

**BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

**October 5, 1999**

**7:30 PM**

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

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

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

Absent: Alderman Klock

Mayor Wieczorek recessed the regular meeting to return to the public participation session.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

**3. Presentation to the October recipient(s) of the "Spirit of Manchester" Award.**

Mayor Wieczorek stated the Spirit of Manchester Award Committee recently convened and selected a group to be honored in the month of October for outstanding service to the City of Manchester. The parameters of the award stated that the recipient should "have contributed to the improvement of the quality of life in Manchester, performing acts that are clearly 'above and beyond the call of duty'." This month's winner is Manchester Crimeline. Manchester Crimeline has assisted the Police Department in reducing the level of crime in this City during the past eighteen years. this organization raises funds for the purpose of offering rewards for assistance in solving crimes, works with neighborhood groups in developing local offensives to fight crime and encourages public cooperation with the Police Department. Manchester Crimeline has awarded almost \$130,000 since its inception. These funds along with their other efforts have been instrumental in solving over 1,950 cases, recovering \$1.4 million in property and confiscating drugs with a street value of \$3.8 million. The award and commemorative pins will be presented by Alderman Pinard who is a member of Manchester Crimeline. I would ask the organization's officers Ed O'Brien, Chairman; Fred Harris, Vice-Chairman; Robin Bonneau, Secretary; Roland Pare, Treasurer; and other members of the Manchester Crimeline Board of Directors who are present to come forward and accept the recognition from the grateful citizens of the City of Manchester.

Alderman Pinard stated Mr. Mayor, Board of Mayor and Aldermen, and distinguished guests, I had a little something to do with bringing Crimeline 18 year ago when I had a little store and probably right now I'm probably the happiest individual in the State because Crimeline, as you see it today, as I said 18 years ago, so I think the Queen City, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and all of the members of Crimeline should be very proud of themselves. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Alderman Hirschmann presented pins and certificates to those members called on:

Roland Pare, Roland Gamelin, Richard Choate, Robin Bonneau, Richard Guilbert, Albert Tremblay, BJ Perry, Edward O'Brien, David Nixon, Steve Johnson, Fred Harris, Sgt. Paula Glennon, Frank Josiak, Linda Cacza, Henry Bourgeois, and Alderman Read Pinard.

Mr. Gamelin stated Manchester Crimeline was incorporated in July of 1981. We have two original incorporators here this evening: myself and Alderman Real Pinard. Throughout the 18 years that we've been here we've depended on the business community and private citizens of Manchester for our funds. With the numbers that you read out tonight, you can see how successful we here. I'd just like to mention that it has been a rare privilege to be able to work hand-in-hand with the Manchester Police Department and be able to have a hand in preventing crime in Manchester. I'd like to give special thanks to Chief Mark Driscoll, to Deputy Chief James Stewart and our Police Coordinator Paula Glennon.

4. Mayor Wieczorek issues a Proclamation relative to National Health Center Week, October 4-8, 1999.

Mayor Wieczorek read the following Proclamation into the record:

**HEALTH CENTER WEEK  
October 4-8, 1999**

- WHEREAS,** Community, Migrant and Homeless Health Centers are providers of health care to more than 10 million of medically underserved people in urban and rural communities in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the US Virgin Islands;
- WHEREAS,** health centers serve as a vital safety net for growing numbers of working poor, uninsured, and high-risk and vulnerable populations;
- WHEREAS,** health centers bring doctors and needed health facilities into areas with few or no providers and/or suffering poverty and poor health;
- WHEREAS,** health centers expand access to quality and cost-effective primary and preventive healthcare for all people;
- WHEREAS,** health centers contain health care costs by fostering health and prevention and reducing the need for costly emergency care and hospital admissions;
- WHEREAS,** health centers are partnerships of people, governments and communities working together to meet greater needs and address community health problems; and
- WHEREAS,** the Manchester Community Health Center in Manchester, New Hampshire is serving 8,000 patients annually and contributing to the health and economic promise of the community it serves with health services, jobs, leadership and investment;
- NOW, THEREFORE,** be it resolved that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, resolves to commend the Manchester Community Health Center for its commitment and invaluable services in improving and safeguarding health and, hereby, proclaims for the people of our community,

**October 4-8, 1999  
as  
HEALTH CENTER WEEK**

Mayor Wieczorek stated they certainly deserve our commendation because they have filled a very important niche here in the City of Manchester.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I saw Mark Hayward running up here when they were taking pictures of Crimeline. Mark, where are you and Kathy Marchocki, is Kathy here. Kathy, I just wanted to let the Board and our viewers know that Kathy who has been covering City Hall for quite a period of time has now been relieved of this assignment and is going to be working with the Police Department. Kathy, you did an excellent job here in covering City Hall for *The Union Leader* and we want to extend our thanks and wish you well in your new assignment. And, we want to extend to Mark the same cooperation that you are getting from everybody here and we wish him the very best in his new assignment. So, thank you both very much.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mayor Wieczorek advises 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.

### **Accept Funds and Remand for the Purpose Intended**

- A. Communication from the Deputy Finance Officer to accept forfeiture funds for the Police Department.
- B. Communication from the Health Officer advising of a grant award in the amount of \$2,000 from Northeast Delta Dental Foundation, Inc., requesting that same be accepted and remanded for the purpose intended.

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

- D. Communication from Fred Rusczek, Chairman Pro-Tem of the Department Head QM Team submitting an update on the establishment of a QM Council to implement a City-wide, comprehensive Total QM Process.
- E. Communication from Executive Councilor Thomas Colantuono submitting an agenda for the September 28, 1999 meeting of the Governor and Council.
- F. Communication from MediaOne providing an advance copy of the "Important Customer Information" insert which will be sent to all subscribers.
- G. Communication from the Executive Director of Southern NH Planning Commission advising that a public hearing has been scheduled for October 12, 1999 from 7:00-9:00 PM at the UNH Auditorium (Manchester) for the purpose of receiving input on the State's Ten-Year Transportation Improvement Program.

### **REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES**

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

- H. Communication from the American Lung Association of NH requesting the placement of a banner from mid-March to mid-April, 2000 in conjunction with a comprehensive tobacco prevention and education campaign entitled "*Breathe Easy Manchester*".

- I. Communication from Kevin Provencher on behalf of The Riverfront Park Foundation requesting that a "No Vending" zone be declared from the intersection of Granite and South Commercial Streets running the length of South Commercial Street to Singer Family Park during Park events as herein enclosed.

#### **COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT**

- J. Communication from the Economic Development Director requesting approval that the Finance Officer be authorized to transfer \$6,000 into the UNH account from available balance of proceeds from the sale of land at Manchester AirPark in order to complete the Master Plan Contract for the Hackett Hill property.
- K. Communication from the Executive Director of Intown Manchester on behalf of the Intown Board of Trustees advising that they have completed all of the terms of its original contract with the City relative to the operation of the Intown Skating Rink and are now in a position to transfer the ice rink to the City at no additional cost to the City.
- L. Communication from the Director of Planning advising that Mrs. Cecile Pelletier has submitted an offer of \$7,000 for a parcel of City-owned land located on James Pollock Drive.
- M. Communication from Kevin Provencher on behalf of The Riverfront Park Foundation seeking the City's assistance in moving the visitor-side football grandstands from Gill Stadium to Singer Family Park for the USA vs. Ireland Men's Professional World-Cup level Rugby match to be held on Saturday, June 10, 2000.

#### **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

- N. Resolution:

"Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Five Thousand Eight Hundred Dollars (\$5,800) from Contingency to Building-Special Projects (Account #0300C10898)."

#### **COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE**

- O. Communication from William Trombly, President of Trombly Enterprises, Inc. wishing to offer City employees five cents off their daily fuel oil cash price.

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

- Q. Communication from Kevin Provencher on behalf of The Riverfront Park Foundation requests various traffic signage changes as outlined herein.
- R. Communication from Lorraine Shopiak requesting a review of safety issues on Sunset Pine Drive.
- S. Communication from Marie Spink requesting stops signs at the intersection of Blodget and Linden Streets and Smyth Road.
- T. Copy of a newspaper article relative to the City of Orlando, Florida instituting the use of plastic cards for parking meters rather than coins.

#### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

#### **COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE**

- X. Advising that it has reviewed and approved proposed Ordinance:

"Amending Section 33.079 of Chapter 33 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

and recommends same be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

**COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY**

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

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

- C.** Copies of minutes of meetings of the Manchester Airport Authority held on July 22 and August 26, 1999.

Alderman Shea stated reviewing the minutes from the meeting of the Manchester Airport Authority on August 26th under VI, Item 4 Director Dillon announced that the City Security Manager would allot 50 percent of his time to the Airport. My question is, are we or do we intend to bill the Airport Authority for this service. Namely, 50 percent of Mr. Robidas' salary.

Mayor Wieczorek replied yes, we do.

Alderman Shea stated so his salary now presently as \$54,000 would be reduced.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it would be split by whatever percentage he spends over there.

Alderman Shea moved that Item C be received and filed. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- P.** Ordinance amendment submitted by Alderman Girard relative to Public Housing Drug Free Zones.

Alderman Reiniger stated I support the proposal to establish Drug Free Zones...I'm just wondering why the Gallen Building was omitted from the recommended list.

Chief Driscoll replied I'm not sure I can tell you that. We worked with Alderman Girard and Grace Grogan from the Housing and Redevelopment Authority and these were the list of places she recommended. Certainly, that would be a fine building to add if everyone felt it was appropriate.

Alderman Reiniger moved to add the Gallen Building to the list, Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated actually it's missing quite a few places isn't it. I don't see the Burns High Rise on this.

Alderman Cashin stated I was going to raise that question.

Alderman Girard stated it is missing a number of the MHRA properties. What we've done here actually...if this State law is adopted by the Board. Technically, every public housing property in the City will be designated a Drug Free Zone. What the Chief's letter and MHRA Director Grogan have come up with are several buildings that they want to target for enforcement purposes initially for various reasons and I'm not sure, to be honest, that I can explain them all though I do understand the rationale. MHRA and the Police Department...and MHRA is going to pay to have the signs made and posted...want to test some areas for enforcement purposes before they decide to expand it. So, the list that you have in front of you is more or less a pilot program targeted at areas where MHRA has got more problems. So, that is why the proposal before you is structured this way. Ideally/personally, I would have liked to see it go City-wide and I'm sure the Chief will attest to that, but in meeting with the Chief and Grace Grogan this was what was agreed to for various enforcement purposes that each are concerned with. They're targeting their worst areas first, I guess. Does that answer your questions, Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman O'Neil replied I guess it does.

Chief Driscoll stated should there be other properties that arise in the future, we'd be pleased to add to that with Grace's approval.

Alderman Girard stated I certainly don't object if anybody wants to add any locations to the target area, I would just say that because MHRA is putting up the resources to put up the postings and because the Police Department for various reasons wants to target it in certain areas first they can all be considered. But, the City may have to come up with additional funds to make the signs and post it and it would be an additional effort on both agencies to enforce it.

Alderman Reiniger moved to refer the communication to the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

U. A Report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that the following policy:

That it is the policy of the City of Manchester that the rezoning of "I" Districts on South Willow Street to "B" Districts not be supported south of the centerline of Runway 6-24 as extended.

be adopted.

Alderman Pariseau stated I would like comments from Mr. MacKenzie relative to the concerns expressed by Ms. Paras.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the issue of the Airport was brought up at Committee. I know I expressed three issues of concern or issues that should be resolved before this zoning took place and one is the fact that we have, for several years, had a relatively solid boundary in terms of where to separate the commercial district from the industrial district. Commercial, of course, generates a lot more traffic and can encroach an industrial area. So, we had suggested at the Committee that a very well-defined boundary line be...if the Committee was going to approve this particular extension for the very well-defined boundary be drawn and I think we agreed that when the Airport Authority as it finishes its acquisition of its properties there will be a large vacant space as you drive down South Willow Street and that will be the approach zone of Runway 6-24. So, the feeling was that a clear and very visible boundary could be drawn and it should be drawn at the extension of Runway 6-24. I think the policy as recommended by the Committee is very sound, is a very clear and visible boundary. The centerline is very well-defined and is permanently defined by the current runway and in the plans. So, I think the policy is very sound. The question that I had raised at Committee dealt more with a public information or information program that we should be aware that the invisible approach planes have not been finalized by the FAA and I did speak with the Airport Director...that is underway and perhaps in the next one to two months that will be finalized. The only thing that would potentially impact on this current situation is the potential height of the buildings being proposed here. So, the approach planes, the invisible approach planes that come out at an angle from the Airport once those are set it is possible that those could affect the ultimate height of some of these new buildings. Now, the Board in its action could potentially postpone action until that time although it is very likely that the approach planes will be identified even before they could come through the various processes including this Board and the Planning Board for final site plan; that those invisible boundaries would be defined. It is a question of ultimately when the buildings are built how high those buildings can be.

Alderman Wihby asked, Bob, can't you control that in the site plan review.

Mr. MacKenzie replied if we knew exactly where those invisible lines are, yes, that could very easily be controlled and again it's the timing issue. If it is as the Airport Director says within the next one to two months there should be no problems in the site plan review process because it's likely any development coming in in that newly rezoned area would not come in for three to four months to the Planning Board.

Alderman Girard stated I have a question about this and it ties into a question I have about Item V. It seems, Mr. MacKenzie, I had a chance to take a look at the City's Master Plan today and I took a look at the map of the proposed City Zoning Ordinance...the new Ordinance and it would appear, at least, at my looking at the colors and the lines and everything else that this policy is inconsistent both with the Master Plan and with the proposed Zoning Ordinance which if I'm looking at the maps correctly remain industrial zones. So, I guess the question I would have to you as the Planning Director is that inasmuch as this policy seems to conflict with both those documents how can you recommend to this Board that we make a policy statement of this kind.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I think it's fairly clear if you read the Ordinance there is an entire section on how to handle growth in the South Willow Street area and that identifies the key provisions that the Board should look at when it goes to rezone areas to commercial and it anticipates that rezoning will occur just because of the tremendous pressures to retail growth in South Willow Street. It says that the Board should be careful about expansion of traffic into adjacent residential areas and that was discussed to some extent although, frankly, this is one of the areas that is relatively far from any residential impact. The second was traffic impact and the Committee did discuss that they recognize that the developments that come in should be paying their fair and proportionate share. If the community has costs associated with widening roadways or putting in signals that the developers that come in should be paying that and that is most equitably done at the Planning Board level because you know specifically what the project is and the traffic impact. And, the third is that in defining these policies that it is best to have the Board define ultimate boundaries or boundaries that will remain relatively stable for a number of years; that that boundary should be defined either by the Board or the Planning Board so that there is some consistency, some recognition by developers that they cannot go past that line. So, whereas the map still defines the line relatively closely at Cohas Brook and it would be good if the Planning Board ultimately went back and made an amendment to the Master Plan to reflect that, I think the language and the text of the Master Plan recognized the likelihood of rezonings and I think the process and the evaluation criteria in the Master Plan have been followed.

Alderman Girard stated, Mr. MacKenzie, I am somewhat familiar with the language that you are referring to, but in the end the infinite wisdom of those who developed and adopted the Master Plan identified the area that we're talking about as one that should remain industrially-zoned. So, while there is language in the Master Plan that deals with rezonings it still conflicts with the recommendation of the Master Plan and just as an additional comment, I don't see how allowing additional commercial/retail development down that end of town is going to...regardless of what developers do with roadway improvements and light and things like that, I don't see how that's going to, in any way, alleviate the traffic pressure down on that end, in fact, I think it is going to put more pressure on that whole area of town. This is a fairly significant parcel of land.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the total acreage is fairly significant, but if you look at the developable area it's relatively small. Two of the parcels are interestingly already commercial and one of those was actually determined in a court case that even though it was zoned industrial that the City in an overturning of an application for commercial use there was in error. So, the court has recognized at least one of these sites is more suitable for commercial than industrial and for a number of reasons in that particular court case. But, I think the process has been laid out, the Master Plan was adopted in 1993, that was six years ago. It recognized that while you have to make certain boundaries or growth boundaries for commercial that ultimately those will change over time and the best way to change is through a fairly logical process in trying to meet the criteria that were established then and I believe if you look at what the City has done on South Willow Street, the City has done a fairly reasonable job of keeping adequate capacity while still allowing some reasonable growth. The capacity on South Willow Street is actually better than it was ten years ago, there's been several projects including the Mall of NH project that has added

considerable capacity to South Willow Street. So, the combination of improvements on South Willow...if you go down on a weekend it's frankly easier to get through South Willow Street now than it was ten years ago. The City has done a pretty good job of monitoring growth in that area and at the same time providing additional capacity.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept, receive, and adopt the report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Shea duly recorded in opposition.

**V. A Report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance Amendment:**

"Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the B-2 (General Business) zoning district along South Willow Street to include land identified as TM854-Lot 1, TM854-Lot 2, TM845-Lot 1, TM845-Lot 1A, and TM852-Lot 1 currently zoned I-1 (Airport Industrial) and I-2 (General Industrial) and having a total area of approximately 33 acres."

ought to pass.

Alderman Shea stated Item V has to do with the same topic really. At the Committee on Bills on Second Reading, I opposed this Ordinance for several reasons including the fact that personally I am not familiar with the Airport Master Plan, so I would like to learn how much land area they have acquired and how much they intend to acquire to accomplish their goals. Does the Airport Authority have an I-1 airport zoning acreage, is the Airport Authority considering any additional land expansion and, if so, where and when. Other reasons that I oppose this as I mentioned at the meeting was I have concerns about the long-term impact of traffic as brought out by Alderman Girard relating to commercially-developed properties without knowing the intent of this site. In other words, they did not file a site plan with the City, they did with the State, but not with the City. So, we really don't know what they intend to do with that property. I have concerns relating to the City's financial responsibilities when commercial developments require sewage because of wetlands at this particular site and 20 percent of the road construction costs are incurred by the City with 80 percent by the State. I also have concerns as Alderman Clancy brought out regarding the limited industrial areas that we have within the City and as City Planner MacKenzie brought out, the fact that when you have commercial property you can utilize the entire density of that particular property and you can utilize it to the point where you can have either two stories or four stories and I think you brought that out concerning the height, Mr. MacKenzie. So, these were the concerns that I expressed at the Bills on Second Reading, your Honor. So, basically, I wanted that to be filed as a minority report to the Board here.

Alderman Wihby moved to accept, receive, and adopt the second report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Clancy, Shea and Girard duly recorded in opposition.

- W.** A report of the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance recommending that a request from the Airport Director to upgrade a Financial Analyst I (Grade 19) position to Business Service Officer (Grade 22) be granted and approved.

Alderman Shea stated Item W had to do with the upgrading of the Financial Analyst grade from a 19 to a Business Service Officer Grade 21 and by a telephone poll I oppose this because I believe that we did not follow established procedural steps. My understanding, your Honor, was that a department head is supposed to make a presentation in front of the Appeals Board if the classification is to be followed from the Yarger Decker Study...this follows then a recommendation from the Human Resources/Insurance Committee along with the Human Resources Director's approval or disapproval and this, your Honor, was not followed. In other words, there was a telephone poll, there was no literature sent, the literature followed the next day and, therefore, I felt that we didn't follow any kind of procedure, so that is why I voted no.

Mayor Wieczorek asked, Mr. Hobson, do you have any comment regarding Alderman Shea's remarks.

Mr. Hobson stated it is my understanding that the appeals process officially ended on June 30th and will take up items again in January of 2000, but between July 1 and December 31 the group that is reviewing appeals related to Yarger Decker are the Human Resources/Insurance Committee and the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen. So, I believe that we were following the appropriate instructions at this time.

Alderman Shea stated when we had our meeting in August there were several department heads here presenting their appeals and to my knowledge they seemingly went through an appeals board whether it was determined that...I was not aware that the appeals board had terminated their responsibilities. I know that there is a proposal by Mr. Fred Rusczek who is head of the QM Committee to broaden the QM Committee so as to include other people other than department heads as well as two Aldermanic representatives and, I believe, Mr. Hobson. But, I wasn't aware that the Appeals Board or Committee was disbanded. So, that's news to me.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Board of Mayor and Aldermen actually through a committee report did, in fact, extend the Appeals Committee through June 30th, so that technically the Appeals Committee had dissolved as of that point in time. And, all appeals since then have been heard by the Human Resources/Insurance Committee. In the case of Item W the Clerk's Office received a request from the Human Resources Director to poll the Committee on Human Resources. We were informed that the information had been forwarded by their office directly to the Aldermen, we waited a day and polled at his request and that is the result of the report in front of you. So, I guess procedurally I would have to say that it did follow procedure to the extent that polls are conducted of committees on occasion. Sometimes, the Aldermen aren't comfortable with that and request that it be brought before a meeting and if the votes go that way that is generally what happens.

Alderman Shea stated we did not receive the information until after the poll was taken.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I'm understanding that from you today, we did not forward it from the Clerk's Office, it was forwarded by Human Resources. So, I apologize that maybe we should have waited an extra day, but we thought you had it.

Alderman Wihby asked is this because this person is taking on added responsibilities, is that why we're upgrading this position.

Mr. Hobson replied yes.

Alderman Sysyn asked is Mr. Dillon here, maybe he could tell us.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't disagree with Alderman Shea that we do try to have a process. I think what caused this to move very quickly is the fact that Ms. Carson resigned and they wanted to be able to post this at the new grade and my understanding was that it is consistent with other positions and other departments, so that's why I voted in favor of it. I do agree with Alderman Shea that we generally have a process, but I think this was a unique situation and he is correct that the poll was taken before we even had the letter.

Alderman Sysyn stated my vote wasn't taken until after I got the letter. I guess they couldn't reach me until Monday, but if Mr. Dillon is here maybe he could explain why he wanted this upgrade.

Mr. Dillon stated currently the incumbent in the position, Tammy Carson has indicated a desire to resign effective October 15th. So, we have a very short period in which to fill the job. At this time, based on the analysis that I've done in the needs of the financial unit based on the growth of the Airport that's occurred over the past few years and based on the fact that I'm looking to have the job get involved in more complex financial analysis as the Airport continues to grow, I do believe it warrants the upgrade.

Alderman Sysyn stated the Police Department has a Business Officer and so doesn't the Fire Department.

Mr. Dillon interjected the creation of this position would be consistent with what you would find in the other departments as a Business Service Officer.

Alderman Wihby asked it says that you're posting within and you plan on filling from within, is that true.

Mr. Dillon replied that is correct.

Alderman Wihby asked what was the big rush if you had someone there already that could have done the job.

Mr. Dillon stated when I say "within" we're looking to target an existing City employee, the person does not work for the Airport.

Alderman Shea stated, Director Dillon, I want you to know that it's the procedure that I objected to. In other words, not necessarily the upgrading if it can be justified. So, I want that to be known. But, the point of the matter is that I'm the type like "doubting Thomas", okay.

Alderman Girard stated I guess the concern I have with this is that it seems that since approving the Yarger Decker Study back in January that we probably have changed more things than we've kept the same and I worry that we're returning to the days of spot reclassifications here, there and everywhere else. I understand what Director Dillon is saying but it wasn't all that long ago that this position's role was determined, so procedurally I have a problem with this.

Alderman Cashin stated I had the same concern and I just spoke to Mark and he tells me that this does fit into the Yarger Decker Study, so it's not doing anything to the Yarger Decker Study, it's within the parameters.

Alderman Girard stated I would then like to ask the Human Resources Director then that if this fits into the parameters of Yarger Decker why didn't Yarger Decker recommend that this position be upgraded to a Business Service Officer when the study was done. If I understand correctly they thought the position at the time only warranted Financial Analyst I status.

Mr. Hobson stated actually the employee did request in her documentation that the position be graded at a Business Service Officer and the former Airport Director did not agree with the employee. Yarger Decker, after studying it, said that some small changes to the position could certainly make it become more of a Business Services Officer position which is in Police, Fire, Parks and Public Works and Director Dillon has made those changes. In fact, the outgoing employee helped him craft some of those changes and agreed with the recommendations and so that is why we brought it and I do apologize if some members of the Committee didn't receive the documentation in time before the phone poll was made. I'm sorry if that took place.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept, received and adopt the report of the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

6. Mayor Wieczorek made the following nominations:

**Heritage Commission:**

Walter Milne to fill a vacancy, term to expire January 1, 2000.

**Planning Board:**

Thomas B. Getz to fill a vacancy, term to expire May 1, 2002.

**Board of Recount:**

Paul Alfano to succeed himself, term to expire October 1, 2001.

John Durkin to succeed himself, term to expire October 1, 2001.

Under the rules, Mayor Wieczorek advised the nominations would layover to the next meeting.

Mayor Wieczorek (per Charter Section 5.25) appointed Alderman William P. Shea to succeed Alderman Timothy Reiniger as a member of the Board of Recount, term to expire October 1, 2001.

Mayor Wieczorek advised of the creation of the Mayor's Special Senior Center Study Committee to work with City staff on this project, such individuals to serve being:

Alderman William Shea, Chairman  
Ira "Jack" Royer, Elderly Services Commission  
Irene Robie, Citizen Representative  
Penny Sconsa, Citizen Representative  
Bob MacKenzie, Planning & Community Development Director  
Barbara Vigneault, Elderly Services Director

Alderman Girard asked, Mayor, is it your intent on establishing this Committee to not consider the old Police station as a site for the Senior Center.

Mayor Wieczorek replied I'm assuming that when the feasibility study is conducted it will be looking at every available option.

Alderman Girard stated the reason I ask, your Honor, is that the majority of the Committee members that you have appointed here do not support rehabilitation of the old Police station to be used as a Senior Center, so I guess I'm asking is it a foregone conclusion that the Elderly Services Center will not be part of the old Police station.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I would not want to jump to a conclusion, Alderman, because whatever recommendation comes from that Committee will have to come before this Board, so this Board will have the final vote on what is going to happen.

Alderman Girard stated the proposal to build a new Police station, as you know, was predicated in part on moving various departments into the old Police station...that was a proposal that you (Mayor) and Alderman Wihby made. Since the votes on building a new Police station were predicated on that is it still your intent to have a Senior Center built into the old Police station.

Mayor Wieczorek stated let me repeat what I said which is the Committee that I have now appointed will work with the group that is going to be doing the feasibility study, will recommend the option or will recommend an option or options to the Committee, the Committee will make that recommendation to this Board, this Board then will make the final decision.

Alderman Shea stated I want to assure Alderman Girard that we'll be as objective as is humanly possible, your Honor, in terms of that.

7. Confirmation of the nomination of Henry F. Bourgeois to succeed Catherine A. Schneiderat as a member of the Highway Commission, term to expire January 15, 2002.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Henry F. Bourgeois to succeed Catherine A. Schneiderat as a member of the Highway Commission, term to expire January 15, 2002.

8. Confirmation of nominations to the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Commission as follows:  
Howard Keegan to succeed himself, term to expire July 7, 2002; and  
William Allen to succeed himself, term to expire July 7, 2002.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to confirm the nominations to the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department as presented.

9. Presentation on the final draft of the Riverwalk Master Plan by the Director of Planning.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am going to turn over the presentation. You may remember the presenting crew...I'm going to start with Tom Sommers of CLD and they're going to provide the final presentation on the Master Plan for The Riverwalk.

Mr. Sommers stated for the record my name is Tom Sommers, I am a partner with the firm of CLD Engineers, we're the prime consultant and with me tonight is Jim Prost from VBPA, economic consultants and also with us is Hank Alinger, Consultant who is the Project Manager for LDR who are Land Planning Consultants. Also on this project who is not here tonight is Lee Berard of Berard Martel...they were the Architects on this project. Tonight we'd like to do a short presentation, slide show of the final Master Plan that we have. In front of you, you will see the Master Plan at each of your desks in three sections beginning with Section Two, then One, and then Three. Section Two is the "meat and potatoes" of the Project, it's the color version of the plan. I kind of like it because it has few words and what I'm hoping is that if you are anything like me and get sick of reading a lot that you'll be able to go through this and get a visual impact of what we're trying to propose and what we are recommending to propose. Section Two is the reasons and the justification for it happening and that is the economic development and strategic plan and Section Three is the part that nobody likes to hear about and that's the cost. So, without further adieu I'm going to ask Hank to go through a slide show, then Jim will do a short presentation on the economic development and I'll finish up with a brief presentation on the cost.

Mr. Alinger stated I'm pleased to be here to talk about a subject that we're very enthusiastic about and we hope you're equally enthusiastic about and that is the Riverwalk and the Riverfront. Obviously, a very important part of the fabric of Manchester and I've been asked to

be brief tonight and I will be, but we'd like to just highlight a few key points from our study and from the work that's been done over the past six months, as you know, has included a couple of public workshops, a lot of work with our committee, the Riverfront team, and there's been a very productive kind of process to get at what are the key ingredients for the Riverfront and key proposals for you all to move forward with an implementation. I'd like to start out talking about the district you will all remember we highlighted the five key districts and the Riverfront and I'll start talking about the west side. You'll remember we identified the west side very early on as a very key linkage into the overall Riverfront. The focus being living and recreation, looking at the neighborhoods and one of the key ingredients on the west side is the pedestrian bridge, the old rail bridge and making that linkage over to the east side and the Downtown and tying in the neighborhood. Here is a neighborhood plan we looked at that pulled in some of the key components which again as sort of a mini-park could be developed here at the trailhead, the Piscataquog Trail which is underway...looking at linkages such as Sweeney Park, potential expansion of Bass Island Park, improvements to Second Street...to look at how this all knits in and really creates this important linkage over to the other side of the river. The bridge as we've talked about we see as a real key gateway to the City and we feel like it's very fundamental to this whole project, it's obviously very highly visible and it will become a welcoming gesture to the City. We look at some of the details and again some concepts and these are just a series of photos that start to get at some of the things that could happen in this area. Again, improvements for this mini-park at the Trailhead, the idea of possibly some picnic areas, maybe some play spaces, and again these shots just show a variety of the kinds of conditions that we envision for this side of the river. Again, the idea of a gateway statement, playground spaces. The southside...the focus again being active recreation, obviously, building on the Singer Family Field, building on the whole area, looking at what other recreation amenities are potential in this area, really the key. You'll recall we developed a series of plans basically focusing on Singer Family Park and again there are sort of short-term and long-term initiatives looking at creating a terminus to Commercial Street, new parking opportunities, the opportunity to multi-purpose kind of playing fields in conjunction with a park, concessions and other amenities, connections to the bridge and obviously the Riverwalk itself. We looked at alternatives that looked at sort of stepping up the impacts in this whole area and looked at increasing the program...what happens perhaps if a minor league stadium could come into play and a minor league team could be brought to bear in Manchester...how would that work in this kind of site plan and start to rely on more offsite parking, more structured parking and you start to tie these things together again with parking opportunities at this end, but it looks at how this could work as a longer term kind of opportunity. Moving further south we looked at the linkages down to Sundial Avenue, the possibility of creating an access road which would, in fact, work all the way down to Sundial. We think this would have the potential of not only recreation but, in fact, a private development benefit and we've identified two different sites here that could be like an executive inn/hotel type facility, we've also got a potential development site here, so in fact we can bring economic development to this area as well as recreation. Again, some of the details that we're looking at in Phase I and I don't know if you have all been out there recently, but of course, it's well underway and this just starts to show some of the details in terms of lighting, some of the paving materials, and some of the other kinds of special features

that we're considering and working on for that area. Again, retaining walls, plantings, looking at a kiosk, working with the arts groups in Manchester to really provide a detailed and interest in this first phase of the project. Granite Street is really key. As you all know it is a major gateway, it really is the entrance to the Downtown, connection to Elm Street, has a lot of good things going for it, but we think it is something that can be built on. Again, the focus we identified in this entire gateway was retail, entertainment and tourism...three key words, we think, are important for this part of the Downtown. As you can see Granite Street is a focus as you all well know. We looked at opportunities for additional development in this area and in conjunction with parking opportunities and parking in this area is key in terms of maximizing the development potential.

Alderman Thibault asked have you taken any consideration at all as to what the impact might be with the widening of the Granite Street Bridge or the proposed widening of the bridge now and the turnpike on and off ramp and all of that.

Mr. Alinger replied yes, we have looked at that conceptually and we have factored that in; that is what shows up on our underlying plans and so we know that's coming forward, it's an excellent point. The Riverwalk...the continuity of that is key in this area, upgrading some of these spaces is also important and in conjunction with some other opportunities. Again, in terms of a long-term viewpoint we've looked at opportunities for possibly a hotel, also on a site like this again it's a gateway site and we'd like you all to think of it as a gateway site as well as this corner where we suggested that possibly something like a performing arts center ultimately could be considered. On this corner we looked at a possible visitor center, and additional parking in this area again trying to maximize the impact of Granite Street coming into town. This shows some of the details at the Gateway buildings...again, looking at how parking could be improved, connections...this is back to the Pandora building, here's Gateway 1 & 2 with these improved spaces and then just ideas for what those spaces could look like and here is an artist's sketch that we developed for one of these spaces. Again, this is where a building has been recently removed...looking at how we create these public/private transitions to the waterfront. Again, in concept, in cross section we're doing things like working with natural vegetation as you all know from Jillian's we have trees and obviously the riverfront mills and looking at how we can integrate the Riverwalk with the architecture, with the environment to really create a very unique environment and again the Riverwalk is going to transition from district-to-district where it goes from a natural character to a more built kind of character and again we reinforce the themes of each of these districts. This sketch is obviously from the Granite Street Bridge looking back at Jillians, improvements to Loeb Plaza, and it shows how the Riverwalk could work in this area and back to this gateway site. Arms Park also has unique opportunities, obviously working as kind of a nature theme for this area, we have a lot of employment in Arms Park, we obviously have UNH as a major stakeholder and major anchor in this area. In looking at the site plan and the opportunities...one of the things we identified very early and talked with some of the stakeholders about was how do we make Arms Park more of a destination, more of a real greenspace, more of a real park and we know in order to do that we have to create additional opportunities for parking and so we looked at how parking and development could

work together in an area like this and we've shown a development opportunity right here in conjunction with an integral parking deck, with another parking deck here that starts to feed this entire area, we've shown how circulation can continue to work through here, but how we really frame this space is a real focal point for Manchester on the river. This sketch shows what that could look like...again, just enhancing what exists today, but with the potential to develop kind of a major private development opportunity that, in fact, could be done by UNH or could be a combination of UNH and other private folks that could work together to create a major anchor here in this space. Other kinds of Riverwalk enhancements we looked at and in some cases, of course, we have existing Riverwalk that could be enhanced...this is behind the 540 Commercial building looking at how we can buffer parking and service uses that we know we have to maintain in some of these areas, but yet make the Riverwalk a more inviting kind of experience. And, again, this is just a series of images that starts to get at what some of these spaces could be like...the idea of creating these canals and special kinds of spaces at this whole Arms Park focus. This shows how details and paving and walkways can really be designed to really make the Riverwalk a very exciting kind of place and really building cost effectively already on what you have by adding landscaping and other details in important areas. Amoskeag Falls was the northern most area that we looked at. Again, we've got major users in the form of PSNH, we have natural assets including the dam, the falls, and the islands and how do we build on all of those. We thought residential was one key use for this whole district to look at and in the plans, in fact, we know that the owners of the Jefferson Mills building are looking at how residential can work in that building and we thought there might even be other additional opportunities long-term for maybe other residential as well as parking. Again, trying to create parking resources we think at the north and south ends and also maybe there's a satellite bus shuttle system or something...that parking is really important to this area looking at how we create these decks where you really just have two levels of parking and you're working off grade so it's a very cost-effective kind of way to bring in much additional parking. Also, the idea of continuing the Riverwalk, taking advantage of the canal. Obviously, the other potential idea is whether or not we can get access to the islands and set those up as more of an environmental education kind of resource.

Mr. Sommers stated one comment on this. In addition, we have also discussed the idea of a potential boat launch or marina up at the upper end of the dam where boats usually use the river for recreation where it's damned up and the potential for a pedestrian footbridge in that area coming over to the Fishways. Those are really kind of long-term ideas that also have been promoted and not shown in this plan, I just wanted to note that.

Mr. Alinger stated this just highlights the potential to enhance the environment and to really play on the environmental education aspects of this zone; that Riverfront development can really be two-sided and not only address the street, but address the river. So, we really need to think how these mill buildings really can have their fronts not only on the Commercial Street side, but on the water side, but this kind of example could work very well we feel in Manchester. At this point, we'd like to turn the presentation over to Jim Prost to talk about economic development.

Mr. Prost stated I'd just like to briefly talk about some of the economic development and strategic planning issues, what some of our findings are, the implications of putting the Riverwalk and integrating the Riverwalk and the Riverfront and some of the implementation strategies. Our key findings are from other locations is really the need to integrate the Riverwalk with redevelopment to create the synergy, to create extra value, to provide adequate parking, and to make sure that there is a true mixed use opportunity along the Riverfront. This can really enhance the pace of development, it creates a mix of development which reinforces the markets it would serve. From experience in other locations in other cities a significant increase in existing property values and encouraging additional development of a higher value which translates into additional tax revenues and additional revenues for the Central Business Service District. In looking at some of the potential increase we would see a potential within the whole Mill District and along the whole Riverfront and Elm Street of upwards of \$200 million of development occurring really depending on whether the orientation were more to office, residential or a mixed use. The real implications here are not just dollars but also the quality of life and the image of Manchester, the creation of a 24-hour 7 day-a-week City and the attraction as I heard mentioned earlier, a desire for higher wage jobs by creating new office, industrial, high-tech opportunity and also encouraging housing in making it a true mixed-use Downtown. In putting together an implementation strategy, how you would implement, maintain and manage it we think it's important that there is a dedicated entity that is focused on a single purpose of managing both the process for developing and the on-going management of the Riverfront area. It's important that adequate funds be provided to make sure that proper maintenance of such a facility happens over time and it has to be related to critical programming and development which can result in business expansion and business recruitment. The funding approach is a combination of the public and private sector. As I mentioned before we see upwards of \$200 million ultimately of private development, we see the opportunities for significant outside grant funds. There would be significant incremental local revenues in terms of tax revenues from the additional development and the value of that development. We also see very much opportunities for self-funding of events to have activity fees and user fees help pay for the maintenance and operation of the facility, we see opportunities for land lease and sales revenues...I'm working on a similar project in Kansas City along Brush Creek and we have, right now, two major proposals for restaurants and one for an ice rink where if somebody wants to build it with private money and actually pay land lease money to the City Park and Recreation Department for this ice rink and also the provision of in-kind services. So, significant opportunities.

What are the next steps...it's really to move forward with the management entity. It's to continue the detail design beyond the initial phases which are moving forward now, it's to coordinate the construction with the management entity and to move forward with other implementation activities which are marketing and public relations. The whole programming of events that this really becomes the City's new front door and coordinate with both existing property owners such as already has taken place and attracting new development into the Riverfront and along the Riverwalk so we can all have a Riverwalk we can all be very, very proud of.

Mr. Sommers stated the final piece of this is Section Three which is the Cost Analysis. I'm not going to go through this in detail, but I would refer you to page 3 of that analysis which is the summary. In that analysis, you will note that we have 12 construction phases as they are listed here. Section 1(a) through VII, but since some of them are broken up there are actually 12 construction phases, total of those. Please remember that this is the cost for the Riverwalk and the amenities immediately adjacent to it. It is not the parking garages, it is not all of the other development that may occur with both public and private funds as a result of this. It is the immediate, the base project cost; that is the cost that we feel it will take to construct this in a way that is functional and operational and looks nice is between \$10.2 to \$12.9 million; that is from the original discussion that we had with you, I believe we talked about \$7 million. Why has that changed, that has changed because (1) we have now done a very detailed analysis, we have brought in a land planning group that has seen how to make these successful and we have taken their advice and we have looked at this from a point of view of local versus how to make this compete with other small cities in this nation and this is the result of that recommendation and of that analysis. Our cost analysis and you can all go through this is quite detailed in here. We show a range because there is always a range of what things cost depending on what type of product you use and what the economy is. Also, part of this increase has occurred because the original project was estimated in 1997 dollars, this is in 1999 dollars and there's been a significant change in construction since then. There are a number beyond the base cost a number of additional amenities that could be included. Some of those may be done with private funds, some may be public funds, some may be proposed by other organizations and groups. All of these things could happen, but what we're expecting with this Riverwalk is that this will be a catalyst for the Millyard, for Downtown, for connection between the west side and the east side through the railroad bridge and to provide a public amenity for this City that it could be proud of. Not just, if you live Downtown but something that makes you want to come down on a Saturday afternoon because you have access to the water because it's a nice place to be because you can come down and get an ice cream because there are things to do and it makes that feel of the City feel cohesive and that's what this project is really about. This is a public project that we feel is for everyone. I personally, I guess I've never been as committed to a project to see it happen as I have with this one and it's hard from my point of view knowing what I know to always be I guess "objective" about it. With that, honor Mayor and Aldermen, thank you.

Mayor Wiczorek stated thank you very much, Tom and group for your presentation. Are there any questions from the Aldermen.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we need to just formally accept this.

Mayor Wiczorek replied I don't believe we do, no.

Alderman Girard stated I do have a question. The questions are on the management entity. How much are we proposing to spend on a management entity and where would these funds be coming from.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Special Committee had established an upside limit or maximum amount to create an entity for the development portion. Now, that would not be the long-term operational management organization that would run this. We still have to identify the way to fund that long-term organization. But, the Committee had set an upside of \$200,000 for a development management entity. Now, that would take care of several things. That would take care of the construction administration and oversight which would be the contracting, the bidding, the making sure that the project's done correctly. It would include the business development packeting which would be in essence in identifying which buildings might be suitable for what type of businesses and then going out and marketing, finding those firms, preparing development packages, helping them through the development regulations. In essence, what a mall manager might do. Selecting the right businesses to put in the right locations to make it successful and that particular part does take quite a bit of expertise to do correctly. There is also the issue is of who the key person might be handling this information. There would be issues of grant writing, fund raising and raising private capital and administering these grant funds that we would get. There is also the issue of community involvement. There are a lot of groups that want to be involved in this from the public arts groups to groups like For Manchester and managing and including the public is an important part of this development entity. We presently have gone out for proposals and there are two proposing teams for this development entity presently. Those are being evaluated right now.

Alderman Girard stated, Mr. MacKenzie, if you said it and I'm sorry, but where are the funds coming from to pay for this outside management entity.

Mr. MacKenzie replied as with any bonded project there's money set aside to administer the construction and development of a project. Those monies, the \$200,000 would come out of the \$2.8 million of bond that's been designated for development of the project.

Alderman Girard stated that leads me to another question. Your Honor, when the Special Committee Mr. MacKenzie is referring to was established, I do not recall that this Board gave such a broad grant of authority as to allow them to go out and make decisions on what was going to happen on the Riverwalk or any Riverfront development without the approval of this Board. There's talk about an outside management agency, the allocation of funds towards an outside management agency and the role that such an agency would play. There was discussion last night about reallocating funds for the stage project at Singer Park, I think there are some decisions being made at the Committee level that best be made finally by this Board. I certainly don't have a problem with the Committee reviewing the situation, making recommendations and keeping this Board apprised of what's going on, but I don't think it was by design and perhaps as they've gotten into the process they've gotten caught up in it a bit, but I think they are acting with a degree of autonomy that was not intended and I think that any action that that Committee takes ought to be ratified by this Board, so that those of us who aren't on the Committee have an opportunity to know what's going on and participate in the decision-making process, they're operating like no other Committee operates on this Board.

Mr. MacKenzie replied in terms, I can't answer the question how the Board would like to provide public oversight of this project. Currently, the monies are allocated at the present time to our department, we're executing the project with assistance by both our Riverwalk team which includes many of the public officials that work on this type of project as well as oversight directly by this Committee. It's up to the Board how they would like to have public oversight, if they want direct involvement or if they want a specific committee that's up to the Board. I would note that I believe that the management entity in referring with the City Solicitor the creation of a management entity and the dollar limit was brought to the full Board.

Alderman Girard stated yes, but the talk of shifting funds within the allocated bond money, for example, to go from Riverwalk projects to the stage at Singer Park, an additional \$200,000 was mentioned. Does a change of that magnitude, in your opinion, warrant the approval of this Board. We make a separate appropriation for that stage.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would defer to the Board's discretion on this. If you give a project to the Highway Department for \$2 million you normally allow them to execute that project. If you want to have a special oversight committee over the Highway Department on the project you have done that in the past. So, clearly, if you want to have detailed oversight of a project I'd prefer not to have detailed oversight which is more micro-management, but if there's reasonable public oversight of a project I will do what the Board wishes.

Alderman Girard stated, Mr. MacKenzie, with all due respect, to say that it's a prerogative of this Board when there is no mechanism to advise this Board of what's taking place is a bit disingenuous and I as a member of the CIP Committee, for example, and I'm not aware that CIP can make the types of recommendations and changes to projects without the approval of this Board that this Committee has been making and CIP is where the lion's share of all of the other City projects go through. We make recommendations, any Committee of this Board makes recommendations to this Board for final approval and there are exceptions as you know for operational reasons, but this is a Special Committee and I'm not aware that this Committee was given the broad grant of authority that it is currently exercising and I've asked the Clerk for minutes of the meeting where it was established and I've received some of them, but there are other areas. But, I think until we know specifically what the parameters of this Committee are, it ought to be reporting its recommendations back to this Board so we as a Board, as the policy-makers of this City can participate in the direction of this project, your Honor. I was disturbed by what I saw at the Special Committee last night which is why I am bringing it up here because there's a lot going on there that unless you attend the meetings or you read all of the minutes of the meetings which is not possible for everybody here, you simply don't know and I don't think it's wise that any member of this Board on projects of such magnitude not by right of process know what's going on and have an opportunity to approve or disapprove and I support waterfront development. There should be no question of that, but what's happening down there is catching me and a lot of other people by surprise and I don't think it bodes well for the development activity we hope to see there.

Alderman O'Neil stated number one, Alderman Girard, why don't you give some credit to your fellow Aldermen and let them do a job and I think...I don't serve on every committee that this Board has, but I support the actions of those committees whether it's brought before this Board or not. So, I don't know where you're trying to go with that. Secondly, and I don't have the wording in front of me, I don't know if the Finance Officer does...the scope of the bond issue was broader than just the Riverwalk, it had to do with Millyard and Riverfront development. I think all the Committee is trying to do is keep this process going, there have been some issues that have come up. If it's the wishes of the Board to bring back all actions to the Board, that's fine. The Committee has not recommended spending any additional money, it's all within the scope of what has been passed by this Board. The RFP and that whole process came before this Board and was supported by this Board, so I don't know where you're going with your hand grenades.

Alderman Rivard stated after many months I finally agree with my colleague Rich Girard, I really believe that this thing is out-of-control, I am a strong supporter of the Riverwalk, but absolutely did not believe that this Committee...that my good friend Dan O'Neil is on is going in the right direction. We have a Civic Center Committee who is dealing with a lot of issues, but we don't make any decisions of this magnitude without coming back to the Board, the Board has the final word. So, I'm really concerned at the way they're proposing to spend this money without our concurrence, so I would really wish that we could give a directive this evening to that Committee that before they make any commitments that this Board put its stamp of approval on hiring management companies and spending money down at the Riverfront...it went from five or six million to possibly \$20 million, it's escalated considerably and I supported it when it was five or six, but I'm not sure at \$20 million how far we can go here. So, I don't believe that that Committee should be out-of-control. Sorry, Alderman, that's my personal opinion.

Alderman Thibault stated, Tom, I'd just like to ask you a question. The figures that you just gave before...\$11-12 million, is that what you said...does that include all of the monies that may come from the rights like on the bridges where you want to sell the rights and all of that.

Mr. Sommers replied that is a total cost via federal, local, private, whatever money that would participate in the Riverwalk.

Alderman Thibault asked what would be your best guess estimate as to what public money might be.

Mr. Sommers replied I do know that the City through the Planning Department going after (right now) in the neighborhood of \$4 million in grants. So, that gives you some sort of idea and I know they will go after others as they see them become available. So, that is targeted towards it. It would be hard for me to say with local, it's going to be up to you, but I can see myself, another couple of million being put into it and then expecting other federal money, state money and

private money. I think one of the biggest things that we talk about with the Planning Department is that bridge which is a key component to this in terms of bridging the east with the west and with making a statement for this whole thing and bringing developers in and money into the City is a key component that you could get private money invested to help pay for it. It won't be just private money because I know that the Planning Department has gone after what is called T21 money for it which used to be the ISTEA Program which is federal money and that's available. So, this is not just going to be City money and Bob is right in terms of the upset limit of around \$20 million in terms of a whole number of entities; that includes that idea of that pedestrian bridge going over to the Fishways; that includes a marina/dock boat at the upper part which are all add on pieces...

Alderman Thibault interjected some of that may not even happen.

Mr. Sommers stated which are not necessary to make this place work, but we're trying to put everything in there that we possibly thought could ever happen without prejudice as to where the funding is coming from.

Alderman Thibault stated I know that some of this might be phased in over the course of three, four, five, six years maybe ten.

Mr. Sommers stated some of these things may be phased in over the course of more than ten years.

Alderman Reiniger stated I can assure this Board that all matters involving money that the policy of this Committee recommends come back to this full Board to discuss and vote on the RFP's for the management entity. The Committee has only been meeting to talk about...to bounce off policy ideas of Bob MacKenzie with some of the specifics and just to monitor the process and I think a misperception was created earlier about the money for the stage...it was discussed in Committee, but there was no quorum, there were no votes taken at this Committee. Nothing was done about anything in terms of implementing money or spending money. This issue was brought up by Alderman O'Neil which is an issue that interests him, but the Committee did not vote, could not vote on this issue and if it were to take a vote it would be merely for a recommendation to the full Board. So, I can assure you that that is the way the Committee will continue to operate.

Alderman Girard stated I'd like to thank the Chairman of the Committee for making that clarification and I'm sorry that my colleague At-large views the concerns that have been expressed as either somehow lacking faith in my colleagues or throwing hand grenades, but there has obviously been a significant amount of change in this project and I think it's only appropriate that any changes of the magnitude that we're talking about considering how every other Committee in this City operates be brought back to this Board and Alderman Rivard made a motion to direct the Committee to report any recommendations to this Board for final approval

and if he'd like to keep that motion on the table, I will second it to ensure that what the Chairman has advised us happens.

Mayor Wieczorek stated let me have the Clerk address this issue.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk's understanding of the Special Committee on Riverfront Activities is that it is an advisory committee established by this Board. There were reports that have been provided to the Board in the past to establish various phases of the Riverfront, there was a bond authorization done, there was an authorization done to expend funds which outlined general parameters of the project. Traditionally, the way those matters are handled is the authorization authorizes a certain department or entity to expend funds be it Highway, Planning or whatever that's typical of the CIP project. In the instance of this particular project it is assigned to the Planning Department. The Planning Department is authorized by this Board to expend the funds within the project parameters that were outlined in the budget authorization. I have conferred with the Finance Officer on that matter, and he concurs that the procedures have been followed.

Alderman Rivard stated it's very unfair and I'll admit publicly that I made a mistake because I didn't know I voted for this if that's what I did and I'm anxious to see the minutes of the meeting where I did vote for this. The other side of the issue is that this \$200,000 is only the beginning from what I understand because there is a need for constant management and it could go as high as \$500,000 as an annual cost to do the management of this project, isn't that a possibility or hasn't that been discussed.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't believe I've discussed that, but yes it could run as high on a project of a \$10 million project, it could run as high as \$500,000, yes.

Alderman Rivard stated for permanent management that the Riverwalk is maintained up to somebody's standard and the flowers are the right flowers and it's swept and all those other good things, but I'm serious. The City of Manchester is losing control of the Riverwalk to these people you're considering hiring and I didn't realize that I voted for that. So, I made a big mistake, if I did. We need to reconsider.

Alderman Shea asked, Mr. MacKenzie, was your intention to hire one or the other firms and have them proceed with the work, is that what you intended to do.

Mr. MacKenzie replied it wasn't necessarily my intention, it was the recommendation of the consulting group that at some point we hire a separate management entity and the Special Committee felt that particular recommendation was important, so the Special Committee recommended that we move ahead fairly quickly to handle that. At some point, I believe, that we will need a special entity to handle that, I'm not sure how we got to the price level of \$200,000; that may have come out of the report perhaps by the consultants.

Alderman Shea stated the other concern that I have is that the Riverwalk, the Riverfront Foundation or the Singer Park is a private entity, a private non-profit entity and although they're doing great work I do have somewhat of a concern when we begin to appropriate money in order to subsidize certain programs that are going to be taking place down at the Singer Park. I think that we want to help people but when we begin to subsidize one particular entity a precedent is set and, therefore, it's difficult to refuse someone else. So, again, it's a very wonderful organization, however, I think that until we learn all of the facts and can objectively view all of the matters concerned and know exactly as Lou Costello used to say "who's on first and what's on second", we really don't know exactly how to make adequate decisions and I think oftentimes what happens is a decision is rendered without knowing about the implications of that decision and then obviously we then have to bear the brunt of what the community in turn feels about us as a Board, so I think that the discussions have been fruitful here although they tend to be lengthy. But, no one is picking on you, I think are just trying to get a full grasp of what's going on and I appreciate your efforts even though sometimes people find a little bit of fault with you.

Mr. MacKenzie asked, Mr. Mayor, could I just respond to one of the issues raised because there's a very important point there. One is and I've made it clear as late as today that money from this project cannot be used any way to subsidize activities at Singer Field. This is a bonded project, the money that's being used for this particular development entity is bond money, you cannot in any way use that money towards an operational long-term or otherwise and I think I made it pretty clear that money could not be used for Singer Field operations, maintenance, supervision. This is only money that can be used for oversight, supervision, administration and construction of the Riverwalk itself. I just want to make that clear. There can be no money used by the Riverfront Park officials where they'd be the one that was chosen for this entity, they could not use any of the money for the operation of Singer Field and I know Kevin Clougherty would agree with that.

Alderman Shea asked wasn't some money going to be appropriated for a stage at the Riverfront or am I mistaken there.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Special Committee has talked quite a bit about the stage. Originally, they asked us and apparently asked several groups to identify the cost associated with it. The Board, as you may remember, originally allocated \$800,000 to develop Singer Field. Even though it's a private entity it provides public services and there were, of course, a number of issues to work through on that particular project but the Board allocated \$800,000 of bond money to construct Singer Field. I think the intent here was to allocate monies in a similar vein towards a stage that could create the main venue for an outdoor performing arts area in Manchester.

Alderman Shea asked was that in the form of a loan or a grant or what...that money towards the stage.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I'm not sure if that has all been identified yet. The Committee has not acted on that final dollar amount, they discussed it at the Committee, but there was not a quorum at the last meeting.

Alderman Shea asked would that be a loan to the Singer group or would that be an outright gift or grant to them.

Mr. MacKenzie stated as I understand Singer Field, the field itself is City property, it's being operated and leased to a non-profit organization and the stage would be a City facility, operated by a non-profit organization.

Alderman Shea stated my question is if we gave them money for a stage would we give them money and they would pay it back in the form of the \$800,000 that they're paying back or would that be a grant or something that we would give them to improve the facility.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would perhaps defer to the Committee to answer that question.

Alderman O'Neil replied in my eyes, Bill, it would be the City would own the stage, it's not a grant, it's not a gift, it's a City facility at a City park.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I voted for Riverwalk. I think that the citizens of Manchester want a Riverwalk. I did not vote to give funds to Singer Park or Singer Field. If they want to come to the CIP Committee and request those funds they should do that just like other enterprises do. The Riverwalk money should stay with the Riverwalk, that stage is not part of the Riverwalk and it's kind of askew that the Riverwalk people are going to bid with you to manage the Riverwalk...the Singer Field people are going to bid to manage the Riverwalk and we're talking about giving them money at the same time for a stage, it just doesn't wash out too good, Bob. I don't like the sound of all this, I don't like what Alderman Girard brought up is a bigger thing...these two bids that you received, let them manage it but I don't see where we're going to give them money for Singer Park out of this project. No way.

Alderman Cashin stated, Bob, let's cut to the quick here. Have we hired a management firm.

Mr. MacKenzie replied no, we have not yet.

Alderman Cashin stated so there's no damages here right now, right.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't...I would want to perhaps confer with City Solicitor, I don't believe there's any damages at this point, no.

Mayor Wiczorek interjected he (City Solicitor) said no.

Alderman Cashin stated something of this magnitude to be discussed the way it's been discussed here tonight makes me a little concerned and moved we table this, your Honor, and get the Board and the Riverwalk Committee and these gentlemen together so that we might discuss this at length. We can't do that here this evening and I think all we're doing is muddying waters and we could jeopardize the whole project and I don't think anybody wants that to happen.

Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Clancy stated what I really don't understand...I voted for this myself, but if we don't have this management company as Tom Sommers said we're going to miss out on \$4 million worth of grants, is that right.

Mr. Sommers stated what I said is that the Planning Department, right now, has made application for grants to the federal and state governments worth over \$ 4million; that is separate from anything to do right now with a management entity. I would expect that if the management entity were brought in via public, private, quasi-public or whatever it is that one of the things they wanted to have that do is to write for future grants, but the two don't necessarily equate right now.

Mayor Wieczorek asked, Mr. MacKenzie, if they table this when are you going to deal with the issue.

Alderman Cashin interjected call a special meeting to talk about this one thing and not have an agenda in front of us.

Mayor Wieczorek replied I will call a special meeting.

Alderman Girard stated I do have one more question that has to do with the bid process and I would like to ask the questions before it gets put on the table, if I could. Mr. MacKenzie, was there a pre-qualification for this bid process.

Mr. MacKenzie replied no, there was not.

Alderman Girard stated you (Mr. MacKenzie) said the Committee decided to cap the amount spent at \$200,000, when did it decide to make that cap.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that was done prior to the provision coming to this Board.

Alderman Girard asked were the bidders aware of the cap.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes they were.

Alderman Girard stated then I don't know if you can answer this question, but how come one entity comes in at \$191,000 and another entity comes in at \$495,000...

Clarification was made that it was \$195,000.

Alderman Girard stated okay, I'm sorry I heard \$495,000.

Alderman Wihby asked if it was done before it came to this Board then why wasn't it on the agenda when it says picking somebody, why didn't it say it was under \$200,000.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it did, the report indicated not to exceed \$200,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated traditionally when we do schools or we do sewer projects we pay for these services, it's very focused for a sewer, a bridge, building construction of schools, fire stations...we paid for these administration services. I think this is a very unique project, therefore, we had construction portions, we had marketing portions, we had security, maintenance, etc. and I think to his credit Mr. MacKenzie tried to design an RFP to do and he did a fine job with it. This is no different. We could pay Tom Sommers to do this for us and it would be a new venture for him getting into marketing and other things. We pay CLD to do this on many of our construction projects. We pay other consultants to do that in many of our construction projects. This is not a new concept. All we're trying to do is get a bang for our buck here. It's a very unique project with many different goals. so, I take some exception when the Special Committee is trying to do something that's never been done. We do this all the time in the City of Manchester. We're going to build a fire station and there are going to be issues that come up during the construction, that doesn't get brought back to this Board, it's worked out by the Fire Department with their architect, they run into sewer problems everyday probably on our sewer projects and it's handled within the Highway Department. So, this is not unique and that's what I take exception to; that we try to create in spending money foolishly on this. We're trying to get the City the best bang for their buck. Thank you.

Mayor Wiczorek stated the motion to table is for further discussion and to Mr. MacKenzie that this would prevent you from moving...

Alderman Cashin interjected until we've had time to discuss it at length, so everybody's comfortable with it.

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

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

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

12. A Report of the Committee on Finance was presented, recommending that Resolution:

"Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Five Thousand Eight Hundred Dollars (\$5,800) from Contingency to Building-Special Projects ( Account #0300C10898)."

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

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

13. Communication from Mayor Wieczorek requesting that a plaque honoring former Alderman John G. Batalis be placed at the comfort station located at Elm and Merrimack Streets and seeking authorization that the Director of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery and the City Clerk craft appropriate wording for such plaque.

Alderman Reiniger moved to approve a plaque honoring former Alderman Batalis. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Wieczorek stated "JB" is at the Hanover Hill Nursing Home and he was very instrumental in making sure that that comfort station stayed open when he was on this Board. So, he certainly deserves that.

Alderman Thibault stated I went to see him at the nursing home about five months ago and he was really thrilled to see me, I hadn't seen him for a very long time and he's doing very well.

Alderman Sysyn stated someone from the west side came over to my cart today and wanted to know why the comfort stations weren't open during the day, are we manning those, are we keeping them open.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I just spoke to Mr. Ludwig last week on that particular issue and I guess this is something we're going to try to work out to see if we can keep that open for a longer period. So, I will bring the plaque over and show it to him before we put it on the comfort station.

Alderman Pariseau stated he probably could make it down there, your Honor, he could get out.

Alderman Cashin stated he was here at the grand opening of the Chambers.

Mayor Wieczorek stated okay, I see his sister periodically.

Alderman Cashin stated maybe you could dedicate it and have him there, I think that would be appropriate.

**14.** Notice of Reconsideration given by Alderman Girard relative to the vote taken on the acceptance of the Yarger Decker Study.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated I don't know if there was a second to the reconsideration notice, but that was put on the table first. I'm not going to go into great detail. I've already spoken to this study both in non-public and public session and as I said before there are some aspects of the study that I do like but as this thing has gone through the implementation stage and as things have come to light through the budget process such as automatic three percent so-called merit increases for 97% of the City's employees year-after-year, I was told by one individual that it's not every year for every employee it's only their first 11 years of employment that they get an automatic three percent raise. One of the problems that I have with the study, your Honor, is that the merit system to me if it's automatically giving 97% of the City employees a raise it's not a merit system, it's a step system and if it is to be a merit system then there ought to be different rewards given to the employees based on their performance and not just if they're doing okay they get three percent. We have to remember that in addition to the three percent that 97% of everybody is going to get every year for their first 11 years of employment. There are also cost-of-living increases being granted on top of that. So, this, I think has turned out to be something that I didn't anticipate it was going to be. A merit system to me is not giving those rewards and we have to remember that the potential for these so-called merit increases depending on where people are with their steps, where they are with their grades could be as high as 12% in some cases not counting the potential cost-of-living increases granted by this and future Boards. I don't find that to be a realistic proposal.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I think with a merit system it could be as low as zero.

Alderman Girard stated as I understand it and this is what went through the budget process, your Honor, if an employee gets a passing grade they get three percent. So, three percent of the City employees with get that zero that you talked about and that's for a failing grade. So, if they do okay they get three percent, if they do exceptional they get three percent and maybe more. But, 97% of everybody every year for the first 11 years is getting three percent. The other problem that I have with this study, frankly, is the way the appeals process has been handled, the way the recommendations of the Human Resources Director, in some cases, the Appeals Committee and other cases have been ignored. There are things that we have looked at in contract language that are not consistent with the study and for all the work that was done to bring some parity here, we had examples of it here tonight with the Airport...we're going to change the job description, we're going to give this person a little more to do so we can reclassify it and upgrade it, but we know who we want to hire for the job, so it leads me to wonder whether or not we're changing the job because we need to up the ante to get that particular person to come over. The way this whole thing has gone about, frankly, the extension of the appeals process...I just do not have any confidence in the integrity of the system and I was talking to the Human Resource Director and he is concerned that we are getting to a point (and I don't want to put words in his mouth

and if I do I'm sure he'll correct me) where the integrity of the system and the point of the reclassification altogether is becoming lost in the process. Now, I have some...just the merit system thing alone is something that causes me to reconsider this, but I have read the minutes of several of the meetings where these appeal hearings were held and I've got to tell you that's some pretty interesting reading and I don't know what to make out of any of it and I don't think...I know this is not what I thought...we've had several people admit their lack of knowledge on things when they're casting votes. I did not know that these were going to be the implementation costs and the practices and the impacts when I made the motion to adopt this back in January. In my opinion, that was a mistake and I'd like to see this...we haven't even approved the ordinances for the implementation of this yet, they're in Bills on Second Reading right now. But, we've gone about negotiating contracts and implementing this thing as if we've actually approved the ordinances. We've got the carts way ahead of the horses here...I'm not even sure the horses are on the horizon and I think that we ought to let the process catch up and all have a better idea of what's going on here before we go any further.

Alderman Shea stated I think one of the points that Alderman Girard hit upon is the merit rating. I think that for many years being in education it was difficult to evaluate properly people to receive merit rating and I think in discussing this previously I mentioned that because in essence who evaluates the evaluator...that's a difficult thing to do and, therefore, the standards that the evaluator brings to the evaluation is personal prejudices usually, favoritism at times, social interaction, and other things that may not be job related. The second point that concerns me is not so much as I mentioned before the first year of the study itself which again there are certain positive aspects, but how much is this going to cost down the road and Manchester is not a rich community. Manchester has people that are hard working taxpayers, but like I mentioned to you there are two things hanging there...I won't mention the first, but the second is the Yarger Decker Study and it is and I agree with Alderman Girard that it is out-of-control...that there are no limits to where it's going to go and that's where the difficulty rests. So, I concur with him that there should be a complete and total examination of this system by the members of the Board.

Alderman Girard stated another concern I have is that the Human Resources Committee asked the Human Resources Director to go ahead and start considering a reclassification of all of the City's department heads because market situations were changing and we needed to update that and I was late in looking at the draft that was produced and everybody's getting an upgrade. I did not realize that in adopting this reclassification study...it's been tabled at Committee, but that every couple of years we're going to go back and we're going to reevaluate everybody. We have a fluid situation here which if every time we run into a market situation we have to reevaluate it and push everybody upward in addition to the merit raises and in addition to the cost-of-living adjustments we're also going to give people upgrades. This thing is bleeding money hand over fist. A lot of stuff is frozen until January 2000 where the Committee is going to start up with appeals again. There are over 50 appeals that have been frozen for after January 1, 2000. Now, I don't know why they've been frozen until after January 1, 2000 and I don't know why they're not being dealt with within the timeframe that this Board first specified and

then agreed to extend for three months, but it seems that there is going to be no end to this and I don't think the study we adopted is the study we're going to end up with by the time the day is done.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the floor to receive and file. The motion carried with Aldermen Shea, Hirschmann and Girard duly recorded in opposition.

- 15.** Communication from the Deputy Finance Director requesting to discuss a request of the Police Department to accept a donations and remand for canine activities.

Mr. Clougherty stated all we're asking for is to have the funds received and remanded to the Police Department for use for the canines.

Alderman Pariseau asked are we looking to hire a new person to handle this dog.

Chief Driscoll replied no, Sir, it's to replace a dog.

Alderman Pinard moved to accept funds and remand for the purpose intended. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- 16.** Communication from the Public Works Director submitting a retirement request for Mr. Edward J. Syrek.

Alderman Clancy moved to accept and approve the retirement of Mr. Syrek as submitted.

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

- 17.** Communication from the Manchester Historic Association requesting a grant of \$5,000 from the City to partially fund a new exhibit entitled *Manchester: Work and Leisure in a Planned City*.

Mayor Wieczorek stated the funds would be coming out of Civic Contributions.

Mr. Clougherty indicated the funds would come from the Contingency account.

Alderman Thibault moved to approve a grant in the amount of \$5,000 as requested. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated I don't make it a habit, but I am going to oppose this request. I certainly don't have any problems with the Historic Association, but the City just gave them \$150,000 to do a handicapped accessibility ramp that they're building in the Millyard and I worry that we are going to be setting a precedent here where any civic organization that's got some project that has something to do with the City is going to come looking for five thousand here, two thousand there...we got away from doing this year's ago and I don't think this is good practice. I think by and large that the City has been very good to the Historic Association and I think this is beyond the top...they're going to hold it at the Airport, maybe they should ask the Airport for the funds

since they are going to host the actual exhibit, but I think we're setting a bad precedent here if we're going to do this.

Alderman Thibault stated as I understand it they've been given about \$5,000 a year for the past several years.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. Aldermen Clancy, Shea, Rivard, Pariseau, Girard and O'Neil being in opposition, the motion failed.

- 18.** Ratify and confirm agreement with the Manchester Association of Fire Supervisors and the Negotiations Committee of the Manchester Fire Department (City).

Alderman O'Neil moved to ratify and confirm the agreement with the Manchester Association of Fire Supervisors as presented September 22, 1999. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Cashin in reference to the clause we were talking about asked is it in this contract, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek replied the so-called "Driscoll amendment", yes. No, wait a minute, the Negotiator is saying no. I guess if somebody else got it...was that the thing.

Mr. Hodgen stated the Board may recall that I sent a memo to the Board members this weekend with a suggested motion which would address that and would clarify the fact that that so-called "Driscoll amendment" is included for the Fire District Chiefs. Either the Board could refer to my memorandum of October 1st or the Board could say that this does include the so-called "Colleen Driscoll amendment".

Alderman O'Neil interjected my motion was as worded by the Chief Negotiator in his memo or October 1st which I will give to the Clerk.

Deputy Clerk Johnson read the motion into the record: "that we ratify the Agreement with the District Chiefs in accordance with the Chief Negotiator's memorandum of September 3, 1999 and the associated cost calculations and that any District Chief who would have received a Decker merit or longevity step between July 1, 1999 and October 5, 1999 will be placed on the Decker pay matrix on the step that gives credit for said merit or longevity step; however District Chiefs who received merit or longevity steps during the said time period under their former Agreement shall not qualify and in no event shall there be any retroactive payments.

Alderman Girard asked does this amendment take place upon ratification or are the Firefighters going to have to wait for somebody else to settle a contract, there seems to be some confusion on that issue.

Mr. Hodgen replied I believe they will have to wait until somebody else settles their contract because it's conditional on at least one other union settling their contract.

Alderman Girard stated I am going to end up voting against the contract because they implement Yarger Decker, but I do not think it's fair to the firefighters who are here to settle their contract and have made efforts well above the other City unions to have to wait for somebody else to agree to the City's terms in order for them to get something that I think they should get now. It's not fair to penalize the firefighters for the inactivity or the lack of desire on behalf of the other City unions and they should get the "Driscoll amendment" upon passage.

Alderman Cashin stated we have two ratifications here tonight, right. One for the Supervisors and one for the Firefighters, wouldn't that put it into effect.

Mr. Hodgen replied I hate to be technical, but I don't believe so. The discussions at the end of the meeting at the last meeting were that the Firefighters, specifically, would receive it if some other union ratified that included the "Colleen Driscoll amendment" and both of these unions the Firefighters and the District Chiefs came in before any other unions successfully negotiated their contracts including that clause, so I think from a technical point of view that they can't bolster each other, it will take another union to put this into effect.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that is how I understood it.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that is not how I understood it.

Alderman Cashin stated may I refer my question to the City Solicitor. Aren't we talking about two different unions here.

Solicitor Clark replied you are talking about two different unions and if that's the Board's wish, it could apply that way.

Alderman Cashin stated if it's two different unions and we've got two requests...we approve one...we're dealing with two aren't we.

Mr. Hodgen stated yes, but it is the wish of the Board...the motion that I crafted I tried to be faithful to my understanding of the discussion at the end of the last meeting, I think it's obvious that the Board can vote as it pleases.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it is my recollection that the Firefighters did come in quickly to settle their contract prior to any of these other things like the "Colleen Driscoll amendment" being passed, but since they "in good faith" went ahead, I think my recollection is that we said to them that we will protect you in the event that somebody else is going to get it, so that you're not going to be penalized for being one of the first ones to settle; that is the way I understood it, is that correct.

Mr. Hodgen replied that is my understanding, Mayor.

Alderman Cashin asked isn't that what we're doing here tonight.

Mayor Wieczorek replied no.

Alderman Shea stated in order to clarify my position, I would like to treat the Firefighters and the Supervisors fairly. Not predicating their signing or their receiving the "Driscoll amendment" benefits. So, if there has to be an amendment to their contract I would like this amendment to their contract because I think that it is only fair that we treat all of them the same and I think that there was a misunderstanding because I think that in discussing the problem at the end of the session there were two schools of thought. One, was that they were included...the other that they weren't included and I think that in order to clarify that I think that I would want to vote to give them the benefit of that particular amendment because it's not going to be that much of a cost. In other words, it's only going to allow the people...when they sign the contract...if their anniversary occurred between July 1 and the signing of the contract...there would be no retroactive steps.

Alderman O'Neil stated my motion was that everybody be treated the same and we don't penalize those that missed between July 1 and the date of ratification. Whatever we need to do to word it to do that, all these other little curves in here...let's get it done and I believe that's the wishes of the Board.

Alderman Cashin stated, your Honor, I know you're a little bit upset here this evening...when we left the last meeting everybody understood what we wanted to try to do. Now, that should have been taken care of tonight and we should just be passing this, we shouldn't get into this discussion. This should have been taken care of and I don't know how you're going to do it, David, but I want it taken care of and I want it taken care of now.

Mr. Hodgen stated, Alderman (Cashin), there was confusion on the part of the City Clerk's Office after the end of the last meeting and they were not clear what the intent of the Board was and this motion is an attempt to clarify that. Now, if the Board wishes to grant that to the Firefighters and the District Chiefs tonight, I have not objection to that.

Alderman Cashin stated you know full well what we wanted to do, David. Number one, we called the meeting back in session and evidently we didn't have a roll call, so there was a problem with the City Clerk's Office, I understand that. But, everybody knew what we were trying to do and now here we are tonight debating the same damn question and I see no reason for it. Now, what do we have to do to rectify it and get it done, move it.

Mr. Hodgen replied either you can do it as I proposed or the Board can grant this amendment to the Firefighters and the District Chiefs irrespective of whether any other union settles its contract.

Alderman O'Neil interjected that's my motion, your Honor, that was my motion.

Mayor Wieczorek asked the Clerk has the motion, right.

Alderman O'Neil reiterated it has nothing to do with any other union.

Deputy Clerk Johnson read the motion as follows: it would be "that you ratify the agreement with the District Chiefs in accordance with the Chief Negotiator's memorandum of September 3, 1999 and the associated cost calculations and further that any District Chiefs who would have received a Decker merit or longevity step between July 1, 1999 and October 5, 1999 will be placed on the Decker pay matrix on the step that gives credit for said merit or longevity step; however District Chiefs who received merit or longevity steps during the said time period under their former Agreement shall not qualify and in no event shall there be any retroactive payments." What we have done in essence is remove the qualifier of any other union contract being settled.

Alderman O'Neil stated any other District Chief that should have got a step or a merit in that time will be granted to them, they will not be penalized.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied that is correct.

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

- 19.** Ratify and confirm agreement with the Manchester Professional Fire Fighters Association, Local 865 IAFF (Union) and the Negotiations Committee of the Manchester Fire Department (City).

Alderman Pinard moved to ratify the agreement with the District Chiefs in accordance with the Chief Negotiator's memorandum of September 3, 1999 and the associated cost calculations and further that any District Chiefs who would have received a Decker merit or longevity step between July 1, 1999 and October 5, 1999 will be placed on the Decker pay matrix on the step that gives credit for said merit or longevity step; however District Chiefs who received merit or longevity steps during the said time period under their former Agreement shall not qualify and in no event shall there be any retroactive payments.

Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Pariseau duly recorded as abstaining

Alderman Girard stated I've lost the battle on the Yarger Decker Study, the Board has decided to implement it, my vote against the Firefighters contract should not stand because I don't agree with Decker.

Alderman Sysyn stated I just wanted to publicly thank Chief Joseph Kane and all the firefighters for the wonderful job they did on East High Street they did this morning, they did a super job.

**20. Resolution:**

"Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Five Thousand Eight Hundred Dollars (\$5,800) from Contingency to Building-Special Projects (Account #0300C10898)."

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted that the Resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

**TABLED ITEM**

**21. Bond Resolution:**

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Six Hundred Sixty Thousand One Hundred Sixty-Eight Dollars (\$660,168) for the FY2--- School District Lease Programs (Portable classrooms at Hillside and Southside Middle Schools)".

(Tabled 9/7/99)

This item remained on the table.

**22. NEW BUSINESS**

A Report of the Committee on Community Improvement was presented recommending that a communication from the Health Officer seeking the Board's approval to enter into a three-year lease agreement with 795 Elm Street Realty Trust, Bernard Gasser, Trustee; and further to authorize a transfer of \$48,000 from Contingency to cover increased lease cost (estimated at \$18,000 for FY2000), computer and telephone rewiring (estimated at \$3,500), modular office work stations and office appurtenances (estimated at \$26,500) be referred to the full Board for discussion.

Alderman Wihby stated this is basically a transfer of \$48,000 from Contingency that I think everybody had a problem with, we understand that the Health Department needs the extra space and it's a 3-year lease that will probably go until the Police Department's old building is fixed up, but we had concerns with the \$48,000. First of all, we didn't know what was in Contingency and second of all it was a big amount, so I guess we brought it here this evening just to see if anybody was concerned with the amount or what anybody wanted to do. But, we did find out today that we have \$320,000 in Contingency.

Mayor Wiczorek asked is Fred here. Fred, what is the rent currently, annually and what is it going to be when you have the \$48,000.

Mr. Rusczek replied our current rent is about \$67,000. With some additional lease space and some reconfiguration of our space...we're building a new reception area, building a few

walls...the lease costs are estimated to increase by about \$23,000 per year. The cost for the remaining part of this year would be about \$18,000. The lease cost for the Health Department ranges per square foot...some of our space is more improved than other space...the most expensive space is about \$10.00/square foot. The blended cost, if you will, when you look at all of our space in the aggregate is about \$9.00/square foot which compares favorably with other places that we've looked at.

Mayor Wieczorek asked are there any escalators in there.

Mr. Rusczek replied there are no escalators.

Alderman Clancy asked, Fred, who is going to pay for the renovations.

Mr. Rusczek replied the cost of the renovations will be worked into that lease cost. If you recall, a report was submitted at the last meeting where a consultant, an architect Tom Wallace estimated that to upgrade the current Health Department space to appropriate office space would be about \$247,000 and to develop another Health Department office in a location we were looking at about \$361,000. What we did was take a look at those cost estimates and what was planned in terms of reconfiguring our space...we did that realizing that to spend that amount of money for three years is certainly not practical and we tried to pare down to what we really felt we needed at the minimum for security reasons and for function reasons within the Health Department and that's how we arrived at the work that we had come up with.

Alderman Shea moved to approve the transfer from Contingency as requested. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communication from the City Clerk's Office relative to legislative issues.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted that this communication had been submitted for informational purposes only.

Communication relative to the Rubenstein property.

Deputy Clerk Johnson asked that the communication relative to the Rubenstein property be referred to the Committee on CIP.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to refer the Rubenstein communication to the Committee on CIP.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it is my understanding that the CIP Committee will take the Rubenstein communication up at its next meeting and a report should come to the Board that evening which is why we're trying to make sure the Board has advance notice.

Alderman Wihby moved to set a public hearing on Monday, November 22, 1999 at 7:00 PM in the Aldermanic Chambers pursuant to RSA 498-A for the purpose of acquiring property generally located within the boundaries of Lake Avenue, Chestnut Street, Auburn Street, Willow Street, Cedar Street and Elm Street. The acquisition to occur by negotiation on eminent domain for the construction of a civic center. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby stated we don't know if this is necessary at this time or not, but we are setting the date. If it's not going to be necessary because we're not that far along we'll cancel it, if we are that far along we will continue with the public hearing; that the public hearing is to receive comments from the public also. So, it's not saying we're buying the property or anything but setting a public hearing just in case.

Alderman Shea replied I am in favor of a public hearing, I hope it doesn't last until after the New Year.

Alderman Clancy stated even though I am against the civic center, I'll go along with the public hearing, but overwhelmingly people are going to be coming down and saying they're against it; that is what I am hearing lately. In my ward they are, I'm just talking about my ward. I'm not talking about the whole City.

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

Communication from the Building Commission relative to property at 628 Hanover Street requesting an order for demolition as it has been condemned.

Alderman Sysyn moved to order demolition as requested by the Building Commissioner.

Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Pariseau stated the money will be coming out of that special fund right and asked what's wrong with the Bishop of Manchester, wasn't that owned by the Somascin Fathers who are under the Catholic Church.

Alderman Sysyn interjected it belongs to the City, we own it now, FDIC took it.

Alderman Pariseau stated it was sold from the Somascin Fathers to Real Gilbert.

Mayor Wieczorek read from the letter as follows: "the Tax Collector has taken the property for substantial unpaid taxes"...I'd say the City owns it.

Alderman Pariseau stated the Catholic Church had nothing to do with it.

Alderman Sysyn stated FDIC had it and the City couldn't touch it.

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

Alderman Shea stated one of the concerns that has been raised by many people in my ward and throughout the City particularly when I go shopping or marketing is the fact that Manchester is in dire need of another supermarket. I don't know, if I had a raise of hands as to how many people have said we need more marketing...people are going to Londonderry, Derry, they're going to Hooksett, they're going to Goffstown in order to do their shopping and I have spoken as Dan O'Neil has said, I had a casual conversation with Bob MacKenzie and also Jay Taylor and I would implore that they look into trying to entice people who are owners or supermarkets to possibly look into the community of Manchester to see whether or not we can induce some of these people to come in. I know that Alderman Wihby is already looking for meat in a new market, but the point of the matter is that we do need this because right now Shop 'N Save has been bought out from a company out of Atlanta, Georgia (Food Lion) and Food Lion was on *60 Minutes* and they were selling contaminated meats. So, basically there is a concern expressed by people, seriously, concerning the type of product that they will receive. For example, when Alexander's was local and then Shop 'N Save became regional, now we're going nationwide. So, I think it's important that we try to do that.

Alderman Wihby stated what Alderman Shea has said is true, I hear it all the time. But, what I'm hearing from developers is that there is nothing in the City, there's no land available that's zoned correctly in order to put these big markets that they want to put. Anybody is willing to come, I think you'll get tons of big chains willing to come, but the way our zoning it there's no place to put them and I understand that the ones have looked at the new Master Plan are saying the same thing...there's nothing in the new Master Plan.

Alderman Shea stated I'm not sure if there are areas in the City where discussions will be taking place that might be helpful, particularly for elderly citizens in the Downtown area.

Alderman Pariseau stated I have a question for Mr. MacKenzie. A while back DeMoulas' was looking at that property on Elm Street at Brown Avenue, the cutoff to Queen City Avenue. Have they pursued that any further.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I was aware of an interest, but I haven't heard any discussions or contacts perhaps in the last year.

Alderman Pariseau stated while I have the floor, I would like to send a message to that Special Committee you appointed on the Elderly Center that they look at this property at 628 Hanover Street. If the City now has ownership of that property, maybe we ought to look at it to see if it's feasible for the Elderly Center.

Alderman Sysyn stated they're taking it down.

Mayor Wieczorek asked, Leon, have you taken a look at that building. Is it so far gone...

Alderman Pariseau interjected I'm talking about the land.

Mayor Wieczorek stated the Special Committee is going to look at all of the options that are available.

Alderman Girard in reference to the supermarket issue asked was it Purity Supreme or Stop-N-Shop that was looking at coming to the City on Mammoth Road or something.

Mayor Wieczorek stated where Sundeen was.

Alderman Girard stated I take it after the reception they got at the Board of Aldermen they decided not to look at Manchester anymore, Mr. MacKenzie, you never hear anything else after that. The only reason I bring that up, your Honor, is any supermarket chain that saw what the local chains did and how the Board of Aldermen reacted at that time may have really been put off in coming to the City of Manchester, that was a pretty ugly scene.

Alderman Pinard stated to clear the air, the Candia Road proposal of a few weeks ago...I got myself in hot water because I guess the people don't understand what a proposal is. The developer and the real estate agent were proposing a senior citizens buildings of about five buildings with a grocery store, a major chain...name unknown. There was going to be a coffee house and a bank, senior meaning 55 years and over. If that failed the owners of the property (40 acres) are proposing a subdivision of some 200 single-family homes which could be an impact on our schools from 300 to 500 kids. A church has approached one of the owners, a non-profit organization. So, to clear the air the Candia Road Project is right now at a standstill because I haven't seen the developer or the real estate agent in over a month.

Alderman Girard moved to oppose State Representative Vaillancourt's legislative proposal. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Clancy and Shea duly recorded in opposition.

- 23.** Communication from Chief Driscoll requesting to enter into Non-Public Session for the purpose of discussing a site location for the new Police Headquarters.

Alderman Girard moved to enter non-public session under the provisions of 91-A:3II.d). Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Alderman Wihby, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Shea, Rivard, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann, Girard and O'Neil voted yea. Alderman Clancy voted nay. Alderman Klock was absent. The motion carried.

A non-public discussion was held with the architects. Discussion of possible costs through negotiation and strategy for various sites was discussed.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated that based on the discussion in non-public session the Board wishes to set an area bounded generally by Union Street to the east, Merrimack Street to the north, Pine Street to the west, and Laurel Street to the south as a site for the future Police station.

Alderman O'Neil moved on the description as outlined by the Deputy Clerk as the site for the future Police station. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Girard duly recorded in opposition.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated a motion was required to authorize the City Solicitor to retain a title abstract company, to do associated title work for acquisition of Police station property.

Alderman Thibault moved on the authorization and associated title work as outlined for the site of the future Police station. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Girard duly recorded in opposition.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk would present at the next Board meeting a public hearing date to be set regarding acquisition of the properties associated with the site of the future Police station.

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

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk