

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

MAY 4, 2004

A meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee was held on Tuesday, May 4, 2004 at 7:24 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber

Chairman David Rootovich presided.

Members of the Committee present: Alderman Richard LaRose, Vice Chair  
Alderman Kathryn D. Vitale  
Alderman David MacLaughlin  
Alderman Robert G. Shaw, Jr.

Members Not in Attendance:

Also in Attendance: Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane  
Alderman David D. Lozeau  
Katherine E. Hersh, Div. Dir., Community Development  
Mike Santa, Manager/Building Official  
Roger Houston, Director/Manager Planning Department  
Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director

COMMUNICATIONS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAROSE THAT THE RULES BE SO FAR SUSPENDED AS TO ALLOW FOR THE INTRODUCTION OF A COMMUNICATION RECEIVED AFTER THE AGENDA WAS PREPARED  
MOTION CARRIED

From: Stephen W. Williams, Executive Director, Nashua Regional Planning Commission  
Re: Circumferential Highway

MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAROSE TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE, AND VOTE TO RECOMMEND ONE OF THE THREE PROVIDED OPTIONS

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Rootovich

If you remember we had Mr. Williams here at our last meeting. We had extensive dialogue with respect to the Circumferential Highway and the three options that were on the table. He asked the committee to give him some sort of recommendation on which way we felt the project should

go.

AMENDED MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAROSE TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE, AND RECOMMEND OPTION THREE

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman LaRose

This recommendation is that the New Hampshire Department of Transportation should investigate alternatives to the currently proposed project. This alternative analysis would be for the purpose of identifying project concepts that are less costly and have reduced impact on the environment.

As the Chairman stated, we did have a lot of discussion. Hudson was one of the communities that wanted the third alternative if I remember right. In all the discussion we had we came up with the same conclusion that alternative 3 would probably be in the best interest of all, and that the State would be paying the whole cost of the study. I can't remember what the figure was.

Chairman Rootovich

Mrs. Hersh would you be so kind as to join us? Do you remember what the cost was?

Kathy Hersh

I quite honestly don't remember the exact figure, but it seems like it was around \$325,000.

Alderman LaRose

I think after a lot of discussion the members that were present felt that alternative 3 was probably one of the better alternatives. It would more or less stay with the alignment they have, but I think that it appears that there are a few spots where they could probably change the alignment a little bit, but primarily it would be more or less what they have already laid out as a route because a lot of the land has already been acquired.

Kathy Hersh

I would concur with Alderman LaRose that from the discussion that was had at the Planning & Economic Development Committee about this issue that is what I heard the direction that people were going. Option 1 just is very expensive, it keeps getting pushed father and farther out, and as much as the people that even support the circumferential we have to be realistic about whether or not that option is going to get built and I think that there is still a need and a value to the city and to the region so I think number 2 isn't an option either. I think number 3 is really the

way people have expressed to go, and it makes sense to me.

### Alderman Shaw

I would wholeheartedly endorse this option 3. I think basked on the concerns that we heard expressed regarding the funding and the opportunities for this project to start as originally conceived and being followed through as well as some of the environmental concerns that we were discussing the last time – this seems like the only viable option for us to support at this time. I will support this motion. Thank you.

### Alderman McCarthy

I didn't get to see the presentation that was done here, but I did last August at the NRPC itself see about a three hour presentation and discussion on the alternatives, and I think this option is the one that makes the most sense. We are unlikely to see the full build and after watching the analysis of it, it is not clear to me that is exactly what we want anyway. Given the situation of developments since the full build was developed it makes a lot of sense to go back and look at what the current alternatives and impact are.

### Chairman Rootovich

I also endorse option number 3, but as we discussed at the last Planning & Economic Development Committee that project has been off the ten year plan now, that the number 1 priority for the State is clearly the widening of 93 from the state border to Concord. That is probably where they are putting all of their energies and monies at this time. Living in a realistic world I don't see this project starting any time soon.

### Alderman LaRose

I partially agree with some of your statement, but I think what the Nashua Regional Planning Commission is trying to get is – they are giving their request to the State Highway Department because I believe this is the year that it goes to the public works and highways committee and they establish a ten year highway plan so I think what they are trying to do is get this back onto the ten year highway plan. The widening of 93 I agree that is their priority, but that highway will be – I believe they are looking at doing it the same way that Massachusetts did Route 3 so that will put – it will make the ten year highway plan a little bit different than it has been in the past.

MOTION CARRIED

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS – None

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

O-04-12

Endorsers: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter  
Alderman Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderman Richard LaRose  
Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner  
Alderman Robert G. Shaw, Jr.  
Alderman David Rootovich

AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE BY ADDING “MEDICAL FACILITIES/  
CLINICS”

AS A PERMITTED PRINCIPAL USE IN THE GB, CB, HB, PI AND AI  
DISTRICTS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAROSE TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE PENDING  
APPROVAL OF THE NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman McCarthy

I actually support this and have since it was brought up. The reason for it is I believe that the usages that are proposed are in fact consistent with what our goals are in land use when we zone things industrial. Typically our land use when we look at balancing the impact on the land versus the kind of usage that it provides. Industrial we looked at things that have high traffic densities for example than residential, but not as high as retail commercial, and things that generate a specific kind of jobs and economic impact. I believe that the facilities that are proposed are in fact consistent with those performance criteria that we have on our industrial zones, and given the changing shape of the economy when we find service businesses that have those same characteristics we probably want to encourage that from an economic perspective. I would support making this change to the use table.

MOTION CARRIED

O-04-13

Endorser: Alderman David D. Lozeau

AMENDING THE BUILDING PERMIT FEE SCHEDULE OF THE CITY  
BUILDING REGULATIONS TO INCLUDE NON-HABITABLE  
RESIDENTIAL SPACE IN THE FEE CALCULATION FORMULA

MOTION BY ALDERMAN SHAW TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE PENDING  
APPROVAL OF THE NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Shaw

I guess if I could direct, through the Chair, to Alderman Lozeau or anybody else that could speak to this – I guess I would like to understand a little bit better the ...

Chairman Rootovich

I would ask Mrs. Hersh or Mr. Santa or ...

Alderman Lozeau

I will defer to Mr. Santa

Mike Santa

I do have a little handout I will give to you. What we are trying to do here is just make our fees equitable. Back in 2002 we adjusted all of our building permit fees, and we basically just went up about 30% on everything. We, however, decided that we were going to figure the – we figure all the permits on aggregate square footage except we made an exception on residential to just use habitable square footage. We thought this was a good idea at the time because we figured impact fees by habitable square footage so we thought we might be saving some time and effort, but what it actually did was although we increased the fee for residential construction, by taking out the square footage that we used to calculate we actually reduced the fee for residential. At the bottom you can see where in prior – 2002 on an average home it was about \$252 and now it is \$171. We thought it was a great idea, but in fact it didn't work out.

What we have now is we have just basically have an inequitable fee structure. We are just trying to bring that back to the way we used to figure it and leave the fee per square foot the same and even it up so to speak.

Alderman Deane

Can you help me I am trying to understand – if you go through from an inspection standpoint and a structure is put up even though it is a non habitable part of the structure such as an attic or whatever you still have to do the inspections in those areas whether you are looking at rafters or floor joices.

Mike Santa

Basically what we did is we eliminated the square footage of the basement and the garage and the deck and yes we do have to inspect all of those things so like I said at the time it seemed like a good idea. In retrospect it wasn't a good idea.

Alderman Deane

You have an inspection for footing.

Mike Santa

Yes footing, foundation, etc.

Alderman Deane

Waterproofing before backfill and then a frame – when you have added all those inspections together you will do a rough one, the rough wiring, plumbing, and framing is done as one rough right?

Mike Santa

It depends. Sometimes the individual inspections by individual inspectors depending on the complexity of the job – we average about 25 inspections on a single-family home so we are there quite a bit. This fee is just the building permit fee then there is electrical and mechanical and plumbing fees as well.

Alderman Deane

I had another comment – I had talked to Kathy Hersh and I was unable to attend a meeting, but we were looking at clumps of people that weren't pulling permits until they got caught. I know it is kind of off the beaten track a little bit, but I still want to look into that because the department has absolutely – the only recourse they really have is small penalty and put a stop work order on the property. There is probably quit a bit of revenue that the city loses yearly with people that don't pull permits, do the work, and the work isn't discovered until re-evaluations or something bad happens to the workmanship involved in that. I think that is an area we should look at so that if we have a fine to enforce it that it would give it a little teeth because right now it really has no teeth. I think it is \$25 or \$35.

Mike Santa

It is 25% of the building permit fee not to exceed \$250. If for the single family home exercise a couple hundred bucks, but most of the time building permit fee might be for remodeling \$100 so it is \$25 and it is not much of a penalty for anybody.

Alderman Deane

If you look at the areas where people aren't caught and they are still doing the work without it being inspected – not only the danger to the people, but the loss of revenue associated with getting the proper permitting and inspections done.

Kathy Hersh

I just want to say that we are aware of Alderman Deane's suggestions, and sat down as a team and probably for a couple of hours and went through trying to figure out how we could equitably address that, and actually wrote up a full memo and I have to go back and see where it is, but I thought we sent it back to Attorney Clarke as that is where it came from in the first place. Let me go back and find it and forward it to you so that you get the benefit of at least our thoughts, our brainstorming on the issue, because it was a very valid point and a concern of ours as well. We would love to see it resolved. Let me make sure that I find that and forward that to you.

Alderman Deane

Thank you.

Alderman Lozeau

The fee restructure would that take affect upon passage of this ordinance or is there a start date for the restructure?

Mike Santa

I didn't have an effective date written into it. The sooner the better. I am not sure ...

Chairman Rootovich

Once the full Board votes on it and the Mayor signs it, it becomes law.

MOTION CARRIED

O-04-14

Endorsers: Alderman Richard LaRose

Alderman David Rootovich

AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE AND MAP FROM PARK INDUSTRIAL TO GENERAL BUSINESS FOR LAND ON THE EASTERLY SIDE OF CELLU DRIVE OFF AMHERST STREET

MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAROSE TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE PENDING APPROVAL OF THE NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman McCarthy

This one I can't support and I want to urge the committee not to go forward with this rezoning. If we go back a few years to the time when the Best Ford site and Target were rezoned during the discussion of those two ordinances I had actually said that I was concerned that this would happen – that as soon as we rezoned the one of those deeper lots that we would see a rash of

requests to rezone the back lots that constitute the industrial property along Amherst Street. If you look at the map that is over there look at the purplish areas where industrial space is left – there is one big blob down between exits 1 and 4, which is very difficult to develop, there are a couple of little places around the city and there is the big piece that is out along Amherst Street. I am fearful that what we are going to do is to rezone all of our industrial property back into retail for big boxes. The reason I am concerned about that is that gets us no economic advantage at all.

If you look at the economics of the properties our retail properties gain us something. They are more taxable than other properties, but that is where the advantage ends. If I look at the economics of something like the Pheasant Lane Mall, people from Massachusetts come up here and spend money at the stores of Pheasant Lane Mall. They go back to Massachusetts their money goes to Texas. The people who work at the mall cannot afford to live in Nashua because of housing prices so the money that is paid out of wages goes to grocery stores somewhere on the east side of the river or somewhere way west of here. There is no cumulative affect on the local economy that is beneficial. Those are the reasons why we put land use codes in place to try and balance development and create a sustainable economy.

What we need in Nashua to deal with some of these problems are locally capitalized businesses where the money that gets spent for those businesses here is paid to Nashua residents who have the capital investment or have professional salaries derived from those businesses so that the money then circulates through the Nashua economy. What we are building is a non-sustainable economy that is based around services and retail that is staffed by people who cannot afford to live here, where the capital does not stay here, and where in the long term we will not be able to pay our bills based on the community impact of those businesses. If you look at the heart of the state education funding crisis it has to do with the fact that we do not have a sustainable source of revenue in the State of New Hampshire. The reason for that is our economy is not stand-alone. We are mightily dependent on the money that is earned south of here for people to be able to afford homes in New Hampshire.

We need to develop a base where we create jobs in this state and in this region that are capable of sustaining the people that live here. If we do this I believe that we will see these fall like dominoes one after the other until that entire purple stretch along Amherst Street is no longer purple, and what we will have is a tremendous amount more traffic and a tremendous amount more less sustainable economy.

### Alderman LaRose

I understand what Alderman McCarthy is driving at, however, this lot is half the land is one zone and the other half is another zone. The industrial part is a small part so what you are trying to do is incorporate the whole lot into one zone. The ordinance is asking for it to be general business. We are not – if we keep it the way it is I don't see how half that lot would be developed in the park industrial. It is one of those gray areas of what is the best outcome for that particular lot. I think the best outcome is probably to rezone it so that it is general business and not park

industrial.

Alderman Shaw

I am wondering Alderman LaRose or anyone else – what size the lot is and what size those portions are that are currently ..

Alderman LaRose

I don't have the figures.

Roger Houston

I do have a copy of the Planning Board staff report. I could hand those out.

Chairman Rootovich

Alderman Shaw does that answer your question?

Alderman Shaw

Yes it does.

Chairman Rootovich

Do you have any further questions at this time? No?

Alderman McCarthy

What is the usage that is across of the drive from that site?

Roger Houston

The usage you mean the Target?

Alderman McCarthy

On the other side of Cellu Drive there is a parcel that by my recommendation is in fact industrial. There is one that is on the picture in the back here.

Chairman Rootovich

Alderman McCarthy what are you pointing to?

Alderman McCarthy

It is on the map that is in the staff report – this column over here.

Roger Houston

That is the Twin Mountain Water Springs Company I believe.

Alderman McCarthy

I guess I would just point out that it would appear that the footprint of that business, which is clearly industrial is smaller than the lot that we are talking about.

Chairman Rootovich

Alderman McCarthy anything further?

Alderman Vitale

I would like to concur with Alderman McCarthy. I believe that we should keep this as park industrial land and possibly if it is a concern that the lot is split into two different uses that we change the front use to park industrial also.

Chairman Rootovich

Further comments?

Alderman MacLaughlin

Even though the resolution before us is focusing on that area, as the host of the purple blob previously alluded to by Alderman McCarthy between Exits 1 and 4, that is Ward 8. Up on that hill are some excellent example of what is right about the current zoning citywide and I guess my biggest concern could be summed up in two words – it would be Wal Mart. I would hate to see us open up potential uses citywide by doing something like this chipping away at this particular type of zoning where this proposed giant super center could then have alternative options for placing itself mainly high on the hill overlooking the turnpike. I would hate to open up that kind of discussion or even an option. I am inclined to agree with Alderman McCarthy on this point as well.

Chairman Rootovich

Is there any further discussion?

MOTION FAILED

MOTION BY ALDERMAN SHAW TO RECOMMEND INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT  
MOTION CARRIEDDISCUSSIONAlderman Deane

Before Jay and Carol leave, last evening's Finance meeting the Finance Committee approved an Economic Development Strategy plan with Mt. Auburn Associates, and I was there and Alderman Rootovich was there as well as Alderman Vitale. I still have issues with this. Taking the marketing strategy out of the equation of this plan just blows my mind. Whether it is a money issue, but when you clearly read task 6, which is the marketing strategy it will take tasks 1, 2, and 3, which were reviewing existing studies, an economic audit, and a resource balance analysis and we will use the research and findings from tasks 1, 2, and 3 to design initiatives and target new business and industry prospects. These initiatives will be based on the city's key competitive strengths and targeted industry clusters and an understanding of location factors in other comparable municipalities. This is to me the gist of doing this project. If we are going – the Finance Committee approved it, and I was told of the other marketing strategy that we were given, and I have a copy of it in my truck, which is fine, but what a mistake to not market this plan.

We're spending \$90,000 to understand what the community can offer, what businesses we can bring in, what jobs we can create and there is no marketing strategy. I was up all night thinking about this. I respect the way people vote, and I realize there are money issues, but if we are going to go after something like this, which I think is an excellent idea I mean it is long overdue – we should be pursuing getting businesses in here, creating jobs, which in turn the revenue that is generated hopefully by the businesses that are successful will fall out into our local economy as Alderman McCarthy had just stated. Although I have looked briefly through the other strategy that we were given by Direct or Hersh probably 2-3 weeks ago, that is fine, but when you go into something like this – what this is going to do is really drill in to the city and it will show us our deficiencies along with what we can do, what we have to offer. Once that is all brought back in and reviewed there is a better understanding of what businesses we can go after, what we have to offer businesses and industries hopefully to come here and be successful and in turn give jobs to citizens or people in the area who in turn make money and put it back into the local economy. I do realize it was talked about last evening and I was talked to like I didn't understand.

I still don't understand why a marketing strategy was removed from this. If it is a money issue then to me doing this plan is important, but cutting the marketing strategy out of it is just ridiculous. That to me is the most – you get the document done, you know what you have to do and there is no marketing strategy to do it. It just doesn't make sense. This falls under the privy of this committee and I just wanted to voice my concerns. I voted against it because the marketing strategy wasn't part of it. Other people voted against it or for it for their reasons. I appreciate getting me the document from Kathy Hersh, but it just bothers me. It bothers me to

no end. Thank you.

Alderman Shaw

I certainly appreciate your concerns regarding the lack of the marketing strategy. Part of what I think is just as critical is the final proposal to the final thing that will lead us is the strategic plan itself, which maps out a whole number of things and it actually appears to be primarily independent of any marketing strategy. Also I think there is the practical nature of whether we like it or not we have just spent roughly \$25,000, which we could have spent again for a marketing strategy which I am sure would be somewhat different, but the marketing strategy that we have just paid for an adopted does bring with it a certain amount of branding and literature and it might not be totally consistent with what is derived from this study, but I guess I look at it and feel that we might need to come back and decide that we do need to re-fund and fund a new marketing strategy based on this firm or another firm's work based on these results. I think there is an awful lot of items that will be defined and can pursue as part of this strategic plan that will be independent of a marketing plan or a marketing strategy. That is why I was comfortable with endorsing this last night. I had concerns that we would be spending the same amount of money to redo a marketing plan too soon. In an ideal world we would have either done everything and started all at once two years ago or whatever – that part of things was really started whenever some of this had originally hoped to go forward, but we are faced with we got that piece done and now we are trying to bring forth the rest of the work. That is why I felt comfortable with it, and I still think it is the right thing to do at this point. I think it will warrant some review of how well does the marketing strategy plan that we have done fit with the results.

Kathy Hersh

What we recently completed were more marketing materials than a marketing strategy at least from the way I see it. They are the materials that you use when somebody is trying to get more information about the city. There is the web site, which is a very useful tool – many companies look to the web in order to find out about the City of Nashua and about what programs we offer and what our perspective is on Economic Development, and then the other marketing materials are a folder and a tri-fold brochure that talks about Nashua and why Nashua is a good place to locate your business and grow your business. Also separate sheets that we can custom so they have a consistency about each sheet and then we put the information on it that we want so that we can custom package when people call for information. Those are the materials that we use to distribute when we get calls and when we go for example to do trade shows or anything else like that – we have those materials that really show off Nashua hopefully in the best light.

The Economic Development Strategic Plan and I think Alderman Shaw pointed out the importance of the different components of it, is something that will step back as Alderman Deane said and take a good look at what we are doing and really drill in on what it is that works well in Nashua from a business and economic development standpoint, what we want to attract, what our demographics say that we should be trying to attract, where those best locations are – I am always wanting to know from a zoning standpoint where industrial land is most appropriate. There are some places – there are calls that we get on a regular basis from people that own

property that are interested in possibly changing the zoning. Some of those rezonings might be reasonable and some not and it really would help us to have that analysis to better understand where we want to make sure that we protect those industrial properties. The marketing strategy that was originally part of this I don't think would be a duplication of what we have already done, and what we have already done is the materials. The strategy would be okay here is your implementation plan, but then how do you market that, how do you get out and make sure that you are really reaching everybody and in what way?

I think that the materials themselves are still very valuable and the materials quite honestly they only have – they don't have a long life. It is not like they have a 10-year life. When you have marketing material like that they – they have a 3-5 year life. The marketing strategy is an important part, but quite honestly we do not have the funds to do that. There is \$75,000 in the capital improvements plan that was funded, there was \$15,000 additional that I could find in different place that I could put towards this, and that was all the money that we had. If this Board feels that is important and quite honestly I would agree then we would be happy to go back and get an additional cost to do that. We probably already have an additional cost to do that piece. Then we can just come back and have you see if the Board is interested in amending the contract. I would have to talk to Carol Anderson and see if I could find the funds or what we could do instead is get through the entire economic development strategic plan and when we got towards the end we could see just where we are at and whether or not that marketing strategy would be an important component to add on or not to add on and then come back to the Board at that time or for example you might put aside that extra, and I don't know exactly what it is, it is somewhere between \$15, 000 and \$25,000.

Alderman Deane

Fourteen thousand.

Kathy Hersh

Fourteen thousand in that proposal?

Alderman Deane

Yes.

Kathy Hersh

You could put it into contingency for next year's budget and then we will move it to that part. We can all sit together and decide whether or not it is something that is valuable to do, and just amend the contract with Mt. Auburn. It is a separate component. It is not something that you have to plan to do at the beginning or you don't get to do. We can get – we feel that the product that we will get the way the contract is currently written is very valuable for us. We really need to step back and take a look at where we are going with this.

Alderman MacLaughlin

It was \$24,000 for the marketing.

Alderman Rootovich

It is \$24,000

Alderman MacLaughlin

It is roughly \$115,000 versus the \$90,000 that we did the contract for.

Alderman Deane

There were two items that were cut correct? There was item 6 cut – their cost here on this plan is \$14,000 for a marketing plan.

Kathy Hersh

Alderman Deane has the proposed budget for the proposal itself.

Alderman Deane

The total proposal with base options was \$114,500.

Kathy Hersh

What I think happened is that he went back and renegotiated the contract based on the amount of money that we had. In order to make sure that we got everything that we needed without that last piece that is where we ended up.

Alderman Deane

So the price of the marketing plan changed? Is it still \$14,000?

Jay Minkarah

I have the amended one. I don't have the original one with me. We did make more than 1 change to the original to get us down \$24,000. We actually wound up better off I think with the differential. The original had \$20,000 for the in-depth cluster analysis, which I thought was a very important component. It also had economic summit in it, which I thought was a very important component and those two were \$24,000 so we decided that we eliminated two items – I will have to look back to see exactly what they were. The marketing plan at \$14,000 and there

was another change there that we took out as well. Basically we got actually more out of this amended contract than we would have just removing the marketing plan.

To go back to your other comment I do agree that it would be valuable to have the marketing plan component if we had the additional funds. I think that would be valuable, but in looking through the steps if you eliminated one of the other steps that we had in here you are losing a significant component of the base. The marketing plan is towards the end. You can do that separately. You can do that additionally. There was a significant component of that which was in fact what we originally went through. I appreciate that what we did more recently had some differences, but I think if you go and look at task 6 and what it encompasses, well it encompasses more than what we recently just did for the \$24,000 - \$25,000. You will also note that it specifically references the city bid number, and RFP number. That is what we just did. That is the contract that we just paid for. Mt. Auburn will work closely with the city's contractor preparing an economic development marketing plan (city bid number RFP 1303-042103) that is what we just did. That is why we decided that of all of the options in here this is the one that makes sense to eliminate the most – why if we were to eliminate something paying for Mt. Auburn to work with a consultant in developing as a reference in here this branding campaign and so on – that would be the piece that would go.

I do think it is valuable to do and I do believe that when we conclude this study we will see a value in coming up with the targeted marketing plan because that is really the difference. The marketing plan that we have now or the materials that we developed are generic – they are filling a very wide net thing – Nashua is a great community to do business in, come do business here – I think what this plan is going to show us is basically what we need to do is target our efforts because if we are going to be effective we know that there are going to be certain industries that are more likely to fly and be attracted to the environment that we have and certain industries that simply aren't going to work in this community for any variety of reasons; because of our location, quite frankly because of our high utility costs, and other factors. There are certain industries that we shouldn't be using our resources to target. I do think we will need to re-examine this. I do think we will have to come back and decide how we can better focus our efforts and our resources. Certainly if we were able, if there are additional funds that we can access to do this full plan, I would be more than happy to do that. I am just not sure where we would get those funds.

Chairman Rootovich

Is there any further discussion?

Alderman Shaw

I am wondering if we could ask Director Hersh to maybe go back and see if there is any opportunity for that approximately \$15,000 for that. ... tape inaudible – speaker away from microphone ...

Chairman Rootovich

Is there any further discussion?

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAROSE TO ADJOURN  
MOTION CARRIED

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Alderman Kathryn D. Vitale  
Committee Clerk