

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
(PUBLIC HEARING)**

June 20, 2000

7:00 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

Mayor Baines called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Pinard.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Levasseur, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, O'Neil,
Lopez, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, and
Hirschmann

Messrs: R. MacKenzie, J. Taylor

Mayor Baines advised that the purpose of the public hearing is to hear those wishing to speak in favor of or in opposition to a proposed Ordinance; that the Clerk will present the proposed Ordinance for discussion at which time those wishing to speak in favor will be heard, followed by those wishing to speak in opposition; that anyone wishing to speak must first step to the nearest microphone when recognized and recite his/her name and address in a clear, loud voice for the record; that each person will be given only one opportunity to speak; and any questions must be directed to the Chair.

The Clerk presented the proposed Ordinance:

"Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the B-2 (General Business) zone to include properties currently zoned I-3 (General Industrial) in the area generally on either side of March Avenue between John E. Devine Drive and Home Depot and generally on either side of John E. Devine Drive from Gold Street to Sam's Club to include the following parcels: Tax Map 438, Lots 2, 3, 4A, 4B, 5A and 5B."

Mayor Baines requested that Robert MacKenzie, Director of Planning, make a presentation.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am going to show an overhead of the area. Just to orient you as to the parcels being proposed for rezoning and to explain a little bit about the rezoning process for members perhaps who have not been through it, the area that is proposed is off of South Willow Street. You can see that South Willow Street runs generally north and south right here. This is Interstate 293. Gold Street bends and comes back and goes up into a residential neighborhood. John E. Devine Drive has been extended and runs right here. This is March Avenue, so the current location of the new Home Depot would be right here. The proposal is to rezone several lots, which are currently zoned I-3. I-3 is a general industrial zone. It allows primarily manufacturing, warehousing, and in some cases certain auto type facilities. The proposal is to extend the B-2. You can see to the east here there are several B-2 zones. Extend the B-2 so that

the entire area of the petition would become business zoned. There are actually several separate parcels. There is a parcel on the corner of Gold Street and John E. Devine Drive right here that is owned by Public Service. That currently has a building on it. There is a larger parcel that extends around and up to the edge of Nutts Pond here that also has a relatively large building that is owned by Public Service Company. So those two on this side are developed lots. There is also a lot in this location directly adjacent to Sam's Club and across the street from Home Depot that is a vacant lot. You have then three other parcels in this area. There is one parcel located right here that is actually the parking lot for Shop n' Save. The Shop n' Save building is located right here so this is the parking lot. This is a vacant parcel that I am identifying here and then the new Volkswagen dealership is located on this corner. So, several of the parcels identified are already developed. Again, the proposal is to rezone this to general business. Normally, this would be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading who would ultimately make a recommendation back to the full Board. I know a question was asked is this consistent with the proposed zoning that has been discussed. This specific location is not consistent with that proposed zoning, but the Master Plan did talk about the process for rezoning on South Willow Street. It recognized that there would likely be rezonings along South Willow Street and a process should be followed. Generally, the criteria that are outlined there is 1) is there going to be an impact on the residential neighborhood or can you mitigate that impact; 2) is it really usable industrial land, for example would the Economic Development Director say that it is probably more realistic for commercial than industrial; and 3) how much traffic capacity is there in the area and specifically on South Willow Street. Those are the kinds of criteria that the Master Plan lays out that the Board should be thinking about and evaluating when they look at one of these rezonings. At this point, that is all I had to present. I would be happy to answer any questions of the Board.

Alderman Wihby asked why would we want to...I mean we have a road there. If we are going to say the road is still going to be there why do we care what happens on one side of the road? To the right...why do we want to do all of that area?

Mr. MacKenzie answered one of these is a vacant parcel. This area right here is a vacant parcel owned by Public Service Company.

Alderman Wihby asked why do we want to do a parking lot.

Mr. MacKenzie answered maybe the applicant could answer that, but the parking lot, if you are rezoning all of this area to B-2 it would not make any sense to leave a little island of industrial in the center of that particular area.

Alderman Wihby asked that vacant parcel if it is industrial probably doesn't make sense to be industrial in that corner.

Mr. MacKenzie asked this one right here.

Alderman Wihby answered yes. Answer the questions that you said were the typical questions that we are going to ask. Instead of Jay coming up, do you have the answer? Is taking up industrial going to be bad here, Jay? I know you are always the first one that gets up and says don't take industrial and then sometimes it makes sense and you say go ahead and take it.

Mr. Taylor replied while I think the general position has been over the years if we continue to take industrially zoned land for other uses and clearly we are not in the position where we are able to create anymore industrial land, what is left is what is left. My guess is we have something in the order of 100 acres plus or minus of vacant industrially zoned land left in the City of Manchester. While clearly this is a major chunk of it, if you take a look at the area around this and what the likelihood of somebody coming in and paying the kinds of prices that this land would command in the open market, those uses are definitely not industrial so while in theory it would be nice to keep all of the industrial land, I think from a practical point of view the area around this is pretty much predetermined the way this is going to go and rather than having it sit there doing nothing and generating no income to the City it almost makes more sense to change it into some category where we would get some income out of it. I don't have a problem with what is being proposed here.

Alderman Wihby asked as far as traffic goes is there going to be more because of the B-2. Would there have been more trucks with I-3?

Mr. MacKenzie answered on average you will have more traffic in a business zone than industrial zone. You might have, depending on the use that went in there, you might have slightly higher truck traffic in an industrial zone than a business zone. It really comes down to the use that is going in there but on average you will have more traffic in a business zone.

Alderman Wihby asked as far as the residential in the back, we just had that at our meeting where we are going to impact...are we going to impact it more by switching the zoning on here or helping it.

Mr. MacKenzie answered you will potentially have an impact. I know that Alderman Pariseau had a meeting the other night that had about 100 people there at Bakersville talking about traffic issues in this particular neighborhood. I still believe there may be ways, through traffic calming, to reduce both the speed and potential short cutting through neighborhoods like this but none of those details are worked out as to exactly how to do it or how much it would cost.

Alderman Lopez stated just a follow-up on the traffic. I know that it is a shortcut. I was just going to mention it and Alderman Wihby mentioned it but given that 2:30 PM to 4:30 PM I know the letter carriers that deliver mail over there find it totally impossible to deliver mail down Gold Street because everybody cuts up that way. If this goes to B-2, depending on what business goes in there, you are going to have a tremendous amount of traffic that is going to eventually need signals and everything else in my viewpoint. Have you looked into that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we have not really analyzed the project yet. In a rezoning, we don't exactly know what could go here. It might be some retail uses. We don't know the exact level of traffic that would go onto the Gold Street/Sewall Street area.

Alderman Lopez asked how much total space is this that we are talking about.

Mr. MacKenzie asked how many acres.

Alderman Lopez answered yes.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I know the largest piece is about 16 acres. I believe the whole thing is close to 27 acres in total. Of course, a couple of those are already developed. The parking lot at Shop n' Save.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I think it is a good idea. I think it fits well with the new use. One question is on the southwest corner there is a little wedge along the railroad yard there that is not included. Why isn't that little piece included in that new zoning?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I would defer to the applicant who would be able to explain that better.

Alderman Hirschmann stated it seems like you are excluding one little property there.

Mr. MacKenzie responded it was proposed by the applicant and not necessarily by the City.

Atty. Tamposi stated I am the special counsel for Properties, Inc. The owner of that property is New England Grading and the woman is a recent widow and when she was approached for permission to rezone, I think that her husband died too close to now and she just didn't want to deal with it. She was afraid that maybe her taxes would go up, but we agreed to leave her property out.

Alderman Gatsas stated, Jay, you said we have 100 usable acres. This would take 25% of those usable acres out of the industrial use?

Mr. Taylor answered I said I am guessing we had about 100 vacant industrially zoned acres. Some of that 100 may not be usable. So, we are taking a substantial chunk out of that, yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked are all of these 26 acres usable.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there are only two sites that are currently undeveloped. Those two sites are 6.9 acres and there are some wetlands on that. The other site is 3.4 acres. So, of undeveloped land there are only about 10 acres that are currently undeveloped. Some of that is wetland.

Alderman Gatsas stated so obviously there is not 16 acres of building remaining I would assume. Not the last time I was down there. Obviously, there is a total of 26 acres. Are you saying, Jay...I need an explanation of 100 acres. Is that 100 acres zoned industrial and would you consider this as part of the 100?

Mr. Taylor replied I would consider this part of the 100 but keep in mind just looking quickly at the map here that two of these parcels already have buildings on them so I am not considering those two parcels to be part of the 100 to answer your question.

Alderman Levasseur asked what is the tax impact or the increase in revenue impact. Do we have a number for that?

Atty. Tamposi answered no, Sir, we don't. We don't know the exact impact until we have some uses. Once this is rezoned as a commercial business and you get commercial we will know the exact fiscal impact. We are guessing that the increased tax revenue would be three to four times what it is over industrial. Again, we won't know until we have an exact use.

Alderman Pariseau stated, Mr. MacKenzie, you make reference to this being rezoned general business. Is that what B-2 is?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. B-2 is general business.

Alderman Wihby stated Atty. Tamposi is going to go next. Are you going to let him speak and then we are going to ask questions or are we just going to go from here? He has a presentation, I think, that he wants to make or don't you.

Atty. Tamposi stated I am very happy to answer questions and I could answer a couple that I have heard right now.

Alderman Wihby stated the size of a building...you must have looked at what you could put on this site. How big? 100,000 square foot building or two 30,000 square foot buildings because of the way it is developed?

Atty. Tamposi replied I am not aware exactly of how big a building you could put up. Again, it would depend on the 6.9 acres. You have a sizable wetland. When you look at, for example, Sam's Club right here could you get a building that size on here, I don't know. You also have to...we have a lot of drainage issues. We have Nutt's Pond that we want to be very careful of. We have parking to consider so I couldn't tell you the exact size.

Alderman Wihby stated just to follow-up to Alderman Pariseau, was that meeting because of this development that you had.

Alderman Pariseau replied no. That was because of my stupidity in closing President Road. Bob, I just want to make sure that the abutters were notified. I think this was a question that I brought up at the last rezoning that I felt that the immediate abutters should receive notice and not just read it in the newspaper. Have these abutters been notified individually?

Mr. MacKenzie responded the Board would have to amend the ordinances to require notifications to abutters and that has not happened yet.

Alderman Gatsas stated Mr. MacKenzie, let me see if I can help you with this. The proposed zoning changes that you presented to us tonight, this was not a proposed zoning change. It seems as though if you can give me a direct answer on whether you are in favor of this or what your thoughts are in favor of or opposed to it and if you could make them brief and concise that would be good.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I don't have a formal recommendation for you tonight. I wouldn't mind outlining what I think are the three major issues and those are first we have to be careful that now we have built capacity on South Willow Street and it has worked pretty good the last couple of years that we don't break down South Willow Street. I think maybe we can solve that issue. I think also that if the Board were to rezone this site they would have to do things to prevent additional short cutting and traffic volumes through the adjacent residential neighborhood. Particularly President Road, Sewall and Gold Street. Again, there are potentially ways but they cost money to do that through traffic calming. I think the third issue is the potential impact on Nutt's Pond if you develop at a high intensity use too close to Nutt's Pond you could further degrade that and I think that is an issue we should resolve. Those are my three issues.

Alderman Gatsas asked in a B-2 zone, what is the zoning requirement for land. In other words the way John E. Devine and March Avenue drop out, if you give me some quick numbers I bet you that we can separate that into an awful lot of small lots to put buildings on so what is the zoning requirement of B-2.

Mr. MacKenzie answered zoning in B-2 is pretty open. You can actually have a ratio of two, which means that if you had seven acres of land you could have fourteen acres of building. In practice you can not reach that because much of this site has to go to parking.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's go the other way. Let's use a two-acre site and how many square feet of building could I put on a two-acre site.

Mr. MacKenzie replied just a rough guess normally roughly half of the site would be parking and half building. So, on a two-acre site you would have about a 40,000 square foot building at the most. That would be under ideal conditions.

Alderman Gatsas asked if we use that variance and say that there is 26 acres and we multiply that times let's say a 15% loss...

Mr. MacKenzie interjected the loss might be higher given some wetlands and some irregular shapes here.

Alderman Gatsas stated you give me the number then.

Mr. MacKenzie replied let's say a 25% loss and I hate to guess too much because they may already have an estimate of how many square feet could go on the site.

Alderman Gatsas stated so that would leave us with 20 acres so if I use my calculation correctly that would be somewhere in the vicinity of if you broke it down into two acre lots because you probably could do it with the load frontage that you have there, you could end up with a lot more square footage than Alderman Wihby was talking about.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes, under those conditions...

Alderman Gatsas interjected obviously if I was a developer and I owned a 26 acre parcel, finding one user at X amount of dollars of finding 10 users at a higher amount per acre would make sense.

Atty. Tamposi stated there are 26 acres in this request, however, this property is not all owned by Properties, Inc. In fact, there is a large parcel that is the parking lot for the existing grocery store. Now the grocery store, if you look at the map, is already in the B-2 zone. It is just that finger of industrial that goes out in front of it that is its parking lot. For example, when this request goes into effect, that parking lot isn't going to change. That parking lot is going to be a parking lot whether it is industrial or business and there are other businesses down there where...you know we want to stay away from the spot zoning issue where we stop and then you say why the heck is there an industrial area that is just the parking lot for an existing shopping center in the middle of nowhere. That is what we are trying to avoid so that is why we are rezoning the whole thing. There would never be that kind of increased square footage.

Alderman Gatsas stated across the street and I guess that is Gold Street, you go back into an I-3. How far does that stretch?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the I-3 stretches out a little bit to Mack Truck to the west and it stretches almost to South Willow Street. It includes the Mercedes dealership and the Nissan dealership so the I-3 actually extends as a finger down towards South Willow Street.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't think it would be economically feasible to do two-acre lots. You would want to do something like the same size as Home Depot or the buildings that are in that area as it is. Isn't that correct? It makes more sense to do it that way.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if this question is for Bob MacKenzie or Atty. Tamposi but the site that they currently house there for lack of a better term their line division, the line crews and that work out of the old Auclair Trucking, as well as the vacant building that is on the corner where they seem to store surplus vehicles, are those the only two lots west of John E. Devine Drive or west of March Avenue. Is that all there is? Those two lots?

Atty. Tamposi replied owned by Properties, Inc., yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked what would it take if they wanted to combine those.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that would be a fairly simple merger. That would be doable.

Alderman Levasseur asked as far as the abutters go, do any residents actually touch the land we are going to rezone. It doesn't look to me like there are any residential houses in that area that touch or concern the lots that we are talking about.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the ones that come close to touching the property are across the railroad tracks as you can see here on the map. The railroad track is about 100 feet wide and across Bradlees so those would be the closest. There are some residences down here on the corner of Gold and Ross Avenue.

Alderman Levasseur stated but for the most part that whole area is mostly already commercial or empty lots surround by big industrial sized buildings anyway. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie responded to the east, north and south it is all industrial or commercial.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked how much acreage is the parking lot for the grocery store.

Mr. MacKenzie answered 2.75 acres.

Alderman Clancy stated I am going to refer to Alderman Pariseau's question. Why don't we let the abutters know what we are planning to do?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is up to the Board. They can change the ordinance and notify abutters.

Alderman Clancy responded I think that is the correct thing to do not only for this project, but for all of the other projects in town. I don't want a person coming up to me and saying what is going on here. Not everybody in town buys the paper.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Adjustment do notify abutters for any of their cases, subdivisions, variances, and site plans. They do notify abutters.

Alderman Pariseau stated we did have this same discussion last year and it was more or less my insistence that regardless of whether there was an ordinance amendment or whatever that these immediate abutters should have been notified. You have those residents that live on Gold Street. I don't know if Beech Hill would be considered a direct abutter, but someone should have been notified. As Alderman Clancy said, not everybody reads The Union Leader and I think we rely too heavily on that.

Alderman Wihby stated I thought we voted on this before to do it for other projects and I thought the City Clerk's Office automatically did that.

Clerk Bernier replied I have no knowledge of that. A vote could have been taken.

Alderman Wihby stated we did it on another project when we said that we wanted it down and I thought it was on an ongoing basis. Either way this goes to Bills on Second Reading and we are probably going to want the Planning Board's and Planning Staff's recommendation to the Committee so we are probably going to be tabling it in the Committee anyway. We could send out the notices then.

Alderman Cashin asked are we going to have another public hearing. This is a public hearing now.

Alderman Wihby stated if Alderman Pariseau wants another hearing, then we should have another hearing.

Alderman Cashin replied I agree with him. I think the abutters should have been notified. I don't think there is any question about that and if it comes into Bills on Second Reading tonight I will move to table it. I am not going to vote on it.

Atty. Tamposi stated Mr. McDermott of PSNH just told me that the abutters were notified by PSNH. Now when we talk abutters, we are talking physical abutters so this was not residential people up and down Gold Street. We are talking abutters similar to what you would have for a public notice for the Planning Board.

Alderman Pariseau asked can we get a list of the people that the letter was sent to.

Atty. Tamposi answered I don't know if it was a letter or a call.

Mr. McDermott stated what we did in this process is we or our agents talked to the commercial abutters in the area first of all to see if they wanted to join in the petition so we do have a list of people that we talked to. It might not be an exhaustive list of residential abutters because we didn't talk to any residential abutters but certainly all of the commercial ones we did.

Alderman Cashin stated I think we are talking about the residential abutters aren't we.

Alderman Levasseur replied there aren't any.

Alderman Cashin stated there have to be some.

Alderman Gatsas stated you can't see by that map because the map I am looking at here you need to put back on the screen because the portion that is north of Nutt's Pond, what is that zoned.

Mr. MacKenzie replied north of Nutt's Pond is I-3. That is where Sylvania GTE is. Home Depot is B-2 and that is just east of Nutt's Pond.

Alderman Gatsas asked who else other than Sylvania is in there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered only the City's park. Precourt Park. Wendy's is kind of sandwiched in between South Willow Street, but the ones closest to Nutt's Pond are Home Depot and Bradlees Shopping Center is fairly close by but not as close.

Alderman Gatsas asked there is one other little piece that is an I-3 piece in the middle of a B-2. I don't know what street that is.

Alderman Clancy stated I think it is Driving Park Road.

Alderman Gatsas replied it is on the other side.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that is where the Auto Centers are. Pet Boys and Auto Zone and they are currently zoned industrial. Those two parcels.

Alderman Gatsas asked did they come in for a variance under that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered originally that area was zoned industrial. They preferred to keep it because they have more auto options under the I-3 zone than under the B-2. For example, repair of autos and trucks.

Alderman Lopez stated let me clear something up. Mr. MacKenzie, you referred to an ordinance regarding notifying somebody and we are at a public hearing for rezoning here and I hear a couple of Aldermen here so what is your position as the Planning Director? Did we follow the right process here or are we supposed to notify all of the abutters before we have this public hearing?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the process has been properly and legally followed. There are not technical flaws. If the Board does want to notify abutters, they should revise the zoning

ordinance to require that and most boards that I deal with do notify abutters. I think generally it is a good idea.

Alderman Lopez stated so without changing the ordinance and I hear from the other Alderman it is not legal...we are supposed to notify the abutters so I am a little confused about how we can notify abutters if we didn't change the ordinance. Can someone answer that?

Alderman Levasseur stated PSNH did it.

Mayor Baines asked what would be the process to do that.

Alderman Lopez replied what I am saying is the point that Mr. MacKenzie is making and then I hear some of the Aldermen saying that we said we were supposed to notify all of the abutters so if we didn't change the ordinance, how can we do that?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated there is no requirement under either State statute or the zoning ordinance that individual abutters be notified of a proposed change. That does not prevent the Board or Planning from doing it on their own. In other words since it notifies more people, you can go ahead and do that even if it is not required by the statute or the ordinance.

Alderman Pariseau stated my recollection is that when this discussion came up at the last request for rezoning it was the intent of this Board to notify the abutters. Now I am not one to make up amendments to zoning ordinances. Mr. MacKenzie was aware of that vote and I would have thought that he would have taken it upon himself based on that vote to amend the ordinance. It is not up to the 14 people here to run in and request changes to the zoning ordinances. They were made aware of the Board's vote and he should have done it.

Mayor Baines stated I would suggest since we haven't, we should and proceed as expeditiously as possible.

Alderman Cashin stated I remember that we voted to have this done. I don't care whether it is an ordinance or not. This Board said we wanted it done and it should have been done. It is that simple.

Mayor Baines replied since I was not here when that occurred, I would have to defer to the City Clerk.

Clerk Bernier responded we will have to look at the minutes. I am not going to stand here and say yes or no. If the Board said that, then I believe they did request that.

Mayor Baines stated can't we just, when it gets to the Committee the Committee can direct the Planning staff to do that and then proceed at least on this case and then prepare an ordinance to take care of this in the future. Wouldn't that be a proper procedure, Tom?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied yes.

Mayor Baines stated so why don't we just agree and the Committee will do that.

Alderman Wihby stated what I am hearing is that in this particular case they want to let the abutters know and have another hearing. That is what I am hearing. Is that not what I am hearing from Alderman Pariseau?

Alderman Pariseau replied I said nothing about having another public hearing. I think for future activities that the Planning Director ought to make the adjustments that have to be made. The PSNH representative informed me that he notified the abutters.

Alderman Wihby stated commercial abutters.

Alderman Pariseau replied there really aren't that many direct residential abutters to this property. In fact, there isn't any.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I would just like to clarify that myself, as Planning Director, really has no authority or jurisdiction in any regulations for zoning in terms of rezoning. There are no procedures. There are no policies. The Board has not directed that I handle these. Typically the Board asks for my input because it is a...

Alderman Wihby interjected, your Honor, we directed Carol and the City Clerk's Office that when she put the notices in the newspaper she was to contact all of the abutters and let them know. That was a vote that this Board had taken and it wasn't just for that particular project that we were doing. It was for future projects.

Clerk Bernier replied I would have to look at the minutes. I can't speak for Carol.

Alderman Wihby responded I know Carol was at the meeting and that is why I am saying Carol.

Clerk Bernier replied I assure you that if that is the case you will have an ordinance in front of you very soon.

Mayor Baines stated the question is what do we do now.

Alderman Pariseau replied I will take the word of Pat McDermott that he spoke to the abutters.

Alderman Levasseur asked are there any people who live in that area who are here to speak.

Atty. Tamposi stated I would just like to say a little about the traffic. Alderman Lopez brought it up initially and that was what is the difference going to be between commercial traffic and

industrial traffic. There are a couple of things. First of all, if you go down to South Willow Street there are a lot of commercial uses now and most new commercial uses won't bring in a whole host of new people. Often times what happens is if you bring in a competitor to Home Depot or a competitor to Shop n' Save and then you have their traffic. For example, Wal-Mart is going to be going into where HQ was so you are going to see a lot of the Bradlees traffic disappear from Bradlees and they will be going over to Wal-Mart. The same thing would happen here. In an industrial setting, you don't have that. If you were to put up a 100,000 square foot industrial building, you are going to have all of those employees who work there and the trucks that haul in the parts and the trucks that haul out the finished product all coming there. That is all new traffic. That is not split from somewhere else. The other thing about industrial traffic is it tends to come at rush hour. When you talk about people using Gold Street as a way in our out, all of the people that would work in one of those industrial plants and it could be 1,000 of them, they would all be coming in at 8 AM and leaving at 4:30 PM where when you have commercial traffic those people might shop at night or on weekends. They don't necessarily go at the rush hour. The industrial traffic can be as bad as commercial traffic.

Mayor Baines stated just correct me on the process and explain, Bob, for example if this is rezoned to commercial any development opportunities would have to come through the site planning process and to the Planning Board and there would be public comment by the abutters and everybody else who wanted to participate in any discussions about what would happen. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied virtually all projects do. Anything over 2,000 square feet and in this case I am sure all of those projects would be over that, would have to go to the Planning Board, abutters would be notified and the project would be reviewed in detail at the Planning Board level.

Atty. Tamposi stated the Mayor and Alderman Pariseau were nice enough to meet with us and we had a meeting with Bob MacKenzie and Terry Harlacher from the Planning staff and certainly traffic is an issue and one of the items that we said would be appropriate is if through the site plan process we would agree that each of these commercial lots would pay a special impact fee alleviating traffic problems in the residential areas. What we are looking for here isn't money for studies because all of this stuff has been studied to death. We want to see that money actually go towards improving those residential areas. So, when you spend \$1 you see a sidewalk go in rather than have it disappear into a black hole. That is one of the things that we can do to help alleviate the traffic in that area.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated Mr. MacKenzie you said something in your first point about how well South Willow Street was going and I think the term you used was break down South Willow Street. What did you mean by that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied traffic engineers gauge traffic flow by a class system called A-F and it is kind of like a report card. The best flowing roads are level of service A. Once you reach a

certain point and typically if you can't get through a signal in two or three signals that is a level of service F and that is considered failure. If you try to put too many cars through a particular intersection, you will reach failure and there were some intersections before on South Willow Street that were at a service level F. Right now they range typically between level of service E and level of service D on South Willow Street.

Alderman Gatsas stated may you can answer this question. Looking at the design that you have there, would you think that the best access road would be up Gold Street to South Willow or down Gold Street to Brown Avenue?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I am a little concerned about short cutting. I know that if I came to this area I would probably come down South Willow to John E. Devine and then leave Gold Street out to South Willow, but people headed west towards Bedford or maybe south Manchester sometimes they do, to get out of this area, cut through Gold Street, Sewall Street or President Road.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you are saying that the impact on those residents is going to be there.

Mr. MacKenzie replied until I know the actual type of retail or commercial uses in there, it is hard to gauge whether it is severe or there will be some impact. There will likely be some impact. You can't rule that out.

Mayor Baines called for those wishing to speak in favor.

There were none.

Mayor Baines called for those wishing to speak in opposition.

Rick Groleau, 714 South Beech Street, Manchester, NH 03103 stated:

I guess I am not in opposition or in favor. I brought my own props. I don't have multi-million dollars to bring props in but this is my own hand drawn prop that I will use. I also brought in some handouts for you, which sort of gives you a developmental phase of Rick Groleau and some students from the NH College Partnership, which is a mentoring program I run. Since 1993, this area of property has been of concern to me being one of those neighbors. There are no neighbors who physically abut this property at all. Not one residential person, however this property affects two neighborhoods, particularly east of that property. That is the South Beech and Gold Street area. Since 1993, you had the City Master Plan and the unfortunate thing about that Master Plan says and I will quote here, "establish neighborhood parks for those portions of the City where deficiencies have been identified. A proposed neighborhood park in the South Beech Street area could potentially be developed at Precourt Park if sufficient land area is available." Well, 26 acres to me is pretty available. That is the thing. I am not here for PSNH's choice to sell that property. I am glad they are but I would sure hate to have the City miss an opportunity just because we need tax dollars. Well, we will need tax dollars next year, the year

after and the year after but unfortunately in talking to some of the coaches at South soccer and baseball, there are 800 kids that play soccer in that area and 500 baseball players, plus there is a junior deb softball field that is needed in the south end. We have talked about a pathway around the pond for several years. In 1996 PSNH also drew up some plans of a schematic to do that, but they chose to begin a process of selling the property so that didn't make much sense to them. As a business, it wouldn't make sense to me either. Anyway, these are highlights of some things that have gone on. There was a proposal that I submitted in 1994. I met with Alderman Pariseau in 1993 and I cannot believe that in seven years nothing has occurred at this site, which is sort of interesting. Not because there has not been an initiative to do it. Has there been money? No. It is just unfortunate. In 1996 and 1997 I had Parks Americorp Group become involved in that area. In 1996 I know you guys had 45 minutes of conversation and I have a five-minute video that I would have liked to share with you but I guess that is five minutes too long. I am not quite sure. The video was put together by a group of students at Memorial High School who did a clean-up in that area and it is the most beautiful commercial for the Nutt's Pond area that you have ever seen.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to see that, your Honor.

Mr. Groleau replied I would be happy to show it to you if I could. In 1997 and 1998 Alderman Pariseau managed to get \$20,000 out of the CIP fund to develop this Master Plan which is here. This is the Master Plan that the City had proposed and that was done. I appreciate that, Alderman Pariseau. In 1998, \$100,000 was made available to do something with the park and it was proposed to do a soccer field across from Tannery Brook. However, that area is unfortunately too small for that and should remain green. If you look at the map here that I have, there is a green space that is still green. It remains probably one of the last buffers that we have between South Willow Street and my neighborhood so it would be nice to have that remain and it will I assume. In 1998 there is a letter in here that I sent to the Mayor and asked to have a meeting and I did meet with the Mayor and Bob MacKenzie was there and we talked about the potential purchase of that property and of course \$6.2 million at that time is a lot of money for 6.2 acres of land. So, you are seeing the updated version, the 1998 letter that I then was ready to send to someone who cared. I sent one to Hillary Clinton. I sent one to everybody. There is just no one who is going to provide funding for that type of thing. In 1999, the Urban Pond Restoration Coordinator who is Art Grindle, held a clean-up at Nutt's Pond again this past weekend. Since 1993, there have been at least two or three clean-ups every year sponsored by some organization or group at least on this green side of the pond. I guess I am here advocating that I am glad PSNH is selling the property or trying to rezone it. I appreciate that and I know that the B-2 rezoning also would provide an opportunity for recreation I believe. Is that correct? I don't really know the zoning.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Mr. Groleau stated so still there is a possibility for some type of recreational usage for at least the property that is closest to the pond. If any of you have been down there recently, I was

around when Home Depot went up and I was very unhappy about that. They have been a good neighbor. They have donated a lot of equipment and materials to park clean-ups and buildings and everything you could possibly need if you are in baseball or soccer down there. They have been wonderful, but unfortunately that building is 50 feet from the water. I am going to take my run around the pond and great there is Home Depot. If you ever walked around Dorr's Pond, you don't see Home Depot there. Those are the kinds of things we are up against at South Willow. We already have 11 strip malls, 14 car dealers, we have the Airport taking up a lot of the south end and that is wonderful. I am an international admissions recruiter and I travel all the time. I need the airport just like everybody else, but I would like to see a few hundred other kids have an opportunity to play baseball. They are not here tonight but these guys know that I am here tonight. I also have phone numbers and all that nice stuff that if you need to have phone calls from them I will be glad to make sure that takes place because I think you need to know what they are thinking. PSNH has been a good friend of mine. Pat and I go back these past seven years and he has been very good about letting me know about things and about tonight as well so I look forward to working with PSNH or whoever the next site people are to make sure that there might be some opportunity for the City to purchase a few acres. I know we don't have \$6.2 million, but I would love to see another ball field or something in there that is appropriate for the kids in that neighborhood.

Mayor Baines stated you should know that Alderman Pariseau and I raised that issue because that is our neighborhood down there and something that we hear often at meetings in the south end because of the impact that you talk about is things like when is something nice going to be done at the south end of the City. We are tuned into those issues and I don't know if you want to comment any further, Alderman Pariseau. We have raised that issue and that concern about some of that space because we do have concerns about Nutt's Pond. A lot of us do remember when that was a recreational activity. I don't know if anybody else is old enough to remember that. We would like to see something like that down in that area of the City.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to comment on this because I was fortunate enough to have a good childhood in that area. It was a fun place to be. Fun in the Sun had a great campground there. I went to that place five days a week and I have found memories of that area. I think that and I don't know if this is Alderman Pariseau's last term or not and hopefully it is not but this would seem to be something that you should go out on and Mayor I would support you wholeheartedly on any kind of redevelopment of Nutt's Pond and making that into a really beautiful park. I think this gentleman has proposed a beautiful, conceptual idea for this and I would totally get behind any kind of a plan to get that place back to where it was when I was a kid because it was a great location. There are a lot of people in that area and it just seems like a perfect spot. Whatever I can do to help, I would love to get on that bandwagon.

Alderman Shea asked, Rick, what do you have in mind. In other words, they have three or four ballparks now. In fact, they are playing right now.

Mr. Groleau answered I don't have anything in mind because everything costs money. We are talking about a property that in once sense if it is rezoned the price goes up and if it stays the way it is and the City purchased part of it, it costs less but that is an issue that I have fought since 1993.

Alderman Shea asked what properties would mostly impact the area that you are trying to...

Mr. Groleau answered having families drive their kids down to a game in my mind and I am not talking for my neighbors and I don't even have children but I see a parent driving a kid down in his baseball uniform to the park and that is different than all of these people cutting through my neighborhood going to Home Depot. Those are the kinds of things I would like to bring back and they are already happening. There just isn't enough space for kids to play soccer and baseball and everything else.

Alderman Shea asked what area are you thinking of in terms of making it recreational. Are you thinking of the area that is right next to where Home Depot is?

Mr. Groleau answered it doesn't matter to me. There are 26 acres. Some of it we can't touch because it is wetlands, but if the site people do their job and are going to put another building there or tear down the existing ones to put a new one in, they could do a nice job with making some neighbors and kids pleased in Manchester. The most appropriate place would be nearest the pond and keeping the concrete buildings away from the waterfront.

Mayor Baines asked the land that used to be part of the beach where actually the old icehouse used to be, do we own that land. It is the west land that used to be the beach.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I don't know.

Mayor Baines stated I know there has been some dumping in that area.

Mr. Groleau stated I guess what I am asking you is in this paperwork I have done I have also come up with ways to purchase some of this property and how could we raise \$6.2 million or whatever. I have some ideas and some legally don't make sense, but I didn't know that at the time. I guess I am challenging you. When Mr. Wiczorek was Mayor we also got along quite well and I asked him if I could go ahead and pursue Judd Gregg and our Senators and Congressmen who have done a great job in our State to go after funding to match or purchase property but I couldn't do that because he said no and Judd Gregg said you can't contact me unless you go through your Mayor. It wasn't him, it was his staff so I couldn't get through but there are ways to fund this. We have 93, which is going to go to four lanes and all of this land has to be replaced so I don't know how money is appropriated for that but I would like you to consider this as one of those sites that...

Alderman Pariseau interjected, your Honor, as you may recall part of our discussion with Public Service was that we are not looking for the City to pay a dime for any land that we may need for a soccer field or baseball field or swimming pool. I think that goes with the rezoning and I don't expect the City to put up a dollar for the two or three acres of land that we may need. If push comes to shove, it may be rezoned but they may not be able to build anything. We can't assess PSNH currently and that would be part of the site development that Mr. MacKenzie will be handling but they are aware of our wishes to take care of the recreational facilities in south Manchester.

Mayor Baines stated I believe that they would be willing to work with us on that and hopefully we will have a happy conclusion to that.

Alderman Gatsas asked the \$6.2 million, where is that number coming from.

Mr. Groleau answered that is the information that I got originally.

Alderman Gatsas asked and that is a price for...is that just something being bantered around.

Mr. McDermott answered I can't honestly remember the number, but it was in that neighborhood. The 27 acres that we own down there, the total price would be around \$9.2 million so Rick may have seen a piece and \$6.2 million may have been the price for the larger piece. It would be more than 6.2 acres. It would be more like 16 or 17 acres for \$6.2 million.

Alderman Gatsas asked the \$9 million number that you just gave me is for 27 acres. Is that with the estimation of the I-3 zoning?

Mr. McDermott answered that would be with the rezoning.

Alderman Gatsas asked what would the price be with an I-3 zoning.

Mr. McDermott answered I really don't know. We haven't marketed it as industrial property. I would think it would be substantially less than that in the neighborhood of a quarter of that amount.

Alderman Gatsas asked so you have been marketing it currently as a B-2.

Mr. McDermott answered it is currently on the market.

Alderman Gatsas asked how are you marketing it. As a B-2 zoning?

Mr. McDermott answered we are marketing it as property that we hope to have rezoned.

Alderman Wihby asked who have you spoken to so far and what do you envision being there.

Mr. McDermott answered all I can tell you at this time is we have had a lot of commercial type interest but because we don't have anything signed or any kind of commitments now and there is some confidentiality issues, I can't really tell you any more.

Alderman Wihby asked how about sizes of the buildings.

Mayor Baines stated we raised the issue of was there enough land for one of the big boxes and the response we got was they cannot. It is not big enough for one of the big boxes.

Mr. McDermott replied again it depends on exactly what they want. A big box could probably not fit there.

Alderman Wihby asked what do you mean by big boxes, your Honor. Are you talking 100,000 square foot building?

Mayor Baines answered yes. I have heard the definition in talking to developers and maybe Mr. MacKenzie can help me out.

Mr. MacKenzie stated a big box would typically be 100,000 to 120,000 square feet.

Alderman Wihby asked and that wouldn't be allowed here.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that larger parcel...I am not sure.

Alderman Wihby stated let's assume that it is not a big box, but it is somewhat of a box and it is an 85,000 or 90,000 square foot building. You don't think that is going to impact Gold Street and the residents up Gold Street? You don't think people are going to take that back road? They are already taking it to go to Home Depot. Why won't they take it to go to another big box?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think there could be some impact and we would have to look at that.

Mayor Baines stated Alderman Pariseau and myself live in that area and travel that area. Gold Street has already had done to it the unacceptable. As you speak now, a number of my friends live on that street and you can't even have a birthday party because you can't park in the street there. We need to do something about that irrespective of what you do in terms of this zoning area. I think the City has a responsibility to make those houses more livable if you will for the citizens. I think we can do some things. I think we need to put that on the map in terms of something we need to do because that is a bad situation for the residents on Gold Street right now between the traffic and the inability to even have company at your house. I think it is a basic right that most people would think they might have in the City of Manchester.

Alderman Wihby stated, your Honor, in the past I remember when we did the Nault property on Huse Road we wanted to assure that there wasn't going to be a big supermarket there and we have asked the developer before and I know you are not supposed to ask the question and they don't have to tell you and they are looking for a rezoning and it doesn't matter because whatever it allowed in a B-2 is allowed in a B-2, but in the past developers have come forward where we have actually, in the Committee on Bills on Second Reading seen what is going to be there. I guess there were agreements made that before we even rezoned it there was going to be money put aside somewhere otherwise that wasn't going to go through. Different side agreements like that that were made before we rezoned it but we knew the impact of what was going to be there before we rezoned it. It doesn't seem like we are getting that today. It seems like we could have a big box there or we could have two little buildings and it doesn't seem like we are going to get an answer. I don't know where you proceed from that.

Mayor Baines replied it is going to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading and you can have more discussion about it.

Alderman Gatsas stated certainly I believe that for the youth of South Manchester and the hassles that the parents have to put up with and all of the businesses that are in that area and having to take detours to get your kid to a game on time because of traffic, I think maybe this is the time...certainly it is all in good faith that people say they are going to take care of kids in the south end and we will talk about what we may be able to give them for some green space and I think that before we as a Board make any commitments to a developer to change the asset value of a piece of property, that they should take some consideration of the kids in the south end and maybe sit down and talk with them or some people so that we can give them a portion of what they are looking for. I think that is something that should come to Bills on Second Reading that is already negotiated out and not just a promise of what is going to happen.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated Alderman Wihby alluded to what I was going to ask, whether that could in fact fit a...we have heard comments about we have a one supermarket City here. Could that fit a DeMoulas or a Shaws? What would that do to the traffic going down...it is absolutely a nightmare getting from Gold Street down to South Beech toward the highway and then if you want to go to Brown Avenue. It seems to me that would make it impossible or am I incorrect?

Tom Prito with Granite Commercial Group in Bedford and I do retail real estate advisory and disposition work for institutions. As far as the issues of...well let's back up. What I thought when we discussed this with PSNH as far as the marketing of the property, the property is currently zoned industrial and a question asked by Alderman Gatsas was what are you telling prospective purchasers of the property. We are telling them that this property is zoned industrial. If they have an interest, we have an interest in pursuing to get this land rezoned to B-2, which is consistent with the surrounding areas. In that conversation, we do not have anyone other than letters of interest from different prospective developers and not users at this point that have said yes, we would like to look at the scope and the demands of that property to understand what we could put there. By way of example, if you look at what can be fully developed on that

parcel versus what can economically be feasible to be developed on the property, you see two significantly different answers. By way of example, I think the minimum frontage in the B-2 is 200 feet. So if you had a parcel of land that is 200 feet by 1,000 foot of depth, you could literally put in X amount of square feet of building but from a practical sense you would never have a building that is 100 feet wide with 900 feet of depth so while you can fully build out the parcel, from a practical matter you can't get anyone to use that building for retail use. As far as, for example, the 3.4 acre parcel that is adjacent to Hannaford Shop n' Save, if you look at that parcel if you were to put a restaurant there like an Applebees for example, you would use 2 acres and they would have 150 parking spaces. If you use straight retail, which demands today a 5 to 1 parking ratio, in other words five spaces for every 1,000 square feet of retail, typically these type of retailers don't extend anymore than 100 feet of depth from a practical standpoint and then when you add in the setbacks from wetlands, from adjacent parcels and from open space requirements, you typically get around 7,000 to 9,000 square feet of economically feasible retail per acre. Again, that changes. For example, if you were to do a movie theatre, a movie theatre on a 16 acre parcel, you may put an 80,000 square foot movie theatre, however, the parking ratio is entirely different because, I think according to your ordinance for every six seats there is one parking space so you could have a significantly smaller building, but because of the feasibility of the parking requirements from the operators, you would have an entirely different amount of GLA fit onto that space, in addition to which you would have entirely different traffic patterns. If you had a furniture store for example, furniture parking requirements are less than traditional retail I believe. I think in the ordinance it is three spaces per 1,000 feet or so because those types of shoppers...typically you have a warehouse type of component to it, you have large purchasers and those purchasers don't come on a regular basis as if it were a supermarket. So, when we look at all of the economically feasible uses of this property, we can't even begin to understand what the scope is until we get the land if it is feasible and the community wants it and the Board supports and votes to zone it retail, go out in the marketplace because it takes about, to develop plans, traffic studies and scope of work, it takes about \$80,000 to get to a point where you can answer questions accurately and fully and we can't even get to that next step because you know what, nothing will be built there. If the land is zoned for B-2, unless the Planning Board is satisfied with all of the questions I have heard tonight as well as the questions that Mr. MacKenzie brought up tonight, nothing will be built there. The traffic on Gold Street for example. Impacts to abutters that are commercial. The issues relating to Nutt's Pond have to be addressed. Open space requirements that Rick brought up tonight are addressed in the planning process. Nothing will be built there. However, we can't get to step one unless we know there is B-2. Right now, what I am doing is grazing. What we do in grazing is just try to find out what level of interest you have out there and we can't get to anything real and I know the issue has been brought up here bring us something concrete so we can decide if it should be rezoned but we can't get there because the retailers are very busy today. There are only a select bunch of them out there and they are not going to invest a lot of time, energy and effort in a property that is not zoned. Thank you for your time.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated as a follow-up, that is all very interesting but if you ask me if I want to abdicate any responsibility to the Planning Board, I refer to the earlier meeting tonight

and back to that 95 acre parcel of land that is going on the corner of Corning and South Mammoth Road so I don't think I want to do that. My question is really very simple. Mr. MacKenzie perhaps could answer it. Could, in fact, a DeMoulas or Shaws fit in that space? It is a yes or no.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I haven't studied the site to see what could go on there, but I would presume a supermarket could go on that larger site, the 15.7 acre site.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked and if we, in fact, changed this zoning to allow for this change then it would not be up to this Board to deny that but it would be up to the Planning Board to deny that, correct.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Planning Board looks at different things than this Board does so they may or may not be able to deny based upon certain factors.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe you can help me, Tom, because I am familiar with grazing. How many actual property owners are in your grazing piece? How many individual owners on the entire parcel?

Mr. Prito answered there are probably right now four or five.

Alderman Gatsas asked so with those four people obviously the intent that has been thrown out the larger the parcel, the larger the box, obviously PSNH is the largest holder. The others that are participating certainly from 1/3 value as an I-3, that grazing opportunity for you gets much larger when you put more abutters into a B-2 zone.

Mr. Prito answered obviously if Home Depot was not there and the surrounding properties like Sam's Club was not there and those were all industrial zones, then this particular parcel wouldn't have the attractiveness to other retailers, but as that entire area has been developed to B-2, it becomes more attractive.

Alderman Gatsas stated right but for you to say that a parcel with 200' of frontage going back 1,000 feet would be a different plan, if you look at the plan that is on that floor there isn't a piece in there that you couldn't develop with two acre sites, which would be 200 x 400 and get a pretty nice building on there if you wanted to.

Mr. Prito replied if you look at the main parcel for example, you can see...

Alderman Gatsas asked how long have you had this property out in the open market.

Mr. Prito answered probably for about the last 90 days there has been an earnest effort to make the retail universe aware of this.

Alderman Gatsas asked would you say that the reception to it is warm, lukewarm or hot.

Mr. Prito answered we have not agreements so I am characterizing it as lukewarm because at this time most people want to be on South Willow Street or they want to be front and center with the highest visibility that exists in the City. It has been lukewarm.

Alderman Gatsas asked for him to point out the largest portion and what could be done.

Mr. Prito answered the largest portion of the property...if you notice March Avenue and John E. Devine form almost like a wing and it creates this type of winged portion on each side. All of these are affected by setbacks from the property lines so you only have this piece of land where the current building is that if you were to take it you could probably get...just to put it in perspective this here is almost an acre and a half to two acres. If you could see that, you could see that you could put one two acre user here and you could maybe get an acre and a half user here but you have the setbacks in addition to which the property is adversely impacted because there is a drainage easement that follows along the north side of the building, which means you can't put a building over the drainage easement so it has to be open space. When you do that, the depth of this particular property I think is about 900 to 1,000 feet of depth. So, when you have 200 feet of frontage, you only get two parcels and having 800 or 900 feet of depth from an economically feasible situation it is very difficult to find any of those types of users. Again, traditional retail, if you look at a strip center, is 80 foot of depth that goes to 100. If you go into a supermarket it is usually 200 feet of depth and the big boxes go anywhere from 225 to 280 feet of depth.

Alderman Wihby asked can't you just go in for a variance.

Mr. Prito answered a variance is a very unique, specific situation that results from having to prove a hardship among the other four criterion and that is an increasingly difficult threshold to achieve. We thought that the appropriate way to do it would be to go for a rezoning.

Alderman Shea asked where is Shop n' Save on the map.

Mr. Prito answered this is Sam's Club and it is right across the street. The 3.4 acres that is vacant is on John E. Devine Drive and next to the Shop n' Save parking lot. Next to here is McDevitt.

Mayor Baines advised that all wishing to speak having been heard, the testimony presented will be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading to be taken under advisement with reports to be made to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at a later date.

Alderman Shea stated I would like unanimous consent to bring up a matter relating to the MTA.

Mayor Baines asked what is the procedure to do that.

Clerk Bernier answered this is a special meeting for rezoning. I would have to talk to the Solicitor for a minute.

Alderman Shea moved to bring up a matter relating to the MTA.

Alderman Lopez asked what is it about.

Mayor Baines answered I believe it is about the bus routes.

Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion. Mayor Baines called for a vote. There being unanimous consent, the motion carried.

Alderman Shea stated a matter has been brought up and called to my attention by three of four different people who are impacted by this. If you could follow, the buses are going to change routes and what the proposed new route will include is the bus will go north on Mammoth Road, it will then go onto Somerville Street to Jewett Street. There is a person who is blind and lives on the corner of Cilley Road and Jewett Street. He takes the bus three or four times a day. There is another lady that lives across the street who takes the bus three or four times a week to go to different places. There are two elderly people living near the corner of Porter and Cilley Road that take the bus two or three times a week as well and another person. What the proposal is and I have talked to Mr. Webster and other people have and the Mayor has been contacted is to go down Somerville Street to Porter and make a loop. In other words go south on Porter to Cilley Road, go west on Cilley Road to Jewett and go north on Jewett to Somerville Street. To me it seems that it would help out this disabled person who depends on the bus for his business, he tunes pianos and so forth, it will help the lady who has to use the bus three or four times a week to go to the doctor and other areas of the City and it will help the two elderly people. What we are trying to do is before the new bus schedule is implemented, which will be July 1, we are asking that they reconsider this loop for the sake of these people. Supposedly, the buses are to serve the elderly, the disabled and so forth and proposals have been made by people at the bus stop to have a step aside or something where you have to pay \$1.50/day and the gentleman said that is \$6/week or \$30/month and the other way it is about \$9/month. What I am asking is that the Board through some MTA Committee meeting or some other way to appeal to the people at the MTA to change that.

Alderman Wihby asked don't we have a sub-Committee on the MTA that could look into this.

Alderman Shea answered I am not sure when they are going to meet.

Alderman Pariseau stated that Committee dealt with personnel issues at the MTA and I don't know if we want to go in and micromanage the MTA. I don't know that much about transportation, but if you want to send it to that Committee I guess it is all right.

Mayor Baines stated they are implementing the schedule on July 1.

Alderman Levasseur asked have you contacted Mr. Webster.

Alderman Shea answered yes.

Alderman Levasseur asked and he said no.

Alderman Shea stated talking to him is difficult and he hasn't really committed himself but he claimed that there was a problem with the printing or somebody else in the City may want and then he said something to the effect that it would impact the people on Somerville Street and I explained to him that my wife and I went over and it would not impact anyone because the people who are going to go to the dentist's office would walk not even 1/10 of a mile and the other people wouldn't walk 1/10 of a mile and the other people who take the bus from the housing take it on the corner of Jewett and Somerville. It seems so logical.

Alderman Levasseur asked could you draft a letter saying that as a Board we are making a recommendation instead of going through the full force.

Alderman Pinard stated I talked to John Webster even this morning and he is a hard man to deal with. One of Alderman Shea's constituents called me over the weekend. It is an elderly lady and she is concerned because she is on Cilley Road and they want to shift. I agree with Alderman Shea. We have to do something about these individuals at the MTA. They seem to be dictators and I think we should stop that.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated this same woman must be calling a lot of people. I have also spoken with the MTA Commissioner that we reappointed earlier this year and he has similar problems in dealing with the aforementioned gentleman. I don't mean to micromanage but...

Mayor Baines replied I think we should be careful because we are getting into personnel matters.

Alderman Levasseur stated we have a meeting coming up real soon don't we. Can't we have the MTA come before us at the next meeting?

Mayor Baines stated what I would like to do is have the Board advise the Mayor and Alderman Shea to sit down with the general manager of the MTA to review this and report back to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at the next meeting.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau it was voted to instruct the Mayor and Alderman Shea to sit down with the general manager of the MTA to review the bus route issue and report back to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at the next meeting.

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

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk