

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

August 2, 2010

6:15 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Ludwig, Shea, Craig, Greazzo

Messrs.: Lt. Tessier, R. Tourigny, P. Capano, R. Duval, M. Allard,
S. Maranto, M. Laroche, K. Sheppard, K. DeFrancis, L. LaFreniere,
K. O'Maley, E. Annunziata

Chairman O'Neil stated if the Committee would bear with me there are a couple of items that we should be able to take care of quickly and get the folks out of here so they don't have to sit through the entire meeting.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Police Chief, requesting acceptance of a donation of a vehicle to the Police Department by the National Insurance Crime Bureau.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to discuss this item.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Police Chief, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount of \$36,606 from the US Department of Justice to operate a multi-jurisdictional drug task force and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding from Deputy Chief Simmons is that this is pretty routine.

Alderman Ludwig moved to approve the request. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Greazzo asked does this have one of those fabulous requirements where we are required to spend more money later on if we accept this grant? Usually there is an attachment to some of these grants that we will give you this money now but we want you to spend your own money later to continue the program.

Ms. Maureen Tessier, Police Department Lieutenant, responded forgive me because I am not completely informed on the grant. It is my understanding that it is a very routine grant that has been a yearly thing.

Chairman O'Neil asked are you talking about the COPS grant, Alderman Greazzo, which said we will fund three years but you have to pick up another year? I don't believe that is the case with this one.

Ms. Tessier answered this is a year-by-year grant.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 21 of the agenda:

21. Discussion relative to the First Time Homebuyers Review.

Chairman O'Neil stated representatives from NeighborWorks are here. This should be pretty routine.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mr. Robert Tourigny, NeighborWorks Greater Manchester, introduced himself and Kelly Coffey, the Home Ownership Manager. He stated we have presented a loan request for the down payment and closing cost assistance program for the City of Manchester, which we have administered for several years.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Presentation from Peter Capano, Chief of Parks, of the Stormwater Analysis Report – Ray Brook Stormwater Study.

Chairman O'Neil asked Alderman Craig, is there anything you would like to say before the presentation starts?

Alderman Craig responded yes I will give a brief overview. The City retained T.F. Moran to study the hydrology of Ray Brook going from Dorrs Pond Dam down to the Merrimack River. The purpose of the study was three-fold. First it was to analyze the ability of the culverts and channels along the brook's waterway to accept stormwater runoff. The second was to investigate problem areas and identify flow restrictions. The third was to provide recommendations for planning purposes to reduce flooding and improve the capacity of the waterway. In addition, the hydraulic capacity of the dam and spillway were also analyzed and compared to the requirements for a Class C High Hazard Dam as the Dorrs Pond Dam is now listed by the NH DES. With that, I would like to have Peter Capano and Bob Duval provide an overview of the results from this study.

Mr. Peter Capano, Chief of Parks, stated I appreciate being here with you tonight. Alderman Craig did a very nice job of introducing the study and I won't repeat that. I will turn it right over to Bob Duval who is the author of the report from T.F. Moran.

Mr. Robert Duval, Engineer, T.F. Moran, stated as Alderman Craig pointed out, we were retained to study the Dorrs Pond and Ray Brook waterways and look for problem areas. In the course of our report, which was a very thorough analysis of the hydrology of that watershed, we did find three restrictions. Starting at the Merrimack River and working our way up, the culvert under River Road is undersized for the amount of flow it is exposed to and should be enlarged. The culvert at Elm Street is also undersized for the flow that it is exposed to and should be enlarged. Finally, the grate at Clarke Street, although it is adequately sized, should be and currently is planned to be kept free of debris. That is not really a restriction so much as a potential restriction unless it is kept clear of debris. However, the River Road and Elm Street culverts should be made larger. Because these are culverts under existing City roads with utility crossings and very close to public property, it would be somewhat expensive to make these replacements. We are anticipating something on the order of \$500,000 to replace the River Road culvert and something like \$1.5 million to replace the Elm Street culvert. In addition, the Dorrs Pond Dam itself, in order to comply with the High Hazard designation that the DES has given it, should also have some improvements made to it. These improvements could range from a complete replacement of the dam to

what we are suggesting in our report which is to instead provide a secondary outlet. The problem with the DES classification of the dam is that it doesn't pass enough water without overtopping. So you either have to raise the dam or you have to provide a second spillway to pass the additional water so that the dam doesn't overtop as much. We are suggesting that if a secondary spillway is provided the dam would then be safe and comply with DES regulations. The cost of that is around \$200,000. So if you add all of that up together you are somewhere in the range of \$2.2 million. Let me caveat this that this is strictly a drainage report. It is not a design and these numbers are not cast in stone. These are approximate numbers strictly for planning purposes and I would say there is a fair range that should be associated with each of those numbers. Nevertheless, it does give us a sense of what improvements ought to be made and the cost of those improvements. We are still in discussion with DES and in fact we met with them today about the recommendations for the secondary spillway in lieu of raising the dam. They are going to get back to us on that so that part of the report has not been finalized yet, pending further discussions with DES. As a snapshot of where we are and for the work that we have done we feel quite confident that the hydraulic analysis is complete and that our recommendations are well-founded. As far as what the ultimate solution would be, I would say we probably need to wait a month or so to have some dialogue with DES but after that time we should be ready to come back with a final report.

Alderman Craig asked could you take a moment and define what a High Hazard Dam is?

Mr. Duval answered let me actually read you the definition, which is fairly brief. Class C Structure means a dam that has a high hazard potential because it is in a location and of a size that failure or non-operation of the dam would result in probable loss of human life as a result of water levels and velocities causing structural failure of: a) foundation of a residential structure or commercial or industrial structure occupied under normal conditions; b) water levels rising above the first floor elevation of a habitable residential structure or commercial or industrial structure which is occupied under normal conditions; c) structural damage to an interstate highway which would render the roadway impassable or otherwise interrupt public safety services; d) release of a quantity of hazardous waste materials; or e) any other circumstance which would more likely than not cause one or more deaths.

Alderman Craig asked so it doesn't necessarily mean that the dam structure itself is not safe? It is how the water overtops and how many homes or businesses are downstream that would classify it as a High Hazard?

Mr. Duval replied that is right. The High Hazard has nothing to do with normal operation and hundred year storms and that sort of thing. It has to do with what would happen if the dam were to suddenly fail.

Alderman Craig responded and that is one of the things that we need to consider when doing this list is requirements from the state on that dam. Correct?

Mr. Duval answered because it is a Class C dam, under the state's definition, it has to meet certain criteria. Those criteria include that it has to pass two and a half times the flow of a hundred year storm. So a hundred year storm is already a lot of water but because it is a high hazard dam you have to show that it can handle two and a half times that amount within certain criteria. That is why we are looking at alternatives.

Alderman Craig asked with that and the suggestions that you have made so far, it would be impossible to make the changes just to the Dorrs Pond dam if we have the areas at Elm Street and River Road that narrow down and wouldn't handle the higher velocity of water, correct?

Mr. Duval answered that is right. If you introduced that second spillway, you would actually be increasing the flow downstream which you wouldn't want to do unless you had previously made these other improvements. If you make these other improvements, you have greatly increased the capacity of Ray Brook. Most of Ray Brook from Clarke Street to Chestnut Street is a six by eight foot box culvert already. That six by eight foot box culvert is plenty big enough to handle a 100 year flow and then some. The only reason it is not doing that is because of the choke points at Elm Street and River Road that are only four by five feet or five by five feet. So they are substantially smaller than the primary box culvert. If you remove those choke points, Ray Brook will flow very well and the levels of flooding will decrease dramatically, which would give you the capacity to make improvements or add still way at Dorrs Pond without any downstream effects.

Mr. Capano stated we should also note that there has been a lot of maintenance activity on the dam. We are following closely the state recommendations for the maintenance of the dam. Further, we have a very good emergency operation plan in place to operate the dam to get the most water saving capacity out of it that we can.

Alderman Shea stated having no knowledge of this at all and just taking notes here, you said that the culvert at the Merrimack River is undersized. Is that the place to begin with if, in fact, we were trying to solve this problem? In other words, working back from the Merrimack River to Elm Street to Stark Street or does it make any difference where the culvert improvement is implemented? In

other words, \$2.2 million is a lot of money at this time obviously so give us your answer to that question.

Mr. Duval replied the three choke points are from the beginning of the river going upstream to River Road, that culvert. The next one would be going from River Road upstream to Elm Street. Then the next area needing improvements would be the dam itself. If you were to try to phase this, the first thing you should do is the most downstream because you don't want to expand an opening upstream and let more water through and make a bad situation even worse downstream. If you start at River Road for \$500,000 or so and get that one done that will give you the capacity so that when you make Elm Street bigger that will pass easily downstream and then you have created capacity for when you improve the dam so that everything will flow through. If you do it the other way around you are just going to cause greater problems downstream.

Alderman Shea asked is there any state help for either one of those areas?

Mr. Capano answered there may be hazard mitigation grants out there and we are going to actively pursue those.

Chairman O'Neil asked would those funds be eligible for only the dam or for the dam and culvert repair?

Mr. Capano answered actually I don't believe they are eligible for the dam but they are eligible for the culverts.

Chairman O'Neil asked and those are called what again?

Mr. Capano answered hazard mitigation grants.

Alderman Ludwig stated Bob, I didn't hear you mention anything about the relationship, or maybe it doesn't have anything to do with it, but of Goldfish Pond.

Mr. Duval responded well, Goldfish Pond is part of our study. Our analysis included the analysis that was done by DOT of Goldfish Pond. We examined that and included that in our model of Dorrs Pond. Ultimately Dorrs Pond starts way up in Hooksett almost up to Bypass 28. That is the upper reach of it. It collects in that sort of rural area and then it flows down across 93 at a couple of points and then it goes into Goldfish Pond and then from Goldfish Pond into Dorrs Pond where it collects at more culverts and then from Dorrs Pond into Ray Brook where it collects at more culverts. It is part of this problem, if you will, but it is not a cause of the problem. The restrictions that we found had nothing to do with operation or misoperation or anything that could be done substantially at Goldfish

Pond. The problems that we saw were caused by the restriction...the primary problem was caused by the restriction at Elm Street. The reason that Elm Street is having an effect on Clarke Street is because that culvert, that six by eight foot box culvert, is very flat. If you are raising water at the outlet of this very flat culvert, you are really backwatering that culvert all the way up to Clarke Street. When you eliminate that restriction and that backwater, you all of the sudden have that entire culvert available to carry water. If you don't eliminate that restriction, you only have part of that culvert able to carry water because the rest is full. That is the real problem. It really isn't Goldfish Pond or Dorrs Pond per se that is causing flooding even on Clarke Street. It is the downstream choke point that is clogging up the system.

Alderman Ludwig stated I am not an engineer and obviously the people who did this study must know what is going on but in the years of my existence...I know over the past four or five years we have had some very strange events going back to the Mother's Day flood in May and the following year it seemed to be April and I guess we thought we were over all of those storms and then we got flooded in June or July. Over the last three to five years we have had some very unusual circumstances but prior to that, and correct me Peter because you may know the answer to this, but I don't remember this kind of flooding taking place. What has changed in terms of...backing out the last three to five years, and I know we have had some really strange years in terms of...I think we had 18 inches on the Mother's Day flood and that is a pretty difficult one to compare any statistical data to but going back, and my memory is problem failing a little bit, but I don't remember any huge problems in terms of the backup. Has the grate been clogged before on Clarke Street? Yes it has been clogged before and there has been some minor flooding down there but do you or does anybody else remember any significant problems outside of five years? I will tell you where I am going with this. I think it was this year when some people came to me and said we are lowering the level of Dorrs Pond and they did it at such a time when the ice around the perimeter actually collapsed into the pond. I asked them why they were doing that. Their answer was that they had to get Ray Brook to accept more water from Goldfish Pond. That made no sense to me and then I think we had some people in here that live well I don't know if they live there but there was a gentleman in here saying that you can't lower the water level in Dorrs Pond anymore like that because we end up with these swampy stinky areas out in the woods. He had some merit. There just seems to me to be some interaction between Goldfish Pond and Dorrs Pond that I don't remember happening. It seems to go back to and I think the Mayor will probably remember the date when they had flooding up there at Crosbie Street. Since that time it seems like they don't want to be flooded anymore and I would totally agree with that but we seem to be out of balance between what happens at Crosbie Street and Goldfish Pond and what is happening at Dorrs Pond. Never before have I heard of anything that

says there are failures on Elm Street. I know that Bob has looked at it and I totally respect their opinion in terms of what is going on there but are we absolutely sure that there is no direct correlation between Goldfish and Dorrs and how much water goes over the top or around the side or through or whatever? It seems like a comedy of errors to me for a period of time there.

Mr. Capano replied we are confident that what Goldfish sends out we can handle at Dorrs. The problem is, if we pass it through too quickly we will run into problems like Bob previously described. Goldfish Pond, when Crosbie Street was flooded, wasn't maintained...the outlet structure wasn't maintained. It got clogged and they couldn't get at it anymore. The water came up so high so quickly that it held the water in it. Had it been able to pass the water down then maybe the damage wouldn't have gotten to Crosbie Street. It is tough to say today. As a result you see Goldfish Pond or Goldfish Mud Flats now isn't it? There is almost no water in there at all. They have lowered it as far as they possibly can and they want to leave it that way. That is a choice for them to make at the state. Should they decide to raise that back up and pass all of the water downstream, we can accommodate it at Dorrs Pond. As far as what is happening now as opposed to five years ago, I don't know, but my sense is something is happening as well.

Alderman Ludwig responded I would venture to guess that Parks employees never knew there were boards in Dorrs Pond prior to this year.

Mr. Capano answered right you are. Everybody that I have spoken with at Parks, long-term employees, told me that they never operated that dam before but now we will. This goes to your point...

Alderman Ludwig interjected and it never flooded.

Mr. Capano responded right.

Alderman Ludwig stated unless the grate was clogged on Clarke Street. I hope there is not a lack of coordination here between a bunch of different groups.

Mr. Capano stated we are here in large part though because DES said it needs to meet today's standards and it clearly does not do that.

Alderman Craig stated I have one point in terms of what has changed over the years. We have certainly seen an increase in development with homes and businesses in that area where the water feeds into Dorrs Pond. Even today we have eight or nine houses that just came up on Campbell Street. I think that is one change that we have discussed and we need to know.

Mr. Duval stated if I can just amplify on that point, there has been incremental development at the Goldfish Pond watershed as well as the Dorrs Pond watershed itself, and Ray Brook. I think the key point of our study here has been that those in and of themselves have not been significant changes. That six by eight foot culvert that was built in the 70's was actually adequately sized. The problem is local to the choke points. To take an example, if you have a street and the grate at the low point of the street is clogged with leaves, there will be flooding in that street even though the pipe has plenty of capacity that is not being used. In a broader sense, that is really what happened at Goldfish Pond a couple of years ago and that is what happened at Clarke Street earlier this year. Those are issues that are the real causes here. They are maintenance issues. There will always be issues that need attention. No matter what you build you have to maintain it and keep it clear. I suppose the good news in my report is that the basic system, the primary culvert, has adequate capacity for everything that is coming from Goldfish Pond and everything that is coming from Dorrs Pond including this incremental development we have seen over the years. There have really been at least two separate independent hydraulic analyses. The one that we did initially in our first report and then the one that the state did. We looked at the two. We put them together and we used the more accurate and more thorough parts of both. They are all consistent and show a very similar pattern with different methodologies as far as the amount of flow that we are getting. I feel very confident that the model is as accurate as hydraulic studies ever get and that the system capacity is there. It is just a question of removing the choke points at this point.

Alderman Shea moved to table this item

Chairman O'Neil stated before I accept that motion, we now have, because of the most recent challenges, a formal management plan that has been practiced for the last X number of storms. You see it. The state is part of it. They are out there to address Goldfish Pond. Parks personnel are at Dorrs Pond. Fire personnel are manning at least the first pass of cleaning the grate at Clarke Street and I guess then Public Works people come in. So we do have a management plan that is going to hopefully improve the situation during some of these challenging weather events. I think, however, that it has been pointed out that we have some potential failures and we have to in the long-term come up with a plan to address them. I will accept Alderman Shea's motion to table. I know you indicated that you will be meeting with the state again at some point and you don't have a date as of now but I think we need to continue the discussions. I have talked to Mr. Sheppard about whether this will tie into the CSO. He doesn't think so but it is worth exploring a little more. I don't know to what level. We have to see what grant opportunities are out there and come back with a recommending plan for us to adopt.

Mr. Capano stated one word we haven't heard tonight is preliminary. This is still a preliminary report.

Chairman O'Neil responded right, so it is still in draft form. I know when we get ready to accept it that Alderman Craig has asked Mr. Duval to put it in an executive summary that can be given out to the public but we are not ready for that at this point.

Alderman Long asked in the capital budget with the state this year, \$225,000 was approved. Is that in this mix? The state appropriated \$225,000 for Dorrs Pond.

Chairman O'Neil stated the Mayor is saying \$500,000.

Alderman Craig responded based on the meeting we had today with Jim Gallagher we were told \$125,000.

Alderman Long replied I was there when it was negotiated and I believe it was...well I signed off on \$225,000. Originally it was for \$500,000. They took it all out and we got it back to \$225,000.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Long, you could do your colleagues a great service by confirming the number. The Mayor has been told numbers and Alderman Craig has been told numbers. I don't know...Peter do you have a number that you have been told?

Mr. Capano responded I was at the same meeting with the state today as Alderman Craig and...

Alderman Long interjected I was at the Committee on Conference and we signed off on \$225,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked if you can chase that down for us that would be great. What is the number?

Alderman Craig stated I just wanted to mention that once we do hear back from the state I will be holding a neighborhood meeting so that everyone can come forward and make comments.

Alderman Greazzo duly seconded the motion to table. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will meet the first Monday in September or the first Monday after Labor Day. If you are ready then that is fine. If not, it will be the first Monday in October.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, informing the Committee that the lease of the City owned building at 177 Lake Avenue is up for renewal.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to receive and file this communication.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Petitions for discontinuance of Lincoln and Hayward Streets, submitted by Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to refer the petition to a Road Hearing at a date to be determined by the City Clerk.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Marie LaRoche, from the Namaske Lake Association, requesting \$1,620 from the City, for the milfoil treatment done last month in Namaske Lake (aka Piscataquog River).

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman O'Neil called the Namaske Lake Association representatives forward.

Ms. Marie Laroche and Mr. Mike Allard introduced themselves.

Chairman O'Neil stated I will start. My concern is you are asking us to approve money for a project that has already been completed.

Mr. Allard responded it is complete but it hasn't been paid for yet.

Chairman O'Neil replied well, we traditionally don't do business that way in the City. If there was any consideration, I don't know how we could do it to be honest with you.

Mr. Allard responded understood. This isn't the first time we have brought this up. We have been working on this for about two and a half years. Incidentally, it was originally caused by the 2006 flood that you were just talking about. We actually came to the City's Conservation Committee and spoke to a number of Aldermen. The problem is that to clean up a mess like this takes a number of different organizations. Over the last two and a half years, in addition to going to the City of Manchester, we have gone to the Town of Goffstown, we have gone to our residents, we have gone to the State of New Hampshire, and we have gone to the operator of the dam, Enel North America. The difficulty was getting everybody to commit the funds during the same year. This year we got the state to kick in one-third of the money and we got the Town of Goffstown to actually vote on a significant portion of the money. We got a \$5,000 donation from Enel North America, the operator of the dam. We are short about \$1,500. We actually had gone to the Conservation Commission in 2008 and presented it to them and they made a recommendation to the City of Manchester that if the Town of Goffstown comes up with their portion of the money that the City of Manchester should participate as well. The bottom line is if we didn't get this done this year, the state funds probably would not be available in the future. I don't know if everyone here is familiar with how bad milfoil is in the State of New Hampshire or the City of Manchester or the Town of Goffstown but it is a significant issue.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have the name of the person who made that commitment to you from the Conservation Commission that said if the Town of Goffstown came up with their share the City of Manchester would commit our funds?

Mr. Allard answered it was on September 4, 2008. We presented to the Manchester Conservation Commission. The Commission voted to send a letter to the City of Manchester recommending that they financially support the clean up as long as the Town of Goffstown participates as well. That is from the meeting minutes.

Chairman O'Neil stated if they were forwarding that letter to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, I will be honest that I can't tell you for sure that it ever came before the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. We can research it but that certainly in no way is a commitment from the City regarding funding.

Mr. Allard replied I understand. That is why we are here asking.

Chairman O'Neil responded but you are asking after the fact.

Alderman Shea stated I am wondering how often we would help out another community.

Mr. Allard replied no, this is for the Manchester community.

Alderman Shea asked what do you mean, it is Manchester? Aren't you representing Goffstown?

Mr. Allard answered no. The Namaske Lake Association has 120 members, 35 of which are from the City of Manchester. The lake itself is 200 acres and 25 of those acres are in the City of Manchester. The only public access to the entire 200 acres is from the City of Manchester.

Alderman Shea asked so you are saying that the City of Manchester is part of your association?

Mr. Allard replied no. Residents of the City of Manchester are part of the association.

Alderman Shea asked but not Manchester itself?

Mr. Allard answered not the City of Manchester.

Alderman Greazzo asked is this the area over by the ice arena near the train trestle?

Mr. Allard answered yes, it is.

Alderman Greazzo stated maybe in our discussion regarding the improvement the train trestle we can sort of incorporate this milfoil issue since it is going to be an ongoing matter.

Mr. Allard responded it is absolutely going to be an ongoing matter. Our expectation is...this clean up was around \$43,000 and on an ongoing basis we are probably going to need around \$5,000 every other year to maintain it.

Alderman Greazzo stated I would suggest in the future sometime moving forward with this and incorporating the milfoil adjustment in the project for the train trestle.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think going forward we can certainly be part of the discussions. I am going to speak for myself and not for my colleagues or for the Mayor. A request after a project is done is not the norm here. I can't support you with that. We might be able to participate going forward but it has to be clear on...it should be assigned to a City department.

Mr. Allard replied I certainly appreciate that and completely understand it. I am sure everybody here who is in politics understands that coordinating an effort between the state, a town, a city, a private company and the citizens is a very difficult process. We really had no choice but to do it the way we did it in order to get this cleaned up this year. This is actually the third year in. Every year that went by, the milfoil got worse and worse. I don't know if you recall but a year ago there was an article in the *Union Leader* saying that the State of New Hampshire who had investigated our lake said it was the worst infestation in the entire State of New Hampshire. I understand what you are saying but in order to get this cleaned up we had to do what we had to do. It did not leave time for us to come to the City of Manchester in advance and ask for...well we tried but we couldn't get on the agenda at the time.

Chairman O'Neil responded I apologize that the Conservation Commission led you down a certain path that maybe they should not have. It was not within their power to commit funds from the City.

Alderman Craig asked Sam, is there money available to contribute to this?

Mr. Sam Maranto, CIP, answered I think the only funding we could utilize at this time would be City funds, and as you are aware, we have zero dollars allocated in CIP from contingency.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think what we are going to have to do is receive and file your communication but it might be an opportunity to start a dialogue going forward with the City. I think we would have to figure out the appropriate department. I don't know who that is tonight. Marie, we have your contact information, correct? No, your letter is just signed.

Marie Laroche, Namaske Lake Association, replied I am not sure if I gave you that.

Mrs. Heather Freeman, City Clerk's office, stated we have that information.

Chairman O'Neil stated maybe we can open some discussion going forward. I am sorry about this.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to receive and file this communication.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will make sure that we open up dialogue with you in the future and good luck in your efforts.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from the Goffstown Board of Selectmen regarding the former B & M Railroad Trestle.

Chairman O'Neil stated I believe we can receive and file this item. It has been referred to Lands & Buildings.

Alderman Shea stated I move to have the Chairman of the Lands & Buildings Committee, as well as the Mayor, meet with the representatives from the Goffstown Board of Selectmen regarding the B&M Railroad Trestle.

Alderman Greazzo duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, regarding installation of Elm Street banner poles.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman O'Neil stated I had a brief discussion with Mr. Maranto about this. Your Honor, do you want to speak on it or do you want Mr. Maranto to give an overview?

Mayor Gatsas responded I would like to speak on it. I talked to Sam...obviously we have a banner that goes across Hanover Street. I know that in the past the Board has had discussions about when we hang banners should we charge a fee. I certainly would think that putting something up across Elm Street that is the main thoroughfare...if we are going to do something like this obviously it is about advertising things that are happening in the City like the Chili Cook-Off. At that point I think we are probably going to have the ability to raise the money from the Chili Cook-Off funding to maybe reimburse the City for those poles. Certainly it

is something that we should look at. If we are going to do something that is going to promote things in the City of Manchester then if you want to hang a banner there we should charge a fee for it. I think that everybody kind of laughed when we talked about the City Clerk having weddings here at City Hall. Well I can tell you that what they put in their budget for this year I think they have already surpassed that in the first month. I think it is a revenue situation. Whatever the Clerk can come up with as a number that makes sense it is a revenue source that we can have. If somebody wants to put their banner up we should charge them accordingly whether it is on a per week basis or per day basis. It would be revenue to the City and certainly an opportunity for the City to start advertising some of the things that we are going to be doing. I had communication last week with the Senior Games that are starting and we kicked off last week that it would be nice to see if we could get the National Senior Games to come here to Manchester. The question was well do we have enough accommodations for 14,000 people. Certainly the Chili Cook-Off is talking about between 50,000 and 80,000 so I think that Ms. Cousineau who is now President of the Senior Games is going to put an application in to see if we can get them. I think it is an opportunity for the City to advertise appropriately the different events in the City and that is why I asked Mr. Maranto to see if he can find the \$11,000 to put those up. It may be a little bit more because the span is a little greater than what it is on Hanover Street and we have to make sure we get it high enough so that the fire trucks can get by them and we are not interfering with them.

Chairman O'Neil stated I need some clarification. If there was a fee involved are you talking only for this particular banner and not what we do on Hanover Street? I think Alderman Ouellette has shared with us...I am not sure they have used it yet but there are a couple of poles over on Kelley Street. We would not be charging for those, correct?

Mayor Gatsas responded I think with this being a main thoroughfare that is going to get somebody an awful lot of advertising if they want to use it, then certainly it is something...

Chairman O'Neil interjected and we could come up with some guidelines. In the letter there is an indication that there is some money in Mr. Minkarah's department.

Mayor Gatsas replied there is some funding that Sam has talked to Mr. Minkarah about that certainly is available. Again as I said we are doing a pretty good job of raising money from the sponsors of this thing and maybe we can get enough coming back at the end to repay the City.

Chairman O'Neil asked and this will be designed and constructed by the Highway Department?

Mayor Gatsas answered absolutely.

Alderman Shea stated my concern about this is that the...I think we discussed this years back and the Fire Department was opposed to banners on Elm Street simply because of the type of equipment that they use. My concern would be, does the main area of a City...is that the right kind of venue for this kind of a situation? I am a little bit concerned about whether...the idea is fine as far as trying to raise revenue. Certainly I am not opposed to that but I am opposed to what impact that might have overall. Not when a particular activity is going on but the fact that there is going to be that kind of a venue or situation on Elm Street. I am really not completely sold on the idea of putting banners on Elm Street. Hanover Street and on the west side or other places that come into the main area is fine. Where would these particular poles be located?

Mayor Gatsas replied we are talking about between Veteran's Park and Stanton Plaza. They wouldn't be right here in front of City Hall. They would be down at that end of Elm Street.

Alderman Shea asked so they wouldn't be right here at Hanover Street? They would be down around Merrimack Street?

Mayor Gatsas answered correct. Just after Merrimack Street.

Alderman Shea asked how high would they have to be in order to accommodate...

Mayor Gatsas interjected it is certainly something we would talk to the Fire Department about to make sure the accommodations are there. Obviously, knock on wood, fire engines still have to come down Hanover Street and there are banners there. I would assume that they have already met that criteria on Hanover Street.

Alderman Shea responded I am not sure if they come down Merrimack Street or Hanover Street.

Mayor Gatsas replied they probably do but if they have to get to Hanover Street and go down to that area I am sure the banner is high enough so the trucks can get under them.

Chairman O'Neil stated Pleasant and Elm is a very key spot. I think there is a large shamrock there for the St. Patrick's Day parade so it is very appropriate, Your Honor, that you picked out that stop for the banner.

Alderman Greazzo stated I have a question for the Highway Director. Do we have poles on opposing sides of Elm Street that we can cable a banner to rather than installing additional poles?

Chairman O'Neil stated we have been through this discussion on Hanover Street and it gets into a liability...are you talking about light poles?

Alderman Greazzo replied we already have the poles with the short banner extensions on them and I am wondering if we have some on opposing sides of the street.

Chairman O'Neil responded it became a liability issue. That very discussion has come up in the past and it came to a liability issue. They are not designed to span the street. That is why we committed some funds for Hanover Street as well as Kelley Street.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated correct. Typically a street light pole is not designed to handle the wind load that would be put on it if you hung a banner between light poles across the street. If you figure the wind load that comes across that, the light poles aren't designed for that. The small banners, when we spec those, are designed for that such as on Kelley Street. To hang a banner across Elm Street, if you think of the wind load, if there is a wind coming down Elm Street even if you put some holes in the banner those poles would not be able to withstand it.

Alderman Ludwig moved to approve the request. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion.

Mr. Maranto asked can you identify a figure for that?

Chairman O'Neil asked Mayor, do you have a good number?

Mayor Gatsas answered I think the number they looked at was \$11,000 but that was for a smaller span.

Mr. Maranto stated I did speak to the Highway Department on Friday and they are still looking into it. They said between \$11,000 and \$13,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked so if we approve up to \$13,000 does that sound reasonable, Your Honor? Is that included in your motion Alderman Ludwig?

Alderman Ludwig responded yes.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve up to \$13,000 in CDBG funds to install banner poles on Elm Street. The motion carried, with Aldermen Shea and Greazzo being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, regarding a request for funds in the amount of \$16,000 for the Y.O.U. Program.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Shea stated Sam Maranto explained to me today about the funding. I am not sure if we could start with Sam and maybe he could answer any questions that members of the Committee have.

Mr. Maranto stated what we are trying to accomplish here is that the Y.O.U. Program, in addition to City CDBG funds, has some other source of funds that I believe are private funds and don't have restrictions on where they can go. They are trying to accomplish meeting a shortfall of the funds that are being cut by the Department of Health & Human Services. I believe it is \$135,000. I was asked if we could use CDBG funds to accommodate that. My answer was no but we could utilize CDBG to assist the Y.O.U. Essentially what we would be doing is increasing the Y.O.U. and they would ship those other funds to the other project thereby funding both projects. As I indicated, I had the balance from the Weed 'n Seed Program which did not need the \$70,000 that was allocated, and I have closed out a few CIP projects as well. That is where the funding would come from.

Alderman Craig asked are there any grants within the School District that would cover this specifically? Any Title I or Drop Out Prevention or District In Need of Improvement?

Ms. Karen DeFrancis, School District, answered I would have to go back and research that. We have a grant writer who can certainly look into something like that but I would not have an answer tonight.

Alderman Greazzo asked can somebody explain the STAY Program, the TAP Program and the Y.O.U. Program? What do they do?

Mayor Gatsas answered the Y.O.U. Program is an after school program at the Beech Street School. It is an incredible program. I think when this came up what happened was a lot of the non-profits that are distributing funding have asked for completion of applications and I think for some reason this didn't get into the mix for the place that it was supposed to be funded. We had already passed our CIP budget. The Y came to me and asked if there was anything we could do to help them out this year so they didn't have to cut the program. I came forward and asked Sam if he could find any monies and move things around in CIP. Because of the funding source they were looking for, we couldn't do anything there but we could move it into another area with the funding Sam had and then they could reallocate within their own budget into some other line items. That is why this is here. They didn't have the opportunity to fund it. They were going to have to cut some of the programs if we didn't come forward with the \$16,000. I think the programs that they offer for after school are not anything that we can cut today. We found the funding with federal dollars and not cash dollars so I think it is an appropriate thing for us to move forward with. Again, I think the definitions of the program were just handed out.

Alderman Greazzo replied I do and I am wondering if the State program, the TAP Program, provides similar services. If there is a duplication I don't see why we need to have all of these other programs at separate schools. This is run by the YMCA but it is done at the school?

Mayor Gatsas responded they use the school to run the program at. It is actually the Y running it at Beech Street School.

Chairman O'Neil stated if you recall during the CIP discussion we did spend some time, probably not enough, trying to get our arms around what is going on out in the community and duplication and who is doing what. Unfortunately I still don't think we have a good handle on what social services are doing either in the schools or out of the schools.

Alderman Craig stated these are extremely valuable programs and I wish they could accommodate more students because they truly are...they just bring so much to the children who don't have opportunities. If this is time sensitive I certainly will vote in favor of this but I would like Karen to double-check to see if there are any other grants from the School District's perspective that would cover the type of programs these are.

Chairman O'Neil asked Your Honor, do you happen to know if this is time sensitive?

Mayor Gatsas answered it is time sensitive. We were supposed to get something done right away so that they could work it into their budget because I think they are putting their final numbers together. It is time sensitive. These discussions happened I want to say back in April or May and it is now just coming forward because Sam was looking for money to fund it.

Alderman Shea stated I concur with Alderman Craig and move that we approve the request. Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil asked Karen, you will get that information to the Committee?

Ms. DeFrancis answered I will.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we need to continue to get our arms around the social service agencies, not only their involvement in the School District but also in the City in general to make sure there is not duplication. I don't believe there is with these programs but we do need to continue to do that work.

Alderman Greazzo stated I need a clarification. If we are approving this does Ms. DeFrancis need to actually look for a grant or do we do it the other way around and let her look for a grant and then approve it? If we approve it there is no need for her to look for money.

Chairman O'Neil replied I think both things can go on. I think we can approve it and look for the grant.

Alderman Greazzo asked how would you receive the grant if you already funded the program?

Mayor Gatsas asked is this coming out for tomorrow's meeting or next month?

City Clerk Matt Normand answered September was the plan.

Mayor Gatsas stated I still think that gives us an opportunity if she finds money in some other funding spot we can correct that in September. If not, we will just have it on the agenda for September's meeting.

Alderman Greazzo asked would that be an acceptable amendment to the motion? That we accept this in the event that they are not able to find their own grant?

Chairman O'Neil answered yes that would be.

Alderman Greazzo moved to amend the motion to approve the request in the event that the School District is not able to find a grant to fund the programs. Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated what I would like to comment on is the fact that Alderman Craig mentioned and that is that each school is sort of part of the School District but they have their own entities. In other words a school in one section of the City isn't the same as another. It is very difficult to actually put together a particular type of situation that would be indigenous to one school but indigenous to another school and that is to say be common to it. There are certain problems existing in parts of the City where you have a large immigrant type of situation that may not be in another part of the City. I think that we have to make that distinction so that when we focus on a particular project it is because of the problems existing in that particular school rather than it being a district-wide program.

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

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve funds in the amount of \$16,000 in the event that the School District cannot find grant funds. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Gatsas asked can we take item 19 out of order? You may want to ask me some questions about that also.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 19 of the agenda:

19. Discussion relative to a request by New Hampshire Minority Health Coalition for temporary financial assistance.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mr. Maranto stated essentially the NH Minority Health Coalition is experiencing what you would call a cash flow situation right now whereby a majority of their grants are not coming in until October. As such they are looking for assistance. They went to Jeanne Shaheen's office who in turn contacted the Mayor's office asking if, in fact, we could accelerate our CDBG payment to them this year. I was asked if we could do that. Unfortunately we have not received our approval yet from HUD but even if we did have it I guess I would have a concern about the

fiscal liability of this organization. We have been looking at their financial records. Somebody from our office has sat down with Mr. Doran. We looked them over to determine what his situation is and why he is in this particular situation. I have spoken to Patrick Tufts from the United Way who indicated that he would sit down with the NH Minority Health Coalition. Essentially they are in the hole for about \$80,000, which represents two months of their operating income. In looking at their financial situation they basically had a reserve of about \$1 million five years ago and each year they have eroded that to the point that it doesn't exist anymore. Apparently they have some grants and they have staff and when the grants went away they made a decision to continue to fund those positions. I guess I would recommend that if we are going to continue to fund them we have to make sure of what they are doing in the future to make sure their doors are open. If we were to give them CDBG funds and they closed their doors in a couple of months that is not an effective way of using our funds. Elise from my office has spoken with Mr. Doran and he is looking at a game plan for what the organization is going to do moving forward. One of the items that came up that was very striking was the amount of rent that they are paying. I believe it is somewhere around \$48,000. That is something that they need to look at. Their lease happens to be up in October. What they are looking at from us would be a consideration for a loan. I understand they would be able to pay us back within 120 days. They are looking for \$87,000. If we were to consider anything I would be reluctant to give that amount; perhaps in combination with United Way. They have 15 employees and I understand that absent of any assistance a majority of those folks would be getting laid off immediately. I think next week some time.

Chairman O'Neil stated just a couple of points that I think are important. Richard Doran took over, and Alderman Long you might be able to help me out on this, but three, four or five months ago so he inherited this mess. I do think they play a very important role in servicing the people of our City. I think it is important that we work with them to try to resolve their funding issues. I appreciate your efforts, Sam, to date. The fact that they are paying \$48,000 in rent is crazy.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think there will be a building soon that we can put them in.

Chairman O'Neil responded I have a pretty good idea of where you are talking about, Your Honor. Sam, you kind of seemed to indicate that you are in favor of a loan but you said something about \$87,000 of not being in favor of.

Mr. Maranto stated Mr. Tufts is supposed to meet with Mr. Doran tomorrow. They do have documentation that they are going to have \$166,000 in grants coming in in October. That is roughly four to five months of their staff time. If we were to fund the \$80,000 they would have three more months to go. They also have \$500,000 worth of grant applications out there that they did during the course

of the year but the \$166,000 is the guaranteed funding that they have available now.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that one year of funding?

Mr. Maranto answered this year's funding; yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked no, one year from October 1?

Mr. Maranto answered the \$166,000 will be coming this October.

Chairman O'Neil asked but it is only for 12 months?

Mr. Maranto answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Long, I know you have done some work with them.

Alderman Long stated I agree with Sam with respect to getting a projection of how they are going to use this money and how they are going to sustain themselves. I wouldn't advocate giving somebody some money and two months from now they close their doors. How much was it that we had allocated for them?

Mr. Maranto responded we have \$10,000 this year in CDBG funds.

Alderman Long asked does that go to them once?

Mr. Maranto answered well they would be drawing on a monthly basis. Because of this situation we could probably change the cash flow but we will probably get that money sometime in the middle of the month.

Alderman Long asked and to carry them over...

Mr. Maranto interjected they need about \$40,000 plus per month for their staff and occupancy.

Alderman Long asked so your recommendation is to do half of the \$87,000 or less than half?

Mr. Maranto answered I would like to do a partnership with the United Way.

Alderman Long asked so commit half?

Mr. Maranto answered or at least this month if we were to allocate something and if United Way doesn't come through we could revisit it next month.

Mayor Gatsas stated this was brought to me last week. I suggested they put it on this agenda so that you could have a discussion about it. I know it is time sensitive. I think it is important that we have a discussion about the number of people they are helping because I think it comes back to again the CIP budget that we have and where is the funding going. Certainly this is an agency that would fit very nicely into the building that we have been talking about up on Lake Ave and would reduce our contribution plus allow us to receive revenue from them for putting them up in that space. I think it is important that as we have these discussions going forward we start thinking about...and I know we have Sam working on a project right now to take all of the people that we have contributed to or made funding available to from the CIP budget to find out what they are paying for rent and where they are in terms of their leases so that we have an opportunity to correlate some of that and bring it back in house to see if we can reduce some of the costs on the City side and maybe save them some money in rent and pay the debt service on the building.

Alderman Shea stated my thoughts run along the line of if they are functioning sort of on a month-to-month basis why wouldn't we want to fund them on a month-to-month basis. That is to say why would we want to commit a large sum when we could renew our obligation or responsibility to them? My thought is that we would try to work something out with the United Way and see if we could go into partnership with them but fund this on a monthly basis rather than on a basis that is going to cover three or six months because we would really want to make sure they are in existence month-to-month but not necessarily fund them if in fact there is going to be some kind of problem.

Alderman Greazzo asked Your Honor, what is their plan to pay us back? It sounds like they are going to be broke in a few months.

Mayor Gatsas answered my understanding is that depending on what we give them I would assume that as soon as their grant money comes in in October we would be replenished.

Alderman Greazzo asked is that allowable under their grant money?

Mayor Gatsas answered I think all it is is an extension of dollars. I don't think it is any different other than us giving them the dollars on the front end and they would then have the ability to pay us back.

Alderman Greazzo asked what is the timeframe?

Mayor Gatsas replied the federal dollars are based on October 1 through September 30.

Alderman Greazzo asked so we have to carry them for three months?

Mayor Gatsas responded that is what they are looking for. They are looking for us to carry them for a three month period. Again I am going to sit down and take a look at where they are at with their financials to see if all 15 employees have to come back. I am not sure how many residents they serve. I think that is what the important thing is. If it is ten residents then the number of \$80,000 doesn't make sense to me but if it is 300 or 400 people that come in and get services from them then it would make sense. I think Sam is working on those numbers to get something before us and hopefully we will have it for distribution tomorrow night so that we know how many citizens are being serviced and how often they are going in for services. I think that is the important thing.

Chairman O'Neil asked if we work off of Alderman Shea's suggestion of at least month-to-month to get their feet under them and figure out what their long-term plan is, what do they need per month?

Mr. Maranto answered approximately \$40,000. He indicated that he needs \$87,000 for the shortfall until October.

Chairman O'Neil asked they don't need \$40,000 month-to-month; they need \$13,000 right?

Mr. Maranto answered no \$40,000.

Chairman O'Neil replied if they need \$87,000 they are short...

Mr. Maranto interjected they need \$87,000 to carry them until October.

Chairman O'Neil responded correct and if we are going to split it with the United Way that is \$40,000. They don't need \$40,000 a month from us right?

Mayor Gatsas replied it is really \$30,000 because we are already giving them \$10,000.

Mr. Maranto stated again I can't speak for the United Way yet. We have to get confirmation from them and they have to look at their records as well.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think the role they play is too important to just let them fold but I think we have to be involved in getting our arms around it, what is their plan going forward...I was surprised to learn they had 15 employees. I was surprised to learn that they are paying \$48,000 a year in rent. We have to get our arms around it but I am certainly willing to allow it for a month or two to see if a plan can be brought forward to stabilize things there with or without the United Way. Can we get a motion on some dollar amount?

Mayor Gatsas stated I agree with you, Mr. Chairman. I think we have to change the way we look at CIP funding. We need to see the entire budget before us before we make allocations. That has never been requested before but I think we need to change that.

Alderman Shea moved to fund the NH Minority Health Coalition on a monthly basis in cooperation with the United Way and each month we get a report from either the Mayor's Office or Sam Maranto regarding their expenditures and whether or not they are going to be able to continue in existence up until the time that the federal funding is going to be available.

Chairman O'Neil stated we can't commit the United Way at this point. With that said, they need \$29,000 for the next month?

Mr. Maranto responded I will have to come up with a number for you on what the payroll for the month is. Again, the total is \$87,000 so one month is half of that.

Ms. Elise Annunziata stated their shortfall was \$87,000 for August until the end of September. Their assumption was that as of October 1 the federal grant money would come through. It is essentially two months. It is August 1st now. This is the whole month.

Chairman O'Neil replied so it is \$29,000 a month. \$87,000 divided by three months...

Mayor Gatsas interjected two months.

Chairman O'Neil asked what happens to July?

Mayor Gatsas answered we are into August so it is August and September.

Mr. Maranto stated they need \$87,000 for two months so whatever half of \$87,000 is. I believe it is \$43,500.

Mayor Gatsas stated minus \$10,000. Deduct the \$10,000 that we are giving them.

Chairman O'Neil responded I am losing my patience on this. Did they need \$87,000 for three months or for two months?

Mr. Maranto replied two.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have to be clear on this and that was not clear.

Ms. Annunziata responded it is two months – August and September.

Chairman O'Neil stated folks, when this comes before us we have to have the details; not one line with some winging it going on here. We have to have the details on what the amounts are. Now you have obviously had this discussion with them. Somebody has to be able to put it down on a piece of paper. We have been talking about all kinds of numbers here.

Alderman Shea stated again my motion is to fund them for one month and get a response as to whether or not the other month is needed and at the next meeting we have we can fund the other \$40,000 or \$43,500.

Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Craig asked will there be a contract here that says we will be the first to be paid once the grants come in?

Mr. Maranto answered there would be a promissory note, yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked and we will have this for tomorrow night?

Mr. Maranto replied the Solicitor's Office says yes.

Mayor Gatsas stated I have a question for clarification. We were going to give them \$10,000 out of our CIP budget to begin with so rather than the promissory note being \$43,000 it should be \$33,000 because we were going to fund them that, which they haven't received yet.

Chairman O'Neil asked it is two different funding sources though isn't it?

Alderman Shea stated they haven't used that yet, Your Honor?

Mayor Gatsas responded we have not distributed it yet.

Ms. Annunziata stated just a thought but if we were to give them the \$33,000 now or over two months...

Alderman Shea interjected it is not over two months. It is one month. In other words, we are giving them \$33,000 and the \$10,000 from CIP and then we will reconsider how much is needed for the next payment to take us until October depending on their expenses.

Ms. Annunziata replied their operating expenses per month are \$43,500 though.

Alderman Shea stated it may be but if there is some sort of adjustment such as the Mayor mentioned because of the amount of people being serviced and whether or not and again I hate to say it but if 15 people aren't needed there might be some adjustments there or what have you.

Ms. Annunziata replied I just wanted it to be clear that it is \$43,500 per month.

Alderman Shea responded if they needed the \$43,500 we would do that in September. I think that is our next meeting.

Chairman O'Neil stated so the motion is on the \$43,500 minus the \$10,000 they were getting anyway so we will be committing a loan of \$33,500 that should carry them for one month. In the meantime, there will be a specific plan brought back before us with a contractual agreement. We will have an agreement on this \$33,500 tomorrow night.

Mayor Gatsas stated not that I want to interrupt your thought process but remember we don't have a second meeting in August. If you are going to do this on a monthly basis, our next meeting is September 7th so there could be a week in there for furloughs if we are not careful with what we are doing. I would say that maybe we need to take a look at whatever process comes forward tomorrow night with all of the documentation in front of us. If it is something we are going to do then it would behoove us, after we see the documentation with oversight from the Finance Officer or Solicitor, to do September because they may be laying people off for that one week in between when we next meet again. Do you see what I am saying? If we fund them for August, we won't be back again until September 7.

Alderman Ludwig asked could we put the \$87,000 in place but not disperse it somehow?

Mayor Gatsas answered I think what we can do is do that and allow the Finance Officer and Solicitor, once they have looked at their finances and are comfortable with it, go ahead and do that.

Alderman Ludwig replied so we could put the \$87,000 in place but...

Mayor Gatsas interjected if the United Way comes forward and decides that they are going to split it, then it would be half of that.

Alderman Shea stated excuse me for interrupting but we are not talking about \$87,000. We are talking about \$77,000.

Mayor Gatsas responded correct.

Alderman Shea withdrew his original motion. Alderman Ludwig withdrew his second.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess my frustration is if we are going...if staff is coming in with a recommendation there has to be a plan and we are winging it on this one which I am not very pleased about. You had the discussions going on and I am not blaming you, Your Honor, but somebody has to be able to put a plan in front of us that makes sense. We have spent 20 minutes talking about all kinds of different numbers here and I am very frustrated about that. It is not a good way to do business.

Mayor Gatsas replied I think this only came up last week, in the middle of the week. Just to get it on the agenda for discussion purposes...we didn't know about the lay-offs until Friday. I think this thing has perpetuated itself without knowing where the United Way is or anybody else. I think it is a matter of first let's find out how many people we are helping in the City and then find out at that point in tomorrow's night discussion whether we are going to move forward.

Alderman Shea moved to allocate \$77,000 to the NH Minority Health Coalition with the proviso that we will get a report back and that there will be a legal document drawn up to make sure that the loan is paid back to the City. Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize for the confusion.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the City Clerk, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount of \$4,630 from the NH State Library to restore various records dating back to the 1850's and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Facilities Division, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount of \$133,430 from Public Service and National Grid to be used to supplement the federal energy block grant and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the request. Alderman Greazzo duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Parks Division, requesting authorization to enter into an agreement with the State DOT and to accept trail funds in the amount of \$94,400 for the Piscataquog Trail Phase IV, CIP project number and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 15 of the agenda:

15. Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for the increase of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program budget by \$380,000 due to additional funds made available by the NH Community Development Finance Authority.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil asked Sam, do we have a game plan for those funds yet?

Mr. Maranto answered those funds were actually approved a few months back. Those will be going to the Odd Fellows building if you approve it.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 16 of the agenda:

16. Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of \$50,000 for CIP #713510 Annual R.O.W Improvements.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 17 of the agenda:

17. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Environmental Protection Division, requesting acceptance of ARRA funds in the amount of \$2,875,000 from the NH Department of Environmental Services and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 18 of the agenda:

18. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Environmental Protection Division, requesting revision of project descriptions to reflect anticipated work and for such purpose revised budget authorizations for CIP Project #710410 Aeration System Upgrade & CIP Project #710610 Phase II CSO Engineering Services for Study & Design have been submitted.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 20 of the agenda:

20. Discussion relative to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Mr. Maranto stated first I would like to advise that we would like to recommend...we had bids come in for 203 Mammoth Road and we would like to recommend that the City accept Socha Company's proposal. They are looking to develop three units there contingent upon getting a variance. They will be 1,320 square feet per unit and each have three bedrooms. They indicated an amount of \$349,407.50. Essentially we would be loaning them \$302,508 with the difference being we had already paid for the land. We would like to recommend that. They would be looking for a 30 year at 0% and they would also be willing to provide money to the Neighborhood Improvement Program as well.

Chairman O'Neil asked how come we don't have any handouts on any of this?

Mr. Maranto answered I have the bids right here if you would like to see them.

Chairman O'Neil asked how much are we committing for 203 Mammoth Road?

Mr. Maranto answered \$302,508.

Chairman O'Neil asked we have already purchased the land?

Mr. Maranto answered yes we have.

Chairman O'Neil asked what did we purchase the land for?

Mr. Maranto replied \$46,900.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you are asking us to approve the \$302,508? Will there be a contract coming back at some point?

Mr. Maranto responded we could do that if the Committee wants to look at it.

Chairman O'Neil replied I think it would be good to have it come back. So you are asking us to commit \$302,508 to Socha Builders and they are building how many units?

Mr. Maranto responded they are proposing three units.

Chairman O'Neil asked subject to a variance?

Mr. Maranto answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked when are they scheduled to go before the ZBA?

Mr. Maranto replied they haven't gone that far because this hasn't been approved.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the loan of \$302,508 to Socha Company as recommended by Mr. Maranto. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked does that include the demolition of what is there now?

Mr. Maranto answered yes.

Alderman Craig stated regarding the variance, what is it that they are asking for?

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Planning & Building Director, responded they are asking to build a three family in a single family district essentially. Currently the existing structure had four units in it and was severely damaged by fire. That will be demolished and they would by terms of the zoning ordinance be able to rebuild that structure as four units if they built entirely within the same footprint that existed prior to the fire. In this case, they would build a structure that fits a more contemporary footprint and, therefore, will have to go to the Zoning Board for approval.

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

Mr. Maranto stated the next item is the Odd Fellows building. After the other commitments we have \$560,000 to commit by September 9th. I have been working with Kevin O'Maley to put together and fast track several architects and engineers to put out a bid on various improvements to the building like the roof, elevator, and electrical system, things that we could accomplish without really knowing the exact fit for the interior right

now. We anticipate that going out sometime next week. It is going to be close but we hope by the beginning of September before the next Board of Mayor and Aldermen that we will have the bids back in. Our goal is about \$550,000 to bid items on there. We will be bidding some items so that we can add or subtract depending on the bids that come in.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that design/build?

Mr. Maranto answered no. We actually have architects and engineers putting the bid together. They have been given nine to ten days to do this and we hope to have the bids go out for a sprinkler system, elevator, roof, windows, stairwell improvements and things of that nature.

Chairman O'Neil asked for clarification, are the architects under contract?

Mr. Maranto replied Mr. O'Maley has secured their services.

Chairman O'Neil asked and how are we paying for them?

Mr. Maranto answered with NSP funds.

Chairman O'Neil asked how much is that contract?

Mr. Maranto answered there are several contracts.

Mr. Kevin O'Maley, Facilities Division, stated we just started working on this last week. We actually just went out and visited the building last Thursday. We have engaged a couple of architects and some engineers to parcel this out into a number of different projects. We are not going to have full plans and specs but we are going to do things on the building where we can have a performance specification. We haven't engaged the designers yet at this stage but we are trying to get that all wrapped up this week and that would be funded through NSP.

Chairman O'Neil asked how much money are we expecting to commit towards that?

Mr. O'Maley answered somewhere between \$40,000 and \$60,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that part of the \$560,000?

Mr. O'Maley responded yes, that would be part of the \$560,000.

Chairman O'Neil replied so then we would only have \$500,000 to do construction. Can we get a report on that when you have selected someone and how much?

Mr. O'Maley asked are you talking about the designers?

Chairman O'Neil answered yes.

Mr. O'Maley stated we have to engage them before the end of the week. The performance specs are going to be due on Friday so we can start advertising next week and get them on the City's website so they have something to bid on in the next two weeks. I would be happy to give you whatever you need. To get these funds obligated by September 6th we have to move quickly.

Chairman O'Neil asked so do you have some idea of who you are engaging?

Mr. O'Maley responded for the architects there is J5 architect organization here in the City of Manchester. We have been talking to them about doing the elevator project at Bakersville and we are going to have them work on the elevator at the Odd Fellow building. Gale Associates, who has done a lot of work for us on building envelopes, and SFC Engineering is going to help us with the sprinkler. They have helped us with sprinklers on other projects. CMK Architects is going to help us with some of the demolition and the stairwell.

Chairman O'Neil replied it sounds interesting.

Alderman Ludwig asked is the City the general contract for the sprinklers, the elevator, the roof and...

Mr. O'Maley interjected we are still trying to figure that out. I was hoping to parcel out different components of this but after some of the discussions we had today we are going to put all of the packages on the website for anybody to bid. A roofing contractor could just bid on the roofing piece if he wanted to but general contractors would be given the opportunity to bid on the whole package as well.

Chairman O'Neil asked so following up on that, if somebody bids just on the roof who are they contracting with?

Mr. O'Maley answered they would contract with the City of Manchester.

Chairman O'Neil asked why two architects?

Mr. O'Maley answered through the procurement code we have a limit of \$25,000 and that is why we tried to package this up with different components.

Alderman Shea moved to commit \$560,000 of NSP funds for improvements at the Odd Fellows building. Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated so \$40,000 to \$60,000 will be spent on the design and the balance for the construction. It is hopeful that we are going to get the envelope for the building repaired – electrical, sprinkler and an elevator.

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

Mr. Maranto stated lastly Manchester NeighborWorks has engaged a construction manager. They will be putting together bids from various contractors for at least five properties. In the initial proposal they had a contingency of about \$225,000 that had been unencumbered. I had conversations with them that since those funds are available we can utilize those for our other projects, keeping in mind that we need to commit all of the funds by September 9. He should have numbers within the next couple of weeks so that \$223,000 makeover may go down once we get the numbers. There may be monies above the \$560,000 that we can utilize.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you are saying that if there are some funds available we would move them toward the Odd Fellows project?

Mr. Maranto answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked when is the full Board scheduled to meet in September?

Mrs. Freeman answered the Board meets on September 7th.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we should schedule the CIP meeting for September 7 then to close out the NSP correct?

Mrs. Freeman answered yes.

TABLED ITEMS

22. Communication from the Kevin O'Maley, Facilities Division, submitting a list of projects to be completed under the recent bonding that was approved by the Committee.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Chairman O'Neil stated we had some folks sit patiently here this evening. I think they did a nice job in laying out all of the funding sources. Our responsibility is really the \$2.87 million. They have laid out the code improvements and what schools they are hoping to address - the Bakersville elevator, Parker Varney site design, playground replacement at Smyth, Jewett, Parker Varney and McDonough, windows at Bakersville, McDonough, McLaughlin, Hillside, Southside, Parkside, West and Webster. I guess that will be the \$2.87 million correct?

Mr. O'Maley replied correct. Has everyone had a chance to look at the charts? That is just what we needed. You will update it if you need to move some funding around or have some balances and would like to get other projects done?

Mr. O'Maley responded certainly. We have the two items at the bottom that are going to have some other work done and as we get those scopes further designed we will come back to the Committee.

Chairman O'Neil asked where are you talking about?

Mr. O'Maley answered the consultants on the windows, as well as the energy work.

Chairman O'Neil asked so items 8 and 10?

Mr. O'Maley replied items 8 and 9. The projects will be done on item 10 but the consultants are for items 8 and 9.

Chairman O'Neil asked but are we committing \$1.150 for multiple school window design?

Mr. O'Maley answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked and we don't have a consultant on board at this time?

Mr. O'Maley replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked will the consultant fee come out of that \$1.15 million?

Mr. O'Maley responded that is coming out of the...if you look over where the consultant is for the window design, that is coming out of the bond balances.

Alderman Shea asked your bonding is capable of handling all of this? I am not sure how much bonding you people have at the School District, Karen. Is this something that you have available now and you are utilizing?

Ms. DeFrancis stated the Board of Mayor and Aldermen has approved these bonds already. The \$2.87 million, the \$1.13...

Alderman Shea interjected my question is is there any more bonding money available or is this all of the bonding money you have right now?

Ms. DeFrancis responded right now this is all that we have and the bonding is determined by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the projects as presented. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Greazzo stated I have a question about some of these things – recreational facilities improvement, Veteran's Park improvement, park facilities improvement, Rockingham Trail, annual bridge rehabilitation on Biron Street...how is this school related?

Chairman O'Neil stated those are bond balances I believe.

Alderman Greazzo asked so those are balances left over and that is what we are using?

Chairman O'Neil replied correct, but those actually are not part of the \$2.87 million, right? They would be the column...can someone help me here?

Ms. DeFrancis stated there are actually two columns that add up to the \$801,000. The fourth and fifth columns of numbers labeled CIP Bond Balances, the column that says Design-Build of \$558,000 and then the Other Issued Bonds is \$243,000. Those two numbers together add up to the \$801,000.

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

Chairman O'Neil asked would it be helpful if this is reported out to the full Board tomorrow night?

Mr. O'Maley replied yes.

23. Presentation by Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, regarding a vehicle locator system.
(Note: Tabled 6/7/10; additional information to be provided by the Highway Department regarding the cost changes and cost savings in relation to the MER Bond.)

This item remained on the table.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have one agenda addendum that I would like to take up.

Presentation by David Preece, SNHPC, requesting a letter of commitment from the City for the Sustainable Communities Initiative Grant program.

Chairman O'Neil called David Preece forward. David, in working with the Mayor's office, has asked us to get involved with the regional planning grant. In the month of July it is tough to get anything done and with Samantha out for a week we realized just how important...I think we all know how important she is but we realized when she was on vacation really how important she is to the Mayor's Office. This was intended to be on the agenda. David, can you give us an overview on what you are requesting from the City?

Mr. David Preece, Southern NH Planning Commission, stated thank you very much for allowing me to come and speak about this exciting program. The Sustainable Communities Initiative is a program that is being offered by HUD on a competitive basis and this program is being sponsored, and it is the first time a program like this is being sponsored, by HUD, Federal DOT and US EPA to look at regional plans that promote sustainability. This grant opportunity was seen by the nine regional planning commissioners in NH as an opportunity to come together and do regional plans for all of the municipalities within the State of New Hampshire and to merge those regional plans into one plan. We can't do this in a vacuum and we are doing this in partnership with several key state agencies such as DOT, OEC, DES and Homeland Security. We are also working with key communities like the City of Manchester because in order for our regional sustainable plan to be effective we have to involve partners at all three levels. What I am asking for tonight is a letter of commitment from the City of Manchester to participate in this program. I will open it up for questions. I gave you lots of information and maybe more information than you wanted but I am here to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman O'Neil stated one key item when I spoke to you last week that you pointed out was that if we are successful in receiving this grant and Manchester was part of it we then...there are other funding opportunities where literally a box

gets checked off that would increase our probability of those other funding opportunities. Is that correct?

Mr. Preece replied that is correct. We don't even have to be successful in getting the grant. If we score at a certain level and we can show that these agencies and municipalities have agreed to be partners with this application then in the future if you go after a federal grant you will be given preferential scoring. That is really an advantage to the City of Manchester.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you give an example of grants that might currently exist?

Mr. Preece responded let's just say...I know there are several HUD grants that you apply for and in the future if you choose to partner with this then you will get preferential scoring on those. It is to your advantage to participate in this. DOT has other options if there are monies out there. I know that the Planning Commission has been working very closely with the Highway Department on Exit 6 and 7 to try to get grant monies through the planning and environmental work.

Chairman O'Neil asked that is for the 293 Hackett Hill area?

Mr. Preece answered yes. So again if we were successful in scoring high on this grant opportunity then we would be given a higher rating with that and might be able to pull some monies in.

Alderman Shea stated my focus goes along this line. There is a regional type of organization. Do the regional type of organizations...are they equally represented and does something that is proposed decided by this I don't know, you said nine different units but how does that break down? In other words, we are the largest community yet if something were to come through could there be a vote whereby we would be over voted because of a smaller community feeling that the needs are...

Mr. Preece interjected no. In fact this grant kind of focuses in on the top six communities of the MPO – Metropolitan Planning Organization. Manchester is the number one community in the State of New Hampshire so they would have a place on this sustainable policy committee along with representatives...

Chairman O'Neil interjected let me just stop you there. That is because we are the largest community? It is based on our population?

Mr. Preece responded that is correct.

Alderman Shea asked who would represent Manchester?

Mr. Preece replied that would be a decision of the Mayor office and who he would like to appoint to this commission.

Alderman Shea asked are there nine people on this commission?

Mr. Preece answered there is a sheet that is attached to your handout tonight. The very last sheet shows the proposed make-up of these committees. Again, this is a draft of it but this is what our current thinking is. As you can see, we are looking at the top six cities to play a very important part in developing policies for this plan and in giving us ideas as to what this regional plan should be.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you need a vote by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen by August 6th?

Mr. Preece answered I need a letter of commitment.

Chairman O'Neil stated so we would need to move this to the full Board for approval tomorrow night.

Alderman Craig moved to approve the request for a letter of commitment.
Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote.
There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil asked David, can you have somebody available tomorrow night in case there are questions that come up?

Mr. Preece answered yes.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee