

COMMITTEE ON LANDS & BUILDINGS

September 18, 2000

7:00 PM

Chairman Cashin called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Cashin, Gatsas, Levasseur, and Shea

Absent: Alderman Thibault

Messrs: Deputy Solicitor Arnold, R. Ludwig, Alderman Lopez, K. Devine,
J. Brisbin, Chief Driscoll

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Ratify and confirm poll conducted August 21, 2000 approving a land transfer/detention pond easement proposed to be located near the intersection of Raymond and Eaton Hill Road in Auburn, NH.

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

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Shea requesting the City Solicitor and Parks Department submit an ordinance that will prohibit hitting golf balls in public parks and which will provide a fine for violations.

Alderman Shea moved the item for discussion. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated we have prepared an ordinance. I would note that if this Committee would prefer, the Director of Parks & Recreation could propose similar restrictions by regulation as they have done, not on this particular topic but certainly other topics, in the past. The Committee could go either way. We have already prepared an ordinance if that is the direction the Committee wishes to take.

Chairman Cashin asked, Alderman Shea, your request was for an ordinance correct.

Alderman Shea answered yes, an ordinance would be in order.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a copy around.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered it is not on ordinance paper. I have a draft copy here that I can pass around.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there is only one copy. Would you like me to read what it states? It is stating, "Amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding a new subsection, Golf, Swing At or Hit a Golf Ball in any City park or on any City property that is not specified by the Superintendent for golfing or unless otherwise approved by the Superintendent." It would be Item F in a listing of prohibited activities I am presuming.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied yes.

Alderman Shea asked is there a penalty or fine involved.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered there was not one specified in the ordinance.

Alderman Shea stated there should be some teeth in this in terms of prohibiting someone from doing it.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied there is a penalty involved. There are a set of general penalties that are for anything that isn't specifically otherwise designated.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated this particular ordinance was designed to go under Section 96.06 Behavior so that it would prohibit golf. I would note that Section 96.08 is labeled Enforcement, which gives the Superintendent and Park Attendants and the Police authority to enforce and provides that anybody in violation can be ejected from the park and we could confiscate or seize property used in violation of the ordinance.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think I need to see the ordinance written out.

Alderman Shea asked is Ron Ludwig here. Could he comment on this.

Mr. Ludwig stated I did talk this over with Tom Clark in the Solicitor's Office and at his recommendation he didn't really feel that we should get into specific fines and that to add another layer of bureaucracy or whatever out there as it relates to...are we going to ask the police officer to come along and fine a person. I think that is where he felt the difficulty lied. Quite frankly, we can't enforce or run up

to someone who is hitting golf balls in a park and say...we do tell them that they are not supposed to do it but we really can't threaten them with any kind of fine.

Alderman Shea asked do you feel comfortable about having some kind of an ordinance in terms of forbidding people from hitting golf balls in parks.

Mr. Ludwig answered I think the Solicitor and I agree that there should be something in place because evidently there are a few people out there that just can't use common sense so we have to develop an ordinance, but the enforcement of it then becomes the issue just like with the dog issues and everything else and the trivial things we are faced with out there.

Alderman Shea stated I feel comfortable with this if you do as long as there is some provision so that if somebody comes along and says to someone hitting a golf ball in a park you are not supposed to do it and if you do it then you are obviously in violation of a City ordinance. We don't want to drag them down to the Police Station or anything.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the ordinance. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion. Chairman Cashin called for a vote on the motion to approve the ordinance. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from the Library Director relative to an option to purchase property abutting the main library located at 2 Bethel Court.

Alderman Shea stated I am in favor of this because I think that in time the library will need the facilities increased and I think that it is a reasonable type of proposal on their part. I am not sure if the Library Director would like to comment and I see the Mayor's hand up as well.

Mayor Baines asked the Library Director to come forward. Obviously, we are dealing with a very untimely situation in the scheme of things with the Library because we are looking at the availability of a piece of property that just happens to be coming up for sale and it is really not something that the Library or the Trustees anticipated happening at this time. I think it is in the best interest of the Board to examine this issue because we do have a six-month window if you will in terms of looking at it. It doesn't fall, obviously, within our budget process but I think there are some options for us to address it. Keeping the issue of the Brown School and this issue separate, I think, is going to be the challenge in discussing this because if you look at the library situation, as you know it is an emerging issue and the focus of libraries is changing although if you look at what is

happening in our own library I think in this past year the circulation is up 3,000 or 4,000 per month. We are also looking at the access to technology and libraries are sort of becoming the equalizer in the community where a lot of people in the community do not have access to technology in their homes, they are now seeking out the library, not only in our community, but in communities across the country to close that digital divide. As you look at the future of the main library here in the City and the option before us, I would like the Board to keep an open mind towards that and look towards some creative way to look at purchasing that property. I would like John Brisbin or Kevin Devine to address this from their perspectives.

Mr. Devine stated I am one of the Trustees of the Library and I thank you for hearing us tonight. We have two essential but very exciting projects that we are looking at and as the Mayor said a lot of it is because of how the world works. Bethel Court just suddenly became available. It hasn't been marketed yet. It hasn't been listed yet, but we found out that the owners wanted to sell. It is directly behind the main library and it would be critical for any future expansion of that library. In 1996, the Library Foundation, which is a private funding foundation to support the Manchester City Library to assist with projects when the City financially can't, funded the Providence Study and it identified two major building needs. One, it said we need to expand the main library because it is overcrowded and inadequate for modern technology and for the people there and for the citizens of Manchester. Two, it identified a second critical building need and that was a significant addition or increase in size for the west branch. We focused first on the west branch as you are aware because three years ago the Brown School became available and again the Foundation kicked in another \$6,000 matched with City CIP money and they did a feasibility study for changing the old, abandoned Brown School into the new west branch. That study was completed and it went to CIP for review and it is sort of in a tabled phase now because the numbers came in exceedingly high from our perspective as well. I think it was \$4.5 or \$4.9 million. We have gone back and asked the Foundation to fund a second level study on that to look at something perhaps more creative for the City. Right now, the architects are doing that study to come back to the City with. They are looking at four or five alternatives, one of which for example is to combine the Brown School with the new Health Department coupled with the west side branch. There are creative things going on and the Trustees are very excited about them but while that study is going to come back to CIP, all of the sudden Bethel Court fell in our lap sort to speak. We are excited about that because of what happened in the past. Several years ago, the old Hesser College building right behind the main library was offered to the City for free to use for the library. For various reasons, the City wasn't able at that time to deal with the issue in the timeframe that the owner wanted the City to deal with it in for their own business reasons so the building ended up going to another entity. At least for now we have

lost the ability to expand in that direction behind the library but Bethel Court opens up an interesting option. For relatively short dollars, we could get that building, knock it down, turn it into a parking lot to be used either for library patrons, library employees or if the City preferred, paid parking. We put together with the City departments involved and through the donated services of Pierre Peloquin, he did an appraisal for us to come up with what the reasonable values are. We got from the Highway Department the cost to make it into a parking lot at \$10,000 and then we realized that CIP funding being so tight this year we might not be able to fit this in at this late date. The Foundation went out and scoured the people who annually have been giving money to the library and the Library Foundation and Richard Nault, who has always been a good donor stepped forward when he heard what was going on and said I am willing to donate \$10,000 to the Foundation to let you buy a six-month option on Bethel Court if the City will look at it in terms of realistically trying to fit that into the next CIP budget is what I believe the proposal is. He doesn't just want to give the money if there is no chance of that at all. I guess what we are really asking for tonight is we would like to give Mr. Nault the green light and say this is good, a citizen stepping forward and saying we know the City can't move this fast...he will donate the money that will give us that six months but we would like to be here to answer any questions that you have and get a sense of whether you think this is a good idea. We think it is a great idea because it insures the future viability of a building that in 1913 was donated to the City by Frank Carpenter. We have an interesting situation in Manchester. Most library things are from donations. All of our buildings have always been donated. The first one before the Carpenter was donated by the Amoskeag Manufacturing Company in 1869 and then Mr. Carpenter built the beautiful building we have on Pine Street. We know have another individual who has been successful in business who wants to come forward and help the library so the citizens of Manchester have the finest library in the State and we would like your encouragement in that and we certainly want to answer any questions that you have.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Devine, is that \$10,000 applicable to the sales price or is that just a pure option price.

Mr. Devine replied it is a pure option price, Sir.

Alderman Gatsas asked so that is a \$10,000 number that just extends the right for six months.

Mr. Brisbin answered if we are able to purchase, then it would go towards the purchase price.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we don't purchase, then Mr. Nault would be out but I assume he is looking for a pretty strong commitment from this Board.

Mr. Devine replied I know that you can't make a binding commitment tonight. I think what we would like to be able to report to him is that this Committee is encouraged about the project and will look at it with a fair, reasonable and favorable eye. I know that you can't make a commitment tonight.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe there is \$175,000 earmarked in CIP now for studies on the west side.

Mr. Brisbin replied correct. That is design money.

Alderman Gatsas stated but we still have to cross the hurdle of whether we are willing to spend \$4.5 million for that and I believe you said that is out to study. When do you think that study...we seem to study everything to death in here and if we collected all of those \$6,000 we could probably buy a new library.

Mr. Brisbin replied December 1 is when the additional supplementary...you will have four different options. Some will be less expensive than \$4.5 million and some will partner us with the Health Department.

Alderman Gatsas stated so basically we are going to be at that point somewhere in the vicinity of two or three months from getting into another CIP budget, which means if we were looking to do the correct business venture we would probably look to purchase Bethel Court today and look to fund the CIP balance for the Brown School Library in the next CIP budget if this Board so desires if you were going to look at it from a business perspective.

Mayor Baines replied we agree with that. That would be the option that would be before the Board to deal with this issue if, in fact, they looked at that as a very viable thing to do in looking towards the future, which I think to be quite frank we haven't done enough of.

Mr. Brisbin stated I wanted to add that 2 Bethel Court or the Hesser Building, when Dennis Meyers built the handicapped accessibility in 1990, the elevator and the elevator hallway were built so that they could communicate to either of those spaces.

Alderman Levasseur stated during the last budget that we went through I asked the question of...you had put in your budget that you get a certain amount of money from the City but you never answered the question of how much money you are getting from the Trust. What is that amount on a yearly basis?

Mr. Brisbin replied \$80,000.

Alderman Levasseur asked why can't we seem to raise money through some sort of process to buy the building. The job of the trustees is to go out and find money from people. This City funds the library and spends a lot of money every year for that and this price of \$139,000 to purchase that property doesn't sound like a lot of money to try and go out and get from the public or to try and get from the trustees. Have you looked at that option?

Mr. Devine answered the fundraising is done through our Library Foundation, which has crossover Boards to a great extent and we do spend a lot of time trying to raise money and we have raised a lot of money and we have spent a lot of money. The Providence study was \$25,000. We have put in substantial monies to studies. The Trust Funds are separate and most of those are earmarked by law for what the donors set them up for. Many of them are very specific. Some of them are so specific that they identify the religion of the text that has to be bought with the interest so we have been advised by the Attorney General that we have to only spend money in the trusts according to the donor's wishes. That is why we created, about 10 years ago, the Library Foundation to open up our ability to do exactly what you are saying. We have been doing that and we continue to fundraise, but these will be City owned buildings and it is a little hard and I am sure that you have been involved in capital fund drives for charities and you know they are difficult but it is hard to do a capital drive to buy a building for a municipality because your donors say what a minute, that is a municipal building, I pay taxes. That is the line I always get when I ask for money from them. It is very difficult to do that. What we have done is raised monies to do studies to look at feasibility and needs of the citizens of Manchester for their libraries.

Alderman Shea stated just to clear my mind, there is really no objection if the money that was earmarked for the feasibility study for the Brown School would be applied to purchasing this property. Is that correct?

Mr. Devine replied I don't think there is an objection except to the extent that we would want this Board to understand that the Trustees of the Library stand fully committed to attempting to assist the West Side in having a proper branch there. We are not abandoning that project.

Mayor Baines stated I would also like to assert that is only the real viable option that we can come to you with if we want to take advantage of this opportunity and then we would have to revisit that other project with the same type of debate that would go on with any project that is ongoing for the community and we have a number of those on the agenda right now so we fully recognize that that would cause perhaps more focus and attention on that issue but that is the option that is before you.

Alderman Levasseur moved to table this item.

Chairman Cashin stated as an Alderman from the west side and Chairman of this Committee, I would recommend that we go ahead and purchase this understanding that we are not going to back off the Brown School. I don't want anyone to think that the West Side Aldermen are trying to hold this up because we are trying to protect the Brown School. We understand that right now you have a bird in the hand and let's grab it. I have no problem with that.

Chairman Cashin moved to purchase the property at 2 Bethel Court. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman Cashin called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Levasseur being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Chief of Police requesting the expenditure of \$2,450.00 from previous CIP Police projects to fund a feasibility study of the Police Department firing range.

Chief Driscoll stated the letter, I think, is self-explanatory. For the past two and a half years our firing range has been closed. We had anticipated as we were going to get a new building that we could use other facilities. We have a contract with Wolf Firing Range and we also go out to a pit in Auburn. It is seasonal. The contract is very man intensive in that we have to transport our people down there. We would like to take the opportunity of renovating the firing range to see what that would cost. We have spoken with a group of individuals recommended to us. They will do that study for the cost indicated, which is \$2,450. I have spoken with Mr. MacKenzie and we believe that there is money in the police project left over and I would ask that the Committee approve this so that we can take a look at it and come back with a recommendation.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the request. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion for discussion.

Alderman Levasseur asked can't you just put this out to bid instead of having a study done. Can't you just call up a bunch of companies and say we are thinking about doing this job and put it out to bid and if they get the contract they get the money.

Chief Driscoll answered we would certainly put the project out to bid if at some point down the road...at this point we don't even know what the project is so for the \$2,450 we would ask them to come forward with a proposal on what needs to be done to renovate the facility and that would simply be a study that would take a reasonable amount of time. I don't think we would put that out to bid, a \$2,450 project.

Alderman Levasseur responded well it is not going to cost \$2,400 and we know that it isn't going to cost that. We know it is going to cost some money to have it redone. There must be companies out there that specifically do firing ranges and that is what they are in business to do. You can call up five or six companies and say come over here and bid the job out and then you have an idea of what it is going to be. I get the feeling you are hiring somebody to hire somebody else.

Chief Driscoll stated what we would be doing is hiring somebody and asking them to fulfill...if you look attached to the letter there is the proposal and scope of services that we would ask them to do. They would then get back to us and tell us this is what needs to be done and this is the cost. We would then be back before the Lands & Buildings Committee, as well as the CIP Committee to see if that was a feasible project.

Alderman Shea stated you indicated that there are funds available from previous CIP police projects that would cover this expenditure. Is that correct?

Chief Driscoll replied yes.

Alderman Shea asked so there wouldn't be any additional money needed at this time for this particular study.

Chief Driscoll answered it is my understanding that I would have to go before the CIP Committee to get them to allow the use of some of those remaining funds to do this. It is on the CIP agenda for this evening.

Alderman Levasseur asked this Turner Group, are they just consultants. They are not the guys who actually do this for work?

Chief Driscoll answered no. They are simply consultants.

Alderman Levasseur asked so they wouldn't be receiving the contract, but they would be telling you who to turn to for these contracts. We have had this firing range for awhile and I know you are not allowed to use it and somebody must have given you some advice to not use it.

Chief Driscoll answered it was the Health Department that worked with us on that.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't know. Maybe this is how it has always been done in government and I know that I have asked you this once before but it just doesn't seem to make sense to hire a consultant to do something that I think you are capable of doing on your own. I think you can call up some companies and ask them to come and look at it. Whenever I want to have something built in the restaurant I don't hire a guy to make the phone calls. I do my research and find three exhaust guys and ask them to come in propose an exhaust system for me and I get three companies and I look them over and make my decision based on that. It seems like a waste of money to throw \$2,400 away to have somebody tell you who to call. Maybe this is the way it is always done.

Chief Driscoll replied I think you give me more credit than I deserve because I, quite frankly, have no understanding of the heating, air conditioning or lead contamination issues. I think we need a specialist to look at that and that is what we have tried to identify.

Alderman Levasseur asked isn't the company that you are going to hire to do the work going to be able to provide you with that information.

Chief Driscoll answered yes, I think they can.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is my point. The companies that you would be hiring to do the job.

Chief Driscoll replied perhaps I misunderstood you. I thought you were saying would the Turner Group be able to determine the scope of the project and I guess my answer is yes. I wouldn't even know who to put this out to bid to without their help and support.

Alderman Gatsas asked what are you using for a firing range now.

Chief Driscoll answered we used a pit out in Auburn, weather permitting. We also use the Wolf Firing Range down in the south end of Manchester.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you have to pay rent at the firing range.

Chief Driscoll answered yes we do. We have a contract with them.

Alderman Gatsas asked what kind of numbers are you talking.

Chief Driscoll answered I think it is somewhere under \$1,000 or maybe \$1,200 for a six-month contract.

Alderman Gatsas asked does that range fit all of your needs other than being housed in the building you are at.

Chief Driscoll answered no it doesn't. The biggest thing at the Police Department is the availability of manpower and for us to transport people down there with their equipment and have them go through the exercise with our training staff multiplies the man-hours by three.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there any way we can utilize the engineer that we have at Public Building Services to come in and give you some sort of...I mean obviously if this company Turner comes back to you and says it is an \$800,000 renovation project to get your firing range up and running...

Chief Driscoll interjected I don't think that is what we are talking about but I don't know and perhaps a person better able to answer that question about using the Highway Department engineer would be Bob MacKenzie. Certainly if that works, it works for me.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am not sure, Alderman, if the Highway Department would have the expertise. It is a fairly specialized area, but I can't say yes or no whether that would have that expertise.

Alderman Gatsas asked have you had an opportunity to look at the scope of services here. I mean basically they are talking about ventilation. Obviously if somebody goes down there and says because it is in the basement and I assume that is probably where it is, that to change the air flow in the building is going to cost X amount of dollars or I think it can be done for \$50, maybe then the attitude would be to go and spend the \$2,400 to get the expert to come in and tell us what it is, but I would assume that if he comes back and says I think it is going to be \$800,000, there is no reason to spend \$2,400 if that is the number.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think the Highway Department does have good expertise in a lot of heating and ventilation and it would be useful if they were involved in that and could perhaps save some of the money. This is a very unique type of facility, though, and there might be some need for expertise. I am sure there

would be some need, but I wouldn't see why you couldn't have the Highway engineer do some of that.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am just talking about a generalized comment for him to go down and say I looked at it and I think this is a project that costs X amount of dollars. I am not saying that he should do the project. I am just saying give the Chief and idea of what that cost might be because obviously we would then have to take a look at whether he is going to come back to the Board for those kind of dollars.

Chairman Cashin asked if we table this and give you an opportunity to sit down with the Highway Engineer is that okay.

Chief Driscoll answered that is not a problem. It hasn't been open for two and a half years. I just think if we are going to remain in that building the City would be making a mistake if they didn't investigate the possibility of re-establishing that as a viable training facility.

Alderman Shea moved to table the item. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion. Chairman Cashin called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning recommending acceptance and approval of the location of the General John Stark Statue for City Hall.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this is an offer and I know that the heirs of General John Stark are here, Gail Forand. We had, during the construction of Stark Street, looked at that potential. I think the heirs had hoped for a different location in front of City Hall and there has been a location identified that would be suitable. So, it has been explored. We actually looked at a couple of locations on Stark Street and I would turn that question over to Gail Forand.

Ms. Forand stated I have for you gentlemen the plaque that will be going on to the stone and I took a little ride to Bennington two weekends ago and this is the statue, the gentleman Mr. John Trafeil, who is donating the statue to the Molly Stark Chapter had also donated one to the site of the Battle of Bennington and this is an enlarged picture of the monument that is there in the battlefield in Bennington, VT. The statue is being donated by Mr. John Trafeil, who was a direct descendant of General John Stark's sister, Isabelle. He was concerned that the battlefield does not have any representation of John Stark who was the legendary hero of the battle. For his purposes and his family interest, he is also donating one to what he

refers to as the General's homestead which is on 2000 Elm Street, which is also the present location of the Chapter House of the Molly Stark Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The statue, as he has proposed on a glacier boulder, which we already have picked out, is a little bit too large for our site on Elm Street. I was Regional Director of the Chapter at the time that this was proposed by Mr. Trafeil and the ladies decided our area was too small. I then proposed that we give the statue to the City of Manchester because I realized that they were doing some renovation to City Hall and the area and I thought it would be a nice gift that the ladies could give to the City. I have been working with the Planning Department and Bob MacKenzie and David Fong who has designed the area where the statue is being proposed. The stone is being donated by a quarry in Hudson, Bronx Industries. I have a crane company that is donating their time to erect the statue on the stone. The Highway Department has agreed to do the work to get the site prepared, which the Molly Stark Chapter will pay for of course. I have a stone cutter in Chelmsford who is going to do the stone cutting. It needs a little bit of trimming for the footsteps and to place the plaque on the front of the stone. I have hired or we have hired Mr. Peter Kidd to design and do the stone and the landscaping around the statue as per the design that was given to us by the City Planning Office.

Alderman Levasseur stated thank you for coming here today. So, you would rather see it down here on Stark Street rather than Stark Park? Is there any reason in particular for that?

Mr. Forand stated Mr. Trafeil lives in Wisconsin and he came down a year and a half ago to look at the different sites. Originally, it was proposed on Stark Street, however, the proposed site was unacceptable to him. It was going to be placed at eye level, which meant that the General would be standing on the sidewalk pointing. We thought that it would be inappropriate at that place. He liked the Southside on Market Street much better and we did pick out several sites off to the left of the courthouse and working with Mr. Fong we also decided that the immediate right of the courthouse or the annex building would be a lovely site. Also, the antique statue in front of the brick would be nice.

Alderman Levasseur replied thank you for bringing that down here. It is a nice place to put it and I think it is going to finish that street off. We have done a lot of work and the statue is going to be the final touch and I think it will look great.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to accept and approve the location for the General John Stark statue.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning regarding the possible land acquisition of a piece of property on the westerly edge of Wolf Park.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it was the Mayor's Office that asked that this be put on the agenda for discussion. There has been a history to this site. There have been a couple of other attempts at either land swaps or purchases. It is a fairly...it is not a site that can be easily developed and I think they are looking to see if the City was interested in purchasing the property. I believe that Joan Porter is also here and she has some information on the site in terms of its tax status.

Ms. Porter stated the information that I have on these parcels is there are five parcels and there are exactly \$21,001 due on this property as of today in back taxes. If we are going to purchase the property, that should be taken into consideration.

Alderman Gatsas asked has the Assessor's...I don't see any communication from the Assessor's Office for value. Do we have anything?

Mr. MacKenzie answered again there is probably some subjectivity because this site is not served by a street or utilities at the present time. So, there would have to be some judgment to make this a buildable lot. To have a true value, this would have to have public utilities there, which are not there now.

Alderman Gatsas asked what are they asking for the lot or the parcel.

Mr. Roy stated I have been contracted by Atty. Thornton, the owner of the property, to work out some type of sale. When Wolf Park was created, the section that used to serve or the street that used to serve this property was entirely encumbered by the City. It is the outfield of Wolf Park. Since then, he has paid taxes on it and not paid taxes on it. He would like to get to the point where it is out of his hair and either get it to the City for fair market value or swap it for a piece of land, which he has discussed with the City Solicitor, the Building Department and the Planning Department. They haven't set a value. If it does go on the open market, they would be looking at a fair market value with probably a fight with the City to try and get a road in there and some type of utility access. It is a piece of property that best suits the City. It is the parking lot to Wolf Park. It would be a very cumbersome and very costly development for someone to do, but it is a piece of raw land in the City and he would like to investigate having the City's Assessor's Office put a value on it. Being residents, I think he is being fair.

He is just tired of paying tax bills for a piece of property that so far hasn't been able to be developed.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Joan, the \$21,000 is how many years of past due taxes.

Ms. Porter answered since 1994.

Alderman Gatsas asked why have we allowed it to go that long.

Ms. Porter answered the first year we could have tax deeded would have been 1997 for the 1994 taxes and at that point the City went into negotiations with Atty. Thornton represented by Richard Denay at that time to do a land swap.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we have been negotiating for three years.

Ms. Porter answered yes. They are still negotiating for a land swap.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Roy, do you have any idea of...what are the size of these lots.

Mr. Roy answered 50' x 100'.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the zone.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am not sure if it is R-2 or an R-1B. If it was R-2, they could build potentially single family homes actually if it was either. I know there was a request at one time for townhouses on that site, but they did not proceed.

Alderman Gatsas asked and there is no road leading there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered not currently, no.

Alderman Gatsas asked and there are no utilities.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no.

Mr. Roy stated on the map in your agenda there is the end of Schiller Street, which is directly south of Arnold Street. A dead end has been cut off of your map, which falls between the two houses that are there leading to the wetland City-owned property and the northwest corner of the five private lots on your map as well. That would be the most logical access without having to move Wolf Park.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you know where the sewer lines are.

Mr. Roy answered they would have to be brought down from South Main Street.

Alderman Lopez stated I served on the Parks & Recreation Commission for 18 years and this has been going on and on for a number of years. I know that Alderman Cashin has been involved in it extensively. I know that on many occasions the Parks & Recreation Commission has denied the request to do anything because there have been some points made that some of the property that the ballpark is on doesn't affect Wolf Park whatsoever. You might move the fence or something along that line. My recommendation to the Committee is only to point out by your own words, Mr. Thornton, \$21,000 is what it would cost to go and put a street, sewage, lighting and everything else in there. It would be a fortune for you to do that.

Mr. Roy replied it is believed with the access that is there, potential land values in the City, that paying the taxes or making it part of a development...he has been approached to sell it and approached me to work with a contractor and developer to sell it. No one, I think, in their right mind believes it should be a development but on the same note it would be costly but the land cost is there. The City of Manchester, even in its state now, it would cost \$20,000 to \$30,000 if you were to go through the development costs to input five single-family houses there, your return for affordable housing would be dramatic even after your very substantial land costs, tax costs and street costs.

Chairman Cashin asked have you got a price on this.

Mr. Roy answered Atty. Thornton in 1996 was looking for \$65,000. We had a conversation today that put it to...if the Assessor's Office would like to put a fair market value on it, the third party would. Looking at raw land, \$20,000 to \$30,000 per lot is achieved in the City. Is that fair? He doesn't want to make that determination. That is Parks & Recreation. We don't want to be unfair. Originally there was talk of \$62,500 for the sale. I think your very capable Assessor's Office would be a good area to put a fair market value on it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I know that I have been out of the real estate market for a few years, but I would tend to look at that and say that affordable housing in Wolf Park's outfield would not want to be the place that you would call affordable housing. Maybe you need to take a look at realistically what those prices are on an R-2 basis. I don't think you can put single families. If they are R-2, certainly the highest and best use would be a two-family there. Looking at the distance that you would have to bring sewer and water in, you would have to...you are probably looking at around \$60,000 just to get utilities there and now you have to bring the road in. I think that is going to make it prohibitive. With the \$21,000 in

taxes you are going to be up close to the \$80,000 to \$85,000 level so at \$20,000 I don't think you are going to find many developers to step up to the plate. I think that maybe somebody should come back with a more realistic approach. I don't know why this thing has been lingering and certainly the next question, Joan, is how many other properties are lingering at this timeframe because I don't think that is what we should be doing.

Alderman Levasseur stated if you want to put affordable housing there, maybe you should donate it to Manchester Housing Services.

Mr. Roy replied in viewing the property with Alderman Cashin, housing is not the highest and best use of this property. Development is not the highest and best use and that is why we started the process. To answer Alderman Gatsas' question, a fair proposal is putting it in the City's hands to put their number on it. If I came to you and said we want \$30,000 a lot and nothing less or it is going to be developed, I think that would be unfair. We are asking your professionals to...you know we think it would be fairer for the City to say what the budget is.

Chairman Cashin stated I would like a motion to have Mr. Roy sit down with the Assessor's Office and come up with a fair figure and then come back to this Committee.

Alderman Levasseur asked, Mr. Ludwig, do you want that land.

Mr. Ludwig answered it wouldn't negatively impact Wolf Park. There is a gravel parking lot there that we have been trying to improve by securing funding for a number of years and I am sure one of these days it is going to happen. Wolf Park is a heavily congested area and if we lost that portion of the parking lot, if that street was ever developed and right now it has always been a paper street and never been accepted, but it would impact the ballpark. There is no question about that. What value it is and who puts that number on it, I don't know.

Alderman Shea asked if any arrangement were made then taxes owed would have to be deducted, right.

Mr. Roy answered absolutely.

Alderman Shea moved to have Mr. Roy sit down with the Assessor's Office, come up with a fair value, and report back to the Committee within 30 days. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion. Chairman Cashin called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Request from John Marchwicz to purchase property located on Crescent Land (Map 218/Lot 21).

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that the Assessor's Office has submitted a report, although there is a typographical error that we are trying to verify. I think it was \$15,000, not \$15.

Mr. Tellier answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. MacKenzie, what is your recommendation. Is it in here?

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered we have not received a report from Planning or Tax on this.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am not familiar with this particular lot.

Chairman Cashin asked do you want us to table it until you have a chance to look at it and come back with a recommendation.

Mr. MacKenzie answered if I knew where Crescent Lane was...again there is a person on my staff who generally reviews these and for some reason I have no seen this one. I could check it fairly quickly and get back to you.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to table this item pending reports from Tax and Planning.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Request from M. Jeanne Trott to purchase two (2) parcels located at the corner of North Bay and Bennington Streets.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted we have a report from the Parks & Recreation Department and it was distributed to the Committee.

Chairman Cashin asked Ms. Trott to address the Committee.

Ms. Trott stated I don't know what kind of history you have on this property, but the property is located directly behind my house on North Bay and Bennington Street. It is directly across the street from Webster School. The reason why I became involved in this is because there was some discussion last year to turn this property into a parking lot to assist the teachers at Webster School. We had a number of meetings that Alderman Wihby was involved in and the neighborhood is very upset about this because we feel that it would further add to the congestion and not really alleviate what the teachers are talking about. There is ample parking on Elm Street. We had gone out and taken pictures to show that if the teachers are willing to walk another block or so, they would have ample parking. My understanding is that Parks & Recreation took a look at this issue and determined that in order to turn the property into a parking lot it would cost \$200,000 because of the grading problems there and that at a maximum it would create 30 parking spaces. When the Community Improvement Program did the work on Webster School this past summer, they put in nine parking spaces so there are an additional nine parking spaces that were not there when this whole issue arose last year. The neighbors or the abutters feel that there has been a lot of deterioration to the neighborhood with the removal of trees and the Madeline Road project and to take what was once a City park for children and tear down all of the trees to make a parking lot to add 30 spaces at the cost of \$200,000 for teachers that can't walk another block or so is just not a good use of that property. That is why I stepped forward. It is actually comprised of two lots. One lot is directly behind my house and the other lot is directly behind George and Grace Rizoto, my next door neighbors and my proposal is a little misleading. What I meant to suggest was that we would each purchase the respective lot to try and curtail any further development of that property.

Chairman Cashin asked are these lots buildable.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. I believe these would be buildable lots.

Alderman Wihby stated what we are asking today is to table this again and let Mr. MacKenzie come back and look for a conservation easement on that so we can make sure that nothing will be built on that lot and we can keep it City-owned property because Bob has some concerns about losing that lot or selling that lot and not having enough acreage when we go get an exemption because of the acreage that you need for a school building. So, if we can come back with a conservation easement that says that nothing can be built on there, we would like to have a chance to review that.

Chairman Cashin asked, Ms. Trott, is that agreeable to you.

Ms. Trott answered yes. The main reason we wanted to purchase the properties was to make sure that none of those projects went forward and if a conservation easement can accomplish that goal, then that would be acceptable to myself and my neighbor.

On motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to table this item pending information on a possible conservation easement.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Request from Sheila M. Grace to purchase property located on River Road (Map 222/Lot 79).

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am not familiar with this particular request. I will check with my staff person who handles these to see what the current status is.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Gatsas, it was voted to table this item pending reports from Planning and Tax.

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Request from Norman Parisey to purchase property located on Sixth Avenue (Map 284/Lot 20).

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that there were reports received on this. It is not something that the City owns. The recommendation is part of a release and discharge or discontinuance depending on locations. There is a letter in your agenda from the Highway Department suggesting that if you received and filed then the information contained therein be forwarded to the person making the request. The Clerk would recommend same.

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

Chairman Cashin addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Request from Sabrina Zyla to purchase property located on Wallace Street (Map 649 between Lots #22 & #26).

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that the Assessors informed the Clerk's Office today that this is something that the City does not own that was a discontinued street back in 1988 and if the Committee so desires, they can receive and file and the Clerk will inform Ms. Zyla.

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

Chairman Cashin addressed Items 14 and 15 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Lopez requesting the Committee move forward and approve the recommendations outlined by the Planning Department and Tennant/Wallace Architects of the proposed Senior Center Site.

Communication from Zane Knoy, Co-Chair of the Manchester Regional Area Committee on Aging advising of their support for a freestanding building for a new Senior Center.

Alderman Shea moved the item for discussion. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I had written this letter to the Board and gave a copy to all of the Aldermen and after reviewing the feasibility study, I am not going to read the whole thing but I think it is important that we go through the process and make a determination on Singer Park. We don't have too many options as the reports indicate and if Singer Park is more valuable than other areas, I agree with Alderman Shea to go to Derryfield Park. One of the things that I want to do is in my last paragraph and when I indicated to accept the report, I was primarily accepting the site. I don't necessarily agree with the numbers that are in the report. Some of the numbers, I think, are very high in the Wallace report. I wanted to bring that to your attention and secondly the most important thing is the exchange of land if we utilize Derryfield Park. I remember Jay Taylor and others who presented the Hackett Hill plan and I think that there could be a fair exchange or even more for what we would use at Derryfield Park because I understand that it has to be an exchange. You cannot put a Senior Center on a recreational outdoor area, which I think the State would not go along with, but an exchange piece of property would be in order as we do the zoning at Hackett Hill and I submit this letter to my colleagues as something that is in process here so that we

can continue to move forward and make a decision as to what we are going to do with the Senior Center. Basically, that is the thrust of my letter.

Alderman Levasseur stated his letter is well written and I appreciate the notification from Alderman Lopez, but in his own letter his quote is “should Singer Park be determined of more value to the City in other ways, then I would support the Senior Center being located at Derryfield Park.” I honestly believe that a lot of us on this Board would love to see a Senior Center built as soon as possible, but in your own letter you raise a question to me that has to be answered before we can ever move forward. What is going to happen down at Singer Park? I mean Alderman Cashin and I spoke about this. If there is going to be a lot of development down there, is that not the right place for the seniors to be thrust in the middle of a big commercial venue with buses driving out of there and a 650 car parking garage. In talking to seniors, nobody ever mentioned the Bedford lot which I think fits all of the needs that we have but there might be something going on there with the parking situation but again that is right on the bus line. It is a square lot and ready to be built on if you wanted to make that adjustment and I don't think we have enough answers to be able to go forward with that at this time.

Alderman Shea stated I have prepared a brainstorming exercise with the pros and cons of each site and I don't want to list the positives and negatives, but I am willing to submit this to the Committee members regarding each site, whether it be Singer Park A or B, Derryfield Park or the Sears building, which were the four sites considered. Each of the members of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen received a feasibility study and the report that I prepared was prior to the submission by the architect of this feasibility study. So, we really have two basic and important questions. One question is the funding of the site and my colleague on my right indicated that with \$1.3 million set aside and another \$1.7 million, about \$3 million would probably be adequate to build a site depending on what contributions would be forthcoming from different sources. The second and perhaps the most difficult is where should a senior center be placed. Should it be placed at Singer Park A or B? Should it be placed at Derryfield Park? Should it be incorporated into another situation where it would be combined with other City departments? I think that the seniors, themselves, have indicated their unwillingness to be part of other City departments simply because in their particular judgment it is not a freestanding structure and, therefore, it would perhaps limit their options. The other sites, the Singer Park sites, obviously have potential as outlined both by Alderman Lopez, as well as by other members of the Committee. The problem is that the Singer Park area is one of the few sites in the City that the City has available for industrial and commercial development. Therefore, it is important that we not limit ourselves to those sites necessarily. The other site, of course, Derryfield Park, has its pluses and minuses. Again, certain members of the Committee agreed that that might be the preferred site.

Other members of the Committee brought up discussions regarding other options. Every day there are different sites seemingly available. If one talks to Alderman Pinard, he came up with a site up by the golf course. Other people have said that a company may be moving out and that could be a possible site. So, we are kind of on the horns of a dilemma. If we move to the left, we don't really please 20% of the population. If we move to the right, we don't please another 20%. If we stay in the middle, we may get the consent of the 60% left so my particular thinking at this time is to try and come up with possible funding. I think the Chairman is aware of my preference for the site. Perhaps more investigation is necessary, but I will leave it to the Committee for further discussion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I can remember, probably it was in December, when I was invited to meet with the seniors up on Tarrytown Road. Alderman Shea was there. Alderman Lopez was there and I believe Alderman Levasseur came in late with the food. I remember listening to the seniors talking about wanting new centers and looking at the approach that something should be done immediately. It should be done sooner rather than later and it should be pleasantly enjoyed by the seniors that are here today and not seniors of my generation where we still have a ways to go. I remember Alderman Shea saying, Ted, that is being pretty aggressive and you need to understand that it not the way government works and that this could be a three or four year project. So, I am certainly in agreement that something should be done soon. The seniors absolutely, unequivocally should be taken care of. We should look at every option that is available. We certainly should provide them with better access and better space than what they currently have. That is the first thing that we should look at. Having them in a multi-story building on the West Side and giving them access on Hanover Street without any parking certainly isn't the best utilized space that we can offer seniors who have taken us through the tough times in this City. So, yes, I am in favor of looking at a site and not spending all kinds of money over and above what we should do because certainly the taxpayers need to take a look at where we are going and making sure that we provide the seniors with the best adequate space. I think we need to look objectively at things. I looked at that report and I looked at it very thoroughly. I certainly commend Alderman Lopez for taking the time and taking a walk through the Sears building and being told that it was going to be a \$2 or \$3 million renovation project, I think he understands now that that is not the case so the \$6 million project that everybody was talking about there is not something that we are looking at. Now I am not saying that the Sears building should be the first building that we should look at and I am not saying that Singer Park or Derryfield Park should be eliminated, but certainly we should look at realistically where this City is going with procurement codes and with architects telling us that projects are going to cost us \$4 million so that when we look at things we don't understand where we are going. So, I think that we need to look at the procurement code and putting the City in the right direction so that when we look to build things for

people or to make changes for people, they are certainly done with the right perspective because yes, this City is a business, and we should run it like a business and no business would ever go out and say to somebody what is it going to cost to build something and come back with \$200/square foot because you could probably lace it with marble and gold and still be under those costs so I don't think that is something we should be doing. I think we need to take a look at where we are going and making sure that we provide the seniors with a first class center. Now, maybe that is a different avenue and maybe we need to look at not just jumping into a location that is not on a bus route because, yes, I have attended different functions that the seniors have and a lot of those people drive. There are a lot of seniors that don't drive, so we need to make sure that the accessibility for those people is convenient so that they can get there and enjoy the center. Certainly, looking at something at 25,000 square feet may not be the option of today and maybe it should be the option of a later date and giving them first class space and say here is some space today that is 100 times better than what you are in and yes if there are 500, 600 or 700 seniors attending then we should build them a 25,000 or 30,000 square foot building so that they can enjoy themselves and do the things that they would like. I think we need to take a look at it and certainly venture forward and not wait three or four years to do this project, but I don't think that we should be looking at something and just saying let's do it when it is a \$4 million project. Let's get \$1.7 million and see if we can do that and get some donations to finish the project because we all know how that works and sometimes it doesn't finish a project and we are always back looking.

Alderman Levasseur asked, Mr. MacKenzie, is there any reason that the Bedford Lot was not looked at in this study. I still believe that it is the alternative to the other three that we are looking at right now.

Mr. MacKenzie asked when you are referring to the Bedford Lot, could you be more specific as to which one you are talking about.

Alderman Levasseur answered Mechanic Street over to Canal Street in front of Wall Street Towers. Isn't that known as the Bedford Lot?

Mr. MacKenzie asked the Bedford parking lot.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that one has been committed by the City to be parking for the UNH project.

Alderman Levasseur asked it has been what.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the City last year committed those parking spaces to UNH.

Alderman Levasseur asked forever.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am not sure of the terms. I don't know if Mr. Taylor is here, but I do know that it has been committed long-term to UNH in order to get them to fully develop their building in the Millyard.

Mr. Taylor stated I am not absolutely sure of the term, but it is at least in the 49-year range if not 99-year range. That was all approved as part of the transaction a year and a half ago.

Alderman Levasseur asked, Mr. MacKenzie, if we were going to move on this today, what would be your recommendation. I don't think Singer Park is your first choice.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there are a lot of issues. Singer Park would be great for a senior center because of the river views, but there are a lot of issues that would not make it a quick development project and we do have the potential garage going in and short-term parking going in. There would be a need for an access road. I still cannot rule out the site, but it would not be a quick solution for a senior center.

Alderman Levasseur asked do you have another one in mind.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think the problem now in Manchester is it is an urban area and there are no great sites. When the program for the senior center was first identified, it was an ideal solution. 100 parking spaces on a large lot. The problem is there are no such ideal sites in the City. We will have to look at all of the final contestants and weigh the pros and cons. Each site has cons as well as pros.

Alderman Levasseur asked so it would be appropriate to say right now that we have not come to the determination of which site is the best choice so this discussion is actually too early because I don't think there is going to be an agreement as to which site we can go to in a quick manner unless we start going after something new or coming up with new ideas.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I guess I would concur with that. I have been back through all of the alternative sites. I have gone out to look at some other sites that might fit the program requirements, but have not found one. I have not pinned down a final site myself. All of them have pluses and all of them have minuses.

Alderman Levasseur stated suggestions on parks that we have...there was a suggestion made by someone who sat on the Senior Study Committee who talked about Kalivas Park. Do we start getting into all sorts of Federal rules and regulations when we decide to take that over?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would have to check on Kalivas Park to see if there have been any Federal funds used. I would want to check that first. I am not even sure if Kalivas Park would be large enough to meet the parameters. I do not think it would be able to get 100 parking spaces in and that was the original goal of the senior center. I would have to check to see if there were Federal funds. I know that is one of the original Amoskeag parks so we would have to get an approval of the reverter right from Amoskeag Industries to do something other than a park but we would have to check as well to see if that had Federal funds in the past.

Alderman Levasseur asked do you think it would be appropriate to recall that Committee and put them back to work.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think that would be a decision for this Committee rather than myself.

Alderman Shea stated we have a few other considerations. I think that Barbara Vigneault is here and there is a lease on the Hanover Street...which runs until next year or the year after so that should be a consideration. I know that my colleague from Ward 2 indicated that Mr. Shea said three or four years but what I indicated at the Tarrytown meeting is that there is a Latin phrase, *fastina lenta*, which means hasten slowly. Obviously, we have to examine all of the implications of all of our actions as Aldermen, but I think that where a large expenditure of money is necessary it is very vital that we examine all of the facets of that decision and I believe that in deference to my colleague that we are not looking...at least I don't believe the seniors are looking for a quick fix meaning if we outgrow the facility in a few years we can then move over to a larger one. I think what their initial thought was is that they would like a free standing building initially so that they don't have to do what they have had to do in other aspects of our community, whether it be schools or fire stations or police stations and so forth. Build it big enough so that we don't have to put additions on in a few years.

Alderman Levasseur moved to reconvene the Senior Center Committee to continue their work.

Alderman Lopez stated on Kalivas Park it is being renovated now. The Greek community and Ron Ludwig is here and he can tell you that I think they are ready to go out to bid in reference to that question you had, Alderman Levasseur. I think we all are in agreement. The basic questions about some of these different areas, such as the Sears building, is is it more valuable for it to stay on the tax role. Could that be a location where a hotel could go afterwards and allude to...we are not looking for a quick fix idea. My question, Mr. MacKenzie, is if we are to work on a time schedule as Mr. Wallace produced and we worked on a time schedule to...we can go into any building in time that we want but building a new center and working with the CIP and everything for next year, what are your visions on seeing a timetable here if this Committee or the full Board would act on building a new center. What kind of a timeframe?

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would be looking at the Board, at least on expedited projects, next year I would be looking to make a decision around April 1. Since there is money already allocated for the project, and you were looking for the balance of the money, let's say, in April of next year and if you had made a decision by January of 2001 as to the specific site, then the architect would have to be selected, but the architect would have had a majority of the design work done and a very tight estimate of what the cost would be by the time the Board would have to make a decision on the final funding. If this Board made a decision on the site by let's say early January, I do not believe that would slow up the process. You would have the next couple of months to make that final decision and not necessarily slow the process down.

Alderman Lopez replied just to follow-up, knowing all of the information that we know and speaking for myself, I think this Committee in working with the Planning Board can answer all of these questions and make some type of recommendation.

Alderman Shea stated obviously in deference to my colleague on the left, I don't really see a purpose in the Senior Center Committee being reconvened. I am not sure how long we can keep regenerating the options. We studied this problem for the good part of a year to a year and a half. We had an architect come and we visited sites. People have donated a tremendous amount of their time willingly. I don't know what purpose it would serve. We would just get back together again and we could be looking for sites from now until the next Olympics. It doesn't make much sense. We have to come to some kind of a decision regarding what we are going to do. Unless there is a site that is going to come out and suite all,

like I indicated before no site is going to be acceptable to everyone so it has to be a decision made by whoever, this Committee or the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to say do we want to build this senior center. Then we have to decide how much we want to pay and where we want to put it. That is where it is now.

Alderman Levasseur stated my point is and I agree that reconvening the old Committee would maybe not be a great idea, but I don't get the feeling that you guys came out of there with one site. Was there a vote that was taken that said A, B or C? Was there a vote? I don't get the feeling that anybody made an agreement on which site was the best one. That is where I am a little confused.

Alderman Shea stated Jack Royer was not at the meeting and I think at that meeting, Mr. Victor Goulet was there and at that meeting four people felt that Derryfield was a preferred site. I think that two or three people, Barbara Vigneault, Mike Lopez and I am not sure whether Bob MacKenzie was there and maybe one other person thought that Singer Park was a better site. I think that from what I can gather one lady felt that putting an addition on to the West Side would be preferable. It was not a full 7-0 kind of deal. It was a split decision.

Alderman Gatsas asked is Mr. Clark here. I think he participated in this study. I don't see Mr. Wallace here.

Mr. Shea answered in regards to Mr. Wallace, he asked if there was going to be a discussion and he was told and I called the City Clerk's Office and was told that it was not going to be discussed so the letter that was submitted by Mr. Lopez was done on 9/18 I believe.

Alderman Gatsas moved to table this item to get the experts that we hired in here to discuss this within 60 days. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion. Chairman Cashin called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Levasseur stated if they are going to come forward to us at our next meeting, I would like to know what the plans are for Singer Park. We are going to have to know something. I want to go to Singer Park, but I want to make sure that we do the right thing on this. This is a big decision and I think we have to build a first-class facility and do it right so let's have everybody there.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would be comfortable with 60 days. The only caveat on the time schedule is that I am not sure how long the Sears site may stay on the market. I don't think anybody can predict that, but I think 60 days is a reasonable time.

TABLED ITEMS

16. Proposed Senior Center Building Site Evaluation and Comparative Project Cost Estimates.
(Tabled 7/25/00)

This item remained on the table.

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

17. Communication from Jay Taylor advising of antenna lease fees received relating to the Hackett Hill property and requesting the Board establish a special non-lapsing account dedicated to help offset future expenses required as a result of the development of the proposed business park.
(Tabled 7/25/00)

Mr. Taylor stated the antenna revenue that we get we share with the University as part of a deal we made with the University in 1999 and the City's share progressively gets larger through the first five years of this arrangement. After Year 5, we get the whole \$80,000/year. Right now, we are splitting it \$40,000 a piece. The University gets \$40,000 and we get \$40,000. That is part of the deal that was negotiated in the original transaction. All I am suggesting here is that this revenue be put into some sort of a non-lapsing account to be used for development expenses or other expenses that are going to be required on Hackett Hill as we develop this business park. It just seems logical that the revenue is generated there and it might just as well stay there. It is as simple as that.

Alderman Gatsas stated, Jay, I think this certainly gives the City a huge opportunity. Obviously, the \$80,000/year revenue I think with the way antenna leases go right now, I think we need to take a look at an alternative. We have a couple of the highest spots of the City, one being up at the reservoir, that if we structured a deal correctly we probably could find revenues in excess of \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000 a month if you went out and shopped this and we probably at that point could go out and look at ways to maybe look at some bonding so that we can fix some of the infrastructure and fix some of the roads and let it be in schools. I think if we could find an income source that we could direct and certainly right now if you start talking about antennas, they are going for a premium and I think the City is missing the call by not going out where we don't...obviously somebody looking to put an antenna in their backyard has to come here for a variance. Now we have the two highest sites in the City and we certainly can go out and utilize them as a revenue source that we could designate for school funding, for infrastructure, for fixing up buildings because those numbers are huge

numbers that you can find right now for telecommunication companies that are willing to pay. That is a small number that we are talking about up at Hackett Hill. That is basically just some antenna sticking out of water. I think that maybe...I would like to make a motion to set you out on a mission to report back here in 90 days on what you can find on who wants to come in and allocate space on antennas and what we need to do because I know when I was at the Water Works we have an antenna that the Water Works was leasing somewhere around Hermit Road and I believe the rental source on that was somewhere around \$12,000 or \$15,000/year but I think we should take that avenue and start looking at other sources of revenue so that we can earmark for different projects.

Alderman Gatsas moved to have Jay Taylor investigate the leasing of antennas in the City and report back to the Committee in 90 days. Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion. Chairman Cashin called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

18. Request from Ronald and Kathleen Gosselin to purchase property located on Pond Drive (Lot Map 750/Lot11).
(Tabled 4/4/00)

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee