

**MINUTES OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON NOVEMBER 3, 2016**

An Administration and Finance Committee Meeting was held on Thursday, November 3, 2016 at 7:00P.M. in the City Council office, Room 204.

Committee Members: Committee Chairperson Colin LePage, Council Vice President Melinda Barrett, Councillor Mary Ellen Daly O'Brien and Councillor William Macek. Councillor Andres Vargas also attended.

Department Heads: Mayor's Chief of Staff David Van Dam, City Solicitor William Cox

Attendees: Steven Comei, Joseph LeBlanc

The following items were discussed:

- 1.) **Doc. 26-E** – City of Haverhill – Mayor's recommendations, Capital Improvement Plan – 2016 – 2020. *The Mayor's Chief of Staff gave a brief review of recently completed City Hall and DPW projects. The Committee performed a detailed review and discussion of the Police, Fire and School departments future project plans and noted the following points:*
Police: Chief DeNaro informs that the window repairs for the police station may require an additional funding of \$350,000 and that the dog kennel reconstruction may require an additional \$125,000;
Fire: Chief Laliberty informs that the replacement fire truck may require an additional \$125,000 for a custom cab to allow the truck to fit within the opening of the station doors and recommends moving the FY2020 \$10,000 High St. windows funding allocation to FY2017;
Schools: The Committee noted the full Council's previous requests to the Mayor regarding the matter of submitting Statements of Interest for the Tilton, Consentino and J.G. Whittier schools to the Massachusetts School Building Authority and the request for the construction of a softball facility that would comply with Title IX and ADA requirements. Additionally, Committee members noted that the replacement of the Haverhill High School roof is not listed in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) as presented;
*A motion was made and seconded to request an updated CIP from the Mayor and continue this matter on the Council Committee Study list with incremental 45 day reports given for full Council review. Passed unanimously.**

- 2.) **Doc. 96-B** – Communication from Councillor LePage requesting discussion regarding local regulations of building permit fees. *The City Solicitor presented a draft ordinance amendment of Chapter 36-7 (Waiver of fee or charge) to the Committee for discussion. After review of the proposal, Committee members determined that the submitted draft ordinance was not applicable to the recent matter of the City charging a building permit fee to a City owned project. The Committee then reviewed the building construction ordinance, Chapter 120: Building Construction, Section 11 (Fees) and its current inconsistencies concerning the allowance and non-allowance of charging permit fees for City projects. After a lengthy discussion on the matter, the following motion was made and seconded to remove "There shall be no permit fee for work being done for the City." from B. Electrical Fees. (2) Local regulations:(g) of §120-11 and to add the following to §120-11 Fees and insert above A. Building permits and fees: "When the City is the property owner or lessee, there shall be no permit fee for work being done for the City" and requesting that the City Solicitor prepare and amend the ordinance for full Council review. Passed unanimously.**

- 3.) **Doc. 38-F** – Communication from Councillors Barrett and LePage requesting to discuss double poles in the City. *The Committee reviewed the progress that has been made of double pole removals by the utility companies since the April 6, 2016 meeting. At that meeting, 469 double poles were reported to be located in the City. As of August 22nd, there were 345 doubles poles and 75 identified as PULL POLE and ready for immediate removal. Currently, as of October 19th, there are 342 doubles poles and still 75 identified as PULL POLE and ready for immediate removal. The Committee noted that relatively no progress has been made in double pole removals in the past 60 days. There was distribution and discussion of the "Home Rule" petition filed by the town of Natick and its fine*

*schedule for failure to remove double poles. It was noted, as an example, that 342 double poles with a penalty of \$250 per pole would result in an \$85,500 fine. A motion was made and seconded requesting that the City Solicitor review the example of the “Home Rule” petition and provide a draft ordinance for full Council review. Passed unanimously.**

- 4.) New Business** – *In the earlier review and discussion of Chapter 36-7 (Waiver of fee or charge), the Committee agreed to add this ordinance to the “Committee Study List” for further review at a later date. Passed unanimously.*

Respectfully submitted,

Colin LePage, Chairperson
Administration and Finance Committee
Haverhill City Council

November 4, 2016

CL/bsa

*Doc. 26-E- Handout from David Van Dam – Capital Projects by Funding Source

*Doc. 96-B – Handout from Solicitor Cox – Draft Ordinance Relating to Fees and Receipts

*Doc. 38-F – Handout from Councillor LePage – Draft Home Rule Petition for failure to relocate or remove utility poles & wires

*Doc. 38-F – Handout from Councillor LePage – Double Pole Removal report

c: Mayor James J. Fiorentini
City Council