

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

June 16, 1998
BMA

Immediately Upon Conclusion of Special

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Reiniger, Clancy, Pariseau, Girard

Absent: Alderman Wihby

Messrs: R. MacKenzie, J. Gardner, K. Edwards

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Li-Hsueh Chang expressing an interest in purchasing City-owned property at 218 Lake Avenue.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the property be sold to the Changs. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there is a process under City Ordinances dealing with disposing of tax deeded property. In this case you will notice there is also an interest by the next applicant on Item 4 to purchase the same property. Joan Gardner, I believe, is here tonight. Normally you would have to go through some type of public sale in order to dispose of public property.

Alderman Pariseau asked how did Item 4 get here when it hasn't come to the full Board. The only issue we had was the Changs and I don't know who thinks they are coming in through the back door. On the agenda there was only one letter and that was from the Changs.

Deputy Clerk LeBlond-Kang answered there were two letters on that Board agenda on June 2. Mr. Mark which came in on May 15...

Alderman Pariseau asked Mr. Mark's letter was in the agenda.

Deputy Clerk LeBlond-Kang answered yes they were both on the agenda for referral to the CIP Committee that evening.

Alderman Pariseau stated I don't recall two. I know the one. I would like to see a copy of that.

Deputy Clerk LeBlond-Kang replied okay. I did the agenda and I remember because there were two items for referral to CIP. These two being that. From Mr. Mark and the Changs.

Alderman Pariseau withdrew his motion.

Alderman Clancy stated, Bob, as I recall this building was an old brown building and was owned by the Jodoin's and we had a fire there. It was residential and to my knowledge, I don't know if this gentleman is here, is Mr. Mark here. I guess not. Anyway how can this piece of property which is residential be turned into a commercial lot?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I did want to note that they were interested in it for selling automobiles and I did want to comment that that is not allowed in that zoning district. I suppose they could try to go to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to get a variance to do that. It is not something that I would necessarily encourage in a residential area.

Alderman Clancy stated I got a call from some people who tried to rent this building on Lake Avenue and Union. They said to me, Jim, if we rent down there and I got four children, where are we going to park? We only have one car. Where do they park down there? I said let me check it out. I went down there with my truck and I looked around. I said where do they park down here. There is no parking down there at all if people are going to rent there. Does anybody here own that building? Where do the people park who you are going to rent to down there? Can you tell me?

Ms. Chang answered there is no street parking and the property at 215 Lake Avenue is no parking too. I am here to buy the City owned property at 218 Lake Avenue, the empty lot. I am going to fix up and improve the environment and also I need to buy the empty lot so my tenants can park. This property has no parking and no street parking. Also, after I purchase it I am going to pave the parking lot, put up a fence and do some landscaping to improve the environment.

Alderman Clancy asked now the buildings you have, do they have any parking spaces right now.

Ms. Chang answered no, not at all.

Alderman Clancy asked nothing at all.

Ms. Chang answered no.

Alderman Clancy asked how many tenants are you going to have down there.

Ms. Chang answered it is 10 apartments and one store so a total of 11 units over there with no parking at all.

Alderman Clancy asked so you have 10 apartments and one store and no parking.

Ms. Chang answered no parking at all so I would really appreciate if the Aldermen could understand that I really need to purchase this lot.

Alderman Clancy stated, Mr. Chairman, I have been getting calls all winter long and all summer long from people down there. Especially now in the summertime because they want to have the streets swept. People are parking their cars all over at night time so I called the Highway Department. They are telling me they have a hard time parking, there is no place to park down there. Here is this woman here just trying to buy this piece of property. Where are they going to put those cars? You tell me on Lake Avenue or Union Street where they are going to put their cars.

Alderman Pariseau stated it is not any worse then just parking spaces. I thought you favored the Changs purchasing this property.

Alderman Clancy replied I do. I want them to get that property so they can pave the property across the street and have parking.

Alderman Pariseau responded I don't have any problem with that but it has got to go through the process.

Alderman Girard stated I don't have any problem selling this to the Changs, but I know there is a process. I am not exactly sure what it is and I would like to ask the Planning Director to outline it for us.

Mr. MacKenzie replied there is an ordinance that deals with disposition of surplus City property. First there is a process to go through, for example, it would go to our department to see if we consider it surplus and I am not aware of any other

public purpose for this particular parcel. It has to go to the Assessors for their estimation of value and there are a couple of other stops. It is under the jurisdiction of the Tax Collector because it is tax deeded property. The ordinance does state that the property has to be sold by public sale which is normally by auction, although there are other ways to do it. There is a provision, though, that says and I don't have the ordinance with me here, that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen can sell it to others if there is a very reasonable public purpose to do so. That the Board can sell it without going to auction if there is a public purpose in doing so. Now we have used that provision where the lots, for example, are too small to build on and in those cases we have sold it to an abutter. We didn't open it up to a public auction. We said lets have it go to an abutter because it is clearly not suitable for building.

Alderman Clancy stated I think we should give the Changs first priority on this mainly because there is no place to park cars down there for the tenants that are going to be moving into this building.

Alderman Pariseau replied you are saying that there is a public need and we should waive the process and have this Committee expedite the sale.

Alderman Clancy responded yes. I want to speed it up so they can rent the property out so the people can park someplace and make the neighborhood more friendly because down there they are fighting all the time about you are in my spot, I shoveled here and stuff like that.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, does it, following along with what Alderman Clancy is saying, can this Committee or the Board of Aldermen declare a public purpose by trying to facilitate private development. In other words, I understand the Changs problem. They can't really redevelop or rent out their property without adequate parking. My only question is whether or not we can declare the renovation of a piece of property by private holders a public purpose. If we can, I don't have a problem doing that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered personally, I think that that may be a valid public purpose. You have a building that has been vacant for quite awhile. It not only is having trouble paying its own property taxes to the City but it affects the property values and the vitality of the surrounding properties so just as the City might go in and do a redevelopment project, in this case there may be a public purpose in stating that this building which has been vacant for a long time would be better off occupied and this parking is necessary to do that. You would have to, however, get the consent of the City Solicitor if that is a reasonable public purpose.

Alderman Girard stated well if Alderman Clancy wants to amend his motion, I would be happy to see this Committee send that question to the City Solicitor's Office so we can get it resolved as soon as possible and at the same time would we still need to go through the SPOT process to affix the value for sale.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we would have to get the Assessor's report and a report from our office which we could do. I did want to make sure I was not forgetting anything, Joan, if the Tax Collector could just either speak or not or help me out to make sure I didn't forget anything.

Ms. Gardner stated I am not sure that is necessarily has to go to the SPOT Committee because we can do it knowing who is on the SPOT Committee if we were rushing it. As long as the Board determines, I think that little clause that allows you the exception is just so that you are not being partial to someone which obviously you are not. I am not accusing you of that, I am just saying that that is the intent. So if your intent is to improve the area, then...

Alderman Clancy interjected my intent is to get the place so that the people who move into this apartment building can have a place to park. Like I said in the past, I have had experience down there where people said, Jim, I shoveled a spot and they were in my spot last night. Now they are having troubles like that all throughout the year and not only that, when the City comes by to sweep the streets I have to have them post the street so they can get through. Right now, the quicker they get this lot, the better.

Ms. Gardner stated I think once the City Solicitor determines that the need is okay, then they draw up the resolution and the Board approves it.

Alderman Girard moved to send the question to the City Solicitor to make sure we can declare it a public purpose and at the same time would like the appropriate process to be put in place so we can have the Solicitor's answer and the appropriate values come to this Committee by its next meeting so we can expedite this matter. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy asked so Ms. Chang if you do get the property you are going to pave it as quick as possible so you can get those cars off the street, is that right.

Ms. Chang answered yes, I will do all the paving and I will put a fence up and do some landscaping and put in some trees to improve the environment over there.

Alderman Clancy replied very good. I appreciate that.

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

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from John Mark expressing an interest in purchasing City-owned property at the corner of Lake Avenue and Union Street.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, in as much as we have two expressions of interest on this property are we, and I realize you are not the City Solicitor, but are we putting ourselves in a situation where we could be challenged by Mr. Mark.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would have difficulty answering that. I would still comment that what he is requesting to do is not allowed under the City zoning ordinance.

Alderman Clancy stated that is the reason I did that and he is not here tonight and I would assume he is going to make a used car lot out of it and I am having a hard time with people parking down there. That is residential property and he needs commercial. He would have to go through the Zoning Board to fix that.

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

Alderman Girard asked would it be appropriate for this Committee to send a letter to Mr. Mark stating that because it is a residential parcel we don't believe the expansion of a commercial enterprise is in the neighborhood's interest.

Alderman Pariseau stated this still has to go to the full Board.

Alderman Girard replied technically you are right but even when we deny things it should be reported to the Board as inexpedient to legislate which I believe the Committee should be in the habit of doing but at the same time if we send this to the Board and say that it is inexpedient to legislate because we don't believe commercial enterprises should be expanded in the residential area...

6/16/98 CIP

7

Alderman Pariseau stated if someone was interested in acquiring property and knew that we were meeting tonight he could call the City Clerk's Office tomorrow. There is no need to overburden the City Clerk's Office by writing another letter. We don't need to.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Michael Sylvester expressing an interest in purchasing a parcel of City-owned land.

Alderman Pariseau moved to accept the recommendation of the Public Works Director. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning submitting a request from Felix Torres (MNHS) expressing an interest in acquiring a tax-deeded parcel adjacent to property they own at 404-408 Manchester Street.

Alderman Clancy moved to approve the request.

Alderman Pariseau asked do we want it to go through the expedited process. I don't have any problem doing this on behalf of the Manchester Neighborhood Housing, Mr. Chairman. They do an excellent job and they pay taxes and it is beautiful and I love it.

Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked does anyone know whether or not Neighborhood Housing Services' intent is to renovate this and hold it as their own rental property or is it going to be something they try to sell for owner occupancy.

Alderman Clancy answered it is going to be parking.

Alderman Girard asked how many units are in this property.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I believe the parcel they own is currently vacant.

Alderman Pariseau stated it is for future housing development, that is what the letter indicates.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I did want to, for the record, note that it is my understanding that this is one of those instances that it is too small to be a regular buildable lot so we would not want to sell this at public auction because it does not meet the City's own requirements. I did want to confirm that with Joan Gardner again. Is that true Joan?

Ms. Gardner replied yes.

Mr. MacKenzie stated so this is one of those situations where it is not in the City's best interest or should not be sold by public auction. It should go to one of the abutters.

Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Petition for Discontinuance of a portion of Cohas Avenue from Bodwell Road to Pahray Lane.

Alderman Girard moved to refer the item to a road hearing. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau asked that sliver of land is in the front of everybody else's house.

Alderman Clancy answered yes.

Alderman Pariseau stated I mean if she wants to do anything in front of those houses on Cohas Avenue, that is her land.

Alderman Clancy asked does she want to landlock this land for some reason.

Alderman Pariseau stated there is a house right there that is in the right-of-way so they must have some connection to that piece of property but I can see, given that in front of their house but to give it all the way down...

Alderman Clancy stated no because people might want to put a trailer there or something like that and you could put anything there.

Alderman Pariseau stated I am just concerned that if someone had frontage in front of my house that I had no say on what they can do. Not that they can do much on 25' width.

Alderman Clancy replied lets put it to the road hearing so we can go out and view it.

Alderman Pariseau stated maybe this diagram isn't right but that is what it shows. They got this little dinky end here that is saved for an easement on the Bodwell Road side and then they are going all this way. This area petitioned to be discontinued all along Cohas Avenue.

Alderman Clancy stated five lots.

Alderman Pariseau stated that is not fair to those abutters of those 10 homes.

Alderman Girard stated Alderman Pariseau it looks like the area to be petitioned, though, is a road running parallel to Cohas Avenue so it doesn't look like anyone would be landlocked.

Alderman Pariseau asked running where.

Alderman Girard answered it looks like the area to be petitioned to be discontinued is running parallel to Cohas Avenue so it doesn't look like it is going to landlock anybody into their property.

Alderman Pariseau stated I am not saying that it is going to landlock anybody, but if she wanted, this M. Louise Cote, if she wanted to put flowers in front of this guys house on Cohas Avenue...

Alderman Clancy asked why don't we view it.

Alderman Girard answered sending it to a road hearing would, I think, help us get a lot of that information.

Alderman Pariseau stated I don't have any problem referring it to the road hearing but I think we have to look at this awfully close because I wouldn't like that and you wouldn't either.

Alderman Girard stated I don't think she is asking to have control over the property. I think she is just trying to get a paper street discontinued in which case that land would be attached to the abutting property owners, wouldn't it?

Alderman Pariseau stated she is asking to discontinue 25' on the westerly side of Cohas Avenue from Bodwell Road to that Pahray Lane. Why?

Alderman Girard replied I don't know but maybe we will find out at road hearing.

Alderman Pariseau stated well we can send it to road hearing but I think we have got to be made aware of that.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Petition for Discontinuance of two portions of O'Malley Street from south Elm Street to Trahan Street and from Brown Avenue to Ahern Street.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to refer this item to a road hearing.

Mr. Edwards stated if you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Alderman Clancy asked this has been like this for a year now. I happened to read this and it says it has been a trial thing for a year.

Mr. Edwards answered both ends of O'Malley Street have been temporarily closed for over a year.

Alderman Clancy asked so how is it working out.

Mr. Edwards answered very well.

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

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Petition for Discontinuance of the southerly unused portion of Page Street.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Aldermen Girard, it was voted to refer this item to a road hearing.

Chairman Reiniger stated the next item we are going to take out of order. We have a request from Alpha for some additional funding. It came in at the last full Board meeting and was referred to this Committee. I asked Mr. MacKenzie to take a look at this but Nury Marquez from Alpha is here to speak on behalf of that request.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have been looking for different funding sources. I believe that they are still requesting the amount they originally requested in the CIP process which was, I think they were asking for a total of \$16,200 in their original request back several months ago when the CIP process started. In the CIP process, there was allocated \$10,500. That was a 5% increase from the previous year. We have looked at all of the CIP Cash projects and with the exception of one small amount, there are no cash balances available. The only one that we spotted was a project called Historical Markers and there was about \$400 left in that account. So of the CIP Cash there was certainly not enough to cover this amount. This project would not be eligible for any bond funding. CDBG funding would be difficult. I know that Alpha has had trouble meeting the HUD requirements in the past in terms of the paperwork and we are also capped in terms of how much of our annual allocation we can use for public service programs such as this. We can only use 15% of our total funding. The only other option that I believe is possible is out of the City's contingency.

Alderman Girard moved to recommend to the full Board that the \$5,700 be taken out of the FY98 contingency fund for Alpha noting that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board is not until July 7, and asking that the Clerk poll the Board on this recommendation so that it can be executed in this fiscal year.

Alderman Pariseau asked do we have the funds in this year's contingency.

Alderman Clancy answered we have about \$150,000 left I am pretty sure.

Alderman Pariseau asked are they looking for FY99.

Alderman Girard stated I think Alpha is just looking for money.

Alderman Pariseau stated but we have to go to the rules and regulations.

Alderman Girard stated if the Board approves this action in FY99 in the first meeting of July, I don't think we can come back into FY98's contingency and we all know what I already think of the FY99 contingency so I don't think we should be taking it from there.

Alderman Pariseau stated but then you would have to make the corrections on all the paperwork dealing with FY98.

Alderman Girard replied no because we are taking this out of contingency rather than appropriating money from any other source.

Alderman Pariseau responded but still it has to go back into this program and these forms that we get.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, what changes if any would we need to have to make to existing paperwork.

Mr. MacKenzie answered normally in CIP programs we would monitor and make sure that they carry through with what they promised and make sure it is benefiting the individuals that were outlined. I do see some complexities in terms of allocating the contingency because I think we would still have to amend the FY99 CIP and that probably couldn't happen until July so I am not sure if it is possible.

Alderman Girard asked why would we have to amend the FY99 CIP if we give them the funds in our FY98. Whether Alpha gets it on June 30 or July 1, I don't think is going to make a difference to Alpha so much as whether or not they get it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I do understand that and you could issue the check and order that the contingency be used and issue the check this year and that is the, I think, the only way you could probably use contingency. The downside is that you will have no ability to monitor what they do with those monies. They could use those monies for whatever purpose they want. Of course, we will be under contract with them for the balance and if you are comfortable with that, issuing a check that we would not monitor, but we would certainly monitor the balance of the funds to make sure it is going where it is supposed to.

Alderman Girard asked Ms. Marquez to come to the mic. He asked you are going to use these additional funds, I assume, as you proposed to use them in your request to the City for FY99.

Ms. Marquez answered right.

Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau stated I don't think we should do that. We don't know what the school budget shortfall is and if we are going to take stuff out of contingency from this year for next I don't think it is fair to anybody. I cannot support that and I don't think we should do it. We don't know. If we knew the status of the School Department that would be a different story but we don't know.

Alderman Girard replied I don't argue that with you, Alderman, but I think the magnitude of the problem at the School Board is going to be substantial and \$5,700 isn't going to be the difference between whether we save it or not.

Alderman Pariseau responded I know but it would help to eliminate the deficit.

Alderman Clancy asked is \$5,700 going to make that much difference.

Alderman Girard answered so far what we have pulled out of contingency hasn't exactly been emergency in nature. Normally when funds from contingency are approved we have to go to Finance. Doesn't Finance have to approve it?

Chairman Reiniger asked should we make this subject to approval of the City Solicitor.

Alderman Girard answered I think probably the Finance Officer is more in line here. The bottom line is, I think, we all want to try to do something to help Alpha here and if we can take the funds from FY98, Mr. MacKenzie is there anything in FY99. Are there CD funds available in FY99 or have we pretty well tied ourselves up for FY99 at this point?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the CIP package has been approved. The only way I would see of changing that at this point is reopening the budget which I don't think this Board wants to do.

Alderman Girard responded well we can't reopen the budget under the new Charter.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the only option would be, again, wait until later on in the next fiscal year to see if there are any cash balances but again this year we are so tight that I would not expect any major cash balances next year either.

Alderman Girard stated so one way or another we are looking at contingency funds potentially from one fiscal year or another.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. Again, the only other option would be CDBG funds but again I think we are at the cap, HUD's 15% cap and I don't think we would squeeze it under that.

Alderman Girard amended his motion to find whatever means we can to take this out of the FY98 contingency. I realize that it has to go from the Board to Finance, from Finance to the Board and to the Committee on Enrollment. Perhaps as part of this motion we could ask the Board to suspend its rules because that is all rule driven if I am not mistaken, if they could suspend the rules so that the poll would authorize the funds.

Alderman Clancy asked you know what is going to happen. I am going to tell you it is going to lose.

Alderman Girard answered well if we don't do anything there is no hope at all.

Chairman Reiniger asked did you want to do the original motion subject to review by Finance.

Alderman Girard moved to take \$5,700 from FY98 contingency subject to recommendations of the Finance Officer and give it to Alpha. Alderman Clancy

duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Pariseau being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Preliminary discussion relative to acquisition of the Portsmouth branch of the B & M Railroad.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I did want to pass around a copy of a map of the City. I apologize that I did not have time to print out more of the ones in color. If when you look at the map when it comes around you can see that it shows the City of Manchester and two potential trail systems. One north and south which goes up along the Merrimack River. There is a blue section that would ultimately be the Riverwalk and then it extends northerly and that would be the Heritage Trail. Also on it you will see an east to west trail system. On the west side of the river it is called the Piscataquog Trail that the City is now in control of, the old Goffstown branch of the B&M, and on the east side of the river there is an old B&M rail line that actually went from the center city all the way to Portsmouth. Now the State does now control what they call a Portsmouth Trail all the way from Page Street all the way to the seacoast. I am aware that we have now an opportunity to connect both the Riverwalk to that Portsmouth Trail potentially at no cost to the City and I wanted to see if, in terms of acquiring that piece of the old B&M rail line to connect both the Riverwalk, the Piscataquog Trail to the Portsmouth branch of this trail system.

Chairman Reiniger stated I think you should be congratulated. This is very visionary and I certainly would support your taking the efforts to do anything you can to put this into effect.

Alderman Girard stated we have been talking about Heritage Trails and Ron Johnson over at Parks has been busy building these trails and doing this, that and the other thing and it is all very nice but what does the City do, if anything, to sort of advertise that is there so that we can attract the type of people who would be interesting in using the facilities. It seems to me to be kind of a waste to do all this stuff and then quickly not tell anyone that it exists.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the systems really aren't in place yet and frankly these things take so much time. Over the years, we have been dealing with the B&M and the State of NH. They take so much time that we haven't really advertised it because if we told the public two years ago we are going to have a Piscataquog

Trail system they would wait for two years and then say where is it. So we have been working, actually the City has been working probably for five years now trying to get all these pieces together. You will be seeing these more visibly certainly with the Riverwalk and in the next year or so the Piscataquog Trail. Real live pieces and we will be publicizing them as they become open.

Chairman Reiniger asked are there tracks in most of this area that is marked in red.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there are tracks in a good portion of that.

Alderman Clancy stated some of those tracks have been picked up.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. It is bits and pieces. I think most of the rail is gone, the actual rail but the timbers, the cross-ties, may still be in place in many places.

Alderman Girard stated I know when there was discussion about the trestle over the Piscataquog River being acquired and the trails back there being opened up for this purpose the neighbors down on Douglas Street Extension and in that area had some concerns about the traffic going through, mountain bikes, dirt bikes and that sort of thing. Have those neighborhood issues been resolved? Are the neighbors a little better with the concept?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I believe so. They did hold a major public hearing and notified all the abutters on the west side. Again, this was several months ago and there were still people who had some concerns but a lot of them, frankly, had concerns that they wanted to have more activity in there. Right now, if you know the old Piscataquog branch there it is rather depressed. It is dark and people are fearful of what that area is. They would be happy to have it cleaned out, lights put in and frankly would encourage more use of that trail just because it is difficult now.

Alderman Girard asked so the neighborhood issues have been resolved.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Pariseau asked how is the acquisition of that railroad track parallel to South Beech and out to the airport.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes, I have, again I think that would be a great connection because it goes directly from the downtown to the airport. We have been following closely and talking with the State and the Airport Authority.

Alderman Pariseau asked you are not going to forget about that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no. That is an important link that is a wide right-of-way, a 100' wide right-of-way and we think it is important. I have made it clear that this City wants to have some say in that when it is disposed of.

Chairman Reiniger asked are you looking for a motion from the Committee.

Mr. MacKenzie answered a motion or consensus would be fine.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to encourage the staff to continue working on the B&M acquisition.

Alderman Girard asked the rail bed that Alderman Pariseau was just talking about, is it possible at some point that we might put some kind of tram or train there to reconnect the downtown to that area.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes and I know when I mention that people are a little skeptical but looking 100 years down the line, I mean that is only about a two mile link. If we had a revitalized downtown and certainly with the inplanements that the airport has now, that is not out of the question. With a 100' right-of-way, you could reserve a section for a tram or transit, you could have a roadway and you could have a trail system with the roadway so I think you reserve chunks of that 100' right-of-way for several different purposes.

Alderman Girard stated I think that could be a vital link for downtown and the City in general.

CONSENT AGENDA

For BMA Approval

- A. Communication from the Director of Planning requesting various CIP project extensions through December 31, 1998.
- B. 1999 Budget authorization:
640399 City Historic Preservation Fund
- C. An amending resolution allowing for acceptance of grant funds by adding

the Parker Varney Technical Training Grant in the amount of \$6,830.00 from the Bean Foundation, and providing for tuition-based Summer School in the amount of \$42,837.60.

- D. An amending resolution and budget authorization increasing the 1998 CIP 830899 City Hall Security/Audio Visual/Other - \$7,500.00 Cash (changing the budget to \$600,000.00 Bond; \$7,500.00 Cash).
- E. An amending resolution and budget authorization allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of a donation from the developers of the Mall of NH by adding the 1999 Community Improvement Program 640399 City Historic Preservation Fund - \$5,000.00 Other.

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

TABLED ITEMS

- 12. 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 Program.(Note: Re-tabled 2/17/98 pending Planning recommendation - attachments previously forwarded to members of the Committee.)

This item remained on the table.

- 13. Communication from Lloyd Basinow requesting that the Board declare 1,255 units of public housing within the City limits to be "Drug Free Zones".
(Tabled 4/21/98)

Alderman Pariseau asked Mr. Edwards about Lloyd Basinow's request to consider the Housing Authority's Drug Free or whatever, do we need this.

Mr. Edwards answered my understanding is that there has been a meeting between our Executive Director, Grace Grogan, and Chief Driscoll to discuss this issue and that they had some questions they needed answered by the City Solicitor and they

have sent a letter to the City Solicitor. Once they get that answer they will report back to the Committee.

Alderman Girard stated I was just going to say that we should defer any discussion on this item until Chief Driscoll and Director Grogan are present. I can say this, I know it was a proposal that I ran under in the campaign and I know it won both their endorsements, the details aside so it is fair to say that they are interested in the proposal. As a matter of fact I think the press release I put out cited both of them.

This item remained on the table.

14. Communication from Deputy Director Johnson, Parks, Recreation & Cemetery submitting a proposed Scope of Services for a feasibility study to explore the possibility of locating an affiliated baseball franchise in Manchester.
(Tabled 4/21/98)

This item remained on the table.

15. Communication from Thomas Seigle, Chief Sanitary Engineer, requesting the Board find that the Cohas Brook Interceptor - Contract #2 is a “public need” and that permission be granted to acquire a temporary easement and a permanent easement from the owners using eminent domain.
(Note: Public Hearing and Special BMA meetings held on May 27, 1998.)
(Tabled 4/21/98)

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Clancy stated there is a piece of property up on Hanover Street just below Ashland that came before the full Board maybe once or twice. The address is 400 Hanover Street. I know that the building is dilapidated, run down and stuff like that. Maybe Joan can give us some update on that building. I would like to have that building torn down because I did get some calls from neighbors there, I know it is not in my ward, but some of the neighbors did call and ask if it could be done. I said I would bring it up tonight. This building is dilapidated. You know what I am talking about right, 400 Hanover Street?

Ms. Gardner replied we have been working on this steadily for the last three years actually. We own 398 which is one side of the building, the west side and another citizen owns 400. It is one building but we own half the building and they own the other half. The proposal that the Board approved about a year or a year and a half ago was that we would give this owner \$2,500 towards the demolition of the building and give them the parcel of land. For them, that wasn't enough money. They said they would be paying for the demolition and for the disposal of the waste and they didn't feel it was sufficient so they just let it sit. We have been contacting them regularly to see what they would agree to and until about three weeks ago they didn't even return phone calls.

Alderman Clancy asked is that a buildable lot. I know there is a two-family on it right now.

Ms. Gardner answered our portion is probably not a buildable lot. If we were to tear down 398 which is half of the building, that portion is probably not buildable because the 400 would still be sitting and the other home is too close.

Alderman Clancy asked but if you tore the whole thing down.

Ms. Gardner answered we can't tear the other. The Building Department tried to declare it condemned so that it would have to come down. 400 has a solid foundation and is a solid building, believe it or not. 398 is not. So there is no problem with taking our portion down. I had hoped to have something by tonight because we spoke to them as late as Friday and we asked them if they would put another proposal together that we could bring to the Board and try to get the building down as soon as possible. I know that they are working on getting us an estimate but I don't know when we are going to get it now. I was hoping to get it in for this budget year too but it doesn't look like we will.

Alderman Girard asked that would have to go to the full Board and be re-referred here.

Ms. Gardner answered yes. We were hoping to do a poll and try and get it done as soon as possible by going through the Committee tonight and...

Alderman Girard interjected what she wanted was for the City to pay for all of the demolition costs which was, I don't want to say it was substantial, but it was more than they were willing to pay because they wanted to demolish the whole thing and rebuild but they wanted us to bear the cost of the demolition and the disposal of the debris.

Ms. Gardner stated the disposal of the debris was the misconception she had. Back in 1995, she wanted us to waive the tipping fees and Frank Thomas informed the Board and us that I can't waive the tipping fees because the City has to pay the tipping fees to Hooksett. So Manchester's dump couldn't accept it and they didn't understand that. They thought it was a simple matter of the City waiving the tipping fees and they would demolish.

Alderman Girard stated when they first started this process, the City, I believe, still had the dump open and after the dump closed and we went to the arrangement we have now, we told her the deal was dead.

Ms. Gardner stated though the dump was still open when she came with the plan...

Alderman Girard interjected the first time, that is right.

Ms. Gardner replied but Frank had said at that time that that debris for tearing down a home could not go to the dump. We were restricted on what could go even the dump was still open so he said it would not be a matter of waiving tipping fees. Either the City is going to say we will pay Hooksett or they pay Hooksett or we split it but we can't waive them because we can't put it in our own dump.

Alderman Girard stated because we would have to pay, it became a cost item to the City as opposed to a revenue waiver. She knows that. I was in the Mayor's Office at the time. She persists in trying to get the City to pick up that cost.

Ms. Gardner stated I think they were a little upset at the time. Now they are talking to us again and they are talking about getting it down and hopefully will get it down soon.

Alderman Girard stated we have to remember, though, that it is ultimately to their benefit because whatever they build there, whether it is rental or new, they are going to generate revenue. I mean we will get the tax revenue off of it but they are going to...

Mr. MacKenzie stated there is an item that came in today. This is a proposed grant that would be from the Federal grant down through the State to us. It is for Operation Streetsweeper for \$111,000. You may remember the program was done in 1996. It was a successful program. They are proposing to repeat it. It is a concentrated program. They would like to get going in July so they had hoped that the Committee could approve it and then we could submit the start-ups and resolutions to the Board on July 7.

Alderman Clancy moved to accept the grant money. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked is this something that normally would have gone to the Board and then been referred here or is it something that is appropriate to be sent directly to Committee.

Mr. MacKenzie answered typically if we are working with a City department on a program that we have dealt with in the past and that the Board has approved, they would normally submit it to us and we would bring it directly to Committee. That does save two to three months in the process.

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

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee

A phone poll of the CIP Committee was conducted on July 29, 1998 regarding forwarding a revised Water Works Bond Resolution directly to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Aldermen Wihby, Reiniger, and Clancy voted yea. Alderman Girard voted nay. Therefore, the motion poll was approved.