

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

Continuation of March 27, 2000 Meeting

March 28, 2000

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting back to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

Absent: Alderman Wihby

Messrs: R. MacKenzie, R. Ludwig, R. Johnson, S. Maranto, Aldermen
Thibault, Shea, Gatsas, Vaillancourt

Chairman O'Neil stated based on the discussion last night and that of the public hearing, the CIP staff has gone back and would like to make a recommendation to us tonight. I believe it addresses the concerns of the Board.

Alderman Lopez stated after we discuss this, there are other issues that we need to discuss.

Chairman O'Neil replied sure but the intent tonight, gentlemen, is to hopefully refer out of Committee tonight a revised CIP budget to the full Board next week for approval so that various departments can get moving on some of these projects.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would like to run through and tell you what the four sheets are first. The first page outlines projects that I understood from the Committee were of importance, but were not included in the CIP so I would like to go over those individually. That is the first page. It is broken down into Option A and Option B because there is a fairly significant difference in the price tag associated with those two. The second page, we have gone through as a staff all of the old projects to see which projects could be closed out at this time. We have identified about a dozen projects, both cash and bond projects, totaling about \$96,000. We have reviewed today with the Director of Information Systems that there is a potential for \$100,000 out of the Y2K contingency computer upgrade. The third page identifies some corrections. You will see that we will have to delete four projects, which we believed at one point could be funded as Enterprise projects.

They are all cemetery projects, but those were really intended to be requested out of bond. At this time, there is no way to fund those. They were relatively low on the P&R priority list. We are proposing that those be corrected and deleted. The next one is adding a new project, which was actually from the Highway Department and EPD. It says Aggregation and it is the same project but in essence the Environmental Protection Division is going to be making some energy conservation measures in their buildings and sewage treatment plant that will pay for itself. That is adding a table to the fifth column. That will pay for itself and does not compete against the regular no obligation bond.

Chairman O'Neil asked why does it have to be referenced as Aggregation.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am not sure why. Originally it was not in there because we assumed that it was the Aggregation Program, but actually that was the way it was written up by the Highway Department and EPD staff.

Chairman O'Neil asked couldn't we change the title of it to something like EPD Energy...Energy Efficient Measures at EPD. It is not truly an Aggregation project. I think that would make the Board more comfortable with that. Do you have any problem just changing the title of that project to Energy Efficient Measures at EPD or something to that effect? Should we take a vote on that?

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated you don't have to do that unless you want to add that separately from everything else you are doing. You can move that first and then that is done if you want to take care of it that way.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is fine.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to change the title of CIP 830201 to Energy Efficiency Programs and add the item to Table 5.

Alderman Lopez asked how does that fit in with the revenue portion of the finance aspect of it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it has no impact on our general obligation bond or our bond capacity because the money to pay off the bond is from the savings from EPD. On the last page, you will see that there are nine projects. These are projects that we would hope to expedite out of FY2001 into the FY2000. We will have to prepare a more detailed Resolution, but I am hoping to get the Committee tonight to recommend this to the full Board or to the Finance Committee next week.

3/27/00 cont. 3/28/00

3

Chairman O'Neil asked do we need that as a vote now on that specific page.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered if he is looking to expedite the projects, the suggestion that the Clerk would have would be to have a motion to recommend to the Board that these projects be expedited and, therefore, deleted from the present Resolution and placed onto a separate Resolution.

Alderman Clancy voted to recommend to the Board that these projects be expedited and, therefore, deleted from the present Resolution and placed onto a separate Resolution. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Thibault stated I noticed that on #2, adding \$450,000 CIP 711101...

Chairman O'Neil interjected we are not there. We are on the last page.

Alderman Thibault asked but don't they also mention that in the Bridge Rehabilitation Program.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is a different project I believe.

Alderman Lopez stated before we vote on this motion and without going through all of the other aspects in the beginning, is it going to have an effect if there is some other element there that we want to change or should we vote on this motion last.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it is up to the Committee. Whatever you decide on...the only thing that might change is if we have a different title for the project or if you eliminate one of these.

Alderman Lopez stated that is my point. We might want to take another project and I don't know at this stage of the game, but we should vote on this last in case we want to add something to it.

Mr. MacKenzie asked could we keep this motion on the table and come back to it later.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I would rather that this motion be withdrawn at this time and we will bring it back at the end.

Alderman Clancy withdrew his motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated now we get into the meat of the first page. Do you want to review this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied this comes basically from the Committee discussions. Alderman Lopez had written a report to the Committee, which I did review and from the public testimony. The first one, Option A, Item 1 would be basically earmarking four additional projects within the Park Improvement Program. Those would be \$75,000 for Pine Island Park, approximately \$150,000 for Prout Park, \$300,000 for Piscataquog Park and \$50,000 for the Skateboard Park. Now you will notice if you do some quick calculations that it adds up to more than the \$475,000 but there was already \$100,000 in that Park Improvement Program that was not utilized. If you take that with the \$475,000, all of those numbers will add up.

Chairman O'Neil asked are there any questions on Item 1.

Alderman Lopez asked what was the \$100,000 for. Are you talking about the uncommitted?

Mr. MacKenzie answered in the original proposed CIP there was \$9.91 million. Of that, a portion was earmarked to West Memorial Field and a portion was earmarked for Livingston. Beyond those two there was \$100,000 in that pool that was not earmarked yet and was not identified for any project. All we are saying here is one of these four projects then would be earmarked to that \$100,000.

Alderman Lopez stated my second question is to fund the Lemire Track, \$150,000. Is that in here anywhere?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it is not in this listing. I did see it in your memo, but it was a large chunk of money at that time and I couldn't see how we would add it to Option A.

Chairman O'Neil stated my recommendation when we were starting to wrap up Livingston Park and this for the most part will be the last year of funding at West Memorial is that Clem Lemire be the next major complex we attack. We unfortunately don't have the room to be doing three of these at the same time.

Alderman Lopez replied Mr. Chairman, with due respect, I believe that the plans for Clem Lemire Park are already to go. They only need the money to do it. They asked for \$150,000 to complete that project up there. There is plenty of money there to add \$150,000. You have \$2,385,000 in that account. Take the money out of there. To hold up that project...we have a good track over at West and we are going to have a good track over at Central so let's complete Memorial and we will have three fine tracks in the City. I think there is \$150,000 there and I wish we would consider putting that money in there for the Clem Lemire track.

Alderman Levasseur stated \$700,000 for turf when we could spend \$100,000 for grass seed and have \$600,000 freed up to take care of this project. That is just a suggestion. That is a lot of money. If it was spread out more, we could satisfy three things at once.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't want to take time now to do it, but I believe that Ron Johnson has a sample of the turf.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't want to take it from West Memorial Field because I think it is an outstanding project. It is going to be incredible for the City. I am very familiar with that project because I was on the Parks & Recreation Commission for 18 years. If there is no second to my motion, I will bring it up at another time.

Chairman O'Neil stated this is a balancing act in trying to address needs throughout the City. I believe, with regards to Parks, that the staff has done that and I would ask for the support of what is proposed here tonight.

Alderman Shea stated if \$150,000 were added, how much would that be for the bond. Instead of \$2,385,000 it would be \$2,535,000. Would that mean a lot?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the bond would be and again just to go back and I will explain it a little later, we have a total dollar figure of \$13.3 million that we are shooting to keep within. That is recommended by our Bond Council and by the Finance Department so we are hesitant about going over that because once you go over that the Bond Council won't say anymore whether it can be bonded. Whereas it is a relatively modest amount of money, \$150,000 would be about \$12,000 annually in debt service. It is just the fact that once you go over that guideline you lose the recommendation from Finance and the Bond Council.

Alderman Shea stated on another angle maybe if we could hear...what I am kind of concerned about and what I think Alderman Lopez was talking about is we don't want anybody to get injured on the track and I am not sure...could either one of you fellows address the condition of the track and whether we are being penny wise and pound foolish by not investing a little bit in the track now.

Mr. Ludwig replied I have received a communication a few times from the School Board about lanes 1 and 2, which are typically the lanes that you wear out on a track first. I did respond back and tried to quiet them down a little bit. There was a patch put on several years ago but it didn't really do much good. Yes, it is a safety concern. We have to address it and say if we have Central up and West up maybe that is where we need to run meets and practice on the other lanes at

3/27/00 cont. 3/28/00

6

Memorial. That is all we can do. It is our ultimate goal to try and get all three tracks up within a period of time.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I just want to make sure that I have this calculation right. I don't have my calculator with me but \$150,000...what percentage are you bonding at to get \$12,000? At 6% it would be \$9,000.

Mr. MacKenzie replied if you bond \$1 million right now given basically our relatively good bonding rate, that would be roughly \$83,000 so I would take roughly...

Alderman Vaillancourt asked you are getting 8.3%.

Mr. MacKenzie answered they use an estimate of how much it will cost and you can't calculate it directly because bonds are not...they don't give you the same percentage rate throughout that 20 year period. If you look at a bonding schedule from Finance, the percentages change from the first year through to the end. They recommend that there is a rough estimate of \$81,000 to \$83,000 per \$1 million of bond.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I heard the figure \$150,000. Didn't I consult with you a couple of weeks ago and you were talking more like \$100,000?

Mr. MacKenzie asked for this particular park.

Alderman Vaillancourt answered for that particular track.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the project request from Parks & Recreation was \$550,000. I am not sure where the \$150,000 figure came from. I think that came from Alderman Lopez and you might ask him what that constitutes.

Alderman Lopez stated I got the figure from Ron Johnson who is the Deputy Parks Director and Ron Ludwig.

Mr. Ludwig stated knowing that the numbers were being crunched by everyone in this room, we started to break down as we were asked by the Chairman of this Committee to do as much as we could. We have been in consultation with the track people and to resurface the Memorial track the proper way it would cost around \$100,000 and that figure goes back six or seven months and it didn't make sense that if we were going to redo the track not to recrown the grass field and reset the sprinkler heads and that is where the additional amount came in.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the next item was discussed at last night's meeting. We did review with the Highway Department what was a critical part of the design. We will have roughly a two and a half year period from tonight before the State completes its design and is ready to go out to bid. We did review...Frank said that roughly \$500,000 or a little bit more would be necessary to do the critical part of Granite Street, which is the bridge. We looked at the numbers and with \$625,000 we can program money next year and still be well within that design period of two and a half years that the State has. Again, we want to keep on a relative schedule with the State if at all possible.

Chairman O'Neil stated I spoke to Kevin Sheppard and he got on the phone with Frank Thomas and they are very comfortable with this number and believe that it keeps them in line with what the State will be doing in FY2001.

Alderman Thibault asked is this \$450,000 besides the \$175,000 that was already in there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Thibault stated so now we are talking about \$625,000. That pleases Highway and they say that we are going to be able to keep in line with the State?

Chairman O'Neil replied I spoke with Kevin Sheppard today. He feels very comfortable. He even called Frank Thomas who believes that this number is fine with moving forward.

Alderman Thibault asked does this include the projected \$5 million a year that we talked about for the Granite Street Bridge for the next three years.

Mr. MacKenzie answered at this point we do have to talk about future years because there are a lot of competing demands. We don't have to do that as part of this action of the Board, but I think it would be good for the CIP Committee to review what is on the horizon for the next three years and how that money could be fit in. \$15 million is going to have to be phased in so we are still able to do other projects.

Alderman Thibault stated my question really is I just don't want to get us into an area that we cannot follow what the State is doing to that interchange. We should be completely ready to do what has to be done by the City. As long as I can be guaranteed that, I will be okay.

3/27/00 cont. 3/28/00

8

Chairman O'Neil replied if I recall their comment last night was they wouldn't be going out for bid on the project until late 2002 and start construction in 2003 so Mr. MacKenzie is right. There is about a two and a half-year window on the design of this.

Alderman Thibault asked so we are comfortable with that.

Chairman O'Neil answered I believe so.

Alderman Thibault stated as long as that is in the record. I am very concerned that the City does not get itself into a back up here and we are not able to fund this.

Chairman O'Neil replied we will have to fund the balance of the design money in FY2002 and we will have to, in order to follow the State's timetable, be ready to fund some construction money in FY2003.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we are putting \$675,000 or whatever the number is on the table for design, I would assume that we are not going to see somebody come in and design this for \$470,000. All I am saying is that if you were to do this outside of public life, if you did it in private life, you wouldn't say here is \$625,000 please come in and spend it. That is what I see as a problem. We just drop it on the table. I am not saying that is what it is going to cost, but certainly we are not inviting someone to come in and do this for \$470,000. I think in private life you would be looking to invite somebody to give you their best bid possible.

Chairman O'Neil replied I believe that is what will happen here. Unfortunately, there is nobody here from Highway to back me up on that.

Alderman Gatsas responded all I am saying is that if there is a number on the table, from my experience at Water Works in the short five years I was there, every time we appropriated money for a project they were always very close to that number. A little bit less or a little bit more, but there was never anybody coming in saying I think we can do this for \$1 million less.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't disagree with you. The number that has been floating around for the total design would be about \$1.1 million so that is out there. I have heard the engineers say in the past, both on the public and private side that it is generally 10% of a project.

Alderman Gatsas replied I understand what you are saying. I am just telling you that we throw a number on the table but I am not saying that number is right or wrong. I am just saying that we do that with every single project.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I agree that it is frustrating. I deal in a very open process here. The price basically supports everything we do. We do have to tip our hand and that is just part of being a public organization. It is unfortunate because it is frustrating for me to accomplish projects and for department heads, but I don't know any other good way of accomplishing the goals and keeping it in a very public process. I do say that when we get down to the bid process we will select or Highway in this case will selected four, five or six very good and capable engineering firms and they do, when they come in for their proposals, sharpen their pencils and they are competing against one another. Historically, even though we do basically say to the world we have this amount of money, it is a competitive process and we do usually get the best value for the dollar.

Alderman Gatsas replied but I have to believe that over the course of time you probably could tell me within a pretty close proximity how much we have spent on a yearly basis for designing. Let's say it is \$1.5 million average for the last six years. You can take these projects and say here is \$1.5 million and bond it and put it in a pool without specific numbers on specific projects. Obviously, we are earmarking this and if this project comes in at \$750,000 we are still going to do it. I am just saying we give the ability for people to come in and certainly take advantage of a very public venue, but I think if you said to me over the last five years here is \$1.5 million that we spent on designing of projects I think this Board would say okay fine here are the six things we are looking at, let's go out to bid and if somebody comes in at \$475,000 it is certainly a feather in our cap.

Chairman O'Neil responded regarding this project I think the State's portion is \$23 million. I have heard the number \$2 million to \$2.3 million for design.

Alderman Gatsas stated but they design it in-house.

Chairman O'Neil replied not necessarily. They contract this work out. There is a number and I have heard this in the nine years that I have been here of 8%-10% of a project for design. They all know that. We can't change that.

Alderman Gatsas stated that is not a number on the private side. If you stood in place in the private sector, that is not what it is going to cost you to design a project.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't disagree with you. Let's move on.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this next one came up at the public hearing. It is the Webster School site. Realistically, doing the entire school site is a relatively expensive option of roughly \$310,000. Under Option A, we put what we guesstimated to be primarily those site improvements related to ADA accessibility. Webster School is earmarked for roughly \$400,000 to do internal ADA improvements and making sure of the external site ADA improvements is a logical move. Just to reduce the impact of that rather large \$310,000, you will see that we put the first critical portion under Item 3 and the balance potentially under Option B if there were, at some point, available funds to do that. Item 4 was referred by the full Board. That was a request for some additional parking improvements downtown for a cost of \$15,000. That was an estimate by the Highway Department. That would, I believe, pick up about 20 parking spaces downtown.

Alderman Lopez stated in reference to Item 3 and other parking lots and the school aspect of it, which you will recall in my notes I said that we have to start looking at putting that responsibility on the School portion because we are dealing with something that they should be dealing with under the law. Parks & Recreation for a number of years hasn't been able to address it as you are well aware. It is just a comment that I think we should look at this in the future.

Chairman O'Neil replied I think the importance of this money is matching it with the ADA work that is going to be done inside and it makes all the sense in the world to me.

Alderman Thibault asked, Mr. MacKenzie, could you explain Option B, #5. What are we saying there?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Committee last night was hoping to maximize available funds for that project. This is just an intent to add some additional funding to Granite Street. I can't say, though, that I know how we are necessarily going to fund this. That is why we kind of broke it out to Option A. The Option A amount clearly has a very specific purpose. This was just an additional amount to try and maximize money.

Alderman Thibault asked are you saying that Highway is in agreement with that, that they have no problem with that and they feel that the money we will need for Granite Street will be there.

Chairman O'Neil answered correct. I spoke to Kevin Sheppard this afternoon. He felt comfortable and he called Frank Thomas who also said that he was comfortable with the \$625,000. He thought they could get involved with the bridge portion, as well as a lot of preliminary work on the widening of Granite Street.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the last item on the page as I discussed before, if we could find the funding for the second half of the Webster School site, that is an additional \$150,000. Again, Option B items are if we found some money.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the FY2001 CIP as outlined in Option A. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Clancy asked how much was originally slated for the Skateboard Park.

Mr. MacKenzie answered last year we felt that we were fully funding the Skateboard Park but it has been difficult to get qualified contractors to do the specialized forms. Both Ron Johnson and Ron Ludwig are here and can talk about it in more detail.

Mr. Johnson stated originally \$15,000 was appropriated two years ago for the Skateboard Park. That allowed for the actual planning and site selection process. Subsequent to that, last year \$100,000 was appropriated. We have also done some additional fundraising and to date we have raised approximately \$50,000. We have had private donations plus a matching grant. As Mr. MacKenzie mentioned, the detail work...it has specialty work. We are looking at an all concrete park. One just went in down in Nashua this past year. The firms that are putting them in come from Florida and California. They travel around the country and they are real hard to get on board. We bid the project twice. For the most recent bid we broke the project into site work and concrete work hoping that we would attract some specialty contractor and it still came in a little high. We are looking at downsizing the project and we need some additional funds.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the next page is trying to figure out how we pay for the things on Page 1. You will note under Item 1 here called closing are old projects that we have gone through and, Sam, correct me if I am wrong but these are ones that we have checked with Finance on and they are okay with. These are basically miscellaneous projects that could be transferred. It really only totals about \$96,000 and I would note for the record that the School Capacity Improvements is a bond balance that we would keep within the School. That would be earmarked for Webster School because we try to keep the bonds within the same category.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to sit down with Sam or Mr. MacKenzie because my figures are a little bit more and maybe I am wrong.

Alderman Thibault asked what is the 1999 CIP 750399 Amory Street/Bartlett Street Stairs. Is this a balance that is left there?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. We did speak with a few different departments in looking for bond balances. The only one we really came across was the computer upgrades. The Y2K Contingency. I know that has been discussed in the CIP Committee. Ultimately in reviewing that with Diane Prew she felt that \$100,000 could be utilized if the Committee so wished for other bond projects. That leaves a total of, if you look at the additional funds required to meet Option A, \$904,399 and to meet Option B, \$1,329,339. That is a fairly significant difference between the two. We don't have any great suggestions on that. Again, we are still hoping to keep the total dollar amount at a guideline that is fiscally prudent. We believe that is \$13.31 million. The only way we could accomplish those projects is by looking at existing bonded projects. Information Systems in various projects does have relatively large bond balances. The only other two that have large bond balances are the Fire Department's 800 megahertz tracking system and the police station.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you know the balances on those projects.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the balance of the 800 megahertz is about \$830,000.

Alderman Clancy asked that hasn't been spent.

Mr. MacKenzie answered right. We have consistently spoken with the Fire Chief about that and he says that has been there for a couple of years now. They hope to utilize that this summer to complete the radio system, but I think he recognizes that it has been a few years and that money still hasn't been spent.

Chairman O'Neil stated I spoke with the Chief today on that money. That is specifically for radio systems and related items in the Fire Department. It is the handhelds that they use. It is on the fire trucks and he assured me that the money will be utilized by the end of the summer. They are the last department, I believe, to come on board with the system. Every other department has been upgraded to date.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the police station, I think, although this will not be the latest report, I think it is about \$2.1 million. There has been some design work. There was a balance of funds in another project that were ultimately used for the design work. The balance could be a little higher than that.

3/27/00 cont. 3/28/00

13

Alderman Lopez asked have we spent more money since March 10.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would not say that.

Alderman Lopez stated I was told by the Planning Department that it was \$2,283,000.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I used a somewhat lower number, a guesstimate, because I know that when we are doing other departmental accounts...

Alderman Lopez responded Mr. MacKenzie if we are looking for \$100,000, we would like to use exact numbers and in exact numbers Sam told me it was \$2,283,000.

Mr. Maranto stated I believe the number I gave you was based upon the report I had from Finance at the time. That may have been reflective of the February draw that came through.

Mr. MacKenzie stated again there are about five Information Systems computer upgrade accounts. I did go through everyone of those and in total it is a relatively large chunk of money, but all of that money is committed to various things. The only money that was available out of that that was not committed was roughly \$100,000. That does leave about \$100,000 additional that was earmarked for procedure manuals. I was hesitant to get into that because of the management letter that the City received.

Chairman O'Neil replied I believe Alderman Gatsas' Administration Committee has had some discussions with regards to that. Am I correct?

Alderman Gatsas responded you are correct.

Alderman Lopez asked, Mr. MacKenzie, I am trying to remember but I think at the last meeting you said there was \$250,000 in Information Systems.

Mr. MacKenzie answered you are correct. The other piece that Information Systems thought was a very high priority was \$50,000 for the Library Telephone System, which is apparently in very tough shape.

Alderman Lopez stated I just wanted to clarify this.

Chairman O'Neil stated the way to come up with the \$904,000 would be what, to take it out of someplace else.

3/27/00 cont. 3/28/00

14

Mr. MacKenzie replied ultimately that is the choice.

Chairman O'Neil stated I spoke with the Chief about this and it is my opinion that even if we...I know that Alderman Cashin's Lands & Buildings Committee has instructed the department to continue to identify a piece of property but it is my opinion that even if we had a piece of property identified today that we never would be under construction in FY2001 by the time we acquire the property so I would support at this time amending the bond issue and taking \$904,399.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the bond issue for the Police Station by removing \$904,399. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated based on the discussions that the Police Department has had with the Lands & Building Committee, we may want to hold on to that and see if any opportunities for the Police Station and/or Elderly Center come before us.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked the \$904,399 that is being taken from the Police Station bond balance at this time, you are saying that those are additional funds required to meet Option A right. When they get to the next motion, which would be to fund the rest of Option A bond are we talking about taking it strictly from the bond balances above. Are those adding up to the difference between the two combined projects or is the cash going to specific projects and the bond going to other projects?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we will have it outlined on the Resolution because the one Cash project proposed we are going to have to make sure that the Cash balance balances out.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied but it is the Clerk's problem because we have to outline that in the report first. I need to clearly understand exactly what is going where.

Chairman O'Neil called for a five-minute recess.

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting back to order.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if the Committee wants to move forward with using the bond balances and using the Cash balances that were outlined on the second page, in essence you are \$5.29 off in the positive. What we would suggest is that you are recommending to the Board to amend Resolutions accordingly to transfer those bond balances into the projects that were outlined in Option A. Some of those now would become...the majority would still be set-up as bond projects but some of them will become somewhat of a Cash project as well because you have Cash balances for some of the bond projects. There is a \$5.29 difference and we can throw that in another project or leave it in. I don't know what you want to do with that, but before you move on it you probably want to decide so that your numbers match.

Mr. MacKenzie asked could we just place that amount in the Parks Improvement Program at this point.

Chairman O'Neil answered that is fine.

Alderman Lopez moved to recommend to the Board that Resolutions be amended accordingly to transfer the balances into the projects listed. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated if you want to go in order, your corrections/deletions have not been addressed yet.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to recommend to the Board the deletions to Table 1 and Table 5 of the CIP budget as outlined.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to recommend to the Board that the FY2000 budget be amended for various expedited projects as listed.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to recommend that the CIP Resolution ought to pass with the amendments presented.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the only other business item on the agenda was the issue of road resurfacing on Dunbarton Road. I would suggest that it be referred to the Highway Department. They set a resurfacing list every year. We don't have the list, but we should see how that could be put on if it is not on there already.

Alderman Hirschmann stated it is really not a resurfacing that is required. I would invite all of you to drive that section of the road. It is almost impossible. They need a reconstruction job and I can't afford it out of my \$50,000 that I get every year. The two areas that I would ask you to look at are the Landfill Closure as some of the landfill money was to be used for the road abutting the landfill and the other portion of money if there is any...where that road is no good is supposed to be the main entrance to the Hackett Hill Corporate Park.

Chairman O'Neil stated why don't we refer this to Highway and ask them to take a look at this.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to refer this item to the Highway Department.

Alderman Thibault asked didn't the State have a program for street reconstruction at one point.

Chairman O'Neil answered I think it has to be a State road.

Alderman Thibault responded within the City they did some reconstruction. I don't know if that program is still going on.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the City does receive each year a State road block grant of about \$1.4 million. The City does receive that and it goes into the general fund.

Chairman O'Neil stated just one final thing. Can you guys keep us up-to-date on where you stand with all of your projects and if you need any resources from us to help seeing that there has been a serious commitment to Parks and I know there are only so many bodies up there to oversee these things? We really need to get these projects done. Could we get a monthly update on where you are with these Parks projects? I would appreciate that.

Alderman Clancy stated first of all, I know that some of my constituents want a lot of things but they are kind of bashful when it comes to speaking up. I know that some of these other Aldermen have people talk to the Committees about different things and I see they are prioritized. One thing that is really needed is Gill Stadium. People have told me that their kids have to put their clothes on the floor before football games. There are no lockers. It is dark in there. The showers sometimes have hot water. Something has to be done. I know that we have money to fix Gill Stadium, but nothing for the locker room. When the kids have pep rallies and stomp their feet, all kinds of stuff falls from the ceiling in the locker room. That is not right. You have 70 kids dressing and you only have 40 lockers.

3/27/00 cont. 3/28/00

17

Mr. Ludwig stated we have 62 lockers. I counted them today and 864 square feet and 77 kids.

Alderman Clancy moved to have Parks & Recreation and Planning look at the issue of the Gill Stadium Locker Rooms and come back to the Committee with a recommendation. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil thanked Mr. MacKenzie and his staff for rolling up their sleeves and getting this thing done so that they could move it to the full Board.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee