

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

March 14, 2000

6:15 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby, Clancy, Cashin, Lopez

Aldermen Gatsas, Shea and Vaillancourt were also in attendance.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Resolutions:

"Amending the 1994, 1995 & 1999 Community Improvement Programs, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eighty-five Thousand Dollars (\$85,000) for the 1999 CIP 211299 PAL Center Acquisition Project."

"Amending the 2000 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eight Hundred Fifty Thousand Six Hundred and Seventy-seven Dollars (\$850,677) for various Police Projects."

"Amending the 2000 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2000 CIP 511200 Derryfield Country Club Rehab-Phase II Project."

Alderman Wihby moved to approve the resolutions. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy initiated discussion regarding the Traffic Department's need for a new van and the police were going to get a new one.

Chairman O'Neil requested that discussion be reserved, and addressed under item number 6.

There being no further discussion, Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. The motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorizations:

1998	510291	Riverwalk Planning & Development - Revision #2
1999	510199	Riverfront Development - Revision #1
1999	211299	PAL Center Acquisition - Revision #1
2000	220700	Tuberculosis Control
2000	220800	Immunization Services
2000	221100	STD Clinic
2000	221200	HIV Prevention Services
2000	221300	HIV Counseling & Testing
2000	220600	Lead Poisoning Prevention
2000	410600	MHRA Summer Foot Patrols
2000	410700	DWI Enforcement Patrols
2000	410800	COPS in Schools
2000	410900	Gang Interdiction Programs
2000	420600	Local Law Enforcement Block Grant
2000	420700	Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant
2000	511100	McIntyre Ski Area Rehab - Phase III
2000	511200	Derryfield Country Club Rehab.-Phase II-Revision #1
2000	820600	TQM Training & Materials - Revision #1
2000	820700	HR Professional Services - Revision #1

Alderman Clancy moved to approve the authorizations. Alderman Wihby seconded the motion for discussion.

Alderman Clancy questioned the Riverwalk Planning and Development, asking if they had the easements for the different businesses where they were going to put the riverwalk.

Mr. MacKenzie responded no stating to my knowledge at this point there was only one easement that's been granted and the Jefferson Mill up at the northerly end of the project. There is an attorney that's been hired to the engineering firm CLD who is working on it who has the prepared the easements and has apparently been working on it.

Chairman O'Neil stated what I recommend, this easement issue has been brought to my attention by at least half the Board in why we don't have easements in place presently. I have spoken to both Tom Sommers from CLD and Frank Thomas.

What might be appropriate is why don't we take a vote of this Board, someone make a motion that we request in writing from city staff why that hasn't happened or why that shouldn't happen. Chairman O'Neil stated that Frank Thomas has indicated to me on sewer easements that it's traditionally they don't go after them until they are ready to do that particular phase. Whether or not that should be the same approach on the Riverwalk, I don't know, but if somebody would like to make a motion.

Alderman Lopez moved that city staff respond to the entire Board with regards to the easement issue as soon as possible. Alderman Clancy seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the position of the other phases of the project. In other words, hypothetical, let's assume I think we already approved \$1.2 million for phase I.

Chairman O'Neil stated for Phase IB and design of Phase II.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's assume for some hypothetical that the attorney can't get five easements through the portion of the Millyard that we are proposing to take the riverwalk and something changes and we can't do it. Does that mean that we are spending \$1.2 million on the back end first before we get easements on the front end? That to me wouldn't be prudent business sense.

Chairman O'Neil stated that was a legitimate question, you and I have discussed this a number of times and I can't honestly answer that.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that all of the owners have been very cooperative. They're a little bit hesitant until they actually see how it's going to develop before they actually commit, that's my understanding. But, certainly if it comes down to it, if there is one owner that does not wish to grant an easement the City always has the power of eminent domain to acquire the easement if it's necessary to complete the project. Eminent domain is something that I am very cautious about, we use it rarely, but the City always has that as an opportunity if they have to complete the riverwalk, they can use it to acquire these easements.

Alderman Gatsas stated I thought this was a user-friendly situation. Eminent domain doesn't sound like a user-friendly situation.

Mr. MacKenzie responded true, and it's rare that the city uses eminent domain.

Alderman Gatsas stated if I were one of the owners and I said if you want an easement, I would like \$100,000 for that easement, and at eminent domain proceedings they find that that's duly what it's worth, what happens.

Mr. MacKenzie stated again, I don't expect we will have to resort to that in this case. The owners have all been very cooperative. They are very excited about the project and I don't anticipate that issue coming up.

Alderman Gatsas stated in the short time that I have been here, in the less than three full months, I've certainly seen a lot of situations that people said wouldn't happen have happened, and again, Mr. MacKenzie, if you wanted to tell me you'd work for the city for the next 50 years at 0 stipends if we don't get those easements, then I might say that that's probably a pretty good idea, but I don't think anybody wants to take that position.

Alderman O'Neil stated they had a motion made and seconded that they request Mr. MacKenzie, Mr. Thomas, other city staff along with Mr. Sommers from CLD to respond to the entire Board with an answer on this easement issue.

Alderman Lopez stated just in a reasonable period of time, maybe at the next CIP meeting we could get some type of concrete answer and have Frank Thomas or Sheppard here at the same time.

Deputy Clerk Johnson clarified if the letter was to be sent to the City Clerk for distribution to the full Board.

Chairman O'Neil concurred that would be fine and requested Mr. MacKenzie to have the response forwarded to the Clerk for distribution to the entire Board.

Alderman Shea asked when the riverwalk is completed or part of it, whose responsibility will it be to maintain that section. Should that be determined before or after it's built, or while it's being built, or.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it was important he believed to have an appropriate maintenance, repair and security program for it. We have reviewed the matter and at some point will be bringing forward a management proposal and how to pay for that. Clearly, before it's completed, the City should have in place the long-term ability to properly maintain it.

Alderman Shea stated that will also be in a certain department, whether it be highway or parks and recreation, and they would be given enough money in their budget to do that, right.

Mr. MacKenzie stated what we are discussing now is a potential for developing a trust, because there are areas and a lot of people look at Wagner Park, so called "pretty park" the reason that it is maintained is that there is a trust. And we think the best way to maintain these is to encourage everybody to cooperate in funding a long-term trust.

Alderman Gatsas stated I still don't know if my question was answered. My question was \$1.2 million has been appropriated for Phase IB, I assume that's ready to be spent. Is that correct?

Chairman O'Neil responded start the design.

Alderman Gatsas stated the design for \$200,000 and the actual work on Phase IB, is that correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so tomorrow, they could possibly go out there with bulldozers and shovels and start spending a million dollars is that correct.

Mr. MacKenzie responded that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated my question is, if that's what they are proposing to do and it takes whenever for easements, and if we don't get those easements, we've spent \$1.2 million on 900 feet as Alderman Vaillancourt said of a sidewalk that is just going to be sticking out there.

Alderman O'Neil stated I believe IB is city owned property, is that correct.

Mr. MacKenzie stated IB is city owned so there are no questions with acquiring...

Alderman Gatsas stated you are missing the point, I don't care who owns the property, we are spending \$1.2 million not knowing whether we can do part of the project that has 85% of the traffic in the city in the Millyard. We don't know that we can do that. Does anybody want to give me that guarantee in writing, cause I don't think that's a prudent business decision.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think city staff is certainly aware as am I of the importance of this easement issue to the majority of the Board and it would be my hope we can get a response from city staff within a very short period of time on this and hopefully ease the concerns of many of the Board members.

Alderman Gatsas stated so what you are saying that before they start spending money in Phase IB, is that what you are saying alderman, or do you feel comfortable letting them spend the money.

Chairman O'Neil stated I personally feel comfortable going forward on IB. We own the property for IB. Three years from now as we are getting to the tail end of this possibly could we run into a snag, I can't predict that. I think the message is clear to me and to the city staff that we need to address the 13 or 14 easements, and would ask them to respond in a timely manner to the Board. Now if somebody would like to make a motion to hold up things for a week until we get response on that I'd accept that. If not we'll proceed.

Chairman O'Neil stated there was a motion made, seconded and we voted, correct?

Deputy Clerk Johnson advised that they had not voted to send the letter yet, there was a motion but no vote was recorded.

Chairman O'Neil stated there has been a motion made and seconded to have city staff to respond to the Board with regards to the easement issue.

Alderman Clancy stated say we go and do this Phase I, does the city have the go ahead, no easements on this Phase I.

Chairman O'Neil stated we own the land.

Alderman Clancy stated okay, now let's say we start the second phase, I don't know how long it's going to take and we do have the right for one easement and somebody gets hurt, who is going to be liable.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would believe that before we start design, and Alderman Gatsas makes a very valid point about it, but I can't answer it alderman.

Alderman Clancy stated yes he does, it's like at the racetrack, I'm that far away from holding back myself.

Chairman O'Neil stated they were going to respond to us in a week. They have a week to respond.

Alderman Cashin asked if it would be advisable to hold this up for a week until you get the information you need, it would clear up a lot of.

Alderman Cashin so moved to hold up the project for a week pending response. Alderman Clancy seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby noted that if they held it up it would be three or four weeks, they could always hold it up at the full Board level next week, if they don't have the proper stuff that we want.

Alderman Clancy stated they hadn't done any work down there anyway.

Alderman Wihby noted the next meeting would not be for two or three weeks.

Chairman O'Neil noted the next committee meeting would probably be a month.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that they had two motions on the floor, and a suggestion from the clerk, if the committee wants to hold this up temporarily, perhaps would be to add a caveat on to the letter of response that they will not expend the monies until a response has been received by the full Board; and ask that the response come in prior to Tuesday's meeting if possible.

Alderman Cashin withdrew his motion. Alderman Clancy withdrew his second to the motion.

In response to question, Deputy Clerk Johnson advised that the original motion was to send a letter requesting that they respond to the question regarding the easements, and what would be added on to that is that the response be received by the full Board by Tuesday (March 21), and no funds be expended prior to that.

Alderman Cashin so moved the amendment to add that the response be received by the full Board by Tuesday [March 21], and that no funds be expended prior to that time. Alderman Clancy seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the main motion as amended. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil stated there was a motion made and seconded to approve the budget authorizations presented in Item #4 and called for a vote. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from the Information Services Director seeking authorization for additional projects to be funded from CIP 2000 #821099, Y2K Contingency and Computer Upgrades as follows:

- (a) for the development of revised policy and procedure manuals relative to the City's financial accounting operations and internal controls;
- (b) replacement of the Library's telephone system; and
- (c) funding for an HTE Web server.

Alderman Wihby moved to approve the request. Alderman Lopez seconded the motion for discussion.

Alderman Lopez questioned the HTE Web server and requested Ms. Prew to explain what this project detailed. He asked if it was a full time employee or a contract item to go out and do all this work.

Ms. Prew stated what this entails is both hardware and software to make the information the information that's presently on the HTE. Members could not hear, and Ms. Prew moved closer to the microphone. Ms. Prew continued stating this entailed both hardware and software to web-enable the HTE system. The intent here is that it would allow eventually for citizens to be able to access the information on the systems, to look up their accounts, to schedule inspections and building permits and those kind of things and eventually to even make payments on particular bills that they might have outstanding.

Alderman Lopez asked who would monitor this after this was in place, all of the items that she had indicated.

Ms. Prew stated that would be part of the support that is provided by our department.

Alderman Cashin asked Ms. Prew if this was money that was allocated for Y2K, .5 million.

Ms. Prew responded yes, it was Y2K and computer upgrades. We have accomplished the computer upgrade that was part of that, and we've covered the outstanding Y2K issues that were necessary.

Alderman Cashin stated so you have done everything that this money was allocated for.

Ms. Prew stated yes that's correct.

Alderman Cashin stated and you have a balance of another \$250,000, and that's the money you want to use for these projects.

Ms. Prew responded yes.

Alderman Cashin stated Mr. Chairman I think that money ought to come back to this committee and we ought to reallocate it. The project's been done. They allocated .5 million, evidently it was accomplished at \$250,000 so there is a balance of \$250,000.

Ms. Prew responded that's correct.

Alderman Cashin asked why this would not come back to this committee and then if she wanted to put in another proposal we could address it at that point, that was just a suggestion.

Alderman Clancy stated Ms. Prew as far as you are concerned is the HTE system up and running in all departments right now.

Ms. Prew stated there were still several modules that are being brought up. The major modules are up. We are working on community development modules and we are cleaning up issues that remain on some of the other systems.

Alderman Clancy asked would these monies that you are looking for, this \$250,000, would that help to bring them up to date or enhance them better.

Ms. Prew responded the first request is to use \$100,000. Of the funds for policies and procedures manual that are part of the management letter that was received from the auditors. In the past we had manuals that went along with the old financial system that were in all departments that what they did was to take how the computer system worked and integrate those with the policies and procedures that the city uses, so you could give those manuals to an employee and it would tell them how to enter invoices, PO's, and those kinds of things.

Alderman Clancy asked how long has this system been in operation, 14/15 months.

Ms. Prew stated it depends, there are various modules. The tax system and the utility billing system has been running for less than six months, so some of them are new, some of them are not.

Alderman Clancy stated like Alderman Cashin said, maybe we should get these monies back to us here and then use them as we see fit, because I know we are going to be in a crunch here for monies for this coming year, that's just my opinion.

Ms. Prew stated if I might speak to one issue, that since I wrote this letter has since become worse, and that's the Library's telephone system. That system is very old, it squeaked through year 2000, but it had problems with leap year, the system is very unreliable. In my letter I say that conversations bleed over into other telephone lines, well now the conversations can be heard over the PA system at times.

Alderman Clancy asked why John Brisbin did not put that money in his budget.

Ms. Prew stated those funds were requested as part of the 2000 CIP, and they were not funded at that time. And since then, the situation has gotten worse with the telephone system, and I really, we really feel that it is imperative that it be addressed.

Alderman Clancy asked what kind of money they were talking about.

Ms. Prew responded \$50,000.

Alderman Wihby stated we have an audit deficiency of these things that they are asking for for the first project. Second one, Library, you've just heard the reason, and the third one with the HTE server if you read why they want it to make it easier for citizens and also to reduce the number of phone calls and everything else. In the long run you are going to save money because that is the whole purpose of doing this. the money was earmarked for computer type operations and I don't see why we wouldn't just give it to them and let them update their stuff. The Committee looked at it, the Mayor's Systems Advisory Committee, and they are recommending it also. I think it should be done because I think we are being foolish if we start getting behind. Anything we can do for the citizens to make it easier to pay their bills and do things on line is where everybody is going nowadays and if we don't do it...we are talking a whole year away. The Library sounds like it is a main concern and we get written up in the audit for not having the manuals and everything else. The next time something happens and there is no manual in place, we are all going to try to chew somebody else up because we are not funding it today.

Alderman Lopez stated in reference to the policy and procedures manual in Finance, since 1989 it hasn't been updated according to the report. Now did Finance put any money in their particular budget to assist us before you found out that you had the \$250,000?

Ms. Prew replied I can't answer that question, Alderman. I don't know.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated regarding the \$100,000 for Item A, do you have a breakdown of how that is going to be spent. Would it be to hire outside experts to come in and do this or would you be doing it internally? How are you going to spend \$100,000?

Ms. Prew replied an RFP would be issued for professional services and a company would be hired to provide that service. That is the way it was handled the last time it was done.

Chairman O'Neil asked these three requests were not included in your FY2001 CIP request, correct.

Ms. Prew answered the third item, the HTE web server, was included in my request for the FY2001 CIP.

Chairman O'Neil asked where was it on the priority list.

Ms. Prew answered it was our first priority.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there any further discussion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I just have one question. I believe that when we were listening to the auditor's report that they said I believe in one of the departments downstairs that uses cash registers and when they are doing transactions the cash registers have to be left open. Has that been corrected?

Ms. Prew replied that will be corrected shortly.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is shortly.

Ms. Prew answered in about four weeks.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you are saying that if you came back to this Committee and told them with that fund date of April 15 in mind that that should be when it is completed.

Ms. Prew replied what is happening in that regard is that there is a new motor vehicle system being installed in the Tax Office. That system will make use of the equipment that is used for the HTE receipting system and it will, therefore, be able to trigger those cash drawers and they will open and close as necessary.

Alderman Cashin moved to have the money returned to the Committee.

Alderman Wihby asked isn't there already a motion.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there was a motion made by Alderman Wihby to approve it and it was seconded by Alderman Lopez for discussion.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve the request. Aldermen Clancy and Cashin voted nay. Chairman O'Neil broke the tie and also voted nay. The motion failed.

Alderman Clancy stated we need more information from Diane. I know that the having the cash register drawers open all of the time bothers me. As far as the Library, I am for them getting a telephone system. I have pros and cons about these items.

Ms. Prew replied these funds in no way affect the Tax Office. With the Tax Office, it is just a question of timing. There is a new system for motor vehicles, which is not part of HTE. HTE does not have a motor vehicle registration module. We, therefore, had to continue to run with the old motor vehicle system. The old motor vehicle system is going to be replaced and the cash drawer problem is going to be taken care of.

Alderman Clancy stated I can't believe that being the largest City in the State we are the last ones to get this on-line motor vehicle system.

Ms. Prew replied we have a motor vehicle system.

Alderman Clancy stated but that is the updated one.

Ms. Prew responded it is being replaced because the equipment it is running on is about 10 years old and it is obsolete. We are holding the equipment together with extra parts that we have acquired. When that equipment dies, the system is done. Now, what has occurred is there was a great deal of work that had to be done. We brought those systems through the Year 2000 and those that we were able to carry through, we did. Now that we are through all of that, we are replacing that system. It is in the process of being tested right now.

Alderman Lopez stated I keep hearing that we need these things and we need to do them and do them and do them and we put roadblocks along the line. I respect the other Aldermen's opinions, but I really think that in order for her department to provide the information that we keep asking for that we can't get, especially the 1989 report an all of that, I wish the Aldermen would take a good, serious look at that. We need money, but they need to be able to do their job also.

Alderman Cashin moved to table the item. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I am just dumbfounded on how you are going to spend \$100,000 on that item. Could you get us some information on how many hours that is going to take and what kind of information is going to go into spending \$100,000?

Chairman O'Neil requested that Ms. Prew provide as much of a breakdown on the three items as she can and send it to the full Board.

Deputy Clerk asked for a copy.

Chairman O'Neil requested that Ms. Prew send the breakdown through the City Clerk's Office.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Chief of Police requesting to purchase a Special Reaction Team Response Van.

Chief Driscoll stated this is a request to expend approximately \$51,000 from our 1998 Law Enforcement Block Grant that was received by the City during 1998. It in no way affects the budget of the Police Department. The base price of the truck that we would like to purchase is \$32,000. We would then send that truck, after we receive the lowest bid, over to Custom Creations and have that retrofitted to meet the needs of the Special Reaction Team. Both Captain Leidemer and Lt. Putney have worked very hard to put together a package that they think will meet their needs to respond to crisis' within the community. We have a small van at this time. It is a 1986 van. I should be able to tell you the mileage on it, but I can't. It is still in fairly good condition. The body is still in fairly good condition. We intend to convert that to a second animal control vehicle, thus eliminating the

cruiser that is presenting being used now. It is my opinion that this is a much needed piece of equipment to respond to those calls for service that come every so often. It would provide us the means of transporting a Special Reaction Team fully equipped, geared and ready to go. I would be pleased to answer any questions.

Alderman Wihby moved to approve the request. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy stated I know that you don't use the van on a daily basis like the Traffic Department that has a 1989 van that they use to put up traffic signs and stuff every day. I also know that it is a block grant, but as far as using the van for the animal rescue, I would rather see the van be given to the Traffic Department until they can get something for themselves. How much mileage did you say it had?

Chief Driscoll replied I don't know.

Alderman Clancy asked did you buy it new.

Chief Driscoll answered yes; we bought it new 14 years ago. I would say that it has somewhere around 30,000 miles on it. The body is in good shape. It has some useful life in it. It has cabinets in it. If you folks remember Deputy Chief Vandell in his younger days he is the one who clipped and made that. It is a homemade interior. It is serviceable. I, quite frankly, believe that it is a good use to convert it to a second vehicle for the Animal Control Division.

Alderman Gatsas asked does Animal Control need two vehicles, Chief.

Chief Driscoll answered yes they do.

Alderman Gatsas asked could you give me an idea of how many animals you pick up on a daily basis.

Chief Driscoll answered no, I can't, but I can tell you that in order for them to meet the needs of the community and go from call to call...they have two vehicles now. They have a converted cruiser that they use as well as the Animal Control van. Both of them are out. As you know, the animal shelter is staffed basically by volunteers when they are not there. It is a much better use of their time having them out on the street doing animal control.

Alderman Gatsas stated this has nothing to do with the Chief and I know that most of the members of the Board are here, but my question is the block grant is a 1998 block grant and how much money is left in that.

Chief Driscoll replied I could provide you with that information. There is no much. There are a couple of items...we received that block grant toward the end of the calendar year. It goes through CIP generally and there is a project number assigned to it. We have a committee or the community has a committee with somebody from the Solicitor's Office who meets with this committee and they listen to requests on how that funding will be spent.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe the question I should ask is to meet with Mr. MacKenzie, but I think there are probably some other freshman Aldermen here who may have the same question. I am looking at CIP ADA Compliance of \$15 million from 1994. What I am looking at is how does anybody know what is left in any bonding issue that has ever been done.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is a fair comment. The first meeting in January that this Committee had, we requested an update on all balances from the CIP staff. I know that they are continuing to work on that, but we need to get that information soon.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we are working on that. We do have a list. The difficulty is that we have not reconciled that list to the HTE system in all of the departments. Potentially, we are considering releasing to you the draft list as long as you recognize that there may be some discrepancies between what shows on HTE and what we are carrying with balances. There are a couple of projects that I know you had asked specifically to find out what projects have never been started for example and there are some on the list and there are no discrepancies on those. We do have the draft list.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would suggest that you get that out to the Committee as soon as possible. One of the problems is that before HTE they were able to generate information a lot quicker. It seems to slow them down and they are almost gun shy with the information they get off the system and they want to double-check it to make sure that what they send out is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you still have the information off the old computer system. It must be alive somewhere?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the difficulties were the first two years of the transition onto HTE. Basically, the old computer system is not usable, the old LGFS. Data was inputted into the HTE system and there was a lot of misunderstanding about how to use it at first in terms of the training so a lot of items were put in the wrong locations and I am sure the Police Department knows about the problems with

THE at that time. I don't think that the old LGFS is going to help us. It is really those projects during a two year span roughly.

Alderman Gatsas asked what years are those.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it was implemented in July of 1997.

Alderman Gatsas asked so anything prior to July of 1997 you still have on the old system.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if there is no tape or anything else that you can print out what happens if those numbers that you brought forward in HTE aren't right. We don't have any way of checking that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we are going to reconcile it bill by bill if we have to, which is why it is so time consuming. We have to go back to the departments and make sure that the bills were done. Those projects, for example, that were started under the old system, let's say underground storage tanks as an example. Those started in 1994 and there is some balance, but when the conversion happened in July of 1997 they started charging new bills to the HTE system so even the old ones before 1997, some of the bills were charged during the HTE transition period and, therefore, even though it was started before 1997 we can't give you an accurate number on all of those.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we never kept any back up. There is nothing that backs up before 1997 that we have in place that you can look at and say this makes sense?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we have the records prior to 1997. The difficulty, again, is after 1997.

Alderman Gatsas stated my question is this. If I asked you tomorrow to push a button in the system that you have, the old system, and give me a record of all CIP projects from 1997 back that still have open balances could you do that.

Mr. MacKenzie replied there is no longer a running LGFS system. That was the old financial system. There is no longer a running LGFS system.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we didn't keep anything going in case there was a problem. We have no back-up system to the old system?

Mr. MacKenzie answered it was determined that there was not going to be any...

Alderman Gatsas asked who determined that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am not sure.

Alderman Gatsas asked the Deputy Clerk to find out who determined that.

Chairman O'Neil stated why don't we refer that to Information Systems and the Finance Department. I know that one of the things Mr. MacKenzie and his staff have been working on is reconciling the numbers with the individual departments to make sure that they match up. The intent tonight was not to bash HTE, but I will tell you it has been a failure in this City and I feel bad for the departments that they have had to live with it.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to request that Information Systems and Finance provide a written response to Alderman Gatsas' question regarding who decided that the old system should be terminated.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Mr. MacKenzie, is there anything that the Board can do to support you in getting information. Are you getting information in a timely manner from the departments?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I know that most of the departments are stretched pretty thin right now in getting projects done. Generally, the departments work well with us. We will show you the draft listing and probably we can tell you which projects are most suspect. I did want to comment that in terms of reconciling, we have another twist in that all HUD projects we have to run a separate computer system connected to Washington on that so we are reconciling two computer systems with our own spreadsheets.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to send a memo to all City Departments informing them that they are to respond to the Planning CIP staff immediately with the numbers relating to their CIP projects.

Alderman Gatsas stated from what I understand, you are doing just about everything manually. With trying to tie into HUD and working with spreadsheets, you must be almost having to put them in on a manual basis.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the HUD system is how we actually draw funds down to the City from Washington, DC on all of the HUD projects so that one is fully computerized. It is a fairly cumbersome computer system, but in essence we have

to reconcile between the HTE and this IDIS system so in order to do that we have it on spreadsheets to make sure that the two are jiving.

Alderman Gatsas asked so they are manual.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Cashin stated I don't want to belabor this, Mr. MacKenzie, but what do you have. You have a HUD system, you have the HTE system and then you have another system that somebody discontinued but nobody knows who discontinued it. Is that right?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the LGFS system was the City's financial computer system city wide prior to HTE. That terminated. They did not run parallel systems so that terminated as of July 1, 1997, the old LGFS. That wasn't one that we ran, that was one that the City ran on an older PC.

Alderman Cashin stated when you first went on the HTE system in July of 1997 you dropped the LGFS system. Is that what you are telling us?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is correct.

Alderman Cashin asked and now you are telling me that you can't get the necessary information you need because the LGFS system is down. Is that right?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I think that until the time that LGFS closed down, we had all of the information we needed. The difficulty was starting July 1 when there was some confusion on how to input into HTE so the records from July 1, 1997 through roughly a two year period and I will maybe rely on one department head who knows about the HTE system to see if I am wrong but during that period there was a lot of issues in terms of the transition between the old system and the new system. In essence, the old system, I believe, shut down in 1997.

Alderman Cashin asked but we don't know who shut it down.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I don't know.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to direct the City Departments to respond to the Planning CIP staff immediately through FY2000 on the numbers regarding CIP projects.

Alderman Gatsas asked could you add a date to the immediately because immediately to some departments may be different to others.

Alderman Lopez amended the motion to direct the City Departments to respond to the Planning CIP staff within seven days of the date of the memo. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Clancy stated I have a question for Chief Driscoll or Mr. MacKenzie. Are there any law enforcement block grants out there...when did you get this block grant for the van?

Chief Driscoll replied we have gotten a grant for the last four years and I anticipate getting a grant again this year to support community policing. Basically what happened was when President Clinton became President he did community policing in a big way and said he was going to put 100,000 new police officers on the street, but he only provided salaries. The law enforcement community spoke out and said that is fine but we need other things. We need uniforms, we need cars, we need firearms, we need radios and they then came along with a law enforcement block grant that supported those types of things. As a result of Manchester's statistical dominance in the State of NH, we receive a fairly large block grant every year that is distributed for a variety of different equipment needs. It actually keeps our capital requests down significantly.

Alderman Clancy stated I asked because I am asking myself how much money do they have over there in escrow that they haven't spent. Each time they come before us they say it is a law enforcement block grant or this or that.

Chief Driscoll replied there is very little in that one. We have approximately \$250,000 in the FY99 law enforcement block grant. The Committee has met. We met with Diane Prew and the people from Information Systems, as well as the NH State Police and the folks from DM Data down in New Jersey. We plan to put mobile data terminals in each one of the vehicles. It is both a radio safety issue and a personnel safety issue.

Alderman Clancy asked what is it about \$157,000 or something like that.

Chief Driscoll answered actually it is \$247,000. As you know, every year the City gives us a 10% new money match to do that. I have a question on Item 6. I would like you to take a vote on it and I would also like to ask one more thing. We are looking at a timeline with ordering this particular vehicle. I realize that it needs to go back to the full Board for approval but I would ask this Committee...I contacted the Mayor's Office today and asked if we could put this out to bid before final approval with the understanding that if final approval is not granted

that we wouldn't spend any money. This would allow us to get a 2000 vehicle as opposed to a 2001 vehicle because they anticipate a cost increase of 7% or 8%.

Chairman O'Neil stated right if you don't get the order in you are going to have to get the next year's vehicle.

Alderman Wihby moved to allow the Police Department to proceed to put the vehicle purchase out to bid. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the original motion to approve the purchase of the Special Reaction Team Response Van. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Discussion of process to review FY2001 CIP Resolution.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I did want to go over the process so that the Committee was familiar with the scenario and if you have your CIP books with you, the schedule for the CIP process is listed fairly early on in those booklets. You will see a tab for CIP Summary and then about the fifth page in you will see the CIP budget adoption process. We are at the point now of mid-March so we are about halfway through the CIP process. This Committee is now meeting and will likely meet as many times as the Committee feels is appropriate to review all of the requests. Next Monday night, March 20, the CIP public hearing will be held where people may come in and testify specifically on the CIP. The following night at the full Board is when we hope to be submitting bond resolutions and amending resolutions for the expedited projects. Again, there is a list of expedited projects that we hope to get underway sometime in April. Typically following the public hearing the full Finance Committee would consider the recommendations of the CIP Committee. At some point, this Committee would be providing recommendations to the Finance Department for their final consideration. We do hope to have some action. If we get an action by the full Board at the first full meeting in April, any bond resolutions have to lay over. The earliest at this point that any action could take place would be April 18. Typically that is a date that if the Board does finalize the expedited projects on that date, the departments can go ahead with the summer construction projects. Once you get into May, it becomes more difficult because you have to order materials and get everything set up. That is close to a drop-dead date. Again, the CIP Committee itself doesn't have a lot of

time to start considering these. I am not sure if you were going to discuss these tonight.

Chairman O'Neil replied no. I think we were going to wait until after the hearing on Monday evening. Does anybody have a specific question or concern?

Alderman Lopez stated I was concerned about the action that we took tonight in reference to the Riverfront Development, which is expedited as you indicated. Is the information about the easements going to bother that particular item. That is Item 3.

Mr. MacKenzie replied since the Board won't be acting formally on this until the first week in April, I don't see where there would be any difficulties. I would assume that you will have your answers from the consultant and the Highway Department before that date so I don't see any problem at this present time.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked how the Committee would like to proceed going through the CIP recommendations that have been presented or referred to the Committee. We will need to schedule time for the Committee to go through all of those items. We are trying to find out how much time you feel you are going to need. We will have the use of Monday and Wednesday evenings to meet the deadlines that Mr. MacKenzie just outlined. I presume that you may want to invite other members of the Board to attend as well.

Chairman O'Neil stated a lot will depend on what happens at the public hearing. I think personally that the budget reflects a lot of the needs of the City. There is one major project that I have talked to the Mayor's Office about that I think we could be making a mistake if we don't put some money in and that is to start design of the Granite Street project. The State is going forward. I get the same message from Frank Thomas, State Transportation officials and their consultant that we could make a big mistake if we don't at least get the design portion of that going. They are going forward with or without us and there is going to be more traffic on that bridge than there is now in the Year 2002 or 2003. I think that is a citywide concern.

Alderman Lopez stated I was wondering if Mr. MacKenzie could provide the Committee...I understand there is a 30% that the State gives back to the City or the School Department when we do projects like adding on school buildings or athletic fields and I was wondering if you could explain that to us, not tonight, but if you could explain exactly how that works and how that is calculated into the bond if it is within the bonds or is that money that actually comes back to the City or does the School Department actually have to put in the application for it and

then they get the money while we bond the full project. I was wondering if you could explain that at a later date.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I could explain it verbally now or did you want me to provide it in writing.

Alderman Lopez responded I would prefer it in writing myself so that I can analyze it. I would also like to ask another question on one line item. Since we split from the City to the School and there are two different Boards and two different authorities, the line item for \$875,000 for parking lots for schools, #18, should not be in Parks in my opinion. It should be assigned to line item 330401 because I think it puts a hindrance on the City if we are talking about schools and I was wondering if you could look at that and comment back to us another time. If you want to comment now, fine.

Mr. MacKenzie replied generally speaking, capital projects are still within the purview...even though it is related to schools, if you talk about school buildings or school sites which is handled by Parks & Recreation under past agreements, projects dealing with schools are actually under the Joint School Building Committee. That Committee is made up of three Aldermen and three School Board members so bond projects are still under the purview of the City whereas the City could grant them cash to do these projects and that would go under their line item of their operating budget if it is a bond project that is handled as a separate process, separate and distinct from the School budget.

Alderman Lopez stated I am talking about the line item for \$875,000 that is chargeable to Parks & Recreation for school grounds.

Mr. MacKenzie asked is it the chargeback that you are talking about.

Alderman Lopez answered not a chargeback. This is for CIP improvement of \$875,000 for parking lots at schools. All I am saying is we are giving \$4+ million to the School Department for improvements and to me the parking lot is part of the school and I was wondering since we had this split in the Supreme Court whether that is true or not. Parks & Recreation, in my viewpoint, shouldn't be charged for those if it is the school grounds when everything is based upon drug free zones and everything like that and they have to come up with \$875,000 when we are giving them over \$4 million to do maintenance for the school. That is all I am saying.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the \$4.3 million, for example, is administered by the Highway Department so bond projects are generally handled by Highway in cooperation with the School District. The Board of Mayor and Aldermen and the

School Board in the past have asked that the Parks & Recreation Commission handle the athletic portions and the sites of the school facilities. If the Board decided that they did not want Parks & Recreation to handle those areas, then it could be referred to School, although they really don't have the capacity to either construct school sites or maintain school sites so that would likely fall to the Highway Department.

Alderman Lopez stated I am not talking about athletic fields like West Memorial Field. I am talking about the actual physical parking lot that is around the schools and should be incorporated into the maintenance of the schools. I mean you have a building and somewhere along the line it is not just a building because the kids play out in the yard. Anyway, I want to have more discussion about this at a later date as we get into the process.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Deputy Clerk Johnson, do you want to make a suggestion on when we should meet.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered I don't have a calendar here, but what I will do is go back and speak with Leo and we will set-up a meeting of the CIP Committee at the earliest possible date following the public hearing.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I want to note that as it goes along we will have some corrections to the CIP Program and we do have those, but I will wait until we get into the process. There are a few minor corrections that we have to go through, but I think I would rather bring those in once you get working on the document. There were items that, for example, there were some cemetery projects, which were believed to be Enterprise type because it was thought that they could come under the Cemetery Trust Fund, but they could not. Whereas they are listed on a table for Enterprise, they would have to be removed because they cannot be funded through the Enterprise or Cemetery Trust. That is an example.

Alderman Wihby asked did you get the communication from Alderman Hirschmann. I think it is a good idea for the CIP Budget to have some idea of what the true cost is. Basically, for example like to build a new fire station we will need 50 additional firefighters, apparatus, etc. All we see in the CIP part is building the building. His communication is asking for the total project cost. I think it makes some sense.

Chairman O'Neil asked did he summarize your intent, Alderman Hirschmann.

Alderman Hirschmann answered yes. I put it on our next agenda so that we can discuss it in Finance or when we are at the full Board. It is like Alderman Wihby said. There are a lot of projects that come before us that you don't anticipate the

personnel or HR numbers or sometimes the debt service number or benefits. There are a lot of different aspects that go into building something. I am just asking any department head, before they put a project in front of you, that they do give you the full picture showing you the body complement, the debt service, etc. When we built the McLaughlin Middle School, we were told that it was a \$9 million building going over two years but we were never told how many bodies it would take to operate that school.

Alderman Clancy stated you are not right in what you said about this project here. It does have to be done because the people out there just can't sit there and say well what year is it going to be built. If there is a loss of life, who is going to take the blame. Do you want to take the blame? That is why this thing should be done.

Alderman Hirschmann replied I used that particular project as an example. I am not saying not to do that project. I am saying that is a typical project with expenses that would come into a next budget year.

Alderman Shea stated anything we do, it is not so much how much you pay for it, but it is how much it costs to maintain it and keep it in good shape. A lot of projects are initiated, but no forethought is given to how much it is going to cost down the road, which is equally important.

Alderman Clancy moved to go ahead with the new Fire Station.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Hirschmann's intent with his memo was just to use that as an example. He wasn't taking a negative side to the project. I don't think his intent was to say it is a bad project. He was just using it as an example.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I could have picked out the West Side Library Project in fact. How many librarians do you need? How many administrators and supervisors and all that kind of stuff? I could have picked that project.

TABLED ITEM

8. Communication from the Manchester Police Athletic League requesting \$85,000 to purchase the parking lot adjacent to St. Cecilia's Hall at the southeast corner of Lake Avenue and Beech Street contingent upon appraised value.
(Tabled 2/8/00)

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Clancy moved to approve the request.

Chairman O'Neil stated we already did that above in #3.

Alderman Clancy moved to give Gerald Parker the authority to park in the empty lot. He has been doing it for years with his business.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there a number of spaces.

Alderman Clancy answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked could you come up with that number.

Alderman Clancy answered 10.

Alderman Lopez asked wouldn't it be better if, just as a suggestion, that we wait and negotiate with the party involved. To just give them 10 spaces at this time wouldn't be right.

Alderman Clancy answered he has been using it for a number of years and there have been a number of people contacting me about their concern regarding going to the laundromat and having no place to park up there. Why would people go and use that laundromat if they don't have any place to park? It is kind of hard to park on Beech Street or Lake Avenue. Do you know the area yourself?

Alderman Lopez answered I am very familiar with it. Alderman O'Neil and myself are on the Board of Directors of the Police Athletic League and I can assure you that we will try to negotiate and include you in the conversations. Is that okay?

Chairman O'Neil asked are you comfortable with that, Alderman Clancy.

Alderman Clancy answered yes.

Mr. MacKenzie stated since we are basically handling the PAL parking lot earlier, the Board could dispose of the tabled item if they would like.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to receive and file the item.

3/14/00 CIP
26

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee