BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

September 16, 2008 **7:30 PM**

Mayor Guinta called the meeting to order in joint session with the Library Trustees.

The Clerk called the roll.

Board of Aldermen

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

Library Trustees

Present: Karen Sheehan-Lord, Madeline G. Roy, Jeffery Hickock, Joanne Barrett, Jack Shea, Patricia Cornell.

3. **Mayor Guinta** advised that nominations are in order to replace Kevin Devine of the Board of Trustees of the Library, term to expire September 2015.

Alderman M. Roy stated thank you, Your Honor. At this time I would like to put the name of Steven Solomon, a Ward 1 resident, in for nomination.

*On a motion of **Alderman Lopez**, duly seconded by **Alderman Domaingue**, it was voted to close nominations.*

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Pinard**, it was voted to suspend the rules and confirm the nomination.*

Mayor Guinta stated congratulations.

*On motion of **Alderman Smith**, duly seconded by **Alderman Domaingue**, it was voted to adjourn the Joint Session.*

Mayor Guinta called the regular meeting of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen back 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.

9. Presentation by Manchester Moves

Mr. Dean Williams, 117 Riverwalk Way, stated beside me is Bob Dastin. I live behind the brand new ballpark down on the river. It's a beautiful place to live and I'm honored to be here tonight. I want to thank the Mayor's office for allowing us a few minutes of your time. And Mr. Chairman and the Board of Aldermen, I'd like to thank you as well. It was a recent as April of this year that there was an editorial in the Manchester Union Leader talking about the Riverwalk. Among many things that were said, there was "…Manchester's Riverwalk remains

unfinished for lack of leadership, not lack of money." The editorial went on to say, "...and it is a shame that no one has made the Riverwalk a high enough priority to take ownership of the project and to find a way to turn it from a wish into a reality. With so many booming businesses poised to benefit from a finished Riverwalk, we see no reason why the project could not be completed with private sponsorship at this point." And finally, "...rather than wait around for more City money to become available sometime in the next two decades, public officials and interested citizens need to join together now and find private money to finish this long overdue project." We'd like to introduce you tonight to Manchester Moves, Inc. The organization is a New Hampshire not-for-profit corporation awaiting our 501(c)3 designation at this moment. Our goals are quite simple: to promote, market, and assist in the funding of a trail system for the Manchester area; to promote a healthy lifestyle through exercise; to promote a more environmentally responsible method of encouraging greater Manchester residents to enjoy and participate in the many wonderful attributes that the City has to offer. More specifically, Manchester Moves, Inc. seeks to be the central point of communication between the City of Manchester and the surrounding suburbs in all things related to trails. We want to lead the effort to connect the City with the surrounding communities and visa versa through a network of trail ways, utilizing abandoned railways within the City area. Additionally, we will encourage those companies located along the Merrimack River to design, fund, and establish a walking trail between their buildings and the river, thereby establishing a seamless, interconnecting pathway for all to enjoy, while stimulating economic development in and around these areas. In some cases a surrounding town has already established their own network of trail ways, yet today there exists no connection of these trails to the City of Manchester. We look to make that connection a reality. It is our specific goal to work with the Manchester officials and administration, railway officials, state and federal government, and various companies in the greater Manchester area that deal with alternative modes of

transportation, and as many individual groups and organizations who have an interest in these trail ways and to be a conduit of information and support. Manchester Moves, Inc. seeks to work with the City to help open railway beds that have been landlocked, to seek private and public funding sources to design and to build new trails on abandoned railway beds, to complete those trail ways that have already been designed and are at least partially funded, and to seek and to secure funding for trails that are on the drawing board but have no funding to date. We have already contracted with Van H. B. van Duzer and we will soon have a comprehensive engineering study which will itemize funding needs, marketing plans, and produce detailed maps clearly highlighting those network of trails. This study, by the way, funded entirely with private funds, will identify how this trail network will connect to the north, the Heritage Trail north, ultimately to Canada; to the south, the Heritage Trail south through Bedford and Merrimack; to the east on what is known as the Rockingham Trail to the seacoast; and to the west the Piscatoquog trail to Goffstown and New Boston. We chose Manchester Moves as our name because it has multiple applications. Manchester Moves to a greener city. Manchester Moves to connect its communities. Manchester Moves to a healthier lifestyle. We believe that working together with multiple partners we can encourage walking, jogging, bicycling, snowshoeing, and more, leading to a healthier and more enjoyable lifestyle. Similar projects are underway in hundreds of cities around the country, with a national organization, Rails to Trails Conservancy, spearheading that effort. Did you know that nearly half the trails in the United States are three miles are less, and the fast majority of those trips are still taken by car? Rails to Trails Conservancy is already the largest transportation recycling program in the country, helping turn unused railway lines into trails, and now they're taking those trails, and the people and places they connect and championing a new future for transportation, active transportation. Now, active transportation is simply travel powered by human energy using trails, walking, and biking. To encourage active transportation, communities must create seamless

networks of accessible trails, sidewalks, and on-road biking facilities. If you travel anywhere around the country, more and more communities today have such trails. They are funded privately; they are funded publically; they are funded nationally. Much work has already been done by this organization. We have registered with the proper authorities in the City and state. We have filed our paperwork with the IRS for designation as a 501(c) (3)not-for-profit organization. We have a bank account. We've already begun to collect private funds. We've registered the name www.manchestermoves.org. An official web page is already under development. A logo has been created. Both the Elliot Hospital and Catholic Medical Center presidents have committed their support for this project. Major media outlets, including the Union Leader and the Hippo have committed their support; more are being solicited currently. And, many community and business leaders have already been contacted, and they have pledged their support as well to this project. You'll see here that we have a logo; we've developed a letterhead and envelopes. We have direct mail postcards that we'll begin sending out, indentifying what this project is, getting it out to bicycling enthusiasts, to companies that cater to those types of people. Thanks to Sean Owen at WEDU, who has been very, very generous to us so far, our web page design is well underway. Here is a template, the beginnings of it. We're going to be collecting names and addresses of those who want to help us in a grassroots effort. We'll be able to collect donations through this web page. We'll also be identifying where all the trails are. We'll be letting people know who come to this great City that there is a network of trails. They only have to log onto our web page to find out where they are. Our intent tonight was to tell you who we are and simply what our goals are. We wanted to be here tonight en masse to assure you and others that we are only concerned with the walkways in the City. We are not competing for funds allocated to the surrounding communities. We want to let you know that we've shared this information with the Mayor previously. We want to let you know that our goal is to build grassroots membership through the web page and

through word of mouth, to identify and solicit grants and other public and private funding sources for this great project. We want to encourage and accept all federal, state and city funds that become available for walkway projects and to meet with the appropriate City officials to present a detailed plan, once the engineering study is completed. This will stimulate economic development, attract and retain young professionals, promote a healthier lifestyle, and connect surrounding communities to our City. Who can be against such a great promise of this organization.

Mr. Williams stated in conclusion, our founding members: Robert Dastin, Robert MacKenzie, Brian Thomas, Court Klein, Jennifer Vadney and myself say we hope that the Mayor's office, the Board of Alderman, and the City as a whole will embrace this project with enthusiasm, with volunteerism, and donations large and small. Remember, www.manchestermoves.org, and you can follow us. Thank you very much for your time and for allowing us to be here this evening.

Mr. Bob Dastin stated let me just say that Dean represents Margneti Companies of New Hampshire, a fine corporate citizen who have put their money where their mouth is. They've contributed $10,000 to this project to get it underway, to start our engineering study, which we hope will be completed before the snow flies.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm sure that the Parks and Recreation department can help you tremendously because they have a lot of overlays of the whole area and trail ways throughout the City, so you can save yourself some time.

Mr. Williams stated thank you. I appreciate those comments. We've already begun to work with many departments within the City. We hope we haven't blindsided anybody, but thank you.

Alderman Pinard stated Bob Dastin and I go back maybe some 60 years in the New Hampshire National Guard. Those are nice memories, believe me. I'm very happy to see you here because I've been working for a number of years on the Rockingham Trail. Thanks to the Board of Aldermen for allotting some money. Today I'm glad that you're here, Bob, you and Mr. Williams. I'm glad to announce that Thursday Timberlane Boot Company is coming into the City with 150 to 175 people to work on the Rockingham Trial from Proctor Road east to the Massabesic Lake and west probably to Mammoth Road. They are cleaning both sides, which is 66 feet, 33 feet from the center of the railroad track. So I'm glad you're here because you're giving the people the chance that we've been waiting for for many years. The west side has got a trail. We've got one on South Willow. Now we have this. When it's done, the Rockingham Trail will probably be the longest trail there is in the state of New Hampshire. I'm very glad that you're here. I'm very glad that I had a little part in pushing this project to where it is today.

Alderman DeVries stated I'm so glad to see coming to fruition the work of many over the last seven or eight years. I see old friends that have worked hard on the projects to make sure that when I-93 was under consideration and they were talking about pedestrian trails, that that trail veered right up into Manchester for the eventual continuation and connection to the bike pedestrian trail network being developed in Manchester. Also, I can remember making sure that DOT was aware that we wanted bike pedestrian crossing on the new bridge crossing the Merrimack River to connect to the Heritage Trail. We finally have somebody stepping forward to help all of us who have been working over the last seven or eight years bring this forward by inches. I'm hoping that with your efforts now on board that we will move by leaps and bounds, and that this City, as you said, will sooner rather than later see an interconnected trail system that will benefit all of us – businesses and residents.

Mr. Williams stated I'll just add one thing to that. Living down on the Riverwalk, when the Hands Across the Merrimack River Bridge was completed, the walking bridge, in two weeks we saw more people on the walkway than I had seen in the previous two years. People want to get out and they want to be healthy.

Alderman Ouellette stated I guess that proves that that bridge is to somewhere. The other part of the project that I'm glad to see, hopefully, sooner rather than later, is the trestle area that heads into Goffstown. That bridge is severely in disrepair and disarray and very dangerous. There are a lot of kids that still hang out there and still for some God only knows reason why, jump off that trestle and into the water. People were doing that when I was a kid, but I would never go near that thing. That's not for me. I don't have a fear of heights; I have a fear of falling. I appreciate the effort just in that area alone. I think that's probably going to be a tremendous undertaking, rehabilitating that bridge to connect it to Goffstown and then obviously up to the New Boston area.

Mr. Williams stated I think you must all be aware that that walkway from South Main Street to Electric Avenue has been funded, and from what I understand it will begin construction in the spring. That would be the last piece to connect to Goffstown, so it's a very important piece.

Alderman Smith stated just to follow up on your comments, there's a RFP out October 15th, and it will be going for South Main Street up by the West Side arena eventually. It's going to be out for bids October 15th.

Mayor Guinta stated I know that Dean first approached me on this issue about a year and a half ago. We sat in my office and chatted a little bit about it. He was just as enthusiastic then as he is now, and I think it's a real opportunity. I said then to Bob at some public events, as well as to Dean and to others, and I'll say it now again. I think this is a good opportunity for a very strong public/private partnership to improve the City. Any time that we can respond to our constituents, whether residential or otherwise, that do want to contribute significantly, not just human resources but financial resources, to improve the overall quality of life of the City, I think we ought to strongly consider that partnership, and this is one of those opportunities where I think we can maximize dollars to improve what I think and what I think many of you believe is a great city. I commend you for your work. I support the project 100%, and we look forward to working with you.

Mr. Williams stated thank you.

Mayor Guinta stated prior to taking up the Consent Agenda, I would like to have a presentation on the status of the September 6th flood.

A presentation by Chief Burkush, Chief Mara and Mr. Ntapalis on the status of the floods from September 6th.

Mr. Harry Ntapalis, Risk Manager, stated I can start off, Your Honor. Thank you very much. As we know, on September 6, 2008, we did experience quite a deluge of water, unexpected by many. We knew Hannah was coming up the coast, but the rainfall ultimately resulted in not only ultimately damaging private property but also a great deal of the City of Manchester's properties as well. The one that was hit the most, the Manchester Police Department, along with the Fire Department and a number of other locations, are identified on the second page of

the handout that Matt Normand is presenting you right now. It gives you a rough estimate of the kinds of dollars that we're looking at, at least at the initial phase. These things can be tweaked up or down as the inventory is more significantly identified in the wake of the loss. At present, as you can see, we're looking at a about $1.25 million for the Police Department as far as an insurable loss, followed by the Fire Department at $150,000. Again, I have to emphasize that it has only been a little over a week. And these are very preliminary numbers. What has been very interesting, after the amount of buildings that you see that have been affected in this particular loss, are the insurers: the insurance company, Philadelphia; our insurance agent Ferdinando and his associates; Fraser Insurance; our office; certainly the chiefs of Fire and Police and the other departments affected all worked very cohesively to be able to mitigate any further loss, as well as to implement some of the changes that are necessary to keep vital services going. The other piece that I want to mention tonight is that the insurance company has already forwarded to the City of Manchester in a very short amount of time a check for a half a million dollars, so we can apply to pay vendors that are doing work for the City of Manchester on this loss. I'm going to probably at this juncture not get into some of the aspects of FEMA, who has also visited with the City of Manchester. I'm going to let the Fire Chief address that. I would entertain any questions now or as we proceed with the presentation about the insurance.

Alderman O'Neil asked Harry, on the Police numbers, is it all-inclusive?

Mr. Ntapalis responded what it includes so far…and again, there's a lot more tweaking to do specifically with some of the smaller pieces with the Police Department, but what on the surface in general, Alderman, it does include is building materials, equipment, furniture, fixtures, IT equipment, and I'm saying this in very general terms. Some of the more specific things haven't been readily identified in their inventory or firmed up like the really hard costs like possibly

replacing furniture, fixtures, and equipment, that's going to be identified as we go along, so it could move the number up or down.

Alderman O'Neil stated my observation was we probably lost somewhere in the vicinity of $100,000 in vehicles, the fleet.

Mr. Ntapalis stated no, and that's a good point. The $100,000 in fleet vehicles are not something that are covered by the property policy.

Alderman O'Neil asked and what about…I know on one of my walkthroughs there were a lot of tools, some personally owned by the mechanics. What is the status of that?

Mr. Ntapalis stated the tools…and I'll let the Police Chief address that in more detail, but my understanding in dealing with our insurers and the clean up people at this juncture, if they are nickel plated or the types of hand tools that our mechanics use or are supplied either by them or by the City of Manchester, they were sanitizing and cleaning those types of tools. Everything that was pneumatic or electric, those types of tools, were just being thrown away.

Alderman O'Neil stated if the mechanics had brought in personal tools, and it is not uncommon for mechanics to use their own personal tools or a mixture or personal tools with department-issued tools, we're assuring them they're going to be covered.

Mr. Ntapalis stated generally what happens, Aldermen, we have a disclaimer for non-owned equipment and there is a piece in the ordinance that very specifically identifies if there is a condition of employment that requires mechanics to use their own tools, we do reimburse them.

Alderman Smith stated I'd like to go back to the Police Department. That's quite a substantial amount and I know they had a serious flood in there. I was wondering, was there any problem with our lines out on Merrimack Street?

Mr. Ntapalis responded I may defer that question. I can't answer that question. I know there was a loss a couple of years ago at the same location and there was a rupture in the line on Merrimack Street. I don't believe that was the case, but again, I'm not certain if that played into the pipe that burst under the Police Department or in the garage area.

Alderman Smith asked then should I direct it to the Highway Department, Kevin Sheppard?

Alderman Osborne stated after insurances and FEMA, what is the cost to the City at the end? I know you don't have a figure on that but what do you figure? What percentage do you think will be a cost to the City itself?

Mr. Ntapalis responded that's a tough one this far out, Alderman, to attempt to answer. Let's look at the bottom line of the numbers we have here. If they all remain, let's say for the sake of argument at about $1.6 million and the insurance we know definitely has identified exclusions that will not be covered such as the fleet, as was mentioned. And we have other methods by which we go with fleet replacement, vans, police cruisers, and motorcycles. We have met with six members of FEMA. They came rather quickly. They were here meeting with us on Thursday. They walked through all the locations. A portion is what they told us as a municipality, if they were going to pick anything up would be picked up of those that are non-insured. The formula they use I'm unclear on. If your question is if there's a balance of what's unpaid, what happens then, I believe there are

other contingencies that we can look at. But at this juncture I really couldn't venture what that balance might be.

Alderman Gatsas stated first I'd like to thank everybody publicly because I think the Highway Department, Fire, Police, and everybody rallied around to wherever they needed to be to get the issues addressed that the constituents of Manchester had. There was no question that the Police Department was badly damaged. The questions that I have is I look at this number of infrastructure and that says $4.2 million, and I guess I'd like a list of how we got to that number and how we plan on taking care of some of those things. I think that certainly the devastation that happened at the Police Department needs to be rectified, but I think maybe this is an opportunity that before we go in and start spending an awful lot of money on a police station that needs to be replaced that maybe we take some of those insurance costs and apply them to a building that we should build anew somewhere and maybe that needs to be an expedited project. Certainly there were discussions about a police station, and now is the time to make a move because we have one that's in pretty tough shape. So with that I would say that we as a Board should take a look at what the alternatives are and how quickly we can move on a new station to provide a safe place for people to work and tools to be stored and ammunition to be stored and everything else. I'm sure in the back of everyone's mind…these 100-year floods that we're talking about… I know I haven't aged 300 years. But I certainly have aged some. They seem to be coming every six months. We're supposed to have some pretty heavy rains again this weekend, and I'm sure everybody in the back of their minds is thinking okay, what's going to be next? Certainly we need to find solutions for the police station and we need to do it quickly. Thank you for everything that you've done and all the people that you've helped.

Alderman Shea asked how long can you be in limbo? In other words, if the intent of the Board here is to obviously start planning for a new police station, which obviously I'm more in favor of than less, depending upon what the circumstances would be as time goes on regarding the ability to finance these things, but how long can you persist in your particular situation on the basis of maybe or maybe not? In other words, what do you need to do to have a viable police station now?

Mr. David Mara, Police Chief, stated I couldn't agree more about the need for a new station. However, what was damaged, things that we have to get back to full power…for instance, our electrical panels, we had to get that set again. We have to take care of having a back-up generator. Right now we have one sitting in our parking lot as a back-up generator. We have to get the phone system fixed.

Alderman Shea stated realistically, even if we ran out tomorrow and started planning, it would be at least two or three years before a police station could actually be built. So you have to exist as a police station, per se, with all the necessary materials and so forth.

Mr. Mara stated that's correct. There are repairs we're going to have to make. We have to put money into repairing the ramp so we can go in and out of the station. That collapsed. And as I said before, we have to take care of the electrical aspects so we had to replace some transformers, and we had to move the phone lines from downstairs, the panel, to upstairs, at least taking a little bit of precaution to make sure that doesn't happen again as far as the phone lines go. All the repairs that we've outlined and have been going over I think are necessary, despite the need for a new station. I think to function we're going to have to make those repairs regardless.

Alderman Ouellette stated Harry, the damage to the schools, by my math I've got $111,750. Are they covered? What is their insurance?

Mr. Ntapalis responded they're covered by the same policy, the Philadelphia, Alderman, as the rest of the City. I don't know if I had mentioned early on, we do retain as a municipality a $100,000 retention. In other words, it's like a deductible. After the deductible has been met, if you're talking a $1.6 million or a $2 million overall total loss after everything has been tallied, once that application has been made as a retention, the coverage is there with the exception of those specific items that may be excluded. Yes, the schools are covered.

Alderman Ouellette stated so even though the School District is separate from the City, it's not two separate policies. We're all under the same umbrella here?

Mr. Ntapalis responded the insurance services that our office provides include the schools and the Enterprise departments. We don't walk away from any of the buildings. That's a good question, Alderman.

Alderman Lopez stated I think Alderman O'Neil and Alderman Jim Roy are liaisons – O'Neil to the Police Department and Roy to the Fire Department. I think as we move forward and we're talking about a new police station and a new Highway Department…and the last time we talked about a police station we talked about $20 million. We need to have the police station work in a functional manner at the present time. I'm sure that that's going to happen. Where are you going to get the $20 million or where are you going to get the $25 million for the Highway Department? Those are big issues, two major issues that have been around since I've been an Alderman. There have to be some slow solutions and a long range solution if we're going to move forward in this range. I just wanted to mention that. And I agree with you, Chief; you've got to clean up what you've got and

whatever you need I'm sure the Aldermen are going to take care of it. I'm sure you'll do a good job with whatever you've got.

Alderman Smith stated I'd like to thank all of the departments, but especially the Fire Department. I'm just looking at the list. In less than the space of a day, they had about 110 service calls, so I want to commend your department and all of the employees. And the people in the Highway Department, thank you very much for a job well done.

Mr. Mara stated I can just tell you that the night of September 6th the Police Department was very thankful and very impressed with the help we got from the Fire Department. If it wasn't for them, it's my opinion that the damage would have been a lot worse. We probably would have lost a lot more equipment. They were out there right away pumping out, providing lighting for us, helping us get some emergency power. Currently we still have our dispatch center over at the Fire Department and we couldn't be more thankful. I'd also like to add that the Highway Department Facilities Division and Information Systems have been fantastic. Because of them and also the men and women of my department, we didn't miss one 911 call. We didn't miss a beat, but we couldn't have done it without those other City departments. I'm very thankful, and again, I'm very impressed.

Alderman Ouellette stated I did want to mention and publically thank Michael Benton of the Executive Health and Sports Center. When he found out that both the Fire Department and the Police Department lost their workout training facilities, he offered every fireman and every policeman that was using those facilities a free one-month membership. So publically I wanted to thank the owner Mike Benton of the Executive for their help. It sounds like it may be a little thing, and it probably is in the big scope of things, but that was one thing that…we need

to take care of the people who take care of us, and he recognizes that. I wanted to publically thank him.

Mr. James Burkush, Fire Chief, stated one comment I'd like to add is during the budget process, the Board stood up and funded the Fire Department to the level that we requested, and that night we had 50 firefighters on duty. When you ask about the effects of budget cuts, we never know what's coming up next, but the Board showed its support to the department and we had every piece of equipment running, so your support saved the citizens a significant amount of money. When the Police Department flooded, we were out answering other calls. So we had to bring in equipment from Mammoth Road, and Engine 11 came back to headquarters. Even though Information Systems is in the basement, the firefighters rallied to save the Information Systems. That would have been devastation to the City right there. They piled up sandbags against the door. The next major initiative was pumping out the police station. We had the Crosbie Street incident and we had the 100 other calls for service. But I guess my point is that the Board funded the Fire Department to the level which we requested, and we're thankful for that. You should be able to stand up to the citizens and tell them that that's what you did. The people you insisted we hire were working that night, the eight new firefighters. So, we are thankful to the Board.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Guinta 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.

Ratify and Confirm Poll Conducted

A. Ratify and confirm phone poll of the Board of Aldermen conducted September 9, 2008 opposing the placement of Raymond Guay in the City of Manchester by the US Department of Probation. And further demand his immediate removal from the City of Manchester by the US Department of Probation, or any other duly authorized federal or state agency.

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

B. Sidewalk petitions:
169 Fleming Street
219 London Street
733 Silver Street
91 Poor Street
174 Jobin Drive

Informational to be Received and Filed

C. Approved minutes from the Commissioners meeting held July 29, 2008, July 2008 Financial Report, and July 2008 Ridership Report submitted by David Smith, Executive Director MTA.

REFFERRAL TO COMMITTTEE

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

D. Resolutions:

"Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Forty Five Thousand Dollars ($45,000) for the FY2009 CIP 213809 Substance Abuse Treatment Project."

"Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Eight Hundred Forty Three Dollars and Sixty Cents ($13,843.60) for the FY2009 CIP 810509 Elderly Services Information System Upgrade Projects."

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

11. Nominations to be presented by Mayor Guinta.

Mayor Guinta stated pursuant to Section 3.14b of the City Charter, please find below the following nominations:

> Anthony M. Williams to succeed Susan Ware due to resignation as a member of the Arts Commission, term to expire December 1, 2008;
>
> Linda Seabury to fill a vacancy as an alternate member of the Arts Commission, term to expire December 1, 2009;
>
> Leah Belanger to fill a vacancy as an alternate member of the Arts Commission, term to expire December 1, 2010.

Mayor Guinta stated the nominations will layover till the next Board meeting, pursuant to Rule 20 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, and your consideration of these nominations is appreciated.

12. Confirmation of nominations made by Mayor Guinta:

Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Commission
Angelo Manni term to expire July 7, 2011.

Police Commission
Richard Bunker term to expire September 15, 2011.

Aldermanic Representative to the Heritage Commission
Peter Sullivan term to expire concurrent with that of his office.

Alternate member Heritage Commission
Donna M. Daneke term to expire January 1, 2011.

Heritage Commission
Kristy Roney term to expire January 1, 2011.
Jessica Gustafson term to expire January 1, 2011.

*On motion of **Alderman Pinard**, duly seconded **Alderman J. Roy**, it was voted to confirm these nominations. Alderman Sullivan abstained from voting to confirm his nomination to the Heritage Commission.*

13. Reports of the Committee on Community Improvement

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that CIP budget authorization for project #713608, Union Street Drainage Project Start-Up be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman M. Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Garrity**, it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendations.*

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request for the acceptance and expenditure of $13,843.60 in funds be used for Elderly Services Information System Upgrade Project be approved. For such purpose an amending resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

Alderman Smith** moved to accept this report and adopt its recommendations. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Shea.

Alderman Gatsas asked did this go out to bid?

Ms. Barbara Vigneault, Senior Services Director, responded Alderman, we looked at various resources out there that would have something comparable to this project. This is unique software that's just for senior centers. There were no other competing companies that offer such software that we were able to locate.

Alderman Gatsas stated so the answer to my question is no. It didn't go out to bid.

Ms. Vigneault stated right.

Mayor Guinta *called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried, with Alderman Gatsas duly recorded in opposition.*

> The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request for the acceptance and expenditure of $45,000 in funds be used for the OYS Substance Abuse Program be approved. For such purpose an amending resolution and budget authorization have been submitted.

On motion of ***Alderman Garrity****, duly seconded by* ***Alderman Ouellette****, it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendations.*

> The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Alderman Osborne for assistance in securing funds in the amount of $38,582 for installing playground equipment for children with disabilities be approved.

On motion of ***Alderman Garrity****, duly seconded by* ***Alderman O'Neil****, it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendations.*

> The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a vehicle from the Highway Department be transferred to the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department for use as a temporary replacement for a dump truck in need of repair.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Smith**, it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendations.*

> The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from Chuck DePrima, Acting Director of Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department for permission for the Facilities Division to administer CIP Project #511609 roof repairs be approved.

Alderman Garrity** moved to accept this report and adopt its recommendations. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Smith.

Alderman Lopez asked is this the McIntyre Ski Lodge?

Mayor Guinta responded no, it's the West Side Arena roof.

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

> The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request for sewer abatement for 37 Ashland Street in the amount of $256.50 be granted and approved, as recommended by EPD.

*On motion of **Alderman Garrity**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy,** it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendations.*

Alderman DeVries stated I wonder if the Chairman of CIP would indulge a question in reference to CIP.

Mayor Guinta stated without objection.

Alderman DeVries stated Alderman, I believe it might have been at the last full Board meeting we had referred a letter from Child and Family Services, and I think I noted in the paper that they had been overwhelmed with flooding. I just wanted to know if you could advise me as to the status of that request.

Alderman Garrity responded sure. It's currently on the table in CIP and CIP staff is looking to find funds. It hasn't been forgotten.

14. Reports of the Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully advises, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Krista Stadnicki of Northside Animal Hospital for permission and installation of directional signs has been received and filed.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Sullivan**, it was voted to accept this report.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Brigit Ryan of the American Cancer Society for permission to paint pink ribbons in the intersections of Elm Street and North Street, Elm Street and Bridge Street, and Elm Street and Granite Street for an event to be held on October 19, 2008 be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Sullivan**, duly seconded by **Alderman O'Neil**, it was voted to approve this item.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Frank Comerford, Cathedral Chair to have "No Parking" signs be placed for the Greek festival Glendi be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Gatsas**, it was voted to approve this item.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from the Manchester Police Department for ten (10) parking passes for on street parking or for the Pine Street Parking Lot to be distributed at the Department's discretion and to be valid for the duration of the Michael Addison trial be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy**, it was voted to approve this item.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that various traffic regulations governing standing, stopping and parking and operation of vehicles, be adopted pursuant to Chapter 70 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester and put into effect when duly advertised and the districts affected thereby duly posted as required by the provisions of that Chapter and Chapter 335 of the Sessions Laws of 1951.

Section 70.36 Stopping, Standing, or Parking Prohibited

RESCIND STOP SIGNS:
On Mulsey Street at Bedford Street – SWC
On Philippe Cote Street, northern terminus at Commercial Street – SWC
(Ord. 2511)
On Philippe Cote Street, southern terminus at Commercial Street – NEC, SWC (Ord. 2512)
Alderman Sullivan

STOP SIGN – 3 -WAY - EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Granite Street at Dyson Street – SWC
Alderman Smith

STOP SIGNS – 4 –WAY – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Taylor Street at Young Street, SEC, NWC
Alderman Shea

NO PARKING ANYTIME:
On Wheelock Street, west side, from Goffe Street to Frederick Street
Alderman Smith
On Alsace Street, west side, from a point 167 feet north of Amory Street to a point 23 feet northerly
Alderman Ouellette
On Front Street, north side, from River Front Drive to a point 60 feet east
Alderman Domaingue

NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Douglas Street, south side, from Putnam Street to a point 555 feet west
On Douglas Street, south side, from the Douglas Street Athletic Field Driveway to a point 220 feet east
Alderman Ouellette
On Trolley Street, east side, from a point 195 feet north of Hickory Street to a point 400 feet northerly
Alderman DeVries

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On McQuesten Street, north side, from a point 105 feet east of Second Street to Hill Street
(Ord. 9043)
Alderman Smith

CROSSWALKS:
On Young Street, east and west of Taylor Street
On Taylor Street, north and south of Young Street
Alderman Shea

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE – 8AM – 5 PM – MONDAY – SATURDAY – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Bridge Street, north side, from a point 60 feet east of Union Street to Union Street East Back Street
Alderman Jim Roy

15 MINUTE PARKING – 8AM -6PM- EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Bridge Street, north side, from a point 60 feet east of Union Street to Union Street East Back Street
Alderman Jim Roy

RESCIND 1 HOUR PARKING:
On Amory Street, north side, from Cartier Street to Dubuque Street (Ord. 8074)
Alderman Ouellette

TWO HOUR PARKING 8AM – 6PM – MONDAY – SATURDAY:
On Canton Street, east side, from Auburn Street to Cedar Street
Alderman Osborne

STOP SIGNS – 4 – WAY:
On South Porter Street at Purdue Street, SEC, NWC (speed survey and accident review underway by Police Traffic Division)
Alderman DeVries

RESCIND

METERS – 2 HOURS:
Middle Street, north side, from a point 80 feet east of Canal Street to a point 90 feet west of Franklin Street (Ord. 7731)
Lowell Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to Pine Street (Ord. 7705)
Lowell Street, north side, from a point 20 feet east of Chestnut Street to a point 130 feet easterly (Ord. 7707)
Amherst Street, north side, from Chestnut Street to a point 75 feet west of Pine Street
(Ord. 6369)
Amherst Street, south side, from a point 130 feet east of Chestnut Street to a point 40 feet west of Pine Street (Ord. 7609)
Manchester Street, south side, from a point 100 feet east of Nutfield Lane to a point 60 feet west of Chestnut Street (Ord. 7713)
Manchester Street, north side, from Elm Street to Chestnut Street (Ord. 7714)
Vine Street, west side, from Concord Street to a point 115 feet north of Amherst Street
(Ord. 7476)
Central Street, both sides, from Elm Street to Chestnut Street (Ord. 2774)

Stark Lane, south side, from a point 30 feet west of Hampshire Lane to Canal Street
(Ord. 7987)
Stark Street, north side, from Canal Street to United Way (Ord. 7400)
Lake Avenue, north side from a point 45 feet west of Chestnut Street to a point 90 feet east of Manhattan Lane (Ord. 7537)
Pine Street, east side, from Monadnock Lane to Merrimack Street (Ord. 7789)
Chestnut Street, west side, from a point 305 feet south of Merrimack Street to Central Street (Ord. 7675)
Chestnut Street, east side, from Amherst Street to Hanover Street (Ord. 7680)
Chestnut Street, east side, from Central Street to Lake Avenue (Ord. 7681)
Chestnut Street, west side, from Central Street to Lake Avenue (Ord. 7677)
Chestnut Street, east side, from Concord Street to Amherst Street (Ord. 7679)
Chestnut Street, west side, from Concord Street to Amherst Street (Ord. 2831)
Chestnut Street, west side, from Manchester Street to a point 52 feet south of Hanover Street (Ord. 7673)

Elm Street, west side, from a point 445 feet south of Stark Street to West Merrimack Street (Ord. 7914)

2 HOUR PARKING
Chestnut Street, west side, from a point 75 feet north of Hanover Street to Amherst Street (Ord. 2833)
Spring Street, north side, from a point 40 feet west of Elm Street to a point 200 feet east of Canal Street (Ord. 7396)

NO PARKING:
Middle Street, north side, from Franklin Street to a point 90 feet west (Ord. 3400)
Manchester Street, south side, from a point 50 feet east of Elm Street to a point 55 feet east of Nutfield Lane (Ord. 6485)
Manchester Street, south side, from Elm Street to a point 20 feet easterly (Ord. 7192)

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE -8AM-5PM- MONDAY-FRIDAY:
Manchester Street, south side, from a point 55 feet east of Nutfield Lane to a point 45 feet east (Ord. 6485)
Manchester Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to a point 60 feet westerly (Ord. 3291)
Elm Street, west side, from Depot Street to a point 70 feet north (Ord. 8159)

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:
Vine Street, west side, from Concord Street to a point 115 feet north of Amherst Street
(Ord. 8798)

PARKING FOR MAYOR'S VEHICLE ONLY:
Spring Street, north side from Elm Street to a point 40 feet westerly (Ord. 7394)

TIME LIMIT 6AM-5PM MONDAY- FRIDAY, EXCLUDING HOLIDAYS:
1155 Elm Street (2 Ordinances – 8940, 8941)

METERS – 10 HOURS MON-FRI 5PM-8PM, SAT 8AM-8PM:
Elm Street, west side, from a point 20 feet north of Depot Street to a point 50 feet northerly (Ord. 8290)

ADD

METERS – 2 HOURS:
Middle Street, north side, from Franklin Street to a point 80 feet east of Canal Street
Central Street, north side, from Elm Street to Chestnut Street
Central Street, south side, from Elm Street to a point 117 feet east of Manhattan Lane

Central Street, south side, from a point 149 feet east of Manhattan Lane to Chestnut Street
Stark Street, north side, from a point 18 feet west of Hampshire Lane to a point 287 feet west of Hampshire Lane
Stark Street, north side, from a point 299 feet west of Hampshire Lane to Canal Street
Chestnut Street, west side, from a point 75 feet north of Hanover Street to Amherst Street
Elm Street, west side, from a point 445 feet south of Stark Street to a point 156 feet north of West Merrimack Street
Elm Street, west side, from a point 132 feet north of West Merrimack Street to West Merrimack Street

METERS – 10 HOURS:
Lowell Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to Pine Street
Lowell Street, north side, from a point 20 feet east of Chestnut Street to a point 130 feet easterly
Amherst Street, north side, from Chestnut Street to a point 75 feet west of Pine Street
Amherst Street, south side, from a point 130 feet east of Chestnut Street to a point 40 feet west of Pine Street
Lake Avenue, north side, from a point 45 feet west of Chestnut Street to a point 90 feet east of Manhattan Lane
Pine Street, east side, from Monadnock Ln to Merrimack Street
Pine Street, west side, from Hanover Street to a point 165 feet northerly

Chestnut Street, west side, from a point 305 feet south of Merrimack Street to Central Street
Chestnut Street, west side, from Merrimack Street to a point 150 feet south
Chestnut Street, east side, from Amherst Street to Hanover Street
Chestnut Street, both sides, from Central Street to Lake Avenue
Chestnut Street, both sides, from Concord Street to Amherst Street
Chestnut Street, west side, from Manchester Street to a point 52 feet south of Hanover Street
Spring Street, north side, from Elm Street to a point 200 feet east of Canal Street

METERS – 10 HOURS - NO PERMIT PARKING:
Manchester Street, south side, a point 50 feet east of Elm Street to Chestnut Street
Manchester Street, north side, from Elm Street to Chestnut Street

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE -8AM-5PM- MONDAY-FRIDAY:
Vine Street, west side, from Concord Street to a point 115 feet north of Amherst Street

15 MINUTE PARKING:
Central Street, south side, from a point 117 feet east of Manhattan Lane to a point 149 feet east of Manhattan Lane
Lake Avenue, north side, from Manhattan Lane to a point 40 feet easterly

15 MINUTE PARKING -8AM-5PM- MONDAY-FRIDAY:
Stark Street, north side, from a point 287 feet west of Hampshire Lane to a point 299 feet west of Hampshire Lane

15 MINUTE PARKING -8AM-6PM- MONDAY-SATURDAY:
Elm Street, west side, from a point 156 feet north of West Merrimack Street to a point 132 feet north of West Merrimack Street

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE 8AM-6PM-MONDAY-SUNDAY:
Elm Street, west side, from Depot Street to a point 70 feet north

RESCIND 15 MINUTE PARKING:
Old Granite Street, south side, from a point 100 feet east of Granite Street to a point 50 feet east (Ord. 6510)
Alderman Sullivan

15 MINUTE PARKING:
Old Granite Street, south side, from a point 442 feet west of Elm Street, to a point 482 feet west of Elm Street. Monday through Friday, 8am-5pm
Alderman Sullivan

RESCIND METERS – 10 HOURS:
Old Granite Street, north side, from a point 105 feet west of Elm Street to a point 85 feet east of Granite Street (Ord. 8323)
Alderman Sullivan

RESCIND METERS – 2 HOURS:
Old Granite Street, south side, from a point 150 feet east of Granite Street to Hampshire Lane (Ord. 7272)
Alderman Sullivan

METERS – 10 HOURS:
Old Granite Street, north side, from a point 105 feet west of Elm Street to a point 413 feet west of Elm Street
Old Granite Street south side, from a point 152 feet west of Elm Street to a point 442 feet west of Elm Street
Alderman Sullivan

RESCIND NO PARKING:
Old Granite Street, south side, from Granite Street to a point 100 feet easterly (Ord. 3456)
Old Granite Street, north side, from Granite Street to a point 85 feet easterly (Ord. 3455)
Old Granite Street, south side, from Hampshire Lane to Elm Street (Ord. 3458)
Alderman Sullivan

NO PARKING ANYTIME:
Old Granite Street, north side, from a point 413 feet west of Elm Street to Granite Street
Old Granite Street, south side, from Elm Street. to a point 152 feet west of Elm Street
Old Granite Street south side, from a point 482 feet west of Elm Street to Granite Street
Alderman Sullivan

TRAFFIC SIGNALS:
Huse Road and Lowe's
Alderman DeVries

RESCIND YIELD SIGN:
On South Willow Street at Huse Road, SEC
Alderman DeVries

STOP SIGNS – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Oliver Street at Somerville Street, SEC
Alderman Shea

STOP SIGNS – 4-WAY:
On South Porter Street at Purdue Street, SEC, NWC (speed survey and accident history study underway by Manchester Police)
Alderman DeVries

NO PARKING ANYTIME:
On Lake Ave., north side, from a point 75 feet east of Wilson Street to a point 23 feet east
On Lake Ave., south side, from a point 75 feet east of Wilson Street to a point 19 feet east
Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Tarrytown Road, west side, from Mammoth Road to a point 115 feet southerly
On Tarrytown Road, west side, from a point 210 feet south of Mammoth Road to Hanover Street
Alderman Jim Roy
On Conant Street, north side, from Notre Dame Ave. to Blucher Street
On Notre Dame Ave., west side, from Walsh Ave. to a point 82 feet north
Alderman Ouellette

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:
On Merrimack Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to Pine Street (Ord. 3392)
Alderman Sullivan
On Tarrytown Road, west side, from Mammoth Road to Hanover Street
Alderman Jim Roy

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME - EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Conant Street, north side, from Main Street to Blucher Street
On Notre Dame Ave., east side, from Conant Street to a point 270 feet north
Alderman Ouellette

RESCIND NO PARKING DURING SCHOOL HOURS – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Notre Dame Ave., west side, from Conant Street to Walsh Ave.
Alderman Ouellette

RESCIND NO PARKING BUS STOP DURING SCHOOL HOURS – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Notre Dame Ave., west side, from Walsh Ave. to Hecker Street
Alderman Ouellette

NO STOPPING, STANDING OR PARKING - EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Conant Street, north side, from Main Street to Notre Dame Ave
On Notre Dame Ave., east side, from Conant Street to a point 270 feet north
Alderman Ouellette

NO STOPPING, STANDING OR PARKING – 7AM-8AM/2PM-3PM ON SCHOOL DAYS –EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Notre Dame Ave., west side, from Conant Street to Walsh Ave.
On Notre Dame Ave., west side, from a point 82 feet north of Walsh Ave. to Hecker Street
Alderman Ouellette

PARKING FOR POLICE VEHICLES ONLY:
On Merrimack Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to Pine Street
Alderman Sullivan

CROSSWALKS:
On Spruce Street, west of Canton Street
On Spruce Street, east of Cypress Street
Alderman Osborne
On Conant Street, north of Walsh Ave
Alderman Ouellette

PAINTED PARKING STALLS:
On Notre Dame Ave., west side, from Conant Street to Hecker Street
Alderman Ouelette

RESCIND PARKING 30 MINUTES- EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Maple Street, east side, from Lowell Street to a point 50 feet south (Ord. 3340)
Alderman Jim Roy

ONE HOUR PARKING – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:
On Maple Street, east side, from Lowell Street to a point 50 feet south
Alderman Jim Roy
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman O'Neil who voted in opposition to all 3 & 4 way stop signs)

be approved.

Deputy City Clerk Matt Normand stated we received communication from Brandy Stanley that this needs to be amended. In particular, there is an ordinance that should not have been rescinded last night that is specific to Elm Street, the east side, from a point 110 feet north of Pearl Street to Bridge Street. Two new

ordinances should have been tabled: Elm Street, east side, from Pearl Street to Bridge Street and Elm Street, east side, from a point 110 feet north of Pearl Street to a point 40 feet north of Pearl Street, metered for two hours. I believe Brandy Stanley is here if the Board needs clarification.

Alderman J. Roy moved to approve this item with the amendments. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Shea.

Alderman O'Neil asked does this include three-way and four-way stop signs?

Deputy City Clerk Normand responded yes it does.

Alderman M. Roy asked does this include the addendum but not the additional item regarding Webster School that was passed at the same vote?

Deputy City Clerk Normand responded the Webster School is coming up in another report.

Alderman O'Neil stated at some point we've got to make a decision. We adopt building codes; we adopt fire codes. We fail to adopt a uniform traffic code, which is a national standard. We are in violation in many, many intersections around the City, and I think there is liability to the City by being in violation of those codes with the installation of stop signs, so that's why I oppose the four-way stop signs and the three-way stop signs. We have all the other codes we adopt and we don't use one for traffic.

Mayor Guinta stated next week we'll have a special committee appointed.

Alderman O'Neil stated I will gladly head that, Your Honor.

Alderman M. Roy stated if possible could we have…I know the Highway Department has one…if there's another copy of the uniform code…I know it's a couple inches thick. But if that could be somewhere in City Hall, maybe the Clerk's office and the Highway Department, so when we do get these requests…I know right now I have a constituent who wants a three-way stop sign and we've worked with the Highway Department to look at the intersection. It would make the intersection more dangerous, but if I had that to go back and copy and refer my constituent to it, it would help not only to justify the Highway Department's decision but my decision in supporting that.

Mayor Guinta stated Kevin Sheppard is shaking his head.

Alderman M. Roy stated thank you.

Mayor Guinta *called for a vote on the motion as amended. The motion carried, with Alderman O'Neil duly recorded in opposition.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic was respectfully advises, after due and careful consideration, that the following traffic regulation has been received and filed:

NO TRUCKS
ALLOWED - 9:30PM–7:00AM – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE
On Taylor Street, from Grove Street to a point 55 feet northerly

On motion of ***Alderman Ouellette****, duly seconded by* ***Alderman Pinard****, it was voted to accept this report.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Jim Costello, Executive Director of Marcel's Way, to use Arms Park on May 9, 2009 for Marcel's Way 6th Annual 5K road race and fundraising walk be approved.

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic further recommends that a request from the Verizon Wireless Arena for free parking for Arena staff members during the upcoming circus event from September 28, 2008 through October 5, 2008 be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Smith**, it was voted to approve these items.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Jeff Eisenberg, Manchester Monarchs, for permission to place yard signs at area businesses, major roads and rotaries throughout the City from Saturday October 4, 2008 through Saturday October 18, 2008 be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Pinard**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy**, it was voted to approve this item.*

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Alderman Mark Roy for "No parking during school hours" signs be placed on Theodore Road, a small section of Chestnut Street and a small section of North Bay Street be approved.

The Committee on Public Health, Safety and Traffic further recommends that a crosswalk from the west side of Theodore Road to the handicap access at the sidewalk around Webster School be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman M. Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Shea**, it was voted to approve these items.*

The Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from the Strange Brew Tavern at 88 Market Street to temporarily close a portion of Franklin West Back Street each week from Friday through Sunday between the hours of 12:00 pm and 10:00 pm for a pilot program allowing for outside seating. Approval is conditional for seating only with no outside music, increased security, and reopening of the alley no later than 10:00 p.m. The pilot program is to start April 2009 and last for one season with the Committee revisiting the program in October 2009. The Committee further notes that this program shall be monitored for compliance by the Manchester Police Department and City Clerk's Office be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Sullivan**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy**, it was voted to approve this item.*

15. Reports of the Committee on Lands and Buildings

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Clem Lemire to name tennis courts at Derryfield Park the Loughlin-Churas tennis courts be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Lopez**, duly seconded by **Alderman Pinard,** it was voted to approve this item.*

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Chuck DePrima to remove the American Elm Tree at the William B. Cashin Senior Center be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Ouellette**, duly seconded by **Alderman Smith**, it was voted to approve this item.*

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the MHRA be authorized to execute lease agreements for two (2) cellular antennae to be placed on the water tower on Hackett Hill, subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor and Economic Development Director.

Alderman Garrity** moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think there may be some discussion that there may be an opportunity for additional revenue. Listening to the lease amounts that are expiring and renewing, it seems as though the lease amounts certainly could generate additional revenue. I understand that money sits in a fund, and it doesn't come back to the City, but certainly with the redevelopment of Hackett Hill and the infrastructure we're going to need there, once that's done and over with, it would be nice to have revenue coming into the City. Maybe that's something that we need to think about moving over here.

Mayor Guinta asked would it be appropriate to have a recommendation from City staff and MHRA before Lands and Buildings?

Alderman Gatsas responded there was a presentation before Lands and Buildings, Your Honor, but I don't know if the leases are being worked as hard as they should be, because I believe we approved a lease…I believe Water Works came before us with a lease, maybe three or four months ago, that was something like $2,500 a month. Maybe they've got a better location, I don't know. But I know that these leases on towers are starting to generate some awful big dollars.

Mayor Guinta asked why don't we have Mr. Minkarah meet with MHRA to talk about that issue and then come back before Lands and Buildings with a future recommendation?

Alderman Gatsas responded there is already a recommendation been made that we accept the leases, Your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated I'm talking about future leases. I'm sorry. I thought you were referencing future leases.

Alderman Gatsas stated the leases that are in place are going to go in place for 15 years. I just don't know if we're getting the biggest bang for our buck there.

Alderman M. Roy stated I was at that meeting earlier and I think the message was very clear to MHRA and Ken Edwards to go get educated on what the market is for leases, and to go ahead and get the highest dollar value for the City that he can. I think that message from Alderman Gatsas and the Committee was very clear. He believes he is at the maximum and he's negotiating. I'd like to see these go forward, possibly, but also ask Mr. Minkarah to work with Water Works and MHRA to make sure that MHRA has the highest and best number.

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

> The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen authorize execution of an amendment to the purchase and sale agreement between Anagnost Investments, Inc. and MHRA I, Inc. for property known as the so-called "Jac-Pac" site to extend the closing on or before October 3, 2008, subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor and Economic Development Director.

On motion of ***Alderman M. Roy****, duly seconded by* ***Alderman Smith****, it was voted to approve this amendment.*

> The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Cheryl LePine Beliveau for the City to eliminate two parking spaces on Map 292 Lot 11 and for permission to access the petitioner's parking lot from this parcel be referred to the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic.

*On motion of **Alderman Ouellette**, duly seconded by **Alderman Lopez**, it was voted to approve this referral. Alderman M. Roy was duly recorded as abstaining.*

16. Reports of the Joint Schools Committee

The Joint Schools Committee respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the granite sign depicting "Manchester High School Central" be moved back to Central High School and erected at a visible location on site with a budget of up to $8,000 to cover costs for the move and placement of the sign.

*On motion of **Alderman M. Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy**, it was voted to approve this item.*

The Joint Schools Committee respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that *Change Order* #6 for $22,690 related to additional site excavation required at the Manchester School of Technology be accepted.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Garrity**, it was voted to accept this recommendation.*

17. Reports of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request made by Information Systems Department for 2009 bond money be referred to the Committee on Community Improvement for review.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Garrity**, it was voted to approve this request.*

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from Jeff Eisenberg, President of Manchester Monarchs, for permission to place a fourteen foot by three foot banner on overpasses throughout the City from Saturday, October 4th through Saturday October 18th of 2008 to promote the upcoming season be approved, subject to the review and approval of the Highway Department.

*On motion of **Alderman Pinard**, duly seconded by **Alderman DeVries,** it was voted to approve this request.*

Alderman O'Neil stated specifically the Director of Public Works and only him.

*On motion of **Alderman Domaingue**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy** it was voted to recess the regular meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.*

Mayor Guinta called the meeting back to order.

20. <u>Report of the Committee on Finance</u>

The Committee on Finance recommends that

Resolutions:

"Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Forty Five Thousand Dollars ($45,000) for the FY2009 CIP 213809 Substance Abuse Treatment Project."

"Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Eight Hundred Forty Three Dollars and Sixty Cents ($13,843.60) for the FY2009 CIP 810509 Elderly Services Information System Upgrade Projects."

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

*On motion of **Alderman Smith**, duly seconded by **Alderman Garrity**, it was voted to accept the reports and adopt their recommendations.*

21. Recommendation from the Special Committee on Riverfront Activities receiving unanimous vote that the City purchase a certain .2633 acre parcel of land located at 2 Line Drive under the terms and conditions identified in the attached purchase and sales agreement.
Note: The Board voted to accept and adopt the recommendation of the committee and it was then vetoed by the Mayor. Additional communications has been provided by Pamela H. Goucher, Interim Planning Director and Leon L. LaFreniere, Building Commissioner, forwarded to Board on September 8, 2008.

*On motion of **Alderman Lopez**, duly seconded by **Alderman DeVries**, it was voted to table this item.*

22. Communication from Alderman Lopez, requesting approval to reassign the Parking Enterprise within the Financial Department and further request that the vote will be in effect immediately upon approval of the Board.

***Alderman Lopez** moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Garrity**.*

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Lopez, you stated in your letter that that was the original recommendation of the consultant. The Board chose to go in another direction at the time. There's no impact on anything? Jay lightens his load and Bill gets a little more.

Alderman Sullivan stated I guess my question is, what is the point? I was under the impression that we were going to be using parking management as a tool for economic development, that it was going to be integrated into our downtown development efforts. It wasn't going to be viewed as a cash cow, to try to make up shortfalls in other areas. I guess I'm concerned that if we move this to Finance the temptation is going to be there to view parking revenue as just another revenue stream, and its role as an economic development tool or as a factor in economic development will go out the window.

Mayor Guinta stated I've had conversations with Mr. Minkarah and Mr. Sanders. The initial concern that I had when we first made this move was just what you stated. So, my recommendation at the time was to place it under Economic Development. I think it has been fairly clear that the Enterprise has been successful. It is unique in the sense that it does provide a dividend back to the general fund. I think everybody has respected that relationship with that Enterprise fund. I think it has been very well managed overall, not just by Brandy, but also by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. I don't object to it; I don't think Mr. Sanders is going to look at it as a cash cow. But beyond that, if he should move on at some point, I think it would be imperative for a replacement to understand that it's not about revenue generation; it is about management. But again, because it has some autonomy from whatever department it would be technically under, that responsibility would ultimately rest with the Parking Manager. That's the individual who is going to have to come to this Board and make recommendations, but I think there has been a clear delineation about the purpose, the scope, and the expectations of the department. I note the concern, and I would hope that people here and after us would be ever so vigilant about insuring that it doesn't become a revenue generator as a sole purpose, that it continues to be a tool to enhance the downtown.

Alderman Sullivan stated I've spent the last several months talking to downtown residents and downtown business owners and trying to explain to them that the parking revision that we recently passed was not simply a revenue based decision and that it was grounded in sound economic development policy. Perceptions are everything though. Optics are a factor here as well. I guess I just have to reiterate my concern that moving this under Finance, the public could very well get the impression that we view parking, not as an economic development tool but as just a revenue source. It's going to make our lives that much more difficult when we're trying to explain initiatives such as the one we just dealt with recently.

Mayor Guinta stated I think your concern is reasonable. And I think it's ever more important for us to reiterate that parking has in the last several years been modified, at least the view and the scope of it. We've been trying to modernize parking; we've been trying to expand spaces; we've been trying to do everything we can for different parts of the City to provide additional parking. To me, there seems to be a nexus between commerce, the economy and development. We need to be vigilant as elected officials to insure the public that…I can understand the concern and hopefully we'll make sure that constituents understand the move.

Alderman Gatsas stated I'm somewhat opposed to this because obviously October 1st is when the fireworks are going to start because that's when all the parking changes take effect downtown on Elm Street. People will no longer be able to park on Elm Street for fifty cents. So if you don't think that we've increased rates, the minimum cost that you're going to pay at a meter on Elm Street is going to be a dollar. That's a revenue enhancement. People don't realize that yet but it's happening. For the people that used to be able to put in their fifty cents, run in, pick up a sandwich and leave, now they're going to have to put in a buck. We have half hour parking downtown? We do? Maybe you can explain

that to us because that's not what it reads. Brandy Stanley is shaking her head so she should have the opportunity to address it.

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated Alderman, the minimum payment for parking on Elm Street is a nickel, and has been for many years. That's not changing.

Alderman Gatsas asked so a nickel buys me how much?

Ms. Stanley responded right now it buys you six minutes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so I can put a credit card in and take a nickel's worth of time.

Ms. Stanley stated with a credit card it's a minimum payment of twenty-five cents. But if you put a nickel in a meter on Elm Street, it will give you six minutes. On October 1st if you put a nickel in a meter on Elm Street, it will give you, I think, four minutes.

Alderman Gatsas stated so I assume the people that have been hired to inspect the tickets that are on the dashboards look very closely at how much time is registered on that little ticket.

Ms. Stanley stated the ticket, when it's printed out, has in very bold print, the date and the expiration time of it. Whether or not the person put in fifty cents or a nickel is irrelevant. It's the expiration date and time, which is very large on that ticket.

Alderman Gatsas stated so people parking on Elm Street, if they want 12 minutes, can put in ten cents.

Ms. Stanley stated that's correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated there goes the revenue that we were told that this new parking plan was going to derive, because I'm sure everybody, by tomorrow, is going to understand they can park on Elm Street for ten cents.

Alderman DeVries stated Brandy, are there any costs associated with the transfer? Is there any printing, stationary, web site? Are there any costs at all that we need to be made aware of?

Ms. Stanley responded as far as I know there aren't any. I'd defer to Mr. Sanders.

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Director, stated I am not aware of any incremental costs or any costs whatsoever.

Alderman DeVries asked is there any inconvenience or anything else this Board should be aware of? I think the first question was, for lack of a better reason, why are we doing this? I still haven't heard anything that answered that.

Mayor Guinta stated it was a communication from Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez stated I believe that the relationship…and the only reason, as Alderman O'Neil mentioned, that we didn't put it in the Finance Department in the first place is because of the past regime. And I'll leave it like that. But I believe that we're in a real financial…and making sure that it's not just becoming a revenue but long-range planning for the parking to get that guidance from an

expert in Finance. I'm not saying we can't do that now, but I think Jay has a lot on his plate, and I think that they have to concentrate more on Jac Pac and Hackett Hill and everything else rather than worry about parking. Parking is financial. Brandy is capable of presenting plans to the Traffic Committee and moving forward, and I think with the expert advice from the Finance Officer and moving ahead in the years, and planning this thing out, I think is in the right direction the way it should have been done in the first place. And actually the parking plan said she should be separate completely and report to no one other than the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, just to clear that up in everybody's mind. But we don't have to create another department. We have a division that can report to the Finance Officer who she deals with on financial aspects, anything she does. Jay still has ability to talk to her about parking and planning for that. So I believe this is the right way to go.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess I still haven't heard any real valid reason why this should happen. I guess I'm putting you on the spot, Brandy, because I do also, as Alderman Lopez stated, see you as an independently functioning entity, wherever you are assigned. You seem to be doing all of the work yourself contained within your department, so it's not that it matters to be. You seem to have a very smooth-running ship down there. I don't want to be the one that upsets that, even if it's an administrative attachment. So, if it is causing any kind of commotion, I hope you would let us know because I have heard nothing but great feedback from all of the actions that your department collectively has been able to do, and I thank you very much for your work this last couple of weeks, getting ready for school opening and assisting us around the high schools with school opening. Your department has always been on the ready. I don't want to rock the boat; if I'm rocking the boat let me know or forever hold your peace.

Ms. Stanley stated thank you very much for your compliments, Alderman. I appreciate it. Honestly, I personally don't see that this is going to affect the way we operate very much at all. It's been historical that we have taken the direction that this Board has given us. I don't see that changing. Mr. Sanders and I talked a couple of times, and I don't think either one of us sees that changing. I honestly don't think it's going to have very much effect on us at all.

Alderman DeVries stated thank you. That's the answer I was looking for.

Alderman J. Roy stated my question is for Mr. Sanders. Do you believe this is where Parking should be, under you department?

Mr. Sanders responded I think there are aspects of the Parking Enterprise that the Finance Department can help with and improve and provide a reporting mechanism and some help in the financial area. I'm not advocating for the assignment. I'm perfectly fine working with Brandy. I also thought Mr. Minkarah and the Economic Development office played a role, and I would hope that over time they would continue to play a role and we would continue to work together. I think there are some improvements we can bring from the Finance office in terms of helping Brandy and facilitating some of the things that the Aldermen might want to see or look at in different ways from a financial perspective. I hope that it will be a good thing.

***Mayor Guinta** called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried, with Alderman Sullivan being duly recorded in opposition.*

23. Communication from Alderman Lopez, requesting the reorganization of the Planning and Economic Development Departments into one department known as the Manchester Planning & Economic Development Department.

***Alderman Lopez** moved to approve this reorganization. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Domaingue**.*

Alderman Lopez stated I have spoken to the chairman of the Administration Committee. Looking at the 2010 budget, we all know it's going to be expensive. I think this is an opportunity to maybe not get the whole pie but part of the pie in the right direction where the Economic, which I voted for in the beginning…to put the Economic division with the Planning Department. Since there is no department head in that division, that would be up to the Mayor to bring some type of closure to both departments and work in the direction for the good of the City, so I believe that these two departments should work together. I believed that a year ago. I still believe it today, and I think with the 2010 budget coming up, we've got to make some of these decisions. We can't continue not to make them, so I'm therefore recommending it.

Mayor Guinta stated I support the compromise. I appreciate the willingness of the Board to work collaboratively. Obviously there are a couple of people that want to make comments, but I gladly accept that motion, and when we're ready to vote, we'll get it done.

Alderman Shea stated in speaking to Pam Goucher last night after our meeting, she expressed a couple of concerns that I think should be heard, because I think that sometimes there might be a situation where…and again, I'm sort of going with what she has indicated. When the Planning Board has to make decisions concerning certain zoning and planning issues, and the Economic Development Department is trying to bring in business, there could be some sort of a conflict of interest, to an extent. Again, I don't want to speak for her necessarily, but…

Mayor Guinta interjected those concerns have been expressed. I know that other communities…when we first dealt with this in committee, a lot of different communities have it organized different ways. I don't think there are any unforeseeable issues or challenges that couldn't be worked through. Again, there are many synergies between these departments. Let me take other comments from other Aldermen, and if it's appropriate I can have department heads come up if they so wish.

Alderman Shea stated before you do, Your Honor, I just am bringing it up so that in the event that there is some sort of a difficulty…There is an expression: Forewarned is forearmed.

Mayor Guinta stated and this also came up in committee when we first…so your concern is noted. I would be confident that members of the departments would be able to deal with those issues. They have been noted to me; they've been noted in public, at committee, and here again. So, I appreciate that.

Alderman M. Roy stated just to echo Alderman Shea's concerns, you have two very distinct and separate actions by the Planning Department and the Economic Development Department. One is regulatory in nature and one is, for lack of a better term, a cheerleader for the City. I believe there would be an incredible conflict within that department if Jay, as the lead development person, goes to a company that wants to come to the City and works with them and tries to get them to love Manchester as much as we all do. And then they come in front of, technically, the department that he's working in, which governs the Planning Board, and gets denied and denied and denied. I find it very conflicting that we'd look to put our regulatory with an economic development department. I didn't support it when it came up before. I think there are other efficiencies we can find

within City government that will allow us to maintain the budget for 2010, but this is not a place that I can support it. I think they both have very distinct and sometimes aligned, very necessary functions within the City. They work together when they need to and they work very separately when they have to work separately. And I appreciate that autonomy, so I'll be voting against this.

Alderman J. Roy stated I share the concerns of my colleague, Alderman Roy. The problem I have that I can't get my mind around is if we have an economic development person in charge of that department, is the emphasis going to be on getting people in here and ignoring the enforcement aspect? Or if we do it the opposite way and someone is a planner and they are in charge of that department, do we not pursue getting people to come in as aggressively as if we had someone who was an economic development person in charge? With that said, in this letter I think we're putting the cart before the horse here. It says that we're going to vote on it tonight but then we're going to see an organizational chart in October. I think I'd want to see an organizational chart first. And I still don't think that will alleviate my fears of combining the two.

Alderman O'Neil stated as the Board is hopefully aware, we have had a tabled item since April 1st in the Committee on Administration regarding a new community development department, which would merge MEDO, Planning, and Building. The Committee is still waiting for information back on that. There were a number of tasks that would be provided. If the question from Alderman Lopez is, would you allow this to move forward to at least gather the information and see if these two departments make sense merging together, I would at least allow that to happen, without committing that at the end I'm going to vote to merge these two departments. I think one is a sales versus a regulatory department. I think before we commit to this, we've got to get all the information in this. The last line of the letter says, "The Mayor shall bring forth an organizational chart by October

7th." I think we need that information. I wasn't convinced on it with the merger of the three departments. I'd keep an open mind, but I'd like to see the pros and the cons of merging these two, because I do see that they conflict with each other.

Alderman DeVries stated for the constituents at home that may be listening to this discussion and trying to understand why we would have difficulty blending the Planning Department into our Economic Development Department, I don't think we have to look any further than the two-plus year controversy that we've watched in Merrimack, trying to bring a very large mall into the area, which is highly controversial for the surrounding property owners. It has been fought aggressively and delayed. So I think our constituents do perceive that there is the regulatory body which is acting on their behalf, the Planning Department, which advises the Planning Board even though that's a citizen board that votes. The Planning Department and their staff are essential in being kind of a front person for our constituencies, where the Economic Development is certainly the cheerleader for the City and is looking for these large projects to help us continue to build and supplement existing businesses. So, though they do have some similarities, there are some different functions, and I have some grave fears in this going too much further. What I think I just heard from Alderman O'Neil is he's been waiting for some material which he would very much like to receive. He'd like us to give him the opportunity to receive that information on this possible synergy at the Committee on Administration and then you will be reporting it back. Are we actually looking to amend a motion to refer this to your committee?

Alderman O'Neil responded the proposal that's on the table in the Committee on Administration is merging three departments: Building, Planning, and Economic Development. And we're waiting for the responses on that.

Alderman DeVries stated I did understand that you have a current tabled proposal for the three. I thought you were inviting this proposal for the merger of the two departments to be sent to you at Administration with the supporting documentation that you've been waiting for, so that you might digest that as a committee and then refer it back to us. Is that the proposal that you were entertaining?

Alderman O'Neil stated I commented that I'm willing to learn more about Alderman Lopez's proposal and the pros and the cons. I don't think it's the committee's responsibility to generate either the merger of the three departments or the two departments. I think it's the people who made the proposals, it's their responsibility to provide that information to the committee for consideration, unless the Board directs otherwise.

Alderman DeVries stated I have one final comment before I'm done, Your Honor. I don't have a problem with this going to the Committee on Administration, and I could do that tonight. The one caveat would be that the Planning Department staff is understaffed, and if I recall the last conversation I had with them, I think they have eight employees there. Is it twelve that you're normally staffed? Okay, they have eight and a half, rather than the twelve that they would normally run with, so I would hope that whatever work is being done isn't going to further burden the Planning Department because there are many projects already being processed. They have work they have to get out and plans to review.

Alderman Lopez stated I think some of the concerns are good concerns. But we have to do something. Either we're not going to merge…we can't keep holding things in committee, with all due respect. I can tell you that the Human Resources Committee had the same problem. We received and filed. If nobody wants to

give any information, receive and file it, and get rid of it. I've always held that position because other cities…and there's documentation that was done by the previous economic individual, where planning and economic development go together. It's a fiduciary responsibility of planning and regulatory functions under state law that they do something. I do not believe that any department head is going to tell an employee to break the law. And if that employee came to this Board and said, I've been told to break the law, I believe we wouldn't have a department head very long. I have no fears in mixing the two, because they do go together. No matter who goes to Planning, they go to Economic Development. Whoever goes to Economic Development goes to Planning. There are those coordination efforts that should be taken very seriously. I'm willing to do whatever the Board wants. If you it to go to committee…but let's do something with it. If you need that information, if the Mayor plans on putting out an organizational chart of how he visualizes those working together, that's one thing. But I'll tell you, come budget season, with all due respect, I'm going to say, I gave you a program, and you did nothing with it. That's what I'm trying to avoid, so the other Aldermen understand where I'm coming from. Let's just make a decision one way or the other. If the wish is to send it to a committee, I'll yield, but get it out of there within a month. There's no reason in the world we can't do that. If that's the wishes of a majority of the Board, I'm willing to do that.

Alderman Sullivan stated I agree with what Alderman DeVries was saying earlier in that there does seem to be a conflict involved here in that one of these departments has a regulatory function and the other has an advocacy function. I guess my question for Alderman Lopez would be this: If you're looking for efficiencies and you're looking for synergies and some functional overlap, why aren't you looking at combining Planning and Building? It seems to me that those two departments both have a land use focus, and it would be a much better pairing for some sort of consolidation and streamlining, rather than dragging in Economic

Development, the folks that try to bring companies into the City. Why have you decided to pursue that when that seems to be the more natural combination?

Alderman Lopez responded I think the original plan was Economic Development, Building and Planning. I didn't put the Building Department in. That's in Alderman O'Neil's committee. I'm just submitting that we should, as a Board, take some type of action, either an up and down vote, they're going to stay as a stand-alone department and Economic and Planning can stand alone, or move them together, and let's get on with the business that we need for economic development. I don't believe that the regulatory laws of the state would be broken by anybody.

Alderman Sullivan stated I don't think anybody is saying that laws would be broken. I think it's a matter of the expertise of the different departments and the functions of the different departments. Just looking at what Planning does and what Building does. The tasks that those two departments perform are far more similar. They aren't identical, obviously, but they have much more in common than either of those two departments have with Economic Development. Out of the three departments, it seems to me that you've thrown the wrong one into the mix by including Economic Development as part of this, while leaving Building out of the equation.

Alderman Lopez stated Alderman, you can make a proposal to put Building into Planning if you want to. I think that's already in committee. The argument is moot.

Mayor Guinta stated there is a motion on the floor. Why don't we take a vote on the motion and see where we are? If it moves forward, then it moves forward. If it doesn't, then we'll determine what next step to take.

Alderman Shea requested a roll call vote.

Alderman Gatsas stated maybe I can shed a little light. I think that when the Economic Developer goes out and he brings a company in and says, 'I want you to come to Manchester', and that person then moves to the office next door, and it's the Planning Department, and he comes back out and says to the Economic Developer, 'Wait a minute. You brought me to Manchester. Why isn't everybody bending over backwards to assist me in doing the things I need to get done to come in here?' So, I think the tie between the Economic Developer and Planning is the wrong tie because it sends the wrong message to a company that might be coming to Manchester, not that we shouldn't bend over backwards to try and get that done. But when the two offices are together, the impression is that everything will be done for you, and you don't have a thing to worry about. I think if you put Planning and Building together, and once Jay brings somebody to the City and they walk them in there, then I think that Planning and Building should be able to be a one-stop shopping for a developer, rather than to have to move to four different fronts to get answers. I don't disagree that there shouldn't be a synergy; I don't think the synergy is Economic Development. If we just took Parking out of Economic Development to leave a space to move somebody back in, I'm not to sure that's where we should be going. I think that when you put those two together, you're just going to be looking for havoc to happen with a developer. So with that I'm going to vote no on this plan and have Alderman O'Neil, if he's looking for people to bring the plan forward…I think that was your plan in April that you talked about…I think he makes a point that if we're going to do that then somebody should bring the information to the committee of why we should be doing it and the synergies that are appearing.

Alderman Domaingue stated I seconded this for purposes of discussion. I'd also like to see it go before the committee. I'm confused because it was my understanding from reading your memo, Alderman Lopez, that the motion was more to allow you the time to bring forward an organizational part so that we could then vote on whether or not to consolidate and not to vote tonight on the actual consolidation.

Alderman O'Neil stated just reviewing the tabled item regarding the three departments, we've asked HR to do an analysis, but HR can't do that analysis until you as the proposer say to Jane, 'I want the new person to be over and above the three current department heads.' She's not making the proposal. She can only do the technical review and technical recommendations. So, that would be the same in any of these scenarios. Staff needs the information from those proposing it on what their thoughts are on how it would work.

Mayor Guinta stated I don't disagree. I have met with HR on this particular issue, on the proposal that I had. There was going to be some information moving forward to the committee at an appropriate time. I do want to say that Jane has a lot on her plate, so there is still another meeting that I have to have with her before she's ready to complete an analysis. But that had been moving forward. If this fails, we're going to continue our meetings to bring something forward.

Alderman O'Neil stated your proposal is merging all three. Alderman Lopez is proposing Planning and Economic Development. There might be a third proposal about merging Planning and Building. If anyone wants to bring those forward, the committee can only act on information we get back from staff. You need to provide staff some direction on what you think a structure would look like so we can see if it works. I don't know if that makes sense, but it does to me.

Mayor Guinta stated it does. We had been meeting. I had been giving her some direction on that particular item.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is on Alderman Lopez's plan, which I think Alderman Domaingue clarified. It's just to have you come back with some organizational chart on this, correct?

Alderman Domaingue stated that was a question that really didn't get answered.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's what his letter says though.

Alderman Domaingue stated right.

Mayor Guinta stated the motion is for the reorganization of Planning and Economic Development into one department known as Manchester Planning and Economic Development Department. That's the motion. There is subsequent documentation that says there will be a request, I think by date certain, sometime in October, for me to provide an organizational chart. I'm happy to do that. Ultimately I think it's for the Board's edification of what it would look like. I can tell you now, it's not going to look much different than it looks today. But I'm happy to put something on paper for review, but ultimately I think you've got to rely on whoever the department head is at that point to make recommendations about his or her department. But I'm more than happy to give you my suggestions or ideas as to what I would think the department would look like. And because there's a request for backup documentation, I'm more than willing to provide that.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion. Aldermen Shea, DeVries, Smith, Ouellette, Domaingue, M. Roy, Gatsas, Sullivan, J. Roy, Osborne, Pinard, and O'Neil voted nay. Aldermen Garrity and Lopez voted yea. *The motion failed.*

Alderman O'Neil asked are you going to come back? Are you sticking with the model that you proposed?

Mayor Guinta responded here's what I'll do. I'm going to meet with Alderman Lopez to discuss his recommendation. Because there is my suggestion on the table in committee, I will continue to move forward with the requests of the committee. We'll finalize those and we'll bring them to the committee.

Alderman M. Roy stated Mayor, since you've obviously done quite a bit of work on this, could I ask you, in that proposal or in working with Human Resources, to look at the two regulatory agencies, Building and Planning, as well as the others, to look at three options versus just two? I don't think Building should be left out of this discussion.

24. Communication from Alderman Lopez, recommending that the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department remain as it is currently structured as a department and that the vote of the Board be effective immediately.

***Alderman Lopez** moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Osborne**.*

Alderman Lopez stated I don't have to tell anybody that this has been around a long time. Many of the employees don't know what to do up there. Some employees have left. One planner left to go join the Army in order to go to Afghanistan. He was in the National Guard. They are unstable as to the direction they are going to go. I think it's time we just make a decision straight up and down. As you read my communication, I'm for keeping it as a department. Let's not procrastinate any longer and let the employees suffer. Let the chips fall where they may. It stays as a department. The Mayor has a job to do, to get a

department head. They have two individuals who applied for the job. It's been in limbo for 14 months, and that's the reason I'm bringing this forward. I therefore ask for your support.

Alderman O'Neil stated I've had conversation with Alderman Lopez on this, and I think we're going to all have a respectful conversation tonight, or discussion about it. I have in the past voted to merge the departments. It is my opinion based on some models in Nashua, Concord and Portsmouth, that the citizens are better served. You have better utilization of manpower; you have better utilization of equipment. It may eventually lead to some reduced administrative costs. I would never advocate that anyone should lose their jobs if there were ever mergers. Nashua has it; Concord has it, and Portsmouth. Somebody challenged me one time, saying I always choose cities smaller than Manchester. With that, I was able to make a contact in Worcester, a city of 175,000. I'm not sure of the exact time period, but in the last ten years Parks was added to Public Works. Their official title of the department is Worcester Department of Public Works and Parks. It includes water and waste water. They call it a commissioner. There are four assistant commissioners, one being the assistant commissioner of Parks who reports to the director. It is the observation of their Commissioner of Public Works that it has worked well down there. In doing some reading, Portland, Maine, as part of their fiscal 2009 budget, merged Parks with Public Works. It's not an unusual trend. Programs available to the citizens don't suffer. It's just better utilization of manpower and equipment, so I will respectfully vote against to be consistent with my past vote.

Alderman Osborne stated I guess I've been around a long time. Looking at this whole picture, between Highway and Parks, we have to remember there are 900 acres of parks and land out there. Plus, we're talking about the cemetery here too. So, there is a lot of work to be done. I think a department like that deserves to be

on its own. They have the expertise in their department. They've been there for years. I think the Highway Department itself has enough on its plate now to take care of without adding that to it. You still need the expertise of both sections. You have the director of Highway and of course a director or the department head at Parks and Recreation. I think the expertise is in two different places here. One doesn't know all the knowledge of the other. It's kind of hard to put two things together, I think, and Manchester being such a large city, like we are. I think we just have to keep going with Parks and Recreation and Highway. That's the way I feel about it anyway.

Alderman O'Neil stated in my time on the Board, we've had two departments merged into Public Works. The first was Public Building Services, which was merged and became the Facilities Division. I think the results were very successful. We merged the Traffic Department into the Division of Traffic of Public Works. What I hear from the employees is that it's very successful. I haven't seen any fewer services provided. As a matter of fact, when they were short some staff...Mr. Sheppard can confirm this...Highway assigned some people to Traffic to help out with some painting at some point. It goes back to utilization of manpower. We've had some successes moving into Public Works.

Alderman M. Roy stated I have nothing but the highest respect for the Parks Department, but I just believe through budget cuts, through changes, as a City we've been driving them into the ground. Chuck DePrima has been an interim director now for 14 months. They do an incredible job of working with our constituents and getting things done, but as Alderman O'Neil says, we don't have the workers. I would love to give Tom Matson and Chuck the ability to have the staff that the Highway Department has. I've been very torn on this because I've always voted to keep them separate. Though it may seem like we're taking something away right now by combining them, I just think we'd be able to let our professionals do what they are paid to do. Someone called me and commended Chuck early this spring because he was out doing cleanups and working with crews. I'm sure that wasn't by choice. I'm sure that was because he was ordered to get it done by City officials. Knowing what he needed to do as an interim director, he went out and got it done. So, I have nothing but the highest respect for Parks, but I would love to see them have the tools and the manpower that we allow Highway to have. Highway has been very successful with other mergers, so I think it would be in the best interest that we look toward combining and making a division within Highway of Parks and Recreation, with a clear division leader, so

they could focus on our parks and cemetery and have the assets and the manpower that Highway can give them.

Alderman Smith stated it's just too bad that I didn't know that this was really going to come in because I went to various communities and one was Portsmouth, New Hampshire. I went up to Portland, Maine. There was difference of opinion, but I'd like to speak…anyone who says consolidation of Traffic with Highway is working well, I contest that. If you ever give a call in, you get a Highway Department employee. She transfers you to the department head. The department head is out on the road. Then they say you should get in touch with the assistant Highway guy. He's out there resurfacing. And this does happen on a daily basis. And I'd like to have anybody contest that. You want services; they give you services. They have less manpower. You've got three high schools. You've got to maintain the fields. You can't maintain a field that's utilized like the Central High annex field every single day, 365 days. I say to let them be a department. Let them do their job. I don't believe it should go into the Highway Department whatsoever. They have their own problems and they do a good job.

***Alderman Lopez** requested a roll call vote on the motion.*

A roll call vote was taken. Aldermen Lopez, Shea, Smith, Ouellette, Domaingue, Gatsas, Osborne, and Pinard voted yea. Aldermen DeVries, Garrity, M. Roy, Sullivan, J. Roy and O'Neil voted nay. *The motion carried.*

Alderman O'Neil asked does that mean we're going to be advertising for a director then?

Mayor Guinta responded yes. Starting tomorrow.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would suggest a friendly amendment to that motion, that maybe the Cemetery Department would be moved under Highway because that's really not a function of anything else that Parks does.

Mayor Guinta asked do you want to make a motion?

Alderman Gatsas replied I just think that it's an easier function there. If you kept…and there may be some other things, and that's why I think there should be a discussion about it. It is very difficult to take Enterprise funds and throw them into Parks, when we still know there is a million dollar shortfall in some of these Enterprise funds. For somebody to run the non-revenue side, can they do the maintenance of the fields? Sure, they should be. I don't think the Cemetery is maintenance of fields.

Alderman Lopez stated I think you have a point of discussion, but I think we need an opportunity for the Director to provide some information in reference to Cemetery because they do cross over. Parks people do go to the cemetery, so I'd let him give some sort of documentation to us or to a committee, whatever the case may be, and let him explain how that interaction works there.

Alderman Gatsas stated I don't have a problem but there should be discussion about that.

Mayor Guinta asked can we do that at committee level first though?

Alderman Lopez stated I'd request that the department head provide us information about Cemetery and how it interacts.

25. Communication from Daniel Garrity, Highway Department, requesting approval for a project to honor Manchester Highway Department Workers who have died while performing their duties.

Mayor Guinta stated item 25 actually was taken care of at the last BMA meeting.

Alderman Smith stated I'd like to refer this to CIP for possible funding. The only reason why is I worked at the Highway Department for 38 years and four of these individuals died while I was working there. I'd like to see if there's some actual funding so we can help out.

***Alderman Smith** moved to refer this item to the CIP Committee for possible funding. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Pinard**.*

Alderman Pinard stated I had a friend that's on that marker, Al Pinard, who died October 29, 1977. If you go back to look at the plaque, the picture, the first one that died as a City worker was 58 years ago in 1950. The last one that died was in 1994. I think as a City and we as Aldermen, and I appreciate what Alderman Smith did because I was going to do the same thing. I think we the Aldermen and the citizens of Manchester deserve, and those people that died working for the City deserve that plaque. Thank you very much, Your Honor.

***Mayor Guinta** called for a vote on the motion to refer this item to the CIP Committee for possible funding. The motion carried, with Alderman Garrity being duly recorded as abstaining.*

26. Communication from Grace Sullivan, MCTV Director, requesting authorization to purchase new video cameras for the City Hall Aldermanic Chambers.

Alderman Pinard moved to approve this request. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Smith.

Alderman Gatsas asked did this go out to bid?

Mayor Guinta responded I would assume not…oh, it did. And it's coming out of MCTV percentage funds.

Alderman Gatsas asked and how much money is left in there? Because it looks like these cameras work pretty good.

Alderman Lopez stated no, they're lousy.

Mayor Guinta asked how much money is left in the fund?

Dr. Grace Sullivan, MCTV Director, responded off the top of my head…I don't have the figures, but we have over $300. We can get these cameras…we get a lot of complaints about this, Alderman Gatsas. The cameras are ten years old. They were not…there was a consultant that came in to say what kind of cameras they should be. They're getting old, over ten years. We have the money and the cameras are going to fall apart. And plus, there's going to make everybody look younger and thinner. They're good cameras.

Alderman Shea stated we hear a lot about greening, and when I came home one night, my wife said everyone was green on the TV.

Dr. Sullivan stated right. There's a problem with the phasing of the old cameras. It's a technical problem.

Alderman Sullivan asked are we certain that this is a camera issue and not in the lines that run between here and the studio?

Dr. Sullivan responded oh, I'm quite certain. We've tested it. I've gone through it. There's a phasing camera problem. We did the tech stuff on it.

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

27. Communication from Jane Gile, Human Resources Director, submitting a request on behalf of the Bright Ideas Evaluation Committee recommending monetary recognition in support of two Environmental Protection Division employees for their cost saving measures to the City in both supplies and labor.

Mayor Guinta stated before I take a motion on this, I commend these employees for making improvements to the department. I still have a couple of concerns about the amount that's being considered. I thought it might be reasonable for the Human Resources Committee to take a look at the guidelines prior to approving the recommendation, so unless anyone has objection to that, my preference would be to send this to the Human Resources Committee, just to look at the guidelines and to make sure the committee has an opportunity to look at it and then come back with a recommendation.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you saying approve these and then send them?

Mayor Guinta responded no, what I'm asking is…I don't disagree that the employees meet the criteria for Bright Ideas for an award. I want to make sure every Board member has the full opportunity to review the guidelines that dictate the amount that goes to employees. I thought that the best place to do that was in

the HR Committee, so I'm asking if this could be referred to HR, they take a look at it and then send it right back to the BMA for consideration.

*On motion of **Alderman Garrity** duly seconded by **Alderman Osborne**, it was voted to discuss this item.*

Alderman J. Roy stated I wonder if I just heard you right. I think I didn't. You said there is some question as to whether or not these people were eligible as employees?

Mayor Guinta responded no, no. I said they are absolutely…the idea and the improved functionality meet the criteria for Bright Ideas. I believe they should be receiving acknowledgement and some sort of financial appreciation from the City as a result of it. I'm asking the HR Committee to look at the overall financial guidelines.

Alderman J. Roy asked isn't that what the Bright Ideas committee did?

Mayor Guinta responded they did.

Alderman J. Roy asked so wouldn't they have looked at the guidelines and decided that…

Mayor Guinta interjected I'm just asking that the Aldermen take a look at it.

Alderman DeVries stated Your Honor, you might have been an Alderman when Bright Ideas came before us for approval and those guidelines were accepted. The employees of the City, I think, have been operating under the idea that if they had an idea that created X amount of dollars of savings to the City with something

outside of the scope of their jobs, they could be rewarded for those Bright Ideas. I guess I just don't understand now where employees I think substantially saved the City money, we are questioning it.

Mayor Guinta stated I'm not questioning…I think they saved the City money. I think they deserve recognition and acknowledgement, including financial recognition. I'm just asking that before we make this decision, because it's a rather significant reward, the HR Committee take a look at the guidelines that are in place and verify through our committee process that they agree with the recommendation of Bright Ideas.

Alderman DeVries asked isn't that like saying if you win some sort of reward in a contest, and after you've been notified that you win that, we're going to change what the prize was?

Mayor Guinta responded no because it's not specific. It allows…

Alderman DeVries interjected I'm sure these employees didn't even do it for the reward. They did not; we know that from having read the report.

Mayor Guinta stated I don't think they probably did.

Alderman DeVries stated you probably even supported this when the program went through.

Mayor Guinta stated and I still support the program. I think it's a good program. I think it encourages employees to go above and beyond.

Alderman DeVries stated but you're asking us to take it at a committee level to change what they would receive.

Mayor Guinta stated no. If you listen to what I said, Alderman…What I said was that there are guidelines. Those guidelines are not specific. They allow the committee to take certain things into consideration. All I'm asking is that our Aldermanic HR Committee look at the recommendation of the Bright Ideas committee and either concur or make an adjustment, and then come back to the full Board.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess that's the clearest explanation that you have given. So, you're not asking us to work outside of the parameters of Bright Ideas but just within the guidelines of Bright Ideas to see if our committee agrees. Who do we have on the Bright Ideas committee now? Who are the Aldermen?

Mayor Guinta asked who are the Aldermen that are on that committee? I don't believe there are any Aldermen. I believe it's City employees.

Alderman DeVries stated that might be something we need to take care of.

Alderman Shea asked the money for this particular award is coming from where?

Mayor Guinta responded EPD.

Alderman Shea asked and is there money in that particular budget for these? In other words, how much did we allocate for that, the total amount?

Mayor Guinta responded I've just been notified by EPD that they have money in their budget. The recommendation is $7,000. We don't allocate within their budget for Bright Ideas. Because it's their department, it would come out of their budget, and I've been told that they have the money.

Alderman Shea stated so basically when someone is given…just for clarification…

Mayor Guinta stated if it's a non-Enterprise fund, it would come out of contingency.

Alderman Shea stated okay, but this is an Enterprise fund. Okay, thank you. So, it would come out of the Enterprise fund.

Alderman Smith stated the letter was sent by the Human Resources Department. If anyone wants to know, the members are Brent Lemire, Mary Makris, Kevin Buckley, Gene Mackie and Jane Gile. I'd like to point out that the committee used established criteria in determining the amount of the award.

Mayor Guinta stated yes, they did. But there is also ability within that criteria to make decisions, whether it falls under different criteria within the criteria. And that's what I'm asking. I'm not trying to make a big deal out of this. I just want the HR Committee to review it.

Alderman O'Neil stated going forward, Your Honor, I don't have a problem with that. My problem is this one is out of the bag. The employees know they have been selected, correct?

Mayor Guinta responded well yes, it's a public document.

Alderman O'Neil stated they know they've been selected. I believe they know the amount.

Mayor Guinta stated I'm sure they do.

Ms. Jane Gile, Human Resources Director, stated communication is sent to the department head or to the division head with the understanding that a recommendation comes before the BMA for consideration, and it's up to the BMA to approve the award.

Alderman O'Neil asked can we break this into two parts maybe and keep this moving? I think we have to move forward on this one. It's too far gone. And then if you want to look at the guidelines…

Mayor Guinta interjected I'm not asking to change the guidelines. I just want to be clear.

Alderman O'Neil stated all we're doing is slowing…they've been recognized. We should stand committed to them.

Mayor Guinta stated Alderman, this is going to happen every single time then. I'll tell you why. The Bright Ideas committee makes a recommendation. At that point it is – quote/unquote – out of the bag. I looked at the guidelines. I don't disagree with the guidelines. But you have flexibility within the guidelines in dollar amounts. That's what I am asking the HR Committee to look at, to ask them if they concur with that decision that was made by Bright Ideas. If they concur, it comes back to the Board; it votes up and down. If they don't concur, they give an alternative financial recommendation and that's voted up or down. If you choose not to do that, we'll take a motion and vote this up or down.

Alderman Osborne asked Your Honor, could this amount be increased?

Mayor Guinta responded sure.

Alderman Osborne stated it could be increased as well as anything else. One sort of an idea is worth a little bit more than another. Is that what you're trying to say?

Alderman Sullivan stated I'm just wondering if Jane or anyone else from the Bright Ideas committee who is here tonight could explain to us in the short version the established criteria that you used in trying to determine this, just so we know what everybody is fussing about here.

Ms. Gile responded sure. The criteria that's established for this award…basically there is a matrix that's been established. Going through the matrix we look at improved economy as one criteria, improved efficiency as another criteria, improved effectiveness and productivity is another criteria, and also improved safety of operations is a fourth criteria that we look at. Based on those four criteria we look at the impact of those criteria, whether it's a minimum impact, which means it's only a small division within that department; whether it's a moderate impact, which means it affects the whole department; or if it's a wide impact, which means it affects the whole City, citywide, in terms of the impact. And then based on those criteria, there are financial amounts that are designated for each criteria. The committee went through that process, evaluated this proposal by those two employees, and realized an award of the amount that's represented in my communication.

Alderman Sullivan asked this matrix that you're working off of, is this something that was approved by the Board of Aldermen at some point in the past?

Ms. Gile responded yes. Originally, there was a matrix in 2003 and it was revised in 2006, which increased the potential amount of the awards to the employees for the creativity or the ingenuity they used in terms of making any suggestions.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman J. Roy**, it was voted to approve item 27, the recommendation of the Bright Idea committee.*

Alderman Gatsas** made a motion that before the Bright Idea awards are granted, they come before the HR Committee. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman DeVries.

Alderman Lopez stated I'm trying to remember…I haven't been on the Quality Council for a little bit, but I was there when it first started. It's an Enterprise system, and I know if this was on the other side, we'd take it out of contingency, as you've indicated. When we passed the documentation, it was supposed to be independent people and I think there is a criteria for the people to be on the evaluation committee. That was the whole intent. I was just talking to Jane to refresh my memory on the criteria. Getting into the Aldermen's hands and changing the criteria, that it has to be approved by the HR Committee before it moves forward, I think we're going to be in dangerous territory.

Mayor Guinta stated Alderman, I'm not asking for the criteria to be changed. I just want to be clear. I don't think the criteria should be changed.

Alderman Lopez stated I just don't know what the accomplishment is going to be by sending it to a committee.

Mayor Guinta stated if I could have time after this just to meet with you and maybe express some of the issues that I see as potential problems…

Alderman Lopez stated okay, fine. We want the employees to bring ideas in.

Mayor Guinta stated I completely agree with that, and I hope employees continue to do so.

Alderman J. Roy asked can we ask for the Quality Council to be involved in this decision about whether or not we should add an extra step to it? They are the ones that developed it. Mike Lopez and I were both on that committee at the time. The idea is that these are our customers. Our employees are our customers, and they should have input into how this is being developed.

Mayor Guinta stated I don't disagree, but wait a second. We're the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. This is just simply a recommendation from the council. How we handle it at our level is up to us, whether it goes directly to this Board or to a committee first for review. Most things go to committee first on this Board, so that would actually be in sync with everything else we do. Any recommendation that's made, everything goes to a committee and then to the full Board.

Alderman Gatsas stated not everything, Your Honor.

Mayor Guinta stated well, most things do. The idea would be to keep it in sync with that. I'm not suggesting that the rules be changed, the criteria be changed, just a recommendation from the Bright Ideas Council go to HR Committee for review and approval and adoption prior to going to the full Board.

Alderman Lopez asked can we address this at the next meeting and have the HR Director send out the criteria and information to every Alderman?

Mayor Guinta stated without objection from the maker of the motion, I'm happy to do that.

Alderman Gatsas stated absolutely.

28. Communication from Jay Minkarah, Director of Economic Development, requesting approval of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to accept up to $4,000 in contributions and to expend those funds for the October Familiarization Tour.

*On motion of **Alderman Smith**, duly seconded by **Alderman O'Neil**, it was voted to approve this item.*

29. Communication from William Sanders, Finance Officer, on behalf of the Manchester Police Department requesting approval of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to accept a donation of $4,315.00 to purchase two Remington 700P Sniper Rifles for the Manchester Police Departments SWAT team.

*On motion of **Alderman J. Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman DeVries**, it was voted to approve this item.*

30. Ordinance:

> "Amending Chapter 33: Human Resources of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding a new Section 33.100 Residency Requirements thereby establishing a requirement of residency within the city of Manchester for City Officers and Department Heads."

Note: Report from the Solicitor's office and the Municipal Association with a review of the validity of the ordinance, if available.

*On motion of **Alderman Garrity**, duly seconded by **Alderman Osborne**, it was voted that the ordinance be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review. Alderman DeVries was duly recorded as voting in opposition.*

31. Resolutions:

> "Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Forty Five Thousand Dollars ($45,000) for the FY2009 CIP 213809 Substance Abuse Treatment Project."
>
> "Amending the FY2009 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Eight Hundred Forty Three Dollars and Sixty Cents ($13,843.60) for the FY2009 CIP 810509 Elderly Services Information System Upgrade Projects."

*On motion of **Alderman M. Roy**, duly seconded by **Alderman Osborne**, it was voted to the waive readings.*

*On motion of **Alderman Osborne**, duly seconded by **Alderman Pinard**, it was voted that the Resolutions ought to pass and be Enrolled.*

TABLED ITEMS

32. 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.

33. 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)

34. 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. Augustine's Cemetery."

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)

*On motion of **Alderman Garrity**, duly seconded by **Alderman Pinard**, it was voted to remove items 33 and 34 from the table.*

Alderman Garrity stated speaking to items, numbers 33 and 34, it's going to be my motion to receive and file both of requests. As most of the members of this Board know, I've been working on this issue for close to three years, and I think it's imperative that both parcels get rezoned together. Just doing one and not the other just doesn't work for the neighborhood. There is too much traffic on Gold Street already. The neighborhood will approve of the rezoning if the Gold Street bypass is built, but pertaining to the AG site, when things start turning around, maybe we'll get a tenant in the AG site.

__Alderman Garrity__ moved to receive and file items #33 and #34. The motion was duly seconded by __Alderman Shea__.

Alderman Gatsas stated I think the dissenting vote when this first went through was myself because there were no guarantees that anything was going to happen. I know that we've been advocating at this Board for, as they say, housing that is affordable to police officers, teachers, firemen, and employees of the City of Manchester, better known as workforce housing. Leaving this and putting it back to an R-1B certainly is reducing the fact that multi-family zoning, which is most affordable to constituents of this City…It is my understanding that this is one of the last large tracts that you could put multi-family zoning in. I think that we as a Board either stop talking about workforce housing or stand behind our guns when we rezone this. It shouldn't have been a contingency on one for the other. I think it was clear that that piece abuts a multi-family zone and there's no question that it's the last large piece that has a multi-family area that abuts it. So with that, Your Honor, I will vote against the receive and file and request a roll call.

A roll call vote was taken.

Alderman Gatsas voted nay. Aldermen Sullivan, J. Roy, Osborne, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Ouellette, Domaingue and M. Roy voted yea. *The motion carried.*

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Lopez stated this Saturday at 1:00 PM, September 20th, we're going to have the fund raising kick-off for the World War II monument at Veterans Park. Everybody is welcome. There will be a short ceremony honoring World War II veterans.

Alderman O'Neil asked Your Honor, could the Clerk send out a little reminder on that?

Mayor Guinta asked the Clerk to send out a communication to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and department heads as well.

Alderman Gatsas stated there was discussion when we were going through the budget process about the retirement and how we as a city were being charged for employees for medical subsidy that they would never be entitled to. And certainly, Your Honor, it is a 28-A issue when we're paying for something and the employees that work for the City are not going to be entitled to that benefit. I think there is another issue out there that's starting to loom in the amendment that was passed in the retirement that there might be an additional $500,000 cost to the City of Manchester. I think these are issues, Your Honor, that we need to discuss and get our hands around very quickly, because time is coming, and if we continue paying the retirement in for firefighters and police officers and teachers, that medical benefit is not going to be available to anyone after 2000. As I stated a few months ago, we have roughly 450 combined firemen and policemen, without the

teacher count. Almost 50% of them will not be receiving that benefit. We as a City and the taxpayers of the City are paying for it. I don't think that's right, and if it means we hold up a payment to Retirement to address this, being the largest city in New Hampshire, then we need to start doing it, because that is a benefit that these employees are not going to receive.

Mayor Guinta stated I would accept a motion to refer this to Human Resources, for not just HR Committee review but staff review for recommendations as to how to move forward and what we would need to do at the state legislative level to try to address that issue.

Alderman Gatsas stated I certainly will accept that, but I can only tell you that this shouldn't be something that's going to linger for a while. Sometimes things linger.

Mayor Guinta stated I know the chair of the committee pretty well, and I suspect that he wants to…

*On motion of **Alderman Gatsas**, duly seconded by **Alderman Pinard**, it was voted to refer this issue to Human Resources for HR Committee review and staff review for recommendations as to how to move forward.*

Mayor Guinta stated I just want to give a quick update. There was some discussion about the Health Insurance Review Committee over the last couple of months. I have had an opportunity to meet with Jack Sharry. After having that discussion I'm convinced that that would be an appropriate committee for us to establish so I will be sending a communication at some point next week. I just haven't had time to get it done.

Alderman Pinard stated just a reminder, at the beginning I talked about the Rockingham Trail. I invite everybody to come down Thursday morning and cheer those 175 people that are volunteering a whole day of work over here. You're all welcome, and just be careful, people who are watching, when you go on Candia Road, because there is going to be a lot of activity on Proctor Road and Candia Road.

Alderman Smith stated I spoke with Kevin Sheppard at the Highway Department and I'm very concerned about Hands Across the Merrimack. I guess that it will be closed during the winter months. If that's the case, because it is a wooden deck, we should post signs up there early, notifying the public that the Hands Across the Merrimack will be closed during winter.

Alderman Gatsas asked did anybody tell us that was a seasonal bridge?

Alderman Smith asked who is going to plow a wooden deck, 1,000 feet?

Mayor Guinta asked can we get a recommendation from staff, not today, as to how to best deal with that? Would that be appropriate?

Alderman Smith responded it certainly would.

Mayor Guinta stated noontime tomorrow is the Employee Recognition Picnic at McIntyre. Everyone is invited.

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

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk