

## COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

**December 18, 2000**

**5:15 PM**

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Wihby (late), Clancy, Cashin, Lopez

Messrs: R. MacKenzie, R. Davis, A. Adamakos, R. Chapman, S. Hughes,  
K. Dillon, J. Webster, F. Thomas, T. Clougherty

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Confirm and ratify poll conducted on December 7 approving a request of Parks & Recreation to utilize the balance of MER funds for emergency repairs to a Parks dump truck used for snow removal operations.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to ratify and confirm the poll.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Amending Resolutions:

"Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) for the FY2001 CIP 511401 Recreational Improvement Fund Project."

"Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Thousand Dollars (\$6,000) for the FY2001 CIP 650301 Community Concert Project."

"Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000) for the FY2001 CIP 820601 Strategic & Neighborhood Planning Project."

"Amending the 2001 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$900,000) for FY2001 CIP 840001 MCTV-PEG Access Grant Project."

Alderman Lopez moved the question for discussion. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated amending the \$6,000 for the Community Concert project, I was wondering if we could ask a few questions. I don't quite understand the total cost of the \$6,000 on the tent structure and the cost estimate that I received of about \$3,000 this year. I was wondering since we have another project down the line, Item 8, if all of this money is really needed for Intown. Maybe we could help out Item 8 at the same time. I was wondering if someone could explain this.

Mr. MacKenzie stated Rich Davis will have that. I do know that this has been a request that has been into the City for some time.

Mr. Davis stated I don't have your agenda in front of me. What is Item 8?

Alderman Lopez replied a request for \$1,600 for the Adopt-A-Plant project downtown.

Mr. Davis stated this is actually an item that goes back to fiscal year 2000. In fiscal year 2000 we basically put in a request as we always do for the CIP process and we put in an amount to cover a number of cycles of putting up and taking down what we call the concert pavilion in Veteran's Park. That costs an average of \$2,500 to \$3,000 each fiscal year to do so we were looking to do this over a number of cycles. That is one of those items if you look in the Intown contract, that we agreed to take on as a responsibility if it is funded out of the CIP process. It was simply a normal part of our procedure to put that in. Fiscal year 2000, for whatever reason and I think perhaps the Planning Department didn't identify the source of funding but that didn't get funded. In other words, the payment from the City didn't get made. It rolled over into 2001 so we basically have put up the tent, taken it down, put it up again, taken it down and we are looking at putting it up again in the spring. Those are all items that would be funded out of this amount. So, it would be for fiscal year 2000, 2001 and next spring.

Alderman Lopez asked and that comes up to \$6,000. Okay, that is fair. You are not paying any back years other than fiscal year 2000?

Mr. Davis answered no.

Alderman Clancy asked, Rich, you said it costs \$2,500 to set the tent up for one year.

Mr. Davis answered that is about right.

Alderman Clancy asked why don't you just lump the two things together. The money for the concerts and the money for the tent all at one time?

Mr. Davis answered that certainly could be done if we could put those both in the same category. We can actually do that for this next fiscal year. We can combine those line items for FY2002. In the previous fiscal year, they were separated.

Alderman Clancy asked so you don't have enough money now for FY2000 and FY2001.

Mr. Davis answered correct. If we get this money we will be able to pay for FY2000, FY2001 and we should have enough money to put it up next spring.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve the amending resolutions. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

CIP Budget Authorizations:

- 2000 CIP 221400 - Tobacco Prevention Project, Revision #1
- 2000 CIP 610300 - Elm Street Restoration, Revision #1
- 2000 CIP 840100 - Sign Language Interpreters, Revision #1
- 2001 CIP 511401 - Recreational Improvement Fund
- 2001 CIP 650301 - Community Concert, Revision #1
- 2001 CIP 820101 - City Clerk Archival Records Project
- 2001 CIP 820601 - Strategic & Neighborhood Planning, Revision #2
- 2001 CIP 830101 - City Space Improvements, Revision #1
- 2001 CIP 840001 - MCTV-PEG Access Grant

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the budget authorizations.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie regarding the Bodwell Road Farm.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we did meet with Tom Clark and Fred Rusczeck last Thursday at Tom's office. There are still a lot of technical issues. They were actually hoping to meet with a larger group of both federal and state technical people and potential funding sources. That was supposed to occur on Thursday, but because of the snowstorm, that did not happen. I am not sure if that has been rescheduled, but clearly that group has to get together. There is some potential funding sources and some potential expertise in terms of the bird population. There are really two separate issues in that neighborhood. The high bird population, as well as the odors from the farm on Bodwell Road. There still needs to be time to review all of the issues. Both Fred Rusczeck and Tom Clark are here to answer any specific questions you may have. I think everybody is trying to work on the project but there are a lot of issues involved.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we put a timetable on when there may be some recommendations on this.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would probably defer to Fred Rusczeck to see if there could be a timetable put on it. I think everybody is trying to resolve it as quickly as possible, but I am not sure if there is a timetable.

Mr. Rusczeck stated I think Bob summed up where we are at pretty well. We did have a meeting scheduled last Thursday that was snowed out. At the meeting would have been starling control experts from out of state who work for the federal government, State Department of Agriculture folks, an agricultural facilities expert, and someone from the USDA Conservation Corp. Equip Program that provides funding to farmers to solve environmental problems. Unfortunately, the meeting didn't occur. As Bob said, there are really two facets. One of them is the odor and to solve the odors we are looking at finding a way and it seems possible through the USDA Equip Program to fund the construction of feed bunkers on the pig farm site. The second issue is one of starling control. Starling control is something that is done by the USDA Wildlife Damage Control folks. Those conversations are going on now. We are waiting to finalize any or they are waiting to finalize any plans pending the two urban bird control experts.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there anything we can vote on tonight that might speed up the process and not require you to come back. Bob, do you have any thoughts on that?

Mr. MacKenzie answered no. I know we had been looking for ways to fund the program, but the funding is not as much of an issue as whether the City can put City tax dollars onto private property. I think the attempt here is to find alternative funding sources and I know that Fred has been working on that diligently and we may be able to solve that.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Fred, with winter here will that make the situation any better or worse.

Mr. Rusczek answered looking at the two aspects, as far as the bird control that issue is something that will take probably a few thousand to five thousand dollars to fund the starling control. It is done by the USDA. That is going to continue until either the starlings leave in late spring to go off to their breeding sites or until a starling control program starts.

Chairman O'Neil asked so they will be here throughout the winter.

Mr. Rusczek answered it looks like now that this is a winter roosting site for the starlings.

Chairman O'Neil asked you have become an expert on starlings.

Mr. Rusczek answered I am learning a lot about starlings. They used to roost in the pine trees that were in the field across from the pig farm and now they are roosting on the homes. The starlings are as much of a problem to the neighborhood as they are to the farmer out there. To answer your question, as soon as we get direction from the USDA in terms of this is the sort of starling control measures that should be employed, I believe we will be back before this group to look for a few thousand dollars to fund that. The second piece is the odor control program related to the garbage that is used to feed the pigs. The application process for the Federal funds that will be available will not occur until March with a determination made by the USDA Conservation Group in April. That actually looks pretty promising that it will occur. The odor during the winter months because nobody is outside enjoying their yards and barbecues and the windows are closed isn't as much of a problem as it is later in the year.

Chairman O'Neil asked would it be safe to say that we can bring some closure, at least with a plan, by April.

Mr. Rusczek answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked has anybody checked with the Audubon Society to see if they have any funds available for the starling program.

Mr. Rusczek answered the Audubon Society wouldn't fund something like a starling reduction program since it does involve killing starling. A starling is not a protected bird. It is a species that was introduced to the United States at the turn of the last century so the Audubon Society takes no objection to starling control programs.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie regarding the McLaughlin Middle School addition.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would like to turn this over to several members from the School Administration. The proposed program has been altered slightly as the School Administration and School Board would like to see it. I think they are here to review that with the CIP Committee.

Mr. Chapman stated what we are here for is previously the CIP Committee had approved I believe \$2.6 million for the renovation at McLaughlin Middle School. In reviewing the needs of the district and going through a revamping and looking at the number of students, etc., what we have found is that we will need \$4.5 million and we are here respectfully to ask for an increase in the CIP. Primarily, what we are looking at doing is adding additional square footage, improving the parking area and expanding the core facilities in the area of the cafeteria program. Tim Clougherty from the Highway Department, Scott Hughes from Oakpoint Associates and Arthur Adamakos are here to answer any questions that you may have.

Alderman Lopez asked are you saying that the School Board recommended "D."

Mr. Chapman answered yes, Sir.

Alderman Lopez asked what happens if we don't go with B, C, or D.

Mr. Adamakos answered what we are concerned about is future growth, Alderman. Right now, I am sure that you are aware we have portables at that location. There are five portables or ten classrooms. Option A, all that does is take the kids out of the portables and put them in the building with no planning for future growth. We are very concerned about the southeast sector of the City and what that is going to mean to us. We are concerned about...we are probably only going to have one shot at an expansion of this building given its location and its

wetland area and we are very concerned that if we don't do it right this time and plan for the future, the future growth of that area, we will not be able to expand on that property in the future.

Alderman Lopez stated I noticed that Mr. MacKenzie at one time, speaking about growth, that he presented a chart of that particular area and there hasn't been the growth that everybody has been talking about. Is there statistical data that the School Department has that Mr. MacKenzie doesn't have or has coordination been made?

Mr. Adamakos replied there is no statistical data other than the fact that we already have two other facilities, Hillside and Southside, with portables at those locations. We know that we are going to have to look at an expansion project somewhere down the road, we think, given that set of circumstances. Given an opportunity to make all of the modifications to one singular building at this point, we could redistrict and maybe it wouldn't be as much of an impact at Southside. The core facility at McLaughlin, given that expansion to the cafeteria can handle the expansion while if we add additional classrooms at Southside we will have to expand the core facility and unfortunately the library and the gymnasium are internal parts of the building and we would have difficulty doing that. We would only have the opportunity to move the cafeteria. We are thinking of redistricting if we have to. If we don't have that growth in that area to ease the load at Southside, because right now, they are the largest middle school in the City and we need to do something in terms of relief at that location.

Alderman Lopez asked is this a one-shot deal or a two or three year program.

Mr. Clougherty answered the program that sits in front of you at any level is one time construction. We are not doing any phasing of the construction.

Alderman Levasseur asked how does this plan that you have mesh with the school facilities program that we will be discussing tonight. Is this going to contradict that or is this something that has already been talked about in that plan?

Mr. Clougherty answered the school facilities plan will back-up the need for the 16 classrooms as opposed to the 12 classrooms.

Alderman Levasseur asked I wonder if we should, before we go forward with this, hear from the facilities audit because their idea and the Mayor's idea of a total renovation...I don't know if it is cheaper to include all of these projects in one number. I am not really familiar with the process for the amount of money if the bigger the amount of money you can do all of these projects at one time and save the City some cash or if that is what the Mayor wants to do as far as his priorities.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Tim, is there a problem with the timeline here that you need to get going to meet a certain deadline.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes there is. We are currently contracted with a consultant, Oakpoint Associates, who are present tonight to answer any questions if you have any on the design but our intention is to get the project out for bid and have documents ready for January 15 pending your approval for bid, of course, with the expansion of funding and scope. Basically, we feel that it is best to go out to bid as soon as we can.

Chairman O'Neil asked and when would construction start.

Mr. Clougherty answered as soon thereafter as possible. As soon as we can get the contracts executed and the groundbreaking done.

Chairman O'Neil asked what would be the targeted date for completion.

Mr. Clougherty answered we had initially set a one-year completion but we are going to be re-evaluating that. It doesn't really make too much sense to require the contractor to be done in one year if he is going to be done in February or March. We are not going to be able to use the school as a facility at that time anyway so we are probably going to be working on a completion that is more conducive to the June timeframe so we can wrap up any outstanding punch list items and things like that before the school year starts.

Chairman O'Neil asked so the School District would be looking to occupy the addition in the fall of 2002.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, how would we go about funding the change.

Mr. MacKenzie answered this change would likely have to come out of next year's allocation, FY2002 CIP. The expedited projects would happen in April. If they did want to proceed prior to April, there are avenues we could take but again the money would come out of the FY2002 allocation.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I have in my hands the November 2 Planning Board minutes in which the 682 South Mammoth Road application for 95 single family homes development was denied. Does this decision on the McLaughlin School either anticipate that that will be approved or will remain denied? In other words, what would the impact of the 95 single family homes in that one location mean to this program either positively or negatively?

Mr. Adamakos replied regardless of what occurs at that location, this proposal is our most solid one because if this does ultimately pass we are prepared for that. If this does not pass, we are going to redistrict and lighten the load at Southside, a building that is much smaller than the capacity it currently has.

Alderman Clancy asked so you are only adding four classrooms here. You are going from 10 to 14. Is that right?

Mr. Adamakos answered yes. Our hope is this. If you look at Option A, 10 room is basically what we have now in the portables. We are anticipating maybe having to add another team of students or another 110 students if something happens down the road. That is why we need the extra rooms. We are not concerned about filling them because we know that by redistricting we can lighten the load at Southside, redistrict maybe a little bit with Hillside and even out the circumstances. We know that the kids are going to be coming down the road and we know that we have to do something. We are very concerned though that because of the physical plant of Hillside and Southside and the inner core of those facilities being able to handle 950 or 980 kids for which it was not built, we now have a property here where we can expand the core a little bit with the cafeteria, make a decent addition to this building and be safe about the future for at least a little while with regards to what we can do at Hillside and Southside. If we only do version A and put 10 rooms in there, all we are doing is making the capacity of the school what it is now with the portables. Then we are going to have to do something with the other two schools, which have eight classrooms or four portables at each location. We know we have to do some building there and if that is the case then we are looking at whatever options are available based on the facility audit.

Alderman Clancy stated so you are going to have four more classrooms and make the cafeteria bigger. At the same time, you are not going to have any portables if this is done?

Mr. Adamakos replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated just to remind the Board, several years ago we moved forward with an addition to Parkside led by the West Side Aldermen. We originally were going to build 16 classrooms and we ended up building 22 and the day it opened all 22 were used. That certainly was not a waste of money.

Alderman Lopez asked, Bob, wasn't there a special thing, bonding, that was \$2.6 million and how is that going to affect...I thought there was some discussion. I know that Alderman Gatsas was involved in the funding of the addition to

McLaughlin. Has that whole process for the \$2.6 million been completed or is this an addition?

Mr. MacKenzie answered that \$2.6 million has not been finalized. Again, a portion of that \$2.6 million has been allocated out of development impact fee money. Again, the balance of money is anticipated from next year's CIP. The Board can proceed as it did originally with the construction of McLaughlin. Half of the money was allocated at the start of construction and the other half came in the next fiscal year. The Board may, in special circumstances, approve the beginning of the project prior to appropriating all of the money. In this case, that would be the logical way to go. Not all of the \$2.6 million had been appropriated by the Board. They would have to do that as part of the FY2002 CIP.

Alderman Lopez asked whatever we fund, a percentage comes back from the State the following year after completion is that correct.

Mr. MacKenzie answered normally it is 30% of the principle of the project that is paid back to the City, but it is on the annual payments. It is not in one lump sum. It is paid over the life of the bond, which is 20 years. Annually, the State pays the City back school building aid but it is not one large lump sum, it is over a 20-year period.

Alderman Gatsas stated currently there are 926 students at McLaughlin. The addition says that the total capacity at that point would be 1,050 and I will just use comparison A. The \$2.6 million roughly is to accommodate another 124 students.

Mr. Adamakos replied we are also taking the people out of the trailers.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am just asking you. I am looking at some scenarios here that...

Mr. Adamakos replied we are projecting a 1,200 student capacity.

Alderman Gatsas responded let's go back to square one. Currently, there are 926 students at McLaughlin. Are there trailers there now?

Mr. Adamakos replied yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many trailers.

Mr. Adamakos answered five. It is 10 classrooms. The entire sixth grade is in trailers.

Alderman Gatsas asked which is how many students.

Mr. Adamakos answered 1/3 of that. I would say 300 or so.

Alderman Gatsas asked 300 students are currently housed in trailers.

Mr. Adamakos answered somewhere around there. Maybe a little bit less. Between 250 and 300.

Alderman Gatsas asked what are the current classroom sizes now.

Mr. Chapman stated 900 square feet is the optimum.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the current room size in the school now.

Mr. Chapman answered they are roughly 900 square feet.

Alderman Gatsas asked the capacity of 1,200 then is an additional 250 students from what is there now.

Mr. Adamakos answered we are looking at maximum, filled to the gills type of situation. We don't want to operate at 1,200.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many square feet are there in the cafeteria.

Mr. Hughes answered currently there is approximately 3,500 square feet.

Alderman Gatsas stated so we are looking to almost double the size of that for an additional 450 students.

Mr. Hughes answered yes. Right now though the current capacity of the cafeteria is about 1/3 of the school and that is how it was designed. You don't have all of the students in that room at one time. As we are expanding the cafeteria, we are taking that same consideration for 1,200 students. A third of that number or approximately 400 students would be in that cafeteria at one time.

Alderman Gatsas stated currently you have 300+ in that cafeteria right now.

Mr. Hughes replied currently, programmatically the Administration has less than that because they don't supervise that many kids at once. They actually have five lunches in there right now so that number is much less.

Mr. Adamakos stated right now there are five lunches. It is not completely full all of the time. I believe we are also adding to the cafeteria as well because we only have one serving line if I remember correctly and in a building that size you cannot operate a cafeteria with one serving line. The addition also includes another serving line.

Alderman Gatsas stated you are talking full capacity. Now, I am looking at based on December 1 secondary enrollment and based on elementary enrollment sheet that was done. What elementary schools draw off of or what elementary schools does McLaughlin draw from?

Mr. Adamakos replied all of Green Acres but then bits and pieces of others. Weston, Hallsville, and I would have to look at a map. I think I have named most of them.

Alderman Gatsas stated if I take the enrollment that I am looking at here and take those schools and if I took a total of Beech Street and a total of Green Acres and a total of Hallsville...

Mr. Adamakos interjected and Weston. This school facility takes all of Green Acres, more than half of Weston, a great number of Hallsville, a good number of Beech and there might be another one in there.

Alderman Gatsas stated if I took 100% of the fifth grade and looked at a comparison of the fourth grade and the third grade across the board at Beech, at Hallsville, at Green Acres, and at Weston and I added that capacity, the total capacity would be 376 at a full capacity of every one of those going there. I don't see at any time that you are going to be venturing anywhere close to that 450 number if I am taking 100% of Green Acres, 100% of Hallsville, 100% of Beech and 100% of Weston.

Mr. Adamakos replied right but if the Southside district expands then we want to make sure that we...we want to redistrict so that we can take some away from Southside because it is a smaller structure and send them to McLaughlin.

Alderman Gatsas responded I just took 100% of those schools that probably would be going there.

Mr. Adamakos stated but we also have trailers sitting at Southside. We know that we have to do something at Southside down the road so we are saying if we can't fill that facility we are going to lighten the load at Southside because they are over capacity and they are in the 970 or 980 range.

Alderman Gatsas asked wouldn't you say I just lightened the capacity by taking everybody from Weston, Hallsville, Green Acres and Beech. All of those students are in that 376 number.

Mr. Adamakos answered just by throwing numbers around based on what you said, I wanted to say yes but we have been on and off for quite awhile now. What I am concerned about and where I am coming from is this. Ten of the rooms are already spoken for so if we do options A or B, it is full with no room for advancement as far as an extra number of students are concerned. No room at all. I am very concerned about what is going to occur in the City as far as the southeast sector and the eastern part of town. I am thinking ahead. I am sitting here saying if we do have that expansion in that southeastern portion where are they going to go? We already have a building that is filled to the gills. We have Southside that is in trailers. If something happens down there, it is a concern of ours. If nothing happens, then we can lighten the load at Southside and try to remove the trailers that are there. I don't think that trailers are an acceptable part of any kind of educational program. For me, personally, I am not concerned too much about filling the buildings because I think we can do it. Right now, the way we are examining it by doing A or B, we already have A or B full because when you look at it from this point of view if we have 926 students, not all of them are in the internal structure of McLaughlin. We have all of the entire sixth grade outside in trailers. Just by building A or B, we are just going to get them out of the trailers with no room for expansion and I don't think that is wise. We know at least at this facility given the set of modifications we are making we can accommodate the number of students that the capacity suggests and have an internal structure that will support that. When we are talking about the core facilities, right now at Parkside, Southside and Hillside, we can't fit everybody in the gym. If we have to have an assembly, we basically have to have two assemblies. Right now, we have to have multiple lunches, five lunches beginning earlier than 11 AM to fit everybody in the cafeteria. I don't know about you but having lunch at 10:30 AM isn't sound to me. Here is an opportunity to do one building right as far as planning for some growth and getting those sixth graders out of the portables. This is where we are heading with it. We are not hiding anything. We don't want to mislead anyone with anything. We just know that physically right now we have 926 students there and what we are doing is going to take them out of the trailers and put them into the building with no plan for any kind of change...we are thinking about ESL modifications we may need to make. We are thinking about special education adaptations that we may need to make. I am not concerned about filling the rooms. I am concerned if we don't build it right this time we won't have a second chance at building it a second time.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with you wholeheartedly. This is the number one top priority of the School Board. We have X number of dollars, which everybody

knows. Whatever happens, this is number one for this coming year. If Alderman Levasseur is correct, once we go through the process and somebody else comes up with a number one priority, the School Board is saying this is what we want.

Mr. Adamakos asked are you talking about immediately, Alderman.

Alderman Lopez replied yes.

Mr. Adamakos answered yes, this is it. This is consistent with...

Alderman Lopez interjected there is only so much money. That is my point.

Mr. Adamakos replied I understand that. This is consistent with the facilities audit.

Alderman Lopez responded okay. I just wanted to clarify that.

Alderman Cashin asked how many portable classrooms do you have.

Mr. Adamakos answered five. There are two classrooms in each portable.

Alderman Cashin stated so you have five and you say that you are going to relieve some other schools with this expansion.

Mr. Adamakos replied if the expansion doesn't come to be, let's say the south end doesn't happen, what we would like to do is redistrict Southside and lighten the load there because they are the largest middle school.

Alderman Cashin asked would you eliminate more portables.

Mr. Adamakos answered that eliminates more portables at Southside.

Alderman Cashin asked how many.

Mr. Adamakos answered it would depend on some other things that we might want to do down the road in a facility audit. I really couldn't tell you off the top of my head what that would be.

Alderman Cashin stated the reason I am asking is are these portables leased.

Mr. Chapman replied the five are leased at McLaughlin. I wasn't here when the ones at Southside went in so I don't know.

Alderman Cashin asked but we will be eliminating that cost if this is done.

Mr. Chapman answered they are on a two year lease and we should be able to eliminate that cost.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Bob, what is the cost of \$1 million.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the annual debt service roughly is about \$83,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a way that because of the cost of the lease on the portables being eliminated that...how is the debt service paid back. Is that an offset?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the debt service comes through School Administration. There is a line item budget in the School budget for debt service so it would be reduced from that line item.

Alderman Gatsas asked so the \$650,000 that you are currently paying for those portables, once that goes away obviously the debt service on the School building is a heck of a lot less on the bonding.

Mr. MacKenzie answered given those comparable numbers. I remember the \$650,000 and yes, that is a shorter-term lease and if that is correct then the total amount in their budget should decline in the second year. You have to remember that they are looking for the Fall of 2002.

Alderman Wihby stated this will all be done in the second year. We are already in the first year.

Mr. MacKenzie replied they are looking to open this addition in the fall of 2002. Is that what I heard? It would not affect next year's FY2002 budget.

Alderman Wihby stated right. That is the second year of their lease, which is all they have anyway.

Alderman Cashin stated if we don't do it then we are going to continue with the portables.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to approve Version D at a cost of \$4,434,705.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked did I hear you not mention Highland Goffs Falls. Does that mean that they go to Southside?

Mr. Adamakos answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie regarding a "For Manchester" funding request.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am going to defer this one to Sam. This was a request by "For Manchester" and I believe that if the Committee wants to, it was addressed to the CIP, we could put this into the hopper for the request for the next year CIP budget.

Chairman O'Neil asked what happens this year.

Mr. MacKenzie answered Sam corrected me. They are looking for the money for this fiscal year.

Alderman Wihby moved to transfer \$1,600 from contingency. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie regarding follow-up on recent Committee requests.

Chairman O'Neil stated we covered Bodwell Road already. We will be covering the Central Business Service District shortly. I agreed, anyway, as Chairman that there were some higher priorities right now than the HOME project although we did request some additional information at our last meeting which hopefully will be coming to the Board sometime soon.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. That one we would hope to have for the January meeting.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Clancy asked for the addresses.

Mr. MacKenzie asked of all of the HOME projects, okay.

Chairman O'Neil asked and you are clear on what the Board was looking for on those items.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I specifically listed those in this memo to make sure that we understood what those were. If there are any others, I would be happy to add those.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert MacKenzie regarding the Central Business Service District.

Mr. MacKenzie stated, Mr. Chairman, you asked us to provide some information. Some of that we submitted in a package previously to the Board. We identified six districts that have been in existence since it was originally adopted in 1984. We have tonight a map showing those six districts. We have some preliminary data from the Assessors that shows total assessments. We just got those at 5 PM and I see that there is some need to review that information. There are some glitches, perhaps, in there and I would like some more time to review that. If I could have Sam pass out the maps. I think the aggregate information for those three districts that you will see in that package as you get it. Again, the spreadsheets I would call very preliminary because just in my quick look at it I found some issues with it. If you look at the total, the assessment at the bottom, I think that is approximate.

Alderman Levasseur asked, Mr. MacKenzie, has the advisory board met on this issue since the last time we sat here in this room.

Mr. MacKenzie answered not since the last time you met, no. They did meet prior to that and provided a recommendation to this Committee and the Board to keep the boundaries the same.

Alderman Levasseur asked is it your opinion that you should ask the advisory board again or were you just going to come to the CIP Committee for a recommendation.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the CIP Committee at the last meeting started to make some motions about changing the district. It was not my understanding to go back to the CBSD Board. I do not think at the present time that they are going to change their vote. By ordinance, they do have to present a recommendation though.

Chairman O'Neil stated I was going to make a suggestion tonight based on all of the meetings that we have had on this and hearing the opinions of the members of the Board and in talking to Bob and some others in the business community. I don't know if the Committee is open to my suggestion but I think it will meet the majority of the goals that we set out to do. If the Committee doesn't have any objections, I will present...unfortunately I didn't have a chance because I spent a good part of the weekend trying to think this through...what I am recommending is to begin with there was an addition in June 1995 that included those eight blocks east of Pine Street. I would recommend that that be changed.

Alderman Levasseur asked when you say east of Pine Street are you talking about the gray shaded area, the East High area.

Chairman O'Neil answered yes. That would help us resolve some of the problems with the multi-family housing, as well as I really don't know why it is in there because it doesn't seem to fit. The other recommendation I would make is that starting a North Street, which is the northern boundary of the district, I would suggest that the east boundary start at Bay Street, come southerly two blocks and then pretty much protect the Elm Street section but end up eliminating all of those buildings along Chestnut Street westerly to Elm Street if I am clear with everyone.

Alderman Levasseur asked how far down.

Chairman O'Neil answered I am suggesting Orange to come around and get those buildings at the Pearl Street lot. Come southerly on Bay for two blocks and then...

Alderman Wihby interjected where is Bay.

Alderman Levasseur asked is that the third street in from Elm Street.

Chairman O'Neil answered it is actually an alley. Then, come back towards Elm and keep all of the Elm Street buildings as part of the district but eliminate everything else east of there.

Alderman Levasseur stated that sounds good to me.

Chairman O'Neil stated in some cases there are alleys and in some cases there aren't. Is everybody with me?

Alderman Wihby stated you are going down Bay to whatever street that is...

Alderman Lopez interjected you said 95. Is there a 1995 or do you mean 1996?

Chairman O'Neil stated it says the revision was June 27, 1995.

Alderman Lopez asked for the 1998.

Chairman O'Neil answered yes. I got the wrong dots. I think if you take a look at the map, Bob, I think that will solve a lot of our problems with the multi-family housing. I think it is a step in the right direction.

Alderman Gatsas stated the Chestnut Street line that you are using from Pine Street, if you take a look or think about Chestnut Street, let's come from Spruce, you have the two senior centers that are there. After that, you have...Alderman Clancy why don't you help me.

Chairman O'Neil stated you have the Federal building, the police station...

Alderman Gatsas interjected so you really, I mean this is a deceiving map when you look at it because those are things that aren't even on the...they don't pay anyway.

Chairman O'Neil asked would you want to keep the old post office in it though, Devine Millimet.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes, keep them in it.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, are you with us on that one.

Mr. MacKenzie stated this is what has been talked about so far. In yellow are the areas that would be eliminated.

Chairman O'Neil stated the majority of that east block is either churches or the multi-family so it meets our objective there I think.

Alderman Gatsas asked what about east of Chestnut.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is out of district.

Alderman Gatsas asked east of Chestnut from Hanover down because that is all, except for the one building you are talking about, if you went from Hanover Street south...

Mr. MacKenzie interjected you have the Federal building, the police and fire stations, then in the next block there are some commercial properties. Going

northerly you have Devine Millimet, NH Insurance, the NH Art Institute, which is a non-profit, and the Historic Association. Extending northerly you have a couple of churches, you have a law firm, St. Joseph's School, a multi-family building and a gas station. There are some commercial properties in there.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to see the West Side of that street taken off.

Chairman O'Neil asked you are talking everything east of Chestnut Street.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes. I thought we had already planned on doing that anyway.

Alderman Gatsas stated but to the south of Hanover Street.

Chairman O'Neil asked what about between Bridge and Hanover.

Alderman Levasseur answered I would like to go Bridge to Hanover to be honest with you because I know that there is a building there where the guy is paying double. The Ten building is paying over here on Elm Street and they are paying out on that building. They are paying twice and none of the services go out that far anyway. I would keep the East Side from Bridge Street down like you suggested, but not the West Side. Where the gas station is is on the West Side of Chestnut Street am I correct or is that on Pine? I am sorry, the East Side. Were you thinking the same thing, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman O'Neil replied I hadn't given much thought to going southerly, but it is a very good point because we have a lot of municipal buildings in there.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think you should go East Side. Just eliminate the East Side of that street. That was the original boundary in 1998.

Chairman O'Neil stated why don't we just do what Alderman Gatsas suggested with Spruce and Hanover.

Alderman Levasseur replied you could redistrict the line to include Devine & Millimet but I don't think they would like that. I know that is the one you don't want to lose, but they could always make a donation.

Chairman O'Neil stated Mr. MacKenzie is pointing out Alderman Gatsas' suggestion on those four blocks. Can we go with this and it is a step in the right direction?

Alderman Levasseur replied I don't have any problem with it, but you are just talking about five little buildings in that block. Not only that, I want to make another point. You are talking about these guys saying they have 26,000 miles of sidewalks that they are responsible for in this district if they went up and down the alleys and along the side and all of that and that is why they had a hard time cleaning them all. By eliminating all of this other stuff, you are also making them responsible for just that side of the street, which is the east side of Chestnut anyway, which is what the original plan was before you expanded it anyway, Mr. Chairman. From Hanover to Bridge is where you want to keep it?

Chairman O'Neil replied from Manchester to Bridge.

Alderman Lopez asked are the people on the east part, the alleys there were they the big offenders with trashcans and stuff like that.

Alderman Levasseur answered no. There haven't been any trashcans put on that side whatsoever, just the Elm Street alleyways.

Chairman O'Neil asked is everyone comfortable with what Mr. MacKenzie has highlighted.

Alderman Cashin asked what is the cost of the assessment.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, I think you said you needed more time to crunch the numbers, is that correct.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we could clearly calculate the impact of this proposal, but it would take us a few more days. As you can see, we have all of the assessments here we would just need to verify all of the addresses. A lot of those are multi-family that are identified in your boundaries here but we would like to make sure and verify and get an exact assessment impact of that.

Alderman Levasseur stated Mr. Shea, who I sit on the committee with said that the revaluation of all of the other properties will increase and offset anything.

Chairman O'Neil stated what I would like to do is bring some closure to this tonight and make a recommendation to the full Board. I think it is a step in the right direction. This has been hanging out for months now.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted that the boundaries for the Central Business Service District be established as follows: Beginning at a point at the intersection of River Road and West North Street; thence easterly along West North Street and continuing along North Street

to Bay Street; thence southerly along Bay Street to Sagamore Street; thence along Sagamore Street to a point at the rear property line of property at 1631 Elm Street (Rite-Aid); thence generally southerly along the rear property line of property at 1631 Elm Street (Rite-Aid) to Pennacook Street; thence westerly along Pennacook Street to an alley – Elm Street East Back; thence southerly along Elm Street East Back Alley to Blodgett Street; thence westerly along Blodgett Street to an alley – Elm Street East Back; thence southerly along Elm Street East Back Alley to Brook Street; thence easterly along Brook Street to Temple Court; thence southerly along Temple Court to Harrison Street; thence westerly along Harrison Street to the rear of the building at 1415 Elm Street (the “Sears Building” so-called); thence southerly along the rear of the building at 1415 Elm Street (the “Sears Building” so-called) to Prospect Street; thence continuing southerly along the rear property line of 1331-1375 Elm Street to Myrtle Street; thence continuing southerly along an alley – North Church Street to Orange Street; thence easterly along Orange Street to Chestnut Street; thence southerly along Chestnut Street to Bridge Street; thence easterly along Bridge Street to Pine Street; thence southerly along Pine Street to Manchester Street; thence westerly along Manchester Street to Chestnut Street.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, regarding a request from the Airport to retain a vehicle that was planned to be retired from service.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is this for.

Mr. Dillon answered the vehicle in question is a 1993 Dodge Intrepid. It has about 103,000 miles. It was supposed to be retired. It has been at the Airport. The vehicle specifically is used on the air side of the Airport to do patrols around the ramp areas. We would like to have the plate, though, to actually use the vehicle on the street side of the Airport. Due to some of the increases that we have had in staffing levels at the Airport we really do need an additional vehicle and we felt that it would be more prudent to use this vehicle which is still in good shape versus requesting a new vehicle.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Communication from Mark Berry, 322 North Main Street, regarding problems with transit service, and advising of a loss of employment resulting from the inability to rely on the public transit service. (Note: Referred to MTA for response to CIP Committee, which is attached).

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to receive and file this request.

Alderman Cashin asked, Mr. Webster, have you been in touch with this Mark Berry. I know you tried a couple of times, but according to your letter you hadn't talked to him.

Mr. Webster answered his telephone number was not included in the letter so I called directory assistance and the number that I got is the one that I included in my response. I left a message a number of times at that answering machine with my home phone number, my extension at work and my pager number. To this date, I have not had a call back from him.

Alderman Wihby stated there was a situation that was brought to my attention. I think somebody on the West Side told me that they weren't getting a ride and you guys worked it out and he is happy that he can get to work now. He was going to lose his job. I just want to thank you guys for doing that.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Communication from TW Bridge Associates requesting consideration for the City to share in the cost to repair the vault located at Hanover/Chestnut Street.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Frank, do you know what is going on. I am not really sure if they are saying we damaged something.

Mr. Thomas stated this is the property that is located at the southeast corner of Hanover and Chestnut Street. TW Bridge Associates recently bought the building. This building has vault areas. The basement extends out onto the sidewalk area and what they have determined is that a section of this vault area is deteriorated due to age, etc. and they had a structural engineer come in and basically report to them that we shouldn't be driving our tractors over the sidewalk. It is still fine for pedestrian use, but there shouldn't be any heavy equipment on it. What the request is is for the City to participate with the property owner in the repair or reconstruction of a portion of the vault area, which is under the sidewalk as I mentioned. The City took a position some time ago that these vault areas are a

portion of the structure or the dwelling. In his correspondence to the Board Mr. Francoeur noted that a precedent had been set on Elm Street when we reconstructed the sidewalk area. I somewhat disagree a little bit because that was a different project. It was a project instituted by the City. It was a total revitalization of the Elm Street area, including sidewalks. In order for us to replace the existing sidewalks and put bricks down, we did get involved with some of the roofs on some of the vaults along the street and we had to make repairs to them. However, there have been other instances where similar situations have come up and the City has not participated in the cost of rehabbing these vault areas.

Alderman Levasseur stated I dealt with this gentleman on many occasions. How much was it going to cost for him to have that vault fixed below the sidewalk?

Mr. Thomas replied I don't believe that he ever got a price completely. Repairing these vaults can be very, very expensive because once you start taking off the top and removing the sidewalk area and getting in to see the extent of the deteriorated concrete on top, it can get fairly expensive and expansive as far as the work that is required. It is like when we replace a bridge deck. We really don't know the scope of the deterioration until we start removing it and typically it goes up, not down.

Alderman Levasseur stated he only bought this building only a year or two ago and that damage had been there prior to him buying that property. Would you say that was correct?

Mr. Thomas replied that is correct. Again, it is a concrete roof over these vault areas and with all of the water and salt penetrating down they tend to deteriorate.

Alderman Levasseur asked if we were to do this now and pay for this then we would be setting a precedent for a request and then anyone who had these problems would be able to come to the Board and use that as an example.

Mr. Thomas answered that would be my position.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is this vault. Is this an electrical vault?

Mr. Thomas answered it is actually an extension of the cellar that extends out into the sidewalk area. In some cases, 100 years ago there used to be little elevators that came up through the sidewalk that accessed the basement area for storage. In some instances, in able to obtain more storage these areas were built out from the vertical face of the buildings out into the sidewalk area.

Alderman Cashin stated requests like this have come before the Board on several occasions. Let me just read one sentence from the letter. "It is our feeling that the damage is due to the cracks because of the parking meters." If we ever get involved in that, we are going to open a can of worms that we will never be able to close.

Alderman Cashin moved to receive and file this item.

Alderman Wihby stated in the second paragraph, though, it says that they jack hammered a hole in the sidewalk and left the hole to the basement. Are you saying that didn't happen?

Mr. Thomas replied I do say that happened. The Manchester Water Works, for some reason...

Alderman Wihby interjected that is different than what they are asking us.

Mr. Thomas stated well they are trying to relate it. That was presented to Risk Management and I believe that there was a claim that was settled to repair the damage caused by the jack hammering of this one hole.

Alderman Wihby asked does this have anything to do with what they are looking for.

Mr. Thomas answered no.

Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion to receive and file.

Alderman Levasseur asked, Mr. Thomas, do they have insurance for this kind of stuff when it happens. Does building insurance cover this kind of stuff? This can't be the first time they have had a problem with a vault.

Mr. Thomas answered well again this is a new purchase on their part. To me, I think it was an item that could have been picked up if there was proper due diligence.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Communication from Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, requesting to purchase a used (1999 demonstration model) asphalt recycler in the amount of \$55,000 with the surplus funds in the M.E.R. vehicle replacement account.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to approve this request.

### **TABLED ITEMS**

- 15.** Communication from Robert S. MacKenzie submitting a report of the Central Business Service District Advisory Board on the boundaries of the CBSD.  
(Tabled 11/28/00)

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to take this item off the table.

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

- 16.** Communication from Robert S. MacKenzie submitting information on HOME projects under Manchester Neighborhood Housing Services as requested by the CIP Committee.  
(Tabled 11/28/00)

This item remained on the table.

- 17.** Copy of a communication from the Deputy Finance Officer to Alderman Gatsas relative to funding options for Millyard parking facilities.  
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

- 18.** Communication from the Chief of Police requesting the expenditure of \$2,450.00 from previous CIP Police projects to fund a feasibility study of the Police Department firing range.  
(Tabled 9/18/00)

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

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

- 19.** Communication from the Director of Planning regarding the possible land acquisition of a piece of property on the westerly edge of Wolf Park.  
(Tabled 9/18/00)

This item remained on the table.

- 20.** Future Year CIP projects.  
(Tabled 8/7/00)

This item remained on the table.

- 21.** 71-73 Manchester Street request submitted by Amoskeag Residences (AR) & Elm Street Restoration Project  
(Tabled 6/12/00)

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

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

Alderman Gatsas stated I saw Tim Clougherty here and I have been questioning about Central High School and Gill Stadium on the \$22,000 that we appropriated somewhere. I believe Mr. Clougherty has a question about where the money is.

Mr. Clougherty replied exactly. From what I understand, this Committee appropriated funds but a funding source was not identified.

Alderman Gatsas responded the whole Board approved it and I think it came from contingency.

Alderman Cashin asked who is holding it up.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I know that Tim Clougherty sent me a memo. I did briefly review that with the Mayor. To my knowledge...I was not aware that it came out of contingency. We were looking for some funds. I had asked Tim if there was any way to get it out of school capital improvement program cash and I think that Tim thought that would be very tight. I had reviewed a funding source with the Mayor, but I am not aware that it had come out of contingency.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think that is where it was supposed to come from.

Mr. Clougherty replied the question arose because I wasn't aware...we weren't made aware that the funding had come out of contingency. I had spoken with Mr. Schubert, the Central High Football coach and talked to him about the possibility of looking for it in FY02 CIP funding so that we wouldn't have to encumber it in this year's CIP.

Chairman O'Neil asked Mr. Sherman if he knew anything about it.

Mr. Sherman stated I did get an e-mail today from Michelle at Highway asking about that but I haven't seen any documents on that.

Clerk Johnson answered we can research that and bring it to the Board tomorrow night.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee