

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

January 07, 2013

6:00 p.m.

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Shea, Craig, Greazzo, Gamache

Messrs.: R. Fixler, L. LaFreniere, T. Arnold, W. Anderson, R. Cunha,
T. Soucy, N. Campassano

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Update on the Airport's 5-year CIP.

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

Mr. Richard Fixler, Assistant Airport Director for Engineering & Planning, stated I am here because back in 2010 the committee approved a five-year CIP for the Airport, which actually was initiated back in 2001, when the Airport went to a five-year CIP. At that time the committee requested that the Airport appear annually to discuss the program with the committee members. I apologize; I have been remiss and we haven't been here, but we are about half way through that five-year program now, so I am here to discuss the program. I will give you a brief overall view of where we are and just remind you of how the program is

structured as well. The Airport divides the projects into six broad categories: roadway and parking projects; airside improvement projects; property acquisitions; terminal and building improvements; equipment replacement; and the residential sound insulation program. Overall, for those six projects, for the five years, there is about an \$80 million capital budget. To-date the Airport has spent or incumbered \$23.5 million worth of projects and we are anticipating that between now and the end we will be at about \$51 million total out of the \$80 million, so some of the projects are not going to be done based on the economic climate and so forth. We have cut back on some of the projects. There are two areas where there may need to be potential amendments to the CIP. One is terminal and buildings; we have a \$6.7 million CIP approved there and there is a project that we are considering at this point, which is the relocation of the rental car counters from the terminal to the garage. If we do that project, it will be 100% funded by what is called CFCs which are customer facility charges. That is a tag-on to the rental car customer. It is customary at all airports around the country that there is an extra tax that is paid. That would be a project that would be funded at 100% by those CFCs. We would require an amendment to the CIP to be allowed to spend that amount of money. This is suppose to be a discussion so I can kind of give a brief overview. I am prepared to discuss projects that we have done and projects that we anticipate and to answer any questions, but at this point I will just ask what the committee would prefer.

Chairman Roy stated I am guessing that you are here for informational purposes only. You are not here to propose that we give amendments at this time, is that correct?

Mr. Fixler replied that's correct.

Chairman Roy stated in our packet there is no report, so for me it is difficult to sit here and ask you any questions because I really haven't gone over any type of report. Is it possible for you to present us with a report?

Mr. Fixler replied I could do that.

Chairman Roy asked none of this is time sensitive, is it?

Mr. Fixler replied no.

Chairman Roy stated if we could get a report in the future, I would like to see a report, so that I could have a discussion.

Alderman Shea stated I was just going to ask if he could give us some kind of an outline. I was trying to take notes and my shorthand skills have left me. If you could, from my point of view, provide us with a sheet with the information that you orally gave, I think that might be helpful so that if there are any concerns that I personally might have, I would be able to know what I am talking about. Thank you for the report.

Mr. Fixler replied I do have a sheet, but I didn't bring copies. I can get them to you.

Chairman Roy asked are there any other questions or discussion?

Alderman Craig stated you had mentioned the moving of the rental car area. With that modification though, you would still stay within the budget that has been allocated to you? We would just have to change that line item for the terminal?

Mr. Fixler replied right. For the overall budget, that is correct.

Alderman Craig stated then you had mentioned there was one other; what was that going to be?

Mr. Fixler replied well, it is potentially in the property acquisition. If we are going to have any additional property acquisitions, we are pretty much at our limit at this point with the acquisition of the Highlander property. Maybe, alderman, if you would like, I could briefly run through some projects, but if you would rather I could come back, I could give you a sheet.

Chairman Roy stated it is up to the committee. Would you rather he gave us a report and came back at the next meeting or do you want him to run through it and we can ask him questions now? What is the preference of the committee?

Alderman Shea replied my preference is just to give us a report that you feel are the highlights of your CIP discussion. That is my personal opinion.

Alderman Craig replied I am fine with that.

Chairman Roy stated okay, go ahead, Mr. Fixler, and give us the highlights.

Mr. Fixler stated under the airside improvements, we initially had a glycol management program which was budgeted at \$8.6 million, but the EPA has changed their approach to how we need to handle glycol and they actually haven't sorted it out yet. We are anticipating not having to spend that \$8.6 million.

Chairman Roy asked we used to have a problem with that runoff into the brook, correct? That money was to correct that? Is that right?

Mr. Fixler replied yes. That is right. Right now the EPA is taking a different approach. They are realizing that glycol is not harmful in the quantities that we are generating.

Chairman Roy stated because it is being diluted by the water.

Mr. Fixler stated that is part of it, but also we have done an extensive study that shows that there is no affect on the river. We are replacing the terminal ramp. We have done the first phase and we are scheduled to do the second phase next year. That was a project that was not originally anticipated, but we have a problem with the concrete. Real briefly, there are other projects that we are not doing which are snow removal equipment storage building, which is quite expensive at \$9.6 million. We put that aside. There is going to be taxiway rehabilitation work that we are going to do as well. That covers the airside improvements. Equipment replacement, we have money budgeted but we are going to see how it goes and we may or may not purchase additional equipment. Because of the five-year CIP that we are in, we are able to take extra grants from the FAA. The FAA issues grants in two ways. There are entitlement grants, which we get based on the number of enplanements that we have and there are discretionary grants, which they give out when they have extra money. Because you allow us to have a five-year CIP, we were able to get two snowplows last year and they gave us \$1.2 million in discretionary funds to purchase those. That was a good situation. Terminal and building improvements; we have made a series of improvements. We are working on HVAC systems right now, to upgrade those. We have had problems with cooling the building. I don't know if you have been there in the summertime, but portions of the building overheat, but we are addressing those issues now. We replaced glass in the pedestrian bridge. We had a problem with the glass and that had to be replaced. Upgrading some of the PA system, security cameras and that

type of thing and as I mentioned, the relocation of the rental car counters is a potential project. Property acquisitions, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, we did acquire the Highlander property. That property has been basically demolished at this point. The reason we had to acquire that is that the hotel itself sat in the runway protection zone, which is not a compatible use for property within, according to FAA's regulations. They pay for about half of that and we pay for about half. The big project and you may have heard some issues with the solar project that we did... On the garage we put up solar panels. There is a major issue with that in that we got bad consulting on that. We analyzed that project ahead of time. We had a consultant do it, who basically told us very clearly that we would not have a glare problem in the control tower. We do have a glare problem. We are currently working with the FAA with our design/build contractor to try to resolve that issue. We had MIT do a study for us in conjunction with the Volpe Transportation Center. They have come back with a recommendation that all the panels be rotated 90 degrees and that will take the glare problem away. It will reduce some of the efficiency of the project, but we are currently working with the FAA to resolve that and the FAA wants to partner with us to fund the correction of that project. That may take a little bit of time, but we are working on that.

Alderman Craig asked what is the timing on that? There is a significant receivable, I believe, that we are looking at and waiting for payment on.

Mr. Fixler replied I have good news on that. We have received word from the FAA that they are paying that at this point, so we are expecting those funds within a few weeks time, at this point, so there will not be any outstanding receivables. Some of the other projects that we are looking at doing; we have some roadway relocations. We are going to be moving Ammon Drive. If you are familiar with Ammon Drive, it runs parallel to runway 6-24. It is in a protected zone so that

needs to be moved. I should mention that all of these projects are primarily funded 90% by the FAA, about 2.5% by the State and the balance by the Airport. There are no City funds directly in any of these projects. Alderman Roy, I will provide you a summary of this presentation. I do have it. I apologize for not having it for you.

Chairman Roy stated I appreciate that. I was going to ask you to do that before it gets to the full board. That's great. We would ask you to get that to all of the aldermen.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**, it was voted to accept the presentation of the Airport's five-year CIP plan.*

Chairman Roy addressed items 4 and 5 of the agenda:

4. Request from Jennifer Rounds for the City to sign a Subordination Agreement for property located at 1552 Belmont Street.
5. Request from Cookson Stephens Corporation for the City to sign a subordination agreement.

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

Alderman Craig asked Mr. LaFreniere, could you please come up? There are two of these on the agenda and it is my understanding that we still retain the first position, which is good news, but in looking at the subordination agreement for both of these, they are significantly different in terms of the content. That is what I am concerned about. I want to make sure that the City is protected and I was

curious as to who writes these and who makes sure that the documents that are here are in the best interest of the City. What are you looking at this committee to do? To approve the request or to actually approve these documents?

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, replied I can't speak specifically to these two, as they were submitted by MEDO and I don't really have any background on these, but typically they are submitted by the bank, the lending institution that is involved, and that is looking for the subordination to the new refinance of the new mortgage. The language then comes from a third party, if you will, being the financial institution. We run these by the City Solicitor's Office to make sure that the City's interests are protected.

Alderman Craig asked the City Solicitor has approved both of these?

Mr. LaFreniere replied again, I can't really tell you about these.

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, replied we weren't asked to take a look at them prior to their submission either. However, I did take a look at them this afternoon. They are both pretty much standard language and both seem to indicate that we are going to remain in the same position that we were prior to granting the subordination, if we do so. Beyond what is here on your agenda, I know nothing additional.

Alderman Shea stated I did call up Tom Clark, who reviewed this and he said that it followed the usual procedures, if that is of help to the committee here. He did indicate that it does fulfill the responsibility that these people are working within the context of what would be acceptable.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just wanted to make sure that I wasn't missing something on the second one; I can't find an address referenced. Am I missing it?

Alderman Greazzo stated there is no address or mortgage company on the second one.

Alderman Craig stated it is at the top, if it is the address, under the subordination agreement it says there is an address. I don't know if that is the address. The maximum principle amount is not included. I noted that the address wasn't included and then the name of the mortgage company isn't included on this one. Again, from a process perspective, I am fine with it, but the two documents that are here in front of me don't seem consistent and I just question whether we would proceed with this.

Alderman O'Neil stated the first one seems to have the information that the committee would look for and then the board. The second one, I can't believe that it is the address listed above, it's not in the community. Alderman Greazzo is right too, it doesn't list the mortgage company.

Alderman Greazzo stated Alderman Craig brought that to my attention.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you, Alderman Craig.

Chairman Roy stated we have one of two things we can do; we can say bring it back next time or we can ask them to clean it up before it gets to the full board in two weeks.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think what you see before you are two revolving loan funds. I think that the collateral that was used on the one that Alderman Craig is bringing up that is out of town, that was basically a collateral basis of what was used. I think what is behind it is somewhere in the vicinity of \$20,000, if memory serves me right, when I looked at it, \$18,000 and change. It is behind the first mortgage on the property that was used as collateral. What they have done, from my understanding, is reduced mortgages and looked to reduce the rate that they have on the mortgages. They have actually paid these down. These are loans that have been existing. The folks have paid them down and looked to refinance them at lower rates. We already have them on the books. It is not new loans, but it is existing loans. The collateral is a piece of property that is not in Manchester. It is a lesser amount than what we originally did. I think the original loan that was in the second position was somewhere around \$28,000.

Alderman Craig stated it was \$45,000.

Mayor Gatsas stated \$45,000; I am sorry. They have paid it down. We are in a much better position today than we were when we originally did the loan. The collateral on it, is even paid down from there.

Alderman Craig stated I agree with you. It is just that the documents that are sitting in front of us, if you are asking me to approve the context of what is in front of me, it is not consistent with the one on the previous page in terms of content. I just want to make sure, from the City's perspective, that we are covered. From a conceptual perspective, I would approve both of these, that we are in a first position and that both of these entities have been paying on a regular basis, but the text that is in front of us isn't consistent and I am just questioning why.

Mayor Gatsas stated I can only say that I believe that the Solicitor's Office reviewed both of these.

Mr. Arnold stated we reviewed them earlier today. As I said, we weren't asked to review them ahead of time, but I did review them this afternoon and I know that Mr. Clark spoke to Alderman Shea also.

Alderman Shea stated according to what I was told, Tom Clark indicated to me that they did review this and they did meet their approval. That is what he said at 3:30 this afternoon.

Alderman Craig stated okay.

Mayor Gatsas stated with all due respect to the department, I know that Chris Wellington had brought them to them last week. I had questions when they were brought to me last week wanting me to sign them. I said it is going to go to the committee and then come to the board. At that time, I believe the solicitor had taken a look at it, but I could be wrong.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. Arnold, can you rewrite the second subordination agreement to be more consistent with the first subordination agreement?

Mr. Arnold replied yes, we can certainly do that if the committee desires. However, as has been pointed out, this basically is subordination agreement. It merely keeps the City in the same place due to a refinance. The short answer to your question is yes, if the committee prefers that then we can do that. I don't know what the reaction of the bank we are subordinating to would be to having that language rewritten. As has already been stated, typically the subordination agreements are submitted by the banks that are requesting them.

Alderman Greazzo stated agreed, however, this is missing some information in the text of the actual agreement itself that is key. I think Alderman Craig's point is pretty solid, that if there are items missing in the subordination agreement, we are not necessarily in the best position.

Chairman Roy stated I think what I am hearing is that we are all in agreement that in theory there are no problems with this, but we don't like what we are seeing. If we were to pass this through to the board in two weeks, could we get the language straightened out in that time, Mr. Arnold?

Mr. Arnold replied we can certainly try to. I only hesitate because I am going to be on vacation next week so I couldn't promise to do it myself, but I think we could accomplish that, yes.

Chairman Roy stated I will call Tom Clark tomorrow to make sure it is taken care of.

Mayor Gatsas asked what is in question on the subordination agreement?

Alderman Greazzo replied in the second agreement, Your Honor, there is no address contained therein and there is also no maximum loan amount.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think what it talks about in the top, says 70 Gage Girls Road in Bedford.

Alderman Greazzo stated that is not part of the actual agreement. That is regarding 70 Gage Girls Road.

Mayor Gatsas stated right, but that is where the subordination is.

Alderman Greazzo stated understood, but to us that looks like part of a memo not actually part of the body of the text.

Mayor Gatsas stated well, if I look at the top, it say subordination agreement.

Alderman Arnold stated the subordination agreement itself and the body refers to the City's mortgage as recorded at book 8268 and page 1324, which is for Gage Girls Road in Bedford. When it refers to the mortgage that we are subordinating, that mortgage contains the address.

Alderman Craig stated I guess the point is that the one on page 4.2 lists the address. It also list the Hillsborough County Registry. It lists the maximum principle amount. It lists the mortgage company and the home address in the content of the agreement. These are both subordination agreements, so if we could make them consistent and our intentions are just to cover the City as best we can, it would be appreciated. Thank you.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve the subordination agreements with the corrections made to the agreement as requested by committee.

Chairman Roy addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Request from Wesley Anderson, Fleet Services Director, to issue an RFP and for the City to enter into contracts to purchase, before the start of the fiscal year, two vehicles that are scheduled to be replaced in fiscal year 2013/2014.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. Anderson, who are we entering contracts with and for how much or is that to be determined by the RFP?

Mr. Wesley Anderson, Fleet Services Director, replied that is to be determined by the RFP.

Alderman Craig asked just to confirm, we will enter into contract this year, but this impacts next years budget via the CIP?

Mr. Anderson replied correct. Basically, in discussion with the mayor, he is still planning to submit \$3 million for the MER fund for next year. These are both long lead time items and we are trying to go through the process now so we are able to get them early in the next fiscal year.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have done this in the past. I think there is action of the board that is going to be required before June in order to do this, or the agreement has to say subject to funding approval.

Mr. Anderson replied correct.

Chairman Roy stated you are correct, we have done this in the past. It makes sense.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Request from Wesley Anderson, Fleet Services Director, to purchase a replacement van for the Parking Division.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Request from the Police Department to retain the vehicle scheduled to be replaced as part of the 2013 vehicle replacement plan and keep the new vehicle slated for the Legal Division.

Alderman Greazzo asked now we will have two vehicles instead of one?

Chairman Roy stated correct, for that division. With the move, they have a longer distance to the courthouse.

Mr. Robert Cunha, Police Department Captain, stated to answer your question, the move to the new building has created more of a need. Ultimately we had the ability to walk, as prosecutors, to court. We have the one vehicle that is shared amongst two adult arraignment prosecutors and a juvenile prosecutor. I also use that vehicle myself, as the captian of the legal division, to go back and forth from court and to tend to other duties. In addition, the sex offender compliance unit is a part of our legal division. The compliance office needs a vehicle to do checks.

The way it was currently working at the old location, is the adult arraignment prosecutors would use the vehicle to get to court, transport all of the files over and everything. The juvenile prosecutor would ultimately walk. Today is a good example, the adult arraignment prosecutors had to go back to do arraignments in the afternoon, which left the juvenile prosecutor with no vehicle to get to court. He was fortunate that the juvenile division has a spare vehicle available. It just happened to be available today for him to use to get to court. Additionally, when I was at court with them today, I had to come back to the station. I actually jumped into an SUV of one of the recruits to drive me back to the station and if they needed me to come back, if they were to run into a situation where they need assistance in dealing with, I would have to try to figure out how I am going to get back. With the number of people that we all have working the same shift and the daily routines of all of us, including the sex offender unit, who generally signs out spare vehicles, there are no guarantees there. They sometimes have to wait if a vehicle is being utilized or repaired or if there is a special function going on where additional cruisers are needed. There is no guarantee. For that number of people, with the new location, we would definitely like to have the two vehicles versus the one.

Alderman Greazzo asked what sort of condition is this vehicle in? I thought the whole replacement program was to get rid of vehicles that were no longer maintainable?

Mr. Cunha replied well I talked to Rick Ranfos and the vehicle has just over 92,000 miles. It is an old K-9 car. For patrol functions it would be something that I would ever utilize or recommend for that. With that being said, the old vehicle that we are talking about keeping, to get people back and forth to court and paperwork back and forth to court... That is another thing, sometimes we are missing an affidavit or something like that and we used to be able to have

someone in the office walk over a copy. We can't do that anymore. That is another need that popped up. The vehicle for patrol purpose isn't good but for getting us back and forth to court and getting paperwork back and forth to court, I think it is okay for that.

Alderman Greazzo asked your department is able to absorb any maintenance that this vehicle will need in the future?

Mr. Cunha replied yes, I checked with Rick Ranfos on that. He is the one who actually first alerted me to the fact that we were getting potentially a different vehicle and that is when I first raised the question about trying to keep this one.

Chairman Roy stated Captain Cunha, you said that you had discussions with your supervisor Rick Ranfos. Did you have any discussions with the Fleet Services Director Anderson about this?

Mr. Cunha replied no, I haven't.

Chairman Roy stated I would hope that in the future you would keep him in the loop because he is in charge of all of this stuff. I would like to get input from him as well. I am going to ask him to come up and I am going to ask him if he agrees with what was stated.

Mr. Anderson stated the cars that come off patrol, some are in fairly decent shape that you don't want to keep on patrol and there are some that you just need to get rid of. We very carefully, as we look through them, determine which ones have the ability to get some more mileage on them, but low mileage. That is what we are doing in this particular case.

Chairman Roy asked so you agree that this one is?

Mr. Anderson replied this one is fine.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Request from Leon LaFreniere for various CIP project extensions.

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

Chairman Roy stated I would like to ask the city clerk to report that out at the board meeting tonight; there are some issues in there that are time sensitive.

Chairman Roy addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Request from the City Solicitor to accept funds in the amount of \$5,792 from the State of New Hampshire for CIP project #411713 Domestic Violence Prosecutor.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Request to change a project name and description for CIP project #710613 – WWTP Odor Control to WWTP Infrastructure Upgrades to more accurately describe the proposed upgrades to be carried out with the remainder of project funding.

Alderman Craig stated I was curious as to what the remainder of the project funding is?

Mr. Frederick McNeill, Chief Engineer, stated what happened is we actually had \$500,000 to replace a failing odor control system. In the meantime a boiler failed, so we are actually doing two projects in parallel. We have another CIP in this coming budget to cover the balance of both. So we took about \$200,000 out of a \$500,000 CIP to address boiler issues.

Chairman Roy stated if I may, that was my question as well. So you are saying that out of the \$500,000 you have used \$200,000 and the \$300,000 is going towards odor control?

Mr. McNeill replied correct and we have another CIP in this coming budget to cover the balance of both.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \$4,000 for CIP project #214013 – Medical Reserve Corp. Program. [Health – new funding]

Alderman Greazzo asked can Mr. Soucy please explain what the medical corp. actually is and does?

Mr. Timothy Soucy, Public Health Director, replied the Medical Reserve Corp. is actually a national initiative by where we recruit medically trained volunteers that we would use in an emergency. For instance when Superstorm Sandy came through and we were preparing to open a shelter, if it became necessary we activated the Medical Reserve Corp. It gives us about 30 additional medically trained people who we can use during emergencies.

Alderman Greazzo asked where is the money coming from?

Mr. Soucy replied the money is coming from the National Association of County and City Health Officials.

Alderman Greazzo asked is that a private organization?

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Amending Resolution and budget authorization for the match contribution for CIP project #612611 – 2010 Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grant Program.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. Request from Fred McNeill, Chief Engineer, for a transfer of funds from two FY2009 projects completed under budget, to CIP project #710510 – Cohas Brook Phase III Contract #2 Design and Construction.

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

Chairman Roy addressed item 15 of the agenda:

15. Request from the owner of 302 Prospect Street for subordination of a City lien totaling \$8,490.

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

16. Discussion relative to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

There were no updates on this item.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Roy stated in front of you are two issues that weren't on the agenda that came in today and they are time sensitive. I agreed with Chief Burkush that he should bring them forward. If the clerk could read those one at a time for us please.

Ms. Maura Leahy, Administrative Assistant III, stated the first one is a letter from Chief Burkush stating:

On January 2, 2013, the department was notified by the NH Department of Safety of their approval of a FFY 2011 Homeland Security grant application. This grant will fund the purchase and installation of fiber optic cable, which will connect the ends of existing cable on both the west and east side of Manchester. This connectivity will provide redundant "rings" which will ensure network integrity in the event the fiber line is severed anywhere along the overhead route. The grant award is in the amount of \$102,346 and does not require any local match. Please accept this letter a request of your committee to approve and accept this grant award.

Alderman O'Neil asked Mr. Chairman, what is the time sensitivity?

Chairman Roy replied these have to be voted on within 15 days.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's fine. I didn't hear that in the letter.

Chairman Roy stated it wasn't in there but it is 15 days and I am not going to have a meeting before that.

Alderman Greazzo asked can you explain what this is going to achieve and what you have in place now?

Mr. Nicholas Campassano, Deputy Fire Chief, replied in the past, we have obtained Homeland Security funding to put in our fiber optic network throughout the city that our City network operates on. Currently, there is not a ring, if you will, connectivity so if the fiber optic cable was disrupted, broken or cut, we would lose network capability in those areas. What this will do is provide, on the west side, connectivity coming across the Granite Street bridge. We currently go across now on the Bridge Street bridge. It would create a ring so that if the line was cut anywhere on the west side, we would still have network connectivity in the opposite direction. The east side would do the same thing connecting from Information Systems to the new municipal complex to create a redundant ring.

Alderman Greazzo asked does this supplement what you currently have? It is basically a redundancy in the system in case you have...

Mr. Campassano interjected it doesn't duplicate it. What it does is it creates a ring, if you will, so that no matter where it was cut, communications can go in the opposite direction, so that you can always reach all parts of the network.

Alderman Greazzo asked you don't have that in the system now?

Mr. Campassano replied no.

Chairman Roy stated so it is going to connect both ends and make a circle which can feed either way.

Alderman Shea stated maybe this was covered and excuse me if it isn't but once you receive the grant, how long before this will be implemented? Just a ballpark figure.

Mr. Campassano replied there is a historic and environmental review that we have to do with EPA and FEMA prior to even starting the project. That takes a month or two and then it would depend on the bid process as well. There is a two-year life span on the grant itself.

Alderman Shea stated so people who are interested will know how long it will be before it is implemented. Thank you.

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

Ms. Leahy stated the second item is also a letter from Chief Burkush stating:

On January 2, 2013, the department was notified by the NH Department of Safety of their approval of a FFY 2011 Homeland Security grant application. This grant will fund a motorized, self-contained vehicle that will handle interoperable communications, data gathering, real-time information sharing (through linkage to the State EOC) and command and control functions for use by Unified Command personnel during emergency situations. This vehicle will be a regional asset for use throughout the greater Manchester region. Signed memorandums of understanding have been secured with the six surrounding community governing bodies. The grant award is in the amount of \$600,000 and does not require any

local match. Please accept this letter a request of your committee to approve and accept this grant award.

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

Alderman Greazzo asked can you explain what this vehicle is and who is going to man it?

Mr. Campassano replied it is a combined law enforcement and fire service command vehicle which will have interoperable communication capability and serve as a command center for large incidence; either law enforcement, crime scenes, or for instance, when we had the plane crash behind the Wal-Mart. Localized flooding; the Goldfish Pond situation where we had need for on-scene command where we are utilizing multiple agencies coming together under one canopy.

Alderman Greazzo asked how do you interact with other agencies currently?

Mr. Campassano replied many times it is outside in the environment, in the rain and snow. We also had need when the Police Department flooded, where we would be able to utilize that vehicle as a secondary dispatch center or command vehicle.

Chairman Roy asked would this also be used by surrounding communities, if they had an incident? We could assist them?

Mr. Campassano replied correct, it would be one of nine other vehicles throughout the state that could be used in an emergency.

Alderman Shea asked is it going to be located in Concord, New Hampshire?

Mr. Campassano replied no, sir, it would be located in the city of Manchester, probably at the Police Department. I don't know if we have the exact location yet, but it will be in the city of Manchester.

Alderman Greazzo stated I am going to vote against this. I think we already have enough of these vehicles in place, with the Fire Department and the Police Department that provide these functions and if they can't talk on their radios in the vehicles then we are in some pretty sad shape. I don't think we need a mobile command vehicle. The State already has their vehicles. The Police has their vehicles and I know the Fire Department has a few vehicles. This is obviously a bigger beast, but if there is going to be nine of them in the state, times \$600,000, I think we are already doing this now. I don't really think that this helps us much. That is why I am going to be voting against it.

Alderman Shea stated what he is indicating is that we would pass up, even though we don't have any matching grants, for a vehicle that you feel is essential for the operation of the Fire Department.

Mr. James Burkush, Fire Chief, stated Chief Mara and I went up and spoke at the grants committee. We illustrated the needs, the availability for mutual aid around the city, the possibility of larger events that exist in the city, with Manchester Airport, larger population center, all of the hazards that we have and Chief Mara and I both spoke at the committee. It was approved unanimous at the committee at the State.

Alderman Shea asked is it of your opinion that we should accept this grant?

Mr. Burkush replied it is. We have been working almost three years to use this for our capabilities.

Alderman Craig stated having lived through the flooding incident of Dorrs Pond, I think it would have been very helpful to have had a vehicle such as this, where everyone could have congregated on-site and communicated. We absolutely did not have that. There were different locations. I will be supporting this. Thank you.

Chairman Roy asked chief, in the past when we have had large incidents like this, even though we do have some smaller command vehicles, we had problems communicating between the two groups because the radios were different and all that kind of stuff. Is this going to help take care of that situation?

Mr. Burkush replied absolutely. As you know, when you do what they call unified command, everybody can command and actually come in and meet and talk or the unit will have interoperability capability.

Alderman Shea stated there is the possibility that another surrounding community could use this vehicle in terms of what their needs may be as well. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied that was high on the priority of why we were able to secure the grant.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve the item, with Alderman Greazzo being duly recorded in opposition.

Mr. Burkush asked can we go back to the MER discussion? We had discussed the purchase of Engine 3. I just want the board to be clear that the authorization that was given to us was to go ahead and enter into an agreement and order the fire truck. As long as everyone is understanding that.

Chairman Roy stated that is what the paperwork said, that you are looking at replacing Engine 3, which is a 1994.

Mr. Burkush stated correct, but the authorization that we were asking for tonight was to sign the contract to order the fire truck.

Chairman Roy replied correct, but it won't be delivered until next fiscal year, so it won't have an affect on the budget until next fiscal year.

Mr. Burkush stated that is correct, but I just want everybody to understand that we are going to go out, solicit bids and award a bid, probably in two months or however long that process takes. I just want everybody to be clear and be on the record that we are getting that authorization, which we did the last two years. We have done it with Engine 10 and Engine 9, we have done it the same way. I want everybody to be clear that you are giving me that authorization. Thank you.

TABLED ITEMS

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to remove item 17 from the table.

17. Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \$10,000 for CIP project #510413 – Gen. John Stark Gravesite Restoration Project. [Parks – new funding]
(Note: Tabled 11/19/2012)

Chairman Roy stated I talked today with Mr. Capano of the Parks Department and he told me that this is actually being handled by the Stark Park group and they don't have to go through the City whatsoever.

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

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

A True Record. Attest.



Clerk of Committee