

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

November 25, 2008

5:15 PM

Chairman Garrity called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Garrity, Gatsas, Shea, O'Neil (late), Smith

Messrs.: T. Clark, K. Sheppard, K. Edwards, D. Webster, P. Goucher,
C. DePrima, K. Padden, W. Sanders, J. Minkarah

Chairman Garrity addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Discussion relating to the Crosbie Street sewer pump.

Chairman Garrity stated I have a recommendation from legal counsel to go into non-public session.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to recess the meeting to meet with legal counsel.

Chairman Garrity called the meeting back to order.

Chairman Garrity stated we have been informed by legal counsel that it is illegal for us to fund any private entities and the only legal motion at this time would be to receive and file the request. I would encourage the Crosbie Street homeowners to continue to meet with CIP staff to see if there are some programs out there for low interest loans and things of that nature.

Alderman Shea moved to receive and file. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote. Alderman Gatsas requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Gatsas voted nay. Aldermen O'Neil, Shea, Garrity and Smith voted yea. The motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Sewer abatement request (21 Tanglewood Court).

Alderman Shea moved to approve the abatement in the amount of \$604.80 as recommended by EPD. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would like to recess for a minute so we can talk about that.

Chairman Garrity asked what do you want to talk about?

Alderman Gatsas answered I guess I need an explanation from the Solicitor on how this request is any different than the one above it. It is ironic how things happen sometimes.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. Clark can we make it brief in the backroom or do you think there is a need to talk about that?

Mr. Thomas Clark, City Solicitor, stated I would have to get the information from the EPD Department. If you want to table the request, I can check with them and get back to you.

Alderman Smith asked Kevin can you help us out?

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated I can just explain that what happens here was a broken irrigation system. It was proven that they had an irrigation system that was broken, therefore, the water didn't make it into the sewer system and it has been the policy of the City to allow for abatements for water that doesn't actually make it into the sewer system. What we bill is for what is assumed to be making it in.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am looking for an answer from the Solicitor. Maybe you didn't understand my question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Clark stated the difference is, as Mr. Sheppard pointed out, the City's ordinance is to charge people for sewer fees based upon water that flows into the sewer system. It was shown by this person to the EPD that this water, as a result of a broken irrigation system, did not flow into the system so they should not have been charged.

Chairman Garrity asked is that by City ordinance?

Mr. Clark answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am sure when the meeting is over the Solicitor will give me the ordinance.

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

Chairman Garrity addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Sewer abatement request (532 South Beech Street).

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the sewer abatement in the amount of \$351.00 as recommended by EPD.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Pamela Goucher, Interim Planning Director, submitting a request on behalf of the MHRA, seeking a commitment from the City of \$200,000 of HOME funds from the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program.

Chairman Garrity stated I know there is a Housing Task Force report that is due next month and I was checking to see if we could put this on the table but I do want to check and make sure it is not time sensitive first.

Mr. Ken Edwards, Manchester Housing & Redevelopment Authority, stated I am here with Dick Webster who is our Development Manager. It is time sensitive. The notification we received from the NH Housing Finance Authority awarding tax credits for this project was as a result of another project that was selected in the last round not being able to proceed.

Chairman Garrity asked when were you awarded the tax credits?

Mr. Edwards answered about three days ago. At the end of last week we got notification. As I said, they are trying to place these tax credits and the reason that they have contacted us is we were next in line, our application was the next to be approved based on the evaluation of our application when it was submitted last June. If we cannot accept the tax credits then they will award them to another community and they will be lost to Manchester.

Chairman Garrity asked how often are the tax credits awarded?

Mr. Edwards answered twice a year.

Alderman Gatsas asked this property, will it be paying full taxes?

Mr. Edwards answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you know off the top of your head how many people are on waiting lists with Manchester Housing?

Mr. Edwards answered about 10,000 on the waiting list with 4,500 of those being elderly and this project is elderly housing; elderly housing and persons with disabilities, who also require supported services so it is even a step beyond our traditional elderly housing program.

Alderman O'Neil asked just so I understand there are approximately 10,000 on the waiting list and 4,500 of them are elderly or others who need assistance and this would address part of that list?

Mr. Edwards answered correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked and this is similar to the Gale Home?

Mr. Edwards answered it is exactly the same model that we used both at the Gale Home and at Brown School and both of those projects are fully occupied and every time there is a vacancy there is another person to take the unit.

Alderman Shea asked Pam is this an appropriate use for the funding?

Ms. Pamela Goucher, Interim Planning Director, answered it is an appropriate use. I guess the question that was raised initially was whether or not the Board or the Committee wants to wait until the Housing Task Force report is out but as you have heard tonight they feel that time is of the essence. It is the Board's decision but it is appropriate.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the request. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Garrity asked Mr. Edwards, on your first bullet point on Page 2...

Mr. Edwards interjected are you talking about the letter that we sent to the City?

Chairman Garrity responded yes it is dated October 29. The first bullet point “it will alleviate homeless elderly persons” – how many homeless elderly people have you placed?

Mr. Edwards replied the requirement under this program is that all of the units meet the eligibility criteria that we have established under our homeless program and our homeless program is persons that are either homeless or in eminent risk of homelessness.

Chairman Garrity asked my question is how many elderly homeless people have you placed in the past?

Mr. Edwards answered we have filled both the Brown School and the Gale Home. There are 37 units at the Gale Home and 34 units at Brown School and they are all occupied by people who meet these criteria.

Chairman Garrity asked your criteria of being homeless?

Mr. Edwards responded yes our definition of homeless as I just described which is in eminent risk of homelessness or homeless and these people are qualified based on income and they are also evaluated by a professional assessment committee.

Chairman Garrity asked have you placed any elderly homeless people that were on the streets at Brown School?

Mr. Dick Webster, MHRA, stated we have had people that we have placed from transitional housing from the VA and from the shelters...a lot of them are at risk of homelessness because they are...we have people who have gone to the hospital for treatment. They are elderly and they go to rehab and by the time they get out they have lost their apartment and they have no place to go so the hospital calls us and says what do you have because they are frail and they can't look for an apartment. They come from all different sources. As many people as we have there are different sources of the application.

Chairman Garrity stated you just said that you placed people out of shelters into these locations. How many of those have you done?

Mr. Webster responded off hand I don't have a specific number but...

Chairman Garrity interjected ballpark?

Mr. Webster stated I don't think that we have many from say New Horizons but I know that we have had others from the VA and some other shelters. I didn't get a breakdown. I just asked staff where do we get these people from but I didn't ask for specific numbers.

Chairman Garrity asked if I were to request that information could I receive that?

Mr. Webster replied sure.

Alderman Smith asked these are not criminals or misfits right but homeless people with disabilities who need a place to live correct?

Mr. Webster answered correct. They have to qualify.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the sensitivity of this? When does this have to be to you? Can it wait until the next Aldermanic meeting or do you need a decision?

Mr. Edwards asked is the next meeting next Tuesday?

Chairman Garrity answered correct.

Mr. Edwards stated I suppose...NH Housing Finance Authority has asked us to get an answer to them as quickly as possible. They have asked us to continue to spend money in development, which we are at risk for, in order to keep the process moving. Any time is costly for us but if that is what the City would...

Alderman Gatsas interjected so you would like it reported out of this Committee so that you can move forward and not lose the money?

Mr. Edwards replied if at all possible that would be wonderful.

Alderman Shea moved that the report be presented this evening. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion to approve the request and present the report to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen this evening. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity stated the Clerk has asked that the majority of these items be reported out next Tuesday but we can bring this one in tonight.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization allocating Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) funds in the amount of \$99,620 for Manchester NeighborWorks.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve the amending resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from James Burkush, Fire Chief, requesting a retired 2004 Ford Crown Victoria Police Cruiser to replace a 1995 Chevrolet Astro Van which was placed out of service.

On motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from Chuck DePrima, Acting Director Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department, requesting additional funds in the amount of \$19,000 to complete the Martineau Park Rehabilitation Project.

Alderman Smith moved to approve the request. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a question. Could we ask Mr. DePrima to come up? Chuck, what have we done since the last meeting when we were trying to get the cost under control?

Mr. Charles DePrima, Acting Director, Parks, Recreation & Cemetery, answered since the last meeting I met with Kevin and the Highway Department and Peter Capano to help with the weekly site meetings. We also met with the consultant and contractor to further reduce costs on this. The request has been reduced by roughly 10%.

Alderman O'Neil asked how far were we off last month?

Mr. DePrima answered the last request was for \$40,000 and now it is \$19,000.

Alderman Shea asked Chuck is this project going to take place in the spring if this money is allocated or are you going to do it in December or January? How is this going to play out?

Mr. DePrima answered construction has begun on this project. It has started and they are going to carry it through as long as they can, as long as the season and weather will allow them to and then it will resume in the spring and be completed.

Alderman Shea asked if you were given this \$19,000 now it is not necessarily going to be spent until next April?

Mr. DePrima answered that is quite likely.

Chairman Garrity stated I think you bring up a very good point there Alderman Shea. If they are not going to spend the money until the spring, we can probably hold off for a bit. Would that end the project?

Mr. DePrima replied it wouldn't end it but it wouldn't provide much of a comfort level in assuring that I could get it completed the way it was designed.

Chairman Garrity asked can you build a park when there is snow on the ground?

Mr. DePrima answered yes as long as the frost doesn't set into the ground you can get the snow cleared away and you can work into the winter season. Once the weather drops below a certain temperature though it becomes cost prohibitive to working.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we have the Community Development Block Grant Funds available?

Ms. Goucher answered it is program income from various CDBG loans.

Chairman Garrity asked so we do have the funds available?

Ms. Goucher answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked Chuck if you were to not get the funding until the spring would that cost more because you couldn't do some work now until the frost comes?

Mr. DePrima answered it could if they had to demobilize and wait until spring for the funding to become available.

Chairman Garrity called for a vote on the motion to approve the request. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Garrity addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Communication from Chuck DePrima, Acting Director Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department, requesting approval to accept a grant in the amount of \$50,000 to be used towards removal of Black Brook Dam at Maxwell Pond.

Deputy City Clerk Normand stated on page 10-19 of your agenda it is actually \$56,000. There are two grants; one for \$6,000 and one for \$50,000 as indicated in your communication.

Alderman Shea moved to accept the grants. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated Chuck, there was a long debate if memory serves me correctly about two years ago and the state was going to come down and they were going to take care of the expenses but the Board at that time felt that it wasn't necessary to get involved. Is this particular amount of money, the \$56,000, going to complete the project or will there be subsequent work necessary?

Mr. DePrima responded this should complete the project. Even as the project moves forward I am working in partnership with DES to seek further grant funding but as you can see in the breakdown I provided in your handout this does bring us to a substantial amount of money and should allow us to complete the project.

Chairman Garrity asked the dam is still up correct?

Mr. DePrima answered yes.

Chairman Garrity asked when is it coming down?

Mr. DePrima answered in mid-December. The pond has disappeared. If you have been out there you will notice that it is just a stream now.

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

Chairman Garrity stated I am going to go off the agenda and have a brief presentation from the Highway Department about their vehicle needs before we have the report from Mr. Sanders.

Alderman Gatsas asked can we take 14 off the table and get rid of it since Chuck is here?

On motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to remove Item 14 from the table.

14. Communication from Chuck DePrima, Acting Director Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department, requesting additional funds in the amount of \$40,000 to complete the Martineau Park Rehabilitation Project.
(Tabled 9/15/08)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to receive and file.

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

12. Discussion related to funding for the "Manchester City Resources" mailer by the Mayor's Anti-Graffiti Task Force.
(Note: Referred to the Committee from the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on 10/7/07)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to receive and file.

Mr. Sheppard stated we just wanted to give a quick presentation tonight understanding that the Aldermen all realize the condition of the City's fleet and we appreciate the time all of the Aldermen have put into this. I think it is important to show not only the Aldermen but also the residents of the City the condition of the City's fleet realizing what is needed to be done. This picture here was not staged. This is how we maintain our fleet in our garage. You can see that is an old police cruiser, which is a jewel to us to have, that is up on jacks to be maintained. That is how we maintain our equipment. Everything goes up on jacks. We do not have lifts in our garage. You can see that is not the best way to be maintaining our equipment. A couple of our priorities are refuse packers. As you know, these are on the streets everyday. An interesting point that is almost embarrassing to me to present but the purchase price of these packers when we originally purchased them back in 1997 was \$80,000 and we have spent over \$140,000 maintaining this equipment since that date. You can see the various areas of rust throughout the

equipment. Part of the problem is with the solids and materials that are in these, the packer beds tend to rust quite a bit. Our mechanics are continuously rebuilding the backs of the packers and inserting sheet metal and welding it in and over time it is going to become fairly expensive to maintain. For example, we have put in twice as much money as it cost to purchase one. Heavy equipment like loaders...again rust is becoming a major problem. Across all of our equipment it is rust, engines and transmissions. We keep our equipment on the road by maintaining it. Our mechanics deserve a lot of credit. Kevin Padden to my left is the Garage Superintendent. We are putting a lot of money into this equipment to keep it on the road. It is all very important, especially during the winter months. Again, these are some more pictures of rust on the heavy equipment. You can see that it is coming to a point where it is becoming dangerous. If it was up to Kevin we would probably be pulling a lot of this equipment off the road. Sweepers. This past year a lot of Aldermen realized and I think a couple of times I have mentioned that we have five sweepers and we are lucky to keep two sweepers on the road at any one time. Thankfully we are able to get through the City a couple of times throughout the year but our sweepers are becoming old as well. The typical age on a sweeper for replacement would be eight years and ten years would be really pushing it. You can see this sweeper is 13 years old. Again, we purchased it for \$85,000 and since 1997 we have put \$131,000 worth of maintenance into that. That does include labor but that is materials as well just to maintain that one piece of equipment. Beyond sweepers another major piece of equipment we have our dump trucks. Rust is a major problem in the truck bed. You can see 10 truck subframes are in need of repair. We anticipate each of those taking four to six weeks and costing about \$8,400. That is money that we have to spend to maintain this equipment. We need to keep these trucks on the road if we are going to attempt to plow the streets during the winter months. This just shows further safety concern for the rust within the beds. You can see on the top left where the truck bed is starting to distort. Again, it is important for us to keep this equipment on the road and that is why we put the maintenance money into it. Sidewalk tractors are a favorite of a lot of Aldermen. Sidewalks during the winter months are very important to keep open not only for the pedestrians but also the school children. Our aged sidewalk equipment is starting to come to bite us. We had problems this past winter in maintaining our sidewalks. This piece of equipment during the winter months is one of our key pieces of equipment to keep on the road. This is a good picture...we have been neglecting our smaller pieces of equipment like pick-up trucks because based on funding we have been requesting bigger pieces of equipment such as graders, loaders and packers. This is a pick-up truck...I believe this pick-up truck has over 220,000 miles on it. Basically it was torn down to the frame and rebuilt. This may have been one of the ones that we took the bed of a truck that was totaled by the City and put it onto this truck to keep this truck on the road. Again, this just shows the continuing rust on a lot of our pick-ups. Sewer vactors...I think

everyone is familiar with this piece of equipment. We have two of these and during that recent storm event back in September both of these were off the road because they weren't working. We are actually working with our Environmental Protection Division to obtain funding through them because where we have two of these we feel a lot of the work done by these pieces of equipment is actually sewer work so I have talked to them and if we replace one there may be the ability to fund on through the EPD Enterprise. Just a quick summary the useful life of a piece of equipment is the point. With repair costs and downtime the vehicle exceeds its value or worth. 58% of our equipment is 15 to 25 years old. To replace all of our equipment that is over 15 years old would be over \$7 million. Bottom line is the majority of our equipment has met the end of its useful life. This year I am concerned...this year to date we have spent \$6,000 more a month to maintain our equipment than we did the previous budget year and this will continue. I know the Finance Director will be coming in with a plan tonight and I think it is great that the Aldermen and Finance Director have been working together to develop a plan. A long-term plan is needed for the City's fleet and I would truly appreciate it if the Aldermen will consider that as part of the budget process. I just want to throw in a quick plug for the new Highway facility.

Chairman Garrity responded no we are just going to stick to vehicles tonight.

Alderman O'Neil stated well it is related isn't it – a centralized maintenance facility?

Chairman Garrity stated well this isn't something we haven't talked about before. What is your monthly maintenance cost on your fleet?

Mr. Sheppard responded we spend probably \$40,000/month. That does include oil changes and typical maintenance but like I said we are starting to see increasing costs not only because of increased parts costs but also because the equipment needs to be in the garage quite often.

Chairman Garrity asked the \$40,000 a month does that include labor?

Mr. Sheppard answered no that is parts.

Alderman O'Neil asked Kevin would you happen to know the number that would not be routine maintenance but maintenance to gain...both labor and material to keep a vehicle on the road? It may not be something handy but I would be interested...you said about \$40,000 a month and some of that is routine but I would have to believe a majority is non-routine maintenance.

Mr. Sheppard stated Kevin Padden may be able to give you a rough percentage. What percentage of work is routine would you say?

Mr. Kevin Padden, Garage Superintendent, stated right now as days go by we really can't plan on our regular maintenance because the equipment is breaking down so often. We start on something and I have to pull the men off to take care of the breakdown to get the equipment back on the road. I do have one person set-up to do preventive maintenance work and I try not to bother him but when I need him, I use him to get the equipment on the road.

Alderman O'Neil asked Kevin just to help paint the picture are we talking 70% or 90% of all of the labor and material is spent on maintenance to extend the life of the vehicle?

Mr. Padden replied I would say 90%.

Alderman O'Neil asked so only about 10% is going for routine maintenance?

Mr. Padden answered yes.

Alderman Shea stated this is just a plug for the Highway Department but that is one service that every single family in the community of Manchester benefits from because they either have to have their roads plowed or their trash picked up or their roads repaired and so forth. Obviously I really feel that we really...I know going back when I first became an Alderman Frank Thomas came to Hallsville School and I had about 20 people there and at that time he was explaining that the packers or the trucks that pick up the trash were in bad shape. We are now almost 14 years later and we are still in the same spot except that they are the same packers but they are being repaired a lot. We really have to do something about that. I certainly am sympathetic to your needs because I know that everyone wants to have their trash picked up and their roads plowed, etc.

Alderman O'Neil stated just to make a point I guess they probably don't get thanked enough and Kevin probably doesn't hear this, Kevin Padden, but Kevin Sheppard and Tim Clougherty and previously Frank Thomas but Kevin the department heads recognize the importance of you and your staff and they regularly remind the Aldermen of that. A thank you from us to you and your staff for doing what you can in not very good working conditions to be honest with you so thank you for that.

Alderman Smith stated as you well know I worked for the Highway Department for 38 years. I will tell you the fleet is in deplorable conditions through no fault of the employees or the management. We have neglected it for years and I am just

worried about this winter. I know that when a plow goes down in my ward there probably won't be another plow over there for four or five hours and when people ask what happened to it well you can't pull a plow out from the East side to go over to the West side. I certainly commend you and I think it is time for the Aldermen to take the ball and start putting money into the MER account.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe this is a pretty simple question but I am looking at the replacement costs of this equipment that you have given us and I look at the fourth item down and that is a Johnson Sweeper and it was purchased in 1995 and the replacement cost is \$188,000. I go down to the fourth one from the bottom and for some reason the cost of that same Johnson Sweeper is \$7,000 more. Is there a reason?

Mr. Sheppard responded I am not too sure if I can give you that answer right now. Maybe that is a mistake. I will ask Kevin if he knows.

Mr. Padden stated the one that you are questioning...one is a vacuum sweeper, which is more money than a four wheeler mechanical sweeper. The first one you are looking at is a mechanical four wheel sweeper, actually that one has three wheels but now we stay with four wheel sweepers. The one further down that you are questioning why it is more money is a vacuum cleaner sweeper. There is a difference in the cost. They are more money.

Alderman Gatsas asked is there a reason why we wouldn't try and keep the equipment...does one do something different than the other?

Mr. Padden answered yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked the total that you have for forty pieces of equipment on this page that we have, what is the cost of the maintenance of those 40 pieces of equipment? You said it was about \$30,000/month. For this page, what is the maintenance roughly? I am sure it is not a question that you are prepared to answer but is it 1/3 or 2/3?

Mr. Sheppard replied I am not too sure we have that information. I would have to get that information for you. One of the things that Alderman O'Neil did bring up is a lot of our time and energy is being spent on being reactive versus proactive. I am not too sure right up front that we could say if we replaced 40 pieces of equipment or 30 pieces of equipment we could eliminate that in our budget. What we need to be is more proactive in our maintenance. Instead of bringing in equipment and being reactive I think we need to be more proactive, which will save money in the long run.

Alderman Gatsas responded I don't disagree with you but if we are trying to make a plan come together then somebody has to say okay this is a \$10,000 or \$15,000 cost per month, which is \$150,000 a year, which takes care of 1/3 of a bonding capacity. So there has to be some reason why we make decisions because in a business if you were coming before me and looking for this as a department I would say to you make sure you tell me what every one of these pieces of equipment costs us to maintain in a year because if we are going to get a new piece of equipment and then there is obviously resale value for some of this stuff and you may say to me no it's all junk. So I guess those are some of the answers that we need to explore as we go through this discussion this evening.

Mr. Sheppard stated I agree.

Alderman Smith stated to pick up on what Alderman Gatsas was saying, I am a strong advocate of Bombadier Sidewalk Tractors especially after last winter with the V-plow where everything comes back into everybody's driveway and into the sidewalk they just plowed because it is so hard. What is the difference between a V-plow tractor and a Bombadier price wise?

Mr. Padden responded they are almost equal right now price wise.

Alderman Smith asked is it because the Bombadiers are slower and neater that you use the regular V-plow or what? I know I would rather have a Bombadier over doing the sidewalks in my area.

Mr. Padden answered the Bombadier can open up the sidewalks much quicker than the other style sidewalk tractors that we have. The other ones are quicker and they can put the snow away and it won't be in your driveway like you said but to get out with the Bomabadiers with that V-plow will open up the sidewalks much faster.

Chairman Garrity addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from William Sanders, Finance Officer, submitting alternatives for the long term vehicle replacement program for the Police, Fire and Highway Departments, if available.

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, stated I will walk through as briefly as possible the material that I have put together with the Public Works Department, Police Department, Fire Department and the Parks & Recreation Department. At request of the Committee last month, our objective was to develop a long-term

plan to replace the City's vehicle fleet. We come forward tonight with really two main goals. One is to replace our vehicle stock in a predictable and comprehensive manner so that the department heads can plan on replacement and we are dealing with the entire vehicle stock of the City, not just one department versus another. The second major goal we are coming forward with is the creation and funding of a vehicle replacement fund for the City to over time achieve a level annual funding over an entire replacement cycle. We have also provided you with current fleet data across the City. The current replacement cost estimate of our current fleet would be about \$42 million. \$35 million of that \$42 million is split between the Fire Department and the Highway Department (\$17 million at Fire and \$18 million at Highway). We have also provided you with some statistics on the average age of the fleet. You can see that the Fire Department average age is about 14 years and the Highway average age is 15 years. That obviously indicates to have an average you have vehicles higher than 15 years and some vehicles lower than 15 years but those are the averages. We have also provided in the material you received this evening the detailed assessment sheets from each of the departments on what they believe their replacement requirements are. Just as a frame of reference, the current FY09 CIP budget includes \$580,000 for vehicle replacement. We are replacing five police cruisers, two Highway vehicles and one Parks & Recreation vehicle. After our work there seemed to be essentially two options and there could be variations on these but I think it is fair to say there are essentially two options. One would be to redesignate existing bond balances for vehicle replacement. There are candidates for that in both the issued category and the approved but unissued category. Examples would include, we have a Public Works Facility bond that has already been issued for \$1.9 million. We could do some work to redesignate some or all of that. There is also a Gold Street relocation bond that has about \$600,000 left in it that would be possibly available. We also have unissued bonds that the Aldermen have already approved for a strategic study of the buildings at Fire and Police and there was also an extra allotment to the 2009 road construction program and there is currently today \$1.4 million remaining or uncommitted in that particular bond. The second alternative and the one that I would like to spend some time on is to designate a new bonding requirement in the City that would be used exclusively for vehicle replacement and then obviously I guess you could make some combination of those. The second page of your material provides a historical perspective on what MER funding has been over the last 15 years for the City. You can see it has varied a great deal from year to year. On average though the City has spent over the last 15 years each year about \$1.2 million on annual vehicle replacement that reaches a level of about \$18 million that has been spent over the last 15 years on vehicles. So essentially if you think about the \$42 million of current installed base that we have and we spent \$18 million dollars we are on about a 30 year replacement cycle right now if we stay at that \$18 million every 15 years. It is also, as you can note, very unpredictable and difficult to

manage. The next schedule is a schedule of the department assessments and what their assessment of their current replacement requirement is. You can see that in the aggregate, in the far right hand column, when you combine all departments there for the next three years you have in excess of \$5 million a year they believe they require. That ratchets down to about \$4 million and then to about \$2 million and \$1 million. The following page is my assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the different options that the City faces. Certainly the redesignation of existing bonds on the advantage side. There is no incremental debt service. The money has already been borrowed or it has been approved and it is incorporated into our budget. It also enables some purchasing immediately to the extent that we have bond balances to redesignate. The disadvantages are that it is a one-time solution. It doesn't prepare a platform for ongoing vehicle replacement. Once these bonds are used for this purpose they are gone. As a result, it does not create a long-term plan and it is going to leave department heads and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in the situation of continuing the annual choice between vehicles and other long-term City priorities. That crux of the issue will not have been dealt with. In terms of setting up a dedicated replacement bonding program, the advantages are that it is a long-term solution and if we can stick to it and dedicate ourselves to it, it can be a long-term solution. It may not be the ultimate solution initially by virtue of the amounts that are required by the departments but we can work toward a long-term solution. A dedicated bonding also provides for scheduled replacement and this will enable much improved efficiency in our overall fleet management. As the Public Works Director has just explained, we are now repairing vehicles monthly and annually that if we had a dedicated replacement schedule we may not be doing all of this replacement work but we are planning on turning in that Refuse Packer in a year so some of the savings could be achieved in the near term by virtue of the department heads managing their fleet to that replacement cycle just as you would manage your car to a replacement cycle. If you are planning on getting rid of your car in six months you may not put new tires on it and that sort of thing. It would eliminate the replacement crisis over time. One point that I know we are all aware of but I think it serves to say it again is that we are going to replace our \$42 million of vehicles. It is not a question of if we are going to replace it. We are going to replace it. It is only a question of when we are going to replace it and are we going to plan to replace it or are we going to hope that there will be money available or there will be some other department budget that can be reduced to pay for it. This dedicated bonding mechanism would eliminate that crisis that looms in the City. It would also provide level funding and would eliminate peaks and valleys from our budget. If you look at the previous MER schedule, we showed history where it is up and down. It is not a healthy budgeting situation to be more this year and less the next year and you are only kicking the can further down the road because the replacement mechanism is going to be as lengthy with as many peaks and valleys as the original purchases were. For example, if you

said well we have \$42 million let's just buy all new vehicles today, that is going to create a situation 10 years from now or 12 years from now where a Board of Mayor and Aldermen are going to have to deal with the replacement of that entire fleet at one time. I also believe strongly that a clear replacement plan and a reserve fund will be favorably viewed by bond rating agencies. Bond rating agencies look to the contingencies that cities have and what plans they have made to deal with those contingencies and I think a long-term plan would do that. On the disadvantage side there is a requirement for incremental bonding, which I will go through here in a moment, for vehicle replacement which I am currently estimating at about \$435,000 each year for the next 10 years. Basically borrowing \$3 million a year. The following schedule entitled "Proposed Debt Service" walks through a proposed 10 year bonding mechanism where we would be borrowing \$2.7 million over 10 years and about \$250,000 over five years for smaller vehicles. We would have annual debt service of new bonds of about \$435,000 each year and you can see that as we run through time if I can point you all the way down to Year 10 and you look at the third column in called "Total", the \$4 million that would be the debt service in Year 10 would be the run rate and then the permanent run rate of a replacement program. We would be spending \$4 million in debt service each year to keep that replacement cycle going. The other important aspect of the proposal is that we establish an equipment reserve fund. One to set aside money dedicated to equipment reserves but also to provide a mechanism for us to level out the payments and not permit the debt service to get up to the \$4 million level. If you look at the net column, the far right hand column on the schedule, we have tried to achieve that at getting at about a \$2.5 million debt service and maintaining that with this reserve fund. What that would require in the first year, which in our proposal would be FY2010, we would have \$435,000 of debt service in Year 1 and we would also be recommending that we put \$800,000 away in the budget into the reserve fund. In the second year \$1 million and you can see as we ramp up closer to the \$2.5 million then we cease putting money into the reserve fund and you can see in the last portion where the debt service is the greatest we are drawing out of the replacement fund to preserve that \$2.5 million of net debt service. The last schedule is the vehicle replacement fund. In addition to requesting annual payments into and out of the fund to level out the debt service requirement, we are also recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen make an initial deposit into the reserve fund of approximately \$4.6 million. The recommendation would be that the Aldermen would approve a transfer of \$2.6 million from the special revenue fund. We also have a \$500,000 equipment reserve that was established in 2005 and I would propose that be moved into this vehicle replacement fund and I would also be recommending that we take the proceeds of the sale of the Seal Tanning Lot of \$1.5 million approximately and put that in the fund so that we would start the fund on July 1, 2009 with \$4.6 million. That would first of all serve as a generator of interest income. It would also serve over time for the crisis until we

get up to a standard replacement cycle where the Aldermen could draw on this fund if need be. The last schedule in the front part, the next schedule is just a projection of our debt service. Currently based on our current outstanding bond, our current debt service is about \$14.6 million for this fiscal year. Our current bond payments would be going down to about \$7.7 million in the next 10 years so there is room in the debt service to bring in some vehicle replacement money and I think we could keep it at the net \$2.5 million. That would still leave it approximately \$4.5 million below where it is today and would provide opportunities for other priorities of the Aldermen. The rest of the package is the replacement schedules provided by the department heads. That concludes my remarks.

Alderman Smith asked Bill if we do bonding the best we can do is 5.25%?

Mr. Sanders answered hopefully we could improve on that, Alderman. The current marketplace is not a good market to project into but I would think 5.25% is a safe place to be right now. It may well be in the coming months that there will be a lot of stimulus in the economy and interest rates will continue to decline and we might be able to do better than the 5.25% but I based the calculations on 5.25% to hopefully have good news later on and not disappointing news.

Alderman Shea stated Bill in your calculations you did mention \$2.5 million that you haven't worked into your scenario yet I assume. That \$2.5 million I assume is sort of out there. You haven't indicated in either of your situations there that it is necessarily going to be used in any capacity at this time have you? I don't know...maybe I didn't follow that but when you said you wanted \$4.9 million that was taken from...

Mr. Sanders interjected the \$4.6 million Sir was being taken from the combination of the special revenue account and the current capital reserve account.

Alderman Shea stated so that kind of leaves that \$2.5 million – the \$1.9 million for the Public Works facility and the...

Mr. Sanders interjected I wasn't talking about the bond. I was talking about taking...

Alderman Shea interjected I know when we received a report from Fire, Police and Highway they came with certain needs that they felt they had and I am wondering if that particular money could be used to meet those obligations like the pumpers for Fire and the traffic bucket truck and refuse truck and the 10 wheel dump truck that Highway needs. I am not sure if the police cruisers are involved with that. What is your thinking on that? Should that be...

Mr. Sanders interjected as the Finance Officer I would prefer that we not use the bonds to start...redesignate bonds to start our new program. If the Aldermen in their judgment believe that the program is not robust enough to deal with the crisis that the Highway Department or Fire Department have and we need to have additional monies then I would say that we should look t these existing bonds and the Aldermen should think of designating some of that money. We would have to work with it to get the terms correct in terms of the length of the bond but that would be my...hopefully that is responsive.

Alderman Shea replied I am not quite sure I am following you. In other words, are you suggesting that we not use that money at all? Are you suggesting that we find other sources or that we not fund these projects? That is what I am sort of confused about.

Mr. Sanders responded these bonds were issued for reasons that the Aldermen in their judgment made over the years and I am not a strong proponent of redesignating them just to deal with today's crisis but if the Aldermen thought that they needed to put more money to it, I would want us to look at some of these bonds and see if we should rededicate them.

Alderman Shea stated what I am wondering is if these critical needs that Fire, Police and Highway need at this time...can they live without them until we start implementing this 10 year program. That is what I am wondering about. There are two separate issues here. One is the funding and the other is the urgency of having these things available.

Mr. Sanders stated I would defer to the Fire Chief and Public Works Director as to their needs.

Alderman Shea asked and Police?

Mr. Sanders answered well Police to a lesser extent I think. We are purchasing them five new vehicles this year.

Alderman Shea replied so they are out of the scenario and we are just talking about Public Works and Fire?

Mr. Sanders responded you could ask the Police Chief that question.

Alderman Shea stated well he is not here right now so we don't have to ask him that.

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. Sanders you and I had this conversation about the second proposal some six weeks ago when we first talked about how do we get into a long-term planning situation and how do we get more money on the front end because the vehicles are in such dire need of replacement. I think my first question to you is if I go and take you to the debt service page that you gave us, if we increase in 2010 the principal payment by \$870,000 because that is a calculation on \$6 million, does that affect the tax rate in any way adding that to this number now? In other words, right now we are at \$9.4 million and if we add \$870,000 we would be somewhere around \$10.7 million. Let me do the math. My question is if I look at your number and the principal payment for 2009...

Mr. Sanders interjected look all the way to the right because I have to include the interest to the total debt service number.

Alderman Gatsas responded okay so the total debt service number drops by...

Mr. Sanders interjected \$1.9 million approximately.

Alderman Gatsas asked if we increased that by \$870,000 that would not...we would not be adding any money and it would still leave us somewhere in the vicinity of \$1.1 million for additional bonding is that correct?

Mr. Sanders answered that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if we were to say that we wanted to accelerate this as you and I had this conversation yesterday to say we were accelerating let's say \$3 million for Fire and \$3 million for Highway and that was going to reduce their ability to have to replace and repair those vehicles, that number and then if we made an agreement with Fire that they wouldn't come back to us for, as your schedule shows \$3 million a year, that they wouldn't come back looking for money until 2012 because that takes care of quite a bit of the equipment that they have. They would be getting no equipment in 2009. We take the equipment line item that they were looking for in 2009 and buy the police cruisers with those funds. They would be able to order their equipment in June for a July delivery. Highway would do the same thing. My belief is that if we gave them those kinds of numbers to work with in today's economic times there has to be a 10% to 20% discount, which would give them the ability to buy even that much more equipment. I am not looking to take the money back. I think we have had pretty good success with Highway saying here is an amount of money, buy what you can buy and if you are getting a discount, buy that much more because anything more that we buy is obviously a reduction in the fleet going forward. I think that looking at your status of three years and saying we are going to spend \$1.5 million per department that is going to put us into some problems with pushing

and fighting and looking at equipment that may have to be bailed out at different times. In the communication you and I have had, I think the first year we should do \$6 million and then \$3 million in every incremental year thereafter and tell Police that they can't come back until 2012 because if you look at the structure the way it is worked out, it takes them until about 2012 with the \$3 million for equipment that they have.

Mr. Sanders responded you said Police but I think you meant Fire.

Alderman Gatsas replied yes I meant Fire.

Alderman Shea stated there is a representative from the Police Department here and I just wanted to acknowledge that.

Mr. Sanders stated in response to your point, I understand it and I don't dispute it. I would say that I would like us to get level and get on level funding as soon as possible. I think historically and as recently as this year and the year before and the year before that we have been nowhere near the \$3 million that you are proposing to provide. I am not saying whether that is a good thing or not I am just giving a sense that the fleet has been managed at very low replacement ratios. The other point that I would make is I do believe an important part of the plan too is to fund this replacement account. I don't know in your thinking, Alderman, in the first year if we are borrowing \$6 million if you are thinking we are not going to be able to make a contribution to the replacement account.

Alderman Gatsas replied I think there are things on the front of this first page as you talked about replacing into the fleet account that I think there probably would be additional money but I wouldn't want to do that until we are coming closer to May in case we run into a catastrophic situation. I think there is enough money out there and there is other money in other one time funds that I am not opposed to putting into that replacement account because obviously the equipment line is the line that we least look at and take the least serious approach with. I would only say that I think there are other one time accounts we could use to get money into that account. I think you and I had a conversation that if you really push the envelope you could get close to \$7 million in the initial year in that account.

Mr. Sanders responded my recommendation was based on trying to manage it to a level funding.

Chairman Garrity stated before we start talking about the other options, I did ask Jay Minkarah to join us this evening to give us an update on the Gold Street relocation and where that is and if we are going to think about tapping that fund we need an honest assessment of where we are.

Alderman O'Neil responded I don't think any of us are going there tonight, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Shea stated what I would like to see is Bill has prepared something from his point of view and Alderman Gatsas has suggested something else and I would like to see all of these things in print before any decision is made. We still have time for...

Chairman Garrity interjected we have a meeting next Tuesday. Come up please Jay and give us a brief presentation on the AG site and Gold Street relocation please.

Mr. Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, stated just briefly we did want to make you aware that we do have a prospective purchaser and developer for the former AG site. They are very interested and very motivated to develop it into a major retail center. There are some obstacles that have to be overcome. They are very serious. They are taking a very close look at the infrastructure improvements that need to be made. They are taking a very, very close look at the costs. They are not yet at a 100% decision point but the cost of the infrastructure improvements is obviously very critical to them so most certainly if we were to make any decisions to remove some of the funding that would obviously affect their decision.

Alderman Gatsas asked have you made them aware that the relocation of Gold Street by this Board was taken off the table and killed?

Mr. Minkarah answered they do know that the previous effort was unsuccessful. They do know that it is not currently on the table but they have also been made aware that in order to redevelop the AG site something has to happen with Gold Street and the plan that was previously approved and had been developed was the plan that was acceptable to the neighbors and residents in that area. So basically in terms of off-site improvement costs, that is one of the costs that they understand has to be undertaken.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe the person that was going to undertake the reconstruction of Gold Street...we have kind of slapped them around so much that maybe they are not in favor of doing that.

Chairman Garrity responded well that person happens to be in the audience tonight and I am keeping in close contact with that person Alderman Gatsas.

Alderman Gatsas stated should we ask him?

Chairman Garrity stated I would rather not bring Mr. Harrington into the conversation right now.

Alderman Shea asked Jay is this something that is going to take place within the next six months?

Mr. Minkarah answered right now they have hired an engineering firm and had a preliminary meeting with Planning and Building and other code enforcement groups. They are obviously at this point really trying to get their arms around what the infrastructure improvements are going to be. I think basically they are reaching decision points every so many weeks. They have hired local counsel so they are very interested. What they are trying to do right now is really determine what those off-site improvement costs are going to be; Gold Street, as well as possibly South Willow Street. So that is really the process that they are in right now and obviously cost is going to be a huge driver.

Alderman Shea asked so we will have an answer before our next budget is finalized in June 2009?

Mr. Minkarah answered most definitely.

Chairman Garrity asked did you bring in a number for the increased tax base in a potential development like that?

Mr. Minkarah answered what is proposed right now is approximately 190,000 square foot retail center and in talking with the Assessor's Office we estimate that value to be about \$15 million. That is a conservative estimate but that is the current estimate; about \$15 million.

Chairman Garrity asked do we have any idea what we want to do? Do we want to meet again next Tuesday night before the full Board meeting?

Alderman O'Neil stated first I would not support tonight or in the near future redesignating the existing bonds. I think as Bill points out in his first bullet point, it is a one time solution and not long-term. If I can, I am all set with Jay. My questions are going to be for Bill. I understand Alderman Gatsas' thought about front-loading the plan to give some relief to the departments immediately. Do I understand that you would not recommend that? If I could follow-up I guess then we would get on the \$3 million a year after that.

Mr. Sanders responded I would not have strong feelings against it. I would...I very much encourage the Board to get on a level funded, predictable replacement program for the reasons that I have talked about in the materials I handed out. If this is a one time \$3 million shot to deal with the crisis situation, I would modestly be okay with that.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe there are other accounts that we could try...if our intent was to give a good hit the first year because we have a lot of catch up to play...I don't know but he has peaked my interest with that thought. I guess my question for Alderman Gatsas if I may Mr. Chairman is you talk about Highway and Fire being pretty much locked in...let's say we went to \$6 million and you did \$3 million and \$3 million for 2010 and 2011. What would happen with the \$3 million that would still come in in 2011? That would be able to be used by others? Do you follow my question?

Alderman Gatsas replied I hear what you are saying. What I did was I merely took what they brought forward and moved the 2009 number into 2010 and just accelerated where Fire was. So that number...you know you are probably talking between the \$3 million...Fire has \$3.6 million that they are looking for for 2009, 2010 and 2011 I think that probably they could get some kind of a pretty good discount and get their equipment done by 2011. I think that leaves you open and Fire would not have to come back and look for anything until 2012. 2011 would be open to Fire, Parks & Recreation and Highway.

Alderman O'Neil responded you already have Fire locked up.

Alderman Gatsas replied excuse me I meant Police, Parks & Recreation and Highway.

Alderman O'Neil asked even though we would still be front loading some money to Highway in the first year.

Alderman Gatsas answered yes because if you look at where Highway is, they are looking for \$3.7 million the first year, \$3.5 million in the second year and \$3.1 million in the third year. They are looking for \$10 million in the first three years. I think you could adjust the number and when you are giving it to them in 2010 they would have to move 2009 into 2010 and 2010 into 2011 and kind of piecemeal it.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there a way you could work with Mr. Sanders to try to fine tune that a little bit. I understand the concept I just...

Alderman Gatsas interjected I don't have a problem doing that but I think it is more important for the departments to do that because as I said to Mr. Sheppard, \$3 million eliminates about 40 pieces of equipment. What I don't want to do is put a piece of equipment that he might have had in Year 14 plugged into Year 12 and all of the sudden the piece he had in Year 12 he moves to Year 14 and that piece dies and we have to replace it. I think the departments have worked well when we said this is the scope we are looking at and I am not trying to ignore Parks but they are in play too and so is Police. Police is a little different because if we took the money that we said we would give to Highway or to Fire in this front piece...the two Highway vehicles is a total of about \$380,000. If you took that \$380,000 and you divided it roughly by \$24,000 per cruiser that gives you almost 16 cruisers you could buy, which clears them out of 2010 and 2011.

Chairman Garrity stated I would assume if we are going to do this we are probably still going to have an MER cash account are we not?

Mr. Sanders responded there might be an MER cash account or something for rust and those sorts of things but vehicles would be gone.

Chairman Garrity asked well if we have a vehicle that dies we are going to have to obviously...well if it is like a sedan for the Building Department we would have to replace it.

Mr. Sanders answered under the plan we would have the funds. We would have the replacement funds that the Aldermen could use.

Alderman O'Neil asked Bill can you walk me through what we do with the reserve? Your recommendation is that we build it up to \$4.6 million if all three of these actions happen. Obviously with a vote of the Board we could transfer the special revenue account...

Mr. Sanders interjected with a 2/3 vote of the Board.

Alderman O'Neil replied correct and the current equipment reserve account exists so the only thing that is a little bit of a wild card is...that would still get us up to \$3.1 million, which I think would be a step in the right direction. When do we draw down on the reserve?

Mr. Sanders responded under the plan that we have proposed this evening, if you look at the schedule titled "Vehicle Replacement Fund" you will see that I have it starting to draw down in Year 7 and Years 7-10 I was drawing down on it to keep the net debt service at that \$2.5 million figure that I was talking about earlier. That doesn't say that the money would not be available if there were a crisis,

although I would hope it would be a capital C crisis to actually go into this money and not just...

Alderman O'Neil interjected so if one of the smaller departments needed a vehicle we would find some other means within the MER and not necessarily dip into this. We need to be disciplined where we would not dip into this until Year 7. Does that mean in Year 7 we not only continue to do the \$3 million of bonding but we also can now do an additional \$400,000?

Mr. Sanders answered no. That \$400,000 was to defray a portion of the debt service as we are building up its debt.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we are still staying consistent with the \$3 million?

Mr. Sanders responded exactly.

Chairman Garrity stated I have a suggestion. If we could meet again next Monday or Tuesday this way it will give Mr. Sanders a chance to meet with the department heads again, well not just them but send an e-mail out to all of the department heads because Building has some needs for vehicles and they are all over the City.

Alderman O'Neil stated I appreciate the efforts of Bill and the departments. We are heading in the right direction. We are afraid to take that next big step. I know the departments are very frustrated but there is light at the end of the tunnel and I think we are close to getting there or as close as we have ever been.

Chairman Garrity stated we want to make sure we do it right. It is a 10 year plan.

Alderman Shea stated if we get more money in the beginning balance that is very important. In other words if we could find additional funding and bring it up from \$4.6 million to \$6 million or \$6.5 million...Bill you can check around and see if we can do that. I think that is very essential.

Mr. Sanders responded I will look into it. We are going to have other needs in the City. We are in a difficult economic time that could continue for awhile and I think some of the monies that are available...for example I am not proposing to take all of the money out of the special revenue account. There is still going to be \$2.6 million left there for the economic development. The Aldermen may find that they need that money for other crises. I am hoping to have handcuffs around this vehicle replacement account so you couldn't spend this money on anything else.

Alderman Shea asked are we getting \$3.6 million somewhere along the line?

Mr. Sanders answered well the Jac Pac money is already in the special revenue account. What is left is the Seal Tanning lot. We had other ideas but some of those the Board hasn't accepted.

Alderman Smith stated I really think that we should have a meeting next week and I hate to pit department against department because they all have their needs but I wish Fire and Highway could get together because their needs are greater than anybody else's at this time and hopefully they can come back with some type of a resolve next week.

Alderman O'Neil stated in my conversation with Mr. Sheppard we have already missed the opportunity to purchase any new vehicles for the snow plowing and salting season. I think Kevin has accepted that fact and they are going to move on with the fleet as is. I know that Chief Burkush pointed out to me in a conversation that there is an expectation in the industry that starting the first of the year there will be an increase in prices from all manufacturers because of some new regulations regarding emissions and all of that so it would be great if we could wrap that up, especially Fire because they have the longest lead time. They are almost ready to go on bids so it would be good if we could get this done and they could get them ordered by the end of the year and not get caught up in the increased costs.

Chairman Garrity stated I would also encourage any of my colleagues to take a walk through the maintenance garage down at Highway. I spent some time down there this week and the fleet is in really tough shape.

Alderman O'Neil asked does that mean you are supporting a new Public Works facility?

Chairman Garrity answered no. We are going to take care of vehicles first.

Alderman Gatsas asked can we make sure that we send a...the departments have to work very diligently in the next day before they meet next week to find out what kind of discount and how accurately we can take the numbers that we are talking if we are going to front load this by \$3 million. Can Fire get a 15% discount if they are doing an early buy to get the numbers in place so they can look at that? Somebody needs to make those phone calls and put those in place because it is just going to give them an opportunity to do more with the money.

TABLED ITEMS

13. Communication from Fred Rusczek, Executive Director of Child Health Services, requesting reconsideration of the Mayor's 12% budget cut of FY2009 CIP allocations to his agency.
(Note: Item was received and filed on 5/5/08 in CIP. At the 5/20/08 BMA meeting it was voted to move this item back to CIP. Tabled 8/4/08)

This item remained on the table.

15. Update from staff regarding potential opportunities for collaboration with the State of New Hampshire in connection with the impending move of the Manchester District Court, if available.
(Note: Additional report attached from Jay Minkarah 7/21/08. Tabled 6/3/08)

This item remained on the table.

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