BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

July 6, 1999 **7:30 PM**

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

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

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Klock, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, O'Neil, Girard, Shea, Rivard, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann

Clerk Bernier stated I understand the old gavel was broken while I was on vacation.

Mayor Wieczorek asked how do you think that happened.

Clerk Bernier replied Carol told me things got a little excitable on the last day, so Carol took it upon herself to get one in oak noting it's not going to break, therefore, we will retire this one

3. Presentation by members of the Manchester Development Corporation relative to the sale of luxury suites at the Civic Center.

Mr. Ashooh stated we just want to take a second. As you probably saw in the paper and are aware that starting June 16th we inaugurated the start of the sale of luxury suites to support the Civic Center. We figured it would take a month to six weeks to get these done. We sold out the 24 luxury suites available to the public in a matter of 12 days which is an overwhelming response from the business community to support this facility. I thought it would be appropriate tonight to just take about one minute which is all I'm going to do. The Chamber of Commerce held back their checks so that they could be the last one and I think it would be appropriate for them…I know Alderman Pariseau back in one of the public forums asked if the Chamber was going to kick in anything, well, they are and so tonight we'd like to formally present to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen the last check for the luxury suites from the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Schwieger stated thank you Skip and before I present the Mayor with a check I do want to say that this week it's not really the Chamber's, it belongs to all of its members. We plan to use it entirely to give members an opportunity (for a fee) to have a night in the box, it is not for the Chamber staff or the Chamber Board of Directors, but it is going to enable several businesses and members who might not normally be able to make use of that type of facility to do so upon occasion that is appropriate when they are entertaining special guests or honoring employees. So, Mayor, it's my honor to give you this check for $5,000 to reserve the twenty-fourth luxury suite in the name of the Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce.

Mayor Wieczorek stated thank you very much, Mr. Schwieger, we certainly appreciate that.

Mr. Schwieger noted it is made out to the City of Manchester.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it's a wonderful job that was done by everybody and I think this clearly indicates that there is a demand to have entertainment in this City. So, I think so far we are moving in the right direction and now you've got more work to do. Thank you very much.

CONSENT AGENDA

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.

BMA Minutes Accepted

A. Copies of minutes of meetings held October 27, 1998; November 17, 1998; December 1, 1998 (two meetings); December 15, 1998; and January 5, 1999 (two meetings).

Ratify and Confirm Polls Conducted

B. Approving transfer of $100,000 from Highway Salaries to Highway Resurfacing for FY1999.

C. Approving acceptance of assignment from MHA to the City originally made in 1987 and confirmed in 1999.

Approve Under Supervision of the Department of Highways

D. Bell Atlantic pole petition #922255.

Informational to be Received and Filed

E. Copies of minutes of Airport Authority meetings held on April 22 and May 27, 1999.

F. Communication from the Bank of New Hampshire expressing their gratitude to municipal officials who dealt with HB117/Claremont II decision.

G. Communication from Moody's Investors Service advising that on June 15, 1999, Moody's Rating Committee assigned a **Aa2** rating to the City's General Obligation Bonds.

H. Communication from Chris Kehas, Chair of the Central High School Alumnus Network expressing their gratitude to the Board for matching funds for the granite patio to the three war memorials.

I. Communication from Lawrence Constantine, Chairman of the Concerned Taxpayers of Manchester expressing their opposition to the proposed civic center and funding thereof.

Referral to the Manchester Airport and Highway Department

J. Communication from the Regional Administrator of the FAA in response to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen's recent inquiry regarding the ability of the City of Manchester to use Airport funds to acquire the homes of residents of Brown Avenue who desire to sell their homes as a consequence of growing Airport traffic.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

K. Communication from Deputy Clerk Bergeron submitting information regarding licensing procedures and police and fire staffing arrangements at selected civic centers in New England.

L. Communication from Deputy Clerk Bergeron submitting a request from Mr. Dennis R. Hamel for changes in the taxi fare structures.

M. Communication from the Public Works Director submitting three proposed organization charts for the restructuring of PBS into Highway.
(Note: Concurrent referral to the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance.)

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

N. Communication from Alderman Girard submitting two proposed amendments to the City Charter as follows:
(1) to insure that School expenditures and revenues will always be separate from the rest of the general fund; and
(2) to help keep spending from further exploding in light of the State's "Claremont Aid."

O. Petition for rezoning submitted by Attorney Casinghino on behalf of Howard Brodsky and Eileen Donovan for parcels of land located on South Willow Street in the area of Harvey Road.

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

R. Communication from Deputy Public Works Director Sheppard submitting the Highway Department's recommending for the FY2000 Storm Drainage Improvements project.

S. Communication from the Chief of Police requesting the department be allowed to add four (4) additional new vehicles to their fleet to be paid by Law Enforcement Block Grant funds.

U. Copies of communications from the Manchester Transit Authority relative to complaints and findings of same.

W. Communication from the Water Works Director submitting a renewal lease between the City of Manchester, Manchester Water Works and the Massabesic Yacht Club.

X. Communication from Else Raymond seeking a solution to her problem regarding a strip of land bordering her property on Pennsylvania Avenue.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Z. Resolutions:

"Amending the 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 Community Improvement Programs, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds for various CIP Projects."

"Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing changes in project numbers, authorizing and appropriating funds."

AA. Communication from the City Clerk submitting a Resolution relative to transfer of funds for security services in City Hall Complex:

"Resolution Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Fifty four thousand four hundred and fifty dollars ($54,450) in line item 0390 (Other Services) be transferred from Human Resources to City Clerk."

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

AB. Communication from Intown Manchester seeking the closure of Elm Street between Bridge and Granite Streets and that the side streets along the route be barricaded on Friday, August 13, 1999 from 6:00-11:00 PM in conjunction with the Time Travelers Class Car Show.

AD. Communication from Peter Telge, Member of the Craft Brewers Association seeking use of Arms Park for their 2nd Annual Brew Festival scheduled for Saturday, August 28, 1999 from 2:00 to 10:00 PM.

AF. Communication from Lorraine Chauvin, West Side Catholic School Board requesting that Walker Street be changed to a one-way street going east to west to address safety concerns for their children.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO REVIEW ENERGY CONTRACTS AND RELATED PROJECTS

AG. Communication from the Public Works Administrator submitting schedules relative to the New Hampshire PUC's Rate Case Docket 96-059 and the Restructuring Docket 96-150.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

AH. Recommending that a request to transfer, authorize and appropriate funds for various CIP projects be approved as follows:

(1) By decreasing:
1994 CIP 650216 – Business Revolving Loan Fund - $65,000.00
1996 CIP 220503 – Lead Poisoning Prevention Program - $25,527.23
1996 CIP 610312 – CIP Housing Rehabilitation Administration - $2,668.83
1997 CIP 220503 – Rehab/Lead Based Paint Program - $30,000.00
1997 CIP 830350 – Handicapped & Staff Parking - $2,000.00
1997 CIP 610312 – CIP Housing Rehabilitation Administration - $18,571.60
1998 – CIP 220503 – Rehab/Lead Based Paint Program - $48,000.00
1998 – CDBG Unprogrammed Funds - $180,000.00

(2) By increasing:
1999 CIP 65C199 – Downtown Revitalization, Right of Way - $371,767.66 – CDBG

and for such purpose an amending resolution and budget authorization has been submitted.

AI. Recommending that a request to change project numbers for the 1999 Community Improvement Program be approved as follows:

(1) by deleting 1999 CIP 420699 – STOP Violence Against Women; 1999 CIP 840200 – Graffiti Abatement; and 1999 CIP 831499 – City Space Improvements

(2) by inserting in place thereof 1999 CIP 420799 – STOP Violence Against Women; 1999 CIP 840300 – Graffiti Abatement; and 1999 CIP 831699 – City Space Improvements

and for such purpose an amending resolution and budget authorizations have been submitted.

AJ. Recommending that a request to extend CIP Projects until December 31, 1999, as attached hereto, be granted and approved.

AK. Recommending that a request from the Library Director to use funds from the 1999 CIP 820699, Adapt Lower Stacks for GMILCS Personnel Office Project to pay for the Manchester City Library's share of a Y2K compliance upgrade and associated costs for the GMILCS Dynix library automation system be granted and approved.

AL. Recommending that a request from the Manchester Water Works Director for a renewal leave between the City, Manchester Water Works and Fairhaven Baptist Church be granted and approved. The Committee further recommends that the Mayor be authorized to execute such agreement for and on behalf of the City subject to review and approval of the City Solicitor.

AN. Advising that it has authorized the Planning staff to execute a six-month agreement with Intown Manchester.

AO. Advising that it has approved the temporary display of the clock mechanism formerly displayed in City Hall in the SEE Science Center's lobby subject to meeting the conditions of the City Clerk and City Solicitor.

COMMITTEE ON JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS

AP. Advising that it has accepted the enclosed project summaries and contractor’s reports for May relative to Northwest Elementary School, the Henry J. McLaughlin, Jr. Middle School, Jr. High School Tech. Ed., Parkside Junior High School Addition, Memorial High School Science Lab and Other Improvements, ADA Accessibility/School Elevators, and Central & West Heat & Ventilation Improvements and is submitting same to the Board for informational purposes.

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

AQ. Recommending that a request from the City Clerk on behalf of Kids Voting USA of NH, for closure of a portion of Market Street on September 28, 1999 in conjunction with a Presidential Barbecue Election poll be granted and approved subject to meeting all conditions set forth by Fire, Highway, Police and Risk Management.

AR. Recommending that a request from the Greater Manchester Chapter of the American Red Cross for closure of Elm Street between North and Webster Streets from 5:30 PM until 9:30 PM on Saturday, October 16, 1999 for their fourth annual "Frightmare" on Elm Street" be granted and approved subject to meeting all conditions set forth by Fire, Highway, Police and Risk Management.

AS. Recommending that a request from OGBE Communications for closure of Merrimack Street, from Elm Street to Chestnut Street, beginning at 12:00 PM noon on August 12, 1999 in conjunction with the 7th Annual Healthsource Corporate Road Race be granted and approved subject to meeting all conditions set forth by Fire, Highway, Police and Risk Management.

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

Warrant to be committed to the Tax Collector for collection under the Hand and Seal of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

AU. Warrant for Collection of Sewer Charges in the amount of $117,053.70.

HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN THIBAULT, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN PRAISEAU, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.

P. Communication from the Concerned Taxpayers of Manchester presenting a motion that there is a need to redistrict the City's wards by establishing under the City Charter a total of 14 wards represented by 14 Aldermen and 14 School Board Members and eliminating the At-Large designations; and further that a non-binding referendum question be placed on the year 2000 ballot.

Alderman Shea stated a brief comment relating to the differences of registered voters in several Manchester wards. For example, in Ward 1 there are 4,736 registered voters; in Ward 6 (4,645); in Ward 8 (4,419); and in Ward 2 (4,052) compared to 2,519 in Ward 5; 2,708 in Ward 11; 2,899 in Ward 4; and 2,955 in Ward 3. I spoke to the City Solicitor briefly and I think and I don't want to speak for him, but I think he'll get back to us concerning legal guidelines relating to equalized voting within the distinctive wards of this City. So, if he'd like to comment on that, he may.

Alderman Girard stated I understand the point that Alderman Shea and the Concerned Taxpayers are trying to bring up, but if I'm not mistaken the ward boundaries are determined not by number of registered voters, but by population within the boundaries. Is that accurate? So, in other words we do not set boundaries and may not set boundaries based on the number of voters in each areas. So, it's a sheer population base.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated I think, your Honor, that is quite true but I think that there has been a population explosion in different parts of our City and that also attests to the fact that you have larger voting populations in certain parts as distinct from other parts.

Mayor Wieczorek stated let me have the City Clerk address that because we redistrict every ten years, isn't it.

Clerk Bernier stated that is correct. Alderman Shea, it is required by the State every ten years and I think that within the next two years we will have to address that issue.

Alderman Shea moved that the communication from the Concerned Taxpayers be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Q. Communication from Deputy Clerk Bergeron submitting a request from Mr. Terrence Casey to vend hot dogs at City Hall Plaza.

Alderman Shea stated a constituent in my ward, Mr. Casey…I wanted to mention that he contributes valuable community services within the ward, he has assisted at the Hallsville community during their cookout as well as helping ailing neighbors whose family members have been notified because they live out of town and I am asking that his vending request received the CIP's endorsement and moved that the communication be referred to the Committee on Community Improvement. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated a question for the Clerk. I thought that CIP had already dealt with this.

Clerk Bernier replied there are two issues. This is the first and then there is another one that you addressed last week or whenever you met last.

Mayor Wieczorek noted Mr. MacKenzie is here.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I am not familiar with this one, your Honor.

Alderman Girard stated I do have a question. Once it does wind its way through the Committee process if all goes well we'd be able to approve this at the first meeting in August, most of his summer season will be gone by then. Would it be appropriate perhaps to give approval for it tonight rather than sandbag him for another month.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I have a motion and a second to the Committee. Do you not want to do that.

Alderman Girard stated I will withdraw my second in favor of a motion to approve it tonight.

Alderman Shea withdrew his previous motion and moved that the request by Mr. Casey be approved. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby asked has everything been met.

Clerk Bernier replied yes the licenses and insurances.

Alderman Cashin asked once this starts, how are you going to stop it. I don't want to deny him his right but I think it ought to go to Committee to at least be discussed and come back with some recommendation to the Board. I don't mean to hold it up.

Alderman Girard stated I understand the concerns of Alderman Cashin, however, as the letter from the Clerk notes this is a request in an activity that has been on-going for years, it's not new to us which is why I seconded the motion that I seconded.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion to grant approval to Mr. Casey to vend hot dogs at City Hall Plaza without referring it to the Committee on Community Improvement. The motion carried with Alderman Cashin duly recorded in opposition.

T. Copy of a communication from Barbara Connor to Sean Thomas relative to vehicle standards.

Alderman Pariseau stated I noticed that the Committee that was set up to establish the vehicle standards exempted cargo vans from air-conditioning and my impression is that those that drive the cargo vans do the work instead of just allowing the department heads air-conditioning I believe that we ought to look at the possibility of the cargo vans being air-conditioned as well.

Mayor Wieczorek asked which are the cargo vans, Alderman.

Alderman Pariseau replied it's your Committee, I believe, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek asked is it the small cargos you're talking about. What would you like to do, it's a referral to the Committee.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the Committee take under advisement the need for air-conditioning in those cargo vans as well as the department head vehicles and that it be referred to the Committee on Community Improvement. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

V. Communication from the Water Works Director requesting the Board's authorization for the sale of 9.7 acres of land located in Auburn, NH along Eaton Hill Road at a price of $105,429.30.
(Note: reports from Assessors, Planning and Tax enclosed herein.)

Alderman Pinard asked that the Deputy Clerk explain the situation.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated Alderman Pinard had approached the Clerk and requested that we receive the reports that the Committee would normally receive in advance so that the Board could act rather than waiting. It is Water Works property and I did speak to Mr. Bowen today who could not be here this evening and he had no objection to the Board moving forward if it so desired. The reports that are enclosed with the Board's agendas was received from the Assessors, Tax Collector and Planning Director in accordance with the City's Ordinance. If the Board wished to pursue this it would move that the Board having received reports from the Board of Assessors, Tax Collector and Planning Director find such property surplus to City needs, that it is in the best interest of the City to dispose of such property through sale to the Town of Auburn for an amount of $105,429.30 which will promote the Intermunicipal cooperation and sensitivity to future site design and having a minimal impact on the quality of the Massabesic public drinking water supply and, further, that the Board authorize that the Mayor dispose of said property for and on behalf of the City subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

Alderman Pinard so moved to authorize disposition of land located in Auburn, NH as outlined by the Deputy Clerk. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau stated I do not know if there is a representative from the Town of Auburn.

Mayor Wieczorek invited Harley Eaton of the Town of Auburn to address the Board.

Mr. Eaton stated the Town of Auburn has outgrown the facility we have in the village and there was a great demand that we build a new facility. The Town…the way that it's designed, laid out that it would be to our best advantage to put in a new Fire/Police facility which lies just east of the present school and part of the Water Works land that's been on Eaton Road Extension for a long, long time. Most of the land in Auburn is presently over in Manchester Water Works. When I was a boy, I didn't like it, now that I'm a senior I'm glad you do because it gives a lot of greenspace. So, we really look forward to putting up a facility there and if it goes through I want to thank you on behalf of the Town for everything that you've…for all of the excellent cooperation with the Manchester Water Works and all of the Committee members. I have some Committee members now here with me: Carl Mann, Jim Padden, Mark Gosselin and the Police Chief of Auburn who is going to be in the new facility. I'm sorry our Fire Chief couldn't be here for one reason or another, but we have some roads out there that are plugged up. But, we really need this very, very badly as we've outgrown the present facility, it's antiquated, new trucks and now we need a new building and if you can see it in your hearts to grant us this we would be very grateful.

Mayor Wieczorek asked do I misunderstand or is the Water Works the largest taxpayer in Auburn.

Mr. Eaton replied without going into that, Mayor, that's kind of sensitive but maybe you'll recall a few years ago a different case.

Alderman Hirschmann asked out of the hundred and five thousand will anything come back to the general fund, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek replied I think it goes to the Water Works.

Alderman Hirschmann asked won't they give us some of that, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek replied it goes to the Water Works, it's an enterprise.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion to authorize disposition of the property. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Y. Bond Resolutions:

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($250,000) for the 2000 CIP 710100, Annual ROW Reconstruction."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Twenty Five Thousand Dollars ($325,000) for the 2000 CIP 710200, Intersection Improvement Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($200,000) for the 2000 CIP 740200, Storm Drainage Improvement Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or lease Purchases in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($600,000) for the 2000 CIP 810300 Revaluation Project."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Million, Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars ($2,350,000) for the 2000 CIP 830100, Police Station and Human Services Buildings."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Seventy Five Thousand Dollars ($175,000) for the 2000 CIP 830500, Main Library Renovations."

Alderman Reiniger noted that Item Y was pulled from the Consent Agenda at the request of the City Clerk's Office.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the City Clerk did request that this item be pulled after conversations with the Planning Director noted that the first Bond Resolution is to be removed from the agenda; also the third, and the last two to be removed; that a motion is required to amend the second resolution to read

> "Authorizing Additional Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Seventy-five Thousand Dollars ($75,000) for the 2000 CIP 710200, Intersection Improvement Program."

the reason being that this Bond actually has been passed and gone out to sale for $75,000 less than what the Board originally appropriated.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the $600,000 for the revaluation project should go forward as it reads. So, we would need a motion to accept that change in the amount of that second resolution and move both of those to the Committee on Finance.

Alderman Pariseau moved to amend the second Bond Resolution as outlined and that such Bond Resolutions be referred to the Committee on Finance. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked what is necessitating all of these changes that couldn't have just gone through the referrals and corrected them at Finance.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied the reason we have deleted the other resolutions is because the Board has actually already adopted those and they actually went out with the last Bond sale, they were done with the expedited projects.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

AC. Communication from the Mothers of South Jewett Street submitted by Aldermen Shea and Rivard seeking three-way stop signs at all streets coming into South Jewett Street along with speed bumps at each of these stop sign locations.

Alderman Shea stated this is in conjunction with Alderman Rivard noting both of us have serious concerns. There is continuous and concentrated traffic between Cilley Road and Weston Road on South Jewett Street and there are nine streets that enter and also exit South Jewett Street plus there is four schools, there's a church and the parents living on that street are very concerned about their school-age children and what they would like is a three-way stop and speed bumps and obviously there are difficult situations that the City has to deal with, but I'm not sure exactly what the Board's feeling on this is. We've had concerns about speed bumps in Ward 8 and Ward 9 and also Ward 1 has indicated that there were concerns on Day Street. I'm not sure if my colleague in Ward 8 would like to address his concerns about this matter, as well.

Mayor Wieczorek interjected, Alderman, I think what you should do is refer this with that recommendation to the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety.

Alderman Rivard stated I want to thank Alderman Shea for joining with me together as a team. We're making progress in that area, there is a serious concern noting we have been trying to get sidewalks constructed up there for several years and I think we've made some progress and I think this year we are going to get a couple of them, but until we have the area completely sidewalked for the safety of the children I think that the Traffic Committee should consider this request and I would appreciate their strong support.

Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

AE. Communication from the Pastor of St. Anthony Parish requesting the closure to traffic on Silver Street from Belmont Street west to the back street just before Hall Street during school hours starting in the next school year (1999-2000).

Alderman Shea stated another traffic related problem exists on Silver Street which poses a problem for approximately 460 plus students attending St. Anthony's Elementary School. There is no fencing restricting the student movement on the north side of the school and the pastor is making request to restrict the traffic between the school building and the rectory. This request would allow for closer supervision during recess periods, again, I'm speaking as a former school principal and safe movement of students to attend religious services between the school and the church. It would also allow for the use of an additional play area across from the school and

school custodians would handle and remove or place any traffic related barriers. So, I'm really asking the Traffic Committee to give serious consideration to Fr. Charles' request.

Alderman Shea moved that same be referred to the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby asked are we saying that just during school we're going to have someone go up in the morning and come back at night. Is that what we're looking for.

Alderman Shea replied they will probably put a barrier there like horses or something, it's a small area that abuts actually the school property. It's on the south side of the building and it would be perhaps around 500 or 600 yards, I'm not exactly sure. I asked the priest and he really didn't have it, but it's that short distance between Belmont Street and a backstreet, not quite to Hall Street. There is no residential area there, it's just a smaller area there.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

AM. Report of Committee on Community Improvement

Recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen find the Chandler School property to be surplus to City needs and that disposal of same by sale of the property to the Holy Family Academy at a price of $1.00 is in the best interest of the City.

The Committee notes that such recommendation is based upon a presentation by the Board of Trustees of said Academy who have indicated a desire to renovate the building and provide an education program for high school students. It is the Committee's opinion that such a family will have a positive affect on the neighborhood, and save tax dollars to City residents by providing educational services to some students whom would otherwise attend school in the City's public school system.

The Committee has requested that reports from the City Solicitor, Board of Assessors, Planning and Tax Collector be provided to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen with the recommendation that the Mayor be authorized to execute such documents as may be required to carry out the terms of the disposition of the property to Holy Family Academy, subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

Alderman Sysyn stated I'm not opposing this, I think it's a great idea. Do we have reverter rights or is there a reverter clause in this agreement.

Solicitor Clark replied our office is recommending that a reverter be placed in the deed or if the Board wanted to do…another process would be to put in a right to repurchase, but that would require negotiations with the property owner and how you would evaluate the repurchase price later. The cleanest way would be to place a reverter on the property.

Alderman Wihby asked is there one in it.

Solicitor Clark replied no there isn't. It's being recommended that one be put in.

Alderman Wihby asked are we moving to accept this then or are we sending it to CIP, is that what we're doing.

Mayor Wieczorek replied no, this is a report of the CIP Committee.

Alderman Wihby stated I just heard from the Solicitor that we should have some sort of reverter in there.

Mayor Wieczorek stated why don't we hear from the Chairman of the Committee first then you can question.

Alderman Reiniger stated the CIP Committee has approved this concept noting that the City Solicitor, in his letter, has asked that we in discussing this report tonight consider two other points whether or not we want to add the reverter clause and also they've recommended that there being a finding that this be disposed of by other than a public sale and that it be in the best interests of the City and is required by justice for the good reason presumed Section 304.21, so if we go ahead tonight those two issues would need to be addressed and/or added to this report.

Alderman Wihby asked how could you go ahead.

Alderman Sysyn asked if you put the amendment in, can't you go ahead.

Solicitor Clark replied the Committee report does address the issue of it being in the best interests of the City, so that is okay. There is no need to add any further language on that after talking to the Clerk you can authorize it today subject to our office when we draft the deed placing a reverter in the deed.

Alderman Sysyn moved to amend the report to include approval subject to placing of reverter clause in documents as outlined by the Solicitor. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated I don't have a problem with a reverter clause I just want to know what the reverter clause would be. Would it be "so long as it's used as a school" or would it be "so long as it's owned by Holy Family…".

Alderman Sysyn stated if they would sell it with the reverter clause it would come back to us, doesn't it.

Solicitor Clark stated they wouldn't be able to sell the property unless they got our permission because we'd have a reverter in the deed. The standard language would be to have it revert back to the City in the instance where the owner no longer uses it for educational purposes, for school purposes.

Alderman Cashin asked Amoskeag doesn't have reverter rights on this building, does it, it's clear.

Solicitor Clark replied no.

Alderman Shea asked if the particular educational groups handles the transaction and then down the road a year or two from now they have put in say seventy, fifty or hundred thousand dollars, but they can no longer use this facility do we have to give them $150,000 in order to get back this building or does it revert back minus the amount of money they have put in it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that's a good question. So, all of the improvements that are made if the City were to take the property over do they pay for the improvements or do they accept the building without payment.

Solicitor Clark replied in a standard reverter when they only use the property for the purposes intended, it reverts to the City with any improvements they've put in it. It just comes back to the City.

Alderman Wihby stated I'm reading a letter from Bob MacKenzie and on here it says that the proposal does not meet the normal requirements, that we can just go ahead and give it to them, that we should go out to public sale, is that not true anymore.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I was basically quoting from the codes that deal with disposition and in those codes it indicates that it is the general policy of the City that properties be sold for their fair assessed valuation and that they be returned to the tax rolls to get property taxes. There are provisions in the code, however, that you can sell it in other ways and as proposed tonight provided that there's a clear public interest and so that's something the Board does have to weigh. I did suggest in this particular case that if you are looking at the long-term potential property taxes…I just did a quick jot as to what it might be valued and potentially up to $30,000 a year you might get out of property taxes. But, if you assume that even a small percentage of the students that might attend it came out of public schools, let's say only ten students going to that school came out of public schools, you could be saving $50,000 a year. Now, I don't have anything quantitative, I don't have any information as to what would indicate how many students might be going so it's only a logical assumption that in this case the public benefit could clearly allow greater return to the City if students went rather than using this for taxable purposes.

Alderman Wihby stated so we could do it in the best interests of the City.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Cashin stated I believe there's a group here representing Holiday Family, could somebody speak to us and tell us how they feel about this, so we don't go too far.

Attorney Jim Doyle stated I have with me Mary Mosher who is the President of the Board of Trustees and I'll let her answer any questions that you have.

Ms. Mosher stated actually I Chair the Building Search Committee for Holy Family Educational Corporation and I'm not sure what question I'm supposed to answer at this time, so if someone could clarify for me please.

Mayor Wieczorek asked do you have anything specific, Alderman Cashin.

Alderman Cashin stated in the reverter that they are talking about here…any renovations that you make to the building, if for whatever reason you should cease the operation that building will revert back to the City of Manchester and we will not pay for the renovations, how does that…

Ms. Mosher replied I'd like to request Mr. Doyle to answer that question for me.

Attorney Doyle replied, Mr. Cashin, basically what we're looking to do…I spoke to Tom Arnold from the City Solicitor's Office and I had no authorization to go into specifics, but basically what we're looking at as a basis of negotiations through the City Solicitor's Office would be something along the line of the contract that was drawn up regarding The Sargent Museum located at 88 Lowell Street and basically what we're trying to do is set up a situation where the equities on both sides would be covered in the specifics of the contract. What we're basically saying to the City is you've got a building that the School District's given back to you and has told you they don't want, at least that's my understanding…for you to give us that building for a dollar ($1.00) and that's all we're looking for from the City. We were then going to have this non-profit corporation that wants
to educate students in a specific way in terms of the classical education in the City of Manchester and provide that opportunity, that educational resource to the City and if there is a situation further down the road where the building no longer serves the needs of the non-profit corporation, etc. we would want to have language that is similar to what was used in The Sargent Museum which would balance the equities. We don't expect you to give a piece of property for a dollar to a non-profit corporation and then have that non-profit corporation turn around and flip it and sell it and make a profit on it. On the other hand, we're not going to ask people to invest a considerable amount of money and you have your own figures of what you said you were going to spend on it and have those people as private individuals take that money and give it to a non-profit corporation and spend two hundred to three hundred, whatever the number is and have it all renovated and then give it back to you for a dollar. We're looking for a balance between those and the specific language that would be used would be something along the lines that was used in The Sargent Museum contract and the specifics of that would be up to whoever it was that was bargaining the specifics of the language on behalf of the City and on the other side and that is all we're looking to do and that's basically it. Does that address your question.

Alderman Cashin asked this is going to be open to all students within the City.

Ms. Mosher replied we are a school that will be teaching in the Catholic tradition, but our enrollment would be open to students in the City, that is correct.

Alderman Girard stated we will have an opportunity to review and approve the final contract or once it is negotiated is it going straight to you.

Solicitor Clark stated if the Board would wish us to negotiate either the right to repurchase or a first option on the property in the event they wanted to resell it, we'd be happy to renegotiate with them and come back, we would have to come back to the Board with that agreement before it gets authorized.

Alderman Girard stated the folks that want to do this school gave quite a presentation to the CIP Committee and it's a very exciting project and I wouldn't want to see this Board do anything to slow down its progress. I don't have a problem with a reverter right, but I also being familiar with The Sargent Museum deal think that that worked out very well for The Sargent Museum people and the City and if the School folks, Mr. Doyle and Ms. Mosher want to pattern language after what we've already done with The Sargent Museum, I personally wouldn't have a problem with that, I think it's in everybody's interest to do that and I think it's fair to all parties. The item here suggests approval and, I believe, the item that is on the agenda does not require it to come back to the Board once it's prepared, it would go to the Mayor, is that correct or is that not correct.

Mayor Wieczorek replied I imagine it would be subject to the approval of the City Solicitor once we decide what you want to have in the agreement, correct.

Solicitor Clark stated the item presently does not have a reverter or a right of repurchase in it. We had recommended that something be placed in there to protect the City's interest in the future.

Alderman Girard stated right, but if we were to approve this tonight "as is" and again I agree with the reverter, but if we were to approve this tonight "as is", would the Mayor be authorized to sign it once you had drafted it, Mr. Clark.

Solicitor Clark replied if you approve it "as is", yes, he would be signing it as soon as it was drafted.

Alderman Girard stated in order for the Mayor to be able to sign whatever you draft without having come back to the Board, would we have to decide what that reverter right should be here tonight.

Solicitor Clark replied the problem with that is that it's going to take negotiations with Attorney Doyle and our office to determine how you're going to decide what the value of the property is in the future, how are the improvements going to be quantified, is there going to be a reduction in value based on time and how are you going to come up with that, are you going to have appraisals and that would have to be negotiated and that would have to come back to the full Board.

Alderman Girard stated by entering into this additional step, we are in fact slowing down the project. Understanding that you are going to have to do some negotiations with the City Solicitor are you all set with the time frame here or what we're looking to do, the steps that we're setting up. I realize that you'd like to have things expedited, but if this doesn't get final approval from the Board say until the first meeting in August which is our next regularly scheduled meeting, would that present you with problems.

Ms. Mosher replied no it would not, that would be fine. We certainly aren't concerned, as you are all well-aware the building has a serious roof issue that needs to be addressed while there is still weather left to do that before there's more damage done to the interior of the building. But, if this were to be finalized and, in fact, we were able to get in there in August to begin our renovations that would be a timely manner for us.

Alderman Girard asked Solicitor Clark, do you have a problem using The Sargent Museum lease as a model as proposed by Attorney Doyle.

Solicitor Clark replied, no we don't have a problem with that.

Alderman Wihby asked are we referring it to the City Solicitor to negotiate and come back to the Board, is that what the motion is.

Mayor Wieczorek replied I guess that is what the motion will be, a motion to refer it back to the City Solicitor trying to include all of the items discussed here this evening and bring it back to the Board at the August meeting.

Alderman Shea asked when do you intend to open the school, if in fact, it were approved in August. Do you plan on opening it in September of '99.

Ms. Mosher replied no, Sir, we can't do that. The State of New Hampshire requires a ninety (90) days notice prior to being able to do that as well as the fact that it's quite an undertaking to hire staff and that building still has a significant amount of renovations, so we would be looking to open in the Fall of 2000.

Mayor Wieczorek asked is there a motion on the floor.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied there is a motion on the floor to accept the report subject to reverter clause, so you may want to have that motion withdrawn and another made to refer to the City Solicitor.

Aldermen Sysyn and Wihby withdrew their original motions.

Alderman Girard moved to refer the report to the City Solicitor for drafting and negotiation of language for reverter agreement similar to The Sargent Museum. Alderman Klock, duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mayor Wieczorek stated as all of you know when Mr. Testa decided he was going to leave Manchester we immediately began a search and hired a firm (Horton International) to locate a new Airport Director or to assist the City in locating a new Airport Director. They interviewed some fifty-one people, as I understand it, and finally came up with the top five of that group and we put together a committee that did the interviewing which was made up of myself, Mr. Clougherty, Mr. Clark, Mr. Duffy, Mr. Denton both from the Airport Authority and Mr. Testa and we interviewed the top five people that we had here and finally, we got through with negotiations this morning which is one of the reasons why you didn't get anything from us till we concluded the negotiations.

Mayor Wieczorek stated please be advised that I am nominating Mr. Kevin A. Dillon as Director of Aviation for the City of Manchester. Mr. Dillon comes to Manchester Airport with over twenty-two years of exceptional Airport management experience in the New York and Boston. This nomination follows an extensive search process led by Horton International of Baltimore, Maryland. We found Mr. Dillon in our backyard as he is a resident of Brentwood, New Hampshire and the Operations Director of Logan International Airport. I am nominating Mr. Dillon at salary grade level 31. This grade level change is a necessary increase due to market changes and the phenomenal growth of Manchester Airport. The City's Consultants Horton International and Yarger Decker and MacDonald recommended the salary change. I telephoned all members of the Board today to advise them of my nomination this evening. The paperwork was delayed to the Board as the interview process was completed this morning. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the efforts of our interview search team including Mr. Patrick Duffy who is Chair of the Airport Authority, Mr. Michael Denton who serves on the Airport Authority, City Solicitor Tom Clark, Finance Officer Kevin Clougherty and Human Resources Director Mark Hobson. I would also like to recognize the support of former Airport Director Mr. Fred Testa. Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to Interim Airport Director Mr. Michael Farren and all employees of the Airport for a job very well done. Mr. Dillon along with members of the Airport Authority and the Airport Assistant Directors are in attendance this evening. Should members of the Board have any questions I request the Board suspend the rules on the pay grade change. I am also requesting the Board to suspend the rules of the nomination process in order to expedite the start date of Mr. Dillon for August 9, 1999. Also, I feel very fortunate that we were able to get Mr. Dillon to come to

Manchester. He has tremendous experience, I know he is going to be a great asset to the City and is going to fit in very well with the department heads that we have in the City.

Alderman Pinard moved to suspend the rules and confirm the nomination of Kevin A. Dillon as Airport Director. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Wieczorek asked do we need a motion first for the change in the pay grade.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied I just conferred with the City Solicitor noting the classification plan is established through ordinance, so it is not a rule that you are suspending, but if you are confirming the nomination which is committed at Grade 31 then it is presumed that the Board is committing to the Grade 31.

Alderman Rivard stated I just want to congratulate you on your nomination, Mr. Mayor, of Mr. Dillon and I look forward to working with you over the next few months. I have the privilege of representing the people in Ward 8 and I also have the privilege of sharing the concerns of the residents with the now relocated Airport Director. I don't know if you ever intended to be a diplomat, but I think that that is going to be part of your responsibilities, I certainly hope it will be anyhow. I think one of the biggest problems we face in Ward 8 is the uncontrolled expansion and the limited communication with the neighborhood and I think that if we keep that in mind, I think that everything is going to go real well. Not only for myself, but for the next individual who will be sitting in this seat next term. We just had a meeting with 250-300 people in Ward 8 and the biggest concern we had was that nobody knew what was going on and every time we have a meeting they're changing the plans and it's a very frustrating and aggravating situation for all of the people who have lived there. So, I hope that you are sensitive to the people who have lived there for 40, 50 years and to their roots because that is very important. The Airport's important but these people are also, I think, more important. So, I just ask for your patience, sympathy, understanding and with that good luck.

Mr. Dillon stated I certainly believe that it's important for the Airport to be a good neighbor and that certainly is a number one priority of mine.

Alderman Pariseau stated welcome to Manchester, Mr. Dillon. In reading the brief synopsis that we were furnished by Horton International there's a couple of references relative to your experience with FAR 107 and 139 requirements. My concern as a representative of the constituency in Ward 9 that's bothered by Airport noise what is your experience with Part 150. This is a number one priority issue that should be turned over to you like tomorrow.

Mr. Dillon replied I have a lot of experience with FAR Part 150 studies. Certainly, in both of my roles at LaGuardia Airport in New York as well as my time at Logan Airport I have been very involved in terms of different programs that include the Residential Sound Insulation Program down at Logan Airport. Certainly, it's something as I said earlier if you're going to be a good neighbor it becomes a very important part of what we do in terms of developing the

Airport and it certainly is something that would have to be taken into consideration greatly going forward.

Alderman Pariseau stated I look forward to working with you over the next couple of years.

Alderman Girard stated along the lines that have been expressed by the Aldermen from Ward 8 and Ward 9 and am sort of interested to know what steps you would take, once appointed, to let the neighborhood know you were there and let the neighborhood know that your door was open. How do you propose to change the relations between the Airport and the neighborhoods which currently are strained.

Mr. Dillon replied as I said earlier, certainly it's important to be a good neighbor, I pride myself on being a consensus builder and I think anytime you approach a development of the magnitude that's occurring at the Airport today you need to do that in a very cooperative fashion. It's something that I would plan to meet with the community on a regular basis, certainly working through your offices, as well to reach out and understand the sensitivities of the community to the greatest extent that I can.

Alderman Girard stated Alderman Rivard made reference to your needing to be a diplomat, I'm sure you know that tensions in that neighborhood are pretty high and I'm interested to know if you have any experience in diffusing situations that are already at impasse.

Mr. Dillon stated certainly as I said working at airport's the size of LaGuardia Airport as well as Logan there are certainly community issues, there are noise issues, there are access issues, there are congestion issues around the airport. Down at LaGuardia Airport, for example, the community is very, very close to the Airport and during my tenure there I was responsible for getting a noise wall constructed along the western boundary of the Airport. Things like that as I said once you firmly understand the issues that exist within the community there are alternatives to make the Airport a little more livable and a much better neighbor.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'd like to echo my colleague from Ward 8 his comments are very appropriate. I guess this reference would be to Mr. Hobson. Mark, Yarger Decker has agreed on the Grade 31. Why weren't they talking a 31 in the report that we accepted less than a year ago.

Mr. Hobson replied that is a very good question. When the Yarger Decker Study was initiated the Manchester Airport was the 119th largest in the country, it is now at number 75 and growing. It had about one million passengers and in the completion of the study it's gone up to, I believe, 2.2 million and when we spoke with Mr. Decker about this process about four months ago when we started the study he recognized that like some other things in the study was an imperfect placement due to as the Mayor said, I believe, phenomenal growth of what's happened to the Airport and I believe that from my perspective is the key driving factor.

Alderman O'Neil stated, Kevin, I don't believe you wrote this but there's some indication in here that you are living in Brentwood, but would consider moving to the City of Manchester, is that correct.

Mr. Dillon replied that is correct, that is something that I have discussed at length with the Mayor and the selection committee and I would be prepared to consider that in the future.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would encourage that, thank you very much.

Alderman Wihby stated to get back to Alderman O'Neil's question…so, Decker approved the Grade 31.

Mr. Hobson stated yes. Just recently when we started to go through this process we realized that Grade 29 was no longer competitive with what was happening out there. To enlighten the entire Board on the search process, we did a North American search (Canada, Mexico and the United States). We have over 51 folks that were reviewed, we had five in my opinion, exceptional finalists and Horton International who does this for a living all over the world basically stated that we needed to upgrade our salary in order to be competitive. We did a national search for a very unique situation where you have a City that owns an Airport. Kevin comes from MassPort which is an Authority that owns an Airport. So, it is unique in that respect. Secondly, when you're doing a national search you're obviously doing that because you've got an Airport that has a national reputation that's growing. So, Mr. Decker reviewed all of that information with Mr. Horton and they both signed off on the salary that you see tonight.

Alderman Wihby stated normally when you do something like this there's a chain reaction to a few people. Is that going to happen in this case, were there recommendations from Decker to do something different for other people too.

Mr. Hobson replied there is certainly a concern on my part that I expressed to the Human Resources Committee the other evening that when you begin to alter different parts of the study and that can happen anywhere. You need to look at where the other effects might be and I hope that the Mayor and the Human Resources Committee will continue to study that issue into August and September.

Alderman Shea stated welcome, Mr. Dillon, to Manchester and I'm sure that you'll have a very prosperous time here in terms of helping out. My concern as an Alderman relating to Wards 8 and 9 is that the flight patterns have changed somewhat and I get concerns from constituents who are bothered by the over flights, so I'll probably be in touch with you concerning that and I just wanted you to be aware of that; that there was a movement a little bit towards the eastward part of my Ward which has impacted the people. Thank you.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I'm sure Mr. Dillon will get to know all of the Aldermen.

Alderman Pariseau stated in the brief synopsis that we got from Horton it says that Mr. Dillon possesses strong organizational skills and is PC literate and then it goes on to say that he has a good administrative assistant who provides a great amount of support…are we looking to bring your current administrative assistant from Logan to Manchester.

Mr. Dillon replied I don't have plans to do that at this time.

Alderman Pariseau stated I was just wondering if we were looking at another position opening up at the Airport.

Mr. Hobson stated if I can make one more comment again for the Board's perspective. Mr. Dillon is the number two person for the MassPort Authority and his purview includes the Worcester Airport, as well. He has 450 employees reporting to him and 26 million passengers that he's concerned about. Our Airport is approximately 50 employees and 2.2 million passengers and that was one of the reasons why the committee was so impressed with the fact that he had a big view background.

Alderman Pariseau stated, your Honor, I just don't understand what Mr. Hobson's comments were in relation to my question.

Mayor Wieczorek replied what he is saying is that the answer is no, that he is quite impressed with the Assistant Director's that they have at the Airport, is that correct.

Alderman Pariseau commented he didn't say that.

Mr. Hobson stated I will concur with my boss, the Mayor, yes. Thank you for interpreting that for me.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think it's the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Mr. Hobson, let's get that straight.

Mr. Hobson replied yes, Sir.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried. We're very pleased to have you in the City of Manchester and I know people are going to be after you, so you may as well get set for your interviews.

5. Mayor Wieczorek made the following nominations:

Board of Health:
Robert Christy to succeed himself, term to expire July 1, 2002.

Highway Commission:
Richard Duckoff to succeed Catherine A. Schneiderat, term to expire January 15, 2002.

Planning Board:
David R. Boutin to succeed himself, term to expire May 1, 2002.
Thomas M. Robert to succeed Mark Gross, term to expire May 1, 2002.

Board of Registrars:
Barbara E. Arnold to succeed Richard E. Fradette, term to expire May 1, 2002.

As per the rules of the Board, these nominations will layover until the next meeting of the Board.

6. Communication from Mayor Wieczorek dated May 28, 1999, submitted to the City Clerk nominating Doughlas A. Gherlone to succeed Michael C. Naczas as an alternate member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, term to expire March 1, 2002.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Doughlas A. Gherlone to succeed Michael C. Naczas as an alternate member of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, term to expire March 1, 2002.

7. Confirmation of the nomination of Richard Fradette to succeed himself as a member of the Manchester Development Corporation Board of Directors, term to expire March 11, 2002.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Richard Fradette to succeed himself as a member of the Manchester Development Corporation Board of Directors, term to expire March 11, 2002.

8. Presentation by the Board of Assessors relative to the Revaluation Project.

Mr. Tellier stated allow me briefly to recap what's occurred since last we brought forward the idea of revaluation. The initial request for RFI went to the Accounts and Enrollment Committee for which we answer to, was okayed on November 4, 1998 by this Board. The RFI went to all vendors that are authorized by the Department of Revenue Administration to perform revaluations in this State. Those went out January 19, 1999. A three-year phase-in to pay for the proposed revaluation was included in the long-term CIP plan as an effect of the '99-2000 budget. The RFP's were submitted to interested vendors in May, 1999 and were due to be received and opened on May 21, 1999. As you know, we are into the eighth year since our last revaluation which was an effective date of April 1, 1991. Since that date, we have gone through a great deal of changes in the City. There was an economic downfall which caused spiraling property values to go down and subsequent to that was an economic long-term boom where we've seen vacancies, interest rates…everything has gone in a much more desirable direction. The Board of Assessors has received two RFP's for proposals for revaluation for the City of Manchester. These were expected as the only two that had the resources available to do a City the size of Manchester which is approximately 30,710 parcels. There's one by Vision Appraisal Technology for $1.597 million and a corporation called CLT (Cole, Layer, Trumble) for

$1,376,500 the difference being $220,500. In going through the RFI's, the RFP process the City Solicitor's Office was often asked to review the RFP and subsequent to that on the critique of the responses. According to the latest Procurement Codes subsequent to opening them there was a series of negotiations that were executed with both vendors. There was a larger disparity at first, subsequent to that we come now to the $220,500 difference which is approximately about 13%, a little over 13%. At this point there's a few comments that I'd like to make as far as what we found on them. I have, in my experience, I have a mass appraisal background so to some degree I have from the bottom up view of how they perform revaluations - from the data collection to the acquiring of all of the data that predisposes the values to the analysis of the income and expense forms to the subsequent hearings and the reconciliation of value. At this point, we're in serious negotiations and with all due respect and in good conscience and again in discussions with the City Solicitor's Office it makes sense to go with the lowest bidder, however, also in my experience I have to caution the Board that the data collection phase of the project which comprises approximately 40% of the cost…the firm that has the higher bid carries professional data collector's…they go from community-to-community. This is one of the most volatile and important portions of any revaluation, that is going into people's homes, looking at properties, analyzing them, listing them correctly. So, it's been my experience that when you carry data collectors, when you carry professionals of that magnitude you have to pay them a little bit more rather than hire them off the street for a temporary job. This is somewhat reflected that we find in the higher value. So, at this point, due to constraints in time the effective date of revaluation that we're proposing is a very aggressive one, we're looking at an effective date of April 1, 2001. At this point, we're asking the Board to support our proposal for a revaluation to enter into contract negotiations and to continue those negotiations to try to close the gap to below 10% disparity between the two. In the event that we cannot acquire that disparity then with all due respect and to looking out to the taxpayers of Manchester then we will, in effect, go with the lower bidder who has been pre-qualified and has met all terms of the Request for Proposal.

Alderman Wihby stated when we went out with the RFP wouldn't we have asked for experienced people going into the houses.

Mr. Tellier replied yes, by the Department of Revenue Administration 600 Rules…they all have to be certified with the State as far as meeting certain criteria. However, one particular firm is northern Massachusetts based and they do New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine and Connecticut. The other firm is a national firm with a regional office. It's been our experience, we've done some due diligence we've been talking to other communities and they do hire a substantial portion off the street, train them on-the-job, get them certified and then consequently they execute their portion of the job. The higher priced firm actually carries 40 to 50 data collectors that they continue to keep employed throughout the New England area.

Alderman Wihby asked do you have a commitment from them that they are going to keep those 40 or 50 on the job.

Mr. Tellier replied in our initial conversations with the two firms, the initial conversation from the lower bidder stated that they thought they could do the job with four to five people. Clearly, that was not enough in a City of 30,000 units. The principal who wrote the RFP for that firm raised that amount to about 8 people. The higher-priced vendor immediately at the outset recognizing the aggressive schedule and the amount of needs the City of this size would take, they propose somewhere between 8 and 12 full-time data clerks on the job right away.

Alderman Wihby stated if we just talked to the low-bidder, save $150,000…we're still talking 10%…it's $150,000 and I guess I'd want an opinion from Tom on that, but why wouldn't we just ask the low-bidder to bring people here and have 8 to 12 people here.

Mr. Tellier stated that is exactly what will have to be entertained/submitted because a City this size and the aggressive nature of the schedule that absolutely will have to be done to meet this schedule. However, again, I refer to my initial observation that the data collection is in excess of 40% of the cost of the job and when you're visiting all of the homes that you do it's absolutely some of the more volatile in nature as far as how they conduct themselves, the professionalism of the firm, the questions and answers that they're able to present to the taxpayers and if they can't answer that the expeditious fashion that they will promote those questions to their supervisors so that they can get back to people.

Alderman Wihby stated I know if we were doing this in the State we would have to take the low bid and we would have to make sure that in the RFP we ask the right questions and you're telling us that both of them are certified and they both meet the agreement of the RFP, so I guess at this point I'd like to ask Tom how we could even take a high bid. I could see if one wasn't there.

Solicitor Clark replied this is a professional procurement where dollars are not the only thing to consider. But, you do have to do it at a fair and reasonable price to the City and make sure you get what you've asked for. We've been discussing this with the Board of Assessors, my office has been meeting with them on numerous occasions to review these materials…we've required that they go back and negotiate if there were any areas where they didn't think the proposal was met. It is my understanding now that both firms have fully said they will meet our request for proposals. My office feels that he ought to go with the lower price, in that case, and make sure that they perform to the level the contract required them.

Alderman Wihby stated, Tom, so if we told them we wanted 8 to 12 people, we wanted to make sure that it wasn't just off the street, they were professionals and everything else to make Steve feel better and with the lower one that would be your approach.

Solicitor Clark stated that could be put in the contract yes.

Mayor Wieczorek asked do you think it is prudent to be telling them how many people to have rather than having them decide what they need to get the job done to meet the requirements. This is where we ran into trouble with the custodial.

Alderman Wihby stated they told us they were going to come in with 8. If we feel comfortable with the higher bidder because they're going to come in between 8 and 12 then we might as well as for 8-12 and stay with the low bid and tell them we want 8 to 12 people rather than just 8.

Solicitor Clark stated there is no problem in doing that. During the negotiations with these proposers…that's the items you're suppose to talk about and determine how many people you are going to need here. If they tell us they're going to need 8 to 12 then we're going to hold them to it.

Alderman Girard asked do you think that the experience that the higher bidder brings to the table significantly improves the chances of having a better reval process. Are we looking at a situation here which would be "pound wise and penny foolish".

Mr. Tellier replied that possibility exists whether you went with the higher bid or lower bid, Alderman. I have first-hand experience with the higher level appraisers and supervisors in the higher-priced proposal due to the fact that in 1991 I was employed by the City of Nashua and they, in fact, did that job. Subsequently, they have also won the bid, they are currently doing the Town of Salem, they've done the City of Concord, they've done the City of Lebanon also. I can't verifiably tell you beyond a reasonable doubt X, Y and Z why I feel that the other firm is a little bit more qualified and to the level of their expertise beyond the fact that they're paying their personnel, they're carrying full-time extensively trained personnel that they carry from community-to-community in the New England area, that being Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Being that, and in the economic boon that we're in and they're paying them a little bit higher, stay with them. What they are proposing in this particular effect would be to take that entire contingent in the City of Salem as soon as the data collection is done and move them to New Hampshire. Now, several of their area supervisors live in parts of northern Massachusetts and many of them live in the greater metropolitan Manchester area. Not in Manchester itself, but in surrounding towns. It's been experience in working with them the extensive high level of caliber, however, I've also done due diligence and it appears that the alternative firm has execute exemplary jobs in other towns also. That, not being the case in a couple where they have had some difficulty with temporary data collectors which is my biggest apprehension.

Alderman Girard stated I am trying to get a handle here on whether there is a recommendation that you're making. It seems to me, anyway, that you believe if you can close the price gap to within 10% you believe we should go with the higher bidder because your personal experience in other cities and in other work environments tells you that they turn out the type of product, quality, service…whatever you want to call it, that the City of Manchester should be having done.

Mr. Tellier stated yes.

Alderman Girard stated, your Honor, I sympathize with the Alderman Wihby wanting to make sure that we spare every dime we can for the taxpayer, but given the problems that we had in this City with the last revaluation and given the problems that we've experienced in the City doing things sheerly on price such as the custodial situation in City buildings and schools. I would almost want to defer to the judgment of the people who are going to have to manage this process. It seems to me that $150,000-200,000 certainly a lot of money, but when you're talking a revaluation of the City's property tax base $150,000/200,000 could be a very, very minor expenditure to make sure that the tax base is appropriately assessed so we can avoid a lot of the problems that we had last time because if they don't do what they're supposed to do when they're out there we could be missing untold millions of dollars in the future by not having the base where it should be.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm sitting here and hearing the Chairman of the Board of Assessors throwing up a flag with some concerns about the lower bidder based on some other communities and temporary people…what's the position called, Steve.

Mr. Tellier replied data clerks.

Alderman O'Neil replied temporary data collectors. He has to live with it and I would support the recommendation of the Assessors that they go with the firm even though a little higher in price.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the Board of Assessors have done a very commendable job reporting to my Committee, your Honor, which is the Committee on Accounts and Enrollment. They've come in on a monthly basis and kept us abreast of the revaluation process and I do believe the Chairman of the Board of Assessors does want to go renegotiate with the top bid and I support that motion, your Honor.

Alderman Thibault stated also sitting on the Committee with Alderman Hirschmann agree that the Assessors have done a good job in reporting to us and letting us know where they're at with this, but I just wonder legally where do we stand. Can we do this, Tom, and just go and take the other bidder or what.

Solicitor Clark replied your Procurement Code allows you to take a higher price, but you have to have a real good reason to do so. As I understand it, both firms can do the job.

Alderman Wihby asked so what's the real good reason.

Alderman Thibault asked so who's going to put the real good reasons…this is the thing that bothers me.

Solicitor Clark replied the Board of Assessors.

Mayor Wieczorek stated if there are no good reasons I'm assuming you have to go with the lowest bid, I don't see any other room.

Mr. Tellier stated the only reason that comes to mind, the single largest reason is again is and again that is going to have to come before yourselves on how you feel about it. Over 40% of the work involved in a revaluation and the price is involved with the data collection phase where these 8 to 12 people enter people's homes, review the interior of their homes, properly list and correctly identify every piece of property in the City of Manchester. These people are going to see elderly people, siblings and children of people who may be home. They won't go into a home unless someone is over 18 years old, there is specific criteria in the RFP, but again the quality of the data collection is there and certainly we would submit and we don't take this lightly at all, that is the single largest issue that comes before our Board for review and our largest critique. When we were under the review portion of the RFP's in speaking with the City Solicitor's Office we conducted ourselves in a methodology where we reviewed them using the same criteria. There was an enormous amount of omissions in the lower bid proposal as submitted on May 21st, however, following consultation with the Solicitor's Office we held another negotiating session with both vendors, they in turn did submit a paper to our office that submits all portions of our RFP that they will be held accountable to and we have that document in our office today. However, like I said the single largest issue that comes to mind is the data collection itself.

Alderman Wihby stated it seems to me that the approach would be you take the low bidder and go over all of the problems you have or you think you're going to have and then you try to iron those out before you pick a higher bidder. You talk to them, they submitted some stuff that made you a little happier and maybe you go back a second time and say we want to be happier and this is what we need. We need this, this, this and this. I guess I don't see a reason why we should take a higher bid if everything in the RFP was met and they're there, it's a low bid, I don't see a difference. I don't see what the need would be to pick a higher company and if you can go back and negotiate with them like you did the first time, why wouldn't you do that.

Mr. Tellier replied clearly that is a tact we're going to take. Should that vendor be the vendor of choice…the expertise, experience and the tenure in the company is going to become a very high-profile issue to protect the City's interest.

Alderman Wihby stated you don't need a motion today, you're going to go back and negotiate with these two again. What are you looking for.

Mr. Tellier replied I suspect that we are again going to go back, renegotiate a second time to hammer out all of the subtleties that are involved and we're looking for some direction from this Board as to a disparity within a certain range or lend myself to the City Solicitor. If in the Procurement Code the lowest bidder is not necessarily the best, we do have to hammer out a contract next month so that we can begin in September of this year. So, we'll try to redefine

that. At this point, I would have to lend myself to the City Solicitor as to the final signing criteria if it's a very small window of difference or we would have to go with the lower bidder.

Mayor Wieczorek stated unless I'm missing something I don't know…you've got to have some reasons for going with a higher bidder, there's got to be some reasons to do it.

Mr. Tellier interjected that would be it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I haven't really heard anything conclusive that says we want to go to the higher bidder because…they do it two times as fast…I don't know.

Alderman Wihby stated we're giving them an opportunity to address what concerns that you think you might have that we don't know yet.

Mr. Tellier stated that is what we'll be renegotiating this month.

Alderman Wihby asked how can we give you a direction today that says take the high bidder because we can't talk to the low-bidder. The directions should be go back and talk to the low-bidder and make sure you feel comfortable with what they're going to do for you.

Mr. Tellier stated should that criteria all be met, Alderman, I guess my question would be for the City Solicitor regarding the ordinances. Who would be signing the contract…would it be the Mayor and the City Solicitor again.

Solicitor Clark asked where is the money appropriated.

Mr. Tellier replied in CIP.

Solicitor Clark stated it would generally come back to this Board and the Mayor would sign it, sure.

Mayor Wieczorek stated one thing I'd like to be certain of…the last time we went out to do the reval we ran into an awful lot of problems because all of the things weren't handled properly when we did that. As a matter of fact there were some things with the State…there was one assumption that was made when the reval was going to be conducted and the State said you can't do it…I forget what it cost us…$150,000 or $200,000 whatever it was. Are you sure now that you're going to meet all of the requirements that are set for the City, the State, and anybody else that you're going to have to be responsible to.

Mr. Tellier replied absolutely. Also, certainly we would confer with the City Solicitor's Office but we would also be conferring with the Department of Revenue Administration under their Administrative 600 Rules.

Alderman Clancy asked, Steve, how long is it going to take these two different firms to do the whole City.

Mr. Tellier replied the effective date would be April 1, 2000. What we're hoping is that the notices would go out with the July tax bill so that the hearings could be conducted immediately after that and a final reconciliation of value would be done in October, sometime in September or October in time for the December bills and it would have the least impact to the overlay account.

Alderman Clancy asked do you have any ballpark figure, how much would it cost between these two firms right now.

Mr. Tellier replied the difference between the two is $220,000. One firm is $1.597 million and the other one is $1.376 million.

Alderman Clancy stated maybe the difference between the two is the experience one has against the other.

Mr. Tellier stated again in conferring with the City Solicitor's Office, both have met all the criteria we have presented in the RFP except for the experience portion on the data collectors and that's where we'll have to engage ourselves to get the best for the City that we can get and to have the highest level of expertise at that level.

Alderman Clancy stated the biggest gripe I had the last time from the revaluation was that a lot of people didn't let these people into their homes and I suggest that we give them a high amount for revaluation, then we're forced to go into their houses and see what they have. When they don't let you into their houses they're hiding something.

Mr. Tellier stated that could be assumed, Alderman.

Alderman Clancy stated they could have put a bathroom in the cellar, might have added an extra room and stuff like that. So, I suggest we give them a higher revaluation and that way they'll have to open the door and let us go inside.

Mr. Tellier stated the data collector's that we are going to expect to perform this job would have the expertise to look for roof vents that would indicate additional baths, it would indicate finish of a basement or conversion to porches to living space, all of those types of things they will have that sort of expertise.

Mayor Wieczorek stated personally I think that what you should do is go back whether you're going to negotiate with one or both is come back with what you think is the best deal for the City and then have the Board take a look and make a decision.

Alderman Cashin stated, Steve, with all due respect tonight you haven't given me any reason to go with the high bid. I can hear you telling me you have a comfort factor with the high bid and that's fine, but that certainly in itself does not give us the authority to go with the high bid. As far as I'm concerned, if you asked me to vote tonight I'd vote low-bid because I really don't see any reason…

Mr. Tellier stated at this point, Alderman, if our Board can't come in with anything further than that we will certainly have all of the criteria available for a contract and to expedite this process following the City Solicitor's recommendations.

Mayor Wieczorek stated so, you don't need a vote tonight. You're going to come back with something and hopefully you'll be back with a recommendation, correct.

Mr. Tellier asked when does the next Board meet.

Mayor Wieczorek replied August 3rd.

Mr. Tellier stated that is correct, we'll come back with a final review.

Alderman Girard asked is it safe to assume that your concern over the difference in the experience levels of the data collectors is what brought you to this Board tonight.

Mr. Tellier replied to highlight that issue and to bring this Board up-to-date in the process. As we all know, any revaluation has the possibility of going smoothly or being very volatile in nature. Certainly, our Board recognizes that…we're looking toward a very comprehensive public relations policy, a very open-ended level of discussion with civic groups, private taxpayers, the Chamber, others and this Board.

Alderman Girard stated the quality of the data collection is critical to the success of the reval.

Mr. Tellier stated there is no question about that.

Alderman Girard stated the experience in data collection is worth considering a higher bid.

Mr. Tellier stated absolutely and we're going to make every effort to get that information from the low bidder and should they be able to bring that level of expertise to the table for the same dollars and submit letters of resume for the data collectors and the personnel they wish to employ that gives our Board that kind of level of confidence.

Alderman Shea stated to close it off the bottom line is the difference in the price $220,000.

Mr. Tellier stated right now that is correct.

9. Presentation by Linda Garriott of Intown Manchester updating the Board on highlights of the upcoming summer events in the Downtown area.

Ms. Garriott stated I want to thank you for your time here and I'll be brief and shift gears here a little bit to talk about some fun stuff going on this summer. I think that each of you has a copy of our brochure and what we've done is I know that a few years ago there was a lot of activity taking place in the Downtown on Thursday night, so what we've done is we've worked with a number of local businesses and our arts institutions in the City to bring events to the City from Thursday noon until 10:00 PM and we're kicking this off this Thursday evening and every Thursday thereafter through the summer and we're actually targeting an audience, not just a local audience, but south/central New Hampshire and northern Massachusetts and we've had a lot of inquiries, in fact, from the Lawrence area, Methuen about our events and we will be anticipating quite a large audience from that area. One of the things I do want to mention The Farmers' Market was kicked off two Thursday's ago, it was wildly successful and we can anticipate with all of our events this summer bringing approximately 5,000 people Downtown every Thursday for the events and it could be as high as 10,000 and finally, this is my mantra, I want to dispel the myth that things don't happen in Manchester. During the second half of the summer we have 48 hours where we're chock full of stuff going on like August 12th the Healthsource Road Race takes places which brings
about 6,000 runners to Downtown. Then the following night Friday through Sunday the Center of NH/Holiday Inn hosts a New Hampshire Antique Show which also brings thousands of people Downtown. Friday the 13th of August we have a Classic Car Show, a Cruising Downtown night and anticipate about 500 vehicles from Bridge to Granite Street and then on Saturday at the Currier Gallery of Art is the opening of the Linda McCartney Photography Exhibit. So, in a 48-hour period we have an opportunity to bring about twenty to thirty thousand people Downtown and we're very excited about that. Just want to thank you all for your support. I know that we have had a lot of requests for street closures and you've been very supportive and also for your support of the Manchester Summer Concert Series which really helps wrap up our Thursday's and provides a wonderful anchor for all of our events. So, thank you very much and we hope to see you Downtown on Thursdays.

10. Presentation by consultants (LDR/CLD) relative to the Riverwalk Master Plan.

Mr. Sommers stated I think we're the ones that caused you not to be able to see the new Airport Director. I'm Tom Sommers, here with me is Hank Alinger from LDR along with Jim Prost from BBP & Associates, Inc. As you know, Hank is the firm that has been doing the master planning with us and Jim of BBP is the firm that has been doing the economic development plan. We recently made a submittal to the Riverfront team of which Peter Ramsey is the Chairman and working with Bob MacKenzie and what we're doing tonight since we are now in a review process of the plan, we are here to present you with an update. The intention is after this update and after an open house that we're having tomorrow down at UNH in the auditorium which is essentially a walk around event in which you can come around and look and make comments and kind of get a more closeup viewing of all of the plans that have been done, we will then be presenting you towards the end of the summer, after all of the comments have been

received and everything has been tweaked with the final product. So, tonight what we would like to do without anything further from me is to have Hank do a slide show for you really to bring you up-to-date with things, changes that have been made since you saw it last and then Jim will do a short presentation on the economic end and where we're going on that plan.

Mr. Alinger stated as Tom mentioned tonight we'd like to just give you an abbreviated sort of version of our overall presentation. Some of the exhibits you have seen before and some of them are new and I won't dwell on some of them, but I'll point out some of the new details and some of the alternatives that have been developed based on our discussions with the Committee and I'll kind of work through the process. As you remember from earlier meetings we initially talked about districts and thinking about the Riverfront and these districts (i.e., Amoskeag Falls Village, Arms Park, Granite Street, west side, and south Riverfront) show up in this exhibit here and again just to orient you north to south (Amoskeag, Arms Park, Granite Street Gateway, south Riverfront and the west side and that linkage to the west side). So, that sort of gives you an overall look at the Riverfront and we'll work through the various districts and talk about some of the key things that we're proposing for these districts. Of course, the west side linkages to the west side are very important. One of the major things that we will be talking about is the Gateway bridge, the pedestrian bridge that will link the west side into the Riverwalk along the east side and we'll also be talking about some of the opportunities for parks and how those interconnect and also how we tie into the Piscataquog Rail Trail which is underway on the west side. Again, to orient you this is the pedestrian bridge that will be tied into the east side, we have an opportunity to create a small kind of a mini-park there at that landing and trailhead and then long-term some linkages to Bass Island Park, Sweeney Park…we understand that the location of the Skate Park is not finalized but there may be an opportunity to incorporate that also in this mini-park happening here at the trailhead. The focus on some of these Gateway features again gets highlighted in these photo boards, again the opportunity for some sort of a gateway at Granite Street, perhaps with flags, the ideas of children's play areas at the mini-park here at the head of the trail as you can see in these before and after shots. Also, the bridge is a major focus as I mention and this photo board just shows some examples again of different kinds of bridge treatments and we're really excited about this. This will be a key gateway to the City. This section shows as I-293 passes under the bridge, again this is the existing structure of the pedestrian bridge as it exists today and the truss framework…the proposal is to add these gateway features at either end…this being I-293, this being the rail trail on the east side again to create this kind of gateway statement and again our architectural consultants have come up with a grade approach. We feel that to create this statement that will be very dramatic on I-293 and can say "Welcome to Manchester" and will also work very well for pedestrians. Moving to the south Riverfront you will recall that the theme for the south Riverfront we've been talking about is really recreation, active recreation building on Singer Field and then also building on the natural characteristics of this area and you probably will recall this plan that was one of the initial plans that we developed that looked at enhancing Singer Field with some new amenities and looking at how the Riverfront works through this area and tying in with the pedestrian bridge that we were just talking about. We developed some other alternatives for this area that could be as part of the soccer fields or open amphitheaters or they could be more intensive. This

shows kind of a cross section as how the trail could work…we are actually proposing a lower and upper trail…this is under construction today, but we also looked at some more aggressive alternatives. Remember, one of the ones we developed was the idea of a minor league baseball stadium and again our plans allow for that kind of development to occur in the future should that prove to be a workable scenario. It is workable from the scenario of just physical land and it obviously requires off-site parking, will require some structured parking, this looks at a terminus to Commercial Street and shows how this could be oriented to take advantage of river views and so forth. Some of the other things that we looked at moving further south…this is Singer Field, the proposal for the next phase of the Riverwalk is to go from Singer Field all the way to Sundial Avenue and Hesser College and what's shown in this plan is not only the extension of the Riverwalk, but also the extension of a Riverfront Drive and what this does is gives you better access to this whole area and it also offers the opportunity for future development and we have a development opportunity site here. We have what could potentially be a residence inn or a small residential development in this area and again that roadway is critical to that as is parking and we think this energizes this whole part of the Riverfront. This looks at how the roadway could be tucked in with a pathway next to JacPac Foods. As you all know, JacPac has recently developed at that end of the Riverwalk and we'd basically work around the edge of that property. Granite Street, of course, if your key gateway of the Downtown and our focus is really how we think about that in the future in terms of really strengthening it as a gateway and where the opportunities for development are, there are plans to widen Granite Street as you all know. Our focus has been looking at the Riverwalk, looking at improvements to the gateway, the low plaza and these other gateway plazas to look at how to create a cohesive riverwalk, but also how we think about what is the signature of Granite Street and how do we improve that. There are development opportunities here and we've suggested that this could even be a future site opposite the tracks and we've looked at this in cross sections, how parking can be tucked in and this happens to be at Langer Place and Riverwalk Mills and how the Riverwalk works itself, again, behind buildings such as at Seal Tanning or the Gateway building where we're actually cantilevering behind the building. Will be a very unique, very strong kind of a Riverwalk that works with existing mill buildings. This obviously show the existing condition looking towards the Gateway and Jillian's and this is an after that shows how the Riverwalk would be incorporated behind this elevation, how it would pass beneath the Granite Street Bridge and improvements that could happen to Loeb Plaza and also this Gateway Plaza. This shows in detail the space between the Gateway building and Seal Tanning and the opportunities for enhancement. The Riverwalk can be more than just a linear walkway, it can provide small park areas and this is an area, in fact, that could be public and private. Could have some private courtyards that could be used by the corporate folks on the ends, but also could become a public gathering space and we did a quick sketch of what that might look like linking these two buildings looking towards Seal Tanning and shows a kind of the way that space could be finished off and be a very positive kind of space for the Millyard, obviously and the Riverwalk. Moving forward, we talked about the opportunities on Granite Street and we had some discussion about a performing arts center or other kinds of opportunities that might happen if Manchester were to move forward with a performing arts center where might that be located. One possible location might be at a site at Commercial and Granite because it is such a high

visibility site and because it could share parking with a Civic Center, it could have service off of South Bedford…there's good reasons why that site could work well and also the possibility of introducing long-term, maybe even a hotel on this site. Now, we have not talked to landowners about these properties, these are just concepts, again there are other areas where this could happen, but this is just a suggestion of what might happen…just again to reinforce the importance of Granite Street and these are things that could happen in the long-term. This is an elevation developed by Lee Berard & Associates that looks at Langer Place and the Riverwalk Mills buildings…the idea of introducing these public atriums that punctuate the buildings and come through to the Riverwalk, the idea that you go beneath Granite Street we think is a very exciting view for this building and will be part of the gateway experience. Arms Park is really the heart of the Millyard, the heart of the Riverwalk, key opportunities include new greenspace, new development opportunities, and new opportunities for parking which would be central to the Millyard and this plan shows the reclamation of Arms Park which is now used for parking by UNH, but this looks at a phased plan that would look at how parking gets relocated into several key decks, a major one here off of Commercial Street and another one that could be incorporated in combination with new development in this area and again the thinking would be that you get development edge all around a new public greenspace, but becomes a major kind of a signature greenspace on the water. Right now, you don't have that kind of an opportunity…this would get you that, it would also get you parking where you'd need it, it would get you new development which could be used by UNH, it could be used by private folks as well. This is a site as you know it today and this is a sketch which shows just how that might work, this is the new development site, this is the enhanced Arms Park. It shows how you could actually step the whole area down to the water, create an amphitheater performing venue, fountain features…there are a lot of things that could happen here to really make Manchester a US postcard, a really great spot on the water with significant development opportunity associated with that. We looked at other pieces of Riverwalk…how do we really make the Riverwalk really successful as a pedestrian experience, we know that we've got to accommodate parking and service, but we've got to look at how we relocate some of the parking to enhance the Riverwalk experience. We think a landscape strip in and adjacent to the walkway is needed of some dimension to buffer that and really make that a great experience. But, obviously, we've got to be working with all of these property owners so that we're not losing parking. We've got to relocate and find new opportunities for parking. Amoskeag Falls is a key area that has some other unique opportunities. Obviously, it's a site that's controlled by PSNH and also has some opportunities to redevelop long-term and again they're looking at ideas for this area. But, a key objective is to continue the Riverwalk in this area, to look at to how to enhance the overlook and then we're also looking at the opportunities we've discussed previously of enhancing the ability to get to the Amoskeag islands and falls, again, there will be questions about this in terms of liability and how it's controlled and managed and so forth, but we think we've heard some folks come back to us and say they think this really is a good idea, that it provides for environmental education, this shows how the walkway could work at different levels off the back of the building, at a low level how we bridge and we would have a series of boardwalks that would lie lightly on the land, so that we don't impact the environment in a negative way, but in fact, provide an opportunity to explore and really understand this opportunities for heritage and a lot

of other things. We think this is a very unique area and this would be a great way to explore it. Phase I is under construction and as many of you know it's just beginning in the construction phases…we've had some materials delivered out there and will be starting soon. This is Singer Field (a little difficult to get oriented here). Here is the existing parking lot, the river's edge…again, Phase I includes a lower pathway, a higher pathway and also includes the special kind of seating modes that we're proposing as part of the…to make the Riverwalk more interesting as well as a little entry plaza…this happens to be a little seating niche which would have some seating areas, plantings, special detailing. One of the ideas for these areas is, in fact, we'll build the first several, but would be looking at some corporate sponsorship, in fact, to maybe take ownership of these and for some nominal fee that some corporate sponsor could come in and help us with the construction costs and take some ownership of some of these places. This just shows in cross section how this might work and this shows you some of the materials and sort of the ambiance, the character we're trying to develop with special paving, seating niches and so forth to try and make these very special areas, to make the Riverwalk memorable. Again, it's very important we feel particularly in these initial phases that we make a big bang, splash and that we really show that the City is committed to quality environment and it's real going to enhance everyone's life. In terms of schedule…obviously, we've been working fairly quickly to prepare the Master Plan, it's about a two-mile segment of the river as you all know, encompasses a couple of hundred acres. Typically, this would be a process that might take one to two years with public participation…it's been accelerated in this case to around six months, so you all should feel very good about where we are, I think moving through it, in fact, to have Phase I under construction also, I think, is excellent that you are moving so quickly and again this kind of Riverwalk development is a long-term business, a lot of cities we're involved with are working on their riverfronts for 10, 20 or even 30 years to be successful, so obviously it's a long-term commitment. The next part of the presentation will be by Jim Prost, he's going to talk about economics and implementation of the Riverwalk.

Mr. Prost stated we'd like to talk a little bit about some of the economic implications and the implications in terms of how we would implement this. Everyone talks about the wonderful success about the Baltimore Inner Harbor, I worked on the original marketing work for that Inner Harbor and that was before my 21 year old daughter was born, so it does take some time sometimes to get these types of projects working and up. What we'd like to talk about is some of the economic development issues related to the Riverfront and what we're really getting into is an analysis of what the economic impacts of the Riverfront and associated development might be and in particular get into some of the organization and management issues. How are we going to implement, particularly the initial stages which calls for the construction and development of the Riverfront. What does the Riverwalk and associated development, what could it mean at build out and what we see here in measurement of what could happen are based on our experience of other areas, based on market evaluations, based on holding capacity…is there a potential for an additional 1.8 million square feet of occupied space in the Riverfront. Mostly, office but also the potential for retail, residential, hotel and other special use factors. That would generate between 4,400 and 6,300 new employees in that amount of development and the added property value both in terms of enhancing the existing property value…and we

talked a lot about property value and assessments a little while ago…and the value of the new development…we estimate in today's dollars would equal over $200 million in development at build out and at the current real property tax rate that would translate into about $7.5 million a year in new property taxes. Looking at the development potential compared to what we see just on a trend line basis an absorption of about 872,000 square feet and we think that the redevelopment potential within accelerated development in introducing a large residential component would add about 900,000 square feet of additional development in the Riverfront area over and beyond existing trends. As we mentioned before that would add significant employment and we looked at different orientations, if it would be oriented virtually, exclusively office it would be a strictly residential mix with strong residential orientation or a mixed-use orientation and all of these could generate between four and five thousand jobs and obviously the largest number of jobs would be generated with a larger office orientation. Such implications in terms of design and obviously the requirements for parking. The same thing, we see the value, we see existing value trends, the existing values were not enhanced but we just added additional development that would be possible which is about $60 million, but if we can enhance existing values and get an additional 900,000 square feet of development we could create over $200 million in value which we said before translate into a trend analysis of about a $2 million increase in real property taxes versus about a $7 million increase in real property taxes. Our real question is how do we get this jumpstarted. We've got the design plans, we have an understanding of what the budget requirements are and we think that the most important next step is to how do we implement this and how do we create an organizational structure to make things happen and we're looking at an organizational structure and management approach…not necessarily for the long-term, but for the construction and the implementation phase and we think that it is very important that there be an entity and group of individuals and organizations that are specifically responsible for the planning, the development, the negotiations, the liaisons, the coordination, the public relations…they're all involved in building a Riverwalk and associated developments. We think the best approach to that is for the Mayor and Aldermen to enter into a contract for an entity to undertake this organizational efforts through a CIP process. The organization entity itself would have an executive director, would have staff to implement it, but it would undertake this under a contracted basis which would go through an RFP process which would involve, in all likelihood the initial approach…the Mayor and Board of Aldermen working with an RFP through the CIP Committee to select an entity, be that any special development corporation, be that a consultant type operation, be that some type of owner's representative(s) that would operate through the staff to help implement the development process for the Riverwalk and we think that the most next step in terms of adopting the Riverfront plan and looking at its approach and implications is to enter into some type of an organizational model, preferably through an RFP process to select a group, an entity to help implement the development stage and that's our initial recommendations.

Alderman Wihby asked why is it going this way.

Mr. Prost replied it can go both ways, it's just done that way.

Alderman Wihby stated we're going to have a contract….that's what's in front of us today to have some sort of an entity to coordinate the day-to-day activities, the riverfront development corporation.

Mr. Prost stated it's not necessarily saying it's the riverfront development corporation. There would be an RFP process and if somebody created a riverfront development corporation or somebody individually bid the RFP process would select the most appropriate entity which could be a development corporation, could be an individual, could be a private contractor, various models have been used in other localities.

Alderman Wihby asked who's the board of directors, where did that come from.

Mr. Prost replied if this was a development corporation it would have a board of directors.

Alderman Girard stated I was just wondering why we wouldn't ask Intown Manchester to take this on rather than create something new. We already have an entity in place, why couldn't we expand their capabilities instead of creating yet another entity.

Mr. MacKenzie replied we did explore that possibility, we even discussed it with the Executive Committee of the Intown Board as an option. At this point, they recognized the complexity of the development of this particular project and did not feel it was in their best interest, at this point, to consider the development role of the project. They are interested, perhaps in the long-term in terms of security, maintenance, festival programming, but at this point they are not interested in the development phase.

Alderman Girard asked has any consideration been given to using the Manchester Development Corporation which may have appropriate expertise then.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I've briefly spoken with Jay about this issue and he did indicate that MDC certainly has a couple of other major projects on their plate and he wasn't sure if this would be a project that would be appropriate for that group.

Alderman Girard stated I don't meant to suggest that either Intown or MDC should take on a project of this magnitude within their existing structure. What I'm questioning is whether or not we've really investigated looking at adding to the capabilities…I have a committee report here that says spending up to $200,000…if we're going to spend any money, why wouldn't we spend it within existing entities that have been part and parcel of a lot of these efforts rather than creating yet another one.

Mr. MacKenzie replied again we have discussed a number of options. These entities if they were interested later could submit under the RFP process, but at this point I don't believe those two are interested. There are other groups…non-profits and other quasi-independent authorities that could be interested and those could be entertained in an RFP process.

Alderman Wihby asked is MHRA interested, Bob.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I have not spoken with them directly, I think Tom Clark has.

Solicitor Clark stated I have talked to MHRA on this. They would be willing to do it, they are not staffed presently to do it, they would have to hire additional staff and they'd be one of the parties introduced during the RFP process.

Alderman Wihby asked do you think they'd could do it for less than $200,000, have you talked numbers with them yet.

Solicitor Clark replied no, we haven't talked numbers with them.

Alderman Shea asked this $200,000, when did this come about, tonight, we just got it about five or 10 minutes ago, so I'm not familiar with it.

Alderman O'Neil replied the $200,000 came out of several month's work that the Riverfront Committee has worked on and based on what Jim Prost said, Jim feels it's a pretty good number to work with, it comes out of the bond issue, there's no increased funding required to do this and the Committee strongly believes that it just helps move the project along.

Mr. Prost stated the estimated number comes from our preliminary draft report and it's based on an estimate of the staff requirements to undertake the development function phase of the project.

Alderman Shea stated so the $200,000 is for staff to develop a plan.

Mr. Prost stated to develop, implement, coordinate, negotiate development agreements, monitor construction, undertake public relations activities.

Alderman Shea asked could you give a ballpark figure as to what the cost for this Riverwalk is going to be. Let me give you a little background. At one time, there was a thought that there would be a three-mile Riverwalk which would cost $6.3 million now this has been supplemented by this particular proposal which is in essence a two-mile Riverwalk.

Mr. Sommers stated to clarify, it has always been a two-mile Riverwalk that's been proposed from day one. The original Riverwalk, an initial ballpark estimate was, I think, $6.5 million with LDR giving us the expertise in terms of what you really need to do in terms of enhancements and there are some added features in terms of the Arms Park area and stuff. The ballpark is going to be probably closer to the $10 million, but we are going to be providing a complete…that's the final stage of this effort…we are drafting the cost estimate, we will be providing the cost estimate, but not only that we will be providing the cost benefits analysis over

a significant period of time, I think, probably 20 years in which you'll be able to see the phasing, the cost, the revenue that you can expect if you do this.

Alderman Shea stated some of the questions I received have to do with is this Riverwalk going to be in existence 12 months of the year. In other words, there are climatic conditions here that are obviously different than San Antonio, Texas or Seattle, Washington or other places.

Mr. Sommers replied I would say parts of it, especially the part around a building that I call the Langer Building which is South Commercial Street will be 12 months a year because it is going to be built into the building. I suspect there will be other sections as this gets moving that will also be 12 months even though one will have to remove snow, etc. and deal with the elements and there will be some parts of it that I would expect with the exception of maybe cross-country skiing or something or hiking in the winter that will not be 12 months a year. These waterfront features are not only done in places like San Antonio, but they are also done up in Burlington, VT and up in Portsmouth, NH and Portland, ME where the riverfront has been used and quite successful even though I suspect that those obviously are not 12 months a year operations.

Alderman Shea stated I am not sure if this question is directed to Bob MacKenzie or whoever but will this be taxpayer's money fully or is there going to be business money.

Mr. MacKenzie replied sure, we don't know the exact breakdown but we believe that this should be funded…the City has already made a major commitment in terms of funding and we believe and hope that there is going to be a commitment by the Federal government, the State government and private interest. We do have applications to the State now. We have an application now for $3 million to the EDA, Economic Development Administration and expect by the end of August to have another grant application into another Federal funding process. That is the T-21, which is transportation related. So we do hope that there is a fairly significant federal funding involvement. We are hoping for the State to be involved and clearly we should get some private commitments for portions of the Riverwalk.

Alderman Wihby asked, Tom, when this first came out…first of all we just had this nice presentation about the economic impact it is going to have on the City and basically most of that impact is probably going to be from Jillians north, would you say that.

Mr. Sommers answered it is not just Jillians because it is also the area that I call the South Commercial Street area and just south of there is also a significant part of that.

Alderman Wihby asked across Granite Street.

Mr. Sommers answered down to Singer Park.

Alderman Wihby stated that is being developed now.

Mr. Sommers replied that is being developed but this would certainly enhance that because you are going to upgrade, especially when you put an arcade or an interior Riverwalk through that building. You are enhancing the ability of those owners to increase what it is they put in there for a higher use.

Alderman Wihby stated but I thought when we first came to funding this that we anticipated that it was going to be an economic boom down to that area and that we were going from Jillians north to those buildings that was going to be one of the first phases. Who decided that it was going to change and go down to Jac Pac first rather than in the middle of the development to try and get some economic impact.

Alderman O'Neil replied I think one of the discussions the Committee had about where to start was that the easiest portions to develop were beginning at Singer Park and heading southerly to the trestle and then continuing on from the trestle southerly to Jac Pac or onto Sundial Avenue. Those were the two easiest portions to do, through Hobo Jungle.

Alderman Wihby responded I understand that it was probably the easiest but I am almost positive that in the minutes of some meeting that came up and the money was allocated and that it was going north because that is where the economic boom was and that is where we were going to see the biggest impact.

Alderman O'Neil replied if I may and Tom help me out with the names of the building but the three mills together, one of which is Langer.

Mr. Sommers interjected Langer and it is not Warner anymore.

Alderman O'Neil stated which is the big U complex just south of Granite Street and there are great opportunities there. LDR has identified two pieces of land adjacent to the trestle that are opportunities for some commercial development of some sort. I think it is equal from the trestle northerly, not just north of Granite Street. I think there are opportunities all along the river.

Alderman Wihby stated it seems to me that we had this discussion. I know I had a discussion in my office with you, Mr. Sommers and one of the proposals was that I said I could see…I mean I was in favor of this but I could see that Singer Park was important and then we were going to go and do something downtown. It wasn’t going to connect at the time. We had talked about well if you are going to have a park that doesn’t connect or something but we felt that the biggest impact was going to be north, not going to Jac Pac.

Mr. Sommers replied I would mention a couple of things. I am not sure that I know exactly how the phase down to Sundial Avenue became first. I thought it came about from the Aldermen, but I may not be certain about that. As far as going north goes, that is Phase II, the part in front of Langer up through Jillians is the next major phase. That does take extra permitting and extra effort in terms of design that the portion going south does not take and in terms of cost, etc.

That is the next major piece that we intend to design up through the other piece that I would say is almost as important as that which is the crossing of the railroad bridge over to the west side, especially given the fact that that now becomes a signature statement for a kind of entrance into the City with the idea of the arch over it and stuff. Those are some discussions, Alderman Wihby, that have happened since we have talked, but my understanding of the phase, I call it Phase IB which is from Singer Field or from the railroad south was that it could be done fairly inexpensively and fairly quickly even without really stopping or changing the schedule on Phase II.

Alderman Wihby asked so the railroad south was going to encompass Singer Park.

Mr. Sommers answered no. The area in front of Singer Park from the railroad north to South Commercial Street, that area…

Alderman Wihby interjected what phase are we in now.

Mr. Sommers replied I call it Phase IA.

Alderman Wihby asked does that go to Jac Pac.

Mr. Sommers answered no.

Alderman Wihby stated my understanding was that…

Mr. Sommers interjected that goes down to the railroad bridge and then loops back.

Alderman Wihby stated my understanding was that was the first phase and then you were going to go north to Jillians, that is still there, and then you were going from Jillians north rather than going from Singer to Jac Pac.

Mr. Sommers replied no that was never my understanding. My understanding was that the phase was to go from what I call Phase II up to Jillians and we may continue simultaneously north by what I call now Gateway I, II and III because that can be done simultaneously with going to the southerly end and that is also the subject of and Bob you can help me out, of some additional funding at the State and Federal level so that may occur that way.

Alderman Wihby asked to do Gateway I, II and III there is additional funding.

Mr. Sommers answered right.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes, the CDFA funding which we understand is very positive would be used for that phase that goes along with those three Gateway buildings.

Alderman Wihby asked so that could be done at the same time as we are going south.

Mr. Sommers answered right. The issue with that is that obviously there is more permitting issues and stuff because we have to go out over the river versus going to the south.

Alderman Wihby stated we knew it was a bigger job. It was just that it seemed like it made more sense to do that because we were trying to get the biggest bang for our buck at the time and we knew that the people wanted it down there and we were trying to go that way to give that economic situation and develop that part of it. That is where most of the people were. It wasn't down towards Jac Pac.

Alderman O'Neil stated in Phase I there are actually three sub-phases. IA which is from Singer Park southerly to the railroad trestle. IB from the railroad trestle southerly to beyond Jac Pac and IC which is the trestle crossing the bridge. So there is some confusion but those are all part of Phase I. There are actually three different sub-phases.

Alderman Wihby stated we were told that the part crossing the bridge was going to be all private funding.

Alderman O'Neil replied that still may be. I think the discussion the Committee has had over the several months is if we are going to involve private funding we need to start showing something done. The two easiest phases to do were IA and IB. Bob MacKenzie and his staff are going to be doing a grant due sometime in August, which may pay for 80% of the construction cost of the trestle across the river to the West Side. I don't know if anybody else on the Committee has any comments, but that was the thinking of the Committee.

Alderman Reiniger stated I do remember the discussions that Alderman Wihby is referring to and he is correct and I don't think anything has changed since then. I agree with Alderman O'Neil. He has outlined Phases IA, B and C. The point is that in the initial development we want to see something visible and they needed to raise the money to do the bridge which is very important to connect to the west side. That is what is happening now. In the meantime, there are plans being developed for Gateway buildings I, II and III and I guess any day that will be made public. I don't know if they have been made public yet, but that is also affecting how that next phase of the Riverwalk will be coming out. All of these things are being done at once.

Mr. Sommers stated I would say that there are a number of projects that are starting to go on simultaneously. In fact, just recently I handed over a copy of our concept to the director for the owners of Gateway I, II and III so they can use those to start looking at the areas in between because I believe there is going to be…I would expect there is going to be public/private participation in those areas.

Mayor Wieczorek asked the Deputy City Clerk to read the report into the record.

Deputy Clerk Johnson presented a report of the Special Committee on Riverfront Activities as follows:

> The Special Committee on Riverfront Activities respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Planning Department be authorized to use the competitive seal proposal process to procure the services of an entity to coordinate the everyday details in furtherance of the development phase of the Riverwalk project at a cost not to exceed $200,000. The Committee notes that such recommendation is made to ensure that the project receives the attention to detail that will be required to fully implement its development and that such entity shall report to the Planning Director while working with the Riverfront Team and the Special Committee on Riverfront activities.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept the report of the Committee. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Rivard asked, Mr. Sommers, the other evening the State of NH presented a major construction intersection project over on the west side and part of their recommendation was for the City of Manchester to widen the bridge to six lanes. What impact, if any, is that going to have on the construction timetable of this Riverwalk?

Mr. Sommers answered I don't believe it will have any, Alderman. We have designed this so it will go underneath that area and allow for those additional lanes if they come into place. I don't think it is going to have any effect at all and we would obviously work that out with that design but I was aware when we were developing this that it was a very strong possibility.

Alderman Shea asked when the Riverwalk goes into a private industry, do we pay for that or are we paying for it. Who is covering that cost?

Mr. Sommers answered there are a couple of pieces to an answer to that. First of all, we will be paying for some of it in terms of providing a public location, but there are going to be many aspects of it that I believe they are going to pay for in terms of enhancements that also make that a nicer public entity because quite frankly those areas will become retail areas. There is a basic element that we have costed in that I would say it would be prudent and wise for the City to pay for to make it work and operate. They, in return, are hopefully going to get and the indication is that I am correct in terms of our preliminary discussions, is that we are going to get easements at no cost to the City and we are working on those easement agreements now in terms of coming up with drafts that I will be presenting to Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Clark for their approval.

Alderman Shea asked how many businesses are going to be involved.

Mr. Sommers answered initially if we are talking about the Langer building we are talking about three ownerships, two of which I have discussed this with and they are very excited about the whole prospect. As far as businesses go, I expect you will see many businesses along there that will be leased from those owners.

Alderman Shea asked from a legal point of view, who would own that particular section in case there was a problem or an accident.

Mr. Sommers answered that typically would be the City.

Alderman Shea asked so that City would be responsible for that area of a private business.

Mr. Sommers answered if it is a public space as I understand it, yes but those have to be worked out in the agreements. I guess I should note one other thing. I may be stepping out of turn for Mr. Clark but there are now State RSA's in the book that also limit liability specifically for this type of thing.

Alderman Cashin asked what have you got budgeted for maintenance on this project.

Mr. Sommers answered I don't have it budgeted yet. We will be putting that together as part of the next piece that we are doing. We will be doing what I call final cost benefits which would include an annual maintenance program that obviously will increase as we develop this project.

Alderman Cashin asked and this all comes back to the Board before we go any further on this thing.

Mr. Sommers answered I would say that with the exception of the Phase IA that we are doing, it all comes back to the Board. I expect that we will be coming back to you at the end of the summer after everybody has had their chance to comment.

Alderman Cashin asked where is the funding coming from going from east to west with the connector.

Mr. Sommers answered I would say two possible sources. One is through Federal funding as part of the T21 grant process. Another possibility is the bridge funding program from the State and Federal government. The third one, obviously, is through private funding because that particular bridge is so visible that we expect there could be some type of naming rights or some type of way for people or corporations to dedicate and to participate.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion to accept the report of the Committee. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

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

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

13. A report of the Committee on Finance was presented recommending that

Bond Resolutions:

"Authorizing Additional Bonds, Notes or lease Purchases in the amount of Seventy Five Thousand Dollars ($75,000) for the 2000 CIP 710200, Intersection Improvement Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or lease Purchases in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($600,000) for the 2000 CIP 810300 Revaluation Project."

ought to pass and layover.

and, further, that Resolutions:

"Amending the 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 Community Improvement Programs, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds for various CIP Projects."

"Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing changes in project numbers, authorizing and appropriating funds."

"Resolution Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Fifty four thousand four hundred and fifty dollars ($54,450) in line item 0390 (Other Services) be transferred from Human Resources to City Clerk."

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

14. Communication from Alderman Cashin requesting the Board review the policy relative to fees charged by the Tax Collector's Office.

Alderman Cashin stated it's been brought to my attention…and first let me preface my remarks. This is not a reflection on the Tax Collector or the Tax Collector's Office, I have nothing but the most confidence in them. But, it was brought to my attention last week that we are charging now $2.00 for a receipt to be sent back to the Tax Collector's. Now, the constituents have to send back a self-addressed stamped envelope and a $2.00 check to get a receipt and that's based on the Committee on Revenue Administration vote in 1989, I believe it was March 21, 1989 that a duplicate tax receipt shall be billed for $2.00. My contention is that these are not duplicate tax receipts, these are the originals. Now, back in '89 we did this because it was a project going back, checking out the records, and getting a duplicate, not getting the original and we said okay, fine, that's $2.00. I have a copy of Joan's letter and I agree with her. I could see where this would be time consuming. However, in my opinion, and I've talked to the City Solicitor's Office there is no way…we do not have an ordinance and we do not have a policy that states that the Tax Collector at this time can charge $2.00 for an original tax receipt, it just can't be done. This Board is either going to have to change it or do something, it's not here.

Alderman Pariseau stated when I called the Tax Collector's Office and spoke with Connie Marion about this same issue she advised me that this was passed by the Board of Mayor and Alderman in September of 1987. I don't know what reference Alderman Cashin is making relative to the Committee on Accounts.

Alderman Cashin interjected the Committee on Revenue Administration noting it's dated March 21, 1989 and it says "duplicate tax receipts".

Alderman Pariseau reiterated I was told it was 1987.

Ms. Porter replied it is '89, I have a copy in front of me.

Alderman Wihby asked have we been doing this since '89.

Ms. Porter replied no. If I could I'd like to give you a little bit of a history and a little background. Back in the old days, we used to do all of the processing of all of the property taxes in the Tax Office. At tax time, we always hired about 6 or 8 temporary people and all bills were rung up in the office. If, at the point of transaction somebody wanted a receipt and there was a stamped self-addressed envelope it was all one motion, you rang it up, processed their receipt, stuck it in an envelope and it was done. We went to a lockbox situation which means that the envelope that is sent out with the bill has a PO Box on it, that PO Box is picked up by Citizens Bank, we don't even have a key to that PO Box. We never see the check, we never see the payment. It goes right to Citizens Bank, they process it, the money's in the bank the same day. This has eliminated the possibility of hiring the temporary people that we used to have and has basically saved us money in that respect. However, it created the other problem of now who handles the receipts. We did have a volunteer who was in her 80's who did this every year. Among other jobs, she would take these receipts from the lockbox and hand stamp them and mail them out. We lost her two years ago and we have not been able to replace her as a volunteer. We've been trying to do this in our office and it's become extremely cumbersome, we're basically talking about three to four percent of the bills that go out are people that want receipts, but that's about 900 to 1,000 bills and we don't seem to have the time…one of the other problems
is that when people want this receipt, they want it today. If we could say August, September or whatever whenever we get around to sending them, we'll send the receipt that would be fine, but the phone calls start as soon as they mail the check and they want to know where their receipt is. And, I'm not criticizing those people, I realize that some people are really attached to that receipt. Basically, what we're saying this year is with all that was going on…right now we're doing an awful lot of checking for HTE because we're getting ready to convert in August, we're tying up two staff persons just checking HTE all day. We have the real estate rush, we have the end of the month for car registration, it's just the worse time of the year for us to have this extra thing to do. Last year, we took them home and stamped them at home because it was the only way to do it and this year we decided…we actually have two separate issues and Alderman Cashin is correct that this is an original receipt, it's not a duplicate receipt. We've never been able to track whether somebody already got a receipt or not. We've never been able to say this person got an original receipt, so now we're going to charge them for a duplicate. So, basically, the philosophy we've always had is if at the point of sale or the point of transaction someone wants the receipt right then and there and we're not doing any other extra work to produce that

receipt, we're simply stamping the receipt, sticking it in an envelope and it goes then there's no charge. If we have to go into the computer bring the information back up and print it there's a charge of $2.00; that we've been doing since '89 and we've been doing it whenever somebody requests a receipt, we have no way of knowing if they've ever requested one before that. So, in a sense people have been paying for an original receipt from the beginning if they come in two or three month's later and ask for a receipt, that's the only way we can produce one. The message that we're trying to say to people this year which is different is really two separate issues. We've always charged the $2.00 per receipt, we do get a lot of these receipt requests from lawyers, mortgage companies, refinances, closings…those sorts of things we get them directly from the business that's doing it, not necessarily the customer and they automatically send in the $2.00. That is one separate issue on the $2.00 charge and I think if we eliminate that $2.00 charge we are going to open a floodgate of requests for these to be faxed out and sent out and there is going to be an expense to the City that would be lost. But, the other issue is we are trying to convince customer you do not need a receipt and I know the change comes hard to a lot of people. It is just like when they stopped mailing cancelled checks to us in the mail and said you don't need your cancelled check, but if for some reason someday you need one you can get one. This is what we're trying to say this year and apparently I didn't do a good job of it. But, we're trying to say to them that you don't need that receipt every year. In many cases, we've talked with people on the phone who have called and we've asked them…the ones who will talk to us…when you got that receipt back last year what did you do with it and in a lot of cases they said they just filed it. Did you ever take it out again, no. So, it's a lot of work that we're doing that isn't necessary and yet if there ever is a situation which I did mention on an IRS audit, you may need, you may not. It depends on what part of your return they're auditing. You need it on a closing and you need it on a refinance and those situations don't happen to all of us every year, they're rare and in those cases there is the capability of getting a receipt for $2.00. But, otherwise the stamping of receipts is just very, very time consuming.

Mayor Wieczorek asked are most of these property tax receipt.

Ms. Porter replied yes.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I can see a couple of problems there. One, is where the mortgage company pays you, what do you do with them. They send you a whole list, don't they.

Ms. Porter replied yes. One bank might have hundreds. They don't request receipts, that is why the numbers are probably so low because these are homeowners.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I agree with you that change comes hard. The people that pay want to get a receipt and frankly I don't see anything wrong with it and that's the difficulty. Now, when you're talking about somebody that is a professional that is doing it because they're settling an estate or doing something else, I think you've got a different situation. But, when an individual comes in to get a receipt I think it's pretty hard to fight. You're talking about 900 to 1,000 and that's total, right.

Ms. Porter replied with each billing, yes.

Mayor Wieczorek stated when you're talking individuals that come in that want a receipt how much of the 900 or 1,000 is that.

Ms. Porter replied the 900 to 1,000 are the ones that are coming in through the mail. Then, we have the people over the counter who are getting them. If they come in and we are at the point of sale and they want the receipt, they are getting their receipt.

Alderman Wihby stated we're charging $2.00 because we feel that if we charge $2.00 people won't ask for a second receipt. We're not doing it to make the money, we're doing it because we want people not to get a copy, so if we charge $2.00 that's going to stop them.

Ms. Porter stated we're not charging the $2.00 to stop them. The message that we are trying to say to them is you don't need it. But, if the day comes that you need one for IRS or you need one for a closing or a refinance, we can produce one for you for $2.00.

Alderman Wihby asked are we eliminating a lot of having to do because people don't want to pay $2.00.

Ms. Porter stated we've only gotten less than 10 that have sent in a request for $2.00 with a stamped self-addressed envelope.

Alderman Wihby stated where before you would have gotten how many.

Ms. Porter replied for the ones that are used to getting it with a stamped self-addressed envelope over 1,000.

Alderman Wihby stated by charging $2.00 we've stopped people from asking for a receipt.

Ms. Porter indicated for the moment. I'm not sure how many of those people…some of them still sent their stamped self-addressed envelope even though the bill said not to.

Alderman Wihby asked what did you do with them.

Ms. Porter replied we have them in the office. We didn't want to throw them away, so we kept them in the office.

Alderman Wihby stated they're still waiting for their receipts and haven't got one.

Ms. Porter stated we get a lot of phone calls from people and we explain to them that we are not doing that anymore and we tell them it's written on the back of the bill, plus the insert did

mention look on the back of the bill for the new policy on receipts. So, we have explained and a lot of the people that we have spoken to have been very receptive.

Alderman Wihby asked did some committee approve this…you said something about a new policy on receipts. How come it didn't go to some Aldermanic Committee or something to decide what they wanted to do.

Ms. Porter replied I'm not sure that the sending of receipts with the bill was a policy one way or the other ever. It was something we did as a service.

Alderman Wihby stated I don't know why we should charge $2.00. I just send my Hampton one in with an envelope and I get my copy, I don't have to pay an extra $2.00.

Ms. Porter stated that is what we have always done until this year. This is the first time we've done it and it's basically because it's become so time consuming.

Alderman Wihby stated I don't think I read you can do it for $2.00. Is it on the bill.

Ms. Porter replied it's on the back of the bill, it says if you need a receipt one can be obtained for $2.00.

Alderman Girard stated I guess there are a couple of different issues. I read your letter, Mrs. Gardner, and I agree with you that cancelled checks or receipts for money orders and what not should suffice as receipts, but I guess the problem I have here is I think there's a policy that was passed by the Board some time ago that had been broadly interpreted. You said that you can't really tell the difference between what is and what is not a duplicate receipt, so you pretty well across the board charge $2.00. I don't think that was the intent of the Board when they…and I realize that this is a practice that has taken place well before you were Tax Collector, I don't think the intent of the Board was to charge people $2.00 to get their first or original receipt, so I think that's part of the problem. The other problem is and maybe this is something for the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration to delve into further perhaps if people want receipts they should be required to come to the Tax Collector's Office and pay their property tax bill in person so that we can take care of your operational needs and we can get them their receipts unless, of course, there are extenuating circumstances where people, for whatever reason, physically unable to do that.

Alderman Cashin stated number one, I don't think we have a mechanism where we can charge the $2.00, there is certainly not an ordinance and the policy states duplicate, it doesn't state original. So, I don't think you have the tool to collection the $2.00 even if you wanted to unless we change something. But, I think more importantly if I go in and pay at the counter, I get my receipt. If I send it through the mail I don't get my receipt. Now, the reason that we went to the mail and we went to the lockbox is to eliminate the long lines that we used to have at the Tax Collector's Office, it used to go all the way down Market Street and now we're saying if you

want your receipt you better go back into those lines because that's the only way you're going to get it and I don't think…

Ms. Porter interjected what we're trying to say is you don't need a receipt.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that is going to be hard to convince somebody.

Ms. Porter stated I know that will take time.

Alderman Cashin stated I have elderly people, they want their receipts. Now, whether it's important or whether it isn't…to them, it's elderly, they want it and they've never paid for it. Now, they're being told they've got a self-addressed stamped envelope and they've got to put a $2.00 check in it in order to get that receipt and they're saying…and this is what really got me going…somebody called City Hall and said well, the Aldermen passed it. Well, the Aldermen never passed it, it was never passed by the Board of Aldermen, no it wasn't.

Ms. Porter stated this report that was done by the Committee…that is the way it has always been interpreted, I guess since '89.

Alderman Cashin stated, again, it says duplicate.

Ms. Porter stated I agree. Except there is and never way any way of tracking whether somebody ever got an original. So, if anyone…if someone came in and got an original or got it through the mail last year and then came in during the summer and got a duplicate, they were being charged the $2.00. But, if somebody never got a receipt before, but all of a sudden for whatever reason had to come in and get a receipt they were also charged $2.00 because there was no way for us to know if they got an original.

Alderman Cashin stated I understand that and I appreciate that, but also you've got to look at it from the taxpayers point. Here they're sending you a check for anywhere from $600 to $1,200 or whatever and in order to get their receipt they've got to send you an extra $2.00 and that's rubbing me the wrong way and I don't blame them. I think, from a public relations point…again, it's no reflection on you, Joan, it's no reflection on your department, believe me and I say that again because I want that understood.

Ms. Porter stated I don't take offense and I would never say that I have a devil-may-care attitude toward customers, it's just that the seams are ripping and we don't have the time to stamp these receipts.

Alderman Cashin stated most of the bills comes in around the end of June, first of July, right. If we hired a high school person in July and worked the month just to take all of the self-addressed envelopes and attach them with the bill, stamp them, put them in, and ship them, could that be done.

Ms. Porter replied it could be done. If we could find a volunteer that could be done.

Alderman Cashin stated I'm not even saying a volunteer. I'm saying hire a high school person to do it. In thirty days it could be done, I think.

Ms. Porter stated if someone were doing this for eight hours a day, it could probably be done in a couple of days.

Alderman Cashin stated for a couple of days from a public relations point of view, I think it ought to be done.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we're not going to get another Blanche. Blanche is the one who used to be there for years and years and everybody misses her there is no doubt about it, but I agree.

Ms. Porter stated a couple of years ago we did…not the present Human Resources Department, but we had gone to Personnel about four years ago when this was starting and we asked…

Mayor Wieczorek stated we've spent more time talking about it now than it would cost to get it done.

Ms. Porter stated we asked if we could have volunteers who have to do community service like children making confirmation and we were told that we can't do that for some reason. I think there was a liability issue.

Alderman Pariseau suggested now that Alderman Cashin has retired, maybe he'd want to volunteer.

Alderman Cashin stated I wouldn't want to deny anybody an opportunity for gainful employment.

Alderman Clancy asked, Joan, what kind of money are we talking about.

Ms. Porter stated if we could even find a volunteer it wouldn't even have a cost except we have not been able to find a volunteer to do this.

Alderman Clancy stated we've been sitting here talking for a half hour about $2.00.

Alderman Wihby stated I know my wife has a checking account noting she never gets her checks back, she has to request from the bank and I don't know if it costs any money, but she never sees a copy of her checks, so how could she ever use that as a receipt.

Ms. Porter stated I guess that was one of my points that the banks did away with sending us back our checks for the same reason that we're saying this, that you don't need the cancelled check in most cases and if you do need a cancelled check it is available to you for a fee and we're basically saying the same thing.

Alderman Cashin stated I'm sorry, but if you don't have the check, you don't have the receipt then how do you prove that you ever paid it.

Ms. Porter stated I've owned a house for 25 years and I have never shown an accountant a receipt for real estate. I've brought in the bill and I told them the amount that I paid. The one year that we were audited we were not audited for real estate, so I didn't have to produce a receipt that year either.

Alderman Cashin stated I have income property and I have to show it, my CPA wants to see it.

Mayor Wieczorek stated the IRS in their regulations state that a cancelled check is not a receipt. So, even if you got your check back what is it. I think we're talking about a very small problem here and certainly I think you ought to be able to get two days of somebody, summer help to do the job if that's what it takes is two days, you certainly have $100 in your budget or $50 or whatever it's going to cost for two days, don't tell me you don't.

Ms. Porter asked in salaries, I don't know that we do in salaries.

Mayor Wieczorek stated come in for a line item transfer and take it out under some other line item.

Alderman Cashin moved that original receipts be sent when requested with the bills. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard asked what if a mortgage company or an escrow company or somebody like that were to send in a self-addressed stamped envelope for every tax bill that they paid, I don't know how likely that is.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

15. Communication from Real Theroux seeking authorization to move a home from 4 Pamela Circle to 4255 Brown Avenue over City streets.

Alderman Rivard to move the request be approved subject to the view and approval of the Building and Highway Departments. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

16. Resolutions:

"Amending the 1994, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999 Community Improvement Programs, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds for various CIP Projects."

"Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing changes in project numbers, authorizing and appropriating funds."

"Resolution Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Fifty four thousand four hundred and fifty dollars ($54,450) in line item 0390 (Other Services) be transferred from Human Resources to City Clerk."

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the Resolutions be read by titles only, and it was so done.

Alderman O'Neil moved that the Resolutions pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

17. NEW BUSINESS

Communication from Pauline Guay.

Mayor Wieczorek read the communication into the record as follows:

Honorable Mayor Wieczorek.

It is with deep regret that I tender my resignation from the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission, its Executive Committee and Personnel Committee effective June 30, 1999, the end of SNHPC's fiscal year. It has been my pleasure serving as a member of the Commission in excess of ten years. It has been a worthwhile and rewarding experience. The demands of my law practice, however, are increasing which no longer allow me the time which is required to be a productive member of the Commission.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I believe this is a Planning Board appointment.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, the Planning Board would nominate and then that is confirmed by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Pariseau moved to accept Ms. Guay's letter of resignation with regrets and forward a letter of appreciation to her. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communications from US Senator Smith and Senator Gregg.

Mayor Wieczorek stated if you will remember at one of our previous meetings the Board requested that we contact them regarding some help in paying for the CSO. Well, we did get a response from both of them and Senator Smith is going to be the sponsor of the legislation and Senator Gregg said he is going to co-sponsor Senator Smith's legislation. So, that's an update on where we are.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to receive and file the communications from the US Senators.

Alderman Shea stated I think I discussed this briefly with you today, but at a meeting of senior citizens during this past week, I assured them that the Aldermanic Board along with the Mayor deeply appreciates their contributions to our community. Acting on their behalf, I am making a motion that a feasibility study be conducted for the construction of a senior citizens center. Also, I am requesting that the Finance Officer and the City Planner report back to the Board in August relative to funding. I know that both departments have dealt with studies of a similar nature and feel confident that both Bob MacKenzie and Kevin Clougherty or his representative will be able to determine the cost and the funding source for such a study. I feel, your Honor, that as we listened this evening every component of our society seems to have some type of a sharing of the pie. Our senior citizens and they are about 20% of our population and I must add that you, your Honor, myself along with possibly one or two other members of this Board…we're all in that particular category and I think that it's about time that we did something for the seniors. They have two places in the City and obviously they're inadequate and I think that we should have a study and have something appropriate for them. If we're putting in money for a riverwalk, a civic center, and every other thing we should put a decent senior citizen center that will be representative of our City and I think that we should begin a study of that. I know Bob and I talked briefly about that and he mentioned something about utilizing the Police station, but the senior that I met with feel that parking is a very important consideration.

Mayor Wieczorek asked could you repeat the motion, please.

Alderman Shea moved that a feasibility study be conducted for the construction of a senior citizen center.

Mayor Wieczorek asked where's the money coming from, Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think the request would be that I review with the Finance Director generally how much that would cost and where that money might come from, as I understand the motion.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated this came before the CIP Committee last month after it was referred by the Board the first time and during that discussion, or part of that discussion was the fact that this Board agreed, in part, to go ahead and build a new Police station because the old Police station was going to be renovated for among other uses the relocation of the Senior Center at least on the east side which would provide better facilities, more space, better access to parking and all of the things that we are all worried about. If we're going to proceed now , after having approved the new Police station on the premise that we were going to use the existing one for

such facilities, I think we probably have to reexamine an awful lot of things that we've done. I don't think that anybody here is opposed to the idea of building a senior center worthy of our elder citizens, but to come up after we've already taken steps in that direction and make a play for a nice, new, shiny building all its own, I don't think is fair to the process that we went through in determining whether or not to build a new Police station.

Alderman Shea stated the point is that the seniors do not feel that parking would be adequate in and around where the Police station is right now and I'm sure that we have creative minds in this City, both on this Board as well as within our departments that could utilize the full space of the present Police station when it's renovated, I'm sure. What I have in mind and I think what the seniors have in mind is a decent area of the City and a senior center that is worth of our seniors, something that will cost hopefully in the range of $1-1.5 million, so that these people can go there, we don't have to rent the Center of NH to have functions, they can do in-line dancing and they can have kitchen facilities and so forth. If we respect our senior citizens then it's up to us to show all the people in Manchester that they deserve a decent area. Right now, there are facilities that are totally inadequate and if one were to visit other communities they do have senior citizen areas located in areas where people can get to, parking is not a problem, ADA accessibility, etc. So, that's my concern, your Honor, about utilizing the Police station.

Alderman Thibault stated this is why I brought up before the Board many times in the past about the Brown School. It has a major, large parking area that would be able to take care, I believe, of both senior centers and also the West Side Library and Bob MacKenzie has been there, looked at the building with me a couple of times and other people have looked at it and we believe that there is plenty of room to do all of that there and that building could be dedicated to that completely, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion to gather information and report back to this Board.

Alderman Wihby stated I thought basically the discussion was that they wanted some place where they could go dance. I thought that is what I had heard from that woman, I thought that is what they were looking for. Is that not the same…

Alderman Shea replied that is part of it.

Alderman Wihby asked what is the other part.

Alderman Thibault replied parking is their biggest issue.

Alderman Wihby stated the person in charge gave me a call the other day and I've been looking around for places for her so they could have their thing. They're willing to rent a facility and everything else. She never asked for anything from the City to build and to put money into, etc.

She was just looking for an empty hall or something where they could go and dance. This is something different.

Alderman Shea replied yes.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I think it's worth at least exploring and called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Girard duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Hirschmann asked this is for 2001 correct.

Mayor Wieczorek replied there's nothing right now, we just have to wait and see what they come back with.

Alderman Rivard moved that the money allocated to the Yarger Decker Consolidation Study be transferred out of the Human Resources Department budget into the Contingency account. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Wieczorek stated you want to take the money out of the Human Resources budget, the total amount.

Alderman Rivard replied whatever it is…$125,000/$185,000…and put it into Contingency, so that when the Board is ready to support that program, when we know we're going to support it and why we're going to support it.

Mayor Wieczorek asked would you mind telling me why it makes a difference then, as to which budget it's in.

Alderman Rivard replied I think it makes a difference because the Board of Mayor and Aldermen would know when and where and how we're going to spend this money and I'm not sure if things had gone the way they were going that we would have known when, where and how.

Mayor Wieczorek stated they're not going the way they were going and it has to come back to this Board, there's no way…

Alderman Rivard stated that is why I am making this motion.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it has to come back no matter where it is, that is not a done deal.

Alderman Rivard stated then it would have to come back twice and then we'd really know where we're going, we'd have a real clear understanding of what we're trying to do.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we're going to try to make sure that you have a clear understanding, I don't think that's necessary to get that done.

Alderman Rivard stated I can't make that motion and get a second.

Mayor Wieczorek stated you can make that motion, but I am going to veto it.

Alderman Rivard stated you're going to veto it at the end after we have a chance to vote on it, okay.

Alderman Shea moved the question.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Pariseau stated I've got an issue that I heard rumors about that Red Robidas is leaving the Police Department, retiring from the Police Department and has been hired by the City to head City Hall security.

Mayor Wieczorek replied City security, not City Hall security.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think that stinks. I have nothing against Red Robidas, he's been an excellent Police officer and whatever, but I think having the City go through the process that it did and advertising for the position and having this guy come along last week, retires from the Police Department and is already supposedly hired to take over that City security position is wrong and I just wanted to express that.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I don't agree with you on that and I'm going to ask the Human Resources Director to explain why because we've talked about that issue.

Mr. Hobson stated I just want to add a little bit of information and that is we went through an internal posting process, the City Solicitor pointed out to us that we also needed to externally post the job according to the ordinances which we did this past weekend. We have done an interviewing process and clearly Mr. Robidas is a very fine candidate for that position and the position in your budget and also in Alderman Wihby's budget, the position would be located in Human Resources "for the time being" and the decision on making that selection would be the department and that would be me.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that is a combination of things because with Airport security the Airport is going to have to pay also because Red's credentials are he is an instructor.

Alderman Pariseau stated I don't have a problem with Red Robidas, at all. I'm concerned about the process that occurred. Here we get a notice that the job was posted and there is no need for

other applicants to apply because it was a done deal in having Robidas retire as a Police officer and come back on City payroll.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I don't think it was a done deal unless somebody with better credentials came along.

Alderman Pariseau asked do you expect me to believe that, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek replied yes, I expect you to believe that.

Alderman Pariseau reiterated I just think the process stinks.

Alderman Cashin asked why would security come under Human Resources and not the City Clerk's Office.

Mayor Wieczorek replied it is not necessarily going to stay there, but we had to put it someplace to start with.

Mr. Hobson stated the position will be funded with enterprise funds, CIP cash, and also School funds. The primary function of the position will be to coordinate security city-wide, particularly the Airport and the School system.

Alderman Cashin asked where is the funding for security right now, in whose budget.

Mr. Hobson replied it is primarily under Human Resources.

Alderman Cashin asked what do you mean, primarily.

Mr. Hobson replied some comes from the enterprise accounts and federal funds.

Alderman Cashin asked is there is any money in the City Clerk's Office for security.

Mr. Hobson replied the money you approved tonight to move to the City Clerk's Office is for professional services for the City Hall Complex which would primarily be security guards and we did go ahead and interview internal candidates for that position; that is a common practice done by all department heads and I don't have any problem with going on the record saying that I would look at internal candidates, employees for jobs first before I would consider outside people, I think that's just past practice and good business practice.

Alderman Girard stated I'd like to know how long the position was posted externally before any appointments to that position were made. Telling me that we went according to the ordinance doesn't tell me exactly when things were posted and how long they were posted for, your Honor.

Mr. Hobson replied I believe it was five and five. I believe it was five days internal and five days external, I believe that is what the ordinance states. Tom, do you recall.

Solicitor Clark stated the ordinance doesn't have a time limit. It says you have to advertise it in a paid advertisement. I believe our letter went out last week to your office, so I think the posting was in this weekend.

Mr. Hobson stated in my opinion and I know, Alderman, maybe it doesn't answer you specifically. We followed the ordinance, we listened to the City Solicitor, we did what we thought was the right thing to do and we are very comfortable that Mr. Robidas will be the person.

Alderman Girard stated this is not about Mr. Robidas, first of all, I have no concerns with him. My question is whether or not he was appointed to the position before you even posted the thing publicly. We're a Tuesday after a holiday and it seems to me that if it only got posted this weekend, the appointment was made before the public posting was given.

Mr. Hobson replied public posting are more than just a newspaper. It also has to do with sending it out to colleges, putting it properly on bulletin boards, sending it out to various agencies which we do on a regular basis. We send it out to the employment agencies, etc. Again, we went through the process.

Alderman Clancy asked what is the salary going to be, Mark.

Mr. Hobson replied Grade 22. I don't have it memorized, I believe it starts in the low 40's.

Alderman Hirschmann moved that it be referred to the Personnel Committee to make a determination on who this manager work for, which department. I'd like to do that right now because it doesn't belong in Mark's department.

Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated that wasn't Mark's doing; that was because we didn't know where it belonged.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I thought the permanent Police protection, this was natural where this belongs. They have a whole department of people that go around giving security surveys, that is where Red Robidas was. Why wasn't this part of the Police Department because he works for the Police Department that's why.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that's not the reason, open your mind a little bit. When you get to the Airport you're in a different county where the Airport is located and you have to have somebody deal with security. Now, how is our local Police Department going to deal with that situation.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the department head told me a month ago who was going to get the job, okay, so I think he's right on track. I think this was awful.

Alderman Pariseau stated why I'm concerned that it stinks is this was posted…the opening occurred on July 1st and I heard before July 1st that Red Robidas had the job and the closing date is July 8th. Now, you have until Thursday before the applications close and here we already have a guy for the position. What's going on, it stinks.

Mayor Wieczorek asked, Mark, any response.

Alderman Pariseau stated he can't have a response, I have his paper that tells me the dates.

Mr. Hobson replied my response is the same thing that we said. We posted it internally, we looked at those candidates, we posted externally.

Alderman Rivard asked is this individual being transferred from the Police Department to this. He's going to retire, he's going to get a pension from the City and then he's going to get a job for forty thousand dollars.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it's a pension from the State Retirement.

Alderman Rivard stated you can't do that in State service. You can't retire from one State department…I can't retire from my State job and get another job in the State and get paid and get my retirement at the same time. He's going to get his retirement and he's going to get a job. It's still double dipping.

Solicitor Clark stated the way the City ordinances have been interpreted over the last 30 years…the ordinance says that you can't retire from the City on the City's Retirement System and come back.

Alderman Cashin stated you're really stretching it, Tom.

Solicitor Clark stated I'm saying that is the way it's been done…

Alderman Cashin stated I've kept out of this, but I heard back some time ago…Red Robidas…I like Red, I've known Red for a lot of years, there is nothing wrong with him. But, now to read that the posting hasn't even closed yet and you've already hired a guy, your Honor, there is something wrong, this is not right.

Solicitor Clark stated our office wasn't involved in this until last week when a question came up on transferring Sick Leave credits. We took a look at it, we questioned what was going on with the department and we told Mark point blank that he cannot hire until it's been advertised and

the appropriate people have been given a chance to file applications. I don't know what has happened since.

Alderman Cashin stated it's not even closed yet, how can they file applications.

Solicitor Clark reiterated we told him he couldn't hire until he followed the ordinance and the ordinance says it has to be advertised and people have to be given a chance to apply. I don't know what he's done since then.

Alderman Reiniger stated I just wanted to thank the Fire Department for their excellent job in saving the Pandora mill building, it was apparently struck by lightening last Friday. I did speak to the Fire Chief who had indicated it was a tricky fire to put out.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I know they were busy today. There were a lot of tree that were felled, a lot of problems that occurred today on the streets and the Fire Department did an excellent job.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there was still a motion on the floor as to referring the matter of where that position should report.

Alderman Girard stated I support what Alderman Hirschmann is trying to do, but I wonder whether or not either the Administration or Public Safety Committee would be more appropriate than HR, this is not a Human Resources issue. It has nothing to do with classification, it has something to do with the structure of government and I think it belongs properly somewhere else. I know it should go to a Committee, it's outside of Personnel's purview.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I don't have any problems with it going to HR.

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

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

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

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

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk