

## COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

**May 13, 2003**

**5:30 PM**

Chairman Thibault called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Thibault, Pinard, DeVries, Garrity

Absent: Alderman Gatsas

Messrs: Robert MacKenzie, Steve Tellier

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Report of Planning Department regarding acquisition of the Wiggin & Nourie building.

Robert MacKenzie stated at the request of the Board we did review the building, Wiggin & Nourie. There was site inspection of the building. We have not had any more detailed inspection such as structural, mechanical reviews or any environmental review. In general we found the building to be in great shape though, high quality office space; asking price was \$3.1 million. We did also review with all the City departments whether they had any additional space needs and there were no significant space needs requested. There was one department that thought we perhaps should buy the building for future use. There was another department that thought that they'd prefer to have a first floor office rather than their current below grade office. But other than that we did not get any significant needs for space at the present time. As you know we are finishing up the Rines Building, and that's going to take another six months to complete that project and get all of those departments moved in. So that's a quick synopsis of our review. It is an excellent building, high quality, good office space, good location. There is only modest parking in this area, I think there are 21 spaces that are stripped and a couple others that are used beyond the stripping.

Alderman Garrity asked Bob was the School District contacted at all.

Mr. MacKenzie answered not we did not contact the School District.

Alderman Garrity stated Mr. Chairman I think its...I spent four year up there on Bridge Street in the Ash Street School area as a School Board member and space has always been an issue over there. I think the square footage over at the Ash Street School is 12,000 square feet and I would like to formally request that the School District be contacted and see if they can take a walk through it and see if they are interested in it at all. I think it would be a great location to have the School District so close to City Hall and other City departments.

Chairman Thibault stated I think if the Committee agrees I would like to have also some type of an idea from the Assessor's as to where we're going with this and what the prices are and does it match in line with whatever, and before we make any decision, and then whatever the Committee wants to do is fine with me. Then we'll send it to the full Board.

Alderman Pinard asked can we table this tonight so further information is...?

Chairman Thibault replied well why don't we get the Assessor's to give us the information that I'm just saying now we should get.

Alderman Pinard asked but why don't we do that all in one package when Mr. MacKenzie gets his end and Steve gets his end and do it all in one meeting.

Chairman Thibault stated that's fine, but I would Bob thank you for your thing. I think we're all set with that. I think Steve I'd like to call you up here and give us some ideas as to what this building is, roughly what it's worth so we can have some ideas to thrash out. Then if somebody wants to table it, table it. I have no problem with that. Mary did you have something to say?

Alderman Sysyn stated I just wanted to ask Mr. MacKenzie. Did he check like all the base people that are in basement that are in the annex would move into that building? You've got the City Solicitor, the Human Resources Department and then you could use that basement for other storage things. Because I think it's...you've got a City Solicitor who is sitting in a city of this size, sitting in the basement of the annex and I think he'd be better off maybe on the first floor. That is something to consider.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we did notify both departments. City Solicitor did not indicate they needed any more space. We did get a response back I believe. Human Resources was the agency that although their space is adequate, they would have been more comfortable with a first level space.

Alderman Sysyn replied right. I spoke to Ginny Lamberton too. He might not need more space, I was thinking in terms of moving his whole office over there.

Mr. MacKenzie replied no that's what I...no I got that impression from you. There would be more than adequate room in the Wiggin & Nourie building. Much larger than the basement area of the annex.

Alderman Lopez asked Bob have you looked at the finances and are these people going to wait while the Committee tables everything? Where do we stand on that? If they sell it, they sell it. We don't have a retainer on in or anything like that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we no option, we have no agreement to a retainer, we have not looked at the financing yet to see what the impact would be on the property tax rate. We have not tried to negotiate at all with the applicant just because we didn't know how serious the intent was of the City. Normally we would not go into negotiations until authorized by the Board.

Alderman Garrity asked in discussions with the Deputy City Clerk he stated that storage of vital records are an issue in Manchester and I'd like to just briefly have you let us know where records and other storage is in and around our City.

Chairman Thibault asked isn't that going into the Rines Center?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied not all of it. I do have some handouts for the Committee.

Alderman Garrity stated the reason why I ask this Mr. Chairman, if we could put possibly the City Clerk's office and Human Resources in that building we could use the basement of the annex for storage. I'm not suggesting we buy a \$3.1 million building just for record storage, but just thinking out of the box.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I had some discussion...at the request of Alderman Garrity I did have some discussion with the archivist. They are meeting informally as a group with some of the other departments and that's really what I'm sort of sharing with you is the cubic foot and square foot space of storage needs that their presently talking about. We have a few departments that have not responded as of yet, which includes some of the large ones such as Police and Highway. Overall, for your current records that you have with the Rines Center, you're at maximum capacity. That's not including the Highway or Police Department's. We still have stuff that will be off site from the Clerk's perspective. We have things at the incinerator and some things at the Fire Department and a few other locations that aren't going to be moved to the Rines Center, but once we move what we have over there, that alleviates, temporarily alleviates the problem, but long range you are still going to have some storage issues. Particularly with archival issues because even that space that we're taking is a record storage is more of a...we look at it as a short-term storage not as

archival space. There is a difference as to what you're air flows should be there are certain criteria that you follow for an archival type of process. There have been suggestions that perhaps the evidence room at the Police Department is overflowing. They have stuff going back into the 20's and 30's. That stuff has to be kept forever. We have not explored anything in discussions with anybody there or with Highway or with anybody else because we can barely take care of what we have or were asked to do now. But it is something that you're going to have to consider at some point in time. It's not that we're saying that this needs to be it, necessarily, or that maybe sending stuff there would alleviate other space that could be created as archival space, but you are going to need more of an archive center for the City at some point in time. And that's something you should be looking at into the future at least. But for right today, you know with using the incinerator space and I a few other things we can manage to get by. It's not going to...

Chairman Thibault asked but the Rines Center will help?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered I'm including the Rines space with that. I mean we have things stacked up in hallways that shouldn't be there right now, and we've borrowed space from other spaces that we have to keep moving things because...we just had to empty space out of the Franco American Society because they needed the space that we were using for voter registration records. So and that's some of what's now by the incinerator, so we just move it around. But overall we have enough for the moment. I guess Leo wants to add to that.

City Clerk Leo Bernier stated as we were looking storage space...as a matter of fact Citizen's Bank gave us some space so we have records there that should be under our control. Again, I think the Rhines Center, we appreciate what you've done, it's a help, but if you look for long term, that's not the solution.

Alderman DeVries stated just to follow up on that. The renovations or improvements to the Rines Center in the form of air conditioning to make it feasible for archives...do you recall what we're spending there.

City Clerk Bernier answered \$95,000.

Alderman DeVries asked about \$100,000?

City Clerk Bernier replied \$95,000.

Alderman DeVries asked and that will make that a somewhat...not a perfect?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied what will happen there is it makes it to the point that you can do records storage. It's not archival storage, but you can do record storage for things that you need to retain for say seven years and then can be disposed of, that's adequate space. For something that is archive forever...

Alderman DeVries asked is it secured against water damage there? Isn't that part of an archive storage as well?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered if you have archives you have a very specialized system that you would not have say in a records storage system. They are two separate entities in and of themselves, such as the airflow and qualities are much more rigid for archival storage than they would be for...

Alderman DeVries asked does this new facility, the Wiggin & Nourie, would this potentially already have an archive?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied I have no idea. I've never visited the site. I couldn't tell you what they have.

Alderman DeVries stated they have an info media center in the basement.

Chairman Thibault asked Bob do you know anything about that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I am aware of the needs but I couldn't tell you whether Wiggin & Nourie would meet those. They're fairly exacting standards for archive storage.

City Clerk Bernier stated the foundation at Wiggin & Nourie is six feet thick. Where the temperature doesn't really change that much at the lower level. But I haven't looked at the facility so I would not know.

Alderman DeVries asked one additional question? If we're going to take a look at it for archives, it might also make sense to look at the City Hall annex and try to do the comparison as to whether that would be the appropriate place for the archives rather than...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked in the basement area, you mean?

Alderman DeVries replied yes, in the basement area if we did move office space or office space became available down there. And just see if something is less expensive than the \$95,000 that we're looking at.

Chairman Thibault asked Steve would you just give the Committee a little overlook onto this building and what we're talking about, and what's it worth, and whatever you think?

Steve Tellier answered well clearly I would echo Bob MacKenzie's observations on the excellent nature of the building. This is a rather prestigious law firm that has been their corporate headquarters for some time. The expenses in that building were always well improved and it was well received. And what they did with their basement offices, they have what's commonly called wells, natural daylight wells. That being they've expanded basement panes of glass further to allow a lot of natural daylight into basement offices so it's more of a natural environment for all of the people that are working in that area. Something that's considered whenever you having a professional environment a little bit below grade. So that's a feature that that building does have, they parking as we all know is a very high valued commodity and he has already indicated there's 21 plus spaces there. Proximity to City Hall is very, very close, so that's an excellent feature as well. The assessment property record card I circulated with Chairman Thibault. It has a picture and a sketch of the building. The assessment at \$2.3345 million or \$2,334,500 is the assessment established in 1991. As everyone knows the market has continued to escalate, so whenever you have increasing market or sales prices, the ratio drops down. So the present ratio that we have for 2002 is 76.6 percent. So if I applied that to the assessment, it would translate literally to an indication of market value of \$3,047,600. So at that point, the \$3.1 that they're asking for is somewhat corroborated by applying the ration to the assessment that was established in 2001. Furthermore, this Committee hasn't asked for a market value or any sort of appraisal at this point. This strictly speaking, we just applying the ratio to the assessment that was established in 2001. As the Committee spends more time looking at this and the need and pressing forward, certainly the Board of Assessor's could add more information, but at this early juncture those are the observations that I would add at this point.

Alderman Pinard moved to table this item. There was no second to the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated actually I would like to see who we have here representing the building. Is there anybody here from Wiggin & Nourie or from Tower Realty? Would somebody like to address some questions from us?

Richard Mulvee stated I am a principal with Tower Realty.

Bernard Nardi stated principal, Tower Realty.

Alderman DeVries asked can I ask a few questions? I think we already heard one Alderman ask if there were any timeframes that we were dealing with as far as...I saw from the literature that was sent to us, I think you have any exclusive until sometime in June?

Mr. Nardi replied that is true, but that's not a timeframe that you would need to worry about.

Alderman DeVries replied I understand. So I mean we're talking about tabling this tonight and we're...

Mr. Nardi stated we want to make sure it's done right. If you need more time, by all means you're welcome to take it. The building will remain on the market and if somebody steps in before you make your move, you'll lose. I can't predict that future.

Alderman DeVries asked as far as some of the documentation on the financial lease agreement maybe or other types of agreements, your fee schedule. Has anybody done any kind of speculation as to whether we would be able to utilize the building to sublease? I mean have you done any kind of marketing to see how it could be broken up?

Mr. Nardi replied our charge is to sell the building. We wished we could have leased it. Right now the leasing market is extremely exciting in downtown Manchester. We also represent Hampshire Plaza up the street and in this year already we've had over 100,000 square feet of office leases. So it's a highly charged market in Manchester today.

Alderman DeVries asked has the building be set up as far as separate entrances so that it could be subdivided and leased individually by floors or would it have to be...?

Mr. Nardi answered the building does divide well. It is not divided today. It is a single tenanted building.

Alderman DeVries asked so it could be secured individually by floor?

Mr. Nardi answered that is correct.

Alderman Garrity asked I have a couple requests of Bob MacKenzie. Bob I'll put this in the form of a motion if I have to, but I would formally like Bob to contact the School District and see what their needs are. I would also like a cost estimate on moving the City Solicitor's office and Human Resources out of the basement,

using the basement of the annex for our records storage and move them over to this building. Just cost estimates of moves and things of that nature

Chairman Thibault asked he doesn't have to make a motion for that?

Alderman Garrity asked just make a request? Also a little bit on what Alderman DeVries has requested is a cost estimate of putting archives down in the basement of the annex and report back at our next Committee meeting.

Chairman Thibault stated my thing would be, why don't we as a committee say we want this done, send it to the full Board, and in the meantime we can get all of those questions answered. That would be my idea, but it's up to you guys.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that Alderman Garrity anything that goes in there and all of your suggestions are very fine, I think what the major thing is right here in my viewpoint, is if we're going to move forward and refer this to the full Board, I think that the very question, do we want to buy it? We can use it; there's no question about it. We can determine what we're going to put in there afterwards. The only question I have of Mr. MacKenzie and Tower Realty is they realize that we're obligated under the appraisal of the building and we only pay what we get. You understand that. And whatever that appraisal comes in at, that's what we pay for. That's how you establish the...okay I just wanted to make sure that. May I suggest to the Committee that if you're interested in this building, that you proceed to find out where the funds are going to come and send it to the full Board with the understanding that there will be plenty of opportunities to put whatever we want in there.

Alderman Garrity stated I'll go ahead and make that request that we have a detailed finance package from the Finance Department and an impact on the tax rate. Will that be adequate Alderman Lopez? Do you think that's what we're looking for?

Alderman Lopez answered yes. I think you're going to have to tell the full Board.

Chairman Thibault interjected let's send it to the full Board right away so they can go to the first meeting right away so that we don't hold these guys up either or lose it because of that.

Alderman Lopez asked if I may. If the full Board says yes this is a good deal, we want to buy the building, then we instruct Mr. MacKenzie to work out the necessary paperwork.

Chairman Thibault asked do we have a motion to send it to the full Board?

Alderman Sysyn asked do you want to send it to the full Board now or do you want to...?

Alderman Garrity stated I would feel more comfortable after looking at the fiscal impact of buying the building. I don't feel comfortable moving it on to the full Board right now. I don't think we have the fiscal impact that we...the fiscal impact information that we need before we move it over to the full Board.

Alderman Sysyn stated you should have it before you send it to the full Board.

Chairman Thibault stated you would save time, that's all I'm looking for.

Alderman Sysyn stated I would think you would want it before you send it to the full Board. The financial impact should probably come before you send it to the full Board.

Chairman Thibault asked Bob can you get back to us next week? How long does that take you to do this?

Mr. MacKenzie answered if you would like a response from the School District, that's probably going to take longer than a week, because they will likely want to tour the building, so it's probably going to be two weeks. Although I am trying to remember when the full Board is scheduled to meet.

City Clerk Bernier stated we're planning May 19<sup>th</sup>, but the next time we meet is June 3<sup>rd</sup>, no May 20<sup>th</sup>, I'm sorry.

Alderman Garrity stated we can call a special Lands & Buildings meeting can't we?

Chairman Thibault replied sure. It's going to take him some time. Like he says if he has to bring the school into it, it's probably going to take them a week or two. Once they're ready to give us the financial impact as well as the other things that Bob is going to be looking at, call a meeting.

City Clerk Bernier stated June 3<sup>rd</sup> is the full Board meeting. I think Lands & Buildings meets on June 3<sup>rd</sup>, so we can...

Chairman Thibault stated so June 3<sup>rd</sup> will be the meeting. By that time they should have all of the information that we need. So do you want to make a motion to that effect?

Alderman Garrity made a motion to obtain a detailed report of the financial impact of buying the building, information on subleasing the building, and a response from the School District as to their potential interest in the building. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated there's additional information I'd like to add to that. I'd also like to have somebody take a look at subleasing the building and the viability of that and what the cost might be. Just some kind of a limited market analysis as to what that may bring us to offset expenses or the bonding cost.

Mr. MacKenzie stated at this point we're looking at total annual costs of close to half a million dollars a year. The only caution that I'd have on subleasing, is that because we're using municipal bonds, or we'd use municipal bonds, we would have to be very careful about any income we'd get back from the building. So clearly we could not sublease a majority of the building. Whether we could sublease 10 percent or something to make some revenues, we could check with bond counsel on that.

Alderman DeVries asked when we get the package from Finance, if he could also include the bond capacity where we're at with some of the other projects that have been recently suggested.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. We will do that as well. I would just note that if we're looking at it for school purposes, that the School Board would have to assume responsibility for the bonding capacity and as you might have heard at certain other meetings they are close to their bonding capacity. So I will just...

Alderman DeVries stated for the next two years and potentially the need for elementary space. We can't forget that.

Mr. Mulvee stated I'd just like to extend a formal invitation to each member of the Board to contact us and we will be very happy to bring you through the building. You would get a better feel for what we're talking about and maybe help you in your decision making.

Chairman Thibault replied thank you very much. So Bob you're going to get all of this information, you're also going to take care of Finance as far as...

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman DeVries stated we just need a formal vote I think.

Chairman Thibault called for a vote on the motion and it carried unanimously.

Chairman Thibault addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Ratify and confirm poll recently approving a business license application from Terry Casey of Standing Room Only, LLC to operate a vending cart at City Hall Plaza on Elm Street.

On a motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to ratify and confirm a poll recently approving a business license application from Terry Casey of Standing Room Only, LLC to operate a vending cart at City Hall Plaza on Elm Street.

#### TABLED ITEMS

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Mr. Chairman we do have some items. I don't know if you want to take off part of the tabled items but we have information for St. Pius X Church and DASS Development.

On a motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to take Item 5 off from the table.

Communication from St. Pius X Church requesting to purchase Map 477, Lot 4 land on Page Street.  
(Tabled pending information from Alderman Pinard.)

Chairman Thibault asked Steve Tellier is going to be giving us something on that? Is that what you said?

Mr. Tellier stated we do have a letter to the City Clerk's office for a potential opinion of value. The value has been set at \$6,500. Carol I didn't see it in the packet here but I do have a copy of that with me if the City Clerk doesn't have one. So the value has been set at \$6,500. I do have a copy of the maps here for the benefit of the members of the Committee if they want to take a look at the site of those lots and how it is in proximity to St. Pius.

Chairman Thibault stated we've seen it Steve, we've been over there on a road hearing. The whole Board has been out there.

Mr. Tellier asked so you're familiar with the site? Would the City Clerk like a copy of the letter?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied I think Alderman Pinard had another question though.

Alderman Pinard made a motion to honor the request of St. Pius X Church to purchase Map 477, Lot 4 on Page Street with a selling price of \$6,500. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman DeVries.

Alderman Garrity asked are we going to set an asking price of \$6,500?

Mr. Tellier stated \$6,500.

Chairman Thibault called for a vote on the motion and there being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked could you take Item six off the table? Do you want to take that off? We have a communication.

On a motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to remove Item 6 off the table.

Communication from DASS Development requesting to acquire land beneath the Pearl Street School.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated we had also forwarded a separate appraisal package that had been submitted by DASS Development on this item.

Alderman Garrity asked has the developer been contacted at all about the price that...?

Chairman Thibault replied yes I believe there has been quite a bit of communication between the developer and the buyer, if you will. Steve am I right on saying that? And how he arrived at his price.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated there is a difference of opinion according to what DASS told us and I believe there's been some communication back and forth between the two parties.

Mr. Tellier stated I would ask if all of you have a copy of a letter I submitted to the City Clerk's office for members of the Committee?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied yes, I just gave it to them.

Mr. Tellier asked do all of the member have a copy of the appraisal as well?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied we had sent it to them with their packets.

Mr. Tellier stated if you don't have it, the main observations I would present as pertaining to this issue Ladies and Gentlemen are the opinion of value that DASS is presenting in this appraisal, is \$135,000. In brief, what that represents is the value, the present value, of the leased fee interest. What they took over was a vacant severely depreciated building and they invested their monies into this building so the profit that they're receiving, the attractiveness of the present building is due to the developer investing that in what the City had as a vacant derelict building. What the City has coming to it presently are the taxes on that property, but what DASS is offering is the fact that the City gets an annual lease of \$13,200...there's another 36 years left on the 49 year lease. What the \$135,000 represents is the value of what those 36 payments are today. In other words, if you were to loan someone X, and then you decided you wanted that money returned to you quicker than the terms of the lease, obviously you not get the interest that you had provided for and that's what we're talking about; the time value of money. What those 36 payments of \$13,200 are worth today. Now as an additional observation the appraiser who performed this appraisal did not attribute a value to the building and at this point it would be very difficult for someone from my office or myself to attribute a value because in 1990 the recession had just started and in 1991 it was in full swing, in October of 1991. So the market value of that derelict, accelerated, physically depreciated building was very low and I don't have a value for that here and now. But the leased fee interest, and I can't disagree with the appraiser, the appraisal is \$135,000. Now under the current proposal we receive the taxes and that \$13,200 at the end of lease, the property reverts back to the City. So with that being said, those are the issues that are presented to this Committee. The value of the building is on the appraisal at \$375,000, but that's the value of the property utilizing the income approach. But don't forget the high value of that property is due to the developer improving the property and putting his own money and resources into it.

Alderman Pinard made a motion to sell the property. There was no second on the motion.

Alderman Garrity asked is it for the equalized value of \$335,000?

Mr. Tellier replied no, absolutely not. From my understanding again, I think the developer should be...the person who is asked to purchase this should be here to represent their own interest.

Alderman Garrity stated we should probably have legal counsel here too. Someone from the City Solicitor's office. We don't have anybody here this evening for that.

Alderman Pinard withdrew his motion.

On a motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to put Item 6 back on the table.

Chairman Thibault asked City Clerk is there anything else we should take off the table?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied I have another communication and I'm just not sure what the Committee wants to do. The communication that's being distributed is relating to a parcel of property out on what is known as Hobart Street. The Committee and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen had actually acted to sell this property to Frank and Janice Hobbs. It was wetland area up off the Bridge Street area. Mrs. Hobbs contacted me and apparently she had a surveyor and some other people out there and in the process of that they told her the land was worthless and that it wasn't worth the \$4,000 the City said they would sell it to her for. She called me back and she said I'm really not interested in it, it's not like I was going to develop it or do anything with it. She said she'd take it if the City wanted to give it to her, but other than that she doesn't have an interest. So I'm just...if you gave it to her it would be incorporated with her land and it would be taxable at that point, but other than that she has no interest in buying it per say...

Chairman Thibault asked right now we're getting nothing for it?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied no.

Alderman Pinard stated I would like to move that we let the Hobbs have that property. It's unusable land, it's swamp and this way we'll be collecting some money because if we keep buying property off the tax roll. So I would just as soon get the taxes.

Alderman Pinard made a motion that the City give the parcel of property known as Hobart Street to Frank and Janice Hobbs. Chairman Thibault seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion were Aldermen Pinard and Thibault and voting in opposition were Aldermen DeVries and Garrity.

Alderman DeVries asked how about a couple of questions from Steve Tellier? The assessed value of the land in question. I don't know if he's prepared to speak to this tonight.

Chairman Thibault replied \$4,000.

Alderman DeVries stated so the annual taxes...

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated he didn't know I was bringing it in.

Mr. Tellier stated I'm sorry ladies and gentlemen, what issue are we speaking to, I was answering some other questions.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied up off from Bridge Street area, Hobart Street, we had Janice and Frank Hobbs that was interested in that parcel of land. The City was going to sell it to them for \$4,000. They're saying that they had somebody out there for something and they told them the land was worthless and it didn't make any sense for them to deal with it and so she said I don't want to buy it. If the City wants to give it to her that was fine, but there was no value to her to do anything with it. It's not like somebody's going to build on it because it's all wetlands anyway.

Chairman Thibault stated if we give it to her at least we'll get taxes.

Alderman Garrity asked how much taxes?

Alderman Garrity stated but that's how we got it before though.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated she thought that perhaps if they gave it to her that at least it would take it off from the City's account and put it back on as a tax roll basis of some sort and I guess that's where they're questioning now is what the assessed value of that property might be.

Chairman Thibault stated so we just had a vote that was tied so...

Alderman DeVries asked so the assessed value is at \$4,000? That's what we were...

Mr. Tellier replied that was an opinion and value using other residual lots. At this point...

Alderman DeVries asked that was tax-deeded property to the City? Correct?

Mr. Tellier replied right.

Alderman DeVries asked so if somebody else found that it was not even worth the value of the taxes that they were paying on it?

Mr. Tellier answered it don't believe they were an abutter so it was something that came through the family or something of that nature and they didn't want to pay the taxes. It had no direct benefit to the previous owner so they let it go, I believe.

Alderman DeVries asked and the taxes that we would actually be receiving on something that is assessed at \$4,000?

Mr. Tellier replied something like that would be negligible. It would probably be joined with other lots of record so there's a sliding scale. Double in size is not double in value and it would be pennies on the dollar. There has been instances in the past where the Committee has looked at a piece of land that the City didn't have any interest in and they wanted to get the liability off, although we have found in the past as well, that wetlands has had a value to the City because those acres are preserved and utilized in other density requirements. So I really can't comment to that at this point.

Alderman DeVries stated I think my motion that I would like to make is to ask this Committee if we could send this property over to the Conservation Commission and have them take a peak at it and determine the percentage of what that it is. It's likely that we might want to hold onto the property to offset permitting needs...yes to put it into conservation as Steve Tellier is addressing, as it is a greater value to us then just giving it away to the abutters.

On a motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to refer the parcel of property known as Hobart Street to the Conservation Commission.

7. Communication from Deputy Solicitor Arnold regarding Jefferson Mill Air Rights.

This item remained on the table.

8. Request of Crystal Lake Preservation Association relating to various lots on Tax Map 506.  
(Tabled pending information from the Solicitor's Office.)

This item remained on the table.

9. Communication from PSNH requesting clarification of easement rights to specifically include overhead rights (Tax Map 693, Lot 40C).

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee