

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

August 26, 1997

6:30 PM

Chairman Robert called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Robert, Wihby, Reiniger, Clancy and Domaingue.

Messrs.: Nancy Barnes, Asst. Solicitor Arnold, Richard Davis,
Chief Driscoll, Robert MacKenzie, Kevin Sheppard, Jay Taylor,
Frank Thomas and Sean Thomas

Chairman Robert advised that he would first address item #18:

Communication from Richard O'Keefe, Columbia Realty LLC requesting the City consider transferring title to a parcel of land currently known as "Auger Avenue".

(Note: "SPOT" Team recommendation enclosed.)

Ms. Nancy Barnes was present on behalf of Mr. O'Keefe.

Alderman Wihby moved to the recommendation of the SPOT team that a petition for discontinuance be submitted for consideration of a road hearing. Alderman Reiniger seconded the motion. Following brief discussion by Alderman Clancy relative to the intended use if discontinued, the motion carried.

The Clerk advised Ms. Barnes that a letter would be forthcoming or she could contact the office the next morning for information on how to submit the petition.

Chairman Robert addressed item 3 of the agenda:

Report from the Director of Planning and the Industrial Agent regarding status of disposition of 1037 Elm Street, if available.

Mr. Taylor stated if you will recall the Committee gave the Planning Director and I the authority to proceed with an RFP process in trying to dispose of the property located at 1037 Elm which is the two buildings on the corner of Concord and Elm directly across from Hampshire Plaza which is owned by the City by tax deed and has been vacant for some time now and I think everyone feels that it is appropriate to try to get this property back on the tax rolls and redeveloped in some form. We went out, as you recall, for an RFP process and as we reported to you at the last meeting of this Committee, we did receive a proposal and this Committee granted the committee of the staff to proceed with the developers of this proposal to try and see if we could come up with something that made sense for both the City and the developers. The staff committee reviewed the proposal that we received and as a result of that review a number of questions arose from the staff, we presented those questions to the developers and we met with them on August 20th to review their responses to those questions and as a result of that meeting there were several additional items or some continuing items that we felt were still unresolved and the long and the short of it is we are not prepared to make a recommendation at this point as we are still continuing on our due diligence activities. Going one step further, we have come to the conclusion that before we do business with anyone we probably need to develop a list of conditions and/or requirements that the City will be concerned about in disposing of this property and to that end we have a meeting of this same staff committee scheduled for next week to try and review that issue, so that we can come up with a list of concerns that the City should be cognizant of in disposing of this property so that we don't end up with a terrible situation down the road. So, it's our intent to try and come back to you hopefully at the next meeting with some sort of a recommendation with respect to what conditions we propose to put on the sale of this property and possibly even whether or not we should proceed with the current developers or whether we should go back to square one and proceed with another RFP process. So, I'm not prepared to make a recommendation at this time, but it's simply a report to give you the status of where we are and where we think we're going with this.

Alderman Reiniger asked, Jay, could you for our benefit briefly describe the proposal that does stand before us, what types of uses to the building are they looking at for the different floors, etc.

Mr. Taylor replied the proposal as it has been submitted suggests retail uses on the ground level which I think we all agree with, at the staff level. Possibly, on the second and third levels they're talking about some office type uses and above that they're considering developing the property in such a way that they can go in either of two ways - small residential units, market rate residential units or office suites - whichever the demand appears to be and we don't have a particular

problem with either of those uses, it's a matter of what the mixture is, what the amount is and what the financing program will support. Clearly, if you're going to do residential units there has to be some financial background behind it to support that kind of use and originally they had talked about single-occupancy room units. We questioned the validity of that proposal and we questioned the market for that kind of a unit and I think they have gotten off of that single-occupancy room issue and they are now talking about making the units occupiable by either office and/or residential type units which I think the staff feels a little more comfortable with. So, that is where we are at at the moment.

Chairman Robert stated we can just let this item go for now.

Mr. Taylor stated I think we would probably would want to come back at the next meeting of this Committee. Whether we have a recommendation remains to be seen but at least we will make a report as to where we are at that particular time.

Alderman Clancy asked what is the asking price of that building.

Mr. Taylor replied they have made an offer of \$75,000.

Chairman Robert asked what is it appraised at.

Mr. Taylor replied I don't know what the assessed value is, if any.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do know that when the City was going to put that property out to auction and the Assessors had looked at and they were talking about that ballpark as a minimum bid.

Mr. Taylor stated if you recall that property had a fire there, the MHRA put some money into it to repair the roof so that it wouldn't deteriorate further and there has been some extensive water damage as a result of the roof being in disrepair and the building is going to need some substantial investment in order to bring it back.

Alderman Wihby asked as we thinking of letting them have it rather than going out to bid when it comes to that or what.

Mr. Taylor replied we did go out for an RFP and they were the only respondents. We have a number of alternatives, we could deny them further activity, we could go back to square one and start again, we could proceed with this group putting on a series of conditions for disposition of the property. The main thing I think we want to be concerned about is the future, that building is considered to be of some historic significance. The facade of the building is very unique in the Downtown

area and I think whatever we do we want to make sure that if a group whether it's this group or some other one should fail to perform under whatever agreement they sign, I think we want to make sure that we have some control over what happens beyond that. The last thing I think we want to do is send it out and have it go in any different direction. We don't want to see it demolished, I don't think we want to see the facade materially changed, so that the delicate balance here between the City keeping some control over the property and leaving the developer some discretion in how they redevelop the property. So, I think we have to get at that issue and address it.

Chairman Robert addressed items 4& 5 of the agenda:

Update relative to the Facade Improvement Program.

Request by Intown Management to utilize balance of funds (approximately \$20,000) from the tent structure replacement at Veterans Park for improvements to the skating rink at Hampshire Plaza.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Committee had requested basically a regular update on the Facade Improvement Program. Rich Davis is here tonight on this one and the next item and they have put together a spreadsheet identifying the various loans or grants under this program and we have that information tonight and Rich is here to answer any questions that the Committee might have.

Alderman Clancy stated I've just got one that pertains to four and five. Are you looking to use the funding on five for fixing up the rink, \$21,000 it looks like. Would that be better used on number four as far as the facade goes rather than on a rink for a year.

Mr. Davis replied they really have different objectives and we have some other sources that we can use in the Building Improvement Program including loan funds we have some additional technical assistance money that will be very helpful in continuing to push the building improvements. So, on the other hand the ice rink is still in its start-up phase as we're really just ending one year of operation and getting into the second year. So, you're asking me to make a judgment call and I really feel that if you are going to allocate the twenty that I need to do the ice rink with it rather than put it into building improvements, but that's just my opinion, of course.

Alderman Wihby stated it sounds like this program for the facade has worked really good, is there anywhere else we could find money to continue this rather than to tell people to wait.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we were looking for some extra CDBG money to fund the technical assistance part of the Facade Improvement Program, we haven't earmarked that yet. I'm not aware of any other money, any bond balances, any outstanding cash that we could utilize for the project right now. We could start looking toward the next fiscal year to identify some money for it.

Alderman Wihby asked how about Jay, does Jay have any money that we could allocate toward this and reimburse it next year in July.

Alderman Reiniger asked how about MDC money.

Mr. Taylor replied we have some CDBG money assigned to our office for the Revolving Loan Fund Program and as you may recall in recent months we have allocated a portion of that to try to support the expansion program of JacPac Foods. If for some reason, JacPac Foods were not to proceed I suppose there was some chance of reallocating some of that money hopefully on a temporary basis, but at the moment if JacPac proceeds I think we're going to be pretty well tapped out in terms of providing assistance there.

Alderman Wihby asked there's no indication that they're not going to continue, is there.

Mr. Taylor replied I don't know but JacPac Foods...they have not pulled the trigger on this expansion at this point, but rather they are having a disagreement with PSNH with respect to electric rates and there was a hearing last Friday at the Public Utilities Commission which the Mayor and I appeared at on behalf of JacPac in order to try and get them some assistance in getting their rates reduced, so I don't know what the results of that are at this point.

Alderman Wihby asked do they do that normally, PSNH.

Mr. Taylor replied because of the Pilot Program and all the ramifications and because of the newly-adopted business retention rates and economic development rates JacPac apparently is asserting that they should be eligible for some discounted rates and it's my understanding is that PSNH and JacPac have some dispute with respect to how far they go with these expansion rate eligibilities and

that they have asked the Public Utilities Commission to rule on this issue and I suspect that will happen at the earliest will be tonight and at the very latest maybe next Tuesday, so we'll have an answer fairly quickly.

Alderman Wihby stated I guess my feeling is that this program has worked real good, we've got people Downtown using it, we've got new stores opening Downtown and if we wait until July of next year...look at what happens when you wait...now is the time to get people in there, they're doing some work, they're feeling good, the City's doing good, the economics is doing well. Now, is the time to get them in there and do the stuff, not to wait until July or they decide to change their mind and not go Downtown. I think something's got to happen where we've got to find the money somehow to continue the program and keep it going and funding it now than wait until next July and I don't know how you do that, I don't know if the city can take out a loan or something, but somehow to help these people do it and get them going. Why wait six months or seven months before you tell them that maybe they have the money and then it's going to take two months to do it and then they want to wait to the following year, if they're willing to do it now we ought to be doing it.

Mr. MacKenzie stated you will remember that we discussed and we did find \$80,000 towards the program and that has been helpful, I think, in a number of companies coming in. You may want to review these sheets. One is from last year, one is from this year and they are carrying all of the projects on it because there are a lot of projects that are...not all the money has been spent, a lot of it has been committed and there will be a lot of activity. A lot of these applications are pending, so a lot of the action is going to actually happen in the next 12 months, so it's not like the action is going to stop immediately in the next month or so.

Alderman Wihby stated if we had more money now more people would do it. I'm reading in here that your saying do you want to choose between McQuade's or the new tenant or give them both, we are already giving them a decision that we're going to tell someone who wants to move in that they are not going to get the money, we're not going to make a commitment to you or we're only going to give you half of what you want and then they're going to decide if they're going to split up the five thousand when they're looking for ten. I understand what you're saying that you're going to see more improvements on the next 12 months but we could see more if we had more money to do it, isn't that true. It's not like they can't do it, these are individual businesses that they can go out tomorrow and start doing it with additional funding. My understanding because we had this

discussion during the budget process that we were going to run out, but I don't think the Aldermen thought that they were going to run out two months into the budget process because I thought we'd go through six or seven months and we'd be closer to next July before something was going to happen and look how much it's picked up since then. This was a topic...I know Alderman Reiniger was talking about it at the time we wanted to do this, we wanted to have this stuff done.

Alderman Clancy asked, Rich, how much money do we have now, \$200,000...\$120,000 plus the \$80,000.

Mr. Davis replied \$120,000 plus the \$60,000 and an additional \$20,000 in assistance.

Alderman Clancy asked we're out of funds right now.

Mr. Davis replied yes, the \$120,000 was committed from last year and those funds are still being spent by people who applied last year.

Alderman Clancy asked how many people does that serve, how many tenants or businesses does that serve.

Mr. Davis replied all together...I've counted...we've had some 50 applicants, I've counted now 32 projects that are in some stage of construction or had been completed and 18 of those are right on Elm Street, so there's a total of 32 projects where you'll begin to see some progress.

Alderman Clancy stated what strikes me funny though, I noticed here 25-27 Lowell Street is a vacant building, it's the old Hesser College, right.

Mr. Davis replied yes. Well, it's not vacant, it's being leased.

Alderman Clancy asked it's being sold, isn't it.

Mr. Davis replied yes and it's being leased, I believe they already have tenants.

Alderman Clancy stated aren't they already in business.

Mr. Davis stated they haven't actually received their money. They have just completed the project, the money is pretty much allocated on a first-come, first-serve basis and then if you say that you are going to start a project and you don't complete it, then we'll try to find the money to plug into somebody else's project. In this case, the people committed to doing the project, they got it done, they turned in their receipts, and they did everything the way they were suppose to do. So, we've tried to do it on a first-come, first-serve basis as the money was available.

Alderman Clancy asked how many are waiting.

Mr. Davis replied the ones you see on this list here there are probably another 12 who feel they could start soon and demand is still pending. There are other businesses that come in kind of week-by-week that inquire about the availability. I'd say every week we get about one new inquiry, so demand is still growing.

Alderman Clancy asked can you tell me the boundary lines.

Mr. Davis replied I should probably send you a map of the boundary lines, but generally the boundary which was really done several years ago for purposes of this assessment district, the boundary starts at Granite, it proceeds eastward to Pine, it proceeds northward on Pine that is between the park and the Library up to Bridge, at Bridge the line goes back westward and picks up the alley on the east side of Bridge.

Alderman Clancy asked at Church Street.

Mr. Davis stated if that's Church, that's the one and it proceeds up Church Street then to Harrison, cuts back to Elm, goes up Elm a block, turns at Brook and goes back to the river. So, at the northend it kind of picks up a narrow stretch of Elm Street and then it picks up all of the Millyard all the way down to Granite and Lake Avenue. So, it's kind of an oddly shaped district and it's kind of wider at the bottom than it is at the top. We have had, I should say, a number of inquiries from people who are adjacent to the district just outside it. It would love to participate, but as of right now lines are drawn in such a way that we can't help them.

Alderman Reiniger stated I also agree with what Alderman Wihby has been saying about the importance of this project. There's a sentence in here that I find very interesting quoting Rich Davis..."my current estimate is that the grant funds are leveraging up to five times their face value in loan and equity investments." I think this is a great return to be getting back five times the money for each dollar, that is incredible. A quick question for Jay and also as a follow up to Alderman Wihby...would the MDC be a possible source for additional monies or would that be worth us approaching them.

Mr. Taylor stated I guess you could always ask the question. I can't speak for the MDC, but I can tell you and you've sat in other meetings so you know what some of their concerns are and their concerns are that they dissipate their assets without any way to get them back so that they can continue to do these things, but I can't speak...I think it would be worth approaching, it might be a possibility. There may also be some possibility of talking with maybe even Amoskeag Industries about some of these issues. I don't know, they're looking for a role to play and it could be another alternative.

Alderman Reiniger stated I do agree, we do have a momentum going now and I'd hate to cut it short. There is a reference here...Rich Davis is saying he is enclosing two sheets which outline the commitments being's made, I didn't see the sheets in my packet, I don't know if you have copies of those.

Mr. MacKenzie stated those came in after the deadline last week. I do have them available right now if the Committee would like to see those.

Mr. Davis stated I regret the fine print on these but there is a lot of information.

Alderman Wihby stated I think it's good that we should have MDC and Amoskeag Industries looked into. Jay, would you look into that for us. Is there any possibility of our getting a big bond for something like the Elm Street project, is there a possibility of using some of that to do something like that to do something like this because it is fixing Elm Street and reimbursing it, I don't know if we're going to use it all before July or not and reimbursing it next year.

Mr. MacKenzie replied there is always a possibility of using bond balances. Right now, construction activity is up so much that we're very tight on a lot of our funded projects. So, there is real no excess in any of our bonded projects. I think you're saying can we use some of the money...

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think there is a cash flow line now on the Elm Street project, they're on a very fast track and I don't see where we could float any money to the next fiscal year for Elm Street.

Alderman Wihby asked could we at least have Jay look into the other two or three, whatever you can think of that can get this project going and I imagine even if it's a matter of someone wanting to be reimbursed and bring that to us and we can decide at that point if we want to do something and tell them we will give it back to them in July or not or whatever. I just think we're losing if we're not there when it's starting to peak, we're just going to lose the whole thing and now it's going and people are talking about Downtown, they're see changes, they're seeing Elm Street...now's the time to do it. Again, I think when we voted it was an issue...I remember discussing it during the budget process because the Aldermen were concerned. We told them that we thought that we would get through half-a-year and we're not even near that.

Alderman Reiniger moved to authorize the Planning Department to proceed with utilizing the funds for the rink as requested in item number 5. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Clancy duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Robert addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Report of the Mayor's Baseball Advisory Committee regarding a feasibility study to explore the possibilities of locating an affiliated baseball franchise in the City.

Mr. Thomas advised that after discussion with Alderman Shea it was concurred that this item should be tabled and have the Parks Department put together an estimated cost of such a study, and scope of services for review by the Committee.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to accept the recommendation of Mr. Thomas and table the report.

Chairman Robert addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Robert requesting that ownership of a parcel of land adjacent to 17 Ferry Street be identified and disposed of in accordance with State law.

The Clerk noted that this property was owned by the Order of St. Benedict, whose home was St. Raphael's and they had indicated they did not wish to dispose of the property. The City had no jurisdiction over this property.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to receive and file the communication.

Chairman Robert addressed item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Assistant Solicitor Arnold submitting a formal offer by Ann Marie Daigle and Michael P. Murphy to purchase land owned by the City known as Map 862, Lot 62, Phillip Street (705 Catherine Street).

Assistant Solicitor Arnold briefly outlined the property in question advising that the Board had once approved of selling the property to the abutter who had then realized it was not the parcel they had thought it was, but instead was a piece that ran through the middle of their back yard. The property had been deeded to the city in 1939 and it had not been discovered when the current owner purchased the property in 1994. The assessors had indicated that the \$1,000 was a fair offer. In response to questions, Asst. Solicitor Arnold advised that it was not a buildable lot, there was already a house on the property.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to accept the offer of \$1,000 from the abutter and dispose of the property.

Chairman Robert addressed item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from the Public Works Director seeking the Board's concurrence in allowing the Department of Highways to proceed with necessary negotiations and purchases relative to the Huse/Weston/Mooresville Intersection Improvement project anticipated to begin in the Spring of 1998.

Alderman Domaingue moved to approve the request but noted she wished to discuss it. Alderman Wihby seconded the motion.

Alderman Domaingue informed Mr. Sheppard of Highway that she had no problem with authorizing the request but noted concern of two property owners who stood to lose a substantial portion of their front yards. She commented that Mr. Gancarz had informed her that he had submitted an alternate proposal to the Highway Department and requested that Highway review that proposal before finalizing their plans. If the alternate proposal could be carried out she felt they owed it to these residents to work it out.

Mr. Sheppard indicated that he would follow up on the matter and if they could work something out they would.

Chairman Robert called for a vote on the motion to approve the request. The motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from the Public Works Director seeking authorization to register a hydroseeder and a small trailer which were purchased in June.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman Robert addressed item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Tom Seigle seeking permission to purchase a mid-sized sedan for use by the EPD administration office to replace a 1990 Chevy Caprice from funds available in the EPD FY98 budget.

Alderman Clancy moved to approve the request. Alderman Wihby seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued where it was noted that the current vehicle had about 125,000 to 135,000 miles on it.

The motion carried with the understanding that the old vehicle would be turned over for auction.

Chairman Robert addressed item 12 of the agenda:

Communication from Deputy Chief of Police Robinson seeking permission to add a crime scene van to the department fleet utilizing Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program funds for such purchase.

Alderman Wihby moved for discussion. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion.

In response to questions, Chief Driscoll advised that they had converted the old paddy wagon to a crime scene van and were in need of replacing it. The old wagon would be sent to auction unless otherwise ordered by the Committee.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to approve the request with the understanding that the old vehicle would be sent to auction.

Chairman Robert addressed item 13 of the agenda:

Communication from the Tax Collector submitting a statement from Steven Rudman who wishes to donate a parcel of land to the City known as Map 279, Lot 13.

Alderman Clancy moved for discussion. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

It was noted that the Committee generally does not recommend accepting property because of liabilities that may occur along with revenue loss, unless there was a specific interest for use by the city.

The general location of the property was discussed.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to advise Mr. Rudman that the City did not want the property.

Chairman Robert addressed item 14 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of the Manchester Water Works submitting a renewal of Sandy's Variety Store lease between the City of Manchester, Manchester Water Works and Massabesic Realty, Inc.

Alderman Clancy moved to approve the agreement. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Robert questioned why the amount of \$400 was set, whether it was a fair value or something that had transpired for some time. He suggested the Assessors be requested to establish a value of the lease.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to table the item and request a report from Water Works on how they came to the \$400. figure and request the Board of Assessors to look at the property and determine a value for the lease. Alderman Clancy was duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Robert addressed item 15 of the agenda:

Communication from Maria Drozd requesting that the sidewalk in the vicinity of 742 Lake Avenue be repaired and/or reconstructed.

Alderman Clancy moved for discussion. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued relative to the sidewalk where Alderman Clancy noted that the woman had contacted him and the new sidewalk from the intersection improvements ended right before her property. It was thought that perhaps they could tie it in with the improvements at the intersection.

Mr. Sheppard explained that the property in question did not basically have a sidewalk left, it was mostly grass. The property was also the first one beyond the intersection which was initially suppose to be a signalization project. Utilizing these funds was stretching the purpose because the property was beyond the intersection.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to deny the request but to have Highway send a letter to Ms. Drozd explaining the situation.

Chairman Robert addressed item 16 of the agenda:

Petition to discontinue a portion of Page Street submitted by William Gardner.

A communication from Highway was distributed. The clerk noted that although the communication raised some issues, the Solicitor's office was recommending that the petition be referred to a road hearing and considered for discontinuance.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to recommend referral of the petition to the next road hearing.

Chairman Robert addressed item 17 of the agenda:

Communication from Louise Gazda regarding the Manchester Transit Authority's cancellation of two "bingo" runs and transportation for after-school programs at the YMCA and YWCA.

(Note: referred to the MTA for review and report back to Committee.)

The Clerk distributed a copy of a letter to members of the Committee which had been received the previous day from the Transit Authority.

Chairman Robert stated in my district I have folks concerned with school buses picking kids up at school and dropping them off at day care providers, is that something that they are going to include in this as well.

Alderman Clancy stated that is something new they just started to my knowledge, is that true.

The Clerk replied it was a separate issue from this.

Chairman Robert stated from what I understand it's one and the same. I really wish somebody from MTA was here.

Alderman Wihby stated the after-school issue is okay now, right.

The Clerk replied it's still in process. They have held their public hearing at the School Department and now the School Board has to take official action.

Chairman Robert stated maybe my concern is why is having children bused to them...there is a need to have kids bused to other places other than just the "Y" and I want to know if they're included.

The Clerk replied I believe the 'y' is paying for that. It is my understanding they have separate contracts.

Alderman Clancy asked didn't Kim Valdez come to this Committee.

The Clerk replied yes, there was a communication received through Child & Family Services noting the crux of the whole thing was that they had discontinued certain services to these centers because they could not use the school buses, the State law had been changed to allow them to do that if they adopted in the same manner as they do their fiscal budget and they have now adopted that as a school-related function or they're in the process of doing that, so that MTA can again provide the service.

Alderman Wihby asked how about Valdez is she going to be able to be a school-related function and, therefore, they will be able to do them again.

The Clerk replied that was the whole crux of the discussion was for the "Y" and the YMCA and those and my understanding is yes they are paying for that, they have contracts with the "Y" and the "YM" at this point in time. If there are other day care providers that want that, I believe that if they contact MTA it can probably be worked out, but on a contractual basis and perhaps you may want them to come in for that issue.

Chairman Robert stated I would like to have that done.

The Clerk stated for the bingo issue, it's not dealing with child care, they are saying that the child care is a State mandate situation, this is just a matter of economics, they don't want to provide it anymore because it's costing them too much money, but if you want them to come back on the child care issue we can ask them to come back at your next meeting.

Alderman Robert moved to table item 17 and requested that Mr. Roy from the MTA be invited to attend the next CIP meeting. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Robert addressed item 19 of the agenda:

Communication from Else Raymond seeking assurances from the City that she will not be hurt in any way by the City's disposition of property located on Pennsylvania Avenue.

(Note: "SPOT" Team recommendation enclosed.)

Alderman Wihby moved to have a letter sent to Ms. Raymond advising that the City could not make the guarantee requested because the City had no jurisdiction as outlined by the SPOT team. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 20 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning suggesting that a request to name a street "Pouliot" be placed on file at the City Clerk's Office for the next opportunity for a street name.

Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk has an objection to it because we have nothing to do with the naming of streets.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the next new street that the City may build, I think, may be the new Airport entrance road where St. Francis is, so I presume that the Airport Authority would like to have some control over the naming of that street. So, I see very limited opportunity for the City itself to name a new street in the near future.

Alderman Wihby stated Leo Bernier's grandfather worked there for many years.

Chairman Robert stated Leo would make sure that this is taken care of, he'll be around for a while, let's have Leo hang onto this.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to place the request on file with the City Clerk.

Chairman Robert asked would you please send him a letter telling him that Leo will look after this.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- A. 1994 CIP Budget Authorization:
6.10316 Rental Housing Preservation & Development - Closeout
- B. 1995 CIP Budget Authorization:
6.10316 Rental Housing Preservation & Development - Closeout
- C. A bond resolution and budget authorization for the 1998 CIP 7.60323
Cohas Brook Trunk Sewer Project.
- F. An amending resolution allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of
grant funds for various School Department projects by increasing Title I
(aka Chapter I) - from \$1,950,000 to \$2,124,268; Title II - from \$110,000
to \$121,429; Title VI - from \$125,000 to \$126,966; and by adding
Technology Literacy Challenge Grant Application - \$100,000 and Goals
2000 Educate America Act Grant Application - \$50,000.
- G. An amending resolution and budget authorization changing the
administering authority for the 1998 CIP 2.50602 Latin American Center
from Manchester Consolidated Services, Inc. to Southern New Hampshire
Services, Inc.
- I. An amending resolution and budget authorization increasing the 1998 CIP
7.50101B Sidewalk 50/50 Construction Program - \$95,000 - from \$90,000
bond to \$185,000 (\$90,000 bond and \$95,000 other).

**HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF
ALDERMAN WIHBY, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN REINIGER,
IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.**

- D. An amending resolution and budget authorizations allowing for the
acceptance and expenditure of an 80% state reimbursement grant for cost of
design and rehabilitation work for the Amoskeag and Biron Bridges by
increasing the 1998 CIP 7.10115 Bridge Rehabilitation Project from
\$116,000.00 bond to \$741,317.91 and decreasing the 1996 CIP 7.10217
Valley/Tarrytown/Massabesic Intersection Improvements - \$18,027.91.

Alderman Domaingue stated Item D was removed at the request of the Clerk's Office.

The Clerk stated Mr. MacKenzie has advised us that after conferring with the Highway Department we needed to change some numbers. The Resolution reflects \$18,027.91 of a bond balance that number should reflect \$16,027.91. Basically, there is \$2,000 left that needs to be paid on taxes in order to closeout the old program. On the budget authorization for the Valley/Tarrytown/Massabesic Intersection Improvements other for tax purposes will reflect an additional \$2,000, so that will increase it to a total of \$182,000 in that column and the budget authorization for the Bridge Rehabilitation Project would show a bond balance of \$16,027.91 instead of \$18,027.91.

Alderman Clancy stated I've had some calls from quite a few of the constituents up there at the intersection of Tarrytown and Massabesic and they are not too happy with that construction job that was done up there recently. They've got water holes up there and they've got an island up there where they've got a sewer in the middle of it, how is the water going to go up to the top of curbing, a lot of people have a lot of water holes throughout and I think we should hold up some of those monies that you want to turn back the \$16,027.91 and put that for the Biron Bridge. I would holdback some of those monies because there still might be some work that needs to be done. Mr. Morin who owns Morin's filling station is not too happy at all with the job that has been done up there. He's had the Highway Department up here daily and also the people up there around the corner have water holes when it rains hard that was recently resurfaced. So, we've got Valley Street, Massabesic and Tarrytown the one area just done and still have numerous things up there that need to be addressed.

Chairman Robert asked is Kevin Sheppard here.

The Clerk noted Mr. Sheppard had left but maybe Mr. MacKenzie could respond.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, you wouldn't know anything about this, would you.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I'm afraid not, Mr. Chairman, I could certainly relay the concerns tomorrow to see if those have been addressed or can be addressed.

The Clerk stated there are two options. One, could be tabled in Committee or the other is to pass it along and pull it off at the Board level because the Board is meeting next week and you won't be able to meet again before the Board meets

again to pass the Resolution. If your answers aren't there then perhaps the Board would table it until you get your answers.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to approve Item 21D subject to report to be made to the full Board.

- E. An amending resolution and budget authorization decreasing the 1997 CIP 5.10155 School Recreation Facilities/Parking Lot Improvements Project - \$74,734.25 CDBG and increasing the 1997 CIP 5.10251 Neighborhood Parks Rehabilitation Project budget from \$100,000 CDBG to \$174,734.25 CDBG.

Alderman Domaingue stated I've read the accompanying information that was sent in particularly from the CIP Department, I guess I have a question relative to the brand new CDBG Park Improvement account. They're asking for the remainder of \$74,734.25 to be used to create a new Park Improvement account. While I recognize that somebody here has stated that we have finished and completed the use for the funding on School Recreational Facilities Parking Lot Improvements Project don't we have some tennis courts and would they not fall under that project or are they not CDBG eligible.

Mr. MacKenzie replied these funds can only be used in eligible areas. They've done all of the school park areas that are eligible. The only outstanding one and where the money was going to be used was Chandler playground and apparently it's the intent now of the School Department to proceed with another facility. So, at this point, and that was the last school park in the area that could use the funds. So, they had hoped to use that money at Sheridan-Emmett along with a community garden and some other improvements which that area is eligible under CD. The areas you mentioned the tennis courts, I know Parks & Recreation is anxious to build a tennis court at Memorial, I don't believe that area would be eligible as a low/moderate income area for the CD funds.

Alderman Domaingue asked if we are creating a new CDBG Park Improvement Project fund account, are we then at this point in the following years expected to fund it at a certain level and have you heard anything from the Parks Department on that.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it's a reasonable question, I cannot answer that. Every year every funding category is up to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen as to whether they think it's appropriate to fund or not.

Chairman Robert asked is Parkside Junior High School CDBG eligible.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it's one of those areas that is border line, I think our staff checks it every couple of years to see if it meets the guidelines and I believe that the last four or five or six years it's been checked, it's not eligible which means to be eligible at least 51% of the residents have to be in low/moderate income residents and according to certain HUD and census standards and I know that the last few times they have checked it is not eligible. I could verify it with the staff again, though.

Chairman Robert stated in my travels, I discovered new pockets of immigrants that look very affluent. I can work with you people and try to get to that, I don't think you have to look too hard. This is just something of an unrelated item, we focused on the schools, the elementary schools, the junior high schools need some looking at. Can we plug them into that program or create a new program at some point.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. As you remember, this year the City funded and increased the funding amount to \$300,000 which will primarily go towards Highland/Goffs Falls and Weston Schools. I think the intent over the last ten years has been to focus on the elementary schools which had been in tough shape but I think they are in very good shape now and it is my understanding that there are at least two, certainly the Hillside site and Parkside are in poor condition and I know that they are on the list at some point to get funding. It's a matter of how much funding the Aldermen may appropriate in next year's budget.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve item 21E.

- H. An amending resolution and budget authorization allowing for impact fees associated with the Middle School Program by changing the 1998 CIP 3.30519 Middle School Program budget from \$4,500,000 bond to \$4,500,000 bond and \$250,000 Impact Fees (Trust Fund).

Alderman Domaingue stated my question is for the Planning Director. I'm looking at what appears to be a set aside of \$250,000 in a trust fund for the impact fees from this project, what would those funds be used for.

Mr. MacKenzie replied those are monies coming in from new developments to pay for new school capacity. Those would actually be directed toward the Middle School construction and that is currently included in the current school construction budget for the project.

Alderman Domaingue asked could you tell me whether or not the safety flasher on So. Mammoth Road might be funded with this money since I was told recently that it was removed from the bid process and children's safety in a school zone I thought was a priority.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I do remember that that one was eliminated during the final budget process, there are a number of alternates that were put in the bid and some of those had to be cut out because of the price of the project. There is a contingency, however, and the Joint School Buildings Committee can direct that the contingency be used for those flashers.

Alderman Domaingue stated so this money wouldn't necessarily be used for that kind of a purpose.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this was money that was already anticipated, we are just switching it from the trust fund area to the actual account for construction. So, this is really the contingency for the project. As we proceed and there are no surprises, so far there has been no major surprises and Mr. Houle has been attending each site meeting making sure that everything is on track. If there is no major surprises and there is some contingency left the Joint School Buildings Committee could utilize that contingency for that type of item.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve item 21H.

TABLED ITEMS

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)

Alderman Wihby asked can this item be received and filed, what are we waiting for.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold replied the reason it is left on is because I have been dealing with the Internal Revenue Service trying to arrange for them to discharge their lien on the property; that ultimate resolution might require some Board action so I ask that it be left so that if Board action is necessary I have something to attach it to.

This item remained on the table.

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

Communication from the Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery relative to the Aqua Golf, Clean-Flo proposal at Nutts Pond in Precourt Park.
(Tabled 4/29/97)

Chairman Robert stated this person is suppose to contact me when they are prepared to make a presentation, could we do this. I haven't been contacted, some of the staff at Parks and Rec keep calling and asking is this the meeting, is this the meeting. Could we take this off, receive and file it with the idea that we will write these people a letter and when they are ready to talk to us they can notify us and we can go from there.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to receive and file item 23 and to forward a letter as suggested.

Communication from the Director of Planning seeking the Committee's acceptance of the assignment of promissory notes and mortgages from the Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority of various Housing Rehabilitation Programs.
(Tabled 6/24/97)

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Clancy presented a communication relative to a drainage problem on Cedar Street. He noted that the children from Wilson School would come by after school and play in the puddle resulting from the drainage problem and it needed to be addressed. He also commented that this item had been on the chronic drain list for some time.

Discussion ensued where it was noted that there may be some funds available under chronic sewer and drain to do the project which was estimated to cost \$10,100. Alderman Clancy moved to have the work done. Alderman Domaingue noted concerns with approving something without discussing it with the department. It was not clear if the funds had been committed under that account or whether other projects on the list were ahead of this one.

A brief discussion ensued relative to utilizing sidewalk funds, where Mr. MacKenzie noted that the Highway Department had concerns about the bids received for sidewalks. Because of construction booming, the prices were high and they were considering doing these projects next spring. Alderman Domaingue noted concerns with waiting until the next year to do these projects which had already been held over.

The Clerk was asked to have Highway review the funding of the chronic drain project and report to the Committee.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee