

COMMITTEE ON LANDS & BUILDINGS

March 15, 2022 at 6:15 PM

Chairman Long called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Long, Fajardo, Levasseur, T. Sapienza, Trisciani

Messrs.: B. Adams, P. Chiesa, L. LaFreniere, S. Kelley, D. Lozeau, N. Ledoux,
M. Larochelle, J. Barrett, J. Craig

1. Communication from Brenda Masewic Adams, Tax Collector, regarding an addendum to the P&S agreement for 521 Maple Street.

Alderman Fajardo asked is the property owner here. I have a question about the status of the building on Lowell Street that this property owner also owns.

Brenda Masewic Adams, Tax Collector, replied the property owner isn't here but Sharyn represents the City. We have asked her to sell the property and we signed a P&S for 521 Maple Street back on September 13, 2021. Lowell Street is owned by the same buyer. That property is paid in full as far as taxes go.

Alderman Fajardo stated my question is around the fact that it is sitting there half burned. I don't know if anyone from your department has insight into what her plans are; particularly her timeline for addressing that.

Ms. Adams responded that wouldn't be our department. I am not sure if Planning or another department has any information on that as far as permitting to rebuild.

Leon LaFreniere, Planning & Community Development Director, stated my information is secondhand at this point but I did have an inspector on-site today who asked that very question of the property owner. Her response was that she couldn't afford to do the work at this time. I don't know how accurate that is but that was the response we were given when we asked when the project was going to start.

Alderman Fajardo stated both of these properties are in Ward 4 and when I drive by the one on Lowell Street I think it shows evidence of a property management style that I have concerns about so by extension I have concerns about what might be the case at 521 Maple Street. She is not here to answer those questions but I wanted to go on record as having voiced them.

Chairman Long stated I also have a hard time giving something when we know there are already outstanding issues that we are hearing nobody is sure will be fixed. Brenda, what is your recommendation?

Ms. Adams responded we signed a P&S in September of last year. There were three offers for the property and out of the three, she was the best one to sell the property to

based on her offer. With her new offer, the amount is roughly the same as the other two bidders. I am not quite sure of the legalities as far as backing out of it. Maybe Peter can speak to that. Is that what you are referring to?

Chairman Long responded yes. What is our liability? Atty. Chiesa is there any liability for us?

Peter Chiesa, Deputy Solicitor, answered it depends. There were several conditions put down if you look at paragraph 19 of the P&S. A lot of the conditions were subject to BMA approvals. It is not clear to me as to whether those Board approvals have been done or not. From the discussion I am hearing, it sounds like she is now saying that she doesn't have the money to do the improvements even if there were Board approvals. I would have to see what the status of those Board approvals are and if she is, indeed, breach then arguably we could keep the deposit or give her back the deposit and put it back out for a brokered sale.

Alderman Trisciani stated one of my concerns is on the original contract. Unless I am missing it, she didn't have any contingency in there that was based on anything found during inspections or costs to improve so part of my thought is if we were to look at this we are still kind of looking at do we accept the original P&S agreement because that we are kind of already committed to at this point. Well actually, you said with Board approval technically.

Mr. Chiesa stated right and this is kind of an anomaly. Usually with a P&S you have a date certain on when the closing is going to happen whether time is of the essence or not. For whatever reason, based on the conditions and the conditions of her offer, the additional provisions I talked about in paragraph 19 of the original P&S apply. They are quite indefinite and wouldn't have been something that we would have ordinarily preferred but based on the offers that came in, it was deemed that it was the best.

Alderman Trisciani stated one of my overall arching concerns is Sharyn had to call her to tell her she had \$1,800 due in property taxes and we find out through an inspection that she had two apartments in the burned out building where only one is allowed at the current time due to the fire damage. There are just alarm bells for me.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think we might be saving this person from purchasing this property because according to the emails that I read today going back and forth, she doesn't even have her variances for what she is planning on doing and before you spend \$75,000 on a sprinkler system you should at least want to know whether the variances would be granted. It also looks like she is going to go for all of the variances at one shot with the ZBA. I don't know if it is better that she just comes back with a different P&S agreement with some contingencies in there. The way the city looks right now, we are sitting in the driver's seat. I don't remember what the building was supposed to become but I just can't understand why she would be putting herself in the situation without variances in place first. If we give her a discounted price, we are setting a market price for people out there that now know there is a lower price that we are willing to take and she might not get her variances through. Plus, I don't think costs are going to be going down. I don't even know when she would be ready to go for those variances. I don't know if you are planning on getting them in within the next 60 days or

90 days.

Sharyn Kelley, Verani Realty, replied yes.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would have no problem reducing the price. I am just concerned about whether or not this is ever going to happen anyway.

Ms. Kelley stated the reason that she asked me to do that addendum is when originally purchasing the building, the estimate was about \$55,000 to do the sprinkler system and now it is coming in between \$75,000 and \$100,000.

Alderman Levasseur responded I understand that because the price of a 2 x 4 is \$7.50 but could be \$8.50 next week. Is she then going to come back and say well I didn't realize how much more the costs were going to be? I wouldn't be concerned if she had gone to the ZBA first and already got all of her approvals and was coming back and saying look everything went up 40% so could you give me a cut but it doesn't smell right.

Ms. Kelley stated she was trying to go to the ZBA. She has contacted several surveyors and is now with Keach Nordstrom. She has been to three or four. They are six months out before they would even go to the site.

Alderman Levasseur asked would it be good to just table.

Chairman Long stated Alderman T. Sapienza has a question and then we can take a motion.

Alderman Levasseur asked can we just table it until she gets her variances and then have it come back.

Chairman Long responded that is a possibility.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I am hearing that the sprinkler system is \$82,000. I am looking at an estimate here for \$65,000 that is dated February 9.

Ms. Kelley replied I thought it was \$75,000.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I am on page 7 of 38 in the agenda packet.

Ms. Kelley asked that is from R.B. Lewis correct. I think that in conversations with her, he had given her this amount as a minimum and once getting in the building and seeing what transpired it could go up to \$100,000. That is what he verbally told her and this is what he gave her in writing. I thought this one came to \$75,000.

Chairman Long stated so we can table this and you will have a month to come back with answers to all of the questions we have. Brenda, would that be a problem with what you are responsible for doing?

Ms. Kelley stated you should table it for two months because she is not going to get before the Planning Board before April or May.

Chairman Long stated well we will table it and whenever you are ready to bring it back forward just get in touch with the City Clerk.

Ms. Adams stated so you want to say 60 days.

Alderman Levasseur stated no we don't want to give it a deadline. Just come back when you have the information.

Ms. Kelley asked so table it until she has her permitting in place.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes just call and let us know.

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, stated this item will be on the table until the Committee takes it off.

*On motion of **Alderman T. Sapienza**, duly seconded by **Alderman Trisciani**, it was voted to table.*

3. Communication from Donnalee Lozeau of Southern NH Services requesting approval of a collaborative project with the Granite State Children's Alliance to be housed in the Hallsville School building located at 275 Jewett Street, which would include giving them the building at no cost.
(Note: Attached are responses from the Planning & Community Development Department, Assessor, and Tax Collector.)

Chairman Long asked Ms. Lozeau to come forward and give a brief synopsis.

Donnalee Lozeau, Southern NH Services, stated I appreciate the opportunity to come tonight and talk a little bit about the proposal. Joining me are probably two very familiar faces to you. Nicole Ledoux who is the Victim Services Director at the Child Advocacy Center and Lt. Larochelle who is very involved with the work that the Children's Advocacy Center does along with the Granite State Children's Alliance. I thought I would just take a moment and set up where we are. I don't think there needs to be a lot of conversation around elderly housing because I think you are all very familiar with elderly housing. Southern NH Services for a very long time has been providing elderly housing for people of low income in the City of Manchester and throughout the state. Currently we have 139 units in Manchester and we carry a waiting list of about 150. That demand is there and often times what happens is people don't get on the waiting list because there are so many people on the waiting list already. I also wanted to point out that we always do payment in lieu of taxes. For example, last year we paid \$116,000 in taxes. The reason we are asking the city to partner with us in this way is because of the costs associated with renovating a building of that size, particularly in today's market which as you know are very unusual. The Child Advocacy Center and the Granite State Children's Alliance have been looking for something in the city, which they will speak to and I was looking for something for elderly housing and we have two buildings near Hallsville now that we operate so it just seemed like a great natural

partnership; a generational partnership and an opportunity to not only do elderly housing and serve the children in the community that are victims of crime but also to look at keeping the gymnasium open for public use in the neighborhood, as well as a playground area. It is kind of a bigger look at things. With that, I will turn it over to Nicole.

Nicole Ledoux, Victim Services Director, Granite State Children's Alliance, stated I am retired from the Manchester Police Department and have an understanding of how this particular project could benefit the city but I will let Lt. Larochelle speak more to that and I am going to just...if you have been lucky enough to never have your children need the services of a child advocacy center, many people don't know what it is that we do. Really briefly I will let you know what we do at the Manchester Child Advocacy Center. We serve children that are victims of physical and sexual abuse primarily. If a child is disclosing that they have been a victim of this type of abuse or there is some sort of concern that arises, either the Police Department or the Department of Children, Youth and Families will refer that child to the Child Advocacy Center. The benefit of the Child Advocacy Center is that they are interviewed about this suspected abuse one time by a forensic interviewer who has extensive training in interviewing children in a developmentally appropriate, trauma informed, legally defensible way about abuse, both physical and sexual abuse. Also, kids that are witnesses to significant domestic violence or other serious crime are interviewed at the CAC. Once that interview is complete, we work with the families to insure that children receive both specialized medical care, so care from a physician or nurse practitioner who is trained to treat children who are victims of abuse and also mental health treatment. We serve in Manchester about 300 kids every year. Sixty-five percent of those kids come from the city so our primary client at the Manchester CAC is the City of Manchester Police Department and the DCYF office in Manchester. We insure that all of those kids get a quality forensic interview and also that they are connected with the services that they need. We work together with the Crisis Center also to make sure that the families receive other co-occurring trauma services that they might need. The Manchester Police Department is the largest user of CAC's in the state so we are the busiest CAC and currently we are the smallest. Our CEO will talk a little bit about what this project means for the city in terms of expanding how we can perform our services.

Matt Larochelle, Lieutenant, Manchester Police Department, stated Nicole really hit the nail on the head. There is not much more to say than that. I oversee our Juvenile Unit which is part of our Special Victims Unit. I am really here tonight just to convey the importance of our partnership with the Granite State Children's Alliance and the CAC. The CAC's are part of a model that was developed more than 20 years ago under the Attorney General's Office. We really cannot do our job without the partnership that we have with them and without the forensic interviewers that they employ. We have eight detectives in our unit as well as nine SRO's that work at the schools. We probably have close to 200 open cases right now and those are solely child abuse; physical and sexual abuse of children. The partnership again that we have with them is unique and it is of the utmost importance for us to bring these cases to trial and to hold these perpetrators accountable. There are 186 cases so 15-25 cases per detective and 200 interviews a year. We are at the CAC multiple times a day every day. The building they are in now just doesn't suit the needs and when this opportunity came up, we couldn't be more excited about it as a Police Department. Again, we are just really here to show our

support for this partnership and to show our support for this opportunity to utilize this space. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Chairman Long stated I have gotten some calls on this. If this project is approved, will it bring an undesirable element to that area?

Lt. Larochelle answered not from our standpoint; no. We are serving these families. The parents are parents of victims of sexual abuse.

Chairman Long asked so it is not angry parents that are going there to get their kids. It is a child with a loving parent and it wouldn't bring an undesirable element to that area?

Lt. Larochelle replied that is correct.

Chairman Long asked and it has police presence I am hearing pretty consistently.

Lt. Larochelle responded it has 100% police presence. If there is a case we are working on, there is a detective in that building. We would actually have...I don't want to get too much into the weeds but we would have an office there for our detectives to work from.

Joy Barrett, CEO, Granite State Children's Alliance, stated this model is really a very exciting model for us in NH. We had the opportunity to build an expanded service model in Laconia and we have seen such remarkable results with the kids that we are serving there; not just as an interview space but certainly being able to have on-site behavioral health and have non-acute medical examinations actually happening on-site. We know that we are able to help these kids with the trauma they are facing and it is just an incredible resource. We did provide packets for all of you about our services but also included in that are the blueprints for what the dream state would be with this incredibly collaborative project. It would include a behavioral health suite and two interview suites. As Lt. Larochelle just cited, the space we currently have has one interview room and there are times when the Police Department has to wait several days to be able to get a child and a non-offending caregiver in for an interview because of that issue. This would have two interview suites. It would have an office suite where we could have offices for law enforcement, as well as prosecution. We obviously work very closely with the County Attorney's Office because they send a prosecutor for the cases. We work closely with the Crisis Center and of course there is DCYF. So the ability to have those professionals present in the building and be able to stay because there could be a case that they are seeing at the very next interview slot time. There would also be a specialized medical room where we would work with physicians from either Dartmouth or the Elliot who currently do child abuse cases and investigations and they would come to our center. I think what is most important to understand is although these services exist in the community, having them on-site at the CAC makes an incredible difference for these families being able to navigate these services. You can often imagine that this is the most horrific experience for a child and their caregivers to be going through and to have to navigate our system outside of that space is really, really challenging and we run the risk that they don't navigate those services outside. Ultimately, we are here to create healthy adults so that we have great residents in the City of Manchester. Being able to be proactive in that way after an intervention is really very important and the Hallsville School really gives us an opportunity to join forces with

another great organization in the city to partner in an incredible project in a neighborhood that really would support us and we would support them, not to mention the proximity of that building to the Elliot and to the Police Department is obviously a benefit as well. We have given you the plans and if there are any questions we would be happy to answer them.

Chairman Long stated so my understanding is if this project is approved, instead of interviewing and telling a parent make an appointment with this person you would have the offices there where they could get an appointment while they are there.

Ms. Barrett answered absolutely. In Laconia, we actually have the clinician present at the interview so they are meeting the caregiver right after the interview and setting up an appointment and giving them a tour and showing them where they will come back next and setting up the assessment and treatment plan. What is interesting and what we worked through in Laconia is that after they go through a treatment schedule with a clinician, if there is a need for long-term ongoing care, we make those referrals to our community health partners. This is really because there is this critical time after this disclosure happens for these children where if they are not seen immediately we run the risk of a serious crisis happening.

Chairman Long stated I am also hearing that you have already tested this successfully in Laconia so you know it is going to work.

Ms. Barrett replied yes and this is a national model. Quite honestly in NH we are catching up. This is a model that is used in other parts of the country. There are 900 CAC's throughout the nation and many of them have this expanded service model. The one that I toured that most inspired me was in Dallas, TX. It is 53,000 square feet where they have a wing that is dedicated for law enforcement and DCYF. We would be taking that model and obviously replicating for the needs that we have in Manchester and scale it appropriately. We did pilot it in Laconia. It will be replicated in cities in NH and we are hoping that Manchester is next.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked where are you located now.

Ms. Barrett answered we are at 960 Auburn Street on the campus of the Elliot. It is the Mary Elliot House. It is 1,400 square feet and a small little house and we do not own it.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked so you are asking the city to deed this property over for zero money to who.

Ms. Lozeau answered the plan is that we would have a condominium association between us and we would own the property or lease it long-term for the city. A long-term lease for a minimum of 50 years would meet our needs if the city would like to maintain the property as their own.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I look forward to supporting your concept and supporting you as much as I can but I am not ready to give this building away at this point. I do hope your plan comes to fruition and I will do what I can to make that happen.

Ms. Lozeau responded thank you. We need the city's partnership.

Chairman Long stated it is a lease.

Alderman T. Sapienza replied they are not asking for a lease.

Chairman Long stated she just mentioned that they are.

Ms. Lozeau stated I suggested that we would be happy to do that.

Alderman Levasseur asked does the facility in Laconia have elderly living in the same building where the child services are being administered.

Ms. Barrett answered no. Laconia's property is solely dedicated to the CAC. It is 4,000 square feet and does not have housing.

Alderman Levasseur stated this kind of looks to me like an oil and water marriage. Obviously we are for both elderly housing, which we need, and this new development that has really been made public because of what is going on at YDC and how overwhelmed our DCYF is. I am very sympathetic to that issue but when we mix elderly people in with...you make it sound like all of the children that are sexually abused are not sexually abused by their parents and maybe they are not and I don't know where it would come from but generally I think it is in the family and then there is a family issue and it turns into a DCYF issue and you probably handle those types of cases in that manner. At some point, parents that are either being accused or have not been accused yet or are part of the problem are going to be on the same property with elderly. My issue is how are you separating the elderly from this and how are you going to determine which elderly are allowed to live on this property because I don't believe under federal law we can keep sex offenders out of these elderly properties unless it is not government owned property and it is not MHA and you guys are running it and have your own authority about how the elderly can be living in that property. I am a little bit worried about the combination. Obviously the neighbors haven't heard about this. We got an email today that somebody left a note on a door for a meeting at the building to talk about it but the neighbors didn't know about it. I think there should be some sort of a meeting with the abutters before we vote on this. How are you going to marry the elderly with something as serious as having the police officers and detectives and counselors on the property? What is the thought process behind that?

Ms. Lozeau answered thank you for the question. You will note in the packet that we gave you the way that the building designs have been done by the architect there are separate entrances for both facilities. We specifically put the elderly housing on the second and third floors so they will go in and take an elevator. They won't have access to the CAC. As I mentioned, we also intend to have the gym open for the public which is actually a nice use because one of the things that you don't want to have happen here is you don't want people to necessarily see a kid and think oh he is going in there because something must have happened. If there is activity there, you are not sure if they are going to visit their grandmother, they are going to the gym or they are going in the CAC if you are an outsider looking in. In our elderly housing, we have never had a problem with sex offenders being in any of them. As a matter of fact, we have a couple

of them that are next to elementary schools and they actually volunteer in the schools and have done pen pal things. It can be a very good mix. A lot of the families that we serve in our Head Start Programs and childcare also have elderly volunteers that come in. It is a generational gift as it is for the elderly to be around children. I don't necessarily mean children that have been in this circumstance, although there is an opportunity for them to volunteer if they meet the criteria but more along the lines of the gym and things happening in the neighborhood.

Alderman Levasseur stated as an attorney who has dealt with these types of cases, the most important... and if you have ever been to juvenile court and I know our officers do it all the time but the confidentiality of these children, even the parents and families, is utmost in the minds of attorneys, police and counselors and the fact that you have people coming in now, and that is a third use for this building and I don't agree that it should be an open gym for people because it kind of makes it seem like...the elderly on the second and third floor are going to know who the children are coming in. There will be shared parking. I just think that the confidentiality of these children and these families...just an allegation of that can destroy a person's life and of course the children's life forever. I am concerned about the mixed use of this building. If it was just strictly for children or strictly for elderly, I would have absolutely no issue but I am very concerned about now three uses for this property in the center of the city in an area that is widely traveled and used by a lot of people in that area. The fact that children are involved makes me very skeptical at this point.

Chairman Long asked are there any perpetrators that are being interviewed there.

Lt. Larochelle answered there is never an opportunity for an accused perpetrator to be on the property of a CAC. It simply wouldn't happen. Just to get into the process a little bit and how it works, when a victim comes forward and discloses that they have been abused in whatever manner to whoever they tell, that information gets to the Police Department in the form of a police report. One of our officers takes a report and it gets forwarded to our Detective Division and we assign it to a detective who immediately reaches out to the CAC. At that point, the CAC interview is scheduled and the only person being interviewed is that child. The design of that is so that child doesn't have to tell their story three, four or five times. In the 80's and 90's, the child would come in and tell the two detectives in a room that they were abused and the next day they would go and tell DCYF the same story and two days later they would have to tell a doctor the same story and then the prosecutors. This model is a one-stop shop for everybody that is involved – the police, attorneys, prosecutors, DCYF and medical personnel to come into one room and observe that child telling their story to a forensic interviewer one time. It is a model that was designed years ago and a model that works now and it drives the success of our cases. The CAC now on Auburn Street is somewhat secretive. We don't want perpetrators to know where it is. On the other hand, it is right next to a hospital so you could say that people know who is coming and going from that 1,400 square foot house. For us as a Police Department, this building is perfect.

Chairman Long stated I am sure you are all aware of the confidentiality issues. Do you foresee a problem with that in this location?

Ms. Barrett stated I can address that. We oversee all 11 CAC's in the state. Two of them are stand-alone and the rest are all in mixed use properties. There are CHAD owned properties that have CAC's. The Children's Hospital at Dartmouth has a CAC in a mixed use property. Our property in Keene is in mixed use. The Veteran's Affairs Office is right next door. The CAC in Rockingham County is on a community campus so there are multiple community services within that same building. All but two of the CAC's that operate in the state of NH are in mixed use properties. We have not had an issue with confidentiality in terms of people approaching kids or outing kids for being victims of abuse. Also, we teach kids that there is no shame in being the victim of abuse because it is not their fault. Mixed use is something we are used to in the CAC world because those are the properties that are available to non-profits.

Alderman Fajardo stated I would say that I don't share the same concerns as Alderman Levasseur around the mixed use. I would defer to all of you as experts to determine the appropriateness of that. I can certainly imagine an inter-generational scenario being very positive in both directions. My concern is less about the details of the proposal and how the building will be used and hinges more on the fact that you are asking for the city to essentially donate the property. As I was reviewing the materials, I noted that the last assessment was in 2017 and with that assessment being seven years out of date, we know what the market has been like over the last several years and I think we would be remiss not to have a more sound understanding of what the scope of our contribution would be to this collaboration. That is really my only reservation. I have also heard from constituents in Ward 7 and heard from a couple of people in Ward 4 that share a similar perspective so I want to raise that for consideration.

Alderman Trisciani stated I do agree with the first part of Alderman Fajardo's statement. I have no concerns about you managing both in the same facility. I know you are experts in what you do and I trust your judgment on that. My concern, along with a few others here, is the giving of the house before we have really looked at what it could be or what a lease would look like to you as far as an amount goes. I feel like we are doing a disservice by quickly deciding and saying yes we are going to put this in here right now because it is the first thing that came to the table. I will be honest with you that I have heard from developers that would do something affordable and want to do other things. I have heard from neighborhood residents that just want to have a meeting to talk about what the building could be and the future of their community. I feel like we would be remiss in making this decision right now without doing any other RFP research or understanding what else could be used in that community or what our needs are. We are in a great situation now where every conversation starts with yes we need affordable housing. I am an affordable housing advocate. I understand that we need it. I think what I would like to see is what our current needs are. What are the total number of units and what are they in each age group? What is senior and what is 18-25 that I know WayPoint does a lot of work with? What are those needs and how are we balancing that with what we have approved and got in the planning pipe already? What is the best use of this building ultimately? I struggle with giving it away without putting it out there and spending more time on it. Maybe our Housing Commission would have some great ideas.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is a good point.

Chairman Long stated I totally believe that this is a benefit to the city. We have 150 on a waiting list. I have sat here before when we said let's see who would be interested and we sat on property for years. Since I have been on the Planning Board, I have never seen a developer who did both affordable housing and market rate. It is usually divided. I see that as an issue. Again, I see us sitting on this property. When was it returned to the city? I think it has been about eight months and this is all we have received. With respect to 67% of Manchester cases that are increasing, this is the best case scenario. I do agree that we should meet with the neighborhood and the abutters. We can do that within the next couple of weeks. I am also hearing that a 50-year lease would be conducive. I know we spoke about a 99-year lease but I guess there is a tax thing where if it is 50 it is better. So it would be a 50-year lease and the city would own the building. If they grow out of it in 20 years, we would get the building and we could add whatever we need to add. I am just the Chairman.

Alderman T. Sapienza moved to table. **Alderman Levasseur** duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Long stated there is no discussion on a tabling motion but can you come back with some answers to our questions.

Ms. Lozeau stated I can but if the committee would indulge me for just a moment I know that tabling ends the conversation but I neglected to put on the table that when you talked about giving the building, one of the reasons we are making that request is because of the cost of developing it which I said. Right now our estimate is \$8 million. That is a serious amount of money that we have to raise so that we don't have to ask the city for the funds. We have also experienced throughout the state in many locations where the community has given our agency the land to build elderly housing at no cost. It was a way to get it in affordably for a project that was going to serve a population of people over 62 that were not going to have to pay more than 1/3 of their income on their rent. In order to affordably do that, buying the land or buying a building that we then renovate is just insurmountable sometimes. That is why we made the ask.

Chairman Long stated we have a month to meet with the neighbors and allow developers who might be interested get their proposals in to us.

Ms. Lozeau stated we would be happy to follow your lead and we are also happy to meet with the neighbors. We have never purchased or built a property without meeting with the neighbors.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated you mentioned OLPH. Did you get that from the Diocese in Manchester?

Ms. Lozeau answered yes.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked did they give it to you for free.

Ms. Lozeau responded I can't answer that but I can get that answer for you.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I am pretty sure they never gave anybody anything for free.

Mayor Craig asked do you want to make a motion to declare the property surplus tonight.

Alderman Levasseur answered no. It is tabled.

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, stated you can do that at the next meeting.

Chairman Long called for a vote. *The motion carried with Alderman Long being duly recorded in opposition.*

2. Communication from Mayor Craig requesting that the Brown & Mitchell Park be named after Alderman Barbara Shaw.

*On motion of **Alderman Levasseur**, duly seconded by **Alderman Fajardo**, it was voted to approve.*

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I want to thank Parks & Recreation for using Hallsville for pickle ball. I have heard a lot of good things about it and it was a great idea. Hopefully we will continue to do that no matter what we do with the property.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Fajardo**, duly seconded by **Alderman Trisciani**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Clerk of Committee