

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

March 23, 1999

6:00 PM

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Reiniger, Wihby, Clancy, Pariseau, Girard

Messrs: F. Testa, Chief Driscoll, M. Bennett, Chief Kane, S. Thomas

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 3 o the agenda:

Communication from the Airport Director requesting that all present and upcoming Airport Master Plan implementation projects be consolidated into three projects.

Mr. Testa stated as we were adding to the Master Plan and as we developed the Master Plan, what we had done in order to get funding last year was just to put a CIP number on each little project. Some of them are small and some are rather big. When we did the new terminal building in 1994, we had one CIP number which made it much easier to keep the paperwork and a lot easier to transfer money between the components of that plan. At a meeting held with the City Planner, the City finance Officer and the Mayor's Office we talked about the difficulty in trying to keep records for 12 and if we kept this up we would probably have 20 different CIP projects all going at the same time. What we would like to do is consolidated it into three projects. One being airfield development, all the runways, taxiways, runway drainage, the electrical, all the new lighting for the runway, etc. That would be in one CIP project called Airfield Development. The second is Land Site Development meaning the terminal building, the roadways, all the things that are off the airfield and the third one would be the garage because it has to do with different types of bonds. They are taxable bonds in the garage, a percentage of them are, whereas the bonds on the airfield are not taxable. In addition, the paperwork created for the Planning Department is quite extensive in that when we get a grant from the Federal government, it may be \$6 million or \$8 million or \$9 million. In that are portions of five or six different CIP projects and we have to take out those portions and place them here with other grants of money from different places and its very, very hard to keep track of. What we are asking for is really to simplify the

process. It will create less paperwork for City Planning and certainly will create less paperwork for the airport.

Alderman Pariseau moved to approve this request. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion

Alderman Clancy asked could you tell us whether the facilities are going to be in Londonderry or Manchester.

Mr. Testa answered some are in Manchester and some are in Londonderry.

Alderman Clancy asked for a definition.

Mr. Testa answered Airfield Development Runway 6/24 is mostly in Manchester. The bottom half is in Londonderry. Runway 17/35, it goes north/south and that is about half and half in Londonderry and Manchester. The City line goes right through there. The garage is all in Londonderry. The roadway development, part of Kelly Avenue is in Manchester. Part of Kelly Avenue is in Londonderry. North Perimeter Road is all in Manchester. The entrance road into the airport would go from Manchester into Londonderry and into the airport. What other projects are part of that? All of the wetland development is in Londonderry. The Cohas Brook with the tunnel and the cover is in Londonderry.

Alderman Clancy asked are you going to put a bridge across that.

Mr. Testa answered no we didn't put a bridge across that brook, we tunneled it. It is going underneath the new runway extension. The garage extension that we are asking for here tonight is...I'm sorry the bridge is in Londonderry. Some of the projects that have been built like the Wiggins new terminal that is in Manchester. That \$7 million facility is all in Manchester.

Alderman Clancy asked and the fuel tanks are going to be in Londonderry, right.

Mr. Testa answered right.

Alderman Clancy asked they are going to be above ground right.

Mr. Testa answered yes. The airport has a rule of no more in ground fuel tanks for several reasons. One is the environmental concern of DES, EPA and every other environmental organization doesn't like tanks in the ground. Secondly, whether they be steel tanks or fiberglass tanks, they also have the possibility of splitting and/or rupturing. Our present fuel tank is in the ground and we are going to take that out.

Alderman Clancy asked they generally bunker those, don't they.

Mr. Testa answered sometimes, yes, but you don't have to. If you have double wall construction and you pressure test and you have a constant pressure gauge, you don't have to bunker it. The above ground tanks do bunker. They are on cement skids that hold the fuel and most of the airports today are going to above ground tank systems. We pump so much fuel on a daily basis that they are constantly loading it. Right now at the airport we pump about 80,000 gallons a day with a capacity of 100,000 which means that these tank trucks are in there all day long just pumping and pumping. That tank is constantly flexing and we don't want to take the chance underground so it will above ground. Not only that but since the terminal building and the cargo development is on the Londonderry side, that is where the fuel tanks want to be, as close as they possibly can to the uses where all of the airplanes are.

Alderman Clancy stated a few years ago we had a major leak down there which ran into the sewer system.

Mr. Testa replied we haven't had a leak since I have been there, but yes, you are right. We are trying to prevent that. The U.S. Airforce came back just before I got here in 1991 and removed a lot of underground tanks and did a lot of remediation on soils because of what had leaked but on occasion we still run into the odd pipe or two and one odd tank that we didn't know was there when we started digging. That is normal with all ex-military fields. Mr. Chairman, the proper resolutions and numbers will be done by my friend here on the right after I leave. He will do the proper resolutions for the Board.

Alderman Clancy asked what is the actual figure, total monies.

Mr. Testa asked that we are spending on the airport. Total of the Master Plan?

Alderman Clancy stated these three here.

Mr. Testa replied not these three; we are taking all 12 projects that are about \$135 or \$140 million into three big projects rather than 12 separate projects.

Alderman Clancy asked over how many years.

Mr. Testa answered over about eight years.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote on the motion to consolidate all present and upcoming Airport Master Plan projects into three projects. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from the Airport Director requesting authorization for funding of \$12 million for continuation of the Airport Master Plan implementation.

Mr. Testa stated this is a further addition. Remember I was before you previously for actual bonds for specific projects. This is just asking for authorization for funding. It means borrowing for these projects. How specifically will be up to the Finance Department. It may be a piggyback on a City GO that we would be responsible for paying our portion of. It may be going out to a local consortia of banks for a loan or it may be a standard loan bond although I rather doubt that. \$12 million is a very, very small amount for a standard loan bond. Those three projects are as follows. As you know, we are building the garage at the airport and that is a rather large facility, 4,800 spaces of which rental cars have rented the whole entire first floor to help us pay the bill on the parking garage itself. The rest of the five floors are public parking spaces, approximately 4,000 spaces. The rental car companies came up with an idea that they would like to pay for. They are not coming up with the cash up front. They would like to help pay for or pay for a bridge to get from the garage, which is about 520' to 550' into the terminal building. If any of you have been to some of the other cold weather airports, they usually have these kinds of bridges connecting the terminal building with the garage. This particular bridge will be totally enclosed. That means we have to have HVAC systems and life support systems like sprinklers enclosed in there also brings up the cost. Also, it will be all finished. It will not be just a concrete walkway. It will be all finished with the terminal finishes and it will have moving sidewalks. Those four sidewalks, moving sidewalks will cost about \$3 million installed. They are not cheap, but the rental car companies have come forward and said we would do it for our customers so they can go from the garage into the terminal and from the terminal into the garage without having to walk outside. That would be about \$7 million. The rental car companies have agreed to pay for this by way of a rental car facility charge called CFC and that car facility charge will start being charged sometime in June/July. It will be about \$1.25 per day per rental car which would raise about \$900,000 a year which would be more than enough to pay for this facility and it is a facility that everyone can enjoy, not just the rental car companies but everybody who uses the garage and I think at \$12 to \$13 a day for the garage, it will be one of the cheapest garages in the northeast also.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. Testa, the rental car companies have they expanded their fleets yet.

Mr. Testa answered oh yes, quite a bit.

Alderman Girard asked do you expect that they are going to continue to expand their fleets.

Mr. Testa answered yes I do.

Alderman Girard asked do you have any idea by how many more cars.

Mr. Testa answered there are probably 2,500 cars out there now. They will be reflecting soon. What they did was they brought in, this past Fall when the big push came they brought in cars from all over the place that were already registered.

Alderman Girard asked so those cars were registered here.

Mr. Testa answered some of them were and some of them weren't. I would expect, in fact the contract calls for once a year in June for them to reflect and they must reflect 100% of their fleet. 50% in Manchester and 50% in Londonderry.

Alderman Girard asked in June, Mr. Testa, how many cars do you expect will be registered.

Mr. Testa answered 1,500.

Alderman Girard asked total.

Mr. Testa answered 1,500 in Londonderry and 1,500 in Manchester.

Alderman Girard asked so 3,000 cars all together.

Mr. Testa answered I would think that is about right, yes. Maybe a little bit more than that.

Alderman Girard asked and how many right now are fleeted in Manchester.

Mr. Testa answered I don't have that number. By the way, they have a contract with us that absolutely requires them once a year to report their total number of cars and the total number registered and they have to show all the plates and all of the cars that are registered. That will be coming up in June and by then they will have reflected their whole fleet. They understand that otherwise they would be in default and owe us lots of money.

Alderman Girard asked and the 1,500 that you expect would be registered here in the City is a significant increase over what is registered now.

Mr. Testa answered yes. In fact when I got here I think they had 200 cars registered.

Alderman Girard moved to approve the request to fund \$7 million for a pedestrian bridge between the garage and terminal. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Testa stated the next project is a fuel farm project. The old fuel farm at the airport is on the old Stead site and it is underground. We had just bought that facility from Wiggins to allow them to move and build a brand new facility on the other side of the field. Right now, it has a capacity of 100,000 gallons a day and we are pumping about 80,000 gallons a day of fuel at the airport. In one recent day about two and a half weeks ago they pumped actually 105,000 gallons so this means you have these big tanker trucks all day long coming into the airport. What we are trying to do is get away from that kind of running fuel in on a daily basis because if there was an accident on the highway or an overturned vehicle and we were running short of fuel, we would be at their mercy and they couldn't get into the airport with it. Not only that, but also this is a fuel farm that will be built entirely with private money from Wiggins. It is \$2.5 million. We had to have an appraisal done of some property that we looked at. We met very preliminary with the owners of that property and told them what their numbers were. We will meet with them again and see if we can't come to an agreement pretty quickly. The numbers, I think, are fair. All we have to do is work on terms. They will be offered property right on the JA side of the field next to Wiggins in that area to build new corporate hangars. It will allow Wiggins to build about a \$2.5 million facility which would have a modern 200,000 gallon capacity fuel farm with expansion possibilities of 300,000 gallons when and if needed. This would also be paid back by a lease back to Wiggins so we wouldn't be using any funds other than airport generated funds.

Alderman Girard moved to approve the request to fund \$2 million for a new fuel farm at the airport. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the request. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Testa stated the third project, Mr. Chairman, is a site that we had never intended to take or to move and we had some preliminary drawings of the new road into the airport off of Brown Avenue. Because we have changed that configuration to meet with the airport access road of the D.O.T., if you remember at the hearing many people didn't want intersections where the access road hit

Brown Avenue; they wanted an overpass. Our access road was way north of that. We have moved that quite a bit further south now and our access road now becomes an access road into the airport. It becomes an access road into the industrial area or the cargo area and it also becomes an on-ramp for the D.O.T., which eliminates the need for ramps on Brown Avenue. They don't have to take any more homes in that area between the two numbers of people who are residents in that area and all it does is have an overpass at Brown Avenue at that point. We accomplished several things with this new alignment. It is not quite there yet. We have engineering drawings that have sort of put it in the general locale, but again we are asking for the authorization for another \$3.5 million. That doesn't mean we will borrow it. It is for negotiations that are ongoing with the property owner. We actually have two ways...I hope to have that done in another 10 days or so...there are two roads to take here. One would be less expensive than the other road and we are simultaneously pursuing both of those roads. It may be that we have to buy out this one particular area and move him down a little bit or we could work some land swaps and things with land that we own in the area and this is a public meeting and I would rather not go into details. It does involve some property acquisition and it is something that we had not planned on before but it actually comes in and does a better job than what we had planned originally. We can slide the road a little bit south and combine it with the onramp of D.O.T. and, therefore, release some pressure for people who live south of Manchester to have two major intersections before they get into the City.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to approve the request to fund \$3.5 million for the new roadway entrance to the airport.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Resolution:

“A Resolution Approving the Community Improvement Program for 2000, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefor and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program.”

Alderman Pariseau moved to approve the Resolution as amended per Alderman Wihby. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion for discussion.

Chairman Reiniger asked Alderman Wihby to explain his rationale.

Alderman Wihby stated as you all know, we had a presentation yesterday from people who wanted different things and some of the Aldermen had concerns about different projects. What I have done is taken those recommendations from other Aldermen and put them together on this piece of paper. Basically, we are going to have the police concept of a new facility coming up later, but this is saying that we are going to go forward with a new police station. The reason why that assumption is made is because we can take out \$1 million out of the new police station. If we were going to fix the old one up we would need the money ahead of time or earlier than if we were going to build a new one and have the design work and everything. By doing that, we are saying that we are in favor of a new police station and at the same time all the rest of these items can go through and we will have a discussion with the Police Chief in a few minutes. The first item there is \$1 million savings from the police station. This is all based also on the assumption of the Mayor's budget that he had done for CIP. Everything that the Mayor had put in the CIP including these items so whatever was in the budget, including the volunteer and all that other stuff is all still in here and these are additional items to those numbers. It adds \$100,000 for Precourt Park, \$150,000 for Prouts Park, \$100,000 for Livingston Park. It adds \$75,000 for the playground improvements to Green Acres School. The \$700,000 basically is a new number. The Mayor had put in \$1.2 million for the Riverwalk/Downtown parking. This plan would keep the \$1.2 million in there and also increases the Downtown parking. What I have done in there is earmarked reconfiguration of the Seal Tanning Lot, maximizing existing parking on street (Commercial Street, Bedford Street, Arms Street), develop, including planning, acquisition, design and construction of a possible parking facility in the southern portion of the Millyard and planning and preliminary design for possible parking decks. In that \$700,000, it takes a lot of planning to be done. That is why that number is kind of big and also whatever work we can do in the meantime to help the downtown as far as parking goes, that number is an addition. It also funds an extra \$75,000 for the Weston Road/Jewett Street intersection. It earmarks \$100,000 for the Central High Practical Arts Auditorium, \$150,000 for replacing the Northwest School roof and hopefully we will get our money back on that, and it also earmarks \$150,000 for the West High Auditorium and that will be subject to the School Board approving that. I understand that they have some concerns about doing that. The money is there and if they want to get it done, we will have the money to do it. It takes another \$100,000 and puts it under the Somerville Fire Station but basically that \$100,000 is for design work and buying the land for the Bodwell Road Fire Station and I would assume that the following year Bodwell Road would get their fire station and it would start being built the following year.

Alderman Pariseau asked are we stealing from the Somerville Fire Station.

Alderman Wihby answered no, this is an additional \$100,000 and that \$100,000 is basically doing design work and buying the property for Boswell Road. So Somerville will get done and in the meantime we will be designing the Bodwell Road station and buying the land for Bodwell Road. That \$100,000 is enough to do that.

Alderman Pariseau asked so we are not taking \$100,000 out of the original amount for the Somerville Fire Station.

Alderman Wihby answered no. That \$100,000 is going into the Somerville Fire Station account and adding \$100,000 to take care of Bodwell Road problems. We heard from the Assessors that they want to do a revaluation. I talked to them and they can live with the \$600,000 over five years to do that. The final payment won't be due until the following year so it assumes that we do revaluation in two years but it puts in \$600,000 for revaluation and I am also assuming, because one of the items that came up was paving, I am assuming that we are going to again as we did in the last three or four years take \$250,000 out of Rooms & Meals. If we do that, resurfacing will be \$900,000 this year. Last year it was \$850,000. It is additional money. The second page is cash items. It funds the St. Joseph's Community Service for \$30,000, gives \$10,000 for some extra things that have to be done at Youngsville and Stevens Park. It also funds \$50,000 for the extra van so that they can purchase three and the lift so that is \$50,000 for those two items. \$15,000 for the van and \$35,000 for the lift. When you take all of that into consideration, on the third page what that does is it assumes that it is the same tax rate. The bonding will be the same affect on the tax rate as this year's number is. It is actually half a cent more but it is also a third of a cent less in cash so the net result is basically \$5,000 off on the total budget. Basically the same net affect for bonding on the City tax base. It accomplishes all of those other items that the Mayor had and I think the CIP plan was...I think the Mayor did a great job with it. I think there are a lot of items in there that people wanted and got and should stay in the Mayor's CIP part but there was also...these were the ones that some of the Aldermen were concerned with and some of the ones that we heard the other night.

Chairman Reiniger stated I have a question about the School Capital Improvement Program adding \$150,000 for the reconstruction of the roof at Northwest elementary School. Now in the Mayor's budget it referred to repair of the roof at Northwest School.

Alderman Wihby answered my understanding is we were afraid that we weren't going to have enough money for Hallsville and Wilson because it was going to cost more money to do the roof at Northwest because that was just fixing it and we needed a new roof so we put the additional money in to put on a whole new roof.

Alderman Clancy asked what about the one at Wilson.

Alderman Wihby answered that has to be done too.

Alderman Pariseau asked that \$150,000 for Northwest we have the ability to recoup.

Alderman Wihby answered yes. If we recoup it, fine, but that is not included in the figuring here. We have to get it done.

Alderman Pariseau asked if we recoup that money, where would it go.

Alderman Wihby answered I imagine it would go to the general fund.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it would be up to the Board whether to send it to the general fund or put it back into the School Capital Improvement Program.

Alderman Girard stated regarding the Northwest School, I have the great honor of sitting on the Joint School Buildings Committee and we don't need to put an entire new roof there. There was a special fire treated wood that was used in two sections of the building and the recommendation is that we replace those entire sections of roof, however, I just want to know where the \$150,000 number came from because at the Joint School Buildings Committee meeting there were no numbers.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we do not have final cost estimates yet. We do have numbers that were originally put together by Mr. Houle. They have been reviewed by Frank Thomas and his crew at the Highway Department. We are looking at a potential of maybe \$300,000 for the Northwest School roof. It could be slightly less than that but \$300,000 is a conservative number. Now that is a little higher than some of the first numbers we had heard and that is why the additional \$150,000 was suggested. Actually after meeting with the Highway Department I had suggested that \$150,000 be added to make sure that we could do that. The time frame is extremely tight if we want Northwest to re-open next fall.

Alderman Girard asked so this \$150,000 then is not intended to cover the entire project. It is intended to make sure that the entire project can be done.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is correct.

Chairman Reiniger stated I know that Alderman Girard has talked about the parking issues in the Millyard and the decks and so forth. Does this refer to some of the things you had in mind?

Alderman Girard replied it does, but I don't know to what degree. I don't mean to be vague here and I certainly appreciate the effort that Alderman Wihby has put into developing this but I came prepared with some questions tonight that I would still like to ask. I think when it comes to Millyard parking there are some areas here that have been addressed but I don't know that it addresses a lot more than what is currently in the Mayor's budget for what was envisioned for parking to begin with. As I understand the conversations I had with the Planning Director, the \$1.2 million or so that the Mayor had recommended for the Millyard was basically to be split 50/50 between the Riverwalk development and the parking. So, if we are dedicating \$700,000 we are really just adding another \$100,000 to Millyard parking and I have a number of concerns that perhaps the City is not moving quickly enough to address the problems of parking in the Millyard and I think if we are to move quickly anywhere it should be to make sure that the infrastructure of that area keeps up the demand on its capacity. Perhaps Mr. MacKenzie could tell us specifically, and I realize that Alderman Wihby has done it here in a general sense, what the Mayor intended to do with parking in the Millyard and how Alderman Wihby's proposal improves on that and if Alderman Wihby would like to speak to how his proposal improves on that, that would be fine too.

Alderman Wihby replied first of all, it was \$1.2 million that was earmarked for Riverfront Development/Millyard. What I have done is broken it out to assure that we are going to look at the parking problem downtown. That was the first step. I wasn't aware that the \$600,000 was going into parking. I thought it was closer to \$840,000 or so.

Alderman Girard responded the Planning Director told me it was about 50/50, which is why I am asking this question.

Alderman Wihby stated well when you have it in one account, it can \$1.2 million and \$0 so that is why we broke it out into two accounts.

Alderman Girard replied I do not argue that, Alderman, however I am still interested in the specifics as to how the dedicated \$700,000 is different than the anticipated \$600,000.

Alderman Wihby responded I don't know. If it was an anticipated \$600,000, I don't know.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I don't think it is significantly different. Again, I think there is a plan before us that we are reviewing now that was by Amoskeag Industries. I think it is reasonably well laid out. We know what we have to do. There are a number of steps that have to be taken though and a number of those steps we plan on doing over the next year. I don't see any, what I call heavy construction, within the next 12 months from this point in terms of a deck or parking garage. There are, if you go down and look at the Millyard today, a couple of hundred spaces that are not utilized on any particular given day although many of the spaces are leased. We do want to stay ahead of the curve though and I think this particular list spells out those key items. Again, the Amoskeag Industries Plan had three tiers of improvements. One, what are quick fixes in terms of looking at and maximizing on street parking and starting to look at some of the off site spaces and improving those. The second tier they talked about decks and reconfiguring lots and the third tier, which is longer term in terms of major garages. There are still some questions that are unanswered. The State has been very interested in a particular site and they might want to co-develop a site that would then save us quite a bit of money. We are in some discussions with the State. They had been very cooperative along with the Southern NH Planning Commission. That makes pinning down exact numbers fairly difficult at this time. We do need a little bit more flexibility so we can give you better numbers within the next four to five months. Clearly there are some specific things that we do want to do. Seal Tanning Lot for example we do want to reconfigure that lot to maximize spaces in there. It has been proposed that the Seal Tanning building be redeveloped and that would be a major redevelopment in the Millyard so we have to attack that one fairly quickly so that it is consistent and concurrent with the private development.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, is there a difference between doing things like planning and preliminary design and getting engineering studies underway. I guess my concern here is that, and I understand your desire to take things in steps and be cautious in your planning, however I think the situation in the Millyard while you alluded to a couple of hundred spaces that may be vacant at any one given time, having recently had an office in the Millyard I can tell you that there are some mill building owners down there like the owners of the Waumbec Mill that have a full building and they are having to make arrangements...I mean the arrangements that they are having to make for parking and still not being able to supply the parking are incredible. There was a front page article in the *Union Leader* with a business owner watching an employee walk from one of the parking spaces of which he has 20 too few. We read about companies like EPE leaving the City because they cannot find parking in the Millyard. I am concerned that we are not being aggressive enough for our caution

and want to know what other steps we can take now to be as aggressive as we can possibly be because I don't see it in this budget.

Mr. MacKenzie replied again if I could review with you the scenario in the Millyard, yes, in terms of leasing spaces immediately adjacent to the building, certain buildings not having much site area are fairly tight and yet there are opportunities. For example, Stark Landing parking area is typically vacant. That is 200 parking spaces. You might have 150 vacant spaces at any time in the Arms Lot. The Bedford Lot, which ultimately is committed to UNH but in the near term is available, is probably 100 spaces. The Myrna Lot probably has close to 100 spaces. There are 150 spaces available in the Wall Street towers that the City could lease to any interested party. Available right now through proper management is probably over 500 parking spaces.

Alderman Girard stated you touched on a couple of lots. I see that you want to do a redesign of the Seal Tanning lot so you can maximize the space there and you mentioned the Bedford Street lot. As you and I and others have discussed, for example, Seal Tanning is an ideal candidate for decks so as part of this money are we going to be taking a look at designing and getting the engineering done so that in the future we are ready to put in the decks? We have talked about the Bedford Street lot and the possibility of digging into the hill there so that you can build parking into the slope to create spaces in addition to going up from where it is now. Are we taking the steps that we need to do the design and engineering that we need to do so that when the time comes to do we don't have to say well we have to get the planning done and we have to get the engineering studies ready and it is going to take us a construction season to do that and we will have to put it off another year? What am I getting for this \$600,000 or \$700,000? It doesn't seem to me that I am getting or that the City is getting what it needs to quickly construct those facilities when the time comes to construct them and frankly, Mr. MacKenzie, I think the time to be constructing things like that is already here and I don't see us in any way ahead of the curve for parking in the Millyard. I don't see us ahead of the curve, I don't see us on the curve, I see us behind the curve looking for a desperate opportunity to get caught up. I just don't see the types of things that I think need to be done here. Granted, they are all steps in the right direction but I don't think they come far enough fast enough.

Chairman Reiniger stated I think the question is does this amount of money accommodate the planning and engineering work that is necessary for future building of decks. It mentions planning and preliminary design for possible parking decks. I don't know if that is a big deck or a triple decker garage. Maybe that is to be determined.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think the logical location for a deck is, for example, the Myrna Lot. That is a three-tier lot right now that could relatively easily be decked. I think we could initiate the planning and design for that type of deck and be prepared for when the Myrna Building fully leases out and for when the adjacent Jefferson Mill then starts to pick up. I think clearly we will be ahead of the curve on that particular site. The only time that that lot comes even close to being full is during special evenings when Fratellos is there. I think clearly we can be ahead of the curve on the Myrna Lot. The Bedford Street Lot which is committed in the near term to UNH I think is a potential logical site for a parking garage if needed in the future, but again there are still spaces in garages available to lease. There are 150 spaces available for anybody to lease in the Wall Street Towers facility as of today. The Seal Tanning Lot I think we have to look at. There is a potential for a deck there and I think we have to design the reconfiguration to support a deck, but in the long term I think we have to really evaluate whether we want a deck in that particular location, particularly if we have a very high quality renovation of the Seal Tanning building you do not want to obscure a major part of that building. We will be looking at that to see what the potential impact is of a deck on that particular lot on the Seal Tanning building.

Chairman Reiniger asked have you been in close contact with the building owners down there in terms of phasing in the long term and short term and the timing issues and their needs.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes; we have been in discussion, either myself or Jay Taylor the Economic Development Director or others including the Riverwalk Team like Peter Ramsey. I know that we have discussed the Seal Tanning Lot. Those applicants have been in to speak with the Mayor and myself and they have some reservations about a deck on that particular site. I think we can still look at it. We do need some reconfigurations to maximize the parking spaces there and we can look at whether or not a deck can be built there and still suit the needs of the abutter.

Alderman Clancy asked, Mr. MacKenzie, this \$700,000 is this a quick fix or is this going to take care of the whole Millyard.

Mr. MacKenzie answered this is an initial step. Clearly in the long-term we may need a parking garage and parking garages can be very expensive. We may be looking for other sources to fund a parking garage.

Alderman Clancy asked are we also going to be having some satellite parking for the civic center down here eventually.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes, I think a site is mentioned here in the southern part of the Millyard that I think would be ideally located as a satellite parking lot for the civic center. There is actually a fairly short walk up to the proposed civic center site and it would make a logical connection, also to an area, which I think is ripe for redevelopment and that is the West Depot Street/Franklin Street area.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, you mentioned the Myrna Lot. My understanding is that the Fratellos building, for lack of a better term, the people who own that building, the McDonoughs do they not now lease all of the spaces in the Myrna Lot.

Mr. MacKenzie answered they do not lease all of the spaces and I would defer to Mr. Taylor.

Alderman Girard asked do they have right of first refusal on them.

Mr. MacKenzie answered they have a set number and I believe that number is 45 spaces that they have a right of refusal on. There are roughly 140 spaces in that lot so they have a right of first refusal on only a portion of that.

Alderman Girard stated I can tell you that having had an office in the Jefferson Mill, one of the big problems in trying to redevelop that space is having no parking up in that end of the Millyard. As to the deck at Seal Tanning, my understanding and I just confirmed this with Mr. Clark is that the only problem or issue they had to putting a deck there was how would the City offset the loss of parking they would suffer during the construction of that deck, not that they were worried about the aesthetics or anything else along that line. Saying that you have aesthetic reservations in putting a parking deck there, and Mr. Clark was among those who helped me pull together a parking proposal for that area of the Millyard which included parking decks, comes as something as a surprise to me and I wonder why it is you feel that way.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I did have discussions with Mr. Clark and if he would like to come up and perhaps clarify those I know that early on in our discussions he did have some reservation especially where they have a ground floor that they want to lease to restaurants and perhaps other retail shops, he did not want a high imposing structure on the Seal Tanning lot that might block that from Commercial Street so I did take that under advisement and I think that is something we can work on when we get into redesign of the lot. He needs a specific number of spaces to make Seal Tanning work and we were developing an approach to make sure that we can hit that number because we want that building, actually those couple of buildings, redeveloped.

Alderman Girard responded I agree with that and I would hope that we would build enough parking too so that the folks who own the Waumbec building that are also dying from lack of parking would be able to make use of that also. I know it is a tricky issue and something has got to give somewhere, but this gets back to what my problem with this is and that is are we being aggressive enough and are we taking the steps that we need to with this budget to insure that as much design and planning and engineering can be done so that we can construct things sooner rather than later.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I believe this is the correct approach to take. Sometimes, some people would like to overreact and get things done quickly but in the long term, 20 years down the line when you look back and say did we do the right job and did we do it the right way sometimes you do have to spend the additional time to do it correctly and that is the approach here. I believe it is the correct approach. I think we are all excited about the Millyard redevelopment and we have a number of people who have worked very ambitiously to get it done correctly.

Chairman Reiniger stated, Alderman Girard, in the language do you want to specify design for decks at the Seal Tanning building and Myrna Lot. Right now it is not specified.

Alderman Girard replied no it is not, Mr. Chairman, and my concern is that even if we were to specify what we wanted to see done, we have no idea what any of it would cost and we have no idea whether or not the money that is allocated would be adequate to that. This is not the first conversation that I have had with Mr. MacKenzie about this so it is a little frustrating that I am having it again here in public. We can specify all we want but if the money is not there to do it and if by doing it we leave something else out that we need to leave out, like I said I don't think that this number does what we need it to do.

Chairman Reiniger stated the thing is, as I understand it, we would in this season hopefully budget to have the engineering and planning work done so that in the next budget it could be funded to be built.

Alderman Wihby replied that is what the intention of this is. Planning and preliminary design and discussion about the Millyard and they have \$700,000 to do it with. The following year, they would fund anything that came out of the study or design work. Along with that they are going to be doing some reconfiguration and maximize parking downtown. Other than giving \$6 million and saying spend it any way you want and we don't have it and raising the tax rate, this was the best that could be done and what I was told was needed to do the planning and preliminary design for the Millyard. That is why that number is there. Who knows if it is enough or not but it is a good start. I agree that

downtown needs more parking but it is not going to be done overnight and it is not going to be done unless we study something and design something.

Chairman Reiniger stated I do know a bit of a wild card here which is the Claremont issue and that ties into the tax increment-financing district. I understand that people looking at this issue are hoping to have that as a major part of funding revenue.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it was an idea and I think it is perhaps a good idea for the long-term, but I have reviewed it with the Finance Officer and we are both very concerned that in the next 12 months the Claremont decision could have a major impact on tax increment financing, both existing and proposed. So for the next 12 months I think we are going to hold our reservations on any kind TIF's in the Millyard.

Alderman Girard stated just to get to the issue of cost, I have the Amoskeag Industries Parking Study here and while we are talking about the issues of decks I just want to throw some numbers out and this is why I have some concerns because even though we may not spend the money in this fiscal year, as you know in the CIP process we can appropriate it and those funds don't last once they are appropriated as bonds, but the Bedford Street deck anticipated in this study would cost \$1.5 million. A Seal Tanning Lot deck would cost \$2 million. A Van Wick deck, which I guess would be up at the Jefferson Mill, would be \$800,000. A Myrna Lot deck would be \$1,140,000. The Langer Learner deck down at the southern end would be \$1.3 million. Seal Tanning building deck would be another \$1.3 million. The Granite Street Lot deck would be \$800,000. I mean there is almost \$9 million worth of potential parking down here and I am not saying that we should run out and build \$9 million of parking and not have an organized plan to do it, but if you take a look at this budget and what we are being asked to do we can come up with the planning money and all that fun stuff now which is something that we definitely should do. I am still not convinced that \$700,000 is going to do the planning and design that needs to be done for all of this construction but that having been said we are going to run ourselves right into FY2001 with an \$8 million appropriation for a brand new police station and I can tell you that if we are going to make a commitment this year to start construction of a police station something tells me that the parking improvements we need to do in the downtown, knowing that \$8 million of the general fund bonding obligation capacity is going to be eaten up if we make a commitment to a police station this year, I have a feeling that parking in the Millyard or parking in the downtown which is something that we really need to do because it generates tax base value by enabling property owners to fill their buildings with businesses and tenants is going to be put on the back shelf. That is a real concern here because in the end the actions that we should be taking are those designed to improve the

value of the tax base. If we are not going to take a real serious look at appropriating some money to put some of these projects in the works this year and I mean beyond plan, these are going to end up on the back shelf and the revival we have going on in the Millyard is going to choke on its own success because it has nowhere to go.

Chairman Reiniger stated I share your concern that the parking not be put on the back burner. I guess what we have to assess here is whether more money is needed or this amount does honestly push it forward. Now one of the major building owners representatives is here who we may like to hear from, Mr. Clark. They, of course, are engaged in some of the more aggressive construction work down there at the Seal Tanning Building. The issue, Mr. Clark, is what is currently being proposed is a phased-in approach and how does that meet your needs. Is it acceptable or not?

Mr. Clark asked the phased-in approach for the redevelopment of Seal Tanning or the phased in approach for the parking.

Chairman Reiniger answered the phased-in approach for the parking.

Mr. Clark stated I will preface all of my remarks by saying that I am very pleased that we are discussing it, but if you read the Amoskeag Industries report and go back and study some work that was done in 1984 and you will see without exception that all of these suggestions came up in 1984. We haven't made a whole lot of progress on that front. Certainly, all of this stuff needs to be designed properly. The disagreement about what my thought is as far of the decks on Seal Tanning, you are both right. If properly designed, it would be a good amenity to the extent that you can capitalize on a number of parking spaces. We don't, however, want to put some butt ugly structure up there that is going to shield the view of a historic rehabbed building so to the extent that you can do it aesthetically, it should be done. When you consider putting parking lot decks up, you need to consider the number of cars that are currently utilizing the lot on which you wish to deck because you have to off shoot those people somewhere.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. Clark given that you have not yet renovated the Seal Tanning building and I don't know what your schedule to do that is, if the City were going to build what you would call an aesthetically pleasing deck in that area, should it do it before you have tenants then.

Mr. Clark answered it would have to be done before we could get one. In fact, we have had considerable conversations with a major out-of-state tenant that the City would be proud to have in that building and they said there are three problems with that proposal. Parking, parking and parking.

Alderman Girard stated I don't think we are ahead of the curve, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Clark, what is the assessed value of the Seal Tanning building currently.

Mr. Clark answered including the Gateway building which has been rehabbed, we will call them Gateway I, II and III since the middle section has now been demolished, is \$1.9 million.

Alderman Girard asked if you were to renovate that structure, the Seal Tanning structure top to bottom for any client, could you give us an idea of what the assessed value of the Seal Tanning building would be including Gateway.

Mr. Clark answered in round numbers I would say you would probably triple it.

Alderman Clancy asked, Mr. Clark, what do you intend to do with that building anyway right now the way it stands.

Mr. Clark asked what portion are we talking about.

Alderman Clancy replied the burned down area.

Mr. Clark asked the one that we took down. It was demolished and we are going to create some parking there and maybe a couple of other amenities that Mr. MacKenzie and I have discussed and his staff was kind enough to design some amenities they would like to see built.

Alderman Clancy asked that empty lot there, could that be a parking garage.

Mr. Clark answered I would prefer not to see it as a garage simply because we didn't think in our mind that there were enough spots that you could actually see the river.

Alderman Clancy asked you want to keep that space for a view.

Mr. Clark answered we would like to see a view as you come down Cote Street there you can see the river now as of a week ago and we think that looks a whole lot better than what was there before. Not to say that we wouldn't consider potentially putting a parking garage there but I think you would block some views that, if you really wanted to use your foresight, if Pandora were to be rehabbed perhaps as residential one of the nice amenities that you now have is that all of the windows on the west side of that building can now see the river somewhere. If you put a parking garage in there, you will block that view for at least some of those units.

Chairman Reiniger asked are there current plans to develop the Seal Tanning building or is it totally hinging on the parking.

Mr. Clark answered we have proposals before a major tenant and they are in consideration of those right now that would have them occupying it. They have a drop dead date as far as occupancy would be concerned of May of next year. So if we are to rehab it for that tenant or at least for them to be the major occupant, we would have to have it done in a year.

Chairman Reiniger asked, Mr. MacKenzie, how many parking spaces could be added by your phased in approach.

Mr. MacKenzie answered Mr. Clark and I have talked about that. We have some proposals and I think as long as we follow those proposals we can meet the number of spaces that they are looking for and that includes some issue dealing with the Arms Lot, the parking on Commercial Street and reconfiguration on the Seal Tanning Lot. Once you get beyond those if you are looking at Pandora, I think clearly the issue will be additional parking and we will have to address that.

Alderman Clancy asked, Mr. Clark, if you are going to triple the value of those buildings down there, why don't you people build a garage.

Mr. Clark answered well I guess you could say that we have tripled the value on a number of other buildings we have rehabbed and did that at our risk as far as parking was concerned in some cases.

Alderman Clancy stated you rehabbed a lot of buildings down in the Millyard. I know most of those buildings down there because I have been in them myself. Not once, but many times. What have you done to help the parking down in the Millyard?

Mr. Clark replied frankly any parking spaces that have been created down in the Millyard in the last five years we created ourselves. We would like to see the City belly up to some of that as well and not only speaking from our condition as an owner but you have owners like Waumbec where are they going to create parking. Where is Peter VanWick going to create parking?

Alderman Clancy stated you know what would be nice, if everybody down in the Millyard would share the wealth and help us build these garages, these parking spaces.

Mr. Clark replied we consider that our payment of taxes is quite a bit of sharing the wealth and our buildings are assessed as high or higher than every other building in the Millyard so we certainly feel that we are sharing our wealth with the City.

Chairman Reiniger stated that is what the tax increment financing would have done. It would have done what you are suggesting but we are having a...until Claremont is resolved, we won't know how well that will work.

Alderman Clancy stated well here it is March 23 and time is running out.

Alderman Girard stated not only are the property owners in the Millyard paying their taxes to support it, but they are also paying to lease the spaces that the city has made available to them and there have been a number of owners over the years that have leased vacant spaces from the City for years just to be able to have the space be marketable for the types of companies that we want to see downtown. Now statistically if you were to do the numbers and once upon a time they were done, if you take the value of the lease payments paid to the City for the parking plus the additional tax revenue you get out of the buildings, you more than bury the debt service on any of the parking we build in the downtown. Space is an issue. Some buildings have it. Most buildings don't and where there is parking, guess what? The City owns it. Unless we are going to start giving, and who would we give that lot to? Who would we give any of the lots to, particularly when the buildings around them are owned by different concerns. If everyone wants to share the wealth and everyone wants to make sure that the whole area comes up then the City is the one that has to make the parking available and regulates it otherwise the building owners are going to keep it for their own purposes and ends and that naturally, given the area, is going to come at the expense of the ones around them.

Alderman Pariseau stated maybe Alderman Girard can go into a partnership with those people in the Millyard to abate the taxes, let them build a garage using the tax money and revert it back to the City after six or seven years. That would be a fine partnership as far as I am concerned. That is how we started East Industrial Park Drive.

Alderman Girard stated I don't know if we can do that anymore. I don't know that State law allows us to do that anymore.

Alderman Clancy stated we know that everybody has some concerns and we appreciate your comments.

Alderman Girard stated, Mr. Chairman, and I am sorry, Don, but probably one of the worst properties in the Millyard is on the verge of being able to capture a major tenant but for parking. I think that brings the issue right to the forefront of if we are going to do something to provide parking in that area for Seal Tanning, potentially Pandora and Waumbec which is so full it doesn't know what to do with itself right now, we ought to be taking a look at appropriating money so that by the time their drop dead date comes in May they have a place to park their cars.

Chairman Reiniger stated not to put anyone in an awkward spot but I think I have been hearing conflicting statements that I would like clarified. I know that you gentlemen have chatted about these issues quite a bit. Obviously we don't want to be in a position where a month or two from now we are told that Seal Tanning can't go forward, it is dead because the Aldermen didn't do enough about parking. Mr. MacKenzie you mentioned the phased-in approach of reconfiguring the ground, the surface area first would meet the needs so I guess we need clarification of that.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we did meet with Don and other representatives of the various properties there with the Mayor. They basically outlined their goals for parking. They had several recommendations themselves and I think we can meet those goals with what is laid out here. Clearly the market is going upbeat now and it is great to see that perhaps even other buildings in the Millyard may potentially be renovated and we may have to take some additional steps to meet parking in those areas. I believe that to get the Seal Tanning building up and running that we will be able to commit to those spaces and get that done.

Chairman Reiniger stated I don't think there is any question that at minimum a deck is going to be needed for all of the buildings in that immediate vicinity – Seal Tanning, Pandora and Waumbec. The question is are we doing enough in this budget to keep this whole process going forward. It sounds like you are saying yes.

Alderman Girard stated it is nice to hear that we can reconfigure the Seal Tanning Lot to take care of what the needs may be if this tenant moves in, but my colleague at large, Alderman O'Neil, has and I agree with him has said the City has got a great way of building for today if not yesterday but we never build for tomorrow. If we are going to do this and we reconfigure that lot and we take care of all the spaces that we need now we are going to run into the problem when we have to put a deck up to support the rehab hopefully someday of Pandora or additional expansion in Seal Tanning or additional expansion at the Waumbec Mill having to displace all of the cars that are parking in Seal Tanning so we can put the deck up and I have no idea where you are going to put 300 cars in that area of the Millyard. I don't. why wouldn't we want to create as much parking space as we possibly

can in that area now before we have to worry about displacing an entire building full of people?

Mr. MacKenzie replied again, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are taking the correct course. Obviously there is tremendous need for facilities and capital improvements throughout the City. We don't talk about providing parking on South Willow Street or on Kelley Street. This is a fairly unique area. I think we have charted the correct course. Clearly, as I mentioned when I originally spoke, when we do the design for reconfiguration at Seal Tanning Lot, it is very likely that we should be designing the underpinnings of what will eventually be a deck. If you do that properly and you put the foundations in when you reconfigure for a deck, the actual decking can be fairly simple. As long as we have the time to do the proper planning and the proper design, I think that is the correct course and clearly if there is an additional way even during the year to fund a deck, we will be looking at those alternative ways and there are a variety of ways, we will then come back as Mr. Testa did tonight showing ways to bond for projects and parking garages, not using property tax revenues I believe we could do that as well.

Alderman Clancy asked, Don, what you heard here tonight, now this tenant that you may have coming in, if we had the parking spaces that we are talking about do you think the tenant would come in.

Mr. Clark answered yes.

Alderman Clancy asked how many parking spaces are you actually looking for.

Mr. Clark answered on this one we talked and again made some recommendations to the City about how we could create some parking spaces, maybe an overbooking situation on one particular lot. The City, I think, is already under study of how you can restripe Commercial Street to pick up perhaps another 100 spaces there. In very real terms, I need 100 parking spaces to accommodate this and their possible expansion within the building.

Alderman Clancy stated my concern is I want to build up the tax base here in the City of Manchester so I don't want to see anybody moving out of town. If we can get the parking spaces here, lets go for it. I want to see the Millyard filled up as quickly as possible.

Alderman Girard stated I would like to ask Mr. MacKenzie since the question I asked wasn't directly answered, what sense does it make to do something now and I don't mean to suggest that you shouldn't do proper planning and engineering and all that fun stuff. I am well aware that you can go through and put all the foundation you need to put decks and stuff like that but unless somehow all of the

equipment and materials that are needed to build the deck are going to levitate magically over the cars, you are still going to displace those cars to build that deck. I don't see where it is prudent planning, to be candid, where you have a situation now where you can go in and build the whole thing you need to build now and not worry about the issues of displacement and maybe even encourage a little bit more development in the area as a result of having the facilities, why you would want to take the half step now only so you would have to retake it and then take another one later.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I am sorry if I was unambiguous before. It is clear to me, again, that additional design is needed to do this project properly. Again, if you were going to reconfigure the lot it could be designed so that you could put a deck on a portion or all of the site and again if you do the foundation work so that the only thing you would have to do would be the structural steel or the structural concrete you could actually design a project that would entail perhaps only a portion of the site being shut off and therefore displacing only a portion of the cars. Again, until we do the design and do it correctly, we can't tell you how it will proceed. These projects do happen frequently. Larger cities, major urban hospitals do it continuously where you can put a new structure in without displacing all of the cars and clearly that would be important to do in a situation like this. I do believe that we are taking the correct approach. I am sorry if you think I am ambiguous. We do have to do additional design. We are hoping that the Board does expedite this project. We do have it on the expedited list and the sooner we can get to doing that, the sooner we will be able to provide the parking and attract the businesses.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, why would you be opposed to taking the numbers that exist in the Amoskeag Study for the Seal Tanning Lot which is \$1.3 million to put a deck, why would you be opposed to appropriating that money now, doing all of the design and everything that you are talking about now and having this thing constructed by May of next year when hopefully Mr. Clark will have a tenant. Why would you be opposed to that? How is that bad planning to appropriate the money now with the intent of constructing it this year?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think, Alderman, that it is bad planning to go in and appropriate money when you have not done the planning. If you have not done the design and gotten the proper cost estimates...

Alderman Girard interjected why can't we appropriate the money to do the design and the money to do the construction. Why do we have to go through two separate appropriation processes to have the money? I am not saying that we don't appropriate money for design. Why can't we do both?

Mr. MacKenzie replied if I could be allowed to finish, there are of course a lot of issues when dealing with the CIP Program. We have a tremendous amount of outstanding operating issues in the operating budget. The intent of both the Mayor, as originally proposed and as Alderman Wihby has proposed now is to try and minimize the impact of the CIP Program on the tax rate. The tax rate is relatively high and I think the attempt all along had been to do as much as possible while not jumping the tax rate. Now I can tell you that if you are talking about implementing the Amoskeag Industries without doing the proper design and planning and without evaluating different ways to fund it, you are going to have a significant impact on the tax rate and that is why I think this is the proper course to take. It is prudent planning. It would be imprudent to go in and allocate money without even knowing the ultimate construction costs.

Alderman Girard stated first of all, that comment presumes two things. It presumes that the majority of the CIP budget is going to be adopted as proposed and second it doesn't presume but what it does is miss entirely the fact that a building which could triple in value cannot triple in value without the parking in place. If it can triple in value for one building we have to consider what it would do for Waumbec and we have to consider what it would do for Pandora and if you want property tax relief, Mr. MacKenzie, I suggest that the best effort is to make sure that we are maximizing the value of those properties in the Millyard and I can't do that without parking. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Reiniger asked are there any specific proposals yet for Pandora that have come forward.

Mr. Clark answered no, Sir.

Alderman Wihby stated again no one is against adding parking to the Millyard. I think that the right approach is the way that we have approached the fire stations in the past. You design them, you make sure they belong there and the next year you build them. I think that is the approach that we are taking here. We are trying to plan the approach and we are trying to take care of in the fast track some of the problems and initiate the first step of the Amoskeag Industry Study and we are going to look at what other items we can look at and do next year. Again if there is preliminary funding that somehow they are going to fund themselves because we get additional revenue or whatever, we can look at that. We can still be able to do that in terms of this year. I just think that, again, that number was put in there because in speaking to Mr. MacKenzie he feels that we can do the planning and everything that is necessary to accommodate what we all want at the Millyard.

Alderman Pariseau moved to accept these bond amendments.

Alderman Girard stated I still have several more questions.

Alderman Clancy stated I have some concerns also. I would like to start off with the police station.

Chairman Reiniger replied the Chief is here to give a presentation. Do you want him to do that now?

Alderman Clancy responded let me ask him some questions first. You are proposing a new police station right?

Chief Driscoll replied yes, Sir.

Alderman Clancy asked it originally was supposed to be an add-on in the CIP. You were going to add on to the old station. How much was that going to cost?

Chief Driscoll answered it was projected to be \$6.9 million.

Alderman Clancy asked how much is a new station going to cost.

Chief Driscoll answered something in the area of \$12.9 million total.

Alderman Clancy asked is that strictly the building itself or is that for the land and buildings around it.

Chief Driscoll answered all of this information will be in the presentation that we would make to you, but I would say that it includes acquisition of land also.

Alderman Clancy asked how old is the police station right now.

Chief Driscoll answered it was built in 1976. It cost \$2.5 million.

Alderman Clancy asked so it is 23 years old.

Chief Driscoll replied it is a fine building. It is a wonderful building. It simply isn't big enough and doesn't meet our needs at this time and we were asked by a number of people to look at all alternatives and try to make the appropriate recommendation back to the Board as to how the City's money could best be spent and that is what we have tried to do, look at all alternatives and come and present that information to you folks tonight.

Alderman Clancy stated I find it hard to understand and I am not saying about building a new police station or adding on but the people in southeast Manchester in the Bodwell Road area, they have like 450 new homes out there if they have a heart attack or a fire call it takes anywhere from 12 to 15 minutes for the apparatus to get out there. Our priorities here are...where are our priorities right now? There are people out there...how would you feel paying \$4,000 a year in taxes and having an impact fee out there for over six years and have a heart attack and the apparatus coming to you from Harvey Road takes 12-15 minutes.

Chief Driscoll replied I strongly support public safety as you know and would strongly support and I have spoken with the Fire Chief and I strongly support a fire station out there if that is determined to be needed. Quite frankly, I look on the police side of public safety and have tried to analyze and bring forth information to the Committee tonight relative to the Police Department. I have always been a strong supporter of the Fire Department and have supported all of the projects that they have done in the past. I would agree with you that probably that building is needed.

Alderman Clancy asked do you think that is needed.

Chief Driscoll answered there would be people who know that better than I. Certainly that should be a priority project. I agree with you, but I don't set the City's priorities. I would suggest to you very strongly that the needs of the Police Department are a priority also. We have come to the City over the last five years asking for an expansion and I think that we have a good presentation for you this evening that I think you will be very interested in. Alderman Girard made a statement earlier to build for today and tomorrow. That is what we have tried to do. We tried to plan something that the City can be proud of, something that will be cost-effective if we build it today as opposed to a year from now or two years from now. It will be less expensive. We think we have a good plan for you and we would like to have an opportunity to present it.

Alderman Clancy stated when that building was built, it was built specifically to go up and out.

Chief Driscoll replied no I don't think it was. I think maybe people believed that. Our architect, Melissa Bennett who is here with me tonight, if you were to ask her that question I think she is prepared to answer that. Could I introduce her to you folks and have her make the presentation. This is Melissa Bennett and she is somebody that we have worked with for about six months now. She was brought up to and made a proposal to the Police Department relative to a building expansion. She is from West Medford, MA.

Chairman Reiniger stated while the architect is getting ready for the presentation, would the Committee like to move all of the items except for the police station.

Alderman Girard stated I hope you are not going to call for a vote because I still have questions on some of these items.

Chairman Reiniger asked which other items so that we have a sense because Alderman Pariseau has to leave.

Alderman Girard answered there has been a lot of money added here and I would just like to know why some of it has been added and what it is going to be used for. Maybe Alderman Pariseau can tell me what would be done with \$100,000 at Precourt Park. Why is there another \$400,000 going to Livingston Park?

Alderman Wihby replied everything that is on here we heard people talking about yesterday. These are items that had been on the CIP and are items that Aldermen in their wards wanted and that a lot of the people who came yesterday wanted. I don't know if there is any item here that is a surprise to anybody.

Alderman Girard responded that is not the point, Mr. Chairman. The point is and I was here too and I heard Aldermen and whatnot say what they wanted but I didn't hear anything about the need for another \$400,000 at Livingston Park. I understand the playground equipment for Green Acres. Alderman Rivard is looking for a new traffic signal at Weston and Jewett Street, but the number that is in the amendment here is different than the number that he submitted to us in the letter which was given to us tonight.

Alderman Wihby replied that is the newer number.

Alderman Girard stated I know that Alderman Pariseau has been diligent with Precourt Park. First of all, are these one-time appropriations? Are they continuing appropriations? What is going to be done with the money? When you walk in the night of the meeting and hand these things out, you don't have the benefit of having that information.

Alderman Wihby replied where do you want to start. Precourt Park and Prouts Park are in the CIP book. If you read it, you would know what it is going for. This is the initial stage for these developments and they have been in the book and asked for, for a number of years from Alderman Shea and Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Girard stated you will notice I didn't say anything about Prouts Park because at least I had a plan to look at from Prouts Park, but Precourt and others just because they are in the book doesn't tell me what they are going towards. I haven't seen any plan from Precourt Park and I don't know what the \$400,000 additional for Livingston Park is for.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I will start with Livingston Park if you would like. The \$400,000 would bring the amount requested by Parks & Recreation up closer to what they requested. They do have several items that they would like to complete at the park. This amount would provide for the playground that had been a primary request of the residents in the area. They want to complete the paving, the curbing and the landscape at the entrance. This would help complete that.

Chairman Reiniger called for a recess.

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting back to order, stating that during the recess, Alderman Wihby, Alderman Girard and the City Planners had further discussion regarding the parking issue and maybe Alderman Wihby can speak to that.

Alderman Wihby stated basically we had a long discussion about parking and again nobody disagrees that we should have some money in there. There are two ways of doing it. One way would be to open up the CIP or go ahead and amend it later adding some more money into the CIP budget for a parking lot or garage or whatever way we wanted to do it. The other way would be not to do anything today, not to put it in the CIP budget and get a commitment from the people down in that area that they will sign some lease agreements. Now their lease agreements would, in turn, be a revenue producer for the City and with revenue bonds we could go forward at any time, it doesn't have to be in this budget, and issue those revenue bonds and build a facility as long as we have the lease agreements and the contracts from the different people down there. We talked to Mr. MacKenzie and the numbers look pretty close to doing that and we can pursue that further to see if we can get commitment from the Millyard businesses. We can do it any time and proceed any time in building it. I think that solves a lot of the problems since it is revenue producing we can do it any time. It is not a rush to have it put in here. If, in fact, we got leases ahead of time we could put it in the CIP and we count the revenue and it doesn't affect the tax rate. It is the same thing. It doesn't make any difference. It is probably a little better for the people who know it is going to get done because it is there. I don't know if we have enough time before the CIP had to be approved. What is the date? When is the full Board going to look at our recommendations and then vote? Is it the first week of April?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think it is the first week of April.

Alderman Wihby stated so the time frame is only a week or two away to do that and I don't know if anyone is going to want to sign a lease that fast. Either way, I think that the Millyard residents should know that with revenue producing bonds we can go forward and even if it is not in the CIP, take care of their needs. Does that explain everything to you, Mr. Clark?

Chairman Reiniger asked, Alderman Girard, is that what you had in mind.

Alderman Girard answered yes and I would like to thank Alderman Wihby for his willingness to discuss the matter and address the concerns. I would also like to ask, though whether the Committee could ask the Planning staff or whoever may be appropriate to contact Mr. Clark and the owners of the Waumbec building to let them know what is in the works here to see what arrangements we could secure with them as soon as possible because I think everyone would like to see something built there as soon as it can be done and the sooner we can secure the lease arrangements that Alderman Wihby was discussing, I think the better off this whole process would be. There are some big clients coming into that area and some potential big clients that could and I would rather be ready for them as soon as possible. Thank you.

Chairman Reiniger stated now we will turn back to the police station issue and let the Police Chief take it from there.

Chief Driscoll stated good evening and thank you. I have introduced Melissa Bennett and she is going to make a presentation to you.

Ms. Bennett stated we have handed out a package to each of you and I am going to read from that but also explain some of the figures in this chart here. To start with, the existing police facility was built in 1976. Its area was a little under 44,000 square feet and in 1976 it cost \$2.5 million. A space needs analysis has been completed, as well as a review of existing conditions of the building and to answer Alderman Clancy's question about whether or not the existing building was designed to actually have another floor added, the answer is yes. It was designed to have another floor added. The existing building has a mechanical penthouse on the roof that is about 30% of the floor area. The structure from the footings all the way up through the columns is designed to support another floor of "office space", that type of floor loading. So we could build around the penthouse and have a donut of office space up there. Another idea would be to move the mechanical penthouse to the top floor. The structure will not carry a fourth floor and the penthouse actually all the mechanical equipment in it has a tremendous amount of vibration. The station right now has a lot of problems with vibration throughout the building because of the equipment that is on the top floor, on the roof and in the basement because it transfers through the structure. So we do not

recommend building up one more floor mainly because it would be a donut space of office space. What our renovation and addition plan was, was to renovate about 29,000 square feet of the 44,000 square feet, add about 14,000 square feet which would be over the existing parking lot and that would be a two-story addition over the parking lot meaning that it starts at the second floor and is on the third floor. We would build, our proposal was actually to build on top of the existing building using part of that floor area but not all of it because we would end up with a donut around the mechanical space and it also included reconfiguration of a lot of the departments within the building. The total project cost was about \$6.9 million. The building program for the Police Department that has been generated is for planning for a minimum of 20 years. In order to make this building program work with the renovation and addition we actually would have had to add a lot more space than we are able to add on that site. So we actually had some shortcomings with an addition renovation project. We only meet about 75% of the program requirements and it is a very difficult operational layout within the building itself. When you configure any building it is wonderful to be able to reuse an existing building but this structure was built so permanently and there are so many concrete block walls that are expensive to move and relocate to reconfigure departments. In fact, with this addition and renovation there isn't any ability to expand in the future. This chart is actually the second page of the handout I have for you and we have done a review of a comparison between an addition renovation project and a new building. We have identified a series of issues down one side and whether or not the addition and renovation could comply with those issues and whether or not a new building could. The first issue is separate circulation for the public, the police personnel and the detainees. It is extremely important to keep that vertical circulation in elevators and stairs and horizontal circulation of quarters separate so that the three do not interact. The public space is public space and it doesn't interact with the secured space that the police officers use and the area that the detainees are in. Our plan could not accommodate that with the existing building and addition. A new building could. Functional and operational space needs met for at least 20 years. The Traffic Department and the Records Department have no expansion ability in this scheme. The lockers that were designed in the original building are actually on a...the entire locker room is on an outside wall which is really prime space for offices. It is best to really relocate lockers to an interior core of a building or a lower level of a building, not prime office space and the existing building has lockers on the back wall of the second floor so it is eating up a lot of the administrative space on that floor. The detention area renovations were not addressed in this study. The computer equipment room expansion hasn't been addressed. There isn't any room to address any of these issues with the existing building and the existing pistol range has now been closed because it is inoperable for meeting safety requirements. Efficient operational layout is categorically a no compared to a new building because you have to reconfigure a lot of spaces and you don't always do

it the best way possible because of the existing structure. Using durable low maintenance materials. Yes, we definitely always plan on that in any project, any addition or renovation and yes we would use that with the new building. No offense Chief, but Police Departments are the hardest users of any building. They are the roughest users of any structure. Energy conservation and building design. We have an existing system that we would need to upgrade again for the umpteenth time. Yes, we could meet energy conservation in the addition but not in the existing building. Efficient and controllable mechanical systems. Yes, we are replacing the mechanical systems in the original building and new ones in the addition and yes we will have new ones in the new building. Accessible communication system layout. Yes, we plan for a flexible infrastructure for communications for the future. It is very critical. Flexible design for building security systems. We can do that in the new building. We cannot do that in the addition, as it is less flexible. Flexible design for future expansion. No, we cannot expand on the existing site. With a new building, yes, we can. Secure site circulation and parking. Right now, the Police Department has a parking lot next to the building. We would be building out and over that. We would require, in order to maintain security of the office building itself on the second and third floor, we would have to build a protective wall around the parking area in order to make sure it is secure and someone can't drive in under the parking lot and cause any damage to the building. Full building access for public staff and detainees. Every project, the Americans with Disabilities Act requires that once you spend 30% of the assessed value of a building you must bring the entire building up to full access. We actually would need to blow out all of the restrooms in the existing building in order to make the building accessible. Compliance with Federal and State regulations for juvenile holding and detention. There are very strict guidelines for detention and for juvenile holding that are Federal and State guidelines and we would be able to meet some of those. Where we couldn't meet those guidelines, we would not be able to provide that kind of service within the department. We wouldn't be able to provide all of the necessary services for juvenile holding and detention. Straightforward construction schedule. With the addition and renovation project, we would propose that it be a phased construction project so that the addition is built first, part of the Police Department moves over into the addition, we renovate part of the existing building and then whoever moved into the addition comes back and then we renovate the rest of the building so it would be a long construction process as opposed to a very simple new construction process where there is just one move. It is also, if any of you have lived through any renovation project, it is also uncomfortable to deal with the dust and noise that would go on constantly. Future expansion. We did talk about that. Ability to accommodate citywide training facilities. The Police Department, in their program, has training facilities that are to be provided. In the addition and renovation project, where the location of those facilities would be on the top floor so they are accessible to the internal staff and officers and escorted guests but

wouldn't be readily accessible to the public, with a new building the training facilities could be on the ground floor and available for other City departments to come and use. Ability to accommodate citywide emergency dispatch. The existing dispatch area as it is relocated into a new building could be designed to consolidate both Police and Fire communications and dispatch if that is an interest of the City. This is a comparison of whether any of these issues can be met with the addition and renovation project or a new building. With a new building, the preliminary analysis is probably for a 65,000 square foot building. The addition and renovation project was actually close to 59,000 square feet. The difference between 59,000 and 65,000 is much more efficient use of space plus some additional facilities that couldn't be met in the proposed program. The new building would meet the Police Department's space needs and its operational efficiency. It would have the capacity to expand in the future. It would provide space for citywide training facilities and provide space for consolidation of Police/Fire emergency communications and dispatch. The existing police facility, once vacated, could provide space for other City departments and the phased financing of this Police Department project could actually allow other City projects to proceed. That is the conclusion of my report.

Alderman Girard asked regarding the four existing City departments that could be accommodated in this building, are there any cost estimates for the renovations that would need to be done to the station in order to accommodate those departments and has anyone spoken to those departments to know whether or not that building could be adequately altered to really meet their needs.

Chief Driscoll answered I don't know that Melissa has that information. I think Mr. MacKenzie and I have spoke about that. There is considerable cost and he could perhaps answer that better than I.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I do know that Fred Rusczek looked at it. It is a structure that has different entrances and potentially could be divided into smaller spaces. I don't have any cost estimates right now, although based upon our experience with other projects and the fact that the structure is in relatively good shape, there are certain issues to deal with from heating and ventilation to handicap accessibility but our initial guesstimates have been approximately \$1 million to retrofit the space for several different smaller City departments. There are several space needs out there in City departments. The four that have been talked about – Elderly Services, Youth Services, Health and Welfare. There are also needs for other facilities in the City. Information Systems is in need of additional space. Channel 16 has expressed a desire for production and there is a need for and I think they talked about it in this proposal, there is a need for a centralized training facility for City departments.

Alderman Wihby asked the rent they are paying now in total is how much.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is approaching, I think, \$200,000. Next year we will be talking closer to \$250,000 million.

Alderman Wihby asked how many additional million could you bond.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that would be roughly \$3 million.

Alderman Wihby stated well \$6 million was the difference between the new and the old. Half of that is going to be paid for by not paying rent anymore, right.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is correct.

Alderman Girard stated years ago there was a proposed consolidation that would have taken the Health Department, Elderly Services and the Youth Services Office and consolidated them into space over at 50 Bridge Street. The department heads from Elderly Services and Youth Services weren't too thrilled with being in the same space even though they were going to be on different floors and they were going to have separate entrances for everybody to use. Do those objections still exist?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I am going to be a little careful here. I think there were reservations about the potential, I suspect, for consolidation. To my knowledge there has been no discussion about that.

Alderman Girard responded I am not talking about consolidation. During the discussion of that consolidation, one of the reasons why it was opposed was because Elderly Services didn't want to be in the same space with Youth Services even though they were going to be located on different floors and even though they were going to have separate entrances. The idea of having the clientele that Mr. Lemaire serves and the clientele that Mrs. Vigneault serves...if these departments are going to be housed in the former Police Station I wonder whether or not those concerns and objections have been addressed. I realize that we are not talking consolidation, but it was a matter of sharing the space that they had concerns about.

Alderman Wihby replied I can answer that because I spoke to all four of them. I don't think it was Elderly and Youth that didn't want to be together, I think it was Health and Welfare not wanting to be together.

Alderman Girard answered no.

Alderman Wihby stated my understanding was that Health and Welfare were concerned about being together because of the clientele going in and everybody would know where they were going because we had looked at moving them over in the Annex. In the meantime, I spoke with all four of these people because they happened to me in my division in the budget. We brought that subject up to all of them. They were looking forward to moving. Youth and Elderly both said we could work well together and that is why I don't recall them ever saying they couldn't. They specifically said that it was a nice thing for them to be together. We are going to try, when we develop this thing, to not have the doors together and have them on different levels and different sides of the building or whatever because we are sensitive to that. When we looked at the preliminary figures in doing that, we could do it. It did work to have these people separated and not close together coming in and out.

Alderman Pariseau asked if a new building is agreed to would there be any Federal or State funding available for construction.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I might refer a little bit to Melissa, but typically these are functions that are what I would call hard core public functions and Federal and State agencies are very reticent about providing funding for projects that are core functions of City government. There might be certain Federal funds available for perhaps communications or certain other things but to completely do this project it would be remote in my opinion.

Chief Driscoll stated I would suggest that that is probably the answer also. We have actively pursued Federal grants that are available for public safety and they all specify no new construction.

Alderman Pariseau stated in light of that we have different programs within the Police Department where money is accepted and it is specifically earmarked for a program like the D.A.R.E. program, the drug forfeiture money and whatever else you have over there. You have a slush fund for this and that.

Chief Driscoll replied I don't think we have any slush funds but we do have a number of grants.

Alderman Pariseau asked could we tap into those funds to assist in the construction of this building. Why I ask that is because you have police officers, the domestic violence team that you just got \$300,000 for and they work out of the Police Department. Why shouldn't they be assessed a rental fee as we do in Concord for different Federal programs? I don't see why we can't do that and take some of that drug forfeiture money or the D.A.R.E. Program money so they can pay their fair share.

Chief Driscoll answered I would be very pleased to look at that and get a specific answer for you. I don't know if that possibility exists now. I would be surprised if it did, but I will certainly look into it and make sure that if there is any money that we can allocate towards this project that we do that.

Alderman Pariseau responded I would appreciate it. I don't see why we can't.

Alderman Clancy asked didn't we just renovate the first floor of the police station.

Chief Driscoll answered yes we did. Probably something in the area of 1/3 to 1/2 of the floor. We reconfigured it.

Alderman Clancy asked how much money did we spend.

Chief Driscoll answered I would say something in excess of \$200,000.

Alderman Clancy stated I thought it was closer to \$300,000.

Chief Driscoll replied it might be.

Alderman Girard stated it was \$325,000.

Chief Driscoll stated we did about 1/3 to 1/2 of the first floor to include the communication section, which badly needed to be renovated.

Alderman Clancy stated as I recall, when that building was built it was built by P.J. George right.

Chief Driscoll answered yes.

Alderman Clancy stated it had all electric heat when it was first built. The building was all electric heat and costing the City \$300,000 a year.

Chief Driscoll replied yes. It has been converted to gas now. It is basically a very good building.

Alderman Clancy stated as I recall, when I first came on the Board 1100 Elm Street as available for \$549,000 in back taxes. I made a suggestion that we should have bought that and put all of the outfits in the City of Manchester who were renting like Health, Planning, Welfare and Elderly Services. I thought it would be a good idea then. They could have driven in to pay the taxes on their car or their house taxes but I guess it fell on deaf ears. Now, maybe six years later, I don't

know who came up with that idea. What gets me is the total figure. \$14 million, is that what it is?

Chief Driscoll answered yes, Sir.

Alderman Clancy stated that is a lot of money.

Chief Driscoll replied you are right but I think it is a very necessary project that answers a lot of the City's needs and solves a lot of the City's problems.

Alderman Clancy stated but I am saying \$14 million for that and we also have to put into our existing City buildings another \$5 million in renovations and repairs. We don't have a City painter. Can you imagine that, a City of 100,000 doesn't have a City painter? I can't believe it.

Alderman Girard stated I would like to follow-up on a point that was made by Alderman Pariseau. Mr. MacKenzie, do you know and perhaps it is not fair to ask but would you know whether or not the Health Department in particular which seems to have all kinds of different Federal and State fund that it taps and I am not certain about Elderly or Youth Services, but would there perhaps be funds available through the Health Department to do retrofitting of the Police Department. It is something to look at.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it is a possibility. They do a good job in grant writing and get quite a few grants from the State. It is a possibility. I did want to add that the only other source I would know of is potentially you could use CDBG money for ADA accessibility and that would be particularly true in the existing facility. You could also apply some of those monies to ADA facilities in the new building. That would be the only funds I would be aware of.

Alderman Girard stated I don't know if this goes to Mr. MacKenzie or not but the concern that I have with the station is not whether or not it is needed but as I take a look at the out years and what is being proposed, I am seeing a \$7 or \$8 million appropriation in FY2001 and knowing that we really haven't got a lot more than \$13 million in general obligation bonds, I wonder what that is going to mean for the other priorities in the City that need to be addressed. I don't argue that the police station is inadequate, but as Alderman Clancy has raised we have some issue with fire protection at the southeast and northwest corners of the City and there are school building problems. I got a capital asset preservation plan for the schools today from Mr. Houle that identified \$46 million worth of projects in the schools. How is this project going to impact our ability in the next fiscal year to address our concerns? Right now the budget we are looking at as amended has roughly \$10 or \$11 million for everything else and roughly \$2 million for a police

station. Now that is going to be pretty well flipped on its head next year. How are we going to do this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, it is clearly a large project and we will have to make adjustments in future years. Those are shown tentatively in the multi-year portion of the CIP Program as to how the adjustments would be made so the following year would be the most difficult year, the third year there would be a small amount still allocated so it does take some foresight and some planning to make sure that the one large year can be accomplished.

Alderman Girard asked how much bonding capacity in dollar terms could we add to what we are doing now before we hit the ceiling that DRA sets for us or for cities and towns.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would defer that question and I don't believe that anyone from Finance is here. We are not near that cap. That is not an issue to us. The primary issue to us is the tax rate impact. We are not near bumping that State DRA cap which is a very high cap.

Alderman Girard stated I know you are a gifted man, Mr. MacKenzie, but even with the best of planning if we remain with the cap that we have now that we set on ourselves of \$13 or \$14 million in bonding, there is an awful lot that won't get done next year and that is trouble because there is an awful lot that needs to get done that is not getting addressed now.

Alderman Pariseau stated to get back to Alderman Clancy's concern about renovating the first floor over at the Police Station, didn't we just expend funds for the pistol range.

Chief Driscoll replied a number of years ago. I would say about five or six years ago, there was a significant amount of money invested in the pistol range.

Alderman Pariseau asked did I hear Melissa correctly that it is closed.

Chief Driscoll answered yes it is. It was designed improperly when it was first constructed many years ago. It recirculates the air. Since Day 1 it hasn't functioned properly.

Alderman Pariseau asked why didn't we do something back on Day 1. That is the problem with this City. We go out and build these Taj Mahals and they don't work. The new fire station was a disaster the day they opened it. The Police Station was a disaster when they opened. Engine 6 on the West Side was a disaster when they moved in and we don't do anything. We just let the architect

and the developer get away with...and look at Northwest Elementary School. What do we have to do?

Chief Driscoll replied that is a hard question for me to answer. I don't think it is a disaster. I think our building is a fine building.

Alderman Pariseau asked didn't you have problems with ventilation up on the roof back in 1981.

Chief Driscoll answered you probably have a lot more recollection of that than I do.

Alderman Pariseau stated we don't do anything. We just keep soaking the taxpayers. We don't go back to the developer. We don't go back to the architect. Could we get guarantees if you are fortunate to get a new station from the developer and/or architect that if anything goes wrong in say a 10-year period it would be taken care of.

Alderman Wihby replied you would pay for it. You end up just putting it in the cost of the building. You can get whatever you want.

Alderman Pariseau stated I am getting sick of the way the City handles things.

Alderman Girard asked, Mr. MacKenzie, back to the question that I was just asking regarding future bonding capacity, the multi-year as you pointed out does have a slight increase. It is about \$1.9 million or so in funding over this year, but with some of the decisions that this Committee has made tonight and perhaps with the decisions that the Board will follow we have added projects that are not anticipated by this. We may have accelerated the schedule, happily, of the Bodwell Road Fire Station and we know have additional park projects that we started this year that weren't anticipated in the multi-year. I guess I am back to my question of unless we significantly increase what we are going to bond next year how are we going to take care of this project, the projects that have been approved, and the projects that we know are going to come knocking on the door next year with any sort of reasonable approach?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I could give you a couple of answers to that question, Alderman. One is that based upon the latest schedule that they have put out in terms of the actual construction and correct me if I am wrong, Melissa, the construction would not likely start until roughly January of the Year 2001 on the new facility which means that it would be under construction for something over 12 months which means that it would be about equally split between two fiscal years so the numbers that you see here where we assume \$7 million I think we can

more equally spread over a two-year period which would significantly soften the impact on other projects.

Alderman Girard asked so instead of \$7 million you would be looking at \$5 million.

Mr. MacKenzie answered perhaps \$5 million and \$5 million over two years. I also believe and hopefully it will come true that we will not only increase our tax base with the projects that we are working on now in the Millyard and on the UNH site and in other areas around the City, but once you increase the tax base you will be able to significantly increase the amount of money you can bond. Secondly, if the City does go through with revaluation. The properties that currently exist are undervalued. The property revaluation could be brought up and again we could bond more. Thirdly, in a few years from now the fiscal year conversion will be completed. We will tap those bonds and that will also free up additional bonding capacity for the City.

Alderman Wihby asked again it is a \$6 million increase over rehab of which \$3 million is really taken up with the rental property payment that we are not going to have to pay anymore so really it is only an additional \$1.5 million per year for the new Police Station rather than a rehabbed one.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes and another way to look at it is that the City has been trying to solve the problem of the Human Service agencies since the old Franklin School where they were all housed previously was demolished as part of the Center of NH. That, I think, is approaching 18 years now that the City has not been able to solve the problem. A number of solutions have been looked at but that has not happened. Another solution is to build a new facility for Human Services and that would cost on the order of \$4 million. That is another way to look at it. If you add the \$4 million to the \$6.9 million for the addition you would be talking close to \$11 million for renovating the existing station and building a new facility for Human Services.

Alderman Wihby asked isn't it also true that hopefully where this building goes we would be taking a blighted area and fixing it up. Isn't that the intent?

Alderman Clancy stated I know some people that live on both Laurel Street and Merrimack Street. They have lived there a number of years and they don't think that area is blighted, truthfully.

Alderman Wihby replied well blighted might be the wrong word. Empty, vacant.

Alderman Clancy stated I don't want to offend the people who live up there.

Chairman Reiniger stated the site has not yet been determined. Is that correct?

Chief Driscoll replied no, Sir, it hasn't.

Chairman Reiniger stated before the Committee originally was Alderman Wihby's proposed amendment to reduce this line item by \$1 million.

Alderman Wihby moved to approve amendment to reduce the Police Station line item by \$1 million. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion for discussion.

Alderman Clancy stated what I really don't understand and it is not that I am against a police station but six years ago I proposed buying 1100 Elm Street for \$549,000. We could have bought that for back taxes. We could have had all of these departments that are going up there now plus we could have had the Tax Office because they had drive-up windows in the back. That would have been an ideal building to buy. That is three stories, but that fell on deaf ears.

Chief Driscoll replied I am not sure that I can respond to that. I didn't know that. I don't think that I was in a position to make those types of decisions.

Alderman Clancy responded I know you weren't. I am just comparing that to what we are talking about right now. That is my concern.

Chief Driscoll stated perhaps that was a very feasible plan then.

Alderman Clancy stated \$549,000 and that building is probably worth \$2.5 million right now.

Chief Driscoll replied I wish we had that option, Sir.

Alderman Girard stated I have a question for the Fire Chief. One of the concerns, candidly, that I have about building a police station is that it is difficult for me to reconcile constructing a new facility for the Police Department when the southeastern end of the City, as Alderman Clancy has pointed out, is inadequately served and there are also similar, though not as extenuating circumstances up on Hackett Hill. Alderman Wihby has included in his proposal \$100,000 to do something or to start something out on Bodwell Road. Assuming that you are able to locate and acquire the site and start the planning for a station out in the southeastern section of the City, how long would it take you to build and staff and equip a station. My concern is that going forward with this Police Department project may hinder the effort to put a station in that area of the City and I think you know that needs to be done.

Chief Kane replied obviously that area of the City has been a concern of the Fire Department and elected officials in that area for some time. We look at the approach of handling that as a multi-phased approach and this is the way we do it in all of our projects. The proposal, as I understand it, that is before you is something that we agree with. You go in and do a study. We want to take our time to insure that we find the right place. When we put a fire station somewhere, it is going to be there for 100 years and that is something that we look at. Currently, some of the locations of the fire stations that are in the inner City now, 100 years ago those stations were on the outskirts so when we look at that area, we want to take our time to insure that we get the right location. We also think that the funding with the \$100,000 that is in there would adequately do that and allow us to hire architects to do the engineering similar to what the police station is going through right now.

Alderman Girard stated it is not so much the phased approach that I have a problem with. The question that I have is you get the \$100,000 to search for and acquire a site and I don't know if you have any potential sites in mind...

Chief Kane interjected not really.

Alderman Girard replied okay, so we are starting from ground zero on this then. From the time you get that \$100,000 until the time you cut the ribbon, what is that time frame?

Chief Kane responded construction, just the construction end of a fire station is about 12, 13 or 14 months. Somewhere around there.

Alderman Girard asked in theory if you were to find and acquire a site in FY2000, in FY2001 you could be funded for and have built a fire station in the southeastern section of the City.

Chief Kane answered somewhere in that ballpark.

Alderman Clancy stated so here we are almost at April 1. Are we talking that maybe in July of 2000 possibly? I don't want to pin you down. If we are going to build something out there, we want to get a good location. I know of one station in town where you are turning around and going up a hill all the time and the other way you are going where the deceased are.

Chief Kane stated I think that planning has to go into the location of a fire station no matter where it is. When we did the planning on the last couple of stations, it was about a six to seven or eight month project looking at different sites and looking at different buildings that would fit on that site and looking at how those sites get utilized. If we get funding in July and start in July you are looking at about eight months into that fiscal year before we even have something that might be viable and then from that point on we would be looking at construction. Construction could go out over two fiscal years.

Alderman Clancy stated we are looking at a three bay station I would assume. A truck and a pumper, right.

Chief Kane replied I think we need to really formulate our plan, but our basic footprint is a three bay station but we need to formulate a plan, look at the needs of that area, we need to address the needs of that area and we need to look building out and what the needs of that area will be for the next 20, 30 or 40 years.

Alderman Clancy stated if we go along with the new police station and I am assured that we are going to get the southeastern part of the City taken care of from this Committee and we are going to take these other agencies throughout the City where we are renting and move them into the police station, I have a tendency maybe to buy that. I am not tipping my hand yet though.

Chief Kane stated I have had a tendency to stay away from this because it certainly is Chief Driscoll's project. If I look at the overall impact that this project is going to have on the City, it is going to do a number of things. That area of the City of Manchester right now is a government center. You have the court, you have the Federal building there, you have the county offices and as some of the other government offices come in that becomes a little more of a focal point. With a new police station in there that kind of really firms up that area.

Alderman Clancy stated it would be like a Manchester government center.

Chief Kane replied that is correct with a fire station in the middle of it. I think it sounds like a good project.

Alderman Girard asked, Chief Kane, if you get the \$100,000 to take a look at and plan a site, are you confident that by the time the next budget cycle comes around you will have recommendations to make to this Board.

Chief Kane answered I would believe so but locating a fire station, as Alderman Wihby can attest to in the Webster Street situation that we went through, is a very emotional issue for neighborhoods. Where the fire station goes and if it is in someone's neighborhood or not in someone's neighborhood so I would say that if everything goes according to what one would normally expect, I would say yes but obviously citizens have input into this.

Alderman Girard asked but you are going to be aggressive in your effort to locate a site.

Chief Kane answered I am always aggressive.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote on the motion to approve the amendment to reduce the Police Station line item by \$1 million. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger stated we have spent a considerable amount of time talking about the bonded projects and now we can go back to the rest of the CIP.

Alderman Clancy moved to add \$17,000 to Table 1-2 Community Development Block Grants, Emergency Shelter Grant, and Home funds, 210400 PAL Community Outreach Worker, to bring the total to \$34,000. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau asked why do we want to do this.

Alderman Clancy answered it is the PAL Committee and we need a full-time person. When the kids come in we don't just want someone part-time. We want the guy to be there full-time.

Alderman O'Neil stated the PAL building is actually going to be a joint effort between not only the Police Athletic League, Youth Services, Girls and Boy's Club, Makin' It Happen but one of the items that came up in discussion was Youth Services assigning a position there. It is an existing position. Am I correct, Mr. MacKenzie?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I cannot answer that.

Alderman Wihby stated I think it is one to run the new program.

Alderman O'Neil stated the bottom line is the \$17,000 only funded half of the position.

Alderman Pariseau asked why don't we put that in with the OYS office. Why are we creating another position? We have the Office of Youth Services and now you want to create another position.

Alderman O'Neil answered in the Office of Youth Services. Within the Office of Youth Services but they would be primarily assigned to the PAL building in that area of the City.

Alderman Wihby stated actually I had forgotten to fund that because they came to us and wanted to do that.

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

Alderman Girard stated there are two programs on Table 1-3 City Cash, both of them having to do with Child Health Services. The first one that I have concerns with is the Childcare Coordinator. I don't know who could answer these questions but as I understood the presentation given at the public hearing the other night by Kim Valdez, apparently she spends her time trying to help parents locate private providers and works with private daycare providers to make placements. Why isn't that being funded by the daycare providers that are benefiting from the services? It seems to me that the ones who are getting the kids should be the ones paying for the service.

Mr. MacKenzie replied several years ago you may remember that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen funded a City position at the time of Childcare Coordinator back when childcare was very tight. Childcare is becoming tight again. That position was ultimately shifted to that agency and that ultimately originally was in the Mayor's budget and was now shifted to the CIP Program. It is a continuation of a long-standing practice to have the City committed to helping solve the childcare problem.

Alderman Girard responded I understand that, but it sounds like she is a referral service, which is nice. I am just not sure the City should be paying for that referral because ultimately the people that she refers get the money for the services they are providing and it seems to me that we should be asking the daycare centers that benefit from this to pay for it.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we do have a report that outlines the activities and exactly what they do and how many people they have assisted. I know the Mayor asked similar questions and we provided a copy of that report to him. We can provide that same copy to the Committee if they would like.

Alderman Girard stated I will not make any motions regarding this item right now, but I would like to see that report because even with the work that is done in the report it still seems to me that it is something that the private sector should be, as the beneficiaries of her work, should be ponying up the money to pay for it. The second question I have is also about Child Health Services and it is the Teen Health Clinic. At the risk of stepping on a landmine at the end of the night, I have recently been informed that Child Health Services is affiliated with Planned Parenthood. Is that true?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't know that to be true. Our staff is not aware of that.

Alderman Girard stated I did not get a chance to follow-up on that information, but I would like to say that if they are affiliated with Planned Parenthood there are some activities that Planned Parenthood undertakes that I would, in no way, want to see City funding supporting. I don't know if staff can get that information, Mr. MacKenzie.

Chairman Reiniger stated I don't know if the Mayor's Office has any information about that.

Alderman Wihby asked you just want assurances that it is not being used for things that you don't want it to be used for.

Alderman Girard answered yes and I would have serious concerns if the City were supporting an agency that is using the services of Planned Parenthood.

Chairman Reiniger asked is your concern that the Teen Health Clinic would be offering or giving advice on abortions as an option.

Alderman Girard answered precisely. I don't believe the taxpayers should be paying for birth control after the fact.

Alderman Wihby moved to recommend the Mayor's recommended CIP budget with the proposed amendments made by the Committee to the full Board. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

A handout listing proposed projects to be expedited was distributed.

Alderman Wihby moved to recommend that the proposed list of expedited bond projects be placed in the current CIP budget and removed from the FY2000 budget. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy asked, Mr. MacKenzie, do we have enough money in the MER account to take care of some of the vehicles needed in the City for this next year. I know that the snorkel at the Fire Department is 1981 vintage and it is in tough shape.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think it would be good to put the Mayor's assistant on the spot. I know that he has been working diligently on the MER.

Mr. Thomas stated the \$850,000 that is in the bond right now in the MER, the major ticket item is replacement of the ladder truck for the Fire Department. It is the one they have been asking for in the last three years. We are looking to split that over two years. Allow them to go and order that now because they won't receive delivery of it until FY2001. The other three priorities we would be funding out of that \$850,000 would be a new paver for the Highway Department to replace theirs. I think that Frank Thomas told me that they expend about \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year now to repair that and it seems to be escalating. With all the repaving that we have been doing, it is needed.

Alderman Clancy asked we got \$900,000 for repaving this year right. I need to get Maple Street done before they run me out of town.

Mr. Thomas answered with all the repaving we have been doing and continue to do, it would seem that is their number one priority to replace that. We would also be providing replacement of two three-ton trucks for snow removal purposes.

Alderman Girard stated during the recess Alderman O'Neil expressed some concern about the stage project for Riverfront Park. Do we need to do anything?

Chairman Reiniger replied that has been clarified.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote on the motion to recommend that the proposed list of expedited bond projects be added to the current CIP budget and removed from the FY2000 budget. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Reiniger stated before we adjourn, the agenda states that discussion of items deferred to this budget are as follows: traffic signalization at Hackett Hill Road and Front Street and Prouts Park. Those have been added.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee

3/23/99 CIP

48