

## BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

**March 4, 1997**

**7:30 PM**

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, I know that Mary Sullivan passed away over the weekend and her wake was today and unfortunately with the meeting here, probably a lot of the people have not been able to get over to the wake. But, I did want the family to know that on behalf of the City we want to express our condolences to Henry Sullivan and his entire family. Mary Sullivan has been very active in our community for a long, long time and as you know we recognized her when she had given so many years of service to the Library and she is certainly going to be missed in the community. So, on behalf of the community and the entire Board of Mayor and Aldermen we would like to express our condolences to Henry and the entire family. So, if we may just enjoy a moment of silence in memory of Mary Sullivan, it would be appreciated.

The Clerk called the roll. There were eleven Aldermen present.

**Present:** Aldermen Wihby, Elise, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Soucy, Shea, Domaingue, Pariseau, Cashin and Hirschmann

**Absent:** Alderman Robert

Introduction of Jim Pliakos serving as an Intern to Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated Jimmy Pliakos is a Junior at Memorial High School. He is a high honor student, he is a member of the soccer program at Memorial and he's very active in school affairs as well as a young man helping out in his father's business. So, Jimmy is a boy I have had long experience with he was a student at Hallsville School and he worked in my supply room and did a fine job there and he's worked his way into the Junior High School program and into the Memorial program. If I might digress for a moment, I would like to compliment Alderman Elise for initiating this program and for her design of the program because that is the model that I really followed and the objective of this program is to allow a student chosen for this program to receive first-hand experiences relating to how our City government functions as well as to provide that student with insights relating to the City government matters and how our City government then interacts with the State and federal branches of government as well as the private sector of our society. Jimmy has been invited up to Concord on March 19th to attend the meeting that you will be at when it's in session, your Honor, and I think you're going to address the Legislature along with the Mayor from Nashua. So, Jimmy will be a guest of the Chamber of Commerce and so without further ado I'd like to introduce Jimmy Pliakos from Memorial High School.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, Jim, I hope that you will find this a good learning experience for you and I'm please to have you aboard.

Mr. Pliakos stated I'd like to thank, Mr. Shea, for offering me this opportunity and I'd like to learn a lot from this experience. Thank you.

### **CONSENT ITEMS**

Mayor Wieczorek advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

### **Approve under Supervision of Department of Highways**

- A. NYNEX Petition #222359

### **Informational to be Received and Filed**

- B. Communication from the Manchester Airport Authority submitting minutes of their January 23, 1997 meeting.
- C. Communication from Lloyd Basinow advising of his opinion that the August 6, 1996 vote of the Board relative to the Traffic Committee report was illegal, and that unless proper action of a legal nature is taken on March 4th, a class action suit may be considered.
- D. Communication from Arthur Dion expressing his concerns relative to complaints he had issued to the Building Department regarding a variance (Case No. 95-Z0-94) and the fact that he has yet to receive a response to such complaints.
- H. Communication from Nancy Muller, NH State Historic Preservation Office, advising that property located at 418-420 Notre Dame Avenue was entered into the National Register of Historic Places on December 20, 1996.

### **REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES**

#### **COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

- J. Communication from Barbara Grant, Telephone Services of America, submitting a Long Distance Commission Program Agreement to the City on public pay phones as listed herein.

#### **COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING**

- K. Petition to rezone property located at 1466 Bodwell Road from Residential to Neighborhood Business submitted by Edward Houle.

#### **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

- L. Resolution:

“Reimbursement Resolution of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.”

#### **COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL/INSURANCE**

- M.** Communication from Lloyd Basinow requesting that the municipality adopt a fair labor employment policy.
- N.** Communication from Lawrence Fuller seeking reimbursement for Blue Cross/Blue Shield insurance premiums he paid following his retirement from the Water Works.

#### **COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY**

- O.** Communication from Lloyd Basinow requesting special parking privileges to the news media be granted.

#### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

##### **COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

- Q.** Advising that Sections 90.11 and 90.12 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester, relative to amending the uniform fine schedules relating to unlicensed dogs and dogs at large; and recommending that it be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for ordinance preparation.
- R.** Recommending that a request from Ron Pappas for a carnival license to be utilized at Stark Landing from April 17-27, 1997 for the 4th annual Pappy's Pizza Spring Carnival, all proceeds to benefit the Central High School Gridiron Club be granted and approved; subject to licensing requirements of the City Clerk's Office.

##### **COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY**

- S.** Recommending that a request of Jon Erdahl, General Manager, WGIR to use Arms Park and the Bridge Street Bridge on Sunday, May 25, 1997 (with a rain date of Monday, May 26, 1997) for the 6th Annual Memorial Weekend Fireworks display be granted and approved; subject to approval by the Fire, Highway, Police, Risk Management, and Traffic Departments.

**HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ALDERMAN PARISEAU MOVED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED. ALDERMAN REINIGER DULY SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH ALDERMAN DOMAINGUE DULY RECORDED IN OPPOSITION TO ITEM L.**

- E.** Communication from Ted Herbert recommending that the Board reverse its recent decision to increase metered parking rates.

Alderman Shea stated Mr. Ted Herbert is recommending that the Board reverse its recent decision to increase the metered parking rates, noting he was a resident of Ward 7. Alderman Shea moved that this item be referred to the Committee on Traffic. Alderman Domaingue duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- F.** Communication from Tom Irving suggesting the new track facility at Livingston Park be named in honor of his uncle, Robert H. Irving.

Alderman Elise moved that item F be referred to the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Mr. Girard stated the Mayor's Office had already referred it to Parks and Recreation.

Alderman Elise moved that item F be received and filed. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Domaingue commented that Mr. Irving was a constituent of Ward 8 and his suggestion that his uncle's name be considered for naming of this track was a good one.

Alderman Domaingue requested that in addition to the Parks and Recreation review, she would like to have the CIP Committee keep an eye on where it was in the process so they could be informed as well.

Alderman Elise and Alderman Wihby rescinded their motion.

Alderman Domaingue moved to refer the communication to the Committee on Community Improvement Program. Alderman Elise seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

**G.** Communication from Thomas King, President of the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee,  
extending an invitation to the Board to participate in the parade on Sunday, March 9,  
1997 at 1:00 PM.

Alderman Shea stated I think the Hibernian Club should be commended for the efforts that they made both last year and again this year to bring people to the Downtown area in the form of a St. Patrick's Day Parade and I think that all of the members of the Board, this year, have been invited and I'm hoping that they will all participate. I know that last year some marched and some didn't because there was a little bit of confusion, but I think that this year there is no confusion and everyone has been invited and even my good friend in Ward 12, Mr. O'Hirschmann has been invited and he plans to participate, as well. I think that it is commendable that they are taking the time and effort to do that for the community and it shows community spirit.

Mayor Wiczorek asked are you going to promise us a little better weather, it was a little cold as I recall last year.

Alderman Shea stated you never know, your Honor, it depends on what you consider sound weather. Some of us like the cold weather, some of us like the less cold weather, but I think it'll be shining and everyone will be happy that day.

Alderman Shea moved that item G be received and filed. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- I. Communication from Brendan Gilmartin requesting that Ordinance 111.70 Curfew at Dances be amended to allow dancing after 2:00 AM.

Alderman Hirschmann stated item I is in reference to all night RAVE parties being allowed to dance all night long within the City limits, it's a request to amend an ordinance to allow that to happen and we've already made a statement in Committee and had a report to the full Board that we didn't want that to happen in Manchester, your Honor. If we make an exception for this group they'll be dancing in bar rooms until eight o'clock in the morning and there will be other requests coming in. This is definitely something that could become detrimental to the City and moved that this be received and filed. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau stated I just think we have to give members of the public the opportunity to follow City procedure and if a gentleman is asking us to look at amending an Ordinance it ought to go through the process. I know it came to Committee, but I think it still should go through the process.

Alderman Hirschmann interjected it was in Committee, your Honor, and it failed.

Mayor Wiczorek stated this was a referral to the Committee and I imagine this is the same...

Alderman Hirschmann stated this is the same person that failed in Committee once and he's trying to come back in again.

Alderman Pariseau stated that is not true. He's asking us to amend the ordinance and it has to go through the process, it's not to...he's not asking us to go against the current ordinance, he's accepted the decision of the Committee. He is asking this Board of Aldermen to look at the possibility of amending the current ordinances Section 111.70.

Mayor Wiczorek stated all he is doing is that the Committee referred him to the City Clerk's Office. Frankly, I'd like to meet these folks who could dance all night and recommended that item I be referred to Committee and let the Committee do what it has to do.

Aldermen Hirschmann and Shea withdrew their previous motions to receive and file.

Alderman Pariseau moved that item I be referred to the Committee on Administration/ Information Systems. Alderman Soucy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

**Report of Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration**

- P.** Recommending that the Board of Assessors recommendations that income level changes be adopted in order to allow the elderly to retain their present exemption status; and for such purpose a Resolution has been submitted.

Alderman Hirschmann stated a recommendation came forth from the Board of Assessors allowing the level of income to be increased for elderly exemptions and I want to draw everyone's attention to this item. In Committee, it was a three to two vote with Aldermen Pariseau and Hirschmann dissenting because the elderly increase was more than the State had asked us to do. The Assessors came in with higher numbers of exemptions and we're already exempting about \$63 million of property due to the exemptions. There was not enough information, your Honor, to support this, I don't want to see this pass.

Alderman Soucy stated when we discussed this in Committee there was a piece of legislation that was introduced that was signed into law that will take effect in 1998 that will change the way elderly exemptions are awarded. What the Assessors did in considering the legislation was to consider what the City should do in anticipation of that 1998 date. In 1998, what is in the legislation will take effect across the board. Prior to that municipalities and communities throughout the State have the opportunity to consider how they will put in place their elderly exemptions. What the Assessors did and, I think Tom Nichols might be here to further explain, but what they did was look to the actual total amount disbursed from the exemptions and divided that out by the number of people that would qualify for the exemption and came up with a dollar amount so that basically people that currently get the exemption would still get it. It isn't increasing the dollar amount of total exemptions disbursed, but the idea was to look at the changes in age and income requirements and not take away an exemption that people already have. In addition to that, it would also include recertifying people who currently qualify for the exemption because there might be some changes in their income status and I think the recertification process would really be helpful to the City because we haven't done it in quite a while.

Mayor Wiczorek asked, Tom, do you have anything you'd like to add to what Alderman Soucy.

Mr. Nichols replied not really. What Donna had said is true that the State has handed down new legislation as far as the amounts that they think each municipality should be giving out, but if you don't do anything they're just going to give them minimums and they're not saying that you have to stick to the thirteen four and \$20,400, so what we did was we went to the Social Security Office and asked what was the average for a person collecting and it was \$8,400 and even the New Hampshire Assessors Association has agreed with us and had it in our fliers that it

was a reasonable amount and if we don't it might kick some of the people out. By requalifying everybody, I think it would settle all of the issues. Now, if we weren't going to requalify them it would be a different story, but we want to requalify them.

Alderman Pariseau stated our concern was the fact that the Assessors could not tell us one way or the other if the elderly exemption would increase as it was a \$66 million pricetag you were talking about and we couldn't get the Assessors to say one way or the other if it was going to increase the elderly exemption by a substantial amount of money.

Mr. Nichols stated we can't tell you because we don't know how many people are going to qualify in the bracket between 65 and 75 and 75 and 79 and over 80. We don't know what those figures are going to be, they could be the same, they could be less.

Alderman Shea stated I was at that meeting and their best estimate was that it would not impact the budget whatsoever. It would even itself out and I certainly agreed with their projections that although it's difficult to ascertain they would still be within a certain frame or a certain area so it would not adversely impact the amount of exemptions that were given and they made that clear to us at that meeting.

Alderman Domaingue stated I noticed in the legislation that the State of New Hampshire has allowed for "a single person for an exemption of not less than \$13,400" and you're proposing for a single person an exemption of not less than \$18,400. I guess I can understand the need to allow for the elderly exemption, it's critical at times like these, but I'm a little bit concerned when you're sitting here before the Board and you're telling us you really don't know if you're going to overall increase the budget impact of that money. I heard discussion that you don't think it'll really impact it, it will kind of even out, but I don't know if I'm that comfortable with that assessment.

Mr. Tellier stated when we arrived at these figures the present values that we're using right now are \$10,000 for a single person and \$12,000 for joint income and that excludes Social Security. The average...when we inquired with Social Security, when we added that average amount of income to Social Security on a single and a joint-income is where we came up with the numbers. Now, the additional value that the exemption is moving toward upon occasion is not the additional people that are being eligible on the tax rolls, but it's the fact that people are living longer and they're going into a higher bracket of an allowance of the exemption. It goes from \$22,500 to \$45,000 and that's where the increase in the exemption came out. Not the additional numbers of more people being qualified on the elderly exemptions rolls, but the fact that they are living longer. So, we leave it to this Board. We came up with numbers that we felt that would keep the people that are presently qualified on the rolls and we leave it to this Board to make their decision on that fact.

Alderman Domaingue asked the recertification process, is that determined by the legislation by the State as well as our own process or do we determine that at the local level.

Mr. Tellier replied we determine that at the local level using the criteria that is set by State Statute and the Ordinances that are before you tonight on the income levels.

Alderman Domaingue stated so there is local consideration for the conditions that these people are in.

Mr. Tellier replied absolutely.

Alderman Wihby stated, Steve, so basically what we are doing is we are not adding the number of people to the rolls to get exemptions. If we don't do this, we're going to eliminate some of the people that were on it before, is that true.

Mr. Tellier replied that is correct, Alderman.

Alderman Shea moved to accept, receive, and adopt the report of the Committee. Alderman Soucy duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Wieczorek asked is there any more discussion.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I'd like to discuss this, your Honor. This is HB 331 and over 400 State Representatives put this bill together and they set forth limits for the elderly and I don't think that the people that serve in those seats would do that arbitrarily as most of those people are very concerned with the elderly and unless you get a figure...if you act on this there's not even a guesstimate of what the exemption could be. There has been no discussion of any number whatsoever. It's an arbitrary, irrelevant thing.

Alderman Soucy stated what was set by this piece of legislation was a minimum, a floor so that communities could not go below that amount, that was the rock bottom amount and that doesn't preclude a municipality from looking at the income levels of their elderly and essentially what it does is it's a recalculation of what income now will apply when considering whether or not someone is eligible to meet those requirements and the primary change was the Social Security and based on the figures they were able to ascertain from the Social Security Department, that averages \$8,000 and that's where the \$8,000 comes in added to the ceiling. I don't think the effort in any way is an effort to add people. It's an effort to preserve the status quo and in the process by doing a recertification to reexamine whether or not anyone's financial circumstances changed and in that case to reevaluate whether or not they still qualify and through that process, I think we might gain a few people, but we might also lose a few people because I don't know how long it's been since we recertified.

Mr. Nichols stated since 1991, since the revaluation.

Alderman Shea stated one other point to mention was that there might be 400 legislators up in Concord but they don't all live in Manchester and Manchester may have a higher cost-of-living because of our property tax or because of other factors that other communities might have. So, I don't think we should start eliminating the elderly from any kind of situation that they are presently in. I think that would be a bad, bad signal for the community, for the Aldermen to give to our community. If we can't help the elderly, we can't help anybody.

Alderman Cashin asked is it my understanding that if we pass this the elderly will obtain, the qualified elderly will obtain the same benefits they're presently obtaining.

Mr. Tellier replied to the best of our knowledge using all of the information that was available to us from Social Security Services, the State associations, the Municipal Association and our own, that is correct, Alderman, and I also think it is important to note that we will be including in our budget request the fact that the recertification process will be in this next budget period and again it hasn't been done since 1991.

Alderman Hirschmann asked can this be referred to the budget process. This is a big item. The exemptions could go up to a hundred million dollars, they don't know.

Alderman Domaingue stated I understand what Alderman Hirschmann's concerns are and I'm sure we share them from time-to-time as we go through the budget process, but I have to tell you the elderly in this City have made a large investment for a long period of time and I guess I'm going to give this process the benefit of the doubt and hope that it's going to work out the way that the Assessors have projected it will because if anybody has made the investment in this community is the people who have lived here the longest and I think we owe it to them to give them the benefit of the doubt with this process.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion to accept the report of the Committee. The motion carried with Alderman Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

**Report of Committee on Traffic**

- T.** Recommending that certain regulations governing standing, stopping and parking, be adopted and put into effect when duly advertised.

Alderman Elise stated the report contained items with more meters being increased to 50 cents and wanted to go on record as being opposed and wanted to use Ted Herbert's quote, he did tell the Traffic Committee this several years ago at a public hearing that in essence using parking meters and to date increasing the meters to 50 cents, we're actually charging people admission to use Downtown.

Mayor Wieczorek stated frankly, I wish there was some easy solution to the problem. I hate parking meters to be honest with you, I wish there was a way we could get rid of all of them.

Alderman Cashin stated if we're going to be on record, I'm opposed to it too.

Alderman Soucy stated as I recall when we were originally discussing this proposal wasn't the Intown Management group in support of it because it would increase the turnover, that was my understanding. And, the only reason I supported it because I was very hesitant was because that group actually said do it to us, we want to see it happen.

Mr. Girard stated Intown Management did feel it would.

Alderman Sysyn stated it would also move people into the garages.

Alderman Soucy stated I just wanted to make sure that that group was on record.

Alderman Elise stated I just wanted to make a point that Ted Herbert has been a long-time tenant of Downtown and this is his opinion and he is part of the Intown Management organization.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept, receive, and adopt the report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Aldermen Cashin, Elise, Reiniger, Clancy, Soucy, Shea and Pariseau voted nay. Aldermen Hirschmann, Wihby, Sysyn and Domaingue voted yea. The motion failed.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to amend the report of the Committee by deleting all sections relating to the installation of new meters (Section 24 Old Granite Street and Section 25 in its entirety); and further to accept the report as amended.

Confirmation of the nomination of Charles Goodwin as a member of the Heritage Commission, term to expire January 1, 1999.

Alderman Wihby moved to confirm the nomination of Charles Goodwin as a member of the Heritage Commission, term to expire January 1, 1999. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Confirmation of the nomination of Roger Bouchard to succeed Doug Mitchell as an Alternate on the Zoning Board of Adjustment, term to expire March 1, 1999.

Alderman Wihby moved to confirm the nomination of Roger Bouchard to succeed Doug Mitchell as an Alternate on the Zoning Board of Adjustment, term to expire March 1, 1999. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Shea duly recorded in opposition.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to recess the regular meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

Report of the Committee on Finance, if available.

The Clerk advised that there was no report of the Committee on Finance.

Communication from Alderman Wihby requesting the Board address the "Bag and Tag" program issue.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I would just like to read into the record a letter that I am distributing to the Board as follows:

Attached to this letter is information regarding the proposed "Bag & Tag" program. Normally, this information would have been forwarded to the Committee on Community Improvement as this matter is currently pending there. However, as Alderman Wihby wishes to act prior to the Committee's recommendation, a Committee on which he serves, I present it tonight with a request that it be forwarded to the Committee for proper consideration.

There is other information that the Committee and the Board should consider prior to acting on this matter. As you know, members of the Committee, various City staff, and members of the community traveled to the City of Dover to learn from their program. The information presented tonight as well as other information we are developing is the result of this meeting. As you will see from the enclosed material solid waste costs continue to skyrocket and unless the City steps forward with a proper remedy, it will rise without relief.

The "Bag & Tag" proposal notably reduces the City's transfer and disposal costs and, therefore, provides needed tax relief. Yes, it is a user fee. As such, it requires all citizens, property owners and renters, tax-exempt, and tax-paying entities, non-profits and for-profits to pay for the services used. This is the only remedy I see to the ever escalating costs of solid waste. It deserves the full attention of this Board if for no other reason than it could provide significant tax relief.

After visiting with officials in Dover, I can assure you that they have been a substantial reduction in solid waste costs. Dover's records document a reduction in their solid waste stream of nearly 70% largely because of this program. We, in Manchester, cannot simply ignore a reduction of this magnitude nor the potential savings for the taxpayers.

Dover's citizens also strongly support this program, even though it was widely opposed prior to implementation. If this program proves more costly than our current arrangements, then I will not support it. I will be the first guy out there saying "let's not do it." But, we owe it to our taxpayers to determine definitively whether or not we can develop a program that will save them money.

s/Raymond J. Wiczorek  
Mayor

Mayor Wiczorek stated we have spent a lot of time working with this project. I know Frank and his department has and we have spent an awful lot of time trying to get things together and it is in the Committee on CIP and, Richard, you have been working very, very closely with that and do you want to just go over those and tell them what page you're on so everybody will know.

Mr. Girard stated the first page in the attachments to the Mayor's letter is entitled "City Recycling dated 2/20/97 and it's from the Highway Department. There has been a lot of discussion at the Board level as to what the City participation recycling has been. If you look at the materials, you have recyclables at 4,763 tons which is by-and-large what the City collects through its curbside recycling program. The metals, tires, and demolition wastes are things that are dropped off at the City's drop-off facility and the yard waste at 6,000 tons is also collected at the curbside. We structured the recycling this way because this is how the City of Dover has it structured and for comparison sake we wanted to make an accurate comparison. If you were to add the recyclables and the yard waste that are picked up at the curbside, the City of Manchester's participation rate is roughly 19.8%. When you total everything in aggregate including what's at the drop-off center which incidentally the City of Dover does not have because it's only five miles from the turnkey facility in Rochester, our participation rate is about 25.9%, roughly 26%. The City of Dover as the Mayor mentioned in his letter is recycling about two-thirds of its waste stream. The next page is a chart - Solid Waste Cost History - and we presented the information on recyclables first to show that even though there is some participation from City residents in various recycling programs, it has not done much to contain the costs because it is not enough of an effort. The first graph that you have shows three years of solid waste revenues and costs. In fiscal years 1990 and 1995...in 1990 the cost of the City's program was roughly \$2.1 million, it collected about \$2.25 million in revenue for a net gain of \$268,572 to the taxpayers. In other words, we were making money on our solid waste operation. In fiscal 1995, we were losing money. The cost of the program was roughly \$1.65 million, the revenues were only \$775,000 for a net tax impact of \$900,000 and projected costs for fiscal 1998 have the City's program costing \$4.9 million with anticipated revenues of roughly \$570,000 for a net tax impact of \$4,330,870. The next chart - Solid Waste Cost History - is a chart that compares those three years solid waste costs to various estimates of cost and

revenue that would be under a "Bag & Tag" program. After visiting the City of Dover, we sat down with the Highway Department to refine the numbers in the Mayor's original proposal to more closely reflect the experience of Dover. They had several years of history going back to July of '93 when they first started their program and what their numbers showed was a consistent participation among the citizens, a consistent number of 15-gallon bags used versus 30-gallon bags used, it allowed us to update our ratios and also to better calculate anticipated recycling rates. For the Board's information, the City of Dover's citizens on average per household, per week put out less than one 30-gallon bag of trash. The original proposal that we submitted to this Board used an average of 1.7 30-gallon bags of trash per family per week. So, what we did rather than use the Dover numbers was provide a range of numbers for the Board to consider to show the potential impact of this problem. The averages we used were the use of 1.6, 1.4, 1.2, and 1.0 bags. Now, keeping this chart in front of you if you go to the next page titled "Bag & Tag Use Comparison, you will note and also on the graph you will note that the costs and the revenues with the implementation of a "Bag & Tag" remarkably alter the impact on the tax rate. In fact, based on an average household the \$4.3 million that our program would currently impact the tax rate by cost the average household \$125.51. You will see that in any of the scenarios listed here (1.2, 1.4, and 1.6 bags) we have a combination of yearly bag fees based on the averages and yearly taxes. The only scenario where it would cost, using average tax bills, the only scenario where it would cost more to implement "Bag & Tag" would be 1.6 bags per week which would indicate the City's performance in recycling or participation in this program was rather poor compared to the experience of Dover, Somersworth, and other cities in New Hampshire and in New England that have used it. The next page is FY '98 Solid Wastes Costs with no Bag and Tag Program...incidentally, before we go to that page...on the previous page - Bag & Tag Use Comparison, the first four numbers, bags per week per unit you will see that we have different prices for the bags. Because of the way we learned how Dover structured their program and anticipating our costs we were able to move from the dollar a bag for the 30-gallon bag and the 75 cents for the 15-gallon bag. Depending on the participation rate of the population and what was being removed from the waste stream we were able to get the bag prices for the 30-gallon bags to between 94 and 99 cents per bag and for the 15-gallon bags down to between 70 and 74 cents per bag. This allows us under whatever scenario to have the tax impact constant because it's all based on usage. The more people recycle, the less that's in the waste stream, the fewer bags that need to be bought, the less cost there is to the City and that's how the concept works. The remaining information is really a detailed calculation on each scenario. The one, the 1.2, 1.4, and 1.6 where we lump in the fixed and variable costs with potential revenues, again based on the recycling participation rate, it shows exactly how we came up with the bag costs and where we are at this point. There are some things that we have yet to determine detail on and are in discussion with the Highway Department and it includes the Welfare subsidy, it includes enforcement, it includes various other issues and Alderman Hirschmann has asked us to look into weekly recycling. We do have some numbers regarding that. But, there are some details that still need to be worked out, so while these numbers are encouraging based on Dover's experience in their program there are details that we need to address that could possibly lower the costs even further depending on how the rest of the

program is structured and we would appreciate the time to pursue those details and follow the Committee process that has already been initiated at this time.

Alderman Wihby stated on page 2, Solid Waste Cost History, where it says 1.6 the revenues are \$3,161,234 asked is that bag revenues.

Mr. Girard replied that is bag revenues.

Alderman Wihby stated a couple of pages later where you have the Bag & Tag Use Comparison chart and 1.6 says bag revenue of \$2,591,803 asked what's the difference in the half-a-million dollars.

Mr. Girard replied the revenues on the Solid Waste Cost History are the bag revenues, but they are also the revenues from things like the Reclamation Trust, all of the revenues.

Alderman Wihby asked why is the revenue number different.

Mr. Girard replied because this reflects an overall revenue, and the other reflects just the bag revenue.

Alderman Wihby asked what is the extra revenue.

Mr. Girard replied the extra revenue would be from the Reclamation Trust and the revenues generated from the drop-off facility.

Alderman Wihby asked if we don't have "Bag & Tag" don't we still have revenues at the drop-off center.

Mr. Girard replied your revenue at the drop-off center, I believe, would be about \$170,000.

Alderman Wihby asked is that was you calculated in our number and where is that.

Mr. Girard stated I'm not sure I understand your question.

Alderman Wihby asked where is that number (\$270,000) that reduces the...if you put it on the tax...

Mr. Girard replied if you got to the page with the 1.6 bags, Alderman, under Variable Costs Revenues in the right-hand column it has drop-off revenues and it has a negative of \$270,000 on the tax rate, so that is figured into the tax rate calculation.

Alderman Wihby stated the Assessors are here and asked what is the average house now in Manchester, the valuation.

Mr. Girard stated we used \$100,000.

Alderman Wihby in addressing Mr. Tellier asked what is the average, Steve.

Mr. Tellier replied it might go as high as maybe \$115,000. I think that \$105,000 would be apt for this cause as a conservative figure, but you could go probably as high as \$115,000.

Alderman Wihby stated, your Honor, my concern is...first of all, I brought it up at the last meeting and you said we were going to have it in sub-committee and the sub-committee didn't meet. My concern is, your Honor, that last year there was no support at all for "Bag & Tag", I think the vote was 10 to 2 or 9 to 3 or something and speaking to some of the members of the Board, I don't think there's support any more and I think the support is still the same thing and my concern is, your Honor, that we have a hard time after you give us your budget to change everything back to the way it was, so that is why I wanted to have a vote today to see if there is support for "Bag & Tag" and if there is, fine. If there's not, we should just go forward and when you do your budget instead of us having to change everything back again, it just should be put into the tax base rather than into the "Bag & Tag" figure.

Mayor Wieczorek stated as I stated in my letter, in the aggregate, if this doesn't work out to cost the taxpayers less, I won't support it either. I'm not going to be supporting something that is going to be costing them a lot more money. My feeling is that we should let the Committee proceed so that we can really bring this to a conclusion. If it saves them money, we present it to you and then you can vote on it. If it doesn't save money, I won't even propose it to you.

Alderman Wihby stated there are so many variables. It's relative. How many bags is someone going to have, what is the value of their house. You're going to have so many different scenarios that you can make anything work, you can give us a book of all of your numbers that's going to show us that it works and I can give you a book that says it doesn't work and depending on where you sit on there with the value of your house or how many children you have and how many bags you put out, it could be a benefit or not a benefit for anybody. I don't know how you're going to get any closer to coming up with some numbers unless you know what everybody is going to use in a particular situation...whether they're going to save money or not save money or how they do it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, Alderman, all we can do is go by the experience of other communities and that's why we went to Dover and I wished you had come to Dover because I think getting the information from people that are already into the program is very enlightening.

Alderman Wihby stated, I heard from a number of my constituents from last year that they don't want this and they still don't want this and I don't know if anybody else here has heard anything.

Alderman Sysyn stated I got a lot of calls.

Alderman Domaingue stated one of the reasons why this is still in Committee is evident tonight, there are an awful lot of questions about the possibilities of this program. I raised some of the early issues last year when we were talking about not wanting a "Bag & Tag", but I don't think we can ignore the issue of solid waste altogether. So, while we may not want a "Bag & Tag" as a resolution, we can't close the door on discussing what we're going to do with the waste stream or what it is going to cost the taxpayers. Now, interestingly enough your Administrative Assistant made the comments that he thought or you thought, I don't know whose being represented here that the City of Manchester is not making enough of an effort and that "the City's participation has been rather poor" on the issue of recycling and I would agree with that except for the fact that the City's effort on educating people on recycling and even on providing them with a recycling calendar for pick-up has been poor because I requested a new calendar for 1997 and didn't get it until the third week in February. I don't know when the rest of the City got it. My neighborhood got it the third week in February. We weren't telling people who had moved into the City since the last time we handed out a calendar when they could expect to get their recycling picked up, let alone educating them on how to do it. We're not making the effort from the Board level, from the department level, and yet we're expecting the taxpayers to make the effort at home. We haven't revisited the issue of whether we want to pick up on a weekly basis which is something we keep hearing people who are really into recycling scream for, they want their recycling picked up on a weekly basis. All of these things need to be discussed. I think Alderman Wihby is correct when he assume the Board would not support "Bag & Tag" as a part of a budget, but, I don't think we have the luxury of shutting the door to what our options are given what you've cited here in costs and I have to tell you, your Honor, that this is an awful lot of information for this Board to try and absorb in one evening at this meeting. I'd like to have the opportunity to look at it.

Mayor Wiczorek stated that is the reason why I said let it stay in the Committee and get the further information that you need and then come back to the Board and take a look at it. If it isn't going to go, it isn't going to go. But, you at least need to take a look to see what is going to happen because looking down a little bit on the horizon we're trying to project what is going to be happening here.

Alderman Clancy stated I was one of the people that went down to Dover. I was impressed with what I saw in Dover, but when I get the phone calls at my house, I'd say five out of eight are for garbage in my area. Now, if I could find out some way how I'm going to get my constituents to use the "Bag & Tag" and some of them can't afford it, I have people there...single mothers with three and four children and they can't afford to buy food for themselves, how are they going to

buy a bag unless we get them subsidized from Susan Lafond or something like that. But, we have to educate the people like they did down in Dover. I think they had the school program and stuff like that. I'm not saying "Bag & Tag" is dead, but we've got to educate the people first before we try to do this because a lot of people in my area will not "Bag & Tag" they don't want it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated this is precisely why we are saying let the Committee continue its work and come to some conclusion.

Alderman Clancy stated a little education might go a long way.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it is going to take more than a little education, it's going to take a lot of education.

Mr. Girard stated one of the details, one of the things we would like to work further on having spoken to already is the issue of education and how do you give people what they need to know how to use this program. We have addressed and will continue to refine the Welfare subsidy. We discussed that in Dover, we discussed how the MHRA would handle the situation same as the Dover Housing Authority and for Alderman Domaingue and Alderman Hirschmann we do have some preliminary numbers from Waste Management as to what it would cost to move from weekly to bi-weekly recycling and the increase of our recycling costs would be anywhere from \$900,000 to \$1.4 million.

Alderman Domaingue stated but if they're throwing it away because you're not picking it up, Richard, it's six of one, half-a-dozen of the other.

Mr. Girard stated, Alderman, I'm just sharing that information with you, I'm not making any judgment on that.

Alderman Domaingue stated I'm including a lot more than just that.

Mr. Girard stated if they're throwing it away in the bag, they're paying for it. Whereas right now, they're not.

Alderman Clancy asked, Richard, if they don't have any bags how are they going to use it.

Alderman Shea stated when the Finance Department made a presentation to us, I think Randy made that presentation, my understanding was that it would cost more to use the "Bag & Tag" than it would to increase the tax rate. At least that was what I was led to believe when he made that presentation. In other words, if the "Bag & Tag" were adopted it would cost more for that program to be implemented than it would for a tax rate to be implemented. I might have been confused, but I thought he indicated at the time.

Mayor Wieczorek stated you're not confused at all. As a matter of fact, as time has gone on this has been refined because they have more and better information. I'm not here to say let's do the "Bag & Tag" today. What I'm saying is let's continue to take a look at this because we're going to have to determine what are options are going to be in the future.

Alderman Shea stated if it's going to cost taxpayers more to use the "Bag & Tag"...

Mayor Wieczorek stated I won't even support it myself, Alderman.

Alderman Shea stated that is what he came out with, that is what Randy was saying.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, Alderman, you're on the history page, let's get off the history page.

Alderman Shea stated we learn from history and that's when it repeats itself.

Mayor Wieczorek replied, I know we do. But, you can see what's happened with the cost of the bags as they have continued to work and to refine this as they get more information. All I'm saying is let's not close the door on this because we should at least examine it as an option. I'm not saying we have to do it today because I'm not even sure myself. As I said and I'll say it again, if it is going to cost us more to do this than it is to do what we're doing, I won't support it and I can't be any plainer than that.

Alderman Elise stated I think Alderman Wihby is on the right track here. If there's enough people on the Board that have decided they can't support a "Bag & Tag" now or at budget time then it's time to get that issue out of the way now, so we can do what Alderman Domaingue has expressed already - look at our options, not neglect what we have to do with solid waste in the short period of time we have for the next budget period. There has been very poor education in the City, definitely recycling picked up once-a-week is something that a lot of people in my ward have asked for and those are things that if the majority of the Board has decided that they cannot support "Bag & Tag" now then we can get onto those issues right away and do something for the next budget cycle and that may help.

Alderman Reiniger stated a quick question for Mr. Girard. Did Dover have a voluntary system before implementing the "Bag & Tag".

Mr. Girard replied no. As a matter of fact, the City of Dover implemented its recycling program in the month of September, they implemented their "Bag & Tag" in the month of October, and they had their municipal elections in the month of November and every candidate who ran opposed to "Bag & Tag" lost soundly.

Alderman Cashin stated that was not the question, was it.

Mr. Girard stated they did not have a recycling program prior to the implementation of the “Bag & Tag”.

Alderman Reiniger stated that was because their landfill had just closed and they were facing escalating costs.

Mr. Girard stated their landfill was a superfund site. The City of Dover had no voluntary recycling program prior to implementation of “Bag & Tag”.

Alderman Reiniger stated, I know there’s a lot of controversy about this issue. I supported it last year and I fully knew that it was an unpopular position to take, but I think that it’s a shame that it is being caught up with budget issues because my view of it is as a society we have to be more aggressive about recycling given our huge waste problems and I just think that we owe it to the City, given the complexity of this problem to continue to study this to come up with a solution that at least more of the Board members can accept, I think it would be irresponsible to throw out the whole issue as if it’s not a problem.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I agree with you.

Alderman Cashin asked how long has this been in Committee, your Honor.

Mr. Girard replied this was referred to Committee in November.

Alderman Pariseau asked why haven’t they acted on it since November.

Mr. Girard replied we spent a good two months trying to make arrangements to meet with the City of Dover so we could discuss the details of their program and that meeting only took place within the last month. For various reasons we have not been able to develop the detail that we would like to go to the Committee with and that’s the only answer there is, Alderman.

Alderman Cashin stated so in two months there’s been no meetings.

Alderman Wihby stated we’ve never discussed this in Committee. It went to Dover and we never discussed these numbers or anything, this is the first time I’ve seen them.

Alderman Cashin stated it could take a long time to get out of Committee, right, if you’re not discussing it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I’ve seen some things take an awful long time to get out of Committee.

Alderman Wihby stated it has to get to Committee before we can discuss it.

Alderman Cashin asked aren't you on the Committee, Dave.

Alderman Wihby replied, I'm on the Committee. It's sitting there somewhere looking for some numbers and nobody's given the numbers to the Committee. To say that it's been sitting there since November is wrong.

Mr. Girard replied it was referred there in November.

Alderman Wihby stated it was referred there with nothing to look at and not even to be taken up in Committee.

Mr. Girard stated the Mayor's original proposal included bag numbers, it included various assumptions along this line and they were all referred to Committee and they are there now.

Alderman Wihby stated those are the numbers that Randy said would cost more money. You know the numbers here, did you take into consideration that you have it on your taxes and you could deduct some of that, is any of those numbers on here.

Mr. Girard replied, no. We used the \$105,000 as an average household which Assessor Tellier told you is a very conservative number and because the averages of various tax brackets and tax rates only seem to add to the confusion as to who is going to get what and what it is going to cost, we thought it would be simpler just to throw the raw numbers out because there's no way to average, there is no way to come up with a median of what the average tax deduction is for a resident in the City of Manchester and the other thing is you're talking only the property taxpayers versus renters or other people who don't pay property taxes, so the deduction doesn't apply universally to everybody.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we are not asking you to support this program today. What we're saying is let the Committee do its work and come back with some further information, that's all.

Alderman Pariseau stated, your Honor, I received so many phone calls against the "Bag & Tag", whether the Committee spends another four months discussing it, I cannot support "Bag & Tag" and I thought you ought to know that and I think that's the purpose of Alderman Wihby's request. I'm sure I'm not the only Alderman that received phone calls concerning "Bag & Tag" and the majority being opposed to "Bag & Tag".

Mayor Wieczorek asked how many calls have you had, Alderman.

Alderman Pariseau replied, I got seven yesterday, okay and over the last two or three months I would probably say 34-40.

Mayor Wieczorek stated what I'm saying is this is going to be a large problem for the City that we are going to be facing, we ought to anticipate this and be able to at least develop the information. You don't have to pass this, I'm not asking anybody to pass this. I'm saying let the Committee do its work.

Alderman Cashin stated can we be completely candid. It seems to me that this is being held in Committee for some reason, maybe you haven't had a chance to meet or whatever, but I wouldn't be surprised if this doesn't come out at the same time that you present your budget and I wouldn't be surprised if it would be in your budget and I think that is what this is all about, quite frankly.

Alderman Hirschmann stated whether or not this passes or fails, I'm really interested in a public relations effort on recycling and more recycling within the City and a greater effort expended toward recycling. I think it's quite a side issue from "Bag & Tag". I think "Bag & Tag" ties in with it in your proposal but I think it's totally a separate issue and I want the emphasis of recycling to continue even if this dies tonight.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, Frank, if there's anything you want to say. You've been sitting there very casually and quietly and he has spent a lot of time. Let me just hear what Frank has to say.

Mr. Thomas stated we've worked with Rich Girard in generating this numbers and different scenarios. A lot of the information that has been furnished tonight was the result of the trip to Dover. There are a lot of other questions that have to be answered, they've been brought up here again tonight. Solid waste costs are rising, it is a major portion of our operating budget, it's a major impact on the City's operating costs. There is really only two ways of funding it - off property taxes or through user fee. The bottom line is it comes out of property taxpayer pockets, whether it's the left pocket or the right pocket, it's still coming out. I think the decision has to be up to you people. What is the best way of passing on these ever-increasing solid waste costs. My opinion and it has always been that a user fee in this area is a fair and equitable way of passing on that cost. I also do agree whether "Bag & Tag" goes ahead or not that public education promoting recycling has to be a key effort that we all make. The Recycling Committee that Victor Hyman heads up is up and running and the priority directive that I've given him to bring through this Committee is to promote recycling and I'm sure that you're going to see a lot more activities down the road in that vein. However, as mentioned here again tonight that's going to be a long-term gradual process to increase the recycling efforts up to the higher percent numbers and without a "Bag & Tag" program or some type of mandatory recycling program, you'll never see the same results that Dover has achieved.

Alderman Wihby stated I feel like Alderman Pariseau, I'm never going to support a "Bag & Tag" and moved that the Board should take a vote tonight to see if there's a majority of this Board who wants to continue with it or not.

Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby continued by stating if they do, your Honor, that's fine, if they don't then it's ended today.

Alderman Domaingue stated I just want to make sure that I understand what the motion will be. You're asking the Board to vote down the option of "Bag & Tag" for the fiscal year '98 budget, is that the question.

Alderman Wihby replied, yes.

Alderman Domaingue stated for the record, your Honor, I want to make sure that I understand that the man who cannot now support "Bag & Tag" was the guy who called you the miracle man for bringing it out, is that correct, Alderman Wihby.

I believe the quote that I read a year ago was that you thought the Mayor was a miracle man for bringing out the "Bag & Tag" a year ago, I'm glad to see that your constituents got to you.

Alderman Wihby stated I might have said he did a miracle job on the budget, but I voted against the "Bag & Tag" last time.

Mayor Wieczorek stated even if you decide that you don't like to have it in for this budget that we ought to continue exploring it to find out because at some point this City is going to have to come to grips with the problem and as I said if it doesn't cost less to the taxpayer to do it this way, I won't support it. I don't know how I can make that plainer.

Mayor Wieczorek asked for clarification on the motion.

Alderman Wihby replied that the Board not go forward with the "Bag & Tag" program for FY98.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Reiniger duly recorded in opposition.

Communication from Mayor Wieczorek submitting his proposed CIP Budget for FY98.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we are going to have problems here because of the change in the fiscal year and the reason for presenting the CIP budget to you now is to enable us to take advantage of the construction season. For example, on Elm Street, if we don't do that then we're really not going to be able to get it done this construction season, so, Bob, if you could give them a cursory view of what we're going to be presenting prior to the public hearing.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I will try to keep this fairly short because we will have another presentation. As the Mayor mentioned, we are looking to speed up the CIP process this year and there are a couple of reasons for it. I think, in general, most of us would agree that the change to the fiscal year has been very positive for the City financially, however, it has caused some headaches for me in trying to implement some of the projects in that that starts July 1st and cuts our construction season basically in half. So, in order to get prepared for construction season and saving the City both time and money we are hoping to move the CIP Program ahead in advance of the Operating Budget, go to a separate public hearing on the CIP Program and get an adoption early in April and what we have provided is somewhat similar to last year. You'll see in your booklet under the first tab is a general summary of where the funds come from, where they are going to, the next tab is the annual budget which is what the Board would actually be adopting and that's broken into five categories based upon where the monies come from. Under the next tab is a multi-year which gives you an idea of the various costs facing the City over the next 5 to 6 years and gives the City both departments and elected officials an opportunity to plan and program for some of these projects. Under the next tab is the CIP policy which gives the general outlines and procedures that we used in developing the program, and under the last tab is the Resolution that ultimately the Board would adopt. The proposal this year involves about \$58 million which is a large program, it's the City's Community Improvement Program which includes both the capital projects and special community projects. Of that \$58 million about a quarter of that is based on our property tax and of that based on property taxes there is two parts. There is the CIP Cash which is about a million dollars and there is the Bond amount which is right on target with the benchmark that was set last year. Other than the City's property tax, about a quarter of the Community Improvement Program is based upon the Enterprise Program fees. And, the balance slightly over half is from State and Federal and Other sources which brings me to kind of a good news/bad news scenario with the Federal and State issues. The good news is that we get for the Community Improvement Program a little over half of our funds from State, Federal and Other sources. The bad news is that there are a lot of strings attached. The City is facing perhaps some of its biggest costs through Federal mandates. These include the landfill closure which has an impact again on the operating costs that you've been wrestling with tonight, the combined sewer overflow program which you'll hear more about in the near future, handicapped access, underground storage tanks, asbestos removal, special educational facilities. Those are some of the mandated requirements that we face and we're trying to deal with. They're all, of course, well-intentioned programs. Certainly individually important programs that have been required of us, but it does place quite a burden on the City and leaves limited funds for the City to do projects that the residents feel are important and I think listening to the Board over the last couple of years, I think things like good schools, quality parks, efficient emergency services, strong economic development projects and adequate roads and utilities are what the citizens generally want. Even though we've had limited funds over the last couple of years, we've done about as well as I believe we can do in implementing and making changes to make some improvements and this year's Community Improvement Program is a continuation of that process. We're working on our schools, we do have capacity problems, we feel that we have one program to build on facility

that will take care of a lot of capacity problems in the City, in the Middle School. This year's CIP includes the other half of the funding, you programmed half of it last year, we're about ready to go out to bid on the project and things have been flowing fairly smoothly. We've been working on our high schools. Certainly, we've had some problems in the past, but we made some major strides. Both Central and West - heating and ventilation, stage lighting, locker rooms, and we're going to be working more on that this year. Memorial High School...we're also starting to work on. We would be, if approved, starting to work on the design for new science labs at Memorial. These have been fairly significant improvements and we're working hard. Certainly the staff is working hard to accomplish these goals. Parks...it's been a number of years since the City's really worked on its park system other than the federally-funded improvements which have occurred over the last 20 years...we are making progress on those parks. Road and sidewalks...there's funding again to do reconstruction projects. We're looking to reconstruct Elm Street, as well this year. We're into the final phase of the Emergency Communications Systems...the Fire Department would be the final phase of that, it has been a successful implementation. We've taken what was 14 separate and independent radio communications throughout the City and provided one efficient 800 MHz system and it has worked. That is a quick synopsis of the program. We would expect to have a public hearing, I believe that is scheduled for March 19th now. I would be happy and my staff would be happy to work with any of the Aldermen. I believe this is being referred to the CIP Committee, is that correct, your Honor.

Alderman Cashin asked, Bob, what's the impact on the tax rate.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Cash portion is the same as last year. So, there's no increase based upon the Cash portion. The Bond amount is about \$10.65 million. We have been looking, you may remember last year we said we'd have to look at this as really a two-year bond program because the Finance Department isn't going to go out for bonds for probably the next fiscal year. So, that we've kept right on target to keep basically a negligible or no property tax impact. It would ultimately depend on what the interest rates for the bond issuance was, how many years the bonds were issued for, but we're on target to keep this a negligible or no impact on the tax rate.

Alderman Wihby stated I see we're going to have some problems when the Resolution comes, your Honor, because we're going to be okaying stuff from 1998 to 2003....\$30 million and \$11 million and all that stuff is going to be okayed when we pass the Resolution.

Mr. MacKenzie replied, no; that gives planning purposes for projects in the future. We look out to five years ahead to help us...

Alderman Wihby stated it says here...programs and projects for 1998 to 2003 are generally endorsed. I don't think this Resolution will do...

Alderman Soucy stated we've always done a Resolution for five years.

Alderman Wihby stated but if we're going to be okaying a Resolution for five years, \$30 million for five years. I won't know until...same thing as the other one. If we're going to have problems with that one, we're going to have problems with this one.

Mayor Wieczorek asked haven't you always done this.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would note, your Honor, that those are for planning purposes. We would not be appropriating or authorizing the bonds for those future years, we'd only be authorizing the monies for the FY98.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the FY98 CIP Budget be concurrently referred to a public hearing on Monday, March 24, 1997 at 7:00 PM in the Aldermanic Chambers and to the Committee on Community Improvement Program. Alderman Domaingue duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Wieczorek presented the following nominations:

**Board of Registrars:**

Rita Pepino to succeed herself, term to expire May 1, 1998.

Richard Fradette to succeed himself, term to expire May 1, 1999.

Under the rules these nominations were to lay over to the next meeting.

Ratification of agreement with MAPS in accordance with the memorandum of agreement and cost calculations presented on February 18, 1997.

Alderman Domaingue moved to ratify the agreement with MAPS in accordance with the memorandum of agreement and cost calculations presented on February 18, 1997. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

**TABLED ITEM**

Discussion regarding temporary relocation of meeting rooms for the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and its Committee during the renovation of City Hall (to be presented by the Office of the City Clerk.)  
(Tabled 2/18/97)

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to remove this item from the table for discussion.

Clerk Johnson stated this afternoon the City Clerk's Office forwarded a letter to you regarding Aldermanic space and because of the relocation of City Hall offices, it also includes the Board Chambers and we need to find another place for you to meet for approximately 14 to 18 months.

I apologize for the tardiness of the letter, but we were negotiating with UNH as recently as this afternoon and the figures are their final figures presented to us today. In our letter we wanted to recognize various public and private concerns that had assisted us and cooperated in showing us space that they had available and trying to work with us. It included Devine, Millimet & Branch, the Manchester City Library, NYNEX, Public Service Company of NH, the University of New Hampshire, and the State of New Hampshire Bureau of Court Facilities. In reviewing the sites that we were looking at, we were looking at a space that would be at least as large as what you are presently in to hold at least the same amount of people that generally attend the public meetings. We were concerned also for the ZBA and for the Planning Board and have included them in our quest for space. We wanted to try and remain in the Downtown area to promote the Downtown as that is where City Hall and the City offices are located. In addition, we were trying to locate one place so that we would not confuse the community as to where the meetings would occur on a regular basis. We didn't want to be meeting one place one week and another place another week, we thought that would be confusing to the public, so we tried to keep it as condensed as possible. After looking through the various options that we could find out there and we took an approach of both renting a large space and converting it into a Chambers and setting up a permanent base, we also looked at renting existing facilities and conference areas that are located throughout the general Downtown area. We came about with three options which we have presented to you along with the cost and I'll just outline those. In all of the options, we are suggesting that the City graciously accept the offer of NYNEX to hold Committee meetings on Monday evenings in their building. It will limit you to have to being out of the building by 9:00 PM for security reasons, but it would serve for your Committee purposes on Monday evenings and we would try and restrict the Committees to those evenings. The first option that we're showing here is the Manchester City Library. The Library has offered the use of its auditorium in order to accomplish utilizing the...

Alderman Pariseau interjected, your Honor, due to the lateness, why doesn't the City Clerk be allowed to select whatever they feel they can live with, they have to do the work. You're not going to please everybody.

Alderman Clancy moved to accept Option #2. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

A report of the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration was presented recommending that the increased motor vehicle registration fees be eliminated in the FY1998 budget and, therefore, that the Board rescind its actions with regard to collection of such fees under RSA 261:154 effective July 1, 1997.

The Committee notes that it has unanimously requested the City Clerk forward such report to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on March 4, 1997 for its consideration.

Alderman Elise presented the report noting it was a result of a meeting held this evening where the Committee on Accounts voted to rescind the increased motor vehicle registration fees for FY98 budget.

Alderman Wihby stated I agree with what we are doing as far as taking a vote, I disagree that we should do it, but I agree that we should take a vote to see if we want to have it in the budget or not as a fee. But, my concern is I have a lot of phone calls from people who were upset when they first initially called and I had one just before I came here and what she said was I asked the Tax Collector for information on why, why was it done and they said call your Alderman, we don't know and I'm just wondering if that is why there was such a negative attitude out there because when I explained to them that it was something that was controllable from year-to-year because we had set it up that way, it was something that was necessary one way or the other it would be on your tax rate or in the parking fee, they understood that and accepted that. But, when they first called they were angry and they were concerned with what had happened and the Board's always raising fees and everything else, but once they understood the facts they appreciated it. So, my concern is once we add the construction of the garages in our budget, say that number was \$2 million that \$2 million might go one year and might a \$1 million, but that \$1 million is going to be lost in the budget and that budget's not going to come down, it's going to stay constant, whereas if we controlled it with a fee, at least we could eliminate the fee or reduce the fee like I think we'd probably do next year if we kept it that way. So, that is why I am not in support of reducing it, I am in support of taking the vote to see how the Board feels so that we know whether or not it's in the budget or not, but I'd be against changing it.

Alderman Pariseau stated he's talking about having everybody pay that doesn't use the garages. Why don't you raise the garages fees from \$45 a month to \$90.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, I think that was always the problem, the discussions that have taken place.

Alderman Pariseau stated I probably got 84 phone calls on this one, your Honor, that my people don't want to continue to pay for the parking garages.

Alderman Shea stated in Committee we discussed the fact that the parking garages lose money and that they don't substantiate themselves, so we need extra revenue in order to substantiate their existence. Many people feel that it's really poor planning on the City's part to continue to have parking garages that continuously lose money based on the premise that they are vital for Downtown revitalization. But, the point of the matter is that it's not being felt. In other words, the revitalization is not taking place and as one constituent that attended the meeting noted, it's been an on-going process and a double-whammy. People don't see the revitalization as a positive aspect relating to the garages and they have to pay garage fees and they don't use the garages. So, the Committee feels at this time because of the many complaints that all of us have received regarding this fee and I must say that I at one time voted for the fee, Alderman Cashin

indicated that he didn't and I think that in hindsight he was correct because people object to this. They feel that they are being unjustly taxed, they didn't have a say in it and the way it was introduced in the budget was not to anyone's knowledge, the general public and when they were hit with it, we were hit with it by their response to that particular tax, so I think that the Committee felt unanimously tonight although Donna wasn't there, but the four of us that we should do away with it for 1998.

Mayor Wieczorek asked how to you suggest that we take care of these problems with the garages, increase the fees.

Alderman Shea replied like I said before, I think we should do away with the garages that aren't benefiting the City, how we can do that nobody wants to buy them. I don't know if Dave Wihby can come up with a couple of other millionaires, I don't know. People just don't have confidence in the garages. The people don't use the garages predicated on the fact that either they don't come Downtown enough or the fact that they don't feel safe, women don't feel safe going into the garages, I don't really know but they're not paying for themselves and as far as my thoughts I would have to give it more thought, but as of right now I can't come up with an answer other than it would probably have to be absorbed by the tax rate. I don't think people have any other choice in that matter. Eliminate them or do something to use them for another fee.

Alderman Wihby stated we looked at this is Lands and Buildings when I was Chairman of it and we actually went out and had offers from people that we said we'd give it to them if they'd fix them up and run them. The problem is I don't know if there are a lot of garages, first of all, that really do make money. The garages are there to benefit Downtown and the economic development of Downtown. The first thing you want to do if you want to build Downtown up, you try raising the rates \$200 and you'll see how many of them are going to move away. So, they have to be subsidized and they're either going to have to be subsidized by the fee or subsidized by the tax rate. When we looked into selling them nobody wanted them, nobody came forward. I think we had one company that came forward and the rates were going to have to be \$130 or something in order to make it work so they just went away and said thank you, we don't want anything to do with it. But, I think they're necessary, they're necessary for Downtown, they're necessary for economic development. If you start raising the fees you're not going to have anybody Downtown so you're just going to hinder the results Downtown and one way or another they're going to be from the fee or the tax rate.

Mayor Wieczorek stated there's no question. When you talk about people that are...you're tacking it onto the automobiles, so these are people who maybe don't use the garage, but they have a car. What you're talking about when you put it on a tax rate is people that don't have a car have to pay too, so then you're spreading it among everybody and I don't know that that's really fair.

Alderman Domaingue stated it is tough to sell these garages as much as many of the constituents that I heard from thought we ought to if they're broken and that was the position that the Committee found itself in in a year ago. I disagree, your Honor, that we ought to be putting this onto the people who own automobiles only because that was a premise upon which I agreed to it initially and then found out we were tacking it onto pop-up campers which don't get parked in the garage and utility trailers which don't get parked in the garage. So, a lot of this has gone by us. We've heard from the public, we've learned a lot from the process, we added a public hearing to the revenue policy, but I haven't seen the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration with its proposal tell us what the figure is and I think we're obligated to present that. You're asking us to eliminate it, how much money are we expected to make up in the next budget cycle so the public knows this. Because it's coming right at their tax bill.

Mr. Girard stated in the current fiscal year, Alderman Domaingue, the City has budgeted \$1.2 million, however, that \$1.2 million will be collected in a period from October 1st to June 30th, so for the entire months of September, August and July a full quarter of the fiscal year, that fee was not in place, so it is likely that that revenue could be roughly \$1.6 million in FY98.

Alderman Domaingue stated so long as the public understands, your Honor, that that revenue once we take this vote to eliminate that as part of the '98 budget will have to come from somewhere else and the likelihood of it being on their property tax rate which once it's stuck there usually stays there is probably the best reality.

Mayor Wiczorek asked, Alderman Elise, in your Committee did you discuss where this money would come from to make it up.

Alderman Elise replied there was a lot of discussion about economic development, the role of the garages, the role of the people utilizing cars in terms of supporting the garages, and the different degrees of money that would be needed to finance the garages at different times and what the Committee came to consensus on was that this particular revenue mechanism did not make sense to the general public or the people that we report to. It doesn't make sense to the general public that if they drive a car that they should, even if they don't use the garages, support the garages; that there are employees presently parking in the garages free and why should they support free parking for the employees. I don't think employees would object to a nominal fee at least to contribute to support the maintenance of the garages. So, we did have some general discussion about that and we urged the Finance Department to look at another finance mechanism to support continued repair of the garages and we did recognize that a lot of work was done in this area on this particular fee, but in sub-committee it was not acceptable to our constituents.

Mayor Wiczorek stated so far we've had several discussions here tonight on what we're going to be eliminating, so what you're doing is limiting the options I have. I am going to be preparing my budget, but you're telling me what I can't put into that budget before I even start.

Now, when you take out \$1.2 million that's a substantial amount and I'd like to know where the heck is that going to come from. You talk about economic development and Alderman Shea is talking about the fact that we are subsidizing them, what is your recommendation. Do we then charge the full amount that it would cost to amortize the garages.

Alderman Elise stated my very strong feeling is that we wouldn't be in this situation right now if this City was more business friendly. The buildings Downtown and in the Millyard could be worth twice-as-much if they were filled and developed, but the City does not cater to businesses or people who want to lease space here. People would want to pay forty, forty-five, fifty plus a space for parking spaces in the garages if the City was more accommodating to businesses in this area. People go to different towns with higher tax rates to put their businesses because they're more accommodating and more friendly.

Mayor Wieczorek asked so what do you suggest with the parking. You're saying now that they would pay \$50.00, \$50.00 a space is not enough to subsidize the garage.

Alderman Elise stated, Mayor, I suggest your administration has focused on putting your economic development eggs in very singular baskets and not in overall looking at what we can do for economic development that may be would not cost the taxpayers much money and that's why we may be in this situation today and maybe it is a problem for you to deal with.

Mayor Wieczorek stated, Alderman, my administration is right out here, all of you including you.

Alderman Elise stated could you please repeat that.

Mayor Wieczorek replied my administration is right out here, including all of you. You are part of this administration.

Alderman Elise stated that can be debatable in terms of the issues that you presented to us and also the issues that we've brought forward to this Board and you.

Alderman Clancy asked so what would you recommend.

Alderman Elise replied, I recommend that we look at a different finance mechanism for repairing the garages and there are various degrees of which garages need to be repaired at this particular time.

Alderman Sysyn stated the reason that we did that...I'm Chairman of Traffic and that's where it came from...and we had to bond the money last time. So, rather than bond the money to repair the garages we put that fee on the cars and when you tell me about why should they pay to park in the garages, then why should I pay to educate your kids, I don't have any more kids in school.

Alderman Elise stated it's a constitutional right for children to have education.

Mr. Girard stated just a point of order for the Board to consider. There has been a lot of discussion about the fee as it applies to the garages, but it's not limited to the garages. This fee goes to the City's entire parking system, the garages, the lots, the parking meters, the maintenance and its operation and its additions and improvements. So, to focus on the three buildings that we call garages is far too narrow a focus. It's the whole Downtown parking system that this fee supports.

Alderman Hirschmann stated in that Committee I learned some things about City government and I'm mindboggled, spending \$90,000 to improve the Numerica Parking Garage which we don't own, which is a contract that we are all sitting around having to endorse and pour parking garage money into garages we don't own, but we have a little clause in a lease tucked away somewhere and that's the kind of stuff, we have to get out of these contracts, get out of these garages, we don't belong in them. Those meters will be in there for 20 more years before we get ninety grand out of them. Get out of that contract. Sell these garages. If Wihby can find one of his millionaire buddies, give them one.

Alderman Wihby stated nobody wanted them for free, we tried.

Alderman Cashin stated originally the maintenance of garages and parking lots was in the CIP and for some reason it's no longer there. Now, the CIP Program was originally set up as a 5-year working document. Now, we have taken a lot of that money out and we've used it to supplement the Operating Budget, whether you want to agree with that or not it's a fact. I would recommend that maybe the CIP Committee look at maintenance of the parking garages back in the CIP budget.

I'm sure I'm going to get a lot of flack on it, but that's where it was originally.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we know you can only put five pounds in a five pound sausage, there's no way to get ten pounds in there.

Alderman Cashin stated, your Honor, you asked where you might and I'm giving you a...if you want to look at it, fine. If you don't...

Mayor Wieczorek stated I'm open to any suggestion you have. So far, we've knocked out a million two or we're going to knock out a million two.

Alderman Elise moved to accept the report of the Committee on Accounts. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Wihby, Reiniger and Sysyn duly recorded in opposition.

The Clerk stated there was a report of the Committee on Traffic to be presented to the Board as follows:

A report of the Committee on Traffic was presented recommending that a request for closure of Elm Street, from Clarke Street to Auburn Street, on Sunday, March 9, 1997 for the St. Patrick's Day Parade be granted and approved; subject to the review and approval of the Police and Fire Department.

Alderman Shea moved to accept the report of the Committee on Traffic. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Sysyn stated I suggested Debra Quimby write a letter. Her car was stolen recently. The Police Department when they found the car had it towed because they wanted to finger print it and this woman wound up paying over \$200.00 to get her car back. Why should she have to pay because the Police wanted to finger print the car, she's the victim and paying two-hundred plus dollars to get her car back. This isn't right and moved that Ms. Quimby's letter be referred to the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Sysyn moved to refer her letter to the Committee on Community Improvement Program relative to the Enterprise Community funding. When they first proposed this it was supposed to be a center for the youth from 12 to 18 and also to assist the parents of the youth in this area. All of a sudden we've got religious groups involved in this and I don't think they should be. I think we should have our own separate unit for this. We've got that Enterprise money, when we proposed the grant I don't know where the Committee came from that's proposing something else. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman nominated William Desrosiers to succeed himself as a member of the Manchester Transit Authority, term to expire May 2002.

Alderman Pariseau moved to close nominations to the Manchester Transit Authority. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Soucy stated I just wanted to raise one issue relative to the Road Hearing that was suppose to have taken place. It's my understanding that we need to advertise those issues in the paper and there is a cost associated with doing that. Not only was there a lack of a quorum, there was almost no one who could make it, and I just think that we should be aware that when

we're scheduling these things...we all have difficulties with making meetings and if a couple of people are missing that happens, it's a matter of course. But, there is a cost to doing that and there is an inconvenience to the people who did have items on that agenda and I think that we need to be more aware of that when we schedule the next Road Hearing and make the commitment to be there. I just hope that when we reschedule it we're all able to be there or as many of us can be.

Alderman Cashin moved to reschedule the Road Hearing to Monday, April 7, 1997 at 5:30 PM in the Aldermanic Chambers. Alderman Soucy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Elise stated I'd like to compliment you for your great appointments to the Heritage Commission. I know the first meeting was a big success and I am looking forward to the good things that the Heritage Commission is going to do. As you know it took about three years for the Heritage Commission to come to fruition and working with the Planning Department, the Planning Board, the Historic Association, Heritage Manchester, two separate Board of Aldermen, and what I'd like to do is make a strong recommendation to you this evening. Bernie Cowette was with the various groups throughout the whole process in terms of balancing the piece of legislation so that it worked for everybody and he did an awful lot of work on this piece of legislation going through for three years and the full Board here this evening has signed a letter strongly encouraging you to nominate him to the Commission. I know that there are three Alternate positions to be filled and this letter just strongly encourages you to appoint Bernie Cowette to the Heritage Commission as an Alternate and I'd like to forward it to you this evening for your consideration.

Alderman Domaingue stated I would ask the Board indulgence, I didn't put it in writing, but there was a recent situation in Ward 8 and also upcoming in Ward 9 regarding the taking of trees by the Manchester Airport and the issue seems to have resurrected itself and unfortunately, your Honor, this Board receives no input or any reporting on whether the taking of the removal of these trees is a done deal and finished or if next year we're going to have more trees taken and I think the people living in these neighborhoods need to know that, so I would ask the Board to request that the issue of tree clearing for the Airport be moved to the CIP Committee where we can ask members of either the Airport Authority Board or the Airport Director to be present and respond to some of the constituent questions that we've been receiving.

Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau stated I hope there's no trees being cut in Ward 9, I'm not even made aware of it.

Alderman Domaingue stated Alderman Pariseau has received no information on this, your Honor, and indeed his neighborhood which abuts the Ward 8 neighborhood...

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to recess the regular meeting to meet with the Chief Negotiator for a negotiation strategy session.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

Alderman Soucy moved to approve layover of agreement with Water Works and United Steelworkers in accordance with the memorandum of agreement and cost calculations presented for ratification at the next meeting. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Clancy moved to approve layover of agreement with the Firefighter's Association in accordance with the memorandum of agreement and cost calculations presented for ratification at the next meeting. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. The motion carried, with Alderman Pariseau duly recorded as abstaining.

There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk