COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

May 19, 2009 **4:30 PM**

Chairman Smith called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Smith, Gatsas, M. Roy, J. Roy, Osborne

Messrs.: K. Sheppard, C. DePrima, D. Mailloux

Chairman Smith addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Professional Association requesting acceptance of the proposed easement from the Boys & Girls Club of Manchester.

Alderman Osborne moved to accept the proposed easement from the Boys & Girls Club of Manchester. Alderman Jim Roy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Smith called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Smith addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. City purchase a certain tract of land adjacent to their current property on Maple and Valley Street, parcel ID 859-2.

Alderman Osborne asked could we have Mr. Sheppard come forward. Can you just give us a little background on this? Is this a tract of land on Valley Street?

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated correct. They run parallel to Valley. It is a 20 foot piece of property between Valley and the City yard.

Alderman Osborne asked so the amount is $58,000 or something?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct. We have worked with Dave Cornell of the Assessor's Office, as well as the railroad and they sent us a P&S. Based on correspondence from Dave Cornell we feel that it is a reasonable price for that piece of property.

Alderman Osborne asked this is from Maple to Lincoln?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct. It is about 20 feet by 550 feet or a quarter of an acre.

Alderman Osborne stated it would be nice if they would give it to us for $1 wouldn't it?

Mr. Sheppard responded that would be very nice if they were willing to do that.

Alderman Osborne asked but they are not willing to do that are they?

Mr. Sheppard answered we have been in discussions with them and they have not expressed any interest other than the P&S they sent to us.

Alderman Osborne asked did anybody ask them? It doesn't hurt seeing that the City is in such turmoil here. Well nobody ever brought that up I guess.

Mr. Sheppard replied believe me, we negotiated with them and we talked to them. They are not always the easiest to work with but they were actually very responsive to us and got the P&S out to us. When we talked to them about price, we in the back of our mind had a number based on our City Assessor's recommendation. What they came back to us it was a little bit lower than that and that is what we are bringing before the Committee.

Alderman Osborne stated places like where Central Paper used to be, that will probably be there forever and they will never collect any money from that unless they decide they want it and I don't know what for but…

Mr. Sheppard interjected well the B&M is actually paying taxes on this property right now.

Alderman Osborne asked they are paying taxes on the railroad?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated for Alderman Osborne's information I am in that exact conversation with B&M right now to see if we can get them to contribute it to the City. I had initial conversations with them today and we will see what happens. If we can just put this on the table for a week and see if we can't get that done…

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to table this item.

TABLED ITEM

6. Communication from John Gimas, Gimas Electric, requesting permission to leave an existing sign pole on City property adjacent to his property at 60 Beech Street. (*Note: The Committee has requested a recommendation come from the City Solicitor, Tabled 5/5/09. Communication from the Highway Department attached.)*

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

Alderman Osborne stated I would like to move on this item subject to the lower sign being removed and also a revocable type of situation and I will pass it on to my colleague Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess where Alderman Osborne is going is that as long as the current owner continues to own the property then I would think that the Board would move forward with approval. If he sells the property then the new owner would have to remove the sign.

Chairman Smith stated Mr. Sheppard, I have no problem with this but I was just wondering what your thoughts were on the lower sign. It is only seven feet high.

Alderman Osborne stated I said to remove that.

Mr. Sheppard stated I would probably agree with Alderman Osborne's recommendation. As you can see from the plan that he submitted, the sign post is actually located within the railroad right-of-way that runs through there that has been turned over to the City. The post itself…the sign does overhang the right-of-way by a few feet but it is that lower sign that I would be most concerned about where it is only 7' above the sidewalk.

Alderman J. Roy stated Kevin, we got that drawing in our packet. The two drawings confuse me. The one on the left shows that the sign post starts in what I consider the right-of-way I guess, and then the second one shows the edge of the pavement and the right-of-way and the sign isn't in the right-of-way. I am kind of confused about that or maybe I am reading it wrong.

Mr. Sheppard responded the right-of-way is different than the edge of pavement. The edge of pavement is the edge of the street and the right-of-way is typically the edge of the right-of-way that the City has through there so the distance between the right-of-way and edge of pavement is typically considered the sidewalk area. So the one on the left you can see the sign does overhang the right-of-way a little bit and if you follow that right-of-way line vertically on the right hand you can see where that sign would overhand.

Alderman J. Roy asked so that line is actually the sign that overhangs not the post in the ground?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct. The post is labeled on the left 'sign post'. Right where the arrow is is where the sign post is located.

Alderman J. Roy stated I am fine with removing that lower sign and if it is sold it has to be removed.

Alderman M. Roy stated Kevin, I was under the understanding when we left our last meeting that we were going to put some measurements on the former railroad easement, as well as looking at moving that sign or the cost of moving the sign and/or squaring off that property. According to the GIS system there is a nice little jog that makes this property smaller. It is off of the tax rolls if you are talking about the easement area. To me this isn't about the height of the sign. I don't like it and I think they should go through the sign process but why are we keeping…and again, I don't have a measurement but I would assume it is about 50 feet. Why are we keeping an easement in that area for this? I mean, it is wider than any trail would ever be. We are not going to put a roadway through there. Wouldn't it make more sense to deed a piece of property over to 60 Beech Street LLC?

Mr. Sheppard responded I guess that is not my decision. I mean should the City need that width in the future and it is probably 66 feet wide. When you say 50 feet, it is probably a 66 foot wide right-of-way that the railroad typically would have…you know in the future is the City going to need that full width for a trail potentially? I guess I can't answer that. I can't imagine a trail needing 66 feet of right-of-way. If that is the decision of the Board to sell a piece and subdivide that is the will of the Board.

Alderman M. Roy stated again I really expected to have more information. Right now we have the sign post and edge of pavement but I don't know if we are talking about selling off or deeding off ten feet or 20 feet or 55 feet of the 66 feet. I would assume if this is close to scale we might be talking about 12 feet, and it might square up the property and make the sign post legal and then add something to the tax base.

Mr. Sheppard replied what I remember from our last discussion on this was whether the City was going to grant them a license or an easement for that. I don't remember any discussion regarding selling a piece of property and I apologize not having that in there. I thought based on the last meeting that the biggest concern was how far it overhangs into the City's roadway right-of-way. Once it was surveyed we found that it does actually fall within that old railroad bed, and like I said, it is about 66 feet wide. Potentially it is something that the City could subdivide and sell off to the abutting property owner if that property owner is interested and if the Committee so chooses to recommend that.

Alderman J. Roy stated just for informational purposes this right-of-way is already paved and correct me if I am wrong, Kevin, but Building Services is kind of using that as a driveway for their garage.

Mr. Sheppard replied correct.

Alderman J. Roy stated so it is being used right now. It is not going to be a trail, I don't think, in the future. The one other point I wanted to make is I drove past there today and on the post closest to Beech Street, which looked to me like it was a metal post to guard that switch or whatever it is, they have mounted a flag out there that says 'Open'. I mean, when are they going to stop encroaching? It seems like they will finally be satisfied when we they get something in the middle of the road that says 'We Are Open Over Here'. I mean what is going on with that? They are not supposed to have that flag either and I keep seeing stuff like this over all the City and it kinds of irritates me because everybody keeps pushing the envelope.

Chairman Smith asked the Clerk to read the motion.

City Clerk Matthew Normand stated the motion as I understand it is that the lower sign on the pole be removed immediately and that a revocable license be issued to maintain the sign in its current location so long as the current owner retains ownership of the property.

Alderman Gatsas stated if I notice that sign, if the bottom sign were flipped so that it was on the inside it wouldn't be encroaching. I think what you are saying is just get it off that side of the post because if they just turned it…

Alderman Osborne interjected that could be but I don't think he wants to spend the money for that. That's fine.

Alderman J. Roy stated the last I remember about this is that the original permit was for the large sign that is in the middle. The sign on the top was never permitted and the sign on the bottom was never permitted. They never went through the process to do it properly so I don't agree that they should just flip the sign on the inside unless they go through the permitting process and I don't know how they could do that since it isn't on their property.

Alderman Gatsas stated thank you for that information. I have no problem going along with the motion.

City Clerk Normand asked are you amending the motion to have the top and bottom sign removed?

Alderman Osborne answered no that is not my motion.

Alderman Osborne moved to have the lower sign removed immediately and a revocable license issued to maintain the sign in its present location so long as the current owner retains ownership of the property. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion. Chairman Smith called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman M. Roy duly recorded in opposition.

5. Communication from Chuck DePrima, Acting Director of Parks & Recreation, requesting approval to enter into an agreement with Trinity High School for the Al Lemire Field at Derryfield Park.
(Note: The Committee has requested that the Parks & Recreation Department submit an itemized list for the $80,000 proposal, Tabled 5/5/09. Communication from Chuck DePrima regarding the agreement attached. Additional information to be provided by the City Solicitor, if available.)

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

Chairman Smith asked Chuck, could you please enlighten us as to what has gone on since our last meeting?

Mr. Chuck DePrima, Acting Director, Parks & Recreation, responded yes. I have with me tonight Denis Mailloux, the Principal of Trinity High School, who has been working for quite some time on crafting this proposal or agreement. What has changed since the last time is that I wrote a letter to the Committee clarifying several points. I guess one of the points in terms of maintenance is that the life cycle of one of these fields is about ten or twelve years on an average turf field. We have to rehabilitate them all of the time throughout the City. This field has been long overdue for that. Trinity High School has come forward to make an offer to enter into an agreement with the City to make the improvements with capital donations to help fix this field. Again, the life cycle of these fields is about ten or twelve years. I provided a price comparison of what it would cost us to put in a synthetic field like we did at Memorial and West in an attempt to analyze maybe a cost savings over a longer period of time. In reaching that number it became clear to us that it is an upfront cost that is just not feasible for either party at this point. That is one of the main things I wanted to clarify. Again, just to sort of reiterate, this is a field that the City would normally be on the hook to rehabilitate. It is up regarding its life cycle and I think this is an excellent opportunity to do so until the next time it does need to be rehabilitated – the partnership that is being proposed.

Alderman Osborne asked can you state the terms again? You said something about an $80,000 up front payment and $5,000 a year.

Mr. DePrima answered that is correct. The terms would be an original $40,000 cash payment based on the lowest of three estimates that I have received to do the work appropriately from qualified contractors. Then a $40,000 advance payment for an annual maintenance fee of $5,000 a year.

Alderman Osborne asked how many years is this covering?

Mr. DePrima answered it is in lieu of 12 years of what they would pay as part of the…the original agreement assumed that the City would be providing half of the funds needed so their annual maintenance payments would now pick up…in lieu of their advance payment of $40,000 and the $40,000 contribution they would begin their maintenance payments of $5,000 a year between 2021 and 2040. That is roughly an additional $100,000.

Alderman Osborne asked if we were to cut that exactly in half would there still be an interest?

Mr. DePrima asked are you talking about cutting the $80,000 in half?

Alderman Osborne replied well, you are talking 12 years. What if we made it six years. Where it is so far out…I think that is what everyone had a problem with so I am just asking the question. I made the motion the first time to accept this anyway so I am not against it. I am just trying to work with it a little bit.

Mr. Denis Mailloux, Principal of Trinity High School, stated just to provide a little bit of the school's perspective, the City has been kind enough to allow first Bishop Bradley High School and then Trinity High School use the field and for that we are extremely grateful. At this point, the field has reached a point where it is of limited use and probably in the near future will be relegated to non-use. We know that the City at this time is in a situation where repair of the field is difficult if not impossible so we wanted to step forward to some extent with self-interest on the school's part, which I will explain, but also as an attempt to be good partners in this as well and realizing that there is a cost associated with maintaining the field and we wanted to be good partners with the City in that endeavor. In terms of the school's self-interest we have been fortunate in that there has been an understanding, which goes back to the inception of Bishop Bradley High School, that seems to be further bolstered by the Diocesan contribution of land for Fire Station #10, again all on a handshake or an understanding. The City has been extremely gracious in allowing Trinity to utilize that field. Looking ahead, we would like to make this gesture with some assurance for the school that we would continue to have priority use of Derryfield Park. It is a situation that the City has supported through the existence of Bishop Bradley then Trinity High School, so as we see it we are offering to

participate at this point to cover the cost of refurbishing the field and the advance $40,000 payment is an attempt to front some money representing a $5,000 annual maintenance fee, which to this point we have not been paying. So from our perspective it is more than we have been paying into the park in the past and we understand that is a responsibility on the part of the school as well.

Alderman Osborne asked Chuck what does it cost to do the outfield? It is the outfield that is the worst correct?

Mr. DePrima answered yes.

Alderman Osborne asked what does it cost to rehab that outfield only?

Mr. DePrima answered the lowest price of three quotes that I solicited back last fall was $71,000. That is assuming an area of approximately 80,000 to 100,000 square feet of field that would have to be striped up. The loam would be screened, regraded and resoded.

Alderman Osborne stated we were talking about half of that but the City isn't putting anything towards that field at all? You have nothing towards that at all? So half of that would be around $35,000. If the time period was half of that you are not going to be putting $80,000 into it. If we cut the time period in half and instead of 12 years it would be six years…

Mr. Mailloux interjected so if I understand correctly the school would commence the $5,000 annual maintenance in six years or after six years?

Alderman Osborne stated well, the maintenance you still provide.

Mr. Mailloux asked so you want to accelerate that and the school would begin paying that after the sixth year or in the seventh year? I am just trying to be very clear because I will need to go back to our people.

Alderman Osborne stated I am just talking here. I am not trying to revise your contract. This is just a little food for thought here.

Mr. Mailloux stated anything is open for discussion. I would just need to go back to my people…

Alderman Osborne interjected I would start there. It is just the time. It seems like 12 years today is a long time and the economy changes so quickly and you can see that. Maybe the City will have more money in six years where we can help out and do more

for that field but right now we can't. If we cut things in half that might be better than nothing. That is all I am saying.

Mr. Mailloux replied yes, and from the school's perspective at this point where there really aren't any funds to upgrade the field we are not undertaking this as an attempt to assure from our end that we are taking on the responsibility to continually upgrade the field but to again show that good stewardship on our part as well and help out at this time.

Alderman Osborne stated if the City can come up with the $35,000 or something else that is what I am talking about. If we can see our way clear on this I think that would be a better situation in a way. I don't know.

Alderman J. Roy asked the condition of the field right now, is it just from use?

Mr. DePrima answered yes.

Alderman J. Roy asked how much have we been spending to try to maintain it?

Mr. DePrima answered we haven't.

Alderman J. Roy asked so this paper here tells me that even after you build it…I am sure that for the first few years you won't have to do much to it but after that it is going to be $5,000 a year?

Mr. DePrima answered well the $5,000 is what we estimate our cost is right now to do what we normally do, which is line the field and mow it and fertilize it and aerate it and repair the irrigation system as needed.

Alderman J. Roy asked are you going to have the money to do that?

Mr. DePrima answered yes. That is just part of my typical operating cost for any field.

Alderman J. Roy stated the reason I am asking is you just told me that you haven't been doing anything to that field at all.

Mr. DePrima responded we haven't been making repairs to it. We have been maintaining it.

Alderman J. Roy asked you have been lining it and aerating it?

Mr. DePrima answered yes, we have been doing that but we haven't been making repairs to it if necessary.

Alderman J. Roy asked now this agreement actually goes further than 12 years. It actually goes out about 32 years correct because it goes from 2021 to 2040?

Mr. DePrima answered yes.

Alderman J. Roy stated you said the life of one of these fields is ten to twelve years. So in 2020 when the life of that field has run its course Trinity is still willing to put up $5,000 a year. What are we going to do? Are we going to rebuild it?

Mr. DePrima replied we are going to do what we have to do…

Alderman J. Roy interjected my question is…and do you see what I am trying to get at? If the life of the field is only ten to twelve years it is going to be used up by that time, so how are we going to maintain that field so that Trinity can still have the use of it at that time? That is my question. I guess my angst here is that at that time we are going to have to look at taking care of the situation again. We were bound to a contract that says we have to have a field for them, which I think we should, for another 20 years. So what is the long term plan that you have to make sure that they will have a field for those 20 years?

Mr. DePrima responded the long term plan that I would have for that field would be no different than any other field. When it reaches a point like it has now it is beyond just normal maintenance. It now has become a capital improvement project and this is what goes on in all of our fields, even the synthetic ones do need to be replaced eventually. So at such time I would just go through the same process that I would for any field and put in a request to the CIP Committee. This particular situation and this offer by the school is just prolonging the time where I would actually have to do that.

Alderman Gatsas asked Chuck, how is the irrigation system now?

Mr. DePrima answered we get sufficient coverage. It is in working order.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the sod is not going to die in two months because it won't get water?

Mr. DePrima replied no.

Alderman Gatsas asked how often other than Trinity's use, how often do other ball teams use it?

Mr. DePrima responded the other two main users of that particular field at Derryfield Park are the East Cobras and the Colt league. They both use that field. I don't have the schedule in front of me but if you were to do a comparison for example of the time they spend on the field compared to Trinity, they actually occupy far more of that field time.

Alderman Gatsas asked so wouldn't a more fair distribution be…obviously if you are looking to resod it and the sod is let's assume $80,000 and Trinity puts in $40,000 and the City puts in $40,000, that is good for a ten year period. I don't know if I like looking out at a 30 or 40-year deal because somebody is going to have to put another $80,000 into that field ten years from now. If the Cobras and the Colt league and Trinity are there and it isn't like it isn't being used for football and that is probably what chews up that outfield more than anything, so I look at and say if we get ten years out of it we will be pretty lucky unless you have the sprinkler system working for the times that people aren't out there to keep the people who aren't supposed to be on it off.

Mr. DePrima answered we don't make an investment of $80,000 or $100,000 without irrigation. We irrigate all of our facilities.

Alderman Gatsas responded no you don't. There is no irrigation that happens at Livingston. I haven't seen irrigation up there in five or six years where the soccer fields are. I haven't seen a sprinkler head move. I would think that maybe the deal should be changed so that we are talking about a ten year period, which is the lifespan of that field and then we can talk about it ten years from now if it needs another resodding. I don't think that the City should not participate. Certainly we should participate because there are other users on the field.

Chairman Smith stated I just want to comment that I played on that field in 1952. It is used and it is just like the Central High Annex field. It is overused. There is no question about it. I don't even know what the situation might be but either we do it now or we do it later and it is the City's responsibility. I know that Chuck and I have been to CIP asking for funds and we didn't get any for Derryfield Park. I think I reminded the Committee what it would probably cost for a synthetic field, which should probably be up there, $760,000. We don't have the money to do that. This is a band-aid approach, but it is a good approach for the youth that utilize that field. That field is used just as much as Gill Stadium and all of the other major parks in the City. It is used constantly by the kids. Maybe we can restrict it to certain individuals at certain hours so the field does get watered and maintained but I am for this agreement but it is up to the Committee. The only reason why I am is I don't want to penalize the school or the youngsters who play there and I don't know where these kids will play their sports. They are just going to double up another field.

Alderman M. Roy stated Chuck, what is the bond payment on $760,000? What is your bond payment on Gill Stadium for the synthetic field?

Mr. DePrima responded the Fisher Cats paid for that so I am not entirely sure what the bond payment would be. I can't amortize that off the top of my head.

Alderman M. Roy asked the lifespan of synthetic versus sod is what?

Mr. DePrima answered the lifespan of a synthetic field is 12 to 15 years. Its major benefit lies in the fact that you don't need to irrigate it or fertilize it or mow it. You can play on it immediately after a rain event and you do not risk damaging the field. It can receive continuous play. I know at Memorial and West those facilities are scheduled from roughly 3 PM all the way until 9 PM. That is the major benefit.

Alderman M. Roy asked what would your yearly cost savings be if it was synthetic? When you take out the mowing, irrigation, water pumps and everything?

Mr. DePrima answered we don't pay for water as a City entity.

Alderman M. Roy stated you pay to maintain irrigation.

Mr. DePrima responded yes and again the figure I have come up with for their annual maintenance payment is an approximate cost obviously not taking things like equipment depreciation and things like that into account but that is the approximate cost to maintain that field.

Alderman M. Roy asked current dollars per year?

Mr. DePrima answered yes, man-hours and materials.

Alderman M. Roy stated I would support this but I don't think it is the best route we can go for the kids who use that field. I think honestly I look at this as a gift from Trinity to some of our youth sports. I would much rather find a way for the City to help Trinity expand their gift of $80,000 to do something that is going to last longer, be safer, and less maintenance in the long run because we all know how tight City budgets are getting. If this does go to a vote tonight, I will vote yes for it but I would much rather find a way to use or capitalize on their gift of $80,000 to come up with a long term solution. As a past President of the East Cobra Program, I thank you for this gift.

Alderman Osborne asked so far is what we have before us what we are talking about? We are not making any changes?

Chairman Smith replied from what I understand from the principal, they are willing to give us a certain amount of money and they have first priority for use of the field, as they always have had.

Alderman Osborne asked but you want to keep the 40 year or 12 year and all of that the same?

Chairman Smith responded personally I think if members of the Board feel strongly about it we can get this into CIP in the next three or four years and it would absolve Trinity of their obligation.

Alderman Gatsas stated let me see if I can offer up a different deal. Let's assume it is a ten year deal and Trinity comes up with $40,000 and the City comes up with $40,000 and the maintenance for Trinity still is a $5,000 number and we do that for ten years and obviously you have to do the striping and maintenance on the other side and I don't see how $10,000 a year with the $5,000 that Trinity is going to pay and the $5,000 that the City will put in would come anywhere near paying a debt service on a $760,000 project. I think at least it gets us to a point where there is sod on the field and there is a ten-year deal. It gives Trinity and I certainly understand that they have been on a handshake deal and I would think maybe they want to get something in writing that protects their interest going forward but if we are going to be looking at something that every ten years is going to have to be redone then I would think we would do this now and give us four or five years to look at an alternative measure and certainly if the economy turns around maybe at that point or if the Diocese happens to sell a big piece of land that I know they are looking to maybe we can sit down and try to do a partnership there and that may make some sense. I think at least for now it should be a ten year deal with the City coming up with $40,000 and Trinity coming up with $40,000 and $5,000 a year from Trinity for maintenance. So you are kind of taking that extra $40,000 that you were going to give us and holding on to it and just pay for the maintenance for ten years.

Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion of Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Gatsas stated I know the principal has to go back and talk to people.

Mr. Mailloux asked just so that I am crystal clear at our end, what you are proposing is that we would pay the $40,000 up front and then after five years, beginning the sixth year through the tenth we would begin paying $5,000 annually for maintenance costs?

Alderman Gatsas answered I think my clarity was that you would begin paying $5,000 for the maintenance from year one to get you to year ten, because the striping and all of that has to be done to preserve that sod that is going in. The City obviously would put up the other $40,000. I assume listening to what Mr. DePrima is talking about there is another $5,000 to maintain on the other side. We can't just mow half the field. We have

to mow the other half too. So $10,000 seems like a pretty low number to do all of the maintenance and everything else that needs to be done but I certainly will take his figure at what he is saying. I would think that some of the other things that would be done is put some wood bleachers on the seats so people can sit. I don't know what is there now.

Mr. DePrima stated two years ago we replaced all of those bleachers. They are all aluminum now.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there any left of those that you might be able to take up to Livingston? I saw somebody the other day fall off on a chair and get hurt pretty bad because there is no place to sit.

Mr. DePrima answered I got a price when my predecessor was in charge of the department to do both fields but it was around $40,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked so is it $20,000 for each field?

Mr. DePrima answered no it was between $37,000 and $40,000 for each field.

Alderman Gatsas asked so you did the one at Derryfield?

Mr. DePrima replied yes but we didn't have enough money to do Livingston.

Alderman Gatsas asked are there any two foot by eight foot planks around that we could put there so people could maybe at their own risk get a sliver if they sit on them because it certainly looks awful up at Livingston?

Mr. DePrima answered I agree with you. To make those improvements it comes down to a matter of manpower and right now my carpenter is out with a back injury and will be for several more weeks and even still to have one person go up there and do that is cost prohibitive and time prohibitive.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you get some bids? You did pretty well getting bids on the sod?

Mr. DePrima answered yes, I can do that.

Chairman Smith stated I just want to clarify that there was a motion made by Alderman Gatsas and seconded by Alderman Osborne. Denis, do you have the particulars? I imagine you have to go back to the Diocese for approval and I know time is of the essence because you want to put down the sod and utilize the field in the fall?

Mr. Mailloux replied correct. So as I understand it $40,000 up front from Trinity and $5,000 annual maintenance fee to begin immediately. Is that correct?

Alderman Gatsas answered yes.

Mr. Mailloux stated one of the concerns that we have is, as Alderman Gatsas mentioned, that the school have something in writing beyond a handshake in terms of our priority use, so the language to craft that going beyond the ten years that we have for the current agreement. Is that something that is possible? We would like the wording to look beyond the ten years only so we have a commitment on both sides to continue that relationship.

Chairman Smith stated in other words I think he is looking for priority for Trinity High School beyond ten years regardless of what the cost is and so forth.

Alderman M. Roy stated one of my concerns while looking at the Bishop Bradley to Trinity transition makes me want to say yes to this. If it was not to remain the school that it is today then I would look for it to come back to the City or this Board for discussion. I do appreciate the fact that in your letter you have your successor's junior high or high school. I don't think anyone on this Board would be unreasonable with building anything but if it was, for some reason, to become a for profit then I think we would need to look at it.

Mr. Mailloux responded understood. Hopefully the language that we have currently is specific enough to satisfy that need but we understand entirely. Our context and our thinking was only in terms of another Diocesan school at that location. There is nothing in the plans but there is possibility of that in the future.

Alderman Osborne asked how far in the future are you looking? I know you are worried after that first ten years. How far in the future are you talking about?

Mr. Mailloux stated well we hope that Trinity High is in place for many, many years to come and that we continue to be a contributing asset to this community. So as long as Trinity is there we would like to…

Alderman Osborne interjected what do you feel is the right way to approach that? What do you think is a good relationship?

Mr. Mailloux asked in terms of a timeframe or in terms of language?

Alderman Osborne stated well the language comes after the timeframe but the timeframe? You would like it forever right? Eternity?

Mr. Mailloux responded that was our thinking initially, yes.

Alderman Osborne stated so if we were to say do this in five year options or something like that and keep going on every five years…in other words, maybe Trinity would change their mind in that five years and if they don't well we just keep going. I know you are looking for some sort of an option after that first ten years, right?

Mr. Mailloux replied well, we are not looking to find fields elsewhere. We have been very happy with the current relationship and we would like to see that maintained as far out in the future as we can see. Again, how that is crafted in terms of language, I understand your necessary caution in terms of the financials but we would like to have something in writing that says that this relationship between the school and the City will go on as long as the school is located here in Manchester at that site.

Alderman Osborne stated well the way things are going in Manchester maybe 20 years from now we will have the Empire State building sitting there. Forever is a long time.

Mr. Mailloux responded well in terms of an option if Trinity had a first option to consider let's say the first timeframe is ten years and each ten years we could sit down again and Trinity would have the first option in terms of arriving at that understanding with the City.

Alderman Osborne stated I guess we could talk about this. Like I said, it has to be worded correctly and the City Solicitor would probably have to look at it. There has to be some sort of an agreement after that ten years. That is the whole thing. To bring something back to you and to talk to somebody else about it is going to be kind of difficult because they are going to ask that question too. That is why I thought maybe we could get something together but it will be kind of hard to get something together tonight.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have no problem talking about an extension into perpetuity but I think the financial terms should be looked at at the end of ten years. I am certainly not saying that Trinity shouldn't participate there for as long as there is a school there. I think that is what everybody would agree to. I think it is important that we find some other source because the number of parks that we have in this City is not growing. Some of them are shrinking and if we are going to have complete utilization there, maybe in three or four years we should take a look at it like I said and if the Diocese decided to come forward with a portion of money for a synthetic field we could talk about that. Those are things we should talk about after we get this initial project in place so the kids can play on the field and not have to find a new home to go play. I think obviously being across the street from the field is very vital and it is certainly vital for the East Cobras for a football field. I think that we should make the motion and put it on the table and let you come back and bring it up to the full Board tonight about the $40,000 should you folks agree to it so we have an appropriation in place and maybe we can do a phone poll of this

Committee to move if forward because again the next meeting is not until June. The further we get the worse it is to sod a field and you are looking at the Colt league that is going to be…if we can find a place to put them because I don't think they will be able to play on that sod right away. So I mean there are issues.

Mr. Mailloux stated if it is appropriate for you to make that motion tonight with the Board of Mayor and Aldermen with the understanding that I need to seek approval on our end as well, I would imagine that we can work it out.

Chairman Smith asked can we get the motion again?

Clerk Normand stated my understanding is that the Committee would like to enter into an agreement with Trinity High School to repair and maintain the Al Lemire field with the understanding that the City contribute $40,000 and Trinity High School contribute $40,000 up front and that a $5,000 annual payment be made from Trinity for a period of ten years to begin immediately for maintenance of the field and that there be an option to renegotiate the terms after ten years. I was a little foggy on the balance of that.

Alderman Gatsas stated renegotiate the terms in perpetuity as long as Trinity High School exists or I don't want to say Trinity but if there is a school there that…

Mr. Mailloux interjected if I may, something in terms of perpetuity regarding a Trinity High School or any Diocesan school in its place. Again our interest is to safeguard that priority option for the field that is so important to us.

Chairman Smith called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Gatsas asked are we reporting this out to the Board tonight?

Chairman Smith answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked and we can table it there and do a phone poll?

Chairman Smith answered yes.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee