

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

June 24, 2003

6:15 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby, Smith, Lopez

Absent: Alderman Shea

Messrs: Jane Hills, Michael Schaaf, Alderman DeVries, Robert MacKenzie, Robin Descoteaux, Fire Chief Joseph Kane, Kevin Sheppard, Tom Lolicata

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Presentation regarding the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS).

Assistant Economic Development Director Jane Hills stated we're coming to you tonight to request your approval of a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) that was prepared according to the parameters that the US Department of Commerce Economic Development Administration sets forth. This strategy has to be prepared in order for us to qualify for any funding from the Economic Development Administration in the future. To remind you we did get \$1 million grant from the Economic Development Administration which went partly toward the rehabilitation of the Chase Block building, so we do have a history of using these funds for infrastructure improvements is primarily what they're used for. Rehabilitation of buildings or putting in water or sewer or whatever, and there a number of possibilities in some of the projects that the Planning Department is looking at around the arena for the use of these funds. There was a committee set up that was appointed by the Mayor as is set forth by EDA and Betsie DeVries, Alderman, sat on the committee. The Chairman of the Committee, Chuck Hungler, who represented the Manchester Development Corporation on the CEDS Committee, was unable to be here tonight. I would like to also introduce to you our consultant Michael Schaaf from Community Investment Associates who worked with us on the project and he'll be making a bit of a presentation. We'll try to be

brief. I see you have a very long agenda this evening. I just want to emphasize that we're asking for approval of this to be passed along to the full Board meeting in July. What it does basically, it was a document that I think everyone that worked on it enjoyed preparing and thinking about, but the reason that we need it is in order to qualify for federal funds in the future. So I'd like to pass this along at this point to Michael Schaaf.

Michael Schaaf stated thank you Jane and good evening. I promise to be briefer than the CEDS process was because we were in the very stunted process in order to formulate the document that I believe that you've received. A very thick document that comprises the draft CEDS plan. Jane thought it would be useful to briefly describe the CEDS process. It was indeed a comprehensive process that first began with a CEDS Committee that you have I believe a list of the folks that participated in that Committee that set forth the process that we pursued in this subsequent several months in undertaking the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. The Committee met itself on five occasions over a six or seven month period and during that time broke down into several sub-committees to devote attention to topics that were particularly pertinent and ones that reflected on opportunities for the City. Those Committees were the Downtown Regional Committee, the Industrial Development Committee, Small Business Assistance and Financing Committee, a Tourism and Marketing Committee, a Workforce Education and Training Committee, and finally a Housing Committee. One might ask why was there a Housing Committee. The Committee acknowledged that housing can effect the economy and is an important element in housing workers and providing an attractive place to relocate and expand your firm. The Committees broke down according to expertise and interest, and worked over a couple month period to develop some goals and objectives and strategies that were the basis for the plan. I believe that you have before you a summary of the strengths and weaknesses that were derived by the Committee and of some goals and objectives set forth by those sub-committees that were then submitted to the full CEDS Committee and after some discussion and adjustment were adopted by the full CEDS Committee. Having completed this stage of the CEDS process we submitted a draft of the CEDS plan to EDA and EDA has responded positively that it satisfies their needs for Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy and in order to complete the full acceptance by the EDA we need the endorsement of the Aldermen. That will complete this stage of the CEDS process. We undertook an extensive analysis of the economy and definition of opportunities and weaknesses. I surmise that you don't want me to go through 78 pages of economic analysis and bore you all, but I will be pleased to answer questions.

Alderman Lopez stated I just have one question. Is the Planning Department, Bob MacKenzie, and the Destination Manchester coordinator had any input whatsoever into this process?

Ms. Hills answered the Planning Department was involved. Louise Donington in the Planning Department served as staff support to the Committee. Alderman Lopez asked and they concur with this report? I see one shaking his head over there. Thank you.

Alderman Smith stated on Page 3, Downtown Retail, I'm very interested in "2) make downtown an attractive and safe place in which to work and visit." What manner of speaking are you talking about? Improvements of sidewalks, or store structures, or what?

Mr. Schaaf answered this particular goal was articulated by the sub-committee and then adopted as I mentioned by the CEDS Committee. I believe as I recall they understood that in order for downtown to attract shoppers and visitors that it not only has to be a safe place it needs to be perceived as safe and that they wanted to establish the atmosphere of safety. I don't think that there was any particular concern that it was unsafe, but that the perception of safety was very important. And attractiveness; I'm not familiar with those objectives. There were specific objectives that they set, which was to continue to support the efforts of Intown Manchester to beautify the downtown area, keep it clean and well maintained. Secondly, to review the City parks as far as maintenance and improvements needs and to develop a project plan to improve the City parks. A third one was to determine Main Street, side streets, and parks where additional lighting is most needed for security. Develop a plan to provide this infrastructure. Repair and upgrade sidewalks on Elm Street and surrounding side streets, and lastly, secure resources from all range community policing programs.

Alderman Smith stated you hit on one point that I was very interested, Elm Street sidewalks. I'm somewhat handicapped and disabled and right now because of the frost and so forth, the mortar is out and they're in dire disrepair. I mean if walk down Elm Street to some of these restaurants you're taking your life into your hands, especially if it's raining.

Ms. Hills stated I'd just like to emphasize if I might that the Committee and the full Board's approval of the CEDS in no way commits the City of Manchester of having to do any these projects or having to fund any of these projects. But this is an ongoing process that in working with the Planning Department and with the community will guide the types of things that we may want to look at in the future. But there is no commitment to funding or even to a specific project by the approval.

Alderman Smith stated this is no reflection on the report, I think it's very, very good. But I know that since you put in Elm Street and the sidewalks the CIP or Board of Mayor and Aldermen have to do something quick. I'm very glad you did

put this in there. I think that being especially now you're going to have them going to retail stores, they need a sidewalk they can walk on.

Chairman O'Neil stated could one of you or maybe both of you just...I was trying to tie together the goals and they were broken into six categories with the priority projects.

Mr. Schaaf replied the priority projects are projects with two characteristics. One, the CEDS Committee felt that they were very important projects for the City, and secondly, that they are projects that were eligible to be funded by EDA. So the sidewalks where as they may be an important project for example, are not EDA eligible. So therefore we sort out important projects and from that those which we could obtain funds from EDA for.

Chairman O'Neil stated once hopefully this Committee recommends to the full Board for approval and hopefully the full Board approves it, what things do we need to be doing immediately to make sure these priority projects become reality?

Ms. Hills answered well the Committee will be continue to meet probably on a quarterly basis to take a look at the objectives and the projects and to try to do what ever we can to facilitate them.

Chairman O'Neil asked Jane remaining within the priority projects? Will that be the focus of the Committee as it moves forward?

Ms. Hills answered it will definitely be one of the focuses of the Committee, but his plan was conceived as a larger picture than just looking at projects that could be EDA funded. And there may be other projects that come out in the future and this Committee needs to keep updating the plan because if a project is not in here, it's not eligible for funding, but the plan can be updated on a regular basis to include new projects as they come along.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess my question kind of led...what I was talking about was with regards to these priority projects needing EDA funding. What can we be doing to get those projects in a position for funding under EDA grants?

Mr. Schaaf replied I'm not intimately familiar with the status of each of these projects, but let me lay out more generally an answer to your question. The CEDS plan is a...I think it's best described as a management document. In the sense that it sets forth some broad activities and there are activities which the CEDS plan suggests that the City undertake. Not necessarily sidewalks but that's an example of that. On the other hand there are other projects that more appropriately undertaken by partners of the City. So to more directly respond then, each of these

projects involves either initiatives on the part of the City to take direct responsibility or secondly to work with their partners to initiate activities to approach EDA. So Hackett Hill I believe is your project, the Manchester Revolving Loan Fund would be a responsibility of the Manchester Development Corporation. For downtown retailing you have a small partner, Intown Manchester, as well as City staff that are engaged in an activity. Intebater project is Southern NH University, and in the rezoning would be an internal Planning Department activity, although we could receive planning funds to assist with that. So in each of these you would have to evaluate the readiness of the project to proceed. Relative to the requirements for funding, so in just taking Hackett Hill off the top, which is of course been an important project to the City for quite a while. In order to obtain funding from EDA and having worked on EDA funding for these types of projects, you need to have site control of the property, you need to have it demonstrate marketability, you need to have a financial plan to demonstrate that you can carry out the development of the property as proposed, you need to demonstrate that it's a potential positive impact on the economic development in the City. Broadly speaking. Does that answer your question?

Chairman O'Neil replied it does. I guess really the ball is in our court to make sure that these are carried out. There's no magic to it, it's just a matter of keeping these projects as priorities and that's something we're going to have to work out, and so I thank you.

Mr. Schaaf stated yes and to your direction, in some of these balls you're going to shoot them and other ones I think you're going to be working with a team to bring the ball to court there.

Chairman O'Neil asked any other questions, and can I entertain a motion to recommend approval to the full Board?

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy report to the full Board.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman DeVries regarding park needs in the South End of Manchester.

On a motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, this item was moved for discussion.

Alderman DeVries stated this is really just a preliminary notice that I'm giving. I'm hoping over the course of the summer with the neighborhood meetings that we've initiated to be able to utilize the staff of Parks & Recreation to further develop a master plan for the Crystal Lake beach area. Maybe I can have Ron Ludwig come up and if he's prepared...I don't know if he is...we really wanted to have the blessings of the Board to take a look at developing a master plan to see what priority projects would be there. Several of the neighborhoods including Ward 6 neighborhoods up Megan's Meadow have indicated they are looking for some swing sets and that sort of park facilities as well.

Parks & Recreation Director Ron Ludwig stated I don't have a lot in terms of Crystal Lake, I know in terms of the needs of south Manchester, although many of the department heads have been searching for many years both in the private sector and for public land opportunities. Nothing has really come forward. As terms of Crystal Lake in the master plan, there hasn't been anything identified in the budget for it at this point. You could do some work in house to try and take a look at the lake, but some of that typically involves engineering and work that could mean some dollars, but certainly we would want to take a look at it and work with the Board if that's its wish.

Alderman DeVries stated I was just going to follow up on that. I believe in August we're going to see a return of funding coming from the I93 mitigation to the City and it would be my intention that we utilize the funds there to maybe capitalize on some of these projects.

Alderman Lopez asked Ron wasn't there some land down in the south end at one time that we were looking at? So many acres down there? What ever happened to that?

Mr. Ludwig answered we have looked at several parcels in the south end, and by that I mean south of the Memorial High School, that's kind of like we refer to the new south end and that tail piece of property that Manchester goes down into Londonderry. The few pieces that the City owns are really not developable. Some of them are past the Moe's Garden Center on the right, you walk in and you can't go too far, you are definitely in the wet areas. We've had some discussion with private developers over the years trying to make some trade offs of pieces of property. That hasn't come to fruition either. We've looked at several pieces that we've brought to the Planning Board and identified about five different locations in the south end, some that abut Water Works property. Sent out letters to individuals to see if there was interest to sell pieces of property who had interest in the past to sell to the City and the City actually turned them down nine or ten years ago in regards to some of those purchases. So we've been I don't want to say aggressively searching to try and make purchases because we really don't have any money to

make any purchases, but we've just been trying to find people that are willing or maybe have an interest of disposing of property that the City could purchase.

Alderman Lopez asked could you in the next three months identify working with the Airport, Water Works, or any land in the south end, could you just identify it as a potential and report back to this Committee as to where it is, whether it's Water Works, or whether it's Airport, so that we would have some idea that maybe we can communicate with both of these authorities and see whether or not they would be capable of doing something in that particular area? Because right now I don't believe that we as a Committee know a) you have a portion over there, b) this is the land, c) this is the land but it belongs to Water Works or this belongs to the Airport or this is a private developer. We do not have that.

Mr. Ludwig replied the answer is yes, we can. But in terms of us as a department going forward and identifying pieces of property that are Water Works property or Airport property at this point, we wouldn't initiate that on our own. Now if this Committee is saying they would like us to go and talk to the Water Works and talk to the Airport in terms of availability of those kinds of parcels, we could do that. But we wouldn't want to come to you and say well we understand there's a very nice parcel that we could make good use of that exists in the Water Works. That would kind of like putting the cart before the horse and that's not the way to do it. So if your wish is that I ask the department to go and open some dialogue with these different agencies, Airport and Water Works, we can certainly do that.

Alderman Lopez stated well that's all I'm asking is to have a dialogue so that you can come back and say I've talked to the Water Works, I've talked to the Airport, they don't have any land whatsoever to give us or make a negotiation for a parcel in the south end of Manchester. I think that's the only portion of the entire City where recreation is needed and I think you'll agree with that.

Mr. Ludwig stated absolutely.

Alderman Lopez stated so that's all I'm asking if you could have a dialogue and come back later to this Committee. Don't worry about the money, I mean that's the second stage. We have to identify that first.

Mr. Ludwig stated but I think that it's the direction, if I'm hearing that that could be the direction from this Committee, that's a good thing. Because that opens the door for me to at least go into the Water Works directly and say we're here to explore, we've been asked to do it by the Aldermen and that's a good thing and we certainly can do that. The private parcels that you've identified is pretty much done. There's some property, which the size is substantial of use that we would like to see. In other words, this is not one or two acres, when we looked at a parcel we looked at

something that may be 25 or 30 acres that gets a complex, a one-time shot that's maintainable within in the south end and we can bring everybody to it. That's the way we like to do business today in terms of maintenance and accomplishing everything in one general area. So that may never be attainable but we don't know that yet, and we keep looking forward to trying to find a piece of that magnitude and size that doesn't impact neighbors and neighborhoods and things like that. But I think that in terms of the way this should move, this Board should definitely be taking a serious approach to try and find something in south Manchester. If it's some Water Works property, a combination of or whatever, that's a good thing. I also think we need to start to set aside, and it would make good sense to set aside, some dollars in the event that anything came forward, that we could step in and make a purchase of some property too. And I know that's a difficult thing to say, you know land banks areas, but I think we're at a point where we're going to miss, or we already have in a lot of opportunities, to south Manchester and they are huge now.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't know if any of you recall but during the CIP budget I brought up the thought of possibly going to a citywide master plan. Bob MacKenzie and I have talked about it several times and I think it ties right into this. We have no idea...look at what we have wrestled with with regards to relocation of Singer Park. That should have been an easy decision for us. We should have had some plan about where to relocate it to, but we don't. So we get into these internal wars within the Board on where it should go and I thought the work that was done by the consultant that did the work on the schools gave us a very good document to work with. We knew what the deficiencies were, we knew what the future needs were of the School District and I'd like to suggest we may consider doing something on a Citywide basis. We could ID what property we have. Land & Buildings is going through this surplus property issue right now. What parks do we have? What are their current uses? Get into demographics like what sports are being played there now? How many teams? What are future needs? Maybe some design standards? Maybe some maintenance standards, which we don't have. We kind of approach each project as an individual project and I think we need to start looking at it as a bigger picture. So if we're going to commit some money down the road, I would strongly suggest that we consider a citywide park master plan.

Alderman Lopez asked could I just add to that Mr. Chairman? I agree with you and I think that can be done and don't think it would cost very much money because there is a plan that was developed and we've worked that plan and everything...I think 90 percent of the things that have been accomplished in the five or six year plan that we had that Mr. MacKenzie and Ron Ludwig have worked that plan. But it needs to be updated, I agree with the Chairman, it needs to be updated and I don't really think...I think you can do that in house, can't you?

Mr. Ludwig replied there are two plans. The 1992 Recovery Action Plan for Parks which I think I've circulated amongst members of this Board fairly recently, within the last couple of months, and yes that needs to be updated. And if you flip through that plan, not to go into it too deeply but, you'll find quickly that we have done a whole lot of the things that we thought about to do. We also have a maintenance management plan that speaks to parks uses, who uses the parks, how many groups use the parks, and what the needs are. So there are two plans that are available. Now is it nice to have a consultant with a more objective opinion? But I think that's what we did with the maintenance management plan, some things were implemented for other things. For instance at that time in the maintenance management plan had spoke to putting a moratorium on actually building fields. That's in there. That's one thing that has jumped out to me, yet we are constantly under the gun to produce additional facilities for people, yet that's spelled out a moratorium on the conditional building of fields until we could properly maintain the ones we had, spelled out deficiencies related to the number of people we had at that time and the number of people that we have now. Yet we continue to increase facilities, so I welcome with open arms the dollars to put together another study. We could certainly update Recovery Action Plan quite easily and bring it up to speed, but if...over the winter I'm sure.

Chairman O'Neil asked those plans are 12 or 13 years old, in the early 1990's?

Mr. Ludwig replied they are 1992.

Chairman O'Neil stated so they're 11 years old. The demographics of the City have greatly changed. South Manchester has greatly affected what's going on. I think, my personal opinion is, this is bigger than in house. This is...again, I think the documents were received on the school...I think it was Parsons-Brinckerhoff who did the school study, they gave us an excellent document to work with. We knew what the deficiencies were in every school, we knew what the needs were in every school in the future, and that's what I'm suggesting we may want to look at here. You know I don't know if demographics is the right word, but uses have greatly changed. Eleven years ago field hockey didn't exist, lacrosse didn't exist; do we still need as many fields for baseball and softball as we did a decade ago? I'm not sure. Those are the kinds of things I think we need to find out. How many of these leagues are playing on private facilities and not on City parks? So that's what my suggestion is. Bob did you have anything to add to this? You and I have talked about it a couple of times.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes, I do think it would help us to update that plan to really give a basis for how many fields we need, because we're quickly running out of land and we don't have any more opportunities, so we have to balance the different

uses between soccer fields versus fields to try and meet each of the demands as you mentioned.

Chairman O'Neil stated and it could be a present baseball field becomes a soccer field, but until we did... So it is those kinds of things, but I think in order to address and I fully support what Alderman DeVries is trying to accomplish, but I think unless we have a Citywide plan, we're just putting out a small fire by trying to address just the south end. I think if we can develop a Citywide plan and I would hope that with ID that we need a major park facility in southeast Manchester. That's what common sense is telling me anyway. So I'd like to see us head more in that direction than trying to do stuff in house. Number one, it takes away from getting regular work done while working on that.

Alderman DeVries stated and I certainly agree with you that a larger park facility is going to be needed in the south end of Manchester. This in no way is meant to alleviate that need or that desire, but in the meantime we have added pressure on Crystal Lake in light of one of the City pools being down, it has a higher attendance problem and they have been fighting to address day to day concerns at the use of the public beach. There's not security or maintenance that occurs up there on a daily basis, so people come in because there's no security, even though there's a lifeguard, there's no security, they come in and they drink out of glass bottles during the day, leave them in the trash cans as they should and the kids come through at night and break the glass all over the sandy area of the public beach area, creating hazards. So what we envision is really a much smaller scale than what you're addressing is to take a look at the young child needs to maybe establish a small play area, swing sets and slides, that sort of thing, that a parent who is there at the beach has some other activity to offset the attention of small children. Potentially there's space there for volleyball or something of that sort, but at the same time to take a look at the security needs there to see if there can not be funded an individual who can take a handle on the people as they are there during the day. Making sure that all activities are as they should be and also to at the end of the day to be sure that the trash is secured, the trash receptacles need updating at that park just the same as were recently done at Livingston Park and they came up with some very good alternatives that are cosmetically pleasant but also negate some of the vandalism that takes place at night. So there are many small things that I think can be addressed in house and maybe solutions even that can occur this summer. Some of the others might take a little bit longer to achieve, but there may some things that we can accommodate this summer if they are handled in house. It doesn't take away from your suggestion to do something Citywide, to look at park facilities and to do an inventory.

Mr. Ludwig stated the department does pay Alderman, I thought you were aware, we do have a policeman out there daily. We take that out of our budget as we...we

have two. We have one at Hunt Pool on a day to day basis, and we have to have one at Crystal Lake. There's just no other way we could...the lifeguards are not life guarding and watching the water, which is their primary responsibility, they are chasing dogs and people that are drinking so, we've had to pay a police officer out of our budget.

Alderman DeVries stated and as I've said the suggestion really comes out of neighborhood meetings and the individuals that are living and involved in the spring clean up there every year indicate that the current arrangement with police officer may be overkill for their needs that maybe a less expensive summer student would have the authority to police as a police officer is doing but then at the same time have the responsibilities to make sure the trash is out of way of the use that might come through, or do come through, at night and break the glass bottles on the beach area and maybe address a few other concerns with the same...

Chairman O'Neil stated might I suggest that you work with the Parks & Rec Department to maybe address some of those.

Alderman DeVries replied and that's where this started. I did initiate conversations with them and I just wanted to alert this Committee that we were doing that so that it wasn't done secretly.

Alderman Lopez moved that Parks & Planning get together and divvy up ideas on the south end, make it a priority, include schools in the Citywide master plan, and bring their feedback to the Committee within four months.

Chairman O'Neil asked to do the master plan or recommendations?

Alderman Lopez answered the recommendations, because we won't have any money until then anyway.

Chairman O'Neil called for a second on the motion. Chairman O'Neil seconded the motion and with Aldermen Smith and Wihby opposed, the motion was defeated.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is our next step with this communication from Alderman DeVries? Do we need a motion to receive and file?

Alderman Smith stated all she was asking was...she was informing us of some new developments and making us aware that she's working with the Parks & Recreation and all of this is informational. Right?

Alderman DeVries replied yes informational.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Lopez regarding funding for the Manchester Art Commission.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I believe the City Clerk has some information regarding that.

City Clerk Bernier stated that issue has been addressed. There was a balance in the Art Commission account and the brochures have been paid for.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with that. The process of...I talked to Georgie and she would like to appear before the Committee it's not the \$2,000 any longer, it would be about \$1,000. So what I'd like to do is to table this until she's able to put some type of purchase together because it's going to be stamps and envelopes and stationary and other things that she has to do for the Art Commission. So I'd like to table it at this time.

Alderman Lopez made a motion to table this item at this time. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Smith.

Alderman Wihby asked was there funding in the Mayor's budget for some...

City Clerk Bernier answered that's correct. There was a funding of \$5,000.

Alderman Wihby asked what did they ask for? Do you know?

City Clerk Bernier replied \$5,000.

Alderman Wihby stated so we gave them what they asked for and now...?

City Clerk Bernier replied that's correct.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I think it's two different funds that you're talking about.

Chairman O'Neil stated well there's been a motion recommending to put it on the table. Could we double check on that and report back at the next meeting?

Chairman O'Neil called the question and it motion carried unanimously.

[Note: This item was later removed from the table and received and filed.]

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Lopez regarding snow removal and vehicle compound.

Alderman Lopez stated the communication can speak for itself in reference to snow removal and the Highway Department is here and I believe that the full Board, the Parks, Highway, Traffic, and Planning and Police Department were supposed to be working on this and maybe somebody would like to comment on that. Is the Highway here?

Alderman Wihby asked there's no committee set up yet is there?

Alderman Lopez answered we just referred it to those major departments who deal with snow as to what they were going to do and how they were going to proceed.

Deputy Public Works Director Kevin Sheppard stated I know Steve Tierney has met with the Police Department with one of the concerns on here regarding towed vehicles, space for that. And the Highway Department is currently looking at the vacant City property that's been identified to see if there's anything out there for us. I think as the Aldermen know we used to use a piece of property across from Airport. That's now currently leased for storing vehicles. We've used the Rubenstein lot and we're losing that, so right now we do not have a spot for snow storage or for towed vehicles, but we are working with the Police and working with Traffic to try and identify some areas.

Alderman Lopez stated yes and I think...its going to take a while for you to work on it, I understand that. Because Frank Thomas is concerned and I know Tommy from Traffic is concerned. The intent of this documentation here was to make sure that we don't wait until the snow falls and then come back to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and say what do we do. We surely don't want to truck it out of here; it would cost us more money. So I don't know who's in charge of this. Is the Highway taking the lead on this as being somebody who is coordinating all of the details here? Or is each individual department head taking...

Traffic Director Tom Lolicata stated Mike I spoke to you over a year ago about this and you finally wrote this letter. Since then we've been working more or less "independently". We've had two changes at the Police Department; I've been talking with the new Lieutenant down there. Basically those guys there have to

have a place for the impound spot, or is that private more or less? I think it's the Police, the towers, etc., and in some storms you talking what 140, 150, 200 cars. All my snow was being dumped with the Highway and then I started using Rubenstein this past year and I'm paying a contractor. Now that costs a few bucks to have it all taken all the way down to Goffs Falls and back and there's no more room besides that. I do not know where the private industry dumps; I haven't followed anybody so I couldn't tell you that at all.

Chairman O'Neil stated why don't we get this moving. Why don't we have Highway be the lead because they have the biggest issue to resolve and the other departments can work with them on it, but it should Highway to come back with a recommendation and answer these questions.

Alderman Smith stated I don't know if it's possible because we spent a lot of money capping the sanitary landfill, but is there any possibility of using that for snow removal?

Mr. Sheppard replied we actually used pieces of that this past winter. I guess the concern of using the top of that is surcharging the landfill. You're probably familiar the landfill actually settles over time, and if we put snow on the top of the landfill it will increase the settlement and it could create problems with our liner, so we have our consultant actually taking a look at that right now to give us an answer.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there a motion to ask them to give us an update, maybe the September meeting? Is that reasonable or the October meeting?

Mr. Sheppard replied that's fine.

Chairman O'Neil asked September or October Kevin?

Mr. Sheppard replied September I think would be good in case there are problems.

Chairman O'Neil asked report back at the September meeting?

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted for the Highway Department to work with the other departments on this issue and report back to the Committee at the September meeting.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and

expenditure of funds in the amount of \$6,000,000 (HUD Section 108) for the FY03 CIP 612803, Section 108 Economic Development Initiatives.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations transferring State funds in the amount of \$361,083 (\$30,000 from FY04 CIP 210204 HIV Counseling & Testing, \$50,000 from FY04 CIP 210304 HIV Prevention, and \$70,000 from FY04 CIP 210504 Immunization Services) to FY04 CIP 214604 State of New Hampshire Health Grants.

Alderman Wihby moved to approve the Resolution and budget authorizations. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Smith.

Alderman Smith asked is anybody here from the Finance Department?

Chairman O'Neil asked Health of Finance Department Alderman? Because I think Health is represented as well.

Alderman Smith replied Finance. My first concern is the Finance Department had been contacted for input but we hadn't received any thoughts from the Finance Department regards to consolidating of all of these funds.

Robin Descoteaux stated I spoke with Randy yesterday in regards to this, because at first he said he didn't realize that the award agreement is a total of all the grants together that is signed off by the Board. What happens is right now once the grants get approved through the CIP process, in order for us to get our start up approved or get the award signed off, I have to come back to the Committee and rearrange the numbers because the grant sometimes will be \$5,000 more for HIV prevention and \$5,000 less for HIV testing. And the State also now is doing a two-year budget, so my award is being held up because next year the State FY05 budget is being added into this years award letter. Bob MacKenzie won't sign off to let the Mayor sign off on this award to send back up to the State to go through their process, so right now ours is being held up because it has to go through all of these different processes because we have to increase one, decrease another. When Fred submits for the budget he puts in an estimate of what he is applying for for the award.

Alderman Smith stated my main concern is if you consolidate all these different awards, and so forth like that, sometimes you have a priority and it might have an overrun in a certain, like say HIV prevention, and you take money from another, like say lead poisoning, and take it in there, that's what I'm a little bit afraid of pooling all of these individual amounts into one account.

Ms. Descoteaux stated with the award agreement they have contract pricing with a breakdown of all of the projects. I can not exceed those prices when I submit for reimbursement with the State. So with the HTE system I'm going to set up the work orders to help me facilitate all of these projects so I can differentiate which projects are which.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion and it carried with a unanimous vote.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$73,483 for FY04 CIP 713004 Crystal Lake Water Quality Improvement Project.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations transferring \$78,397.27 from FY94 CIP 7.40200 Chronic Sewer & Drain Project to FY98 CIP 760326 Test Seal & Repair Green Acre Sewers Project.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorizations transferring HOME funds in the amount of \$600,000 (\$120,000 from FY99 CIP 610099 HOME Project, \$263,300 from FY02 CIP 611702 HOME Affordable Housing Initiative, and \$211,700 from FY03 CIP 611603 Affordable Housing Initiatives) to FY03 CIP 612703 Piscataquog River Apartments.

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$56,664 (Federal) for FY03 CIP 411503 Domestic Preparedness Equipment Funds.

On a motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$24,000 (State) for FY03 CIP 216003 Oral Health Services.

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$478,414 (Federal) for FY02 CIP 210902 Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 15 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$17,500 (State) for FY03 CIP 210603 Immunization Services.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 16 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$37,826 (State) for FY03 CIP 211103 STD Clinic.

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 17 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning submitting a request for various project extensions, as outlined.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I believe this was taken care of by the Board directly. I'll defer to Bob on that one. I think it's just a repeat of a previous...

Director of Planning Robert MacKenzie stated these are just Water Works projects, so I believe there has to be a motion.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected yes there would have to be a motion.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to accept the request for the various Water Works project extensions.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 18 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning regarding pay off of the mortgage on the Eastgate housing project on Holt Avenue.

Alderman Wihby made a motion to receive and file the communication. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez asked this \$2 million Bob, what projects...have you analyzed the projects that we're going to be using this money on?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we will be doing that in the next couple of months. The board has committed to a couple major projects and we do not have all of the funding for those, including the Gale Home and the Brown School. So we're going to go back...we have reviewed all of the old projects, but we will probably come in making certain suggestions. It is a lot of money that we go back and the funds to have to be used for new affordable housing projects.

Chairman O'Neil asked you want to just repeat that Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie stated the funds originally came from HUD. It was called a HODAG, a Housing Action Development Grant and according to the repayment requirements of the federal government, they have to be used...any repayment has to be used for affordable housing projects.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion and it duly passed with a unanimous vote.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 19 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning regarding remaining balances for completed CIP cash projects.

Alderman Wihby asked this is moving it to the graffiti? Is that what we're trying to do? Move \$20,000 to graffiti?

Mr. MacKenzie answered it was suggested. I know the Chairman of the Committee expressed a real concern about the graffiti issues. We are closing these projects out and if the Committee wished, they could use it to attack that graffiti problem, although we really don't have a strategy. It is a citywide issue, not just a downtown issue. Perhaps that something we could coordinate with the Highway Department.

Alderman Wihby asked but at this point you're only looking to accept the balances and then you'll come back with some recommendations for the \$20,000? Is that what you're looking to do.

Mr. MacKenzie replied these projects expire at the end of this month. So unless the Committee specifically authorized it for a project they're going to expire at the end of this month. But if you wanted to specifically earmark it towards graffiti, and take an action on that, we would come back later with kind of an action strategy and how to utilize those funds.

Alderman Wihby asked do they need \$20,000 for graffiti?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there is a lot of graffiti citywide and I'm sure the cost would certainly exceed that.

Alderman Lopez stated one area that we were looking at, Traffic brought it up, need \$2,600 for Elm and Valley Street in order for people to cross the street, that was brought up in Traffic. It doesn't have any money for that and it's a safety issue over in that particular area. I would like to see that at least that \$2,600 goes for Traffic,

for the walk light. But he's not here. That was brought up in Traffic. Remember the Committee here on Traffic?

Alderman Forest stated I'm not sure of the person's name, a gentleman from the south end on two occasions wrote a letter to the Board about trying to cross Valley Street at any time. There's four lanes there, actually there are six really with the left turn lanes and there are no walk lights and cars are making right turns, and cars are doing 40 or 50 miles an hour down there and it's very difficult for a pedestrian to cross and I guess this gentleman asked for walk lights down there.

Chairman O'Neil asked and the Traffic Committee recommended they get installed if funding was found?

Alderman Forest answered correct.

Alderman Wihby asked can't we get the baseball developer to pay for something like that, since we're going to be using the streets more?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I can't answer that question either.

Alderman Wihby stated they're going to be pushing traffic that way with the streets that are going to come down from Elm Street, don't you think they should be paying for some of the crosswalks down there? It's only an advantage for them.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I guess I really can't represent committing to the developer to expend those funds.

Alderman Wihby asked is there some planning process they're going to go through with you that, and when you look at it, you can suggest that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. They would be coming site plan review in the next few months and we could make a notation to do that and review that issue with them. We certainly want to encourage pedestrian crossing in that area between the projects.

Alderman Smith asked Bob I know these are cash balances. Couldn't we utilize them for the sidewalks down Elm Street? For the repairs? You're talking about pedestrian crossings are a hazard from Bridge to Merrimack Street.

Chairman O'Neil state Bob why don't we take the action to clear up the funds this evening and have staff come back with a recommendation on whether or not we need to do those traffic signals. My understanding is they were talking about some access at Valley Street on the baseball possibly. So that intersection way be

upgraded anyway, and maybe develop some plan working with Highway how they can attack the sidewalk problem in the downtown, and maybe by that time there might be some recommendations on how to start addressing the graffiti issue in the City, because I think it hits every single ward.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think if I could Mr. Chairman could we just request Committee extend these particular projects so they do not expire and then we would come back with a more detailed recommendation on the projects you asked about?

Chairman O'Neil asked is there a motion to extend the projects?

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to extend the CIP cash projects.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I just want to make a notation on that Bob. These projects are ending July 1st, on June 30th, and then we're going to need a poll of the Board for this, so the Committee is aware of this. Otherwise you're going to have a problem.

Chairman O'Neil stated and would you just note Carol when you poll it's per the recommendation of the CIP Committee.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 20 of the agenda:

Petition to discontinue a portion of Sargent Road.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated this would require a referral to a road hearing.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to refer the petition to discontinue a portion of Sargent Road to a road hearing.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 21 of the agenda:

Petition to discontinue a portion of Millstone Avenue.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that motion could be consider the area already having been released and discharged pursuant to statute. No, I'm sorry, this one needs a road hearing too, it's the next one.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to refer the petition to discontinue a portion of Millstone Avenue to a road hearing.

Mr. Sheppard stated excuse me Chairman O'Neil. The Millstone one I don't believe needs to be referred to a road hearing.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected it does. It does have to be referred to a road hearing even though...it was not accepted. I understand that we did the reference on it but the law also references that it requires the hearing process, the same as if a dedication had occurred. I researched the law and... If you want it clean that's the way it's got to be done.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 22 of the agenda:

Petition to discontinue a portion of Mystic, Myrtle and Shady Lanes.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated since those have never been opened, built, nor used for public travel they could be released and discharged pursuant to RSA 231:51. In essence they already have been.

Alderman Wihby stated Kevin Shady Lane is in my ward, but when you look at this it's described as south end.

Mr. Sheppard stated it's actually down by Crystal Lake, behind the MERS.

Alderman Wihby stated I have a street Shady Lane.

Mr. Sheppard replied right. This is a street that was never constructed. It was laid out, but was never constructed or formally accepted. There is a Shady Lane in your area, but this is a separate area of the City.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept the recommendation from the Highway Department. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Smith stated Betsie this is addressed to you. Does this have any concerns from you?

Alderman DeVries answered no, none whatsoever. I'm in favor of this action.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion and it carried unanimously.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 23 of the agenda:

Sewer abatement request of Robert W. Daniels on behalf of RKD Properties, LLC (318 Lake Avenue).

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated EPD is recommending an abatement in the amount of \$420.00.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to accept the recommendation from the Highway Department to abate RKD Properties, LLC (318 Lake Avenue) \$420.00.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 24 of the agenda:

Communication from Bruce A. Thomas, Engineering Manager, requesting approval to complete work on various projects as part of the City's Chronic Drain program.

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve the request from Bruce A. Thomas to complete work on various projects as part of the City's chronic drain Parks & Recreation Department

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 25 of the agenda:

Communication from Frank Coyne, President of the Manchester South Sabres, regarding the new set of goal posts that were purchased for the Memorial High School field last year.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I believe Ron Ludwig is here if you want to have him address this.

Alderman DeVries stated it is my understanding that it has not been determined yet that these goal posts will not be deployed to a new location, so it seems that that would be the logical first step to address that issue. To see if they have usable value somewhere else. I'm not sure if Manchester South Sabres, since it was a donation, we extremely short lived. I think they expended several thousand dollars. I haven't read this recently but it was several thousand dollars and it was just last year that they gifted them for use. So potentially we might want to consider returning their investment so that they can use that in another fashion to help with some of the field improvements maybe at Memorial.

Chairman O'Neil asked Ron do you have a recommendation on this?

Mr. Ludwig stated I know very little about the letter. I can tell you that this department and if you read in between lines of this letter it sounds like we never talked to the South Sabres, but that's not true. First and foremost in regard to the goalposts, we had a meeting at the Parks Department upstairs before the goalposts were purchased and we instructed them that there was a good possibility at that time that they could be undertaken the Memorial project and that new goalposts may not be compatible with the type of surface we're going to recommend and the number of events that were going to be played there. They're an interchangeable set and at that time another individual was the president and they said we would just like to upgrade them for this year if that's okay and we said fine and it cost the City a few thousand dollars. So this is just one good thing and another good thing and there was really no intent here. Now in terms of using those goalposts, I'm anticipating that we will have to use them some place and as soon as we can determine where that's going to be. Right now we're putting off the consultant a little bit and trying to delay the Memorial project to get football in there if we can, and we really don't know everything in terms of usage at Gill. So we still kind of in the dark as it relates to where we're going. We're working with the Athletic Director Joe Raycraft and we will also be bringing the Sabres in. We will not leave them behind in terms of where they are going to play either, so we'll find space somewhere and probably with their goalposts.

Chairman O'Neil stated Ron it was my understanding, we talked about this at a previous meeting, that the football teams were not to be displaced at Memorial High School this fall. That specifically was discussed.

Mr. Ludwig replied I think that you know we're going to have to take a close look and...

Chairman O'Neil interjected there is no close look to take. The Board of Aldermen voted on that. They are not to be displaced.

Mr. Ludwig stated if there will be no displacement, and we will not be able to start officially until after Thanksgiving. If that's what that vote meant, then we will have to come back to this Board and indicate that there may be delays in August.

Chairman O'Neil stated in my opinion we had this discussion a month or so ago, as long as your documents indicate that they can't displace the football teams, there are other parts of the project that can go on during that time period. We're not here to make life easier for the contractors, we are here to get the job done based on our schedule. Plain and simple.

Mr. Ludwig stated what we can't determine for the contractor is the weather.

Chairman O'Neil stated we can't determine...we could have snow in October.
Right?

Mr. Ludwig answered they'll still practice at Memorial. But the contractor may not work.

Chairman O'Neil stated the Board voted that the football teams were not to be displaced from Memorial.

Mr. Ludwig replied I understand that, and if there's no displacement there, we will have to come back and inform this Board that there may be delays next August.

Chairman O'Neil stated we had this, I think it was with Ron Johnson, in my opinion and I worked in the construction industry for 25 years, they're given a starting date and they are given a finish date, and if they don't meet that finish date, there should be penalties in the contract. It's up to them to get it done not us. Plain and simple.

Mr. Ludwig stated in our discussions with the contractor and the consultant, which I think that you have met on several occasions, that if we were to go forward and build I penalties, which we have in every contract that we put out there, most good contractors given the time constraints and weather permitting, may well increase the price of their contract to offset any penalties that may take them beyond that August 15th date that we would like to use Memorial Field by. So I think that we could be looking at an increased contract by putting those kinds of constraints, but we certainly can do that.

Chairman O'Neil stated Ron I don't believe that for one second. That they are going to drive up the costs because they have to get a project done by a certain date. Either they want to do the job and get it done, or they don't. Plain and simple. And if they can't meet those guidelines, then they shouldn't be working for the City.

Alderman Lopez stated I think this...Ron Johnson was here before and maybe you ought to talk to him. He was going to bring back to this Committee the actual construction period and then if you allow, which the Committee said they want the people to play on the field, is at that time you were to tell us if there was additional cost or whatever the situation was. So you might want to talk to Ron Johnson about that. And as far as the goalposts, I think the letter can be answered that we're going to use the goalposts, we just don't know where, so they'll be stored at the Parks & Recreation until we find a place to use them. If that's the case. But the letter would be answered that yes we're going to use them, as a City we're going to use them.

Chairman asked all right is that your motion. That they will be used for football at a location to be determined.

On a motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted that the goalposts will be stored at Parks & Recreation until a location for them is determined.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 26 of the agenda:

Communication from the Planning Director regarding the Intown Manchester contract, which expires June 30, 2003.

Chairman O'Neil asked Bob you just want to give us an overview?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. The contract that we have with Intown, the City has to carry out the Central Business Service District has provisions for two one year extensions and this Committee by Ordinance has the ability to extend those contracts. We would suggest in this case rather than two years that you just extend it for one year, because we may want to come back later with the Board and review the process for selecting who runs these. But we are recommending that you extend the contract for one year.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to extend Intown Manchester's contract by one year.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 27 of the agenda:

Discussion of Motorized Equipment Replacement Program.

Chairman O'Neil stated okay we have a recommendation from the Deputy Director of Public Works. Just for review, there's only \$120,000 in the budget, they need...Kevin am I correct right off the top you need \$50,000 for maintenance and the recommendation was to try to see what we could do with Police and where Highway has the largest fleet see what we could do there, and I just see it's one Police cruiser and one pick-up truck and it doesn't leave...there's about \$11,000 left.

Mr. Sheppard replied right and what we could look at with the balance of \$11,000 if there's any money or balance available in the vehicle maintenance line item towards the end of the fiscal year, request the Committee to allocate some of that money with that \$11,000 possibly to purchase another vehicle.

Chairman O'Neil stated there's not much we can do. So is there a motion to accept the recommendation? It still doesn't even get us close on the Police cruisers, but we heading...we're at least I think the net will be for the year four plus one patrol wagon, at least there's something this coming year.

On a motion by Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to accept the recommendation.

Chairman O'Neil stated just for a point of interest the Finance Officer has assured us that with the fiscal year conversion bond being paid off there will be some cash available in future years and that...I know Kevin you're working with Finance to develop the cash side of the motorized equipment replacement account to come up hopefully next year we can start moving forward and on an annual basis have a plan that we can...

Mr. Sheppard stated we're looking to put together a plan before the next budget process for presentation to the Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated I just got a question on vehicles. The Highway runs the whole scam, right?

Mr. Sheppard answered they oversee the MER program.

Alderman Lopez asked is there policies within the City as far as employees carrying their dependents in City vehicles and decals that have to be displayed for City vehicles?

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe, I didn't bring the policy with me, but I believe the policy reads that City vehicles will have decals, obviously there's exempted vehicles, certain Police cruisers I believe.

Alderman Lopez asked could you send some policies out to us just as a general knowledge as to...because a lot of questions have come up and I've seen a lot of cars without decals and see what the policy is so that we have a good feel of it? If there's policies that whereby the vehicles are carrying their children around in, what's our liability and stuff like that.

Mr. Sheppard stated I will send out the most recent copy and I will verify with the City Clerk that I've got the most recent copy of the policy for the Committee members.

Alderman Wihby stated Kevin a follow up to that. Is there a policy about children in vehicles? I got a call the other day from someone who complained about it.

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe the current policy allows City employees to drive their children to school on their way to work.

Alderman Wihby stated I see someone shaking their head in the back though. Could you get that policy please? I think that's interesting.

Mr. Sheppard answered I will get the policy out tomorrow.

Alderman Lopez stated just to follow up. I want to double check that because I'm getting different viewpoints and it might be a liability to the City if there was ever an accident.

Chairman O'Neil stated somebody brought up at one point about taking City vehicles out of the City.

Alderman Smith stated in my past in regards to City vehicles, I believe when the Building Commissioner was here he didn't have his decal and he was required to put it on, and I think it's supposed to be on very vehicle and as far as I know, I don't think any personnel outside of the person operating the vehicle, I could be wrong, at a time when I did have a vehicle, could be transported any place except a City employee.

Mr. Sheppard stated I'll verify that and I'll send out the copy of that.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman O'Neil stated we have one item of new business. There's a Resolution in front of you. Carol do you need to read it or...?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there's just a resolution and a budget authorization dealing with Fire Emergency Management plan project for \$12,254. The motion would be to accept the funds and approve the budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil asked Chief can you just tell us what you do with the \$12,000?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected and this would also be subject to approval of the grant by the G & C because it's going to appear before the Governor and Council.

Fire Chief Joseph Kane stated just quickly there's a number of grants that are coming down from the Office of Emergency Management. This is just a small first one. What this is specifically is for the City of Manchester to update its plan. The federal government has changed the format of its plan. The State is required to follow the federal format and we are not required but they'd like us to follow the State format and therefore they are giving us the money to change the plan.

Chairman O'Neil asked so do you hire a consultant or what's the \$12,000 go for?

Chief Kane answered most of it will be for a person to come in and change that plan to their format.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you do an RFP and all of that jazz?

Chief Kane replied yes.

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to accept the funds and approve the budget authorization.

TABLED ITEMS

Discussion of graffiti-related issues confronting the City.

This item remained on the table.

On a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to remove Item 29 from the table.

Removal of a 12" concrete drainage pipe located at 747 Mammoth Road.

Alderman Smith stated we discussed this last year and if you remember there was insufficient funds to remove this pipe and they said that the Highway Department was going to take care of it this spring and I was wondering, because if we're talking about chronic drain if Mr. Thomas is going to proceed with this. If you could help us Kevin?

Mr. Sheppard replied there were funds allocated in the fiscal year 2004 CIP to extend the drain up Mammoth Road to this property. Currently that property is being proposed for development by the owner and it's at the Planning Board process right now. I believe Thursday night there may be possibly a decision on that property. So we talked to the owner and we're looking at the extension,

whether it's needed or not, but we're waiting to see how the Planning Board acts on the property.

On a motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, there was a unanimous vote to receive and file.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Lopez wants to take an item we put on the table tonight off from the table.

Alderman Lopez stated yes I'd like to remove Item 5 off the table and then receive and file.

On a motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to remove Item 5 from the table and receive and file.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee