

**COMMITTEE ON  
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

**March 26, 1997**

**6:30 PM**

Chairman Robert called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

**Present:** Aldermen Robert, Wihby, Reiniger, Clancy, Domaingue  
Alderman Shea, Pariseau, Hirschmann

**Messrs.:** Mayor Wieczorek, R. Girard, W. Jabjiniak, R. MacKenzie,  
J. Thompson

Chairman Robert addressed item 3 of the agenda:

1997 CIP Budget Authorization:  
6.1000 HOME Project

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to approve the 1997 CIP budget authorization.

Chairman Robert addressed item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning advising that he wishes to review the current status of budget and plans for the City Hall and Annex Renovations Project.

Alderman Wihby moved for discussion. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated I just wanted to know that at the first meeting I had, I had some parking consideration problems and I know I missed the second meeting, but I understand they have done something with the parking and wanted to see what that was, so could Bob explain what they really did or do they have a map.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, was that going to be part of your presentation.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I had it and it could be part of the presentation if you'd like.

Chairman Robert asked would that be accepted to Alderman Wihby, let him talk and see what happens.

Alderman Wihby stated okay, let him talk, I didn't realize he was going to talk, I thought we were just voting on it again.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do have the plan and could show you what's happening, we do have our architect here as well, Joan Thompson who is with Lavalley/Brensinger. We have recognized since a couple of meeting that parking was an issue, there was an interest in getting additional spaces, particularly for the public. Right now, there is really no public parking spaces available other than the parking lot and some on-street metered parking. We weren't set up for a presentation on this, but may I approach the bench. The goal was really to...right now, the parking is very tight on-site. I know that the Fire Chief has told me his concerns about how many cars were up close to the building, so part of the interest was getting the cars away from the building. We had looked at the option of having at least ten spaces available, one per department, and those would be in the rear of the building. This does not show the entire construction plans, this shows just the parking proposals. So, here's Market Street, the plaza out in front of City Hall and what we had done then was to look at putting all of the department spaces behind the building and we are still trying to get ten spaces in the back. Then, in the front what we were looking at was creating off Market Street which is essentially a dead-end street, the only cars coming up there to go to the service alley could have head-in parking, one of them would be a handicapped space, and then eight and perhaps a ninth spaces in the front on Market Street. So, the Mayor normally parks right here now. These would then form the corner of the public parking space which would take up three Aldermanic spaces and there could be a couple of options. Of the nine, three could be assigned Aldermanic with the rest public or could say they were spaces for public/customers attending City Hall with one-hour parking with nine spaces which is more than what is available now for the public to conduct building.

Alderman Clancy asked is that the only handicapped spot you'll have for the whole area, one spot.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Domaingue asked could we put a time limit on that, Bob, would the State allow us a time limit on the handicapped space as somebody out there parks all day now.

Alderman Clancy asked what about the overhang over the alley, I know Piaseczny had some concerns about it, he wrote us some letters - Ted Herbert.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there will be about eight feet so it would be limited to cars, small vans and we have been continuously working with Ted Herbert's and at this point we are proposing to...right now, it is tough for trucks to get down, make the turn and get down Hampshire Plaza. What we propose to do is have a space as a full-length for a tractor trailer loading zone and would be fairly easy to get onto Stark, park, and unload into Ted Herbert's and I think that's a good layout, they wouldn't have to go into any alleys, could stay on a public street. They've seen this and they'd like something in writing from the Board. We were going to submit this to the Traffic Committee for their review.

Alderman Clancy suggested that it be forwarded to the Traffic Committee and I think he'd be happy.

Alderman Domaingue stated I'm just concerned about the handicapped space not being abused and right now we have someone who's abusing it on a daily basis. Obviously, we're going to have handicapped accessibility and we should have the opportunity for the handicapped people to be able to come in and park in that space without being blocked by somebody who is obviously using it for an all-day parking space, so will the State allow us to put a limit on the amount of time that someone can use that space.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I believe that it possible and I think it's actually done in Concord.

Ms. Thompson stated we also met with Access Manchester who is the Committee reviewing the proposals on items like these and they also suggested that same item and we do need to confirm it with the State.

Mr. Girard stated just for the Committee's information, the Mayor's Office had this discussion with the Police Department on several occasions and they have advised us that on public streets you cannot limit handicapped parking. I don't know whether or not that is correct, but a couple of years ago when it was a real problem officers from the Police Department tracked down the people who were abusing the spaces and asked them not to and it's one of those things where it

stopped for a while and came back and stopped for a while and came back. The Police have said they don't have citation authority in that event.

Alderman Domaingue asked so how do we get them.

Mr. Girard replied I don't know. I believe that State law governs the handicapped parking regulations.

Alderman Domaingue stated my only other concern is with the entrance and exit have we been in communication with NYNEX for their garage.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, yes. We have received a letter from them. Our engineer Eric Stump at CLD has been working with them. What we do want to do, if you ever watch the tractor trailer's come up, turn, and back-up into the loading dock, they hat the same spot on the curb every time and there will have to be an adjustment made to the curb, so they could make it in. So the swing should be fairly easy to bring in the trucks and backing up into the loading ramp.

Alderman Wihby stated, I think what we should do with those nine is leave them for the Aldermen and customers as during the day there are no Aldermen here and the customers could use them, limit them to one hour and see if we could limit the handicapped to an hour and I think it's a good plan. The whole idea of City Hall is a one-stop shopping, so at least now there is nine parking places.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this would be ideally located for the customers because right now the core of the one-stop shopping is going to be with the Tax Collector's Office, Ordinance Violations, the Assessors, and across the bridge at the City Clerk's, so within a relatively short distance corridor they'll have access to all of the primary one-stop shopping functions.

Alderman Reiniger asked if Market Street would remain two-way traffic.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, and the sidewalk would come down and be fairly nicely done.

Ms. Thompson stated when it would come across the front of the Annex it would match up directly with the entrance to the plaza.

Chairman Robert asked with your presentation, what action was needed from this Committee.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I'll hand it out, I mainly wanted to talk about the cost issues. I'd be happy to review this in more detail and certainly we've been working hard to try and keep the costs down. The architect's have brought back a package that they feel is the way to get the project done correctly. We think it's a great project and we think the City will be proud of the project after it is completed and we're going to do it right, but we do need the money to do it correctly and we are prepared now to have the departments start to move out to Hampshire Plaza, but we want to make sure that this financing package is in place before we start to do that.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, do you need this money before we begin and this is your recommendation as to how we get this money, we can't get around this.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I think this is what's needed to do the project correctly. There are shortcuts we could take, but in the long-term we want this to be an efficiently operating building, we want it to be solid, easy to maintain, and I think for those long-range purposes we ought to try and do the building correctly.

Alderman Wihby stated the additional \$350,000 would be coming under additional bonding.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes. There were ways they could look to find ways to do the impact of that, they could review all of their current bond balances to see if there were any that they could simply delete at this point or closeout, and that was an option that they could review and bring back to the Committee at a later point, but at this point they would just be recommending that that be added on top.

Alderman Domaingue asked what is the cost on the tax rate for the additional bonding.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that the additional bonding at \$350,000 was a little bit under a penny on the tax rate.

Alderman Wihby stated you know how we always set a limit, is that limit already over in the budget or is it just where we want it to be.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I can go into that in more detail. There are guidelines in the CIP Program and they're different than the old, there originally was a \$12.00 limit which was knocked down to a \$3.00 limit, and so we do have guidelines that are in the package. There are several different type of guidelines. In general, the program is consistent with those guidelines and another way we also looked at it was that we tried to develop a two-year package because the City, the Finance

Department does not go out to issue bonds every year. They might do it every two years, sometimes every three years. What we did look at was that this is basically a two-year package, last year's and this year's, and we've tried to make sure that the additional debt service that we were incurring even though we haven't issued the bonds yet was about the same as the debt service being retired and I just looked at the numbers again and the total package, we're retiring over the two-year about a little bit more than \$1.5 million as being closed out - old loans from 20 years ago that are being completed. The debt service that we've added as part of these two packages is somewhat less than that and there's somewhat of a little leeway there, but a lot of this is based upon assumptions as to what your bond rate is going to be when you go out to finance it next year.

Alderman Reiniger stated if I may ask how the Mayor feels about this.

Mayor Wieczorek replied, I think if we're going to do it, we ought to do it and do it first-class. If you're talking about saving a penny, I think it would be kind of foolish on our part. It's only taken us a hundred years to get to this point and if it's going to take other groups another hundred years, then I think we ought to do it right and at least start on the right foot and see what happens after that.

Alderman Reiniger stated so you're saying it would be a "penny wise, pound foolish".

Mayor Wieczorek stated sounds good to me.

Alderman Wihby moved to recommend approved of the Director of Planning's recommendations as submitted under Items 1, 2, 3 & 4. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert asked if it needed to be referred to the Committee on Traffic.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I have not requested it yet because these plans as you saw were somewhat in draft form, but if this Committee is comfortable with it as the former Lands & Buildings Committee we could submit it on to the Traffic Committee and I think that's appropriate.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Traffic subject to the nine parking spaces being made available for the Aldermen and customers.

Chairman Robert addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Petition for Discontinuance of a portion of Dartmouth Street.

Alderman Clancy moved for discussion. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy stated I looked at this map here. Behind Sully's where the condos are asked are we going to give this land to these people, are they going to pay for it or what. A person just recently purchased a piece of land from the City and called me up said I hope you're going to get a fair market value for this as I have to pay for the land I just bought.

Clerk Johnson replied what this person is asking for is to discontinue a street. In this instance the street has been accepted by the City, but it's a public street, we don't own the land, so you can't sell the land. It's like if you discontinued a portion of Elm Street, you don't own what's under it. By law, it reverts back to the abutters, but they have to go through a whole court process to get it. This petition for discontinuance would have to be referred to a road hearing whenever that next road hearing would be scheduled by the Board. Unless the City originally owned and held the land underneath this road, the City would have no rights to go to the courts and say we own it or want to own it, unless you're an abutter. So, the motion before you would be whether or not you want to recommend that it be referred to a road hearing.

Alderman Clancy moved to refer the petition for discontinuance of a portion of Dartmouth Street to the next scheduled road hearing. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Domaingue stated just as a matter of course, Mr. Chairman, could someone tell me where on this map included in the packet is this parcel that we're talking about, try as I might I could not find the parcel you were talking about by looking at that map. By this map included in this packet, I could not tell what was being asked to be discontinued, if someone could tell me that I would feel better.

Clerk Johnson stated a more detailed map would be requested from the Highway Department prior to the road hearing.

Alderman Domaingue asked who was responsible for providing the Aldermen with information that should have been very clear and is not clear at all, this should have been a relatively simple issue.

Clerk Johnson replied if you would like we could table it and request the Highway Department to submit an official petition on behalf of the person, it was submitted by a private entity.

Alderman Domaingue asked can we still go through this process if we put it to the road hearing.

Clerk Johnson stated the road hearing is the full Board.

Alderman Domaingue stated all I'm saying, Mr. Chairman, is we have departmental people we pay salaries to that ought to know, at some level, no matter what the department, that if the Aldermen are to make the determination, they're to be given the best information possible. When I looked at this map and tried to decipher what it was I was expected to react to, I couldn't find a label. I find that kind of important. I won't put it on the table, I'll go along with the road hearing, but just so that I'm on the record to let everybody know that the Aldermen need more specifics when they're asked to make a decision and this certainly did not provide it. Thank you.

Chairman Robert called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Review of the proposed FY98 CIP Program.

Chairman Robert stated, your Honor, this is your proposal and I'll afford you the opportunity to speak to it before we get going or we can go right to it.

Mayor Wieczorek replied we already presented it to the whole Board, now you're just going to discuss it in Committee.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, did you want to lead into something.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I did want to identify certain requests or changes that have come in since the CIP Program was submitted by the Mayor just to put those on the record. These would normally be new items, but I will also tell you what page they're on if they're revised. I was aware of Office of Youth Services' request prior to when they came in Monday night, they are requesting \$18,000 for an Alcohol Court-Directed Program. We have looked at various options on funding that and at this point would suggest that the only option that we see is to

put that under the Cash budget which would then add \$18,000 and I'm not necessarily providing that as a recommendation, but that is an option for the Committee.

Chairman Robert stated for clarification, if we add to the Cash portion, we're adding to the overall total budget and that is really where this Committee has the impact one way or another.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is correct. I would note that the Mayor's CIP Cash portion is very close to what it was last year, so the attempt was made to try and keep that at no or minimal impact on the tax rate, I believe it's a couple thousand dollars more than last year, but it's very close.

Chairman Robert asked how much would we need for this item.

Alderman Clancy replied \$18,000 and asked is that Tom Jordan and Regis and those guys you're talking about.

Alderman Wihby replied it's a program they're working on with the Police Department and the juveniles to have them go to counseling and get help rather than throw them into jail and it's seed money because they're going to be charging the youths some money in order to attend the program, the \$18,000 gets them started and then they'd keep absorbing that in their budget because the money they're making by charging individuals. So, they'll never come back and ask for money for this program.

Alderman Domaingue asked is this counseling basically.

Alderman Wihby replied it's basically counseling and it's a new program that we never actually had before where they went to the judges and the judges accepted the recommendations of the Police Department and the Office of Youth Services and to work with the City on counseling youth and getting them the help they need, the same thing like the tobacco thing they go to with the 4-hour classes on Saturday and this program is there for alcohol, but they will have an option where they can either pay a \$250 fine or attend this class which I think will cost \$100 and if they attend the classes then they won't have to pay the fine.

Alderman Domaingue asked are these youths who are already incarcerated somewhere.

Alderman Wihby replied they are high school students who have trouble with alcohol abuse.

Chairman Robert asked are there any other points, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie replied no, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Robert asked were there items, do we have specific items of concerns.

Alderman Wihby replied I have the Youth Services which I'd like to see plugged and obviously the \$350,000 for City Hall for the bond; ALPHA was one of the concerns that we heard from people. It seems like every year we throw it in at the end anyway, so we might as well talk about that (\$4,000 Cash). There was a Tenant Assistance Program we heard from but I'm not sure about it other than they were short \$14,500 in Cash, somebody talked about it at the public hearing, I don't know if you want to address this, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I do have a couple of other items when we get through these.

Mr. Girard interjected as does the Mayor's Office.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Security Deposit Loan Fund, I think they came and spoke in support of what was already allocated in the CIP Program. I don't think they were looking...

Alderman Wihby stated the Tenant Assistance Program 2.50603, is that the same one he's talking about.

Chairman Robert stated they were speaking in order to maintain funding.

Alderman Wihby stated I had the ALPHA and the Youth Services and City Hall.

Alderman Clancy stated I've got the YOU (Youth Opportunities Unlimited).

Chairman Robert asked are they looking for extra or looking to maintain funding.

Alderman Clancy stated they're looking for \$4,000 more.

Mr. MacKenzie stated they had originally requested, I believe, \$15,000. They were refunded last year at \$12,000, they were funded this year at \$14,000 which I thought they had considered appropriate.

Chairman Robert stated so, YOU is funded properly.

Alderman Clancy stated I received one call from a woman saying we want to be properly funded like we were when they got \$14,000 or \$15,000 in one year.

Chairman Robert stated the program funded as the way it is now...

Alderman Clancy stated remember when we had that 18-month period.

Mr. MacKenzie replied in this case there was an increase in the funding for the YOU, but I believe they would be comfortable with the funding that is recommended.

Alderman Clancy stated okay, I just wanted to make sure because I did receive a couple of calls about that and they come down to Beech Street School.

Alderman Domaingue stated, I don't know whether Mr. MacKenzie is going to address this or not, but it's recently come to my attention that in Ward 8 on Lucas Road the cause of the recent fire there, we learned that there is no fire hydrant on the entire road. I'm very concerned about the safety of those homeowners and whether or not it's feasible for us to put it into this year's CIP, I don't know, but I would certainly advocate for it because we saw an article in today's paper and we're talking about improvements and additions to the fire houses and it would be a little ridiculous having all that money spent knowing that still waiting out there on Lucas Road in Ward 8 there was a street that had several houses and no fire hydrant.

Alderman Clancy asked couldn't we refer that to the Water Works and see if they could help us out.

Mr. Girard stated Water Works maintains the hydrants.

Alderman Domaingue stated I didn't know what the process was, but I certainly wanted to raise the issue because I don't think that they can wait, we've already had one fire out there and I'm very concerned about their safety.

Alderman Clancy stated I think there's a lot of ledge out there.

Chairman Robert stated referring this to the Water Works would now be the proper step.

Mr. Girard stated my understanding is that the Water Works is responsible for providing and maintaining the fire hydrant network.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, CIP doesn't do that does it.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I was aware of this concern, it's never come through CIP before. I did want to check to see if it was Water Works, certainly it would be appropriate for the Committee or the Board to refer it to the Water Works.

Alderman Wihby stated I'll second it to send it to Water Works because I know we had looked into charging a tax instead of that stuff.

Chairman Robert asked Alderman Domaingue if she wished to refer this matter to the Water Works.

Alderman Domaingue moved to refer the matter relative to fire hydrant(s) on Lucas Road to the Manchester Water Works. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Domaingue stated under the City's Cash portion, we have put in the Child Care Coordinator which we understood from the public hearing is different from how we previously funded it and I just needed to know why now we were including that position as part of a CIP budget.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I'll start and the Mayor's Assistant could answer it. It was funded under the Mayor's discretionary budget before but there were no contracts or anything for it. Under the CIP there would be a contract, the goals would be spelled out.

Alderman Domaingue asked does it remain a part-time position.

Mr. Girard replied yes.

Alderman Domaingue stated under Access to the City - State, Federal and Other Funds - there was this proposal to acquire a residence on Route 28 for the Manchester Airport Authority in the sum of \$475,000 and I was wondering which residence that might be, actually it's \$495,000.

Mr. Girard replied, I believe that's the church. I thought it was the church, but I'm being corrected.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I did notice that myself, but I have not checked yet. There is separate funding for the St. Francis Church, this is a different one further on the east side of the Airport and I'm not familiar with which one that is.

Chairman Robert asked, Alderman Domaingue, what do you want to do with this.

Alderman Domaingue replied I just need to know what it is. Once we give approval, if we found there to be a problem we could take it out at some time in the process could we not.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we will get that information and provide to either the Committee or the full Board.

Alderman Reiniger stated a sticky issue that's come up again is the Chandler School and they are under a lot of pressure now to come up with a solution here. A lot of people have been asking me can we combine it with other projects, how about combining it with the Middle Street, we're spending a fortune on that. We're going to finish the Middle School and some other projects and people are still going to be harping about Chandler School and I'm not sure there is any fall back position and I don't know if there is any imminent State order or some order that says we have to get out of there, I don't know what the status is.

Chairman Robert stated as I understand it there is real no idea ever since the Hevey School option fell through, there has been no further discussion about it and I'm just concerned that if we go and spend some more money on Chandler and the School Department decides they want to do something else, they want a new school, they want to put it somewhere else in town, we're stuck. I'd like to have some idea. First of all, I don't want to have substandard conditions, if something should be fixed, it should be fixed, but I think we need some sort of vision as to what they want to see or what they want to do at the School Department before we move ahead. How that's accomplished I'm not sure really.

Alderman Clancy stated I'm also going to talk on that subject myself. I was told, I got a call this afternoon from one of the School Board members and they've brought this up as a discussion and the Lake Shore Hospital was more-or-less mentioned. Mayor do you know anything about it.

Mayor Wieczorek replied, yes, I do.

Alderman Clancy asked why don't you relate to us what is going on, please.

Mayor Wieczorek replied they decided that Lake Shore Hospital wasn't going to be satisfactory to meet their needs and I don't think we should leave anybody with the impression that they want to have an unsafe area or to be providing an area that is not going to be safe for the kids, that's not the case, but it's going to take

some time to do this. As you know, last year there was an option provided with the Hevey School and the option that was presented, I thought, was a pretty good deal because it was going to cost the City in the neighborhood of two hundred and twenty or thirty thousand dollars to provide a handicapped access and some other things. The problem was the Principal at Chandler School didn't want to have the parish use the rooms. In other words, she wanted exclusive use to it and rather than having the church use some of the basement in there and on that basis, I guess as she presented it to the Board, the Board decided to not go ahead with that project, the School Board. So, the School Board is still grappling with that problem and I'm sure there's going to be discussion at the Board again this year regarding that and that's one of the reasons why in the budget this year, we had put some money in to do a study to find out what really we should do. Whether we should be forgetting about the Chandler School or whether we should be trying to relocate to new quarters or whether we should try to refurbish the school.

Chairman Robert stated, your Honor, if I may ask at this point. This has been thrust upon the Committee, do you have a recommendation for the Committee as we should proceed.

Mayor Wiczorek replied, yes. I think what you should do is have the School Department refer this back to the School Department and notify them that there is an interest and that somebody at public hearing has commented and that you are going to refer to that Board for further discussion and their recommendation.

Chairman Robert asked with the Hevey School wasn't there some money that was allocated for its use or some renovations, where's that money right now.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there was \$275,000 of CD money allocated, a small portion of that was actually used for design in looking at Chandler and the Hevey School. A bulk of that money is available and could be used, for example, to do the planning necessary to look at what the options are for the City. Either reusing Chandler, going to another site, so that money is still there.

Chairman Robert stated, so let me ask you a question. If this Committee wanted to, it could earmark that money for whatever comes out of the Chandler School discussion at the School Department.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it can't be used for the final design documents at this point, but it can be used for all of the planning, looking at alternative sites, analyzing what the School program needs, and in looking at purchasing property or what the options are. Basically, all through the planning program and that's what's required. I think there has to be a definition of what the School Board/

School Department needs in terms of both pre-school and special ed programs and you have to go through a logical planning process to get to that point.

Chairman Robert stated, Mr. Girard, do you wish to touch upon this.

Mr. Girard replied, yes. To elaborate a little further the money that is in the current fiscal year's budget for that purpose was not earmarked specifically for the Hevey School, it was earmarked for the "Chandler population options". Whether that meant making the Hevey School handicapped accessible or money that could have been used to do some renovation work to the Chandler School and I think it was decided by the parties involved that that \$275,000 would not even begin to address the concerns at the Chandler School which is why the Mayor's proposal was to bring it forward to the Hevey School. It's still an option as far as we know. Now, as to the Lake Shore Hospital option, the School Board initially decided that the Lake Shore Hospital was not an appropriate option as a Middle School as the Mayor alluded to. And, shortly after that was determined and the Board allocated the funding to build a new Middle School it became an option for the relocation of the Chandler School population, the entire pre-school program and the School Administration facilities. There has been some discussion at the School Board regarding that option and as a result of that discussion the Mayor in the proposed FY98 moved \$2.5 million worth of out-year money into next fiscal year, so that if the planning process that Mr. MacKenzie has alluded to determines that it would be used there would be something there to address it. If that proves not to be a viable option, then that money may or may not be there depending on what the Board does and what the Mayor's recommendations will be next year to address Chandler School and I think it ought to be noted that no matter what kind of renovations you do to the Chandler School, the building itself is physically too small to handle the population that it has been tasked with serving. The Hevey School did provide more space, but it was never considered a permanent space, it was considered a carryover till the School Department could find a more, not a more, but a permanent solution. Other discussion on that topic has taken place about adding 10 or 12 classrooms to the McDonough School to perhaps house that population and that is the only other option that we are aware of at this point that has been expressed by the School Board. The other issue that the School Board has to decide is as you know there has been a request in year's past by the School Board to put a \$2.5 million addition to the Parkside Junior High School, that was actually a higher priority if memory serves me correctly of the School Department in last year's CIP requests in where the Chandler School dollars were and originally that's how the whole Hevey School came into play, it was to try and create a 6th grade to alleviate the need of putting on that addition and one thing led to another and it became a Chandler School operation. We don't know where that it, but we know that Parkside has a very definite crowding problem. Mr.

Wade has used every storage closet, every back room he can, and one of the things really hurting him is the ESO Program, he has 14 different languages over there and he's trying to run that program and it eats up an awful lot of space. He's got a problem. So, the School Department needs to give this Board some direction as to what it's priorities are in that area and before we can move forward with anything on the Chandler population they really need to tell us what is it they're looking for and what the options are. But, that's as we know it, those are the outlines.

Chairman Robert stated so there's money out there in the background and it does make some sense to move this to the School Department.

Alderman Clancy stated we have other options here. That's a good idea, Richard, about what you said about McDonough School. We have the land up there and everything, we already have the gymnasium, we already have the cafeteria. If we're going to put an addition on, that's the place to put it on. But, I don't want to second guess you about Parkside either.

Mr. Girard stated I'm just bringing to the fore what we know about the School Department's issues. There are some issues at the McDonough School that maybe make that a less attractive option and I don't know them well enough to know, I know there are concerns. But, putting 10 classrooms onto the McDonough School may not be as permanent a solution as we'd like given the growth of that population which is probably the fastest growing segment we have right now.

Alderman Clancy stated like I said Chandler School is too far gone.

Mr. Girard stated I think there's agreement on that.

Alderman Clancy stated if we're going to do something, let's build something someplace in the City...we've got the land up here by McDonough School, we've got both side of the street.

Mr. Girard stated the Chandler School population couldn't go to Parkside.

Alderman Clancy moved that the Chandler School issue be referred to the Board of School Committee. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated Lake Shore Hospital might not be an issue any more because I was told that a company from out-of-state had come in and I thought they had already purchased the property.

Alderman Domaingue stated just a question of either Mr. MacKenzie, yourself, or the Mayor's Office - how long has this situation at Chandler been going on.

Mr. Girard replied I am not sure I can answer that specifically. The problem at the Chandler School has been exacerbated in recent years by the growth of the population. I'm not sure, I can't answer you, Alderman, I don't know how high it has been on the critical priority list. All I can tell you is that last year, for example, it was behind the Parkside addition, so what the School Board is telling us and what we're hearing from other people doesn't necessarily come together.

Alderman Domaingue stated I appreciate it and I thank you for at least attempting to answer the question. Mr. Chairman, I think it needs to be said publicly that what the decision is, is ultimately up to the School Board and for this condition to have gone on as long as it has been when education is supposed to be the priority for them is what surprises me the most. So, I favor sending it to the School Board provided they can put this on a fast tract, do you understand what I'm saying. I'm disgusted with the process that has allowed this to continue. We all know that we can't fit those children into that building. We all know the conditions are deplorable. Their main function is education. We deal with the rest of the services in the City, their job is to deal with education and they haven't dealt with this one issue yet. So, I'm hoping that they are going to put this on a fast track.

Alderman Reiniger stated my concern with sending it to the School Board and I guess this is just to say how the set up is that almost every time they are going to come back and say we need a new building, it's always a new building from the school crowd in every town and city. It's never let's use an old building, let's do something in a thrifty fashion and my concern is it's going to come back in another year or two recommending a new building and that will be the only choice we have for millions of millions of dollars instead of a Hevey School option or something else.

Alderman Clancy asked, so what do you recommend, Tim.

Alderman Reiniger replied, I guess we're caught in the trap again because we're being told that well, it's a School Department policy so we can't move on it. It's just very frustrating.

Chairman Robert stated the Committee on Joint School Buildings will just have to...

Mr. Girard stated that is not their jurisdiction.

Alderman Domaingue stated ours is construction.

Mr. Girard stated for the record, I should also advise that the School Department did look into the rehabilitation of the Brown School as a potential home for the Chandler population. Actually, the Brown School's not in bad shape, the problem is it actually has less space than the Chandler School, believe it or not, the way the building is configured.

Alderman Clancy stated well, anyway, we know it's a top priority.

Alderman Domaingue stated we hope it's a top priority, we don't know it's a top priority.

Chairman Robert called for a vote to refer this matter to the School Department. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Robert asked Alderman Domaingue if she had any other issues she wished to discuss.

Alderman Domaingue replied, I think I was done except for these little letters off to the right-hand side - ESG.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is the Emergency Shelter Grant.

Alderman Clancy stated I received a call and even though it's not my ward, but I'm kind of concerned myself because I use the street quite frequently. It's Cilley Road and Taylor Street. They do need some sort of a light over there or take a hump out of the road, it needs a traffic light over there. So, I wish we could get a hold of Mr. Lolicata or someone from the Highway Department...they've had a lot of accidents over there. I did call the Police Department and they've had 20 accidents over there since the first of the year. Now visualize...when you're going up the street with your Frito Lay truck over the hill, we do need a traffic light up there, I'm serious. Is the Alderman here from that ward. Yeah, Bill, do you know anything about that.

Chairman Robert asked do you wish to speak to that, Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated if I've received 50 complaints, I've received one. People are taking pictures over there and cars are bouncing off of people trying to walk in the area there. There's about four or five thousand cars that go by there at 40 miles per hour from Maple to Jewett Streets, seven streets. I did speak as Alderman Clancy mentioned, the hump in the road has the attention of Mr.

Thomas and I think they put something in their particular budget concerning that and the other issue is that because of the speed that the cars go at there's no impeding that. They go seven blocks and they just continuously go 40, 50 miles per hour depending upon who's driving and it's a terrible situation.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it is one of the items I did want to mention as a request that had come in. As he mentioned there are two parts of it, the Highway changes which the Highway Commission has on their list of items to do and it looks like with the funding given to them this year could be handled. The other item, I think is perhaps a little more difficult is the signals themselves. Now, there was request by the Traffic Department for other signals and that came through a process of the Traffic Committee and those requests for new signalized intersections was ranked. The Mayor's budget did not have any funds for new signalized intersections only for reconstruction of existing ones. So, if the Board were going to entertain...it's my understanding from the Traffic Department that this would cost about \$65,000 to install signals at that location, the Board would have to consider adding options either cash or perhaps bonding and we'd have to look at that.

Alderman Wihby stated my concern is that there is a process we follow in doing lights and I understand that that's a particular point; that normally it goes through Traffic, Traffic looks at it and talks to Police...what's the worse intersection in the City, labels them all, and then as funding becomes available we fund that one. So, the right approach for this one would be to add it to that list and maybe it's already on the list, see which one is the worse one and if we're going to fund one, we ought to be funding the one that causes the most accidents, or most traffic, or most children. Something like what we do for the sidewalks.

Chairman Robert stated so, what you're saying you want to do is if we want to do something like this add "X" amount of dollars to that line item.

Alderman Wihby stated all I'm saying is if Highway had extra money and prioritize with the other list and if there is any extra money, we should be taking whatever is number one on that list.

Chairman Robert stated I think what I'm hearing is that there was nothing that was put in here to do that. The question that the Committee has to deal with is does it want to add the money to do something like that. Whether or not that money can be applied to that intersection is we don't know.

Alderman Wihby stated can I ask the Mayor first. Did they ask for any particular money for something like that.

Mr. Girard replied the only new request that the Mayor's Office is aware of for traffic signalization was the corner of Elm and Brook Street.

Alderman Wihby stated so obviously, with the money they have this is low on their priority list and they want to consider doing roads and other things before they take care of intersections.

Alderman Domaingue stated it may be low on their priority list, but we're talking about danger to the residents of the City and it shouldn't be low on our priority list. Now, I don't disagree with your theory that we ought to go through some sort of a process and we ought not to just anoint a traffic light in a particular area, and I'll respect that, but I think what the Alderman from the Ward is saying, what this Alderman is saying is that enough residents have raised the issue that it needs to be addressed as quickly as possible. So, what would the options be if we were to set aside, possibly it may not end up for this intersection and you may be correct, there may be something more needing. But, to put in a traffic signalization, what would that cost be, where could we fit it in.

Alderman Clancy interjected \$60,000. How much would it cost, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it would range anywhere from \$60,000 to \$100,000 depending on the intersection.

Alderman Wihby asked would it have to be cash.

Mr. MacKenzie replied normally you don't want to bond anything under \$65,000.

Alderman Wihby stated I think the proper procedure would be in the budget process when we have Frank here, we can ask him what his priorities are, what intersections, we could send that proposal now to have it prioritized for when they come to us and then we could always add the sixty or seventy thousand dollars to the Highway budget and/or Traffic to fund it.

Chairman Robert stated the Committee has got to make up its mind as to what it wants to do. We can add money for the purpose or we can do something later on in the process. What does the Committee want to do now. I guess you're looking to add on to the cash portion, I need some sort of motion.

Alderman Clancy stated I don't want to take it away from any other Aldermen, but like I say I want to prioritize it if the numbers from the Police Department, the number of accidents and stuff like that, if it warrants it, it needs to be done.

Chairman Robert stated I've just been keeping a running total...I've got Alcohol Court-Directed, ALPHA, and I've got Taylor and Cilley Road signal...I've just got a bunch of things we've been writing down that we seem to want to do and maybe we could take a vote on all of them after-the-fact. Any other discussion on this one item, Alderman Reiniger.

Alderman Reiniger stated I've got another item. Two quick things...there was a lot of testimony the other night and the request was for \$850,000 and we're funding \$500,000, is that sufficient for the purposes this year.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, could you address that please.

Mr. MacKenzie stated in discussions with the Parks & Recreation Department, the bids came in very good for Phase I, so it does appear that all of the work can be done for the allocated money of \$500,000. I do have a listing of the different phases of the Livingston Park Master Plan, but it does look like the key parts of Phase II could certainly be done for the amount of money \$500,000.

Chairman Robert stated for this year.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, it is my understanding that that would be adequate for this year.

Alderman Reiniger stated I have another issue.

Alderman Domaingue stated before we go onto another issue, can we ask a question about that issue. We're talking about a \$3 million project, but all I see in the multi-year capital projects for this project is one year 1998 (\$500,000), is there a reason for that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated when we developed this, the further you go out in time, the more vague things become. It was our impression that, at least, in the first year we should be allocating money to specific projects and then for future years we lump that together more into a general Parks Improvement Program. Just for planning purposes how much money we're going to be able to allocate, in general, to parks. Now, that does allow room next year to start analyzing which parks should be getting that larger chunk of money and I know that that may be just a discussion of the Board.

Alderman Domaingue stated am I hearing you tell us...I mean when you talk about vague...this project and I'm not opposed to it, but this project started out real vague and ended up costing \$3 million and I'm just wondering if the impact of this

project will be taking away from some of the other park projects in the City that are also in need. We, obviously, are supportive of, I think the Board is supportive of that project going forward. But, I'm curious to know what kind of draw this has had on the other projects in the park's area because several of the parks in this City also need attention.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if you look at the requests of the Parks & Recreation Department which you don't have, but I am going to hand out a copy as requested by the Aldermen before, they had requested multi-million dollars for parks improvements. Obviously, they believe there is probably in total \$50 to \$100 million worth of need for parks in general. I think when it comes down to recognizing that there is a very finite source of monies for these projects, in the end this Board and Parks & Recreation is going to have to work together to say, okay, given the finite amount of money what best bang can we get for that money. When it comes down to it, it may not be possible within the next five years, at least, to do this \$3 million work at Livingston and I think most of the parties recognize that. We can get to the highest priorities within that park improvement program, but there may be others and there's one fairly large ticket item on this for over a million dollars and that may have to be postponed beyond the five-year purview of this Capital Improvement Program. Certainly, Parks & Recreation asked for more than they recognize is available in funding that the City has.

Alderman Domaingue stated let me just say for the record, Mr. MacKenzie, I'm not comfortable with the way that this Committee of this Board has been given information regarding any of the department's requests. When we sit here to look at final approval as a Committee to the full Board of approving this budget, we don't even know what the priorities were for the departments. We go by what the final determination was by you or your department or the Mayor's Office and it's not a criticism, it's just an observation. I think those departments owe it to this Committee, so that we can make an appropriate recommendation to the full Board and let us have that information before we get to this level and we didn't have it and Alderman Wihby pointed that out at the last meeting.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we do have that information for the Committee...

Alderman Domaingue stated, but, you've had it for some time. Why didn't we get it.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is up to the Mayor as to determine what the budget process is.

Alderman Domaingue stated for the record, it stinks.

Alderman Wihby asked is it a true comment to say that we don't know what the priorities are for Parks, for instance. Is that true? Don't we know when we put things together that you go and look at the priorities they've given you and with the amount of money they have and try and prioritize what they have, so are we going to have department's coming to us saying that that is Planning's priority, not ours, we disagree with the CIP.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, no.

Alderman Wihby stated so they've looked at this and they agree with what you've done.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, yes.

Alderman Wihby stated in the process that we do normally as we do with sidewalks because we're all familiar with sidewalks is that we prioritize and then we fund what we prioritize and the fact of the matter is that Livingston was on the Master Plan, was funded, and was the number one priority of Parks, am I wrong.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it was their number one bonding priority, they had other programs - Fun-in-the-Sun.

Alderman Wihby stated we were aware of what was needed over there and the first thing that was needed was a Master Plan, which we did, and the Master Plan came out saying we know we can't get \$3 million in one year, so we should be phasing it in. My concern is the comment that said \$500,000 is plenty for Phase II and there's no money in for Phase III, so explain that to me. Yes, we can do Phase II, but we don't have anything in the budget for Phase III yet.

Mr. MacKenzie stated given that the City has not funded parks for a long time, you have to recognize that we are making great progress in relation to what has happened in the past. I think the City, both Parks & Recreation, our office, and others are doing are darndest to get the job done for a very little bit of money. Obviously, Alderman Domaingue, I know that you'd like to get a lot of things done in a lot of parks, but you have to recognize that we are trying to keep a balanced view and trying to limit the impact on the tax rate. So, you can't do everything. What we do is we have a process as governed by the Mayor, that process requests each department to provide a prioritized ranking of those projects. We do get that information, it's a large package of information, we haven't provided it, but we do have that information tonight. The Mayor, I would say in reviewing each of these priorities sticks very close to each of the

department's priorities and I think you can see why there were no departments here for the hearing Monday night. They understand the process and they're reasonably comfortable with everything that came through here. We can provide you that, but we try to stick to a prioritized process because it is the only way to do it when you have a very small amount of monies to handle a lot of different projects.

Chairman Robert stated I think what may have spurred this that there was no money allocated to several projects in the out years and there was concern as to whether or not they were going to remain funded, I think people just got a little nervous about it. Could we do something, are there some numbers we could put down there.

Mr. MacKenzie stated, I think from my perspective, once and I'm sorry the term vague bothers you a little bit, but every year you have to look at the situation and see how can we handle each year; that money that we allocated for the parks programs basically from a financial standpoint, we're trying to determine and keep the most level tax impact on the City, and that's why we look out five years also for planning purposes. So, we were hoping to allow some discretion in future years as to where that money would be allocated. At this point, when it's just allocated to Parks & Recreation, they would decide the Parks & Recreation Commission would decide where that money is going to be allocated. If this Board does want to do that, then they will have to go through the process of understanding the cost and decide which projects to allocate it themselves.

Alderman Clancy stated seeing this is going to be Phase II, does that mean that every year it's going to be a top priority for the next three years.

Chairman Robert replied, I think that is the understanding.

Alderman Clancy stated I'm just asking you now because we have other parks here in the City that need some attention. In other words, we are going to give everything throughout the City for one park for five years, is that the intent.

Chairman Robert replied it has been my understanding and maybe the CIP guys...what's the big picture on this that you folks have...we don't have a Parks & Recreation person here.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we do have the costs here. Obviously, I want to stress again that there is a lot of demands on the money. Ultimately, this Board last year said we want to put high priority on West/Memorial Field on the west side and Livingston on the east side and there are certain primary things that we have to get

done. We took the key priorities first in each of the two projects to get done. So, as you get out in time, this Board and Parks & Recreation is going to have to sit down and compare those. For example, would be analyze Phase IV of Livingston, the total value to the City versus a Phase I at a Derryfield Park, or a Phase I in the southern part of the City. We do have to analyze those, but those should probably be done on a year-by-year basis.

Alderman Clancy stated I'm not against the project right now, but are we going to put all of our eggs in one basket and let the rest of the City go.

Chairman Robert replied, I guess it's up to the Committee.

Mayor Wieczorek stated you can't do that. As Bob said and he doesn't deserve to get a lot of heat because he's working very hard in doing this, but, to be absolutely fair with him when you're looking out five years, priorities are going to change. So, when you begin to look at one year, two years, you can't say that this is going to remain the number one priority for five years, who knows, something may occur here in the City that will be jumped to the number one priority, it could be the third year which is then going to change everything that we have here. So, the only thing you can do...

Alderman Clancy interjected you may have a baseball team that wants to come to Gill Stadium, we might need some renovations over there too, Mayor.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that's true. To pick a specific project and to say this is going to be the number one priority for the next five years, I don't think you can do that. Right now, that's where it is and maybe it'll be there next year, the year after that maybe as you look at the mix and the department looks at it and they make their recommendations to the Mayor, the Mayor looks at it and is going to take a look at those recommendations too and discuss it with CIP, and make his recommendations and then it's going to come to this Committee and to the Board and then the Board can do what it wants with the stuff when they get it.

Alderman Clancy stated all I'm asking is for everybody to get a fair shake.

Mayor Wieczorek stated the Aldermen and the Mayor are always going to be a part of it, so if anybody is going to get a fair shake, it's going to be whatever the shake is that's determined by the Mayor and by this Board, whatever Board there is.

Alderman Domaingue stated, Mr. MacKenzie, please understand I don't think we're stupid here. We understand that there's a lot of projects on the table, we

understand there is only so much money, we're sympathetic to that on behalf of our constituents, that's a given. My objection tonight is in the fact that I don't know what the progress is of this particular Parks outlook, I don't know how much money in each given year, I don't know how much of that project can be scaled back and that's only one project. We really haven't been given the particulars to this particular project which is going to draw so much of the funding of and as I said I'm not opposed to it, I think that track is necessary and the Parks improvements are obviously necessary. But, when you look at the whole picture as you pointed out there are a lot of demands on that money. As an Alderman sitting on this particular Committee, I would have liked to have had the information on this project as well as the others so I could make a reasoned, educated determination. You haven't given me, or someone hasn't given me the benefit of that opportunity and that's my objection here tonight.

Alderman Wihby stated to follow-up on what the Mayor said. The priority this year is what was set and what was funded. Next year, that's why I think probably why Bob did it was it's all lumped into Parks - seven-hundred something thousand dollars, of which the Mayor, Parks, and everybody else prioritized it again next year and then that money is distributed and everybody gets whatever the priorities are next year. So, if the priorities change for Livingston or any other project next year, the money's not anywhere, it's in one big bulk to be distributed next year and I think that is probably the fair way and to keep it as one big bulk and decide next year as Parks and everything else happens what's needed first and prioritize. What happens is, and I guess I'm kind of sensitive about Livingston, Livingston was number one, and for someone to say that the northend gets too much or whatever is unfair. Livingston was number one, we decided it last year. We took fund money away Livingston to fund the west side and the west side came in after the fact. But, the fact is we should be looking at what is priority by the department heads because that's what they're there for, we shouldn't be giving grief to the CIP Committee or the Planning Director because he's presenting the facts of what the departments say and we should be going with their priority and if we're going to fund a light, we should be funding it with what's worse, the worse one. If we're funding a sidewalk, we had this discussion years ago when we came up with a policy for sidewalks, road construction. All of that stuff is decided, not from us because we're all going to have 12 different ways whether by Parks or Highways or Traffic, whatever, and that's the way we should be leaving it and we should be funding things according to what they say and not with what ward it's in or whatever. Last year we had the fight because Livingston had been number one, but had been dropped and West was funded, if you remember, and we said we're going to correct it, we're going to give a little to West and then we can only do so much at Livingston anyway and we'll take care of everything the following year. This isn't a surprise of what's being done over there. This track was planned last

time we did the CIP budget, everybody knew where we were going to go with this.

Alderman Reiniger stated I've seen references to Master Plan II building another outdoor ice rink although we have one Downtown. I just want to know if we can represent to the public that by funding this phase we will be building the track this year, is that a yes.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I could describe Phase II, I could read Phase II to you if you'd like, so you'd know.

Alderman Domaingue asked why didn't we get this before.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Phase II includes grading for tracks, storm drainage, paving for track and field events with markings, curbs, and paving of entrance road and walks and forty parking spaces, signalization for the main entrance, loaming and seeding for fields, fencing for track and fields, security lighting for track, fields and entrance including contingency. So, that would fund the track, the main entrance to the track at the signals and some of the internal parking and driveways.

Mr. Girard stated just a couple of notes on the mechanical process on the presentation of information to the Committee and I think that Mr. MacKenzie has been unfairly put on the spot because the Mayor has determined what information will be distributed, in what form, and the reason why you have the information you have in the format that you have now is because to provide the Board or this Committee with all of that information would mean giving you at least a six-inch thick stack of what we receive from the departments including all of their priorities, all of their projects, all of the detail, and honestly, it is not practical to present that information. And, if we take all of the information and all of the requests bondable from departments, from community groups, and so on and so forth and bring it to the Committee...it is not a conscious attempt to deny the Committee any information, but rest assured that when we go through this process that the departments have prioritized everything and that they have given us the justification for what it is they've asked for and when the Mayor makes the recommendation, he makes it based on that information. People are looking at the multi-year and the out years and think that it is sort of an iron clad commitment as to what amounts will be funded. Really, all it is if you take a look at what's in there is a thumbnail sketch and our best guess at this time. We can't legitimately give you Phases II, IV, and V at this time of Livingston Park or of any other project because we don't know what we're going to run into when those projects go along. We don't know what the competing demands for bonds are going to be, we don't know what the cost of the contracting is going to be...that depends on the

economy. So, to be able to sit here and give you a five-phase plan for Livingston Park from beginning to end with exact cost and exact process is not practical and it gives the Committee information that as time goes out it's going to prove to be incorrect. So, the best we can do is give you that one phase ahead of time and let you know that our best guess going forward is A, B & C. But, again, the multi-year is only a thumbnail and if you look at the multi-year it highlights particular things that we know we're going to have a problem with. We know where the impact of the landfill closure is going to hit in the multi-year because we've sketched that out and an example of how the multi-year can change is how we brought \$2.5 million for Chandler School solutions into next year or planned to do something next year when that wasn't even on the radar scale in the last five-year plan submitted. It's very, very fluid, it's not binding, it depends on the availability of funds, it depends on the projects that are already running, and the departmental priorities change each based on what they're faced with. We could give you all of the information, but mechanically it's not a practical process.

Alderman Domaingue stated you ask us to be understanding and we're trying to be. Why are you treating grown people like three year olds. We didn't ask for a six-inch volume of particulars, I didn't. We ask...is it possible to get the priority listing, we got it last year, it amounted to 20 or 25 pages, it's not that big of a deal.

Mr. Girard interjected, I misunderstood your request, Alderman.

Alderman Domaingue stated out of respect to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, I think the minimum we should be able to obtain is the basic information, that's not a damning indictment of any department head, it's simply a request, so we can make an informed decision. What is the big deal.

Mr. Girard stated, Alderman, I understood your request for the detail regarding priorities of projects was to ask for everything. Well, my apologies.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we did at the request of Alderman Wihby at the last meeting, we do have that information and perhaps we could hand that out to the Board members.

Chairman Robert stated that would be wonderful. How thick is it.

Mr. MacKenzie replied this is the summary of the priorities, so this is just the first level.

Alderman Domaingue stated this is now an hour-and-a-half into the meeting and now we're going to hand them out.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I indicated I had this information earlier to the Committee.

Chairman Robert stated that's my fault.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do have other changes or requests, Mr. Chair, if the Committee is done.

Chairman Robert stated in looking at this right now, is this something that we're going to have to digest outside of the meeting and get back to either next week or the week after.

Alderman Clancy stated why don't we take a five-minute recess, look it over, and if anyone has any questions, they can then ask them.

Alderman Wihby stated well, then we're micro-managing.

Alderman Clancy stated we're not going to micro-manage anything, we just want to see what they are.

Chairman Robert recessed the meeting.

Chairman Robert called the meeting back to order.

Chairman Robert stated the CIP budget is loaded and there is a lot of anxiety over what gets funded and what doesn't. My concern was to try and focus in on what the Committee's concerns were and I did intend to afford you folks to speak out. I don't intend to be here until ten o'clock. As soon as the Committee is all set, we'll get to you folks.

Chairman Robert asked, Alderman Domaingue, after looking at this information, what do you think.

Alderman Domaingue replied, Mr. Chairman, it is not my intent as I said to hold up this process, I'll go with the will of the Committee. I have to be honest and tell you, I'm aware that a lot of people put a lot of time into this. As a Committee member there are issues on these requests that we as Aldermen are not as familiar with as we could have been. I fault a process that does not allow for the very Aldermen who are elected by the people to have input into what the priority listing is going to be based on what they've heard from their constituents and Parks & Recreation is but one department where we have all raised an eyebrow just briefly in seven minutes in looking at that page. If we can move this process along and

yet hear from Park & Recreation, I will be amenable to that, it's not my intent to put a hurdle up here. It's my intent to make sure that when this Committee makes it's final recommendation to the full Board, we do so having been educated on where we are with the money, the issues, and we can go back to our constituents and say why certain favored things of theirs wouldn't see the light of day in financing. But, I think that's only fair to the Aldermen.

Chairman Robert stated what you're saying is that you've got questions and you want more time to look at information and you're not prepared to act on any of this stuff tonight.

Alderman Domaingue replied, I am not comfortable acting on it tonight, no.

Chairman Robert stated let's see how the other Aldermen feel and see what the Committee wants to do. We were talking parks, go ahead.

Alderman Clancy stated, Bobby, what's your idea, you haven't said much tonight, you must have some ideas down there.

Chairman Robert stated let me ask this of the Committee if I could. Are there any other concerns that the Committee has before I go to the other Aldermen.

Alderman Pariseau stated, I thought Mr. MacKenzie was going to present it to the Committee, but why I'm here is to see if this Committee could up the priority of Precourt Park which is currently listed in the Park's priority list as number 20 and I ask that because several people are involved in the process today. They are looking at a nature walk type thing, they are currently in the discussion stage with Public Service Company that abuts Nutts Pond, there's an Eagle Scout in Ward 9 that's interested in it as a Scout Award project for a foot bridge across the pond. There's a request from the soccer league for an additional soccer field. Currently, Precourt Park handles 1,300 children in the soccer program and they only have two fields and I thought to keep up with Rock Rimmon and Livingston that we could have the third soccer field. But, the Parks & Recreation has told me that they would like an in-depth study as to the status of the park and I think if we could move ahead it would assist these people that want to make a better park for the southend residents and also looking at the possibility of having a family picnic area on the west side of the pond. The abutters of that park on the west side have agreed to that proposal and currently have \$1,500 set aside that was received from Home Depot for that purpose and it's just that I would like to see where this park will go and we have to do that soon and that's why I'm asking for your assistance in upgrading the priority and it doesn't only affect Ward 9, but Ward 7's involved and 8 and part of 6 may be involved with Precourt Park.

Alderman Hirschmann stated while we're on parks, I just want to remind everyone that West/Memorial was given some funding this year \$150,000. For the upcoming year, for '98 it's \$100,000. The request for this year was \$550,000. I'm not asking for additional funds for '98, but what I am asking is that you are aware, Mr. Chairman, that a Committee just worked hard on a Master Plan for that facility, as well, and that for '99, 2000, maybe 2001 those three years the funds could be available for West/Memorial. The total price tag was about \$1.4 million and it's scheduled as number 8 on the priority list right behind Livingston Park and that's why I was concerned about where the \$3 million price tag came in for Livingston, I don't want to pit the two projects together, I don't think that's fair at all. I did hear the Oval Society from Central say they had collected some money, so I would like to see that applied to that project.

Alderman Wihby stated the Oval Society is coming up with money to maintain the track in future years.

Chairman Robert asked could Bob answer any of your questions.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we have been working as a group to resolve the issues of the U. S. Naval Reserve Facility as well as coming up with a master plan for the site; that has actually just jelled within the week and we don't even have all of the information. I think all those parties involved including all of the School officials, west side Aldermen, Parks & Recreation people, our office, the Mayor's Office are comfortable with the process that we went through. It is important to get that U. S. Naval Reserve facility from the federal government, we worked hard to do that, and I think we have a pretty good plan, but it's not totally formalized. The plan is more money than is allocated now, but it is certainly something to work towards and we're going to have to look at that each year. I'm looking now at the final numbers for the different components and how we can break those out into phases.

Alderman Hirschmann stated could I ask that when those numbers are established could they just be put into the out years. Like I said, I'm not advocating for '98 dollars, I'm just advocating that in '99 the numbers are reflected and for the year 2000. If that site is acquired, we will have to act within an 18-month period approximately.

Mr. MacKenzie replied for anything we would do on the U. S. Naval Reserve site, we would have to act, I believe, within a 3-year...is Sean Thomas here...within a 3-year period to accomplish those and that would essentially be the tennis courts and

the parking, so we would have to allocate enough money to handle those two parts of it.

Chairman Robert stated but once you figured out what the costs would be as well as at Livingston, you could punch the numbers on the out years.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, I guess I would want to do that only in conjunction with this Committee, you're not saying for me to do that unilaterally, are you. I think it is a policy issue that the Board is going to have to do and I will look at the phases and see what the dollar costs are and see how they fit in, but again, as Alderman Domaingue mentioned we will, at some point, have to look at how future phases of each of these two parks compare against early phases of other parks in the City.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, Mr. Chairman, if I could just mention to the Aldermen here that as you know every two years you could have a new Mayor, you could have a new Board, and as such you are going to have different priorities. As I look at these priorities and review these, I look at these with what the department head's are recommending and I either agree with them or maybe we'll make some modifications or we'll make some changes, then the Board gets their opportunity to do the same thing. To have 13 people all trying to come up with something you would have utter chaos. I think in my estimation the best way to do it would be, for example, Alderman Pariseau to talk to the Parks & Recreation Department about that and if it's a priority number 20, which it is in here out of 22 and you would like to get it to be a higher priority, I think it would be a good idea to talk to the Parks & Recreation Department to find out if after you talk to them and they come up with a higher priority.

Alderman Pariseau stated, I did. They never told me it was item number 20. They told me that they had submitted it to the Mayor for funding and you didn't accept it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that is true.

Alderman Pariseau reiterated that they had never told me it was number 20 out of 22.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I agree with you about elections and all that, while you have the horses in the room that is what I am trying to do is get this on the priority list just for the out years. Everything else is projected, so why couldn't this.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, I know what you're talking about and it would be good, but each Board and each Committee each year is going to be evaluating this and determining what the priority is going to be. What is it that you want to fund.

Alderman Hirschmann replied, I want to "stack" the deck then.

Mayor Wieczorek stated then somebody is going to want to call it a mixed deal next time and they're going to want to do it a different way.

Chairman Robert stated in an effort to bring some focus back to what we're doing here, I think everybody has had a chance to speak except for Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated my concern is the safety of my constituents and I agree that...I'm willing to wait for my two parks and obviously I'm willing to wait in line for that and I certainly don't appeal to the Board in terms of priority because I don't think they're important. There are certain things that we have to be patient about, but when a dire needs exists, it's my obligation as an Alderman to call it to the Board's attention. I understand that as far as parks are concerned and so forth and I plan to have Ron Ludwig come to my Advisory Council on the 9th, if he can explain what his program is and my constituents can ask questions and so forth and if down the road, 2, 3, 5 years from now consideration is given to other parks other than what the priority list is, then fine. But, there are other things that do come up as the Mayor explained and I would be remiss if I didn't call it to the Board's attention. In terms of signalization, like the Mayor said, circumstances change and where a road may not have been heavily traversed at one time, it becomes maybe because of developments in the Bodwell Road area and because people use that it becomes a serious matter and it does become it in a matter of months or a year. So, that's my two cents.

Chairman Robert stated this is what I've got and tell me if I've left something out. The CIP budget is okay with the exception of \$18,000 for Court Ordered (OYS), \$4,000 added to ALPHA, we want to consider \$65,000/\$60,000/\$70,000 for signalization at Cilley Road/Taylor Street, we would want somebody to speak with us about the Park Renovation Program...Livingston, West/Memorial, Precourt Parks...Child Care Coordinator was mentioned earlier, have I left anything out.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there were a couple of other items that I didn't get to early on and I would like to mention then. We have received word from the Highway Department that the Biron Street Bridge Reconstruction would need another \$11,000 under the bond program and that is now listed under the General Obligation Bonds and that's basically they reestimated the cost of the bridge and

they did want that brought to your attention. It's under Table 1-4, #7.10115 Bridge Rehabilitation Project. I do have to bring to the Committee's attention related to the auto registration that there was money allocated in the City Cash portion amounting to \$743,000. The full Board has essentially eliminated the additional auto registration surcharge. You could simply leave it in the City Cash, but suddenly that has a direct tax impact. The options would be to bond the project, another option would be to not do the project, to postpone it although I would indicate that will create additional costs for the City in the future - not doing anything would have - that is the Center of New Hampshire Garage. The last one was that the Mayor did call me today and was discussing the Derryfield Park Gazebo and looking for whether there might be funds available, about \$10,000 to complete that project and that was the last item that I had.

Chairman Robert asked is that cash.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that would have to be City Cash, yes.

Alderman Wihby asked if we bonded the \$743,000 for the Center of New Hampshire Garage does that preempt the \$300,000 in revenues.

Mr. Girard replied no because that revenue can only be used for specific purposes.

Alderman Wihby stated we could bond \$434,000 and use the \$300,000 in revenues.

Mr. Girard replied you could do that. I should also advise the Committee that the auto registration fee was covering the debt service that we're paying on the garages, so whether you bond any portion of the project or not, you're automatically adding \$626,800 of bond to the tax roll that will be carried by property taxes.

Alderman Clancy stated that would be about 20 cents.

Mayor Wieczorek replied it would be about 16 or 17 cents.

Mr. Girard stated that debt service can be carried by the fee, the Board eliminates the fee or the Board has, that \$630,000 comes directly back to the tax rate.

Alderman Wihby asked how much did we fund last year that we paid. It was two percent, the mill rate.

Mr. Girard replied it was \$1.50.

Alderman Wihby asked what did that accomplish, how much in money.

Mr. Girard replied, I believe we budgeted \$1.2 million.

Alderman Wihby stated this year it would have been \$600,000.

Mr. Girard replied no, this year, if the fee had stayed in place, we would have been able to allocate \$1.3 million of that fee toward General Fund expansion. The mill rate still would have been one and a half, it wasn't going down, it wasn't going up; that formula could be reviewed and it was my understanding and I'm not entirely certain of this, but it was my understanding that we are still going to collect \$1.2 million in this fiscal year even though we did not have the first quarter of the fee. So, that fee could be adjusted. Everything you collect over what you can spend goes into the Parking Trust, so if you wish to avoid having the Parking Trust gain any money, you could revise the fee downward and given the rate that the fees have come in at, it's probably logical to assume that fee could be revised downward and still cover the debt and the construction costs on the Center of New Hampshire Garage if you go with the mill rate. Otherwise, it all comes out of the tax rate. The Mayor is reviewing his numbers.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I'm looking at it. I'll tell you Tuesday when I get through with the final punch.

Chairman Robert asked, Bob, do you have any more.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, no, I didn't.

Mr. Girard stated, I have one on the Library, Mr. Chairman, if I may. Alderman Domaingue has a question, so I will defer.

Alderman Domaingue stated just so that I understand the breakdown and there's no misunderstanding when we get to the final adoption of these budgets, I thought I heard Mr. Girard mention and maybe I misunderstood, speak to the issue of the funding for the parking garage maintenance and then the additional funding that was necessary, the six-hundred plus thousand dollars. Where are we with the maintenance on the garages, is that also going to be lumped onto the tax rate at this point because the Board has eliminated the auto registration fees and is some of this \$1.2 million going to be used for that purpose, I guess is where I am lost.

Mr. Girard replied there is some carryover and I apologize because I don't have the specific details. What I can tell you, at this point, is that the construction costs

related to the Center of New Hampshire Garage and the debt service that we have on all of the garages can be funded by the fee. I do not know specifically whether the normal maintenance and operation of the garages can be supported by the fee, but I can get back to the Committee on that. What we did last year with this fee and I would presume that would carry forward if the fee were going to be enacted was so that we were keeping the mill rate as low as we possibly could, I believe it was determined by the Board to just fund the construction on the Center of New Hampshire Garage and to carry the debt service. I believe we left the operation, regular maintenance of the garages on the tax rate.

Alderman Domaingue stated all of these costs will then be lumped onto the tax rate if the Board maintains its position that the auto registration fee is gone.

Mr. Girard replied that is correct, as of October 1st.

Alderman Domaingue asked do we know what that impact is on the tax rate, roughly.

Mr. Girard replied every million dollars, at this point, is coming out to be about a percent on the tax rate, so you're looking at about a percent and a half.

Alderman Domaingue stated just for this issue.

Mr. Girard stated 1.3/1.4 percent. Actually, the numbers, the debt service and the construction are actually closer to \$1.4 million.

Alderman Wihby stated that's why when we had the discussion on the fees and someone said well, it's better to do it this way because no one is going to feel it, well, they are going to feel it on the tax rate.

Mr. Girard stated unfortunately, I don't believe that not doing the project or even scaling it back at the Center of New Hampshire is an option because that's got structural cracks that have to be addressed.

Mr. Girard stated we have kind of an awkward situation that's been presented by the Library. As you know, when we go through the budget process MIS computer requests are supposed to be forwarded through the Information Systems Department for processing and what not. The Library mistakenly processed that through the capital request side of the budget which is handled directly by the Mayor's Office which wasn't really a big deal, but we heard from the Library Director, I have a fax here dated March 18th that said that part of the money that he had in his General Fund budget (\$78,000) was for an Internet Project that

would basically get the Library ready to go on the web or put the Library on the web. He has the ability to get grant funds from the State if he can show that the City has committed to funding the project that he has put on the capital side of his budget. He needs that commitment by April 4th. Now, that won't come if it's in the General side of the budget. So, Mr. Brisbin being in Chicago and not being able to be here asked us to bring a request in. There are a couple of options that the Committee could consider that would enable Mr. Brisbin to have a commitment on the funds to leverage the State grant. In the CIP Program that you have in front of you, you have \$75,000 in a Library Improvement Program; that money has been proposed to be used for various renovations to the building (i.e., carpeting, the Children's Room, and a couple of other things that are necessary); that money could be rearmarked if the Committee chose to for this computer project. Inasmuch as it's the Mayor's hope that the Board will accept, or pass a final CIP Resolution April 1st, so that we can take advantage of the construction season that would serve Mr. Brisbin's purposes. The other option that the Board has, actually it has two more, the other option that the Board has is it could lift the money out of Mr. Brisbin's General Fund request and add it to the Library Improvement Program for the computers or it could substitute the Library Improvement money for the computer money. In either case, it's sort of a wash, it's trying to swap one for another and if we can carry it on the General Fund side for the renovations through the Capital project which would be appropriate on that side of the budget, we could also do that and it would be a special project.

Chairman Robert asked do you have a recommendation.

Mr. Girard replied, I would be hesitant to make a recommendation. The Library Director's request is to take the money that is in his General Fund for computers and add it to the \$75,000 that's in the CIP for one great big Library Improvement Program project. I did discuss with him the alternative of swapping the money and bringing the renovations back to the General Fund and he is hesitant to do that and I did talk to him about dedicating the Library Improvement money in the CIP for the computers in trying to fund the renovations through the General Fund, he was hesitant to do that. His request was to add the computer money to the Library Improvement money and try to get it all through at the same time. I'm not prepared to make a recommendation, I did want to raise it with the Committee and take direction from the Committee as to how it wanted to proceed. But, if you do it as a Cash project, it will have a corresponding decrease on the General Fund side which may or may not come anyway.

Chairman Robert asked what is he looking for.

Mr. Girard replied the request is just over \$78,000 and he did program it into his General Fund request, but in order to get the commitment that he needs to try and leverage, I think it's about \$48,000 in State grants, he would need a commitment by April 4th which the only shot he's got is to get some kind of commitment out of the CIP.

Chairman Robert stated we need \$78,000 for this.

Mr. Girard stated it is a project that would put...

Alderman Clancy asked how much do we have for books this year.

Mr. Girard replied the Library has requested \$200,000 for books.

Chairman Robert stated can we finish up with this first.

Mr. Girard stated they are looking for \$78,000 to be moved from the General Fund into the CIP Cash portion of the budget, so they can attempt to leverage that State grant.

Alderman Wihby asked is the reason why it's coming here is because he thinks we're going to pass the CIP budget before April 4th and if we only pass the bonding side of it and not the Cash side of it, will he still have the same problem. So, are you anticipating that we are going to okay the CIP plan before April 1st including Cash, but we don't even know the Mayor's numbers yet.

Mr. Girard replied that was the Mayor's request. I don't anticipate what the Board will do as passing bonding or cash projects or whatnot.

Alderman Wihby stated, I thought we were here to look at the bonding projects and that was the projects in bonding items because they're bigger and move faster. I didn't necessarily think we were going to take up Cash before we did the budget.

Chairman Robert stated, I was under the impression we were going to do everything.

Mr. Girard stated that was the Mayor's intent.

Chairman Robert stated we can do what we want.

Mr. Girard stated it was the Mayor's intent to try to have the entire CIP because even some of the smaller non-bondable projects such as this computer project can

take advantage of the extended construction season and it would enable the City to do more projects.

Alderman Wihby stated, so I sit here and say what's \$30,000 here, what's \$40,000 there, \$50,000 there, \$60,000 there or \$743,000 there and then I have no idea what his numbers look like.

Mr. Girard stated that, I guess, is a hazard of the process, but that is also why we worked as hard as we did to keep the CIP Cash portion of the budget level with last year. We understand and it's something that we had difficulty with ourselves in bringing the proposal, but it was felt that the benefits to the department's administering the projects.

Alderman Wihby asked if we don't do the Cash, will that hurt a lot of the projects. We only want to do the big projects and move them along, is the Cash going to hold up something.

Mr. MacKenzie replied in effect, we wanted to show the entire package of the CIP, I think it's important to see the comprehensive part of the CIP Program. In essence, you can't really approve that CIP Cash portion until you approve the Operating Budget, so it was my hope that at least you could conceptually give us the rough number that we'd be dealing with in the CIP Cash, subject to final approval in the Operating Budget.

Alderman Wihby stated so in the budget, we could reduce it.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, yes. The Bond portion they could authorize now, we wouldn't actually be expending money until July 1st, but we'd be able to do planning, get rid of contracts, etc.

Mr. Girard stated I'm sorry I wasn't clear on that. But, for example, on the Road Resurfacing which is a Cash item, if the Highway Department knew about what they were going to be looking at, it would enable them to get their road reconstruction underway more easily.

Alderman Clancy stated so we're here tonight discussing this, yet we don't know what the figures are that the Mayor is going to give us.

Mayor Wieczorek stated you've got the CIP budget, you're reviewing it now. I think what Mr. MacKenzie said is correct that you can take a look with all of the projects, approve conceptually the Cash part of it and have that move along with the Operating Budget.

Mr. Girard stated that conceptual approval would assist Mr. Brisbin.

Alderman Clancy asked how are we going to digest this now.

Alderman Wihby asked can we go over all the items now that we have.

Chairman Robert replied I'll run off all of the stuff I had written down that people have brought up. Eighteen thousand for Alcohol Court-Ordered Program; \$4,000 ALPHA (Cash); Signalization (\$65,000 Cash); Biron Street Bridge (\$11,000 Bond); Derryfield Park Gazebo (\$10,000 Cash); Library Grant (\$78,000 could be Cash).

Alderman Domaingue asked is that in addition to what the Library's request is or are we trading off as has been suggested.

Mr. Girard replied that would be up to the Committee to determine.

Chairman Robert stated I would put it down as Cash \$78,000. City Hall (\$350,000 Bond); all I have after this is park concerns; the auto registration money - what are we going to do with it \$743,000; we want to know more about Parks & Recreation their programs, the concept division and we've got to make a decision as a Committee and Precourt Park, do we want to bump it up or what do we want to do.

Alderman Clancy stated ask them what their priorities are.

Chairman Robert stated, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is what I figured we could do and I'll leave it up to you. I'll put together a meeting with everyone of these things listed on it, we can vote it up or down, and we can have the people come in, explain to us whatever we want to know, and we can go from there or I can do the same agenda, you folks can do your homework and we can just come and vote.

Alderman Clancy asked why do we have to ask these people to come in, we don't need it because they stacked the deck here.

Alderman Domaingue stated he's not talking about a public hearing.

Chairman Robert stated not a public hearing, but rather get the department heads in here, if you want to have it done in a meeting format that's fine, if you want to do your own homework on the side that's fine too.

Alderman Wihby asked can't we go through some of these items today that we know we're going to change or not change and see if we want them to come in or not. Four thousand dollars for ALPHA.

Alderman Domaingue stated I'm willing to do that and what is that for for ALPHA, what was the hardship for them.

Alderman Wihby replied only because we cut them.

Mr. Girard stated the funding level that Nury Marquez has referred to when we came to the public hearing was for two programs. They used to run a program called Positive Parents in addition to ALPHA Teen and to our knowledge they no longer run that program. The ALPHA Teen Program is what they sought funding for in recent weeks, so though she is correct in saying the City has funded her at a higher level, we're not aware that she is still running the programs that we funded at that level.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated it is proposed to be level-funded this year as compared to last year.

Chairman Robert stated I'll do the agenda and we'll have the people come in and we'll go from there.

Alderman Wihby stated the big one is the parking money. Is there money for the \$743,000 now in bonds.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, no.

Alderman Wihby stated if we wanted to do the Center of New Hampshire Garage, we have to put in \$743,000.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, yes.

Alderman Clancy stated we're going to bond that, right.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could, Mr. Chair, I would recommend if you're not going to have the auto registration which has already been acted upon, bonding would be the most appropriate way to do the project.

Alderman Wihby asked who do you plan on having come in.

Chairman Robert replied we should have Tom Lolicata for the Traffic Signalization Program; somebody has got to come from Parks; Mr. Brisbin from the Library; Garage Maintenance - Highway Department.

Alderman Wihby moved to authorize \$18,000 (Cash) for the Alcohol Court-Directed Program. Alderman Domaingue duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Wihby asked do we want to authorize funds for the Traffic Signalization Program at Cilley Road and Taylor Street today or do we want them to prioritize it, so they can come to us and tell us the number.

Alderman Clancy moved to authorize \$65,000 for the signalization.

Alderman Domaingue stated the problem is if he comes in and says it's \$120,000, we've short-changed it and I think we need to know the reality of the cost and what it is whether it's for Alderman Shea or anybody else.

Alderman Clancy withdrew his motion.

Alderman Wihby stated let us send him a notice that that is what we are looking for - priority/signalization.

Alderman Reiniger stated so we don't know what the top priority will be. I've been through this with Mr. Lolicata and he's always said you have to go out for the warrants and the studies and we finally had it all done for Elm & Brook Streets, it's a thick study, it's taken a long time, and a lot of people want it. I know there are a lot of other intersections too, but I don't think we vote tonight to say one intersection or the other.

Chairman Robert stated let us have him come in and tell us what the in's and out's are.

Mr. Girard stated for the Committee's information, the only new signal request that came through the normal Traffic Committee's CIP process was Brook and Elm. If the Committee wants, as I understand the process, if the Committee wants to know what the warrants are and all the other work that Traffic and Police have to do on these things, it would probably be appropriate to send it through the Traffic Committee with the normal process and I'm sure Traffic would be willing to expedite it and I'm sure Mr. Lolicata would be willing to go to them or here directly, but every time we get into these traffic signal things, I don't know exactly how it works, but I know Tom has a whole series of steps he has to go through.

Chairman Robert stated we have three members of the Traffic Committee here and this won't be a wasted exercise, I don't believe. But, the Committee does have questions and let's get them answered.

Alderman Shea stated Tom has already sent to Mr. MacKenzie how much it would cost, he mentioned that it would cost \$65,000, is that correct, Bob. He's already investigated how much it would cost. This is not impacting on yours, yours is already approved.

Mr. Girard stated the CIP does not fund any new signalized intersections at this point. The only funding for intersections is reconstruction.

Chairman Robert stated we will have Tom come in and answer our questions and this Committee will decide what it wants to do.

Alderman Wihby stated Youth is done, they will get their \$18,000 according to what we did. But, you're asking Traffic to come in, Library and Highway to come. Can we move City Hall tonight for \$350,000.

Alderman Clancy moved to authorize \$350,000 - Bond - for the City Hall/Annex Renovation Project. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Wihby stated the Center of New Hampshire will be Traffic and Highway, Library, and Parks & Recreation and what is Parks coming in for.

Chairman Robert replied as I understood the Committee, it wants the Parks priorities to be explained to them and they can talk about the Gazebo.

Clerk Johnson stated Monday night, March 31st is a meeting of the Committee on Personnel from 6:30 to 8:30 PM, which has been on the schedule for some time and had indicated they needed two hours.

Alderman Reiniger stated you want to substitute CIP for Personnel.

Clerk Johnson stated they would move Personnel to Tuesday, April 1st at 6:00 PM and schedule CIP on Monday, March 31st at 6:30 PM.

Chairman Robert asked if we put this off to a meeting later on, so we could bring this in for the 15th would that disrupt the process.

Alderman Wihby stated I'm off the whole week, I'm going away. I don't have a problem if we are going to prioritize the signals as long as we are going to have a program for signals and we're going to do one every year; the Gazebo I think we should do it (\$10,000); the Library, I don't know, I think we can go either way on that; that the Fire and Bridge I don't think we have an option; the Center of New Hampshire Garage we have to get it done, so I don't mind bonding that.

Clerk Johnson stated let me clarify that; that if you're trying to adopt a Bond Resolution, it has to be introduced at a regular meeting and referred to the Finance Committee, then it has to layover for five days, now it could be laid over and adopted at a special meeting of the Board which could be held on one of the nights of the Finance Committee. Is it your intent to adopt the Bond Resolutions before adopting the CIP Resolution.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, no. We would want the Board to adopt the CIP Resolution formally for the Bond, we would not do it for the Cash portion; that would be tentative.

Clerk Johnson stated the CIP Resolution is one whole Resolution and that has to layover as well, Bob.

Chairman Robert stated Alderman Reiniger offered to move the Personnel Committee meeting to Tuesday, April 1st with the CIP Committee meeting scheduled for Monday, March 31st at 6:30 PM.

Alderman Reiniger stated at the risk of causing some trouble here tonight, if it makes Alderman Wihby feel more comfortable I'm happy to move on the Livingston Phase II project this evening. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Domaingue stated when you say approve Livingston Park, I think we need that clarified. Are you talking about the \$500,000 going forward in the 1998 budget or are we talking about the whole project going forward no matter what the cost is.

Alderman Reiniger replied just Phase II.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it would be \$500,000 in FY98 which would be Phase II.

Mr. Girard stated you can't commit beyond this one year.

Chairman Robert called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee