

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

March 11, 2003

5:30 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Smith, Lopez

Absent: Alderman Wihby

Messrs: W. Jabjiniak, K. Sanborn, R. Ludwig, R. Sherman, R. MacKenzie,
Chief Kane, Aldermen Gatsas and DeVries

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from William J. Jabjiniak regarding Singer Park
Relocation.

Mr. Jabjiniak passed out a map stating that this is what was proposed in
November.

Chairman O'Neil asked is Mr. Sanborn here for support or does he wish to speak.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied I am going to ask him to come up here and join me. As you may recall, at the November presentation when the MOU was approved we talked about the developer agreeing to relocate Singer Family Park to a location that we choose. Certainly the architect took a look at Derryfield Park and said it fits. They could move the park, the field I should say, and its amenities up to Derryfield as one alternative. We have gone out and looked for some other alternatives. The Wolf Park area has been suggested. I think that has been backed away from because you are going to displace an existing field from over there as well. I think the alternative that we are looking at still is Derryfield Park. We are open to suggestions. That is why we are here tonight. As you recall and look at the map, this goes directly north of the existing Lemire field and includes the creation of the field, additional parking, the concession area is created, restrooms are provided, seating is provided, and some lighting so just about everything you see down at Singer Park now is recreated up at Derryfield Park in this example. I am looking for direction from the Committee and Mr. Sanborn can add anything to that that he would like.

Chairman O'Neil welcomed Kurt to the meeting.

Alderman Shea asked what is the purpose of this. Why are we doing this? What is its purpose?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered there was a whole lot of discussion early on with the developer about what the community would think about losing the field. I think the concern early on was Singer Park and the Riverfront Park Foundation has done a good job of providing a venue that attracts not just local people but I think regional people and State people as well and with that in mind they have offered as part of the overall development of the riverfront to recreate the venue, recreate the field if you will. That is why we are here looking for that direction. I guess we want to make one thing clear. There is a stage down there. It is not anticipated, it is not even planned to take that stage and move it anywhere near Derryfield Park and I am sure the Aldermen are happy to hear that as well. That stage is going to probably be dismantled and sold for scrap. That is where it is at now.

Alderman Shea asked if we were not to have anything to do with Singer Park or the Singer Park Foundation you mentioned at a recent meeting that the money could be transferred to some other City project, namely we will say working to improve Memorial High School or something else. We are not committed at all at this stage to Singer Park or anyone associated with the Singer Park Foundation is that correct?

Mr. Jabjiniak answered let me clarify a couple of things. The group has stepped up as part of their termination of the lease and signing the documents and have agreed to pay off the loan that the Riverfront Park Foundation had with the City. That totals \$748,000. They have agreed to settle and make a payment and clear up the whole lawsuit issue around the stage contract. They agreed to pay off the loan that the Foundation had with the Bank of New Hampshire. So those are three things separate than another option that Mr. Sanborn is going to talk about just briefly that if you don't want to create this field they would consider a cash payment in lieu of creation of the facility or the field. That is what I referred to in the past. You can move it anywhere you want. If there is money to move...certainly the \$748,000 needs to pay off the bond. Anything new and above that is up to the Board. It is really up to you.

Alderman Shea asked just so I am clear, if we were not to do anything with Derryfield Park in terms of any kind of renovation there, the City would be able to use the money that the group that is representing the development of Singer Park...they would be willing to pay the City \$748,000 or \$749,000...

Mr. Sanborn interjected no. The \$748,000 is already being paid. The \$748,000 for the City is money that was owed to the City as a result of the Singer Park and debts owed to the City because of that complex. We are paying that off already. We are also paying the contractor on the site approximately \$250,000 who is owed money for building the stage. We are also paying back debt to the Bank of New

Hampshire of approximately \$120,000. That clears the site from all debt. It is now a clean piece of property. We are taking care of all of that. As part of this project, Alderman, we offered to relocate Singer Family Park, not the stage but the soccer field basically. We have allotted, through construction estimates, between \$500,000 and \$750,000 to do that depending upon the site. We are willing...to be honest with you we don't really care. It is your decision as to what you want to do. If you want to recreate the park or put the money towards another worthwhile cause, that is totally your decision and I think that is why it was referred to this Committee.

Alderman Smith asked if this does move to Derryfield Park, the Foundation has nothing to do with it I hope.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered that is correct. It will be under the control of the City's Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department.

Alderman Lopez asked could we have Ron Ludwig come forward also as he is the Superintendent of Parks. I think before we make a decision we should hear from him in reference to this location because there are two ball fields up there that are utilized by Trinity and I think two girl's softball teams. Ron, could you come up and explain a little bit about that area before we make the decision here? Then I will have a couple of other questions after Ron explains about Derryfield Park.

Mr. Ludwig stated what I did was prepare a summary of usage sheet for the area that I will have the Clerk hand out. I am sorry that I couldn't get this information to you sooner but this all came forward rather quickly. I just went through this exercise of trying to kind of show everybody how Derryfield Park is...what the current use is. Until you put things down on paper sometimes you don't really realize how busy a location is. I am sure that we have forgotten some of the ancillary items that may also go along with the park like pet walks for the Police Department and things like that that would not appear on this list but the point being in a nutshell that it is a passive park. It has dual usage between recreational use and such. We recently constructed a new playground up there, which will bring additional people to the area. I only bring this information forward as it relates to bringing to everyone's attention how many more people could possibly be drawn to the park under what I think is the proposed venue. I am not sure exactly what the proposed venue is. The exit on Mammoth Road from Reservoir Avenue and Bridge Street and from Reservoir Avenue onto Belmont Street in conjunction with the Hillside School area are very difficult areas and we receive numerous complaints now about congestion in the area just with the softball players. So under any proposal there is some displacement. I am not necessarily opposed. I just want to bring to everyone's attention that this is going to bring far more congestion to an already congested area. When we talk about track meets in the fall we can do a lot of things with proper scheduling, there is no question, but I just want to bring to the attention of everyone here that this is a rather difficult site

in my opinion for what we are proposing to bring here. It can be done but it is going to require some creative thinking.

Alderman Lopez asked so understanding that it is going to displace a lot of people, for the record, Clem Lemire called me and as everyone knows he is the past Superintendent of Parks & Recreation and he feels that putting Singer Park at this location would be disastrous for that particular area. I wanted to mention that. He asked me to mention it and, therefore, I did. In saying that, I think now comes the option that Bill has indicated. I sort of agree with Alderman Shea. Why do we need another Singer Park in the City of Manchester? I don't subscribe to your economic theory but let's look at the bleachers down there. If we took those bleachers and put them over at West High School we could save ourselves \$100,000 for the City and if we could take those lights and then what would be the cash value...have you analyzed any combination there?

Mr. Sanborn replied no we haven't but the suggestion of moving the stands over to West came up at a meeting that we had recently with the athletic directors and the athletic coordinators of the schools. We certainly would be more than willing to do any of that.

Alderman Lopez asked, Ron, would you verify the cost of putting the stands there. What would you say the average cost would be?

Mr. Ludwig answered I think your estimate is pretty good and also there would be some costs associated with moving them. We did take the liberty...I forgot the gentleman's name from Harvey Construction but we have shared some information back and forth with him to see if that section of the bleachers would fit at West. Again, West was a place that we ran a little bit short of funds on and there is no visitors section to accommodate football games, which is kind of awkward over there. They will fit. We will have more space once the off ramp comes down. We gain a little bit more space on that side. It is a little bit tight right now but they will work in that location and I would say that that is a fairly good guesstimate as it relates to the cost. It may be a little low but not by much.

Alderman Lopez asked what about the lights. Is there a location in the City where they could be used?

Mr. Ludwig answered well obviously that is a Musco set of lights and that is a good system. That is pretty much premiere in the industry today. Musco is a good sports lighting. That is what we have at Gill. That is what the Little Leagues have and we have it at Piscataquog Park now. Again, that is a good grade of quality light. One idea would be maybe we could do something with them at a place like Memorial. We propose to renovate Memorial and in my opinion I would like to do a little bit more research on that that they are the right fit for the Memorial complex given the shielding and the neighbors because that is always a concern of

ours but I think they would work there pretty nicely if that is something you are interested in.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we can save ourselves some money.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Jabjiniak, you didn't for one second try and imply that this was going to be a Singer Park venue. I would hope that you didn't imply that because I thought you were an economic analyst to bring businesses to the City and I don't know if a soccer field is bringing any business to the City at Derryfield Park but maybe you could expound on your thinking.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered sure I would be glad to. My simple theory is anybody who is using Singer Park now I would like to see them stay in the City and continue to contribute to the economics of the City of Manchester. If it is the Phantoms or anybody else, Mr. Ludwig can accommodate them at a site like this or any other location like maybe Livingston or something like that. That might be an alternative that Mr. Ludwig can certainly analyze. Those are my simple thoughts. I would hate to see the youth of the City do without another field and that was the reason we pushed the developer to consider another alternative and that is what they came back with. It is certainly up to the Board or the Committee to set direction and that is what we are looking for.

Alderman Gatsas asked you don't for one second want to imply that you believe that the Phantoms are part of the youth of this City.

Mr. Jabjiniak answered no but the economics is.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess your answer is no that you don't assume that they are part of the youth and I would think that if we were doing this for the part of the youth then that is fine. To have a field at Derryfield Park that is going to accommodate the youth is fine. To put a field at Derryfield Park that is going to accommodate some 2,000 Phantom visitors I guess I would take a look around and see what part of the economy they are going to bring to the City of Manchester other than maybe stopping at the Derryfield store to buy a six pack when they are leaving the City. I would think that if we are going to attempt to help the youth of this City then that is fine but I don't think the youth should be having any kind of dialogue that we are going to be moving Singer Park to Derryfield Park.

Alderman Smith stated Ron this is for you. As you well know I am an advocate for youth sports. I see that we are going to displace, if we do it this way, six groups that play from April until October. One is Trinity High School and we have ASA and Manchester Co-ed. Do you know how many participants there are in all of these programs?

Mr. Ludwig replied I don't know the total.

Alderman Smith asked can you give a guess, a ballpark figure.

Mr. Ludwig answered you are probably talking 500 or better.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess my thought was that if we call Singer Park a venue of the City right now I guess my thought was with the investment that would be made at Gill Stadium that Gill Stadium would be a venue. You could host...as Alderman Smith and I visited Fitzpatrick Stadium up in Portland, it hosts football, soccer, field hockey...that is a rectangular field so it also hosts lacrosse and spring soccer seven days a week. My thought was that groups like the Phantoms or State High School championships could be played at Gill Stadium. There is definitely a need in this City for additional parks. Whether or not they need to have lights with them, I don't know. I am sure it would be nice up at Derryfield to have restrooms for people with the amount of activities that go on up there. I need to, speaking for myself, indicate that I don't think we need to move the venue of Singer Park to Derryfield or to another location but there certainly is a need in this City for additional parks. Now I spoke to someone who plays softball up there and I said give me on a scale of 1-10 the condition of the two fields. He said the best of the two was a 4 and the other one was probably a 0.

Alderman Gatsas stated he was being kind, Alderman.

Chairman O'Neil stated so I don't think we are displacing people from great fields. Both fields are in very rough shape as we speak today.

Alderman Gatsas asked, Mr. Ludwig, how does this plan fall into the plan that you have laid out for Derryfield Park expansion. Obviously, the playground equipment that is there now and the parking that is there now and where the tennis courts are laid out...how does this fit into the expansion?

Mr. Ludwig answered actually this pretty much is the plan that we had going forward. It redoes the existing soccer field and softball field on the back side but our plan did not involve bringing a different type of event but this is pretty much the plan or pretty close to it.

Alderman Gatsas asked so this plan fits into your thinking without bringing another 2,500 people to Derryfield Park. This would be for the youth of the neighborhood, Trinity and whatever other use there is. It wouldn't be about having this as a State championship soccer field or anything to that effect?

Mr. Ludwig answered no.

Alderman Shea asked, Ron, instead of the money going up to Derryfield Park how would it fit in to go down to the Memorial High School area where they are overseeing a major project there. Do you see that as fitting into your particular situation over at Parks & Recreation?

Mr. Ludwig answered obviously we are in the process or well into a Master Plan for Memorial. It is going to be a significant investment to rehabilitate the Memorial field depending on the route we choose as it relates to what we can afford. How it gets funded and hopefully the funding could come forward a little bit faster than it did at West Memorial. Any additional infusion of dollars would certainly help I would think.

Alderman Shea asked so basically, Bill, if we were to ask the group that Mr. Sanborn is representing to move that \$750,000 into the Parks & Recreation project down at Memorial High School that would be acceptable.

Mr. Jabjiniak replied he has laid out a cash option, however, I don't think the final number has really been determined.

Alderman Shea responded whatever. The overall generic type of situation here, whether the number is \$700,000 or \$725,000 or even in that ballpark that would fit in perfectly with what the intent that these people have is.

Mr. Sanborn replied our intention here is just simply to provide you folks with an enhancement for future athletes and athletes of the City. However you determine to spend that money is up to you. We just hope it is something that isn't controversial and does some overall good for the City.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to clarify something for my own benefit. When you say the cash option is between \$500,000 and \$700,000 is that in addition to the equipment or is the equipment subtracted if we move it or what?

Mr. Sanborn asked are you talking about the lights.

Alderman Lopez answered yes. Let's say the bleachers and the lights...that is not subtracted from the \$500,000 or \$700,000 that you were referring to is it?

Mr. Sanborn responded it was all-inclusive. We anticipated to relocate the stands, the lights and to recreate the field as it is and that it would run, depending on the site work that was needed, somewhere between \$500,000 and \$750,000. It is all-inclusive.

Alderman Lopez asked so if we would just take the stands and the lights then you would have to come up with another figure.

Mr. Sanborn answered right but with that said, I mean obviously if...

Alderman Lopez interjected you are going to give us the \$700,000 plus the lights and bleachers.

Mr. Sanborn stated we are going to work with you on this thing. If you need the stands at West then we will move the stands to West. I don't think we want to get this thing up to \$1 million but it would be nicer if we could get it all done and create a great facility for \$500,000 but whatever. We want to recreate...we have given the City the option to recreate this facility someplace else or use those funds in some other way that you deem appropriate.

Alderman Lopez asked so if we were to say take the lights and the stands plus \$700,000 you would say okay.

Mr. Sanborn answered probably not. It depends on what the costs are. Obviously if it is \$750,000 or \$775,000 or \$625,000, whatever it is we want to provide you...I mean we are splitting hairs at that point.

Chairman O'Neil asked Ron do we have a plan that says if money became available we would like to build a field in East Manchester or South Manchester or North Manchester or West Manchester. Do we have any plan that says that?

Mr. Ludwig answered not that I am aware of. We have been looking for and Alderman DeVries can speak to this but we have been looking for some period of time now for land in the South end given the influx of homes that have been built in that area even if the City would have to land bank it but we haven't been successful at getting anything at this point.

Chairman O'Neil asked so we don't necessarily have a plan that says gee if we could build another baseball field this is where we would like to do it or if we want to build another softball field this is where we would like to do it.

Mr. Ludwig answered we have a couple of locations where we could go in and say...like I know one in particular on the West Side, which is kind of hidden that we could go in and hopefully some day create another field, however, it isn't the kind of field that we would be creating that you would want to bring a lot of people there beyond some parents on a Saturday or Sunday given that you would have to travel through a very residential neighborhood to get there.

Chairman O'Neil stated, Bob, you have been here a long time. Have we ever had a Master Plan for field locations?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there was something called the Recovery Action Plan that was put together by Parks & Recreation but that did not include necessarily a specific listing for new facilities. There was in the City Master Plan an identification that there was a need for a new park facility in South Manchester and again, as Mr. Ludwig said, we have looked at a few different sites but none of them have worked out yet for a new field.

Chairman O'Neil asked so to the best of your knowledge South Manchester is the only place that has been identified for new additional facilities.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated I welcome the opportunity to get a copy of this Recovery Action Plan because I don't ever remember seeing it. So there hasn't been anything about enhancing the existing facilities in the City?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Recovery Action Plan is focused on existing facilities. The community Master Plan, which is about 10 years old now, it is from 1993, does show generally new facilities needed but the primary one would be somewhere in South Manchester for additional fields.

Mr. Sherman stated before you take a motion I have a few comments. I would like to say that if you are going to go for the cash option keep in mind last fall the Aldermen adopted some ordinances that set-up new reserve funds. This would qualify as a one-time revenue source, which would have to go into the reserve fund. Now that doesn't mean you can't use it but it would go into the reserve fund and then what I would recommend is if the Committee wants to make a recommendation on how to use this cash I would send it to the Finance Committee in the budget process. You wouldn't be able to make that recommendation out of here and have it go to the Board and have it be approved. The other thing I would say is if you were going to use this cash I would not recommend that you put it into a school project, especially a high school project. We can shuffle the walnut shells around here and get you in the same place but if you use this cash for a high school project you won't get reimbursed from the sending communities for that project. You are better off using this cash for a City project and again if we are going to do renovations up at Derryfield you could still use this cash for Derryfield Park for what you want to use it for but then use the cash that you were going to use at Derryfield over at Memorial. That allows us to get some reimbursement from the sending towns. Again, if you are going to go with the cash option I would make the motion that you accept the cash proposal but again it goes into that one time account and again you could make a recommendation to the Finance Committee.

Chairman O'Neil asked do projects like West Memorial or Livingston or Memorial that may be coming forward qualify for the 30% reimbursement.

Mr. Sherman answered we are going to...it is very gray. We are going to try to do West Memorial and when Ron Chapman was there we had talked about this. We are even going to try to do something with Livingston if we can. We may even try to do something with Gill Stadium and see how far we can push it. Obviously I think West Memorial would be the best chance to get something but it is very gray. If you read the statutes it is a very gray area.

Chairman O'Neil stated and you can't actually submit until the projects are complete, correct.

Mr. Sherman replied that is correct.

Alderman Shea asked, Randy, why if the money weren't converted into repairing Memorial...would there be some implication from the tuition towns. Is that what you are saying? Do they contribute to the renovations of our athletic fields?

Mr. Sherman answered if it is high school related it would. Absolutely.

Alderman Shea asked how about if we were to take the bleachers and put them over at West High School. Does that involve any kind of...

Mr. Sherman interjected no because in essence what you are getting at that point is Mr. Sanborn's group already owns those assets or when they close with the Foundation they will own those assets so at that point you are receiving a donation. You wouldn't have that. Again, if you could use those somewhere else and then actually buy bleachers to put over there you would then get a reimbursement but if there is no other alternative site, as Mr. Sanborn said we talked about that last week. The folks at West are very excited about that possibility.

Alderman Lopez stated, Randy, I need a clarification. If Mr. Sanborn was to work hand-in-hand with the Superintendent as they have done many times with businesses and they paid for renovations of some park would that be authorized under the financial rules if you understand my question.

Mr. Sherman replied you lost me.

Alderman Lopez asked if I was to say to Ron Ludwig as a developer here are the stands and I am putting them over there and here are the lights and what other parks would you like me to fix up you do the work and I will pay you.

Mr. Sherman replied that would be fine. I think in this situation where you have already got your agreements in place...I mean if this had been outside of the agreements that we already signed. I think in this situation you have already gone too far down the road to back that up.

Alderman Smith asked, Randy, in regards to this cash option could it be, let's say over in my area Wolf Park is deplorable. It is one of the worst fields in the City and it is utilized almost daily. Could this money be used to rehabilitate that field?

Mr. Sherman answered yes. Again what you would do is put this money into this one time fund and then the Board would take parts out of that fund and appropriate it to different parks.

Alderman Smith asked we would still have to go through that process.

Mr. Sherman answered yes absolutely.

Chairman O'Neil stated before you make a motion I would like to make a comment. I believe there is a need to create more field space in the City of Manchester. I am involved with the Police Athletic League. We have been the sponsors of the lacrosse programs, the high schools are kind of now on their own and they are playing in some third rate fields around the City. It is actually embarrassing for other communities to come here. I think there is a need...as much as I like the thinking where you guys are going about existing facilities, we need field space badly in the City of Manchester. Our soccer eats up the facilities both in the fall and spring. I am told that field hockey is squeezed. I know lacrosse is squeezed in the springtime. I would encourage my colleagues, whether or not Derryfield is the right place, are there other opportunities...that is why I was kind of interested in this was there a plan and there isn't unfortunately if we are able to create more space where would it be. So, as much as I think it is great to get the cash I would like to see us build another field somewhere. It doesn't have to have stands. It doesn't have to have lights but we need field space badly in the City of Manchester.

Alderman Lopez stated you bring up a very good point but let me assure you that with all of the fields that I have seen in 20 years that Parks & Recreation has taken care of and what we have done over by Kelley Street...how many soccer fields do we have other there, Ron? Four or five?

Mr. Ludwig replied five.

Alderman Lopez stated we have five soccer fields. I think the problem that even as a Commissioner on Parks & Recreation we had a lot of out of towners that come in and use our parks. I think that is an area that we have to take a good look at. I will give you an example. About 10 years ago we had a lot of out-of-towners at Wolf Park and we got a hold of the softball league and we set-up some guidelines as to how many out-of-towners could play in the league. I think we have to look at all of that. Manchester is not the place for every town to play in. The more fields we make in the City of Manchester, the more people are going to come to utilize those fields and the more maintenance fees and the more people are going to have to take care of those fields. I just wanted to bring that point up. Your point is valid and if the Board wants to go that way fine but I think that if we take a good look and we can look at the red book as to how many parks there are and Bob MacKenzie can attest to it and Sam can attest to it, how much recreational activities we have been putting in to the City of Manchester for the last 20 or 30 years. Back in the 60's we had practically nothing and today we have everything. One of the other points I would like to make is that most of these fields you can find empty in July. Everybody wants to complete their play by July

4 and then there is no problem getting a field. I think before we start building and spending more money that we should have a complete analysis of recreation so that we know the whole thing. Thank you.

Chairman O'Neil responded we do have a great number of facilities in the City but I can tell you... I know for instance that the youth lacrosse program, City kids, they are looking at playing in surrounding towns because they can't get field space in the City of Manchester and I think that is a shame. We have allowed some of these facilities to be built and even though we own them we allow others to control them and determine who plays on them. That is an issue. We have talked about it here before and done nothing with it. What ends up happening is a lot of our many youth groups in the City of Manchester end up playing in really third rate facilities, just flat areas attached to schools and I think it is embarrassing for the City. That is why I strongly believe that we need to create new facilities, additional facilities.

Alderman Shea stated I don't want to be the devil's advocate for Ron Ludwig or Ron Johnson but let's face it. They don't have the same staffing personnel today as they had a few years ago and they are asked to maintain several more park venues and they just don't have it. As Aldermen...I am probably one of them or I am probably not but we cut their budget and then we expect them to do more work and how can you do more work and create more parks if they have less people? It doesn't make any sense. We have parks that are difficult to maintain and I am sure Ron you know better than I that you just don't have the personnel to handle all of the work that the City of Manchester requires of you. If you want to comment you can.

Mr. Ludwig stated I hope that I am not going on record as saying as the Director of Parks that I am against additional facilities because that is certainly not the case. One of the things we know given the limited land opportunities that we have in some cases is that we have to try to better utilize some of the places that we have. I think the Aldermen took a huge step when they did that at West Memorial field and I applaud everybody that supported that effort over there because it is a chance as it relates to whether the athlete is going to like the infill system that exists over there. If it didn't work, I probably wouldn't be sitting here talking to you now. Whatever the case may be it seems to have caught on to some degree to the extent that we are seriously considering the use of it at the Gill, which will totally enhance Central's ability to play and anybody that wants to play there 24/7. I think we are taking...

Chairman O'Neil interjected I need to correct you. It is not seriously considering using Gill. It will happen at Gill Stadium.

Mr. Ludwig stated I think I will use the same terms I used seriously considering using it over at the Memorial complex as well. What we need to do to accommodate some of the lacrosse people and that sport is coming regardless of

what the School District says, I know it and I have heard it and I like it quite frankly but the fact of the matter is that we have to get more usage out of some of the facilities that we have. I think with this infill system field and lighting that we can if it doesn't impact the neighbors makes all the sense in the world and we are going to get there. I am not against additional facilities. I appreciate Alderman O'Neil's support as it relates to trying to get additional facilities and I hope that he supports us going forward in that respect.

Alderman Smith stated in regards to the new fields I know that the Alderman from Ward 8...this is where all of the development is going on and that is where all of the open space is. We do need something down in the South end. I can't understand why after several months we haven't found a location yet. I think this was brought up last February or March. What is the status, Mr. MacKenzie? You don't have any possibilities for locating a youth field down there?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we have not...our office has not done any site searches. We do keep an eye out for potential parcels that might be reasonably priced. I think Parks & Recreation did do a site search maybe a year and a half ago and there were a couple of alternatives but we have not done any extensive site searches.

Alderman DeVries stated I can add to that a little bit. Most of the land that has been identified between Parks & Recreation and myself that would be highly advantageous for the City to procure for field development is privately owned and is ripe for construction so the price tag on it is high. There is another recommendation and I know that we had talked about the potential \$500,000 to \$750,000 going for capital. Would that preclude us from using that for land acquisition?

Mr. Sherman replied land acquisition would qualify.

Alderman DeVries stated that really is what Parks & Recreation needs. They put it into their budget request every year. I believe it was \$1 million that you had put for the South end of Manchester. That is what the South end of Manchester needs is money put aside for land acquisition so that when a parcel is identified somebody can negotiate to purchase it for the City for a new field. The \$500,000 to \$750,000 would be nicely allocated in that direction and I think then Parks & Recreation could work towards serious negotiations and possibly come up with a new site.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the things that we should maybe consider is some type of Citywide Master Plan. We have no plan. We kind of react to certain sections of the City but we have no plan going forward on improving our parks. Alderman Lopez you are shaking your head yes. I have never seen a Master Plan.

Mr. Ludwig replied the plan that Bob MacKenzie referred to is the only one that I am aware of and I will give you a for instance. It identified in it that the City was deficient in tracks back in 1993 and it said that for a City of our size we should have three and now we do so it is 10 years but we are making progress.

Chairman O'Neil stated I guess moving forward is progress, Ron. I would love to see a copy of this because I have never seen it.

Mr. Ludwig replied I would be happy to get you a copy, Alderman.

Chairman O'Neil asked why don't you get it for all of the Aldermen.

Mr. Ludwig replied I can do that.

Alderman Shea stated according to my thinking we do have a Master Plan don't we, Bob. I mean we are supposed to. It hasn't been updated but we have a Master Plan. I believe the last one was in 1995?

Mr. MacKenzie replied 1993 and it did have certain recommendations for recreational facilities and actually many of those have been implemented.

Alderman Shea asked and the updating was supposed to be a five-year deal wasn't it. I am not sure.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it is recommended that it be every five years.

Alderman Shea stated so basically it is behind the times. I think you are working on that.

Alderman DeVries stated I have one more question of Ron Ludwig. If we are looking at non-high school facilities that could use renovations, updating, reconfiguring, whatever, what would your recommendation be? What field to you think? I mean I know that we have had some discussions about South Taylor and Parkview for that field.

Mr. Ludwig replied I would really want to go back to the office and take another look at that and try to make sure that we are...again even when I made a recommendation to take a look at relocating Singer to a place like Wolf I did that very tongue and cheek and where was I going to put the softball players and I knew that for instance. We have a couple of locations that we could allocate dollars to and build another field as Alderman O'Neil is suggesting, however, they are not in locations that are going to accept the kind of events that had typically surrounded Singer Park.

Chairman O'Neil stated, Ron, you and I have had this discussion. We are not talking about a venue like Singer Park. It is hoping that moving forward Gill is the venue for State tournaments and for the Phantoms. All we are talking about is as Alderman Gatsas said earlier youth type activities. Flat land where we can developer soccer fields, football fields, field hockey, lacrosse, baseball, and softball.

Alderman DeVries stated and rugby.

Chairman O'Neil stated Mr. Laberge has his hand up. This is not a public hearing. I am not sure what you want to bring up. Maybe we can allow a quick comment from you but I just want to let you know that this is not a public hearing with regards to what is going on with parks in the City. Did you want to make one quick comment?

Mr. Laberge stated from reading the papers the only sites discussed have been Wolf Park and Derryfield Park and I think there are other sites to be discussed. Will there be a forum where we can discuss other sites in the City? These are the only two being suggested. I think there are other alternatives. The paper said that other alternatives would be acknowledged tonight, at least in Monday's paper so I thought this was a public hearing.

Chairman O'Neil replied I appreciate your comments and I think it is something we need to...it may not be specifically addressed by this "relocation of Singer Park" but we have to have a game plan in the City with regard to our park system and I don't believe we necessarily do. We can't say if \$5 million came along what is our next step. If we have something like that I haven't seen it in the six years that I have been back.

Alderman Shea moved that the bleachers be moved to West Memorial Field; the lights be given to Parks & Recreation for future use; and a cash proposal from the developer, Manchester Downtown Visions, be accepted and put in the City's Special Revenue Reserve Account. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I need to ask Randy a question. Randy, is the procedure that the Board can tell you where we want that money put?

Mr. Sherman replied you would have to, through your budget process, make that part of your appropriation.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think that we have an opportunity to complete a project. Derryfield Park is in need of completion. We either complete it in a two year phase and allow some soccer fields to happen up there where there is a junior high school and Trinity is up there and there is going to be some use to it along with completing the project that is there. We have a habit of going in and starting projects and letting them worry that they are going to be completed in a four or

five year phase. We have an opportunity to complete a project and go forward. It creates some of the fields for the youth that we are talking about and I think that is an important part. Now moving the lights and the bleachers I certainly don't think that those should be here. Now if they want to move the lights to Memorial or move the bleachers, that is fine. I don't think you need that kind of a complex at Derryfield Park for youth to play. At least it completes the project.

Alderman Shea stated what we are talking about is moving the money into a reserve in order to determine whether or not we are going to apply money to Derryfield Park or Memorial High School or Wolf Park or wherever. I mean it is not as if it is going to be necessary at this stage to...I am sure under the CIP budget there will be some allocation for the completion of Derryfield Park. I mean if there isn't then obviously Alderman Gatsas will put his two cents in and try to get it. I am just saying that this is not necessary at this stage in my opinion.

Alderman Lopez asked, Alderman Gatsas, are you subscribing to a soccer field versus two ball fields at Derryfield. Is that what you are subscribing to?

Alderman Gatsas answered I believe that the two softball fields are included in the project plan that Mr. Ludwig had brought forward. I think the soccer field is just an addition to that.

Alderman Lopez replied okay I understand.

Alderman Gatsas stated again I think the City Finance Officer was very clear about talking about renovating high schools. If we do that we are not going to be able to chargeback on them. I think he was very clear so for any intent and purpose to think about doing that is foolish on the City's part.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the point was well made about the high schools. We are not talking about doing the high schools.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Mr. Sanborn, would you be willing to just have your consultants that have taken a look at the Derryfield situation confirm that in their thoughts it was keeping the softball field with, as you have heard this discussion go on for quite a long time now...we are not looking for a venue at Derryfield Park but just a soccer field type facility with softball fields can you just ask your people to take a quick look at it to see if all of that would fit if we eliminate stands and lights and all of that.

Mr. Sanborn replied certainly and if I may I think what I am hearing is there are a number of different items here that this Committee would like to get accomplished. I would volunteer our efforts in equating a price to each one of those. So we will come back to this Committee with a price to move the stands to West. We will work with Parks to find out what the number is to put a soccer field and do some of the renovations that you already have planned at Derryfield and se

if we can get a cost and a price to that. The lights. What it would cost to take those down and put them someplace else. We will put prices to those and then maybe I can resubmit that to you folks and you can select what you want to do.

Chairman O'Neil stated so if I am hearing from you right there is probably no need to take action tonight then.

Mr. Sanborn replied from my side you have so much money. If we can get all of those things accomplished for the amount of money that we are giving you, that would be great. I don't really know what those costs are so I can't say that.

Mr. Ludwig stated the proposal that we had as a part of Phase II in the Derryfield plan said that we will rehabilitate the existing soccer/two softball fields as they exist now. They are effectively located on a rectangular field 180° apart from one another. So it is not a premiere soccer field in the fall given that you are transitioning from turf at some point on to some stone dust and that is not typically what I know that premiere soccer field to be but it is usable in that regard.

Alderman Lopez stated that is the point I want to make. You are going through the process and it is already there so why would we put Singer Park over there? We have already got a plan on the books to do what Alderman Gatsas wants to be done over there – the ball fields and soccer fields and playground equipment and everything else. That plan is already there. I know that you are talking about the money aspect of it. You can't have everything completed in one year. I would like to move the motion that Alderman Shea made.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to move the bleachers to West Memorial Field; give the lights to Parks & Recreation for future use; and accept a cash proposal from the developer, Manchester Downtown Visions, to be put in the City's Special Revenue Reserve Account. The motion carried with Alderman O'Neil duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil stated Mr. Jabjiniak had asked while Mr. Sanborn was here if we could take Item 12 off the table.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to remove Item 12 from the table.

Disposition of ice skating rink previously located in the Hampshire Plaza Mall.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated while Mr. Sanborn is here I noticed that Mr. MacKenzie has also included in his package information that he had regarding operating costs and the developer is certainly here to address the operating costs if he is given the ice skating rink to operate.

Mr. Sanborn replied we submitted a letter to folks under the understanding that you folks have a rink with chillers and boards and things like that available. Our stance on that that I submitted back to Bill on February 3 is that we are more than happy...if the City is looking to recreate that existing venue that you originally purchased it for we are more than willing to take that equipment and operate it at no cost to the City so that there is an ongoing public skate venue on the site down next to the ballpark. We would obviously, once we got up and operational down there we would take on all of the expenses and there would be no expense to the City.

Chairman O'Neil stated in order to do that we need to continue to store it for a period of time.

Mr. Sanborn replied right. We only have 1,000 square feet at 1045 Elm Street and I don't think I can fit it all in there.

Alderman Lopez stated if they are going to run it and they are going to pay for the operating costs and everything write it up.

Mr. Sanborn stated we feel it is a nice compliment to the site.

Alderman Smith moved that the City donate the ice skating previously located at the Hampshire Plaza Mall to Manchester Downtown Visions and that the City continue to pay the cost of storage until such time as the developer has the facilities to officially acquire the ice apparatus. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated just so everyone understands we will continue to pay the \$100/month to store it and it could be a year. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Resolution and budget authorization authorizing transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$100,000 (CDBG Program Income) for the 2003 CIP 511303, PAL Center Project.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the resolution and budget authorization. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked do we have anyone here from the PAL Program.

Chairman O'Neil stated there was some information shared today I believe and I think Sam or Bob has it.

Alderman Lopez stated I support this but I want to ask the staff if for whatever reason we have to put the sprinkler systems in now and I understand the reason in talking to Deputy Chief Albin because of Rhode Island and all of that stuff and they are preparing it and I can accept that but I think that we need to make sure that things move on at a faster pace in getting this building up and running for the kids in the Police Athletic League and stuff like that. I would like to ask Mr. MacKenzie or Sam what role they are playing to make sure that the funds that we have been allocating is to make sure that this building is in compliance and getting things done.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I will respond to that. We were initially involved just in the acquisition of the property. We have not been involved at all in the plan review or plan development and the code requirements. We do believe there is a need, because the City has a number of codes that they must meet, particularly the fire code but there are other codes as well, that if the Committee would like we would try to keep abreast of the project as it progresses and provide a regular report to this Committee if you would like.

Chairman O'Neil stated if I may, Alderman, being familiar with this project I think other than the purchase the City's only contribution is the \$50,000 of CDBG money, which is being used towards the elevator construction. We actually turned back at one point \$50,000 to complete Beech Street School so the City hasn't been kicking a lot of money into this. Most of the money has been coming from the US Attorney's Office and because there has been Federal money accepted to purchase the building and for renovations, it created a whole other issue for accessibility. That is why the program is moving forward with construction of an elevator. At first it was heading in the direction of a lift to get from the ground level to the first floor. That was going to cost \$25,000 just for that. The decision was made to move forward to install a permanent elevator inside that would service all floors of the building and, therefore, not create any issues for the US Attorney with regards to accessibility. Chief Kane is here and may be able to enlighten us a little bit because he personally walked the building along with Deputy Chief Albin and raised a number of concerns well before the fire in Rhode Island, specifically addressing the basement. Joe, I don't know if you want to come up to talk about it but it was through Chief Kane's efforts that a lot of these issues came to light and again it wasn't until the transfer of the property took place that these issues came to light.

Alderman Lopez stated just to follow-up before the Chief talks I agree with you but I look in the future that this \$100,000 is going to take care of the basement and first floor and as we go along in this process, which is a well worthy cause for the youth and the Police Athletic League which I totally support we have to get the building running and down the road we will probably put some more money in to do the second floor or the third floor.

Chairman O'Neil replied I can tell you that at Chief Kane's recommendation one of the things was and he and his staff have been working with the architect to size the service pipe coming in for the sprinkler system proper so that it is designed to handle all four floors. Even though the sprinkler system will only be installed on the first two, it will go up and I don't know if the correct term is stand pipe but the piping will be sized in order to do a full sprinkler system when the effort is moved forward to occupy the third and fourth floors of the building. That is something recent that the Chief has been involved in. The Chief had some concerns about egress. That is why some of the funding has to do with exit lights and emergency lighting in hallways. I just want to make it clear that the Fire Department has been very cooperative in working to help out to get the building occupied as quickly as possible.

Chief Kane stated as a matter of fact we have a meeting with the architect tomorrow morning at 9 AM to further the progress of the building. One of the things that is driving this thing is because of the Federal funds that the building accepted and that they need to put the elevator in, once you start that type of construction with the elevator, the elevator requires an alarm system and because now you have access to the lower floors it is also handling an exit situation that hadn't gone on down there. If you are utilizing that lower level it really needs to be sprinkled. As the building is being utilized more and more and the plans move along, the requirements grow.

Alderman Lopez replied I completely understand that. I have been involved in that program for 10 years. I agree with the Chairman. I just want to make sure that the staff is making things more forward in a good timeframe and that if they need help maybe we could utilize the Building Maintenance Department with qualified people to do some of these things to get the job done such as the RFP or whatever needs to be done. I noticed that you have to get three bids and stuff like that. That is all I am pointing out is that I would like to see the building up and running as much as the Chairman and every kid that goes to the Salvation Army and the Weed and Seed continues to be a safe haven.

Chairman O'Neil responded I can tell you, Alderman, that there was a significant replacement somewhere in the \$50,000 range of the boiler there. Tim Clougherty helped with some of the specifications on that installation. City staff...the Fire Department has been outstanding in their help. The Building Department has been over there. Max Sink has walked the building and they don't have any issues. They just stated that they thought there were more issues that the Fire Department would want to take a look at and as I said both Chief Kane and Deputy Chief Albin have been over there and walked the building and have recommendations that would improve the use of the building.

Alderman Shea asked when is it going to open.

Chairman O'Neil answered as soon as these life safety issues are addressed.

Alderman Shea asked a couple of weeks or a month.

Chairman O'Neil answered it is going to be longer than that. The Fire Department is working with the architect on the specifications. Within the next six months if not sooner.

Alderman Smith asked to move the question.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to approve the resolution and budget authorization. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

2003 CIP Budget Authorization:
410803 VAWA

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to approve the CIP budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman O'Neil regarding the Manchester Community Resource Center (MCRC), which is currently housed in a City owned building with said lease expiring in August 2003.

Chairman O'Neil stated, Bob, you and I had talked and you had asked that we put this on the table so that you could have the proper communication with the many parties that are involved, correct.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. If we could have one more month there are a couple of more meetings we have to have.

Chairman O'Neil responded so for the most part you have reached a conclusion but you wanted to be able to reach out to...there are at least two boards involved and a couple of other agencies correct.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated so he has asked to put it on the table for a month and it is guaranteed that we will have a recommendation next month.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to table this item.

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Bill Hoyt, Citizens for NH Land & Community Heritage, submitting a sample resolution In Support of Continued Funding for the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP) and requesting the Board's support of same.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, do you have some additional information for us this evening.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. The full Board of Mayor and Aldermen agreed to almost all of the language but there was discussion about trying to give some additional preference to urban areas. We have put together some suggested language and I believe that has been passed out to the Committee members.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the resolution by adding the language provided by Mr. MacKenzie. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Bob, does this address the need for LCHIP to allow for more urban uses.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked isn't this resolution going to the Governor.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't remember specifically the Governor. I thought the LCHIP governing board. Bob, do you remember?

Mr. MacKenzie stated it was originally intended for the Governor because it was intended to provide support for the higher level of funding but the Governor has already submitted a recommendation so it is going to go to the full Legislature.

Chairman O'Neil asked wasn't the intent also to send this to the Board that oversees LCHIP, which has some members of the Legislature on it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas replied that was the point that I was making. I would think that this resolution more than going to the Legislature would go to the LCHIP people themselves that make the decision on it.

Alderman Shea stated I thought it was going to the committee in order for them to bring it to the attention...

Chairman O'Neil interjected I think we are talking about two different issues. We are talking about funding for LCHIP and I think that is where Bob is referring to the Legislature and then the allocation of the money is from the governing board, whatever it is called with regards to LCHIP.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion to amend the resolution by adding the language provided by Mr. MacKenzie. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to remove Item 8 from the table.

Communication from Chief Kane seeking authorization to accept FEMA grant money in the amount of \$79,275 for the purpose of purchasing a brush firefighting truck and requesting that \$33,975 (city match for remaining costs) be appropriated under a CIP project account as stipulated in the grant.

Chief Kane stated thank you for allowing me to be here. I first want to apologize for not being here last month but I wasn't aware that this was on the agenda or else I would have been here. What I would like to ask you this evening is to just forward this request to the MER budget process for 2004.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to refer this item to the 2004 MER budget.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you know if this is a cash appropriation or a bond appropriation.

Chief Kane answered I think that is something that Mr. MacKenzie and the Finance Department can discuss.

10. Discussion of graffiti-related issues confronting the City.

This item remained on the table.

11. Removal of a 12" concrete drainage pipe located at 747 Mammoth Road.

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Communication from Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, regarding the Lead Hazard Control Program.

Mr. MacKenzie stated at the last meeting the Committee wanted quite a bit more detailed information on who was going to be involved in this project and how it was going to be administered. There were three groups involved. There was the City, The Way Home and Southern NH Services. We tried to outline who would be operating what portions of the project. This is a fairly detailed memo and if you have any questions on it our staff will be available.

Chairman O'Neil asked is there a need to act or is it just for informational purposes.

Alderman Lopez asked will the rest of the Aldermen get this.

Mr. MacKenzie answered if the Committee would like.

Chairman O'Neil stated we can have the Clerk's Office send it out to all of the Aldermen.

Chairman O'Neil stated we do have an addendum to the CIP agenda regarding the Derryfield Country Club. Why don't we start with City staff? Solicitor Clark is here and the Deputy Finance Director, Randy Sherman is here and I believe Mr. Ludwig is still here. We also have Mr. Lanoie here and his advisor.

Mr. Sherman stated what you have in front of you, if I may, is actually the product of about 18 months worth of negotiations with the current lease holders up at Derryfield. You may recall that we came back to the Board I believe last May with the proposal and we were authorized to go forward and negotiate a lease. This was after a number of months of discussions. Just a little history again. The lease that you have in front of you is for a new country club up at Derryfield. It is with the current lease holders that are up there. The building that they are in as you recall from the presentations that we had last summer is really in a state of disrepair at this point. The lease is a 25-year lease. We have put in a number of provisions that were missing from the current lease – some ability for the City to control noise and to control some of the conduct that may appear up there. The lease payments are based on the debt service that we anticipate. The way the lease works is that the City will put forth \$2.2 million of bonds to the construction of a new facility. The tenants or the managers will assume 69% of the debt service and that is what we are calling the base lease. That debt service will follow the schedule for the first 10 years and then after that there will be a CPI increase for the last 15 years of the lease. There is also the provision of a revenue sharing. If the revenues from the facility hit certain thresholds, the City will receive an additional payment. There is also the provision in the agreement that they will

share in the maintenance costs and in some of the insurance costs. If I can get back to the \$2.2 million item real quick because I know there may be some comments about that number and whether this building can be actually constructed for that \$2.2 million if for any reason we don't feel that we can stay within that \$2.2 million the lease actually lays out a series of steps that the two parties will go through where either the parties will sit down and redesign the building or the parties will sit down and do some value engineering and try to reduce those costs. There is always the option to come back to the Board for more funds or the management group can assume the additional costs or any combination thereof although at this point we still feel that the \$2.2 million is a doable number. That provision is in the lease to deal with that. The last thing I was going to point out is that this lease can be assigned but if it is going to be assigned to another party the City does have approval authority on that.

Alderman Lopez stated since you were talking about the \$2.2 million and the cost overrun I guess my question is if this building goes forward and Tom maybe you can answer this, I couldn't find it in here but there are about 16 years remaining on the existing lease. Let's say the City decided not to give them more money if there were cost overruns and then the manager has the right to terminate the management agreement within 10 business days thereafter. What happens with the 16 years left on the lease? Do we have to pay him or what?

Solicitor Clark replied his original lease, which he is operating under now continues in effect until you tear the old building down.

Alderman Lopez responded but that would be torn down.

Solicitor Clark stated it won't be torn down until you determine whether you are going to build this and whether the \$2.2 million is sufficient. We will know before we get to that point.

Chairman O'Neil stated one of the documents that you hopefully all have in front of you that Solicitor Clark has prepared...correct me if I am wrong Tom but this Committee does not have jurisdiction over the special purchasing procedure but your handout is advisory only although we could include it in our recommendation but it would have to go to Bills on Second Reading.

Solicitor Clark replied you can include it in your recommendation. What it is is as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, City staff like Parks, Highway, Finance and our office have been working on this project for a long time. Highway has taken a very close look at the best ways to build this building, how to get the most bang for your buck and how to get it done fast because you have a short window here with the golf season and everything else that goes on up there. They recommend that we use the construction management type of procurement. It is still a competitive procurement but it is an RFP negotiation process rather than strict bidding. Our present ordinance allows us to adopt a new ordinance to allow

construction management, which we have done on a couple of projects. We have done it on Airport projects and on the skating rink and on the Chase building. I have prepared an ordinance, which would allow this project to be done under construction management, which I would suggest that you refer to the full Board for passage that night under suspension of the rules or for referral to Bills on Second Reading. I don't think it is urgent that it pass in one night.

Chairman O'Neil stated in my discussion with Mr. Frank Thomas and Mr. Tim Clougherty from Highway they believe that if for some reason the prices come in a little higher than the money we have allocated this is the best method for working with the restaurant folks to bring those costs under control and keep the project within the budget. That is their recommendation, to move in this direction.

Alderman Smith asked has this proposed clubhouse changed from the original architectural drawings that were submitted last year. Is everything status quo?

Mr. Ludwig answered that was a few of us sitting around the table and saying this is what we think the best location would be. Once we bring an architect on board...I am assuming that is going to be very close, Alderman. If an architect said it should go a little to the left or a little to the right for whatever reason and it made sense I suppose that could happen but that is a conceptual drawing. That is the look that we thought we might like. It kind of fits into the New England look and that is something we were looking for.

Chairman O'Neil asked, Ron, can you update us on the process to date without awarding any contracts where you are with the architect selection.

Mr. Ludwig replied let me say that anything we have done thus far has definitely be done with a subject to. Everyone is fully aware that there has been on Aldermanic approval of the funding so everything we have done is subject to that process.

Chairman O'Neil stated you have made it clear and we have had discussions on this. We were on a timetable in order to meet the golf season, etc. so they needed to move forward on some of these items subject to the Board funding the project otherwise they would be six months behind and not meeting the obligations of the manager/restaurant people and all of the golfers that use the facility. They have had to move forward without awarding contracts on some items. When will an architect selection or recommendation be made?

Mr. Ludwig responded a couple of things that this Committee or you, Alderman O'Neil, asked us to look at the last time we were here was could we move forward on the process and what we have done just so people know up front is that we first put together a committee of City employees, which involves facility engineer, Tim Clougherty, Mike Lanoie, the owner of the restaurant, Pam Goucher from Planning, Ed Wojnilowicz from our staff, myself and Ron Johnson. We have

solicited RFP's from architects. We have looked at it and we have short-listed them. As of Monday morning we have gone out and asked that short list of architects to respond to an RFP. We will be hopefully getting those back on March 25 and because of someone in our group being on vacation we will probably review them on April 8. That is not a bad date given that there isn't much we can do legally out from under the guise of this Board anyway until about that date so it kind of works out. We are a little bit behind based on the timetable we provided some time ago due to some minor setbacks but we appear to have gone past those now. We think that there should be some opportunity to make that up and we would like to be in the ground some time around the end of July or maybe August and that is pretty much Tim Clougherty's recommendation to try and get the building closed in to accomplish winter construction.

Alderman Shea asked, Randy, what kind of bonding are we going to have.

Mr. Sherman answered it will be a general obligation bond that will be entirely on the Parks & Recreation Enterprise side so it will not impact anything that you want to do on the City side.

Alderman Shea asked the starting date for the bonding will be next year when we pay the first amount on that particular bond.

Mr. Sherman replied it will actually depend on when we issue the bond but they will start their payments...I mean you have to get through a construction period so they won't start their payments until they are in, which we can actually pretty much mirror the bond payments to. We will have that in mind when we set-up that service.

Alderman Shea asked now the length of construction once it begins, Ron, how long will it take before we have a finished product up there.

Mr. Ludwig replied again what we would like to see and what we would hope for is somewhere around a year from this time. It will probably be a little later but given the construction process it appears that we may be able to go forward with here we think we should be able to hold to a timetable and certainly by the latest in May it will be up and running. That is wishful thinking maybe but that is what we would like to see happen.

Alderman Shea asked what would be the time of the construction period. How many months?

Mr. Ludwig answered roughly August until May.

Alderman Shea stated and you are saying that there would be no impact on the golfing community during that period in time right or no negative...

Mr. Ludwig interjected I think we will be able to keep it to a minimal impact on the golfers. When school goes back in session, shortly thereafter, our junior crowd goes down a little bit and basically we are busier on weekends when we wouldn't expect the construction to be taking place anyway. We would have the area completely enclosed with construction fencing. There would be minimal impact to the players.

Alderman Shea stated I guess in the year 2028 this particular situation will run out but after 25 years does the facility then...the agreement stops. Do they pay real estate taxes after that time on that or do we still own it or how is that going to work after 25 years?

Solicitor Clark replied the City is always going to own the building. They are going to have a management agreement to run the restaurant and the banquet hall. Parks & Recreation will be located in the lower half of the building and be operating their own section. After the expiration of this agreement the City then has an option of looking for another operator if it wants to or going out to bid but the City will own this so there will be no taxes paid.

Alderman Smith stated as you well know it used to be the county farm and it is the building with the fire deficiencies and so forth. There are several of them around and I think with the situation with the Fire Department I don't know if anybody has been up in the lounge but I know I am disabled and if you get 80 or 90 people up there they won't be able to get out. This building was built...I am not quite sure but I think it was 1880 or something. It used to be the county farm and I think with the situation with the fire inspector and so forth that this is a way to go to build a new clubhouse. I would just like to say one thing that struck me as funny and that is when they made the presentation they were going to put in roughly 61% and now it is 69%. I think we are dealing in good faith and it is a win-win situation for the people who play golf and I would endorse this completely and I hope my colleagues would too.

Alderman Lopez asked, Tom, has Harry okayed the insurance aspect of this contract and certified that everything is in order.

Solicitor Clark answered yes.

Alderman Lopez stated you said Randy that it is going to be funded totally by the Enterprise fund is that correct.

Mr. Sherman answered what we are going to do is we are going to issue the debt on the Enterprise side but because some of the facilities are being used for general fund purposes in essence the general fund will rent and make a payment to the Enterprise fund for their portion but we will keep all of the debt on the Enterprise side and not tie up any debt on the City side.

Chairman O'Neil stated I want to thank the staff as well as Mr. Lanoie and his folks for talking about and I am going to refer to it as almost a zero tolerance policy with regards to behavior and noise. I know that Mr. Lanoie has indicated to me that he is going to take some corrective action in regards to one night of outdoor music and I appreciate that. I appreciate both parties working on that. I guess and I am not going to beat on this but I still can't figure out why the golf pro doesn't make a contribution to this. I will go to my grave questioning that but I am not going to hold up this project over it. I do have a concern with the maintenance building because I have gone up and looked at...the last drawing I looked at showed a maintenance building. Do you remember anything about that discussion?

Mr. Ludwig replied no. I am a little bit confused. What I remember is what we have always said where we would like to put it and that is on...well I call it to the right of the 18th fairway in the woods along I guess that would be Nyberg Lane. Am I saying the same thing you just said?

Chairman O'Neil responded I think we are talking the same point. My concern, Ron, is that there is an awful lot of activity up there in the winter time with sliders of different ages and I really think the maintenance building for the storage and repair for the lawnmowers and all of that really should be out next to the garage on Bridge Street Extension. I feel very, very strongly about that.

Mr. Ludwig replied again we have looked at. We have had our golf course superintendent, Stan Jaworsky, look at it. He has been there almost as long as I have – 28 or 29 years. We do have issues when you go down below and I have also done some research in talking with others as it relates to when we put up the maintenance facility in 1973. We were actually taken to court for building that facility down there and asked to make sure that we never clutter the outside of the area and that we keep it neat and clean and buffered. I think we could get some kind of negative feedback either from the neighbors on Bridge Street Extension or the neighbors on Nyberg Lane. I am certainly open to a process that allows them to come in, as you suggested, and have their say.

Chairman O'Neil responded we are only talking about an 80' x 100' building roughly, correct.

Mr. Ludwig replied that is certainly the maximum size that it would be.

Chairman O'Neil stated I cannot see taking prime recreation property because they slide all the way over to...Ron I have been up there and watched them. You were showing parking areas and all that stuff. You have to take a significant part of the land to put up this building and I can't see taking it from free recreation for the citizens of the City.

Mr. Ludwig replied I have no interest in impacting the people that slide there. Unless I am wrong I don't think we will have an impact. If the building, in effect, would impact the people that are sliding it would have a negative impact on the way we play the game.

Alderman O'Neil stated the building is technically going to go, if I recall, in the area where the golf pro traditionally teaches – over to the north of the parking lot.

Mr. Ludwig replied no I think you are missing a whole other section that is wooded along that edge where there is a lot more space there than you think.

Chairman O'Neil stated the parking lot goes right over to the old Bridge Street Extension. I can't be missing much of anything up there.

Mr. Ludwig replied if you walk it and we have and be careful because there is poison ivy there, that piece goes up and you will find that there is quite a bit of land in the heavily wooded area now. My intent, Alderman, if it comes out into the 18th fairway to affect sliders then it will be coming out into the 18th fairway to affect golfers. That can't happen. I would never suggest it.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would strongly recommend and actually I would make a motion that it goes where the maintenance garage is on Bridge Street Extension. I feel that strongly about it.

Mr. Ludwig responded that is up to you but I will tell you that you will make our life...at this time of the year when we try to get out of that area to get to the high land of the golf course because as you typically know if you are aware we play what we call an old nine at Derryfield in the spring. The reason we play the old nine is because we cannot play the lower holes of which 17 is one of. This would mean that we would either have to come out with equipment on Bridge Street Extension and come around or try to build something that gets us over to the high ground and that is what the superintendent, Ron Jaworsky's, concern was really more than anything.

Chairman O'Neil replied to me to inconvenience, and I truly believe we are going to inconvenience golfers and more importantly people who are going to use that in the winter time, I have to disagree with you that there is all kinds of property up there because I have walked it. I don't see all kinds of property up there. I feel very strongly about...we have a maintenance garage on Bridge Street Extension and that is where in my opinion the crew should be working out of for the golf course. Let's take care of the big items here.

Solicitor Clark stated I gave you a copy of an addendum that the developer has provided to me today to be included with the lease.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we get an action on the addendum to the management agreement, which you all have.

The Committee members noted that they did not have a copy of the addendum.

Alderman DeVries stated I noticed that within the 25-year lease you have a provision to go back upon request and increase the liability insurance or any other portion of the insurance coverage that needs to be updated. I think it says upon reasonable review and request so it needs to be generated on the City side. I think it is on page 9 of the lease agreement. My concern is the mechanism in place for reviewing agreements, management agreements, in the City is not very good. There is not really an individual that does review any of our lease agreements or any other type of agreements annually or...so my concern is what can we put in there that will actually trigger a review of the insurance. When I had some discussions on the insurance I understand that they are kind of coming in at the bare minimum amounts at \$2 million liability so it may not take long for us to out pace the coverage. So three years from now we may wish to have that increased and we should probably have a mechanism in there that we will have staff review the coverage.

Solicitor Clark responded well this agreement is going to be administered through the Parks & Recreation Department. In the event that the City changes it standard requirements for insurance that is the reason that language is in there to allow us to go back and talk to the developer and say the standards have now changed and we are required to either increase the insurance limits or add new types of insurance. This allows us to do that.

Alderman DeVries replied I understand that it allows us...

Solicitor Clark interjected the Parks & Recreation Department will be working hand-in-hand with the Risk Manager in administering this agreement.

Alderman DeVries stated I understand that the lease allows us to go back and revisit that. My concern is that it doesn't routinely happen. I am not meaning to offend Parks & Recreation or any other department it is just that everybody is understaffed and pushed into many directions and we have while we have been on the board seen many times in these different lease agreements where things have not been attended to. I am wondering if we can add language that would say it will undergo staff review within a timeframe so that we are sure that every three years somebody is taking a look at this.

Solicitor Clark replied if you want some language in there I am sure the developer or the restaurant people would agree to put it in there.

Alderman DeVries stated knowing that the City is on the hook for any liability and we have just seen the fire down in Rhode Island. I don't think the \$1 million/\$2 million for each occurrence would have carried us too far. I am not saying that the world of liability insurance is going to change that much on the City's recommendations but it could.

Solicitor Clark stated I think we could build in something where it is done automatically.

Alderman Lopez replied I didn't hear you.

Solicitor Clark responded I said I am sure that there could be language inserted that would require an automatic review of insurance requirements every so many years.

Alderman DeVries stated I had a similar question with the audit review because I understand that is an in-house audit through Parks & Recreation.

Solicitor Clark asked which section are you looking at.

Alderman DeVries answered I was working off of the old lease agreement.

Chairman O'Neil stated wasn't it my understanding that the internal auditor was going to review it.

Mr. Sherman replied we could either have it done internally or if we want to request that we hire an outside auditor to come in and do it we always have that ability. The City in that case would pay for the audit unless the audit reflects that they are outside of a certain variance on the revenues. My recommendation would be that we have the right to request the books almost at any time and that would be something that the internal auditor certainly could take a look at.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is not the Parks & Recreation auditor that is going to do it, it is the internal auditor in Finance.

Alderman DeVries responded when I did a little research on the audits as they are done in the current contract I found out it is annually reviewed with the Parks & Recreation audit process but it has been and I am trying to remember but it either had not been reviewed by an independent auditor or it had been many years, like seven years or something. That is what is making me concerned about setting a timeframe so that it will be reviewed by City audit.

Mr. Sherman stated right. Rather than just leave it at the City's option you want to make it a mandatory item.

Alderman DeVries replied right just to make sure that somebody actually because we are depending on the revenues from...

Mr. Sherman interjected are you talking about an internal audit where our own staff would do it or actually hiring an external auditor.

Alderman DeVries stated I think the language in there would allow us to hire if the City staff indicated that they thought there might be a need for that.

Chairman O'Neil stated I want to make sure that I am clear on this. I thought the intent was to have our internal auditor who is currently Kevin Buckley, do a yearly audit.

Mr. Sherman replied we can do that. I think what the Alderman is asking for is we also have the right to hire an external auditor to go in and obviously do a more thorough audit.

Chairman O'Neil asked isn't that what Kevin does.

Mr. Sherman answered he does. I think from sitting on their side of the table it would be a little bit more independent. Kevin does an excellent job but it just may give the impression that there is a little more...again you can do it either way.

Alderman DeVries stated that is not what I am asking for, Randy. What my concern is is when I did some checking of the existing lease...

Mr. Sherman interjected nobody had looked at it.

Alderman DeVries stated nobody had looked at it meaning Kevin Buckley had not looked at it. It does get reviewed by Parks & Recreation with their in-house finance staff but I am saying it was not even undergoing Finance Department review on a yearly basis and there is nothing in there that would change it from Parks & Recreation to the Finance Department.

Chairman O'Neil asked where are you.

Mr. Sherman stated it is 5C.

Alderman Lopez stated that is a problem all over the City.

Mr. Sherman replied I think what you are looking for then is to have the requirement that it be done annually and that is fine. We can put that in as well.

Alderman Lopez stated just for clarification the Accounts Committee can order an audit anywhere in the City.

Mr. Sherman responded that is true.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think the point where part of this...it is a percentage on gross revenues and we need to make sure that an audit is done.

Alderman Lopez asked can we change that language.

Alderman Shea stated we do have an audit every year don't we Randy when a private company comes in and...

Mr. Sherman interjected they would audit the City as a whole. They may do some testing over at Parks but what we are looking for is a more specific audit to zero in on this topic.

Alderman Shea asked so it is more of an internal audit that we are talking about rather than an external audit.

Mr. Sherman answered yes and again you have the option to do either. I think what the Aldermen are asking for is to make it an annual requirement that our auditor would actually go in and do that and that is fine. Once you have done it once it would go fairly quickly after that.

Alderman DeVries stated it is a 25-year lease agreement. Is it still 20-year bonding?

Mr. Sherman replied yes.

Alderman DeVries stated so I guess my question is the 20-year bonding is in lieu of paying any taxes basically. We are bonding and giving some assistance and the property is not going to be formerly taxes to offset that expense.

Mr. Sherman replied actually the way we approached the negotiation on it was almost that the additional revenues that we get, the percentage of revenues really is the offset for the property taxes. That was really the mindset that we had.

Alderman DeVries asked and that carries it through the full 25 year lease so even once the bonding is done at year 20 the next five years there still is a mechanism.

Mr. Sherman responded once the bonding is done they will still pay the bond amount, 69% of the bond that has been increased through the CPI index and they will still continue to pay the revenue sharing.

Alderman DeVries asked and that is years 21 through 25.

Mr. Sherman answered yes.

Alderman Lopez asked can the language on the liability and the audit be written up before this is presented to the full Board.

Solicitor Clark answered I would ask that the Committee report recommending this to the Board recommend it subject to the inclusion of the statement that the City staff shall review the insurance limits and coverages every three years.

Alderman Lopez asked and then the audit will be done...

Solicitor Clark interjected Item 5B on page 3 already states that annually they shall submit audited statements to the City. Your Committee report would also include the other proviso, which would have the City internal auditor review the statement on an annual basis.

Chairman O'Neil asked would it be appropriate if we took the amendments to that right now.

Solicitor Clark asked are there any other amendments you are looking for.

Chairman O'Neil stated we just need an amendment for those two recommendations on the insurance and the audit.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the amendments to the management agreement in regards to the insurance and the internal audit as outlined above.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to recommend approval of the ordinance on construction management and ask that the Board suspend the rules and adopt the ordinance at it's next meeting on March 18, 2003.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to approve the addendum to the management agreement as presented by Solicitor Clark.

Solicitor Clark stated on the addendum what we will do is add the two provisions that you just asked for on insurance and audits to the addendum and I will present it at the Board meeting.

Chairman O'Neil stated before we take a vote on the funding for the project I want to note that Parks & Recreation has scheduled a neighborhood public meeting for the third of fourth week of April and a meeting with the members of Derryfield Country Club. There will be two separate meetings to review what is going on and I want to commend Ron for that. I think it will be good to let the neighbors know what is going on up there.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the Resolution:

“Authorizing The Issuance of Bonds and Notes for Demolishing the existing Derryfield Golf Course Club House and Constructing, Originally Equipping and Furnishing a New Derryfield Golf Course Club House (\$2,300,000), Authorizing the Execution of a Management Agreement between the City and BLL Restaurant, Inc. for the Operation of the new Derryfield Golf Course Club House and Authorizing the Mayor and Any other Designee Thereof to take any and all Other Actions to Accomplish the Purposes of this Resolution.”

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to remove Item 9 from the table.

9. Lowell Terrace Associates request for a mortgage/debt consolidation for property on Lowell and Chestnut Streets.

Mr. Sherman noted that Peter Morgan has withdrawn his request to make any changes so this item can be received and filed.

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

Chairman O’Neil stated I would just like to congratulate Mr. Lanoie who spend a lot of time on this.

Alderman Shea stated I know that Alderman Lopez brought this up a long time ago and I don’t know if we have ever gone any farther with this but it has to do with the Geographic Information System. I don’t know whether Information Systems is going to come back but we had a presentation in April 2002 and we haven’t heard anything since that time. Bob, could we have some kind of feedback on this as far as what they are going to do about it? Are they going to implement this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Information Systems Department has, based upon their past funding selected a firm to do it and they have started to move ahead. If the Committee would like, I think it is important for the City because this is information that hasn’t been updated for perhaps 150 years, but you might want to get a quick presentation on the schedule.

Chairman O’Neil asked would you like us to bring them in at the next meeting.

Alderman Shea moved to have a presentation on the GIS system by the Information Systems Department at the next CIP meeting. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee