

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

November 24, 1998
PM

6:00

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Alderman Reiniger, Wihby, Clancy, Pariseau, Girard

Messrs: R. Pinard, R. Ludwig, R. Houle, R. MacKenzie, J. Taylor

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Reiniger 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. Resolutions:

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 221899 NCADD Window Replacement.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Hundred Forty Thousand Dollars (\$540,000) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 31099 School to Work Grant.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Twenty-three Dollars and Sixty-five Cents (\$623.65) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 420599 SWAT Training.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Thirteen Thousand Dollars (\$113,000) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 610799 MNHS Acquisition - 282 Auburn Street.”

B. Budget Authorizations:

1996 410118 COPS More - Closeout
1999 220899 Homeless Health Care
1999 221899 NCADD Window Replacement
1999 310199 School to Work Grant
1999 420599 SWAT Training
1999 610799 MNHS Acquisition - 282 Auburn Street
1999 760499 Amoskeag Hydro

THE CONSENT AGENDA HAVING BEEN READ, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN GIRARD, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN CLANCY, IT WAS VOTED TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Communication from Alderman Pariseau regarding the possibility of minor league baseball coming into Manchester.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think that prior to any love affair that the City may get involved with with the people proposing a minor league baseball team, our number one priority should be identified as the youth of the City and if they want to come in and build a facility or do whatever that is fine but I think our first priority should be to the youth Legion and Babe Ruth baseball. That was the purpose of this memo and I would refer it to the Special Committee on a Manchester Baseball Team if it is still active.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the letter be referred to the Mayor’s Special Committee on Baseball and to the Parks & Recreation Department. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked, Alderman, is it your intent to make sure that the Parks & Recreation Department and the City in general take a look at the issue of displacing sports team and if we are going to take a look at a minor league baseball team that we address the issue of displacement. In other words, if teams that play there are going to be dislocated, is that your real concern, that nobody lose a place to play ball?

Alderman Pariseau answered yes.

Alderman Clancy stated I read the letter that you wrote here and as you said you are quoting the Sea Dogs of Portland, ME and stuff like that. Why can't we have the same agreement that they have up in Portland, ME? In other words, they all get together with their baseball dates and stuff like that and nobody is left out. In other words, if we had a semi-pro team and they wanted 22 dates for the summer, we get the American Legion team and others who play there and get together and work around the schedule.

Alderman Pariseau replied I understand that but our first priority should be the youth of the City.

Alderman Clancy stated I am sure they are not going to take up all the dates for the summer if we get a semi-pro team. I think they can come in and we can say what dates do you need and do the same with the other teams. I don't want to leave anybody out. If we are going to have a semi-pro team, fine, I am not going to throw anybody out but I want to make the best place available which is Gill Stadium right now.

Alderman Pariseau asked and if there is a conflict in scheduling where do the Legion and Babe Ruth baseball teams play.

Alderman Clancy answered well they can work it out.

Alderman Pariseau stated well that was the whole purpose for setting the stage. Our priority should be the youth of the City, not a minor league baseball team. So those concerns have to be addressed before a team decides to come to Manchester. Don't bring them in and then throw the American Legion out.

Alderman Clancy responded no, I am not going to throw anybody out but like I said I am sure if we had a semi-pro team they are not going to play every day of the week and neither does the American Legion or anybody else. They just have to get together and see what they need.

Alderman Pariseau replied that would be up to Parks & Recreation to schedule it.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote on the motion to refer Alderman Pariseau's letter to the Mayor's Special Committee on Baseball and the Parks & Recreation Department. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communication from MDC requesting that MDC/MDC, Inc. receive from the City notes receivable or other valuable consideration in amounts equal to the value of the assets assigned to the City for the UNH transaction.

Alderman Girard moved that the City provide ten percent (10%) of the proceeds of sales of development parcels on Hackett Hill as the lots are sold to MDC and MDC, Inc. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby asked what does it mean exactly.

Mr. Pinard stated I am Chairman of the MDC Board. The correspondence refers to the notes from MDC/MDC, Inc. That were provided to the City in order to effect a transaction on the UNH land transfer. It is the feeling of the Board that we would be remiss in our responsibilities to safeguard our assets if we were not to request some form of consideration in return for those notes. As to the structure of the notes or other valuable consideration, we are open to consider whatever scheme is acceptable to the City so as not to impact the project. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Wihby stated basically we are just repaying something that we have taken from MDC.

Mr. Pinard replied right. We had two notes and a mortgage receivable related to the building at the UNH Center in the Millyard and to facilitate the transaction we were asked to turn those notes over to the City so the transaction could be consummated.

Alderman Wihby asked what happens with any profit that is made if we decide to sell the property at Hackett Hill. Does that go to MDC or no?

Mr. Pinard answered well roughly the value of the notes that we have given the City are equal to about 10% of the overall transaction value. So, for instance if the City sold a lot for \$500,000, we would only ask that \$50,000 of that \$500,000 come back to us. We are not asking for any form of accelerated payment, we are not asking for any specific term and we are not asking for any interest. As you sell it, we ask that we share in the proceeds so that we be made whole and then that money can be reinvested in economic development.

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

Communication from the Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery requesting to trade a 1987 and a 1989 pick-up for two (2) one-ton club cab trucks at an approximate cost of \$70,000 in order to address safety concerns expressed by the Risk Manager.

Alderman Pariseau asked do you have that amount of money in your budget.

Mr. Ludwig answered no.

Alderman Pariseau asked where are you going to get it.

Mr. Ludwig answered MER I guess. I was asked by the Risk Manager to write the letter and I wrote the letter.

Alderman Pariseau asked does that \$70,000 include trade-in.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

Chairman Reiniger asked Richard Houle to shed some light on this.

Mr. Houle stated there has been no money assigned to the MER for this purpose. I just advised Alderman Clancy that the result of the sale of the surplus vehicles currently is \$40,000.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. Ludwig, are these vehicles used at all in Enterprise operations.

Mr. Ludwig answered no, they are in Parks.

Alderman Girard asked so you wouldn't be able to apply any Enterprise funds toward the purchase.

Mr. Ludwig answered not really, no.

Alderman Girard stated MER stuff comes to CIP since all of the Committees were reorganized.

Alderman Clancy stated we don't have the money right now.

Mr. Ludwig stated given the fact that we really aren't transporting...this is a summer issue when we have those employees on board that is difficult for us. We transported people that way for a long time and we understand that it is not the best way to transport people and as the letter stated we have tried to make some accommodations, but everyone still agrees that it isn't the best way to do it. We could ask going forward in the next budget process for something to that effect, but we are not in immediate danger right now is all I want to tell you.

Alderman Clancy asked in other words you won't need these until next Spring when you get the summer help right.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes, that is right.

Alderman Girard stated the statute, Mr. Ludwig, seems to apply to children under the age of 12. I wouldn't think that would be a problem for the department.

Mr. Ludwig replied I don't think it is, by State Statute, a problem necessarily. I just think the general consensus of those involved is that is not the best way.

Alderman Girard stated I understand that it is not perhaps the best way to do things, but you know when one attaches a State Statute to something, I assume that State Statute is telling me that there is a problem that needs to be remedied. If the statute does not require anything for children over the age of 12, are we just...I mean is there a reason I guess why this can't be part of the next budget process and why are we having it be addressed right now.

Mr. Ludwig replied I think the Risk Manager was responding to a complaint and I am responding to the Risk Manager.

Alderman Girard moved to refer this to Mr. Houle to be considered as part of the MER process for FY99. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger stated I would like to refer Items 7, 8 and 12 to 14 and we will have a discussion about sidewalks all at once.

Petition submitted by Arthur DesMeules on behalf of residents on Wilmot Street requesting that the street be repaved.

Alderman Pariseau moved to refer this to FY2000 CIP. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communication from Robert Iller suggesting that the City invest funding in the City's parks rather than the Riverwalk.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Communication from Executive Councilor Normand submitting an encroachment agreement with the State of NH Department of Transportation relative to the Granite Street parking area associated with West High School.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to approve the encroachment agreement between the City of Manchester and the State of New Hampshire, Department of Transportation, be approved, and further that the Mayor be authorized to execute same subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor and that a letter of appreciation be sent to Executive Councilor Normand for his efforts.

Alderman Pariseau stated it has been a long time coming for the students over at West High to have parking facilities and this will hopefully eliminate the congestion at the residences within the school district.

Presentation by Messrs. MacKenzie and Taylor relative to 1037 Elm Street.

Mr. Taylor stated I will try to make this brief because I know you have a lengthy agenda and you are trying to get it squared away for the next meeting so I will try to get through this as succinctly as I can. You all are aware, I am sure, that back in September we received a grant from the Economic Development Administration to help us in renovating the tax deeded property across from Hampshire Plaza known as the Chase Block or 1037 Elm Street and that Committee has been meeting on this project since that time trying to figure out how we are going to proceed with getting this property renovated. Again, you may recall that we

talked about matching that \$1 million EDA grant with about \$1.3 million in City funding which would come either from CDBG money or Section 108 which is, in effect, a loan against the CDBG allocation. That determination has not been made at this point but we are working towards trying to figure out which direction we are going to go. As a result of the grant, the major requirement that we are trying to resolve now is the fact that the building must stay in either ownership by the City or by a qualified not-for-profit organization for at least 15 years. That is a contingency of the EDA grant. We can't change that and I am not saying that is bad, but it is making life somewhat more difficult. So given the fact that it is a requirement, there are a couple of different development alternatives that we have been looking at. Number one, the obvious possibility is that the City could continue to own the building, we could renovate it, we could then continue to own, manage and operate the building. There are two problems that I see with that particular alternative. Number one is that, frankly, the City doesn't do a very good job of owning and managing real estate. We are not in the real estate business and we don't have a department that is specifically involved in real estate activities and I don't think that is an appropriate role for the City and secondly if the City continues to own it there is no chance that we are going to be able to generate any real estate payments in lieu of taxes for that property. So those are the two main reasons why we don't think that this is a viable alternative. The second alternative is, of course, to convey title of the property to a qualified, non-profit organization, work with them to get the property renovated and then allow them to own the property, manage it, collect rents, pay the City in lieu of taxes and repay the City its share of the investment. We think this is probably the best route to go for all concerned if we can find a qualified non-profit who is willing to take on this obligation. In order to try to proceed down that road, we spoke informally with a number of the non-profits that we thought might have the ability and/or expertise to do this kind of work. For example, Intown Manchester Management, Manchester Housing & Redevelopment Authority, and Neighborhood Housing Services are three that came to mind and while all of them expressed some level of interest, none of them seemed to be wildly enthusiastic about taking on this obligation given the other responsibilities and projects they have in the works at the present time. In the interim, however, and I just handed out a letter by way of the Clerk, the Greater Manchester Chamber has come forward and expressed to us some interest in becoming the owner/developer of this property. This has a number of interesting possibilities and if you read the letter, basically what it says is they are looking for the Board of Aldermen to give them a 90 day period during which they could do their due diligence work, investigate the property in more detail and find out if they think they can really handle this kind of project as it is a substantial investment both in terms of their financial commitment and their time in supervising this kind of activity. The staff thinks that this approach makes a lot of sense. The Chamber is a highly respected organization in the community with a

long history of commitment to the City. It is a business organization which, if this project proceeds, could make a substantial financial commitment to the downtown and to the City which we think is a positive approach. Going back to the old idea of the public/private partnership, we think this kind of thing makes a lot of sense. So I think the recommendation of the staff is that we allow them the 90 days to take a look at this, at that point if they are interested in proceeding, what we propose to do is negotiate some sort of a development agreement between the City and the Chamber which we would then come back to the Board to get approved. We are not asking you to approve this project. All we are asking you to do is give them a chance to take a look at it and see if it makes any sense from their point of view. We think it does and if that is acceptable, what we would like to do in the interest of time given that we have another interested tenant for the building which has expressed an interest in being in the property sometime in late 1999, we would like to also get your permission to proceed with going out through RFP for engineering and design services for the project which we are going to have to do anyway whether the Chamber is the developer or whether we do it ourselves or some other organization does it. Doing it this way, I think, we save some time and we can be doing our activity parallel with their investigation so when the end of both investigatory periods come we will both be ready to roll at the same time. We won't have wasted any time.

Alderman Pariseau moved approve the Chamber's request for a 90 day extension and to grant permission to put out an RFP for engineering and design services. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. Taylor, when was the last time we went out to RFP on this building in general.

Mr. Taylor answered probably a little over a year ago and we go, as you recall, a couple of proposals, none of which was anything we were particularly interested in. We think that doing it this way, keep in mind that we are going to be subsidizing this project, but if you are looking to keep the facade and control the uses there is a cost associated with that and I think we have to expect that.

Alderman Girard asked the other potential interested tenant, are they looking to buy the building.

Mr. Taylor answered it is a restaurant. They want to be a tenant.

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

Communication from James E. Davenport, Principal of Hallsville School, advising of the dangerous intersection of Jewett and Merrill Streets and requesting that construction of sidewalks on Merrill Street be listed as a high priority in the CIP funding allocation.

Communication from Jewett Street School Principal regarding a previous request by Alderman Shea for additional sidewalks in the Jewett Street School area.

Communication from Louis N. Vinios, LNV Manchester Trust, requesting the installation of a sidewalk on the southside of Valley Street at Union Street.

Communication from the Director of Planning relative to procedures for reviewing sidewalk priorities.

Mr. MacKenzie stated what I would like to do is go back to last year. I think several of the members were on the Committee last year, but there is at least one that was not. There was a basic policy set forth by the CIP Committee for sidewalks. The City, through the Highway Department, has been carrying out those over the last 18 months and is now completing the last couple of projects that were identified in the process last year (handout distributed). The Committee, last year, approved this fairly straight forward policy and guideline to set criteria for sidewalk improvement. Of course, every year there is considerably more requests and need for sidewalk improvement than there is money to fund it. Typically, the City would have about \$200,000 a year through various bond or CDBG funds for sidewalks. The demand for sidewalks is actually much higher. This is reviewed each year by the Aldermen and CIP process to see how much money is available. The primary policy that was laid out was that there were certain streets identified in the City. On your maps the red streets were identified as key streets throughout the City, those are where there is heavy traffic volume and it is appropriate to have sidewalks on each side of the street. There are some other specialized areas, such as school staging areas around Central. If you think of Central, Gold Street is here and that is a staging area where people come and park for various activities during school. The lighter blue area on the map. There was also criteria established last year. They said that we should focus the funding on those sidewalks that are needed within 1/3 of a mile of a school. There was some discussion at the time as to whether we would extend that to parochial and private schools and extend that to some of the high activity parks. Given that we had limited money, I think it was agreed that we should focus on public schools because the City is responsible for getting those students to school safely.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, isn't the City also responsible for getting bussing and getting kids to parochial and private schools also. I mean we do bus them know.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we bus under contract.

Alderman Girard asked we are not obligated.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I don't believe we are obligated in a state law to provide transportation to parochial or other types of schools.

Mr. MacKenzie stated as a result of these policies and all of the sidewalks needed, we came up with a prioritized listing.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, is this list the ones that were requested and approved or is this the list of ones that if you were just to take an objective look at the map and see what was needed these would come up.

Mr. MacKenzie answered these were both an objective review of the areas around the schools, as well as projects that were requested by various groups or Aldermen. This was a listing that was then prioritized based on the criteria on the right, i.e. proximity to schools, density, demand, safety factors, continuity, etc. That was a rating system that was developed.

Alderman Girard stated I asked that question because I don't see Merrill Road and I don't see Jewett Street and some others that we have heard some concerns with. Now are they now on the list because in an objective review of the map they did not merit being placed on the list or they are not on the list because no one had forwarded a request.

Mr. MacKenzie replied nobody had forwarded a request. In some of those cases, for example, Merrill Street, that is a relatively low volume street that was not picked up when they went out and did the review. I have gone out since to look to see if there is staging activity. Normally, if there is no traffic, parking, turning movements and it is a very low volume street, sidewalks are not critical. In that case it may appropriate because a lot of people pull up and park so it is an extremely active area during just those school hours. Off school hours, there is no problem but during school hours there are. Similarly, Jewett Street.

Alderman Girard interjected or Montgomery or Goffstown Road or any of those areas.

Mr. MacKenzie replied Goffstown Road, I don't think there has been any requests. Montgomery Street there has been a request and I do have a listing to show you the requests we have received. That other requested listing is from individuals, from the Highway Department, from Aldermen, from the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and what our intent would be is to if this Committee is happy with the policy that the Committee adopted last year, we can review that again and go back and analyze all of those streets that had been requested and if the Board has any others we would go through the same calculations to see how they compare against each other in a prioritized listing.

Alderman Pariseau asked do we have any coordination with the Highway Department.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. We would sit down, Frank Thomas is here. We would sit down every year. We sat down when these key streets and this list was prepared. They actually prepare the cost estimates when requests come in and frequently the requests come directly from the Highway Department. They are out in the field, they identify a problem area and they would identify to us and to the Committee problem areas. So yes, we coordinate with the Highway Department as well as the School District.

Alderman Pariseau asked so the list that was submitted to the Highway Department through CIP probably back maybe in 1981 or 1982, the serious problem we have on Calef Road with high traffic, children walking to Bakersville and also for the children waiting for busses for Highland Goffs Falls, where is that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there was a clean slate started last year by the Committee. We reviewed all the streets and again we focused on areas that were within 1/3 of a mile of existing schools. I believe that those areas on Calef Road, for example, were not within 1/3 of a mile or within 1/2 mile of existing schools. There might be some at the very northern end of Calef Road near Baker Street and West Baker Street, but as you can see, I believe those were actually purged last year when the Committee reviewed the process.

Alderman Pariseau asked so the Highway Department hasn't maintained that list of sidewalk reconstruction or installations that were submitted to them back six years ago.

Mr. MacKenzie answered as I remember, that entire list was reviewed by the Committee last year and once they focused on the projects within 1/3 of a mile of schools, streets or sidewalks that did not fall in that criteria were essentially cleaned off the slate.

Alderman Pariseau asked why did they do all of Mammoth Road.

Mr. MacKenzie answered all of Mammoth Road is within 1/3 of a mile of Hillside and Smyth Road.

Alderman Pariseau asked from Bridge Street to Smyth Road School is 1/3 of a mile.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. You can see on the map here that Mammoth Road, the northerly part here, is within 1/3 of a mile of both Hillside and Smyth Road School and I know that when they did Kennard Road sidewalks they were able to save money in terms of transportation because they no longer had to bus them.

Alderman Pariseau asked would it be prudent that we request from the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen a listing of sidewalks to be reviewed by CIP and Highway for reconstruction.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think that would be up to the Committee as to how you would like to proceed. We would review all of the projects of the Highway Department and again the only real way to come up with a prioritized list is to identify what the criteria should be and then evaluate each of the projects and come up with a prioritized list.

Alderman Pariseau stated I wasn't aware that the listing was purged. I was under the impression that the sidewalks that were submitted years ago were still on a list somewhere.

Mr. MacKenzie replied they are probably on a list, yes.

Alderman Wihby stated my understanding is that there are two separate lists. There is a list for reconstruction which includes all of the sidewalks other than in the school zone and then there is a school list that we actually funded last year so the Aldermen decided in their budget last year to fund the school sidewalks and we did some reconstruction, the Highway Department did.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there were a couple of major reconstructions and they did do sidewalks, like South Mammoth Road for example and Mast Road.

Alderman Pariseau stated it brings up an issue. It is fine for school children and God forbid that we don't take care of them but we also have the elderly population that are twisting ankles and whatever walking down cracked up sidewalks and this sort of stuff and we have to start looking at those areas too.

Mr. MacKenzie replied one of the things that I wanted to discuss with you tonight is the issue that we have a lot of situations, primarily in the Central City, where we should have sidewalks on both sides of the street with high density housing, where there is frequently gaps in the sidewalks and there are a lot of sidewalks now that are in such poor shape that they are almost impassable. I believe that in those cases, those are smaller cost projects. I know a couple that have been identified to me that we may just want to set aside a certain amount of the sidewalk reconstruction to be used by the Highway Department at their discretion to take care of some of these small, \$3,000 or \$4,000 projects that we have let slide in the Central City area and in a lot of cases the sidewalks have almost become impassable so as part of this I guess I would suggest that a portion of the total sidewalk reconstruction be set aside to address these immediate type issues that are primarily in the Central City.

Alderman Clancy stated, Mr. MacKenzie, I called you in reference to Hayward and Beech Street which is a sand sidewalk. It is probably about 60 feet and I get calls on it every week. What is the status of that one?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think that is a good example of where it is too bad we didn't have a fund that...I think that one we did review that and it was only \$3,000 to accomplish and if the Highway Department had a discretionary fund of perhaps \$50,000, they could address those more quickly.

Alderman Clancy stated that is like 1/3 mile from the school.

Mr. MacKenzie replied right. Those are the ones that are small and sometimes fall between the cracks but if we had a fund of \$50,000 they could address a lot of those emergency sidewalk issues.

Alderman Clancy stated I hope that gets on the list. Will that be on your list, Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it is on the request list. I have it here.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, the Highway Department has, for a number of years now, asked for money to do an infrastructure and management study presumably to review the conditions of streets and sidewalks and their absences in various places in the City to develop a comprehensive inventory of those facilities so that priorities can be established and the City could systematically address some of these issues. Would such a study be helpful in your efforts to determine where the sidewalks need to be placed, need to be fixed, addressed, reconstructed, etc. I have to tell you that though I agree with the criteria that is here in the sidewalk policy, you know I have some difficulty with the idea that certain streets did not show up even though there were no requests for them, such as Jewett Street or Goffstown Road or other streets like that where there are high volumes of traffic and you do have children walking to school. No matter what, it strikes me that some streets are missing and I don't quite understand how this blend between objective review and requests works because I would have to say that an objective review of something like Jewett Street would say you need sidewalks on both sides here.

Mr. MacKenzie replied part of the issue that came up in the Committee and there are two parts to that if I could answer both of those. At some point, we would like to build a comprehensive system based upon some geographic information system that we have been working on together...Highway Department, Water Works and our department. We have to build a computerized database so that we can have good information throughout the City on all the sidewalks, conditions, etc.

Alderman Girard asked would that study that the Highway has asked for for the last several years be useful in that effort.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am sure it would be useful. In terms of Jewett Street, for example, just to highlight that one, I think there are areas that have been under discussion. Last year they wanted to focus on sidewalks where there were no sidewalks on either side of the road. There are clearly situations, and Jewett Street may be one, that the staging area that you would like should have them on two sides of the street, but again last year they focused on roads primarily that didn't have any sidewalks at all and the Committee felt that we should focus on those streets first before we looked at the others.

Alderman Wihby asked now this list, are these done.

Mr. MacKenzie answered not all of them are done. I think that all of the...we typically have a little bit more CDBG funding.

Alderman Wihby stated I am looking at like Webster.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think all of the CDBG eligible projects were done and I think probably at least the top half of the bond projects were done.

Alderman Wihby stated if you look at Webster School, it has a black mark with a circle and it says proposed sidewalk construction then you have that blue part that says school approaching staging street. Well the school approaching staging street hasn't been done but the other part was done.

Mr. MacKenzie responded in that case, the smaller circle near Webster, that was done because there were no sidewalks on that western portion of Bennington and there was a sidewalk on River Road. There are kids that walk up and down River Road. People could walk up and down the sidewalks on River Road but then there were no sidewalks to connect to Webster School and that is why that section of Bennington was done, because there were not sidewalks on both sides of the street. The lighter blue section, the staging area directly adjacent to Webster does have sidewalks on one side. That is why, again, last year the focus was on streets that had no sidewalks.

Alderman Wihby asked so if I look at this list when it talks about Webster it is talking about the circle part.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked so there is another list that tells you what wasn't done and what is on the list now.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. I have not gone through to check off all of these against what the Highway Department has done. Again, I think a majority of this list has been done. The ones that have not, the ones that were and they went pretty much on a prioritized basis. They took the top rated ones and went down and did those. The ones that have not been done and I see some here down near the bottom of the list, Smyth Road, Union Street, Webster Street, would then be put in with the additional requests this year and prioritized again.

Alderman Clancy asked is Mammoth Road on there between Nelson and Lake Avenue. There is no sidewalks on either side of the street. That was prioritized before Mammoth Road that is being done now.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes and I am familiar with that one. There has actually been a foot path, because there has been so many people, there is a foot path there but no sidewalk. That particular one is not within 1/3 mile of a school. I know that was a difficulty and last year the Committee talked about whether we included active recreational parks because that was not within 1/3 mile of either Weston or Hallsville School. It is clearly a tough area and there is high traffic.

Alderman Clancy stated it is a high traffic area and the elderly are walking up there and there is no place to walk. Alderman Pariseau just mentioned about the elderly walking. The people at 211 Tarrytown Road go to Shop n' Save so they can't really walk. They are cutting up a path through their house and when they walk on Mammoth Road they are either walking on somebody's lawn or by the park so that is the reason I say that.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I guess the question, this was discussed last year, the question to you would be as a policy would you also like to include high activity parks alongside the schools to be used as a rating criteria this year.

Alderman Clancy responded well that should be considered because I am telling you I am getting a lot of calls from people at 211 Tarrytown Road apartments. They like to go out and walk in the morning. They can only walk on Tarrytown Road. They can't walk on Mammoth Road. They could walk around a square, which they can't do now and when they walk to Shop n' Save or walk down to Christy's Market, they are either walking on somebody's lawn or in the park.

Alderman Girard stated we can include high active parks, we can broaden the circles to 1/2 mile or 1/3 of a mile and we can try to prioritize these things, but there are two problems. One, again we don't have that priority list but second of all we don't put any real money towards doing these sidewalks. Do you or does

the Highway Department have any idea of the funding level that the City should be looking at committing to these projects because \$200,000 does not add up to a whole lot.

Mr. MacKenzie replied as you know, Alderman, when it gets down to the final equation and you are comparing sidewalks against street reconstruction, against a new school addition, against a park, those are very tough decisions to make.

Alderman Girard responded and I understand that. My question is though, like Mr. Thomas can tell us how much we should be doing each year in road resurfacing so that we don't keep falling further and further behind. Is there such a number for sidewalks?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I will see if Frank wants to answer that question.

Alderman Pariseau stated we had a request from a resident to participate in this 50/50 sidewalk program. The representative from the Highway Department went over and encouraged the individual to call his Alderman and get it part of the CIP program because he was within walking distance of Bakersville School, but it is not a high traffic area but if there are one or two children that use that particular sidewalk, that is a lot. So I am the bad guy because I tell him that he is not eligible because of him being too far away from Bakersville and whatever. So if we are going to have a criteria of 1/3 of a mile or whatever, we ought to relay that information to everyone concerned and when you purge a list, let me know. We have a whole length of Calef Road that had been submitted to the Highway Department from Baker Street to Gold Street and I am assuming that that was going to be taken care of in 1998, 1999 but they paved a portion of Calef Road and didn't put in a sidewalk on the east side. Well not Calef Road, it was Brown Avenue.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to refer Items 7, 8 and 12 to the CIP Sidewalk Program.

Mr. Thomas stated I don't have an exact answer for you as to how much money should be allocated for sidewalks, however, I do support Bob's notion. I think that you have to, potentially, look at different programs. Granted construction of sidewalks around school areas is a high priority, but I agree with some of the comments made here that maybe we should be looking at high pedestrian walking routes too as a high priority, maybe keeping in mind the elderly if there is an elderly complex, is there a store next to that and also I support Bob's notion that there should be some discretionary money given to the Highway Department so that we can go out and construct a half a block like Alderman Clancy raised to fill in a gap. We don't have that flexibility now. One of the things that I will be pushing for in the budget process this year is, last year if you remember we started to shift away from the Highway Department doing street reconstruction to focus more on resurfacing. If we can totally get away from the Highway Department doing major street reconstruction work, put a major effort on funding resurfacing, that will free up some of our people, our sidewalk and curb crews, to be doing projects in school areas for sidewalks or these heavy pedestrian routes. Right now, those crews are tied up and committed on the street reconstruction projects. So by shifting us away from street reconstruction, we can probably put more of an effort in with our own people into some of these projects and I will be working with Bob through this next budget process to try and identify some reasonable funding levels.

Alderman Wihby stated the Mayor committed that too.

Mr. Thomas replied correct.

Alderman Pariseau asked would you welcome suggestions from the full Board on where sidewalks or sidewalk reconstruction should occur or would you do that on your own.

Mr. Thomas answered well no, I think we would seek input, but again I think what Bob said I think it is going to be up to you to set the policy. Are you going to broaden what you have approved right now? Right now, you have a very focused program which is based on those circles that you see on that map there and I guess what I am saying is maybe there should be a policy change to at least allow some flexibility into looking at heavily traveled pedestrian routes.

Chairman Reiniger stated I support such a policy change.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, is the policy one that says that sidewalks within 1/3 of a mile of a school are a priority for construction or repair.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that was the policy of the Committee last year, yes.

Alderman Girard stated it seems to throw a pretty good blanket over the City. Not that I am opposed to taking a look at high traffic areas or what not but if that is the policy, has there been a strategy developed to evaluate the conditions of the sidewalks or the lack thereof in these areas so that the Committee can review them in a full picture. Right now, it seems that we are again playing the request game.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we did go out and survey all of the areas within 1/3 of a mile that were on key streets, not the side streets, but the key streets or the school staging areas.

Alderman Girard stated so you haven't taken a look at everything.

Mr. MacKenzie replied no.

Alderman Parsieau asked can we request that Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Thomas develop a policy with regard to sidewalks other than the one we have here.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes with the intent to recognize that there might be discretionary areas that need a quick response such as Alderman Clancy had identified, plus broadening somewhat the scope although school areas would be still a priority, broadening it to include certain other very high pedestrian areas. Is that generally the idea?

Alderman Pariseau replied we have to take care of what we got, I think, before we continue moving on with other major projects. The infrastructure is going to hell, the streets and sidewalks, and here we are and I am repeating what constituents tell me, we are building a Riverwalk and you can't walk on Calef Road that has been there for 80 years. I think as a full Board we have to start setting our priorities to take care of what we got or the Riverwalk won't be able to take us anywhere. We won't be able to get to it.

NEW BUSINESS

Communication from the Director of Public Building Services recommending that a request from the Highway Department to replace two police cruisers with two airport vehicles.

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

Alderman Girard asked when is the Fleet Committee going to make recommendations as to what cars everyone should be driving. These recycled cruisers are no bargain. They cost a heck of a lot of money to operate and maintain. These recycled cruisers are more of a drain on the maintenance budgets of these departments. Has the Fleet Committee made any recommendations or are they going to make any recommendations?

Alderman Clancy answered yes, they have made recommendations. Certain people should have a pick-up truck and other people should have a small, compact car.

Alderman Girard stated I don't mean to be flip but where did those recommendations go. Have they been sent to the Board or the Traffic Committee?

Alderman Clancy replied we sent them to the Mayor.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. Alderman Girard being duly recorded in opposition, the motion carried.

CIP Budget Authorization to receive reimbursement for improvements to West High School in the amount of \$10,000.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve this budget authorization.

CIP Budget Authorization revision for the Cops Ahead Program to move the funding from the equipment line item to salaries.

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

TABLED ITEMS

15. Proposed ordinance amendment submitted by the City Clerk:
“An Ordinance establishing procedures for the use of the Public Areas and Facilities Maintenance of City Hall Complex.”
16. Communication from the Chief Sanitary Engineer submitting Amendment No. 3 to the Londonderry/Manchester Intermunicipal Agreement for Sewer Service.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to take Item 16 off the table.

Alderman Girard stated just to briefly update the Board, back in I think it was March, the residents that live in the neighborhoods off of Bodwell Road that are serviced by Bodwell Waste had a pretty significant increase in their waste water treatment fees by Bodwell Waste and Alderman Pinard and I intervened at PUC to try to bring the rates down and we were successful but the reason why I asked this to be tabled is part of the justification for the rate increase was Bodwell Waste's anticipation of expanding the network into Londonderry to support a residential development in Londonderry. That ended up getting separated out of the docket and the PUC is going to deal with it separately. I asked to have this tabled along with Alderman Pinard so that we can go to the Public Utilities Commission and I have spoken with Tom Seigle at Highway to make sure that if the PUC approves the expansion of the sewer network into Londonderry, that the developer is forced to reclaim the capital costs of the development through the sales of the homes and not pass them on to the rate payers in the City as the original docket proposed to do. If we let this go before the PUC hearings happen, we will lose all leverage with the PUC and with the Town of Londonderry on that development so the residents of Manchester at Rosecliff, Megan's Meadow and Eastgate would be in jeopardy for further significant increases to offset those capital costs.

Alderman Pariseau asked are you on record with the PUC.

Alderman Girard answered yes I am.

Alderman Pariseau stated so we can take it off our table.

Alderman Girard replied well Tom Seigle asked that this stay on the table also until it is resolved at PUC. The developer has not filed a new docket at PUC, at least I am not aware that he has so these new issues have not been addressed yet or separately and on behalf of Alderman Pinard I would like to keep this on the table.

Alderman Wihby asked are we talking new homes or existing homes.

Alderman Girard answered new homes.

Alderman Wihby stated so we are trying to stop the new homes from being able to get charged the sidelist, the sign-up.

Alderman Girard replied no. First of all it would be to support a residential development in Londonderry. What we want to make sure we do is that the capital costs of expanding the sewer network into Londonderry are built into the cost of the homes in Londonderry and not thrown onto the rate payers in Manchester as they originally tried to do. I am sorry if I was unclear.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to put this item back on the table.

17. 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.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee