

## COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

**January 19, 1999**

**5:15 PM**

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

**Present:** Aldermen Reiniger, Wihby (late), Clancy, Pariseau, Girard

**Messrs:** F. Monnelly, R. Sherman, D. Gherlone, B. Jabjiniak, R. MacKenzie,  
P. Williams, M. O'Shea

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Update to be presented by Fire Department officials relative to the  
Somerville Fire Station.

Mr. Monnelly stated thank you for the opportunity of meeting with us tonight. I would like to give you a brief presentation on where we are with renovations to the Somerville Street Fire Station. In fiscal year 1998, we had asked for funds to go through Somerville Street and to rehab that fire station. We were initially given \$60,000 by CIP and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to conduct a study on designs to see whether that fire station needed to be replaced or remodeled or moved to another area. The results of that study came back and said that the fire station needed an addition built on to it and that we were to go through that building and renovate it completely from one end to the other and that it was to the best interest of the City to do that. Consequently, our 1999 CIP budget request for \$1,490,000 was to do that. That request was not fully funded, but what was funded was \$625,000 for FY99 to start this project and move it along. Back in November, the architect firm CMK was hired to bring this project on board and to see it to fruition. They have been here for the last two months and they have been working diligently on a plan to try and get the station up and running so that we can come in here with a budget to the CIP Committee and to move the project along for the construction season which begins, obviously, in the spring time. It is a very aggressive schedule that they need to meet to move this project along. The first part of this is to look at design schematics to come up with a preliminary building as to what it was going to look like and whether it met the needs of the Fire Department and the community as a whole. They have done that. They have

1/19/99 CIP

2

just finished that within the last week or so. We have met with various City

officials as far as ADA plans go to make sure that we were in step with the City's policies and that this building would be completely ADA compliant. We met with the Highway Department to address issues of sewage run-off. The Highway Department does not have any concerns with what we are doing up there at the present time. Right now, we are here to inform you as to where we are in this process. To date, the bulk of that \$625,000 is still there and hasn't been spent yet. What we are looking for from CMK is in the next week to 10 days to get back a budget from them as to what they feel the final cost of this building is going to be so that we can bring it back to CIP for their budget season. When that is done, CMK can get construction documents and hopefully we can have some type of an aggressive schedule to get it out there and on the streets by the end of March so that pre-qualified contractors can bid on this and hopefully have a contract on board and start working on this project sometime in May. That is pretty much where we stand with it right now. If we start some time in May or the early part of the construction season we feel that we can get the bulk of the work done on this building before the winter comes and probably by December we will have the major part of that facility up and running.

Alderman Pariseau asked did I miss something. Are you still looking at the renovation of the current building?

Mr. Monnelly answered that is correct. What we are going to do is add three new apparatus bays onto that building, on the west side of that building, to house the fire apparatus and they will exit onto Hall Street. At that point, once those bays are on there, we can move those pieces of fire apparatus out of the bays and utilize the existing building for living. The second floor would be bedrooms, showers and things like that and the first floor would be support areas.

Alderman Pariseau asked so trucks will be coming out onto Hall Street.

Mr. Monnelly answered yes.

Alderman Girard stated this may be a silly question but why does the fire station need to meet ADA compliance standards. It seems to me that firefighters are not subject to ADA requirements so I guess I am curious as to why the building has to comply.

Mr. Monnelly replied the federal civil rights bill says that any new construction needs to be ADA compliant.

Alderman Girard asked regardless of the construction.

1/19/99 CIP

4

Mr. Monnelly answered regardless of the construction, yes.

Alderman Clancy stated my colleague here, Alderman Girard, many times people stop at the fire station asking for directions. Sometimes they could be incapacitated, in a wheelchair or something. Most of the time the firemen run out to the car and ask them what they want. Some times people want to use the bathrooms.

Alderman Girard asked fire station bathrooms are open to the public.

Alderman Clancy answered all municipal buildings are.

Alderman Clancy stated as far as the station on Somerville Street. This is an old, dilapidated station. I worked over there myself. I know the building. It is in dire need of repair. The other thing is when you back the ladder truck in some times you back it in too quickly and hit the side of the building, either the back or the sides. If you want to buy a new ladder truck out there you can't put it up because the building is not adequate for the housing as far as the length and the height. Lets get up-to-date here with these buildings. I am in favor of renovating this fire station.

Alderman Pariseau asked why couldn't we just tear the building down completely.

Mr. Monnelly replied and allow a new structure.

Alderman Pariseau responded yes. You were going to do that on Hall Street anyway.

Mr. Monnelly stated if you are talking about on-site, first of all the cost of a structure on-site would be about \$500,000 more than we are looking for for this renovation and addition. It would give us a much smaller building than we have right now as far as firefighter support areas go. The best dollar advantage to the taxpayer is to gut the old building and put the additional three apparatus bays on there and do it that way. If you built a new station there, it would be smaller in size and it would still cost us somewhere between \$430,000 and \$500,000 more to do that.

**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.

B. Bond Resolution:

Two “Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of  
Hundred Eighty Five Thousand Dollars (\$285,000) for various water distribution improvements.”

C. Resolutions:

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds for the 1999 CIP 250799D the Way Home-Operation Assistance.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds for various School Department Projects.”

D. 1999 Budget Authorizations:

25A799 The Way Home-Essential Services - Revision #1  
25C799 The Way Home-Homeless Prevention - Revision #1  
25D799 The Way Home-Operational Assistance

E. Communication from the Director of Planning seeking authorization on behalf of Tom Seigle (EPD) to apply to the State for grant funds towards the cost of the 1998 CIP 7.40204 Tougas Avenue Sewer Extension Project.

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

A. Ratify and Confirm Poll Conducted:

Approving the sale of the Police patrol wagon to the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office.

Alderman Girard stated this is ratifying the poll on the Police Department's request. The letter from the Clerk's Office to the Police Department said that it was approved unanimously but the Clerk's note on the Department's letter has Alderman Wihby voting no and I am wondering if there is a mistake somewhere here.

The Clerk replied yes that is a mistake.

Alderman Girard asked so did Alderman Wihby vote yes.

The Clerk replied he voted no.

Alderman Girard stated for the record then, the request by the Police Department was not approved unanimously.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to ratify and confirm the poll.

- F. Communication from the Director of Planning requesting authorization to accept a lot adjacent to the Neighborhood Resource Center for parking.

An amendment to this item was distributed.

Chairman Reiniger asked Mr. MacKenzie to clarify this item.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have an opportunity to work with Neighborhood Housing Services in getting a lot adjacent to the Neighborhood Resource Center. It is a lot that you might be familiar with. There was a bad fire on Spruce Street and the building was badly damaged and had to be removed. The Neighborhood Resource Center has been quite active. They have limited parking spaces and we have an opportunity to acquire this lot on Spruce Street which is actually right behind the Neighborhood Resource Center. We acted, in essence today. I think the closing is going to be today for the City to have the opportunity to acquire this lot.

Alderman Clancy moved to have the City of Manchester accept a certain tract of land known as 120 Spruce Street, that the Mayor and the City Solicitor be authorized to prepare, execute and record any documents as may be required to carry out such acceptance, and that the Committee Report be brought before the full Board at tonight's meeting. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

1/19/99 CIP

8

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, will the City be acquiring this lot.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the City would acquire it and the Neighborhood Resource Center is actually a City building on City property.

Alderman Girard asked so the City will then be responsible for maintaining this lot.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the facility is maintained and operated by a collaborative of agencies. The City will, therefore, lease this particular lot to that Collaboration.

Alderman Girard asked is the City going to construct the parking lot.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we anticipate that we would likely fund the construction.

Alderman Girard asked where would the funding for this come from.

Mr. MacKenzie answered probably out of a later CDBG grant.

Alderman Girard asked and the cost for acquisition, the money for acquisition.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered basically there is no cost to the City. NHS is going to give us the property.

Alderman Girard asked so it was an NHS property, the building that burned.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered Manchester currently owns it.

Alderman Girard asked so NHS bought the lot, they are going to give it to us, we are going to pave it and stripe it and then we are going to lease it back to them and they will be responsible for removing snow and policing the lot, etc.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is not NHS that operates it. It is a collaboration between Southern NH Services and they carry out City programs.

Alderman Girard asked has a lease rate been discussed for this.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we have been leasing the facility for \$1 a year.

Alderman Girard replied I mean the parking lot, Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the parking lot we would add into that lease.

Alderman Pariseau stated with Neighborhood Housing being involved and they pay taxes, this isn't going to be a sole proprietorship. It is going to be the City leasing to the Resource Center and they are a good service.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it would be City property so there would not be taxes on this piece of property.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote on the motion to have the City of Manchester accept a certain tract of land known as 120 Spruce Street, have the Mayor and the City Solicitor be authorized to prepare, execute and record any documents as may be required to carry out such acceptance, and that the Committee Report be brought before the full Board at tonight's meeting. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 5 of the agenda and noted that he has been advised that we don't have to go into non-public session:

Facility Evaluation of Amoskeag Hydro Plant Report.

Mr. Sherman stated representatives from Public Service informed us, after they reviewed the report, that they did not feel we had to go into an executive session. To refresh the Committee, what we are doing here tonight is the Committee and the Board has already authorized \$63,000 for the evaluation committee which is made up of Frank Thomas, Bob Beaurivage, Tom Arnold, Rich Davis, Doug Gherlone, Tina Parsons and myself to go out and do a Phase I study and evaluation of the Amoskeag Hydro Plant. We are here tonight to present Phase I which was the safety review report. What we are asking the Committee to do is accept this report and make such a report to the full Board and then subsequently Item 7 on the agenda is the additional funding so that we can move into Phase II of the project which would be actual costing of the facility, doing some easement work, doing some land work, some site work, etc. so that we can then start the negotiation process with Public Service. If it is appropriate, Mr. Chairman, Doug Gherlone, a member of the committee, has asked to make a comment before I turn it over to our project manager.

Mr. Gherlone stated I have had the pleasure of being a part of this committee from the beginning. In fact, I volunteered at a public meeting a while back now. Again, my background is in banking here in NH for the last 20+ years, most of it with First NH. My specialty was financing power plants, specifically hydro and cogeneration, wood/fire plants. I thought that I might be able to add something. The reason for these hopefully very few comments are to say that having been involved with this group from the beginning and having what I didn't think was

1/19/99 CIP

11

going to be but turned out to be the pleasure of working with Randy and Tina...my

past experience with public officials in banking led me to be somewhat negative about the whole concept of doing this and I mentioned this to Tina and Randy at the last meeting that if I was still CEO of the Bank of NH I would move heaven and earth to hire them away from the City and come to work with me. They have done an amazing job both professionally and personally with a very difficult situation. Neither of them, to the best of my knowledge, had any background in the hydroelectric facilities, but educated themselves and have dealt with this in a matter that certainly brings distinction to the City and to the Board itself. The project, I have inspected it myself personally, I have worked all the numbers and talked with all of the players and I feel very comfortable with the presentation that is going to be made. I volunteered to do this on behalf of watching over the shoulders of everyone for the City just to make sure this wasn't a run away train. It isn't and as I said with the information that is going to be presented to you ladies and gentlemen here tonight, I just am comfortable with it.

Mr. Sherman turned the presentation over to Paul Williams who is the project manager from Kleinschmidt Associates.

Mr. Williams stated I am a Principal and Senior Engineer with Kleinschmidt Associates. Our firm has been in business since 1966 and we have focused primarily on hydroelectric and hydroelectric related resources. We were engaged to conduct what was described as a Phase I facility evaluation of the Amoskeag Facility. We completed that and the results are summarized in the report that I believe everyone has. We conducted a number of visits to the site. We looked at the major features that make up the project. Briefly, those include the dam, fishway, the visitor center, all the water retaining structures, the gatehouse in the old canal, the mechanical equipment, the electrical equipment, transformers, we stopped short of looking at the transmission assets. There is a common understanding that the dividing line between generation and the transmission is at the high side of the step up transformers which are located out on the tailrace stack. Our investigation also included an underwater investigation of the water retaining structures. We subcontracted to a diving outfit. We had one of our Senior Engineers on site to supervise that operation. Over a period of three days, the divers inspected the gatehouse, the upstream face of the dam below the water surface, the intake area of the powerhouse and they also went into the tailrace and looked at the foundation of the powerhouse and the draft tubes, the draft tubes would be the three water passages where the flow exists from each of the tubes. All of the structures that were examined were found to be in good condition. Overall, we found the facility to be in good condition. It is well designed and has been well maintained. That statement holds true for the structural features, as well as the electrical mechanical equipment. The facility was built in 1924. Back in 1924, the technologies that were being used resulted in equipment that in general

1/19/99 CIP

13

is very simple, robust and quite reliable. We are very familiar with the

manufacturers that supplied the generators and the turbines. There is numerous examples of this equipment from the same vintage and the same design that has been operating quite reliably across the United States. There are some aspects of the project that require some maintenance work, some superficial deterioration. Probably one of the most evident aspects of that would be visible to anyone on a day when the water was not spilling over the dam and that is on the downstream face of the spillway. It has some cracking. These cracks and what you see in the downstream surface does not jeopardize the structural integrity of the dam, nor does it hinder the function that the dam serves. In general, we were looking for serious problems, what we would determine in the industry to be a fatal flaw that would suggest that there was reason not to proceed any further. We did not find any such problem. We are looking forward to moving towards the second phase of the project where we will examine the economic benefits associated with the project and also identify short-term and long-term costs, capital costs and allow benefit cost ratios to be calculated. I guess I will open it to questions or any clarifications that anyone would like.

Alderman Clancy stated I know that you inspected the dam and waterways and all that stuff but I did notice in some of the photos that you have here that there are some cracks in some of the areas there. Do you have a ballpark figure of what it would cost to bring it back to normal?

Mr. Williams replied that is kind of a loaded question. To bring it back to what? The cracks, one of the most prominent cracks is a crack that is internal in the inspection gallery or the tunnel that is constructed through the body of the dam. It is almost impossible to construct a massive concrete structure like that and not have any cracks resulting. The geometry of that type of structure...it is not unusual to expect to find shrinkage cracks like that. Usually, the type of repair that one would perform on a crack of that nature would be if the crack was leaking. If there was water coming through the crack or it was a crack that would jeopardize the structural integrity of the dam. This crack was not. A massive concrete dam like that is designed to perform as a gravity structure. In other words, it does not require a lot of internal reinforcing steel. It basically gets its stability from the sheer mass of the structure. As long as that crack doesn't go completely through the structure and allow the top half to slide against the bottom half, the structural integrity isn't compromised and the function that the dam serves, one to retain water and to safely pass floods is also not compromised.

Mr. Gherlone stated you might want to mention the monitoring program.

Mr. Williams stated the FERC, about five years ago, required that PSNH monitor a series of cracks that were located in the powerhouse. Those cracks have been in a monitoring program for four or five years. Every six months, PSNH was required to file a report with the FERC. The data that was collected on the cracks that were subject to that monitoring program show that there was virtually no movement in the cracks. FERC was satisfied that the cracks were benign and they have allowed PSNH to discontinue the crack monitoring program for the cracks in the powerhouse. The crack in the dam that we just talked about has just recently been required to be surveyed similarly to the cracks in the powerhouse.

Monitoring pins were installed inside the dam in June or July of this year. There is only six months or so of data, but the six months of data that has been collected has also shown that there has been no movement in that crack that is in the dam. The crack is believed to have been there for quite some time. Most PSNH people who are familiar with the project say that for as long as they can remember they have seen the crack. I looked at it and it doesn't look like anything recent to me. The inside of the crack is quite old. You could go in and cosmetically repair the crack so that you didn't see it, but I am not sure that that would accomplish anything. Our recommendation would be to continue the program that the FERC has asked for and if there is any significant movement to address a proper repair at that point in time.

Alderman Clancy stated the reason I asked the question is because if the City does purchase it or get the hydro plant, they won't be stuck with a bill for \$2 or \$3 million to repair it.

Mr. Williams replied that is precisely what we were looking for when we went out there was to find out if there was any such expenditure that could reasonably be expected. We don't think there is.

Alderman Pariseau stated that photo that depicts the dam spillway, Photo #7, states that it is in need of resurfacing. Would that be the City's responsibility, or would that be taken care of if the City went ahead and acquired the property prior to the City's acceptance?

Mr. Williams replied my understanding is that would be the City's responsibility. There was an inspection that was performed by the FERC in May of this year. I just read the inspection report which was released in November. This inspection was performed by the FERC. As a result of that inspection, the FERC has required that PSNH submit a plan to deal with this surface deterioration and they are obligated to perform a condition survey and then come back to the FERC with a five year plan or a plan and a budget to perform the repairs to that spillway.

1/19/99 CIP

16

That is not required for another five years. It is not anything that would imminently threaten the integrity of the dam.

Alderman Pariseau asked how much do you think that would cost.

Mr. Williams answered PSNH has actually budgeted money over a period of five years and I believe that have budgeted approximately \$150,000 every other year for five years so you would be looking at \$450,000.

Mr. Gherlone stated if we are approved for Phase II, that would also be figured into what the offering price would be. Any repairs would be included in that, Alderman.

Mr. Williams stated one of the things that we plan to do in the next phase of the work, if we are authorized to go that route, is to independently confirm these capital cost estimates that PSNH has included in their long-range plan. The numbers appear reasonable. They look like they are in the ballpark, but that is something that we plan to address in the next phase.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept the report and to have Phase II of the Amoskeag Hydro Project proceed. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. Williams, would it be fair to say that because this dam has apparently been as well maintained as it has that the structure is largely intact.

Mr. Williams answered it is very much so intact.

Alderman Girard asked if the City were to take this dam over and continue a maintenance plan like the dam has been subject to, then for the foreseeable future there are no major expenditures evident, correct.

Mr. Williams answered the two biggest areas of financial concern for an owner of dam are remediation measures that are required to bring the stability up into compliance with the FERC requirements. That generally involves rock anchoring which is a very costly proposition. This structure complies with current FERC safety criteria so there is no additional funds that are required from a stability concern. The second issue is fish passage. Fortunately, this facility has recently constructed fish passage facilities. They are all in excellent condition. The fishway, I believe, was built in 1988 and the visitor center in 1990. There are some ongoing discussions with the agencies now about modifying the fishway to enhance passage. I think that might be something as simple as modifying one of the waist gates on the structure so we do not anticipate that this there will be extensive expenditures for fish passage reasons. Everything else will fall into the category of routine or five or ten year maintenance items.

1/19/99 CIP

18

Alderman Girard asked in your opinion, is the condition of this dam, given its age, unique or is it fairly common for structures of this type to be in as good a condition as it is.

Mr. Williams answered I would say that the condition was observed is representative of structures of that design.

Alderman Girard asked so there is a standard that it can be measured against reliably.

Mr. Williams answered I would say so, yes.

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

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

1999 CIP Budget Authorization:

760499 Amoskeag Hydro - Revision #1

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

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Rivard relative to Pine Island Pond property.

Alderman Pariseau moved to refer this item to the FY2000 CIP budget process. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department requesting

that funds in the amount of \$1,400.00 from Allied Domecq Retailing be accepted and placed in the FY99 cash account for the Fun-in-the-Sun Program.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to accept the funds.

1/19/99 CIP

19

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from the Public Works Director informing the Board of on-going discussions regarding the CSO Program and seeking authorization to formally enter into negotiations with Alliance Resources and the Pichette's for the acquisition of environmentally significant land (Hackett Hill).

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to authorize the Public Works Director to enter into negotiations with Alliance Resources and the Pichette's for the acquisition of environmentally significant land.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Attorney Andrew Bauer on behalf of SNHS Management Corp. requesting that the City release the reversionary interest on property located at 214 Spruce Street; and further requesting discontinuance of a portion of Lake Avenue South Backstreet.

Alderman Wihby asked what is this building and where is it.

Alderman Clancy answered this is the old convent. It is a white building. Southern NH Services wants to buy the building from the diocese and they are going to have a daycare in there from what I was told.

Alderman Wihby asked is the daycare a for profit daycare.

Alderman Clancy answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked so why are we giving them a building. Who do I ask the question to?

Mr. O'Shea stated I am the Assistant Director of Southern NH Services. We received a grant that is called Early Headstart. It is basically to provide infant care for low income families. We have a grant that is called Headstart that takes care of three and four year olds. This grant calls for age 0-2. It calls for us to service 64 children from Manchester. We worked together with Catholic Charities and identified the old St. Augustine's Convent on the corner of Spruce and Beech Street. The parking lot for St. Augustine's Church is what we are talking about where these alleyways are. It is also the parking lot for St. Cecelia's Hall, but that is where these alleyways...the Catholic church put up a set of garages right at the

1/19/99 CIP

20

end of the alleyway that comes down so basically that alleyway hasn't been used in some 30 or 40 years anyway. We are requesting...we worked with the Catholic

church and they want to retain possession of the playground. The playground area alone isn't big enough to be a City lot so they need to push it further over into the alleyway and then they get enough density for it to become a City lot.

Alderman Wihby asked was this City property first and then we gave it to the church basically so they could use it as a school and if not it reverted back to us. Is that true? Who knows?

Mr. O'Shea answered I don't know for sure if that is true.

Alderman Wihby stated I read this in here. I didn't make it up. It says to be used for a school otherwise the reverter rights go back to the City.

Mr. O'Shea replied but during that same time, after it became a school I believe it became the convent.

Alderman Clancy stated the cedar house on the corner of Cedar and Beech Street was St. Augustine's School and this building here is part of the diocese. That is where the nuns stayed. When they had recess at St. Augustine's School, they came across the street and used the playground.

Alderman Wihby stated all I am getting at is what I read here is that it reverts back to the City if not used as a school and that is one of the reasons why it is here.

Alderman Pariseau replied but it hasn't been used as a school apparently for some time.

Alderman Wihby responded maybe not, but nobody caught it. I don't know if we ever voted on it or not. Now clearly it is up to us to decide what we want to use it for. I know that Alderman Pariseau always questions, and just questioned last week and rightfully so, the not for profit for profit entities should be paying real estate taxes and here we are giving another building away. I know we gave \$100,000 to some organization for daycare. Is that true?

Mr. Jabjiniak replied \$65,000 a year.

Alderman Wihby responded okay \$65,000 a year. We tried to stop giving and we can't. We have to keep throwing it back in because it keeps somebody going and because it is something we want to keep doing I guess, but I question it ever year in the budget process. Now what is Southern NH Services all about? Are they non-profit?

1/19/99 CIP

22

Mr. O'Shea replied yes.

Alderman Wihby asked what do they do.

Mr. O'Shea answered they provide multiple social service programs from elderly housing to Headstart to fuel assistance, the WIC program.

Alderman Wihby asked with what money.

Mr. O'Shea replied federal money.

Alderman Pariseau stated the problem I have is that we have a program in the City with Neighborhood Housing Services and they pay and to turn around and give you people land and whatever and you don't pay any taxes...if we could get a commitment from you for payment to the City in lieu of taxes, I would appreciate that but again we are looking at writing off another \$9 million to \$11 million worth of property this year for non-profits and the civic center and whatever. We are going to have to make up that difference to keep the tax rate level and if we continue to give property to non-profits with nothing coming back to the City in lieu of taxes, John Smith and I are going to be absorbing your pleasures. I don't think that is fair and I haven't for years. I have a problem with non-profits not paying anything to the City, nothing, and we have the Fire Department running up to mental health on Merrimack Street at all times of the night and they don't pay a dime. Don't you think they ought to pay something? I am just fed up with non-profits. That is me, not this Committee or anything. When you are looking at another write-off for \$9 to \$11 million this year on the tax base, we have a problem.

Alderman Girard asked this property is not currently on the tax role is it.

Mr. O'Shea answered no, it is not.

Alderman Girard stated as a general comment, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the sentiments expressed by Alderman Pariseau in its general principle and I don't think it is fair to vent it at you, Mr. O'Shea. As a general rule, I think the City has got to start to take a look at whether or not we are going to continue to give pieces of the tax base away, but the population that you would serve, would you, if this request were to be granted and you were to convert that building into Headstart, what population in particular are you looking to serve or would be served and is there currently a demand for that service or are you creating that demand by getting the grant.

Mr. O'Shea replied to answer your question, we currently serve roughly 100 children ages 3 and 4 from low income families in our Headstart grant. The Early Headstart grant would basically identify these children at an earlier age. We would work with the families for four years or five years rather than just the one or two year period that we work with the families now.

Alderman Wihby asked where do you work with them in all different locations like basements somewhere.

Mr. O'Shea answered no. We have 40 Pine Street, the old Tom Ray Office Supply. We converted it into five Headstart classrooms which basically have 17 children in each classroom. We also operate a childcare center over at Brookside Church. We also operate out of the new Bishop O'Neil Youth Center. We have a project based childcare center/Headstart center there. We are servicing well over 100 children from Manchester. Low income children, ages 3 and 4 now. What this grant calls for us to do is to start identifying with those families earlier in a child's life and working with them for a longer period of time. Just to make a comment, again, the property we are discussing is not on the tax maps and we could work around this and just lease the building from the Catholic church and go around the rules that you are expressing. We worked together with the church. It is in the neighborhood that we want. It is where the low income people reside. It is a homey building. It is white. It is an old convent. We thought it was ideal for childcare.

Alderman Wihby asked is it for profit.

Mr. O'Shea answered no, it is not for profit. Southern NH Services is a private, non-profit corporation.

Chairman Reiniger asked, Alderman Clancy, since this is in your ward do you support this.

Alderman Clancy answered yes I do. I wholeheartedly do. I will tell you what, Mr. O'Shea, are you going to be charging people to bring their children there.

Mr. O'Shea replied no.

Alderman Pariseau asked he doesn't charge.

Mr. O'Shea answered we got a \$488,000 grant from the Federal government to provide these services.

1/19/99 CIP

25

Alderman Pariseau asked free services to a family. You don't even make them pay what they can afford? They don't pay a dime?

Mr. O'Shea answered they must meet income eligibility guidelines in order to participate.

Alderman Wihby asked what about your other programs. Same way?

Mr. O'Shea answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked what about the other Headstart program.

Mr. O'Shea answered the same exact thing. Now we have some children at some of the other centers that we mix in that do pay. At Brookside, for instance, there are children that pay so if you go there and say there are some families who pay at that particular site yes we do accept paying children.

Alderman Clancy stated this is going to give people in the area a place for their children to go so they can go to work.

Mr. O'Shea stated as far as the new Welfare-to-Work requirements, TANIF is going to require Welfare people to go back to work.

Alderman Wihby asked are you going to be involved in that.

Mr. O'Shea answered no. We are working with them. We don't actually distribute the Welfare benefits but we will be a referral agency for childcare services.

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

Alderman Pariseau asked for the legal thing, can we check that reverter clause with the City Solicitor to see if we can do this because there is, as Alderman Wihby pointed out, a release of the reversionary rights agreement.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. O'Shea, when you take these children, is there any requirement that the parents either be employed or seeking employment. Alderman Clancy has made reference to enabling the parents to go to work. Do you require the parents to either be employed or seek employment?

Mr. O'Shea answered no. They could be disabled. There are a number of circumstances that could be involved. They have to be low income.

Alderman Girard replied I understand that but to be low income and receiving services while you are sitting at home with no motivation to go find a job is not...you know I am not sure those are services that I want to be subsidizing. Is there any kind of...is there a requirement that parents of these children be employed or seeking employment?

Mr. O'Shea responded no.

Alderman Girard stated in theory then you could be taking care of, if you max out your capacity, you could be taking care of children whose parents have no motivation to get into the private sector and not being able to care for children whose parents are motivated and trying and need help.

Mr. O'Shea replied they are going to be receiving those motivations through the new Welfare Reform rules and regulations. Two years and off or it is actually five years and off I believe.

Alderman Girard stated well two years or five years is still a long period of time. Now is the program, can the program be designed to cause people to either be employed or at least actively looking for work in order for you to accept the children.

Mr. O'Shea replied I think priorities could be set as far as how we select which children go into the program, but I don't think we could deny anybody if there were slots available.

Alderman Girard asked how do you determine eligibility now through your regular Headstart Program.

Mr. O'Shea answered income.

Alderman Girard asked strictly income. So there are no job criteria or employment criteria.

Alderman Clancy stated, Alderman Girard, if you have a single woman in the center city area who wants to go back to work this is a place for her to bring her children. This is a good thing for the inner City.

Alderman Girard replied I understand that. I am just trying to ask some questions. You brought up the point that this is to enable single moms to work and that is fine, but if there is no requirement through the program that they either be employed or at least looking for work, how do you know you are actually going to be serving that population. That was my question to the gentleman and so far the answer I am getting is they are not interested in doing that. As a comment, I have a problem with a program that does not at least have a requirement or a guideline. I am not being told that you can't put on these restrictions or you can't have some kind of requirement like that. Are you telling me that the Federal government does not allow you to do that?

Mr. O'Shea stated the Federal government issues rules and regulations on the operation of the grant.

Alderman Girard asked are you telling me that the Federal government does not allow you to set that criteria.

Mr. O'Shea answered yes. The rules are the rules is all I am saying.

Alderman Girard replied that is all you had to do was answer the question with that word. If the Federal government doesn't allow it, then it can't happen.

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

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Petition to discontinue a portion of New York Street submitted by David Giovagnoli.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard it was voted that a petition for discontinuance of a portion of New York Street be denied and that same has been released from public servitude under the provisions of RSA 231:51.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

13. 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."

This item remained on the table.

1/19/99 CIP

28

14. Communication from the Chief Sanitary Engineer submitting Amendment No. 3 to the Londonderry/Manchester Intermunicipal Agreement for Sewer Service.

This item remained on the table.

15. 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.

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee