

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

September 7, 2010

4:45 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

Messrs: T. Clougherty, T. Arnold, J. Minkarah, L. LaFreniere, S. Maranto

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Presentation by the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce Joint Sustainability Committee.

There was no one present for a presentation.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Sewer abatement request (20 Milky Way #2.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be granted in the amount of \$2,454.34.)

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Sewer abatement request (105 Brae Burn Drive.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be denied.)

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Sewer abatement request (257 Ledgewood Road.)
(*Note: EPD recommends the abatement be denied.*)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, it was voted to approve the recommendation to deny this request.

Chairman O'Neil stated Tim, a question was asked of me and you may know why we seem to have had a lot of abatement requests lately. Has the department noted that?

Mr. Tim Clougherty, Deputy Public Works Director, replied no, we have not looked at that specifically. We can certainly look at that relative to the delinquency and those that we send for warrant and compare. It could be a sign of the economy. People are looking at their bills a little bit closer than they may have in the past but I don't have a specific explanation.

Chairman O'Neil stated no, you don't have to. It just seems that we have had a number at each of the CIP meetings and someone asked me why and I said that I really didn't have an answer. It may be typical. If you have a chance, can you look at it to see what is going on?

Mr. Clougherty responded sure, we can take a look at that.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Petition to release and discharge from public servitude a portion of Schuyler Street submitted by Jeanniffer Mills of Notre Dame Avenue.
(*Note: A review from the Public Works Director is attached.*)

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

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated if you look at the materials submitted with this particular request, the Highway Department noted that it was discontinued by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on April 24, 1997.

Chairman O'Neil asked so Tom, what is the proper motion then? Receive and file?

Mr. Arnold replied yes, it appears that would be proper because back in 1997 they were granted what they were looking for.

Alderman Craig withdrew the motion to approve. Alderman Shea withdrew his second.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization appropriating funds in the amount of \$25,000 for the FY 2011 CIP 612411 Façade Improvement Project.

Alderman Ludwig moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Shea.

Chairman O'Neil asked were we going to come up with some criteria based on past discussion? If you recall, there were some concerns at one point about where our review was of the process.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried, with Alderman Greazzo voting in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, regarding the ARRA Recovery Zone Facility Bonds allocation of \$8,966,000 to four qualifying projects.

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

Alderman Shea stated Jay, I noted that four people have taken advantage, but I'm wondering if there is a time limit on this. It may have been listed as December of 2010. Is that it?

Mr. Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, replied yes, December 31st of this year.

Alderman Shea stated my point is that are there some discussions with other people, so as not to return this money but to utilize it.

Mr. Minkarah stated we only had five total applications, but we have definitely been very mindful of that deadline in working with MHRA to make sure that all these projects will be able to close. In the back of our mind, in the event that any of these don't go forward we have a couple of backup projects where we could allocate the funds. That is something that we are very mindful of because the clock is ticking on these and we do have to move forward.

Alderman Shea stated let's say we reach December and \$8 million or so remains. Can you get an extension so that money is not lost? What happens then?

Mr. Minkarah replied we have heard that there is an effort underway to get that deadline extended, but at this point it hasn't been extended. We can't count on that so we are moving forward assuming that these bonds have to be issued by the end of this calendar year. These are fairly complicated and it is not an easy process to close on these loans so realistically that has to happen by October and certainly by November so we are going to know if these budgets can move forward long before December.

Alderman Shea asked these are the four projects you are listing here, correct?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes.

Alderman Shea asked and the rest of the monies, if they are not...in other words, if the deadline is not extended, what happens then? Does the money revert back to the federal government, the state or somebody else?

Mr. Minkarah replied there is no additional funding. We allocated the full \$8.9 million so assuming that these projects go forward, there will be no remaining money. We will have allocated everything.

Alderman Shea asked in other words, all of the money is allocated?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked Jay, if for some reason there needs to be a modification between now and the end of the year, can that happen?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we can amend or add a project?

Mr. Minkarah replied we couldn't add a project because there isn't any available funding, unless one of them happened to drop out and then absolutely, that is exactly what we would do.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Communication from Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, requesting a separate fund be set up to accept contributions from participating businesses for the cooperative marketing program.

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

Alderman Shea asked the way this is written, your department would not commit any funds to it?

Mr. Minkarah replied we probably would commit some funding to it. What this does is allow us to receive additional contributions or matches from the other private parties. We do expect that we would expend some of our marketing budget on this item, yes.

Alderman Shea asked when would you do that? In other words, you are looking for businesses to contribute a certain amount of money, so could you fill us in on when you would expect to use some of your own funding?

Mr. Minkarah replied what our intent is with this specific plan is that we are going to be working with downtown restaurants on fine dining promotion. Our intent will be that we will participate as if we were one of the restaurants. Right now it looks like we are working with about six so we would contribute one sixth. This is still a moving target because we are hoping to get more restaurants to participate, but we would probably expend somewhere around \$1,200 to \$1,500.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, on behalf of the Police Department, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount \$5,000 from the New Hampshire Department of Justice to be used to conduct alcohol compliance checks CIP project 410211 and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, on behalf of the Police Department, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount \$36,606 from the United States Department of Justice to be used to operate a multi-jurisdictional drug task force CIP project 410711 and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

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

Alderman Shea stated we did have a presentation, Mr. Chairman, regarding drugs and the efforts that were made, focusing on West High School. Would this, as far as you know, be part of that particular project?

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't know specifically. I don't believe so. That was related to gangs. It probably all ties together eventually somehow.

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, stated I really don't have any clarification beyond that myself. We can definitely find that out from the Police Department.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there any reason why Police isn't here? Can we remind the departments that if they have agenda items they should be here?

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, on behalf of the Health Department, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount \$5,000 from the Endowment for Health and \$15,000 from the Bean Foundation to fund the development of a new five year strategic plan CIP project 214511 and for such purpose an Amending Resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

Alderman Shea stated it seems like a very good plan. The only thing is that there are no details as far as this strategic plan is concerned. I wondered if the Health Department might present a little bit of background at a future time.

Chairman O'Neil stated okay.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, on behalf of the Finance Department, requesting rescission of \$590,000 of the Bond Resolution for Annual ROW Reconstructions Program, CIP 711209.

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

Alderman Shea stated Tim, I'm not exactly sure where the streets are that are being restructured or resurfaced. Could you fill us in on that?

Mr. Clougherty replied the \$590,000 was part of the 711209 CIP bond from FY10 or FY09. The \$590,000 was intended for right of way reconstruction, but during the course of the negotiations with the individuals redeveloping Gold Street, there was a need determined for a certain amount of funding for the City of Manchester to participate in. That is where this \$590,000 came out of, so what was originally intended for right of way reconstruction was reallocated to support those infrastructure improvements on Gold Street, but we all know that that is not what is currently the case. We would be more than happy to have that money back into the right of way reconstruction fund so that we could pave some roads and I could identify those for you, Alderman.

Alderman Shea asked is each ward going to get additional money so we can update our wards in terms of repaving or is there some place that this money is going to go that is not allocated towards ward improvements? I appreciate the \$590,000, but I'm wondering if my ward or Ward 1 or Ward 2 or Ward 9 will be in line to have additional paving done. We have been allowed about \$40,000 in each ward so if you divide 12 into \$590,000 that gives us a little more.

Mr. Clougherty stated not to be argumentative, but I think we went with \$50,000 this year, but just to be clear, this is a rescission of \$590,000 in bonds that were intended for right of way reconstruction. This is money that is going away.

Alderman Shea asked it is going away?

Mr. Clougherty replied it is going away.

Alderman Shea asked in other words, the money itself is not going to be used so the bonding itself is not going to be done?

Mr. Clougherty replied I believe that is the intention. I believe Mr. Maranto or Mr. LaFreniere could speak to that point.

Mr. Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, stated Alderman, as part of the 2009 CIP, the Highway Department requested \$3.2 million and change for reconstruction. During the course of deliberations, the \$590,000 which had been set aside previously for Gold Street became available. Rather than bond \$3.2 million, the City, in effect, decreased it by \$590,000 and put out a bond for \$2.6 million and utilized those bond allocations. We did get \$3.2 million with the reconstruction; it is just that we used money from a previous year. This effectively allowed us to decrease our budget in total by that amount for 2009.

Alderman Shea stated that explains it. Thank you.

Chairman O'Neil stated so this money never got bonded for that amount. The bond was \$2.6 million.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 15 of the agenda:

15. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting permission to revise the City's current agreement with NeighborWorks of Greater Manchester so that applications for assistance by owner occupied property owners could be processed through their organization.

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

Mr. LaFreniere stated this request is in reference to the SAFE Act which was adopted by Congress to regulate the mortgage industry and deal with problematic and predatory lenders. What the SAFE Act does is create a set of criteria for lenders for owner-occupied dwellings. We do not meet those criteria currently. It was not anticipated that the act, when it was developed, would affect programs such as ours, but the law, as structured, does in fact do that. It would require us to expend considerable resources and money to certify and license and issue these mortgages. Since NeighborWorks is already licensed to do this work, we are asking for permission to work with NeighborWorks to effectively act as our agent in these cases so that we can then have these monies put out as loans and have liens against these properties as opposed to issuing an outright grant.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't know if you or Sam know this off the top of your head. How many of these we probably see in a year, on average?

Mr. Maranto responded two or three perhaps. The majority of our work is multi-units.

Chairman O'Neil asked and they are paid specifically a fee?

Mr. LaFreniere replied administrative fees only.

Alderman Shea asked would there be communications between the agencies so we would be informed as to what is going on in that regard?

Chairman O'Neil responded they would still carry out the mechanics, but they would be carrying them out on our behalf.

Mr. LaFreniere stated the individual cases are not necessarily brought back to the Committee in current practice, but we could certainly do that. We would definitely communicate with NeighborWorks in each case and maintain records

for the Committee. If you would like to have them individually come back we could do that. We can also bring them back as a net report.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have two options: whether or not we need to approve or just to inform the Committee about what is going on. What are your wishes? Is everyone okay with just communicating to let us know what is going on?

Mr. LaFreniere stated we will do that on a quarterly report.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve this item and have Planning and Community Development submit quarterly reports.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 16 of the agenda:

16. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, regarding the settlement associated with the discharge of the City's mortgage on a three-family property located at 140 Conant Street.

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

Chairman O'Neil stated I know both Leon and Sam would like to speak on this item.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I am going to defer to Sam on this one because he has had some recent conversations with the parties involved.

Mr. Maranto stated the owner of a three unit property on the west side contacted our office indicating that he had been served with foreclosure proceedings. However, he came in and requested that he be allowed to do a short sale. As such, he proposed to us...we are in third position. It is a three unit building. It presently has a first loan of \$257,000 a second loan of \$30,000 and we would be third for doing LEED work there for \$15,000. He offered to us that he would be able to pay us \$3,000 if we would sign off on our lien. As such, we told him we would bring it back to the Board because we don't have that authority. In the past, luckily, we haven't been doing a lot of these over the years. We had had a pretty good track record. Last summer we did do two and we were able to secure approximately 50% on the dollar. Again, a three family with liens in front of us of \$275,000, if that went to foreclosure, it is extremely doubtful that we would ever see a penny. It is basically \$3,000 versus taking our chances at foreclosure. The bank itself has postponed the foreclosure, initially set for August 23rd, to give us

some time to discuss this. I spoke to some of these liens about an hour ago and we're not sure how long that person is going to wait for some type of recommendation on whether or not they are going to go for sale. As far as the foreclosure itself, if you were to say to me that you were going to wait two weeks to think about it, it wouldn't be foreclosed on, but the seller may end up walking away from it and at that time it would go into foreclosure.

Chairman O'Neil stated the staff recommendation is to not approve this request.

Mr. Maranto stated I would counter with a couple thousand more dollars to get a little more on the \$15,000. My concern is that if we wait until October we are probably going to lose all of this so I don't know if you want us to negotiate.

Alderman Greazzo asked are we up to negotiate if the bank is getting some of those funds?

Mr. Maranto replied not the bank. It would be the owner. The owner himself is paying this. My understanding is that the bank is already allowing the second lien holder to take \$5,000 out and they felt that if they identified any more, the bank would want those funds versus giving them to us.

Alderman Greazzo asked the bank is not willing to contribute anything?

Mr. Maranto replied right. The bank is looking at about 60% on the dollar on what they owe.

Alderman Greazzo asked and if we agree to this, they are the ones who make out and we get the short end of the stick?

Mr. Maranto replied no. The bank is going to get the amount of money regardless. It is basically the owner...

Alderman Greazzo interjected that's my point. The bank is going to get the money regardless and we won't get any.

Mr. Maranto replied exactly.

Alderman Greazzo stated I don't see any need to hurry up and make sure the bank gets their money if we are not getting ours.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I think Sam's point is that they are not going to get 100% on the dollar. They are only going to get \$.60 on the dollar.

Alderman Shea asked how does the owner benefit by giving us \$3,000?

Mr. Maranto replied he doesn't go through a process of foreclosure. He will have a short sale.

Alderman Shea asked so in other words, because he doesn't have to go through a certain process he is willing to give us \$3,000 out of the \$15,000? Is that correct?

Mr. Maranto replied that's correct.

Alderman Shea asked how much would it cost him to go through whatever he has to go through for that?

Mr. Maranto replied I guess that is not so much the focus. On his credit record it will be identified as a foreclosure versus a sale.

Chairman O'Neil asked so the bank is in the first position. Who is in the second position?

Mr. Maranto replied he has a second, but I don't know with whom. It is a \$30,000 mortgage. They are going to be getting \$5,000. They have agreed to \$5,000.

Alderman Shea stated this is not taxpayers' money; this is money that is either federal or state money. Is that correct?

Mr. Maranto stated the \$15,000 was part of our LEED program which is federal.

Alderman Shea stated I think that you mentioned that in the affordable housing trust fund there is probably \$80,000 that can be used for the people.

Mr. Maranto stated in 2011 we have \$200,000 for our program.

Chairman O'Neil asked what are the wishes of the Committee?

Alderman Shea replied my own thinking is that a bird in hand is worth two in a bush so I would say take the \$3,000.

Alderman Shea moved to accept a partial payment of \$3,000 of the \$15,000 balance owed to discharge the mortgage for property located at 140 Conant Street. There was not a second to the motion.

Alderman Craig stated just based on what Sam has said, did you say that the entity that is second in position has agreed to receive 30% of what they are owed?

Mr. Maranto replied 20%. They have a lien for \$30,000 and they are getting \$5,000.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we have any history with this owner?

Mr. Maranto replied no. I am quite doubtful that it would ever get to us if they were to go to foreclosure. I'm not sure they would get to the second mortgage holder either.

Alderman Shea stated just mathematically, Mr. Chairman, if the second is getting 20% and we are getting 20% there is consistency there. One is getting \$6,000 and one is getting \$3,000, but 20% of \$15,000 is \$3,000 and 20% of \$30,000 is \$6,000.

Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed, with Aldermen Greazzo and Craig voting in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 17 of the agenda:

17. Update from the Public Works Director on use of former police vehicles.

Chairman O'Neil stated Tim, there were some observations made that some have seen recycled black and white police cruisers going around town, but it is my understanding that you have been working on a program trying to implement as best as possible in phasing out the Crown Victorias from being recycled two or three times and getting some more energy efficient vehicles.

Mr. Clougherty stated that is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. At the beginning of last year, at the advent of the first year of our mechanical equipment replacement program (MER), we had roughly 24 to 26 Crown Victoria type of vehicles on the street. Once this process is completed this year, after year two, we are going to have, at most, six Crown Victorias on the street. We have been replacing these with four cylinder Ford Focuses, Ford Rangers and in limited instances some of the Chevy Impalas that some of the detectives have driven that are more fuel efficient than the Crown Victorias. We have made some great strides and we are hopeful that by the end of next year we will be away from the Crown Victorias in their entirety.

Chairman O'Neil asked for the 2011 MER, how many Crown Victorias are on the road, to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. Clougherty replied for fiscal year 2010?

Chairman O'Neil replied you said that there were 24 to 26 when we started. I thought that was the 2009 MER.

Mr. Clougherty stated 24 to 26 and then...I'm looking at a list in front of me with 17 Crown Victorias.

Chairman O'Neil stated so we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. Clougherty stated like I said, that is going from 17 to six and we anticipate having those phased out next year.

Chairman O'Neil asked are you finding a market to get rid of them or is that the challenge?

Mr. Clougherty replied there is a market to get rid of them. We always bring to the auction at the White Farm in Concord. They bring anywhere from \$500 to \$2,500. Sometimes we get a little bit more for them. I don't want to say that we get less because \$500 is pretty minimal, but the most that we have been getting is somewhere around \$2,500.

Chairman O'Neil stated could you put together a memo and get it out to the full Board just summarizing what you just told the Committee?

Mr. Clougherty replied sure, not a problem.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 18 of the agenda:

18. Discussion relative to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.
(Note: Communication from Sam Maranto is attached.)

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

Mr. Maranto stated I believe that everyone got my letter. If you have any questions or want me to briefly summarize what was said in that letter I can.

Chairman O'Neil asked did everyone get the communication? Sam, go ahead and summarize.

Mr. Maranto stated essentially, acting with the authority of the BMA, Public Facilities put together a package for improvements for 434 Lake Avenue. Unfortunately, we had a budget of \$550,000. Bids were received by five contractors and they were all over \$900,000. That necessitated some value engineering, looking at what would make the most sense to accommodate the budget that we have. As such, we have gone back and looked at items such as a new roof on the property, cleaning up the exterior of the building, repainting it, graffiti removal, repairing some windows that have been damaged, fixing the front, removing the interior stairwell and in its place putting in a shaft and elevator for AVS accessibility for the future, also bringing in utilities for sprinkler system, electrical system and things of that nature and also various incendiary demolition of the first and second floor, which were probably 1960 modeling style with paneling and that will be taken out of there. The consideration we did have, after the Department of Historic Resources came through and reviewed the building with us, is to make sure that what we do to the building will complement and not take away its integrity from a historical perspective. We did get an approval back from them with certain conditions that we have to comply with for the facility. As you are aware and as was said before, we need to have these funds committed no later than Thursday of this week otherwise HUD will come back and remove the funds from the City. CDFA has asked me to contact them tonight if the BMA approves this and they will have a contract tomorrow. We are putting together a draft contract pending approval from everyone and that would be signed tomorrow, were the Board to move forward with this program. The contract will be for \$690,000. With NSP funds we presently have a little over \$500,000, which means that I am going to be doing some swapping of HOME funds. As I noted before, Manchester NeighborWorks got over \$2.2 million to do basically all housing on the west side and they could utilize HOME funds and that is what we are suggesting that you do. We will swap them some NSP funds for our HOME funds. They are amenable to do that. We would have to go back to HUD to get approval from them. I have contacted CDFA and they would put that revision in for us once we did that. Essentially, this would be phase one. We would have to go back and do some other work to get the building suitable for the future. These items are really things that are necessary to secure the building and also improve the looks. This being a neighborhood stabilization program it will clean the building up. In recent months, the building has had considerable graffiti and damage to the exterior and this would hopefully ease that by showing that we are doing something to the property. We are looking at, in the future...there are several possibilities of additional funding and that is what we will be looking at over the next few months.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we are swapping \$135,000?

Mr. Maranto replied \$190,000 of HOME funds.

Chairman O'Neil stated wait a minute, your math doesn't add up. You need \$690,000, correct?

Mr. Maranto replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated you have \$550,000.

Mr. Maranto stated we also have architectural fees, Alderman. We have roughly \$500,000 for construction in NSP. We need another \$190,000. We are authorized for \$550,000 and \$50,000 would be going towards architectural fees. We have a construction budget of \$500,000 so we need \$190,000. That is why I am recommending that we would swap from NeighborWorks.

Chairman O'Neil stated just for an overview of some things that weren't able to get done, we could not upgrade the electrical service.

Mr. Maranto stated right now we do not have electrical service upgrade. The sprinkler system is being put in, although at this point it would be difficult to actually do it until we know what is actually going in there.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding was that there was only enough money to get the service to put it in. We are not going to worry about putting in sprinklers until we know what is going on. We have the two bottom items, \$50,000 from miscellaneous and \$65,000 for contingency. What are some expected things under those?

Mr. Maranto replied when you got that, I had to get something out to you. They have worked further on this. There is no contingency in this project at this point.

Chairman O'Neil asked where is that \$65,000 allocated to?

Mr. Maranto replied that is basically going to the various items in here. The roof was put in. They have been negotiating with them back and forth.

Chairman O'Neil asked when the money is finally committed, can we get a final breakdown? That is \$115,000 that is hanging out there that is in miscellaneous or contingency.

Mr. Maranto stated one of the things that we discussed that was not in there was the front entrance way and that is something...some of these items are in other items, like masonry, so it is not clean to say this is what it costs.

Chairman O'Neil stated provide for the Committee an update when this is finalized. Is our only action the transfer of the money?

Mr. Maranto replied two items. One is to authorize a contract execution tomorrow.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to authorize execution of a contract.

Mr. Maranto stated the second would be to revise our current NSP agreement with NeighborWorks and then revise our sub-recipient agreement with them.

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to revise the current NSP agreement with NeighborWorks and further revise the sub-recipient agreement.

Alderman Shea asked Sam, when all these improvements have been made, will there be occupancy or is that way out of the picture right now?

Mr. Maranto replied this is phase one. We will be doing additional fund raising over the year. I anticipate the program going into 2011.

Alderman Shea stated the intent at one time was to have different non-profits move into this area. Is that still the plan?

Mr. Maranto replied there has been discussion about that. It hasn't been brought to the Board yet.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding, Alderman Shea, is that the building will still have a way to go before it is ready for occupancy. We are moving in the right direction.

Alderman Shea stated that is what I am asking him. In other words, we anticipate that in the 2011 budget, maybe I'm getting ahead of myself, but in the 2012 budget rather, there will be non-profits, possibly, depending upon how much progress is being made in the construction and revamping, moving in there. Am I correct in that?

Chairman O'Neil replied I think you are. It may not necessarily have to wait until the next fiscal year. There may be some funding that becomes available before that. I think one of the things that we should get from staff, once they have completed this first phase, is the ballpark amount from a budgeting standpoint to fix it up into community service offices.

Mr. Maranto stated I don't have the formal notice yet, but I understand that there is an SP3, which is approximately 25% of the initial billion dollars. The State also heard that they were going to get \$5 million. I'm not sure. Last time around, they allocated the funds depending upon how much CDGB you got and the threshold was \$2 million. We fell just below that so we had to go to the State. This time around we are over \$2 million so I'm hopeful the money would come directly to us, which translating at 27%, we are roughly looking at \$2 million.

Chairman O'Neil stated the bottom line, Alderman Shea, is that it gets us moving in the right direction to do exactly what you said. There aren't enough funds to renovate the building completely at this point.

Alderman Ludwig stated I want to thank Sam Maranto, CIP staff and Facilities because they have put a lot of work into this during a short period of time. I know that it is very difficult. They work with a lot of people, architects and so forth. I think it is a great project for that area. It doesn't get done as quickly as we would like to see it, but they deserve credit for a job well done in terms of turning this around very quickly.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 19 of the agenda:

19. Discussion relative to the First Time Homebuyers Review.

Mr. LaFreniere stated we have nothing on this item for tonight.

TABLED ITEMS

20. Presentation from Peter Capano, Chief of Parks, of the Stormwater Analysis Report – Ray Brook Stormwater Study.
(Tabled 8/2/10; to allow the Chief of Parks to meet with the State and research grant opportunities.)

This item remained on the table.

21. 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.

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