

MAYOR'S SPECIAL SENIOR CENTER STUDY COMMITTEE

June 6, 2000

1:30 PM

Chairman Shea called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Alderman Shea, Lopez, Jack Royer, Irene Robie, Penny Sconsa, Fred O'Connor, Rita O'Connor, Bob MacKenzie, Barbara Vigneault

Messrs.: Alan Clark, Tom Wallace

Alderman Shea stated we will begin the meeting once everything is set up. There will be a presentation by Alan Clark and Tom Wallace.

Presentations by Messrs. Alan Clark and Tom Wallace.

Mr. Wallace stated at the last meeting there were a couple of things that as we were looking at the different sites there were some issues that we were asked to look at. I want to go through those and then we will go to Alan and he will present the final six or seven sites that we had narrowed it down to. Then at the end, I would like to overview those sites and try to narrow it down to three or four that we want to look at in the final phase of our work. I have here an enlargement of the Singer Park area. I want to walk through so you know exactly what we are talking about in the different areas of the site. Then David Fang has made up a couple of boards that give you some idea about this site, the Singer Park site that may refresh some of your memories or bring you up-to-date on some of the areas. We may ask for some help as to where some of those pictures are from because I have not seen that board before. This is a drawing I got from CLD that was part of an overall masterplan they had done for the Singer Park riverfront development. It shows some of the areas that we had been talking about as potential sites for the building. Just to orient you, here is Granite Street coming across the river here, WMUR is here, this is Commercial Street and then we have proposed an access drive that would lead to the site. The soccer field is right here. This is the Riverwalk, which is in place now. The proposed pedestrian bridge where the railroad trestle is is down in that corner. This is where Elm Street is up here. This is the old Bradlees building and you can see the railroad tracks coming across here. This is the Gas Company just to give you an overall view of it. There were

originally three different sites at Singer Park that we were talking about. I think they were A, B and C and I am not sure which one was which but one of them was this area here which is where we went on the field trip down to Chelmsford and where the bus went and looked around that area. Another site was further down this way. That was the second site. Then the third site was somewhere up in this area. I am not sure if it was ever really defined. Probably looking at this map the only area large enough was probably here. One of the problems with this particular site is that with this proposed access road coming through here and plans for parking that would be the overflow for the civic center kind of precludes using this for the senior center site. That one does not seem to be too feasible. The one that is down here is pretty remote and probably could get access this way. There is no way of coming across here because of the amount of railroad tracks here. The only other way to get to the site is from way down by the Queen City Bridge and there is no access currently there. In my discussions with CLD it is going to be quite a project to get that access in. It seemed like this was the area that was the best to develop and this blue line here represents the drainage swail and then this red outline here is where it is a ravine or where it drops down. The drop is about thirty feet from here down to the bottom of that. I have looked at placing the building in one of two locations. One is here and one is here kind of assuming that we could maybe fill this in and have the drainage go underground through it. I have a couple of layouts to show you. Before we do that, these are some pictures that David brought in and maybe could describe where they were taken from and where they are related to this map.

Mr. Fang stated this picture...some of this I took early this year and some I took just last week. Basically, this one over here you can see just a couple of weeks difference for the drains coming out. That is the beauty we are going to have for this site. This area shows from the entrance up to Singer Park looking onto our site. Our site is at the rear of this area. This is just yesterday I went over there and they had some function this past weekend so they are using space in front of the concession as their...they set up dining tables to have parties over there.

Mr. Wallace stated the concession stand is here so they picture would go this way.

Mr. Fang stated this is the ravine area that we talked about earlier. The two sketches over there are mainly to show for the riverfront development master plan, our consultant mentioned for the area we would have the walkway for pedestrians and bikes. In the future, we are going to dress up the area so people will have a seating area and have some public arts. This pictures shows the land difference looking up. You can see the top from here and it is about a thirty-foot drop. In general, this is a grand view. You can see from our site looking out this is the river. Here is the bridge.

Mr. Royer asked is a lot of the depth of that ravine on account of the landfill.

Mr. Wallace replied some of it is but over in here there was not anything filled and it also goes from 160 there to about 130 down at the bottom. The landfill was coming into this area here.

Mr. Royer stated that is where we parked the bus. We stood there and looked into the ravine.

Mr. Wallace stated it is thirty feet on this side and a little bit less on this side even with that fill but it is still a pretty sizable depression. We will have to look at what that material is.

Mr. Royer stated if that was leveled off...

Mr. Wallace stated we might be able to lower it but it cannot be too much lower.

Ms. Robie asked are you showing us where the parking lot is located.

Mr. Wallace replied I will be getting to that.

Mr. O'Connor asked where are the silos going to be.

Mr. Wallace replied I am not sure. David might have a better idea. They are somewhere up in here but I do not know exactly where.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I can show you exactly right there beside this building this is an existing switch house that is going to be rehab for the office of the operation.

Chairman Shea stated if one were to come down Valley Street it is going to be behind St. Mary's Bank in that section.

Mr. O'Connor stated I have talked with several elderly people who remember that area purposely to get information and one place used to be the city dump and there used to be sewerage running in there. The water now they say is coming from the place along the streets that drain water out. There is also a stream running from one of the lakes down through there underground.

Mr. Wallace stated I talked with Tom Summers from CLD who has been out there quite a bit and he felt there were some issues to be dealt with but he did not think that they were insurmountable. That is something, as we move forward, we will be looking at. This is a sketch I did, very rough, locating the building in this location here. I did not lay the inside of the building out but I tried to get some

idea of how the site would work. I assumed, on all of these sketches, is that the building would be a two-level building instead of single-level. The only exception would be that the large multi-purpose room, because of the height of that probably needs to be just a one-level space. This is the multi-purpose room at one level. It is about 5,000 square feet. Then there are two levels of about 9,500 square feet to get our 24,000 square-foot building. Inside the kitchen might be in this area here where it could serve this and get deliveries in. The main entrance of the building might be here. My thought is this is the layout for the proposed parking that has been developed so far. If we made an access road off of here and the proposed parking stops here my thought is access to come in our buses could come in this way, have a canopy covering that here and the buses could exit and go back out so you could load people onto the buses this way and have it covered for them. With that kind of a layout, you can see where the Riverwalk is here, you would be able to have some views out here with some windows looking out taking advantage of those pictures that David had showed with your building. Because of the grading, I will have to study this a little bit more, if the building was in this position we would probably go up with the building. There is not an awful lot of difference in elevation between here and here other than right where this Riverwalk is.

Although this goes down and then starts to come back up again to this site. We may go up with the building here rather than down into the ground. Although I need to review the study a little bit more. I have developed the rest of this for parking. I have about one hundred cars shown here. Handicap parking here. I tried to break it up a little bit so that some of the parking is close to this building and then the remainder would drift over into here. This is the existing concession stand and this would leave an area here for them to develop outdoor concessions where they have the tents set up in that section. As you are looking at it, it does fit. The outline of this area which you might theoretically say the site for the senior center is about 74,000 square feet. That is roughly what we were talking about as the minimum size for that. That leaves about 22,000 square feet including this area in this section for the Riverfront concession area. This is where the stream is and the lowest part of that ravine is right here. We stayed out of that area. The advantage of that is that it would help reduce the cost of the building. The disadvantage is that it pushes everything against this athletic field and that may be an issue with the Riverfront people. In the last meeting, it sounded like they were willing to make some concessions. That is a consensual layout for that particular site.

Mr. Lopez asked the ravine is there but if it could be filled in then the building could be moved over.

Mr. Wallace replied in the affirmative and stated that is what I am about to show you.

Alderman Gatsas asked Tom do you think it is actually prudent and wise that you have people driving through a parking lot to get to this location especially seniors with cars backing in and out of there.

Mr. Wallace replied I am not real crazy about this particular layout. I am not sure having this parking like Elm Street with cars backing out. It is somewhat difficult to get in and out. I used the original layout and this showed a roadway coming down. This parking is something that is being discussed.

Alderman Gatsas stated it is already in place...that is the Rubenstein lot that you are talking about.

Mr. Wallace stated we are not sure that there is anything down this far in place.

Alderman Gatsas asked you have to drive through the Rubenstein lot to get to this.

Mr. Wallace replied in the affirmative and stated any of these you are going to have to do that.

Alderman Gatsas stated the parking garage is going over there.

Mr. Wallace stated I am not sure where the parking garage is going.

Alderman Gatsas stated the accessibility that you are talking about for this site is questionable. I assume everybody in this room drives, what are you doing for the seniors who have to take a bus is the city bus route going to go down there.

Mr. Wallace stated we have had some discussions and the indication is that the MTA would either run a shuttle bus or divert one of their routes to go down through here to where the site is located.

Alderman Gatsas asked through a parking lot.

Alderman Lopez replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Robie stated they told me that people who take the buses, they could make arrangements so that there would be a shuttle bus to take them to and from the senior center.

Mr. O'Connor asked has there any thought been given to the times when there are athletic events going on during the day and that is when the seniors are going to be there.

Mr. Wallace replied I have thought about that. Currently your schedule for your senior center and the uses for the athletic facility are not in conflict but that may change. Right now your senior center activities are Monday through Friday maybe about 9:00 to about 3:00 or 3:30. Most of the activities here are either late afternoon or in the evenings on the weekends.

Mr. O'Connor asked what about the parking when there are activities going on there.

Mr. Wallace replied on this there is going to be some competition to use that parking. If there is an athletic event while you have programs going on at the senior center there is no restrictions as to who is going to park here so it is going to be "first come first served".

Mrs. O'Connor stated that is the problem we are having now to share with the church.

Mr. Royer stated we are not supposed to be sharing with the church.

Mrs. O'Connor stated you are going to have the same thing here there is not going to be any assigned parking for us.

Mr. O'Connor stated it is going to be worse over there.

Mr. Wallace stated there might be some things we could do to address that particular issue as we get into this but there is no doubt that parking down here is limited. They had a big event this weekend and I am sure there were cars all over the place. Right now, during the daytime use I do not know how much parking would occur here. It is not being used now so we do not know what is going to happen or who is going to be there. It may be that you are driving down with empty spaces to get into here but that could change. It is certainly not ideal to drive through something like this with cars backing out if it is full.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe this gentleman stated there was a dump there.

Mr. Wallace stated this is a concern about this and as we move forward, we would have to take some tests for the soil capacity and so forth. There are some issues there.

Chairman Shea asked Bob where is the Rubenstein property and could you explain that a little bit and then where the proposed garage might go so that the committee will have some perspective.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Rubenstein property does...you can see the tail end of the property right here it is a very narrow area. It goes down to a point right about here. This part of the Rubenstein is very narrow. You can see the property boundary comes down to a tip right here near so-called site two. It is relatively narrow through this side. It comes out to a bulb here. If you go down to the parking lot when you go to Singer Field you will see this old half-round cement structure that is the old roundhouse that the railroad used. That is right here so any garage that is constructed will likely either go on this large section. Potentially, depending on how it is designed on this section near the street. I do think there has to be some more work in terms of finding the right...I am not sure it is a good idea to have a roadway through this parking area. You have to decide what you want perhaps a separate roadway that comes down to a point and maybe eliminate some of the parking here. The further down you go, the less usable this parking is for the millyard. In the long run, if you are going to have an access road down there you are better off eliminating some of the parking maybe on one side to develop a better roadway into the site. We could have a roadway that extends down below that and curve around the old roundhouse or up around the structure on this side near the tracks. We are going to have to work on that.

Chairman Shea asked if people decide they want that particular site, which comes first the site or all the preliminary plans for access and egress and also the conflict with a possible parking garage.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would ask the Board of Mayor and Aldermen what their priority is. If their priority is to put a senior center here then we will design the garage and parking to work around access to the site. If the Board's priority is parking and a parking structure, then we are going to have to work quite a bit harder to get reasonable access down to this site.

Alderman Lopez asked there is no way to the west of that. Ted Gatsas and me went down there to look at it and there is road along the West Bank. Is there enough room down there to drive to go down that way.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would probably say not because you are going to have a lot of activity with Singer Park there and just getting a reasonable roadway in there near the edge of the riverbank would likely be too tight. I do not think you could have more than a twelve-foot wide roadway down there which might be okay in some areas but not for this type of facility.

Mr. Royer asked somebody mentioned about it being a dump at one time how long ago was that.

Mr. O'Connor replied sixty years ago.

Mr. Royer stated before that it was on Maple Street where all the buildings are right now. That whole square was the city dump.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there is some problem fill right around down here and that is why you have the soil borings done to see how good it is.

Mr. Royer stated it has always been "hobo land" down in that area.

Mr. MacKenzie stated you could build on anything. If you paid enough money, you could have the old fill excavated and good fill brought in but that raises the price on the project.

Ms. Robie stated I am just very concerned about all of the traffic that may or may not be there. All of the sudden they are going to have a garage there maybe and that is going to mean a lot of traffic coming to the garage. The Civic Center is getting more active and it is attracting more people. I understand that they have high school teams that play soccer during the week and they have professionals over the weekend. They also have large concerts and that means a lot of traffic. That would add to the anxiety of the senior driver. It does not look to me like there is a clear way to get through that maze to get back there where we intend to have our senior center.

Mr. Wallace stated there are a lot of things being planned there and that is something we are going to have to decide on.

Ms. Robie stated it does not look like a nice tranquil spot that I had once thought it would be. I am really afraid of all the traffic that will be involved in there.

Chairman Shea asked Bob where is the proposed stage going to be.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it is going to be at about the middle of the field on the river side.

Mr. Wallace stated when I met with Tom Summers at CLD he was suggesting that it was going to be here facing the field.

Chairman Shea stated that would probably be some sort of a problem for that road that you were mentioning.

Mr. Wallace stated as Alderman Lopez suggested I did another sketch seeing what would happen if I pushed this over a little bit. What it does is that it increased the site size from 74,000 square feet to 106,000 square feet, which gives flexibility

and us a little more room. One of the things that it does do is that by having this access ride here if you could move this you can separate that parking into parking just for the senior center and parking is further away. It does put the building right over that drainage swell which means that we would have to look at the foundations and so forth. Because of the grade change probably what would happen is the building would be at the main level here and then the second floor would be down underneath it. The multi-purpose room is here. Deliveries could come in off of this road here. The buses would come in this way to pick people up and go out this way and again have a covered entry. You would still be able to take advantage of these here. It just basically slides this thing down into here and open this up and make it less squeezed into it. That is something that could be developed. It would probably be more expensive to develop but there may be some advantages that make it worthwhile.

Mr. Royer asked is there any reason why it cannot be reversed.

Mr. Wallace replied I was trying to keep the cars away from where the building is so that if you do want an area that is more "user-friendly" you do not have cars driving past everything so you will be able to have the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors without cars there.

Alderman Gatsas asked I would assume that these seniors should be told the reality at Singer Park. They are putting in a \$350,000 stage. I do not think that the concert overflow...I do not know if the City is going to say you cannot park in that parking lot. The people who are going to be going to these concerts will be parking there. The tranquility that everybody is talking about here and the non-interruptions are not being focused on at this point. The Board, at the last meeting, passed for them to be able to put in a stage worth \$350,000. I do not think that size stage is going to be calling for 1,000 people.

Mr. Wallace stated there is going to be a lot of activity there. How many concerts at this point I am not sure. There certainly could not be something of that size going on here and have normal activities there at the same. There is definitely going to be conflict. Most of those concerts are Friday and Saturday nights and there is nothing for the senior center at that time. There is something to be said for sharing the parking too. There is some advantage that it is nice not to have a parking lot that is empty half the time. You could fill it with one activity at one time and then another at another time. We would have to have separate parking for everything.

Mr. O'Connor stated I am really concerned about the activities going on there because they are building up Singer Park all of the time. Every year there are more activities there. I do not see any reason the corner of Bridge and Elm Streets

with an underground parking lot for 100 cars and the building built on street level would more than be adequate for everything the senior center could represent.

Mr. Wallace stated we did look at that site and the area was too small.

Mr. O'Connor stated it is 68,000 square feet according to the papers we were given. You are only looking for 75,000 square feet. With the parking underground then you have all kinds of room.

Mr. Wallace stated part of the problem with underground parking is that it drives the cost up considerably. Instead of parking your car for \$1,000 you are now spending \$10,000 per car to put in a garage.

Mr. O'Connor stated think of the cost of filling in that area and draining it that is going to cost too.

Mr. Wallace stated I thought we had eliminated that site.

Mrs. O'Connor asked do we have other sites besides this one. What Irene said this is nothing compared to...

Mr. Wallace replied there are other sites. We had four last time plus three that we looked into and Alan will go into that. But before we do that, I just wanted to answer one other question if we are finished with Singer Park for the time being.

Mr. Fang asked when you had a chance to talk with CLD did they mention if you are going to fill the ravine how many environmental permits would we have to go through.

Mr. Wallace replied he said that...and he was pushing the site and encouraged me to use that...he felt that for a use of the senior center that you may get a better response from the core of engineers in terms of how strict they were going to be in enforcing their requirements. It was a friendly use they would be more inclined to go along with overlooking some things that we have that is so critical. He did not think it was going to be a real big problem at that site but that remains to be seen. The other thing I wanted to show was a site at 1415 Elm Street which is the old Sears building. At the last meeting, Bob MacKenzie had asked if we would look at the option of instead of using the existing building putting a separate senior center building on the site and seeing how that would fit in the overall site. I did an exercise of laying the building out. The layout did not include this area here which is not part of that site nor did I include this area here as part of that site. There are currently buildings on all of those and they are residential uses. These are some of the different views. These are two of the existing buildings. This is at

the corner of Chestnut and Harrison Streets so that is looking down this way. These are the drive-thrus that you can see. This is looking at the backside of the two residential buildings here. The parking for the existing building is back in here. This shows the character of the neighborhood. This is on Elm Street about a block away. You can see the building here and part of the building here is from across the street.

Mr. Royer asked if you are going to utilize that land does that include having to buy the building.

Mr. Wallace replied in the affirmative and stated you have to buy the whole thing.

Mr. Royer stated from what I understand they are asking a little over three million dollars for it.

Mr. Wallace replied I thought it was about four million dollars as the asking price. The existing building here is three levels about 18,000 square feet per floor so you would have a total of 54,000 square feet in that building. Our program calls for about 24,000 square feet so we would be using a little less than half of the building for your use. What you want to do with the rest of the building I am not sure.

Mr. Royer stated the point I am getting at is if they want four million dollars for the building we have one million dollars appropriated to put up a building.

Mr. Wallace stated but there is some other space and it is my understanding that there are some other City agencies that are renting space elsewhere in the City that could utilize that space in the front building. I am not sure what the layout would be but to share that space with some of those. One of the things that Bob wanted me to look at was to see what would happen if we built a separate building for the senior center. As I said earlier, I did not include this area or that area and if those were acquired we would have more space available for parking. One of the things that it showed me was that again if I took the building and had a two-story section here for the main part of the building and a one-story multi-purpose room which is the larger area and I put the building here (there are other orientations that would work) but it showed me that these areas here provide about one hundred spaces so it pretty well uses up the entire site to do that. My conclusion was that it probably would not work to have a building here and here and one hundred parking spaces for both buildings is just not enough. As we continue with this site we need to look at is renovating space in this for the senior center and seeing what the rest of the space could be used for and providing the parking with the remaining spaces here. We could probably get...if we did it by Zoning Ordinance; you would need about one hundred sixty spaces for this square footage. If you eliminate that and

about one hundred here you could probably get the other sixty in the remaining space. It seemed like the way to proceed on this site is to renovate.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many spaces are there now is it two hundred fifty.

Mr. Wallace replied I do not know I have not counted them. I could have one hundred here and have room for bus access.

Ms. Robie asked if they chose that site I suppose they would be using that for other agencies or renting out the offices. Then how about the two other buildings.

Mr. Wallace replied they are residential.

Ms. Robie asked if we had all of the parking spaces around the senior center we would have to share it with these three buildings.

Mr. Wallace replied in the negative and stated they have their own parking. They could not use it unless the City allowed them to park there but they should not be parking on adjacent land.

Mrs. O'Connor stated but they do.

Mr. Wallace stated the church across the street uses it for parking on Sunday.

Ms. Robie stated I am not concerned what they would do on Saturday or Sunday when we are not there but I am concerned about a building that size would have a lot of offices and a lot of people coming with cars during the daytime in the week. Those other two houses people live there so they must have to have some kind of parking spaces.

Mr. Wallace stated I know this one has a few parking spaces here. I do not know about this one over here. There is a small alley that goes around that. They may park on the street or have a parking lot.

Chairman Shea asked the existing building now is three floors.

Mr. Wallace replied the affirmative and stated one is a little bit below grade and two above grade. There are some doctors in there now.

Mrs. O'Connor asked three and one-half million dollars to buy this piece and then how much more to renovate it. We are better to go with the piece of land.

Mr. Wallace replied I do not know yet. I have not gone through those numbers yet. I just wanted to see whether it made any sense to put your building here and provide parking in here for both and it does not look like that would work.

Mrs. O'Connor stated I do not think so either.

Mr. O'Connor stated it does not seem to me that it would cost three and one-half plus one million dollars to build a building for that and it would cost anymore than that to use the land on the corner of Elm and Bridge Streets to have the parking underneath.

Mr. Gatsas stated I came to a senior event on Tarrytown Road and I was the one who told you that I perceived building a senior center long before I got my AARP card so the process that I have envisioned in the senior center...if you take a look at the Sears building, that building offers two ground levels so that the seniors coming in off of Elm Street is on a busline and has not deteriorated and to build another building there does not make sense. I do not think there is a department in the City that would not like their own building to be standing free by itself.

Obviously, any approach that we can give you that is better than what you have today and up fifty steps from what it is, is certainly an enhancement. The vision of going in there consolidating some departments in this City so that the cost that we would be saving from paying rent in other sections of the City and putting them in that building; MCTV being one of them, Office of Youth Services and a couple of others. There is about a \$250,000 rental factor per year that the City is paying in rent. The 54,000 square feet there would give you folks 18,000 square feet on the first floor and give you two hundred fifty parking spaces that the other people in there are not going to be utilizing. It certainly gives you the access that you need. At the last meeting I was at, you folks were at 12,000 square feet and all of a sudden you are at 24,000 square feet.

Mr. Wallace stated it was about three meetings ago we went to 24,000 square feet.

Ms. Robie stated we would have never agreed to 12,000 square feet or 15,000 or 18,000 because they were not providing us with a second floor. It went to 24,000 square feet because it was going to be on one floor.

Alderman Lopez stated wherever we get a senior center it is better than what we have. I agree with Ted Gatsas. The only problem that I have and there are more seniors here to speak than I am, is to have the Youth Services or Mental Health or Welfare Department into that department with the senior center. All of the ones I have looked at all stand-alone. But if the end result is that is the best location then it will be fine but I think that a building by itself from what I have seen in other

communities will be ten times better than that. Barbara what is your viewpoint, you have handled the senior citizens for years.

Ms. Vigneault replied as I had said before, I had gone to the meeting at the Police Department and we looked at the various other departments to look at space and who needed what and we looked at the parking there. You are looking at parking for a staff of all the departments and public access for parking for all of the departments. You are also looking at special parking needs like Health Department vans and TV station vans. That is an issue. You would be sharing with that. The other part of it is if you put the departments without some type of division of separation so that you do not have the "at risk" kids involved with the seniors. That has been a problem in the past and in several situations we have had to advise against putting them together. That is just from past experiences. That is an issue with the kids. Seniors do not typically like to be associated with the welfare stigma and so that is an issue. The needs of the departments are all very important and everyone is buying for space. I tend to agree with you that there is a strict numbers of seniors that are coming along and that big gorge of numbers that we are going to be experiencing will need to be addressed for the next forty-five years. The growth needs are there. It is that consideration. At Singer Park, there is an access problem. I do agree with Alderman Gatsas that it is not wise to have an access road parking lot with people getting bumped or hit or buses going through. It is a problem of not getting on a bus route. We would have to make arrangements with the MTA that be a regular bus route. We had gone through all of the sites and there is no perfect site. Maybe it would be grand if we could take over the whole section of the Sears building and make nice parks around it. Nothing yet has been real perfect in its presentation to us.

Alderman Gatsas stated I agree with you. What the Sears building offers to you is obviously the potential to grow that if you have seven hundred seniors coming to this facility because there are two ground floors on an access point on the backside. That gives you the potential for growth. It also gives you the potential for some reason from now if you are in 18,000 square feet today and all of a sudden there are only one hundred seniors attending and you only need 9,000 square feet it also gives you an opportunity to downsize. That location gives you both the opportunity to grow by size because obviously you are going to be the primary tenant in there. For some reason, you need additional space there are elevators in it so it is not like it is a building that is inaccessible to the other floors if you needed more space. If the senior center grew to 54,000 square feet I would think that the Board would be in opposition to you taking the right two buildings so that you would have the entire lot if you wanted to do that.

Mr. Wallace stated that was an overview and the next point I want to have Alan go back through and look at the sites that we are down to and then I would like to

make some recommendations before we move forward. This handout is a sketch of those three designs.

Ms. Robie asked what has happened to the theory that it costs less to start from the ground up than to renovate a building. You are talking about all of that money for that building and then renovating it and then put money into a parking lot. That theory was pushed down our throats when we first started with this.

Chairman Shea replied whatever we are discussing is simply discussion so there is nothing really decided. It is just ideas and thoughts and concepts and we should not really close our minds to any kind of ideas and thoughts. We should keep them open realizing the implications of each if we are being serious about any one particular site. We are not saying that the Sears building is the ideal place. It is just a thought and idea and Singer Park is another. What we are discussing is not really the final decision, it is just discussion but it is good to keep in mind what your ideas are in terms of the cost. That is obvious.

Mr. Clark stated we are going to go backwards so that we can go forward. As I said last time we met there is no perfect site. The best site, in my opinion, the Mayor says we cannot have which was that site down by Public Service which is used as a parking lot. We have to deal with what we have. We know we do not have a perfect site. We are going to get to a point where we are going to get this down to a reasonable number today and allow Tom to go forward and do some further research. If you remember, we identified forty-one sites all over the City that had potential. Some got eliminated right away and some required more study. As part of that process, we also looked at where do the people that will use this, where are they currently occupied. We were able to determine the population of those fifty-five and over and where they currently live. For reference, this is the Merrimack River that comes up through. We find that on the West Side there is around 5,000 people currently that is over fifty-five, on the East Side there is about 17,000 and in the Central Business District which would go both on the East and the West there is about 8,000 people. We now know where to concentration of population is. We knew that probably before we did that but we went through that exercise in using census information from 1990 that was updated to be able to determine that. What are the assumptions that we are going to look at. The last time I was in here we said the building has to be all on the first floor. Then it was determined that it did not have to all be on the first floor. Maybe a portion of it could be on the second floor and we could use a basement. We knew we had to have the handicap parking. We know we have to have the ability for a bus to come in and out. We determined that we need about one-hundred car parking. Initially we said prime wetlands would not be violated. Then we said prime wetlands will give them due consideration but we will not necessarily say we would not go through that process. As a result, when we go through that the size

of the site that we need is more on the 60,000 to 65,000 square feet size as opposed to the 74,000 square feet that we were looking at before. Then we said how are we going to rank these. We identified a couple of things. First thing was it had to be big enough. The other thing was it had to be a regular configuration. The third thing was it had to be close to the population base because we identified now where the population base is. We know the site needs to be relatively level. It has to have good accessibility. We were concerned about safety. It could have good accessibility but if it was in an area that was difficult to get in and out that the traffic was such that it backed up into areas that could be a problem. As basic criteria, we knew you have to have water and sewer available at the site. From that we moved on. Here are the sites that we think after narrowing it down from forty-one that require additional work. We identified for you a site up at Livingston Park. We identified a site at Derryfield Park. We identified two sites at Singer Park. We identified a site over at the West Side Arena. Then the Mayor said have you considered the site over on Queen City Avenue. So we added the Queen City Ave. site and then the committee said Livingston Park we do not feel meets our requirements and the Mayor said that the Public Service site had other uses planned for that site. So we eliminated those two. We went through our analysis and we looked at these sites that were left and we said okay what makes sense. We looked first at the Mayor's site. One that I had given some consideration and I was concerned initially because of the traffic that backs up from Queen City Avenue from Elm Street back. But we looked at it since the Mayor brought it to our attention we thought that was probably the prudent thing to do. It meets all of the criteria as far as size, it is level, location is probably okay. Traffic was a problem. The problem was *Velcro* bought this in 1998 for \$315,000 and when we called them to ask if they would be interested in selling they said no. We talked to their corporate counsel and she said no. So that eliminates that site. One of the sites left on was the land by the West Side Arena. That met the criteria as far as it had the size site that we need. It was relatively level, by the river but we proposed to eliminate it at this stage because we are concerned about the access route. The access is down a convoluted way to get through some residential neighborhood then down a fairly steep way onto Electric Street and also because of its location. The central core of where everybody is is really in close proximity to where we are today. It would be way over on the edge and did not seem to fit the criteria so we eliminated that one. What are we left with. We are left with a variety of choices. We have this one that Tom was talking about which has a potential to work provided two things have changed since we last talked about this. One is that Tom used this area in here and has made the assumption that the Riverfront Foundation would allow that area to be used and that needs to be further analyzed. We know that there are some other issues that relate to the access through the proposed parking area needs to be examined. There are issues with the soil that need to be examined. We are recommending today that be one, because there is so much interest with Singer

Park, which remains as one of the sites that will receive further analysis. The other one is also at Singer Park. That is the one that slides it so that we get into what we affectionately call the ravine, which is some wetland area. There will be interaction between Singer Park that we will need to talk about. We think because there has been such a strong interest for the Singer Park location that that needs to be further analyzed. We still feel the site at Derryfield Park although it is certainly starting to push a little ways further than we would like from the Central Business District. There is this site here at the corner of Bridge Street and Mammoth Road and there is quite a bit of land although there is wetlands in there. Whether or not there is enough usable land remains to be done but we would recommend that the Derryfield Park site remain one of the sites that would have further study.

Chairman Shea asked is that land city-owned.

Mr. Clark replied in the affirmative.

Chairman Shea asked where is the baseball field.

Mr. Wallace replied there is parking here. The drive off of Bridge Street is here. Then Reservoir Avenue is here.

Chairman Shea asked where is Hillside.

Mr. Clark replied Hillside would be way up over in here.

Chairman Shea asked so that is really closer towards Trinity High School.

Mr. Royer stated that road there goes right into the parking lot of the baseball field.

Mr. Clark stated it does now but we would probably propose that be reconfigured so that there would be a signalized intersection that would come in so you are not going through a parking lot.

Mr. Wallace stated there is actually three access points to this site. One is off of Bridge Street, then you have the one off of Mammoth Road in here and then you could come up from Hillside.

Chairman Shea asked there is 100,000 square feet.

Mr. Clark replied in the affirmative and stated there is over 100,000 square feet. That is a pretty good size parcel of land. This up in here we know is wetlands. Last time we were there I saw it.

Chairman Shea stated people are familiar with that because the fireworks used to be up there.

Mr. Clark stated the main part of Derryfield Park is over here so this way up and all wooded. There are some trails up in there.

Alderman Lopez asked where is Mammoth Road.

Mr. Clark replied Mammoth Road is out here.

Alderman Lopez asked is it that far.

Mr. Clark replied in the affirmative.

Alderman Lopez stated there is a sign "Welcome to Manchester" is right on the corner.

Mr. Wallace stated it is right on this corner.

Alderman Lopez asked how much feet in between there do you know from Mammoth Road to the outline.

Mr. Clark replied not that much.

Mr. MacKenzie replied probably about one hundred to one hundred fifty feet roughly from Mammoth Road to the City property. There are a couple of multi-family houses on Mammoth Road.

Mr. Wallace stated that site is pretty deceiving. I have driven by there thousands of times and not really realized how much land was in there until I went in there and walked around it.

Alderman Lopez asked did you figure out...there is 100,000 square feet...the wetlands.

Mr. Clark replied somebody would have to do a wetlands survey to be able to determine just how much of that is wetlands. But we know there is a brook that runs from here.

Mr. Wallace stated this is wet in here. We really could not do much there but there is a very small brook coming through there.

Mr. Clark stated after looking at it and walking it I am confident that there is certainly enough building site there. How the configuration would be requires further study. The last one that we have would be the site Tom showed you which is 1415 Elm Street. We think this site deserves at least some analysis. Mrs. Robie has said what about this theory that renovating is going to cost more than building. I do not know until we go through some of this process and I just think that the location is good. As Mr. Gatsas says, there is roughly 250 parking spaces. It is a quality building. It may get eliminated. It may just not be cost effective. But I do not think we know until we go through that final step of this analysis that we have been asked to go through. That is to let us look at it. It does not cost you anything for us to look at it. It is already part of what we are supposed to do. Those are where we are at. I wish I could tell you that there are more. There were comments about Bridge and Elm Streets. My thoughts are accessibility there is not the easiest thing in the world. You cannot come in off of Bridge Street. Elm Street you have the lights where the traffic backs up. You can come in off of Canal Street and come up. Quite frankly, talking with the people at MDC and their expectations of that site is for a much more intense use. They would like an office building comparable to the Numerica Building or a hotel. I know they are in the process of doing some marketing research to see just what it was. Those would be what we would classify as the final four that Tom would then continue forward to do some further analysis. You have Singer Park not encroaching on the drainage swail. You have Singer Park that goes across the drainage swail. You have Derryfield Park that we talked about and then the cost related to renovating 1415 Elm Street. Those are the four sites.

Chairman Shea stated Fred in particular and the other Alderman would concur with this that the corner of Bridge and Elm Streets is going to be eventually something will come of it and they are hoping that we will probably bring in some tax money for the City. It has not for nine years. The Manchester Development Corporation is working on that and I really think there would be quite a bit of aldermanic opposition for a senior center to be built there. You might get a few people in favor but I would say I am not sure if the other Aldermen would concur.

Ms. Robie asked what about the piece of land around Stark Park.

Mr. Clark replied initially we had on our list land up at YDC that we did not pursue because it was State land and it was kind of off the beaten path.

Alderman Gatsas asked Alan could you put the analysis up that you had for the number of seniors within the district. If you have an overlay of that along with the site locations that helps you take a look at the number of people within a certain area so you have that familiarity and comfort of going somewhere.

Mr. Clark stated I do now know that they are the same scales.

Alderman Gatsas stated the proximity of the seniors is pretty close to downtown. You have the greatest of them looking quickly there are 8,000 just in that shaded area. That tells you the proximity of the seniors and where they are located. That is probably more important to your group and I do not think anybody has talked about it.

Mr. Clark stated this is the Merrimack River here and the Queen City Bridge. The Singer site is somewhere around here and Derryfield site is up here.

Chairman Shea stated there is quite a few people around the Derryfield site.

Alderman Lopez stated we have 10,000 people around Singer Park who could walk there.

Chairman Shea stated one of the considerations is that you are not building it for the year 2000 or 2001. You are building it for the year 2020 or 2025 so the concentration of people that would be utilizing that would not necessarily be reflective of what it is right now. That is the point we have to consider also. You want this to be a long-standing structure that obviously would fill the needs of people for the next fifteen, twenty, twenty-five years. You could add to it or place it in an area where people in 2010 still be concentrated in that area or will there be more people who own homes in outlying areas now where kids are attending school.

Alderman Gatsas stated it should not be hard for Mr. Clark to put something together that was in 1985 census to show the last fifteen years.

Mr. Clark stated what would happen is the nature of the housing that is in the outskirts is not going to be as conducive to seniors. Typically as a suburban location that has younger families. In the core, you have more apartments and senior housing that the City owns and it is going to be hard to think that, just because of the nature of the infrastructure of the City, the core of the senior population is going to move to outskirts. I do not think that is going to happen. You can be pretty certain that the core is going to remain into the foreseeable future in the Central Business District just because of the infrastructure.

Mr. O'Connor asked where is the location of the Sears building.

Mr. Clark replied it is right there.

Ms. Robie asked I was thinking of the future who are coming along over on the West Side they have so many condominiums and they are all people who are working now but they will be getting along in years. I think there is going to be a lot of them on the West Side. Just now it may seem like it is over here but over here you have more three-story buildings and individual living. The West Side is just loaded with condos.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the intent is to bring it down to the final four so that Tom can prepare the final...

Mr. Wallace stated the next step, once I know what the sites are, is the develop a specific design for each one which would be a building layout, what it would look like, what the cost would be, and site development. Our agreement with the City says that we would develop four of those. I would summarize what Alan has just said. I have a handout so you can see what the sites are. Then we will go with this or we can change or add something or take something away.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I just want to go back because we are going to finalize four sites today. The only other site I thought might be possible was the Livingston Park site. There was concern about access to Livingston Park as well as the activity with all the youth clubs there. I just wanted to raise that one last time before we went to the final four.

Chairman Shea asked how does the Committee feel about the Livingston site. Does anyone want to reconsider that.

Ms. Robie replied in the affirmative.

Alderman Lopez stated I do not mind reconsidering it. It is an athletic complex up there. The Central football team might go up in that area that you are talking about. They do not have a place right now and it is developed as a youth place. The kids get out of school around 2:30/3:00 and it is going to be crowded up there. I am just bringing those points up that we talked about before. If you want to look at it then it just might be a waste of time in my viewpoint. But whatever the Committee decides fine.

Mr. O'Connor stated it is the same problem with Singer Park too.

Mrs. O'Connor stated already with all of these things coming to the Singer Park that we did not know about. It does not seem like it is the place for us to be.

Mr. Wallace stated Singer Park is a little different.

Chairman Shea asked do we want to eliminate Livingston Park or do we want to include it. We should take a vote.

Ms. Robie replied we should continue looking into it because we do not have to have the same entrance as the sports people have. We could have an entrance further north of there.

Chairman Shea stated Irene is in favor. How about you Jack.

Mr. Royer replied in the negative.

Ms. Vigneault replied in the affirmative.

Mr. O'Connor replied in the negative.

Mrs. O'Connor replied in the negative.

Alderman Lopez replied in the negative.

Chairman Shea stated the Livingston Park site is out.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the only other issue that really has not been raised by the design team because everyone presumed it would not work is the Millyard space. Is there any interest. In looking at the sites now it is clear that there is no ideal sites. I am sure we can find the space but the parking would be very tough to meet. I cannot see how we could get one hundred parking spaces.

Mr. Royer stated if there is no parking, forget it. That is our big problem now on the East Side.

Mrs. O'Connor stated we might as well stay where we are.

Chairman Shea stated no one is interested in that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated ultimately one has to come out of the final four. If we have considered all of the sites when it goes to the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen they say did you really look at Livingston Park. We can say we have looked at Livingston Park and because of the issues of the competition with all the other kids and access to it will be a problem.

Mrs. O'Connor asked is that going to be the same problem at Derryfield Park. We will have Trinity High School that will take the parking spaces. We have the kids

up there in all the schools and we have the park so we are running into the same thing at Derryfield Park as we are at Livingston Park.

Mr. Wallace stated Central teams use Livingston Park for practices and games so it is five days a week it is being used. Derryfield Park there are ballgames from 5:00 on are pretty much when they have games up there. Trinity High School I do not know if you want them to park there or not that is something that is under the City's control.

Mrs. O'Connor stated I have three grandchildren who park there because Trinity does not have enough parking. Here we were all set for Singer Park and then all of these things that Board of Mayor and Aldermen are allowing in down there to eliminate us.

Alderman Gatsas asked Alan being the expert in the City if this Committee were to ask you which site do you think will be the best suited site for the seniors what would you tell them.

Mr. Clark replied at this point, out of those four we need to analyze the next step. From a location standpoint the 1415 Elm Street is probably the best location. It is central on a bus route and has adequate parking. If that were a vacant site there would be no question. That would be the overall winner.

Mr. Fang asked could you provide the definition for location to everybody.

Mr. Clark replied the location goes back to those criteria that we were looking at. The criteria that you need to develop anything are the site has to have the basic size to be able to accomplish what you want to do. It has to be configured in such a manner that you can build on it. If it were a long narrow strip you might have adequate size but you would not be able to put on what you would need. The location close to the population base that we are trying to serve is key. We now know where the current population of those fifty-five plus is. I believe, within reason, we know into the future. The site has to be relatively level because you cannot have parking that is sloped especially for seniors because it would be difficult for them to walk and close the doors. If you are trying to build your parking lot on some topography that is less than level. Ease of access; it needs to be easy on a major direct route that you could drive to it without going through for example the West Side Arena where you would drive through a residential neighborhood and take several roads to get there. It should be on a bus route. It needs to be in a location that is safe to get to but it is not too congested. It needs to be in a safer area as far as that congestion and such and the availability of utilities. All of these sites that were considered for the most part would have the availability

of both water and sewer. Those are the criteria. When you are going to make a decision like this that we have to take into consideration.

Mr. Fang asked is it true, referencing the third bullet location close to population base, does that include all the supporting amenities such as a convenience shop, gasoline station, post office, barber shop also.

Mr. Clark replied clearly that would play a role in it. You want to be close to those type of services so that if you get out into the outskirts of town you are further away from the basic infrastructure and you are going to be further away just by definition, from the majority of the population. You want to be close to that population base which typically would have all those other type of amenities such as a drug store and post office and the day-to-day activities so you can do it in one sweep.

Mr. Royer stated we have been trying to get a new location since 1987 as far as the East Side Center is concerned. We finally got the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to come up with one million dollars and here you are talking about buying a building that is asking about four million dollars plus renovating it. Where is all this money going to come from. We were lucky to get the one million dollars.

Mr. Clark stated we need to go through this analysis. You are not going to build a 24,000 square foot building for one million dollars anyway. It is conceivable that once you do the analysis if you utilize the other two-thirds of 1415 Elm Street for other City purposes that the net effect for the cost for the senior center could very well be in the same range of what it would cost to construct a 24,000 square foot building.

Mr. Royer stated that is all well and good but to begin with, where are we going to get the money to buy a building to begin with. That is the main thing. As far as Singer Park is concerned or Derryfield Park it is City-owned property to begin with. We have one million dollars to invest into that and the rest will come later on.

Chairman Shea asked I am sure that you are, in an analysis, going to put down the plus and minuses, strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Wallace replied when we get to presenting the final four designs and costs will be in that evaluation on each of the sites. We can take this and rate and rank each site based on that.

Chairman Shea stated if members of this Committee wish to give you certain questions beforehand they could submit them to you.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe I can help you with where the four million dollars is going to come from. The presentation at the Board of Mayor and Aldermen addressed with the School Board was that they were going to spend \$460,000 for portables. That was in a course of three years. Which was going to come out to somewhere around \$1,380,000. The Board proposed for us to build an addition for 2.6 million dollars which would accommodate the children and not have to put them in portables and the cost of that would almost be the same as the portables on a carrying charge out to thirty years because the rates would be low enough that we could bond. What Mr. Clark is saying that because we take some other agencies that the debt service of the four million dollars would be reduced because their rents would be eliminated that the City would be paying and they would be in that building with you. MCTV we have \$70,000 a year allocated for rent for them. If they were to move into a portion of this building that would do some of the debt service carrying charges that the City would not have to pay. That is where that number would come from.

Mr. Royer stated our rent right now is \$47,000 per year plus electricity and everything else. If they can come up with the money all well and good but one thing I will be against is Youth Services being in that building. We had problems with them in the past. They were right next door to us on 66 Hanover Street. That is one of the reasons they wanted to move us with them with Health and Welfare on Bridge Street. We had reasons not to do it.

Ms. Robie stated I couldn't envision turning a big ugly building into a class act senior center. We would have to take a field trip over there and look at it for us to be able to intelligently make these decisions. I can understand there several people who have complained about the City could use the top floors for the agencies that they are paying high rent for someplace else and that would help the City to pull through. I do not want to sound selfish but I am selfish and I would like to have a freestanding senior center that the seniors would be very proud to approach. We have been cooped in under a library and on streets where there is no parking and at this time we should consider something other than just plunking us someplace.

Alderman Lopez asked Alan Clark have you worked on senior citizen centers before.

Mr. Clark replied in the negative and stated Tom Wallace has in the past.

Alderman Lopez asked what is your experience in being freestanding.

Mr. Wallace replied in the negative and stated I did one that was associated with a daycare center in the same building. It was not as large as this but they had a daycare program going on and the senior center on the other side. It had adequate parking so that was not an issue. There was some integration in the programs, which was a good thing for that.

Alderman Lopez asked but in the most part of your experience do you see freestanding.

Mr. Wallace replied the senior centers we visited were freestanding. One of the senior centers I worked on was in another building with smaller social service agencies. They had Visiting Nurses and so forth. There was some benefits to the senior center because they could do screenings right out of the same building.

Alderman Lopez stated I just wanted to point out that there is 54,000 square feet in that building and even if we moved in four or five different organizations that would come up to about 20,000 square feet because they are only using about 14,000 square feet right now. I am adding another thing in there. My wife worked at this building for many years with the eye clinic and everybody in the neighborhood uses that parking lot including the Masonic Temple. With all of these other agencies and I know Regis Lemaire would agree that those type of characters that he gets in Youth Services just would not fit in with the senior center. Welfare Department surely would not fit in. Maybe the Health Department because it is a different program and MCTV would be all right. The bottom line is the Board of Mayor and Aldermen with this Committee's recommendation and if that is the only thing we can do but there would have to be a lot of money putting into that place. Four million dollars to buy the building and renovations will be six/seven/eight million dollars.

Alderman Gatsas stated do not get out-of-hand with it. Mr. Clark was a tenant in that building and he knows the building better than anyone does. If I told you 20,000 square feet would you give me \$50 a square foot for renovations and probably have a palace. You are the architect. That takes you to five million dollars not seven or eight million.

Chairman Shea stated one of the considerations that Irene did bring up was we are a committee but also we are representing other people in the community. Their input is important as well in terms of what they would like to see. If they would like to see a free-standing building that is going to be completely a senior center or if they would want to be in a particular situation where they would share facilities with certain departments. That is a question that should be asked.

Mr. Royer asked Mike have you got that survey that was taken.

Alderman Lopez replied in the affirmative and stated 48% of the people want a single centrally located senior center.

Alderman Gatsas stated the majority does not have a problem with being combined.

Mr. Wallace stated that question was in relation to preferable to a multiple center.

Alderman Gatsas stated 52% then do not have a problem with being involved.

Chairman Shea stated what does the rest of the survey indicate.

Alderman Lopez stated out of 109 people 48% strongly agree to it, 29% agree to it and no opinion and disagree and strongly disagree. The majority of the people only want a single.

Mr. Wallace stated but that was talking about one center versus two centers.

Ms. Vigneault stated the question that Alderman Lopez is reading off is east and west. The mean a single center as being not two but one. There is another question in the survey that relates to a freestanding building.

Mr. Wallace stated we are not asking for a final decision today. We just want to narrow it down so we can answer some of these questions.

Chairman Shea asked when do you think you can bring all of this together.

Mr. Wallace replied the next phase we have set aside for about six weeks. That would be about July 18, 2000, which is six weeks from today.

Chairman Shea stated July 18th is a fine date. Are there any problems with that.

Mr. O'Connor stated we should put Bridge Street back in the desirable area even if the City does not like it.

Alderman Lopez asked on July 18th you would be presenting the final four with cost factors.

Mr. Wallace replied in the affirmative and stated what they would look like also.

Alderman Lopez stated we have a meeting on the 19th of July is there any way to do this the week before our regular Board meeting because we only meet once a month in the summer.

Chairman Shea asked is it critical for July because we will meet in August too.

Mr. Wallace replied it is kind of squeezed for me. We have to get some information on the sites.

Chairman Shea stated I do not think there is a decision that the Board is going to make in July or August because even if we make a decision in July as it were there still would be other preliminary work to be done. It would be easier for you if you did it in August.

Mr. Wallace stated to finish by July 11th is going to be pretty tight because we are going to have to get some test borings out there for the Singer site. We have to look at some things on the Sears building structurally inside of it. Six weeks is working hard anyway and I just assume push it back rather than forward.

Chairman Shea asked Bob MacKenzie in terms of July or August do you see any problem with that at all.

Mr. MacKenzie replied in terms of scheduling towards a...if ultimately the group selects a site we go back to the Board and the Board agrees with it, we get the money to go ahead with design. We are hitting design sometime December of this year and that is a good time to be going out to bid. We will get our best prices if we are bidding for a project in January.

Chairman Shea asked is it not critical that we do anything in July.

Mr. MacKenzie replied you do not want to let it slip past early August to present to the Board.

Chairman Shea asked is July 18th a good time or do you want another week beyond that to make sure.

Mr. Wallace replied in the affirmative and stated I just picked six weeks straight. If you want to push it back a week that would be a big help.

Chairman Shea stated because then we would be presenting it to the Board in August.

Mr. MacKenzie stated they meet the first Tuesday in August but I am not sure of the date.

Alderman Gatsas stated my problem is that if we continue putting time and Mr. Wallace should be prepared to do this presentation the week of the July 12th so the Board can make a decision because we start getting into December and January you will have to go to fifty different committees with this. Why are we continuing to wait. He should be able to do his job in six weeks. If this committee tells him to do his job in six weeks he will get it done.

Chairman Shea asked but the point is that Bob MacKenzie just indicated that the bids would go out in December and that would be the best time.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I always try to shoot for any project to go out to bid somewhere between December and the first week of February.

Chairman Shea stated then I do not see a problem with this.

Alderman Gatsas stated that is going to push you outside of the budget cycle again because you are going to be in February before you are getting numbers.

Chairman Shea asked what do you think Bob.

Alderman Lopez stated our meeting is the 19th of July for the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Mr. Wallace asked the following is the first Tuesday in August did you say because that is August 1st.

Mr. MacKenzie stated in the summertime they only meet once a month. Normally it would be the first Tuesday of the month but because of the fourth of July weekend that July meeting has been pushed up two weeks.

Chairman Shea asked the committee if they would like him to present it to us on July 18th.

Mr. Royer replied in the affirmative and stated it is all right with me.

Chairman Shea asked do you see a problem with that.

Mr. Wallace replied I could do it for then.

Chairman Shea stated it could be put on the agenda for July 19th.

Alderman Lopez stated if we meet the 2nd of August we can have it ready by the 18th of July that way Alderman Shea could call a meeting and we can go through the process to get it on the agenda for August 2nd if we have to or if we could push it for July 19th under New Business but I do not think that will materialize.

Mrs. O'Connor asked what if we do not like any of these four sites.

Chairman Shea replied this is what I am trying to say. If on the 18th he presents something and we are going the 19th it does not make any sense to me.

Mrs. O'Connor stated Singer seemed to be good but now we have lost it.

Alice asked would we prepare July 18th for the land or for what is going to be inside.

Mr. Wallace replied it would be both. I will be showing the layout of the site and the inside layout of the building.

Alice asked so we will decide the land on July 18th.

Mr. Wallace replied you are going to decide which specific site and building design to go along with it. That will be four sites.

Alderman Lopez stated we could put it on the agenda for July 19th BMA meeting or take it off.

Mr. Royer asked you said four sites.

Mr. Wallace replied in the affirmative and stated two at Singer Park (one north of the ravine and the other) there are two different layouts on that site and it could effect the cost.

Alderman Lopez stated Alderman Shea you could notify them to put us on the agenda for July 19th and if we are not ready we could pull it off.

Chairman Shea stated the next meeting for this committee would be at 10:00 on July 18th.

Mr. Fang stated should the committee recommend the designer to spend a little more time on 1415 Elm Street because you are going to have a hard sell to the larger group.

Mr. Wallace stated we are going to have to spend some time in addition to the building design on how it is going to be financed because it is going to cost more than the others are because it has more square footage.

Mr. Fang stated he did not really say absolutely no single building. He was trying to figure out the front building how he can make it balance. If you can do a creative solution and solve the parking issue and in the back.

Mr. Wallace stated if we could put another building on the site that was not necessarily 24,000 square feet.

Ms. Robie asked Mr. Clark that piece of land that I looked at while you were there is there another way that you can get at that.

Mr. Clark replied we looked at the one in the front but that is where the City is going to put a parking garage so that eliminates it.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Jack Royer, duly seconded by Rita O'Connor, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee