

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

July 6, 2010

5:45 PM

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Ludwig, Craig, Greazzo

Absent: Alderman Shea

Messrs.: F. McNeill, L. LaFreniere, K. Sheppard, K. O'Maley, K. DeFrancis,
W. Sanders, P. Capano, T. Arnold, S. Maranto, M. Brewer, R. Fixler

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Sewer abatement request (36-46 Mason Street.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be denied.)

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Craig it was voted to deny the request as recommended by EPD.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Sewer abatement request (22 Lovering Street.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be granted in the amount of \$382.32.)

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to grant the sewer abatement in the amount of \$382.32.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Sewer abatement request (1509 Elm Street.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be granted in the amount of \$7,055.50.)

Alderman Craig moved to grant the sewer abatement in the amount of \$7,055.50. Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. McNeill how does this large number get to be abated?

Mr. Fred McNeill, Chief Sanitary Engineer, answered I believe there is some back-up information in your agenda package. If you look at that, since construction they have been having some plumbing problems within the buildings itself. They have spent several months trying to document and alleviate it. Because our billing is based on water consumption and there is an unidentified leak somewhere in the slab, that water never really ended up in the sewer waste water collection system. Also, if you look at the information, what we do is review their past consumption and this is extraordinarily high compared to their other consumption. Based on those two facts, we recommend that we grant the abatement.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Sewer abatement request (25 Claremont Avenue.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be granted in the amount of \$4,289.50.)

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, it was voted to grant the sewer abatement in the amount of \$4,289.50.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Sewer abatement request (598 Corning Road.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be granted in the amount of \$406.57.)

Alderman Greazzo moved to approve the sewer abatement in the amount of \$406.57. Alderman Ludwig duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. The motion carried, with Alderman Craig abstaining from the vote.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Sewer abatement request (618-620 Prescott Street.)
(Note: EPD recommends the abatement be granted in the amount of \$193.96.)

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to grant the sewer abatement in the amount of \$193.96.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting extensions of various CIP Projects.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. LaFreniere, are these in order of need or just in general order of what you would like?

Leon LaFreniere, Planning & Community Development Director, answered these are projects that are ongoing and they are in order of the dates that the projects were initiated. If you take a look at the top there are 2010 projects down to the earliest projects being from 1994, the South Willow Street area improvements. That project is an older project obviously but there are funds that had been received from developers towards improvement projects on South Willow Street as a result of development that has taken place in that corridor. The rest of the projects are more recent and they are not in order of need but in order by date.

Alderman Greazzo asked so there is no specific need or priority? These are just ongoing projects?

Mr. LaFreniere answered correct; they are ongoing projects.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to approve the request to extend the CIP projects as submitted.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Communication from the Mindy Salomone-Abood, Purchasing Agent, regarding vehicles purchases.

Alderman Ludwig moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion.

Chairman O'Neil stated I believe, Mr. Sheppard, and you can shake your head but we thought we could get three vehicles out of it and that didn't happen. I think that is why we got the letter.

Alderman Craig stated Kevin, I was wondering if you could talk to me about why we are recommending a small pick-up truck versus a car.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, replied based on the needs of the departments...we ask what is best for them, a small car or a small pick-up. To tell you the truth they are roughly the same price. The Building Department uses their pick-up truck to carry equipment some times. So it is based on the needs of the departments.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin, do you remember who the third department was that was going to get the pick-up truck?

Mr. Sheppard answered it was going to be another vehicle for the Building Department.

Chairman O'Neil asked we are working separately on a vehicle for the City Clerk, right?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from the Kevin O'Maley, Facilities Division, submitting a list of projects to be completed under the recent bonding that was approved by the Committee.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin O'Maley and Karen DeFrancis to come forward. I appreciate the document. Do we have at this time on the multiple school window design and replacement and envelope repairs a tentative list of those schools?

Mr. Kevin O'Maley, Facilities Manager, replied what we plan on doing there is we are going to first engage a consultant. We have had some problems that we have been able to track. There are about six schools that we would like to take a look at on the building envelopes and then we are going to have them develop a scope for potential repairs and we will execute those projects accordingly.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have a ballpark amount that you will need to engage the consultant out of that \$2 million?

Mr. O'Maley answered not at this stage. We are just getting it out on the street, literally.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you can come back to the Committee then to get proper amendment of that amount?

Mr. O'Maley responded absolutely.

Chairman O'Neil asked that doesn't hold you up from going out and bringing a consultant on board, correct?

Mr. O'Maley answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated and then as things develop you will come back to the Committee even though the School Board has approved the overall concept. I think we just need to amend the bond resolution as the projects are identified. Do we have to do anything with the balance of \$800,000? Do we have to reassign those balances at all?

Ms. Karen DeFrancis, School District Finance Officer, responded I believe the Committee has already approved those bond balances to be used for School District projects. The listing that I e-mailed earlier and I am not sure if everyone has a copy of that...

Chairman O'Neil interjected I don't think we have that.

Ms. DeFrancis asked do you want me to hand it out?

Chairman O'Neil answered that would be great. That is just on the \$800,000?

Ms. DeFrancis replied yes. The listing of \$801,000...Mr. Maranto can correct me if I am wrong but I believe it was already approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to spend the \$801,000. About halfway down the page we have a school improvement program for \$558,000. That represents the balance in the design/build project and the Joint School Buildings Committee has approved spending that money on these particular projects.

Chairman O'Neil asked would it then be that we need to reauthorize the difference between the two? I don't honestly think we have done that.

Ms. DeFrancis answered I am not sure what this Committee has to do.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have to list the projects. That was per discussion with Mr. Sanders. It is very important to the bond agencies that we list what the projects are.

Ms. DeFrancis asked so would this Committee have authority over that \$558,000?

Chairman O'Neil answered no, I don't think we have authority over that. I think what we have the authority over...

Ms. DeFrancis interjected so it would be the \$801,000 minus the \$558,000.

Chairman O'Neil stated if my math is correct that is \$243,255. Does that sound right? We should move on that amount. Any questions before we do that?

Alderman Craig stated in looking at this sheet and one that is in our Board packet and the information at this meeting, it seems like you have \$552,000 going towards multiple window design and replacement and then over \$2 million going to multiple school window design and replacement. What is the total on that line item?

Ms. DeFrancis responded if I walk you through the schedule it might help. The \$801,000, the first listing of about 12 projects are the projects that have remaining bond balances on them and it has been approved to fund School District projects with that money. So those are the 12 projects that have funding available in them. What that \$801,000 will be used for is the last listing on the page that has four items. You can see that the multiple window design and replacement is \$551,000. So out of the \$801,000, \$551,000 will be used for window design and replacement.

Alderman Craig replied but that is in addition to over \$2 million...

Ms. DeFrancis interjected no that is included in that number.

Alderman Craig asked is this the design/build money? I believe in our Board packet tonight we are approving the reallocation of design/build money. Is that what this is that you just handed out? Was that also allocated to use for window design and replacement?

Ms. DeFrancis answered I am not sure what is going to the Board tonight.

Mr. O'Maley stated I think what was asked for tonight was there was \$6.4 million in bonds that were made available to the School District on an item that was in your Board package. That doesn't have anything to do with the design/build money. There were two separate bonds that totaled \$6.4 million. It was \$2.87 million for the school facilities project, which was in that first category. There was \$2.4 million for the new school administration building and then there was \$1.3 million in a qualified energy conservation bond.

Alderman Craig stated it was from the Joint Committee on School Buildings.

Mr. O'Maley stated there was an authorization from the Joint Committee on School Buildings to utilize some of these funds.

Alderman Craig stated I will try to find it. My other question was to me one huge piece that is missing on this list is closing in of classrooms and we have talked about that over the years. I am just curious as to why that is not listed.

Mr. O'Maley responded Karen DeFrancis can probably add a little to that but as it went through the Building & Sites Committee and the Joint Committee on School Buildings, they were the ones who prioritized these projects and this is the list they came up with. That was not included in their priority list.

Ms. DeFrancis stated we do have our listing that was approved by the Board of School Committee and it had 42 projects on it. What we tried to do was take care of some of the priority projects with the funding available. Although the Board of School Committee feels that everything on here was a priority obviously there is not enough funding to fund all of these projects. The open concept classroom at Beech Street, the estimate that we had on that during the CIP process, was \$3,267,000 and the closing in of the open classrooms at Webster was \$683,100. So that will still remain on our CIP list as we go into next year, but again, we have limited dollars available to take care of some issues here and that is what the Board of School Committee chose.

Alderman Craig asked and the energy efficiency bond wouldn't cover replacement of windows so that we could use that money to close in classrooms?

Mr. O'Maley answered potentially that is one of the things we will be looking at with the energy conservation bond.

Alderman Craig asked so why would we...I guess I am just confused by this list. Why would we allocate \$2 million to replacing windows when we could use that money to close in classrooms and replace windows with the energy conservation bond?

Mr. O'Maley answered again, the School District prioritized all of the projects. On the energy conservation project right now we have a consultant that we are working with and they are going through and identifying a number of projects. On that list of projects there will probably be some window replacement projects but we are going to go ahead and prioritize all of those projects. I do agree that it is confusing because some of the money is coming from design/build and some of it is from other bonds but every one of these different bonds or different funding sources have a different scope that they have to be used for. It does look like there is some duplication there but it is really going to be a function of what we can come up with once we get the list of what all of the projects are going to be.

Alderman Craig stated at our main Board of Mayor and Aldermen meeting it says you are asking us to approve \$558,000 from the design/build and a portion of that would be used for window replacement. So to me it seems like we are putting an awful lot of money in that bucket when we could be using it to help our students in the classroom by closing in classrooms or other ways. I don't know what we do with that.

Chairman O'Neil stated we have a couple of items here. My understanding is that the Joint Committee has the jurisdiction over the design/build money and only the Joint Committee. Mr. Sanders is nodding his head yes. It is questionable whether this Committee has jurisdiction on that. If we back out the \$558,000...things are very confused here and we tried to work on simplifying it but I am not sure we did. That leaves, if we are working off the \$801,000, a balance that this Committee is reauthorizing of \$243,255 but yet the projects add up to \$249,600. We should probably...we have jurisdiction over the \$2.87 million. Why don't we begin by accepting a motion on the five projects as identified and for clarification the fifth group of school projects will be the multiple school window design and replacement and envelope repairs. All we will be committing to at this point is to bring on a consultant to study the six schools. We are not committing any funds to do anything over and above that. Am I correct Kevin?

Mr. O'Maley answered yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated so we are doing the code improvements, ADA compliance at Bakersville, Parker-Varney Master Plan and I think we discussed doing that design in-house, playground replacement and then to bring on a consultant for the six schools at an unknown amount at this time. It won't be the \$2 million.

Alderman Ludwig stated I have a different question because you said the Parker-Varney Master Plan would be in there. Is that what you are saying?

Chairman O'Neil answered yes.

Alderman Ludwig stated I also see Parker-Varney...and I know it is in desperate need of equipment replacement, but are we doing those together? I mean it says Parker-Varney School for playground equipment replacement but isn't that going to be part of the overall Master Plan? How do we know the playground equipment is even going to go back where it is until we look at the Master Plan?

Mr. O'Maley responded unfortunately I don't have a lot of background on that. I could find out from the Parks & Recreation Department what their plan was on that.

Mr. Ludwig replied I think over there it is a big change in the way the circulation of the school worked and the bus drop off again. That school was looked at probably 20 years ago. I wouldn't think that we would be doing something with the existing playground equipment until we saw what the Master Plan was going to speak to in relation to how the site was going to look going forward. If that is being considered I am okay with it I guess but it seems like we have funding in two places.

Chairman O'Neil stated this is taking the projects per the request of the Board of School Committee. We can only act on what the Board of School Committee has approved. Peter, do you have anything you can add to this regarding Alderman Ludwig's question?

Mr. Peter Capano, Parks & Recreation Manager, responded I had the same exact thought Alderman Ludwig had. Without the Master Plan done it may be premature to rush into replacing the playground equipment. What we will do is put that one aside for a short period of time and get the Master Plan done.

Alderman Ludwig stated I am fine with that. I know that the whole site is in need of some help. I hope it gets as much equipment as it needs. It's just...Is it going to go in the same place? Is the teacher parking going to be moved around? There are just so many things that need to be done over there. I am happy that the Master Plan is being done. I am sure that nobody would go forward with replacing that, right?

Mr. Capano replied right.

Chairman O'Neil stated I would accept a motion from the Committee on the code improvements at multiple schools. Kevin, do we have a list of those multiple schools?

Mr. O'Maley replied there are quite a few schools. I can go over them if you want.

Chairman O'Neil responded yes. We need this information for the bonds. That is the problem. Can you read the list so we can get it into the record?

Mr. O'Maley answered this was originally intended to be done over multiple fiscal years but we are looking at sprinkler systems at Bakersville and Webster...

Chairman O'Neil interjected this is all within the \$715,000?

Mr. O'Maley responded correct. There are some stage curtains that need to be replaced at multiple schools.

Chairman O'Neil asked do we have a list of those schools?

Mr. O'Maley answered they do, but I don't have it with me. I think there are 12 of them.

Chairman O'Neil stated again, we need to get that list.

Mr. O'Maley stated there are some classroom doors that need to be replaced at Green Acres and Henry Wilson, exit stairwells at Bakersville, classroom doors at McDonough and then at Webster School there are some stairwell enclosures and at Weston there are some classroom doors that need to be changed as well.

Chairman O'Neil asked all of that is within that \$715,000?

Mr. O'Maley answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked so just for clarification sprinklers at Bakersville and Webster, stage curtain replacements at 12 schools and you will get that list for us, classroom door replacements at Green Acres and Wilson, stairwell work at Bakersville, doors at McDonough, stairwell work at Weston and doors at Webster?

Mr. O'Maley replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think the Bakersville ADA speaks for itself. The Parker-Varney Master Plan speaks for itself. Playground replacements speak for themselves and then on the building envelopes we are not committing the \$2 million until those projects are identified. What we are committing is to go out

and spend the money out of that \$2 million to bring a consultant on board. Am I correct?

Mr. O'Maley responded correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked Your Honor, do you have something to add to this?

Mayor Gatsas stated I think there are two different buckets of money. The \$2.4 million is allocated through the bonding on the new administration building. There is an additional \$2.87 million...

Chairman O'Neil interjected we are working on the \$2.87 million.

Mayor Gatsas stated those dollars are in for building aid. That is what the allocation was. When we first started the \$801,000 that we had the first discussion about we knew that there was roughly \$548,000 in the design/build portion that was going to come forward and then as we worked through our CIP projects at the City level, we took \$249,600 as balances from CIP projects that we had gathered to go to the School District for bonding on their side that had nothing to do with the bonding that was going to come from the state.

Chairman O'Neil stated I need to correct myself. The balances should be \$243,255.

Mayor Gatsas replied whatever that balance is, that \$243,255 comes from various projects that we had in CIP as we put our full budget together. So the \$548,000 comes from the design/build project and then we allocated another \$243,255 to the School District and what that was supposed to encompass when we first started was some of the life safety issues that we saw at the schools. That was going to be the first article. There is a sheet that was given out a couple of weeks ago and maybe this is the one that is going to clarify but there is funding in 2012, 2013 and 2014 that was going to take that code improvements for multiple schools per Manchester Fire Department...we had agreed that we were going to do that over four years but because we went out and got school building aid because this is the last year for it, we incorporated all of those into one year. That is where your \$715,000 comes from for the life safety issues. We then looked at some of the other life safety issues like stair enclosures and doors. That is part of the \$2.87 million bond also. That bond appropriation is really based on building aid coming from the state. It is not from funds that we have allocated here but from funds that the School District put together for their bond balances. The \$243,255 was based on the conditions that we had. When you take a look and add those numbers together, that is where that \$3.78 million comes from; from those total allocations. As it was devised, \$2.4 million was for the administration building and \$2.87 was

for the new building facilities that we were going to do to meet the fire codes and the doors were going to come from building aid. I will remind the Committee that they are doing the elevator at Bakersville and I think that was \$300,000.

Chairman O'Neil replied it says \$760,000 in what we have.

Mayor Gatsas responded that is the elevator plus the lift. We approved the lift and then they added the elevator at a later date. So those are the projects as you see them coming forward. When you take a look at the number of \$3,789,000 it is a combination of the \$2.4 million, the \$810,000 and the \$2.8 million. If you add those all together that is where you get your \$3,789,000. I don't know if that adds any clarity or if I am just confusing the Committee even more. I am just trying to give you a clarification of how those numbers were derived. The \$2.87 million came after we did our CIP budget. So that is why you may see some duplication of windows. There is also in there \$558,000 that was allocated for the West Side boiler, which was in our original plan to be \$801,000 but because we ended up getting energy efficiency dollars they moved the big boiler to the energy efficiency side rather than looking to go here. I think that may be where some of the confusion is coming from. I think that when our discussions started we thought that the only bonding that was coming forward from the School District...there was one number. If you see the placeholder number that says "new facility to meet capacity" they had applied for \$11 million from the Department of Education to meet their needs. They have trimmed that down to somewhere around \$6 million or \$6.2 million. The \$2.8 million plus the \$2.4 million.

Chairman O'Neil replied we don't have a sheet with \$11 million, Your Honor.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think it was in your Board packet. It was given out a few weeks ago I think. I apologize, Mr. Chairman, but I think if you had this one in front of you it would show you the clarity. I think it is in the full Board packet.

Chairman O'Neil stated I apologize for the confusion but all we were trying to do was...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I think that is an easier list to work off of because it gives you clarity of how those funds were...as the School District saw them this was their list of 42 items. I think Alderman Craig asked why weren't some of the enclosures happening with those dollars and I think as you see it here that is how they came up with the funding and what they had available in their budget to pay for bonding based on the 40% that was coming from the state and the balance that was coming from the School District. If you take a look at West High, design and replace boiler, it is \$522,000 and then it shows you as it goes down the other allocations in that number. I think it shows you a complete breakdown of where

those numbers are coming from. If you look down at the code improvements, we were going to look at those and do them in four increments - \$178,000 a year for the situation that we had developed with the Fire Department to make sure that the schools were going to be put into a safer situation. Well because of the bonding that came forward that was approved at the state level for building aid, they accelerated that and did all four of them in one year. I think that is where you see some of the numbers as they were accelerated. The Bakersville ADA Compliance and the elevator and the lifts, as you can see that was a \$380,000 number. They were going to do only the lift and they ended up allocating the entire amount because the state approved the building aid for this year. I think that was their big concern and that is why you didn't see anything as an itemized list until the Department of Education came back and said your building aid has been approved.

Chairman O'Neil stated what you are saying makes sense based on that list but unfortunately we didn't have it included with this. I do remember seeing this. I guess the only thing that was open was if you look at this they have identified the \$2,069,760 and then there is a note that \$367,604.74 is to be determined.

Mayor Gatsas asked that is on...

Chairman O'Neil interjected that is on the priority list from the Board of School Committee.

Mayor Gatsas stated what it is is there wasn't enough funding for that project so the project was short the \$367,000. I think, Mr. Chairman that when these were developed there was nothing that was developed that said that we were going to spend...what is the number for windows, \$400,000 plus? I think that when you start looking at pricing these were based on pricing from two years ago or a year and a half ago. I think that when these projects go forward and they start looking at people going out to bid on this stuff, I think you are going to find that the pricing is going to come in better. We may accumulate enough funding for the \$367,000 on the \$2 million to maybe have enough to finish that project up down below. They are about \$367,000 short. As you can see, when we talked about the Fire Department and what they needed, we did that over a four year period. I think that if we went out and looked at it as a \$715,000 project we are probably going to get a better price than \$715,000.

Chairman O'Neil responded understood. All we were trying to do tonight, Your Honor, was plug the projects with the bond and that had not been done previously. That is what we were trying to do tonight.

Mayor Gatsas asked does this clarify...

Chairman O'Neil interjected it does. We are fine on the items. Kevin, what does the \$367,000 on the windows mean?

Mr. O'Maley answered if you look at the one page with the \$3.789 million in bonds and then there is another \$2.78 million and if you take whatever is left over from that \$801,000 schedule that Ms. DeFrancis handed out, the difference between that and the \$551,000 totals \$2,069,760. Does that make any sense?

Chairman O'Neil replied it does. I think what happened was the bond got mixed with the bond balances, which it should not have. They should have been treated separately.

Mayor Gatsas stated right. I think that is the confusion.

Chairman O'Neil stated the items got mixed and that is not what should have happened. Let's see if we can get this straight now.

Alderman Craig stated when you are working with the money for the energy conservation bond, I assume you are going to have a consultant come in and do a look through the schools and provide you with a priority list like you have done in the past. Is that correct?

Mr. O'Maley answered yes.

Alderman Craig asked so do you need to get a consultant in regarding windows or can you use the information from the consultant who is doing the energy conservation?

Mr. O'Maley replied the problem isn't just with the windows. You will see it says envelope repairs in there too. We have a lot of water infiltrating. Sometimes it is around the windows and sometimes it is around the connection between the roof and the walls and those types of things. That is what we need the consultant to help us with. We have tried a number of repairs that we thought would help but we haven't been able to accomplish that yet so now we are going to bring a consultant in and scope out the work and have him identify what he thinks the problems are going to be.

Alderman Craig asked so you don't feel like there is duplication there?

Mr. O'Maley answered no I don't. There is some duplication in the nomenclature in the projects but once we get all of the projects identified there won't be any difference.

Alderman Craig asked and if we approve this bond ,the \$2 million for the windows, and you end up covering a lot of that within the \$1.13 million, can we use that money to do other things like close in classrooms?

Mr. O'Maley replied what the Chairman asked us to do was once we get the consultant arrangement identified we will come back to the Committee and tell them what we are recommending as far as projects are concerned and if there is anything left over you can deal with it that way.

Alderman Long stated being on the Joint School Building Committee, I have to agree that it is difficult to follow. We are allocating money to specific projects but whether those projects get done or not I mean I know in the Joint Committee we allocated money specifically for the equipment and sand at these playgrounds and now I am hearing we are going to relook at it. I don't know where that allocation would go from there. That is on design/build and I understand that. On the CIP if we are allocating the same amount of money and for whatever reason that project doesn't go forward, does it come back to this Committee to reallocate or does the Board of School Committee allocate it?

Chairman O'Neil responded it would be my opinion, and the Mayor or Mr. Sanders can correct me if I am wrong, but the Board of School Committee has jurisdiction over what projects are funded. I think our responsibility is just making sure on the CIP side that we have approved them so that for Mr. Sanders regarding tracking the bonds and selling the bonds, the projects are properly identified. He can't just say \$2 million for schools. You have to say what in the schools is being done for that \$2 million. That is our jurisdiction. It is not the priority. It is just making sure on our side that they are publicly voted for approval. The priority list comes from the Board of School Committee.

Alderman Long asked so we know where the money is being allocated?

Chairman O'Neil answered correct.

Alderman Long asked and if there is a change in that allocation?

Chairman O'Neil answered it would go to the Board of School Committee but then we would have to reauthorize the bonds. I am getting a yes from the Mayor and a yes from Mr. Sanders.

Mayor Gatsas stated on the \$2.87 million let's assume that that came in and they spent \$2.4 million. They would have to come back to this Committee and say we have another \$400,000 and this is where we want to allocate it.

Chairman O'Neil replied correct. I think what happened here is the pots of money got mixed and that is the confusion. I think we should take two actions tonight, and Mr. Sanders can correct me if this isn't what we need to do, but the code improvements at multiple schools for \$715,200 as identified by Mr. O'Maley, Bakersville ADA Compliance for both elevator and lift for \$760,000, Parker-Varney Master Plan and Design, playground replacements identified and Smyth, Jewett, Parker-Varney and then the only thing I believe we are authorizing tonight is for Mr. O'Maley to engage a consultant to look at six schools and those funds would come out of the \$2 million. Once the projects are identified, Kevin will come back and we will reauthorize the balance on that. Does that sound correct Mr. Sanders?

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, stated I don't want to be confusing at all but I want to make one point on page 11-2. The bond resolution that we are talking about is for a total of \$2.870 million. You can see that in bold at the top of the page. The total in the far right column for the items listed under that bond total \$3.789 million. Now I am going to get confusing for a second and I apologize. The detail that is provided here is higher than what the bond resolution is for. So a schedule needs to be put together to say explicitly what the intent of this \$2.8 million of bonds is for. I talked to Ms. DeFrancis and I think that schedule can be prepared but I would like to have that schedule. It can't be all of these items because they total \$3.789 million. Now I have exhausted my understanding of the schedule.

Chairman O'Neil asked would it be okay if we approved, out of the \$2.87 million, the code improvements at the multiple schools we listed tonight for \$715,200; the ADA Compliance at Bakersville, which is the elevator and lifts for \$760,000; the Parker-Varney Master Plan and Design for \$72,000; playground replacements at Smyth, Jewett and Parker-Varney for \$172,300 and then the fifth project would be authorizing the Facilities Division to bring on a consultant to look at the envelopes of the six schools? That should be within that \$2.87 million.

Mr. Sanders answered that is correct

Chairman O'Neil asked are we okay on that?

Mr. Sanders replied yes, and then I think when they come back after they meet with the consultant this schedule would need to be reconfigured so that it agrees with the \$2.87 million.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think the balance you have, Mr. Chairman, would be \$1.150 million for them to come back and look at the envelopes of the schools.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you agree with that, Mr. Sanders?

Mr. Sanders answered yes, I agree with the Mayor's math.

Alderman Greazzo stated Mr. Chairman you have said it many times that staff needs to do a way better job of getting this paperwork to us. I actually want to table this until we can have it presented to us clearly. We have had four people try to explain it to us and I don't really see where this is going.

Chairman O'Neil asked Mr. O'Maley, is any of this time sensitive that if we don't move forward you can't do this work over the summer for the opening of schools?

Mr. O'Maley answered we are getting ready to do a lot of the work for the code improvements right now. The other stuff we could probably wait a little while.

Chairman O'Neil asked can you wait a month on the other stuff if we just approve the code improvements?

Mr. O'Maley answered I am just talking about the Facilities projects. I don't know what the Parks & Recreation schedules are on the two projects they have.

Chairman O'Neil asked Peter, were you going to do anything on the Parks & Recreation side before August?

Mr. Capano answered no.

Chairman O'Neil asked would the Committee be comfortable with at least moving forward on the code improvements? Are we okay just to approve that tonight and then come up with a clean schedule for our August meeting? Your Honor, do you agree with that?

Mayor Gatsas replied I feel comfortable with the allocations you just talked about, leaving \$1.15 million to be discussed at a later date. I think that is where the confusion is coming from because you see in these packets two different numbers that talk about window replacements. I think if we go along with what you just said with Facilities & Parks because I think for them to design it, I am not too sure I like spending \$72,000 to design something that we should be able to do in house somewhere.

Chairman O'Neil responded well I think that would be part of it. We would be charging in house for that project. That would be my recommendation.

Alderman Lopez stated we talked about the Parker-Varney in previous committees and from experience in talking with Chuck DePrima previously, as soon as this is approved they will be ordering the equipment and everything else so they can get the playground in before school starts. If you wait another month, I don't think that is going to happen.

Chairman O'Neil stated well the Division Director just told us that is not the case.

Alderman Lopez replied well, I question whether or not that is the case. We have a former Parks & Recreation Director who will tell you that you have to order this stuff and get it in place.

Alderman Ludwig stated I agree that there are huge...I mean they don't inventory this kind of stuff, but for Parker-Varney if we are looking at design, they are a long way off from replacing equipment at this point. I don't think they are going to get there in August.

Alderman Lopez responded the design from the last committee meeting was for the entire parking lot, not just the playground. Don't get confused on that. The design is for how they are going to get the buses and cars up there, the whole area. The playground equipment has already been identified where it is going to be.

Alderman Ludwig replied I don't disagree but I respectfully disagree because they could be looking at maybe the playground equipment doesn't even end up where it is going. I mean, there is a good chance that it probably will but there is a backfield there that has never been utilized properly and the bus drop off is problematic. Again, this site that hasn't been looked at in 20 years, I believe. I don't think we are doing our due diligence if we just move ahead with playground equipment. Certainly I am speaking for it because I know how bad the condition of it is but we may be a little premature. I don't think that Parks is going to be able to move forward with a total design in my opinion.

Mayor Gatsas stated back to your original question, Mr. Chairman, I would say if we could leave the \$1.150 million so they can come in and give you some clarity numbers. That allows them to move forward on the projects and I think the Parker-Varney discussion is not so much about playground equipment but the actual facility and how buses get in and pick up children. I think that is the clarity and maybe we need to talk to Southern NH Planning to come in and do some of this work.

Chairman O'Neil replied I don't disagree with you. I think that we have identified the five projects but would you be comfortable if we just approve the code improvements so that he can get going on this and we can clean this up to the

satisfaction of Mr. Sanders for the August meeting? I don't believe it holds us up from doing anything.

Mayor Gatsas responded I guess where we are at with the elevator...

Mr. O'Maley interjected yes, if we could get started on the design of the elevator that would be helpful. I don't know anything about the Parks projects at all.

Chairman O'Neil stated when you were asked a few minutes ago you said the first one...

Mr. O'Maley interjected you are right, because we are further down the road on the code improvements things but as I listen to the discussion...we don't really need to do anything and probably won't get started until next summer on doing the elevator work but if we could get some of the design work out of the way that would be helpful.

Chairman O'Neil asked but do you need that in the next month?

Mr. O'Maley answered I could delay it but it would be convenient for us to get started on that right away.

Chairman O'Neil asked Mr. Sanders, are you comfortable with the first five identified or would you prefer that it be clean?

Mr. Sanders answered if it is the will of the Committee that they commence work on these items I would be comfortable with approving the first five. There is just some double counting going on here somewhere. There has to be. This is covered under other bond balances; some of these amounts must be. I am not answering clearly. If that is what you want to do I am sure it will be sorted out in the next 30 days.

Chairman O'Neil stated the Committee is saying they want this straightened out. I would just like to get at least the code projects done this summer. Could we get a motion on the \$715,200 for code improvements as identified by Mr. O'Maley out of the \$2.87 million?

Alderman Greazzo moved to approve the code improvements project for \$715,200. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman O'Neil stated so everything else we will clean up. The School District will work with Facilities and the Finance Officer to get this cleaned up and bring it in in a simpler manner. I think the Mayor is right. There is going to be a balance of somewhere over \$1 million. We will get this cleared up. The balance of the \$2.87 million we will table.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. O'Maley can you bring us a detailed list of the projects that you outlined earlier?

Mr. O'Maley answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to table the remaining projects for the balance of the \$2.87 million.

Chairman O'Neil stated now the other question here is, do we need to reauthorize the \$249,000 of that \$800,000 that was already approved? It is identified tonight for Central Practical Arts Façade Rebuilding, State Mandated Pipe Upgrades at Hallsville and Painting of Fire Escape. I, like my colleagues, am very confused tonight. Kevin, are we okay if that gets put off until August to clean up?

Mr. O'Maley responded the projects you just mentioned I would like to get done this summer.

Mayor Gatsas stated let me see if I can give you some clarity. On the sheet that you have that has three separate columns, the \$801,000 came from our original CIP budget. \$558,000 is for the design/build portion that came out and then the other \$243,000 is what we gave them as bond balances. I think what you are seeing here is you are seeing two numbers of \$801,255.56. At the top, those are the bond balances that were left of the \$801,255.56 that we allocated. Down below when you look at the \$801,255 that is why you see those two equaling out. Those are the projects that can be done with those funds.

Chairman O'Neil replied I agree, but we need to identify those projects because as of tonight they are identified as just balances from the projects above. I don't believe the Board has ever voted to reassign them to those three projects below.

Mayor Gatsas responded I think they have been assigned to the four projects below – the Central Practical Arts Façade Rebuild for \$45,000 is on this other sheet that you have. If you take a look at it, it is number 13.

Chairman O'Neil stated Mr. Sanders is saying we are okay on this thing.

Mayor Gatsas stated Item 13 is the Central Façade.

Chairman O'Neil replied that is fine. All we are trying to do, Your Honor, is make sure for the bond authorizations that the projects have been identified and Mr. Sanders is saying we are okay on that.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Communication from the Timothy Soucy, Public Health Director, requesting permission to register their 2011 Car Mate trailer.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Communication from Alderman Arnold requesting the Committee evaluate the Friends of the Manchester Animal Shelter to see if they may qualify for CDBG funds.

Chairman O'Neil stated my recommendation would be let's send it to staff to report back at the August meeting. I am told that this is not time sensitive.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to refer the communication to City staff to report back at the next meeting.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. Petition to release and discharge from public servitude a portion of Francis Street submitted by Paul and Lucille Stelmach.

Mr. Sheppard stated I believe the street was never opened or accepted by the City. The Solicitor can confirm whether you need to take any action.

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, responded typically what the Board has done in the past is just acknowledge that the street has been discharged according to statute.

Chairman O'Neil asked Kevin, are you okay with that?

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to release and discharge from public servitude a portion of Francis Street as submitted.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 15 of the agenda:

15. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount of \$20,000 from the State of New Hampshire Department of Justice to be used for the implementation of a comprehensive underage drinking enforcement program and for such purpose amending Resolutions and budget authorizations have been submitted.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 16 of the agenda:

16. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, requesting approval to accept grant funds in the amount of \$2,720 from the Federal Institute of Museum and Library Services to be used to restore financial records of Manchester Civil War soldiers.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed Item 17 of the agenda:

17. Amending Resolution and budget authorization for acceptance of \$2,000 for the FY 2011 CIP 714211 Hands Across the Merrimack Bridge Project.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Greazzo, it was voted to approve the amending Resolution and budget authorization.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 18 of the agenda:

18. Amending Resolution and Bond Resolution for acceptance of \$43,500,000 for the FY 2011 CIP 810411 Public Safety Complex Project.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Greazzo asked are we going to get any information on how this money is spent? I know we have a conceptual design of what the project is but that doesn't tell us exactly what it is going to cost. I would hate to bond for \$43 million and need \$53 million or bond for \$43 million and only need \$33 million.

Mr. Sheppard stated it is a good point and what we do is put together a preliminary estimate for the work and once we get the construction manager on board we will have a better idea. We have an estimator working right now on tightening up our numbers to see where we stand but that is the number we were carrying for the construction. Once we have that estimate we will be able to come back and give the Board some better details on the project and different costs within the project. Every project starts with an estimate and that is what that number is, \$43.5 million.

Alderman Greazzo asked is it possible to wait until we have a hard number before we approve this bonding?

Chairman O'Neil answered my understanding was that in order to allow the project to proceed and get to that point, we have to approve the bond. That was my understanding.

Mr. Sheppard stated we are moving forward with the design right now and we need the funding or at least some funding to move forward with the design. Obviously we don't need the construction funds at this point but we need to move forward on design. We are going to be running out of money in the near future and part of the bonding for this project I believe requires that the bonds be sold before the end of the year. We are in a time crisis to get this project moving and designed and out to a construction manager.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Greazzo, I had those very questions. My understanding was this just allowed the project to keep moving forward. I had the same question you did about whether it is higher or lower. I believe Mr. Sanders

can answer that and it will come to the full Board tonight so we can answer it there. I agree with you.

Alderman Greazzo asked Kevin, the money that you are using for the design, is that part of the \$1 million that had been allocated previously?

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Alderman Greazzo asked did you get a copy of where the rest of that money had been spent and how much was left?

Mr. Sheppard answered Tim Clougherty is actually bringing that later on tonight. I can give you a good idea. \$600,000 of that was used to start a schematic design. About \$279,000 was used for the master planning going through the Police and Highway Departments and looking at personnel and equipment. \$50,000 was for the technical work that was done on the site. We spent \$20,000 for a consultant to look at various properties when we first got the \$1 million. They looked throughout the City for a site for the Highway Department before we landed on our same site. There was another \$60,000 that we used to purchase some railroad property that ran along Valley Street next to our property.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. Sanders, do we have until the end of the year for these bonds in order to be able to secure the state and federal money that would go along with this project?

Mr. Sanders answered that is correct. In order to get the interest rebate of 45% on the economic development zone bonds and the 35% rebate on the Build America bonds they have to be issued by December 31 of this year.

Alderman Greazzo asked if we were able to find some funds to keep the project moving forward without bonding this \$43 million is that possible? My point is I don't want to bond \$43 million without actually seeing a better solid direction on where it is going to be spent. If it is not that time sensitive and we have until the end of the year and Mr. Sheppard needs something to move forward I would like to see that happen rather than throw down a \$43 million bond right now.

Mr. Sanders answered you need to authorize somewhere to find the money and the bond authorization is similar to an appropriation. You are authorizing the expenditure of money. If you didn't want to authorize \$43 million you could authorize a bond resolution of \$1 million or \$2 million if you wanted to do that.

Mr. Sheppard stated my assumption is these bonds probably won't be sold in the next couple of months. If the \$43.5 million is authorized, what we could do is move forward on the design and come back to this Committee before we go to construction with a number. I think it is important for us to be reporting back to the Committee on this project because it is a very large project. If we did get authorization for the \$43.5 million, we are not going to go out and spend it tomorrow. I believe the bond isn't going to be sold for a few months so we would be moving forward spending some of that \$43.5 million but we would not be committing that \$43.5 million until we came back to this Committee.

Alderman Greazzo asked if we bond \$43 million or whatever the number is going to be, is that something that can be adjusted once we have a more solid number or if we bond the \$43 million that is what we get?

Mr. Sanders answered the Board can revoke a bond authorization, so you could revoke it.

Alderman Greazzo asked however, after it has been issued that is it?

Mr. Sanders replied these bonds would probably not be issued until sometime in October or November. We are going to try to wait as long as we can.

Chairman O'Neil stated let me follow-up on Alderman Greazzo's question. If the project actually comes in at \$42 million and we don't need...you know we have \$43 million, we would then have a balance of \$1 million which could be reauthorized for other projects, correct?

Mr. Sanders responded correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked or the other way. If the project came in at \$44 million we would have to amend this bond resolution, correct?

Mr. Sanders answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated we would have to amend it either way depending on what the project comes in at. Am I correct?

Mr. Sanders answered you are correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you see any reason why we should not move forward on the \$43 million this evening?

Mr. Sanders replied from a financial point of view, no. As long as you have the condition that the Public Works Director would come back at a later time and detail the number.

Chairman O'Neil responded which I believe has always been the intent of the Public Works Director, to come back numerous times as the numbers are more defined and as the project moves forward. I guess the only way he would not have to come back to us is if the project comes in exactly at \$43.5 million correct?

Mr. Sanders replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated anything lower or higher he would have to come back to the full Board.

Mr. Sanders stated the only point I would make is traditionally when the \$43.5 million is authorized the Public Works Director has the authority to spend the \$43.5 million. If it is the intent of the Aldermen to only give him the authority to spend \$2 million to finish the design or get a better budget number then that would be a reason to limit the bond.

Chairman O'Neil responded but we have a timing issue. If we don't get moving on this project we lose all of the incentive opportunities correct?

Mr. Sanders replied correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated so it would be my opinion that we should move forward on the \$43.5 million this evening.

Mr. Sheppard stated I can add that this project is fast tracked as you talked about, Alderman O'Neil, and the Mayor has told me that before we sell that bond he wants a "not to exceed" number or a guaranteed maximum price for this project so we will be coming back to the Board with a GMP from our construction manager. I think that is important. If that gets bonded it is my understanding that we will move forward with the design but we will not move forward with complete construction until we come back to this Board with a GMP from the construction manager.

Chairman O'Neil asked but it is clear that not only this Committee but more importantly the full Board will have at least one or probably multiple opportunities over the next few months to review the status of the project, correct?

Mr. Sheppard answered correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated I don't know if that helps you, Alderman Greazzo.

Alderman Greazzo responded my concern is that this is going to the full Board tonight and if the Board approves it then we have a \$43 million bond without knowing what it is actually being used for. We have a conceptual design but that doesn't tell me what the material costs are or the labor costs or any of the other details that go along with \$43 million.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think that is going to develop over the next month or so but I think they need to have some idea if there is a commitment that we are going to move forward on this.

Mr. Sheppard stated again it is my understanding that until that bond is sold that bond can be reduced. Until that bond is sold, even though I have authorization...I have authorization, as Mr. Sanders said, to spend \$43 million but I am sitting here before you to tonight telling you that all I am moving forward with right now is design. I will be coming back with the construction manager and the GMP before we move forward with construction.

Alderman Ludwig moved to approve the amending resolution and bond resolution. Alderman Craig duly seconded the motion. Chairman O'Neil called for a vote. The motion carried, with Alderman Greazzo being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 19 of the agenda:

19. Communication from Leon LaFreniere, Director of Planning & Community Development, on behalf of the Airport requesting to accelerate property acquisition funds as identified in the 2011-2015 Airport Capital Improvement program. The Airport notes that property acquisition funds will be increased to \$10,000,000 thereby increasing the total budget by \$1,300,000 for a new Airport CIP total of \$79,790,444 and for such purpose a budget authorization has been submitted.

Chairman O'Neil stated this item has been before the Special Airport Committee. Your Honor, have you seen this or do you want to speak on it?

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mayor Gatsas stated I just want to make sure that the discussion...we were presented a five year plan and I want to make sure that that was \$78 million in that five year plan and it is being adjusted accordingly. Are we adjusting it higher?

There is no other adjustment that can be found in there to make it the same number that was presented to us some three or four months ago.

Chairman O'Neil stated my understanding is that we are increasing the budget by \$1.3 million for a new number of \$79,790,444.

Mayor Gatsas replied well I guess the question I would ask the Airport Director is can they live within the number of \$78 million without increasing it \$1.3 million. Can they move other allocations around in their three year plan?

Chairman O'Neil stated well, the Director and Deputy Director are here.

Mr. Mark Brewer, Airport Director, stated what you have before you today is the modification to our CIP. Rich, can you take it?

Mr. Richard Fixler, Deputy Airport Director, answered I believe we can accommodate the Mayor's request. There are other areas that we can reduce by \$1.3 million, so if it is not put in place at this point we can certainly do that. Our five year plan is a pretty broad plan and it is intended to give us a lot of flexibility and cover a lot of potential projects. If we found that we were going to spend the full amount over a five year period we could always come back to this Board and request an increase.

Chairman O'Neil asked so you are okay with the Mayor's request and it still allows you to move forward on what you need to move forward with?

Mr. Fixler answered yes, it will just have to come out of a different project.

Chairman O'Neil asked so your request, Your Honor is for them to stay within the framework of the \$78 million?

Mayor Gatsas answered the \$78,690,444.

Chairman O'Neil asked and gentlemen you are fine with that?

Mr. Fixler answered yes.

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

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 20 of the agenda:

20. Discussion relative to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program.

Mr. Sam Maranto, Planning & Community Development, stated what you have before you is the latest breakdown. As you may recollect I have said in the past that we have had to demonstrate to the CDFA a 75% commitment of our NSP funds by June 30th. In looking at the total here it is showing 86.6% so we have accomplished that. On the second page I have a breakdown of all of our commitments to date for our projects showing a total of \$2.106 million. That is the City's end. We have additional funds of \$863,000 that remain to be committed. You may recollect or if you read the *Union Leader* a couple of weeks back, we had proposals come in for Lake Avenue and Mammoth Road, actually 335&337 Lake Avenue and 434 Mammoth Road. The one on Mammoth Road came in and unfortunately in conversations with the apparent low bidder he made a mistake on the bid and dropped a zero and has asked to withdraw the bid. Because he was the low bidder by \$50,000 we are going out again tomorrow to rebid the project and have it submitted within a week. He has indicated that he will come back with an additional low bid, which will be approximately \$300,000, which is still compared to all of the other projects for three units under \$100,000 per unit which we feel is very advantageous to the City. That is for the burned out structure at 203 Mammoth Road. That leaves us a balance of funds of \$564,000. Now we did ask for a proposal for Odd Fellows. We did receive one proposal from the Amoskeag Architectural Group. They have a series of stipulations if they are to move forward with development of the project, the first being that we donate the building to them and then identify basically what they call a Business Enterprise fund. Their bid was requiring between \$1.5 and \$1.55 million of our NFP funds. That really isn't within our scope so we are not considering that project. With that we have had some other discussions. He basically wanted to put one federal residential unit there and based on conversations with various people including the Mayor, I guess the Mayor wants to speak at this time relative to a different situation there that I believe might be more appropriate for that neighborhood and that will also significantly reduce the amount of funds needed to make this work.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think that we have had conversations during the CIP budget about the non-profits that we service here in the City. I think that in taking a look at what we might be able to do there to house some of the non-profits and make it as they say "one stop shopping" for the clientele that it would behoove us to at least look at that. I think it is important that we look at that and move forward. I think you were in a hearing sessions with me last week along with Alderman Long when we heard some concerns form the refugee community and where they can get services. I think it is important as we look at this project that we move forward with an idea of how do we put everything that we are funding throughout the City and I have Mr. Maranto coming forward again

with a package of all of the non-profits that we participate with and what we have given them and their administrative costs because if we can house ten or fifteen of them in one building and have one operator answering telephones instead of a separate one in each non-profit it certainly will give us an opportunity to get more money directed to the services rather than to the administrative costs. I would like to take a look first at what it would cost us as a city to renovate it and what we can save on the administrative end for some of these non-profits.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we have identified all of the projects with the exception of the \$564,179. In a brief discussion that you and I had last week, your thought was that we could ask the Facilities Division to look at a cost to get some of the basic needs of that building no matter who goes in there because we have a little bit of time to figure that out.

Mayor Gatsas replied I think Mr. Maranto is working with an individual right now to give us what it would cost for structural and for HVAC and for windows and for sprinkler systems, etc. just to have some rough numbers on encapsulation of the building rather than looking at what we want.

Chairman O'Neil asked that would be committing probably in August that \$564,000 once we know what those costs are and then that will commit all of our share of the funding we have in the Neighborhood Stabilization Fund, correct?

Mayor Gatsas answered yes, I agree with that.

Chairman O'Neil asked Sam, what do we need to act on tonight?

Mr. Maranto answered essentially from a policy perspective that we investigate looking at putting institutions in there as opposed to residential units and we continue moving forward. We are putting together a survey of the non-profits to identify what their needs are.

Chairman O'Neil asked with the intent that we would use the \$564,000 towards that renovation?

Mr. Maranto answered that is correct.

Chairman O'Neil asked we don't have to take any other action on purchasing Odd Fellows tonight?

Mr. Maranto replied well, we have purchased the property.

Chairman O'Neil asked we already have approval for that?

Mr. Maranto answered there are a couple of things we have to do. We will have to identify a lead agency that will take that over so I can contract with them. That is what I will be working on between now and August. I need to find an organization or entity in order for CDFIA to recognize our commitment of those funds.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think it would be appropriate to have Sam engage somebody into getting the structural costs. We certainly don't want to go in there and have a structural engineer come back and say it is going to cost \$890,000 just to secure the first floor.

Chairman O'Neil asked can we utilize the resources of the Facilities Division to assist with that? I will have that discussion with them offline.

Mr. Maranto stated although we have this 75% commitment, our drop dead date for funding is September 9th. We don't have a lot of time.

Chairman O'Neil asked what action do you need tonight?

Mr. Maranto answered just a policy decision to move forward in that avenue.

Chairman O'Neil asked subject to coming back to Committee?

Mr. Maranto answered yes.

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to allow Mr. Maranto to move forward with looking at moving institutions into the Odd Fellows building versus having it residential and report back to the Committee.

Chairman O'Neil stated I want to thank the staff of the Planning & Community Development Office for their efforts on this. We took advantage of the funding and I think it is going to make a difference throughout the City because of your efforts.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 21 of the agenda:

21. Discussion relative to the First Time Homebuyers Review.

Mr. Maranto stated we are looking for approval for \$20,000 for First Time Homebuyers assistance.

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

TABLED ITEM

22. Presentation by Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, regarding a vehicle locator system.

(Note: Tabled 6/7/10; additional information to be provided by the Highway Department regarding the cost changes and cost savings in relation to the MER Bond.)

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee