

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

May 19, 1998

5:45 PM

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Reiniger, Wihby (late), Clancy, Pariseau, Girard

Messrs: F. Thomas, R. MacKenzie, P. Ramsey, B. Jabjiniak, D. Houle

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Discussion update on second phase of the Elm Street Reconstruction project.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that there is a handout.

Mr. Thomas stated the status report that was just passed out summarizes the first contract and what is remaining to do. You can see at the top of the page there there is miscellaneous work that is ongoing, powerwashing the sidewalk, repointing the brick sidewalks, work around City Hall, etc. Most of the work will be done in the May/June time period as you can see there. The last page of the handout goes into a little bit more detail as far as what remains to be done in that first contract and the anticipated completion date. Below that is a summary of the costs for the first construction contract. As you can see, we have added to it and we have come under in some of the areas. The bottom line with the contingency that was built into the contract, right now we are looking at a final balance of about \$140,000. However, there are still issues that are being evaluated right now and as you can see there are going to be potentially some additional change orders. The largest is the tree protection. There is a proposal to put in some posts with some hanging chain around the trees to protect them. That is still under evaluation whether we are going to go ahead and do it. However, if we do elect to go ahead with the change orders, the additional change orders, there is going to be a balance of \$57,651. Some of those change orders we are definitely going to have to go ahead with such as the modifications to the traffic signals at Merrimack and Concord Streets. We have to put in a foundation under that telephone booth that

somebody got from England and there is some electrical work and overload protection that definitely has to be done. So the only thing that is up in the air right now is whether we are going to go ahead with the tree protection. The second page summarizes where we are going under this next appropriation, the next contract. Money was allocated to design the improvements to Stark Street and also North Elm Street. That will be done. In addition, there will be a design on a signage package which we will potentially hold off and put out as a second contract. As you can see, the cost breakdown is the allocation in FY99 CIP was \$630,000 and then there was \$60,000 put up by a private developer to address North Elm Street so we have approximately \$690,000 to spend. You can see the estimates for the design phase of it and construction administration. We will be going with a new consultant, a new engineer on the second phase because of the various HUD requirements. The first contracts and studies we got up to I believe amendment #6 and because of the scrutiny that comes down from the Feds, we had to go through a selection process again and through that selection process a different consultant came in quite a bit lower in his design fees so this consultant is willing to do it on a lump sum basis so it looks like we will be going ahead with it. The bottom line is that we are going to have about \$609,000 available for construction. The estimated cost for Stark Street is about \$500,000 in that range give or take what the bids come in at. What that will mean is that hopefully there will be a surplus and we will then make a decision whether we put out this signage contract which will improve signage in the downtown area or revisit the cobblestone issue on Elm Street in front of City Hall. The original contract, first contract, allocated \$20,000 to put maybe a little patch of cobblestone in the intersection of Elm and Hanover Street. Various groups felt that that was inadequate and wanted to expand that to include the entire intersection from curb to curb in that Hanover/Elm Street intersection, however, the cost of installing the cobblestones that were taken out of the road through excavations came out to about \$170,000 and it was over the budget so there will be, hopefully, surpluses in the second phase where we can either do signage, revisit the cobblestone issue, etc. I would be glad to try to answer any questions you may have.

Alderman Pariseau stated you have a surplus of \$57,000 whatever added to that \$690,000 so you are talking \$747,000 to take care of the second phase.

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct.

Alderman Pariseau asked and your projection is that it will cost \$609,000.

Mr. Thomas answered no, it should be less than that. That is what has been allocated. The construction estimate to do Stark Street is about \$500,000 so we are going to have about \$100,000 surplus in that \$609,000 plus the balance from

the first contract of about \$57,000. So hopefully we will have a pretty good balance once we advertise.

Chairman Reiniger asked what is the reason why we didn't continue in the second phase with the same engineers and consultants.

Mr. Thomas answered as I mentioned, this is Federal money so there is a lot of scrutiny on the hiring, contracting, etc. The study phase and the construction phase, the City wound up with, besides the original contract, six amendments so basically we had the original contract and six amendments to that contract. It was the opinion of everybody involved that in order to satisfy or answer any concerns that any auditors or anybody who is auditing those type of funds would have that we would go through a selection process again. Not only did the original engineer take part in that process, but two others. As I mentioned, one engineer, one of those three engineers was over 50% cheaper than the next engineer or the engineer that had the project the previous round and again, there are various issues that have to be evaluated through the procurement process and this new engineer met the requirements and we sat down with this new potential engineer and said well you are a lot lower, a lot cheaper than the next engineer, can you do the work for that price. The response we got back was we would be willing to do it as a lump sum contract. Basically, they are willing to put their name on a contract saying they will do all the design work that has been identified, the construction administration, etc. For X amount of dollars and that they won't come back asking for any more.

Chairman Reiniger asked does HUD require us to chose the lowest bidder.

Mr. Thomas answered no but the procurement code does take into account price because the procurement code requires a price proposal and I don't know how I could justify or anybody else could justify giving a design contract to an engineer at over double the fee.

Chairman Reiniger asked now the consultant you are choosing is an out-of-town consultant or a local consultant.

Mr. Thomas answered it is a local consultant. They have an office on Elm Street.

Chairman Reiniger asked are they based in Manchester or somewhere else.

Mr. Thomas answered I think they are probably based somewhere else. I don't know where their main office is but the people that would be doing the work are a local firm on Elm Street.

Chairman Reiniger stated my understanding is it is an out-of-state company that is trying to break into the local market. Is that an unfair characterization?

Mr. Thomas replied well it is an out-of-state company. I mean the main office is out-of-state. They have been in Manchester for a couple of years now. As a matter of fact, they submitted a proposal for this Elm Street project for the first phase, the study phase.

Chairman Reiniger stated I think every business faces competition that will low ball a price, willing to take a loss to get into a market. Is that...I don't know how you would deal with a situation in which there may be a low ball situation.

Mr. Thomas replied I am sure that is the case here.

Chairman Reiniger asked will the citizens get the quality. We are talking about downtown Elm Street. So far the work has been first rate. I don't know if you want any skimping at this point.

Mr. Thomas answered well again that was a concern that we had. As a matter of fact, the contract still has not been awarded because we want to make sure that all of the i's are dotted and the t's are crossed. As I mentioned, this consultant is willing to sign a contract stating that they will do everything that we define or has been defined by date for the fee that was proposed so they are not coming back and asking for an amendment to the contract. As I mentioned, the original consultant had six amendments. Now, there are all justified that is why they got them approved, however, this consultant is saying we will not come back. We will do it for that amount of money.

Chairman Reiniger asked I wonder if there would be any merit in having the consultant come before the Committee.

Mr. Thomas answered I am sure the consultant would be glad to. Again, the situation that we are faced with, with the procurement code the way it is written right now it would be very difficult to come in front of a Board like this and justify not giving it to this consultant and quite frankly I would think that this consultant who is willing to sign a contract on a lump sum basis, if we didn't give it to him, quite frankly if nothing else he is going to make a lot of noise. I mean I don't know what legal basis we would have not to give it to him.

Chairman Reiniger stated one thing I am thinking of here is if the work is not done right, if it is a shoddy job or whatever, the citizens are going to blame us. They

are not going to blame the consultant or you or anybody else so obviously we have a lot riding on this and it is a very high profile project so...

Mr. Thomas replied well this consultant, first of all, went through a prequalification process and it is not a fly-by-night outfit by no means and the work that is being performed here is not the most difficult in the world.

Alderman Girard stated I just want to put my concern on the record. The i's can be dotted and the t's can be crossed but if the handwriting is lousy it doesn't matter a whole lot and that is the concern that I have is can we legitimately expect a company, no matter what their qualifications, to come in with such a low bid, so far below the other two bidders, can we expect reasonably to get the same quality of service. As Alderman Reiniger has said, it is a critical downtown project but I think if we are going to change horses here, particularly away from the company that did the study and designed the work, it seems to me we ought to be darn sure that we are going to get what we need to get.

Mr. Thomas replied and I think that is our job and that is why the process has been going on for a few weeks now. We have not awarded the contract to them because we sat down with them on numerous occasions to make sure that we are not letting anything go by and I think the Chairman mentioned that I think this consultant group wants to get their foot in the door to do business in the City and that they are willing to write-off some of their costs to do it. I don't think it would behoove this consultant to come in, low ball something, do quite frankly a crappy job and then expect to get more work in other areas in the future. I mean it just doesn't add up.

Alderman Girard asked was this an RFP process or was it a bid process.

Mr. Thomas answered it is an RFP, but the procurement code requires that fee be part of the proposal.

Alderman Girard asked but it does not require that it be the sole consideration.

Mr. Thomas answered no. I think there are eight or nine areas that have to be evaluated like involvement in earlier phases, locality of the company, etc.

Alderman Girard stated as a final comment, I would also have concerns with a process that allowed major national competition to come in and undercut the local establishment who, by and large, have served this City very well.

Mr. Thomas replied to respond to that, again this is a local consultant. Yes they are connected to a larger operation, but they are local.

Alderman Clancy asked when is this guy going to start the second phase.

Mr. Thomas answered we can't actually sign the contract until July 1 when the funds are available.

Alderman Clancy stated because most contractors now have their work lined up for the rest of the year.

Mr. Thomas replied this would be to do the design. This consultant felt that if he could have a signed contract by July to do the design he would still have time to get it out for bids and construction before the winter. He estimates a two and a half month construction period for Stark Street.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Status report on Riverwalk project.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Peter Ramsey is here tonight and he might like to have some words. We have been meeting to discuss how to approach the whole project. I think those meetings are coming along good. We are actually looking at potentially a co-developer situation where City officials would be working with the Riverfront Foundation and perhaps even Intown Manchester to develop the whole project. It does look like the first portion to be done would be that section within the lease area of the Riverfront Foundation. That is also the easiest area to develop because it does not hang out over the river as some portions are going to. At this point, we have identified all of the tasks we have to accomplish. We are looking at divvying up those responsibilities and we are looking at potentially some next month to get together a larger design meeting of everybody who is interested in the Millyard area to come to a design meeting to in essence create the vision for the Riverwalk itself.

Chairman Reiniger asked how soon do you think work can begin, the section you just identified near the stadium.

Mr. Ramsey answered it appears like we can start in about six weeks. I just have to design meeting. The Foundation is ready to hire an attorney to begin the development contract with the City. As soon as the development contract is signed with the City we would hire a design team and then hire a contractor who is going to work with the design team as we build this thing so it can go quicker.

Bob is correct I think. We have had two meetings now with the legal staff, with the finance staff, with parks & recreation, Intown and Bob's office and things appear to be on target. I don't see any major hassles at this point.

Chairman Reiniger asked if the City were to ask as a co-developer would that slow down the project. Would that change the way that parts of the job have to go out to bid or is there anyway to do it in such a way that it is done faster?

Mr. Ramsey answered you know the devil is always in the detail. Frankly the Park Foundation would like to build this thing the same way we build the field and by the way I just left the field and there is a rugby game going on there and they are against a team from England. It was kind of fun to see a couple of hundred rugby guys down there. But I think the devil is in the detail. We would prefer to build this thing and have all spending reviewed by the Planning Department the way we built the field. I don't think we had any problems with that process, at least major problems and it seemed to go pretty quickly.

Chairman Reiniger asked do you disagree with that approach, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no that is the approach we will be using for the section that is under the control of the Riverfront Foundation. The difficulty becomes once you start acquiring easements hanging out over the river that is where the tricky part comes, particularly in terms of permitting. We are going to have to be working with both the State, the Federal agencies, our Congressional delegation. In those cases, it will have to be the City applying for those and ultimately it will have to be the City basically owning the Riverwalk. So in those cases I think we all agree that the City should retain ultimate control over that and under the procurement code you can't necessarily have a non-profit or separate organization building a public facility. It just doesn't work under the procurement code so I think that getting started with the critical link which is the easiest one in this case we can do fairly quickly. That is going to be actually done by the Riverfront Foundation. Once we get to acquiring easements from property owners and putting some of these out over the river, that is where I think we agreed ultimately that has to be City property and has to be done by the City in cooperation with the Riverfront Foundation.

Chairman Reiniger asked and the funding is already in place to do the first phase.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. We haven't divvied up that first chunk of money. I am sure that there is enough to do that one section.

Alderman Clancy asked is Phase I going to be done this year.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would like to see it done this year.

Mr. Ramsey replied I had planned on Phase I being done in the middle of September.

Alderman Wihby asked by the middle of September.

Mr. Ramsey answered yes by the middle of September. We are going to be very aggressive. In the course of our talks, and we have had a couple now, I think the only area that I am a bit apprehensive about is whether in fact the Riverfront Foundation, through its lawyers, could obtain those easements with a provision in those easements that it could go back to the City once the Riverwalk is completed. For example, down by Dean Kamen's building. It seems to be construction will go much quicker if it was run privately with supervision by the City and have those riverwalks deeded back to the City forever once they are completed.

Chairman Reiniger asked is that the way it has been done in other cities.

Mr. Ramsey answered it has been done a number of different ways. I think we would have to have Tom Clark look at that and see if that is legal, but it appears like we are going to need seven easements on the river. I am personally going to ask each one of those easement owners to donate that to the City. Now it is hard to say whether or not they will do it. I hope they will and if those easements are donated first to the Riverfront Foundation with the caveat that it go to the City forever, Bob is absolutely right. I think the Riverwalk should always be maintained and owned by the City of Manchester.

Alderman Wihby stated my concern is that we don't want to delay the project. Does the City Solicitor agree with any method or do you prefer one method?

Asst. Solicitor Arnold replied well we would of course have to take a look, as Mr. Ramsey pointed out, at the legality of having a private foundation acquire easements and then transferring them to the City. We are perfectly willing to do that. It would appear, probably, that a major time commitment here is going to be obtaining those easements one way or the other.

Alderman Wihby asked how about the construction of it. Are they going to have to go through bids and all that stuff?

Asst. Solicitor Arnold answered it depends on where the money comes from. If the City is paying for that, then yes it would have to go through the procurement code. If a private foundation does it, depending on how it is done, probably not.

Alderman Wihby stated I guess I envision this being the same thing as the Riverpark where it was technically our money but we gave it to the Foundation and the Foundation did the work. I don't think you had to go through the procurement code or any of that stuff did you?

Mr. Ramsey replied no. Every dollar we spent was completely reviewed by Planning.

Alderman Wihby stated there is no problem with Planning looking at it. A lot of people should look at it but can't we do the same thing for this project?

Mr. MacKenzie replied what had happened in that case though is ultimately the Riverfront Foundation actually owned those improvements and they will own that for an extended number of years. That is why that project actually had to go to the Planning Board for site plan review because it was owned by the Riverfront Foundation. I think clearly there are considerable liability issues with a Riverwalk that hangs out over a flood plane and certain other issues that I think the Riverfront Foundation will be hesitant to get into to actually own that property. Once they own it, they also have to maintain and control that property. I think those are issues that I am not sure the Riverfront Foundation wants to get into.

Alderman Wihby stated we have to have people working together on this and we ought to realize that we want it done and we want to get over any humps we can get over. I don't mind Planning looking at it but I would hope that you are not going to delay the project or have them have to take an extra step because of some reason...of course if there are some problems with it we want you to certainly look at it but we want to move it along.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think we are all moving towards that goal. I think we have had a couple of good meetings. The question really comes down to procurement codes and certainly we cannot violate those. If we find that procurement codes are going to create an obstacle to implement it quickly, I think we will bring that to the Board and that will be your decision as to whether you want to look at the ordinances over again. Again the critical link here is for the rest of the Riverwalk. The section on the Riverfront Foundation property is going to be fairly quick to do. The other links though, the critical part is getting the permits from the State and Federal agencies and in those cases it is going to have to be the City applying for those applications. There is just no way around that so

we have to get that done and we can use all the help we can get in getting that done quickly. It could be a year and a half just to permit some of those sections because they are in the regulatory flood way as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Alderman Wihby asked something like the train that we had all of those meetings for and never got anywhere. We had 55 agencies in one room one day and we still didn't have everybody there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. I did want to clarify one issue just so there was no misunderstanding. I know when the money was approved there was earmarked \$1.6 million City funds and \$500,000 of private funds. The Committee for awhile discussed the fact that the City money would not be triggered until the private money was committed. Now I don't believe the Committee or the full Board ever acted upon that discussion. I just wanted to make it clear that we are proceeding on the understanding that we can have access to the \$1.6 million. We will, of course, be trying to gain the \$500,000 but is that understood?

Chairman Reiniger replied yes.

Mr. Ramsey stated these reviews are a great idea to have us come in. If you want us to come in once every couple of months, it is a great idea. It keeps you apprised. I am excited to say and Alderman Wihby knows this that there is some potential gigantic developments on the riverfront that private developers want the Riverwalk to be involved in their buildings. The possibilities are fun and it is exciting. That is why we have to get something built.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Update on Enterprise Community Center project.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated as some of you might remember, the Neighborhood Center is a 6,500 square foot building being constructed on Lake Avenue between Pine and Union Street. The City, in conjunction with Neighborhood Housing Services, is undertaking that. Despite your typical construction problems, we actually hit water at 12 feet, which was a surprise, we are on schedule. We are on budget and we are looking at a completion time sometime this summer with programs beginning on or about September 1 so things are, if you drive by you will see a steel frame in place. It is ready just about for a mason to step onsite. There are a lot of rough things taking place inside. The roof is on. The windows are due to go in any time now. It is really going along pretty smoothly at this point.

Alderman Clancy asked what is the status of the club next door. Are we going to buy that or what?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered we have not, at this point, been able to come to agreement with that. The owner of the building took offense at our first offer. At this point it is up to the Committee if they want us to pursue it we can certainly do that.

Alderman Clancy stated they only paid \$1 for that building you know.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied I am not sure of that. I know the City Solicitor was involved back then and I thought it was a little bit more than that.

Alderman Clancy asked can we take it by eminent domain.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am always hesitant to use eminent domain as the last resort of any public process because it can be difficult for both the City and the owner. I assume and NHS has helped us out in the past in looking at acquiring critical pieces of property and we are still going to do that on that piece.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Brief update by the Director of Planning on expedited projects.

Mr. MacKenzie stated there are a few, as you know, several projects that we are trying to move along. There were 13 expedited projects. I am not going to talk about all those projects. Certainly we have already discussed the Riverwalk. Four of those were Airport projects which I don't have any updates on at this time. Most of the other expedited projects are underway. For example, Livingston Park and the Livingston Park Athletic Facility is under construction again and there has also been a meeting of a number of people to iron out the athletic facility in terms of the use, control, construction and exactly where it is located so I believe that is actually going along pretty well. Other projects, West Memorial Field, we are still shooting to get the building demolished. The U.S. Naval Reserve Facility, we have run into some issues with asbestos in the building but we are working on that. We are hoping to have the U.S. Marine Corps assist us at not cost on some of the grading later this summer. So the project has been delayed a little bit with certain environmental issues but is still underway. The other one I wanted to mention was the School Capital Improvement Program. That is actually funded a couple of key projects this year. The Memorial High School improvements. We have now received the bids. We are reviewing those bids and likely will be awarding that fairly soon. The School Capital Improvement Team is meeting tomorrow to go over those bids. Heating and ventilation at Central and West.

There are bids on that and we are looking to review those tomorrow and see if those are ready to go out to bid. There are also funds for the design of the Parkside addition and we will be meeting with the School Department and others to define the scope of that particular addition. So that comprises most of the funds in the School Capital Improvement Program. The other projects, I can provide an update later on. Most of those are underway. We are trying to hit the summer construction season as we had hoped. So that is just a very brief update of the expedited projects.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from the Tax Collector expressing her concerns regarding bathroom facilities in the new office at City Hall Annex.

Alderman Pariseau moved to refer this item to Mr. Brensinger, the architect. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated I think the Tax Collector stated her case pretty well in the letter and I certainly support what she would like to do. I don't know if we need to send it to the architect or if we can send a directive to the Special Building Committee or tell the Special Building Committee to do what she wants.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am part of the Special Building Committee, not the Chair but I am part of that group. Originally they did adopt a policy on bathrooms, internal bathrooms within departments and that is why one was not included for the Tax Collector. I think we are at the point of construction of City Hall and the Annex where it is critical to have a decision reached probably within the next couple of days. If the Committee is very serious about going along with the proposal or request of the Tax Collector, I think we would appreciate a decision fairly soon. We are extremely tight on money. We have been trying to make this project work without any additional funds. This would likely add in the order of \$7,500 to \$10,000 to the project. We are tight. I am not sure if we can make it but we can always give it a try. I cannot guarantee that we may not be back to get some additional small amount of funding if it gets down to the end.

Alderman Clancy stated we might as well get the thing done for the security of the woman working down there they would feel more at ease than with the bathrooms that are out in the corridor. For \$7,500 it is well worth it.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think it is foolish not to have a ladies room or a men's room on that main floor within the confines of their office.

5/19/98 CIP

13

Alderman Pariseau withdrew his motion.

Alderman Pariseau moved to take \$7,500 from contingency to put the bathroom in and to forward the request to the architect. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked is there a project contingency that these funds can be drawn from.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there is a project contingency and we are showing that contingency to go right down to the wire. I can't say whether there is going to be any funds left out of that contingency.

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

Alderman Girard asked will that go to the Board tonight given the time-line that Mr. MacKenzie has stated.

Chairman Reiniger answered yes we can bring that in tonight.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from the Public Works Director requesting that the Highway Department be allowed to choose eight of the recently replaced Fire and Police vehicles to replace eight of their existing vehicles which are 8 to 12 years old.

Alderman Clancy asked, Dick, how many cars are you going to have.

Mr. Houle answered between 13 and 17. There are approximately seven available now and we expect another six or seven or perhaps more this summer. Currently there are 22 used police cruisers in service at other departments, including the Highway Department.

Alderman Clancy asked and they are asking for eight.

Mr. Houle answered they currently have eight and they would like first pick of...

Alderman Clancy asked how do you generally do that.

Mr. Houle answered in the past generally it has been first come, first serve. I am suggesting that the Committee consider turning it over to my office as Fleet manager and to distribute the surplus vehicles in an equitable manner among all departments.

Alderman Pariseau asked why can't you take the older vehicles from Highway and give them the newer ones.

Mr. Houle asked do you have a list in front of you, Alderman. There are 22 older ones and as it stands, Highway got in here first.

Alderman Pariseau stated well it says there are 22 recycled cruisers according to this.

Mr. Houle replied that is correct. That is the list my office generated.

Alderman Pariseau asked plus these 22 so you have 44.

Mr. Houle answered no. These are all of them.

Alderman Pariseau stated they are not all cruisers.

Mr. Houle replied they are basically, they were old cruisers. These are old cruisers currently in service that have been recycled.

Alderman Wihby asked so we are talking about taking, out of these 22, taking some and giving them to Highway but there is not really 22 because I thought Police asked for some additional cruisers.

Mr. Houle answered that is why I am using the numbers 13 and 17.

Alderman Wihby asked, Chief, how many new cruisers did you want to keep on or how many new cruisers did you want to keep on out of the ones you were getting rid of because you had additional officers or something didn't you.

Chief Driscoll answered we presently have seven or have given seven back to the City to be recycled. We expect to receive 10 more. We would like to keep four of those and we have spoken with the Board before. Before that we will make a formal presentation sometime after July when we receive those vehicles but there certainly will be the initial seven and probably at least six more.

5/19/98 CIP

15

Alderman Wihby asked so 13 out of the 22 you want to keep. How many new cruisers are you getting?

Chief Driscoll answered we are getting seven. We have seven now and we have given seven to Dick. We expect to get 10 shortly after the first of July. We would like to give six to Dick and keep four of the old ones.

Alderman Wihby asked where does that come in this 22 number.

Mr. Houle answered that would be 13 vehicles and we would take those 13 and distribute them, replace the 13 worse out of the 22 here.

Alderman Wihby asked okay so the 22 is really 13 because they are taking additional cars.

Mr. Houle answered no. This is a separate list. These 22 vehicles are currently in service. They are used cruisers that have been around for a long time.

Alderman Wihby asked who has got them. Has he (Chief Driscoll) got them?

Mr. Houle answered no. These individual departments have them.

Alderman Girard moved to allow Mr. Houle to distribute the cars.

Alderman Wihby asked Chief Driscoll if this motion would affect him.

Chief Driscoll answered it doesn't bother us at all. Those seven, they can do anything they would like with them.

Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau stated I don't think a department head has to go begging to Mr. Houle. What is the responsibility of this Committee?

Alderman Girard replied the same as the old Transportation Committee. Basically Mr. Houle is the Fleet Manager and he has asked the Committee to give him the latitude to replace the cars that are most in need.

Alderman Pariseau stated say Mr. Thomas doesn't go along with Mr. Houle's way of doing business. Is this Mr. Houle's way to get back at Frank?

Alderman Girard replied no, I would hope not.

Alderman Pariseau stated well it could be.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. Alderman Pariseau being duly recorded in opposition, the motion carried.

Clerk Johnson asked for clarification on the motion. Is it going through the Fleet Advisory Group or is it going through Mr. Houle?

Alderman Girard answered it is going through the Fleet Manager.

Alderman Wihby asked the Fleet Manager is going to decide who gets what cars. What are you (Alderman Clancy) doing on your Committee? Nothing?

Alderman Clancy answered I am going to oversee it. Before he gives anybody a car he is going to contact me.

Alderman Wihby asked so before he gives cars he is going to talk to the Advisory Group. Are you on there?

Alderman Clancy answered I am Chairman.

Alderman Wihby asked is there more than one Alderman on that.

Chairman Reiniger asked to clarify the motion.

Alderman Girard answered the motion was to give Mr. Houle, as the Fleet Manager, the discretion to replace the vehicles that are in most dire need of being replaced throughout the City with the recycled cruisers.

Alderman Wihby asked what is the Advisory Committee going to do. Why can't the Advisory Committee decide who they are going to give cars to?

Alderman Clancy answered they can.

Alderman Wihby asked because he reports to you anyway.

Alderman Clancy answered yes.

Alderman Wihby asked then why don't you guys decide. Who is on there anyway?

5/19/98 CIP

17

Alderman Pariseau asked why doesn't it just go to public safety and MER. Why here?

Alderman Girard answered because this Committee took over the old Transportation Committee's duties. Fleet Advisory is supposed to develop the policies for new cars.

Alderman Wihby asked is there still a Fleet Advisory Committee. Made up of who?

Alderman Clancy asked Fred Rusczek, Frank Thomas, Dick Houle, me...

Alderman Wihby asked so why can't that Committee decide where the cars are going.

Alderman Clancy answered okay we will have a meeting.

Chairman Reiniger stated the motion does not send it to the Committee. It sends it to Mr. Houle.

Alderman Wihby changed his vote to no.

Chairman Reiniger stated maybe there was some confusion here. You (Alderman Wihby) want it sent to MER?

Alderman Wihby replied yes I would rather have Alderman Clancy decide who gets it.

Alderman Clancy withdrew his second to the motion.

Alderman Clancy moved to give the Fleet Advisory Committee to have the authority to disperse the cars. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. Alderman Girard being duly recorded in opposition, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Thomas Seigle, Chief Sanitary Engineer, requesting the Board find that the Cohas Brook Interceptor - Contract #2 is a "public need" and that permission be granted to acquire a temporary easement and permanent easement from the owners using eminent domain.

Alderman Pariseau moved to refer this to a Public Hearing.

Alderman Girard stated this was sent to a Public Hearing the night that it was referred here. Alderman Rivard pulled it off of the consent agenda.

Alderman Pariseau moved to table the item. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Randall Gustafson seeking information on purchasing the lot owned by the Manchester Tax Collector's Office known as the River Road property which is located near his property at 1371 North River Road.

Alderman Wihby asked is it a buildable lot or could it be a buildable lot.

Ms. Gardner answered the Gustafson's just purchased the property. The previous owners were going to purchase the property. Some of you may remember going through this and at the last minute the previous owner decided that we were asking too much money and he backed out. In the meantime, the Building Department had to remove a structure on there so there is extra expense the City has put into it. Normally what would happen in this case is it would go to the SPOT Committee. The SPOT Committee would then determine the assessment and all of that and then we would contact the Gustafson's.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to refer this item to the SPOT Committee.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Peter Kanteres, Chair of the Ward 2 Republican Committee, requesting construction of sidewalks on Mammoth Road between Kennard Road and Bridge Street be expedited.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, is this sidewalk project currently on the sidewalk list.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes it is. That is, I believe, to be going out to construction this summer. It is high on the list. I know those construction projects are getting ready.

Mr. Thomas stated that is correct. That project has been funded. There is a little bit more money that is needed out of the next budget but it is under design and it is going to construction this construction season and after the sidewalk work is done we intend on resurfacing that section of Mammoth Road out of our resurfacing budget.

Alderman Clancy asked where does Mammoth Road, between Lake Avenue and Nelson Street come in. That was high on the agenda too.

Mr. Thomas answered I don't know. I don't have a copy of the priority list in front of me.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that one was identified. I remember you had identified that. It is not near a school. This first year of construction was geared toward school walking routes. I think next year as we are going to come back to this Committee to again reprioritize, next year we were looking at high activity parks and that is where we are going to look at funding that particular sidewalk but it is not within the normal 1/3 to 1/4 mile radius of any of the schools.

Alderman Clancy stated but there is not a sidewalk on either side of the street there.

Mr. MacKenzie replied right, I do understand that.

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

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Communication from the Director of Planning on behalf of Federated Arts who are seeking "seed money" to start an e-mail newsletter noting if the Committee so desires, staff would review current cash funded projects for balances that may be available towards the end of the budget year.

Alderman Wihby moved the recommendation to review current cash balances.

Alderman Clancy asked how much money are you talking about.

5/19/98 CIP

20

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think it is \$5,250. We are not aware of any cash balances right now but we will track it and report back next time to the Committee.

Alderman Girard stated don't we already give Federated Arts \$5,000 a year out of the general fund.

Mr. MacKenzie replied they do not get any money out of the Community Improvement Program. They may get some out of civic contributions. I can't answer that one.

Alderman Girard stated I know they used to get \$5,000 but I believe...

Alderman Clancy asked they don't get any money whatsoever.

Mr. MacKenzie answered not out of CIP. They may out of...

Alderman Girard stated and I know that was taken away at some point but I thought it was reinstated in recent years.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I am not aware of the other funds, no.

Mr. Thomas stated unfortunately I didn't bring my budget book but I do know that it is under civic contributions. It is the same funding that was put in last year.

Alderman Girard asked which is \$5,000.

Mr. Thomas answered yes. It should be \$5,000 again.

Alderman Girard stated well we are already funding them \$5,000.

Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. Aldermen Girard and Pariseau being duly recorded in opposition, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Petition for Discontinuance of a portion of Kelly Avenue.
(Note: Solicitor's Office and Public Works Director recommend the petition be referred to the next road hearing. City Clerk suggests date of Wednesday, June 17, 1998.)

5/19/98 CIP

21

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to refer this item to a road hearing on June 17, 1998.

CONSENT AGENDA

14. Chairman Reiniger advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

Recommend Approval to BMA

- A. Request for sewer abatement at 207 Hall Street.
(Note: EPD recommends abatement in the amount of \$316.20.)
- C. An amending resolution and budget authorization allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of private developer funds totaling \$123,500 for the 1994 CIP 7.10227 South Willow Street Area Improvements Project.
- D. An amending resolution allowing for the acceptance and expenditure of additional grant funds for the Summer Youth Program - Cast in the amount of \$70,000.00 from the NH Job Training Council.
- E. An amending resolution and budget authorizations adding the 1998 CIP 6.10601 MNHS Acquisition Project ; and decreasing the 1998 CIP 6.10408 Elm Street Rehabilitation Project - \$300,000.00 HOME.
- F. An amending resolution and budget authorization adding the 1998 CIP 7.40204 Tougas Avenue Sewer Extension - \$100,000.00 Sewer Fees.

Informational to be Received and Filed

- G. Communication from the Industrial Agent advising that an application will be filed with the Economic Development Administration to apply for a grant of up to \$1,000,000 to be matched by an equal amount from local sources, to assist in the total renovation of property located at 1037 Elm Street.
- H. Communication from the Director of Planning advising that Rich Davis has requested a total of \$5,000 as a partial advance of the funds designated for the Summer Concert Series and tent set up.

HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN WIHBY, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN PARISEAU, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.

NEW BUSINESS

Letter from Assessor's Office requesting assistance with parking at the new City Hall.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee