SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COMMON COUNCIL
MIDDLETOWN CONNECTICUT

QUESTIONS TO DIRECTORS

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2020
6:00 PM

MINUTES

The Special Meeting – Questions to Directors Workshop -- of the Common Council of the City of Middletown was held in the Council Chamber of the Municipal Building on Monday, January 6, 2020, at 6:00 PM.

Present:

Councilwoman Jeanette White Blackwell
Councilwoman Meghan Carta
Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr.,
Councilman Darnell Ford
Councilman Edward Ford, Jr.
Councilman Anthony Gennaro, Sr.

Councilman Vincent Loffredo
Councilman Anthony Mangiafico
Councilman Edward McKeon
Councilman Eugene Nocera
Councilwoman Linda Salafia

Mayor Benjamin D. Florsheim – Chair
Corporation Counsel Daniel Ryan, Esq.
Clerk of the Common Council, Linda S.K. Reed
Sergeant –at-Arms – Officer Kurt Scrivo, Middletown Police Department

Also present:

Diversity & Equal Opp.– Faith Jackson, Dir
Finance – Dianna Doyle, Deputy Director
Legal – Brig Smith, Esq., General Counsel
Legal – Kori Wisneski, Deputy General Counsel
Health – Dr. Joseph Havlicek, M.D.
Planning – Joseph Samolis, Director
Public Works – William Russo, Director
Public Works, Christopher Holden, P.E., Deputy Director
Recreation – Cathy Lechowicz, Director
Water & Sewer – Joseph Fazzino P.E., Director
Barbara Knoll Peterson, Mayor’s Administrative Assistant

Absent:

Councilman Philip Pessina

Members of the Public: 3

1. Call to Order

Mayor Benjamin Florsheim calls the Question to Directors Workshop to order at 6:03 PM. He leads the public in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Clerk reads the Call of the Meeting and the Chair declares the call a legal call and the meeting a legal meeting.

2. Questions to Directors Opens

The Chair opens the meeting to Councilmembers for questions at 6:05 PM. The Chair reminds Councilmembers that there is a presentation at 6:30PM from the Legal Department regarding social media and the implications of the Freedom of Information Act. He asks that Councilmembers be mindful since this session is limited to 30 minutes this evening.

The Chair calls on Councilman Eugene Nocera.

Councilman Nocera asks Public Works Director William Russo. Nocera to podium. Councilman Nocera asks Director Russo to provide the background on the initiative to install new lights at Palmer Field.

Director Russo replies that Jay Silva, the consulting engineer, who did the structural evaluation of the towers at Palmer Field. He explains that, about a year ago, there was a guide wire at the left field tower snapped. He asked Public Works Deputy Director Christopher Holden and City Engineer Tom Nigosanti to look at this situations. Deputy Director Holden took this project and reported that they should do a structural analysis because: (1) they did not know why the guide wire was there; and (2) there were also guide wires attaching the baseball safety netting to the towers. The consulting engineer, Jay Silva, did all structural analysis for the Palmer Field rest rooms, the concession stand, and the decking, adding that everything
that is new was done by Silva Engineers. If the Council would like, Mr. Silva can explain the calculations, which deals primarily with wind speeds. Director Russo asks Mr. Silva to join him at the podium to explain the calculations and his findings.

Mr. Silva introduces himself as Silva Engineering of Willimantic, CT. He reviews aspects of the project. There are eight (8) light poles at Palmer Field. He explains that, as near as they can tell, they were likely constructed in 1963, approaching 60 years of age. They are welded steel with slip-fit connections; that is, the top piece slides into the bottom piece, noting that there are five (5) interconnecting pieces. Lights sit on top of that. There is a thorough inspection of the poles each being about 10 feet high. They measured all components, thickness of the seal, and documented conditions. The poles are generally in good conditions, considering their age. There are some rust spots, some paint is thin and can see primer behind it. On one particular pole by the concession stand, the anchor bolts are not completely attached and the pole is out of plumb. There are other issues with some of the other poles. There is a small grout pad where the poles sit above the concrete foundation. Many of the grout pads are cracked, noting that this is the general condition. There are issues with some of the lights. After the field work, in the office, they did a structural analysis of the poles. The Code requires that, based on this type of construction, 105mph wind speed. Based on the analysis, one problem that they found, particular with the two poles at first base, which are, for some reason different from all of the others, the seal was found to be too thin. What happens with that is that it will crimp before it will fail in any other way. It can be a sudden collapse, noting that, because of that, it reduces the capacity of those poles by quite a bit. If the steel was a little bit thicker, there would be a lot more capacity. In summary, going through the analysis, they found that the poles have a capacity between 76mph to a low of 44.7 mph. He reiterates that this means that the poles with the lowest capacity is about 44 mph compared to the best case of 76 to 77 mph, well below the 105 mph needed for these poles. The next step was to prepare the report with recommendations as to how to reduce the lighting and remove some of the catwalks, using more efficient LED lighting. The City contracted Musco Lighting, which subsequently came back with recommended lighting which would be effective for the field, but with a smaller projection than the lights that are now there. He explains that they reanalyzed the lights with the configuration and found that they could make. Three (3) poles work: Pole #1 at right center field; Pole #2 at center field; and Pole #8 at left center field. While these poles can work, there are significant deficiencies with Pole #3 and Pole #4, which are at 1st base and sit in front of the bleachers in an area which generally has a lot of occupants. The other poles with low capacity are along 3rd base. They discussed with Musco to see if there is any other way to reduce the lighting; however, it would not be efficient for the field. The recommendation was made to consider replacement of the lights.

Councilman Nocera refers to the structural assessment chart and being a “stats” person, he sees “red” all over the chart, an indication that it is below standard.
SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

SITE DESCRIPTION

General

The site includes a total of eight light poles located along the perimeter of the playing field. For purposes of this report, pole locations are identified based upon their location around the perimeter of the baseball field, and are numbered in a clockwise manner beginning with Pole No. 1, which is located in right-center field and terminates with Pole No. 8 in left-center field.

![Pole Map](image)

Figure No. 2 – Site Map

At the beginning of the investigation, SILVA was informed that these light poles were not likely purchased as new for use at this site. The poles and light fixtures are believed to have been originally installed at another (unknown) site(s), and were moved and installed to their current locations at an unknown time(s). No existing data sheets or design drawings were available regarding the poles and fixtures.

After determining the basic field data (size, shape, thickness, et. al.) of the poles, SILVA has concluded that there appear to be two basic pole shapes, and two types of light fixture attachments. For the purpose of this report, we have identified the poles as either a Type I or Type II pole, and the Light Fixture Attachments as either a Box Structure or a Mast Arm assembly system. A general description of these two pole and light fixture systems follows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pole No.</th>
<th>Pole Segment</th>
<th>Existing Condition ([F_y = 50 \text{ ksi}])</th>
<th>Modified lighting ([F_y = 50 \text{ ksi}])</th>
<th>Modified lighting ([F_y = 30 \text{ ksi}])</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 1</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Modified lighting reduces stresses in the Pole No. 1 below to below allowable stresses regardless of whether the steel yield strength ((F_y)) is 50 ksi or 36 ksi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 2</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Modified lighting reduces stresses in the Pole No. 1 below to below allowable stresses regardless of whether the steel yield strength ((F_y)) is 50 ksi or 36 ksi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 3</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 3</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>Plate Depth to Thickness ratio ((D/t)) exceeds maximum allowable at all splice locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Analysis of poles with the modified lighting is based on limiting the steel yield strength ((F_y)) to the maximum permitted to meet D/I requirement. Pole stress exceeds maximum allowable at all locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 4</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Pole overstress with modified lighting is due to abandonment limits which significantly reduce the allowable compressive stresses. Pole would be adequate if height of lighting is lowered by approximately 15 feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 5</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 3</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 6</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.39/2.0*</td>
<td>1.39/2.0*</td>
<td>Plate Depth to Thickness ratio ((D/t)) extends maximum allowable at Splices 1 and 2. Analysis of poles with the modified lighting is based on limiting the steel yield strength ((F_y)) to the maximum permitted to meet D/I requirement. Pole is overdimensioned at base and at Splice 2. * Indicates (steel hanger bolt) utilization ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 3</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 7</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>Level of overestress in Pole No. 7 with modified lighting dependent on yield strength ((F_y)) of the steel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 3</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole No. 8</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Modified lighting reduces stresses in the Pole No. 1 below to below allowable stresses regardless of whether the steel yield strength ((F_y)) is 50 ksi or 36 ksi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 1</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 2</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Splice 3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Silva replies, “That is correct.”
Councilman Nocera continues, noting that here are very few light poles in the “safe” area, adding that it can be inferred, based on this technical analysis, that this is a serious issue, which we were not expecting, but which need to be addressed.

Mr. Silva agrees that it is a serious issue, adding that the field and these poles are 60 years old. The poles are made of welded pieces, allowing the poles to rock back and forth with the wind. They fatigue. We check for cracks and know that there will be more maintenance in the future. Inspections will be needed on a more regular basis to be sure that the poles are not cracking and-fatigu ing. They will not have to worry about that in the near future with new construction.

Councilman Nocera asks if it is true that it is old technology with basket lighting at the top, which are heavy compared to what exists today, adding that these features add to the stress.

Mr. Silva concur s, noting that new poles are more efficient.

Councilman Nocera explains that they have new poles at Pat Kidney Field and they don’t look anything like what we have at Palmer Field. They are shorter and thicker and have fewer lights.

Mr. Silva notes that, if the City elects to keep the poles in place, they will need to address the issue of the netting, which is attached to the poles and provide significant force on the poles. He notes that this analysis does not include the force of the netting, adding that, regardless of what is done with the poles, they will need to address that issue, which will incur other costs.

The Chair calls on Councilman Edward McKeon.

Councilman McKeon (inaudible) cannot predict ... will wind knock over poles ... (inaudible).

Mr. Silva replies that the types of winds that we are talking about, no one will be in the field, noting that we are talking about 40-50 mph, so hopefully no one will be on the field. He notes that two (2) of the poles are relatively close to Bernie O’Rourke Drive and Route 66 (Washington Street) so it could happen. If it is during the middle of a storm there will hopefully not be many people around, but it is still a very serious concern.

The Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo states that his question ... this is just one field in Middletown with lighting and poles. He asks if the consultant has been asked to evaluate other poles at other fields other than this park (Palmer Field).

Mr. Silva replies, “No,” that this is the only park.

Councilman Loffredo asks if there is any reason. He asks Mr. Silva whether or not he was involved in anything dealing with lighting for any other park.

Mr. Silva replies that he understands that some of them are relatively new lights, such as the High School. Mr. Silva defers to Public Works Director Russo.

Director Russo notes that other poles are 15 years old and, thus, younger where, at Palmer Field, to the best of their knowledge, the Superintendent has reported that six (6) of the eight (8) (poles) were put in the late 1960s. With the age of these poles ... noting that at Hubbard Little League one set of poles is about 10 years old, the other a year old. At Country Club Road, they are new and, at Smith, newer, which is why the City did not ask for other analysis.

Councilman Loffredo notes that, at the parks which have been worked on, such as Pat Kidney and other for lighting, not a problem that you see.

Director Russo replies that they have 25 year warranties and, as the engineer has explained, different steel.

Mr. Silva adds that the poles are 15 years and younger. He explains that the Codes have evolved since the original construction at Palmer Field. The Codes 15 years ago are relatively similar to the Codes as they are now. If it was designed for the wind speeds back then, it would be okay versus something in the 1960s when they didn’t have a lot of the same information.

The Chair calls on Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr.

Councilman Faulkner notes that the resolution is to move $600K from Hubbard to Palmer Field. He asks what was being done at Hubbard for $600K.

Director Russo replies, as Councilman Faulkner may recall from hag served on the previous Common Council, the parks bond was put together by Mione & MacBroom, noting that it took almost 1 ½ years to do all of the analysis for all of the parks in town. They came to the Council and, as he may recall, most of the fields are synthetic turf. There was debate. They were told to take that park bond back and rework it. They had 30 days to do that and come back to the Council. He states that he believes that former
Councilman Thomas Serra requested that it be postponed for six (6) month. He reiterates that they had to rework all of the numbers within 30 days, which was almost impossible. They are taking this money from Hubbard Little League, noting that all of the work that had to do with the little league fields is done: there is new lighting, restroom upgrade, new fencing. All of the work there is done. He states that, usually, when we put together a bond there is a number; however, in this case, they were asked to put a number to every facility done when we put together a bond were asked to put a number to every facility, which was difficult.

Councilman Faulkner replies that, in other words, Hubbard Park is not losing anything.

Director Russo replies, ‘No, we are done.’

Councilman Faulkner replies that was his concern.

Director Russo adds that they meet with little league on a continuing basis to see their needs.

Councilman Faulkner replies that was his question. He asks if this lighting was something that was overlooked when Palmer Field was redone.

Director Russo replies, “No,” adding that, over the past three (3) years, there have been a couple of problems at Palmer Field. First, the scoreboard failed and it had to be replaced. Then, three (3) of the light towers had electric wires inside, which needed attention and had to be replaced. When he saw that guidewire, which is attached to the left field tower had broken, he went to Deputy Director Christopher Holden and had him look at it. The Deputy Director can back with the recommendation that they have a structural analysis done. It is no different than what happened on Main Street with the traffic control signals. It was originally built without the guidewire at the top. An analysis was done and the engineers recommended that guidewire go on top. He reiterates that, to the best of their knowledge, these poles were much different than they are now. If the Council approves this, at Palmer Field, you will see exactly what you see at Pat Kidney Field.

Councilman Faulkner asks if everything that is now there will be removed and is unusable, bringing in all new materials.

Director Russo replies that the consulting engineers are concerns with heavy gusts of wind up. The City has probably put 20,000 to 25,000 people in that park every summer, so, as the analysis shows, it needs to be addressed.

Councilman Faulkner replies that, if there is any chance of salvaging any of it that would be great.

Director Russo explains that Russo the whole thing will go to scrap when it comes down.

The Chair calls on Councilman Edward McKeon.

Councilman McKeon has a couple of background questions. He adds that it was discussed at Public Works, but he would like to share it with his colleagues. He asks how many are played at Palmer Field each year.

Director Russo replies that there are 50 to 60 night games, including football, baseball, Ahern Whalen, Legion, high schools, and CIAC finals.

Councilman McKeon states that, even if there are day games, leaving faulty poles will be liability.

Director Russo replies that, based on Mr. Silva’s calculations, yes. He continues, saying that he believes that Councilman McKeon asked him one more question: relative to the savings with LED compared to what is now existing, Michael Harris did the calculations as $44/hour at the meter, which is about $110 per game.

Councilman McKeon asks Director Russo if he knows the total savings of the top of his head: $44 from what.

Director Russo replies that, by simple math, if they play 60 night games . . .

Councilman McKeon rewords the question: what is the rate, $44 less than what.

Director Russo replies that it is $44 less per hour to burn the LED light versus what is there now.

Councilman McKeon asks what the current cost is now.

Director Russ replies that he does not know the electric cost at Palmer Field, but knows that they will save about $110 per game; night games times 60 games, noting that this will be the savings in the summer.

Councilman McKeon asks if Director Russo has any sense as to, out of those 60 games, how many people are in the stands, on the field.
Director Russo replies that it is his belief that they have 20K to 25K people in the stadium. Just the CIAC finals brings 6K to10K per for that one event, which is only six (6) games. He adds that they have football games, Vinal plays there as well as Xavier, American Legion almost every night, twilight games, Ahern Whalen kids play at night games. It’s a lot of people in that park.

Councilman McKeon notes that revenue is generated at the park. He asks if the City pays for the lights or is it paid by the people using the field.

Director Russo replies that it depends. American Legion pays for the field. Hartford Twilight pays to use the field. Ahern Whalen is a City league, which is paid for out of the City budget. The high school play there as part of shared services filed user agreement. Portland comes in for a couple of nights and pays. The technical school’s have a tournament there and pay. The biggest fee user is American Legion, paying about $4,200 per summer to use Palmer Field.

Councilman McKeon asks, for clarification, if it is $600K coming out of the parks bond fund; however, the total cost of the project is higher than that.

Director Russo replies that the total cost is $780K and, with that, is, as Mr. Silva explains, Musco is a State bid filed lighting company, noting that, with that, comes a 25 year warranty Musco as the City now has at Pat Kidney. Musco has done work all over town -- Xavier, Middletown High School, Wesleyan, Pat Kidney Fields -- so they are familiar with Middletown.

Councilman McKeon notes that Finance Director Carl Erlacher is not here this evening, adding that he is curious. He knows that it has to be done, but that he is worries that the City has other things . . .

Councilman Loffredo interjects, saying that Deputy Director of Finance Diana Doyle is here.

Councilman McKeon acknowledges that Deputy Director of Finance Diana Doyle is here. He continues, saying that he has spoken with Recreation & Community Services Director Kathy Lechowicz about some urgent needs at Crystal Lake and Veterans’ Park pool. He asks, if the City spends the money on this project, will these other projects just be pushed off or will we not be able to address those.

Director Russo replies that he does not think so, adding that, to date, the City has spent $15.4M of the $33.6M parks bond. They are looking at upgrades at Crystal Lake. The biggest project left is the multi-use trail. They have earmarked $4M for that project. There is a big push for the upgrades at Vets Park pool, adding a splash pad. All the summer kids are put out at Crystal Lake. He notes that these are the three (3) big ones that are left.

Councilman McKeon asks about Veterans’ Park pool, adding that he understands from Recreation Director Lechowicz that she has to tape up the side of the pool so kids don’t get injured. He asks if this is true.

(inaudible response.)

Director Russo replies that they are taking care of that before the season opens this year. He states that he wants to get a study done by Milone an& MacBroom to present to the Public Works Commission to see what options they may have with the pool and splash pad and other request that they are getting.

The Chair asks if there are other questions for this director or any other directors. Councilman McKeon indicates that he has a follow-up question for recreation Director Lechowicz on these issues, noting that he would like to be assured that, programmatically, that the City is addressing what we need to address. The City is spending this money and he wants to make sure that, from Director Lechowicz’s perspective, that the recreation needs are being addressed.

Director Lechowicz replies that she has no expertise in terms of safety and does not want to hinder that decision. She has made it clear to Councilmember and Public Works in terms of concerns with the pool and trying to get it addressed before this season. It requires major upgrades. Part of the timing is related to the bond and taking on more debt over time. She defers to her colleagues in Finance as to how taking on this expense may impact future expenses. One league, Ahern Whalen, does use Palmer Field. It is an important recreation league for older baseball players, who benefit. In terms of recreation priorities, Veterans’ pool is an area of concern to be addressed in the near term.

The Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo asks Planning, Conservation, & Development Director Joseph Samolis to the podium.

The Chair notes that Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr. has his light on. He asks if Councilman Faulkner has something on Palmer Field. Councilman Faulkner replies (inaudible).

The Chair calls on Councilman Eugene Nocera.

Councilman Nocera asks Public Works Director Russo to return to the podium. He suggests, given Councilman McKeon’s questions, that, at the next meeting, we look at the remaining projects because, in his estimation, we are still under, have the revenue to accomplish our projects. He asks that the Council go through the list together.
Councilman McKeon states that his concerns is, based on the warning from Finance Director Carl Erlacher, that the money being spent on these projects is not in a pile somewhere, but needs to be bonded.

Councilman Nocera concurs, saying, “Yes, we need to be careful.”

Councilman McKeon continues that it does affect what the City needs to pay back in terms of debt and will affect taxes. He reiterates that the Council needs to be careful and needs to prioritize. He notes that obviously this thing needs to be done without question.

Councilman Nocera states that they should look at this information to be sure that they are on target.

Director Russo states that Deputy Director of Finance Diana Doyle is in attendance this evening in Director Carl Erlacher’s absence. He explains that every project that he has starts in the Mayor’s office and then goes to Finance. He notes that every year he gives them what he believes are the expenditures they give every year we give them list of expenditures and Finance tells them yes or no, adding that they are in the loop on this.

The Chair calls on Councilman Vincent Loffredo.

Councilman Loffredo states that an item was brought to Economic Development Committee (EDC) from the Council’s last agenda (boathouse). He indicates that there are updates, it having been modified. He asks Planning, Zoning, & Conservation Director Joseph Samolis briefly to explain to the Council why this was done.

Director Samolis said he will be quick, knowing that the Council has a 6:30 PM meeting. He explains that EDC looked at information supplied to them, noting that Councilmembers all have a copy and it is on Granicus. The consultant from Tighe and Bond, Amy Vallencourt, attended, noting that she will be at the Council meeting this evening if there are lingering questions. In the information supplied to the Council, one question that came out at the last Council meeting was the economic impact of having a community rowing center. Councilman Faulkner asked that question. In the information supplied to the Council, there were a number of economic studies that the Building Committee undertook. One looked that the large boathouse idea and looked at the feasibility of it being self-maintaining long-term. They also did another economic study from Sport Facility’s Advisory, which right sized the boathouse based on user need and want. In that information, the boathouse was shrink to a 22,000 sq. ft. facility. At EDC, the Commission, looked at the proposal and said that wanted to look at the 4th as an option: a boathouse that is 22,000 sq. ft. based on the FSA recommendation to right size the boathouse. They went back to the consultant and asked them to include a 4th concept – D – which the Council has a copy of in the information as to the scope of work, which looks at a 22.00 sq. ft. facility based on the EDC’s recommendation. The fee structure came out to $28,000 for that additional work, slightly below the $30,000 being requested. He notes that they should be able to accomplish that 4th design.

The Chair calls on Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr., asking him if he has a question or if he is looking to call someone else.

Councilman Faulkner replies that was his question, noting that the Council has not yet heard anything as to impact.

Director Samolis replies that, based on FSA’s recommendation and analysis of the sporting events that do occur, as well as could occur with the added square footage, they estimated that the facility could generate enough revenue to be self-sustaining long term, bringing in over $1M annually, minus expenses of a couple of hundred thousand dollars each year. That would keep being rolled over into the program or into the riverfront. There is a positive economic impact not to mention the events that are down there on an annual basis, which bring revenue to the local economy.

Councilman Faulkner asks if residents will still have access to the community boathouse.

Director Samolis replies, “Yes, because it will be a community boathouse.”

The Chair calls on Councilman Edward McKeon.

Councilman McKeon states that he has a couple of questions and is willing to ask them during the regular meeting, which means that Director Samolis will need to stay to answer them should this be an issue with timing.

The Chair notes that it is now 6:34 PM. He asks Councilman McKeon if he has a sense as to how much time he needs.

Councilman McKeon replies that the questions are short and almost rhetorical questions. noting the he just wants to be sure. He states that the money that we will be spending is coming from the Economic Development Fund, which is in place and is not money . . . this is a situation where the money is in place.

Director Samolis replies, “Correct,” adding that is just money that we get from revenue and other economic incentives, which gets placed in this fund for dispersal as the Council sees fit.
Councilman McKeon asks, after this money is spent, what is the balance.

Director Samolis replies that he estimates “probably close to $80,000.”

Councilman McKeon asks, in terms of plans for the rest of the year, is that enough to deal . . .

Director Samolis interjects that they are going to, hoping to, hit that fund to do economic studies, potentially a new parking study. He notes that they will bring that quote to the Council to determine if it feasible to take from that account.

The Chair asks if there are any other questions.

3. Questions to Directors Closes

There being no further questions, the Chair closes the Questions to Directors Workshop at 6:36 PM.

4. Meeting adjourned

Councilman Eugene Nocera moves to adjourn. Councilman Grady Faulkner, Jr. seconds the motion. There being no discussion, the Chair calls for the vote. It is unanimous, with 11 aye votes (Councilmembers Blackwell, Carta, Faulkner, D. Ford, E. Ford, Gennaro, Loffredo, Mangiafico, McKeon, Nocera, and Salafia) to adjourn the meeting. The meeting is adjourned at 6:37 PM.
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