

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

December 17, 2013

7:30 p.m.

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Craig, Ludwig, Roy, Corriveau, O'Neil, Levasseur,
Shea, Katsiantonis, Shaw, Greazzo, Gamache, Arnold

Absent: Aldermen Long and Osborne

Messrs: T. Clougherty, T. Arnold, J. Gile, P. Chiesa, W. Sanders, J. Burkush

LED Lighting – Public Utilities Commission (continued from Public Participation)

Alderman Ludwig stated no one is sure of the savings at this point. Is that right? What is the cost to change out all of these lights?

Mr. Clougherty responded that's exactly what the petition is contemplating, and PSNH has proposed a cost structure to the PUC and as I think the Mayor explained, we filed a petition to intervene so that we can be a party to that process, comment on how we feel the LED should be applied to the tariff. So there is no cost structure, per se, that's been adopted by the PUC.

Alderman Ludwig stated Your Honor, if this was even not immediate savings but savings down the road, I would be all for getting rid of the lighting we have right now because I think it's lousy.

Alderman Craig asked have you communicated with any other communities such as Nashua, Concord or Portsmouth? I would think that they would interested and maybe we could share the cost.

Mayor Gatsas replied I don't have a problem having that communication with them. We didn't have the luxury of time when all of this happened. Tim saw it in the paper, nobody notified us about it; as a matter of fact, the ability to intervene had already passed, because we were there and speaking with a loud voice so the commission understood that we should be part of this discussion. So I have no problem talking to other communities going forward and seeing if we can get them to participate because we

had that conversation just the other day when we were driving back. I don't disagree with that; I think that Nashua probably would be somebody that's going to have some interest, and certainly if we can find people to partner with us, they don't get the interveners status, and I think that that sometimes is a problem. We're the only ones that are delegated as to having interveners status but certainly they could benefit.

Alderman Craig stated so the cost for us could eventually go down.

Mayor Gatsas responded it could happen.

Alderman Craig asked what is the timing on this? If people are not too comfortable making a decision tonight, could it go to committee or do we not have the luxury of time?

Mayor Gatsas replied I'll let Mr. Clougherty speak on that. I don't believe we have the luxury of time because we have to get questions to the PUC by January 15th. What we did the other day when we were there was pretty much incredible for them to give us status, because we basically stopped the hearing that they were going to have to move this forward and the tariff was going to come out January 1st. Am I correct?

Mr. Clougherty replied that's correct.

Alderman Craig asked so you're going to hire an attorney prior to the January 15th date?

Mayor Gatsas replied no; we have to hire somebody as soon as possible because by January 15th we have to submit to the PUC our findings or our questions that we have for findings. We haven't even had an opportunity to take a look at what the findings are that PSNH has put in for the hearing. We weren't entitled to those until we got the status.

Alderman Craig asked when do you expect a final outcome on this?

Mr. Clougherty responded the final hearing is scheduled for the first week in April.

Alderman Craig stated I would support this, however, I would prefer to take the money out of the one-time account knowing what we have coming out this year and the lack of money we have in contingency and it's something to save money on that we would replenish the one time account when we get that savings. Thank you.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman Corriveau had a question if we're going to propose and I think what we heard that day is just because we go to LED lighting, we will release the numbers that you and I looked at and was that you weren't going to see a savings. Is that correct?

Mr. Clougherty replied under the currently proposal from PSNH, that's correct. Our savings would be minimal. Single digit percentages to the point where I don't think that we would recommend moving forward with a wholesale changeover to LED.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess my issue is, and we were copied on the letter of December 4th and I have to apologize if I missed it; we were not copied on the letter of December 17th, so to tack it onto the discussion tonight is the first time I'm hearing any of this. This is pretty big and it should have gone through a different process. I understand timing, but a decision was made to intervene without the Board in that discussion, and I'm not particularly thrilled about that to be honest with you.

Mayor Gatsas asked so is it your summation, Alderman, that we should have just stayed out of it and not taken that position?

Alderman O'Neil replied no, but you could have called a special meeting of the board. I don't know when all of this took place. The first letter is December 4th.

Mayor Gatsas asked when was the hearing?

Mr. Clougherty replied the hearing was December 10th.

Alderman O'Neil stated and we met on the third. Did we know anything about this on the third?

Mayor Gatsas replied we didn't even talk about it until the day of the letter.

Alderman O'Neil stated we knew about it the next day because the letter was written on the fourth. I think this is pretty big, and I understand the timing issue and tonight we're being asked to spend \$25,000 to hire a lawyer that we have less than a month to get the questions done. I don't know who is doing the procurement. Is it the solicitor's office, are we going through all of that, and I'm not comfortable with this. I will leave it with that.

Alderman Arnold stated I'm not sure to whom I should direct the question. How did the city get notice of this if we weren't copied on the original orders of notice?

Mr. Clougherty replied someone in our office heard about it, questioned me about it, and I took it upon myself to look at the docket status that's on the PUC website. There was some confusion relative to exactly what the schedules for the hearings were and realized at that point, like the Mayor had pointed out, PSNH had filed this sometime, I think, in late August, it was heard by the commission, I think, on October 23rd, they required notification in the *Union Leader* five days after that, approximately 10 days after that petitions to intervene were opened and closed, and a technical hearing was held in the first part of November as well. This thing was moving at light speed, as far as I could tell. Based on what I've seen with the proceedings, with tariffs and rate changes and things like that, and I brought it to the Mayor's attention as a potential area for concern. LED lighting is a technology that we've been interested in for years. We've talked to PSNH for years advocating for the introduction of such a tariff, and, as a matter of fact, back in 2010 we petitioned to intervene in a larger rate case with PSNH and at that time provided testimony to the commission supporting the introduction of LED and to the tariff. I think the haste that was shown was primarily due to the fact that this is a technology that we've been looking for for a number of years and no one even told us that they were up there lobbying for introduction of the LED into the tariff. I think the chairperson of the commission heard that loud and clear, questioned some of the individuals involved as to exactly what notification was provided to the city of Manchester, and based on some of the testimony that was provided there, I believe that was a strong basis for their allowing the City to intervene. We can choose to do nothing. Even though we're granted the petitioners status, it doesn't technically require us to do anything. I would think it could be withdrawn, but, again, I think that introduction of LED into the city is extremely important, the opportunity to save energy, providing greener technology for our streetlights, there are about 9,000 of them, is extremely important, and I think the opportunity exists to save a lot of money relative to the streetlights when you talk about just kilowatt savings or wattage savings. Roughly 50% of the wattage is necessary with a light emitting diode-technology as with a high pressure sodium technology, so you're delivering half the energy to all of these streetlights around the city. I think the potential for savings, the potential to be greener and more environmentally friendly, is there, and I think that those savings and other benefits are diminished under the way that it was currently proposed, and, therefore, I got in touch with the Mayor and said we should consider talking about this.

Alderman Arnold stated whatever frustrations were communicated by either yourself or the Mayor or the PUC are certainly related to by members of this board tonight because some of us are just getting notice of this now. As is too often the case in this chamber, we're being asked to spend money with very little notice. On behalf of the board I appreciate you bringing it to the Mayor's office's attention, this board's attention, but it's an unfortunate set of circumstances. Thank you.

Alderman Levasseur stated thank you, Mr. Mayor. The cost to change out a light bulb is \$400. Does that include the price of the bulb itself? Do we know what the price includes from PSNH?

Mr. Clougherty replied no. Are you talking currently?

Alderman Levasseur replied the Mayor threw out a number of \$400 we're charged every time they come and change a light bulb.

Mr. Clougherty responded it's something like that. There are different levels of maintenance that they provide. Changing out a lamp is probably more along the lines of that \$400.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many highway men is it going to take to change a light bulb in the city? That is not a joke. I know it's hard to say. How many of our guys is it going to take to change out the light bulb and the cost of the light bulb? Is that something that the highway department is prepared to go and do? It sounds to me like a big job.

Mr. Clougherty replied it's an opportunity that we're prepared to explore, yes.

Alderman Levasseur asked have you explored the cost of it? Is that just the next step you want to take after you go through the PSNH hearings? I'm just trying to figure out how we're going to work this through.

Mr. Clougherty responded the matter at hand really has nothing to do with whether we would be assuming control of maintenance at this point in time. That's certainly an opportunity that we have advocated for and have wanted to explore, but that's not really on the table, so to speak, with the PUC.

Alderman Levasseur asked is there a rule that says we have to have an attorney show up for the PUC hearings or can anyone speak? It sounds like our own guys are quite capable of handling the issue with the PUC. I don't know if there's a requirement that it has to be an attorney.

Mayor Gatsas replied there is no requirement, but I would suggest that if it's a \$1.4 million cost to the City, that we get somebody that understands clearly how to move around in that PUC because as I said to you, I think that we were granted status because (1) we were the largest user of PSNH's lighting for streetlighting and obviously, as I said to the chairman and the commission, that I've never seen any docket move this fast.

Alderman Levasseur asked did an attorney file for the PUC?

Mayor Gatsas replied they had four of them up there.

Alderman Levasseur stated no; did we have an attorney ask for intervention.

Mayor Gatsas replied no; we did it.

Alderman Levasseur asked who is we?

Mayor Gatsas replied myself and Tim. Tim actually drove the letter up the day before the hearing or the day of the hearing.

Alderman Levasseur asked are we looking for somebody to negotiate for us with the PUC or just be there to listen?

Mayor Gatsas replied this is to get the data that we need to have before us before we can talk, whether it be \$0.30 a kilowatt or whether it should be \$0.07. I don't think either one of us are prepared to have that discussion with PSNH or the PUC.

Alderman Levasseur asked may I ask if you have existing staff to handle the job of handling all the lights in the city or are you going to have to add some more staff?

Mr. Clougherty replied I'm not sure that I understand the question, Alderman.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't think the discussion right now is about us taking over the lighting. That's at a future date. Today is talking about whether that rate of \$0.30, when we put LED lighting in goes down or it stays the same. That's what these discussions should be about.

Alderman Levasseur responded well, I'm sorry. I was led to believe we were going to be owning the light bulb portion of it and replacing the light bulbs and have our guys do it at a savings. I thought that's what we were discussing.

Mayor Gatsas stated the savings should be based on less kilowatts that we are using based on LED lighting. In other words, if a light is 40 kilowatts and we put the LED light in and it's 20, we should see a reduction in cost. That would only make sense.

Alderman Levasseur stated so the PUC is going to set a tariff or set a rate, there must be somebody who is already out there watching out for the cities. There's no one out there. They're having a hearing specifically only where PSNH gets to speak and provide their part of the evidence and then PUC decides where to go with this?

Mayor Gatsas replied there was nobody at that hearing. If we didn't show up, they would have had the hearing, they would have been done, they would have set their rates in January, and there would have been no discussion about the city of Manchester is or anybody else.

Alderman Levasseur asked did PSNH themselves provide an advanced report on what they think the tariff should be?

Mayor Gatsas replied we couldn't get it, they had done it, but we couldn't get it because at the time we didn't have interveners status. It is there now. Tim, do you have it?

Mr. Clougherty replied yes; they did provide the basis for what they proposed the tariff to be; they pre-filed testimony along with the mathematical calculations of how they arrived at that. What the Mayor is referring to is some of the further data that PUC staff had that we weren't privy to. Until we were granted interveners status they wouldn't allow us that information, but we have since received it.

Alderman Levasseur asked so the information that you've received, have you made a determination that it is against what is going to benefit the city of Manchester and that by sending up our own guy we have an opportunity to argue against that rate?

Mr. Clougherty replied correct. My recommendation would be that we do not agree with the way that the LED tariff as it is currently structured as proposed by PSNH is as beneficial to the city as it could be, and I think it's minimally beneficial as it currently stands.

Alderman Roy stated thank you, Your Honor. Just so I get this straight in my head; we're being asked to spend this money so that we can hire somebody who is knowledgeable in this stuff, and I'm certainly not knowledgeable in it, so that we have the possibility of a significant savings in the future. Is that correct?

Mr. Clougherty replied that's correct.

Alderman Roy asked if we don't do this, there is no chance we can get involved in this rate structure, or whatever they're doing up there, and have any savings in the future at all? Is that correct?

Mr. Clougherty replied that's correct.

Alderman Roy asked and it's your opinion that we should take this route because it's in the best interest of the City that could save significant money down the road?

Mr. Clougherty replied I believe, yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked can somebody tell me why the city of Nashua, who I believe is a PSNH customer, the city of Dover, city of Portsmouth, city of Keene, city of Concord I think is Unitil, and I'm probably missing some, why they didn't get involved in any of this? Are we that much smarter than all of these other cities?

Mayor Gatsas replied we were that much luckier. That is exactly what it was, because normally I don't have to tell you that in those hearings the rooms are usually full. There was nobody in this room, there was nobody that contacted any of us that anything was happening with the LED rating. If we didn't fall upon it, if Tim didn't call me, if he didn't drive the letter up, we wouldn't be having this discussion about \$25,000. So certainly I would agree with Alderman Craig that I call Mayor Lozeau and certainly have the conversation with her and if she wants to participate. Nobody knows about this.

Alderman O'Neil stated we spend about \$1.4 million annually for streetlighting, that's all cost, that is usage as well as what we pay PSNH to go out and do any repairs or anything.

Mr. Clougherty responded that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked by getting involved, what is our potential savings?

Mayor Gatsas responded you weren't here, Tim, but I told them I certainly don't have a problem going into non-public and having that discussion. Again, I don't think we should be out here trying to negotiate against ourselves. That is only my opinion. If you want to recess, let's recess for five minutes and go in the back room and then come back out.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to recess the meeting to meet with legal counsel.

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting back to order.

Alderman Shea moved to obtain legal counsel to represent the City before the PUC for petition to intervene relative to Docket DE 13-248, with an amount not to exceed \$25,000 from the one-time account.

Alderman Roy stated I will second the motion if the money is coming out of the one-time account.

Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated I'd like a further amendment that the Mayor request other towns and cities to chip in on that cost.

Alderman O'Neil asked who is reaching out to find the appropriate attorney?

Mayor Gatsas replied we had somebody represent us the last time when we went up there two years ago I believe. Certainly there have been a couple of other names that have come up and certainly I don't have a problem exploring with whoever we can get that's going to fight this because I believe that we have a real possibility of saving some money with the right person.

Alderman O'Neil asked who was the lawyer two years ago?

Mayor Gatsas replied Doug Patch.

Alderman O'Neil asked from what firm?

Mr. Clougherty replied Orr & Reno.

Alderman O'Neil asked who are the other names?

Mayor Gatsas replied he was a previous PUC commissioner; the other one she was also a PUC commissioner and I believe her name is Nancy Geiger.

Mayor Gatsas asked for the motion to be read back with the amended portions included.

Alderman Shea moved to obtain legal counsel to represent the City before the PUC for petition to intervene relative to Docket DE 13-248, with an amount not to exceed \$25,000 from the one-time account, and to ask other cities and towns that are PSNH customers to assist with the cost. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated we need to clarify that other cities and towns that are PSNH customers.

Alderman Shea asked should that be taken out of contingency?

Mayor Gatsas replied the one-time account.

Alderman O'Neil requested a roll call vote. Aldermen O'Neil, Arnold and Corriveau voted nay. Aldermen Levasseur, Shea, Katsiantonis, Shaw, Greazzo, Gamache, Craig, Ludwig, and Roy voted yea. Aldermen Long and Osborne were absent. Without a 2/3 vote the motion failed.

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated since you're taking the money from the one-time account and it's not for a capital expenditure to authorize that, I believe you need a 2/3 vote.

Alderman O'Neil asked Your Honor, can I reconsider my vote? My message is clear; I don't like how this has been handled and the lack of information to the Board. I will revote so we can do this, but the information shared with the Board of Mayor and Aldermen has been poor. We have an energy committee, the letter could have gone in and it should have been a request for the energy committee to meet. I will ask for reconsideration.

Mayor Gatsas responded I guess, Alderman O'Neil, I'm really upset because you think that there is some deceitful thing that's happened.

Alderman O'Neil interjected no, I don't.

Mayor Gatsas interjected let me finish; I let you have the floor. Let's talk about what the committee would have told us to do. What would they have said to do?

Alderman O'Neil replied I don't know, but there are 14 people that should have been part of this discussion, not two people making the determination to intervene.

Mayor Gatsas interjected and sometimes there are other issues that only one person makes a decision on. That needs to stop also.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Corriveau, it was voted to reconsider the previous vote.

Alderman Shea moved to obtain legal counsel to represent the City before the PUC for petition to intervene relative to Docket DE 13-248, an amount not to exceed \$25,000 from the one-time account, and to ask other cities and towns that are PSNH customers to assist with the cost. Alderman Katsiantonis duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Arnold requested a roll call vote. Alderman Arnold voted nay. Aldermen Craig, Ludwig, Roy, Corriveau, O'Neil, Levasseur, Shea, Katsiantonis, Shaw, Greazzo, Gamache voted yea. Aldermen Long and Osborne were absent. The motion passed.

The Grossman Company 60-day Extension

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the 60-day extension for The Grossman Company.

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 3-28)

Mayor Gatsas advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate.

Accept BMA Minutes

4. Minutes from the December 3, 2013 Public Participation and BMA meetings.

Information to be Received and Filed

5. Communication from Mayor Gatsas to the PUC regarding a Petition to Intervene relative to docket DE 13-248.
6. Minutes from the October 29, 2013, MTA Commission meetings, October 2013 Financial reports and October Ridership report submitted by Michael Whitten, MTA Executive Director.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

7. Bond Resolution:

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) for the 2014 CIP 711514 – Water Main Rehabilitation & Water Supply Storage Structures.”

8. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Hundred Thirteen Thousand Three Hundred Seventy One Dollars (\$513,371) for the FY2014 CIP 212114 Homeless Healthcare.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Million Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,900,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 711014 Phase II CSO North Chestnut St.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eight Million Dollars (\$8,000,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 710413 Cohas Brook Sewer Project-Contract 3.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$7,200,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 711514 Water Main Rehabilitation & Water Supply Storage Structures.”

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

- 9.** Recommending that the amending resolution and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \$513,371 from the US Department of Health and Human Services - HRSA for CIP project 212114 Homeless Healthcare be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- 10.** Recommending that the request from the Environmental Protection Division for approval of budget increases to CIP projects 711014 and 710413 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- 11.** Recommending that Water Works be permitted to apply for a loan of \$4 million through the NH Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund and to allocate an additional \$3.2 million from their operating budget to cover the full cost of the CIP project 711514 Water Main Rehabilitation & Water Supply Storage Structure.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Greazzo who voted in opposition)

- 12.** Recommending that request from Leon LaFreniere for various CIP project extensions be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

- 13.** Advising that the communication from Mayor Gatsas requesting a change to ordinance section 33.046, Entrance Pay Rates, has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Ludwig who was absent)

- 14.** Recommending that the communication from the Human Resources Director, on behalf of the Central Fleet Management Department, requesting a change to their complement as follows:
 - Eliminate one vacant Equipment Mechanic I, grade 16; and
 - Create an Equipment Mechanic II, grade 17be approved.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Ludwig who was absent)

15. Recommending that the communication from the Human Resources Director, on behalf of the Parking Manager, requesting a change to their complement as follows:
- Eliminate one Administrative Services Manager, grade 16;
 - Eliminate one Parking Attendant, grade 9
 - Add one Customer Service Representative I, grade 11
 - Reclassify one Customer Service Representative II, grade 12, to an Accounting Specialist II, grade 12
- be approved.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Ludwig who was absent)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

16. Recommending that the following regulations governing standing, stopping, parking and operation of vehicles, be adopted pursuant to Chapter 70 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester and put into effect when duly advertised and the districts affected thereby duly posted as required by the provisions of that Chapter and Chapter 335 of the Sessions Laws of 1951.

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Glenwood Avenue south side, from Boynton Street to a point 100 feet east
Alderman Greazzo

BLIND DRIVEWAY SIGN:

On Bodwell Road, east side, south of 1118 Bodwell Road
Alderman Corriveau

SCHOOL ZONE SIGNS – POLARIS CHARTER SCHOOL

On Coolidge Avenue, east side, south of Kelley Street
On Kelley Street, south side, east of Dubuque Street
On Coolidge Avenue, west side, south of Cartier Street
On Cartier Street, west side, south of Coolidge Avenue
On Cartier Street, east side, south of Kelley Street
Alderman Gamache

SIGNS – DRIVE SLOW CHILDREN – 15 MPH – THANK YOU

On Morning Glory Drive, south side, east of Bodwell Road
On Stonington Drive, south side, east of Bodwell Road
Alderman Corriveau

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Maple Street, east side, from Myrtle Street to a point 85 feet south
Alderman Ludwig

CROSSWALK:

On Maple Street, south of Myrtle Street
Alderman Ludwig

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Carpenter Street, south side, from Elm Street to North Bay Street (Ord. 2758)
On Carpenter Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to a point 150 feet west
(Ord. 2757)
Alderman Craig

DEAF CHILD SIGNS:

On Belmont Street, east side, north of Summer Street
On Belmont Street, west side, south of Cedar Street
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND METERS 2-HOURS

Stark Street south side, from a point 50 feet west of Elm Street to a point 45 feet
westerly
Ord. 7406
Alderman Long

METERS 2- HOURS

Stark Street, south side, from a point 50 feet west of Elm Street to
Hampshire Lane
Alderman Long
(Unanimous vote)

17. Advising that the request from residents on Brown Avenue for "No Trucks Allowed at Anytime" signage and the addendum submitted by Traffic Division have been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Chairman Katsiantonis who voted in opposition)
18. Advising that the request from the National MS Society to use Arms Lot for their annual walk event Saturday, May 3, 2014, through Sunday, May 4, 2014 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
19. Advising that the request from John Giles, Peddler, for reserved parking spaces for the Civic Center Zone Pilot Program has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
20. Advising that the communication from the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission regarding the top 100 hazardous intersections has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
21. Advising that the communication regarding hiring additional police officers has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
22. Advising that the discussion regarding MHRA and the issue of bed bugs has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RIVERFRONT ACTIVITIES AND BASEBALL

23. Recommending that the amendment to the management and operations agreement with 6 TO 4 TO 3, LLC, be approved.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Aldermen Ludwig and Arnold who were absent)

25. Advising that recommendations:

1. Expiration of Planning Board Approvals
2. Update Site/Subdivision Regulations

have been found favorable by the committee.

The committee recommends that the Planning Board be informed of the committee's action.

(Unanimous vote)

26. Recommends that the performance zoning recommendation from the Chamber of Commerce be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading.

(Unanimous vote)

27. Recommends that recommendations:

4. Training of Planning/Zoning Board Members
5. Control of Public Hearings

be forwarded to the Committee on Administration/Information Systems.

(Unanimous vote)

28. Advises that recommendation:

6. Certified Sites Program

have been found favorable by the committee.

The committee recommends that the Planning Board be informed of the committee's action.

(Unanimous vote)

HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN O'NEIL, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN ROY, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON JOB CREATION\JOB RETENTION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- 24.** Recommending that the communication from Alderman Arnold regarding economic development incentive programs and required enabling legislation be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Arnold stated there is a recommendation coming out of the committee on jobs and economic development concerning the redevelopment incentive that the city used to have on the books that got repealed about four years ago. Some enabling

legislation got modified up in Concord, and I've asked the next board to consider reenacting it. The committee on jobs and economic development discussed it over the course of a couple of months with very limited conversations about it and I'm asking that it be referred to the committee on accounts or any other committee the Board wants to send it to to consider readopting this incentive program. It is 79-E.

Mayor Gatsas stated let's send it to administration and let them work on it in there.

On motion of Alderman Arnold, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Administration.

REGULAR BUSINESS

29. Nomination(s) to be presented by Mayor Gatsas, if available.

There were no nominations.

30. Confirmation(s) to be presented by Mayor Gatsas:

Board of Trustees of the Trust Fund

Heather Whitfield to succeed herself, as a member, term to expire
January 1, 2017.

Conduct Board

Michael Langton to fulfill a vacancy, as an alternate member, term to expire
October 1, 2015.

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

31. Communication from Jane Gile, Human Resources Director, requesting approval of the MassMutual Deferred Compensation Plan Document and further that the Human Resources Director be authorized to execute all necessary documents.

Alderman Shea moved to approve this item. Alderman Katsiantonis duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked Alderman Shea, did this go to the Committee on Human Resources and Insurance?

Alderman Shea replied no; I did not see it there.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm just curious why it wouldn't have gone to the committee.

Alderman Shea responded maybe Ms. Gile can speak to that.

Ms. Jane Gile, Human Resources Director, stated we received the plan document in later October. It was reviewed by staff as well as our PFM financial advisors and unfortunately we did not meet the deadline for the December HR meeting. In consultation with Mass Mutual, they strongly advised us that if we could have the plan approved prior to the end of the plan year, that would be the best alternative. That is why we put it on the agenda so that it would meet the 2013 plan year. If you want to refer it to committee, we can do that, but it would be advisable through Mass Mutual if we could do it tonight.

Alderman O'Neil asked why didn't it go to committee?

Ms. Gile replied it did not meet the deadline. We reviewed it internally and we also had PFM, our financial advisors, review it and the review was not completed in time to meet the HR agenda schedule.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion. With Aldermen Ludwig and Arnold voting nay, the motion carried.

- 32.** Communication from Michael Roche, United Steelworkers Local 8938 President, regarding improper notification for health insurance.

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

Alderman Corriveau stated what I'm unclear on from the communication is assuming the steelworkers allegation is true, and maybe this question is for Jane or maybe Mr. Sanders, but how would we be able to quantify how much money we allegedly paid them that we should not have. How much money we took from them, that originally we should not have? Do we have the ability to make that calculation? Has anyone within city government, whether it's the Solicitor's Office or anywhere, made the determination that this did in fact happen?

Ms. Gile replied it's not our position that Mr. Roche is correct in his thinking regarding this matter. The City was obligated to give a 60-day notice of material modifications to the health plan, which we did, that was prior to the health plan being implemented as part of the contract. The new health plan went into effect December 1st; it is the City's practice to begin collecting for health insurance the month prior to the implementation. We always collect premiums in advance of the plan year, so December 1st the plan actually started, according to the contract, they received notification 60 days in advance of that, which is what we needed to do.

Alderman Corriveau asked Jane, what is your position? When did the City give notice, on what date?

Ms. Gile replied the steelworkers modified their part of the contract on September 23rd or thereabouts, then it went to the water board of commissioners, who then subsequently approved it. We had reached tentative agreement obviously before that point with the union. The notification was sent September 26th, and the Board did approve the contract October 1st. There is no IRS regulation that says...

Alderman Corriveau asked what board approved it October 1st?

Ms. Gile replied the Board of Mayor and Aldermen gave the initial approval of the contract October 1st.

Alderman Corriveau stated but you're saying October 1st is not when the clock started.

Ms. Gile replied at least 60 days notice. No, you have to give at least 60 days. You can give more than 60 days; you have to give at least 60 days notice, which we did.

Alderman Corriveau stated I'll just go back to my original question. They're saying they were not given 60 days notice. When are you saying we gave them 60 days notice?

Ms. Gile replied we sent out the letter on September 26th. The new plan design started on December 1st.

Alderman Corriveau asked how could we give them notification on September 26th if the Board of Mayor and Aldermen hadn't even ratified it until October 1st?

Ms. Gile replied I'll explain that to you. According to our counsel there is no IRS regulation that says that the contract must be approved prior to that point. All we're doing is giving them notification that the employer has the intent to change the plan design. We had reached a tentative agreement with the union, and based on that tentative agreement, as well as the union's ratification...

Alderman Corriveau interjected I understand that. Whoever says anything about the IRS, fine, but I'm concerned with what the contract says. If the contract ratified by the City wasn't until October 1st, it seems to me that's when the clock starts running, the 60 days. I understand maybe the IRS can say something different, but.

Ms. Gile stated in any event, the 60-day notice, if it was October 1st, we gave it at least 60 days, so it was more than 60-days notice. The 60 days is the minimum notice that you have to give.

Alderman Corriveau asked what date were the insurance premiums?

Ms. Gile replied the plan year started December 1st. That is over 60 days from October 1st.

Mayor Gatsas stated we deduct from employees a month prior.

Alderman Corriveau responded I understand that.

Mayor Gatsas stated that takes you from November 1st to December 1st that they were doing the deductions.

Alderman Corriveau stated maybe this is just a legal question. I just don't understand if they have 60 days, how we can deduct within that period of time.

Ms. Gile replied it's the way that the City traditionally has done it. You pay in advance when the change is made. Every employee pays a month before the actual plan starts. For employees they begin paying for the July 1st plan in June.

Alderman Corriveau stated I understand all of that, that's very simple to comprehend. I don't necessarily agree with when the clock starts running here, but if from the time we ratified this contract to the time it would go into effect is 60 days and we collect in advance, if you're saying that, I have no problem with this.

Ms. Gile stated the first approval by the board was on October 1st.

Alderman Corriveau stated there is 60 days in between and we collect a month in advance. I just want to make sure from a legal standpoint, I don't care what the IRS says, I care what the contract says.

Ms. Gile stated it is also on the advice of our attorney that helped in our negotiations, Matt Upton, advised us that we were correct in doing this in this way.

Alderman Arnold stated thank you very much. Jane, I know you don't have a crystal ball, but do you have any reason to believe at this point that there's an unfair labor practice going on or has there been anything other than the communication the Aldermen have been provided with tonight concerning action?

Ms. Gile replied I don't believe so; I don't believe so.

Alderman Arnold asked you're not aware of anything? I know you can't see into the future.

Ms. Gile replied no, I don't.

Alderman Arnold asked Mayor Gatsas, are you?

Mayor Gatsas replied I'm not aware unless you are. Are you aware?

Alderman Arnold responded far more aware than I think.

Mayor Gatsas stated then if you are, you ought to tell the board.

Alderman Arnold stated not on this particular issue. But, again, like some of the other issues that the aldermen have been asked and in some cases demanded to vote on tonight, I feel like there is more information that should probably be sought before the aldermen ultimately decide what to do with it. I'd like to see it go to committee for that purpose.

Mayor Gatsas stated unless you know something and you want to share it. It sounds like you might know something.

Alderman Arnold stated I know lots of things, Mayor Gatsas.

Mayor Gatsas stated then you should share them with this board.

Alderman Arnold stated I tried for months to share my insights with you, and I will probably continue to do so in the months after this. I'd like to see it go to committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated Jane, I want to pick up on Alderman Corriveau's comments. The first vote this board took was October 1st.

Ms. Gile responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated it would have laid over two weeks, it was not a binding agreement until mid-October. So at the advice of Attorney Upton we started to look...what if we tabled it, what if we voted it down, what happens?

Ms. Gile replied then we would have just withdrawn and said there had been no plan changes.

Alderman O'Neil asked when did you start the deductions? November 1st?

Ms. Gile replied yes. The month of November for December.

Alderman O'Neil stated it could have gotten real messy if the board tabled the agreement or something, I guess.

Mayor Gatsas responded no; there would have been no deductions done from the employees' checks in November. There would have been none.

Alderman O'Neil stated but we wouldn't have met the December 1st date.

Mayor Gatsas stated there would have been no plan change. There would have been no raises.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we jumped the gun a little bit on this that there would have been some validity to.

Mayor Gatsas stated there would have been no raises or anything else.

Alderman Corriveau asked has anyone, whether Your Honor or any member of this board or the solicitor's office, been made aware of whether this might result in legal action other than the steelworkers?

Alderman Arnold stated he wants just another bite of the apple, Mayor Gatsas.

Alderman Corriveau stated I just want to make sure if we're going to be taking a vote to receive and file this that tomorrow we don't get notification that the steelworkers are taking action against us. Perhaps Alderman Arnold is correct; maybe if we refer this to a committee and invite the steelworkers to come in here and give a little more clarification to this two-sentence letter, then maybe we can avoid a potential legal issue. I'm not saying that the City wouldn't win, but I would rather not spend time and resources on potentially defending against this.

Alderman Arnold moved to send this item to the Committee on Human Resources and Insurance. Alderman Corriveau duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Gatsas stated I'm a little confused on what we're going to do sending it to HR when we've already done the deductions in November and the plan started December 1st.

Alderman Corriveau responded I understand that. I proposed my initial question.

Mayor Gatsas asked we send it to committee and the committee is going to say what?

Alderman Corriveau replied that's just it. If the committee finds that these allegations have any substance to them, and I'm inclined to believe they may not, but if they do, then we do have to somehow figure out a way to quantify how much money they've paid and we would need to reimburse them, and if we explain to the steelworkers here is how the process played out, we don't owe you anything, and they end up agreeing with the committee, then I would much rather have some sort of dialogue between the steelworkers and perhaps the human resources committee saying there is no dispute here or ascertain whether or not perhaps there is one.

Alderman Shea stated I've been part of the human resource committee and I'd just as soon make a motion to receive and file now.

Alderman Corriveau stated there is a motion that's been seconded on the floor already, Alderman.

Mayor Gatsas stated I guess my question is, the deductions were being taken in November. Is that correct, Jane?

Ms. Gile replied right.

Mayor Gatsas asked so if somebody had a problem with deductions being taken in November, why would they have sent the letter December 4th?

Alderman Corriveau responded I can't answer that. But perhaps we ask and answer that in committee, Your Honor.

Mayor Gatsas stated don't you think we could have had that discussion if the letter came November 4th and sent it to committee and have those discussions before we started taking them up now.

Alderman Corriveau responded you should be asking Mr. Roche this or perhaps the committee can.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't know what we're going to achieve by sending it to a committee.

Alderman Corriveau stated we may we'll achieve nothing, but you know what, I would much rather we go through this one extra hurdle, see if there might be any violation or not. If there is not, fine, we receive and file this and see what happens. But if the steelworkers end up agreeing with us saying we understand the process, we understand when you started the clock, we understand when we did, I just don't want this to potentially subject us to some sort of grievance when we've been having to deal with enough of those.

Alderman Shea requested a roll call on the motion to refer this item to the Committee on Human Resources and Insurance. Aldermen Shea, Katsiantonis, Shaw, Greazzo, and Gamache voted nay. Aldermen Arnold, Craig, Ludwig, Roy, Corriveau, O'Neil, and Levasseur voted yea. The motion passed.

Mayor Gatsas vetoed the motion. The message is clear. The letter comes to us December 4th, we did the collections in November, I think that any way we're going to go forward to change the perspective of claims that could be paid really is going to be a problem.

***Alderman Shea** moved to receive and file this item. **Alderman Shaw** duly seconded the motion.*

***Alderman Arnold** requested a roll call on the motion to receive and file. Aldermen Arnold, Craig, Ludwig, Corriveau, O'Neil, and Levasseur voted nay. Aldermen Roy, Shea, Katsiantonis, Shaw, Greazzo, and Gamache voted yea. The vote was tied, and Mayor Gatsas voted yea. The motion passed.*

- 33.** Report from the City Solicitor regarding Alderman Greazzo's allegations of City Charter violations, if available.

Alderman Greazzo stated obviously, I disagree with the report, and the board also got the follow-up letter from Tom Arnold regarding the insurance. One problem that I have in your conclusion is you state that getting the information is fine, disseminating the information is fine, howeverb the information that was disseminated was not true.

Mr. Peter Chiesa, City Solicitor's Office, replied I haven't been able to verify whether the statement Alderman Levasseur claims he was told was true or not.

Alderman Greazzo stated understood. Alderman Levasseur's claim was that there had been an insurance lapse, however, your office says that there had not been.

Attorney Chiesa replied no, I didn't say that at all. I said we could not conclude one way or the other whether that was the case or not.

Alderman Greazzo stated I'm looking at this letter from Tom Arnold that says the association had insurance being the requirements of the agreement with the City. I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, that is a separate matter.

Attorney Chiesa replied that has to do with the present insurance.

Alderman Greazzo stated I understand that that's a separate matter. I just don't see how they can both coincide. The fact that you take Alderman Levasseur at his word is something hard for me to accept considering he's been documented being caught lying, lie after lie, after lie. For you to make that assumption without him having anything to back up his claim, I think says it all for me. Whereas the association provided you with the documents that they had available to them, however, there wasn't any provided against them. I can make wild accusations as well and not have anything to back them up. Does that mean that my allegations are somehow held to a higher standard because I didn't have anything to back it up and whoever I made the allegation against is somehow required to provide the information to back up my allegation against them in some manner?

Attorney Chiesa responded I believe the report is clear is that we're not making a determination as to whether or not there was a lapse. The materials that were supplied by the MDPA are not sufficient to enable me to conclude whether there was a lapse in coverage or not. As I cited in the report, there are two policies that seem to be in effect and they overlap. I question, query, why is that the case. Has one been cancelled, I don't know. Aspen won't talk to us; the dog park won't let Aspen talk to us.

Alderman Greazzo stated those were answered in committee.

Attorney Chiesa stated if you want that specific answer whether there was a lapse in coverage or not, that's what I'd have to do. You say that there is no evidence that there was a lapse, Alderman Levasseur says he was told there was a lapse and that seems to be what the remaining issue is.

Alderman Greazzo stated understood, however, one side has also provided documentation whereas the other has not.

Attorney Chiesa responded no; all we have is his statement and he's articulated it a number of times that he was told there was a lapse in coverage, and all I've been given by the dog park and by Aspen are a couple of old certificates of insurance and a couple of deck pages, which as I said, evidence of two policies which overlap. Why do they overlap? I don't know. We did not reach a conclusion as to whether there was a lapse in coverage or not. Indeed there was not evidence of any lapse.

Alderman Greazzo asked have you as a city as additionally insured received any of those notifications?

Attorney Chiesa replied no, and the reason we haven't, according to the safety officer, is that Aspen says they will not issue certificates of insurance to the City unless they are told to by the MDPA.

Alderman Greazzo asked and they have been additionally insured?

Attorney Chiesa responded we received an endorsement that the City's additional insurance was on the last policy.

Alderman Greazzo stated that's a separate issue from my charter violation claims. I had to get in the record that I disagree with it. I don't see how you can side with an individual over his word, which doesn't hold a lot of water with me. That is my position. I'm not going to drag the board through a whole long process on it. I think that you've given a lot of deference to Alderman Levasseur at his word but not to the association that has, to this day, been cooperative with the City as far as the information that they've asked of them that they were required to provide in the agreement. How you could side one way or the other, I understand it's a difficult position to be in, however, I disagree with it. That's what I wanted to get on record, Your Honor. I'm sure Alderman Levasseur is not happy with the fact that I made mention of his untruthfulness or anything to that effect, but if you'd like to get into that, we can certainly do that because aside from this, I'm hoping that he will meet with you in January, as he has stated to your office, to deal with the other charter violations that I've made to your office. I'm glad that you had this one reported to the solicitor so that they can get it out this session, but I'll also wait to see what happens when the attorney general comes back with his rulings on the complaints against the Manchester police, the Hooksett police and other issues that they're dealing with with the alderman-at-large.

Alderman Roy stated let me ask you. Going forward what is our process? Are we going to be able to get notification that they have insurance? Are we going to look back two years from now and say we don't know if there was a lapse?

Attorney Chiesa replied as of right now, they're not going to give us any certificates of insurance unless the MDPA tells them to, and I gather that is with committee.

Alderman Roy stated I guess that's something we should send to a committee.

Alderman Greazzo stated it's currently with the committee on accounts.

Alderman Roy asked is it correct you can't let it layover until the next term?

Attorney Arnold replied I was just going to mention with Attorney Chiesa's comments, that the agreement we have with the Manchester Dog Park Association calls for them to provide us with insurance certificates and that if they refuse to do so, I believe it would be a breach of that agreement.

Alderman Roy asked so the dog park associaton will have to give us copies of their insurance, the insurance company won't send it to us direct? Is that correct?

Attorney Chiesa replied yes. That's what's called for in the agreement. They have to tell the insurance company to issue us the certificates of insurance.

Alderman Roy asked so going forward your office is going to make sure that we get those certificates each year?

Attorney Chiesa replied that's typically done by the safety officer and the risk management office.

Alderman Roy stated the risk manager retired.

Attorney Chiesa replied right; there is a safety officer still, and he's been trying to get the information for the last two or three weeks.

Alderman Roy asked has he asked the dog park association? It sounds like he just asked the insurance company.

Attorney Chiesa replied no; I've asked the dog park association and they refused to permit Aspen to give us any certificates of insurance.

Alderman Greazzo stated I believe they have already been given the certificates of insurance.

Attorney Chiesa stated we have the latest one, but we asked for the prior.

Alderman Roy stated I'm looking forward. I want to make sure that this situation doesn't happen again. Is it possible to get something in writing from the dog park association that says we'll make sure that we get those in the future? It sounds like they want it from the insurance company and not from the association.

Attorney Chiesa responded typically it's the insurance company that issues the certificate of insurance, but as I said, they're not going to issue us certificates of insurance, as is called for in the agreement, unless they're told to by the dog park.

Mayor Gatsas stated obviously somebody must have told them because you got one.

Attorney Chiesa stated that was the latest one.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman Roy is looking for going forward. So if somebody has told them to send them to you and you've gotten them.

Attorney Chiesa stated they've changed their tune since the last certificate came out.

Mayor Gatsas stated he's only looking at going forward.

Alderman Craig stated I would like them going back. I think its important. This is a question and if it's in the contract and they're not providing the information, then they're in breach of the contract. Can you provide all of the insurance certificates that are available?

Alderman Greazzo stated I believe that we did it at the last committee on accounts. The association submitted those as well as all of their bank statements.

Alderman Craig stated I'm only interested in what the contract calls for. The parties that need to get together and confirm that, I would appreciate it.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to know what in the world anybody would think my motivation would be to come in front of this board to tell this board, which I believe was my duty, that there was a lapse. There is no motive whatsoever that you can apply, and for what you just said publicly, as a member of the bar association and as an attorney, and call me a liar in public is not only reprehensible and dispicable, it is the lowest form of engagement that I have ever seen on any board level at any time in my 14

years of watching these kinds of boards go on. I have not lied to this board, and I've not lied to anyone. I know what I was told, and once I was told that, I had an obligation to bring it to the board. It is nothing more than that. You can make it into a big conspiracy and a big old bunch of whatever crazy stuff you want to bring it into, it was nothing more than a phone call to ask to make sure that there was insurance, and as everyone has stated and even in the letter that you received from the insurance agent, it was to cover Greazzo's butt. I was doing this to get people off your back. I've never not considered you a friend. Prior to this, I considered us to be very good friends, so there was absolutely no reason for me to come in here and make that statement. I didn't even know anything about lapses and insurance coverage until I was told that. If this was two centuries in the past, you and I would be sitting outside in a duel for what you just said about me. We live in a different age right now and you can make these public statements because I'm a public figure, but they are reprehensible and without merit and you should be completely and utterly ashamed of yourself for saying what you just said, and I want it to rest at that right there. What are you looking at me like that for? Do you think this is a joke or something? You think somebody can come out and say something like that to somebody? You think it's appropriate for somebody to use that kind of language at a board meeting?

Mayor Gatsas called for a recess.

Mayor Gatsas called the regular meeting back to order.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor, we have to bring closure to this issue. We have two alderman going back and forth calling each other liars, etc.

Alderman Levasseur stated I have not used the term liar, not once.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have to bring closure to this and move on. The Solicitor's Office has done what was requested of them, there could be a disagreement or people can disagree with what's in their letter, but Attorney Chiesa has stated what backs up the information they've provided and we have to move on. We can't have this go on all night, and out of respect for this body, we can't have two aldermen going at it.

Alderman Greazzo stated my apologies to the board, but I don't just make wide accusations as some people do. I like to back them up with things. Chief Mara, could you please come up or Deputy Chief, either one.

Alderman O'Neil asked can I ask my colleague for what purpose is it that you bring the police department up?

Alderman Greazzo replied because I would like the board to know what the standing order is over at the Manchester Police Department when they're left alone in a room with Alderman Levasseur.

Alderman Levasseur stated now you've turned this into a circus. Mayor. You've turned it into a circus and you like it, you appreciate it.

Mayor Gatsas stated Mr. Chairman, you need to bring it under control.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, with Alderman Greazzo voting nay, it was voted to receive and file this item.

- 34.** Proposed 90-day extension to the Purchase and Sale Agreement between the Manchester Development Corporation and Giorgio's Ristorante Corp. for property located on Granite Street (Tax Lot TPK3-005).

Alderman Roy moved to approve this item. Alderman Katsiantonis duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Craig stated in reading the agreement I don't see where it says the 90-day extension.

Attorney Chiesa stated I can answer that. That was tied to the MDC lot. To the south of the MDC lot and the City's lot is a parking lot to the north on Granite Street. What happened was the lender's consultant did an environmental review and they had some questions because it had been so long since doing environmental monitoring on the MDC lot.

Alderman Craig stated I agree with the 90-day extension.

Attorney Chiesa stated the date should be February 21, 2013. The MDC met on Friday and I received an email this morning from the chairman, Joe Weichert, that the date they set was February 21, 2014.

Mayor Gatsas asked Alderman Craig, would you like to put an amendment in to put February 21, 2014?

Alderman Craig requested an amendment to the motion to extend the Purchase and Sale Agreement to February 21, 2014.

Alderman Craig stated currently the way Item #3 is written it seems as though the effective date would reference two different dates.

Attorney Chiesa responded right; it is confusing and it should just be stricken. The problem is Attorney Griffin, the attorney for Giorgio's, has been out of state since I believe Thursday. I haven't been able to contact him regarding making any formal changes. I would suggest to just strike that and put as a date certain February 21, 2014.

Alderman Craig stated this would be the effective date of when we sign the contract is what I'm talking about.

Attorney Chiesa responded yes.

Alderman Craig stated currently it reads the effective date of the second amendment shall be as of the last date of each party's execution hereunder and the delivery to the party first signing below. They signed it December 11th; I'm assuming we would sign it tomorrow. So can you just make it the last date signed and then delivery?

Attorney Chiesa replied right. I think that would clear it up.

Alderman Craig asked are there any other changes that you would recommend?

Attorney Chiesa replied no. It basically parrots the MDC lot and that's pretty straightforward. It does appear as if the matter is going to be resolved and it looks as of right now it closes.

Alderman Craig stated thank you.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion as amended to extend the Purchase and Sale Agreement to February 21, 2014. With a unanimous vote, the amended motion passed.

35. Budget projections to be submitted by William Sanders, Finance Officer, if available.

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, stated thank you, Your Honor. You have what was handed out this evening as the current FY2014 general fund expenditure and revenue forecast based on current department head forecasts. The current projected general fund surplus for 2014 is \$483,000. The surplus is comprised of a revenue shortfall of \$6,000 and an expenditure surplus of \$489,000. The forecast of expenditure surplus includes the \$805,000 balance remaining in the contingency account and a forecasted surplus of \$21,000 in the severance account. There were 13 retirements through November 30th at a cost of about \$330,000 and departments continue to forecast 15 additional retirements through the balance of this year at a cost of almost \$450,000. Also, attached is the departmental overtime report as of December 7, 2013. I would note that the improvement in the fire department's remaining overtime balance is attributable to the approved transfer of \$470,000 from the department's salary line to the overtime line and that's why last month they were in a deficit in that account and now they are showing some surplus. Turning to the detail page: In large measure the forecast is similar to last month's with one significant exception and that is the revenue projection for the finance department. The finance reduction of \$270,000 is associated with an anticipated lease that we expected to enter into on billboards along the former Manchester and Lawrence railroad corridor. The corridor was transferred to the City in 1998. CBS Billboards had come forward to the City about a year ago recognizing that they took control of the billboards in 2008 and they had been paying no rental as there was no lease on the billboards. We had entered into discussions here in the past couple of months, and we confirmed that the property had been transferred to the City in 1998 by the railroad. Unfortunately, last week we discovered that the corridor was transferred to the state of New Hampshire. It was technically owned by the Manchester airport and it was transferred to the state of New Hampshire in August of 2003 for a purchase price of about \$700,000. That information, as I said, only came to our attention, myself, the assessor and the city attorney, last week. The solicitor's office has investigated it and confirmed that indeed the transaction did take place, and the GIS system obviously needs to be updated for this transfer, but unfortunately as a result, we're not going to be able to conclude a lease agreement on land that we do not own and will not be able to meet that \$270,000 figure that was in the finance budget. So that is the shortfall. Other than that, as I mentioned, the overtime report that is attached is the third page, and that concludes my comments.

Alderman O'Neil stated Bill, just for clarification. The state of New Hampshire owns the property?

Mr. Sanders replied they do.

Mayor Gatsas stated I'd recommend that somebody would talk to DOT because it doesn't make any sense to me that the trails to rails is where these two are along with a couple of others and they haven't been paying anybody rent. When was the transfer?

Mr. Sanders replied 2003 it was transferred to the State.

Mayor Gatsas stated I know this board did it, but I'll tell you, I know Mr. Dillon signed it, this board gave him approval, but I don't know how the airport had access to that property. It doesn't make any sense to me. If we want to investigate it, then we should investigate it. That \$270,000 is an awful lot of money, and I think it's probably even more than that. Mr. Sanders and I had a conversation and it might have even been higher.

Mr. Sanders stated I had hopes that we could go prior to 2008.

Mayor Gatsas stated so we paid \$25,000 tonight, or expended \$25,000, to see if we couldn't find a lawyer to protect us with streetlighting; I would think that for \$270,000 that's exposed right now, somebody would probably perk up and say how come we didn't get the information sooner. I'm only joking. So for the \$270,000 I would hope this Board would jump up a little bit and say how do we present ourselves to collect the dollars because when a vendor comes in and says I'm ready to cut you a check, they want to cut us a check for \$140,000, with no questions asked.

Mr. Sanders stated they probably would have requested the deed, Your Honor, I presume. Actually, we sent them the deed for 1998 and they accepted it, and we didn't realize there was this 2003 date. The right thing is we don't own the property. If people want to communicate with the State that's possible.

Mayor Gatsas stated we're going to have to pay somebody.

Alderman Craig asked and you think the State will say sure, go ahead? If you feel that you want to speak to the State, I'll make that motion.

Mayor Gatsas stated it is the DOT, and I think that somebody needs to talk to them.

Alderman Craig stated I would make the motion to allow the Mayor to communicate with the DOT.

Mayor Gatsas stated let's send it to committee.

Alderman Arnold asked what would your motion be?

Alderman Craig moved to allow the Mayor to communicate with the DOT to see if there's any way the City can realize any revenues from the renting of the billboards on their land.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm just laughing because Alderman Corriveau said the State needs the money.

Mayor Gatsas responded no; they've got surpluses right now.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know about the DOT.

Mayor Gatsas responded I'm not sure that that's where the money goes.

Alderman Shaw duly seconded the motion. With a unanimous vote, the motion carried.

Mayor Gatsas stated I've had conversations with Chief Burkush. He's got a \$200,000 deficit; he had a shortfall in his budget of \$450,000 and we met. I asked him to come forward with an idea that would not constitute layoffs and it wouldn't constitute closure of stations. Chief, do you want to come up and at least explain to the board the ideas that you came forward with and what that would do for your shortfall this year and also your shortfall for next year.

Mr. James Burkush, Fire Chief, stated again, for the public's information, we had predicted this shortfall going into this budget year, and it was clear to us to operate with 46 line firefighters on duty and that there would be contingency available but as we know, things change. In our budget deliberations for FY2015 we spent considerable time with the Mayor going over our budget numbers and the projected shortfalls and all the other scenarios that we would have to deal with. He did say that he wanted the stations open and he didn't want any layoffs, and I responded the only other way to do it is to

reduce personnel that are on duty, and I told him that I was not in any way, shape or form advocating it or suggesting it or approving it or anything of that, and he fully understands that. But we're dealing with the fiscal realities that we have to deal with and, again, it's not a climate that I really support. It's a reduction in personnel. As you know, somebody says how do you quantify that. Everything we do is task oriented. Getting to your house with the stations open would be the same amount, but getting all the tasks done that you have to do when you get to your house would take longer. Those tasks are going in, search and rescue, stretching lines, performing ventilation, all the other functions that we do daily. So all those efficiencies would be lost. Going back a few short years ago we had 50 firefighters on duty, we had to make an adjustment at one time to go down to 44, we came up with a plan, we implemented the plan, we did some efficiencies, reorganization of personnel, and then the firefighters made an additional concession and said we will work for straight time if we put 46 guys on the line. So in addition to making insurance concessions, the firefighters also made the overtime concession and that's the tribute to the guys that we work with working for straight time. Nobody else does that and that has given us the ability to save 30% of our overtime money. So in order to meet the budget requirements we have to go down four personnel per shift in order to cover vacancies, and, again, that is down eight guys per shift and a few short not that long ago. The policy of the Board was June 4th to stay at 46. If that's going to be a change, then I would assume that the Board would give me that direction.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor; I think we have to have really only a discussion about one year. As you and I spoke last week, what you end up recommending in fiscal year 2015's budget is your business, it's your proposal, when you make your recommendation to the Board on an operating budget. So I don't think we need to spend a lot of time tonight on 2015. But from what I understand the discussion was about, what could occur in the next fiscal year, and it's my understanding for both of you that's how the discussion started was it has then come to move into ultimately if we can do it in 2015, can we do it in fiscal year 2014. When we met last week, based on a piece of paper you showed me, I had some understanding, part of it was going to affect the ladder truck that was in Alderman Shea's ward up on Somerville Street. What I didn't understand until I talked to the Chief I think on Saturday, was that it also affects staffing at the South Main Street fire station and the Webster Street fire station. That's how this plan for fiscal year 2015, that's possibly being asked to be considered for the balance of this fiscal year, would be achieved. It is my belief that when we approved the operating budget for this fiscal year, fiscal year 2014, that we were very clear with that approval that it would be that we stay at 46 firefighters on duty per shift. As I shared with you last week, I certainly recognize that a surplus in fund balance at the end of the year is important to us

and that maybe these discussions could happen in March or April. I am one that is always very, very concerned about during the winter months with people using alternative heating methods, I guess not alternative heating methods, but other heating methods of wood stoves, fireplaces, space heaters, and I'm sure I'm missing a lot of other ways that people have tried to help keep warmth in their homes, their apartments, and then add Christmas lights to it. I can't base this on anything but my own opinion is that we have our fair share of very serious fires in the wintertime, and I certainly recall fires where we've had more than one person die. The one back where I think we lost three or four children over on Second Street right around Christmastime. Although I think as we continue to get our reports from the finance officer each month, we need to take a look once we get through the winter whether it is the fire department, public works, etc. I think tonight they're calling for a snow emergency, so in three or four days we've had three nights and they have to get out and treat the streets. Alderman Ludwig and I were talking earlier today that he had gotten some calls, I understand some other aldermen got some calls that we didn't have enough people out there. So they ran almost two days of snow operations over the weekend. I could not support right now with the cold weather we've had reducing the number of firefighters on duty. It's something I'm certainly willing to look at as we come into March, but I certainly could not support that at this time. Thank you, Your Honor.

Mayor Gatsas asked Chief, did you have an opportunity to take a look over the last three or four years on how many fires we've had in January, February and March?

Mr. Burkush replied I believe we had 262 in the past three years.

Mayor Gatsas asked in three months?

Mr. Burkush replied three months in three years; 262 fires of all types.

Mayor Gatsas asked so that's roughly 90 a year or 30 a month? I don't think so.

Mr. Burkush responded look at the statistics. Fires of all types.

Mayor Gatsas stated I know I hear the fire engines going down the street on a pretty regular basis, but I don't think it is once a day.

Alderman Levasseur stated but how many are ambulance calls.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't disagree. So you're saying we have three building fires a day.

Mr. Burkush replied not including all other kinds of fires, building fires we had in those months was 103 over three years.

Mayor Gatsas stated so that is 30 a year and that is 10 a month. If I divide 103 by three, it is roughly 35, and then divide that by three, it's roughly what a month? That is besides the point. You're showing a deficit here of \$200,000. If you implemented that January 1st, what would you end up a year with?

Mr. Burkush replied we wouldn't be in deficit.

Mayor Gatsas stated you would not be in deficit. You would probably have a surplus.

Mr. Burkush responded possibly.

Mayor Gatsas stated possibly a surplus. I don't disagree with you, Alderman O'Neil. In three days we've had two snow storms, and I'm looking at a bottom line of \$483,000 and we've spent an additional \$50,000 in just one month. I know that there are a couple more retirements coming that aren't booked here, I think that if we don't implement it, it is going to be difficult enough, and I know what happens is there are positions that I've held up on hiring because I'm worried that we aren't going to be able to meet those needs, and I don't know how else to do it. Certainly, it's always been a position of not laying anybody off, not closing a station. I'm not saying that this is the best plan in the world, but I asked the Chief to go out and come back with something that met the needs of the community and didn't lay people off and it didn't close stations, and certainly if I remember correctly, you were in a staffing situation on stations 6, 7 and 10 already. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied that was shared staffing.

Mayor Gatsas stated so in 6, 7, and 10, Alderman O'Neil, I don't know what stations those are, but we're already doing shared staffing there now. When we talk about the west side or ward 7, it's already happening. Is that correct? Shared staffing?

Mr. Burkush replied that is part of the reorganization that we did a couple of years ago. That is correct.

Mayor Gatsas stated and I only look at the numbers on their face value. The Chief was running at about \$1.3 million in overtime. The new budget he came in with of 42 staffing took that overtime down to \$600,000. He's showing you here, or he said, that he could take the \$200,000 deficit and possibly create a surplus and nothing basically has changed because 6, 7 and 10 are already on shared staffing.

Alderman O'Neil asked Chief Burkush, isn't 7 operating as two companies?

Mr. Burkush replied that's correct. It is not 6, 7 and 10.

Alderman O'Neil stated it's station 5, station 6 and station 10. Station 5 plays a role at the northwest Manchester protection as well. Is that right? So more than just protecting the north end, they cross the river very regularly.

Mayor Gatsas stated I apologize that I had the wrong number.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I may, Your Honor. I think when we go back and look at the minutes, we had a somewhat similar discussion around the same time last year when we came to it. I certainly recognize that it's very important for us to carry a surplus ending this year; I think we carried a surplus of fund balance of \$2.5 million into this coming fiscal year, so I recognize that's important. And many of the department heads have heard me talk about the importance of trying to be frugal these last six months. I know you're holding positions at this point, but maybe don't fill them, there might be some that make sense to fill, but I just think with the cold weather upon us this is the wrong time to have less firefighters out there. I really do. I'm bothered by it whether the numbers speak for themselves until we come up with 10 building fires a month.

Mr. Burkush stated really to me that is irrelevant. It is so much more than that.

Alderman O'Neil stated right, but some of the things that stick out to me are things, and this maybe goes back to the early 1990's or the late 1980's, a building fire around Christmastime on Second Street, and I want to think four children lost their lives. For some reason I think we have those more tragic fires during the cold weather. People are seeking alternative ways to heat their homes. It's a fact, it's not an opinion. Drive all around the city and I don't think it's limited to multi-unit buildings. Sometimes it is single family homes. Again, your discussion that you started with the chief was regarding your proposed budget for fiscal year 2015 and then it moved into a discussion

about this year. Chief, when you made the recommendation, it was regarding fiscal year 2015?

Mr. Burkush replied it was not a recommendation. It was a response to a directive that I was given. I would not recommend reduction in staffing at any time in any way.

Mayor Gatsas asked Chief, aren't you in shared staffing now at 5, 6 and 10?

Mr. Burkush replied I am.

Mayor Gatsas asked who recommended that?

Mr. Burkush replied that is in response to a reduction.

Mayor Gatsas stated so the only one you were adding is 7. Are you doing shared staffing now?

Mr. Burkush replied we are doing shared staffing now.

Mayor Gatsas stated at 5, 6 and 10. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied that's correct.

Mayor Gatsas stated so the only addition to 5, 6 and 10 would be 7. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor, just for clarification.

Mr. Burkush stated it's not that simple a response.

Alderman O'Neil stated when I spoke to you on Saturday, it was beyond reduction in staff at the Somerville station, it was reduction of one firefighter per shift in station 2 on South Main Street, and there was a reduction of one firefighter per shift in station 5 on Webster Street. So it is more than just reduction in staff at the Somerville Street station. Am I correct or did I misunderstand you?

Mr. Burkush replied that's correct. We went into this budget year, we went through the whole budget deliberations for fiscal year 2014, we stated that we would have a shortfall, and we were given the directive to stay at 46. That was the directive of the Board for last year's budget, we have the minutes, and that there would be a contingency available for departments that need to come back. So the fire department comes forward, puts out there that we have a deficit, and then now I'm going to take a budget cut for \$200,000 to give to another department. I'm not for that. I'm not for a reduction in personnel any way, any how. So if you direct me to do it, we'll do it. I'm not advocating it.

Alderman Roy stated Chief, you said there were 12 building fires a month. A pot on the stove where the oil ignites would be classified as a building fire. Is that correct? A trash can that burns?

Mr. Burkush replied you know the answer to that question.

Alderman Roy stated I know the answer and that's why I'm asking you so everybody understands what we're talking about because they're right. Most of those fire trucks going down the road aren't for building fires, and everybody has to understand that. They're for fires inside of buildings but it is not the whole structure that burns.

Mr. Burkush responded that's correct.

Alderman Roy stated and the reason I say that is because we know that the number of fires have gone down steadily over the years. The reality right now is that I think 75% of all the runs are med runs. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied that's correct.

Alderman Roy stated we have a big piece of apparatus, four guys going down the street to a med run. Have you thought of doing anything about responding with smaller apparatus to med runs? You don't have to answer me now. I'm just throwing that out there. Food for thought. We talked about this at the last meeting within the last month right here, and you said you need to go manage your department and wait until the end of the year until it all shakes out to see where we're at because we're looking for surplus. Correct me if I'm wrong; you were just talking about you went from 50 to 46, and did you say you were going to go down to 42.

Mr. Burkush replied to meet this number, next year's would be 42. That is what the directive was. The directive was how do you meet your budget without laying off people or without closing stations.

Alderman Roy stated and this is what you came up with, the number 42. Okay, thank you for explaining that to me. The number of 46 firefighters is in our contract. Is that right?

Mr. Burkush replied that's the number that will allow us to have straight time overtime.

Alderman Roy stated if you go below 46 then it is time and a half, so it wasn't a directive from this board, it wasn't the policy of this board, it was an agreement within the contract that allows us to do that and we understand, and if we go below those numbers, we have the flexibility to go below those numbers but we're going to start paying time and a half. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied absolutely. You can go to whatever number you want.

Alderman Roy stated if you want to be crazy you could go to 20 and that certainly wouldn't get the job done, and that's why I used that number, it would be time and a half. One other thing; Alderman O'Neil, you said you had some information from the chief about this plan that was developed for next year and now it came into this. If you could share that with all of us, I'd appreciate that because I really don't have a handle on what that plan is right now. I think I'm getting a pretty clear picture of it. I agree that we need to wait until the end of the year to see what the surpluses are and all that kind of stuff, but I also think that the Chief needs to manage his department.

Mayor Gatsas stated just for clarification, Alderman Roy, I met with the Chief, he came to me and showed me a budget that showed \$415,000 in excess of the 1% that we had given directives to everybody in the city to do. I directed him to go back and come to me with a budget that had no layoffs and no station closures. This was a discussion for 2015. Alderman O'Neil was not in the discussions at all. I commend the Chief, we sat there for the better part of an hour and a half talking about 44, talking about 42 or how we could do it, plans, what are some other ideas. And I said Chief, it is your department, the only conditions I'm giving you is no layoffs and no closures. He came back to me some four or five days later, showed me the plan, made up the deficit of \$415,000 in next year's budget, and I said to him, Chief, if you were to implement that plan today, because obviously I'm looking at his numbers and there's a \$200,000 deficit, I said what would

happen and he said I probably would make up that deficit and there could be a surplus. That is how that came about. The Chief didn't come in here and say, I think this is a great idea, I think we have to implement it. He showed me the sheets, he said to me, right now we're doing shared staffing at 5, 6 and 10, that shared staffing would have to go to 5, 6, 7, and 10 to make that work.

Mr. Burkush stated that's correct.

Mayor Gatsas continued so this is in advance of one more station versus what he's doing now to meet that shared staffing.

Mr. Burkush stated and reduce two other stations.

Mayor Gatsas stated but the shared staffing at 5, 6 and 10 is already happening. So that is how it came about.

Alderman Roy asked Chief, when the straight time overtime came in, we talked about getting rid of the floaters. You'll disagree with me because they're assigned to a company, there are extra people who we're paying benefits for. Have you looked at that? Eliminating that floater position or that assigned position that is used to cover other places when people are out so that we don't pay benefits. Have you looked at that?

Mr. Burkush replied yes, we have, Alderman, and it's still efficient for us and I'll give you the example and you'll understand it more than anybody. When you have a company officer that's out in one company, for an extended amount of time, you know that that rotation of overtime would stay in that work group, that we would end up paying time and a half anyway.

Alderman Roy asked for an officer?

Mr. Burkush replied correct. We have four available to cover those extended leaves.

Alderman Roy stated a firefighter would be the same.

Mr. Burkush replied we've only got two, but we can move firefighters a heck of a lot easier than we can move the company officers. So that is still efficiency that we gain by doing it that way.

Alderman Roy stated and from what I'm saying, and I'd appreciate it if you or Alderman O'Neil could forward us this plan, what I heard is that it's not just flex staffing I will call it up at engine 7, there's a firefighter being eliminated at stations 2 and 5. Is that what I heard?

Mr. Burkush replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you, Your Honor. Just for clarification; I met with the Mayor last Thursday, we agreed with the agenda, and while I was there we also talked about how he has asked to meet with all folks that are coming back with committee assignments, we talked about that. He shared this discussion with me. He showed me a piece of paper that had other information, if I recall, Your Honor, on it, so I didn't take anything from the Mayor. He showed me a piece of paper, then I followed-up with a phone call to the chief on Saturday, who was on vacation, so I don't have any plan or writing. It was a conversation with the Mayor and a conversation with Chief Burkush. I'm not sure there's anything specifically in writing other than looking at some numbers that you two shared with each other.

Mayor Gatsas stated the only numbers that are there, and I certainly don't have a problem sharing them, is what the Chief gave me at 42. And, again, the biggest problem the Chief has right now is, how many people do you have out on workers' comp. Is that 11?

Mr. Burkush replied ten.

Mayor Gatsas stated there are 10 people out on workers' comp.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think they're all workers' comp.

Mr. Burkush stated some sick and some are on workers' comp.

Mayor Gatsas stated he's down 11 people.

Alderman Roy asked can you get that information to us, Chief?

Mr. Burkush replied yes.

Mayor Gatsas stated I've been very clear with all of you. This next budget and what's before us, I've been just that clear with the department heads, and if we don't start thinking now on how we can make up some of those dollars to have fund balances to do what we need to do or move those dollars into other distribution of numbers.

Mr. Sanders, between fire, police, highway, and facilities based on their chargebacks and vehicle maintenance, what are those dollars? About \$70 million out of \$85 million?

Mr. Sanders replied right. On the operating budget that would be about \$70 - \$75 million.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's \$75 million out of \$85 million. We've got to find, as I've told you all, there is \$6 or \$7 million we have to find just to get to the cap now. So it is before us.

Mr. Burkush stated the best of context is that with less.

Mayor Gatsas responded absolutely Chief, I agree, no question. And then I said to you, I was the one that said it to you, what can you do with that number if you implement it in today and it's good enough for 2015, it should be good enough of 2014. Chief, if you could tell me that you can create a revenue of \$1.6 million, I welcome it because there are not a whole heck of a lot of places we can look.

Alderman Arnold stated thank you very much, Mayor Gatsas. If I can back up just one or two steps, and I appreciate your offer of clarity. Am I understanding this correctly that first of all it's not an agenda item and the plan, for lack of a better term, that the Chief is describing is not a proposal that he endorses, in fact he says we shouldn't do that because there could be implications at the level of service provided because of responsibilities that some of the firefighters have that are responding to a call. If that is true, because correct me if that's not true, Mayor Gatsas. You are asking this board tonight to give the Chief an instruction to go below the 46 number of firefighters on duty per shift.

Mayor Gatsas responded I think that's probably the same vote I asked you to take on February 1, 2011 and dropped it to 44 and this board approved it.

Alderman Arnold stated this Board gave a directive.

Mayor Gatsas stated you just asked me a question. The Board approved it in 2011.

Alderman Arnold stated this board also gave a directive to the fire chief that staffing will remain at 46.

Mayor Gatsas stated I'm not too sure that was a directive, that was a conversation, but it was not a vote, it was not a directive.

Alderman Arnold stated the staffing is currently at 46. When the chief is talking about the possibility to the falling of responsiveness that could be impacted by us going below 46, that's outrageous and sure I'm right there with Alderman Ludwig. You're saying you have shared staffing in some parts of the city already. That doesn't make it okay, and you're asking this board to tell the fire chief to expand that even more. That's what you're asking this board to do tonight. Is that right?

Mayor Gatsas replied let me give you a comment on it if that's what you're asking. Nobody asked the chief to do shared staffing at 5, 6 and 10. Did anybody ask you to do that, Chief? No. You came up with that on your own to meet the standards because you had 11 people out on workers' comp and you had to do something to make it work.

Mr. Burkush stated that was when we dropped 30 people.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's when we dropped 30 people off our staff, that's when we went to shared staffing. You're doing shared staffing and removing just two more individuals. What would your number look like, Chief, if you were carrying 46 and full staffing at every station? Where would you be with your budget? Would you be over by about another \$600,000?

Mr. Burkush responded I guess I don't understand the question.

Mayor Gatsas stated if you were at full staffing and no shared staffing.

Mr. Burkush replied if you were at three and two, whatever this magic number is, your overtime would still be the same. Forty-six is 46. It doesn't matter where they are.

Mayor Gatsas asked but you're having shared staffing now. If you didn't have shared staffing at 5, 6 and 10, if you didn't have that shared staffing, what would your number look like?

Mr. Burkush replied it would be much higher.

Mayor Gatsas stated correct, it would be much higher. Wouldn't it?

Mr. Burkush stated it wouldn't be at 46.

Mayor Gatsas stated but your cost would be higher if you didn't do shared staffing. Is that correct?

Mr. Burkush replied we have 10 engines, 6 ladders, we didn't have enough people to put on it, so we had to decide whether we were going to staff a fire truck.

Mayor Gatsas asked so you've been doing this?

Mr. Burkush replied we've been doing it.

Alderman Arnold stated thank you, Mayor Gatsas. The chief has managed his budget to date and he has expressed in no uncertain terms tonight he is not comfortable with, nor does he advocate, going below the 46 number, and I'm with Alderman O'Neil in terms of if you believe he should, then when you present your budget proposal, you have the right to factor that in. It is mind boggling that this board is being asked to make that change tonight.

Mayor Gatsas stated maybe we'll ask it next month if that \$483,000 disappears because we have a few more storms and if Mr. Sheppard comes before us and asks how he's going to do the snow storm. We're looking at \$483,000 left in a budget that we started out at \$140 million.

Alderman Arnold asked could I have one last follow-up on that.

Mayor Gatsas replied sure you can.

Alderman Arnold stated thank you very much. Public safety: every single member of this elected body, yourself included, has to go defend the decisions we make in here, no more so than when it comes to public safety issues. When you have the fire chief tell us that this can impact the level of service provided when firefighters are responding to a call, how are we supposed to go defend that to the taxpayers that are paying for the service. Thank you very much.

Mayor Gatsas responded I think that we're going to have to tell the taxpayers when the taxes go up by 7% that's what happens. Are we going to go to 7%? Not right now.

Mr. Sanders, in the proposed numbers that... If we have 10 votes then we should just do it tonight. Listen, we all have our prerogatives, we can all do it.

Alderman Ludwig stated quite frankly every department in this city has been taking hit after hit after hit. We listen to this same story either from the chief of the fire department or stores in my neighborhood, hairdressers are being knocked off and robbed, and what we say about the chief is that I learn through the chief on what I need and what I don't. Let's get him up here and start asking him the same questions. It's not your fault.

Mayor Gatsas stated I've had that conversation with the chief.

Alderman Ludwig stated it's not your fault, Your Honor, I am defending you. The fact of the matter is 1.3% or 1.5% or 1.6% isn't going to cut it. We're probably going to have to start laying people off. With all due respect to every highway worker, this was the worst plowing I've ever seen in the city for this much snow, with all due respect to them. I don't know why we lost 24 mailboxes, we have guys in wing plows, one guy, it is dangerous. Good thing we lost 24 mailboxes and not 24 kids. We're doing a lot of things, we're rolling the dice. He's being pushed back against the wall because with other budgets you've said you can you do it with 44. Can you do it with 46? He says yes, then he's called in here and he's chastised about well it's working. We rolled the dice; nothing happened. Look how good we're doing. We're not doing that good, Your Honor. We're really not. I know you have to live within the numbers and I know you don't want to lay people off and nobody here does, but we may get to the point where we have to, and that's going to be a sad day for Manchester. We're going down, down, down. That's the way I see it; I'm sorry, that's just my opinion.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's why I gave him the directive of no closing stations and no layoffs. That was the directive I gave.

Alderman Ludwig responded well, maybe we need layoffs. Why don't you advocate for layoffs?

Mayor Gatsas asked Chief?

Mr. Burkush replied no layoffs.

Alderman Levasseur stated I remember during the budget that we said that we were going to put \$200,000 in into a contingency fund and you said that they could come back to this Board and ask for that \$200,000, and I knew when he made that statement that when they came in front of us and asked us for it, he would get his head beat in for it. For the last 45 minutes that is all you've been doing is beating his head in.

Mr. Martineau comes in with a \$276,000 projection of losses or deficit, did you sit down with him and give him a directive. It's always the Fire Department.

Mayor Gatsas responded yes, I did.

Alderman Levasseur stated well, I can't wait to hear what that one is all about. What is your budget \$21 million or \$19 million? Nineteen million dollars and we're talking \$200,000. I know that's a lot of money because it's coming out of this account, but from the very beginning that the budget was put together you said put the money into a contingency account and let him come and ask for it if he needed it. You told him that. You said it to the full board. I remember saying to him good luck with that one, Chief. You'll never get that money. It is always the fire department that's always getting beat on.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think I told the chief... Chief, what did I tell you that you're to end up with for a shortfall at the end of the year or maybe a surplus? Didn't you tell us last year you were going to have a shortfall and what did I tell you last year?

Alderman Levasseur stated he doesn't need a directive, Your Honor. Let him run his department, he knows what he's doing. He came in with a surplus under tough circumstances last year, and when it comes towards May or June, let him come back and talk to us about what's going on. Let his run his department. You're saying to him you have 7 and 8 and 9 and you've got shared this and shared that, let him run his department. You don't think he's capable of running the department?

Mayor Gatsas responded I never said that.

Alderman Levasseur asked then why are you giving him directives?

Mayor Gatsas asked why am I giving him a directive?

Alderman Levasseur replied yes, without the board's knowledge about it.

Mayor Gatsas responded I don't think you want to go down that road, Alderman.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't want to go down that road; I don't know if that's the purview of the Mayor to go out and tell department heads this is your directive without the board knowing about it.

Mayor Gatsas stated yes, it is.

Alderman Levasseur stated let him run his own department. We've already had this discussion over the last two years about the fire department and you are always bullying the fire department. Let them run their own department. It's getting nauseating to sit there and watch you berate him for the last 45 minutes. Its embarrassing.

Mayor Gatsas asked Chief, have I berated you?

Alderman Levasseur stated it sounds like berating. He's not going to say that you're berating him. He has too much respect for you. He won't say it to you, Mayor. He's a very honorable man, a very respectful man. He's working under very rough circumstances.

Mayor Gatsas stated maybe we should go into recess.

Alderman Levasseur responded fine. You should see how you go after this guy all the time. It's getting sickening.

Alderman Corriveau stated thank you. Chief, I was just looking around for any past budget materials I might have and I didn't find any, and I don't expect you to know exactly, but I guess following up on Alderman Ludwig's narrative. Since the implementation of the tax cap, how much has the fire department's budget gone up? From what number to what is it today?

Mr. Burkush replied there have been changes in the budget process, correct. It stayed pretty flat but there were some things that were in our budget that have changed such as benefits and workmens' comp. There were things that used to be in our budget that are not now.

Alderman Corriveau stated I'll rephrase my question. In the past three years how much has the fire department spent on firefighting operations, manned equipment, whatever that might be, and how much has that gone up, if it even has, in the past few years? I'm inclined to believe your budget, I remember when I met you four years ago as an alderman, and you told me your department's budget has been flat for a number of years. I imagine in the time the four years since it has been relatively flat, so you're looking probably at a department that's had very negligible increases in it's budget over probably the better course of a decade. Would that be correct?

Mr. Burkush replied, again, there were some changes to the budgets, and then with the reduction of 40 staff members, we had a significant budget drop. The past relatively few years we've been cutting our expense line because our salary lines have gone up due to the contractual obligations is what has impacted our budget the most, which is the salary increases.

Alderman Corriveau stated I guess what I'm asking you is over the past few years the fire department has operated under very tight confines, in terms of what you need to do, you've had to make adjustments, make some staffing reductions, look for efficiencies, all kinds of things that you've looked to do. Looking forward, and the Mayor saying looking at right now, it may very well be to lay people off, it may be to shut down stations, it may be to come up with this shared staffing, and that is going to have a public safety impact to a number of neighborhoods. What I want to know is given the track of the last four years and what you're being asked to do over the course of the next few months and then the next year; what can this board, as policymakers, do to change our firefighting operating budget to make it to a level where you can come before us and say the fire department is...let me put it this way: It concerns me that you have said that I absolutely do not advocate this plan and to me that's all I need to know. If you're saying this isn't the way to go in terms of protecting Manchester's public safety, then I'm certainly not the person that would in any way disagree with that assessment. But I imagine we're on a course right now where year by year it's becoming more and more and more difficult for you to say you're comfortable with your public safety operations. Would that be correct?

Mr. Burkush responded personally, I'm not going to jeopardize public safety or firefighter safety in any way, shape or manner. Part of the reorganizations that we have done by increasing staffing on certain apparatus, the shared staffing, has increased the number of people that I roll on the first alarm. These are things that I looked at, that I've studied, so that we're more efficient, less injuries, and we're quicker and more efficient to do that, but I would never jeopardize public safety. I won't do it. That's why I'm sitting here screaming right now that I don't want to go to the level where we're going. But I won't do it and I don't believe anybody in this room wants to do it either. When you sit and you look at the financial situation with the Mayor and Mr. Sanders and Guy Beloin and you look at your contractual obligations that all department heads are facing, it's not only us, all department heads are faced to do with, all City departments are looking for whatever ways we can to be more efficient. Alderman Roy's made some suggestions and we've looked at some of those things, but you're up against a way out of the city where you need to have 10 fire stations just by the geographical layout of the city, the demands of the service, like we see high incidences that are in the center city, when people call us we don't delay, we don't stack calls, we respond. When we responded the other night we had six heroin overdoses in a short amount of time, we're seeing unprecedented EMS incidences like that where you need more than three people on the rigs, we're responding to the shootings and what have you that are in the city. We're getting up against the wall, and sitting with the Mayor there is no talk about compromise of safety, I will tell you that. We sit in the office and discuss it, but there is no talk about compromising public safety. It's always you have to come up with some ideas, you've got to be able to do more with less is what we're faced with.

Alderman Corriveau stated you mentioned that you believe you might be looking at a \$400,000 deficit going into the next fiscal year. Apart from implementing this directive, did you see an feasibility in any alternatives other than city hall finally stepping up and saying we are going to meet your deficit. I did not vote for this past budget, but I certainly understood that you would be coming back to us looking to make things right, I think that's the term Alderman O'Neil has used in the past, when certain departments have to pick each other up, and sometimes the Board of Mayor and Aldermen are asked to make difficult financial decisions. But it seems to me that this is far and wider disproportionately on your department, for a department that's already been asked a number of times to make staffing sacrifices, to look for any number of efficiencies.

Mr. Burkush responded it's getting increasingly difficult because city departments are competing for limited resources and it is getting increasingly difficult to do that. Short of some kind of increase in funding, I don't see any other way up. We had the SAFER grant a couple of years ago, a federal grant, but I've been reading across the country where cities have not been able to maintain those positions and they're getting grants and trying to save grants and that's ridiculous. Right now, I'd be very concerned if we had taken that SAFER grant; I would rather do it this way than be beholden to 2-year federal grant. I think looking back on that I don't think we should be, and I haven't gone out after staffing grants, we'll keep going for equipment grants, that might give us a little breathing room on the other side of the budget, but we need another funding increase somewhere in the city.

Alderman Shea stated thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Chief and Assistant Chief. I didn't realize that there was shared staffing at 5, 6 and I want to make clear 10. How long ago did you implement that?

Mr. Burkush replied it was two years ago when we had to go down to 44 and then we went through the last extension of the collective bargaining agreement when the concession was made there was a provision in the contract where the firefighters would work straight time for 46. At 46 we keep truck 7 in service is the way we're running it. Strategically if we were able to combine and build a station in the south end, we would take the personnel there and get truck 6 in service, is what we would like to do down the road, but we haven't been able to get going on that project.

Alderman Shea stated the present way that the firefighters work are 24 hours and I think that was implemented six or eight years ago, I'm not quite sure. How does that work? In other words, has there been any discussion about changing that particular time?

Mr. Burkush replied the collective bargaining agreements have been extended, there hasn't been any negotiations and we're going another year, so we'll begin to negotiate and ask the unions for some ideas about efficiencies.

Alderman Shea stated so with the contractual agreement that is the way it is. Do you have any thoughts on whether to continue that?

Mr. Burkush replied no; 24 hours is an efficient system. I think even if you were to extend the workweek, you would still stay at a schedule such as that. It's an efficient system.

Alderman Shea stated I'm just wondering did you come before us to tell us or to ask the board to approve or disapprove? Or is this just to let us know what was going on because I wasn't aware that 5, 6 and 10 were on this particular shared staffing. Are you asking us to approve or disapprove?

Mr. Burkush replied no.

Alderman Shea stated you're just going to implement whatever you feel would be beneficial for the department as well as safety in terms of the community, whether it be my particular ward or some other. Is that the gist of why you came?

Mr. Burkush replied no; tonight we're here to discuss not approve for this operation.

Alderman Shea stated thank you for your discussion.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you, Chief.

Alderman Greazzo stated since Mr. Sanders has come back into the room, there is talk of layoffs and ways to find more revenue. Mr. Sanders, has anybody found any way to save any money throughout the city other than the recycling program?

Mr. Sanders responded you say save money. Do you mean services more efficiently? We've talked about ways of increasing revenues.

Alderman Greazzo stated let's talk about ways to save money.

Mr. Sanders responded once again, I would just mention that the budget, if you look at the salary line of the City departments, just salary and overtime and that sort of thing, it's probably about \$60 to \$65 million of the total \$85 million operating budget. In the operating budget my personal opinion is they are pretty tight. I don't think you're going to see much operating surpluses in any of the departments on an expenditure side unless they have vacancies that they don't fill. Obviously, you can look at combining departments, but whether that's efficient, whether we're in the kind of building where you

could do things like that, I don't mean to deflect your question, but meaningful, substantial efficiencies are not clear to me at the moment where they would come from.

Alderman Greazzo asked Mr. Clougherty, how much have you saved in the recycling program so far?

Mr. Clougherty responded without having the actual data with me; I think since implementation to single stream we're probably deferring about 2,000 tons at about \$70 per ton from the landfill.

Alderman Greazzo asked per year?

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you. Mr. Sanders, do you see any other departments that are able to do things like that to offset their operating budgets, not their salary item obviously.

Mr. Sanders responded I do think in this upcoming budget with revenue issues, the City has low fees in certain areas that I think should be looked at that will alleviate some of the tax pressure maybe over time, provide money to maintain or enhance services, but I defer to the Mayor and when his budget comes out. Parking fees are an example. We have very low parking fees in the city. When you compare us to other cities, we are low and there are opportunities to raise those. The aldermen looked at permit fees and what our fees are relative to other cities in that area. There are things in garbage collection that have been talked about for years, but for a lot of good reasons have not been decided upon. If the departments can in some way enhance their revenue side, you have to determine their expenditures and then you're laying off people, which there will be a service impact to that, that the people will be able to do less, I think. It's not a very pleasant answer but it is truthful at best.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you.

Mayor Gatsas stated Mr. Sanders, if memory serves me right, our revenues are about \$44 million roughly, without taxes, I'm talking about department revenues, right around there.

Mr. Sanders replied yes.

Mayor Gatsas asked so if we saw a 10% increase in revenues, would that cover the shortfall that we need?

Mr. Sanders replied no, it would not.

Mayor Gatsas stated that is \$4 million and that wouldn't cover it. So don't think that I'm having these conversations with you this early because we don't need to.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you, and I think, Alderman Greazzo, if we could pull together the size of the city workforce 10 or 20 years ago, we're much smaller, but the city has grown. I was looking out into the audience; these folks are doing more with less people and it's generally on the administrative side that they have cut back. They have been very responsible not cutting back, or attempting to cut back, on the direct services to our citizens, but when I look across the board, they've all cut back on administrative positions. So at some point it's going to hit where there is an impact on services.

Alderman Greazzo stated I'm not suggesting that, Alderman.

Alderman O'Neil stated you bring up these efficiencies, and these efficiencies have gone on for years. This isn't the first board that said can we be more efficient. Boards have been looking at this for years. I think they deserve a lot of credit and a lot of thanks for their efforts because they're doing more with less.

Alderman Greazzo responded I couldn't agree more.

On motion of Alderman Greazzo, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to accept the report.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to recess the meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting back to order.

38. Report(s) of the Committee on Finance, if available.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to waive the readings by titles only.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Bond Resolution ought to pass and layover:

Bond Resolution:

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) for the 2014 CIP 711514 – Water Main Rehabilitation & Water Supply Storage Structures.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted that the Bond Resolution ought to pass and layover. Alderman Long and Osborne were absent.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Resolutions ought to pass and be enrolled:

Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Hundred Thirteen Thousand Three Hundred Seventy One Dollars (\$513,371) for the FY2014 CIP 212114 Homeless Healthcare.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Million Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,900,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 711014 Phase II CSO North Chestnut St.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eight Million Dollars (\$8,000,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 710413 Cohas Brook Sewer Project-Contract 3.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$7,200,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 711514 Water Main Rehabilitation & Water Supply Storage Structures.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted that the Resolutions ought to pass and be enrolled. Aldermen Long and Osborne were absent.

39. Report(s) of the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration, if available.

There were none.

40. Report(s) of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems, if available.

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from Mike Reed of Stebbins Commercial Realty for an extension of the Listing Agreement for 351 Chestnut Street be approved.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to accept the report. Aldermen Long and Osborne were absent.

41. Report(s) of the Committee on Lands and Buildings, if available.

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Water Works Director for two easements to Water Works property in conjunction with the PILOT Program with Auburn be approved.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to accept the report. Aldermen Long and Osborne were absent.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to congratulate Dave and his staff on the great job with this. Who knows what direction it was going to go, but great job in sticking with it and working it out.

42. Report(s) of the Special Committee on the Manchester Municipal Complex, if available.

The Special Committee on the Manchester Municipal Complex respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the proposed policy from the Police and Public Works Department to sell various commemorative items at the municipal complex for the following rates:

- Commemorative Brick Paver: \$75
- Tree Marker: \$500
- Engraved Granite Bench: \$900

be approved; and further that both proposed policies be amended to specify that the funds raised through these efforts will be kept in a special revolving fund to be administered by the Finance Officer in addition to both department heads.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, on a unanimous vote, with the exception of Aldermen Long and Osborne who were absent, the report was accepted.

Alderman O'Neil stated I wanted to state for the record that McDonalds School came into play here with some of this.

Alderman Shea stated that was a compromise from \$100 to \$75, \$50 was one number and \$100 was the other. So we came out simultaneously with \$75.

Alderman Levasseur asked when does the program begin and who will be administering it?

Alderman Ludwig replied the department heads will administer the program, finance will handle the dollars that are collected.

Alderman Levasseur asked who do people call if they are interested in getting one of these items?

Alderman Ludwig replied I would say call either Deputy Chief Willard or Mr. Sheppard.

43. Ordinance:

"Amending Section 90.04 Dog Fouling Prohibition of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by deleting subsection B, Enforcement, and adding to subsection A Violation to include Method of Removal and Disposal."

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to waive the reading by title only.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted that the Ordinance be placed on its third and final reading and that it be ordained.

44. Resolutions:

"Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Hundred Thirteen Thousand Three Hundred Seventy One Dollars (\$513,371) for the FY2014 CIP 212114 Homeless Healthcare."

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Million Nine Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$2,900,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 711014 Phase II CSO North Chestnut St.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eight Million Dollars (\$8,000,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 710413 Cohas Brook Sewer Project-Contract 3.”

“Amending the FY 2014 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Million Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$7,200,000) for the FY 2014 CIP 711514 Water Main Rehabilitation & Water Supply Storage Structures.”

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to waive readings by titles only.

On motion of Alderman Ludwig, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was moved that the Resolutions ought to pass and be enrolled.

Alderman O'Neil stated Fred McNeill had some pretty challenging projects this year both downtown and there was nothing easy about that whole Wellington Road thing. He deserves some credit with keeping everybody happy and the phone calls down to a minimum, if they even happened, so he deserves some thanks for that.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted that all matters pending before the present Board of Mayor and Aldermen and its committees be referred to the next Board of Mayor and Aldermen meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman O'Neil stated to Alderman Greazzo and Alderman Arnold, I'd like to thank them for their service to the City and wish them nothing but the best moving forward. I also want to thank all of the departments for taking the time to meet with Alderman-elect Barry and Alderman-elect Hirschmann and myself a week or so ago. It was a whirlwind tour and the airport even got us sandwiches to go because Alderman-elect Hirschmann and I were going to die if we didn't get something eat. In one day we saw every City department, so that was pretty interesting, with the exception of the Mayor's office.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think I can on behalf of the Board and the citizens of Manchester wish the UNH football team all the best with their national semi-final game this coming Friday against North Dakota State. Deputy Airport Director Brian O'Neil will be leading the group of Manchester fans heading out there. Please give them all our best, we'll be watching on ESPN2 at 8:00 p.m.

Alderman Corriveau stated I just wanted to use this opportunity to tell my constituents in the Megan's Meadow neighborhood; I know two or three dozen of you woke up yesterday morning to the lack of mailboxes, and for those of you who didn't see any of the media coverage, our department of public works has worked very, very hard and that was our first big snowstorm of the season. Those guys really do good work, tireless work under some really tough conditions, and I know I can't speak entirely for them but I certainly regret that occurrence. If you are one of those individuals who needs a new mailbox in the Megan's Meadow neighborhood, call the highway department at 624-6444 or you can call me at 624-6850 and we will move rapidly to make sure you get the new mailbox and hopefully it won't happen again tonight. Thank you, Your Honor.

Alderman Levasseur stated thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's not often that we get the opportunity to do this publicly, but for the City Solicitor's Office and for City Solicitor Tom Clark and for the staff that worked on the recent arbitration with Sgt. Coco, I want to say how much I appreciate the work that Tom Arnold did on that job. It was a huge public issue in the papers, and I believe that the win was a very strong psychological win for the City, and I would like to give props to Chief Mara for following the protocol and sticking to his guns and going with the arbitration. I've heard from a lot of people on this. I posted it up on my Facebook page last night and the amount of comments that were positive towards the City Solicitor's office, and you particularly Tom Arnold, and the Chief for plowing through with that. I think it was a very important message and a very important win for the City of Manchester. I wanted to put some accolades out for the office and for what you did Mr. Arnold. And to everybody on the Board, I want to thank everybody for a very exciting, very interesting, and a lot of learning and great fun for the two years that I've been here. I wouldn't trade this job for anything. I love being in this position and I really appreciate all of my colleagues and working with you for the whole year and I can't wait to start over again on January 7th. Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas to everybody and Happy New Year for all of you and your families.

Alderman Arnold stated thank you very much, Mayor Gatsas, and I know we're all eager to get out of here, but if you'll indulge me just for a minute or two for personal privilege. Believe it or not, next to marrying my wife and the birth of our daughter, serving in this chamber with all of you has been the greatest honor of my life thus far, and I've enjoyed every single minute of it. I've enjoyed working with everybody, Mayor Gatsas, the Aldermen, the department heads, City staff, and I'm very grateful for many of you who I now call a friend. Everyone here knows that we face challenges in our city; none of those challenges are insurmountable. I have confidence in the people of this city, tonight's meeting at some point is notwithstanding, I have confidence in the members of this board, I have confidence in the members of the new Board who are going to kick off on January 7th, and I know that all of you have the capacity and the tools necessary to meet those challenges. I will offer, if I can, a couple of thoughts and I ask that over the next two years as you're discussing, as you're having your debates and as you're making decisions, on behalf of the people of our city give some thoughts to these things. At first I would say don't tolerate complacency because we lose far too many opportunities that way, and I know many of us on this Board feel that we could point to some specific examples, I won't do that tonight, but I would just ask my colleagues don't tolerate complacency. The second thing is don't settle for mediocrity. We have challenges in our city and we can, and I know that one day we will, have the very best that New Hampshire has to offer. The last and most important thing, I'd ask my colleagues to remember don't ever doubt, not even for a single minute, that the decisions that are made in this building, and especially in this chamber, they determine whether and to what extent Manchester is known as a leading city in the state of New Hampshire. I'd ask you to consider those things as you carry on the peoples' work in the next two years. I leave you with those thoughts, and I wish everyone the best, Mayor Gatsas, my colleagues, my friends, make our city proud. Thank you very much.

Mayor Gatsas stated it has been a pleasure to have served with Alderman Greazzo and Alderman Arnold. I know certainly you will both be around the city of Manchester and certainly we will be hearing from you one way or another, I'm sure. It has certainly been an honor and a pleasure to serve with you, and I think that this Board, along with the next Board, is going to have its challenges and we should discuss them early and we should be as collegial as we possibly can with each other because that's what makes the difference, come to a common understanding and to at least listen to the other person's ideas. With that, I would ask us all to stand and wish the folks out there a Merry Christmas.

ADJOURNMENT

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

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

City Clerk