

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

July 20, 2004

5:00 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Garrity, Smith, Lopez

Messrs: R. MacKenzie, W. Jabjiniak, K. Sheppard, R. Ludwig

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Ratify and confirm poll conducted on June 18, 2004 approving the following item:

Communication from the Deputy Public Works Director requesting the reallocation of an anticipated balance in the FY04 MER (Cash) account in the amount of \$15,000.00 for the replacement of a 1991 Ford Explorer.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Intown Manchester seeking authorization to utilize the \$2,500 balance in their FY2004 CIP appropriation for the Mill City Festival scheduled for September.

Alderman Lopez asked is there anybody here from Intown?

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, stated I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Lopez stated just for discussion, I had some conversations with Stephanie, I thought maybe she would be here since this is her budget. The only concern I have is that when we had Riverfest and we gave them money, they paid us back. And I just don't know if we're going to start a precedence here by funding for these types of activities. I know the St. Patrick's Day parade that they raised their money, the Latino Festival raised their money, and we just had a Caribbean Festival that raised all of their money. I think like with Riverfest when we used to loan them \$10,000 or \$15,000 they at least paid us back and I just wanted to bring that to the committee's attention and see what direction we'd like to go. I'm not so in favor of giving up \$2,500 when I know that there are sponsors out there and I know other organizations that help in this particular degree.

Chairman O'Neil stated Bob refresh my memory. They did have a request in to the CIP for the 2005 budget for \$10,000, if I recall, to help out with Police details.

Mr. MacKenzie replied but that was not funded. And again, I do remember when the Riverfest itself, the City did not participate in it except I believe for one year and then I think the City made that a loan to the organization if it was payable.

Alderman Smith stated just to follow up on Alderman Lopez. It's funny that we just wrote off \$10,000 to Riverfest tonight in Accounts Committee for Police detail.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is two different events though. Isn't it?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. This is technically a different organization.

Alderman Smith stated I have to lean towards Alderman Lopez. If we start something next year, they'll be in for \$10,000 or \$15,000. Is the way you're going to go Bob?

Mr. MacKenzie answered correct. Again, they did ask for quite a bit of money this year but that was not funded in the CIP. So it's likely they would be in next year.

Alderman Lopez stated I think another point I just want to bring out. The group For Manchester...Bob do you know how much money they have in there and why don't they get the money from For Manchester since they are sponsoring the organization?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I suspect that For Manchester does not have the money. I know we did fund one For Manchester project and that's the beautification program where they put the flowers around the City. That's a relatively modest

amount, but I'm not really aware of the finances of For Manchester, but I don't believe they have a significant amount of resources.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to deny the request from Intown Manchester.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Bond Resolution and budget authorization in the amount of One Million Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,600,000) for the 2005 CIP 411305, South Main Street Fire Station Rehabilitation Project.

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

Mr. MacKenzie stated Mr. Chairman, could I just note that this project had been approved before. The committee did want it worded so that before they went into the construction, after the design and before construction, they come back to the committee to review the design and the process. So that's why we put it back on the agenda so that in the startup that it has to come back to committee.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think the other thing we wanted to confirm was the actual construction dollars once it was designed and estimates for those.

Mr. MacKenzie replied right. So this one and the next item dealing with the City Library we have the same notation on the startup that before they go into construction.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Bond Resolution and budget authorization in the amount of Four Million Four Hundred Forty Thousand Dollars (\$4,440,000) for the 2005 CIP 811405, Building Improvements Project.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Resolutions and budget authorizations authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of Seven Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000) for the 2005 CIP 710205 Public Works Infrastructure Program.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to approve the Resolutions and budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$30,000 (Other) for the FY2004 CIP 713204 Public Works ROW Improvement Project.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$112,010 (State) for the 2005 CIP 214005 Wrap For Youth Resiliency Project.

Alderman Shea to approve the Resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil asked Bob, was this the grant that was a joint effort led by OYS and it was a joint effort with Schools and Police?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. Schools, Police and our office put the grant together.

Chairman O'Neil asked and we were successful?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$242,964 (Federal) for the 2005 CIP 410005 Comprehensive Wellness Matching Grant Program.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the Resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked Bob, in looking at Item 10 here, I just want to clarify. The \$242,964, that's not all Federal funds, right?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. Those are all Federal funds.

Alderman Lopez asked and that's the one we lowered the Police Department down to...?

Chairman O'Neil interjected the Fire Department down to \$9,000 maybe?

Mr. MacKenzie replied \$95,000. But this is all Federal funds.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$14,993 (Federal) for the FY2005 CIP 411405 Project Safe Neighborhoods Program.

Alderman Lopez stated I think Officer O'Keefe is doing a fine job.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$150,000 (Other) for the FY2005 CIP 610105 Second Street Mill project.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$16,000 (Other) for the 2005 CIP 811605 Valley Cemetery Improvement Project.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Communication from William Jabjiniak advising that a neighbor of the Lowell Street Sidewalk Project has requested it be extended northerly along the east side of Kosciuszko Street through property at 21 Kosciuszko Street noting that they will contribute \$25,000 toward the sidewalk and lighting improvement with the balance of \$75,000 possibly being eligible for CDBG funding.

Alderman DeVries asked is it going to be eligible for CDBG or not?

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is an eligible activity provided we can document that there were jobs created as a result of that and Mr. Jabjiniak is aware of that and has indicated that he would expect that the jobs would be created.

Chairman O'Neil stated Bill I know you're quite familiar with the CDBG program as well as the Sidewalk Improvement Program. Are you pretty comfortable there will be no problem meeting the requirements?

William Jabjiniak replied I have a letter from, actually Barry Boisvert is the brother of one of the owners at the Wild Rover who indicated he would be able to create three additional full-time equivalent positions, which would meet the requirement for CDBG.

Alderman DeVries asked is there a way that this would worded just because our CIP cash component has been fairly well exhausted, the concern being if for some reason it is not eligible under CDBG, would the \$25,000 that is being donated be returned or would we be obligated to go forward with the project? I understand it is quite likely or going to be.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied if we can identify the additional funding to do the project, we're not going to be able to jump in and contract for it. So before I spend our money, we'll know where we're going with it.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we actually set up a reserve? I know we've done that to hold the money? Do we get that up front or do they match once we have approved the \$75,000.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered before we'll sign a contract, we'll have their \$25,000 in hand.

Chairman O'Neil asked and once the funding is identified, it still has to come back to us again or are we approving it tonight?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we do have to talk a little bit about where the money comes from.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we bring that back to the committee at the next meeting then if you've had a chance to identify it?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I'd have to turn to Bill because I know they were on kind of a fast track on the construction project.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated what I'm trying to do is utilize since Lowell Street is just about done, we're looking to execute a change order and carry it down Kosciuszko. So I'm looking for action as soon as possible. We're really hoping to identify sources for tonight, they would come in and say yes here is \$75,000 of CDBG along with \$25,000 personal contribution to make the project work.

Chairman O'Neil asked but have we even attempted to identify the funding source? Is it balances? We're not talking about taking away anything we recently approved for the 2005 budget?

Mr. MacKenzie answered nothing recently in the 2005. We thought we had a couple of leads but those did not work out. There's one project that we have identified, but we haven't spoken to the person responsible for that fund. It's the only fund that really has funds that haven't been touched for about two years. So typically those are the accounts that we would look into as to whether they could be transferred for this, but I haven't had a chance to speak with that person yet.

Chairman O'Neil asked Bill, is this a unique situation when we get a property owner to step up 25 percent on this program, and I know you've done it on a number of other streets, Amherst, Concord, Lowell Streets.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered Amherst and Concord Streets were total City investments because we're trying to stimulate some work. Lowell Street the business owner has actually approached me with some money and asked can we do this, and with this happening we simply turned to the property owner and said if you want to contribute towards it and he volunteered \$25,000. I got a price from the contractor and said this works pretty well if we can identify \$75,000. So it is unique, I guess, in this situation.

Alderman Lopez asked is this going to be a private contractor that does this?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered yes it is.

Alderman Lopez asked why wouldn't the Highway Department do it?

Mr. Jabjiniak replied I'm not going to speak for the Highway Department, but Highway has been involved with oversight of the project on Lowell Street for example, utilized their engineering staff quite a bit here in this situation.

Alderman Lopez stated maybe Kevin Sheppard can come up.

Chairman O'Neil stated while Kevin is coming up, why don't you just explain what's been going on on Lowell Street. I know I noticed for several weeks it was closed and so this project has been going on, the Lowell Street portion.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated Lowell Street is now open to traffic. We were able to identify some additional funding and really redo sidewalks, add I think 11 different light fixtures, there will be an arch eventually, really make it an inviting place for people downtown. Business owners contributed some of the funding there as well. Sidewalk work is done, we are waiting for those lights, which should be about Labor Day and the arch will be later on in the year. Business owners actually agreed to the street closure. We were trying to do it and keep the street open, they agreed to the six-week closure. So everybody has worked together very well on this one.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the question I have, have you looked at this particular area as to whether you could do it cheaper what is indicated here?

Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, answered we're familiar with the project as Bill said. One of the things is it is a brick sidewalk; it is a specialty type sidewalk that we are not typically installing. We deal with asphalt and concrete. This type of sidewalk is something that we prefer be left to the contractor.

Alderman Lopez stated and I understand Bill that you need this done because the contractor is out there now, is that the situation?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered that's correct.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. MacKenzie, how about the revolving account?

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is the account that we were looking at. The business revolving loan fund. Again, the Deputy Director of MEDO is here tonight; I haven't had a chance to speak with her. That's the only program that has like two years worth of CDBG fund that will have been outstanding for two years that haven't been touched. So at some point we may have to address that because we have expenditure rate issues that we have to satisfy with HUD. There is about I think \$150,000 of CDBG set aside for that and there's also money that has come back into the revolving loan fund from repayments for loans.

Alderman Lopez stated along that line, if we were to give the authority tonight to look at the revolving account and work it out with the Director, Jane Hills, and if it is feasible and legally can be done, then you could proceed with this project without waiting. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes, I believe that's feasible. The committee would have to authorize us to get a startup to the full Board, but I'm sure they could get into contract mode very quickly and then the full Board could approve the actual startup.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted that City staff, to include Jane Hills, William Jabjiniak and Bob MacKenzie, look into using the revolving account in MEDO to fund an extension of the Lowell Street Sidewalk Project in the amount of \$75,000 and if it is found to be legal use of that account that they be allowed to proceed with the project.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 15 of the agenda:

Communication from Messrs. MacKenzie and Jabjiniak and Ms. Hills seeking authorization to apply for an Economic Development Administration (EDA) grant of up to \$68,000 for economic development planning.

Alderman Shea asked Bob, the grant itself, has it been applied for yet, or is it still in the process of being written?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the grant application itself should be done sometime this week. We did have a preauthorization reviewed by EDA and they indicated that we had a good chance to get it if we did apply.

Alderman Shea asked could you explain a little bit. I know that there's documentation here, but could kind of break down a few things maybe for the general public that might be helpful and also helpful for us as well.

Mr. MacKenzie answered sure. There would actually be three pieces that we would utilize these funds for. One is a small piece that would be used to help satisfy the paperwork of the economic development administration in what is called a CEDS (Community Economic Strategy). So that's just something we have to do to keep in the authorization for EDA. The two other bigger pieces; one would be a new economic development strategy for the City. The City has not done this type of thing for roughly 20 years. With the changing economy and particularly after the JacPac closing we realized that we're going to be relying less and less on manufacturing and we felt and I think the Mayor felt that the City should know what are our opportunities for the next 20 years for example. So that would be an economic development strategy for the City. And the third piece would be a little bit more detailed planning for economic development activities in the south downtown and that would include potential redevelopment of the JacPac site, potential for a rail station in the south downtown and other areas. So the three chunks are one is a small one, the two bigger pieces are long-term economic development strategy and a strategy for the specific south downtown area.

Alderman Shea asked assuming that you are successful and we get the funding, how proceeds? In other words, not the full extent but what happens? Who does the work or do you hire someone? How does that procedure work?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would be happy to have either Bill or Jane jump in. Generally the bigger chunks of it we would probably get a specialized consultant to do. One that could explain how Manchester fits into the national economy and the world economy and help us sift through all the data to see where the real jobs will be 15 years from now. That would be a contractor and some of the design work for the redevelopment of let's say the JacPac site would also be consulting. But we would cooperate with the Destination Manchester Coordinator, MEDO and perhaps other groups such as the MHRA in doing that planning. It would be nice to have a steering committee through this entire process but we haven't really pinned down who would be involved on that steering committee.

Alderman Shea stated one of the things that you mentioned that sort of doesn't concern me but is open for question, wouldn't we be more apt to want to know what the job opportunities would be within a five year period or a six or seven

rather than a 15 year period? In other words, are you saying that the report would be more for 15 and 20 years down the road, or five...what I'm concerned about is what's going to happen in the years 2005 to 2010, rather than 2010 to 2020.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it would be up to a 15-year period. So it would look at short range, mid-range, and longer term and then a portion of that would be actually used in the City's master plan that we're going to be updating. So it would look at what happens when all of the JacPac jobs in the City leave. What type of jobs will we have five years from now?

Alderman Lopez asked Bob, I presume it's on your letterhead, so this person would actually come under your supervision?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I don't know if that's been agreed yet. We did do this under the auspices of the Mayor's office. Historically EDA grants have come through the economic development office though, not the Planning Department.

Alderman Lopez stated well I think it's important as we move forward because I know two committees have approved a coordinator for the City and they will be taking that up tonight in the Human Resources as we proceed forward with that. I think that if this person, you get this grant, to be designated under one department. I don't see how three people can be directing traffic say to speak, but I'm for getting the money, getting the grant, getting the person aboard, but I don't think it should report directly to the Mayor's office for example, I think it needs to report to the Planning Department or MEDO or the Coordinator. It has to be in that category. So that's my viewpoint.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if you'd like, if we get the grant we will come back to the committee and advise how we might do a steering committee and who the money would come through and review that again with the committee.

Alderman Lopez replied that would be fine.

Alderman Shea asked Bob, when do you anticipate the acceptance or the rejection of the grant?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think that is...I'm going to turn towards Jane. I think it would happen fairly quickly because EDA is hoping to allocate these monies shortly. In the next month, Jane?

Jane Hills, Assistant Director of MEDO, stated what I was told was that this money needs to come out of the EDA budget for the fiscal year ending the 30th of September. So they want it committed definitely before then. I don't have a sense

of exactly what the timeframe would be. We probably will submit the grant application within the next two weeks. So I would say probably some time in September would be my best guess.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to authorize Messrs. MacKenzie and Jabjiniak and Ms. Hills to apply for an Economic Development Administration (EDA) grant of up to \$68,000 for economic development planning

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 16 of the agenda:

Discussion regarding FY 2005 MER Cash recommendations.

Chairman O'Neil stated just a quick question for Kevin [Sheppard] or Chief Kane. The maintenance truck was recommended but wasn't there a desperate need to replace a van at one point and the vehicle did not pass inspection and it's on a borrowed car from the Manchester Transit Authority or something? I'm just curious of the priority here.

Joseph Kane, Manchester Fire Chief, answered the van is off the road and has been off the road for about four or five months now. That division is using a car to get around in from the Manchester Transit Authority. The maintenance truck is in just as bad shape and is not going to make it for very much longer. The maintenance truck is basically something that's on the road a lot more than the van and both of them are very important, but priority is put with the maintenance truck.

Chairman O'Neil asked and what special equipment does this thing come with? It's a pickup truck pretty much?

Chief Kane answered it's pretty much a pickup truck. It does have a plow on it that we use to plow the fire stations in the wintertime.

Chairman O'Neil asked don't you already have one that has a plow on it?

Chief Kane answered right. There is another one that already has a plow on it. We have two trucks; this is replacing one of the pickup trucks.

Chairman O'Neil asked but the one you have now doesn't have a plow on it?

Chief Kane answered no.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the recommendations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 17 of the agenda:

Communication from the Deputy Public Works Director requesting the issuance of a new license plate for the purchase of a sewer jet trailer by EPD.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Items 18 & 19 of the agenda:

Discussion regarding synthetic turf maintenance at Gill Stadium, West Memorial Field, and the Clem Lemire Sports Complex at Memorial High School.

Communication from the Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery submitting a list of additional capital items needed to properly operate Gill Stadium.

Chairman O'Neil stated I might want to suggest that we kind of tie Items 18 and 19 together if the committee is fine with that. Those are similar discussions. I guess the committee would like to find out what do we have currently at West field and what is planned for West Memorial and Gill Stadium regarding maintenance of the synthetic turf.

Ron Ludwig, Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemeteries stated just to bring the committee a little bit up to speed, we really will have three different products shortly within the city, although two of the products at Gill Stadium and West are SRI fields. The one at West is not exactly like the one at Gill. You do have a 10 millimeter rubber pad under that turf at West Memorial Field; that was the recommended practice when we put it in to further protect against G force and impacting on the carpet. As time went on, I guess it's my understanding when Gill was installed they felt that was somewhat overkill in terms of cost and that at Gill you just have the regular carpet infilled with straight rubber over an aggregate base. So those two surfaces are a little bit different. Memorial will have, again, you know the issues that came about when Memorial went out to bid and the failure of SRI, and we ended up going with the field turf product which is a sand/rubber mix similar to what they have at the Stello's field. Again, that's a

little different spin. If I could work backwards for a second, at the Memorial field we worked with field turf given their price was a little bit higher to get them to throw in a better piece of grooming equipment that typically comes with the installation when they turn the field over to you. So we should have a very nice piece of equipment to groom the sand/rubber infield mix at Memorial. I've been doing a lot looking into and studying if this piece of equipment sand/rubber infill can be used also at all rubber fields at Gill and Memorial, and the initial indications are that they can not. At West, all we really have, and what the manufacturer SRI at the time supplied, was just a small sweeper that actually picks up litter and does brush the top of the carpet a little bit, but we probably should be looking something a little bit better that hopefully when we get Gill online, we'll be using. Right now the ball field as a baseball field isn't receiving that same wear and tear up and down the 50-yard line or across the football field as it will once we start using it as a rectangular surface. So it will be interesting to see. Ed Renelowicz is sitting to my right here has been doing some homework looking at some groomers that are out there to keep these fields in tiptop condition. One of the things that we do find out is that people want to do a lot more to these fields than is really necessary. The initial break in period takes some brushing, grooming, and grooving over a period of time, maybe the first few months of installation. After that that kind of action is really only needed maybe once every few months. So that's what we've looked at, but I think initially what we wanted to bring to the committee's attention through the budget process that there was particularly at Gill some pieces of equipment that were going to be needed for us to operate the ballpark a little differently than the way we have in the past. Off the top of my head a for instances are lighting, we can no longer go on this field given the sophisticated drainage structure under it with a heavy piece of fire apparatus to change lamps. We looked into that and the lighting manufacturer has a 10-year program which they would sell to us for like \$23,000, so we listed that. Some of the other types of pieces of equipment that we've looked into are balloon tired vehicles that actually are made to go out and work on these field, pull bleachers and things like that, rather than your straight pickup truck where your pounds per square inch on that surface are not recommended by the manufacturer. So there are some specialty type of pieces of equipment that we will need to be able to work on the field in order to do certain things. We all know that no one worries about snow and Thanksgiving day until the day before it snows and the question would be asked quite frankly this year, I'm not sure what I would have done at West High School who played the Turkey Bowl game had we gotten five inches of snow the day before. We've been doing a significant amount of investigating both NH College field, there is an individual up there, who is actually a fence installer in Manchester, Dennis Sweeney, who has given us some tips. He's actually taken on the snow removal up in at NH College and he has some interesting thoughts. But we had to cross some large hurdles in terms of not voiding warranties from the field turf company and things of that sort, actually to the extent where he went out

and bought himself an insurance policy to remove snow, but he did do it and he has proven that it can be done. So it's new in the industry, everyone's working at how to maintain these fields a little bit differently, but I think we'll have a fairly decent handle on it, although it may take us one season to get through it at Gill. We know at West and these infill systems that it is important to have companies come in occasionally and test they call it G max forces, which is actually shooting a missile at a particular height and it registers what the impact is on the field. Rather than using a football, they use a sophisticated piece of equipment. That can tell you if your rubber has migrated around over a period of time, maybe to the sidelines, not up and down the middle, and they can give you some good indications as to whether you should be out there grooming more often or not. We will be having that done at West probably before the season starts to determine if there's been any migration of the rubber out there and are we playing on a safe surface. Again, at West we have a little bit of insurance because we do have a 10-millimeter rubber pad under that surface for some added protection. So even as the crumb rubber compacts a little bit, we'll always have that 10 millimeter pad under there. So I always felt it was a good thing, however, industry wise said it was a bit of overkill at the time, although we got it for the same price, and they don't use it any more. So there's three different fields, we've tried to supply you with some information, I know it was quite a bit on the different backup information in terms of the different pieces of equipment that we would need. Hopefully that was helpful to you, maybe somewhat confusing, but we would certainly try to answer between Ed and I any questions that you may have relative to the information we have supplied at this time.

Alderman Lopez asked Ron have you calculated...I notice you have \$100,000 here. I guess let me just throw this out. Personnel to handle it, all the equipment you're going to get, you've got \$100,000 and is that going to be charged back to the School Department on the athletic fields?

Mr. Ludwig answered it gets a little more confusing this year. As you know the Aldermen were nice enough to kind of lower the School District's number, the way we used to calculate the payback or the charge back or the service contract for the City to the School District, was pretty much about a 90 percent charge of Gill back to the School District this year. The School District had some concerns that they were going to be paying a higher rate given the new condition at Gill and some of the bonds that were going to be put in place for Gill. Right now the School District is not being charged on any of those bonds, at least that's my understanding. The City has picked up the \$3.8 [million] or whatever it has put in, I guess, along with the \$1 million from the developer.

Alderman Lopez interjected let me just stop you right there. I want to forget about the bonds. I'm interested in, let's say everything is done, you need the equipment, it's going to be \$100,000.

Mr. Ludwig added about 50 percent could be possibly charged back to the School District, is my guess. Right now the split in expenses of about \$225,000 at Gill Stadium is about \$125,000 School District and the Aldermen have accepted in the general fund about \$100,000.

Alderman Lopez asked and have you had discussions about maintenance of these three fields with the School District?

Mr. Ludwig answered we've had discussions about maintenance at West because we've been into it for a while. They haven't gone 100 percent smoothly because quite frankly they don't want to pay for maintenance. But we've been...we're having another meeting August 3rd, which maybe we may get into that a little bit as well because that came up at the Parks Commission meeting today, quite frankly as it relates to brining to someone's attention that they really need to step to the place and start assuming some responsibility for doing maintenance at these two beautiful facilities where you have a combination of \$10 million being spent on the two of them now. So it doesn't seem prudent to be prudent to me to spend \$10 million on two facilities and not spend maybe \$24,000 a year to keep them up in each place. And I more than anyone would hate to see them go downhill. I go by West three times in a week and just from walkers and people who use it and it's a great thing, there's trash, there's litter and there's whatever, and it just shows the lack of maintenance overall and that's unfortunate. We're not going to give up trying to bring it to the School District's attention that if they want to hire someone, contract or whatever to do it, but they really should do something.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that when you have this discussion because you brought up a very good point. We're spending a lot of money \$10 million and we need the equipment and whatever financial arrangements as far as charge backs of the maintenance and all of that and if they don't want to do it, we need to know what goes on. We must maintain those fields or we're going to lose a lot of money. Now the question I have, are you going to be taking any money out the enterprise for Gill Stadium?

Mr. Ludwig answered well again, the Aldermen it has kind of an unwritten rule in the enterprise, the enterprise is our expenses matched by revenues. So over maybe a two and a half year period, I think we've probably furnished a list at prior times to the Aldermen, and we've put about a quarter of a million dollars of capital dollars not bonded money, from the enterprise into Gill Stadium for various items over the years. Some of those charged back to the School District and some not.

The fact of the matter is, the majority of that money, if not all of that money, out of the capital item out of the budget, must come on the back of the skier, the skater, the golfer, or someone else, because no revenue is effectively generated at Gill Stadium. We only charge the School District actual numbers. If it is \$7.67 for a dump truck to go around the block, that's what they get charged. It's \$12.00 an hour for the person to work there, that's what they get charged. So there's actually no revenue to be made at Gill. The Aldermen have been excellent recognizing what I believe to be an unwritten rule. I'll use the pigeon netting for instance and some of the other things that came forward and helped the enterprise out and I think because they realized that we can't really fund those kinds of things in the enterprise.

Alderman Lopez stated Mr. Chairman, I don't know exactly where we're going. Do we have the money to do everything that we need to do to buy this equipment? Or are you asking for money? I'm looking at the request here and I don't know exactly...

Mr. Ludwig stated as we watched the process in Gill evolved into the facility right now, it will be when we take it over, it quickly came to our attention that come September, we were going to need something. That's why during the budget process we brought this up, back in May or March, it didn't seem fly too far at that time and I think I believe it got tabled at the time, we're back here again to bring to someone's attention if we'd like to play football at Gill, we're going to need some equipment to work on that field.

Alderman Lopez asked so right now, tomorrow you take it over, you need equipment.

Mr. Ludwig stated we would need a few pieces of equipment.

Alderman Lopez asked okay the question is money? Is that \$100,000?

Mr. Ludwig answered it's close to that number.

Alderman Lopez stated that's the basic question I'm looking at. If you had to do everything tomorrow you'd need \$100,000 for the equipment? That's the issue right now.

Mr. Ludwig answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. MacKenzie, do we have any suggestions for Parks?

Mr. MacKenzie answered no we don't right now. There is a project called Gill Stadium equipment that we're just trying to track down right now. I'm sure it's not \$100,000, but we don't have any suggestions right at the moment.

Chairman O'Neil stated I for some reason thought we carried a number. I don't have my CIP book with me, but I thought we carried a number and approved something in FY2005 CIP budget, and for some reason \$100,000 looks familiar.

Mr. MacKenzie asked does anybody have the Finance Committee agenda for tonight?

Chairman O'Neil stated while we're doing this let's move onto to some other questions.

Alderman Shea stated I just wondered if when Gill Stadium is being renovated, is there any contingency that would be returned to the City? I don't know if Kevin Sheppard knows that.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin, the contingency fund for the construction at Gill Stadium, does that stay at Gill or does that have the right to move to the other baseball project as well?

Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, replied honestly I'm not too sure that I'm the one to answer that question. Frank has been the online person with that.

Chairman O'Neil stated if memory serves me right, I think it's considered one project and they can move that money, whatever they save on Gill can go into the new facility.

Mr. Sheppard stated I believe it's a GNP for the full project between the two.

Alderman Shea asked so nothing can be spent for any kind of equipment to maintain Gill Stadium?

Mr. Sheppard replied from what I remember in the contract, that contract does not include any maintenance equipment. It's for the construction only and we've given it over to the developer.

Alderman Shea stated well right now Kevin when they're working on Gill, do they use any equipment now? Are they renting the equipment they're using to maintain it or aren't they maintaining it at all? What I'm trying to indicate is if for instance

they needed equipment now for some type of situation, would the monies that are being spent for the construction be kind of used for any other...?

Mr. Sheppard answered I don't believe any money from construction is being used to maintain it. Maybe Mr. Renelowicz knows. How are they maintaining that field now?

Mr. Renelowicz answered the people we met with right now were kind of green. They're getting better at it. We've brought in different consultants, people that work at Northeastern University and the latest was a former employee of SRI. These folks offered opinions and indicated that they would come and do the work, but they have their own equipment. They do have a drag brush over at Gill right now, but the one they have right now that I'm aware of is more of a sweeper rather than a grooming brush.

Alderman Smith stated I don't think we have any other alternative. We've put in money for three fields. I'll tell you what, I know the machine is not compatible at Memorial with the other ones at Gill and West Memorial. We talked with the gentlemen from New York and we met and I can't if anybody goes over to Memorial High School field, I took a look over it today, it is beautiful. It's got the insignia M and it looks like a million dollars and we have to keep it up and that's where we always run into a problem. We don't have maintenance and we got to have maintenance and I don't know where we're going to get the money for this, but we have to get it because we spent this money and I think that you should talk to the School District because they are utilizing and they should help maintain these fields and they should pay somewhat back for your services for charge backs. And I really think that we should push the ball in the...

Chairman O'Neil interjected we do have a grooming machine for Memorial. It was part of the package. I was told that you can in fact by adjusting the heights use these groomers on different products. That's what I was told. So it's just a matter of each product there's a different height requirement because of the material mix. I don't know if we still have to do a little more research on that. I agree with you Alderman Smith that most of these items to me look necessary. I'm not particularly sure we need the pickup truck to plow the field, that one I leave out. Have you don't much research on the striping machine? I know you quoted a number of products regarding the synthetic surface because I've got to be honest. What went down, the temporary markings at West Memorial were not very good this year.

Mr. Ludwig asked and how so Alderman?

Chairman O'Neil replied you couldn't see them.

Mr. Ludwig stated there is a...

Chairman O'Neil stated I like you guys whenever I go anywhere and as you know I officiate sports, I ask questions. People tell me the best way to do these synthetic surfaces with paint is that you mix it with detergent with something and that's been a proven. At one particular university they've proven that's how they get it down and it will wash off eventually where it doesn't leave a permanent... The problem is we have two different manufacturers, three different products, and you're always going to have differences of opinion. I agree we need to mix it, I can't see us necessarily right now buying three different groomers, I think we need to do a little bit more research, it may be a little more trial and error to figure out can the groomers work on all three fields with some adjustment. I know you said you've reached out to the people at Southern NH, they have a field turf product, have you reached out to the people in Nashua at Stello's, and I'm sure you're going to get different opinions on different ways to groom it. But I was informed by Mr. MacKenzie that we did approve \$100,000 but out of the enterprise, so we have to show \$100,000 in revenues.

Mr. Ludwig replied right, and the other question Alderman O'Neil would be is if the items we're purchasing are bondable items, which I don't think that a service contract for lighting would even qualify in that regards.

Chairman O'Neil stated usually they have pickup trucks and that, Finance has taken the opinion in the past that that's not a bondable item.

Alderman Lopez stated clarification Mr. Chairman. Did you say that we gave \$100,000 out of the enterprise for him to buy this equipment?

Chairman O'Neil answered correct. Bob you want to answer to that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes, it is proposed, they did request in the 2005 CIP and the Board approved \$100,000 but it does come out of enterprise. So it would either be a bond or it could be cash, but it would have to be subject to the ability of the enterprise program as a whole to pay for that.

Alderman Lopez asked is it necessarily that the enterprise could buy this equipment and we'll have to give them an IOU or something along that line because they need the equipment right now? What I'm hearing that they can buy the equipment, they have the \$100,000. Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. MacKenzie replied they will have to demonstrate at some point to Finance Department that they have the ability based upon the funding mechanisms that come in, that they have the ability to either pay the debt service on a bond or get

the cash necessary. So they could use it for bond items, they could use it also for cash items if they're not eligible.

Chairman O'Neil stated before I go to Alderman Garrity and then Alderman Smith, Ron or Ed is there a possibility you could prioritize the list that we have in front of us of about 10 or 12 items, stencil, stripe machine, utility vehicle, balloon tire tractor, could you prioritize those in case going forward we only have X number of dollars instead of Y, and get back to us as soon as you can on that.

Alderman Garrity stated when you do that Ron...has the School District said they're not going to pay for any of this?

Mr. Ludwig answered no, I don't want to start vicious rumors about our relationship with the School District because it's been fairly good. They do question every item that purchased as you know if you watch any of those shows as I do on television, and that's okay that's their business. The fact of the matter is that they've stated from the beginning of the budget process this year back in January when we made our presentation on a Saturday morning with them, that they didn't want to be owners of the ballpark and go forward paying 95 or 98 percent of the expenses, they wanted to renters of the ballpark, which is a huge difference. They didn't want to participate in things like things debt expense, so that we tried to make them more of a renter even though they are the major user, which leaves us as a general fund with the City little time to use it for anyone else because they are the major users.

Alderman Garrity stated but they can't be the renters on the West Side and the south end for the new fields. Right?

Mr. Ludwig replied no, they are the owners.

Alderman Garrity stated who are all lined up. Every School Board member from the south end was lined up saying hey make sure you fund that \$4.4 million down there. Now we've got to maintain it.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the things that has been successful and might be worth looking at and I've kind of thought about this as the West project was in the process being constructed and maybe...there was an agreement made with Livingston Park where a staff person was hired specifically for Livingston Park and I do have to say very honestly it's pretty clean. And personal observations having done some ballgames at West field, it isn't always clean. I'm not over there regularly, I was only there a couple of times this year, but garbage cans were overflowing, there was garbage in the bleachers and I'm afraid that similar type of thing might happen at Memorial and I've always have thought that maybe we can

ask the department to take a look at this in the long term is maybe assigning a person to West Memorial maybe with a couple of other West Side responsibilities, give them a pickup truck and say it is your baby, as has happened at Livingston. And Livingston has been pretty successful from that point about maintenance, about cleanliness of the restroom, about trash along the Daniel Webster; it might be worth something looking at it again where we may take a look at some positions. I don't know. That may be where it comes down to. To be honest they have been cut over the years, they are maintaining more fields now than ever, I know I'm very hard on them about that, but I do recognize that and maybe with some these large projects we need to look at something like that. I don't believe we charge back the schools for the person at Livingston?

Mr. Ludwig answered that's where they get us in I'll call the rope-a-dope. If they see any kind of charge back in July, they'll call us in and want to know why were you aerating the field in July and charging it back to the School District. Well you can't aerate a field in February. Not to sound trite, but those are some of the questions that we end of answering because we're trying to do some turf maintenance. If they have a soccer camp there and that individual is there to open bathrooms and clean up after that camp, then there would be a charge back, but other than that we would not charge this time.

Chairman O'Neil stated and other than that we've had some infrastructure issues at Gill Stadium, Gill Stadium has always traditionally been very clean because there are staff assigned to Gill Stadium and JFK. Maybe that's something we need to look at for West and for Memorial. I'll be honest with you, I get a little frustrated with this whole charge back issue. It's coming out of one pocket...if it's coming out of the left pocket from schools or the right pocket from Parks, it's still coming out of the taxpayer's pocket. So that may be one thing to look at. Alderman Garrity I know you had other questions and I apologize for jumping in.

Alderman Garrity stated the charge back situation is what it is. When you come in with your priorities, can we have a yes or a no from the School District of what they're going to do for the West Side and for Clem Lemire Field? Are they going to participate in the maintenance or not and cover some of the funding.

Mr. Ludwig responded Alderman Garrity and Alderman O'Neil is correct about the person at Livingston, it works, it's been proven. For the two years before West came on line we came in with a similar proposal to the School District, and believe me I'm not trying to build an empire of individuals, they could handle it by contract if they wanted straight forward and that's fine with me too...

Alderman Garrity stated I spent four years over there, so I'm certain...

Mr. Ludwig interjected but if they left it up to us, we went in with a proposal to the School District that said we would need a person nine months a year chargeable to you at the field to be there and take care if, the other three months we take them on, we do snowplowing, tree removal, that's the way we use the individual up at Livingston right now. With the cut backs they get that's one of the first things they eliminate from the project and what we're saddled with right now is under the old way we did business at West Memorial and Memorial with two facilities that weren't in very good condition, that's saying it lightly. Was that we went in and did the minimal maintenance that was needed there for the amount of use they got, which wasn't much. No one wanted to use them and that's understandable. Now you have almost a mini Gill at each of these places with far different and more use and we have to look at them that way and they have to treat them differently. I see West sliding downhill a little bit as we speak and I'm going to go there, I think maybe Alderman O'Neil is aware of it, August 3rd and bring some of this up though it may be a slightly different issue, but you can't give up on it.

Alderman Garrity stated just a final comment. We need a commitment from the School District. There's \$10 million in fields and we need the commitment if they're going to maintain them.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding is there has been a pretty good dialogue, they need to take it, both Parks and Schools needs to take it to another level and we have to be partners in this as well somehow and figure out what...but I'd ask any of you that weren't around with the Livingston deal was put together, talk to Ron about it because it has been pretty successful in my eyes.

Alderman Smith stated we can discuss this all night. I really think we have to maintain what we have. We have now three beautiful fields, we have to get the equipment and I think with field turf being in town and the gentleman we're not quite sure that formerly worked for SRI, if Mike Costanza's working and hopefully he can get the money through Harvey Construction we're holding for SRI, to come in and address the uniformity of the crumb rubber down at Gill Stadium and address the boxes, the sliding boxes, I think everything will be restored. And from what I understand, and this is what the gentleman told me and if he comes in you can ask him, the machines are not compatible between Memorial, but they are compatible West Memorial and Gill Stadium. That's what he told us that particular day.

Alderman Shea stated Ron if a person were to be able to work at West, would that same person work at Memorial? In other words, is it necessary to have a person at each place, or could the same person spend a morning at West and in the afternoon

at Memorial or vice versa? In other words, when you discuss any kind of situation with the School Department I'm just explaining certain options here that's all.

Chairman O'Neil stated my thought always had been, and we had talked about this, for instance if you had somebody at Memorial, I know schools also uses McLaughlin for school sports, spring and fall, I believe. I believe St. Anthony's is involved and there might be others, I almost saying that you give a guy a pickup truck and say you've got Memorial High School, you've got St. Anthony's, you've got Prout's Park, whatever, kind of regionalize the maintenance a little bit and maybe it could work. One guy takes care of West and Memorial, I don't know.

Mr. Ludwig stated there are times seasonally when the workload isn't quite the same. In the fall it picks up a little bit because you've got soccer and we've been trying to work with them in terms of cleanup on week ends, which I think maybe Alderman O'Neil is alluding to in terms of cleanliness and they kind of drive the bus, do you want somebody to clean up at West Saturday morning after the Central/Memorial game where there's a large amount of litter? Yes we do, so we'll go in there. When does it need to be done? We have a soccer game at 10:00AM so it must be cleaned. I mean someone can't be coming into the stands that are filthy at 10:00AM. They'll play three or four soccer games on Saturday, then we ask them the question, do you want to clean it on Sunday or do you want to leave it for the man that might be there on Monday morning? We leave that call up to them because we're not trying to build overtime budgets for them, but they have to understand that the litter stays around all weekend. That's not something that we would do at Gill the way we operate it now. It gets picked up right off.

Chairman O'Neil stated just to bring some closure. I think we're all supportive, obviously Finance is going to have to take a look at this enterprise issue. I would ask one more time to reach out as many people as you can on this grooming issue because as I have traveled to some different places, and again, it could be just their opinion, and who knows who is right, we may never know, that the groomers can be used for different products. That's what I've been told. How many of these items listed for Gill Stadium could possible be used to help out at West. We had a sweeper or something at West, which turned out to be not that great.

Mr. Ludwig stated no and that's what the company supplied at the time.

Chairman O'Neil stated so in my opinion we need to look at...Gill is kind of the focus, but can we also support some of that with, if for some reason they were going to play a home football game at Memorial and we had to do snow removal there, that pickup truck would go over and do that. If we could take a look at that stuff, prioritize it, let's talk to Finance, I think we can move forward. I agree with

Alderman Smith. We've made million of dollars in investments, we've got to have the maintenance on this.

Mr. Ludwig asked do you want that information back here at this committee.

Chairman O'Neil replied yes, and if you can get it before the next meeting, that would probably be helpful and we'll get this thing moving.

Alderman Garrity stated can we also get a response from the School District on what they're going to do for maintenance?

Chairman O'Neil stated but again I think Mr. Ludwig has a meeting with them coming up in a couple of weeks and are going to try to work that out. I'll be honest, I'm aware of an issue because there was an issue about somebody using the facility, no restroom, they didn't want to allow you to use the restroom, which was a complete embarrassment. A clinic had to get cancelled because of it, so I think that's what prompted the meeting to get together and get everybody on the same page.

Alderman Garrity asked Ron, are you asking for the School District for a certain number to purchase this equipment? Are you asking for 50 percent? Are you asking them for a number?

Mr. Ludwig answered we haven't identified anything that would be a service agreement or charge back to them at this point. Again, because they want to be treated as a renter not as an owner.

Alderman Garrity stated well they're not a renter on the West Side or the south end. We all know that.

Mr. Ludwig stated but at Memorial it is what it is as you say and at West, it is what it is. They control all the games, they do all of the permitting...

Alderman Garrity interjected so it's your goal to get maybe 50 percent? Is that what you're going to ask them for?

Mr. Ludwig answered right now we're talking about equipment to maintain Gill Stadium. The super groomer we got as a part of the Memorial High School deal, which is an upgraded piece of equipment. If we can use it at Gill and West, so much the better.

Chairman O'Neil stated but in all honesty we're probably going to need, we might need a utility vehicle at each facility.

Mr. Ludwig stated well I think we can cross over with like the utility vehicles, Alderman O'Neil, in certain areas too. Because if there's a little bit of plowing that's needed at West if we had to go there, we could certainly...

Chairman O'Neil stated why don't we put and if need be, we won't necessarily wait a month, but why don't we put Items 18 and 19 on the table to get that information back.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to place Items 18 and 19 on the table pending feedback from Mr. Ludwig on meetings with the School District, prioritize the list if equipment needed, and work with the Planning and Finance Departments to work out the enterprise issues.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 20 of the agenda:

Communication from Nicholas Bonardi requesting the discontinuance of a portion of So. Bedford Street.

(Note: Highway Department supports the discontinuance in conjunction with the proposed Riverfront Development Project.)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted refer the discontinuance petition to a road hearing with such date to be scheduled by the City Clerk's office.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 21 of the agenda:

Sewer abatement request of Theodora Thanos (135 Cedar Street).

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the request for a sewer abatement in the amount of \$261.95, as recommended by the Environmental Protection Division

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 22 of the agenda:

Sewer abatement request of Nelson Kinder Mosseau & Saturley (99 Middle Street).

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to not approve the sewer abatement request.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. MacKenzie stated the City contract with Intown Manchester to perform the services within the Central Service Business District that the District basically pays a special tax for. By State statute and City ordinance there is a special advisory group, that group has been meeting, there are some issues that they would like to raise and questions they'd like resolve, some of those contractual issues. And so we are basically recommending that the committee authorize or concur with either a six to nine month extension of the contract so that the advisory board can do some more of this work.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the six to nine month extension of the contract between the City and Intown Manchester with the Planning Director (Mr. MacKenzie) reporting back to this committee with a recommendation from the Central Service Business District Advisory Committee within that time period. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked this advisory committee, is there a list of people that are on this committee?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes, we would be happy to provide that, although I could tell you who the members are.

Alderman Lopez stated are they an existing committee or is this a new committee?

Mr. MacKenzie answered there have been a couple of new members appointed, but it is a standing committee.

Alderman Lopez stated that's what I thought, and they haven't done anything in the past? Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie answered they normally meet once a year, but while the contract is in effect, normally they just advise on the geographic boundaries for example of the district. Last year they reviewed whether to extend it into the Singer Park area, for example.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't know what is developing in extending this for eight or nine months. Usually an extension of one year would sufficient because the planning aspect of...I guess Intown is involved in this. Right?

Mr. MacKenzie answered Intown is the group that actually gets the money and they are who we contract with currently.

Alderman Lopez stated I've heard some comments about different things about Intown and I want to public say that I think for the money that she does get, it does an excellent job in the City. I think all we have to do is look around. I think also some of the things that I've heard along the line is that the Highway Department could do some of the jobs that Intown does. I'd hate to see that go in that direction. They get \$225,000 from the Central Service Business District, maybe they need to increase in the Central Service Business District for next year's budget, 2006. But I'd be very, very...know when these committee's are going to meet and I think that I'd like to have some input into it because just to make sure that people are not saying and the right information gets to the Central Service Business District that hasn't provided in five years I've been on this board, haven't provided me with anything or this Alderman anything. So I'm very curious as to how all of this came about.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct, the Central Service Business District exists by state law.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is state law and City ordinance and they do meet at least once a year to review.

Chairman O'Neil asked you couldn't have Intown as just a determination of who you contract with, but they're actually...

Alderman Lopez interjected I understand that and thank you for the point. Under state law that's why Intown does exist and I understand all of that.

Chairman O'Neil interjected no, not why Intown exists. Why the Central Service Business District advisory board exists.

Alderman Lopez stated my point is I haven't seen the advisory board here for five years and I was just wondering, what is wrong, what's happening with this contract we have Intown that they want to review it. Are there some problems that we don't know anything about?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I know that the board has reviewed a few issues. They've invited Stephanie Lewry and the Chairman of Intown to come in and review some of those matters. I know one of the matters they looked at and were surprised about was that the contract does not in any way specify what services will be offered and they feel that the contract between the City and Intown should have those specific services enumerated in the contract.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would suggest that there is some dialogue going on now from my understanding between the Central Service Business District and Intown as well as Mr. MacKenzie. Let's let that continue and when they're ready to come back to us. I think we probably should stay out of it at this point.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure just about the last comment. I just want to make sure that Intown, who has done a tremendous job for the City of Manchester, that there is some input and actual facts other than... One of the things that I hear that Intown like you've indicated that on helping some of the non-profit organizations to get some activities going is not spelled in the contract, and I understand that. But I'd hate to see that eliminated because that's the only resources that some of the non-profit organizations have.

Chairman O'Neil stated that ultimately comes back to us anyway. Correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied technically in this there is a 1-year option renewal and I have the ability to extend that, but I have requested concurrence from this committee because basically you handle the dollars.

Chairman O'Neil asked but if for some reason the Central Service Business District advised some other startup group, that would still have to come back to the City for approval?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve the six to nine month extension of the contract between the City and Intown Manchester with the Planning Director (Mr. MacKenzie) reporting back to this committee with a recommendation from the Central Service Business District Advisory Committee within that time period. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEM

23. Derryfield Park Rehabilitation Phase II.
(Tabled 10/14/2003)

This item remained on the table.

07/20/2004 CIP

30

There being no further business to come before the committee, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee