

A special meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Wednesday, April 13, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Acting President James R. Tollner presided; City Clerk Paul R. Bergeron recorded.

Prayer was offered by City Clerk Paul R. Bergeron; Alderman Deane leading in the Pledge to the Flag.

The roll call was taken with 10 members of the Board of Aldermen present; Alderman Rootovich, Alderman Vitale, and Alderman Gage were not in attendance.

His Honor, Acting Mayor Brian S. McCarthy and Corporation Counsel David R. Connell were also in attendance.

COMMUNICATIONS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN SHAW THAT ALL COMMUNICATIONS BE READ BY TITLE ONLY MOTION CARRIED

From: Brian S. McCarthy, President, Board of Aldermen
Re: Special Board of Aldermen Meeting

MOTION BY ALDERMAN SHAW TO ACCEPT AND PLACE ON FILE MOTION CARRIED

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MOTION BY ALDERMAN BOLTON THAT THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN RESOLVE ITSELF INTO A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO DISCUSS THE CITY'S SPACE NEEDS MOTION CARRIED

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman LaRose

What is the status Alderman McCarthy? Is it the Acting Mayor or it the President of the Board at this time?

Acting President Tollner

At this time, he is the Acting Mayor who is very fortunate in sitting in the seat of the Vice President of the Board of Alderman, but he is the Acting Mayor tonight.

Alderman LaRose

I just wanted that for clarification because you introduced him as alderman-at-large.

Acting President Tollner

I did, didn't I? I think it should be appropriate – it would be appropriate that we would accept his comments. Maureen, did you want to come up? I'll ask you now.

Maureen Lemieux

Actually President Tollner this evening, I don't have anything prepared at all. I simply planned on being here as a resource to you. So when you discuss either Burke or if you discuss 165 Ledge and the status of that, I intended to be here as a resource to you.

Alderman Lozeau

Yes, I'd like to be clear on what exactly we can discuss and what exactly we can't discuss. At one time we were told the information that we had received was quite confidential. Can we discuss dollars? Cents? Things like that. I think it should be made clear as to exactly what we can discuss.

Alderman Dion

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would request the Chair to ask Director Lemieux to join in Alderman Rootovich's seat because I think there will be quite a few questions and she'll be jumping up and down every five minutes.

Acting President Tollner

Acting Mayor McCarthy, would you like to comment or kick everything off?

Acting Mayor McCarthy

I don't have a whole lot to say. You're having this because there were several – back when I was acting as President of the Board, there were several requests to have another meeting to continue the discussion of the space plan. There are three alternatives that we currently have looked at, which was continue the lease at Ledge Street in some form. Look at Burke Street, and look at the property at Riverside. I don't think at this point any of the pricing information is particularly secret. We've had – all of the property owners know we are interested and have given us the prices that we sent around. I'm not sure any of it is terribly secret at this point.

Acting President Tollner

I will just start off with one piece of information and correct me Maureen if I'm wrong. With regard to Burke Street, that piece of property that is owned by Brady Sullivan. If we were to purchase that, the purchase is contingent upon us purchasing both of the buildings. They are not comfortable at this time with us purchasing the building that they have renovated that we had the tour in on that Saturday morning and not the warehouse. We have to take it as a package. Is that correct?

Maureen Lemieux

Yes. As I understand it, the larger of the two buildings they have not owned for a sufficient amount of time. So there would be no incentive for them to sell them separately. At least at this point in time, they are looking to sell the two of them together.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. Given the state of affairs of the City, are we really still trying to pursue anything, or are we just going to basically think we should table this at this point in time. Get on the budget; see where we are going with the finances of the City and then maybe revisit this another year or so. If we have to find other buildings, that's what we do. Because I can't see – if we're trying to find \$9 to \$10 million holes and gaps of the budget, I will not vote to bond another thing in this City because we are in a financial crisis as we sit here tonight again. I thought this was just going to be more or less discussion and probably hopefully table this because I'll tell you, I know my

phone start ringing off the hook tomorrow if I say we are going to purchase the building or two or half a building to move people around. It just can't work out this way. Thank you.

Alderman McCarthy

I think it is important to note that doing nothing in this case has definite cost associated with it. If we don't do anything, we have to at least renegotiate the lease on Ledge Street, which will involve probably paying more money and/or leasing more space than we currently have. So the Board is going to need to make a decision of some sort to do something about space later this year. I think it is important to consider whether (1) there are opportunities that are less expensive in the long term than what would happen if we do nothing, and (2) whether there are opportunities that are available now that may not be available at some other time that are of great benefit to the City in some regard.

Alderman Bolton

Yes, in a similar vein, I was going to say the same thing. Right now we are renting space. When we rent space from a private party, that private party has got to recover in the rent we pay enough money to pay its taxes, its business profits tax to the State of New Hampshire, its federal income tax, whatever property tax it is to us with its share that goes to the County, its share that goes for the state-wide property tax. So it's not just coming back to us necessarily. It's got to cover its debt service, and it intends to be in business to make a profit. It stands to reason that to a larger extent even than a homeowner, we can be in a position where we pay more money to rent than we do to own. When we issue bonds in order to own something, we don't pay federal taxes or our lender does not pay federal taxes on the money. Therefore, we get a very favorable interest rate. We've been paying over \$60,000 a year for the space on Ledge Street that we've been renting. That is as Acting Mayor McCarthy says, in all likelihood is going to go up, and in all likelihood is going to tie us in not for just one year, but for multiple years. It may well be that if we decide on an appropriate course, we can reduce what we pay on a yearly basis. IF that is the case, we'd be foolish not to look into it because it would save us money.

Alderman Dion

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I happen to have been one of the aldermen that on that Saturday morning that we had the walkthrough participated in the walkthrough. I know some of us weren't able to make it. I was very impressed with that property on Burke Street. Particularly the old machine shop which is now an office building that has all been renovated. It's brand new. We are in a severe crunch as far as space is concerned. I thought the price was reasonable for the amount of land and the amount of buildings involved. In fact, I thought the price was very reasonable. For me to say that, I thought it was reasonable. It is reasonable. To make a long story short, I think we ought to look into it. Okay. It is something that is needed. Is there some kind of discussion that is possibly going to go on with the people with Conway Arena that could facilitate the purchase of this building? I don't know if that will every come about. I think talks are probably going to be underway. I don't think we should shut the door on this whatsoever. The office building there that has been redone that I spoke about, I'll tell you, you could put the Board of Public Works people in there. You could put Community Development in there, plus other departments in there. The place is humungous and it is beautiful. For the price, like I said, it is very reasonable. There's 21 or 22 acres of land involved. There's a railroad siding. Then there's this huge assembly weld shop building that can be used for garage space for the buses, Board of Public Works' vehicles, you name it. I think it is worth exploring. I really do. I wouldn't say if I didn't think so. Something could be worked out. I think it should be pursued. I didn't visit the site on Riverside like Alderman McCarthy and the group did. I couldn't make that one. I understand that is a pretty good size building too, but it's not anywhere as close as big as Burke Street. Whether that could be utilized, maybe it could. I know City Hall has reached a point where people are on top of each other; they are confined. It's just too many people for a small area. It's just too congested. Mr. Chairman, I think we should pursue this, and that we shouldn't let this fall through. I think

something possibly could be worked out. It would be a benefit to the City. You've got to think long range on this. I'm taking long term on this. I think we should explore it.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you Alderman Dion.

Alderman Deane

Thank you. I haven't had an opportunity to look at any of the buildings, although I've talked to Alderman Dion quite some time ago about the size of the building that was down on Burke Street. The thoughts that I have – I know there's been discussions about tearing down the existing Street Department facility, and expanding the ice arena and perhaps putting in a swimming pool, and things of that nature. The sad part about it is we just built that salt shed not too long ago, and we spent a considerable amount of money doing that. The other thing is the ceiling height in that existing building is rather high. In order to properly maintain that facility and keep vehicles in there – I wouldn't want to be paying the gas bill on that place. That's one part of the renovation if we purchase it something would have to be done. I believe there's monorail system that's still in tact in there for moving equipment around and things like that.

Alderman Dion

Yes, for the overhead cranes. Yes.

Alderman Deane

Yes. The other thing is I had really an interest in going down to Riverside and looking at that piece of property because the police department was looking for some additional parking. From what I understand from Alderman McCarthy, most of that building had been diced up and there's a mezzanines area where I think offices could be put into place. I believe there's part of a garage or whatever in there for storage. But I'd like to go down and take a look at that. My major concern with Burke Street is the overall impact that that is going to have to that neighborhood where you are now going to have heavy equipment operating on those roadways – Allds Street, Burke Street and up and through that area during the same time that the school is open. When it opens and when the kids are out of school there is going to be a lot of increased traffic flow along with the fact that if you move different departments down there, you are also going to have that traffic flow as well. People looking to get permits, or if Community Development went over there to do whatever had to be done with the Building Department. If in fact the Building Department was moved down there, or left here, or whatever that's something else that has to be looked at. Other than the space needs, we also have to look at the – this has to be done so when the citizens come in looking for things or items that they normally come here to get, that's where the services should be provided out of this building such as permits, registrations, and items from the City Clerk's office. That's where I feel a disservice will be done if we are sending people driving all over town.

The other thought I had is I'd like to hear from the Director of Public Works as well because this adversely affects his department. I'd like to see what his opinion was on the buildings that have been looked at by the Board. I couldn't agree any more with Alderman Bolton. I mean we're paying \$65,000+ a year in utilities and everything else in that facility. We're getting the rental out of it, and we are getting nothing in return but the use of the space. So, it's money gone. By purchasing something, we'd be investing in something that we would eventually we would own. Although there was an interest cost associated with it. We should really be looking in that direction because we will never see that money back from Ledge Street. If Rick is still here, I'd like to understand what his feelings were on the buildings. I do have concerns about the impact that Burke Street property would have on those neighborhoods. It is going to be pretty significant.

The other issue is where the Street Department is located now is pretty much centrally located. We did, in fact, have some dealings, and Rick can correct me if I'm wrong, with the State. When they put their salt barn up, we agreed to allow them to fuel at our depot. That way the State wouldn't have to incur a cost of putting another fuel depot in up where their salt barn is. We spent a significant amount of money putting that in. We took the tanks and put them up above ground. So that was another investment that was made down there. I do realize the existing Street Department building has some significant problems. I know all the doors need to be replaced, the heating system, the trash trucks, Solid Waste vehicles. They don't have a storage area as well. Everything is pretty crammed in there. I really would like to look at the property on Riverside. That satisfies some office space, but it doesn't really take care of the Street Department per se.

Acting President Tollner

Rick, do you want to come up. We have Alderman Plamondon, Alderman LaRose, and Alderman McCarthy.

Alderman Plamondon

Thank you Mr. President. I, too, visited the Burke Street property as well as Riverside. I am very familiar with both locations but particularly Burke Street. My family has owned property in this area – I think it's 1918. I just wanted to say I have to concur with some of the comments made that by far the Burke Street property is the cheapest cost per square foot, provide the greatest potential for current and FUTURE space needs for the City. I think that is key. It shows vision. It was in the best condition, and then on top of that, we would utilize some federal monies to offset the cost for a City Bus going in, which if someone could correct me, I believe we are renting space for City Bus as well. So there's additional rental monies we would save. Again, to mention I don't know if it was ice tee monies or – there was some federal monies that the federal government would help out if we located the bus garage there. It was mentioned with the cranes at the Burke Street location. I think there was 12. I know there were over 10 cranes. That is a huge – no the 2 major cranes each with 2 hoists on them, but on the sides of the building there were several other cranes for Public Works equipment and City Bus ease of repairs and so on, removing whole chassis. It would give us a huge potential for maintaining our vehicles and complete repairs from A to Z. You could lift a dump truck off the ground with these cranes and do work.

I had spoken with Director Seymour as well. I had asked if we were to look at this I would hope that we would be able to keep the salt shed and hope the filling station. We'd have to do something as far as planning goes in order to try to keep that, which this is still in the speaking phases. Nothing has been drawn up. Particularly the salt shed is new. I think this would be good because we would be able to store salt and load our dump trucks during the winter time from 2 locations and attack the City snow storms from 2 locations as a possibility.

The Burke Street also what I like about it is it provides rail head access, which currently we don't have. So talk about large savings, we'd be able to buy our salt in bulk and our sand in bulk, which currently we don't. We run out after winters like we've just had with salt and we go around trying to fill the salt shed with a much higher cost of salt and sand. This would give us the ability to buy in bulk. A rail head also gives us future consideration for a solid waste transfer station. No matter how we cut it, one day the Four Hills is going to be full. Hopefully its 35 maybe even 50 years out. One day it is going to be full. This gives us the vision of planning ahead for an alternative for solid waste removal via the rail head.

As far as the neighborhood and the impact, William Prove was there and IMPCO. It's always had high commercial traffic. The City vehicles there would really be less than when Improved and IMPCO were in their hay day. I think if this site continues to be developed industrial or commercially, you're going to have even more commercial vehicles and automotive traffic for the employees and so on for the employees and so on for these buildings. Anyone who's been in that area has seen this one – what used to be one large manufacturing facility is subdivided into small industrial lots. I think that trend will continue. The current trend commercial/industrial I think will have a greater impact versus the City going there. I do counter the view about this being out of the

way. I view this as a very central location. It's a little bit more than a mile from City Hall. The two main wide avenues connecting Arlington and Burke Street. One is off of Main Street, and one is off of 111. I think overall the Burke Street property shows a lot of vision and a ton of potential. I thought it was in a much better condition. I, myself, was not satisfied with what I saw on Riverside. That's my view. I understand the police department's need for parking. Hopefully something could be done. As I mentioned earlier with the salt shed and the gas pumps that we have, maybe we could have an additional site for parking of our police equipment in that area. Maybe over the old landfill area over there. I don't know. I'm trying to keep it consolidated. Or in the rear of the property on Riverside was the old rail corridor, which was actually the Worcester/Nashua rail. IF we could acquire that property maybe some point in the future, I don't want to go crazy buying things especially with what we are facing with here for the budget. That could satisfy their parking needs. In my conversations with members of the police department, they also concur that would help. But the Riverside address would help them in moving their shooting range, which is currently in the Millyard area to this area. But that is not a priority. I think it is what we need to look at right now is priority and vision. Thank you Mr. President.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you Alderman Plamondon.

Alderman LaRose

Thank you. Around '87 '88, the Board of Aldermen at that time looked at space needs in the City. It was very apparent then that we needed it. So the Board of Aldermen had the late Dave Cheevers make up a plan for architectural drawing for the expansion of City Hall. The idea behind all that was that we were looking for one stop permit getting. In other words, if you are a builder and you are going to build something and you have to go to engineering, you have to go to planning, and whoever else it would be centrally located. Unfortunately, at that point in time we had, especially in New England, a building boom. The price of everything was out of site. The bids came in very high. We went back and we asked Dave Cheevers to reduce the size of the expansion, and that's what he did. Those bids came in even higher than the original project so the whole thing was scraped. In the back of my mind and maybe it's because I was involved in this then, I find it hard to understand why we can't take a look at those plans and see if they are still applicable at today's market and today's needs for City Hall. Thank you.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you Alderman LaRose.

Acting Mayor McCarthy

I guess when we first starting to look at this I saw value in the Burke Street plan that upon analysis no longer necessarily see. I want to preface that by saying you have to look first of all at what to do with the Public Works garage. I'm reasonably convinced that they cheapest solution in terms of dealing with the Public Works garage is to leave it where it is, repair it, and expand it if it needs to be expanded on that site. If we are going to move it somewhere else, I think the unspoken policy decision that this Board needs to make is are we going to move the Public Works garage off of its current site for the purpose of vacating the site to expand the Conway Arena? We ought to take that up as an independent question because that's the one that motivates what action we will take. If we were to decide to move it, I was not impressed the way some others were with the large building on the Burke Street property. I think the overhead cranes are, in fact, a detriment. They are huge. If you ever chose to move them it would cost you a fortune in energy to do so. It would cost you a fortune in maintenance to keep them moving through a standard that OSHA will allow you to operate. I don't believe that any of the operations that we normally carry out can, in fact, be done with that equipment in any way that fits into our maintenance strategies. The building as Alderman Deane pointed out is extremely large. That has its own problems with it. It

has 3 acres of roof. Those conditions I don't know that we understand. But that is going to be expensive to replace when it needs replacing. It in fact we may find that when it does that, we want to lower the ceiling some so that we're not heating multiple thousands of cubic feet of empty space in order to keep our trucks starting.

When I look at that, and the price starts to creep up when we do maintenance on that building, suddenly the alternative that was presented by the public works department a couple of years ago putting a new facility out at the Landfill, begins to look pretty good. The reason is it doesn't have 100 trucks a day running in two directions up Burke Street. It doesn't have the City buses running up and down Burke Street. I think the impact on that neighborhood should not be overlooked. The impact elsewhere, when we have deliveries made to that facility, someone coming from the south is very likely to get off at Exit 4 and either go up past BG or go down East Dunstable Road and up Main Street to get to Allds to get out there. You're putting a lot of emphasis on our surface streets for traffic that I don't think belongs there. Whereas the solutions that are along West Hollis don't have that problem. We need to be concerned about that.

Part of the reason we are looking at that site is simply because of that garage. We also need to look at is that the office space you'd pick if you were just looking for office space? The conclusion I reached is I don't think it is. There is much more space over there than we need. I don't want to get into the landlord business. We're in the landlord business and we are not very good at it. I think anybody who has been on the Board for the last 10 years would understand that. The only lease that we are able to collect on regularly is the one we charge \$1 for. I'm concerned about that. I'm concerned that that site is extremely out of the way to put Public Works and Community Development that people have to go to get permits all the time. I'm not sure it serves the citizens as well as it might. Once again, the alternative that we've discovered that's available to us on Riverside Drive is, in fact, very centrally located. It's one door down from the police station, which was located there because that's the geographic center of the City. It's in a place where we control almost everything around it. We wouldn't have a lot of the issues that we have with putting things in residential neighborhoods. I think it is – and all of the federal monies regarding the bus garage would, in fact, apply to that site. Mr. Newman was of the opinion that we could easily get the bus garage sited there primarily using the federal funds in the same amount that we would use at Burke Street. The advantage, again, is that's a centrally located site. It's only a few hundred feet from where the bus garage is on the other side of the turnpike because that's the center of the City and that's the right place to put it.

I guess the conclusion I reach is unless we see some advantage to moving the Public Works garage right now to a place that I don't think is optimal for the long term in order to vacate that site for the arena. I would not support the Burke Street property, but would rather support either renegotiating the lease and leaving Public Works where it is for the time being, or looking at the property on the other side of the highway to put both divisions into and simultaneously solve the police department's problem which we are not solving if we buy Burke Street.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you Acting Mayor McCarthy. I'll get it right by the time Mayor Streeter comes back I think.

Alderman Lozeau

Yes, thank you. I would implore us that we develop some sort of strategy going forward from this point as far as least identify who we are looking for space for. Until we all agree, and I can't agree with Alderman McCarthy more that this Conway/Public Works garage has got to come to the table and it's got to come up for discussion because it is an intricate part about this whole thing. If Conway is, in fact, going to take over Public Works garage anywhere in the near future, then that should be on table from the get go. I know it has been mention, but there's all kinds of money sitting in a pot somewhere ready to go with the expansion of Conway Ice Arena. If we can get a piece of that money, that helps us make this decision of where we are going to go, and whether

we're going to add on to City Hall, or whether we're going to go to Burke Street or Riverside Drive. Whichever way go, we've got to know who we are looking for space for. Until we identify who we are looking for space for, how can we intelligently go forward. I would implore this Committee to at least identify today who we are looking for space for. Also stress that this Conway/Public Works place on Riverside Drive has got to come to the table and it has got to be discussed. Unless we do that, there's no sense of doing anything because that is a big, big piece. Geographics should have a lot to play with it. We've got to look 25, 30 years down the road also. Thank you.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you Alderman Lozeau. Before I go over to Alderman Dion, we'll hear Alderman Dion's comments and then Rick maybe you want to comment on what your comment is on both of these buildings. Chief if you wanted to come up and provide some comments as far as the police department's perspective that would be appropriate.

Alderman Dion

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Rick Seymour would probably want to make a statement after I get through with mine pertaining to the treatment plant and the wastewater money available for this property. I cannot disagree more with Acting Mayor McCarthy about this property. I worked at the Improved Machinery Corporation from 1952 to 1970 – 18 years. There was 550 people working in that plant. They came from every direction all these workers from Allds Street, Main Street, from the fountain street area. There was all kinds of traffic. There was steel coming into that building day in and day in that machine shop and that weld shop. A lot of heavy equipment coming down Burke Street. Burke Street is a pretty wide street, and it can take it.

As far as the heating is concerned in that building that Acting Mayor McCarthy talked about, I worked in that building. I worked in there for 18 years like I said. We had no problem heating it believe me. There was maybe a dozen ceiling fans generating heat. This building is about maybe 80 feet high, 60 feet high - whatever it is - blowing down. We were comfortable in that building and we had no problem with heat. Now probably Director Seymour would like to comment on what I said pertaining to money available for this purchase probably from wastewater because of the treatment plant abutting this property. I would like to listen to his comments pertaining to that. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Acting President Tollner

You're welcome Alderman Dion.

Rick Seymour

I think maybe to give an overview of all the different choices and the DPW's perspective on it would probably help everybody. As far as Ledge Street is concerned, obviously that is the most expedient and the least cost for the short term. Obviously disruptive to move the division out of that building at this point in time. We realize too that there are long-term needs. That's why when we talked to individuals that were looking at selling the Burke Street property, and when we did talk to Tommy Monahan about the potential swap, we did think that it was important that we looked at the advantages to moving into Burke Street. Obviously the property at Burke Street is very large. It's 21, 22 acres. It is adjacent to the river. So there are some advantages there. There's advantages, and I'll cap what Alderman Dion said about wastewater. There's potential there for expansion and room for expansion at the wastewater facility. Presently, we are building a weather facility at the wastewater plant. We have sufficient room for that facility, but we probably have no room for additional space at the wastewater plant. We've shoehorned this new process into it and designed it so that it fits on the existing site. Additional space in the future will probably not be available unless we can find process that will either piggyback on top of the existing process or that are so small that they don't really take up that much space at the site.

The Burke Street site is ideal for wastewater because there is a major interceptor that goes across the property. There's the north Merrimack interceptor that goes through and underneath the Burke Street property. So if there needed to be a treatment facility or some kind of chemical addition at that site, obviously if the City owned that property it would make it a lot easier.

One of the things too as far as wastewater, I'll stay with wastewater right now, is that there is a need for vehicle storage at wastewater, since we inherited the sewer maintenance program. So we have vehicles right now that are either stored at the Street Department, and they are pretty tight as far as vehicles are concerned. Also we have other vehicles that are being garaged outside. It would give us some ability to place those vehicles at the Burke Street property. I think that the Burke Street property would have to be look at very carefully before anyone made a decision to purchase it or to move the Division of Public Works into that building. One is that the facility is large. The old welding machine shop, whether or not it is structurally sound – we'd need to look at that, the roof and all. We'd need to make sure that the logistics of using that building as a Street Department facility made sense for moving trucks around, to storing trucks, to repairing trucks, and the like. Obviously, and I'm not going to talk for Paul Newman or Kathy Hersh, but the bus transit facility could easily fit in within the square footage. We looked at the square footage and we had plenty of square footage for both bus transit and Street Department, and potentially some pieces of Park & Rec. As far as the salt shed is concerned, we could leave the existing salt shed as is and use it as a satellite salt shed. It is a small salt shed and during the winter we are continually having to fill it. So we could look at a larger salt shed at the Burke Street property. Obviously that would cost money.

As far as the Street Department is concerned, the building on Riverside Drive right now has some problems and they probably could be fixed with a few hundred thousands. The doors are in bad shape. As far as heating is concerned, we don't heat the garages at Riverside more than 50 – 55 degrees. So there is not a huge amount of heat that you need to store trucks and truck equipment. You really need to heat the area where you've got truck maintenance. Even then, you don't need it that a warm of a temperature. Typically it's the office areas that are around 70 – 72 degrees.

There are advantages, obviously, to having consolidation within the Division. Whether or not the Burke Street property the office property is ideal to consolidate some of the functions of DPW I don't think we've answered that question. We could easily put in almost every function except for the Solid Waste Department. We could bring in recreation, probably the administration from park, traffic, engineering, administration, etc. So those would all fit into that building obviously with a lot more room left over.

There is some we think and we know that there is some hazardous waste material. There is some concerns about hazardous waste contamination at Burke Street. So we would definitely have to look into those. I think what I'm trying to say is Burke Street has a lot of possibilities. It also has a lot of things that need to be explored well before we decide to sign out a purchase on that property.

In regards to traffic, one of the things we tried to imagine is the amount of traffic in that neighborhood. We're talking about a Public Works Division that typically only works Monday through Friday. They don't work holidays. The highest number of vehicles that we would move out of that facility in a given day, at least DPW only vehicles would be 76. Usually on a normal day, we don't move all those out. The only time we would move out that many vehicles is during a snow storm or an emergency where we need to move the vehicles out. Being a neighbor of that facility over the last 15 or 20 years when I was at the wastewater facility, there was a lot of traffic. Alderman Dion is correct. There was a lot of traffic when it was a manufacturing facility, very large trucks, very large pieces of equipment going in and out. Obviously this kind of an operation if you moved it down there would have much, much less traffic impact on the neighborhood. There is a possibility, too, for using 3 exits or ways to leave the property could be done Burke Street or Arlington Street. Also if we could work an arrangement, we could also come out at Sawmill Road. Those would give us 3 means of exiting that facility.

There are some monies available as far as talking about money. If there was property that would be needed in the future for wastewater expansion, it would make sense for the Wastewater Enterprise Fund to purchase that property at the southern part of the section of property. If you've ever been to the Burke Street property, it is very narrow property that runs along the river. The southern portion of it – at one time they even looked at potentially putting a compost facility there, but we pulled back on the plans for that. That site is very close to the wastewater facility. It is probably about 30 seconds by car. A minute walk from the facility.

There are some savings that we might see if we were consolidated that facilities and shared resources, staff resources, possibly even some shared staff resources with Community Development especially in probably the front office area. One of the things too is we might look at some bulk savings with salt if we could get salt off of rail cars as Alderman Plamondon mentioned with the rail spur that is presently on the site. That is kind of an awful lot.

As far as Riverside is concerned, the facility next to the police department, I've been in there. I haven't been in there lately. Obviously if makes from the City's viewpoint to move the garage there, that would be quite an undertaking to build a City garage there on the property. That's a pretty small property. Obviously from a logistic standpoint – the best site right now in the City for the Street Department is where it is at. It's right off the highway, right off of the exit. It makes it a lot easier for us to move out in emergencies. If we had to move down to Burke Street, obviously we would have to reconfigure some of the ways that we get trucks in and equipment out during emergencies or snow storms. That's a lot of details in a few minutes. If you have any questions.

Chief Hefferan

Briefly, I want to qualify these remarks by saying this is certainly a cursory review of the 11 Riverside Drive position. We were looking to acquire it simply as something for the future. So we envision some expansion to address a number of issues. One of the most significant ones is that we have a growing employee shortage of parking in the facility that we currently have. We are looking to address not only the employee parking but also leased vehicles that we house. We continue to grow in that area with specialty vehicles.

We at some time envision that we would have to have an additional garage because some of the specialty vehicles that we currently have and are in the process of acquiring require that they be heated especially action vehicle, crime scene vehicle because of the chemicals and the necessary agents that they use to process crimes scenes. Those things cannot be subjected to extreme temperatures of heat and cold of winter and summer.

We are also through Homeland Security acquiring a \$236,000 command vehicle, which is about 40 feet long and will have a tremendous amount of electronic equipment inside of it. That vehicle should be housed inside at some point. Again, I will stress that these are long term. They are not something that is certainly looming in the near future. We also at some point envision a K-9 training area. We currently lease for \$1 one portion of the cemetery. We tried to acquire that property, but they were not interested in selling it to us. So we are looking for an area to permanent house our K-9 training facility. We also as far as the parking we are considering an impound lot. We have vehicles from homicides, fatalities, drug forfeitures and seizures that we currently house in the back parking lot that take up about 25 of the limited spaces that we have. We cannot release those cars because of their evidentiary value. AS a result of that, that consumes more time. We can't put these off-site because we have to stringently control the chain of custody so when it gets to court we can vouch for the fact that they have not been tampered with. So it's another consideration that we have.

With respect to the building itself, we were looking potentially at one small slice of that building if possible 5,000 square feet out of a 33,000 square feet that the building offers. We have an ever increasing evidence storage area currently in the building with approximately 60,000 pieces of evidence. We seem to bring in more than we

release. We have bicycles that we store at the landfill. We have found property that by law we cannot just dispose of. We have certain things that we unfortunately hold on to indefinitely if we don't find the rightful owner. We have things such as boats, canoes, motorcycles, appliance, and jet skis. Some of the larger items that we have a difficult time finding storage for. We also have record storage that we have since filled up one room in our new building, and now we are putting them in another portion of the building. These are just some of the long-term considerations that I have. We also store – we buy our tires for the cruisers by bulk. We get a good price that way. We have a difficult time storing those tires. All of the rear seats of our cruisers are withdrawn when we purchase a new car and a fiberglass molded seat is installed instead. When we trade those vehicles in, we need to reinstall those factory issues seats. So we store all of those as well as building maintenance equipment, lawn care equipment, and so forth. These are just some of the considerations that we have that we are enticing and looking at the 11 Riverside Drive property. Certainly its location situated directly next to us.

I would comment on one thing that was mentioned earlier. I had initially floated the idea back in January that I was considering in reviewing the offsite firearms training facility that we have. I've looked at that in great detail and got an assessment of the building, its condition, and the actual work that goes on. There is not another building or situation that is set up like that in the northeast. We have FBI, DEA, we have every federal State and local law enforcement agencies that comes to this one because there is nothing like this in the entire northeast. I have painstakingly reviewed that and it is my view that we should maintain that. I'll find ways to rectify the issues with respect to a boiler and some of the other maintenances issues if I have to do it through drug forfeiture. I'm convinced that we should keep that building because of its uniqueness to what it offers with respect to training, firearms training, defensive tactics, and all that we do that keeps the officers safe and avoids liability is housed within that one particular location. It would be difficult to transition that into Riverside Drive and be able to accomplish those same objectives. That's all I have. Any questions?

Acting President Tollner

Any question for the Chief?

Chief Hefferan

Thank you.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you. Maureen, maybe you can update. As far as Ledge Street is concerned, when do we have to make a decision on signing a new lease for that facility?

Maureen Lemieux

Thank you. Actually the lease expires on September 30 of this year.

Acting President Tollner

Of this year?

Maureen Lemieux

Yes. I have been in contact with the owner of that building throughout this entire process. I believe you probably all recall, if he were to continue to lease to us he was looking for us to take about 14,000 square feet of

space. We currently have about 7,000 square feet. I have told him that if we were to stay we would not necessarily want to double our space. I spoke with him again as recently as a week and a half ago probably. He is working on a proposal for us. He said that we could certainly be confident in knowing that he will definitely not kick us out if we haven't come up with an answer prior to that point in time. I don't think realistically we want to find ourselves in that situation. So we are certainly at a point where we need to make some decision. He is definitely willing to work with us. What he is formulating is whatever proposal he would want to put in front of us potentially for the same amount of square feet. He is trying to determine how many years he would want to do it and whether or not he would want an out so that if he did find a much larger tenant whether he would want to be able to give us some notice for us to leave. I know at least in the original proposal that he gave us when he was talking about the 14,000, if after a year or two of the lease – I forgot how long it was, if we were to move to City-owned space, he would allow us to have an out from the lease – not if we were to move to other leased space. So he is working on trying to come up with something that is reasonable for him, and then we will take a look at it and make sure that it is reasonable for us too.

Acting President Tollner

Is there anything in the lease now that provides us with a grace period? So the lease ends you said on September 1st?

Maureen Lemieux

September 30th, I believe.

Acting President Tollner

September 30th.

Maureen Lemieux

No. The lease that we currently have is really the final few months or what was the final four years of the Teradyne lease. So that's really how we ended up in the building.

Acting President Tollner

They have a few buildings Teradyne right now that are...

Maureen Lemieux

Right. But we really moved into the rest of their lease.

Acting President Tollner

Okay.

Alderman Cardin

Thank you. Certainly as the Ward 7 Alderman, I'm concerned about the neighborhood impact on Burke Street. However, I did live there 30 years ago on Burke Street. I remember all the cars going in and out of IMPCO and the big huge pieces of machinery that were pulled in and out of there. I raised my kids over there. It has quieted down quite a bit, but that's not to say that if the City doesn't move in there that someone else with a lot of traffic isn't going to move in there. I haven't been on the site. I missed the opportunity to take the tour over there but

from what Alderman Dion says it sounds like a heck of building.

The other thing that I wondered about is we talk about the permits, and people going from building or across town to get different permits, how far away are we from doing that on the internet or doing anything that is more centralized to getting permits? Any idea on that Director Lemieux?

Maureen Lemieux

Thank you. As I believe you all know we are currently working on the installation of our new web site. That should be up and running hopefully within the next month to two months. It will not take us a very long time to do that. We are certainly investigating the opportunities that the City could have as far as having people do motor vehicle registrations on line and a number of areas. At least of the meetings that I have attended with the different organizations that offer those services, right now I'm not sure we have found anything that does exactly what we are looking to do. I know one of them and I forget if it was egov or erench that we've looked at. One of them either does not take checks or only takes checks. The other one only takes credit cards. To have really one stop shopping for what we are looking for I don't know if it is out there and readily available.

As I believe most of you also know Director Hersh has certainly been moving toward trying to get the Community Development permitting process out to the web. We are currently working on that, but that probably is also at least a few months away. I don't know if that is being optimistic. I haven't been involved in those meetings. She would be much better able to answer you as far as the Community Development permitting process is concerned. None is this is moving as quickly as any of us would like to see it move.

Alderman Cardin

Well I guess my concern is that if we are looking for long-term space needs that this process in the near future should be in place so that people aren't running from building to building from one side of town to other sides of town. I don't think that really should be a major consideration when you are looking at this process. Can you tell me how much we are paying for rent at 165 Ledge and for the bus rental?

Maureen Lemieux

I believe the actual rent at Ledge is really about \$45,000 and that the other 20 that when we talk about the 65 I think close to 20 of that is actually the utilities and taxes and everything. I believe the rent itself is around \$45,000. The bus garage I want to say that the City's share – I know I had it on a handout that I gave all of you along the way when we were analyzing this, the City's share I believe is less than 30. Paul may know.

Acting President Tollner

Paul, do you know what it is? The City's share, Paul, is 25 to 30? Thank you.

Alderman Cardin

So certainly \$95,000 a year is something to consider in savings and in long-term obviously if they own it. It is more beneficial to the City than to lease it. That's really all I have. Thank you.

Alderman Deane

Thank you. I wanted to get into some of the funding numbers that I've heard kicked around. First off I want to go into the wastewater scenario that Rick had brought up. Since we have this new renegotiated plan that

reduced the overall cost of the project by what was reported as \$100 million, although we still haven't factored into the cost of repaving the streets now that we're not going – that were part of the original process. I had spoken with Rick briefly a while back about reducing the wastewater user fees. Rick explained to me that the way the negotiated plan is going with the current status of the fees that are being collected at the rates the users are being charged, we wouldn't have to borrow any money to do any of this new renegotiated plan. So I said that's good to hear. The users are going to be paying cash for the plan as it moves forward. Now I'm hearing that perhaps we can use some wastewater fees as part of a funding mechanism maybe to purchase as part of the funding mechanism to purchase Burke Street. Is that what you are proposing Rick? If so, what affect is that going to have on this new renegotiated plan where I thought **...end of Tape 1, side A ...**

Rick Seymour

...maintain a health balance within the retained earnings and equipment replacement fund in order to fund all the activities at wastewater, including the 10 year long-term control plan for CSOs. Obviously if we do allocate some funds towards purchasing some property, there are a couple of things that come into play here. One is that at some time and place we are going to have to purchase some property in the Burke Street area for our tank that is being installed near the Burke Street overflow. So it's not too far from where obviously where the Burke Street facility is situated.

One of the other things is that as part of some of the EPA grants that we received, we are required to do matching funds or at least in-kind services and any purchase of property will be considered as in-kind services. So if we purchased let's say \$500,000 worth of property as part of a Burke Street acquisition, then we could take that \$500,000 and consider that our match on the EPA money. Typically we have to match \$.45 to a \$1 on the monies that we've been getting through the SAG grants and the Army Corp. of Engineer monies. That would wash a lot of that out so you'd eventually have to purchase property anyways. That was concluded as part of the cost of the long-term control plan. So it may be or could be pretty much of a wash because you've got money that you know you're going to have to spend as part of the long-term control plan, part of putting in facilities as part of the long-term control plan. It is purchasing property. Also if you do purchase that property, you can also utilize that as matching monies for grants.

Alderman Deane

So if in fact this does come to fruition, the users of the system aren't going to see an increase in their wastewater fees because of this.

Rick Seymour

Hopefully it wouldn't. I mean if it did happen it might be something at the long end of our 10 or 15 year sewer fee plan. Right now the plan that we put forward about 2 years ago when we reduced the sewer fee is running pretty much where it should be. One of the key factors in that plan is that we garner an EPA grants, and we have been very successful within the last year or two to get annual EPA grants. We are also working with Army Corp. of Engineers to put together an agreement to work on the CSO program. Their involvement in the CSO program obviously stimulates interest by the Feds. to also add additional funds into the Army Corp. Army Corp. is going to be doing some of our management and engineering on the weather facility I talked about earlier. The more involved they are in the project, that's one of two avenues. There's the SAG grants, which is the grants that we get through the wastewater EPA funding. Then there's money that gets funneled through the Corp. Once the Corp. is involved in the project and actively involved, they become kind of an indirect solicitors for money through the Feds because the Feds want the Army Corp. to continue to work on a project. So hopefully they'll funnel money – I can't say what kind of grants we're going to always get. But we've been lucky to get between \$1 – 2 million a year. A lot of those grant monies were not factored into our long-term funding program because we couldn't guarantee that they were there. So we have that safety net that \$1 million that we did not

put into several years of the sewer user fee program because we felt that we were going to be getting grants. But we've been lucky enough to get them.

Alderman Deane

So it sounds to me like the reduction in the wastewater user fee that was brought in by this Board which wasn't as much as what was initially touted as the reduction people were going to see. It has actually worked out in the long run – to this date has worked out better not reducing inasmuch as the administration had previously planned which that is good news.

My other question is on the Public Works garage. I can't agree with Alderman Lozeau any more. What is going on with the ice rink? Are they waiting for us? Who's doing the negotiating Maureen? Who's talking to them? What's been talked about? I mean if we are going to commit that piece of property, I think the City – I enjoy the rink. I think it has worked to well for the community. But I'm going to have some trouble giving away or leasing that BPW garage space for \$1 a year. We had some costs associated with the moving. In fact, this does happen. That space at the garage sits on along with the relocation of the fuel pumps, the salt shed, and all those things of that nature have a significant value to them. It's not just a parking lot any longer. Now it's a building with other structures involved that would have to be relocated. Have you spoken with anybody or negotiated with anyone at this time?

Acting President Tollner

Could you live with a \$5 – I'm just kidding.

Maureen Lemieux

Thank you. Actually I don't know if anyone else around the room has had conversations recently. I want to say it's probably as long as at least 2 months ago since at least I was part of any conversations. The last time I was I was with the Mayor and I believe Director Seymour was in the room also. I want to say that was probably two months ago the last time that I was part of any conversation. So I don't know if anybody else has had any more recently.

Acting President Tollner

I think I can comment a little bit on that. I had a conversation it must be about 2 maybe 3 months ago. Probably after the conversation that the City. It was just a general conversation. Basically, I think Alderman Lozeau is right. I think before we make any decision between Riverside, or Burke Street, or anything else, I think we have to find out where our position is on that location. I didn't really get into any specifics. I do know that the parties that were interested in possibly working next to the rink were also at one time possibly interested in the Brady Sullivan property. I think that is an alternative. Again, I have not heard anything since. I don't think the City has heard anything since or Rick has heard anything since either. I do think that that is one decision we need to make before we proceed, and I think Alderman Lozeau is correct on that point.

Alderman Deane

You didn't explain your conversations. What happened? Are they talking about taking the land for free? What's the...

Acting President Tollner

We didn't even get into whether they were going to purchase that and, take the land, swap the land. There were

no discussions as far as money was concerned. At one point there was discussion that if a certain party purchased Burke Street, they might be willing to flip the property at Burke Street at a reduce cost for the property next to Conway. That was pretty much the extent of it. There wasn't any detailed conversations.

Alderman Deane

And we will look at the value of our property with the structures that we currently have on it as well as understanding what, if any, sort of communication was held with the State. I don't know if Rick is familiar with that. I think that was before his time when we put the fuel depot in over there and the State didn't have to...I don't know what sort of compromise that the State has done as well. I'd really like to understand that because that DPW property, garage, structures, all has a significant value to it especially the location.

My other question is, speaking of buildings, how are we doing with the Fish and Game with the State of New Hampshire about that building that we have out on Gilson Road?

Maureen Lemieux

Thank you. Actually the last that I heard on that – I know the Mayor's office has been in contact with I believe it's the Department of Safety that actually is utilizing that building at this point in time. They are certainly aware that if the State no longer wants that building, that the City wants to talk to them. I believe at this point in time they are still utilizing it. I think they only have a couple of boats in it. They don't have much in it. But they are not willing to turn it over to the City I do not believe. I know that the Mayor had a conversation with someone also fairly recently. I would say within the last two months on that.

Alderman Deane

Who was that someone?

-
-
Maureen Lemieux

I do not know. I can certainly find out for you and let you know.

Alderman Deane

So we have a beautiful building sitting out there that has two row boats in it. From what my understanding is we had an opportunity to take that building and we refused it. Absolute travesty.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. May I ask Mr. Seymour a question please?

Acting President Tollner

Yes you may.

Alderman Johnson

Traffic. How well does traffic work in that area right on Riverside Street? Is that a good area for the Traffic Department?

Rick Seymour

I may defer it to Wayne Husband or Susan Klasen on that one. Maybe Susan could come up and talk about any problems that we've had.

Alderman Bolton

When school gets out traffic doesn't flow very quickly.

Susan Klasen

I'm assuming you are talking about the intersection of Riverside and West Hollis?

Alderman Johnson

I'm talking about if you had to get up and leave your building. Are you happy where it is? Would it be an easy fix to move elsewhere?

Susan Klasen

In and out during the day on Riverside Street I don't see a problem. There is a surge of traffic when school lets out. It does back up beyond the entrance where the salt shed is, but that's for about a 15 minute time period. We've adjusted the signal timings to allow the traffic to flow out of that area as quickly as possible. But that is the only time of the day that I see a problem when I am there.

Alderman Johnson

Okay. I think you missed my point.

Alderman Johnson

I wanted to know how well do you work in that building over there if you had to move over to another area, are you better situated in that area centrally located or would Burke Street be just as easy for you?

Susan Klasen

I haven't been over to the Burke Street property. I do know that where we are today it is convenient being in that location being next to the Street Department. We just moved over there about a year ago. I was over at Ledge Street prior to that, and that was very convenient being in the same building with the Engineering Department. I don't know what the Burke Street property is like. Where we are now I'm satisfied with that if that is the question.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. Also I'd like to find out what that area on Riverside Street where the Street Department is what is the full assessment of that property is? I'm now willing to give anything away for \$1 again. There is a value to that and if we were to sell that property, it would be for fair market value. Because if we had to make any moves, I'm not willing to bond at this point in time. If we got enough cash on hand to make a move, that it wouldn't cost us anything that is one thing, but to float another bond at this point in town – I hear the argument about rent money is spent money. I wasn't on the Board when Ledge Street came up and why Public Works was moved over

there. I understand that there was crowding like there is crowding again now. But I wasn't on the Board at that point in town to come up with saying yes go ahead and rent. At this point in time, I understand the arguments. I understand why the arguments. I saw both buildings. Burke Street is a gorgeous building. It's got a lot of room to it. You could probably take all of City Hall and put it over there and it would be one-stop shopping and make this into a museum and charge people to come in and you'd make back your revenue. But that's not what the issue is. What can we afford these days. You can't buy a palace if you can only afford a bungalow. That's basically where we are at right now. It's not my money, it's the people's money. Riverside Street would help the police department. It would keep the barn over there, and it would keep everybody centrally located. To move everybody might not be the biggest cost effective way to go. I think we really need to see the analysis at this point in time on the cost to move everybody over to Burke or just keep everybody where they are and move just a small portion of City Hall or whatever you are going to move. Of course, is that area, does Conway expand with a swimming pool? And for what is the value of that land? What is the cost going to be back to the citizens of this City? There could be an argument that they are helping us, and that could be a valid argument, but the cost factor involved to move everybody and to buy. I think we really need to see what our land is worth because I don't think we're at a point to give away any more. Thank you.

Alderman Dion

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Originally we were going to – we were asked to discuss this at the Infrastructure Committee level. I spoke with President of the Board McCarthy at the time, and I told Mrs. – if you recall Brian, I said this is too important of a project for the Infrastructure that this be discussed and yet I think as a committee of four or five people that I think it is so important that I feel as though the whole Board should discuss it. He agreed to call a meeting this evening. I want to thank him for that because I think it is such an important issue that everybody on the Board should join in and discuss this instead of just at a committee level. I'm glad that we had this meeting this evening. I think this has got to be explored further. This is not something that we should drop like a hot potato. I think this is something important that if something can be worked out along the lines of the Conway Arena like Alderman Lozeau said, and also Alderman Bolton was saying about paying the \$50 – 60,000 a year rent. It gets to be pretty expensive at the end of an extended period of time like 20 or 30 years. I think the price is right. IF we can work out a deal, I think we should grab it. I think Director Seymour should probably have his engineering department or someone in the know check that heating system, check that roof and see what we are faced with if there is any major repairs that have to be done what the cost would be to our best so that we have all the cards on the table so we could discuss it and decide intelligently as to whether or not we should go forward with this project. I spoke with the Mayor that day we had the walk through about the possible deal with the Conway Arena, and he said it had possibilities but I've never heard from him since. I don't know if he discussed this at any length with the other parties. I have no idea whether any discussion happened. I hope something does happen because I feel as though this is an opportunity that if we don't take it, we'll be sorry later on in the long term. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Acting President Tollner

Thank you Alderman Dion.

Alderman Plamondon

Thank you. Actually I want to concur with a lot of points that Alderman Dion just mentioned. I won't reiterate them, but I share the same sentiments. Another point that was brought up was the heating. That was a concern that I had too. If you remember when we went there it was during the winter months for our walk through. It was actually quite warm in there. When I was speaking to the owners of the building, it is because of all of the glass there and the east/west facing. Once that sun comes up and is high in the sky, it really got pretty warm there. A couple ceiling fans, I think, would be beneficial. But that kind of impressed me. Also, this particular location traffic and neighborhood impact was brought up a couple of times. As Alderman Dion said, he has a lot

of experience there. I do too. My grandparents' house. I pretty much grew up there and over here on Elm Street. I was there almost daily. In fact, my family still owns this – the last residential property east of Arlington Street. It's in that commercial mix. I remember as a kid the number of trucks hauling steel, cars coming and going, it was very, very heavy. The impact, I think, would be extremely negligible compared to those days.

I also had a question I wanted to pose for clarification just to make sure that I understand to Traffic Engineer Susan Klasen if I might. I'll ask and then I'll get up from my chair so that she can use the mic. If I might through you Mr. President?

Acting President Tollner

Sure.

Alderman Plamondon

Sue, I just want to – if I can understand the question –

Acting President Tollner

She's not here. She'll be back for the Infrastructure meeting. I think she is going to check out Burke Street and she'll be back. Let me try and wrap this up. I want to thank everyone for their comments. Let me try and position this and then if the Committee of the whole agrees, Maureen if you could work with the different divisional directors that would be affected by this move. First and foremost let's tighten up some of the numbers around Burke Street, and Riverside, and Ledge Street. I think the City should have some conversations about that arrangement that Alderman Lozeau was discussing that some of us have had some brief conversations with. I'm sure the City has had more deeper dialog with those individuals. Then possibly you could report back to the Board of Aldermen, especially on those discussions around the Conway piece. I think we need to make a decision or come to some conclusion or some clarity on the Conway piece before some of us can move forward on whether it is Burke or Riverside. In those discussions we need to think of long term or both. Long term 5, 10, 20 years. Then when the President of the Board of Aldermen gets back, we can have another discussion. If you could have those conversations and get back to us say in a week or two weeks, we could possibly move forward. But just a little bit more clarity than what we have right now.

Maureen Lemieux

If I can just jump in. What I would also expect to continue is to negotiate back and forth with the owner of 165 Ledge because it sounds as if – and so correct me if I am wrong and redirect me if this isn't what you want me to do, it sounds as if whatever we do we would probably not be ready to move by September 30th.

Acting President Tollner

I think that is a reasonable assumption.

Maureen Lemieux

Okay. I will certainly continue at least to talk to him and bring back whatever proposals he may put toward us.

Acting President Tollner

Yes. Just the one piece on the Burke Street. We could move into the one facility at Burke Street if that ended up happening and leave that big building the way that it is for an infinite period of time. IS the rest of the

committee comfortable with that? Do you have anything to add Brian?

Acting Mayor McCarthy

I guess with respect to just getting information, there's some intangibles that I'd like to understand about the arguments that have been brought up. I first want to state I don't feel like I have a horse in this race. There's been a couple of proposals put on the table. I like one of them better than the others. I don't think some of them are to our advantage. I do want to know some more things about them. Some of the stuff we've talked about like the advantage of having a rail there. I'd like somebody to actually understand whether we could save any money on salt. I've got to tell you that the rail operations associated with trying to drop off a carload of salt at that facility and us offloading it are tremendous. I suspect when that site was in operation, that it owned a switcher engine that it used for moving cars around on the lot. It is much more difficult when I think that the single engine spur that is in there, is that correct Mr. Seymour? It is very difficult with a single engine spur to pull a car out of the middle of a train and put it on the spur. I don't think you are going to find that's something the railroad is particularly amenable to for the amount of traffic we would be putting there. We've got to look at some of those things if we are going to assume that there is some advantage to these things. Frankly, I think trying to ask the administration to go out and deal with the Conway problem is dodging the issue. That issue belongs squarely in the middle of this chamber. Whether we are going to sell, or lease, or give, or whatever City property to Conway Arena for expansion is solely the responsibility of this Board to make a decision on from a policy perspective. I'd hate to see us go very far with anything else until we understood the answer to that.

Acting President Tollner

I would agree with you Alderman McCarthy. What I was getting at was for them to formulate a position after discussion with developers on what the options were. Whether we lease it, whether we sell it, whether they buy it at market value, whatever they are going to do with it. That would play a major role and whether this board thinks that's a good idea. I think if it was for \$1, we may not think that was a good idea. If they were willing to purchase the property from us, people might look at it differently. That's what I was getting at.

Acting Mayor McCarthy

I will repeat that I believe it is incumbent upon this Board to make policy on that issue before the administration tries to go out and figure out a solution based around it.

Alderman MacLaughlin

Thank you Mr. President. It is interesting that Acting Mayor McCarthy would bring that up. It's actually a good segway. No matter what the Board might think, we still have a little \$9.5 million problem out there called the budget. At this time, I'm guessing – at least the voters in Ward 8, would not necessarily approve of us giving anything away at this time number one. Number two they really would be, I'm guessing – I haven't spoken with them cause I just heard this stated, that it may not be a choice of one property versus another. The other option it may be at this time neither. By the time we are done cutting the budget, City government may actually be a little smaller than it is right now. We kind of have to keep in mind as we move forward. Thank you.

Alderman LaRose

Thank you. What I need to understand is that if you are going to consolidate the Public Works into one office, in other words the Street Department, and so forth, and so on, how many square feet of space do they need? If the Community Development Division is going to leave City Hall, how much space are they going to need? Who is going to take their space? Those are the questions that I asked, and I need an answer for that. It seems to

me that if we are moving people around, we need to know the footage they need. We also need to know if somebody vacates City Hall, who takes up that space. How much space are they vacating? Thank you.

Alderman Deane

I don't want to belabor this any longer. I believe Mrs. Lemieux gave us a document that showed the domino effect of the different spaces as they became available and how different departments moved around throughout this building and outside of this building as well Alderman LaRose. That was quite some time ago. There is a document that already has that done.

Maureen Lemieux

Thank you. Actually Alderman LaRose if you need another copy of that, we'd be happy to furnish that to you.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN BOLTON THAT THE COMMITTEE RISE AND REPORT
MOTION CARRIED**

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DEANE THAT THE APRIL 13, 2005 SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF
ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Attest:
Paul R. Bergeron, City Clerk