you will see on the sheet a refinement of what the neighborhood center would be. In essence, it was similar to what the original plan was. I would like to read the goal of the center as that formed the basis for the request for proposal, that is, "To promote the economic self-sufficiency and improvement of the residents of the EC through education, training, business development and employment opportunities. It is recognized that certain supportive services and information and referral activities may be necessary to achieve the goal of self-sufficiency." As a result of that the Board went out for request for proposals for organizations on how to meet these specific criteria.

Chairman Wihby stated, Mr. MacKenzie, these criteria weren't changed.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think you can see that the basic emphasis of the program has always been on jobs, with job training, helping residents find information.

Alderman Sysyn stated Bob, because I was involved with this also, and we went to all of those meetings with the groups of inner city residents who were there. The biggest vote was that they wanted, I believe, but I don't have the records with me, they wanted a youth center.

Alderman Clancy stated your right Mary.

Alderman Sysyn continued where the kids could come and play basketball; that you could also have people helping parents with the teenagers, the upper kids, I'm not talking about the kids up to age 12, because those kids have the Boys Club, but the biggest vote was on the 12-18 youth center. It would seem to me that we would funds, how much do we have left for this, do we have \$1.2 million.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Sysyn stated we do have the \$1.2 million, we have the land on Lake Avenue. I don't think that any of this should be religiously connected regardless of who it is or ethnically connected, whether it is the Salvation Army, The Greek Orthodox Church or Catholic, it doesn't matter to me. I don't think it should be

religious oriented. I don't think it should be connected to any religious group as you won't find youth going in. There is a lot of new religious groups that are coming in and these kids won't go into a religiously affiliated group. A lot of them are Muslims and there are a lot of different groups. I don't think it should be and I still think a lot of it should be on the youth, because I believe the heaviest vote we had was on the youth.

Alderman Clancy stated we have the land on Lake Avenue, near the North American Club between Barry Avenue to Union Street on the right hand side going up, so there are two lots there where we had a couple of fires within the last few years. We have the land already and this way we could control it ourselves, in other words, we can control when it opens and when it closes, who we hire and stuff like that.

Alderman Sysyn stated the residents could have a lot of input. There are a lot of residents in the inner city who are very skilled and could volunteer a lot of those skills into this center. It doesn't have to be all paid staff either. I think with that \$1.2 million we could do a lot of good.

Chairman Wihby stated that was over five years.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think that's part of the difficulty. If your main focus of your program is to help job skills, job training, how to find places and also to run a daycare which is important to a lot of the people, for people to get jobs, you could easily spend \$200,000 a year and just barely skim those requirements. \$200,000 a year times five is \$1 million, that only leaves \$200,000 for a physical plan.

Alderman Sysyn stated you could save a lot of money though if you could do something like Habitat did with that house on Cedar Street. A lot of that is volunteer. Youthbuild is also always getting training besides making the kids do it and they do very good.

Chairman Wihby asked Bob, if we tabled this are we hurting anything or is there a rush on it.

Alderman Clancy stated we would like to get something going in the inner City, Dave.

Chairman Wihby stated if we table this proposal to allow them to go back and discuss what we want to do. I'm not going to say we're going to kill it. Will it hurt anything.

Alderman Sysyn replied no.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would state that there have been a lot of people waiting a long time for this to happen and it has been 1 1/2 years since this particular project started. The Enterprise Community Board set a goal of deciding on which proposal by April 1 and they will be meeting a week from tomorrow. I suspect if the Board of Mayor and Aldermen ask them to review it in detail and perhaps wait until additional information came in.

Chairman Wihby stated they could hear input from Alderman Clancy and Alderman Sysyn and then come back to the next meeting.

Mr. MacKenzie stated okay. Ultimately, the Enterprise Community Board is the one that would probably be selecting the proposals and implementing those proposals. I'm sure that they would be happy to get input. I do want to mention one other thing related to youth recreation that even though I don't feel it was the original primary goal it was definitely mentioned and was always a concern of the neighborhood. What happened last year is we were made aware that for several years there had been plans already to build a youth recreation center which is under construction today. That center is on Maple Street and we are using Federal funds to upgrade the old garage across from JFK. Its in a perfect location because its in the middle of Gill Stadium, JFK, Baskell Sheeham Park and the Pool. Both the Office of Youth Services and Parks and Recreation are working together to make that an appropriate youth recreation center. I know the Board in the past has been very concerned about avoiding duplication of efforts and I had talked to the Board about whether they wanted to follow that one particular path or allow the youth recreation center to go and provide that service. The Board ultimately did make the decision that they were going to allow the City to basically establish a youth recreation center.

Chairman Wihby asked did they talk to anybody over at Parks and Recreation as to what is going to happen over there.

Mr. Girard stated that Mayor had just signed the paperwork and the contracts for the construction today.

Chairman Wihby replied I knew that, but has the Board talked to them to what is going to happen as far as the youth center.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I had advised the Board. I would like to have the Board have more input into what's going on. I think there is a lot of good opportunities, there are a lot of people even on the Enterprise Community Advisory Board that

would like to have more involvement in that youth recreation center and certainly if the Committee wanted the Board to do that, they would.

Chairman Wihby stated it was the opportune time to get these two Aldermen, Parks and Recreation and that Board together to try to work out something with the \$1.2 million that can take care of everybody. It seems like now would be the time to do it. My suggestion would be to table this, have you all work together and come back at the next meeting with a plan that takes into consideration the recreation center, takes into consideration \$1.2 million and the proposal from the two Aldermen.

Mr. MacKenzie stated as long as you recognize that there are two proposals on the table and these involved literally dozens of organizations that have provided a lot of services to the City and I think in fairness the Board still has to consider those proposals because it has been through the RFP process of the City and it is not something that they can toss out lightheadedly.

Chairman Wihby stated that maybe some of the concerns they have centering around the youth center solves all the problems and we can go forward with one of each.

Alderman Clancy stated in the Union Street area they needed a daycare center. They had talked about a daycare center because they are going to put the people back to work that is on welfare and they need a place to put there kids.

Mr. MacKenzie stated one of the proposals specifically did have a daycare center involved.

Alderman Clancy stated they needed a daycare center in the inner City area plus the recreation center.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Enterprise Community Board is meeting a week from Wednesday night, I think if the Committee wanted to have the two Aldermen who were interested come and speak with the Committee, I'm sure that they would be happy to do that. I could set that up.

Alderman Sysyn and Alderman Clancy both replied they would like that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that it would be March 19th at 5:30 PM, at NYNEX on the fifth floor.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to table item 5.

The Chairman addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Industrial Agent requesting approval of both the existing lease and proposed amendment for MEDO space at 889 Elm Street and requesting authorization for the Mayor to execute same subject to the review of the City Solicitor.

Chairman Wihby stated this was basically adding their lease to make sure that it matches when they finally move into City Hall.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to approve item 6.

The Chairman addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department relative to a Clean Flo water restoration system proposal to be installed at Dorrs Pond from Charles Sheppard of Pangea Int. Ltd.  
(Note: Nutts Pond has been suggested as an alternative site.)

Chairman Wihby stated the recommendation from Park's is that they don't want to do it and I don't know if they have evaluated Nutts Pond or not. Do you want to send this to them again and have them look at.

Alderman Clancy stated if you look here this is what they've said about Livingston Park. Here is what they need up there they need drains, culverts and urban run-off entering the pond. Therefore, water entering the pond is continually being contaminated by pollutants entering the watershed. Therefore, we do not recommend the proposal at this time due to the planned construction.

Chairman Wihby stated it was okay as that was for Dorrs Pond, but I don't know if they have looked at Nutts Ponds.

Alderman Clancy stated they looked at Dorrs Pond.

Chairman Wihby stated we can send it back for Nutts Pond and let them come back with a recommendation.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to send it back to the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery for their review and recommendation of Nutts Pond.

The Chairman addressed item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning requesting that the Committee consider recommending to the full Board that MEDO be authorized to enter into a subrecipient agreement with the Manchester Development Corporation for the disbursement and collection of loans on behalf of the City using CDBG monies presently allocated for the Business Revolving Loan Program as well as any loan repayments to be received.

Alderman Clancy asked Alderman Reiniger what do you know about this.

Alderman Reiniger stated it makes sense.

Chairman Wihby asked Jay is it his or is it Bob's.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I could give you the short answer and both Jay and Sam Maranto of my staff is here. The short answer is that there is about \$500,000 allocated in HUD CD funds for business revolving loans. Now, if we did not have a separate organization to put the loan money back into it would come back to the City as program income and we would still have all the federal strings attached that we have now, all the paperwork all the strings. One of the options that we looked at is that the money coming back, if it came to MDC, the money would no longer be program income and would not have all the federal strings attached. In essence, the money could be more flexible to use for Economic Development then if it had to come back and came under the federal strings again.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve item 8.

Alderman Domaingue stated she had a question. Mr. MacKenzie, if I understand you correctly you said that if it comes back through MEDO then we don't have the strings attached that we would have attached if it came back through the City. That then those funds could be used in a broader sense or a broader range of programs. Is that the way you put it.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the programs are and Jay could explain the programs, but it is for business loans to generate primarily for existing businesses looking for debt financing, but since the money is HUD funded we have a significant paperwork

load that we have to do like environmental reviews, historical reviews, we have to track the monies to see where they go. That in itself, the paperwork, takes a percentage of the monies available towards just reviewing all these strengths. If the money came back we would have to keep doing all of that paperwork over and over again. The alternative would be that the money go in the MDC as a revolving loan fund and when they go to do the second loan, the next one after the money is paid back, we would not have to do all this paperwork. I would like to have Jay maybe jump in and add anything that I missed here.

Mr. Taylor stated the MDC, in accordance with HUD regulations, is an approved subrecipient for these fundings, as long as it has to be used for economic development purposes. It can not be used for anything else other than economic development. Secondly, the money will be accounted for by the Finance Department of the City, so its not going anywhere as its going be accounted for by the City Finance Department. There will be regular reporting requirements and activities by the Finance Department. The significant difference between money after it is paid back and a re-loan is that we can use it for as an example in the initial stage. The CGDB money can only be loaned for use if there is job creations, activities for low and moderate income people. Those restrictions disappear the second time around so we can loan it to a business that didn't qualify necessarily under the low moderate income job requirements. That's basically the difference in addition to the reporting requirements which Bob mentioned. That is at least my understanding of it.

Alderman Domaingue stated my concerns are really rooted, I think you have a noble purpose, which you are trying to make this transition from the government agency to the sub-government agency, but I seem to recall the City got itself into a little bit of trouble a couple of years ago with GMDC, with the question as to where the funds were, what the funds are being used for and this one makes me nervous, gentlemen. I guess I'm just not going to go with this for that purpose. It makes me very nervous as to activities going on.

Mr. Taylor stated I understand what you are saying and just let me try to belay your concerns if I can. The difference between MDC and GMDC, the basic difference is that the Manchester Development Corporation as currently constituted cannot spend major amounts of money without the approval of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, whereas GMDC had some additional latitude there. The reason for that is that the sole stockholder in the corporation currently is the City of Manchester through its Board of Mayor and Aldermen, whereas prior to that that was not the case. The City has entirely more control over MDC and its activities then it did over GMDC. That's basically the difference that I can give to you quickly.

Alderman Domaingue stated I'm sorry to take the Committee's time and I accept your rationale for this, but I'm still nervous and I'm still going to vote against it and the main reason right now is because I see the potential here for favoritism. When you turn that money around and you loan it out you no longer got it by those restrictions and sometimes cities don't like those restrictions, no doubt about it, and certainly there's a lot of paperwork, but there is a purpose for it. What I see happening is there is a potential here for that money, once turned over, to be awarded on the basis of favoritism and that make me really uncomfortable. I can't support it.

Chairman Wihby called for a vote. Alderman Reiniger, Alderman Clancy and Chairman Wihby voted yea. Alderman Domaingue voted nay and was duly recorded as opposed. The motion carried.

The Chairman addressed item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from the Public Works Director seeking approval to charge overtime costs to the existing CIP landfill account for the operators of specialized leased equipment for the rough grading of the sanitary landfill to accommodate the Phase I, Contract Closure work.

Alderman Clancy stated Kevin, it states you're going to spend \$43,000 for rental of the equipment.

Mr. Sheppard replied on a monthly basis.

Alderman Clancy stated yes, on a monthly basis, with unlimited hours so how much money are you talking about for overtime.

Mr. Sheppard replied maybe \$5,000 over the time period, maybe \$5,000 to \$7,000.

Alderman Clancy asked do you have it in your budget over there.

Mr. Sheppard replied that's a problem. Where its happening during the winter we still don't know what's going to happen.

Alderman Clancy stated what if there's no snow.

Mr. Sheppard stated I don't think that is going to be very likely. We spent a lot of money on salt and our salt budget is actually over budget at this point. The overtime is still okay, but we're still not through the winter obviously.

Alderman Clancy stated this is what I suggest. Try to get it within best you can with the money you got in your budget and if you have to come back for the \$5,000 then they could take it from contingency. See if you can get through it.

Chairman Wihby stated you're not asking for the money now are you.

Mr. Sheppard stated well we are looking for the ability to charge this overtime to this CIP fund where we are spending \$43,000 a month.

Chairman Wihby stated we still would vote on this and tell you that you would have to live within your budget and come see us if you can't.

Mr. Sheppard stated right, if you choose not to approve this that would be right.

Alderman Clancy stated its got to be done one way or the other. Lets go along with it and lets be done with it.

Mr. Sheppard replied to us it's a minimal cost as far as charging this off to CIP. We feel it is in the best interest of the City where we are spending such a large amount of money per month no matter how many hours we use the equipment.

Alderman Clancy stated its gotta be done, so lets go and do it as far as I'm concerned go and do it.

Chairman Wihby asked Mr. MacKenzie do you have a problem with it.

Mr. MacKenzie stated no I don't. I assumed this has been reviewed by the Finance Department.

Mr. Sheppard stated I have talked to Sam about it, but I'm not to sure if whether Finance has been directly involved with. We do it on other CIP projects.

Chairman Wihby asked if he saw a problem with it.

Alderman Domaingue stated did you say it was part of their budget.

Chairman Wihby stated no, its not part of their budget.

Mr. Sheppard stated we are asking that it be charge to the CIP. The difference being if we don't charge the overtime to CIP we might not be able to work the overtime, therefore keeping the equipment longer, therefore incurring a charge to the CIP anyways by payment of equipment.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Board has authorized a \$12 million bond to accomplish the entire project, so the money is there.

Chairman Wihby stated that is a lot of overtime.

Mr. Sheppard stated no, like I said we're talking maybe \$5,00 to \$7,000 and if you want to put a cap, you can put a cap on it.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to approve item 9.

The Chairman addressed item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from the Deputy Public Works Director requesting that any

balances left in the 1997 CIP Storm Drain Infrastructure project account be authorized to the relocation and upgrading of an existing 12" storm drain pipe located within an easement off of bicentennial Drive in conjunction with the "Paquette Ave/River Road Sewer Extension" project.

Alderman Clancy stated Kevin, how did this Paquette Avenue and Bicentennial Drive get priority over the rest of the City.

Mr. Sheppard asked is it regarding the drain or the sewer.

Alderman Clancy stated both.

Mr. Sheppard stated the sewer had been identified somewhat like the Cohas Brook Interceptor has been identified. So this sewer has been in the planning process for many years and that money has been allocated through the EPD, its actually through the sewer user fees fund. The drainage is part, we are asking that this be part of this project as that has been identified in the past, but where it was a drain project we are looking at using drain infrastruture monies. This piece of property on Bicentennial Drive, we are actually crossing a person's piece of property with a sewer, so we are requesting an easement across it and its part of that is because he has had flooding problems and we have not been able to correct that flooding problem. There has not been money available and we saw this a perfect

opportunity to save money in the construction of that drain because we will have a contractor there already who will have his driveway torn up versus paying for this a year or two down the road and tearing up the driveway again and putting in contract mobilization. We feel we can save some money by doing it at the same time as the sewer project and that is why we are requesting it at this time. The homeowner in giving us the easement is putting a little pressure on us to get it done at the same time.

Alderman Clancy stated it was a pretty good swap off though.

Mr. Sheppard replied well it is, but there is a need to bring a sewer across that property also.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to approve item 10.

The Chairman addressed item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Tom Irving suggesting the new track facility at Livingston Park be named in honor of his uncle, Robert H. Irving.

Chairman Wihby stated I know that I saw this in the newspaper that the Parks Commission took it up yesterday, but I don't know what they did.

Alderman Domaingue replied they didn't do anything with it. I was hoping that somebody would be here.

Alderman Clancy stated lets receive and file.

Alderman Domaingue stated I don't want to receive and file it yet. We need to hear from Parks as to whether there is competition for this.

Mr. Girard stated I don't have an answer from Parks, but I did just want to alert the Committee, however, that they had a major planning session tonight at the Department regarding potential uses for McIntyre Ski Area which may explain their absence.

Chairman Wihby stated why don't we table it and let them come see us.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to table item 11.

The Chairman addressed item 12 of the agenda:

Copies of communications received from Robert McLaughlin relative to extinguishing the City's interest in a passageway in the vicinity of the Parker-Varney School.

Chairman Wihby asked is there anyone here that can take that up. How about Highway.

Mr. Sheppard stated we had received a request from that property owner regarding that easement that goes across his property.

Alderman Clancy asked is that that pie shaped piece of land. This is not the first time that this has come up.

Mr. Sheppard replied it may not be. He had purchased a piece of property from the City a little while ago.

Chairman Wihby stated have you look at this and what is your recommendation.

Mr. Sheppard replied we looked at this and we don't see any problem with the City releasing as Kevin St. Onge had recommended in extinguishing the City's interest in the passageway. We don't see any problem why that could not happen.

Chairman Wihby stated does the Solicitor have a problem.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold stated no.

Alderman Clancy stated we're not giving them any land are we.

Mr. Sheppard replied no, there's an easement across his property, so we are just releasing an rights we have in that easement.

Chairman Wihby stated but you guys don't see that we are ever going to need it again.

Mr. Sheppard replied exactly. If you look at the plan the large area up top is where the school is and its a steep hill basically that goes from Hunter Street up to the property.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold stated our office doesn't have a problem with it. We were contacted with a question about whether the City had an interest in the

passageway. We came to the conclusion the City did and having coming to that conclusion obviously the appropriate decision making body is the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on whether they want to release that interest or not.

Chairman Wihby asked who had a interest in it.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold replied the City had an interest in the passageway.

Chairman Wihby asked who told you that.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold replied that was the question to our office. Did the City have an interest in the passageway itself and we concluded that the City did.

Chairman Wihby stated if you concluded that they had an interest then who told you that they had an interest.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold stated there was a question as to whether the City had what I would call an ownership interest in the passageway. There was a questions about whether the City may not have or whether we did and we came to the conclusion that the City did.

Chairman Wihby stated so, in doing they would have to have the Board of Mayor and Aldermen approval.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold replied yes.

Chairman Wihby asked Asst. Solicitor Arnold are you going to write it up.

Asst. Solicitor Arnold stated I guess our office would be glad to assist in that, but I would presume that the person who would like to have this passageway discharged, so to speak, would probably draw up the initial document subject to the review of our office. If the Board would like I could certainly draft the documents.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to extinguish the City's interest in the passageway be approved, subject to the review and approval of documents to be presented to the City Solicitor.

The Chairman addressed item 13 of the agenda:

Communication from members of the Manchester Child Care Committee

requesting to meet with City officials to discuss the problem associated with the transportation of school children from Manchester schools to their respective after-school programs.

Mr. Girard stated Mr. Chairman, I spoke with members of the School Administration regarding this item and they do have some interest and concerns, however, they are tied up in labor negotiations this evening and are unable to be here.

Alderman Clancy asked if this was something like a latchkey program.

Mr. Girard stated my understanding of it Alderman, is that the Committee is seeking to have bus transportation for after school students to various daycare programs. I think it is entirely separate from the latchkey.

Chairman Wihby stated lets send it to MTA and the School Department and table it for now and take it up at the next meeting.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to send a copy of the communication to the MTA and School Department for their review and comment and also to table this item.

The Chairman addressed item 14 of the agenda:

Request for sewer abatement, 468 Union Street.  
(Note: EPD recommending abatement of \$854.05 be granted.)

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to approve item 14.

The Chairman addressed item 15 of the agenda:

Communication from Lloyd Basinow expressing his concern relative to the area known as "Hobo Jungle" being environmentally unsafe.  
(Note: communication from the Health Officer dated 2/14/97 enclosed.)

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to receive and file item 15.

Alderman Domaingue stated this troubles me a little bit, Mr. Chairman, because I happened to be watching television last night and this person also made the same comment about their being an existence of this kind of bacteria. When you spread

that kind of rumor and you don't have documentation it bothers me because your frightening City residents unnecessarily.

Chairman Wihby stated he got this letter as I made sure he received a copy of the letter from Fred that we received at the last Aldermanic meeting. So Lloyd knows that day what Fred has said.

Alderman Domaingue stated he was still saying that last night; is that what you understand Alderman Reiniger.

Alderman Reiniger replied yes.

Alderman Domaingue stated he was still making those comments as of last night.

Alderman Reiniger stated he was alleging that the anthrax is throughout the entire area, south of Granite Street. My understanding is that its only under the paved areas of where Stark Landing is and it was used to fill in the old canal under that parking area.

Alderman Domaingue stated it troubles me that he is sending out that message.

Alderman Clancy asked Alderman Reiniger to repeat what he said.

Alderman Reiniger stated his understanding is that the anthrax materials was used to fill in the old canal, which was South Commercial Street and the Stark Landing's parking lot and it was paved over. Its not under the dirt area.

The Chairman addressed item 16 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning submitting the staff report on the proposed Riverfront Soccer complex.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he would just like to run quickly through this memo as we did not answer all the questions asked and when I say we, basically it was a staff team composed of myself, Jay Taylor, Ron Ludwig and Ron Johnson from Parks, Frank Thomas from Highway and Kevin Clougherty. There were some key issues I think that are important for this site and we wanted to broach those fairly quickly. The first question that we identified was, is the proposed use appropriate to the site. I won't go into a lot of detail on the actual proposal as I think you're all familiar with it. I think that the basic conclusion here is that it could be appropriate to the site as part of a park setting on a riverfront park, but there are a

couple of major issues that we have to resolve even before we get into the details of this proposal. So that was the first question. The second question was, is this type of facility needed in the City. I know that in dealing with other projects there is a strong demand for a lot of park facilities, active recreation, soccer and football fields. There is a tremendous demand. This has even a little different dimension though, that this also in our group felt it bordered a little bit more on an economic development project because it would not necessarily cater just to Manchester athletes and residents, but could be a venue for other sports activity. So, is the type of facility needed in the City. I think generally the staff felt it could be an appropriate project in the City. What are the competing demands for this site, and I guess that's where it starts to get a little more difficult. The combined sewer overflow program is a federally, unfunded mandated program of the City, which the City has been working on for a few years now. Basically what happens is that we've put in a sewer interceptor program that goes down to the treatment plant, but during certain periods of high rain it floods out all of the sewage discharge and then floods out into the river and this might be 2% of the time that this happens, Kevin. Certainly, many of the staff are not happy about this unfunded mandate and there are no federal funds at this point that I'm aware of to fund the project and the cheapest cost alternative to handle this is \$44 million. The best location to handle this, because the cemetery brook comes down right under Hobo Jungle, is Hobo Jungle. That is the least cost alternative and there are several ways to handle it and the cost ranges from \$44 million to \$200 million plus. Certainly, this is a very serious issue for the City, a very serious issue for the ratepayers of the City and I say ratepayers because the funding might come out of sewer fees rather than bonding or it might have to be a combination of two given the cost. The Highway Department is in negotiations with various groups including the EPA. They believe that it may come to some resolution later this summer and given the potential cost involved we want to make sure that we don't subject our ratepayers to any unnecessary cost as a result of this. Certainly, even a small change on that site could have a multi-million dollar impact, so that is one of our concerns. Other uses of the site is the impound lot, that's a resolvable issue, I believe. I did speak with Chief Driscoll and he said if given a little bit of money and a little bit of time we could find another place.

Alderman Reiniger asked what would happen if you had a CenterPlex there and you wanted to build the sewage project.

Alderman Clancy stated you move it.

Chairman Wihby stated the overflow would come before the CenterPlex.

Alderman Reiniger asked could you build the CenterPlex over that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we did have an architect develop some sketches on how the two could work together. The first problem is, that you look at the Civic Center and the original plan was to put it in one of the mill buildings. I think, generally the staff group feels, that the changes because of the WMUR complex perhaps negate that as a feasible alternative. This means you would have to put the entire center on the Hobo Jungle cite. We did look at how many parking spaces you could put, if you put the CSO program, a civic center and the parking. The parking you might be able to get slightly over a 1000 parking spaces, surface parking. That does not meet the minimum for the latest feasibility plan that was done. At that time the feasibility plan said you need 2000 parking spaces, so certainly then you might have to look at some structured parking, if that parking demand is a true number. Of course the City is going to be reviewing that and Jay Taylor has started on the feasibility study and we will be reviewing that parking issue again, so we do have some just very preliminary rough sketches, but I can't tell you right off the bat until we know better about the market requirements for parking in that case.

Alderman Reiniger stated it seems if you wanted to put the CenterPlex there it would take many years because you would have to wait until the sewage issue was resolved. You couldn't build a CenterPlex now and then tear it down and move it. So if you wanted to do a CenterPlex in that location it would take many years.

Mr. MacKenzie stated you would have to know what the Feds are going to require us to do and that we will not know for probably eight months. Once we know the specific requirements then we could start laying out do we need two or three gigantic underground tanks. If you need two you could say okay we maybe able to find the base area to put a Civic Center, but that is still several months off before we can determine that. Kevin am I correct in that.

Mr. Sheppard replied yes.

Mr. MacKenzie stated other issues are for the Riverfest site and while a Riverfest site maybe able to co-exist with a soccer stadium/soccer complex there are some questions that there would be some logistical issues and we have just not approached the Riverfest Committee with those issues. Of course, if you're developing a high quality venue soccer complex with surf, with sod turf, you might be hesitant to put Riverfest tents on there and have the traffic involved, so I think that might need a little bit more research. I think it is potentially doable, but certainly Riverfest people would have to be involved in that. They have already been moved once from one site to another and it is a key festival of the City and we certainly want to keep that in Manchester and on the riverfront, so we would

have to work closely with them. The next questions was, could this project co-exist with a Civic Center. I think I started to elude to the fact that at this point we're looking to see if it would be possible to put a Civic Center with a CSO program. It was a general feeling of the staff involved in looking at that just problem, that the stadium could not exist with both the Civic Center and a CSO program. So we believe, if the Board feels that the Civic Center is more important than a stadium, they will have to address that issue before they address the issue of a soccer field.

Alderman Clancy stated there was a gentleman here tonight ready to give maybe a little presentation and answer questions that we may have.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the last question really asked was is the proposal was financially sound and what financial risks and impacts would be created for the City. They had requested \$800,000 and felt that they could pay back that bond, and it would be a general bond to the City, so if for some reason the monies did not come in from the non-profit organization, the City would be liable for it. I think at this point, based upon a review by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Finance Department they are not comfortable at the present time and that there is enough information there to really determine whether its feasible. There would have to be a lot of events scheduled. I know the applicant would be looking for a professional management of that facility and it might be possible, but at some point you are going to have to rely on the Finance Department to say, is it feasible to have revenues that would finance the bond so that property taxpayers are not paying for this. I think you will have to ultimately ask the Finance Department that as they are not comfortable at the present time. In conclusion, there are several issues and there is a lot of work to be done. There are a lot of other questions that perhaps could be asked, there are issues that might have to be resolved by the City Solicitor Office, like the procurement issues. We feel that perhaps we should review the major ones first, the Civic Center and CSO before we progress to much further. Although we do find the project an interesting one and if the Civic Center doesn't go on that site, I think it is one that we can work towards and the staff would be happy to work with the Board and the applicant towards that. At this point I would be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Clancy stated we have some gentlemen here from The Park Foundation.

Alderman Domaingue stated my goodness, let me see if I have this right now. We can overcome the Federal Government when it comes to money that can be channeled through MDC and kind of work around the Federal Government. We can't overcome the Federal Government when it comes to combined sewer overflow because the only place we can let all of that storm water drain off on is

Hobo Jungle, despite the fact that the City is how many miles around. We can overcome the Federal Government if it involves putting the CenterPlex and the CSO in the same spot. Let me ask you this question as it relates to Alderman Reiniger's question, what if we had already built something on that spot, Mr. MacKenzie, what if 10 to 20 years ago the City of Manchester had placed something on that spot. We would still have to deal with CSO and the aftermath of the federal mandate of CSO's anyway, would we not.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, but tonight instead of saying that we potentially have a \$44 million project I would be sitting here saying we have a \$120 million project.

Alderman Domaingue stated what I keep hearing from the City is all the reasons why we can't go forward on projects with the exception of CenterPlex where we seem to find interesting way to do it, projects that are deeply rooted in people who have a vested interest in this City and want to see the City progress and we seem to find more hurdles for them to jump over or doors that they can't get through and I am beginning to become frustrated by it, because I know there have been enough people in the City that have approached me and said why can't we do a project like this, why do we have to go through a CenterPlex, why can't we start with something like this and if CenterPlex couldn't feasibly go on that site anyway, which according to two previous studies it shouldn't be, why do I keep hearing negative rather than enthusiasm for a project that the City would clearly would get behind.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could respond a little bit Alderman, I do recognize the frustration. Certainly we have proposed a lot of projects in the City and not all of those come to play, its a tough environment to get projects done in. When it comes to the Civic Center where giving you the options here, if the Board does not want to pursue a Civic Center at this particular location they do not have to, but we have a responsibility to you, we provide the staff to you, we provide the information and we are telling you that this particular site is the largest undeveloped site in the central City and it would seem logical that you would want to at least explore the issue of having the Civic Center there because the costs are tremendous.

Alderman Domaingue asked didn't we have two previous studies that did that.

Chairman Wihby stated they picked that location.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that was correct, they did pick that location.

Alderman Domaingue asked what did it cost us for those two previous studies.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he would defer to perhaps Jay as it was one of Jay's predecessors.

Mr. Taylor stated it was over \$50,000 for the Hunter study and the other was for \$75,000.

Alderman Domaingue stated that the one before that was somewhere in the vicinity of \$75,000. So we have spent \$125,000 in studies on some plex proposal, CenterPlex or otherwise, and we're about to spend another \$180,000 and that's \$300,000 by my count. We don't have anything to show for it, am I wrong.

Alderman Clancy replied no.

Alderman Domaingue stated we have a vested interest from people who want to make an honest commitment and a City that keeps finding ways why people can't and you want to know why people want to leave this City. It doesn't surprise me at all.

Alderman Reiniger stated I think that Alderman Domaingue raises a good point. If we have already spent \$125,000 on two studies which have ruled out the Hobo Jungle, where not spending \$80,000 to look at the Hobo Jungle are we.

Alderman Clancy stated no it was \$180,000.

Alderman Reiniger stated \$180,000 and I have a 1988 report of a consultant team that ruled out the Hobo Jungle because it was too far from the downtown and the access was unacceptable. The Hunter report said the same thing in 1994, so this property was designated to be an outdoor recreational use for the central part of the City in 1980 by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. This report says it is premature for us to do anything, but we have been waiting 17 years and I have a letter from Tom Seigle at the Highway Department who said we were looking at six years before we start to build the sewer project, which means if we delay this project tonight, this Riverfront Project, where in affect killing it because it would be another 10 years before we could consider this again for the people of the City and of the central part of the City. I would move that we recommend adoption of this proposal.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to recommend to the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen authorizing the approval of the Riverfront project.

Chairman Wihby stated he sat down with Peter and think it is a good proposal and it is something that the City needs as soccer was getting big, but I don't think you want to put in something that is going to cost you more money eventually in the end. If the sewer project, even if it takes six years and if they come back and say you can spend \$44 million there or \$150 million somewhere else in six years then we should leave it empty and pursue with the Planning the sewer system.

Alderman Reiniger stated it was our City, not the Federal Government's. This is our City.

Chairman Wihby stated it was a matter that it was going to have to be done. We can sit here and say that we're not going to do the sewer system, but its going to be done.

Alderman Domaingue stated she said she didn't say we weren't going to do it, I said this is our City and we have a right to decide what we're going to put there.

Alderman Reiniger stated is anyone saying that because of a field you would have to totally relocate the sewerage program.

Chairman Wihby stated what I'm hearing is that it is \$44 million there and a \$100 million plus somewhere else, is what I'm hearing.

Mr. Sheppard stated I don't think if you put the soccer field down it would impact that much that we can't put the CSO there.

Chairman Wihby stated you're also eliminated the site that in three months will have an answer on if that's the site or not. It may delay the project a year.

Alderman Domaingue asked the CenterPlex.

Chairman Wihby replied yes, the CenterPlex and it might delay the project a year, but at least you know its not going to eliminate CenterPlex.

Alderman Reiniger stated we've already spent a fortune to eliminate it.

Alderman Domaingue stated Mr. MacKenzie just gave all the reasons as to why CenterPlex shouldn't go there. You can rip out a stadium, but trying ripping down a CenterPlex if they decide to put the CSO there.

Chairman Wihby stated I don't think Mr. MacKenzie just ruled out CenterPlex being there.

Alderman Domaingue stated she would have a tougher time ripping down a CenterPlex for a CSO project.

Alderman Clancy interjected no, a soccer field.

Chairman Wihby stated by the time we're going to build a CenterPlex you are going to know what the CSO's are going to do. If the plan is to put it there then you rearrange the CenterPlex so it fits in with the CSO and you build both of them there. Then you can save the \$100 million plus by moving the CSO and you build a CenterPlex there. If the CenterPlex doesn't go in three months then we are going to have that idea and then we can pursue what we want over there and then its probably a legitimate concern as to put that thing there. I think it looks nice there, but my concern is eliminating CenterPlex and what are we going to do with the CSO. If we are told that we screw up that property now, so that we don't put a CSO there and its going to cost us an additional \$100 million.

Alderman Reiniger interjected that nobody has said that. Nobody has said that a field is going to cost another \$100 million, that's absurd.

Chairman Wihby asked what is the difference in price if it doesn't go there.

Mr. Sheppard stated if we cannot locate the CSO's at that location, I think it would cost probably millions of dollars, but I'm not to sure whether we have actually investigated the actual cost. If I think I understood what Bob is saying, is that if this field goes in right now and we find out come this summer that the CSO or the storage project needs to go there, next summer or three to five years down the road, we might be tearing the soccer field up to put the storage basins down and put the soccer fields back down on top. I think what Bob is saying it may be feasible if CenterPlex doesn't go there, but may not be feasible this year. Next year hopefully we will have an idea from the EPA what our CSO solution is going to be. At that point, if there is going to be a structure at that location, maybe the best option, if the CenterPlex is not going to go there, is to put down basins as part of that project and possibly put down a soccer field, but don't put down the soccer field then tear it up and put in the storage basins and then put it back down.

Alderman Clancy stated we would be tearing up only sod, truthfully.

Mr. Sheppard stated I'm not to sure what the \$800,000 identified is.

Chairman Wihby stated with \$800,000 your going to have to rip something up.  
Chairman Wihby recognized Mr. Ramsey

Mr. Ramsey stated my name is Peter Ramsey and I'm a resident of Ward 1. There are a couple of other people here tonight and I could have invited a lot of other people and a lot of people did want to come, but I told them it would be a long meeting. Roxanne Turner is here tonight from the Philharmonic and the reason she's here is because this is not a soccer field, so lets get that straight right off the bat and drop that terminology, which is one of the many mistakes in the report. Its going to be hard for me to contain my temper because there are a lot of reasons. The first thing is it is a multi use concept. At the south end we envision a hatch shell, just like they have in Boston where you can have the Philharmonic play down there on the 4th of July and have 5,000 people down there free. That could happen this summer. There is a another gentleman that is here who is the head of the Rugby Association of New Hampshire and for New England. I don't want to speak for him and if you want to ask him a question you can, but he has told us that he can organize international rugby matches down there that will bring thousands of people to Manchester from all over New England. It's a \$800,000 bond that we are incredible confident that we can pay back. We have been approached by three major sponsors. They will not come forward because they don't want to have their names, their corporate names thrown around the Board of Aldermen. They are very interested in having their name across the middle of the field. As an example, it could be Wihby Park, but these organizations are ready to put down substantial money to help us pay back the bond every year. The reason it is going to be hard to contain my temper is that of the 60 people, I'm sorry that I don't have the list of the 60 people, that have agreed publicly to let their names go forth as members of the advisory board. This all happened in two months. The original proposal started because we saw Manchester Central High School girls, the best team in the State, play West, the second best team, out in Amherst. Why couldn't we play it here in the City, because the soccer coaches won't play at Gill Stadium. They have said it publicly. They have sent us a letter saying that they will play at this stadium if we build it in Manchester. I believe in Manchester. I have lived here a long time and I think that you people do to. What bothers me here is that clearly there is some sort of hidden agenda, let me say publicly, Kevin Provencher and I, who started this, there were no members of the Board invited to give any input to the staff report. We had to call the staff members individually, it took two or three calls sometimes, which is fine as they are busy people and they get paid a lot of money. I'm not being paid to do this, they are being paid to give the report. We had no input on this. There are major inaccuracies on this, for example, the reason I brought Roxanne tonight and she was nice enough to come, she's busy too and on the forth paragraph on the first page says plan for a concert venue have been dropped at this time. That's not true. The revenue from concerts

we dropped, because we didn't want the debate to be about big fat 10,000 seat concerts. We wanted the debate to be about City kids playing sports down there as multi use like football, soccer, rugby and field hockey, a first class venue that is private and we can shut the gate so that people don't walk their dogs, so people don't go up there with rollerblades and stuff. We want to shut the gate and keep it first class, run by private people in the City of all different classes all across the City. A man, who you all know, has said that he can organize boxing down there because the seats are movable with television coverage. What a wonderful thing every Sunday night. I mean, I understand the hidden agenda, but that doesn't mean that I have to buy into it. I don't have to buy into it because I'm not elected and I haven't promised things to people, so I don't have to buy into that. I just think that this would be great for the City and the bottom line here is that the sewer goes down in five years, we rip up the field and it costs approximately \$35,000 to \$40,000 to put the field back in, that's the turf. If you have to put the drainage in on the conservative side maybe a \$150,000 and by then, hopefully, we have a kitty put away, money put away to handle the sewer stuff. Not to mention, and this will be my last comment we went to an engineer and begged him, and I didn't want to spend a lot of money, I'm not a wealthy guy, to put together an engineered plan Dennis Anctil, who I think the City knows, has worked on that site and he put the plan together. If you think anybody from the City staff would have asked to see that plan at their meeting, as they met twice and they never asked Mr. Anctil to go down there. He works in private industry and he could have answered these questions. What is this. If you take a look at this its all sorts of drawings. They don't even make sense. I'm one of the few people who have been down there with a tape measure. The site is only 85 yards wide, not unless you want to cut down the trees, but I don't want to cut down no trees as there beautiful. Its only 85 yards wide. Can you put a CenterPlex on 85 yards. I don't think so. You got to have fire access. At UNH it's much, much wider than 85 yards, its about 150 yards, which is only common sense. Its a very narrow thin area down there.

Alderman Reiniger asked did you speak to Mr. Harris about the Riverfest.

Mr. Ramsey stated we have spoken to Mr. Harris and he is excited that somebody finally has said that it will help him improve the site. He's very excited about it.

Chairman Wihby stated he doesn't like dirt. You know one of the things state, "note the revisions are made based on the deletion of the facility hosting major concerts and variety shows". You gave that letter to us.

Mr. Ramsey stated it was related to revenue, Alderman. At the top it states i.e. budget. Its only related to revenue. We could have told you otherwise.

Chairman Wihby stated that's where they probably got it from, but they never bothered to talk to you.

Mr. Ramsey stated I'm just saying, I spent two years at the University of New Hampshire when I was younger trying to get a masters and study government. It is uncomprehensive to me that the City of Manchester doesn't assign someone, whether it is someone in the Mayor's Office or a volunteer to meet with developers private or public. It's just uncomprehensive to me. My recommendation as a taxpayer if you do anything, go ahead and kill it tonight, but if you do anything recommend that someone in City staff meet with developers and keep them informed and at least let them know. With what's happening to minor league baseball, I would like to see minor league baseball here.

Alderman Reiniger stated Mr. Chairman I would like to move the question.

It was noted the motion on the floor made by Alderman Reiniger and seconded by Alderman Domaingue was to recommend that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen authorize the approval of the Riverfront project.

Chairman Wihby asked what about the financials from Kevin Clougherty and them to find out if the numbers are right.

Alderman Domaingue stated they could have those ready by the next full Board meeting.

Mr. Ramsey stated I have talked many times to Kevin Clougherty and he was the one guy that was absolutely positive about the project and that they could have it done in two weeks if the Aldermen would approve it.

Chairman Wihby stated so they haven't done it yet. They haven't done the numbers or do they have the numbers.

Mr. Ramsey stated they are right here on the back of the proposal, Alderman.

Chairman Wihby stated he's reviewed it.

Mr. Ramsey stated yes, he has reviewed the bonding schedule and he has told me to my face and I have dealt with him as a member of the legislature and he has never misled me. He told me this thing makes sense and this is his document right here.

Alderman Clancy stated you know what I suggest, you guys go on television program like Don Rondo.

Mr. Ramsey stated we were on last night.

Chairman Wihby asked for a vote, there being none recorded as opposed the motion carried. Chairman Wihby then asked what are we going to do about the funding of it. Do we have any money.

Alderman Reiniger stated it was part of the proposal.

Chairman Wihby stated they are going to want to know where it was coming from.

Alderman Clancy stated we could find out in the mean time.

Alderman Domaingue stated I thought Mr. Clougherty had already done up the numbers.

Mr. Ramsey stated he had done up a general obligation bond.

Alderman Domaingue stated Mr. Clougherty is very familiar with this and he can give that information at the time to the full Board.

Chairman Wihby asked is that true Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would note that the wording in the report here came from Kevin Clougherty.

Alderman Domaingue stated then he has some explaining to do before the full Board doesn't he.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I guess so. In terms of the bonding the Board would most appropriately amend the Mayor's proposed CIP program to add the additional bonding and I would assume at that time he would evaluate the financial issues, but that would be the most appropriate procedure amending.

Chairman Wihby asked if he wanted to amend the motion.

Alderman Reiniger stated he would amend his motion to include amending the proposed FY98 CIP Program. Alderman Domaingue seconded the motion with the amendment. The motion as amended carried.

The Chairman addressed item 17 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning advising the Committee of staff availability to assist in the review of the Mayor's proposed FY98 Community Improvement Program.

Chairman Wihby stated we are going to do this just like we did last year, Bob. Last year you came to the full Board and that's being presented at the next meeting on March 25th. We're going to have an outline as to what the departments and stuff going to meet. Does this Committee want him to see us before he goes to the full Board.

Alderman Domaingue stated I'm not clear as to what you are doing with this report.

Chairman Wihby stated we are going to go through the book. He's saying that if we need some staff he's got some people that if this Committee wants to meet with them we can or we can do it all as a whole and review.

Alderman Domaingue stated do you want to do it as a whole or do you want it do by this Committee.

Chairman Wihby stated I have it scheduled the same way as last year, as last year was a whole.

Mr. MacKenzie stated as we are trying to accelerate this to get some projects going this summer, we're a little a bit of ahead of the operating program so there is going to be a separate public hearing just on CIP, which is going to happen on March 24th. We would then meet after the 24th and it would be up to the Board as we would love to get the CIP program adopted in the first week in April, but it would be up to the Committee as to how they would like to proceed.

Chairman Wihby stated the Committee is not meeting till April 7th. That would be the first time that we would be reviewing the budget.

Alderman Domaingue stated well maybe we should schedule just a separate meeting just for this.

Alderman Reiniger stated that's what should be recommended.

Chairman Wihby stated does this Committee want to recommend that we schedule a full Board to review the CIP.

Alderman Clancy stated I think we should.

Chairman Wihby stated we might as well do it all together or do you want this Committee.

Alderman Domaingue stated this Committee hasn't even had an opportunity to look at it and review it. Usually the proposal comes out of Committee.

The Clerk noted that the public hearing is scheduled for Monday, March 24th at 7:00 PM and then the CIP Committee is meeting on Tuesday, March 25th to discuss the FY98 CIP budget only.

Chairman Wihby stated it is and was it for the full Board.

The Clerk responded yes it was scheduled to meet, but it wasn't for the full Board, but the CIP Committee only.

Chairman Wihby asked did Tom do that.

The Clerk responded yes.

Chairman Wihby asked is that how we want it.

Alderman Domaingue replied yes.

Alderman Reiniger asked we have changed the timeline when we approved the CIP budget, when is the date.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Mayor presented the CIP budget a month early. He will be presenting, I believe, the operating budget proposal early in April. At this point it is up to the Board as to when they would like to approve the CIP, but certainly there is a lot of projects we would like to get done this summer and the earlier in April that we can get it approved the quicker we can get going on these projects.

Alderman Reiniger stated the reason I asked was that Mr. Ramsey's project to open July 4th and we're talking about when the CIP budget would pass. So it would be any time before the end of April.

Mr. Ramsey stated I was under the impression that Mr. Clougherty was talking about a general obligation bond because he told me that once the Board approved it, it would be set.

Chairman Wihby stated that would be in the regular budget then the CIP budget which we are looking to approve early this year. Normally it would be July 1st.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if our time table is looking for the first week in April for the approval of the CIP budget that would also jive with the foundations proposal.

Chairman Wihby stated so this sub-committee is meeting on the 25th we are going to recommend something for the full Board for the 1st of April.

Alderman Domaingue replied yes.

Chairman Wihby stated at the 1st of April we would have already had the public hearing, so the full Board will take it up. When is the full Board taken it up. Are they going to take it up when we bring up the recommendation on the 1st.

Alderman Domaingue stated the full Board has the option of attending the public hearing and as a matter of fact we should encourage it. They will get all there questions answered and if they have any questions about whether priorities that some Aldermen have they will have been included and that's the time to take that up.

Chairman Wihby stated could you note that the Sub-Committee is having a meeting after the public hearing on the 24th, on the 25th, and we ask that the full Board participate as we are looking for a vote as soon as April 1st.

Mr. Girard stated point of order Mr. Chairman, I believe the public hearing is on the CIP budget is of the full Board and not of the Committee.

Chairman Wihby stated at the public hearing you don't really ask questions you just listen to whatever anybody else says.

Mr. Girard stated to refresh the Committee's memory the Mayor last year when he presented his budget referred his recommendations to CIP Committee, so that members of the Committee as a Committee could review them and make recommendations back to the Board, so we are trying to follow the same process that we went through last year, which was the first time we went through the process in that manner, but we are trying to do it on an accelerated time schedule.

Chairman Wihby stated and the Committee is going to take it up on the 25th and we recommend that everybody be there so they can have the input, as we would like to have it passed on the first.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to send a communication to the Board inviting them to attend the March 25, 1997 CIP Committee meeting to discuss the proposed FY98 CIP budget.

## **TABLED ITEMS**

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to remove item 18 from the table.

Report from SPOT Team regarding:  
397 Spruce Street, request of Beverly Fosher.  
(Originally tabled 3/26/96 - remained on the table 9/30/96 in anticipation of taxes to be received.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to receive and file item 18.

Communication from Al Lindquist, A & A Resource Mgt., Inc., requesting the City's assistance to expedite a closing on property located at 241 Crosbie Street which the City held at public auction in 1995.  
(Tabled 6/10/96)

This item remained on the table.

Discussion with representatives from The Sargent Museum relative to their proposal to acquire and renovate City-owned property located at 88 Lowell Street.  
(Originally tabled 7/9/96 - remained on the table 9/30/96 and requested Mr. Taylor to pursue going forward with the formation of an agreement for consideration by the Committee.)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Jay Taylor regarding improvements to the corner of Bridge and Elm Streets property.  
(Tabled 8/27/96)

This item remained on the table.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to remove item 22 from the table.

Sidewalk Program -

(Note: revised map from the Director of Planning forwarded under separate cover for discussion on March 11, 1997.)

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have been through a process, if I can address this, we have been through a process of identifying a policy showing you a map based upon that policy. Tonight I would like to review with you, if you're comfortable with the policy and the map a prioritized schedule of sidewalk construction programs and I do have a map showing those as well. If you're comfortable with it we could get moving on if you would like to. Let me just review this, this is in your package under item 22 and it looks like this. I do have a map if any of the Aldermen want to identify where those are specifically. We went through a process based on the policy of trying to find the best bank for our buck in terms of sidewalk construction. The best way to do it is to rate different projects according to certain criteria. You can see on this table that we have identified the street section, the school, the length, how far it is to a school, feet to school, whether it is eligible for CD monies or not and we do have two pools of money here that we are working with, both HUD CDBG, which can only go on certain qualifying areas and bond monies. The type of project it is either filling in an existing gap of sidewalks or it's a brand new sidewalk. Then you see across the top a series of evaluations criteria. The first three we weighted more heavily because we felt those were more important, proximity, demand and density and safety factors and then we had other criteria such as alternative routes, continuity, direct school route and construction factors. Each one of these projects was evaluated according to those criteria and we came up with a total score and then we ranked them according to that score. Under the CD projects, just to run down through those, we have Wilson Street, which is just a small section near Wilson School that has no sidewalks; two sections of Valley Street, Mammoth Road A, another section on Valley Street and two sections on Mammoth Road. The projects under the bond would be Weston Road A and again certain sections because they are large and costly broke down into bite sized bites. Weston Road, Goffs Falls Road, Youville Street near the Northwest Elementary School, another section of Weston Road, Bennington Road, Mast Road on the west side, Huse Road, Smyth Road, Parkside Ave, which is right near Parkside School, Smyth Road, Mooresville Road, Union Street and Webster Street. Each of these projects are ranked according to there score over the far right hand side. At this point, we feel that it has been a reasonable approach and we feel that this criteria and map will help us each year if we get allocation of monies to construct sidewalks. This will give a fair and equitable approach across the City in doing sidewalks. We have made some recommendations if the Committee would like to entertain them. I know you haven't seen these.

Chairman Wihby asked does anyone have any questions so far. Is everybody happy with the way that he did it. So basically your asking that the policy and map be endorsed as guidelines for the sidewalk construction program and that the prioritized list be forwarded to the Highway Department for this summer's construction season and that the projects be implemented in order as funds allow. How many funds are allowed that you think we'll be able to get off this list. Are all of these going to be done.

Alderman Clancy asked Kevin, is Highway going to do all of these or put them out to bid.

Mr. Sheppard replied that the Highway Department will be doing it.

Alderman Clancy asked all of it.

Mr. Sheppard replied yes.

Chairman Wihby asked what do you anticipate being done.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it would only be guess work now, we would prefer just to go as funds maybe available. You might have the first four or five CD projects, you might have the first four or five bond projects, but that's guess work until, it depends on the prices.

Alderman Domaingue stated Highway, you have Highland Goffs Falls listed here and I know that Goffs Falls Road has already got a sidewalk and drain project scheduled for next summer approved. Is this section that is being pointed out here part of that or has that already been scheduled and if it is can we substitute Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. Sheppard stated I'm going to tell you the truth, I not sure exactly where that sidewalk would be compared to the project.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it is on the north side of Goffs Falls Road between Beatrice Lawrence Drive and Westwood Drive.

Alderman Domaingue asked can we leave it to these two to get together that if it is they can substitute.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if they are doing the project then that is one we can just eliminate from the list and then move on to the next one on the list.

Alderman Domaingue replied okay.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to endorse the enclosed Sidewalk Construction Program Policy as guidelines for the City's sidewalk program and to forward the prioritized listing to the Highway Department for implementation in the upcoming construction season in the order listed as funds allow.

Alderman Clancy stated Bob, let me ask you a question, where is Mammoth Road A. I know there are two, three sections. I know that some is in Ward 5 some is in Ward 2.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Mammoth Road A is from Bridge Street up to about the Sandpiper Village Condominiums.

Alderman Clancy asked is my Nelson Street to Lake Avenue on the list.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Mammoth Road.

Alderman Clancy asked is it C or B.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that was not on that particular list. It is not near a school, it's not within a mile.

Mr. Girard stated the Committee's directive was to give schools the first priority, Alderman Clancy.

Communication from Donald Tomilson requesting the Committee review the current ordinance relating to deduct water meters, and suggesting it be amended to provide the same relief from excessive sewer charges for commercial and industrial establishments, as now applies to residential irrigation systems.  
(Tabled 10/22/96 pending further report.)

This item remained on the table.

Communication from Alice Bellemare advising that neighbors in the

vicinity of Candia Road suggest that a thru street from Mammoth Road to Lovering or Page Streets would cut down heavily on speeding and traffic on Candia Road.

(Tabled 12/10/96 pending a response from Alderman Soucy.)

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS:

Alderman Reiniger stated I have a property I think its 113 Spruce Street across from Bakoulas and we tried to auction it once and didn't work.

Alderman Clancy stated I have a buyer for that. Its on the corner of Barry Avenue and Spruce.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to send 113 Spruce Street to auction.

Alderman Domaingue stated on the first item we took with the Airport, what was the resolution of that where the reporting back to the Committee with what the Airport Board is going to do.

Chairman Wihby stated they were going to report back to you and if you weren't happy with what they said you were going to come back to us.

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

A True Record. Attest

Clerk of Committee