

# **August 8, 2000 - Regular Planning Board Meeting**

CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE

*PLANNING BOARD*

---

Minutes of August 8, 2000

510<sup>TH</sup> meeting

Present were: Messers. Ditraglia, Fisher, Gerstein, Medeiros, Poland, Sullivan, Jeanne Boyle (staff), James Moran (staff), and Tim Chapman, Assistant City Solicitor.

## **I. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBER**

## **II. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

### A. Minutes of April 11, 2000

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the minutes of April 11, 2000 were unanimously approved and made part of the Board's official record.

### B. Minutes of Special Meeting of April 25, 2000

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the minutes of April 25, 2000 were unanimously approved and made part of the Board's official record.

### C. Minutes of May 9, 2000

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the minutes of May 9, 2000 were unanimously approved and made part of the Board's official record.

### D. Minutes of June 13, 2000

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the minutes of June 13, 2000 were unanimously approved and made part of the Board's official record.

## **III. APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD CORRESPONDENCE**

None

## **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

### ***A. Public Hearing - Modification of Plans for Application #95-2, Hemingway Drive Sales and Service.***

Mr. Wilfrid Gates, Landscape Architect for the project whose offices are at 865A Waterman Avenue, East Providence, RI was sworn in by Assistant City Solicitor Chapman who also swore in the others affiliated with this project.

Mr. Gates explained that the proposed development for Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 51 Realty Corporation, 4 Hemingway Drive, East Providence, is on a parcel of land that was previously brought before the Board and was passed for Marshall Properties company for a series of their office type spaces that they have been doing in this particular neighborhood. He said that proposal was no longer before the Board. He stated the applicant has brought lesser use before the Board in that we have one user of a 17,125 square foot, one story building which will be of a very high quality architecture. Mr. Gates said Mono Die, for instance, was also done by the same people that he was working with on this project. Mr. Gates said we are not asking for any variances or any kind of deviations from an rules or regulations of the Zoning Ordinance or Planning Board. He explained that this is the headquarters and educational facility of Local 51 and will be used for meetings for the union, education sessions and classrooms. There is more parking than the actual square footage allows. He said we have been very careful to make sure we have adequate vehicular circulation all around the building and in fact even have an overflow parking area in case the owner wants to have a picnic or to play volleyball in the area. There is an easement along the southeasterly side of the site and while it is part of this site, it is not used in any of our calculations to preserve its value or perhaps some other development on the other side of the easement in the future. Even within that exclusion, Mr. Gates said we are well within the bounds of all the requirements.

Mr. Gates stated we are protecting the trees along the right-of-way to Route 114 at the Wampanoag Trail that this site backs up to and we intend to have a site development and building that is equal to and above the other architectural development in the area. Mr. Gate's stated that in Ms. Boyle's opinion this use was more than just an insignificant change to the previous proposal and even though it is a downsizing in intensity we felt and she felt we should be before the Board for proper action.

Ms. Boyle stated she would like James Moran to go through the staff report, but would like to reiterate what Mr. Gates said about the minor modification vs. the major modification. She said the Administrative Officer under the Land Development Project Regulations does have the authority to approve minor modifications, however even though this was a lesser intensity and did not require any variances, it was her opinion that it was such a departure from the previously approved plans that it was more appropriate that this come before the Board for action tonight.

Mr. Moran went through the staff recommendation. He stated the original development was brought to the Board in October of 1995, and because of the changes in the Land

Development and Subdivision Review Regulations and the fact that it was going to be heard after January 1 of 1996, it was required that the Planning Board be the primary body for reviewing this particular development rather than the City Council which was responsible prior to 1996. It was brought in as a two-phase development and as Mr. Gates has indicated Marshall Properties proposed a number of office space areas. Phase 1 has been completed. Mr. Moran said the applicant came back to the Board in 1998 to get an extension on the Phase 1 as they had not commenced construction for that particular development. They received their extension and have since built that first phase which is a very good looking development and an asset to Hemingway Drive. Subsequent to this, Local 51 has come in with a modification to the Phase 2 development. It generally represents a less intensive use with a smaller office area. The proposal has been reviewed by the Zoning Officer and he has found that the use is compliant with the zoning district at that location. As a result of the modifications, off-street parking will provide 50 spaces with an additional 37 overflow spaces that would be located on a grassed area and will serve as parking for special events that are occurring at the site according to the applicant's description.

#### Landscape Design

As indicated previously, this particular development exceeds all the landscape design criteria outlined within the development plan review application and regulations. All those general areas have been met.

#### Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Moran stated that this use is very much like the previous development in the way it looks and feels. The mixed-use category allows a number of uses and this use falls well within the parameters of the Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Department continues to feel that this development is in full compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Moran stated there were a few issues relative to the development that were not modified in the final plans that were delivered to staff. These particular items are referenced in several City staff memoranda including Steven Coutu's memorandum to Julia Forgue identifying several issues relating to waterlines and other utility issues that need to be updated on the plans. He said these were not provided on these plans, but we provided a recommendation stating that the Board create a condition that all these issues listed in the staff memorandum be updated. There was another issue that was identified through the Fire Department that a water service line should also be shown on this plan which is reiterated in Mr. Coutu's memorandum as well.

Mr. Moran stated the Zoning Officer had some issues relating to signage and also off-street loading which have been updated on the plans and these two elements have been included on these plans that were sent to us as updates. Mr. Moran stated that City staff believes this major modification is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that it is a well-suited use for that particular location and would recommend that this major modification be approved subject to the single stipulation that the applicant meet all the

conditions and technical requirements identified by City staff in their memorandum as attached to this recommendation.

Mr. Poland asked Mr. Gates if he had seen the recommendations of staff. He answered yes and agreed to all the recommendations stated in the staff memorandum.

Mr. Poland asked the Planning Board members if they had any questions.

Mr. Ditraglia asked Mr. Gates if the Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 51 are all in the same union or will they be separate.

Mr. Bill Turner, Business Manager of Plumbers and Pipefitters, Local 51 Realty Corp. was sworn in and stated the plumbers and pipefitters would hold their meetings around once a month. There would be about 100 people in attendance for an hour or two. At night when the school is running there will be around 35 to 50 people attending. During the day about 8 to 10 people. The hours of the school will run 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. or 6:00 to 9:30 p.m. The Saturday class would run from 8:00 to 12:00 p.m.

Mr. Poland commented this will be a nice addition for that area and believes they will do well.

Mr. Sullivan asked if there would be any gases or explosives in there. Mr. Turner answered there would be a welding truck, and that anything inside the shop is safe and has been inspected and approved by OSHA.

Mr. Medeiros asked if the reason why they expanded their program was because they expect bigger and better things in RI and Massachusetts? Mr. Turner answered yes.

#### Public comments

Mr. Poland asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

#### Motion

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher the Board voted to approve the major design modifications as proposed subject to the following condition:

1. That the applicant meet all applicable conditions and technical requirements identified by city staff memoranda as attached to this recommendation.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. Ditraglia            Aye

Mr. Fisher                Aye

Mr. Medeiros           Aye

Mr. Sullivan           Aye

Chairman Poland       Aye

***B. Application #96-7 Request by Mr. Ron Rodrigues for final release of the improvement guarantee of the Mason Street Subdivision.***

Ms. Boyle explained that this is a request for a final release of the \$3,000 being held for the Mason Street Subdivision. This request was referred to the Department of Public Works and staff has reviewed it as well. The Department of Public Works has recommended that the final \$3,000 be released. The remaining items had been the as-built plans and also work to a driveway for an abutting property owner. She said the Department of Works states this work has been successfully completed and the performance guarantee should be released in its entirety. The Planning Department concurs with that recommendation.

Chairman Poland asked if there were any questions by the Board. There were none.

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher the Board voted to release the final \$3,000 of the improvement guarantee of the Mason Street Subdivision.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. Ditraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher              Aye

Mr. Medeiros           Aye

Mr. Sullivan           Aye

Chairman Poland       Aye

Mr. Ron Rodrigues, the applicant thanked the Board.

***C. Application #96-9 Request of partial bond release for Seaview Estates.***

Attorney Martin Sleprow, attorney for the petitioner was sworn in and stated that he is aware of the recommendation from the Planning Department based upon the recommendation from the City Engineer that the bond be reduced from \$213,000 to \$100,000 and agrees with that recommendation. He stated Mr. Larry Smith is present and would like to discuss the detention pond.

Mr. Larry Smith of 450 No. Broadway was sworn in by Assistant City Solicitor Chapman. He stated that the detention pond was designed to CRMC standards. It is not a direct outfall but below the bottom and when it was first installed we took some time measuring. At that time it was a slow drawout and CRMC no longer wanted it to come in and go out. Mr. Smith said that he would get together with Steve Coutu about the grading of the pond so that all the water does not drain into the low points.

Ms. Boyle asked what the differential between one of these drawn out detention ponds vs. a normal detention pond. Mr. Smith answered they take about four or five times longer to drain. He stated that CRMC two years ago made up a new set of standards for detention ponds. Ms. Boyle asked how long it would take to drain after a typical storm event for this pond to drain? Mr. Smith answered two days. Mr. Poland asked Mr. Coutu if this was correct. Mr. Coutu answered you have to go back to the calculations and when the flow goes through the basin, but believes that CRMC has a period of time that it should be more than a 48 hour period of standing water.

Mr. Sullivan stated he has witnessed the detention pond at its maximum and asked Mr. Smith if it is at its maximum level does it only take two days to dissipate? Mr. Smith explained that the outlet structure has an overtopping so that if there is a second level or additional level beyond the only flowout of the top. The old detention pond seems to have a positive outlet, but they had done away with it. Mr. Smith continued to explain the way the water goes out, and said some of the water goes into the ground and cove.

Mr. Coutu stated that the new design for detention ponds is to design them for water quality aspects and discharge the water into the cove. He said we are also looking at the standing water issues because of the mesquito concern. He stated it is important that it run properly because of these concerns. Mr. Poland asked if it was installed properly. Mr. Coutu stated he would have Mr. Smith take a look at it. Mr. Poland asked if the money were held by the City would it be enough to correct any problem with the detention pond. Mr. Coutu stated yes he is satisfied with the amount being held.

Mr. Ditraglia asked Mr. Smith if the detention pond was gravity fed into the place where it drains out and if the pipe is large enough itself to withstand the amount of water coming out. Mr. Coutu stated he is not sure yet, but that the regrading of the pond itself would be sufficient.

Mr. Medeiros asked Mr. Coutu if the detention pond will get clogged up with material or is it a self cleaning type. Mr. Coutu stated there is a maintenance schedule and the City is responsible for maintaining it.

Mr. Poland stated he read the miscellaneous work and asked if he is stating that they put in too many plants and need to take them out? Mr. Coutu stated the Parks Superintendent looked at the plan submitted and noted every plant species out there were in different locations. Mr. Coutu stated he is meeting with the developer this week to resolve some of the issues. He stated he is basically accepting everything that is out there with the exception of a few plantings. He stated there are no major issues regarding the plantings.

Mr. Fisher asked if there were funds set aside by the developer in order to maintain this. Ms. Boyle answered that we have set them aside on a lot of them, but not on this one. Ms. Boyle stated that the Public Works staff had the same recommendation for detention ponds on this one as well as the others that have come up in the past. She stated the reason why this one was treated differently was because of considerations or the donation of land by the developer for a park.

Mr. Poland stated he took a ride through there and noted how nice it looked. He asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

On a motion by Mr. Ditraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board voted to approve the request to reduce the improvement guarantee from \$213,000 for the Seaview Estates development to \$100,000.

#### Roll Call Vote

Mr. Ditraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher               Aye

Mr. Medeiros           Aye

Mr. Sullivan            Aye

Chairman Poland       Aye

#### ***D. Bridgham Farm Subdivision Bond Reduction, Applicant: Christopher Morra***

Ms. Boyle explained that this is also another request for a reduction in bond. The request was initially submitted as a request for final release, however upon review by the Department of Public Works a number of outstanding items were noted making it impossible to recommend final release.

Ms. Boyle said at the time the package went out to the Planning Board, we did not have any calculation on the amount of money associated with the outstanding items. Subsequently the Department of Public Works has prepared a calculation for a partial release. At this time Ms. Boyle reads from City Engineer Coutu's memo dated August 8, 2000 to Julia Forgue. She stated: *"As requested by the Planning Department in anticipation of a partial bond reduction request for the August 8, 2000 Planning Board meeting, I have calculated that \$15,000 should be held by the City for the completion of the outstanding items related to the subdivision. These items are identified in a previous memorandum as the following: driveway aprons, street trees, granite bounds, as-built drawings and final cleanup"*. Ms. Boyle stated that in light of that memorandum from the Department of Public Works, the Department of Planning recommends a partial release of the Performance Guarantee reducing it from the amount of \$60,000 to the amount of \$15,000.

Chairman Poland asked Ms. Boyle if any of the items listed in the letter to Mr. Morra been completed? Ms. Boyle responded that the work had not been completed yet to her knowledge.

Mr. Christopher Morra, 21 Morra Way, East Providence was sworn in. Mr. Poland asked Mr. Morra if he objected to the performance bond reduction from \$60,000 to \$15,000? Mr. Morra answered yes. Mr. Poland asked Ms. Boyle if there were any cost figures? Ms. Boyle said generally we do not get an itemized number, just an overall number.

In regard to the street tree planting, Mr. Poland asked if there were a lot of trees that were not planted. Ms. Boyle stated the plan notes the trees that are missing or dead. Mr. Coutu stated the last number he received from the Parks Superintendent was 34 of the 56 required trees are acceptable, but that there are a number of trees that are dead or were never planted in the first place.

Mr. DiTraglia asked Mr. Morra if he know why the trees were not planted? Mr. Morra stated they did plant all the trees. In looking at the map he said that one tree was removed on the left hand side island where the plan states it is missing. It is missing because the neighbor could not swing into his driveway and they had to remove it. The other one had died and the rest of the six died. Mr. DiTraglia asked if he could replace them. Mr. Morra stated he had his landscaper plant the trees according to the diagram. They have a one year guarantee on trees and since it is three years later he does not feel obligated to replace them. Ms. Boyle stated the guarantee on the trees is between the landscaper and the developer. She said the City does not take ownership of this street until all the work is completed and signed off. She said most of these subdivisions have a fairly long timeframe from the beginning of construction to the time that the final release is done. The Picerne subdivision is an example of that. At the time that it is dedicated to the City, the City expects that street trees be healthy according to the original plan. Mr. Poland asked if there is anything in the ordinance about this after it is turned over to the City. Ms. Boyle answered she did not think so. Mr. Morra stated in the Subdivision Regulations it states it is just a one year guarantee from the time the trees are planted.

Mr. Robert Sousa, 14 Danforth Avenue, Massachusetts was sworn in and explained about the trees and when they were planted and replaced on June 2, 1998 because two had broken. He said we stopped maintaining them on June 15, 1999. He said we took care of some of the trees for 19 months after they were planted. He said a couple of them got hit by the trash trucks and that is why they died.

Mr. Sullivan stated since the developer and the landscaper are putting the trees, they are responsible for them until the City assumes responsibility for the properties, and asked if it wasn't the responsibility of the developer and landscaper to make sure these trees stay healthy?

Ms. Boyle responded that she is not sure where Mr. Morra saw in the Regulations that there is only one year guarantee on the trees. She said Section 10-7 of the Regulations states that: *"the Planning Board may require that a maintenance guarantee be provided*

*by the applicant for all improvements which are being dedicated to the City for a one year period subsequent to the completion, inspection and acceptance of the improvements.* The City has not signed off on this yet and stated it would be staff position that that period has not commenced. Ms. Boyle also stated that the other section which is Section 13-11A and B notes: *"that the trees may be planted prior to or at the completion of building in the subdivision"* and if the developer desires, they could deposit funds with us so that we can do the procuring and the planting of the trees too. Ms. Boyle stated that until all of the performance guarantees have been signed off on, the subdivision is not turned over to the City of East Providence. She stated the one year guarantee from the date of the actual completion is not even mandatory, that is something that is at the discretion of the Planning Board under Section 10-7.

Mr. DiTraglia asked if the City inspected the trees when they were being planted. Mr. Coutu said yes, and they were fine. Mr. Coutu stated there were a number of trees planted in the fall of 1997, they were checked by the Parks Superintendent, and it is noted in the memo that there were 33 trees planted at that time. Mr. Coutu stated the plan calls for 56 trees. He said the Zelkova trees were an issue so they decided to plant those later in the following spring. A number of them were planted, but there were only 43 trees planted at that time where 56 were still required.

He said subsequent to that time in April of 1998 several died. Mr. DiTraglia asked about the initial planting and if everything was planted and alive at the time of the inspection. Mr. Coutu said yes. Mr. DiTraglia asked if the Parks Superintendent asked why the remaining 13 trees were not planted at the same time. This question was not answered. Mr. Coutu stated he had written a letter to Chris Morra telling him of the inspection. At this time, Mr. Sullivan said what we need to find out is if the City is responsible for the trees or is it the developer's responsibility since the subdivision has not gotten final approval? He said if the City is not responsible, then let us drop this whole conversation

Mr. Poland stated he agrees with Mr. Sullivan. He asked Mr. Morra if there were 56 planted? Steven Coutu stated he will check on the Pear trees with the Parks Superintendent and said they were not part of the original approval.

Mr. Poland stated there are 11 trees unaccounted for.

Mr. Poland stated back three years ago there were already trees in this area because it was a treed area. He said at the time of the Board's meeting, there was a question that came up that the trees that were already there should they be counted towards street trees if they could be saved. The Parks Superintendent stated he went out there and marked which ones could be saved and which ones could be taken out or should be taken out and then they would adjust the number of the trees. Mr. Poland said while there might have been 56 on the original plan that was pending an agreement between Mr. Morra and Mr. Gammell exactly how many trees would be planted.

Mr. Poland said he recalls three years ago that the City was going to save some of the trees and that some of them were going to be marked. He said that Mr. Gammell at the

time said there were some trees that were too close to the street and when they dug for the utilities, the roots of those trees would be damaged. Mr. Poland said he recalls that Mr. Gammell had recommended that those trees be taken down, but that Mr. Morra did not agree, but then they did agree to go out there and go over that. Mr. Poland stated he did not know how many trees at that time were supposed to be planted.

Mr. Coutu said that the plan states 56. Mr. Poland stated yes, but that was subject to how many they could save. Mr. Poland stated that at that meeting the Board did not have an indication of what trees could and could not be saved. He said he remembers that three years ago we spoke of saving those trees and asked Ms. Boyle if she recalled this. She answered yes and stated that we they went out there they found that it did not work out to save those trees especially the ones in the island.

Mr. Poland asked the City Engineer if the amount of money its going to take to fix the landscaping is included in the \$15,000? Mr. Coutu answered yes. Ms. Boyle stated the figures correspond with the sketch that was submitted by the Department of Public works. It appears to show 56 trees on the sketch and presumes it is consistent with what the Parks Superintendent has submitted to us on a more finalized basis. Mr. Poland is asking if were are supposed to have 56 or 45 trees. Mr. Coutu stated that the earlier memoranda that he received from Mr. Gammell back in 1997 stated that 33 of the 56 had been planted and that the spring of 1998 when additional trees were planted he notes that 44 had been planted of the 56.

Ms. Boyle asked Mr. Chapman if he had reached a conclusion in reading Section 10-7 of the Regulations. He stated it is up to the Board in that they would have had to be accepted previously which would mean all of the trees, than the issue is moot, but if they had not been accepted and these improvements are being dedicated to the City for a one year period subject to the completion and inspection. He said it is incumbent on this Board to decide whether they are going to accept the trees as is or require that they not be accepted and further completion done before the Board accepts.

Mr. Coutu stated he would accept the ones that were there. Mr. Sullivan said the Board never accepted the trees, but that the Board acknowledged the trees that were in the ground back then. He asked Mr. Poland if the Board had accepted the subdivision as yet. He answered no. Mr. Sullivan said than if nothing has been accepted, why should we accept the trees when the contractor is still working on the property?

Mr. Poland stated he felt the trees should have been put in at a later time that at the beginning of this project to insure that they would have been safe against any of the contractor's equipment going in there and damaging the trees or other possible ways they could have been damaged.

Mr. Coutu stated as far as missing trees, the trees were there and now they are gone. Mr. Poland stated there were 11 trees that were never put in and what we do not know if those 11 trees were to be substituted with some existing trees.

Mr. Fisher asked about the number of trees on this particular plan. Ms. Boyle said 46. The figure of 56 includes the plant schedule including the Forsythia. She read from the note on the plan through May 8, 1997 that the trees planted per Parks Superintendent requirements will be depicted on as-builts. She stated there are inconsistencies between the plans that were approved. There are 56 trees depicted on the plant schedule and the other plan shows 46.

Mr. Morra said when he first submitted the plans before Mr. Gammell had approved it. He said they planted twice as many trees as required by the Regulations and the regulations stated you need a tree every 50 feet. The cul-de-sac and the main street is 1150 feet. He said the plan that was agreed on by Mr. Gammell was for 46 not 56 trees. Mr. Morra said he agreed to let Mr. Gammell come out and see what damage had occurred with some of the trees.

Mr. Morra stated he asked Ms. Boyle to give him a list of what was accepted back then so they could avoid this discussion this evening, but stated he did not receive the list and it was not until this evening that Mr. Coutu provided the Board with a list of how much money to hold back.

Mr. Morra said he applied to have this hearing on April 27, 2000 for the bond reduction, you indicated you received it on May 2 and here we are on August 8 having this hearing. Mr. Morra stated there is a report where Mr. Coutu stated there were 33 trees present at a minimum when I was given my first release. He stated he wants a copy of where those trees were and said if those are the trees we are discussing, those trees were accepted back in 1997. If they were accepted, he stated there is a one-year warranty on them. Mr. Poland stated of the 33 trees that were there, it was probably all of the Zelkova trees that were not planted at that time and all the trees that were damaged are probably Zelkovas.

Mr. Poland stated we are talking about 8 trees which are valued at about \$250 to \$300 a piece installed. Mr. Coutu read from the memorandum that accompanied the sketch that was entitled "Bridgham Farm Subdivision Tree Report dated May, 2000" It stated 34 of the 56 required are accepted as of May 3, 2000.

#### Driveway Aprons

Mr. Coutu stated that the plan notes that the driveway aprons were shown on the plan. Ms. Boyle stated the Regulations call for the subdivision to be built as shown on the plans. The plans are part of the stipulated approval. Mr. Morra stated he has a letter from the surveyor that he installed all the bounds except the two that he could not install because they were stone walls for which he had to install drill holes.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Morra about the 16 granite bounds being in and the two drill holes. He answered that the surveyor stipulates there are 19 points indicated on the plan, one is an existing stone bound with drill holes, 17 are stone bound with drill holes that were set. One is a drill hole set in an existing wall on Bridgham Court. The surveyor claims they are all installed. Mr. Morra asked the surveyor to send him a letter on this. Mr. Morra

stated in this letter that he'll have it completed by August 18. Mr. Morra said anything that I have not done that I am required to do I expect the Board to hold.

Mr. DiTraglia asked Mr. Morra if he had any problem with the staff conditions in the memorandum. Mr. Morra said he did not have a problem with the as-built plans, and they will be submitted on the 18th. Mr. Morra said once I submit them, then it can go and be released once they are accepted.

Mr. DiTraglia asked Mr. Morra if he understood that the bond was not going to be released until the conditions of the staff memorandum are met. He said he understands and that is why he is only asking for a partial release.

Mr. DiTraglia states that he would recommend that this whole matter be deferred to next month in order to get everything straightened in writing.

Mr. Poland asked Mr. Morra if he would be willing to post a certified check for the \$15,000. Mr. Poland asked if we could get a report in from Mr. Gammell before the next meeting about what is there and what he agreed to at the time of the development. Mr. Poland stated he thought Mr. Morra was responsible for the Zelkova trees. Mr. Poland stated he would have to work out the remainder of the trees with Mr. Gammell. Mr. Morra agreed.

In regard to the lot cleanup, Mr. Morra stated the rest of the lots are now cleaned up.

Mr. Poland asked Mr. Morra what he did as far as providing electrical service of the two houses that are serviced by the electric line.

#### Electric Line

Mr. Poland explained that before this subdivision went in, there was an electric line that runs on Pleasant Street that services three houses within the area. Mr. Poland said that on Mr. Morra's plan, it states that he would remove the wires upon an agreement with one of the tenants because one was a partner and the other was Mr. Morra that was serviced by this wire. Mr. Morra said that as a courtesy to Mr. Ley I let him know that I extended an offer to the people of the three homes there. They could tie into an underground service. He said we offered to let them tie into the lines and put the trench in for them, but they chose not to do it because of the expense. He said the plan note states "*to be removed upon acceptance of an agreement between the owners and the Leys.*" No agreement was ever accepted. Mr. Morra stated he did provide a conduit which goes all the way to their house which ends at their foundation. Mr. Morra said he installed this. Mr. Poland asked if they did the electrical work. He answered no, they never completed the job from then on.

Mr. Poland stated that Mr. Morra explained this to him one day when he had asked him about it. Mr. Poland said that Mr. Collard was also asking him about it and he wanted that answer to be on record that we had talked about it before.

Ms. Boyle said she asked the City Solicitor to provide an opinion, but that he was not able to provide it for this meeting. It is not one of the items being listed and calculated in the \$15,000. She said by the next meeting we should have an opinion from the Solicitor, but the Department of Public Works has not included it in the \$15,000 that is being held.

Mr. Poland asked if the Board members had any questions.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the driveway apron. Mr. Poland answered it is the piece of driveway that is in between the concrete sidewalk and the edge of the paved road, about 12 or 18 inches. He asked if the 18 inches was part of the road. Mr. Coutu stated it is part of the sidewalk and the roadway connection. Mr. Poland asked if it would normally be done with asphalt or cement in other subdivisions. Mr. Coutu stated it could be either/or. The plans show it is cement concrete.

Mr. Sullivan asked if it is compulsory for the developer to put it in? Mr. Coutu states it is on the plan submitted by Mr. Morra.

Mr. Morra explained he does not allow asphalt driveways in there and noted it is in the covenants and stipulations that there be no asphalt. He said they are just showing that all the driveways would be concrete. And that every driveway that has been put in the owner has paid for it. It matches the driveway and you do not put it with the sidewalk. He said what we are showing on the plan is typical of what the driveways look like. Mr. Morra stated there is nothing that states in there that we are going to do it. When the owner puts their driveway in they are going to put it in whether it be red brick, cement, or whether it be gray slate. He said you do not do it at the time you do the sidewalk. Mr. Morra stated that in the memorandum its is noted to be a concrete sidewalk, the driveway opens. He said we left out the bridge that crosses the driveway. and noted when I tried to get the road paved last year, Mr. Coutu told me I had to get that done before he would let me pave the road. Mr. Morra said he told Mr. Coutu he did not think it was smart to do it because when they go to do the foundation, they will run over the opening and crush the driveway, the sidewalk area will run through the driveway and they would have to pay to break it up and put it back in. Mr. Morra stated we extended the wire mesh so that it would go into the driveway and into the apron. Mr. Morra stated it was all decided back then and was never held in the previous release. He said he just wanted to clarify this tonight that it is not his responsibility to do that.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Morra if he was in agreement for a reduction from \$60,000 to \$15,000 at this time and if he chooses to post a certified check vs. to maintain the bond. Mr. Morra stated yes.

On a motion by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. DiTraglia, the Board voted to accept the recommendation from the Department of Public Works that the bond be reduced from \$60,000 to \$15,000 for the list as stated in City Engineer Coutu's memorandum dated August 8, 2000.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia	Aye
Mr. Fisher	Aye
Mr. Medeiros	Aye
Mr. Sullivan	Aye
Mr. Poland	Aye

Mr. Poland commented that he would like Mr. Morra and Mr. Coutu to work this out before they come back to the next meeting and if they cannot work it out, the Board would like a full report from Greg Gammell, Parks Superintendent similar to the one he did for Seaview Estates Subdivision including what is already there, what is extra, whether or not he is going to accept those pear trees etc., the bounds of the property, the driveways etc. He said to Mr. Morra if he decided not to put them and if the City still requires them, then it will be up to the Board at the next meeting.

***E. 2000-2006 Capital Budget and Six Year Improvement Program***

At this time, Ms. Boyle introduced Ms. Melissa Kaplan, Planning Intern and noted that Ms. Kaplan volunteered to take on the Capital Budget because she expressed an interest in how the budgeting process works.

Ms. Kaplan went through the staff memorandum. She explained that there were two copies of the Recommended Capital Budget submitted. One of them was an earlier draft and it should not have gotten into the packet. She said the difference between the final one and the other one is that under Highway Division the listing for a Three Wheel Street Sweeper for \$92,000 is not in listed in the first draft, but it is in the second one and that is the one the Board should be reviewing. Also she explained noted that in the Highway Division column there should be four items in the correct version. She noted these would be corrected in the final form.

She went through the staff memorandum of the Capital Budget and the Six Year Program which states that the Department of Planning is recommending a Capital Budget of \$1,563,667 for Fiscal Year 2000-2001. Based upon the City Departments requests of \$8,014,417, note that the minimum amount for eligible capital items was raised from its previous level of \$10,000 to \$25,000. The total funding requests for all City Departments and divisions including water and sewer is \$49,256,217. Of this total \$25,192,867 is proposed to be funded from the City's Capital Budget, \$2,750,000 from the proceeds of the 1998, 1999 Bond Referendums, \$12,713,300 from a future bond issue and \$8,994,050 from other funding sources. According to the American Planning Association a municipality should expend at a minimum between three and five percent of its previous operation budget for capital projects. For Fiscal year 1999-2000 the total amount of city operating budget was \$32,655,231. Therefore capital expenditures should at a minimum total between \$979,657 and \$1,563,677. This amount is equal to 4.8 percent of Fiscal

Year 2000-2001 Operating Budget. Projected debt service for FY 2000-2001 will be \$865,198. Of this total, approximately \$620,000 is to cover payments on the 1998 and 1999 Bond Issues with balances being voted to service the debt on Library construction and open space bonds for 1990.

Combining recommended FY 2000-2001 capital spending and projected FY 2000-2001 debt service will result in a total of \$2,428,865 or approximately 7.4 percent of the City's prior year budget. While this 7.4 figure is higher than the 3 to 5 percent minimum range recommended by the APA, the additional amount is attributable to the debt service on bonds issued in 1990 which are scheduled to be retired in FY 2009-2010. In November of 1998 and May 1999, City voters approved two capital bond issues totaling \$9,993,000. The Board will note that a total of \$12,713,300 of capital projects are proposed to be funded by future bond issues whose date as yet is undetermined.

#### Capital Budget 2000-2001

At this time, Ms. Kaplan went through all the items recommended for funding, as well as the rationale for these recommendations. The descriptions and rationales are drawn from material submitted by Department and Division Heads. Listed are:

### ***PUBLIC WORKS***

#### **PUBLIC BUILDINGS DIVISION**

##### **- Bentley Street Garage (Roof Replacement) - \$35,000**

This request is for the replacement of the Bentley Street Garage roof. This roof is in poor condition, resulting in heat loss and leaking. Repair of this roof will result in energy savings and promote a more comfortable and efficient work environment.

#### **CENTRAL GARAGE DIVISION**

##### **- Exhaust Removal - \$41,000**

This request is for the installation of an exhaust removal system for the Central Garage. Currently, when vehicles are running exhaust fumes build up in the garage, resulting in unsafe levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. This problem is particularly serious in the winter months when vehicles are running and the overhead garage doors are opened in order to maintain safe air quality. The proposed exhaust removal system will vent fumes outside, resulting in improved air quality and savings in heating costs as the overhead garage doors can be closed in the winter. Failure to make these improvements will result in continued loss of manpower due to exhaust induced sickness and a possible violation of OSHA standards.

##### **- Vehicle Lifts - \$75,000**

This is a request for replacement of the vehicle lifts in the Central Garage. Currently because of the age and condition of the lifts, they must be pinned in order to avoid dropping. The continued substandard condition of these lifts represents a serious safety hazard and should be addressed as soon as possible.

## **DISTRIBUTION & COLLECTION**

### **- Infrastructure Rehabilitation (Year 2) - \$2,015,800**

This request is to continue system-wide infrastructure improvements identified in the City's Infrastructure Rehabilitation Plan of March 1997. These improvements are necessary to reduce the potentially high costs associated with emergency repair work and the resulting degradation of water quality and loss of service.

## **ENGINEERING DIVISION**

### **- Infiltration and Inflow Study and Rehabilitation - \$500,000**

This is a request for funding to continue the Infiltration and Inflow ("I & I") Study and remediation to the collection system servicing the City's Wastewater Treatment Facility off Bullocks Point Avenue. Currently, groundwater infiltration and inflow has led to sanitary sewer overflows at City pump stations and sewage discharge into the Narragansett Bay, along with increased cost for wastewater treatment caused by higher volumes of effluent. Discharges into the Bay have resulted in a Notice of Violation from RI Department of Environmental Management and resulted in the City entering into a Consent Agreement with Save The Bay for the elimination of these discharges. As such, this Study and associated improvements are necessary from both a legal and an environmental standpoint.

### **- Grassy Plain Soccer Field Master Plan - \$50,000**

This request is for a Master Plan for the Grassy Plain Recreation area for the development of a municipal soccer complex. The need for a soccer complex was recently highlighted at a series of public hearings before the City Council. The number of youths involved in soccer is growing rapidly and this master plan will provide a blueprint for a soccer complex which will partially meet this demand.

### **- Watchemoket Force Main Replacement - \$900,000**

This is a request for the design and replacement of approximately 3,300 linear feet of the 16" forcemain from the Watchemoket Pump Station to the 27" interceptor which conveys flow to the treatment facility. Hydraulic analysis and testing has revealed that the force main is in poor condition. This force main is a critical component of the City's sanitary sewer system. With a history of prior breaks and the potential for sewer overflow if it is not repaired, the replacement of this line is a critical priority. In addition, these improvements are essential to the City's efforts to eliminate sewer overflow and

discharges into Narragansett Bay. The City has committed to completing this improvement as part of its response to the RIDEM Notice of Violation

## **HIGHWAY DIVISION**

### **- Pavement Management Program - \$70,000**

This is a request to purchase computer software and hire personnel to survey and rate all City streets, in order to establish a road resurfacing program.

### **- (15) 12' Fixed Wing Snow Plows - \$65,800**

This is a request for snow plows to replace existing plows which are rotted and subject to frequent breakdown. The existing plows have been repaired many times and are in desperate need of replacement. Without new plows, snow removal operations will be hampered as old plows need to be frequently repaired.

### **- Jet Vac - \$200,000**

This is a request for purchase of a combination catch basin cleaner and jet flush. This new vehicle will replace a 1982 Vac-All that has been rebuilt and is constantly breaking down, as well as a 1984 trailer mounted Aquateck Sewer Jet that was sold at auction. Acquisition of this equipment is necessary to enable the City to comply with EPA Phase II regulations pertaining to stormwater discharges, which will take effect in early 2001. The Jet Vac will result in greater efficiency and enable the division to clean more catch basins and larger pipes.

### **- Three Wheel Street Sweeper - \$90,000**

The purchase of an additional street sweeper is requested to supplement the two existing street sweepers (1986 and 1989) to provide an efficient and effective street sweeping program. A documented street sweeping program is a Best Management Practice (BMP) which will be required to conform to the EPA Phase II regulations.

## **PARKS DIVISION**

### **- Two (2) Five Ton Pickup with Snowplow - \$86,000**

This request is for replacement of two (2) 1981 five ton dump trucks with new trucks with snowplow hitch and blade. Both existing dump trucks have large areas of body rot and frame decay. New pickups will result in reduced maintenance costs and less down time. .

### **- Three (3) 3/4 Ton 4 x 4 Pickups with Snowplow - \$81,000**

This request is for replacement of three (3) pickup trucks: 1985, 1988 & 1989 with new trucks with snowplows. Pickup trucks are used on a daily basis, as well as seasonally for snow removal. Deferring purchase will result in higher maintenance costs, due to increased downtime, and higher replacement costs.

**- Kent Heights Soccer Field Enlargement - \$86,000**

This request is to enlarge the existing soccer field at Kent Heights Playground from 50 x 100 yards to 70 x 120 yards including an irrigation and drainage system for the enlarged field. Increasing popularity of both youth and adult soccer programs has led to the demand for more soccer fields. The proposed enlargement will result in a regulation sized field which can accommodate the additional demands of both youth and adult soccer leagues.

**- Dellefemine Football Field Renovation - \$40,000**

This request is to rehabilitate the football field at Dellefemine playground. The existing field has been worn down by extensive use over the years by the Riverside Junior High Riverside Raiders "Pop Warner" teams and is now "concave" rather than "convex". The proposed renovation will include regrading and seeding of the field and the installation of an irrigation system.

**- Kent Heights Playground Equipment - \$26,000**

This is a request to purchase new playground equipment for the Kent Heights Playground, including a new play structure, swing sets and climbing structure. Because the manufacturer of the existing 1985 play structure is no longer in business, replacement parts must be custom made, at a high cost of repair. Swing sets and climbing equipment do not meet current safety and use requirements. Continued deferral of equipment replacement will result in higher maintenance costs and require longer downtime as custom repairs are required. In the short-term the cost of equipment maintenance will exceed the cost of replacement.

**WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITY**

**- Facility Plan Update - \$125,000**

This is a request to hire a consulting engineering firm to review and update the City's current Facility Plan, which was prepared in 1975. A Facility Plan update is necessary because of the significant modifications and improvements that have been made to the treatment facility equipment over the past 25 years. In addition, such a plan update will soon be mandated by RIDEM.

**FIRE DEPARTMENT**

**- New Station # 3 with Fire/Police Dispatch Center - \$1,250,000**

This is a request for construction of a new Station #3. Land for this new station has been acquired and both land and construction costs will be covered with bond revenue from the referendum approved by voters in 1998-1999.

**- Three (3) Multi-purpose Fire Apparatus - \$225,000 (lease/purchase)**

This is a request to lease/purchase three (3) combination ladder/pumper vehicles. These vehicles would be equipped with a 100' aerial, a 1,500 gallon per minute (gpm) pump, 1000' of 5" feeder line, a 500 gallon water tank and ground ladders. These vehicles would replace three of the Department's engines currently in service. The purchase of these vehicles is intended to enhance fire safety protection and allow the Fire Department the necessary flexibility to respond to a variety of emergencies in a timely fashion.

**POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**- Closed Circuit Television System - \$25,117**

This is a request for funding to completely upgrade the existing closed circuit television system (CCTV). The current CCTV system is outdated and does not include audio recording capability. A new CCTV system is critical to the Department's responsibility to monitor prisoners in the cell-blocks and to provide for prisoner/police officer safety, including liability concerns.

**- Gas Pump Replacement - \$45,000**

This is a request for replacement of the existing fuel pump with an electronic security system. The current pump is outdated and does not have a functional security system. Due to the age of the system and the potential for failure, a new system will be needed within the next two (2) years.

**LIBRARY**

**- New Riverside Library Branch - \$2,490,000**

This is a request to build a new Riverside Library Branch on the site of the former Riverside Water Tank located on Bullocks Point Avenue. The current Riverside branch library is located in the old Riverside Junior High School, located off Bullocks Point Avenue. The existing branch library is undersized and lacks sufficient parking and is not handicapped accessible. The proposed new branch will contain a full range of library service, including an enlarged collection and meeting rooms.

**PUBLIC WELFARE**

**- New Welfare Department Building - \$250,000**

This is a request for funding to construct a new Welfare Building. The existing building on James Street is in poor condition, does not contain adequate space nor is it handicapped accessible. The existing Welfare building is slated to be closed in the fiscal year 2000-2001. Without a building for welfare services, clients will need to travel to Pawtucket.

## **PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

### **- Taunton Avenue Streetscape Improvements - \$750,000**

This is a request for funding to implement streetscape improvements along Taunton Avenue, between I-195 and Six Corners. Improvements will include, sidewalk repairs, landscaping, street lighting and signage. These improvements have been identified in the "Taunton Avenue Improvement Study", prepared by the Planning Department in August 2000. Funds for these improvements will be sought through the "Transportation Enhancement" program managed by the RI Department of Transportation. The presentation will be presented to the City Council on August 15<sup>th</sup> and the report will be distributed to the Planning Board at their September 12, 2000 Planning Board meeting.

### **- Center Street Open Space Acquisition - \$80,000**

This is a request for funding to acquire a one (1) acre parcel of land at the corner of Center Street and North Broadway. This land will be dedicated to passive recreation use. Funding for this acquisition is proposed as follows: 50% State DEM Open Space Acquisition Grant; 50% City funding.

### **- Crescent Beach Park Design Plan - \$50,000**

This is a request for funding to develop engineering site plans, landscape design and architectural design plans for the Crescent Beach Park facility, located on Bullocks Point Avenue across from the Crescent Park Carousel. The design plans will be based upon a conceptual design prepared by Gates, Leighton & Associates in January 2000.

---

RECOMMENDED CAPITAL BUDGET 2000-2001: \$1,471,667

ITEMS TO BE FUNDED FROM 1998-99 BOND: \$1,750,000

ITEMS TO BE FUNDED FROM FUTURE BOND: \$1,190,000

ITEMS TO BE FUNDED FROM OTHER SOURCES: \$5,150,050

TOTAL CAPITAL BUDGET COSTS 2000-2001: \$9,561,717

Ms. Boyle stated that some of the items the Board has seen listed were partially covered in the 1998-1999 Bond Issue, but at this point we do not really know exactly how much of

the proceeds of that bond issue will be available for some of these projects so we may or may not have those funds available. For example there was money in the bond issue for the Crescent Beach Park Design Plan. With the Center Street open space acquisition there was a \$100,000 item for a Turner Reservoir Walking Path and it might be possible to use some of those funds toward that project. At this point we do not know what the exact disposition as far a dollar amount for the 1998-1999 funds.

Mr. Fisher asked where the open space was located. Ms. Boyle answered there is a lot for sale on the Ten Mile River. At one point it was considered to be a retail, but no one came in for any plans or approvals. She said there was a small subdivision of two lots where they built a house, but this is the remainder of that lot. The lot is also subject to flooding and we are using that \$80,000 figure. Ms. Boyle said before we can proceed an appraisal needs to done.

Ms. Boyle stated the heading of this memo is misleading in that it does say "Capital Budget Items Recommended for Funding from the General Fund for FY 2000-2001. As you read through the description, there were several of those items that were actually being funded from outside sources such as the \$2,000,000 from the Water Department Enterprise Account.

Mr. Fisher asked about the new fire station and if that is the one on North Broadway. Ms. Boyle answered yes and it would be corrected to read: *New Fire Station #1*.

Mr. Sullivan questioned the amount of ladders requested. He said he has spoken to retired firemen and they say the City is top heavy when it comes to fire fighting apparatus. He said the days of the large fires are gone and it doesn't seem that they would need so many ladders. Ms. Boyle explained that the medical emergencies do constitute a large portion of what the Fire Department does. They are trained to be EMTs and the City does receive some funds from that in terms from the reimbursements from Blue Cross. She said whether or not they are acquiring too many pieces of equipment I would defer to the Fire Chief in his submission that these are needed pieces of apparatus. Ms. Boyle commented that in the City of East Providence we are not just single-family residential area. We have chemical factories, high rises and properties that are very close together where you have the risk of fires spreading from one to another. If a big fire was to occur they would have the equipment to put it out. The chemical and manufacturing sector alone is something very serious in its possibilities.

Mr. Poland stated the Fire Chief did attend a past meeting in which he brought in photographs and standards that the State of Rhode Island had adopted as law. Mr. Poland felt that a number of trucks and equipment is what is required by that law and it goes by the population and size of the buildings and nature of the land use. Ms. Boyle stated that the point the Fire Chief made at that time was the combination vehicles that we now have reduce the number of apparatus that you have because instead of having a separate pumper and ladder truck you have everything all combined into one. She stated about a year ago they attended a demonstration for these trucks and they are equipped to get into the confined spaces so you do not have to have the ladder truck pushed back as far, it can

get right up on top of the fire. The ladders can go up vertically and are much stronger vehicles structurally.

Mr. DiTraglia asked where the money is for the sewer use fee. Is this included in this. Ms. Boyle stated the sewer use fee as currently constructed only covers the operating costs associated with the Water Pollution Control Facility. It does not include capital needs unlike the water enterprise account which actually encompasses both operating costs and capital costs. She said the year before everything was coming out of tax dollars and is not coming out of the General Fund anymore. It is not sufficient to cover capital needs as well.

Mr. DiTraglia asked if we voted for a bond approval in 1998 for the Library expansion. Ms. Boyle stated the only money that was set aside for the Library was for a feasibility study. This is what they are using for the administrative costs in the architectural design services. There was no money set aside for the actual capital construction.

Ms. Boyle stated that the 1998 bond issue started in motion a number of capital projects at some point the decision is going to have to be made whether to move forward with them. The Library is one, the Recreation Center is another. Some of the park improvements and that whole category in the bond for parks and cultural types of facilities was only about \$900,000 or so. It only included enough money to do some of the design work as well as the smaller items that you would consider actual tangible improvements.

Mr. DiTraglia asked about the Water Pollution and Control Facilities and why we are hiring a private company for that. Mr. Coutu explained this is a plan that DEM requires updated. Mr. DiTraglia asked if we could do that in-house. Mr. Coutu answered no.

Ms. Boyle stated that the way she understood the way the bond issue was specified was that within those categories, no more may be spent on any of those items. If it says \$925,000 total, you cannot spend more than \$925,000. She said there is some flexibility within those categories. If they chose to spend \$50,000 on a master plan versus \$100,000 that you might have the \$50,000 that could be available to some of the projects within that category, but that you could not spend it on any other categories nor could you spend it on an item that was not identified to the voters when they were originally set. Ms. Boyle explained that the Finance Director asked all the department heads what the status is and in the next six to nine month period we anticipate whether we are going to be drawing down any of the funds. Based on that he will decide whether or not to sell the bond in anticipation notes. For some of the items where there has been no action, the bonds have not been sold.

Mr. Medeiros asked what the caption "Other Funding Sources" meant. Ms. Boyle explained that there is a variety of other funding sources and said if you look at the note section of the Capital Budget and Capital Improvement Schedule, it specifies what these other funding sources are. Ms. Boyle said they include a variety of bond issues and grant funds such as CDBG funds. The Taunton Avenue Project will be provided through the State's DOT Enhancement Program. She said that the Recreation bond issues and the

DOT are not sure things, but we have to pursue them since they are competitive grant applications even though we may or may not get selected. She said whether or not the City Council actually adopts it, the Capital Budget process is an important document for pursuing those sources of funds. In the scoring criteria, they look to the Capital Improvement Program. If it is not noted there, then you lose points.

Mr. Medeiros commented that the Department of Planning does write some very good grants.

Mr. Poland asked about the Recommended Items under Police Fire Dispatch Center for \$1,225,000. He questioned Station #1 in the year 2001-2002 and asked if this shouldn't it be \$2,000,000? Ms. Kaplan stated the memorandum from the Fire Department did not give staff a complete set of documents like most of the other departments. She said it states under Priority #1 for 2000-2001 is building new station No. 3 with Fire/Police Dispatch Center with a \$1.25 million dollar bond under the 1998-1999 Bond Issue. Station #1 with Administrative Offices is for the years 2001-2002. Mr. Poland stated that should not be in there because we have already funded it. Ms. Boyle stated Station #1 is a new request which is on N. Broadway. She said the reason staff submitted that was that even though it was included in the Bond Issue which is why it is shown as \$0 under the Capital Budget column. This project was in the bond issue, but the difference there is that we had 100 percent of the funding. Station #3 was initially shown in the bond issue for \$850,000. The estimated cost now is \$1,250,000. That is combined with Police funding, and we are putting that in there as an abundance of caution because it is a slightly different item. We can eliminate it from this year since we are not talking about any new funds for it whatsoever. They said to cross off New Station #1 for \$2,000,000. Ms. Boyle stated it should have been under the "Projects Underway Chart". All these changes will be made.

Mr. Poland stated on page 2, it states future bond issue and the third line down says "Items to be funded by the bond issue include such projects as Riverside Branch Library and Station #1. It should read Broadway not North Broadway.

Mr. Poland asked if there were any more questions. There were none.

Motion

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board voted unanimously to approve the 2000-2001 Capital Budget and 2000-2006 Six Year Capital Improvement Program with changes noted by staff.

Roll Call Vote

Mr. DiTraglia           Aye

Mr. Fisher               Aye

Mr. Medeiros           Aye

Mr. Sullivan            Aye

Chairman Poland      Aye

Mr. Poland commented that Intern, Ms.Kaplan did an excellent job on the presentation.

## **V. CONTINUED BUSINESS**

### **1. Staff Report**

A. Ms. Boyle we are finishing the Taunton Avenue Study. Interns Ms. Kaplan and Mr. Pezzullo will be presenting it very briefly to the Council meeting of August 15th. We will be distributing a copy of the Study to the Planning Board in September if we do not have the "Trailside Farms" Subdivision on the same agenda.

B. Ms. Boyle said we are putting together some changes to the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Boyle stated we never got a response back from the Zoning Board's joint meeting with the Planning Board. We are hoping to submit something to the Board in September regarding the zone changes. She said we are addressing parking standards and reviewing the Industrial Use Schedule.

### **C. Plaque for Charles Goodwin**

The Board decided to have a small cocktail event for about two hours from 4 to 6 p.m., possibly at the Squantum Club in honor of Charles Goodwin for his years of service on the Planning Board. A plaque for Mr. Goodwin will be presented.

## **VI. COMMUNICATIONS**

On a motion by Mr. DiTraglia, seconded by Mr. Fisher, the Board accepted the following communications and made them part of the official record.

A. Memo dated June 23, 2000 to the Zoning Board of Review regarding Requests for Variance or Special Use Permit to be held on June 28, 2000;

B. Memo dated August 25, 2000 to the Zoning Board of Review regarding Requests for Variance or Special Use Permit to be held on August 30, 2000.

C. Copy of revised Land Development and Subdivision Review Regulations dated December 14, 1999 to each member.

## **VII. ANNOUNCEMENT**

A. Next Meeting - September 12, 2000, 7:30p.m.

B. Ms. Boyle asked the Board if they would consider having the Leonardo Subdivision in the Council Chambers. They said that would be fine. Stephanie will check on the availability of the Chambers.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Medeiros, Secretary

JM/JMB/sac