

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

March 04, 2013

5:30 p.m.

Chairman Katsiantonis called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Katisantonis, Long, Roy, Osborne

Absent: Alderman Gamache

Messrs.: N. Campasano, L. Wallace, W. Sanders, J. Hoben, D. Boutilier

Chairman Katisantonis addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. The Traffic Division has submitted an agenda which needs to be addressed:

**RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY
ORDINANCE:**

On Cypress Street, west side, from Valley Street to a point 55 feet north (Ord. 2902)

On Cypress Street, west side, from Massabesic Street to a point 35 feet south (Ord.9123)

Alderman Osborne

**RESCIND PARK ONE HOUR – 8:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. –
EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

On Cypress Street, west side, from a point 35 feet south of Massabesic Street to Garland Avenue (Ord. 9228)

Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME –EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Cypress Street, west side, from Massabesic Street to a point 155 feet south

Alderman Osborne

On Notre Dame Avenue, east side, from a point 88 feet north of

Putnam Street to a point 70 feet north
Alderman Gamache
On Laurel Street, south side, from a point 250 feet east of Beacon
Street to Cass Street
Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Porter Street, east side, from Cilley Road to a point 78 feet north
Alderman Shea

STOP SIGN:

On Sullivan Street at Dubuque Street – NEC
Alderman Gamache

RESCIND ONE HOUR PARKING:

On Maple Street, east side, from Shasta Street to a point 60 feet
north (Ord. 3345)
On Maple Street, east side, from a point 70 feet south of Silver
Street to a point 100 feet south of Hayward Street (Ord. 3349)
Alderman Shea

Alderman Roy stated Mr. Chair, I would like to pull out the 4-way stop sign.

*On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted
to approve this item.*

STOP SIGNS – 4 –WAY:

On Shasta Street at Wilson Street –NEC, SWC
(Review enclosed)
Alderman Shaw
Alderman Shea

Alderman Roy stated there is a 4-way stop sign being requested on the corner of
Shasta and Wilson Streets. Once again, it meets none of the criteria that we
should meet before we put up a multi-way stop sign. As a matter of fact, it is
supposed to be five accidents in 12 months and there have only been five accidents
in seven years. There are not 800 vehicles; three hundred vehicles, per hour, for

eight hours. There are 800 vehicles a day. The average speed is 16 in one direction and 21 in the other direction. I would make a motion that it be denied.

Alderman Roy moved to deny the 4-way stop sign. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Chairman Katsiantonis addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Presentation by the Local Emergency Planning Committee.

Mr. Nick Campasano, Deputy Fire Chief, stated good evening. I am joined tonight by Leonard Wallace, EPA Region 1. The reason that we came before you this evening, the City of Manchester, through the Fire Department, through a hazardous materials emergency planning grant, contracted with Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission last year to reactivate the City's local emergency planning committee. There was one established many years ago that fell into inactivity and Mr. Wallace will kind of run through how that timeline went. We are looking tonight for a recommendation, from your committee, to the full board, for formal recognition of the City's Local Emergency Planning Committee. You have a green folder that we provided to you and on the right side of the folder are handouts that I provided. One is a screen shot of the City's Local Emergency Planning Committee webpage. There is a packet, which contains all of the agendas and minutes for the meetings that we have had this last year, which were our formation meetings, as well as a copy of the mission goals and rules of procedure for the committee. On the left side are handouts that Mr. Wallace has provided that he will briefly overview for you.

Mr. Leonard Wallace, EPA Region 1, stated on the right-hand side there is also a small document that outlines this program in laymen's terms for anyone to easily understand without rules and regulations. The LEPCs came in existence in October of 1987 and has been in existence for 25 years. The reason for this basic law was Bhopal, India, in which 1,000 people died in one night and 100,000 people were injured permanently. Because of that event and a similar event in West Virginia, at a sister facility, caused 100 people to go to the hospital just several months later, congress enacted this law that gave people in the community the right to know what is going on at businesses and industries; what type of chemicals are in their community and plan for them. Both as a community they can plan and as multi-communities with regional hazmat teams. Sometime in the mid to late 1990s, the emphasis was changed and of course 911 occurred and a lot of people were doing activities related to accidental releases in this county. The LEPC became a little less known because it is an unfunded mandate in one respect. Then the State Emergency Response Commission (SERC), on the left-hand side you will see that, the State of New Hampshire made the Advisory Council of Emergency Preparedness and Security. Basically they made it all hazards. The SERC's duties along with other commissions were put together and hopefully when you reform the LEPC, you will also mimic what the state has done in making it all hazards. The same resources, just with different emphasis, go to the same committee meetings. That is why the State did it at the state level. The SERC made every single city and town in the state of New Hampshire their own LEPCs. They could regionalize if they wished. There are some regional LEPCs. Manchester, at this point, is a single city LEPC, Local Emergency Planning Committee, and they do have their membership. There are facilities who are automatic members. They don't have to go out and ask people to join. If certain companies have certain chemicals, then they are required to be a member of the LEPC. There is no option for them. They tell the LEPC in the state who they are and who will participate. They currently have probably about 30 people who are

automatic members of this organization. It is not like they are going to be out looking for volunteers. The emphasis, also, is on educating the public. What plans do they have? How do you want people to behave in different events? How do you want them to report things? The LEPC is a gathering of information. They analyze data and educate the public. Many communities are going back to their basic roots. What are we supposed to be doing? How are we supposed to be helping the public? This organization allows all of those things to occur, where industry, citizens and government sit together to think about how something could impact them and how to prepare for it.

Mr. Campasano stated we are currently in the middle of performing what is known as a commodity flow study. We are analyzing various transportation routes throughout the city to identify where hazardous materials are transported either to facilities in the city or simply through the city over highways or various surface roads, in order to create emergency contingency plans. The LEPC is really that gathering group, as Mr. Wallace explained. It is a planning group looking at and identifying gaps in our emergency responder training and determining what types of training programs are needed for our responders. They coordinate exercises and develop mutual aid agreements. They are really the catch-all group when it comes to hazardous materials and hazards within the city. As Mr. Wallace explained, the trend now is actually to expand to an all hazards type committee.

Alderman Long stated thank you for the presentation. One of my questions was identifying hazardous material that has come through Manchester and would you also identify if there are companies that have hazardous materials and what are the potentials there?

Mr. Campasano replied yes, there are federal laws that require inventory forms that are filed annually. The LEPC is one of the receivers of those forms, as well as the local fire department and the state. The LEPC also inventories those to also add into our plans to make sure that we are preparing for potential emergencies at those facilities.

Alderman Long asked what is the membership? Who is a member of this committee? Is it by statute or federal CFR?

Mr. Wallace replied it is federal law that is correct. If you go to page 31 in the booklet, page 31 lists the membership that should be making it up. This isn't exactly the words from the law, but any facility that is subject to this act and there are certain chemicals with very low threshold amounts and if a company has those chemicals they have to tell the SERC and LEPC in the state, the ACEPS that who a member of that company will be a member of the LEPC to participate in this process. That is the ideal makeup of the committee plus companies or facilities that could be subject to this rule, have to identify themselves and are automatic members of the committee.

Alderman Long asked how is this information disseminated to the public? Let's say on a particular street there was a hazardous material or chemical carrying company that transports. How do those neighbors know how to react to an emergency?

Mr. Wallace replied we have three basic levels of types of facilities within this law. One of them, the facilities and the LEPC are supposed to be working with the neighborhood, if you have that particular type. There are very few. There is only one in Manchester that meets that type of category where they should be actively

participating on what alarms sound like. Then there are the EHS facilities, Extremely Hazardous Substances. It is a very specific list. A lot of facilities in Manchester qualify to this. They are supposed to be working with the LEPC, meaning the community, in developing plans and educating the public. How that is accomplished is really up to the committee. Do you do community meetings? Do you do flyers through the school or through the water bill to educate the public about certain things? That is where the LEPC has to decide how they are going to educate the community about certain things.

Alderman Roy stated the reporting you were talking about is that the tier two stuff?

Mr. Campasano replied correct.

Alderman Roy asked we are not going to put that list out to the public, are we?

Mr. Campasano replied no.

Alderman Roy stated I am just concerned. The difference between an accidental release and a terrorist attack is intense, so if they all know where the stuff is, I don't think it would be a good thing. That is where I was going with that.

Mr. Campasano replied under the regulations the community has a right to know, so a civilian can request information, but since September 11th there have been safeguards put in place where an individual has to formally request it.

Alderman Roy stated right, and then we would have documentation of who it was.

Mr. Campasano stated correct, but we wouldn't be publishing just a list of tier two reports.

Alderman Roy stated okay. That is good. Springfield, Illinois, years ago, passed an ordinance that said that any company that had any chemicals in site had to put the NFPA 704 system on the outside of the building. Are you thinking of doing something like that? If you are, we could start the ball rolling and have that in place so that not only would the public would know that there are hazards there, but you guys when you respond would know that they are there.

Mr. Campasano replied that hasn't come before the committee. We haven't gotten to that point, the community outreach and how we get to that, but that would be something that the LEPC could recommend back to the governing body to enact as an ordinance.

Alderman Osborne asked are you looking for a go ahead from this committee?

Mr. Wallace replied the way the state emergency response set up the LEPCs they made it the responsibility of whatever authorities in the towns to recognize them because they have to follow the open meetings laws, keep minutes and archive the minutes. Every single city and town in New Hampshire has to formally recognize the committee and that body and the ordinances and rules that they are going to operate by. They can't operate in a vacuum without that recognition. Then there would be a formal listing on your city website, as a committee, for the public to participate in.

Alderman Osborne stated so we want to be part of that. That is the whole thing.

Alderman Long asked there is not a local elected official on that committee now, correct? Where would that come from? Is it a nomination from there?

Mr. Campasano replied either one. I wouldn't have a recommendation as to who that comes from.

Mr. Wallace stated many times it's both groups, depending if you have a strong mayor or weak mayor, who send representatives from both organizations on the committee.

Alderman Osborne moved to formally recognize the Manchester Local Emergency Planning Committee. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Chairman Katsiantonis addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from the Lansing Melbourne Group regarding the Bedford Lot feasibility and Master Plan follow up.

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

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, stated I had sent the material just as Mr. Flotz had forwarded it to me last week. Just to refresh the committee's memory, if it needs refreshing, last summer we had an update to our parking study done that you might recall by the Lansing Melbourne Group, who actually did the original parking study back in around 2005. One of the recommendations that they laid out, in that report, on page ten, item 2.23, was a discussion of the Bedford Lot and their recommendation that we do an assessment of what the development options

are relative to that lot. It has sat empty for some time. The City did issue an RFP back in 2008 relative to interest in the private sector to purchase the lot and develop a parking operation there. There were zero responses to that RFP and the project has lain dormant, essentially, since that timeline. We have had discussions with Mr. Flotz about doing just one task associated with that. It seems the most fundamental to whatever ultimately we decide or the aldermen, I should say, decide or decide not to do. It is a parking demand study of the millyard area in totality to determine what the demand situation is relative to parking. Today, in the Commercial Street area it is very crowded during the daytime but we do have some open permits in Arms Lot and we don't have 100% parking utilization down there. From the Parking Division's perspective, I think it applies broadly to the City as well, one of our fundamental concerns about building a garage in the Bedford Lot or on the Bedford Lot is, what I will refer to as cannibalization of our current demand. That is Bill Sanders, today, got a permit to park somewhere in the millyard and we build a new garage; I move my car now from buying a permit from a surface lot to buying a permit to park in a garage. It is not creating incremental demand, but what is happening, in a purely simplistic case, the City will be borrowing money, bonding this parking garage and building the structure, however big it may be and it will be detrimental to the financial operations of the Parking Division because we will have to cover the debt service and we don't have any incremental demand to give us additional parkers. That is the basic issue of what cannibalization is about. We are just taking a person who is on a surface lot and putting them in a parking garage. Part of what this project would involve in task one is meeting with business owners in the millyard area, property owners in the millyard area and other interested parties in greater Manchester, who might have an interest in moving a business there or creating some other demand profile, if I can put it that way. For example, if someone was going to put a hotel up or an apartment area that would create new demand that would pay toward the parking garage. This particular project that we are asking for your approval for tonight is

to retain Mr. Flotz, who has great familiarity with the City of Manchester and a variety of parking developments and operations throughout the county, candidly, to come in and spend a couple of days, three or four days in Manchester, meeting with property owners, business owners and the business community generally, to talk about the parking demand situations today and what it might look like two or three years from now. If we were going to build a garage we can wait until the demand is overwhelming and then build it and then we can maybe put some plans in place and monitor it to see if we want to build a garage as time goes on. The cost for this specific task that is laid out in your material is \$14,000, which includes his travel expenses from Melbourne, Florida, to Manchester. It will also incorporate a formal package of material that will be brought to the aldermen and he will make himself available to this committee and to the full board, to review his recommendations with you. I would assume, on the outside, that this would probably be a 60-day project, maybe a little longer, but not a year from now or five months from now. The fee would be paid by the Parking Division. The Parking Division has a vested interest, obviously, in how this is handled. We are obviously supportive of going forward with ideas on increasing parking but we are extremely concerned that our current financial performance and the profile that we are dealing with are dealt with at the very beginning of the process. Those are my comments. I would be glad to answer any of your questions.

Alderman Osborne asked what affect would the \$14,000 have coming out of the Parking Division? What kind of affect is that to that budget?

Mr. Sanders replied well, it is not a small number. I would acknowledge that. We have been doing well this year. The winter has not been horrible to us. We believe that we will find most, if not all of it, in savings and other accounts. We would have kind of waited a little bit just to get the year behind us a little bit before declaring this. Once again, this is coming out of the recommendation from

last summer. For task one, I think we can manage it. I think that going forward, if this was something that the aldermen wanted to do, the project is more than just a parking task. This task is a parking task, but how this development may evolve over time, hopefully there will be substantial private interest in participating in it and that is part of meeting with property owners and business owners in the millyard to also determine what the appetite is for private participation going forward in this project.

Alderman Osborne asked do you feel this is a good thing to do?

Mr. Sanders replied I do. The lot is vacant. It has been vacant. I think, if we were going to sell it or do something with it, I think the City should have a good understanding of what the demand structure is down there. To be perfectly honest I would hate for us to sell it and someone build a parking garage and it ends up something we could have probably done and if the demand was there, we could have been a participant. Having said that, I am anxious for others to participate, so yes, I think it is a good thing, alderman.

Alderman Osborne asked what size is that piece of property? Do you know approximately?

Mr. Sanders replied it is not a large site.

Alderman Osborne stated I didn't think it was that large, but you were talking about a hotel and I don't understand.

Mr. Sanders stated I was just talking about things that would increase demand. I am not suggesting tonight that a hotel be built on the Bedford Street Lot or anything.

Alderman Osborne stated no, I understand.

Mr. Sanders stated you can obviously go up, but it is not a huge site. I am going to guess that it is certainly less than a couple of acres. It might be smaller than that.

Alderman Long stated what I am hearing is that this is a potential for public/private project. We are not looking to build ourselves a parking garage over there. There is the question of who should control parking. Is it to the City's benefit, so if some company wants to come in we can work with them on formulating a plan and we have control of the parking or do we just leave it up to the private sector to charge them whatever they want and does that jeopardize any company moving in? Those are interesting aspects. The Bedford Lot is underutilized, correct?

Mr. Sanders replied correct.

Alderman Long stated just to go over what he is going to give us, the DESMAN for garage and design layouts, is he going to give us potential layouts of a garage for that property on that? It's on the bottom of the second page.

Mr. Sanders replied he would only be doing task one, alderman. There are two tasks. That is task two and after task one is completed, we will come back to the board. The short answer to your questions is no, he is not going to. He might have some concepts about size of garage or that sort of thing, but we will not be designing a parking garage.

Alderman Long stated to Alderman Osborne's comments, right now garages that are being built have buildings; whether its retail buildings or something above it so that would pick up some of the...

Mr. Sanders interjected apartments, condominiums, hotels; I use that as what would incrementally create demand that would pay for this, in some way.

Alderman Long stated the millyard's parking, I haven't heard complaints, but it is pretty jam packed in there. Try going for a walk at lunch, or what have you, every available space is taken by parking. This would be some relief, but like you said you do not want the cannibalization. You don't want to have a garage built and they are just moving from the Arms Lot, where the City is getting revenue, into this garage where there is a potential of somebody else to get revenue.

Mr. Sanders stated plus we have to pay debt service to build the garage.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to retain Mr. Flotz for task one of the recommendations for the Bedford Street Lot, at a cost of \$14,000 to be paid from the Parking Division.

Chairman Katsiantonis addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Request from John Mortimer, Owner Millennium Running, to use a portion of Arms Parking Lot for a race event to be held on Sunday, October 27, 2013.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve this request for the use of Arms Parking Lot.

Chairman Katsiantonis addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from Anthony Pawlak, 720 South Main Street, requesting a "Blind Driveway" sign be placed in front of 728 South Main Street and possibly 734 South Main Street.

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

Alderman Long stated it is not a blind driveway. I drove by it today. Actually the truck sticks out onto the sidewalk. I looked in front of the truck and there was no more room to go forward. I don't know why we can't get somebody over there to inforce this truck hanging over onto the sidewalk. That seems like the fix to me. Putting up a blind driveway sign, there are no other signs south of that truck, so you are putting up a sign in front of somebody's house, not Mr. Pawlak's house, obviously because it is after when you are heading north. To have us put up a blind driveway, when there isn't a blind driveway, is setting a precedence that is somebody is blocking somebody's driveway, we are going to be putting up blind driveway signs.

Chairman Katsiantonis asked is this the same issue where they wanted no parking on one side of the street?

Mr. Jim Hoben, Deputy Traffic Director, replied yes, this is the same gentleman who was here a while back.

Alderman Osborne asked this was brought up to us before, on that situation, right Jim, on the parking on one side?

Mr. Hoben replied yes.

Alderman Osborne stated what we have here is an odd situation, but there is a curve there and I guess these people have a hard time coming out of the driveway because this particular truck is always parked there, for what reason I don't know. I guess there is no ordinance or anything else against it, so I can understand that too. I would hate to see something happen in this situation with what these people have to go through to come out of that driveway. I would hate for them to get into some sort of mishap. I think basically, for the safety of this situation, whereas, they weren't granted "no parking" in front of their house or wherever it might have been, I think this is the least we could do for them, to protect them. I have no problem with that. We have signs out there, basically, in other places that say that. Some places are straight on; there is no curve at all. It just says blind driveway. I don't know why we should be against this particular situation all the time. I will go forward with it. I have no problem with it whatsoever.

Alderman Roy stated Alderman Long said that he thought that the van was parked on the sidewalk. If it is, that is the building department that needs to go over there and straighten that out. I thought that they had looked at that before. If that is the case, then that is the solution. They can't park there because they are on the sidewalk. The problem would then go away, I think. I don't have a problem putting this sign up, I just want to make sure that this individual, with the truck, isn't parking on the sidewalk.

Chairman Katsiantonis asked is your suggestion to inform the Planning Department?

Alderman Roy stated I have a note here, I am going to call the building department tomorrow about it.

Mr. Hoben stated I went by this afternoon. There were two trucks; there was a box truck and a pick-up truck with a plow on it. They were both backed over the end of the sidewalk by two or three feet. I had discussions with Denise. She said she could enforce the parking on the sidewalk.

Alderman Roy stated that is what we need to do so they don't park there.

Alderman Osborne stated if you are parked on the sidewalk, that is a police issue. It has nothing to do with the building department. For anything parked on the sidewalk, is a police issue. The building department has nothing to do with that, just on private property. I am not the alderman there, but that is ridiculous to deny 22 people. He got signatures from 22 different residents next to him and we can't even put up a blind driveway sign to protect somebody? That doesn't sound right to me, at all, whatsoever.

Chairman Katsiantonis asked Jim, have you had contact with the police about the issue?

Mr. Hoben replied back when he originally made his complaint to us, I met with him and Lieutenant Tessier at police. We told him that his truck was parked over the sidewalk and he said he would move it in all the way. Of course, now there is snow and I am sure he doesn't have enough room to store the truck properly.

Alderman Long stated I am not suggesting that this blind driveway sign is going to make this guy safe. You are putting a couple of signs in front of somebody else's home and I don't think that the blind driveway sign... I just want to be on the record that I don't believe that this blind driveway sign is making this guy any

safer. That is all that I need to say. I am going to approve the blind driveway, but I don't think it is making him any safer.

Chairman Katsiantonis stated I agree with you.

Alderman Osborne stated lets put it this way; it makes him half safer.

Alderman Long stated I don't agree with that.

Alderman Osborne stated it is better than nothing. You don't agree with that?

Alderman Long stated no.

Alderman Osborne moved to approve the request for a "Blind Driveway" sign to be placed in front of 728 South Main Street and possibly 734 South Main Street. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

9. Discussion regarding restrictions, policies and penalties for aggressive animals and animal attacks.
*(Note: Retabled 10/1/2012; **Ordinances of surrounding areas and recommendations are attached.** Originally tabled 8/6/2012.)*

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Long stated just for the committee, on page 9.2, on this agenda, that is the proposed change. I have a meeting with Captain Hopkins to finalize it. I emailed it to Shelley Greenglass, with the Manchester Animal Shelter, and she is going to review it and advise me. Also, I emailed it to Gail Fischer, All Dogs Gym. She is a certified dog behavior consultant and she had some great input, originally, so I emailed her the final language that you can find on page 9.2. If there are no changes to the language on that page, that will be coming to this committee for approval. That is the way that I would prefer it, or we could send it to the full board and I would have two weeks...

Alderman Roy stated I would prefer it came here first. Alderman Long, when you said 9.2, are you talking about page 9.2?

Alderman Long stated yes, page 9.2 and 9.3 is the language that we are proposing. Captain Hopkins sent this, but he had confirmed with the animal control officer and the chief. They came up with this language. This is the language that I am sending off to these two other organizations to get some input from them and then take it from there.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to retable this item.

Alderman Osborne asked what are we going to do with some of these other items? We should go through these a little bit.

Chairman Katsiantonis stated let me talk with Alderman Arnold tomorrow regarding item 11. If he doesn't have any new information, we can receive and file it and he can bring it back in. I will also talk to him about item 13.

10. Communication from Stephanie Lewry, Executive Director of Intown Manchester, regarding bicycles and skateboards on sidewalks.
*(Note: Retabled 2/04/2013; a **proposed sidewalk stamp has been submitted by the Deputy Traffic Director**; originally tabled 8/6/2012.)*

Alderman Long moved to take item 10 off the table. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Alderman Long asked Jim, is your proposal the one on page 10.13?

Mr. Hoben replied yes. The last committee meeting you asked me to come in with a stenciled design, so that is what I provided. The stencil would be approximately four feet by four feet, as a painted stencil on the ground.

Alderman Long asked do we have any paintings on sidewalks now?

Mr. Hoben replied no, we don't.

Alderman Long asked what is your thought on sidewalk painting?

Mr. Hoben replied I don't think it would work on the brick downtown on Elm Street. They are uneven surfaces.

Alderman Long stated well, we have new sidewalks coming this summer.

Alderman Roy stated it is going to be like brick.

Alderman Long stated it is going to be brick stamped. You don't think it will work on the brick stamp?

Mr. Hoben replied I don't think it would. It is uneven surfaces. The paint would just settle in.

Alderman Osborne stated I just want to discuss this being on the sidewalks. Even if we put in new sidewalks, this is going to blight them, I would say. Another thing, you have kids that skate or skateboard, or bicycle in the wintertime. It is hard with snow on the sidewalks or ice or whatever it is, they won't pay any attention to this at all. I can't see a big thing with this particular kind of a thing to do. Plus the work that is involved for the Traffic Division to do all of this and paying to keep up with this every year or the sprucing up of it. I think they are up to their ears as far as painting lines. The best thing to do, I know you don't like signs, but at least those can be removed in a hurry or they can be put back up and they will always been seen, whether it is snowing, raining or otherwise. If I was to go along with something like this, I would say to put at least a sign, every other block or every three blocks. I am not saying we should put a sign every block, but maybe every other block. That way there is still no excuse for them not to see that particular sign and they can take it from there as far as ordinance and so on and so forth. That is my recommendation. Thank you.

Alderman Roy stated I have said it before and I will say it again, I don't care what ordinance we do, if it isn't enforced, it isn't going to work. We have an ordinance now that says you aren't supposed to ride bicycles on the sidewalks and they do it all the time because it is not enforced. I am not in favor of any of this. Thank you.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to receive and file the communication regarding bicycles on the sidewalks.

NEW BUSINESS:

Ms. Denise Boutilier, Parking Manager, stated I received a request from Jules Norcross, of JLX Photography, to use the Arms Lot for a benefit he is going to have for the Susan Komen Foundation for a Cure. He wants to feature a couple of women who are going to be professional stunt riders. He needs the Arms Lot on April 6th, just a portion of the lot, from 1:30 p.m. until sunset to do the shoot. I believe he is going to be asking for a \$5.00 donation. I am in contact with Jeff, at Cotton, and Gary, over at UNH, and both have reservations about this particular event. Cotton will be having outside seating, at that time, and he is afraid that the noise from the two motorcycles is going to be distracting to the customers. UNH's concern also is the noise and the distraction to the folks in the library.

Alderman Long stated we need a scenic lot that would be closed to the public to ensure the rider's safety. That is where I have an issue with that. This is a public piece of property and they want to charge a \$5.00 donation. I will give them the benefit of the doubt that that is a \$5.00 donation. I don't have a clue what is going on. Are they going to set up a ramp? Are they going to be doing stunts out there? I don't know what is involved. What kind of noise is going to be happening there? They want to go from 1:30 p.m. until sunset. How are they going to control people going in there? Are they going to hire police to control that?

Ms. Boutilier replied I don't have any more information. I am not in favor of it, myself.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Roy**, it was voted to deny the request for the use of Arms Parking Lot.*

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Roy**, 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.

Clerk of Committee