

## COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

**April 17, 2007**  
**Aldermen Thibault,**  
**Smith, Forest, Roy, Long**

**6:15 PM**  
**Aldermanic Chambers**  
**City Hall (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor)**

Chairman Thibault called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Thibault, Forest, Roy, Long, Smith

3. Communication from Mayor Guinta submitting a proposed policy recommendation relative to payments-in-lieu of taxes from EPD and the Water Department.

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Long asked if the Solicitor knew what the issues were with the related state statutes.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied yes with both the Water Department and the EPD Department as you know there are state statutes authorizing those particular departments and specifying how their funds are to be used namely water funds are to be used to supply water, and EPD are to be used to buy waste water treatment services. We think that in order for either of those two departments to make payments in lieu of taxes that it will take a change to state statute authorizing that, they will probably also have to look at the taxation statutes and I would note although I haven't researched that a few years back the water department was exempted from regulation by the public utilities commission, the PUC, I don't know whether payment in lieu of taxes would effect that exemption or not.

Alderman Long asked if he knew the statute was it section 72.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied no 72 is a general statute allowing a municipality to enter into negotiation for the voluntary payment in lieu of taxes with tax exempt organizations, I don't believe that that statute applies to the municipality itself.

Alderman Long stated if I had the statute it would help.

Alderman Smith stated it says the internal auditor, is he here, and if he isn't here then I would request that the director of the Water Works make a presentation.

Tom Bowen, Director of Water Works, and Mr. McNeill of EPD approached the presenter's table.

Alderman Roy stated if this is something that due to state statute we cannot accomplish at committee level I would look to make the motion we refer this back to the Mayor's office. He has a full time legislative assistant to look into this and come back with the statute. It was a suggestion made by the Mayor that we have no authority to transact. So instead of wasting these gentlemen's time...

Alderman Lopez stated I've been around with the Parks and Recreation Commission and we have been through this so many times and I think it would be important for them to inform the committee of their particular position and then if you want to table it and get some other information I think it is very important.

Alderman O'Neil asked Fred McNeill if this was to pass would we see a rate increase for our sewer users.

Mr. McNeill replied yes you would.

Alderman O'Neil asked Tom Bowen if this was to pass would we see a rate increase for water use.

Mr. Bowen replied yes.

Alderman Smith stated he disagreed with his colleague I think we should hassle this out tonight. I don't think it is a good idea and I can understand where the Mayor is coming from but I think he is ill advised in this presentation I would like to hear from Water Works and EPD.

Mr. Bowen addressed the Committee stating I wouldn't propose to speak to the legal issues although I believe the reference to the water fund is RSA 38:29; the tax exempt status for a municipal operation I believe is 72:23 but I would defer to Tom Arnold and Tom Clark to discuss that issue with them. With regard to the information that was presented I guess I would basically make two points. The first being that in the event that this would go through that we would pretty much be obligated to go ahead and raise our rates both for our in town customers as well

as our out of town customers to cover the costs. We just don't have, we have certain bond covenants that we have to meet for the recently approved 28 million improvements for the water treatment plant and with that in mind we are obligated to certain capital improvements and our 10 year CIP, our bond money and so forth is all factored in that the cash flow has to be there and we are talking about some substantial money as far as we are concerned. The other point that I would make is that the one thing that the net benefit to this was estimated to be a benefit to the City of \$670,000 that's fine until you take into consideration that it does not factor in municipal fire protection. And right now the Water Works does not charge the City for municipal fire protection, and just to give you a feel for what that number is the City of Nashua pays Pennichuck Water Works \$1.7 million a year for municipal fire protection. Now that is not charged to the City, and it has been in our dealings with the Public Utilities Commission over the years the PUC has acknowledged the fact that there a trade in services between the Manchester Water Works and the City taking into consideration services such as the City Solicitor, the Finance Office and so forth do not charge us directly for their services like they do the school district for example. But taking into consideration that we are providing them not only free water to the tune of nearly \$300,000 a year, but also the municipal fire protection so that number that really we're providing to the city is in excess \$1.5 million in total so when you factor that in the net effect of this would be a payment from the city to the water works and not the other way around. This is not the first time that this has come up, this has come up probably in the last 15 years it probably has been discussed two or three other times and the final decision has always been that the services that the water works provides to the City and it has been decided to let things just stay as they are.

Alderman Smith stated in other words like Parks and Recreation, the golf course and everything else they do there would be a charge, right.

Mr. Bowen replied yes.

Alderman Smith stated Highway with the sweepers so forth like that and what about the School District, anybody that uses water there would be a charge is that correct.

Mr. Bowen replied yes, there would be no more free water at all.

Alderman Smith stated so there is a multitude....

Mr. Bowen stated yes, all city departments some of them are enterprise funds, others are not, but there would be a charge to all city departments for services.

Alderman Smith stated out of all the departments I would assume that Parks and Recreation uses the most water outside of the Fire Department if they had a severe fire, am I correct.

Mr. Bowen stated yes they do.

Alderman Long stated just to be clear you are saying that if we were to implement this the net benefit of \$670,000 wouldn't be a net benefit it would be the city would actually be paying.

Mr. Bowen stated our estimate is that there would actually be a payment to the water works of over a half million dollars.

Alderman Smith moved to table. Alderman Long seconded the motion.

Mayor Guinta stated I have no objection if you table this, but if the motion to table is in essence killing the proposal then I would object. What I would ask the committee to do is try to meet with whether it is a subcommittee of the group or the chairman of the committee to meet with Tom Bowen and Kevin Buckley to reconcile the numbers that he's looking at and that I'm looking at. I think that it is a worthy review beyond just one committee meetings. Secondly I was watching a little bit in my office and one of the concerns that I have is that I believe that Manchester residents are subsidizing out of town users of water. I think that's a policy issue that we should be looking at and trying to consider is that in the best interest of Manchester taxpayers. At the end of the day Mr. Bowen may be accurate and correct in his math, I look at it and take a different perspective and look at it from a different perspective and think that there would be a savings today based on the numbers that I saw from our internal auditor. So there may be a benefit to the committee if Mr. Bowen and Mr. Buckley, myself or members of the committee sit down and try to reconcile those numbers and study them over the period of 30 -60 days.

Alderman Thibault asked about having Mr. Bowen give us a breakdown of how they deal with the other towns and cities as compared to Manchester and look at the whole gamut but I think the whole committee should be involved.

Mayor Guinta stated that is fine I just didn't want to see a tabling motion and then no additional work be done on the matter.

Alderman Smith stated I am very disappointed. It says our internal auditor and he is not even here. How come he is not present to present his case?

Mayor Guinta stated I cannot speak as to why he is not here.

Chairman Thibault advised he would invite him to the next meeting.

Mayor Guinta stated we can have him at the next meeting, if need be we can have him meet individually with members of the committee to go over how he comes to his calculations, and maybe he needs to sit down with the water works director to reconcile some of the differences of opinion, I'd be happy to make sure that that happens.

Alderman Forest noted that this is the second time this happens this year. I was under the impression that if we table an item it is non-debatable and we shouldn't be doing this.

Chairman Thibault noted they had not taken a vote on the tabling.

Alderman Forest noted there was a motion made to table and seconded. I'm asking for the solicitor to give an opinion on the motion to table was it debatable or non-debatable.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated first of all the Board of Mayor and Aldermen has it's own rules as a general matter if you were to follow Roberts Rules the motion to table is not debatable.

Alderman Lopez stated as a point I agree with Alderman Forest. It is not debatable but I think when you table something we should give some instructions to people to go find that information other than just keeping it on the table. I think with what we are talking about, I don't know if the auditor is the one to participate in this. I spoke to him and he didn't consider a fire when he reviewed his particular item. We have the Assessor here. If the position of the committee is to table it and have the legal people on our side and the legal people on the Water Works side put position papers together so you have a and b, who is right and who's wrong, then I think in the end you will see that in all other cases this probably can't be done unless you go to the PUC and all that stuff. We just have an idea that somebody came up with and just threw it out there and now you have to counteract that with the right people that can give a position paper and I think that is what the Mayor is saying. It's an idea, in the end I agree with Tom Bowen I've been through it with Water Works when I was on the Parks Commission but I'm not going to hash that out. You need something says this can't work because it is going to cost the taxpayers and going to cost the City money. Now what are those numbers if

it's going to be a complete wash or if we are going to have to pay another half million dollars. If that's the final analysis then I think it is a no brainer we are not going to do it.

Chairman Thibault asked to have it tabled and set a date to come back and get to those answers.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is not the first time this has come up. It has not passed because it's never been in the best interest of the citizens of Manchester. I hate to see a lot of effort wasted for a second or third time in the last 10 or 15 years. People outside the city of Manchester do pay a higher rate than people inside the city of Manchester for water. Fred I don't know if that is true on the waste water side, but we have Intermunicipal agreements on the waste water side to accept from several communities so we have been done this road before I just had to see a lot of effort wasted, it hasn't been in the best interest of the citizens of the city in the past I don't see what's changed that would make it in the best interest of the citizens moving forward. Mr. Bowen the number blows me away that Nashua is paying for the fire protection over \$1 million to Pennechuck, and they would have the right to recover a similar cost here.

Chairman Thibault noted there was a motion to table by Alderman Smith, seconded by Alderman Long suggesting a date be set for another meeting with the proper parties. Mayor Guinta stated he would be happy to work with him on getting the right people together if the Chairman wanted.

Mayor Guinta stated he thought it was possible that over the last 15 years that maybe something has changed.

Alderman O'Neil asked that Mr. McNeill from EPD is at the table as well.

Alderman Smith asked to make certain that the Internal Auditor was present.

Chairman Thibault requested the Clerk set a date and invite the appropriate parties to attend.

Chairman Thibault called for a vote. The motion carried.

4. Communication from Glen Ohlund submitting a Jac-Pac Development Proposal update.

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman Smith seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Mr. Ohlund referred to the memorandum of April 9 which outlined the review of where they were at with the review of the JacPac development proposal submitted by Anagnost Investments. Members of the review committee include representatives from the Mayor's Office, Planning Department, Manchester Economic Development Office, and Finance Office. We've also kept the Solicitor's Office informed of the meetings, some of whom are in the room tonight as well as the Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority. The review committee is at a point in their review of the sole proposal that basically they would like to update you on and get some feedback from you hopefully can help us in resolution of these items so we can move forward or take another track. First of all as outlined in the memo there was some discussion in various sources about the purchase price being offered by Mr. Anagnost, and we went out and the MHRA did an RFP for an appraisal on that property, got two proposals both of which were much more expensive that we thought, we thought we could get something in the \$5,000 to \$6,000 range and these came in as \$10,000 or \$12,000. Whether or not that appraisal is necessary in order for the City and MHRA to dispose of this property, secondly certainly concerned about the assurances from the developer in terms of moving ahead if we decide to go through a purchase and sale agreement and that might include subdivision parceling of the 17 acre site as tenants are identified. That's another question we have, and lastly there was some discussion although I think it was a minority opinion of the selection committee that because the proposal did not meet 100%, conform 100% with the RFP issues whether or not we should in fact go out to bid altogether and seek additional proposals. Those are the issues I'd like to get your feedback on this, this evening I don't know whether or not anyone else wished to comment, and also Dick Anagnost is here and would like to spend a few minutes.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there has been discussions as to whether this proposal should be rejected and I think I would be hesitant to do that given the current real estate market, understanding of even the first phase of this proposal and what it could do for the city. So we are at a point where the review committee should actually get down to work and look at how to finalize and RFP but we did not want to do that until the committee said go for it or perhaps start another direction.

Jay Minkarah noted that he had reviewed the matter through discussion with members of the review committee and spoken with Mr. Anagnost and concurred with the recommendations of staff. I do believe it is time to move it forward with no question but it does need to be better refined but thought it could happen.

Mr. Anagnost stated I would like to address just a couple of things. The first being the purchase price if you would like to hear how we came up with that price. We've offered \$3.6 million, which is roughly \$100,000 more than the City paid for it when they took it down. There has been a lot of discussion as to the real value of the property. I can tell you that based on our preliminary research and by no means has it been overly extensive, our proposal calls for the return to the city of essentially 25% of the land, so if you were to take \$3.6 million and add another \$800,000 to it we really are offering \$4.4 million for the total parcel. Secondly the demolition prices to just take out the buildings are hovering somewhere between 700 and 1.1 million. I can tell you that we extensively reviewed the environmental analysis that were done and we've determined that there are additional environmental issues on the site that are not really identified or exploited including significant amounts of asbestos, PCB containing transformers, and ballast, and in addition there are a number of underground tanks that were abandoned in place and there is documentation that they were banded properly however in order to fully develop the site we are going to have to excavate all of those tanks and naturally take out any contaminated soil that might be beneath them. Our estimated cost for that is also hovering close to \$1 million. That's before I even reach the problems with the site from a development standpoint. Those include a lack of subsurface information; we know that there is a huge outcropping of ledge that is going to have to be blasted. We know from the soil conditions under the ballpark and all the areas being developed along the river that we are probably into pylons in order to get the number of parking spaces required under the city ordinances to maximize the site as per the RFP we are into fairly significant parking garages that will need to be built at our expense. I put this up here and you can't see it but running through the middle of the site is all major utilities, so water, sewer, gas probably means in order to build parking structures and high rise buildings on this site we are going to have to relocate those utilities and I haven't got clue what that is going to cost yet. In addition I can tell you that rail is not a plus when you are trying to put in a Class A office building. Having the freight trains running back and forth when you've got a tenant that you are going to try and get at \$25 or \$30 per square foot is not a plus for the site, and lastly with respect to rent, we are sort of cost constrained, and some of you with real estate experience on the Board and know the market around here, we are probably a \$20 to \$26 per square foot market place. I'm looking at between parking garages and

the first phase of this building somewhere around \$30 million in costs which would put in excess of \$30 million in tax base on the tax rolls just in phase one. And if you communicate that down to a per square foot cost this tenant is looking at \$30 to \$32 per square foot which I'm not even sure I can get there yet. So realistically the price that we are offering we think is fair based on returning the city all of it's money and 25% of the land and assuming the liability of everything that I've just outlined to you. There is another way to approach it, we could go up to \$6 million or so if the city wanted to assume the responsibility of giving us an environmentally clean site with no buildings on it, so you know realistically we meet the spirit of the RFP as it came out.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm a little confused, did you look at the environmental study that was done for the City or did you do your own.

Mr. Anagnost responded we looked at the environmental study that was done for the City and we went on site and did some preliminary investigation of our own, with our own scientists.

Alderman Gatsas stated and do you have in writing that the environmental impact is somewhere between \$1 and \$2 million, and I don't question whether you do because I'm sure you do or you wouldn't put it on paper if you didn't, because we were given as a Board a clean bill of health.

Mr. Anagnost responded what you were given that in reference to was the underground potential of contamination. The majority of this cost that I am outlining to you has to do with the excavation of underground tanks that were abandoned appropriately in place in order to develop the site. The building asbestos that is in most of those coolers and freezers inside there that was not part of the scope of the environmental report that we read, there is only a small blurb in there that they believe there is in excess of \$250,000 in asbestos, and I don't believe it is addressed anywhere with respect ballast in the ceiling and the transformers that are on the site containing PCB's.

Alderman Gatsas asked if that environmental report had anybody looking at the interior of the building or did they not participate in that.

Mr. Anagnost stated they didn't participate in that. They were focused on the subsurface conditions; the tanks and potential contamination that was underground.

Alderman Gatsas stated so I guess our experts that did the work really weren't experts and we should have hired somebody that really had the expertise to tell us

what they should have been looking at so that we knew what the ramifications would be as they are before us today.

Mr. Anagnost stated I think that what was contemplated at the time by the report was the fact that any asbestos or PCB containing issues would be addressed as part of building demolition. So if you want to add it to that side it's really \$2 million to take down the building instead of \$1million.

Alderman Gatsas stated you have to do something with the asbestos. Right now we've got a problem.

Alderman Roy addressed Mr. Mackenzie stating if I heard you earlier your recommendation is to move forward with this committee working toward the purchase and sales with the Anagnost Development Team as the cost of \$3.6 million and not go through with demolition, etc.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes.

Alderman Long asked if there was money set aside for Mr. Muskrat with respect to the environmental issues there.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there are certain liabilities owed to the former JacPac employees, we've actually had meetings with them on it, but at this point there is still an obligation of that former employer.

Alderman Long asked and do we know what that is.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do not know what that translates into for a dollar amount.

Alderman Long asked if that was demolition or land itself, or all.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that was all underground. That's related primarily to the underground storage tanks.

Alderman Long asked and the transformers did they generate their own electricity over there.

Mr. MacKenzie responded no these were basically taking public service company voltage and transferring them into the machinery that they needed, so they were transforming different voltage from, they were not generating electricity on their own site.

Alderman Long stated so the transformers belonged to whom.

Mr. MacKenzie responded they were internally owned by JacPac and then Tyson Foods.

Alderman Long stated it would help me to know how much money was in there for the underground tanks.

Alderman Smith stated when they promoted this back a few years ago, the Finance Committee led the charge with the MDC and the assumption that they had at the time was \$6 to \$7 million on the fair market value. I noticed there is no appraisal done when the city purchased the property. I like to ask Dave Cornell what the land is appraised for at this time, somebody must have done an appraisal since then.

Mr. Cornell stated I would have to check to see exactly what we have the property assessed for right now.

Alderman Smith stated in other words no one has done an appraisal. I was at an MDC meeting and they said they were going request an appraisal for this land, and I think Glen you were there at that meeting back in February early March.

Mr. Ohlund stated the review committee discussed whether or not they can do an appraisal, again we thought to get an appraisal done in the range of \$5,000 to \$6,000; when the bids come in doubled that and one of the references on one of the proponents was not a very solid reference we decided we would come to Lands and Buildings and ask for your thoughts and direction on the appraisal.

Alderman Forest stated when we put this out or recommend an RFP sent out I know you all got together and came up with an RFP and we sent them out. How long were these RFP's out there. How much time did we give the developers to come back to us.

Mr. Ohlund stated the RFP was announced November 6<sup>th</sup>, the developers conference was December 6<sup>th</sup>, and they were due on January 18.

Alderman Forest stated and the other was the only one that answered to the RFP was Mr. Anagnost and his group.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes.

Alderman Forest stated and I know again from MDC meetings that I have been at that Mr. Anagnost has already spent a lot of his own money and he is at a point where without some kind of a proposal of some kind of a guarantee he can't afford to spend any more to get his proposal done. And as far as the appraisal that Alderman Smith talked about I believe there was an appraisal done when we purchased the property, and that's where we came up with the price to buy it. I don't know if there has been an updated appraisal as to what we think it's worth, but once we give Mr. Anagnost and his group some guarantees maybe we can come up with a price that is equitable and I think the price he's offered is equitable with the work that he has already put into it. And I will second Alderman Roy's motion.

Chairman Thibault stated he had another person to speak before accepting the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated it's unfortunately that the Economic Development Office didn't coordinate with the Assessors; you know that's another combination. If the Economic Development Office is going to do anything they should be coordinating with the Assessors; they are part of this city to give this city and the aldermen the right information. I didn't vote for buying JacPac, so if you can take the money and run be thankful you are going to get your money back.

Alderman Forest stated with one respect I think the Economic Development Office was pretty well fractured until Jay came along and he's just jumping in. Glen came in half way through the project, so it's not the Economic Development Office that is at fault. It is us as a Board who have allowed it to go this long without coming up with a solution or action to this thing.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm not picking on Jay. I'm picking on the Economic Development Office. These people are down there. They can walk down the hall and see the Assessor and find out what's going on.

Alderman Roy moved to approve as requested by Mr. MacKenzie that they move forward in drafting a purchase and sale agreement with the proposal by Anagnost Development. Alderman Forest seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated he wanted to say thanks to Dick Anagnost for believing in Manchester. He has continued to do that time and time again, and I guess as one of our home grown folks thank god we have him. He believes in Manchester and we are fortunate because of that.

Alderman Long asked for clarification that this was authorizing the purchase and sale agreement.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it was her understanding that you are authorizing staff to draft a purchase and sale to move forward. My question would be is that coming back to the Committee or the full Board.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would anticipate we have a little more negotiations to do with the perspective developer. Certainly Jay has just come on board and would like to take a look at it. So I think it might be useful to come back to the Committee if the Committee did not mind, because it might be a fairly lengthy purchase and sales.

Chairman Thibault suggested he contact the City Clerk when he was ready and they would schedule a meeting.

Alderman Smith stated he agreed with Mr. MacKenzie. Apparently we get a lot of information and we don't get it all and I would like to dot all the t's and admit that Dick has done a tremendous job. I was just under the assumption that the value of the land was much more when it was presented to us and that's why I voted for it. Alderman Lopez said he didn't he didn't vote for it but we were told a \$6 million to \$7 million range and I can't believe an appraisal wasn't done. That's what I am upset about, and I certainly concur and I will vote for the project as presented.

Chairman Thibault called for a vote. The motion carried with none in opposition.

Alderman Roy asked about a time frame.

City staff indicated in about two months, but given the time line of the developer. Committee members requested that staff make every attempt to return within the 30 days requested by the developer.

Alderman Long requested the committee be updated on the money held aside. Mr. MacKenzie indicated he would look into the status of it.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to recess to allow the Special Meeting of the Board to come to order.

Chairman Thibault called the meeting back to order.

5. Communication from Jen Hallee, Events Manager of City Year, seeking approval to paint a community mural on the Maple Street side of the Highway Department facility located at 227 Maple Street.

Alderman Roy moved for discussion. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

While supportive of City Year, Alderman Roy questioned if they had any pictures or layout of what they were intending to paint on the building. Following brief discussion it was determined no information had been presented.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to table the item pending more information on the size and content of the proposed mural. Alderman forest abstained.

6. Communication from Tom Remillard, Principal of Building Networks, LLC, regarding proposal to purchase cell phone antenna leases at Derryfield Park.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to refer the communication to the Fire Department for review or forwarding to the appropriate parties.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

7. Communication from Mayor Guinta requesting staff prepare recommendations relating to placing out to competitive/sealed bid parcels located on Granite Street, Phillippe Cote Way and Seal Tanning parking lot as requested by David Brady of Brady-Sullivan.  
*(Note: tabled 08/22/2006. Previous reports enclosed for informational purposes.)*

This item remained on the table.

8. Communication from Ms. France Howard requesting to purchase city-owned parcels known as Map 861, Lots 32 & 32A.  
*Assessors – range of value \$10,400.*  
*Planning – determined surplus to City needs and recommends sale of two parcels to owner of 126 Phillip Street noting a condition to the sale requiring Lots 32 and 32A be merged with Lot 44 to form a single parcel.*  
*Tax Collector – Map 0861/0032 (\$32.30 in back taxes – not including interests and costs) and Map 0861/0032-A (\$6.69 in back taxes – not including interests and costs).*  
*(Tabled 12/05/2006)*

Alderman Forest moved to remove this item from the table. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Forest stated he had communications with the Ms. Howard, the City Solicitor's office, the Mayor's office, what I would like to do is move to refer this item to the Mayor's office and the City Solicitor to work together to negotiate a price or whatever with Ms. Howard on this property.

Alderman Roy seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

9. Communication from Attorney Craighead, on behalf of Albert Delacey, requesting to purchase city-owned parcel abutting property located at Edna & Claire Streets.  
*Assessors – range of value \$9,000 (rounded)*  
*Planning – recommend parcel be declared surplus if the intent is to sell it for passive, non-building development purposes noting conditions as outlined herein be attached for any such sale.*  
*Tax Collector – no interest as it is not a tax-deeded parcel.*  
*(Tabled 12/05/2006)*

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

Alderman Forest moved for discussion. Alderman Roy seconded the motion. A letter was distributed from the Assessors.

Mr. Cornell stated we have received communication from the attorney representing the taxpayer that he is willing to move ahead to purchase the small to. I have contacted the two abutters and both have indicated that they are not interested in purchasing the property.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Forest, it was voted to find the property surplus to city needs, and to sell it for the \$9,000 value determined by the Assessors with a deed restriction that it not every become a buildable lot, that it be attached to the property at 80 Edna Street.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee