

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

November 28, 2000

5:30 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby, Clancy, Cashin, Lopez

Messrs: F. Thomas, R. Ludwig, R. Johnson, K. Dillon

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Gerald Coulter of Parks & Recreation requesting permission to acquire a 1999 Crown Victoria, which was recently vacated by the Police Department.

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

Alderman Lopez asked, Frank, why did this have to come to our Committee. They needed this vehicle for 60 days. Is there some procedure or ordinance that says it has to come here?

Mr. Thomas answered no it is not an ordinance. It is a policy that was adopted by the old transportation committee of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that all vehicle purchases, all trades, anything dealing with the fleet would have to come through the Committee, which is not the CIP Committee.

Alderman Lopez asked is that efficient or does that delay things.

Mr. Thomas answered I think with something like this I don't frankly think it needs to come through the Committee. I think the bigger interest is if it is a new registration because in the past the Committee was always conscious of not expanding the City fleet so I can see something like that coming to the Committee. However, once the MER or once funds have been allocated for the purchase of a

particular piece of equipment or other swap of a vehicle like this, quite frankly, I don't think it has to come to the Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated that is the point that I was getting at. Maybe you could write something to the Chairman of the Committee and we could address it at another time.

Mr. Thomas replied I would be glad to.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Alfred Sapienza, Jr. regarding lack of pickup yard waste materials and advising of actions being considered by neighborhood residents.

Chairman O'Neil stated Frank I think you have addressed the Board on this issue and sent out a memo on it, not specifically with Mr. Sapienza, but the entire City. Do you want to give a quick overview?

Mr. Thomas answered yes. This is an old correspondence that came into the Board in September. On October 2, I wrote the Board a letter and I have copies of it here if you would like to see it. Quite frankly, the level of service with Waste Management was going down. Because of that, I had met with their new regional manager, the new division manager and quite frankly read him the riot act. Based on that meeting, I had him put in writing, which is included in this correspondence which I will give you, what they proposed to do to rectify the service issues. As I mentioned, a new division manager was brought in. He is very conscientious. We now have a new full-time manager in Manchester assigned to Manchester alone. We have developed various complaint tracking systems. They have modified their answering system and they also have a 24-hour answering service and quite frankly since that meeting they have accomplished everything they promised and I think you have to admit that within the last month or so service has been quite frankly superior. When we do have a problem, it is addressed in a very short period of time - within one day. So, there is good follow-up. We are monitoring the complaints and quite frankly we have received very few complaints during this heavy yard waste collection season so I think they have turned the tide in meeting their obligations to us.

Alderman Clancy stated I had to call Waste Management myself last week. I told them that we had some materials on two different streets in my area and it took a couple of days but they did finally get to it. I hope they are not just pacifying us until they get their contract.

Mr. Thomas replied not at all. I don't believe that is the case. Again, if the calls had come into us, well quite frankly the call that went into ServiceMaster we would have seen that call because they get turned into us the following day and we follow-up on it. Quite frankly, a lot of the problems are that people are missing the day.

Alderman Clancy stated well it is Wednesdays in the center city to my knowledge.

Mr. Thomas replied well if there is a holiday, everything is off a day but people still put them out. Again, we have been tracking the complaints quite closely and what we have seen is that there are very few and when there is a problem that develops, it is addressed immediately. I think, quite frankly, this new division manager I have met with him and he seems to be very conscientious and he seems to be willing to make an extra effort. There are more men and equipment now assigned in Manchester and again I think the key is that they have assigned one full-time supervisor for Manchester alone where before they had him spread between here and other municipalities. I think we have a lot better response when there is a problem that develops. Somewhat in their defense, when they have a new person sent out on routes there might be an alley that is missed or a corner that is missed and I can understand that as long as the issue is addressed in a reasonable period of time. I find that they are doing that. I, quite frankly, am very impressed and pleased with the turnaround that they have done in the last month or so.

Alderman Clancy asked what is the last day for picking up yard waste for this year.

Mr. Thomas answered it ends this weekend. I am not sure of the exact date but it ends this weekend. Legal notice go out on the season and calendars and schedules are sent out. People should know that. Obviously, if the weather is good we are going to continue to see yard waste placed out in the street right through December. That is what happened last year. We make the attempt to clean it up somewhere along the line. We don't want to see it develop. People should shut if off at that time. If we get snow on Thursday, then it is going to be a non-issue.

Alderman Clancy stated maybe we should put it in the newspaper.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to mention the last date for yard waste at the Board meeting this evening.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Frank, have you responded to Mr. Sapienza.

Mr. Thomas answered yes, we have already been in contact with him. He is on what we would call our priority list.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Health Officer requesting approval for acceptance of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Project funds and amendments to existing projects.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the acceptance of funds and amendments to existing projects.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Ron Ludwig, Director of Parks & Recreation regarding West Memorial Field.

Mr. Ludwig stated it has been brought to our attention by the contractor to give some consideration to a proposal and a couple of those considerations came forward regarding the lights at that facility and another consideration was in the bleachers. All of the funds that we received in the FY2001 appropriation I would say that more than 95% of them have been encumbered or committed to the project but it was brought to our attention that one particular installation where the light poles, I think it was at Boston University, could not be used because there was a neighborhood outcry for lighting. So, there are a couple of opportunities that exist here and again this is just for your consideration. We felt that it was worthwhile to bring it forward in the spirit of maybe there is...we know there is not a lot of money laying around but maybe there are some unappropriated funds in the CIP budget and there may be an opportunity to take advantage of this and, therefore, reduce our FY2002 budget numbers.

Chairman O'Neil asked are there any balances in the existing projects at West Memorial.

Mr. Ludwig answered it is minimal. We are down to a few thousand dollars that aren't committed.

Alderman Wihby stated we have a letter from Bob who said that he has already checked other accounts and there is no money available, but Bob is there any way we can work something out. It seems a shame not to take advantage of this \$85,000 or whatever the number is to do this now. Is there any way we can set something up with the contractor so he knows we are going to fund it next year or take something out knowing that we can get the money again next year to replace it with?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it was a pretty attractive savings. I think it was \$65,000 that we could potentially save. Is that the correct number, Ron?

Mr. Ludwig responded I think that is correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the only option, again, we didn't see any available bond balances on that order of \$200,000+. What the City can possibly do though is if it was likely that the City was going to fund the final phase of West Memorial next year and it has been my understanding or perception that the Board was going to finish the project next year, if it is likely that the Board is going to do that it is possible to enter into a contract by the Board...have the Board approve the contract for the final phase which would bind them to the funding in the spring time. We have done this on certain occasions, such as when we built the McLaughlin Middle School we funded half of it but we approved a contract, which meant that the Board was committed to funding the second half in the following fiscal year.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is supposed to be finished in the last phase. Lighting is one of them.

Mr. Ludwig replied the actual purchase of the poles, in other words we have the concrete piers in right now as we did over at Livingston and we have the underground conduits obviously under the existing field. Purchase of the light poles and the racks and the wiring of those would need to be completed.

Chairman O'Neil asked what portion of the bleachers was supposed to be part of next year.

Mr. Ludwig answered in the original contract there were 500 seats to be installed.

Chairman O'Neil asked that was in this year's contract.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes. Now when bleacher people come in and the contractor was dealing with several different groups to try to get his best price although he

was committed to the price on the bid because we bid it that way, he was dealing with several different bleacher companies out there to see what could be configured in a phased-in approach. The truth of the matter is that in order to get one section in, you really needed to go to 800 seats in the first phase because we were going in a phased-in approach. That was a little bit more than the \$178,000 that we were committed to. Also, we wanted to get the piers in to accept the remainder of the bleachers when the time came so the savings that we...again the bleachers is a mobilization cost and things like that to do it twice. Obviously, they want to come and do it in a one shot deal.

Chairman O'Neil asked so all we are doing if we go with the recommendation of the Planning Director is take what we intend to do next year anyway and speed it up because there are some opportunities. Is that correct?

Mr. Ludwig answered I think so.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, is that your understanding.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes. We wouldn't actually bond the money, but the City could commit itself. I would want to verify that with the City Solicitor and the Finance Director, but I believe that could be approached if we wanted to save the money.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated obviously we would need a commitment from the Board to take money from the next fiscal year due to the Charter.

Alderman Cashin stated well we are planning to finish it up next year anyway aren't we.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it was my hope at least that we would finish next year, yes.

Alderman Cashin stated it was my understanding that we were going to finish it up next year. Wasn't that your understanding, Ron?

Mr. Ludwig replied well we were hoping.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to clarify something in my own mind. The additional \$265,000, does that incorporate the money that we already have put aside for the 500 seat bleachers or is that additional? You are saying an additional \$265,000 but we have money already allocated for 500 seats. Is there a subtraction here or are we still looking for \$265,000 plus what you have for the 500 seats?

Mr. Ludwig replied I think if you follow along on the chart and you look at the FY01 budget column you are looking at a number of \$196,000. That is what we have committed to the bleachers that are currently under contract. That is why we would be looking and if you look down and you wanted to take advantage of FY01 for the second phase we could do that for \$148,000 versus if you look across from the \$148,000 you would be at \$190,000.

Alderman Lopez stated to echo Alderman Cashin's remarks, I thought we said we would complete this next year along the same line as he indicated that we would find the money to complete this project because we don't want to wait. I think we have to try to find the money. The only other question I have is when do you have to give a commitment? Is it in the spring time? When would the bleachers be put in?

Mr. Ludwig replied I don't think it is so much when the bleachers would be put in. In other words, the bleachers need to be ordered. Once we commit to the first 500 seats, we are committed to that company because their plan is inclusive. We can't jump around from company to company. We can ask them to give us a commitment at that point so that the price doesn't escalate now that we are committed to putting in that style of bleachers. We are of the opinion that we would like to give them a commitment within a month or so. If we could wait until April, the money would be coming maybe under the expedited projects anyway. I believe this deal is on the table for maybe a month or so before the end of the year. Musco Lighting Company is basically eating the poles and the bleacher company would certainly like to say that we are designing 1,500 to 2,000 seats versus 500 and come out and do the job one time. I think that is where the savings comes from. They would like to see a commitment now. We could wait until April.

Alderman Clancy asked, Ron, now that Livingston is done and West Memorial, how about Gill Stadium. Do you have that on the back burner or what?

Mr. Ludwig answered we continue to make improvements at Gill and it will probably be never ending.

Alderman Clancy stated well if a visiting team is coming into that locker room, that is in horrible condition. You know that.

Chairman O'Neil stated so the bleachers and lighting are the final phase of the project.

Mr. Ludwig replied no; that is not what I am telling you. You have the press box and you see a wall there right now. We have a press box and a few other site amenities that are not included in this. I wanted to...I was going to mention that Alderman but I don't want to mislead you that this wraps up the project.

Alderman Cashin asked how much money are we going to need to finish this project. I have down here \$500,000 or over half a million that you are going to need according to the numbers you have given me tonight. Is that true? You have \$386,000 for bleachers and you have \$133,000 for electrical work, lighting and poles. Is that right?

Mr. Ludwig answered that is right.

Alderman Cashin asked so that is \$519,000 right.

Mr. Ludwig answered right but part of that has been committed.

Alderman Cashin asked so how much do we need to finish this project.

Mr. Ludwig answered so now you are asking us for the price of the building, the press box and the concession and the restroom facilities on top of that. You probably would need another \$600,000. You have a building now. Everything we do, Alderman, is in a phased in approach and we understand that. That is the way our project moves along so we try to bring each phase of construction to some point where it might be able to just stay there.

Chairman O'Neil asked was the \$500,000 for bleachers and lighting...you were going to request that anyway for the next phase. Were you also going to include the other \$600,000?

Mr. Ludwig answered absolutely.

Chairman O'Neil stated you were going to request over \$1 million for West Memorial for this coming year.

Mr. Ludwig replied a little under or we could have spread it out over two years.

Alderman Cashin stated I would like to complete this project. I don't want this to go on forever. If it is going to cost another \$600,000 to complete it, let's come in with the \$600,000. Let's do it right.

Mr. Ludwig replied you have to remember that the building itself, the press box in that facility, that is approximately \$225,000 in itself. This is what we got for a construction estimate. Given the construction climate, I really don't anticipate that coming in with a much lesser number and it is a big piece of the pie in itself.

Alderman Cashin stated before we go too far, tonight you are asking us to agree to spend \$265,000 so you can get a credit of \$65,000 is that what you are asking.

Mr. Ludwig replied that is it.

Alderman Cashin stated with the understanding that you are going to come in later to CIP for the additional money that is going to be needed to complete West Memorial Field. Is that right?

Mr. Ludwig replied yes.

Alderman Wihby asked when would they be doing the bleachers anyway. Would they be doing the bleachers before April?

Mr. Ludwig answered right now I think the general contractor is committed to getting the design work because the manufacture of these things takes so long. We made out well at Livingston and were able to get them in a month earlier, but given the geographic location of these there is a good amount of lead time. I think the winter is going to cover that all right, but we want the contractor in there as soon as he can given the weather conditions, Alderman, to start and we hope that is April.

Alderman Wihby stated if we are waiting until April anyway then why don't we just push all of the bleachers to April and put it in the next budget cycle because that is when the expedited is going to be.

Mr. Johnson replied once we get the initial commitment to go with the bleachers with the company, it takes approximately three months to do shop drawings and then it is three months for fabrication so if we wait until April then we are talking about the bleachers not going in until late summer.

Alderman Wihby asked but you don't have to pay them before April, right. If you just told them we were going to do it and then in April when we did the bond we calculated...

Mr. Johnson answered what our situation is is we can't commit to a contract or contractor if we don't have the monies obligated so if we can get a commitment

from the Board of from CIP that we can go ahead with this, we will do that. That is why we are here tonight.

Alderman Wihby asked, Bob, we have a CIP plan and in the CIP plan was the press box and all of that stuff going to be requested in the next CIP budget.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is my understanding that it would be, although that price tag seems higher than I remember. It was my understanding that for the final phase of this we were going to try to shoot for next year.

Alderman Wihby asked why do we have to say that we want to do everything next year as part of this motion if basically we are just trying to take advantage of the \$65,000 and get the bleachers and the lighting done. Why can't we just do a motion that addresses those and wait until the CIP budget is done?

Alderman Cashin stated I think what we are asking for tonight is a motion to approve the recommendation here to save the \$65,000 realizing that he is going to come back in later under CIP and ask for the rest of the money to complete the project.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could, Alderman, logistically in order to actually commit it, it is my understanding that they would have to produce at least a contract for the Board to review and act upon perhaps at your first meeting in December. That creates a formal commitment and then they can actually order the bleachers. You would have to see the document, the actual contract.

Chairman O'Neil stated but our only commitment is to the lighting and bleachers, not the press box and not the concession stand. That may or may not get funded in the spring time.

Alderman Cashin moved to approve an additional \$265,000 for the West Memorial Field project to take advantage of cost savings for the bleachers and lights. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy asked, Ron, do you think 500 bleachers is going to be enough for West Memorial Field.

Mr. Ludwig answered at the completion of this project we will have 2,000 seats.

Alderman Clancy replied that is only 1/4.

Mr. Ludwig stated when we are done with the bleachers, given the configuration that the designers have come up with, we are under the opinion that there will be

approximately 2,000 seats there. The Gill Stadium grandstand holds, just to give you an idea, about 2,500.

Chairman O'Neil asked you are going to be installing 1,500 bleachers right.

Mr. Ludwig answered we are going to be installing almost 2,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked in what we are approving tonight.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Amending Resolution:

“Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Fifteen Million Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$115,250,000) for Three Airport Projects.”

Alderman Wihby moved to approve the Resolution. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Mr. Dillon stated unfortunately when this Resolution was put together, Federal grants that we were anticipating under these programs were not included. I just want to make sure that there is a full understanding on the Board of the total cost of these projects and we want to include that right up front in this Resolution. The \$115,250,000 will be raised to \$123,250,000. We are anticipating \$8,000,000 in Federal Grants that were not included in these original figures.

Chairman O'Neil asked the scope of the work would remain approximately the same or would there be additional...

Mr. Dillon answered it would be the same three projects. That translates into...the individual CIP projects then have individual adjustments and if you follow along in the Resolution, CIP project 730201, Property Acquisitions, would be raised from \$3,250,000 to \$5,250,000 and the last CIP project 730401, Terminal and Building Improvements, would go from \$92,000,000 to \$98,000,000.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to amend the amending resolution to \$123,250,000.

Alderman Clancy stated Kevin you were hear last night at the Planning hearing. Do those monies include any of these houses that people were asking you to buy on Brown Avenue on the east side.

Mr. Dillon replied no. None of these dollar amounts include acquisition of those properties. The problem with the Airport, as much as we would like to purchase those homes, we have not been able to get FAA approval to expend Airport funds on that location. We are making acquisitions on Brown Avenue and some of these dollars include those acquisitions, but they are on the west side. The east side, as I have said, we have not been able to get the FAA to make approval. What we are trying to do for those folks on the east side is we have approached Manchester Regional Industrial Foundation, which is a private foundation that was created in the 1960's and it was created to promote industrial development in and around the Airport. They feel that their mission has been completed and they do have some excess assets that they are willing to expend to make those acquisitions so they are in the process of making offers to some of those folks. Unfortunately, the offers that are made under that program are not necessarily as lucrative as the offer had it been purchased by the Airport.

Alderman Clancy asked none of these monies are going to increase or decrease the tax base, right.

Mr. Dillon answered all of the funds that you see here will be either Federal grants or bonded money that will ultimately be coming back for bond resolutions to be paid by revenues that are generated all by the Airport.

Alderman Wihby stated just to go back to that subject, what I heard you say yesterday was, first of all you are offering to buy those houses or that trust fund is offering to buy the houses. Are they trying to buy them at low cost or just not as much as the Airport would?

Mr. Dillon replied how that program would work if I can just take a minute, they do not have sufficient money to buy all 16 homes that are in question. There are the 10 that you heard about last night, as well as another 6. They have assets to purchase 6 of the homes. What they plan to do is purchase those homes and then resell them. The funds that would be obtained on a resale would be rolled over and used to purchase subsequent homes and they anticipate that they will be able to offer a purchase to all 16. What they are doing is a market analysis on all of the homes and they are offering market value. The difference between that program and the Airport program is the Airport can typically offer market value, pay for

closing costs, as well as making an adjustment to replace the home in another location that is not in the shadow of the Airport. The MRIF program is strictly market value.

Alderman Wihby asked on the resale they are looking to sell it residential again, right.

Mr. Dillon answered that is correct. They will be sold residential and they will be obtaining aviation easements and recording right into the deed that the new buyer realizes that they are moving next to a growing airport.

Alderman Wihby stated what I heard you say yesterday too, and I guess we all sat here and said why can't they buy the other side of Brown Avenue, but what I also heard you say yesterday was we stopped that because there are other residents in that neighborhood and if you make that commercial it is going to end up affecting those other residents.

Mr. Dillon replied the Airport feels that we should not be taking a position on zoning for that particular community. Certainly we would support anything that would assist these people in leaving the area, however, even if we are successful in purchasing all of the homes along Brown Avenue, there is still a significant community that remains behind, a community from Brown Avenue down to the river and I do believe that their input needs to be...

Alderman Wihby interjected aren't they the ones who came to a hearing at one time and said they didn't want to see commercial there. Isn't there conflicting neighborhoods there and to help one you are affecting the other?

Mr. Dillon replied I think what you heard at that hearing that was held quite some time ago was that they only wanted the area rezoned if that was what was necessary to make the homes eligible for an FAA purchase or an Airport purchase sponsored by the FAA. They had gotten some misinformation from somewhere that it was necessary to have it rezoned commercial in order to have it be eligible for that purchase. That was incorrect so the original request to rezone that commercial was never acted on because it was originally put forward in that light.

Chairman O'Neil asked the six homes that the FAA has indicated at this point that they will not pay for and will come out of the industrial fund, did they close the door or is it just that at this time they haven't approved it.

Mr. Dillon answered at this time they haven't approved it. I guess I never try to close the door on the FAA in terms of future grants. What we had tried to make a case for and unfortunately have not been able to do is that the volume of traffic on

Brown Avenue is such that the majority of the traffic is Airport related. Why they have allowed us to purchase the 19 that are on the west side is that they feel that represents the Airport's percentage of traffic usage on Brown Avenue. We have done studies that show that the Airport traffic is only 42% of the traffic on Brown Avenue so in essence the 19 homes represents a 42% share of an overall program to buy out the homes on Brown Avenue and widen it.

Alderman Lopez asked if at some time when we get to the zoning portion you haven't resolved or can't resolve some of the other housing issues, some recommendations have been made that they do commercial property around that area. I believe you sort of agreed with that at the zoning hearing. Am I correct?

Mr. Dillon answered again, I don't feel it is appropriate for the Airport to be taking a position on a community zoning issue. However, my own personal feeling is that a commercial or industrial use would certainly be more compatible with the Airport land use. I would certainly prefer to have industrial or commercial neighbors than residential neighbors, but I do feel that there are a significant number of homeowners who will remain no matter what happens and so long as they found that the commercial rezoning of the frontage on Brown Avenue was appropriate, certainly the Airport would not object.

Alderman Lopez asked in CIP 730401, which is Terminal Building and Parking Garage Addition, what do you anticipate, another parking garage and where would that be.

Mr. Dillon answered what these programs represent and I think if you recall at a CIP Committee meeting a few weeks back I came forward and asked you to revise the way the Airport budgets its CIP projects. What you see here is representative of what the Airport believes we could encounter over the next five years. This aligns us with the requirement that I have to report to the FAA a five year CIP plan so we are trying to align the City process with the FAA process. What you see under here, the \$98 million, really represents two terminal additions, a parking garage and an enhancement to the Concourse C of the existing terminal. We would anticipate that the first terminal additional would commence this January. What we anticipate is a four gate expansion. That expansion is estimated to cost about \$25 million. \$6 million of that is related to apron work. \$19 million is related to building structure. We would like to kick-off an architect this January and hopefully be into construction very quickly and have it completed by 2002. The second terminal expansion we would anticipate commencing in 2004. That is estimated at that time to cost around \$20 million based on the plans that we have. That would be, again, four gates. All of the projects that you see here are projects that were included in the Airport Master Plan that was created back in the mid-90's and amended in 1997. These are not new projects. These are projects that were

always contemplated for the Airport. In terms of your question on the parking garage, we do believe that we will need to construct a new parking garage probably in the 2004/2005 timeframe. In fact, part of the property acquisition money that we already have authorized down at the Airport is for the acquisition of what is referred to as the Megget site. That site is where this new parking garage will be built. We do anticipate creating an interim surface parking lot on that site until we actually progress to a new parking garage, as I said in the 2004/2005 timeframe.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I just checked my answering machine at home after reading the headline in today's paper and sure enough the natives are restless on Brown Avenue and it is going to be a late night after the meeting tonight returning constituent calls around the Airport so I thank you, Mr. Dillon, for coming here to allay some of the fears that have been aroused already by residents in the area. There are some other fears that I am afraid are going to be set fire to. You will recall and I mentioned this to Alderman Cashin's Committee I think two weeks ago that you and I participated in a meeting with about 50 of the residents in the riverbank area. It was one of the best attended meetings I can ever recall and I am not sure if you stayed for the second hour, but if you didn't I can tell you and you can probably vouch for this that there was almost universal opposition to that land being rezoned industrial there and you did tell the people at that meeting that the Airport would not take a stand in favor or against it as I recall so I thank you for reiterating that here tonight. That is going to arouse some more calls from people in that area after they hear this. My question is a simple one regarding that. We had people here last night from Brown Avenue who complained, and rightly so, about their inability to get in and out of their driveway in that area. Now I ask you this. If those people cannot get in and out of their driveway, how would 200 guests at a hotel in that area be able to get in and out on a regular basis? How would that make more sense to have a hotel there than have seven or eight houses.

Mr. Dillon replied I am not too sure that I am in a position to answer that question. Certainly, the Airport is not proposing a hotel at that location.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it seems to be that somebody from a realty agency last night might have been proposing that.

Chairman O'Neil stated we are going to bring closure to this. I just want to give Mr. Dillon some credit because this issue with the buying of homes on Brown Avenue is not a new issue and since he has taken over as Airport Director he has brought it forward and it is moving in a very positive direction and hopefully we can resolve the issue for all of the residents there in a short period of time so I want to give him credit for that.

Chairman O'Neil called for vote on the motion made by Alderman Wihby and seconded by Alderman Cashin on approving the resolution as amended. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorizations:

- 2000 CIP 410900 – Gang Interdiction Programs, Revision # 1
- 2000 CIP 511100 – McIntyre Ski Area Rehab – Phase III, Revision # 3
- 2001 CIP 730201 – Property Acquisition
- 2001 CIP 730301 – Roadway & Parking Improvements
- 2001 CIP 730401 – Terminal & Building Improvements

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Bond Resolution:

“Authorizing Seventeen Million Seven Hundred Thousand (\$17,700,000) for FY 2001 EPD-CSO Abatement Project.”

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert S. MacKenzie submitting a report of the Central Business Service District Advisory Board on the boundaries of the CBSD.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Central Business Service District be set-up the way it was before it was changed.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Levasseur I can't allow you to have a 15 minute presentation, but I will allow you to speak on this.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would also like to go back to the boundaries that existed in 1998.

Chairman O'Neil replied my concern with that is that the last time they were changed it was southerly and I don't think it addresses a lot of concerns about the northern portion. I am not sure that that is entirely...what I might suggest is let's table this.

Alderman Levasseur responded the bills are going out.

Chairman O'Neil stated we need to get it right. The most important thing is let's get it right and when we are saying the last amendment, the last amendment put it southerly down to Auburn Street if I am correct, Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. The last amendment went both southerly and northerly and to some extent easterly. It expanded the area in a couple of different directions.

Alderman Wihby asked what were the old boundaries.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, when are the bills for this going out.

Mr. MacKenzie answered normally bills for this would be sent out in mid to late December. In order to stay on schedule, we had hoped that the Committee would review it and the full Board would take an action at their first meeting in December.

Alderman Wihby stated the Clerk is going to advise us tonight that there is nothing for the first meeting in December and ask us to just have a meeting the third week in December. Is that going to cause a problem?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that might be too tight to stick with the normal schedule. Again, normally the Assessor's Office and the Tax Collector would work it so that they would get the bills out in mid to late December.

Alderman Wihby asked so we could do something tonight.

Alderman Clancy asked, Bob, how much money is actually derived from this expanded district.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the expanded zone, I think, is budgeted this year for \$235,000. It is estimated...the Assessor's Office will finalize those numbers during the next few weeks based upon what the Board does with the boundaries of the district.

Alderman Clancy stated if we incorporated it into the City budget, I know that \$1 million is 27 cents. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied roughly 27 cents, that is correct.

Alderman Clancy stated so that would be about 7 cents on the tax rate. Is that correct if we incorporated these monies into the tax rate?

Mr. MacKenzie replied roughly.

Alderman Clancy stated you know we can expand it or bring it down or whatever but nobody is going to be happy. There are no happy campers out there. I had a call from a constituent in the area who pays a lot of money. He asked me what he got out of paying the tax. He stated that one time in the summer some kids went and swept in front of my building but that is it. It is kind of hard to please people nowadays no matter which way you go.

Alderman Lopez asked is the Chairman here, Frances Ciriello. This has been an ongoing issue for awhile now and I notice in your letter here that you wrote down four different subjects but you didn't specify any changes or anything and you didn't indicate when you were going to do this. You said every three months so that would put you back into February to look at some of these things.

Ms. Ciriello answered we did come up with a planned meeting schedule and it begins in April and then would happen quarterly.

Alderman Lopez asked starting April of 2001.

Ms. Ciriello answered yes and we have work to do between now and then but that is the plan. By the time January 2002 rolled around, we would have had all of the appropriate meetings that we needed to to be able to then make recommendations.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Fran, can you tell me about the multi-families within this zone.

Ms. Ciriello answered the original ruling for distinguishing between multiple families was five or more. Five or more paid the tax because they are considered more commercial.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you tell me that of any multi-family unit that has come forward and received flowers or anything from the Business Service District. I mean has anything been down to a multi-family unit that we can justify saying that a unit with five units or more should be involved in this district?

Ms. Ciriello answered that is probably a question better answered by Intown from a day-to-day basis, but if you look at everyone's business, it is supposed to be for the collective good of the area and not necessarily so that one person has flowers and one person doesn't or someone has a clean street and someone doesn't.

Alderman Gatsas replied I hear what you are saying and the collective good should be for the collective good of the entire City. Is Elm Street a city within itself or is it part of the entire City of Manchester.

Ms. Ciriello responded it should be for the collective good of the district and those people who pay the extra assessments.

Alderman Gatsas stated that district was put into effect originally in 1988 and has grown immensely. It started strictly with Elm Street and at that time it did not include any multi-families.

Ms. Ciriello replied that is true and when it was just Elm Street, it was just on a linear basis. From that point there were a number of changes made, including going to the State Legislature in order to have the enabling legislation to change the way in which the district derives its income.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe this conversation when this first came to light that it would be something that the Advisory Committee would look at to eliminate multi-families, but obviously...

Ms. Ciriello replied no, I am sorry but I don't remember that being on our charge. That distinction and multi-families when we first started about three or four years ago before we hired a separate entity to run the day-to-day operations of it, at that point a determination was made that five units and above were considered commercial and anything below that doesn't pay the tax.

Alderman Gatsas responded let me just stop you for a second because I am not talking about 1998, I am talking about when this issue came forward in March or April of this year. If I remember correctly, when this whole issue came to a very heated crescendo, I think that at that point my conversation to whoever was sitting in your seat and I believe it was Mr. Davis and I believe that the legitimacy of eliminating multi-families was made both by Mr. Shea and Mr. Davis as something that they were going to look at and consider. Obviously, the Advisory Committee hasn't looked at that and hasn't considered it so a multi-family that is on the corner of Chestnut and North Street is paying an additional tax only because somebody decided four years ago that they should.

Ms. Ciriello replied four years ago when everyone sat around the table and tried to decide what was appropriate, that was the decision that was made.

Alderman Levasseur stated, Fran, I think I already know the answer to these questions but I would like them answered for the record. How many members are there on the Advisory Board?

Ms. Ciriello answered there are seven.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many people on the Advisory Board come from the expanded district.

Ms. Ciriello answered I don't think any.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many who voted for the continued expansion are from the original district.

Ms. Ciriello stated can I just add one point to that last...the Advisory Board is appointed by the Mayor.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many of those who voted for the continued expansion, in other words when they came back down after the Aldermen requested to look at this, how many of the people who voted for this to stay the way it is from the original district. There were three votes that were cast to keep it the same. John Madden cast a vote...

Ms. Ciriello interjected there were four. There were four people present at the meeting.

Alderman Levasseur asked and all four of them were from the original district.

Ms. Ciriello answered yes.

Alderman Levasseur asked do you know how many of the people who sit on the Intown Board of Trustees are from the expanded district.

Ms. Ciriello answered no, I don't have an updated list.

Alderman Levasseur replied I have a list and there is not one person on the Intown's Board of Trustees, nor on the Advisory Board from the expanded district. Do you know how many events that Intown puts on take place above Bridge Street like Oktoberfest, Hanover Happenings, etc.?

Ms. Ciriello responded I don't.

Alderman Levasseur asked are you getting my point here, folks.

Chairman O'Neil answered I think we do get your point and I don't think we need to beat up on Ms. Ciriello. My suggestion...there isn't a clear cut answer on whether we need this out by the first or third meeting. Correct, Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would probably want to talk to the Assessor and Tax Collector.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is my sense that the Board is going to vote to make a change. There is no question about it. From the size of the district, it is also my sense that the Board is going to make a change on items such as multi families being included. What I don't want to see happen tonight is we just wing it. Let's get exact information. My understanding is the district has changed five times. That is my memory, not twice. If we are going to say let's set it back to the...let's get the right size of where you want to put it. My suggestion is going to be let's meet the second week of December, have a CIP meeting, let's get all of the districts from Day 1 what they were and what they have been expanded to the four or five times and the language necessary if we are, in fact, going to remove multi-family from the Central Service Business District.

Alderman Levasseur stated I had specifically requested this of Mr. MacKenzie on at least five, six or ten occasions. I have asked them to come in here with a better plan to knock that down. I told them that there was a movement on this Board to shrink that district and they refused to do so. Now I hope that it will be put to them in a little more adamant terms than the last time. This has been going on now for almost 11 months. Fran shouldn't even be here. Intown should be here.

Chairman O'Neil replied let's table this tonight and as soon as possible get to the whole Board what the district was from Day 1, the dates it expanded and what those expansions were. Then, the Board can make a fair decision on what the size of the district should be. Secondly, if it is a consensus here tonight that multi-families should be removed from it and my sense is that it is, what necessary language is needed to remove multi-family from that.

Alderman Levasseur responded may I suggest one other alternative. When you give us the downsized districts, please include what the cost to the whole assessment is going to be. If we shrink it back to the original district, what is that cost going to be and also get an estimate...Chairman Shea said that he did not have a problem shrinking the district back to the way it was before because he

figures that the revaluation of the properties in the original district will cover the amount of money that they are going to lose from that extra district that was expanded. So, if you can give us a numerical value on those district changes that would also be helpful.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, can we have that for the second week in December.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I believe so. I do have a map that shows what it was. As long as I am clear on the dollar amounts, if you are talking about the last major change, we could calculate the estimated impact.

Chairman O'Neil asked could you do it through the various changes. I think that is what Alderman Levasseur is looking for.

Mr. MacKenzie asked all five changes.

Alderman Levasseur answered no. If you are going to come up with your own idea to shrink the district, then you can give us your idea of what you want to do and then you can give us the idea of the way it was before 1998. I think those are the two alternatives we will be looking at and then of course the multi-families that are in there are taken out so you have three real good alternatives to take there and I think you understand basically where we want to go with this Bob. We have talked about which area. We really don't want to shrink the whole district, we just want to downsize some areas that are not really getting any services. Nobody is looking to harm this whole project. We are just trying to make it better for what is going on down here.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would note if I could, Mr. Chairman, that we did, after listening to all the testimony on this, our staff went out and did a land use survey of those areas that were most questioned, which is the area east of Pine Street and Chestnut Street northerly of Bridge Street just to try to get a feeling of how that compared to the rest of the downtown. Those are the areas that we were focusing on in question. I know that both of those areas came out in testimony and in Board comments.

Chairman O'Neil recognized Mr. Gherlone.

Mr. Gherlone stated I have the pleasure of serving on the Board of the CBSD with Ms. Ciriello and I am also on the Board of Intown Manchester and I own multiple properties in the district for which I am taxed and it is worth pointing out that this is a self-imposed tax. It is not part of the City budget. We tax ourselves with the money to be spent in a manner hopefully to improve the quality of business and life in downtown Manchester. In regards to the questions asked about the Board,

the terms for the Board of the Central Business Service District are five years. Most of the members were appointed five years ago, therefore, there simply legally wasn't a possibility of having someone from the expanded district on the Board because until the Mayor appoints someone, there is nothing that we on the Board can do about it. It is as simple as that. In regards to Intown Manchester, that is a once a year event and again, that simply hasn't occurred. In regards to shrinking the district, it is imperative to point out that we are halfway through the budget year. If the Board votes to change the size of the district when monies have already been contracted for and in some cases spent, you will financially cripple Intown Manchester. We have discussed this both in the CBSD Board and the Intown Board and we agreed that the reality is that the district will have to be shrunk, but we are looking for that to be done at the next fiscal year in order that it be done in a manner so that it doesn't jeopardize the programs that are already in place. I will be happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

Chairman O'Neil stated I am just going to make one statement. With regards to...and I have heard that argument come up to we would be crippling Intown, back when we approved the budget there was certainly a directive from this Board to be very careful with what monies were spent. There has been a vacancy for July or August. I am not sure if that position has been filled, but it shouldn't be news to anyone involved with Intown that there was a directive from this Board to be very cautious with what monies were spent because there might be changes coming. Although I do certainly respect that it might be easier at this point to wait until the next fiscal year, I think it has been pretty clear that the Board was going to make some changes and unfortunately we get caught up in different business and this issue, other than Alderman Levasseur keeping it alive, has probably fallen off the plates of many of us here. Bob, are you clear with what the Board wants?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the only thing I am unclear about is...the three items I have are you want the history of the district changes, language to remove multi-family and do you also want the cost impact of that...

Alderman Levasseur interjected that is negligible.

Mr. MacKenzie responded okay do you also want the cost to the assessment if it was shrunk back to the 1997 boundaries.

Alderman Levasseur replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated what concerns me is pinning down this 1997. Is everybody in the right year of where it was in 1997? I am certainly not. I don't think we should debate it. If you can provide numbers for all of the various

expansions, that might be helpful. This absolutely has to be done for the second week in December so the Board can vote on it in the third week of December.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the only caveat I have is that we will need the assistance of the Assessor's Office in preparing this. They have all of the data and we will need their assistance.

Alderman Levasseur stated there is one point I would like to make on the record. When you had the public hearing, if you took away all of the Board of Trustees and all of the people that testified from the Farmer's Market and such and you went completely to just the property owners, Mr. Chairman, there were 10 property owners who voiced their opinions. The five that were for the district staying the same were five members who were from the original district. Five people who did not want to be included in the expanded district were actually five people from that expanded district so if you broke it down it was 5-5 and I also have letters from other people regarding that expansion.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to table this item.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert S. MacKenzie submitting information on HOME projects under Manchester Neighborhood Housing Services as requested by the CIP Committee.

Alderman Wihby asked is this just informational.

Chairman O'Neil answered we had some discussion with what were loans and what were grants and I want to thank the staff for putting it together. I know that it took a lot of work to do it. I don't know if the Committee has any questions for Mr. MacKenzie. Mr. Torres is here as well as others from his agency.

Alderman Lopez stated, Mr. Torres, I was just looking at some of the 1994 and 1995 on the loans and what was paid back. It doesn't give me a complete break down of what date it was paid back or how much they owe us. I am looking at the loan values...let's take the next to the last page, Item 610407.2 at \$60,000 and the other one was 283 and so on down the line. I was wondering how is it that this loan has been for so many years and we only got X number of dollars back. Do you follow me?

Mr. Torres replied I will talk about the first one, the Housing Rehab Loan Fund. The way that works is those are funds that pass through the NHS but go directly to homeowners for renovation loans. That passes through one of two ways. Per department policy, if you are above 50% of median income, it is essentially a loan. Now below 50% of median income, those homeowners who get the assistance in essence get money which is not amortizing and is supposed to be paid back due upon sale or death as their properties move on. We can give you a further breakdown of how much were those deferred loans versus those which are being paid back, although I don't have that with me.

Alderman Lopez stated well I just wanted to know, for example, when you say that \$12,000 was paid back for a loan...

Mr. Torres interjected that was the Housing Rehab Loan Fund. The Merrimack Place is different.

Alderman Lopez stated let's take the Home Fund. Is that an average...let's say we take 6100408, \$275,000 in home funds and the pay back was \$25,481 in a four year period of time. Is that a common percentage or what?

Mr. Torres replied I would say that number is average.

Alderman Lopez asked how many years would it take to pay off the \$275,000.

Mr. Torres answered it depends. As you know, a certain percentage of those are given as deferred upon sale or death to the borrower so in essence those people have to either sell their property or pass away before the City would see that money being paid.

Alderman Lopez asked, Mr. MacKenzie, the money that has been paid back in reference to this document, that has already been calculated into some other figure somewhere along the line and we spent it someplace else.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. The money comes back as program income, both Home Fund and CBDG and it has to be reused for the same type of purpose. It still carries all of those Federal strings that it originally had. So, frequently during the year when the Board says we want to do a project, that program income is typically that amount used.

Alderman Gatsas stated, Felix, maybe we can talk about the \$371,000 loan. From what I am reading here, there has been no principal payment. The first funds that are paid...are we in a subordination position that if you pay the entire first mortgage off that you can reborrow?

Mr. Torres replied my understanding is that if we pay the first mortgage we cannot get another first mortgage without your permission.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's assume that you sell the property in the next 10 years.

Mr. Torres replied we would owe the City that money.

Alderman Gatsas stated my question is, I am not questioning what you are saying but it is not here and I don't know if that is something that is in the documentation that Mr. MacKenzie has. Are you under that understanding, Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I didn't look at these documents myself, but typically and the reason they may be a little hesitant is this was developed by a different corporation. This is under the Manchester Area Housing Trust. This one and another project. They have since subsequently merged and are handled by Manchester Neighborhood Housing Services.

Alderman Gatsas responded the debt ratios...net operating income, does that include management fees.

Mr. Torres stated the management fees are paid prior to calculation of debt service.

Alderman Gatsas asked do we have any idea of what those management fees are.

Mr. Torres replied on that property, not off the top of my head, no.

Alderman Gatsas asked who are they paid to.

Mr. Torres replied to a property manager, a private, for profit management company.

Alderman Gatsas stated well obviously that effectively affects the return to the City. Is there any reason why we have a for profit doing that? Why isn't the agency that is borrowing the money doing that or do you not do that?

Mr. Torres replied we don't manage our own properties. There are some non-profits who do manage their properties and they end up being no more cost effective than using a private management company. In addition, some of the funding sources, including the Housing Finance Authority and the investors often will require private management companies.

Alderman Gatsas stated the debt ratio that I am looking at here, net operating income divided by debt service and we still are not getting a return must either mean that you are in the negative cash flow basis or the rents are way below market.

Mr. Torres stated the rents are set by the...it is a Federal Program so the rents are capped. We couldn't charge market anyway.

Alderman Gatsas stated so basically when you put this proposal together, anybody who would be looking at it or analyzing it looking for that debt ratio that would entitle the City to get some of that money paid back would look at it and there is not enough sufficient cash flow to pay anything back. That is the first thing that somebody would look at and say I guess this loan is just there and it is never going to be paid back.

Mr. Torres replied certainly you would look at it and make an analysis. Occasionally, some of the properties operate well and that is not an issue. For example, Merrimack Place and the project immediately above it has a similar structure and that one has a cash flow insufficient to pay back the City.

Alderman Gatsas responded I am looking at the pay back on that and if we are talking about \$12,000 over the course of six years, the principal basis...is this principal and interest or just principal. I am confused by these. Bob, I thought we were going to see what the interest rate was, whether there was interest being charged, whether it was a zero, whether it was a loan, etc. I don't see anything in here that states that.

Chairman O'Neil stated maybe we should table it because we are going to run out of time here. Bob, are you clear with what further information Alderman Lopez and Alderman Gatsas are looking for or maybe they can provide that to you afterwards?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would like to clarify and maybe I can see both of them after the meeting.

Chairman O'Neil stated okay let's table this. This is a step in the right direction, but I think the Committee is looking for a little more detail which hopefully can be provided and let's see if we can get that for when we meet in the second week of December.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman O'Neil stated there are three quick items of new business that I am going to allow to come in. The first is the fact that we recessed the full Board meeting and did not allow an item to get to CIP to get reported back to the full Board. It was Item T on our full Board agenda. Mr. Thomas, if you would like to come up here and speak on it. It has to do with the recycling and yard waste agreements with Waste Management that expires on 12/14.

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct. I was hoping to have that correspondence referred to this Committee. As noted in the correspondence that is in your agenda, and if you don't have a copy I have a copy here, I am requesting authorization to extend the recycling contract and yard waste contract for one year. The original procurement was for five years. The recycling is up on 12/14 and the yard waste is up in March and we have the right to renew the contract for five more one year terms. I am seeking authorization to sign a contract for one year. The correspondence noted that the estimated one year contract for recycling is \$421,092. That includes a maximum 4% CPI adjustment and the yard waste contract for one year is \$461,791 and again that has a 4% CPI. As I discussed earlier, I feel that the services that Waste Management are performing now are satisfactory and we will make sure that they conform to that.

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

Chairman O'Neil stated another item that has been hanging out there is with regard to some bulletproof vests for the Police Department. We stand the possibility of losing the Federal funds for these. There is a match. The department has it within their budget. We need to get this off and we would also recommend that this be referred to the full Board tonight.

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

Chairman O'Neil stated the final item I really don't know what to do with yet but it may be...it is with regards to the continued problem out in Megan's Meadow and Rosecliff. The developer has indicated...this is in regards to the pig farm, a willingness to pay 50% of the cost to correct what everybody believes would resolve the problem out there. We are still having a little bit of an issue on the City side trying to work through it. It is not a lot of money, it is about \$25,000 on the City side, but the new information is the developer is willing to pay 50% of this. I don't know what action we can take until we get a formal recommendation from either the Health Department or the Department of Environmental Services from the State.

Alderman Lopez moved to have the Assessor, Mr. MacKenzie and the Health Department report back to the Committee as soon as possible as to their recommendation.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, can you...I hate to dump this in your lap but could you get a recommendation together to present to the full Board. Would it need to come back to this Committee or could it just be presented to the full Board next week?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think with this Committee's consent it could be directed to the full Board. That has happened in the past. I would note a caution though. We had begun to look for the funds and had tentatively identified some. In discussions with the City Solicitor, there are legal issues that may prevent this type of action.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a memo that was handed to me tonight that states they are starting to find some ways that may be appropriate now. We are not necessarily limiting it to funds coming from CIP. It could come from contingency if we chose, correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think the issue was any type of property tax money, whether it was from CIP or contingency. I think it was just City property tax monies but I would be happy to look at it again with the City Solicitor and the Health Officer to see what options there are.

Chairman O'Neil asked is the Committee comfortable that if they have a recommendation for the next Board meeting they can present it to the full Board. If not, you can bring it back to CIP the second week of December.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to direct the Planning Director, the City Solicitor and the Health Officer to come up with a recommendation for funding for a solution for the pig farm.

TABLED ITEMS

12. Copy of a communication from the Deputy Finance Officer to Alderman Gatsas relative to funding options for Millyard parking facilities.
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

13. Communication from the Chief of Police requesting the expenditure of \$2,450.00 from previous CIP Police projects to fund a feasibility study of the Police Department firing range.
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

14. Communication from the Director of Planning regarding the possible land acquisition of a piece of property on the westerly edge of Wolf Park.
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

15. Future Year CIP projects.
(Tabled 8/7/00)

This item remained on the table.

16. 71-73 Manchester Street request submitted by Amoskeag Residences (AR) & Elm Street Restoration Project
(Tabled 6/12/00)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee