

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

July 8, 2008
Mayor and all Aldermen

7:30 PM
Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen M. Roy, Gatsas, Sullivan, J. Roy, Osborne, Pinard,
O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Ouellette, Domaingue

3. Presentation by Mayor's Youth Advisory Council.

Chairman Lopez reported that this presentation will be made next month. He asked the Mayor and Board of Aldermen for special privilege to address item 15.

15. Communication from Alderman Lopez requesting the Board of Mayor and Aldermen establish a fund for construction of the World War II Memorial as well as providing the City with the ability to accept future contributions. The communication further requests a waiver to the City's procurement policy.

Alderman Lopez stated I thank the members of the Board for allowing me to bring this item in because I would like to introduce Alex Loth from Gilbane Building Company. Just a brief history is that this was presented to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen quite a few years ago and with all of the setbacks that we have had and meetings that we have had over the past four years, it is finally moving forward thanks to Lavallee Brensinger who did the architectural plan for us and has all of the plans. Fred Urtz was going to be here this evening but he had

to go out of town. Former Alderman Leo Pepino made the contact with Gilbane quite a few years ago and that is how this whole thing got started. Things happened over the years, but I don't want to talk about all of the problems that we have had over the four years. This was a gift that was going to be given by Gilbane, and because of the economy and personnel changes in Gilbane, it got lost in the shuffle so to speak. We have been meeting for the last year to get back on track thanks to Alex and Gilbane Company to build the World War II monument at Veterans Park which this Board approved. This can not be done because of the economy by donations, although in the concept of the WW II monument I am sure that there will be people who will come forward and do things for nothing and that will be deducted from the goal. We are trying to receive \$175,000 in order to build this monument, and we're hoping to build this monument by Memorial Day next year. A lot of World War II veterans have been waiting a long time for this, and I have committed myself to follow this through, and I hope that this Board will establish a special fund tonight. For people who want to donate money to this special World War II fund, I have spoken to the Finance Officer and the City Solicitor about how that can be done. With that I would like to have Alex explain the charts that we have.

Mr. Alex Loth, Gilbane Building Company, stated we're very excited to be working with the veterans, with Mike Lopez and Leo Pepino and Lavallee Brensinger and hopefully with a lot of local contractors here around the City to make this World War II memorial happen. There is a long history to the project, as Mike alluded to, before my time. I got involved in this about a year ago. There is some misunderstanding as to what representations were made. Anyway, we are very happy to be involved with the project. We're going to be managing the construction process along with the City. We will be making the first donation to the fund to help kick off the fundraising campaign for this project. We will be working with local trades to try to get the best participation we can in terms of

some donations, some price breaks and that sort of thing. We've talked to a lot of contractors already and I think that is going very well. The drawings that you see in front of you are representations of what the memorial will look like. It's sited in the southwest corner of the park, coming off of where the Prisoners of War/Missing in Action Memorial is now. We've planned it, along with Lavallee Brensinger, Fred Urtz and Khoun Pathana of Lavallee Brensinger Architects. We have put together a nice looking building. It looks like it's going to blend in well with the rest of what is already out there in Veterans Memorial Park. It will be brick with a green metal roof, and the names of the 12,000 some-odd Manchester World War II veterans will be engraved and put up there as a memorial. Like Mike said, the fund raising campaign will be kicking off. Should the Aldermen vote to set up this fund, there will be a secure place for that money to go. I believe the intent is that it is a separate fund that is set up only for the construction and eventual maintenance of this memorial so that those donations will not go into parking or any other needs that the City has. We are very excited to be working with the City and with the Veterans Council, and we're looking forward to getting this done. If the fundraising campaign goes well and the construction goes well we will hopefully have a memorial up by next spring. Once the fund raising really gets going, we'll have a better idea of when the memorial will be up and ready.

Alderman Lopez stated that I just want to add we wanted to present something first of all and then set up the fund as the planning aspect. We are getting a lot of people involved in raising the funds, and we plan on visiting quite a few companies in the City of Manchester. We have a plan laid out as to what we want to do. There are 16 benches around the monument; we have decided that each bench would require a \$5,000 donation, so that would raise \$80,000 right off the top. With the columns that you see, we are still in the planning stages as to whether or not we are going to put three names donated on each plaque or six names. As we go through the process, that decision will be made. It will cost

approximately \$1,100 for each of the columns to go in there, so we are trying to figure out what is a good cost and what is reasonable to donate. A lot of people have come forward and said they want to donate and I've asked them to wait until we set up fund, first of all. One of the requirements that Mr. Sanders can speak to is that we are not going to do any construction whatsoever until we have all of the money. The way I understand it from Mr. Sanders, if Gilbane comes back and says they have donations of \$50,000, and we have \$125,000 in the fund and are willing to sign a contract, we will move forward. Is that the way you understand it? Tom, did Tom Arnold explain anything?

Mr. Tom Clark, City Solicitor, responded I understand that that is going to be the case. I talked to Bill Sanders a few minutes ago and he is all set with this. The letter that is written to the full Board states that there is nothing constructed until all of the money is in place and until Bill Sanders reports back to this Board.

Aldermen Lopez stated we will try to answer any questions from the Board.

Alderman Sullivan stated thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a parliamentary inquiry rather than anything on the merits here. The motion that you are bringing forward, which I suspect includes both creating the fund as well as waiving the procurement policy, would that be divisible?

Alderman Lopez responded that is the question that I will propose to the Board. There is no question about that for the simple reason that Gilbane has spent a lot of time on this and they will be the lead coordinator. They are going to need somebody to coordinate with the contractors, see which ones are going to do something for nothing. For an example, putting the names on the wall, is approximately \$13,000 and Kathy Champagne over at Jutras Signs is willing to do that. Whether she is willing to do for half of that or whatever, we are still looking

at that aspect of it. Another example would be, talking to Danny O'Neil, having union people putting up the brick and stuff like that. All of that will be coordinated and the final number will come down to whatever it is: \$100,000 or \$125,000. No contract will be given until Gilbane...it will only be given to Gilbane for the number of \$125,000 for an example.

Alderman Sullivan stated okay I just have to reiterate this. I am not entirely comfortable with waiving the procurement policy for a project like this. What I would request is that the question be divided as to that particular aspect. I have no objection to the project itself. I do have some misgivings about waiving the procurement policy for this sort of a project. It is not an emergency; it is not a critical matter, which I think it is the intention in the procurement code to allow the City to waive it. So I would ask that the question be divided.

Alderman Lopez stated the question will be divided then. The only thing that I would mention is with the time and effort that Gilbane is putting in, I think it is in the best interest of the City to complete this project and move forward. Are there any other questions from the Board?

Alderman Ouellette stated thank you Mr. Chairman. I don't have a question. This is a little overwhelming to look at that. I think it is beautiful. I lost my father to illness last year in July and it is coming up to the year anniversary that I lost him. He was a veteran of World War II and one of his greatest joys was to go down to Washington, DC with a group from Jutras Post to be there for the National dedication of that monument. In his memory, Mr. Chairman, I would move for the establishment of the fund for the World War II memorial as well as providing the City with the ability to accept future contributions.

On a motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to establish the fund for the World War II memorial and allow the City to accept contributions.

Alderman Ouellette stated I would also move that the City procurement policy be waived.

Deputy City Clerk Matt Normand stated the motion that you are looking for is the motion to suspend the rules and place the ordinance on its third and final reading by title only, and that is the ordinance contained in the attachment.

On a motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to suspend the rules. Alderman Sullivan voted in opposition.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to place the ordinance on its third and final reading by title only. Alderman Sullivan voted in opposition.

Chairman Lopez stated I want to thank the Board very much for moving this forward. I do want to mention that we have one co-chairman and we're looking for another one. We're in the process of talking to a couple of people, but Dick Anagnost is going to be a co-chairman on this committee, and I want to thank him very much. Bill Whitmore from Sweeney Post is going to be on this committee, and also Gene Mackie from the Welfare office, who helped me with the other monument at the Rines Center for Ron Pappas recently. He does a good job. We'll be providing more information as we proceed, and the Finance Officer will update the fund as we go along. I want to thank you for all the hard work you've done.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

Approve under supervision of the Department of Highways

- A.** Pole petitions:
#11-1208 1 pole 13 Ray Street
#11-1209 1 pole 460 Litchfield Lane
#11-1210 1 pole 510 Clay Street
#11-1211 2 poles South Beech Street
#11-1205 1 pole Tessier Street
433A/3 ½ 1 pole Thistle Way

Approve under supervision of the Department of Highways; subject to funding availability

- B.** Sidewalk petitions:
137 Fleming Street
153 Fleming Street
126 Fleming Street
75 Harriman Street
52 Goodwin Street
1520 Belmont Street
305 Holly Avenue
396 Laurel Street
23 Rebel Lane
347 Pearl Street
305 McCarthy Street
255 Pennsylvania Avenue
616 Prescott Street
346 Orange Street

Informational to be Received and Filed

- D.** Monthly Bulletin from the City of Manchester Health Department for June 2008.

- E. Communication from Fred Robinson, Executive Director of New Horizons for New Hampshire, Inc. thanking the Board of Mayor and Alderman for restoring funds to the Welfare Department.
- F. Communication from Alderman Lopez advising the Board that he has appointed Alderman Sullivan to serve as the Aldermanic Representative on the Mayor's Customer Service Committee.

Accept Funds and Remand for the Purpose Intended

- G. In the amount of \$5,400 grant from Fish and Game to pay overtime to officers of the Manchester Police Department to patrol Black Acres.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

- J. Bond Resolutions:

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Ninety Seven Thousand Two Hundred Twenty Five Dollars (\$197,225) for the 2009 CIP 411709, SCBA Update & Replacement Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$275,000) for the 2009 CIP 411609, Police Portable Radio Replacement Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the 2009 CIP 510509, Rockingham Recreational Trail Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2009 CIP 612309, Neighborhood Revitalization Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the CIP 710109, Residential 50/50 Sidewalk/Curb Program.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$150,000) for the 2009 CIP 711109, Annual Bridge Rehabilitation Program/Design-Biron St. Bridge Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Million Two Hundred Eleven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$3,211,500) for the 2009 CIP 711209, Annual ROW Reconstruction Program.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the 2009 CIP 711509, Sidewalk Discretionary Fund Program.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for the 2009 CIP 711609, Storm Drain Infrastructure Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$250,000) for the 2009 CIP 711709, Storm Water Utility Study/Design Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) for the 2009 CIP 711809, Street Light Safety & Rehabilitation Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$150,000) for the 2009 CIP 712009, Elm Street Mast Arm Replacement Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the 2009 CIP 712109, Traffic Signal Reconstruction Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$100,000) for the 2009 CIP 810209, Strategic Planning for Facilities- Police- Fire- Highway Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$800,000) for the 2009 CIP 810309, Motorized & Electronic Equipment Replacement (MEER) Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the 2009 CIP 810409, Hallsville School Roof Project.”

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Million Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$2,750,000) for the 2009 CIP 310209, Open Classroom Elimination- HGF Project.”

K. Resolution:

“Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$125,000) for the FY2009 CIP 611709 Housing Initiatives Program.”

Amending the FY 2008 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Hundred Twenty Nine Dollars (\$729) for the FY 2008 CIP 210208 Homeless Healthcare Program.”

“Amending the FY2007 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Four Thousand Four Hundred Two Dollars (\$34,402) for the 2007 CIP 511207 Derryfield CC Rehabilitation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$5,400) for the FY 2009 CIP 411809 OHRV Wheeled Vehicle Contracts.”

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

- L.** Recommending a sewer abatement at 100 Stewart Street be denied. The Committee notes that the information requested from the applicant by EPD was not provided.

(Unanimous vote)

- M.** Recommending that a request for a transfer of funds in the amount of \$20,000 from various projects for partial funding for the public/private partnership in accordance with the recommendation of the Homeless Plan be accepted. A resolution and budget authorization has been submitted for such purpose.

(Aldermen Garrity, Gatsas, Shea and Smith voted yea; Alderman O’Neil voted in opposition.)

- N. Recommending that the funding proposal for Phase II Stella Arms totaling \$500,000 as submitted by the Planning Department be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- O. Recommending that the City accept an offer from the Airport to purchase for Parks, Recreation and Cemetery, a 25-30 foot fir or spruce tree in Stanton Plaza *(Unanimous vote)*

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEMS

- P. Recommending that CIGNA HealthCare be permitted to hang a 60 foot banner across Elm Street (at Elm and Amherst Streets) marking the official Start Line of the 16th Annual CIGNA/Elliot Corporate 5K Road Race.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

- Q. Advising that it has approved Ordinance:

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.57 Parking Rates increasing the rates for parking at various locations throughout the city.”

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

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman O’Neil who was opposed to Item F of the amendment)

- S. Recommending that regulations for standing, stopping, parking and operation of vehicles be adopted as noted and those inconsistent therewith be repealed.
(Unanimous vote)
- T. Recommending that regulations for standing, stopping, parking and operation of vehicles be adopted as noted and those inconsistent therewith be repealed.
(NO TURN ON RED – On Bridge Street at Candia Road)
(Aldermen Shea, Sullivan and J. Roy voted yea; Aldermen O’Neil and Ouellette were opposed.)
- U. Recommending that the placement of “No Parking” signs on Londonderry Turnpike between Route 101 and the Massabesic Circle be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- V.** Recommending that a request from Mr. Mahboubul Hassan, President of the Islamic Society of Greater Manchester, to close Lagrange Avenue be approved for a period of one year at the discretion of the Public Works Director.
The Committee further requests that the Public Works Director return with an update and further recommendation on Lagrange Avenue at the end of this one year road closure.
(Aldermen Shea, O'Neil, Sullivan and Ouellette voted yea; Alderman J. Roy was opposed)
- W.** Advising that a communication from Alderman Shea proposing the establishment of a Manchester Crime Prevention Committee has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
- X.** Advising that a communication from the Public Works Department regarding the weight of various commercial motor vehicles has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

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

Alderman Domaingue stated that she is opposed to item V.

- C.** Communication from MTA Board of Commissioners regarding the termination of lease contract from Concord Coach with the Manchester Transportation Center lease on or around November 30, 2008.

Alderman DeVries stated we had a presentation from the Mayor a couple of weeks ago or at the last meeting. It is my recollection that he thought he was going to have a meeting in the interim time. I don't know if the Mayor's staff has an update that maybe he could tell us the progress.

Mr. Mark Laliberte, the Mayor's Public Affairs Advisor, stated as far as I know, I think it is July 12th at 10:00 AM. I don't know much more about what's going on with that meeting. I was on vacation when it was put together, but I do know that many people confirmed for that date.

Alderman DeVries stated thank you for the update. I think it goes without saying for myself and probably others on this Board that we are anxious to hear the outcome of that meeting, if you could express to the Mayor that we would like to know that as soon as there is any update available.

Chairman Lopez stated while you're up there, Mark, we've got a letter from St. Anselm for the 14th for Governor Dukakis. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. Laliberte responded I was actually informed about that outside of work today. I don't know much about that. I can certainly get back to the Board with more information.

Chairman Lopez asked Alderman O'Neil, do you know anything about that?

Alderman O'Neil responded I think Southern New Hampshire Planning has put together a forum. I believe the Board has been invited. Other than that, I don't know the details. They have some special guest speakers, including Governor Dukakis, the former governor of Massachusetts, who was a real advocate during his time as governor.

Chairman Lopez stated this committee that's been formed by the City, I hope they've been informed about this meeting because it seems like an important meeting on mass transportation.

Mr. Laliberte stated I'll contact David Preece tomorrow morning and see if I can get some information about this and have it communicated to the Aldermen tomorrow.

Alderman DeVries made a motion to receive and file this item.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm sure that my colleagues have received the information on the contract and also I would have hoped the members of the MTA board would have been here to answer some questions. I would ask the Clerk to send the MTA Board notification to come before this Board at the next meeting on August 5th to have conversation, because I thought we were hiring competent people and not having to pay another company outside additional funding to talk about routes. I think maybe we as a Board need to take a look at those contracts and take a look at options that are before us, certainly to address them going forward. And seeing that there is a termination letter here, I certainly don't know who the best person is to put in the position of talking with other companies about servicing the City. We shouldn't wait until July 12th to find out what Concord Coach is doing. We should start working on that tomorrow to find out if there are other people that want to come in and offer service to the citizens of Manchester, to either take them to Portland, to Concord or to the Park and Ride. But that discussion should be starting sooner rather than later.

Alderman Sullivan stated just to address what my colleague from Ward 2 just brought up, that was a topic at the meeting that was held between the Mayor and some of the other City officials and the state DOT folks about two weeks ago. That was one of the topics that came up at that time; that we do move forward with looking at other alternatives that are out there. So it's not something that isn't on the radar. I would just suggest that we work with the Mayor because it's my understanding...Mark, correct me if I'm wrong...that that's something that

he's already in the process of working on, scouting out what other companies may be able to fill this gap.

Alderman Gatsas stated with all due respect to my colleague, it's been three weeks and there are people that are getting very antsy out there that use this service, and we shouldn't be waiting. There should be somebody, either the Economic Developer that's talking to people out there to come back before this Board within the next 30 days, or a special meeting to report if there are other companies that have interest. We shouldn't be waiting, because the date's coming close, and when it happens, we're not going to be able to do anything. We're three weeks away from them closing. I don't want to wait until the 28th to be prepared to find another company. So, somebody needs to be directed. And I guess I'll make it in the form of a motion, that Jay Minkarah comes forward at the next...well, before that...we should have a special meeting. He should be looking in the next week to see how he can best appropriate bringing companies forward so that people in Manchester aren't thinking that the 29th is the last day they're going to see a bus.

***Alderman Gatsas** moved that in the next week Jay Minkarah should be looking to see how he can best bring companies forward who are interested in providing bus service in Manchester. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Sullivan**.*

Alderman O'Neil stated I happened to accompany Dave Preece of Southern New Hampshire Planning and a town counselor from Bedford up to a meeting with the Commissioner last week. I think everybody is starting to get on the same page. We did at our last Board meeting ask to reactivate our Transportation Advisory Committee, and I think that's where we need to have this coordinated effort between our Economic Development director, our Public Works director, our Planning director, our Airport director, Southern New Hampshire Planning, and

the Transit Authority. We need them all in the same room at the same time because the problem has been all of these side discussions that go on. I don't think assigning another task to Jay that's already been directed by this Board to do is...we need those six people in the same room meeting with the state, meeting with whoever it is, so that we're getting back one message.

Chairman Lopez asked who is the lead person on that committee?

Alderman O'Neil responded we can make Mr. Minkarah. He's sitting up front. He can be the lead coordinator on it.

Chairman Lopez stated I don't want anyone to come back and ask who's on first.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we agreed that we were going to let the Mayor coordinate this through this Transportation Advisory Committee. This is bigger than just saying we're getting a bus company into downtown; this is much bigger than that. That's why I spent a couple of hours in Concord, trying to learn more about this contract with the company that has been created called Boston Express. This is pretty complex and we're going to need the state of New Hampshire to be a partner with us regarding anything related to Boston Express. That's who the contract is with. Boston Express is with the state, not the city of Manchester at Exit 5.

Alderman Sullivan stated I guess my question would be whether or not Alderman Gatsas would accept a friendly amendment asking that the Transportation Advisory Committee come before this Board in two week's time to give us a status report on negotiations with other service providers.

Chairman Lopez stated I agree with you, if there are some questions we want them to answer. We should tell them what the questions are, not just generalize.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't disagree with where Alderman O'Neil is going. There is only one problem: The legislature is out. July 29th is coming before us. I don't know what we're going to tell people on July 30th, because there's not going to be any transportation. To wait to see what the Commissioner at DOT and the company that is Boston Express...it was pretty clear during the process how the funds were moving. Certainly it's not like Boston Express is going to change their plan that's before them unless somebody knows something and is not revealing it to the rest of us. I don't want to wait until the 30th and say how do we get these different things in motion, when it's going to take 30 or 60 days to get another company if Boston Express is not interested. And, certainly by the sounds of it, making their detour in Manchester to go back to 93 is not something that they're looking at. I hear where Alderman O'Neil is going, but the 29th is going to be on us, and we're going to have people without any service. I don't know if I'm prepared to wait.

Chairman Lopez stated maybe the solution...Jay, you can convey the remarks that we have here to the special committee for them to give us some type of report on some of the questions that are...by July 29th. I don't know who's on vacation or whatever the case, but I'm sure if all six of them are not there, four of them can meet and give some preliminary decisions or something in writing, maybe to the Board so that we have some type of answers pertaining to the questions that the Aldermen have. Is that possible? Does that satisfy everybody?

Alderman Pinard stated I don't know how many of you have been down to Londonderry to see what's going on. I would recommend that you get into your car and take a ride and see what's going on. They're going to be paving that 400

car parking lot. I was there last week. They have a clerk at the job. He's right on top of everything. Everything should be ready by October 1st, according to one of the engineers. So I think Alderman Gatsas is right. I think we'd better move and move fast.

Chairman Lopez stated if it's okay with the Board, the motion is withdrawn, Alderman Gatsas?

Alderman Gatsas asked did you amend it, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Lopez responded no, my suggestion was to give Jay an opportunity to talk to the committee and show our concerns and get some information back to us as soon as possible.

Alderman Gatsas stated unless the committee that we've formed is planning on driving buses to move people back and forth, I don't really know what they're going to do. We should be talking to companies that may have some interest in providing the service. There's no question that a committee is important, but to get back some dialogue in two weeks, that leaves us a week. I think there should be serious discussions about who's going to move people back and forth from Manchester to either Concord or Boston, and it needs to be done quickly. If the committee can do that quickly and have conversation, I'm not telling them to make a commitment on the City's part. But we'd better have some answers pretty quick because there's going to be an awful lot of people discouraged that can't travel.

Chairman Lopez stated I agree with you, and I think one individual at the public meeting...and we have the information that he said he talked to four buses; he said that he can get that information to Mr. Smith. Southern New Hampshire, I

presume, sits on that committee, so they can look into that. And Jay, can you make sure you get that from the City Clerk and pass that on and see if we can move this thing along? It's done. The bus company is built out in Londonderry, but we have these other problems that we have to find out about.

Alderman DeVries stated I certainly agree that this rises high enough for our level of concern that we can't wait a long period of time. With July 30th being our deadline, weeks are a long period of time. I just ask...I guess the Mayor's gone for all of this week. I believe that we should add to the proposal that if we need to be back here in a special meeting, and we need to be back here next week, Alderman Gatsas could well be right. Somebody should be reaching out to see if there is an alternative vendor that wants to come into the City of Manchester, what those terms are, have those initial discussions. If we need to be back here next week, we should be back here, if that information is available and viable and something we should be acting on.

Chairman Lopez stated we can set up a special meeting if the Board desires, a tentative meeting for next week. In the meantime, Jay can work with the committee and Mr. Smith. If they can provide us that information by next Tuesday, that's fine.

Alderman DeVries stated and if the information is there, we have the meeting. We don't need to be here to spin our wheels on how important this is.

Alderman Shea stated I just want the people listening to understand that the lease does not expire until November 30th. We're hearing a lot this evening about the fact of the 29th of July, but bus services will continue until November 30th, so people don't have to worry. I think there might be some people asking if it's July

29th that bus service is going to stop. It's not going to stop until November 30th. However, it's important that we consider options before that time.

Chairman Lopez stated okay, hearing no more questions, Jay, take care of that and report back to the City Clerk if you have any answers for us.

H. Communication from the Town of Goffstown regarding the impact of the Trestle on the Piscataquog River during the floods of 2006 and 2007.

Alderman DeVries stated the letter has come to us from the town of Goffstown speaking on behalf of their constituents, addressing some safety concerns. It could be appropriate for maybe Chief Burkush to come up and engage in conversation. I believe that there might be some need to research what the emergency management plan is for the trestle over the Piscataquog River. I don't expect that he has that information at his fingertips, but he might.

Chairman Lopez stated may I remind you that this is going to the Lands and Buildings Committee.

Fire Chief Jim Burkush stated I've just seen the letter. I haven't had a chance to review it.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess what I was hoping is that we...I understand that it's going to another of our committees, but if they have some genuine concerns over there that there are flooding issues and they feel that they are in peril, I thought that looking at the emergency assessment that we did in the City and seeing the report of...was it a FEMA report? We could have that prepared so that we can truly look at the risk assessment that's been determined on that trestle.

Chief Burkush stated I'll certainly work with the committee to resolve the issue of the trestle.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Lands and Buildings.

Alderman O'Neil asked for items I and R to be taken together.

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

I. Ordinances:

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.57 Parking Rates increasing the rates for parking at various locations throughout the city.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.54 Permit Parking in Lieu of Coin Deposit increasing certain parking permit fees and creating new parking districts.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.48 Denomination of Coin to be Deposited and Time Allotted Therefore eliminating the minimum credit card transaction and restricting the transfer of Pay and Display Receipt between parking districts.”

“Repealing the 2000 Edition of the *International Fire Code*, adopted in Section 92.05 of the City of Manchester Code of Ordinances, and adopting the 2006 Edition of the *International Fire Code*, regulating and governing the safeguarding of life and property from fire and explosion hazards arising from the storage, handling and use of hazardous substances materials and devices, and from conditions hazardous to life or property in the occupancy of buildings and premises in the City of Manchester; and providing for the issuance of permits and the collecting of fees for hazardous uses or operations.”

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

R. Advising that it has approved Ordinances:

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.54 Permit Parking in Lieu of Coin Deposit increasing certain parking permit fees and creating new parking districts.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.48 Denomination of Coin to be Deposited and Time Allotted Therefore eliminating the minimum credit card transaction and restricting the transfer of Pay and Display Receipt between parking districts.”

“Repealing the 2000 Edition of the *International Fire Code*, adopted in Section 92.05 of the City of Manchester Code of Ordinances, and adopting the 2006 Edition of the *International Fire Code*, regulating and governing the safeguarding of life and property from fire and explosion hazards arising from the storage, handling and use of hazardous substances materials and devices, and from conditions hazardous to life or property in the occupancy of buildings and premises in the City of Manchester; and providing for the issuance of permits and the collecting of fees for hazardous uses or operations.”

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

(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Gatsas moved to refer the sections of items I and R addressing the repeal of the 2000 Edition of the International Fire Code to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading. Alderman Ouellette duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O’Neil asked can I just ask a question on the topic of discussion before us? If we’re not going to resolve anything in a certain period of time, can we send it back to committee? I think otherwise we’ll be here all night on this. There was some information presented tonight that we didn’t have previously. I’m willing to

sit here and listen to some of this but I don't want to spend the next two hours on this topic. If we're not going to resolve anything tonight we should send it back.

Chairman Lopez stated some Aldermen have suggested that, and I think it would be appropriate because it's such a hot subject. I don't believe that the thing is going to take two hours, but I think an opportunity for the Parking Manager to bring her actions to the full Board and to the public and address misconceptions that people were spreading I think is more important. Then as we get moving forward, if that's what the Board wants to do then we'll do it.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess my first question is Brandy, you provided the committee with a very colorful chart. I don't see it in here. Is there a reason why the rest of us wouldn't have the opportunity to look at that pretty, colored chart?

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, responded the colored chart is actually included in the PowerPoint plan, the maps that I had.

Alderman Gatsas stated but I think you gave everybody one so that they could physically see it before them.

Ms. Stanley stated I apologize, Alderman. I have not gotten back to the Highway Department to get them to print me out some more maps. I don't have the printer to be able to do that.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if you don't sit on the committee, I guess the vote doesn't count. Maybe we should move it right now.

Ms. Stanley stated I don't think that's the case, and I certainly as more than willing to give everyone the larger copies of the map.

Alderman Gatsas asked do you have a copy of the PowerPoint?

Ms. Stanley responded yes.

Alderman Gatsas asked have you passed it out?

Ms. Stanley responded it should be on the agenda.

Alderman Gatsas stated the PowerPoint is not on the agenda; just the ordinance is.

Ms. Stanley stated okay, I apologize about that.

Alderman Gatsas asked how about if we wait and do the presentation so that we have all the information in front of us? If Alderman O'Neil wants to make that motion, I'll second it. We can send it back to committee.

Chairman Lopez stated I think I know where this is going.

Alderman Osborne stated Mr. Chairman, can't the people at least let Brandy do what she's got to do and present this whole thing to the people that are watching out there? Then we can make a motion to table this and go back to committee.

Alderman Gatsas stated well then everybody had better be prepared to have her make this presentation again so that we have the information in front of us. It's unfair that a committee has the information and we as Aldermen don't have it.

Alderman Domaingue stated frankly, I concur with Alderman Gatsas. I'm concerned that we're going to have to go through this presentation a second time. I know I'm going to have multiple questions, and whereas I don't have the documentation in front of me, I don't think it's necessarily productive to go through this process.

Chairman Lopez stated I agree with the Alderman. I don't know why the information is not in the packet. If the committee has something that they have seen, everybody else should see the same thing. I think it's just important that a lot of people are talking about this...that it's going to be in two phases, really. One is to knock off some of the conception. It seems, just hearing the Board, it's going to go back to committee. I'd just like the indulgence of the Board for ten or fifteen minutes and then we can take action whatever way we want to go. I agree with what you're saying about the documentation. So if there are no objections...

Alderman Gatsas interjected as long as there are no objections that she will make this presentation again, a second time, in front of the full Board, even though it's going back to committee.

Chairman Lopez stated that's correct.

Alderman Domaingue stated if I may add one final point, I certainly hope that this presentation is made before a meeting of downtown business owners prior to being made before us again.

Alderman Osborne stated Mr. Chairman, just one more thing: The next meeting, when we come back with this, shouldn't the Chamber of Commerce and Intown be here too?

Chairman Lopez stated I think she's going to answer some of those questions.

Ms. Stanley stated I'll start before I start the presentation with just talking about a few things with relation to the petition that has been going around and some flyers that have been handed out to some of the downtown businesses. This plan was not something that we came up with in a vacuum. It was based on professional studies that have been done throughout the last ten or fifteen years. It was based on industry standards. It was based on a lot of research. It was based on the parking study that we actually commissioned two and a half years ago, and it was also based on a lot of research that we conducted in order to make sure that this plan was workable for the City of Manchester and for downtown. We recognize that it is somewhat complicated and that there is a lot of misinformation and misunderstandings going around out there. I did see a copy of the petition that was signed by a number of employees, business owners and constituents, and it basically consists of two paragraphs. This parking plan cannot be described in two paragraphs. I've since talked to...I've talked to one of the business owners that was initially against the program. Once I got the chance to sit down with him and talk to him, he is now in support of it in full. So, I presented this plan to the Intown board of directors, to the Chamber of Commerce downtown committee, and received no opposition when I presented that. There has only been one individual that I presented this plan to that did not ultimately think it was a good idea. So with that said, the first thing is the philosophy of the Parking Division. The underlying motivation for what we do is to provide quality customer service. It's also based on the two philosophies that short term parkers need spaces closest to their destinations and long term parkers need consistently available parking. Another charge that we have been given is to generate revenues to offset taxpayer contributions where it makes sense. The first problem we tackled was the rates and the hours of enforcement. Our current policies don't support our underlying goals. What we found is when we did space counts in preparation for this plan is

that our ten hour meters are 72% vacant at any given point in time. Our own parking study said that our goal should be 10% vacancy. Those spaces should be taken up by all-day parkers and they are simply not at this point. Elm Street is an average of 5% vacant. The goal should be 15% vacancy. We should have 85% of the spaces filled during peak hours, which leaves enough spaces for people to find spaces as they come in. So the question was this: How do we open up spaces in the right places for short term parkers? The tools we have are to create differences in rates, to create differences in hours of paid parking, to provide stable and less expensive options for long term parkers and to use enforcement as a tool to influence behavior. Unfortunately, we don't have the same luxury as the Mall of New Hampshire does. This is not private property and we cannot mandate that employees of businesses park 1,000 yards away from the front door. These are public parking spaces and we don't have the same types of tools available to make sure that things happen the way we need them. The first thing we looked at was evening enforcement hours. We do we enforce until 8:00 PM. The answer was to create turnover in short term spaces where they are needed. The current policy is not effective because no matter where you park in the City, you pay until 8 PM. In that case we're not giving anybody any incentive to make any other decision but to park in front of their place of business or work. So a solution for this particular portion of the question is to stop charging at 5:30 PM at most of our meters. Long term parkers will now have an attractive alternative, which is less expensive. They don't have to worry about overtime tickets and they don't have to feed their meter and move their car every two hours. Short term parkers, conversely, would now have an increased chance of finding a space in front of their destination. The streets that are outlined in green on this map are the meters that are going to have free parking after 5:30 PM. The meters that will be enforced until 8:00 PM are basically Elm Street between Lake and Bridge, and one block on either side, as well as the Gaslight District. All of the other meters in the City, including the Millyard, north of Bridge and Chestnut Street east and south of

Lake will be free after 5:30 PM. The next thing we looked at was the parking meter rates. Why do we charge for parking? The answer is twofold: to create turnover in short term spaces and to generate revenue. The current policy is not effective because no matter where you park, you pay fifty cents an hour. Market monthly garage rates are actually more expensive than parking on the street, feeding the meter every two hours, and moving your car. In that case, why wouldn't you park in front of your business or place of work? What we wanted to do was create incentives for all-day parkers to get off of the main drag. So we have two solutions here. One is to increase the rates where we need the turnover. The second one was to hold fees steady or eliminate them where we don't need them. The Gaslight District and Elm Street plus one block east and west becomes seventy-five cents per hour until 8:00 PM. Everywhere else will stay at the current rate of fifty cents an hour and will be free after 5:30 PM. What this does is encourage all-day parkers to take advantage of the vacancy rates that we have in our garages. Some of the garages are more expensive than others. Some of the garages have more vacancies than others. For instance, Wall Street Tower has a lot of vacancies and they are charging \$50 a month for monthly parking, which is significantly less than what you pay by feeding the meter every two hours, which, if it matters, is about \$85 a month. That's what you're paying if you work full time and feed the meter every two hours. With a seventy-five cent rate, that monthly rate goes from \$85 to almost \$130 a month. Conversely, if you're a visitor downtown, and you come downtown twice a week and spend two hours each time, your weekly parking cost is \$2. It's fifty cents an hour for two hours and you make two visits. At seventy-five cents an hour, your weekly parking cost goes to \$3. So the magnitude of the rate increase is felt by those that we want to encourage not to park on Elm Street and not to park in front of the retail businesses. If you look at this map you see streets that are outlined in green. Those are the streets that are going to be enforced from 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday. We'll get to the blue and to the red in a second. The

next thing we tackled was Saturday parking. Why don't we charge for parking on Saturday? Quite frankly the answer is we didn't do it right the first time. The reason we didn't do it right was because we charged on Saturday for every single meter in the City, which we've demonstrated does not work and doesn't make any sense. If you don't need to create turnover in every single space in the City. We're proposing a charge on Saturday now because, as a result of the survey that we did, 95 to 100 businesses are open downtown every single Saturday. We also did space counts in the entire downtown area and we found that Elm Street parking spaces are over 95% occupied. Once again, our goal is 85%. We need to be able to open up some of those spaces on Elm Street. Conversely, what we found was that the side streets off of Elm Street had plenty of vacancies. Many business owners say they are losing customers because the customers can't park on Elm Street. So our solution is to charge for parking on Saturday only on Elm Street between Granite and Bridge. It does not include any other streets besides those 115 parking spaces between Granite and Bridge on Elm Street. Long term parkers can park around the corner for free and for all day. Short term parkers will now be able to park in front of their destinations or they too can make the choice to park around the corner for free. This is simply a map of the storefronts that are open on Saturdays. A lot of these parcels have multiple businesses inside of them, but it does make up between 95 and 100 businesses. As you can see, most of them are on Elm Street. The next thing we looked at was event parking. Neither the Arena nor the Stadium was built with attached parking. The idea was to encourage walking and retail patronage. I think that most people can safely say that the result was a dramatic increase in downtown business as a result of the construction of the Arena. There are two problems with Event parking. Number one is Event patrons conflict with the two hour time limit. If they come down early for an event and eat dinner before they go to an event, they run the risk of getting an overtime ticket and they have to move their car or feed the meter. In short, they're doing exactly what we hoped they would do by building the Arena

with no parking in the first place, but they're getting penalized for doing so. The second problem was that parking rates are the same or free for all events in all on-street locations. There is no incentive built into the system to park near retail destinations and patronize them. There is also a large rate gap between private parking and on-street parking, which in most cases is free. There is also a revenue stream that the City pays on the debt service on the building. They pay that to SMG and that goes directly to the debt service on the building. That's \$450,000 that's paid by the Parking Division and we only recover \$100,000 of it. These are the solutions we came up with for Event parking. We wanted to make the first problem go away, which is to lift the two-hour limit on all of the meters in the City at 5:00 PM, so the people who come downtown to have dinner and take their time don't have to worry about moving their car or going back outside to feed their meter. The second one was to institute a one dollar flat rate fee for events on street for both venues, and that's the Stadium and the Arena. This one dollar flat rate would go into effect two hours before the event and it would drop one hour after the event, so there's basically a three-hour window where customers would be asked to pay a dollar. It's important to note, and I think this is one of the sources of some of the misconceptions that are out there, that the rate is only going to be charged in non-destination areas. It's effective for every event, regardless of day or time. If you look back at the map, the streets that are outlined in blue around the Arena are the ones that will be assessed the one dollar charge for the three-hour time window. What we're trying to do is we're trying to get people to park in the streets that are outlined in green. That's where the retail is and that's where we want them to park because that's what we want. We want to build a tax base by making downtown more vibrant and by encouraging more pedestrian traffic. What we found is that people will park all the way down to Arms Park for baseball games, and they will not cross Canal Street. We want to try to change that by getting them to park in the downtown area and actually end up parking

physically parking closer to their destination, if they park on Elm Street or some of the side streets.

Alderman M. Roy stated Brandy, while you are on that slide I was going to have you go back to the other slide on parking zones. My question basically pertains to fairness. One of the people who spoke earlier is in this building here. If I were attending an event and I parked in front of his venue in the Gaslight area, I'm paying the dollar fee, but if I parked directly abutting the Verizon, I'm not paying the dollar fee. Is that what I'm understanding?

Ms. Stanley responded no, it's the other way around. If you see a street that's in green, you do not have to pay the dollar fee. That zone was designed so that it was not, with the exception of the two blocks on Elm Street...and there's only about eight parking spaces there...that section was designed not to be in front of the places we're trying to push people to go into. Those two areas are industrial areas. There is a courthouse up there; there is a retirement home. There is very, very little, if any, retail in those areas, which is why we put the Event rate zone there. We wanted to make sure...we gave people a less expensive option to park in the areas where we want them to patronize the businesses.

Alderman M. Roy stated just so I'm absolutely clear, the green area right now is the place where you do not pay the dollar two hours before and one hour after.

Ms. Stanley stated that's correct.

Alderman M. Roy asked and the one hour after, is that the end of the start of the venue or is that after the actual event ends?

Ms. Stanley responded it's after the start. If you have an 8:00 PM event, the rate would go into effect from 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM. What we looked at in terms of financial results...and I think that this slide will show that we are not necessarily interested in generating more revenue. Over the last 12 months, the meters made \$816,000 as a whole. What we're looking at for the 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM area is an increase of \$208,000 in revenue because the rate will go up. In the 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM area, where we're actually going to be reducing the hours where people are required to pay, we're going to lose about \$84,000. The two events and the Saturday parking are going to make up the balance, which is going to give you a revenue figure of about \$215,000 for a year. Based on the \$5.7 million revenue budget that the Parking Division has, \$215,000 is not significant in terms of trying to generate more revenue. Obviously that's one of our goals, but not at the expense of the rest of the parking system. What we're looking at for an implementation time line is to seek the full Board approval this evening. If that is forthcoming, then the required ordinances would layover as needed and come back to the full Board after the Committee on Bills on Second Reading has had a chance to look at it. What we're shooting for is an implementation of September 1, 2008. The salient points of this plan are basically, if you pay fifty cents an hour now, you still can. You just can't do it on Elm Street or some of the side streets. If you park after 5:30, you will now be able to park for free, depending on where you park. You don't have to worry about overtime tickets after 5:00 PM because we won't be issuing them. You won't have to pay the Event rate if you park outside the Event zone, which is what we're trying to encourage. You can continue to park for free on Saturday, just not in one of those 115 spaces that we're proposing to enforce. The City gets a little bit more revenue and parkers get more options. The next thing that was included in the fiscal year 2009 budget, which is not necessarily a part of the downtown parking plan, is a \$5 per month rate increase and an increase to seventy-five cents per hour in the Victory Garage. It was budgeted to be effective for all permits on-street, parking lot permits,

Victory Garage, and 1155 Elm Street. Our parking lot and on-street permit parking rates are \$40 and \$45, and 1155 Elm and the Victory Garage are \$70. What we're proposing to do is to eliminate the weekday rate of \$70 and go with the 24/7 access rate for all parkers at \$75. This particular increase would add \$250,000 in fiscal year 2009. It is already included in the budget. The last rate increase for permits was July of 2003. The last increase for garages was July of 2005. Underneath there you see a rate survey on the transient and monthly parking rates. The Canal Garage is \$85 for monthly and \$2 an hour for transient. The Center of New Hampshire is \$95 for monthly and \$3 an hour transient. Manchester is fifty cents an hour and \$70.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is 1155 Elm Street?

Ms. Stanley responded it is the Bank of America building that is on the corner of Bridge and Elm. The garage is in the back on Kosciuszko Street. The City leases the ground floor, which is where you see the \$70 monthly rate. That lease was entered into in the mid 1980's and it is a 99 year lease.

Alderman Gatsas asked if we're paying a rate of \$70, who is parking there?

Ms. Stanley asked are you talking about the basement?

Alderman Gatsas responded I'm talking about where it says city lease. We don't own the garage.

Ms. Stanley reiterated we do not own the garage. We lease the ground floor, which comprises 68 spaces. We are on a 100-year lease, which should be some time in next century when it expires.

Alderman Gatsas asked for 68 spaces we pay how much a month?

Ms. Stanley asked how much do we pay? Our annual lease is \$83,900 for the entire year.

Alderman Gatsas asked and how many spaces did you say it is?

Ms. Stanley responded 68 spaces.

Alderman Gatsas stated let me understand this. It's \$83,900 as the lease. Is that including maintenance and everything else, or is that an all in?

Ms. Stanley responded we perform some of the maintenance. I don't have a dollar figure for that right now.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's just use the \$83,900. Can you get back to me for the rest of that? So it's \$83,900 per year, divided by 12 months, divided by 68 spaces. And we're renting them for how much?

Ms. Stanley responded \$70 a month.

Alderman Gatsas stated we're paying \$102 a month per space, and we're renting them for \$70.

Alderman O'Neil stated you have more than 68 leases there, though.

Ms. Stanley stated I believe we have 67 but I did receive a phone call asking for an additional 30 today, which we probably will be able to accommodate.

Alderman Gatsas stated so what you're saying is the net cost is a loss to the City.

Ms. Stanley stated yes, and it always has been under that lease.

Alderman Gatsas stated so the taxpayers are subsidizing this.

Alderman Shea asked do we get tax money from that, though, that offsets that?

Ms. Stanley responded the owners of the building do pay real estate taxes. I don't know whether they pay real estate taxes on the particular square footage that we lease, but they do pay taxes, yes.

Alderman Shea asked and how much do they pay in taxes?

Ms. Stanley responded I'd have to get with the Assessor to get you that information.

Alderman Gatsas stated it doesn't matter. They'd have to pay taxes anyway.

Chairman Lopez stated just a minute please. Let's finish the presentation.

Ms. Stanley stated I think this may be slightly irrelevant, but the ordinance that was passed from the Traffic Committee did contain two errors. There were two references in the ordinance that's before you for Section 70.57 to the Lake Avenue lot. If the Board does take action on this tonight, then those two references need to be removed.

Alderman Garrity moved to send this item back to the Public Safety and Traffic Committee. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Domaingue**.

Chairman Lopez stated I'm not okay with that motion going forward. I just want to remind the Board of a couple of things. As we move forward on this 50/50 sort of issue that's going to be very difficult to vote on, and I understand that. This was presented to the Mayor during the budget process. It included revenue that we voted on and it was included in the revenue that Ms. Stanley presented for the income for the City, at the same time for the operation and the debt service that she carries on the garage over there and the operation of the Parking Division. Understanding that it's going to go back to committee, it should go to Alderman Shea's committee, not Bills on Second Reading, so that we can get some type of answers for the next meeting because there is a time element here. Either we're going to move forward or we're going to forget about it. We'll lose all that revenue and solve the problems that we have had that we could not solve in the City as far as free parking. Or, we might want to say, let's give everybody free parking and see what happens down the road for two months. Then everybody would be screaming, coming back here saying let's have some type of control. I just want to remind you of the budget process and the direction we gave Ms. Stanley. She brought it forward, and I know it's a tough decision, a 50/50 issue. The motion has been made and I'll take questions.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding that it would need approval by not only the Public Safety and Traffic Committee but also Bills on Second Reading, at some point? Is that correct? Wouldn't it make some sense? We've done this in the past. We've had a joint meeting or if we think it's important to make this more coordinated, maybe we would have a special meeting of the Board at some point. I'm not talking next week, but I'm talking down the road. Maybe at some point down the road we would have a special meeting, where this is going to involve so many Aldermen anyway on so many committees. We're not going to meet the December 1st deadline. It's very clear. But, maybe

we can help come close to that if there is some willingness to move it forward. There might be some fine tuning that needs to happen, etcetera.

Chairman Lopez stated Bills on Second Reading is a technical review. The most important committee to look at it is the Public Safety Committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated but unless the Board determines otherwise, it has to go from Public Safety and Traffic to the full Board. Then it goes to Bills on Second Reading and then back to the full Board. I'm just making a suggestion that maybe in August we can work on this.

Alderman Shea stated the point of the matter is that we can refer it back, but unless the committee knows what the people who are referring it back are objecting to, where are we going to go? It will come back again and there will be more objections. So, if people want to refer it back to the committee, then they have to tell us what they object to and what their solution or recommendation may be. It's an easy matter to refer it back and throw it back into our lap, and then we're going to come back with the same situation by the same votes, and the same people are going to say send it back. But the very same people that are referring it back are not willing, in my judgment, to say how we're going to get the money back from the revenues that are being proposed, because basically we're going to have...how much of a problem will we have as far as revenues are concerned in your department, if I may ask, Brandy? If we table it and decide not to do anything, how much are you going to be short?

Ms. Stanley responded probably about \$500,000.

Alderman Shea stated so we'll take that out of the rainy day fund next year if we're that short, because basically we're not magicians here. In other words, you

have a responsibility as the director to come before us with ideas. Therefore, if we refer it back to my committee, and nobody has any suggestions for it, just objections, then we're willing to do whatever is necessary and we'll bring it back and then we can act accordingly. The point of the matter is that we're not going to get anywhere if people just object and send it back to us because the committee is in favor of this. Therefore, it's going to come back the same way, unless people on the committee change their minds.

Alderman Ouellette stated I was going to make the exact same point that Alderman Shea made. We've already discussed this at the committee. We had the same exact presentation at the committee level as we had here. Nothing has changed other than the wording about the Lake Avenue lot. However, I am disappointed that there was not a public meeting of the business owners to explain to them what the issues are with parking. I supported the program at the committee level and I certainly support the program today. I don't think sending it back to the committee is going to solve anything. If Aldermen have questions...and I understand some Aldermen don't have information that we had at the committee level. That again is something that I didn't know until tonight. I certainly would be in favor of tabling this issue for another month or so, but I'm not in favor of sending this back to committee.

Alderman M. Roy stated I have a question for the Finance Officer. If these revenue are not approved...and I'm not talking about the pros and cons of the parking proposal, but if these revenues are not approved by the Board by October, it's my understanding you can't include them on the DRA forms, and that will affect the tax rate even quicker than next year's rainy day fund, as Alderman Shea said. Is that true or false?

Mr. Bill Sanders, Finance Director, responded that is true. If they are not approved I can't put them on the DRA forms. There may be other revenue items that change up or down as well. But ignoring all of that, changes have to be implemented.

Alderman M. Roy stated but a half a million dollars is substantial to what we did with our budget process, so if these are not enacted by October, then as an officer you can't report them.

Mr. Sanders stated that's correct.

Alderman M. Roy stated I just wanted that clarified, that we're not talking about next year. We're talking about this year's tax bills.

Alderman Sullivan stated I supported this proposal at the committee level, and I think Brandy has done a good job of putting together a well-thought-out proposal. However, I do support sending this back to committee for a very short period of time. I think what we failed to do as a committee was to adequately solicit some input from business community. We probably moved a little too quickly on this, without seeking their input, running it by them, just trying to get a sense of how the people that are going to be most affected thought about this. So I would suggest that we send this back to the committee and at the committee level we set up some sort of a meeting with downtown business owners. Maybe we could work with Intown Manchester or the Chamber and set something up at a convenient time. We can meet with those folks and get their input. We can find out if there is anything in here that needs to be modified. Then, if need be, we can bring a better product back to the full Board in a pretty expeditious fashion.

Chairman Lopez stated I have just one comment on that. There have been some meetings of business people in the community that were down at the library in order to start this whole program. So I just want to point that out.

Alderman Osborne stated I have a question for Brandy. Did you talk to the Chamber of Commerce and Intown Manchester? What is their view on this, both of them?

Ms. Stanley responded I believe they are in the process of offering a formal opinion in support, but they are not ready at this point to do that. What they did ask me to convey to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen is that I did present it to the Chamber of Commerce downtown committee and received no opposition from anyone that heard the plan that attended that meeting. So they're doing a survey of their membership to get an idea of what the support is going to be, and they will be issuing a written statement to the Board, probably in the next couple of weeks.

Alderman Osborne stated \$500,000. Where are we going here? If we don't go anywhere tonight and we table this, when is this \$500,000 supposed to cost Brandy? The taxpayers out here are going to have to subsidize this \$500,000. And if we don't charge fees, and we give free parking, the people of Manchester have to subsidize this also. Anyway, could I have an answer on that, Mr. Sanders?

Mr. Sanders responded \$500,000, if she was unable to reduce expenses and this revenue shortfall fell completely to the bottom line, it would be about five cents on the tax rate.

Alderman Osborne asked so what's the timeline here?

Mr. Sanders responded the timeline is that would be factored into the tax bills that are sent out in December of this year.

Alderman Osborne asked but how much time does the Board have to decide which way they're going?

Mr. Sanders responded the tax forms don't have to be filed until October.

Chairman Lopez stated to answer your question, we have to enact the ordinance and that would comply with the Finance Officer when he goes to the DRA, that we have taken action and that we expect that revenue to come in for 2009.

Alderman J. Roy stated Brandy, thank you once again for a great presentation. I supported you during the committee and I support you now. My question to this Board is...I've heard a lot about how we're going to send it back and do some tweaking. This lady has forgotten more about parking than I'll ever learn. If she didn't already know how to do the tweaking...I mean, where are we going to go with this? What kind of tweaking are we going to do? This is a well-thought-out plan and I support it 100%.

Alderman Gatsas stated Brandy, I don't know if you kept it a secret, but I was pretty involved in this budget process, and never once did I ever hear that if we don't implement the plan, we're \$500,000 short in revenue. Did you ever come before this Board and tell us that?

Ms. Stanley responded I did not sit in front of you and tell you that. However, there was a memo that was given in response to some of the requests by the Board that clearly stated that action was required by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on the revenue numbers that I had given.

Alderman Gatsas stated that's not my question. Were you asked by anybody on this Board if you thought the revenues were in...did you come forward with a proposal other than raising the rates at the garages? Did you talk to any Aldermen in here? It looks like you might have talked to some because I see your eyes moving in different directions. You never talked to me about it.

Ms. Stanley stated Alderman, I will say that I was asked to put the numbers in the budget from the get go, and throughout the budget process, through various means of communication...I did write the memo to the Board saying that action was required.

Alderman Gatsas asked required to do what?

Ms. Stanley responded to meet the numbers that were put into the budget by the...

Alderman Gatsas interjected what was the shortfall? Did you tell us in a memo what the shortfall was?

Ms. Stanley responded yes I did. I don't remember exactly, but it was, and I'd be more than happy to get you a copy of that memo that did go to the City Clerk's office.

Alderman Gatsas asked did every Board member have it?

Ms. Stanley responded what happened to it after it went to the City Clerk's office I don't know.

Chairman Lopez stated every Board member received it. Alderman Jim Roy might have the answer there too.

Alderman Gatsas stated well certainly I will...I won't give up the floor. If he wants to answer the question, that's fine. There's certainly a problem here. This is the first time I've ever heard in eight years that the Elm Street garage was being leased by the City and we're losing money on it. That's the first time I've heard that in eight years. I don't think anybody else has heard it. Maybe Alderman Shea has heard it, but that's the first time I've ever heard of a City lease in that garage. And there are Aldermen that have been here a lot longer than I have, and I don't even know if they know it exists. So for us to sit here and say we're losing \$32 a month per space, without us knowing, there is a serious problem. The problem is that we don't have all of the information before us. I'll give you a little test that I did this week. How many of your meter people or enforcement people walk around with chalk sticks?

Ms. Stanley responded none of them.

Alderman Gatsas stated so there's no way that you can tell me if a car's been parked in the same space for two hours or ten hours.

Ms. Stanley stated that's absolutely not correct. I can tell you exactly how we do it.

Alderman Gatsas stated sure tell me. And then I'm going to give you an answer.

Ms. Stanley stated what they do is they go down the street with a notepad in their hand. They write down the license plate of the car and the location of the valve stems on both wheels. If the car has moved or come back to the same place or

come back to a different space in the block, the valve stems will not be in the same position two hours later.

Alderman Gatsas asked do they do that for every car on Elm Street?

Ms. Stanley responded for the most part, yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated let me just tell you that last week I tried a little game. Okay? I parked a car for eight hours in the same spot. I got two hour tickets and kept putting them on the windshield. Never was I ticketed. So if they're doing that, then we're paying them an awful lot of time and effort because the chalk sticks worked much better. Now why they don't walk with a chalk stick and mark a tire...If you think writing the time of a stem valve on a tire and where that car was parked, I think that's pretty antiquated from a position of taking a chalk and marking a tire. I can tell you that people are...there were two cars on both sides of me, and they didn't move for eight hours.

Alderman Sullivan stated point of order. This doesn't address the parking plan. This is the mechanics of...

Alderman Gatsas interjected hold on. I've got the floor. Lay off of the mechanics, but guess what? I asked this question during your committee meeting: Is it going to cost us any more? And the answer was no. If enforcement is not going to cost us more, how are we going to enforce it, because that was one of your articles up there.

Ms. Stanley stated I believe we had this discussion in the committee meeting. There are three quarters of our parking meters that will be free after 5:30 PM. I know I'm going to need four PCO's on the street between 5:30 PM and 8:00 PM.

I will probably need one most of the week, and I will need two on Thursday and Friday. The hours that the PCO's were previously working I can rearrange to manage the events on the weekends. It will not cost us any more. I'm not asking for additional employees to do this. It is not going to be on an overtime basis. We had a meeting with the union and all the PCO's last week and came to an agreement on how exactly this schedule was going to work, should this plan be passed. We ran some sample schedules and came to the conclusion that it was not going to cost us any more because we could rearrange the existing personnel that we had to cover the events.

Alderman Gatsas stated well I'm just a little shocked that there wasn't greater discussion about plans during the budget process that had to be implemented. Certainly if Alderman Roy wants to address it, he can give me a quick synopsis.

Alderman J. Roy stated I distinctly remember during the budget process that it was told to us that these projections were included in our budget that we were passing. However, the plan for parking wasn't available. I asked for the plan to come...I think it was the next night or two nights later, and it was told to me that it wasn't reasonable, it was too complicated, and we as a Board passed it, knowing that.

Alderman Gatsas asked did we know the shortfall?

Alderman J. Roy responded as far as I was concerned it was a shortfall because we were counting on revenues that were projected that we didn't have a plan in front of us on how they were going to be accomplished. I understood it quite clearly. She presented it to us in that manner. She didn't sit here and say that we were going to have a shortfall but...

Alderman Gatsas interjected can I ask the Finance Officer, did he know how much the shortfall was in the parking?

Mr. Sanders responded I did not. I was not aware of the \$500,000. I was aware that some rate increases were included in the projections for FY 2009 but the...

Alderman Gatsas interjected there's our Chief Financial Officer of the City sitting there telling us that he didn't know that there was a \$500,000 shortfall. If he didn't know it, how am I supposed to know it?

Chairman Lopez responded well, I think the answer is that she was charged with putting the plan and the revenue in the budget that was presented to the Aldermen at...

Alderman Gatsas interjected did Mr. Sanders receive that memo about a shortfall?

Chairman Lopez stated let me finish what I'm saying. The revenue that came in indicated there would be approximately \$2,300 coming back to the City. I believe that's the number, and if she did not implement this particular plan, there would be \$1,800. I could be off a few, but roughly that's the way it went. But she was charged to do a plan. She was charged from day one when she was hired to do a parking plan because we can't do it. It's a 50/50 issue. This side doesn't want it. This side wants it. Again, I must stress the fact that it's a control problem downtown that we have. If weren't not worried about the revenue and we just let everybody park wherever they want for the next two months and see what happens. I want to move this thing along.

Alderman O'Neil stated I do think it's a well-thought-out plan. I voted for it in committee. I had some reservations about the Event parking. I have spoken since to some folks and have a comfort level that they believe it will work. I did ask but have yet to receive the operational plan that you talked about at the committee meeting. I think if Brandy is guilty of anything, the timing of the plan coming forward is not the best. She may be guilty; we may be guilty of that. These types of things we probably should be voting on in January, February or March, and not July, especially where we may have included the numbers in the budget. But I do think it's a well-thought-out plan. Out of respect to some of the business owners, I heard tonight, I'm willing to either send it back to committee or table it so that some information can get out. We may be able to provide a comfort level for those business owners, and we can move this thing forward. But I do think it's a well-thought-out plan. I do think we need to make sure...information was handed out the night of the Public Safety and Traffic Committee meeting. There apparently is lack of information tonight. We need to make sure information gets to the Aldermen through the City Clerk's office for the agenda. And that has failed to happen on a couple of items, a couple of meetings now, and I think that has caused some of the problems. I think Brandy has done a good job of trying to reach out to as many of the Aldermen as she could in advance of this meeting. This isn't exactly as I recall it was presented way back when I met with her in her office, but the framework is generally the same. I'm willing to do...I voted for this in committee. If we're going to take a vote, I'll vote for this tonight, but I am willing to compromise and either table it or send it back, and try to keep some of the momentum going. Information has to be given to the Aldermen in proper time. I do share, as I said with Alderman Gatsas, about this operational stuff. We're told it's not going to cost us any money. I need to see that in writing.

Alderman Sullivan stated move the question.

Chairman Lopez stated I've promised two other people, the chairman of Safety, Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated I'd like to make a motion that we accept this. People can vote either way and I'd like a roll call.

Chairman Lopez stated there's a motion on the floor, Alderman. There's a motion on the floor by Alderman Garrity, seconded by Alderman Domaingue.

Alderman M. Roy stated I would prefer not to see this tabled. Let's send it back to committee for work, but it shouldn't just sit on a piece of paper on the full Board. It should go back to the committee at this time.

A roll call vote was taken on sending this item back to the Public Safety Committee.

Aldermen DeVries, Garrity, Domaingue, M. Roy, Sullivan, and O'Neil voted Yea. Aldermen Shea, Ouellette, Gatsas, J. Roy, Osborne, and Pinard voted Nay. Chairman Lopez voted Nay to break the tie. *The motion failed.*

Alderman Shea moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy. A roll call vote was requested by Alderman Gatsas.

A roll call vote was taken.

Aldermen Sullivan, J. Roy, Osborne, Pinard, O'Neil, Shea, Garrity, and Ouellette voted Yea. Aldermen Gatsas, DeVries, Domaingue, and M. Roy voted Nay. *The motion passed.*

Alderman Gatsas stated I would like a full presentation from Parking on every revenue source that they have and what the cost is to the City, because the \$500,000...I'd like the documentation of how that was sent to us during the Finance Committee of the full Board. If it's got to be a special meeting, then we'd better have a special meeting. I want to see documented every single nickel that we spend as a City and every nickel we receive. The first time I ever heard about 1155 Elm Street any place in this City was tonight. I don't want to wait three weeks for it.

Chairman Lopez asked do you have all that, Brandy? The City Clerk will follow up with a memo.

Alderman M. Roy stated this comes up it seems like almost every year. Years ago Brandy had put together a spreadsheet of all former economic development projects that the City participated in. The Numerica Building on the corner of Bridge and Elm, which is 1155 Elm, was one of those from, I believe, the late 1980's. I would just ask the Finance Director to possibly re-create that and get it out to every Alderman so we can have that and see what the payments are and what our options are.

Alderman Gatsas stated seeing that we're on the parking issue, is the RFP complete on the Bedford lot, and when is it expected to go out, and can we all see a copy of it? Come on up, Jay, because it's only been a few months since we've asked about it.

Mr. Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, stated it was been issued, and I can get a copy available to all members of the Board.

Alderman Gatsas asked what was the delay?

Mr. Minkarah responded we first had internal review amongst several staff. We also did have at least one Alderman who had some concerns about it. We reviewed it thoroughly. We wanted to make sure it was accurate, and that the information in it was accurate, and that we had addressed all of the concerns.

Alderman Gatsas asked and when did it go out?

Mr. Minkarah responded it went out last week and the return date is...we did want to give a comfortable period for the return date...The return date I believe is September 12th.

Alderman DeVries we're still on item I of the consent agenda and I don't know that we ever dealt with the second half of that. Is that correct?

Alderman Gatsas stated no we haven't. I don't know where Brandy is going, but she can't be leaving.

Alderman DeVries stated it's actually fire code.

Alderman Gatsas stated no, we already did that. The question is on the minimum payment for credit card transaction. What's the cost to the City going to be?

Ms. Stanley responded I can't give you a specific but basically it adds up to about 29% of credit card revenue is paid in fees.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if we've eliminated the minimum credit card transaction, that means somebody can do it for twenty-five cents.

Ms. Stanley stated that is correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated so the cost is 29% of the twenty-five cents.

Ms. Stanley stated on the average, yes it is.

Alderman Gatsas stated so we're subsidizing...because you said it wasn't going to cost us money. So we're as high now as 29% on every credit card transaction. How many credit card transactions...wait...I want it in writing. I want it detailed. What it's costing the City at 29%...because if I figure twenty-five cents times 29%, that's seven cents on every quarter.

Chairman Lopez stated Alderman Gatsas, we just passed this thing so...

Alderman Gatsas interjected no, we didn't. We passed these individually.

Deputy City Clerk Normand stated the motion on the floor was to send all three back to committee. When that failed, the motion was to accept...

Alderman Gatsas stated okay, don't go anywhere because we're going to do this in Finance, because that's where it's got to go. We'll be doing that shortly.

Chairman Lopez stated we can have conversation any time.

5. Communication from Michael Skelton advising of his resignation from the Safety Review Board.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to accept this resignation with regret.

6. Communication from JoAnn O'Shaughnessy advising of her resignation from the Conservation Commission.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy, it was voted to accept this resignation with regret.

Alderman Gatsas asked don't we want to do item V? Someone brought V out, didn't they?

Deputy City Clerk Normand stated Alderman Domaingue was opposed.

Alderman Domaingue stated I just voted against it.

7. Communication from Stephan Hamilton, advising of his resignation from the Board of Assessors.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to accept this resignation with great regret.

Alderman M. Roy stated I think Steve is here, and he should be commended for years of excellent service and his commitment to the City. We should wish him well. He's moving to a great position.

8. Communication from Jonathan Cote advising of his resignation from Board of School Committee Ward 12.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette, it was voted to accept this resignation with regret.

Alderman Domaingue stated I just wanted to make one more announcement. I know it has been in the paper a number of times, but for those of you who might be watching this at home that haven't had a chance to read it, I've received a number of emails and applications from people that are interested in this School

Board position. I'm still interested in taking more from any resident that it is. I'm not making my decision yet for a couple of weeks. I'll consider anybody and more power to you if you don't have political experience. So if you're interested, I would ask that you email me or contact me by telephone, and my information is up on the manchesternh.gov website. Thank you.

Alderman O'Neil asked once you nominate, will we have an opportunity, if we so choose, to meet with the person as we did during the Ward 3 situation?

Alderman Domaingue responded yes, absolutely.

9. Nominations to be presented by Chairman Lopez, if available.

Chairman Lopez stated you already received communication on the appointment of Peter Sullivan to the Customer Service committee that the Mayor has set up.

10. Confirmation of nominations made by Mayor Guinta:

Building Board of Appeals

Russ Bell to succeed himself, term to expire January 1, 2011.

Board of Registrars

Daniel Wihby to succeed Signe McQuaid, term to expire May 1, 2011.

Conservation Commission

Michael Skelton to succeed Louis DeMato, term to expire August 1, 2009.

On motion of Alderman M. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette, it was voted to approve these confirmations.

11. Chairman Lopez advised that a motion is in order to recess the meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to recess the meeting to allow the Finance Committee to meet.

Chairman Lopez called the regular meeting back to order.

13. Report of Committee on Finance, if available.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends after due and careful consideration that resolutions:

“Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$125,000) for the FY2009 CIP 611709 Housing Initiatives Program.”

“Amending the FY 2008 Community Improvement Program, authorizing appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Hundred Twenty Nine Dollars (\$729) for FY1008 CIP 210208 Homeless Healthcare Program.”

“Amending the FY2007 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Four Thousand Four Hundred Two Dollars (\$34,402) for the 2007 CIP 511207 Derryfield CC Rehabilitation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$5,400) for the FY 2009 CIP 411809 OHRV Wheeled Vehicle Contracts.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

On motion of Alderman M. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to accept, receive and adopt the report as presented.

14. Communication from Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, requesting the Board approve the application for pension under the former retirement system as submitted by Thomas Howe after 41 years, 2 months of service to the City of Manchester.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to approve this request with regret.

16. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$125,000) for the FY2009 CIP 611709 Housing Initiatives Program.”

Amending the FY 2008 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Seven Hundred Twenty Nine Dollars (\$729) for the FY 2008 CIP 210208 Homeless Healthcare Program.”

“Amending the FY2007 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Four Thousand Four Hundred Two Dollars (\$34,402) for the 2007 CIP 511207 Derryfield CC Rehabilitation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$5,400) for the FY 2009 CIP 411809 OHRV Wheeled Vehicle Contracts.”

On motion of Alderman M. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O’Neil, it was voted to waive the reading of these Resolutions.

On motion of Alderman M. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy, it was voted that the Resolutions ought to pass and be Enrolled.

TABLED ITEMS

17. A Majority report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance:

“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the General Business District (B-2) into an area currently zoned Residential One Family District (R-1B), being a portion of Tax Map 381, Lot 47 with an address of 466 South Willow Street and abutting South Lincoln, South Willow and Parkview Streets. A majority of the property is currently zoned B-2 and the petition would extend the B-2 to include the entire lot.”

be denied at this time.

The Committee notes that the business owner should work with the neighborhood and may return with a petition after addressing issue as noted in a communication from Alderman Garrity enclosed herein.

(Aldermen Garrity, Pinard and Duval in favor. Aldermen Lopez and Gatsas opposed.)

(Tabled 06/05/2007)

A Minority report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance:

“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the General Business District (B-2) into an area currently zoned Residential One Family District (R-1B), being a portion of Tax Map 381, Lot 47 with an address of 466 South Willow Street and abutting South Lincoln, South Willow and Parkview Streets. A majority of the property is currently zoned B-2 and the petition would extend the B-2 to include the entire lot.”

ought to pass. The minority advises that the proposed zoning, in its opinion, is consistent with the highest and best use of the property and that neighborhood concerns can be best addressed through the development process at the Planning Board level, therefore, that such rezoning should be considered subject to the Planning Board approving any plans for development of the property.

S/Alderman Lopez

NOTE: Available for viewing at Office of City Clerk; previously forwarded to Mayor and all Aldermen.

(Tabled 06/05/2007)

This item remained on the table.

18. Report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance:

“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the B-2 (General Business) zoning district to include property currently zoned IND (Industrial) located on the south side of Gold Street east of the former Lawrence Branch of the B&M Railroad and including the following three lots Tax Map 875-14, 875-15, 875-16.”

ought to pass.

(Aldermen Duval, Lopez, Garrity and Pinard recorded in favor; Alderman Gatsas opposed.)

NOTE: Available for viewing at Office of City Clerk; previously forwarded to Mayor and all Aldermen.

(Tabled 09/05/2006)

This item remained on the table.

19. Report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading recommending that Ordinance:

“Amending the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Manchester by extending the R-3 (Urban Multi-family) zoning district to include property currently zoned R-1B (Single-family) located on a portion of Tax Map 691 Lot 143-1 that will be on the north side of a proposed Gold Street Bypass and adjacent to Bradley Street and the New St. Augustin’s Cemetery.”

ought to pass.

(Aldermen Duval, Lopez, Garrity and Pinard recorded in favor; Alderman Gatsas opposed.)

(Tabled 09/05/2006)

NOTE: Available for viewing at Office of City Clerk; previously forwarded to Mayor and all Aldermen.

This item remained on the table.

Alderman Shea stated I wondered if Alderman Garrity wanted anything taken off the table as far as some of his...

Alderman Garrity interjected I assume you’re speaking about Gold Street. I had a meeting scheduled last week with people down there, but I was on vacation so we had to reschedule it.

NEW BUSINESS

Deputy City Clerk Normand read a communication from Chairman Lopez that was distributed regarding the Anthem breakfast meeting. The communication encouraged everyone to join Chairman Lopez on Wednesday, July 16, 2008, from 7:30 to 9:00 AM at 3000 Goffs Falls Road. An RSVP to Anthem was requested.

Deputy City Clerk Normand read a second communication from Alderman Lopez that was distributed regarding the Municipal County Cleaner Manchester Project. It will begin on July 21, 2008, at 9:00 AM for a two-week period. A kick off event will start the project and will be held on Wellington Road near Eastern Avenue. The communication extended an invitation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to attend this event which ‘...signifies the beginning of an important project that has taken four years and the hard work of many individuals to become a reality.’ In his communication, Chairman Lopez thanked Tom Katsiotonis, owner of Grand Slam Pizza on Mammoth Road, who will be providing free lunches for all the prisoners.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we could have MCTV and MCAM come in with financial statements so that we as the stewards of the taxpayers’ money understand where they’re spending their dollars. I understand that one of those two segments is having a financial problem, and maybe the other one has a revenue stream that exceeds what their expenditures need to be, and maybe we can try to work it out. I think that obviously just giving a rate of money as we did: 1% to one and 2% to the other, every time Comcast has a rate increase, we give them a raise. So maybe it’s time that we re-look at the contract that we have to make sure that the funds are allocated in the right position for the taxpayers. So, if we can have them come, and also send us their financial statements beforehand, and be prepared to answer questions at the next Board meeting.

Chairman Lopez asked with the next Board meeting being in August, would September be a better month? We've got all this other stuff going on too. If we have one meeting a month...

Alderman Gatsas stated I think August will give us an opportunity to take a look, and maybe we can all plan on staying a little later.

Alderman Domaingue stated I just wanted to concur with what you...I actually received two constituent phone calls on that issue today, so it's one that is definitely of concern to me and the people who live in my Ward.

Alderman DeVries stated I'm not familiar with the phone calls. I haven't received those, but I'm just wondering if this should go first to a committee and if that might allow us to get that sooner in the scheduling. I would suggest that go to the Committee on Administration. That would allow a review sooner rather than later.

Alderman Gatsas stated well I certainly wasn't going to say that it comes to Human Resources.

Chairman Lopez stated if the Board wishes to send it to a committee, we have a contract with both MCAM and MCTV.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think those contracts allow us to get out with a 30-day notice.

Chairman Lopez stated we'll get legal advice on that. What are your wishes?

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think it would be an expectation that the committee would meet before the full Board does. It may be that week, so if your goal is to get it...

Alderman Gatsas interjected I think if it comes before the full Board, we can refer it to committee if they've addressed their questions in front of us.

Chairman Lopez stated let's give this a try. Let's get the information, put them on the agenda...

Alderman Gatsas interjected they don't have to be on the agenda. They can be on the consent agenda, and then we can go from there.

Chairman Lopez stated okay, that's what we'll do. The Clerk will take care of it.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Garrity**, duly seconded by **Alderman Shea**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk