

7/9/96 CIP

1

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

July 9, 1996

6:30 PM

Chairman Robert called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

PRESENT: Ald. Robert, Reiniger, Clancy, Domainque

ABSENT: Ald. Wihby

MESSRS.: R. Girard, F. Thomas, R. MacKenzie, J. Taylor,
S. Maranto, L. Bernard

Chairman Robert addressed item 3 of the agenda:

1996 CIP Budget Authorizations:

4.10303 Pedestrian Safety Program - Revision #1

7.10216 Traffic Signal LED Replacement Program -
Revision #1 - Project Extension

8.20135 Public Access CD-ROM Library - Revision #1 -
Project Extension

Ald. Domainque asked what the revision number one was question to.

Mr. MacKenzie replied they had all been previously approved by the Board.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve the 1996 CIP budget authorizations.

Chairman Robert addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Amending resolution and budget authorization providing for increased funding for the 1996 5.10117 Gill Stadium Rehabilitation Project - Phase II in the amount of \$75,000 and authorizing expenditures for same.

Ald. Clancy stated it was a long time in coming for the life of Gill Stadium, which was the reason they could not hold the American Legion game there; that a few years aback the lights weren't powerful enough to host games noting it would bring money into the City which was why he was highly in favor of the resolution.

Ald. Domainque in reference to financing asked if they were increasing the amount of the bond for the same time period and wanted to know when the bond would be reflected.

Ald. Reiniger stated the payments of the bonds would come from facilities.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman Robert addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Bond Resolution:

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of \$250,000 for the 1996 CIP 5.10117 Gill Stadium Rehabilitation - Phase II."

Ald. Clancy stated he had talked with the Central High School football coaches who had indicated they put some money into it out of the Central Booster Club; that the building was in such poor shape that when it rains at Gill Stadium, the rain comes into the locker rooms and ruins some good clothes and stressed that it was so bad they could see the stands from the locker rooms and noted the coaches had asked him what he was going to do if this continued; that he responded he hoped with the money it would be able to help solve the locker room problem.

Chairman Robert stated it was the same project as before.

Ald. Clancy stated he was going to be perfectly truthful; that he had gone down there and could see the difference between the floor boards at Gill Stadium and in a place like New York and asked how were they expected to conduct business under such conditions citing, for example, if they go out to practice that by the time they come back their clothing is all wet and what was going to be done about it, if anything.

Chairman Robert asked Ald. Clancy if he was just clarifying the situation if the amendment passed.

Ald. Clancy replied he wished to stress the horrible conditions of the locker rooms.

Ald. Domainque asked if this was a proposal that set aside \$15,000 for contingency or was she wrong in her assumption.

Chairman Robert replied she was correct.

Ald. Domainque stated in the event that the left over money was not needed, then the money could go towards what Ald. Clancy was talking about.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it was possible, if it was not an emergency repair; that a bondable item might replace part of the roof.

Ald. Clancy stated it was the grandstand which was above the locker rooms where daylight could be seen from downstairs.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it was possible if the improvements to correct them were of the same bond life as that of the lighting noting he would talk to Parks and Recreation about it.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve the bond resolution.

Chairman Robert addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Amending resolution allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of additional grant funds for the School Department as follows:

Summer Youth NHJTC CAST Program FY97 - \$76,316
Adult Diploma Program FY97 - \$12,183
ABE/ESL program - \$61,975
Vocational Education FY97 - \$532,200

Chairman Robert inquired as to what ABE meant.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it referred to the Adult Basic Education Program.

Ald. Domaingue asked if any of the grant monies replaced funding that was earmarked out of their ward budgets for that kind or program.

Chairman Robert replied they counted on this kind of money for the program.

Ald. Clancy asked if this was separate from what they received.

Chairman Robert replied, yes; that they counted on it and built the budget around it but noted he could be wrong.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve the amending resolution.

Chairman Robert addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning,
Re: Sidewalk, Drainage and Traffic Projects.

Mr. Thomas in reference to what Mr. MacKenzie had already indicated stated he would like to request this year's appropriations (\$50,000) and ask the CIP Committee to authorize the reinstatement of the 50/50 Sidewalk Program; that the 50/50 Program was when the City allocated 50,000 and would then put out a private contract and obtain the other 50 percent from people who would like sidewalks fixed; that he was requesting the Committee allocate the \$50,000 of the \$462,000 to implement the 50/50 Sidewalk Program by contract this year.

Chairman Robert asked how much was CDBG.

Mr. Thomas replied it was \$215,000.

Chairman Robert asked how much would it leave for the School program.

Mr. Thomas replied approximately \$200,000 could be used for the School program.

Chairman Robert asked if CDBG money could be used for anything else other than that neighborhood because he thought they should earmark that money for that neighborhood and suggested the 50/50 Program be funded with \$50,000.

Mr. Thomas stated that would be enough to get the program started this year.

Ald. Clancy suggested that the \$215,000 for CDBG and \$197,000 for whatever else be split up and asked if that made any sense.

Ald. Domainque asked if the ones on the final list on the bottom on the School Sidewalk reports under "waiting approval for listings" were the ones that had not made the list yet.

Mr. Thomas replied she was correct.

Ald. Domainque addressed Chairman Robert stating that in regard to the list she saw several sidewalks and streets that were quite familiar to her; that out of the first 15 allocations, 11 were in one ward which she thought already had a sidewalk and raised the issue because she had three schools in close proximity (Memorial High, Southside Jr. High, and Jewett Street) noting there were not any sidewalks on Huse Road and Weston Road except further down; that she did not see them on the list and stated it had been a long-standing issue for a number of years and felt there was a safety issue on Weston Road where there were children walking to Mooresville, crossing Huse Road and walking down Weston Road to get to their high school and junior high with the traffic going at an amazing speed; that she was raising the issue because she did not see these roads on the listing and hoped there was room on the priority list to have sidewalks where there were none.

Chairman Robert replied that the Planning Department had not developed the list but that the list had been developed over the years at the request of various Aldermen.

Ald. Domaingue asked once again who made up the priority list.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it was done through the CIP Office in the Planning Department pointing out that on page 6 of the attachment there were several times when the Aldermen were petitioned to identify all of the sidewalks in their respective wards; that some Aldermen were more aggressive in submitting a listing and in 1990 they decided they had "X" many dollars in sidewalks which was why they decided to have primary goals which was the listing they were currently working off.

Ald. Domaingue stated it was her understanding that sidewalks would be provided to all of the school areas.

Mr. Thomas stated that everyone was in agreement with that also.

Ald. Domaingue stated there were 9 or 11 projects going on in one area and there were three schools in a given section with high volumes of traffic and no sidewalks and asked if the City could take a look at these areas, not as a request from the Aldermen, but as a need for the City on the whole and make them a priority as she wished that the City did not have to wait for an Alderman requesting such especially when it involved safety issues for school children and that she would like to see some of the money spread out to address the needs of those children walking to and from school.

Mr. Thomas stated one of the problems was that in the mid-80's, they had put \$500,000 into sidewalks annually and that they had cut out the street prioritizing; that they were now down to \$50,000 to \$75,000 pointing out that they couldn't run an effective program in that manner; that the CIP had always had the funding for the program but noted that the rest of the City did not give any allocations.

Ald. Domaingue in reference to Calef Road, Mystic Street, Brown Avenue, and West Mitchell stated some children of those areas were bused to and from school so she was not as concerned with those areas, but was extremely concerned about the students who were not bused and who had to walk to the three schools previously mentioned and asked if those areas were included in the final listing and unless they were she would not support it.

Mr. Thomas stated the Committee had the most currently street listing before them and that it was up to the Committee to make whatever changes it felt were necessary.

Chairman Robert asked if this was the way in which the listed had been worked over the years.

Mr. Thomas replied the listing had not changed since 1993.

Chairman Robert asked if a sidewalk had ever been built in the City without having gone through this process.

Mr. Thomas replied, not in terms of construction.

Chairman Robert stated he was trying to be sensitive to all of the needs and was blaming no one, but there had been a lack of continuity and in order to make this decision there had to be some criteria; that he needed to know where the needs were, so they could put the money where needed and asked if there was any other way they could do it since there was not much money to go around; that he felt the criteria specifically those numbered 1 through 8 had a rating system, cost, and time noting it seemed as though some planning and thought had been put into it and reiterated that he was asking how they could identify the needs and yet still be objective.

Mr. Thomas stated that in the past if someone came in with a critical need, it was put on the list; that four years ago they had stopped doing so because too many people had too many priorities noting it would take up to ten years to finish the projects, therefore, they stopped doing it.

Ald. Domainque stated she was not questioning how they arrived at this point, but rather was questioning the process and whether or not it accurately reflected the intent of the City; that she felt it was the intent of the City to provide School sidewalks and again stressed that the list did not reflect the priorities to get sidewalks in school areas; that before that kind of money was to be spent it must be put into some sort of order for the school children.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. Thomas if they could do what Ald. Domainque had suggested.

Mr. Thomas replied that he could see where the Aldermen's concerns were, however, he was comfortable with the ratings of the projects on the current listing noting he was unsure as to where they came from except that they did come in from Aldermen who in turn were asked what the top priorities were from their constituents; that he did realize that the priorities would change over time and did not have a problem going back to the present Aldermen inquiring of them what their priorities were, so long as his staff had the time.

Ald. Domainque stated she was not asking for that to be done; that there were 23 schools in the area and one was federally-funded notably the School of Technology; that there remained 22 schools which needed help.

Mr. Thomas stated that the maps were done about 15 years ago when school walking areas were identified noting they could go back and identify all of the school areas and walking routes again; that surveys could be performed noting that would be a larger scope of a project as opposed to a planning study noting he would have a problem committing that kind of staff hours within the next couple of months.

Chairman Roberts stated that the City had been doing things a certain way for a long time and it was something that could not be changed overnight, but something they would possibly work towards over time and wished that the sidewalks be built this summer.

Mr. Thomas stated he would also like to see that happen.

Chairman Robert asked the Committee members how they felt with respect to the issue.

Ald. Domainque stated she was asking that this be postponed until such time as a new set of criteria were developed; that the money could be put off to the side until such time as new criteria has been set at which time they would be able to move forward.

Ald. Clancy stated he wanted to hear about Mammoth Road, but was not about to bow down for no one; that he needed sidewalks up near Steven's Park, Nelson Street to Lake Avenue; that he had been told they were unable to get school crossing guards at the corner of Candia Road/Massabesic Street/Hayward Street.

Chairman Robert stated he was asking all of them if they were finished with developing new criteria or were they willing to work with what they had.

Ald. Clancy replied he was willing to work with what they had because there were a hundred and two on the list and he was not willing to go to a hundred and twenty-two.

Chairman Robert asked Ald. Clancy if he was in favor of using the list.

Ald. Clancy stated he was in favor of using such list.

Ald. Domainque stated she would love to see them develop the new criteria, but her intent was not to throw out the baby with the bath water, but rather to raise the question regarding Calef Road, South Beech Street, and South Beech east side because there were kids in those areas who were bused and she wanted to know if they needed to spend the money in those areas; that she was not going to question if Ald. Clancy knew he needed those sidewalks on Mammoth Road, but rather did they need those sidewalks more on South Beech Street than they needed them on Weston or Mooresville Roads.

Mr. Thomas stated that the two top projects were important - Allen Street which lead directly to Parker Varney School and Mammoth Road which was a very tough and dangerous section which was between Weston, McDonough, and Hallsville School and directly adjacent to Steven's Park noting they were approximately \$120,000 and as the estimated had been done several years ago, could be higher now; that it was necessary that the estimates be redone by the Highway Department in order to make sure they were correct and felt it was the safety way to stay with those two projects now.

Chairman Robert suggested that whatever the balance was after the two projects they could then take the \$202,000 and put it away for next year, so they would already have money set aside.

Ald. Domaingue asked if South Beech east side was in Ald. Clancy's ward.

Ald. Clancy replied it was; that there were no sidewalks for Wilson School in the vicinity of Cedar, Lincoln, and Wilson Streets.

Mr. Thomas stated he was sure that every district could come in and say that.

Ald. Clancy stated he was sick and tired of seeing kids walk to school without any sidewalks pointing out that there wasn't any sidewalk on either side of the street and that people had their lunch right out there on the curb.

Chairman Robert stated if they were going to do something they would going to have to come to an agreement and asked what the combination of projects was that the Committee could perhaps agree on.

Ald. Clancy stated he could agree to the first two on the list.

Mr. Thomas stated he would want to know which ones were the biggest safety problem for the City.

Ald. Domaingue stated there were population issues associated with the schools noting that some of them involved the Chandler and Wilson Schools and potential phase out.

Ald. Reiniger stated it would mean they would have to rebuild sidewalks instead of building new ones.

Ald. Domaingue stated she did not know why they could not revise the listing.

Ald. Clancy suggested they agree to do numbers and one two and redo the rest of the list.

Ald. Domaingue stated the remainder should be held until they were able to revisit the list.

Ald. Clancy moved that number one and two be done at this time and that the remainder of the list be redone.

Chairman Robert stated that was roughly \$197,000.

Ald. Clancy stated he was not "greedy", but there were a hundred students per school.

Chairman Robert stated there would be some money left over.

Ald. Clancy stated they could agree on the first two for now and review the remaining later, but it was too bad money was going to have to sit there.

Ald. Domainque asked if it was understood that they were going to come back to this Committee at some later point with a report; that they did not need to come back with a 22 page report as she knew that the Superintendent of Schools knew his schools and that he knew where the highest levels of traffic were and was sure that if people got together they could map it out in a couple of days.

Mr. Thomas stated the best thing to do was to draw a map around the 22 schools, go out and evaluate each, talk to school people, crossing guards to find out where those problems were at which point they could identify the areas; that they could then run the areas through a formula which evaluated the criteria such as route usage, traffic volume and speed, alternate route availability, and a listing of the sidewalk conditions; that this would give them the best possible listing noting it would take time and staff over the next six to eight months to accomplish such a task.

Ald. Reiniger asked if it was possible for those two projects to be completed this summer.

Mr. Thomas replied it would probably be sometime in the fall before they could start construction due to the bidding of the contract noting they would be in a better position in January to come back and review the list because they would know how much exactly the first two projects would cost.

Ald. Clancy stated he could not believe that those two projects could not be done this summer.

Mr. Thomas stated that once he received approval, he would then have to schedule a survey, draw up plans, draw up the bidding documents, undertake the bidding process itself, award and execution of the bidding documents noting that usually took up to a total of two months or so.

Ald. Clancy stated he thought they were already given approval for the first two projects.

Chairman Robert stated he did not give approval as of yet as he was waiting until they arrived at some sort of an agreement; that they would put \$79,000 off to the side for now noting they wished to do at least \$50,000; that they needed to figure out how to spend the \$250,000; that he had looked at the 1991 CDBG Valley Street which was ranked first and also Mammoth Road which was a big chunk of money noting it also ranked high on the list.

Ald. Domainque asked if work was being done on that road.

Mr. Thomas replied they were doing some construction between Cilley and Candia Roads.

Chairman Robert stated they could make a down payment on that \$345,000 or they could go around it or possibly do a combination.

Ald. Domainque stated that the only thing bothering her was that Mammoth Road had been sitting on the list since 1986 which was probably the result of the amount of funding; that she felt the way in which the City had been doing business was crazy because they weren't addressing the issues and that they should probably be setting aside money for these projects.

Mr. Thomas stated that there were two possibilities: that they could do a phase of the Mammoth Road project whereby \$215,000 was authorized to spend on Valley Street going as far as Ken Street and secondly, that the balance of bond money could be put towards the CDBG project.

Ald. Clancy stated that the Valley Street project had been on the table for a while as well as mammoth Road noting it was about \$345,000 and that Wellington Road to Derryfield Court (near the condominiums) was not far from Candia Road.

Chairman Robert asked the members if they wished to approve item number one.

Ald. Clancy replied they should do item number one.

Mr. Thomas stated there was \$215,000 allocated to spend in the area.

Chairman Robert suggested that listed items one and three be completed with the remaining funds be placed into item number two.

Ald. Domainque inquired as to the Concord Street issue.

Chairman Robert asked if it was in the vicinity of Central High.

Ald. Clancy replied it was.

Chairman Robert stated \$16,000 seemed doable to him.

Ald. Clancy stated Auburn Street (south side) all the way to Belmont Street.

Chairman Robert asked if it was the same as Ash Street.

Ald. Clancy replied it was noting it was listed as item number seven.

Chairman Robert once again inquired of the Committee what they wished to do.

Ald. Domainque asked if they wanted to do numbers one, three, seven, and the remaining funds to item number two.

Ald. Clancy replied, yes.

Chairman Robert asked them if they wanted to do six because it was only \$17,000.

Ald. Clancy replied, yes; that they might as well do Ash Street which was adjacent to Central High.

Chairman Robert stated the Committee seemed to agree on items numbered one, three, six, seven, with the remaining on two.

Mr. Thomas stated it sounded good.

Ald. Domainque stated she thought they could do it in pieces.

Mr. Thomas stated it could be done but did not know if it added up.

Ald. Reiniger stated it would not leave a lot left over for Mammoth Road.

Mr. Thomas stated it would only leave \$70,000 which would not really be enough and would probably be better to leave it for another year.

Ald. Clancy stated they could then do the whole thing from Wellington Road down to Kennard Road.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. Thomas for his opinion from a construction point of view.

Mr. Thomas replied if the Committee planned on using \$215,000, then the rest of the money should be allocated for some of the smaller projects such as Lowell Street which was about \$36,000 noting it made more sense to do that then a \$70,000 dollar project which was part of a \$345,000 project.

Chairman Robert asked if they wished to do numbers one, three, five, six, and seven.

Ald. Domainque stated that number two was included as it was a school sidewalk site noting that mammoth Road was not a small street.

Ald. Clancy stated that it was a busy street which had been on the table for quite a while.

Chairman Robert asked the Committee members if they were in agreement with numbers one, three, five, six, and seven.

It was the general consensus that numbers one and two would be approved and that the remaining would be saved; that one, three, five, six, and seven on the CDBG listing were approved and funding of the 50/50 Program as well.

Mr. Maranto stated they had \$330,000 set aside for this fiscal year which would take care of about two intersections.

Chairman Robert asked if they were concerned about the Annual Parking Facility Maintenance Program.

Mr. Maranto replied, no; that it got stuck in there by accident.

Chairman Robert asked which two intersections they wished to go with.

Mr. Maranto replied he would go along with numbers one and two noting that number one had already been completed.

Ald. Domainque asked when number one had been completed.

Mr. Maranto replied just recently.

Ald. Reiniger stated that Traffic had called him last year telling him that they were waiting for money for the traffic signals.

Ald. Clancy asked Mr. Thomas if the lighting at the corner of Tarrytown and Massabesic had been bid.

Mr. Thomas replied that the bids were currently in the process of being executed by the Mayor.

Ald. Clancy asked about the lights at the corner of Tarrytown and Auburn and if the Elliot was paying for part of the installation as he had met a gentleman at Alexander's who was wheelchair bound who had indicated to him that he had almost been hit three times at that particular intersection.

Chairman Robert asked if there were some intersections that were not signalized but should be.

Mr. Thomas replied he could not identify them at this time feeling they were prioritized by the Traffic Department.

Ald. Domainque stated she would like to see representatives of the Traffic Department appear before the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not think it made sense for the City to be picking up Union Street and thought the idea with a particular intersection was to take out the hanging lights and put in new ones.

Chairman Robert stated Mr. Thomas was referring to Item 17 noting he had been told it was about \$250,000.

Mr. Thomas stated if it had been in that area they would have coordinated the work because they were almost finished noting if there was a project which was pending in that area then Traffic would have worked on it, but was not sure and would check into it.

Ald. Reiniger felt that the Committee could vote on one or two of the items.

Ald. Clancy stated he would like a push button for the gentleman in the wheelchair so he could cross Mammoth Road/lake Avenue.

Ald. Domainque asked if there was a time element involved.

Mr. Thomas stated they were in the process of concluding Union Street except for some driveway work noting that CIP had control over traffic signalization, drains, and sidewalks but was unsure if the Committee had the authority to prioritize.

Ald. Reiniger indicated he felt that the committee had control over the funding.

Mr. Thomas stated it was his belief that the committee was to provide funding for these two projects.

Chairman Robert stated CIP would approve the funding and let the Traffic Department and Committee on Traffic make the decisions.

Mr. Girard stated it was not the intent of the Mayor or the organization of the CIP Committee to give authorization and jurisdiction over funding noting that the CIP Committee was only to approve funding for projects and that the Traffic Committee prioritize.

Mr. Thomas stated fund had been earmarked for the first seven projects already, therefore, they were looking to start with number 8 and felt it was up to the Committee to decide which projects should be done; that Mr. MacKenzie had revised the listing that had been prepared at the beginning of July noting the first ones named had been approved; that the first eight projects totalling \$73,000 were approved on December 19, 1995 and

that there was a balance from last year's budget and with the \$25,000 from this year's budget left about \$31,000 which could be committed by the Committee and that the projects had been prioritized by the Highway Department based on need and dollar value.

Ald. Domainque stated that item 3, Bodwell Road, was not in Ward 8, but rather in Ward 6.

Chairman Robert stated that they would not be able to do much with \$31,000.

Ald. Clancy stated they could use the money to address item number 30 which was near a school and between Lincoln and Wilson Streets and could do the whole thing at one time noting there was a big puddle in the area which people had called him on complaining about.

Ald. Domainque stated there were no remarks given regarding that item asked if they were talking about Cedar Street.

Ald. Clancy replied they were talking about 451 Cedar Street.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not know why there were no remarks made in reference to 451 Cedar Street but would check on it; that normally if there was no remark it usually meant that it was a maintenance or rain problem area.

Chairman Robert asked how firm the \$31,000 figure was.

Mr. Thomas replied that as projects were finished the balance of \$31,000 would perhaps increase.

Chairman Robert stated he wished to address item number 10 which was in the vicinity of the condominium which was sitting on the side of a sand bank where water accumulated in the road and collected in the driveway seeping into the building.

Ald. Domainque clarified for Ald. Clancy that they were talking about items numbered 9, 10, 11, and 12.

Ald. Clancy stated Sargent Road was in her ward.

Chairman Robert stated he thought there was a gentleman who wanted to contribute \$4,000, but did not feel he should have to contribute the money.

Ald. Domainque asked if the gentleman, Mr. Gosselin was still willing to contribute the money.

Mr. Thomas stated he remembered that the project involved drains off of Sargent and Goffs Falls Roads.

Ald. Domainque stated there would be a day care center going into her ward on Goffs Falls Road and wanted to make sure that before anything was done for Mr. Gosselin that they make sure whatever improvements were done they should take into consideration businesses which would be going into the area as she felt the need to look at what improvements needed to be made regarding the whole area and not just one lot.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. Thomas if he could do 9,10, 11, and 12 and asked if the Committee could accept the money from the gentleman if they were willing to go through with the project.

Mr. Thomas stated he would like to review it and get more detail and suggested they do 9, 10, 11, and tabled item 12 until he could report back to the Committee with a more detailed accounting of the funding.

Ald. Clancy stated if they were thinking about a sidewalk at 451 Cedar Street between Lincoln and Wilson Streets (item 30) he wanted to make sure the job was done properly noting he thought it was perhaps a \$12,000 job.

Chairman Robert asked if anyone wished to move on item 30.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve item 30.

Chairman Robert addressed item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Frank Thomas, Public Works Director,
Re: response to correspondence from Lloyd Basinow
concerning solid waste disposal.
(Note: to be distributed separately.)

Mr. Thomas stated the City had reviewed all of the waste disposal options in the mid 1980's noting there had been a recommendation from the Highway Commission to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that the City should pursue a mass burner incinerator that would be located on Dunbarton Road and the Board had instructed the Highway Department to go through an RFP process which they did with Vicon; that the project died because of concerns raised by individuals, but he felt the proposal was good and felt it would be impossible to find a site for an incinerator in Manchester; that in addition to the aspects on stack emission movements at that time they were able to negotiate a good PUC rate with Public Services noting it was not now available; that in discussions with Vicon they would have been able to have a regional facility and would have been able to bring trash into the City from outside, thereby making it more cost-effective, however, given the current circumstances it would now be impossible; that the contract they had with Waste Management was dollar wise and excellent noting no one had a better deal than the City and felt the proposal had merit, but did not feel it was the right time or place.

Chairman Robert addressed item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Reiniger requesting that the City's policy regarding the payment of repairs to sewer lines be reviewed by the CIP Committee for possible changes.

Ald. Reiniger stated Ms. Joan Catano was present to address this item.

Ms. Catano stated they had problems with their sewage rising approximately 85 feet into the street; that the people they had called in had indicated it looked as though something had been broken or damaged and came in with an estimate of about \$4,800; that the contract stated they had to fix the hold before anything could be done; that the City indicated they could give them a part which, of course, they were billed an extra \$400 to fix it noting she had to borrow almost \$5,000 to fix it and was told that since it was from her house it was her responsibility.

Ald. Domainque stated that the City had charged the company she had hired to fix the City line noting that she in turn would have to pay for it.

Mr. Thomas stated the City's existing Sewer Use Ordinance defined a building connection as a type that ran from the dwelling to the public main and that the pipe that carried the flow from that particularly dwelling; that it also defined a public sewer as the main in the street which carried the flow from more than one dwelling; that the line which came out from the public sewage was a private line and that the private building connection was the responsibility of the property owner to maintain and repair and in that particular case there had been a problem with the services at its connection into the city main; that 20 or 40 years ago when a plumber made a connection they usually got to the City main with a hammer and chisel and broke into the City main and the trees and roots sought water, therefore, it got into that particular location and blocked private service noting the City main was not broken; that when the City's excavator got to the street it was apparent that the City main had that connection because the service was damaged; that the policy was if the service was damaged or the main the service needed to be fixed with a new "T" connection which was what they were being billed for; that it was the City view that if there's a problem to the connect it is the responsibility of the homeowner; that if the homeowner did not agree they could then submit a claim to the City through the Risk Management Office; that Risk Management goes out to view the property with the Claims Adjuster taking pictures, etc. and ultimately the City would abide by the Claim Adjuster's decision; that he cautioned the City in taking part in the direct involvement of repairing private services as there was a large cost to the City noting the average private repair of services a week were \$7,000 which equated to about \$360,000 worth of work a year.

Chairman Robert asked if this was an insurance claim.

Mr. Thomas replied he did not know.

Chairman Robert asked if he felt that it had been handled unfairly as far as the City was concerned.

Mr. Thomas replied that they had followed the same procedure that had been in place for year.

Chairman Robert in addressing Ald. Reiniger asked if he could recommend any changes.

Ald. Reiniger replied his letter was as of a general policy issue and felt that for \$300-\$400, the City should not involve the constituents in the claim process for that amount of money.

Mr. Thomas stated he hated to see the City reject this and have to go through a Risk Management claim.

Ald. Domainque stated she was in agreement with Mr. Thomas; that if it was part of the pipe that went to the City main it was the responsibility of the homeowner and felt that what she was hearing was that in that section where it was connected to the City main and had deteriorated to the point where it needed to be fixed noting, however, that she understood the homeowner was responsible for her part of the piping, but questioned if the owner had the responsibility of maintaining a section of the main sewer that had deteriorated and felt that they should forward it to Risk so as to allow them an opportunity to make a recommendation and thought they could probably go 50/50 as they could not leave the pipe in that condition.

Ald. Clancy stated he had a similar situation in his ward (5) up by the new Alexander's Supermarket up on Hanover Street; that the woman had told him when Alexander's put in a drain system they had ruined her pipes and he also felt it was the homeowner's responsibility.

Mr. Thomas stated he was recommending that it be sent over to the Risk Management Office for their review reiterating that the damage to the City was the result of the house connection tied into the City main and not the main itself.

Ald. Domainque in addressing Chairman Robert asked if the purpose of the house was to be connected to the main and asked when the house had been built and when it was connected to the main line and asked if the main was damaged at that point or did it occur over a period of time.

Mr. Thomas replied that he did not feel it had occurred over a period of time but rather it got in at the connection of the house service stressing once again that Risk Management could help resolve the issue.

Chairman Robert suggest that it be referred to the Risk Management Office who would in turn report back to the Committee.

On motion of Ald. Robert, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to refer the communication to the Office of Risk Management requesting that they report back to Committee.

Ald. Reiniger stated he did not know what would occur if it was denied by Risk Management and felt it should be split 50/50.

Ald. Clancy stated he sympathized with the homeowner, however, felt that the City should go through the proper channels which included review by Risk Management, therefore, if it was going to be a decision of a 50/50 pay, it should be spelled out.

Chairman Robert addressed item 10 of the agenda:

- Communication from Leo Bernier, City Clerk, requesting the placement of a light fixture/sign on the fascia of City Hall
- seeking contributors to help with the restoration of City Hall.

Ald. Clancy asked what the purpose of the sign was and if it was something similar in nature to what was used by the United Way.

Mr. Bernier replied it had been recommended that a sign be placed on an interior window as opposed to exterior.

Chairman Robert asked of Mr. Houle if he was in agreement with what Mr. Bernier wished to do.

Mr. House replied that short-term he saw not problem but felt there should be policies for the future of not permitting such requests.

Ald. Domainque asked if this was to help raise monies for the renovation project of City Hall.

Mr. Bernier replied in the affirmative.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve the request from the City Clerk.

Ald. Reiniger asked if there was any possibility/interest in having a spot light on City Hall as there was in Portsmouth.

Mr. Bernier stated that had not been thought of as of yet.

Chairman Robert addressed items 11 and 12 of the agenda:

Communication from Deputy City Clerk Bergeron and Assistant Solicitor Arnold, regarding potential changes to Sec. 7 1/2(b) relating to Assessment and Collection of Taxes in Central Business Service Districts.

Communication from Deputy City Clerk Bergeron and Assistant Solicitor Arnold submitting proposed revisions to Sec. 26-19. Discontinuing Service of Nonpayment of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.

Clerk Bernier stated that Mr. Tom Bowen, Director of the Manchester Water Works had requested that this item be tabled and distributed a letter from Mr. Bowen to the members; that the ordinance amendments were currently being proposed for reclarification purposes and keeping up with changes in State Statutes.

Ald. Domainque stated that RSA 31-124 provided that assessment should be made on properties abutting any public right-of-way rather than owners and asked how did that relate to the people Downtown.

Clerk Bernier replied he did not know in-depth the basis of the ordinance.

Ald. Domainque asked Mr. Bernier how could he then ask the Committee to pass an ordinance when he did not have full knowledge of it.

Clerk Bernier replied that Messrs. Arnold and Bergeron had been working on it and they could discuss it with them.

Ald. Clancy asked how it would affect those individuals in the condominium units on Canal Street.

Ald. Reiniger stated he did not have all of the answers and relative to RSA 1996 amendments, which was now law had changed the base language noting it indicated the assessment should be made against the owners of commercial and industrial properties and such other types of properties as may be determined by the municipality abutting any public right-of-way in the Central Business Service District which would become effective on August 9th.

Chairman Robert asked if that particular change had been incorporated into this ordinance amendment.

Ald. Reiniger replied he had just wanted to bring it to the Committee's attention.

Ald. Domainque asked if the amendment address the matter relative to taxing of residential properties in the Downtown area.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold replied it was not sectioning out those condo or residential owners; that when it was originally drafted the City's ordinance had indicated all property owners in the Central Business Service District.

Ald. Domainque asked if item 12 could be tabled until such time as they had a chance to review it.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold stated he would agree with tabling at this time, so as to be able to comply with State statutes.

On motion of Ald. Reiniger, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to table items 11 and 12.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold stated the ordinance amendments should have been referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading.

On motion of Ald. Reiniger, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to refer the ordinance amendments to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading.

Chairman Robert addressed item 13 of the agenda:

Communication from Deputy City Clerk Bergeron and Assistant Solicitor Arnold submitting proposed revisions to Chapter 21A, Sewer Use Ordinance of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.

Mr. Thomas requested that item 13 be tabled at this time pending further review by the City Solicitor's Office.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to table item 13 pending further review by the City Solicitor's Office.

Chairman Robert address item 14 of the agenda:

Proposed changes to the Sewer Use Ordinance submitted by Thomas Seigle.

Ald. Domainque stated it appeared that they were expanding the amount of sulfate that could be dropped back into the main stream.

Mr. Thomas stated that was correct; that chemical limits under the free trade programs were either too low or high and the ordinance amendment would adjust those limits on chemicals which fell into State guidelines or the accepted limits of treatment at the Treatment Plant.

Ald. Domaingue stated as a result of the Treatment Plant being in her ward, she wanted to be more comfortable with it noting she saw no reference to EPA whatsoever.

Mr. Thomas stated the ordinance amendment conformed with EPA guidelines.

Ald. Domaingue stated they would be going from 2.0 milligrams per liter to 280 mil per liter for sulfate and wanted to know if that was okay.

Mr. Thomas replied it met the guidelines.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to recommend that the proposed changes to the Sewer Use Ordinance be approved.

Chairman Robert addressed item 15 of the agenda:

Communication from Leonard Bernard, Superintendent of Schools, advising that he has reviewed Hevey School with various other staff, that an architect's recommendation will be needed with subsequent Board actions and the earliest the facility could be readied is January 1997.

Mr. Bernard stated he had met with Messrs. MacKenzie and Houle and Fr. Mark at St. Marie's Church to discuss the facility being used noting it would take a considerable amount of structural changes (i.e., an elevator for handicapped accessibility) and were unable to come up with a figure for the Committee's review; that they would need the help of an architect.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. Bernard what he was looking for from the Committee.

Mr. Bernard replied that were looking for approval to proceed with architectural services in order to come up with some sort of figure and wanted to know if there was any funding to assist with the handicapped accessibility aspect.

Chairman Robert stated he was unsure if that should be done; that he was concerned with the long-range picture as it related to schools on the west side noting there was a proposal that the facility be used to house sixth grades and asked Mr. Bernard what other options were available.

Mr. Bernard replied it was his belief that the lease be put on hold at the moment until school opened in September so that school officials would have a better handle on the enrollment figures, particularly on the west side; that if all went according to projections then next spring they would asked CIP for an addition to Parkside as Parkside was an integral part of the whole Middle School concept and necessary to the west side population.

Chairman Robert stated he was sympathetic, but he needed to know if there were any options to the Parkside addition noting he would not support an additional because he felt there were other options; that neighborhoods were becoming congested and were taking away from park space; that he thought the Board of School Committee could do such things as vouchers for kindergartens to lessen the demand for school space and was not afraid to say no to the teachers and the School Board and was not afraid to have to use Hevey School if need be and was happy that his parish took good care of the facilities, but stressed they should be looking at other options.

Ald. Domaingue asked about a sentence in the letter - "the State Department of Education had indicated a genuine interest in holding federal funds to the schools that are not approved" - asking if by "approved" they meant by the "statement of standards".

Mr. Bernard replied that was correct.

Ald. Domaingue asked if the City was being told that the State Department of Education was interested in holding federal funds, not state funds, if the school did not meet the "statement of standards".

Mr. Bernard stated he had read it in the newspaper noting that the word from Concord was that it was something which was being considered.

Ald. Domaingue stated she felt that such inference was that it may hold up funding for Chandler School.

Mr. Bernard stated it was his intent to show a clear distinction between not having Chandler School approved and approval for an elementary school.

Ald. Domaingue stated that had caught her attention and if the government intended to withhold federal funds should would be in the Governor's Office in a minute because if the State Department of Education was flexing a lot of muscle when its role should be to aid the school districts.

Ald. Clancy stated he was 100 percent behind the school children and did not want to spend money on Hevey School or any other school until they took a look down the road because if an architect indicated an addition was needed on a school then the City should provide that addition.

Ald. Reiniger asked how long they had known about this.

Mr. Bernard replied they had know for three years and thought that probably it had been a year or two since they felt Chandler School was inappropriate.

Ald. Reiniger asked of Mr. Bernard what alternative plans did the school district come up with.

Mr. Bernard stated discussions had been held relative to a preschool center.

Ald. Reiniger asked how much the addition would be at Hevey School.

Ald. Clancy replied it was \$2.7 million.

Ald. Reiniger asked what the sixth grade population of the west side was.

Mr. Bernard replied that the current sixth grade population of the west side was a full capacity both at Northwest Elementary and Parkside.

Ald. Reiniger stated he would like to see the enrollment figures in September as that would help determinate the population size of the west side.

Mr. Bernard stated Mr. MacKenzie's projections should include population noting the census figures should indicate a sharp drop as it seemed to him that it would be thrifty to abandon the issue now, but as the figures went down they could look at Parkside as an option noting they would also be looking at the demographics also and did not think it was a good idea to combine sixth grades noting it had never been a good idea as there was no type of association other than age level; that "teams" were an integral part of the educational process in that they worked together and not alone (i.e., field trips, assemblies, etc.) and did them as groups but not necessarily the same ages.

Ald. Reiniger asked if those so-called "teams" were joining in other grades.

Mr. Bernard replied the "teams" within those grades when attending activities intermingled with the other grades.

Ald. Clancy stated he did not know what the reluctance was in building another school noting it reminded him of the situation associated with the closing of the dump in that they had been talking about closing the dump for the past 20 years; that in his opinion McDonough School had plenty of land on which to have an addition built, therefore, there would be no problem in closing the Chandler School and hoped the City was looking out for the welfare of its children.

Chairman Robert stated the concept in front of the Committee was to use Hevey School for the Chandler School population.

Ald. Clancy stated it could not see spending money in a school where they were not going to stay stressing once again it was more feasible to build the addition to McDonough School.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there were two problems; that one was the Chandler School population and the other being increase in enrollment on the west side; that they had looked at putting an addition at McDonough, however, there were concerns with that option such as cost noting it would cost approximately \$2.5 million to do it right and they would need 15 classrooms because like other educational programs in the City it would continue to grow; that the second problem was that they were faced with the immediacy of the situation and could possibly lose funds in the near future noting it would be a two-year timeframe in which to build the school.

Ald. Clancy reiterated the City needed to look at future needs.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he felt that with respect to future needs he saw the elementary enrollment stabilizing, therefore, they would be able to use existing elementary school facilities which would be more cost-effective; that he wanted to find a reasonably low-cost to get through the next 5 to 7 years so long as it met academic needs which was why they were looking at Hevey School as it was felt that was a reasonable solution to the special needs situation; that even with the Chandler and Brown Schools they still could not have special needs classes in one building as there were more than 10 classrooms which would be required next year and possible a third if Chandler School was outgrown; that next year some students would stay at Chandler, some at Wilson and other would go to Smyth Road School as it was overflowing.

Mr. Bernard stated that originally they had discussed the lower floor at Chandler being used; that one day a child had found glass and children were also tested whereby germs were located.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that they had looked at Brown School as a possibility, but due to the fact that it was not large enough to house the entire program it seemed a waste of money to fix it up.

Chairman Robert stated they could level Brown School and build something else in its place as the neighborhood needed an acceptable alternative, but did not know if it was feasible.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there was a different between rehabilitating an existing school and building a new one as there were certain standards which needed to be met and if those standards were not met then they would take a chance of not receive school building aid.

Ald. Clancy asked Mr. Bernard how much he thought it would cost to bus the students.

Mr. Bernard replied each bus cost \$25,000 to carry the kids to the Parkside area and they would need two buses, therefore, it would be in the vicinity of \$50,000.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he wished to address the issue of what to do with the west side as projected enrollments warranted the addition to Parkside noting he wanted to monitor the enrollment figures and projects over the next 12 months before committing to anything as he was not convinced it was needed at this time.

Ald. Clancy stated they should wait and see what the numbers were before a decision was made.

Chairman Robert stated he felt there was a need to do something for the schools soon.

Ald. Reiniger asked how much money would be required for Chandler School till it was shut down.

Mr. MacKenzie stated his concern was that they would have to put quite a bit of money into it and did not think it was worth the investment as it would not be able to accommodate people in the future.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve Mr. Bernard's request.

Chairman Robert addressed item 16 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning, requesting the Board's authorization that he negotiate an 18-month extension of the Planning Department office rental agreement.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to approve the Director of Planning to negotiate an 18-month extension of the rental agreement.

Chairman Robert addressed item 17 of the agenda:

Petition for Discontinuance of Lenox Street from Rosedale Avenue northerly to Lancaster Avenue.
(Note: communication from Public Works Director enclosed.)

Ald. Clancy asked Mr. Thomas to discuss the area near Lancaster Avenue.

Mr. Thomas stated the street had been laid out in 1911 and had never been altered and fell under Rule 19 RSA 23:51 Section c indicating it had not public status; that there was a drain and sewer lines noting it was his recommendation to release from public servitude in accordance with Rule 19.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to find that the petitioned area was released and discharged from public servitude under the provisions of RSA 23:41.

Chairman Robert addressed item 18 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, requesting approval to sell six (6) packers to the highest bidders as well as to replace vehicle "487" at an approximate cost of \$83,000.

Ald. Clancy asked if Highway had ever sold the three packers and bought two lawnmowers from Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Sheppard replied they were supposed to have sold six packers last year (\$37,000) and were to use \$36,000 in MER balances which had been approved by the CIP Committee and if they had extra money they would then buy the lawnmowers from Parks.

Mr. Girard stated he believed that in the adopted budget, the Mayor's MER recommendation was to buy the two lawnmowers for Parks, so the problem had been taken care of.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to approve selling the six packers.

Chairman Robert addressed item 19 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Public Works Director, seeking authorization to execute an "Agreement for Three-Phase Line Extension on Private Property" with PSNH as part of the construction for the Drop-Off Facility on Dunbarton Road.

Ald. Clancy asked if it was needed for the Drop-Off Facility.

Mr. Thomas replied the power was already running, but they needed the official authorization.

Ald. Domaingue asked if it was already included in the budget.

Mr. Thomas replied it was part of the Drop-Off Facility funding.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Domaingue, it was voted to recommend authorization to execute the agreement.

Chairman Robert addressed item 20 of the agenda:

Communication from Jay Taylor, Industrial Agent, submitting two proposals for the Committee's information and review from Freedom Writer Corp. and The Sargent Museum for City-owned property located at 88 Lowell Street.

(Note: forwarded under separate cover.)

Chairman Robert asked Mr. Taylor if he was looking for a decision this evening.

Mr. Taylor replied they were seeking guidance as a result of the two proposals received; that one proposal was from a for-profit corporation which would be a start-up of a publishing house who proposed to pay \$10,000 for the property and spend \$325,000-\$350,000 to renovate the property; that the second proposal was from a non-profit group, The Sargent Museum, who were proposing to acquire the property for \$500 and to renovate and restore the building to its original configuration which was a school and to use it as a display for the museum's artifacts; that it was the staff's consensus that the museum proposal fit better into the location although neither of the proposals were what staff had been looking for; that the staff was seeking the Committee's direction regarding the proposals as to whether or not more time should be invested in going in that direction or dumping the whole project and starting over again.

Ald. Domaingue stated both the proposals were not acceptable to her as she felt The Sargent Museum was tax-exempt; that they would be displaying Indian artifacts noting that no where did they list Dartmouth College in Hanover which was founded for the education of the Native American individual; that in their revised proposal they included the statement "environmentalist assessment is any agreement between The Sargent Museum and the City of Manchester will be contingent upon there being no environmental conditions found by the study which the museum is now prepared to address."

Mr. Taylor stated the museum wanted to complete a study before there were any agreements entered into.

Ald. Domaingue stated she was in agreement, however, they did not intend to fund whatever environmental concerns there were.

Ald. Domaingue in reference to the other proposal (Freedom Writer Corp.) noted they would get the building for \$10,000, providing a loan of up to \$100,000 through the Manchester Economic Development Loan Corp.

Mr. Taylor stated there had been no application or discussion of a loan; that they were assuming they would be applying for one; that it was the intent of Freedom Writer Corp. to spending approximately \$400,000 to renovate the building noting after such renovations the building would perhaps only be worth \$300,000

noting it would be unlikely that a financial institution would loan that amount of money when the property would be less than the mortgage.

Ald. Domaingue in reference to the cash flow project they had made a loan payment to Fleet Bank Guarantee of \$29,000/month on the \$400,000 loan merit and asked what the mortgage was because they were supposedly only loan them \$100,000, so how could they be paying a mortgage of \$60,000.

Mr. Taylor replied the payment of \$60,000 is what the mortgage was based on.

Ald. Domaingue stated she felt uncomfortable with either proposals.

Ald. Reiniger stated he felt comfortable with the museum proposal as it fit perfectly into the Downtown district noting the property was very important to the City and did not want to see it torn down and thought that Mr. Taylor should pursue refining of the proposal and like the educational use and thought the museum would be an asset to the City.

Mr. Taylor stated he did not feel it was worth putting in extra time if the Committee did not feel it was a good idea noting if the Committee did like it, then he could pursue it further and come back with a final proposal later.

Ald. Domaingue stated she was not in disagreement with Ald. Reiniger as a museum would be a lovely idea, but was looking at the property from the viewpoint the taxpayers would take noting they kept complaining about the taxbase decrease and felt they were too young of an organization to undertake this project and felt they should look elsewhere.

Ald. Clancy stated either an architectural or legal firm should buy the building and renovate it, so as to get taxpayers back into the City.

Ald. Domaingue stated the likelihood of that happening as she understood it from what Mr. Taylor had stated was unlikely.

Mr. Taylor stated his instructions had been to put out an RFP noting the exterior could not be altered as there was historical significance to the building as it had been the first high school in the City.

Chairman Robert asked if they were looking in the right places for people who would be interested in the site.

Ald. Reiniger stated he wished that negotiations continue with The Sargent Museum with the understanding that it was not the final agreement.

Ald. Domainque stated she had no problem entertaining them as a unit to come and appear before the Committee, but did not want to further negotiations until she felt comfortable with the group.

Chairman Robert suggested representatives from The Sargent Museum be invited to attend a future meeting.

Ald. Clancy stated he did not want to see the building given away as he would like to see the City get taxes on it.

Mr. Taylor stated one of the issues discussed was to get them to agree to make a payment on taxes which would equate to the municipal part of the budget; that they agreed to that so long as other non-profit organizations also paid taxes.

Ald. Reiniger asked what other items had been discussed with them.

Mr. Taylor replied they planned to renovating the building over a 4 to 5 year period noting after a certain point had been reached then they would come in and take over the building.

Ald. Reiniger stated issues such as those should be worked out prior to going before the Committee.

Mr. Taylor stated he needed to know what the issues were that the Committee was interested in.

Ald. Domainque stated she was unprepared to discuss issues until such time as she knew more of the organization.

Ald. Reiniger inquired of the Freedom Writer Corporation.

Mr. Taylor stated he felt that the proposal did not meet with a lot of favor from the Committee, therefore, he felt it would be better to lease the building to them.

Ald. Domainque asked if Freedom Writer would want a \$100,000 loan.

Mr. Taylor replied, no.

It was requested that Mr. Taylor submit a letter to representatives of The Sargent Museum inviting them to attend the July 17th meeting of the CIP Committee.

Chairman Robert addressed item 21 of the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Walter Bachta, seeking reimbursement in the amount of \$168.75 as a result of a flooding problem in his basement on June 14, 1996.

Mr. Thomas stated he had talked with Mr. Bachta suggesting to him that he submit a claim to the Office of Risk Management; that Mr. Bachta had had to wait 1 1/2 hours for them to respond to the emergency call to free a blocked sewer noting the answering services had not followed up correctly; that other circumstances included the plumber telling Mr. Bachta that he thought the problem was in the main, therefore, the two plumbers stayed until the Highway crew arrived.

Ald. Domaingue noted that the answering service ought to be corrected.

Mr. Thomas replied it had been corrected noting people were now on call.

Ald. Domaingue stated Mr. Bachta at 80 years of age was probably afraid of sending the plumbers home thinking that no one would fix his problem.

Mr. Thomas was in agreement, however, he did not think the City should be paying every time someone had a problem.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to refer the communication from Mr. Bachta to the Office of Risk Management for review and report back to Committee.

Chairman Robert addressed item 22 of the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Laura Bascom, advising that she would like to deed 3.28 acres of land on Sheffield Road to the City of Manchester.

Chairman Robert asked Mr. MacKenzie if Sheffield Road was a swampy area.

Mr. MacKenzie stated he thought the land was swampy and adjacent to a City park.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to refer the communication from Ms. Bascom to the Planning Department for further review with report back to Committee.

Chairman Robert addressed item 23 of the agenda:

Communication from Patricia Farrell advising of a drainage problem at the corner of Arizona Street and First Avenue.

Mr. Thomas stated as that area was outside of the project area he could not be accommodated, however, when Highway was up in that area they did put in a drain attachment to push the water away noting, however, it did not eliminate the problem and felt it should be addressed through the small drain extension project.

On motion of Ald. Domainque, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to add this item to the Chronic Sewer & Drain Program.

Chairman Robert addressed item 24 of the agenda:

Communication from Thomas Sommers, CLD, requesting the granting of an easement from the City to the American Red Cross to expand their parking surface three feet over the property line to provide more effective utilization of the existing rear lot at the Reservoir Avenue facility.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Robert, it was voted to recommend that an easement be granted.

Chairman Robert addressed item 25 of the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Kim Valdez, advising that she wishes to apply for a Child Care Recruitment and Training Grant through the City of Manchester.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Domainque, it was voted to approve the application for a Child Care Recruitment and Training Grant through the City of Manchester.

TABLED ITEMS

Communication from Karen Kean-Gould requesting to acquire the left side of 398-400 Hanover Street from the City for \$1.00, and proposing to tear down 398-400 Hanover Street and add the additional yard and parking space to the property she currently owns, creating one unified lot, provided, the City waves tipping fees for deposit of the building materials.
(Tabled 6/10/96)

This item remained on the table.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion.

Communication from Joseph Lamont, President, 1138 Elm Street, Inc., inquiring as to whether or not the City has any interest in allowing them to acquire property located at the southwest corner of Bridge and Elm Streets.
(Note: communication from Jay Taylor dated 6/17/96 enclosed.)
(Tabled 6/10/96)

Mr. Taylor stated Mr. Lamont had made application to the State to acquire the southwest corner of Elm and Bridge Streets between the right-of-way noting he would like to acquire it and fix it up by doing some landscaping and perhaps a parking lot but did not think the State Highway Administration would approve a parking lot.

Mr. Thomas stated Mr. Lamont would not have a direct access to Elm Street if he were approved a parking lot and the lot was too small to put a building there.

On motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to recommend that a letter of support be forwarded to Mr. Lamont by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Communication from Al Lindquist, A & A Resource Mgt., Inc., requesting the City's assistance to expedite a closing on property at 241 Crosbie Street which the City held at public auction last year.

(Tabled 6/10/96)

This item remained on the table.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion.

Communication from Richard Houle, PBS, recommending the Committee consider reserving the one parking space available for the City Coordinator position.

(Tabled 4/23/96)

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to receive and file communication from Mr. Houle.

Report from SPOT Team regarding:

397 Spruce Street, request of Beverly Fosher

Note: Recommendation of staff is to table this item. The subject property, while taken through tax deed, is not clearly the City's parcel due to FDIC, Bank One and a new mortgagee involvement. At present, if the mortgagee elects to pay the taxes, the property will not be available for sale by City; if the mortgagee elects not to pay the taxes the property can then be sold as surplus through public sale.

(Note: tabled 3/26/96 per staff recommendation.)

This item remained on the table.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to remove items 31 and 32 from the table for discussion.

Request of the Building Commissioner to demolish the Pine Island 4-H Center. (Tabled 12/5/95)

Communication from Kathleen Giacomponello, Business Manager, Hillsborough County, advising of payment in the amount of \$107,000 which represents the settlement on the Pine Island facility as a result of the fire that occurred on October 21, 1995; and further expressing concern relative to liability issues directly attributable to the burnt-out structure and discussions relative to the money being isolated for future use at the Pine Island site.

(Note: copy of a communication from Mayor Wieczorek to Ms. Giacomponello dated May 23, 1996 enclosed.)

(Tabled 3/12/96)

Mr. Girard stated the Mayor had sent a follow-up letter which had been signed by both me and Ald. Domaingue noting they were awaiting a reply; that it was his understanding if the City decided not to sue for replacement costs they the County would go after demolition costs even though they had publicly promised them anyway; that the Mayor had him telephone Ms. Giacomponello asking that she reply in writing so it could be submitted to the Board for consideration noting the Board had acting and directed a letter be sent saying the City would not sue for replacement costs and asked for the demolition costs.

Ald. Domaingue stated it was her understanding that three bids had been received for demolition. Mr. Girard replied that the Building Commissioner was asked by the County to provide free written bids which he did. Ald. Domaingue stated she wished to review all correspondence regarding this matter including the bids for demolition prior to this item being received and filed.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Clancy, it was voted to retable items 31 and 32.

Discussion regarding 9.9 percent EPD billings.
(Tabled 2/6/96)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Ald. Clancy, duly seconded by Ald. Reiniger, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.


Clerk of Committee

