

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

September 7, 2010

7:30 PM

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Craig, Ludwig, Long, Roy, Osborne, Corriveau, O'Neil,
Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Shaw, Greazzo, Ouellette, Arnold

3. Presentation by Mayor Gatsas of the Economic Impact Report for River's Edge Development.

Mr. Russ Thibeault, Applied Economic Research, stated the healthcare center is the single largest redevelopment project in the history of the City of Manchester. The total building area is the equivalent of 12 football fields. This project will provide an anchor and new stimulus to South Elm Street, which has needed revitalization and I think that over time...I know that over time it will generate significant spin-off benefits to the entire City. I would like to begin by just putting the healthcare industry in context. Nationally healthcare is expected to add 3.2 million jobs over the next decade and outpatient care, which this facility is focused on, is expected to grow even faster; by 30% over the next decade. Ten of the twenty fastest growing United States occupations are in healthcare. By putting your eggs in the healthcare basket, you are putting your eggs into the fastest growing sector of the United States economy. Right now, healthcare represents 16% of the U.S. gross domestic product. In other words, 16% of the value of all goods and services in the U.S. are healthcare dependent. Looking more closely to home, in Hillsborough County healthcare represented 22,000 jobs in 2008. It is the second largest segment of the region's economy. The wages paid by this

industry are above average and in 2008 totaled \$1.1 billion within Hillsborough County. Those wages are growing very rapidly; much faster than wages generally. They more than doubled between 2000 and 2008. So the healthcare industry is a prominent industry nationally and growing rapidly nationally, and it is expected to continue to grow rapidly nationally. It is a prominent industry in the regional economy and it is growing rapidly in the regional economy, and because of this facility and other expansions that have been announced, it will grow rapidly during the next five to ten years in this economy as well. Just a very brief introduction to economic impact without going into much detail at all, basically there are three times of impacts that a project like this generates. There are the construction phase impacts while the project is being built. That is the phase that we are in right now, very prominently in. Secondly are the direct impacts of wages paid and thirdly the indirect impacts. As those wages circulate through the regional economy they create yet more jobs and more activity. People spend their money in grocery stores and in housing. More jobs are created. So I want to talk about all three. First, in terms of the construction impacts, the construction will spread out over a period of time. If it were compressed into one year, it would be the equivalent of adding 3,400 jobs into the economy and \$187 million in wages during the construction phase, which is the phase that we are in now. When the construction phase is completed, there will be 1,500 permanent jobs on site paying \$82 million annually in current wages and over \$1 million in property taxes. In addition, the facility will spend about \$5 million a year on purchases within the local and regional economy, things like services such as plowing and supplies that are purchased locally. The facility represents the largest single expansion in the City's job base in decades at a time when the economy is severely stressed and is a major economic benefit. It is without question the largest economic benefit of any project that I have examined in New Hampshire or elsewhere and I think that it is coming on at absolutely the best time in terms of the fact that the regional economy is in dire need of this kind of stimulus. You all have copies of my

report. I will be glad to answer any questions. I have one last comment about the techniques. This is definitely...an impact analysis is as much an art as a science but I did use an economic impact model developed by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis that is generally accepted as appropriate and fine-tuned it to this regional economy.

Mr. Dick Anagnost stated thank you Russ. To continue on, the President stated last night that nearly one in five construction workers were unemployed. We are providing construction jobs right now at a much higher rate than that. He stated that a job is about waking up every day with a sense of purpose and going to bed each night fulfilled. A job is about meeting your responsibilities to yourself and to your family and to your community. Let's talk about the jobs and let's talk about what has already been the impact of the River's Edge project. To date, 910 jobs have been created onsite and we are not talking about just the impact on Manchester. We are talking about a statewide regional impact because of those 910 jobs, 93% or 846 jobs were given to a New Hampshire worker. That is a statewide impact particularly in light of the fact that if you think about it New Hampshire has 234 cities and towns and those 846 workers hail from 134 of those municipalities with over 1/3 of them coming from the City of Manchester. The breakdown of the workers has been across the spectrum. There is always the alleged friction between union and non-union workers, but I can tell you that onsite right now there is roughly a 50/50 split between union and non-union workers and I have never seen such a group that supports one another as the workers at River's Edge. You can see where laborers are working together. Laborers played a big part in this job. Labor has come to the table, both union and non-union, and put their best foot forward to create this project for us. The ACC is approximately 68% complete. The garage is 98% complete. In 174 days, 23 hours, 21 minutes and 37 seconds we will open for business on that site and that is the legitimate clock that the contractor is held to in the schedule. The medical

office building, which is a 126,000 square foot second phase is scheduled to begin construction on November 1. The Phase IV, which is the retail portion, is now going to be a pharmacy. It is a pharmacy with a locally run chain out of Concord, New Hampshire so they are all New Hampshire residents as well. That begins construction on October 1st and its opening will coincide with the opening of the ACC, and the medical office building will come on approximately 90 days later. The residential portion I am finally happy to announce is in design. We will be able to bring it forth for Planning Board review probably sometime after Christmas. Above that and overall this project will continue because we have just been given the go ahead to go into design for River's Edge II, which for those of you who don't know the parcel, it is the old Thibeault property at 5062 Elm Street, formerly known when I was growing up as the Theodore Banana Plant. We have now acquired those eight acres. It will come in as River's Edge II and we have begun design and development on it to see what we can locate there to bring forth immediately after River's Edge I is completed. The City of Manchester is lucky that we have this project. We are thankful to the Elliot for essentially building this project to accommodate the region's growing healthcare needs. It is built to retain healthcare spending in the region. It is built to accommodate expected doubling in the age 65 and older population. One of the things Russ left out is the fact that healthcare added over 5,000 jobs in Hillsborough County between 2000 and 2008. The long lasting impact of Elliot's innovative cost-effective healthcare delivery system, which is what this building is built for, will have a lasting impact in Manchester for decades to come. The City is lucky because we have this project, but the City is also lucky because it has the visionary people who are sitting in this room who can continue this impact forward with future projects, namely the City's municipal project at \$43 million and I am also pleased to sit here and announce tonight that I have been given the go ahead to take the contracts with the Department of Labor off the table where they are with the City right now and progress forward with the City putting in the infrastructure for the state's new Job

Corps which will be located in Manchester on Dunbarton Road. That will be another \$35 million in federal construction dollars that will be brought here in the next 12 months. If you just listened to the impact that River's Edge has had, think about the ongoing and future impact that the City itself will bring to bear between its \$43 million municipal complex and its \$35 million new Job Corps. I am thankful to the City for these opportunities. I am thankful to the Elliot Hospital for taking this kind of plunge in this economy. Above all, I am thankful to all of the workers who have come to work every day to make it a reality and to allow us to open it in 174 days, 23 hours, 18 minutes and 10 seconds. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have. I know you have a full agenda this evening.

Mayor Gatsas asked is that 174 days before April 1st?

Mr. Anagnost answered it is March 1st at 7 PM.

Mayor Gatsas stated I just want to make sure the tax value is there for next year. That is why I asked that question. Certainly it is an important date to keep in mind.

Mr. Anagnost stated I neglected one salient point though, Mayor, if I could interrupt. The thing I did neglect to point out is that we are using New Hampshire suppliers as well and for every \$100 spent at a local supplier in New Hampshire, \$70 is returned to the community through taxes, payroll and other expenditures. I am pleased to announce that we have already used 56 suppliers within the State of New Hampshire. If you couple the economic impact of what smart people like Russ have outlined it to be, but above all, you communicate that down into jobs and services, we have had a real impact on the City of Manchester and the State of New Hampshire. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Gatsas replied not a problem. First of all, I am glad you folks came forward because I think that not everybody had an opportunity to understand what the true impact of that project was going to be. I think we all thought it was going to be construction jobs and when that was complete it was going to bring in hospital employees but I think that the residual factors are incredible. I think the important page to take a look at is that there are going to be taxable area costs of \$7.4 million. I think that exceeds the number that we first assumed when we started this project. There is no question and I know that the Finance Officer at the Elliot was talking about somebody talking to him about in lieu of taxes and I am sure whoever is talking to him that those discussions will continue to make sure that we can find whatever revenue that we can find for this City going forward. I think that is an important discussion to have. I think that between this project and the Market Basket project, the south end of Elm Street is going to be the next South Willow Street with an awful lot of growth and the buildings that are vacant now on the western side of Elm Street I think in the next six months will be the spot where the growth is going to happen. This Board, I am sure, is going to have a lot of projects coming forward and we are going to have to make some decisions on what projects we want to see and how we want to see those projects proceed. I think that every place in the country is talking about jobs. We are fortunate here in Manchester because we are actually creating them and it has been because it has been a collaborative effort of this Board working together to make sure we can get things done. I think it is important that not only do we make sure we keep in mind how we are doing the growth and how we are doing the building but also the taxpayers. I think you will see in the next few weeks that the tax rate we thought was at .39% may be at zero or maybe a little bit less. I continue to urge us to work together to make sure we can deliver to the taxpayers of this community everything that we have ever envisioned and then some. I can tell you that again we are starting on discussions with departments about their budgets. Let it not be said that we are not continuing to work on finding ways to make sure

our fiscal house in order because that is the most important thing and we have done that in a collaborative method.

Alderman Osborne stated I have a couple of questions. The service area for the new River's Edge, we have the Elliot and CMC and surrounding hospitals in Derry and so on and so forth, but how long is it going to take to get enough funding in this type of put out that the River's Edge has to put out for all of the taxes and jobs? Does the population warrant this?

Mr. Anagnost replied yes. All of the studies show that not only does the population warrant it but it will be taking the pressure off of currently stressed assets that are already in place. Let me give you an example. Between the Elliot Hospital and CMC, the emergency rooms had roughly 88,000 visits last year. When we undertook the study of what those visits were, only 19,000 of those really needed an emergency room. What the rest of them needed was immediate access to a doctor. When I was talking to you about the innovative healthcare delivery system of the Elliot, it is called urgent care. What it does at River's Edge is it allows you that immediate access to medical care for your child who at 11:00 PM has an earache and you have no medicine at home for him and those type of things where normally you might go to an emergency room and if there was a shooting or car accident you would be there four hours waiting for triage to take place and the emergency victims being treated prior to your child with the sore throat. What this allows is a more cost-effective delivery method because it is less money to go to the urgent care than it is to go to the emergency room and a more efficient delivery method because the wait times will be significantly less and you are not behind the gunshot victim or the accident victim that is there. Therefore, if Elliot's ED is stressed and CMC's ED is stressed, which I am not sure it is or isn't but we were looking at having to expand Elliot's emergency room onsite in order to meet the existing demand of what is there. We no longer have to expand the

expensive emergency room facility by providing the urgent care facility which will actually take the pressure off of these current emergency rooms. That by way of example gives you an indication that the demand already exists and what we are doing is we are helping provide a more cost-effective, more efficient healthcare delivery method to address the existing need as well as future needs.

Alderman Osborne responded what I can't understand, having been born in this City and lived here all my life, is the little Elliot Hospital used to stand up on the hill there and we had somewhere around 75,000 to 80,000 people in Manchester. That little place and a few doctors took care of everybody. Today we are talking what another 30,000 people here. So why such a big enormous...where healthcare is supposed to be getting better why such an enormous span of hospitals and doctors and medicine? I am just getting this off of my mind. On TV all we see is advertising of different medicines. Before it was a sacred thing and something that doctors didn't discuss or advertise. Why such a big increase in the size of these hospitals?

Mr. Thibeault replied my firm has done market research on the demand for hospital services. Just measuring one factor in rising demand, which is the aging of the population, the baby boomer population, without any population growth or any increased admission rate by age the simple aging of the boomer population, the largest segment of our population, will increase the demand for healthcare services by something like 30% going forward, just that one factor. Nationally we are consuming more health services. We are in better shape. I am in better shape than my parents were at my age largely because of the consumption of healthcare services. So beyond just aging, part of it is aging and part of it is that we expect and are willing to pay for improved healthcare services nationally and within the region. Another element is that there is becoming somewhat of a specialization within the healthcare industry and Manchester is now the healthcare center for the

State of New Hampshire for specialized services. Part of what this facility will do, as Dick mentioned with respect to the emergency room access, is enable the Elliot to continue its specialization that draws healthcare patients and provides healthcare services not only to metropolitan but really to the entire State of New Hampshire. So it is a combination of each of us consumes more, the aging of the population...southern New Hampshire is still growing albeit slower than it used to be back in the 1980's. A combination of factors provide the support for this kind of facility. As Dick mentioned, it is a different method of delivery that is more efficient and more cost-effective.

Alderman Osborne replied so you have this all figured out whereas what you are doing today and spending \$43 million or whatever, this warrants it and the money is there from the beginning and not something that is going to take two or three years to build up in order to keep the place going?

Mr. Anagnost answered we right-sized this based on our studies. We are only building 238,000 square feet with an expansion over the next 20 years to 371,000 square feet to meet future demands. So we are essentially building at 100% occupancy right now. We are using every square foot that we built, and we built in the growth factor without spending those dollars today. The other thing I might point out is when I talked about a more efficient delivery system, if you have been to the Elliot lately the Elliot was built as an acute care hospital. It wasn't built for the kind of medicine that is delivered today, which is mostly ambulatory care. This is a state-of-the-art ambulatory care facility that will free up the ability of the hospital to go back to what it was originally designed to be and that is an acute care overnight stay hospital. The existing facility is not easy to get to. The existing facility doesn't have sufficient parking. The existing facility has problems with way finding. You have to travel through some emergency care areas in order to go and get an MRI or CT. What it will do is allow the existing

acute care hospital to become more efficient as well because it will provide additional space for them to utilize. It will make way finding easier and it will go back and place that physical plant as it was originally designed to be. There are multiple benefits to this. Are there spin off benefits significantly? Yes. Are there benefits going into the future? That is why we built in the expansion. What we sized it for today is today's demand. We have the ability to expand it in order to meet future demands and we have designed it in such a way so that expansion becomes easy and more cost-effective without major interruption of services. I might also add that the Londonderry facility, which was the test case for this urgent care, is now drawing from northern Massachusetts. New Hampshire visits all go south. Approximately 19,000 patients a year go to Massachusetts for healthcare delivery services. In Londonderry we are starting to attract those across the border – both the Elliot urgent care and the Dana-Farber, which is the new cancer facility that is located in the same facility with the Elliot in Londonderry. So as Russ pointed out, we are now the medical center of New Hampshire. Soon we will be drawing northern Massachusetts up into New Hampshire for a better and more efficient form of healthcare delivered in New Hampshire.

Alderman Osborne stated I think it is a beautiful project. It isn't anything I am against. I just kind of wondered about all of these things over the years. I hope in the future that we all stay well.

Alderman DeVries stated Mr. Thibeault I am hoping that you might expound a little bit on the report you have done for us. In particular, I just wonder how you came up with the property taxes paid. I can understand certainly the guesstimation of taxes based on the project but I am just curious. I am not questioning your extrapolations of other property taxes but I am curious as to what went into that.

Mr. Thibeault replied I will be glad to let you know what I did. There are portions of the project that are taxable and non-taxable. For the taxable portions, I had construction cost estimates and applied the City's equalization rate against those construction costs and it was actually the 2009 tax rate against the resulting projected assessed value. So it is current construction cost times the equalization rate, which equates assessed value to market value and it is not always 100% times the City's tax rate for the taxable portions of the property.

Alderman DeVries responded I am lucky enough to serve on the Equalization Standards Board so I have some idea of what you are talking about.

Mr. Thibeault stated poor you. You have my sympathy. You know it probably much better than I do then.

Alderman DeVries replied no I wouldn't say that.

Mr. Thibeault stated well that was the basic technique. In effect, it is a cost-based approach to valuation.

Alderman Greazzo stated I put in a little bit of time and energy with our Congressional and Senatorial delegates about the project labor agreements and I would like to thank Mr. Anagnost for being able to resolve that. I would like to know when you will be able to start construction on that Job Corps Center.

Mr. Anagnost responded hopefully we will get the written go ahead that I got verbally tonight in the next week or two, at which time the current contracts that are on the table with the City will come off the table for this Board's approval. Upon approval we would go into design. I don't know if Kevin Sheppard or Tom Bowen is here tonight.

Mayor Gatsas stated just for clarification I think what Mr. Anagnost is talking about is the water and sewer lines that are going to be running up...I think there is a gentleman who has been around town for about a week and he is coming back for another week to do a report for the project labor agreements and decide whether we need to have one on the Job Corps Center or not. What Mr. Anagnost is talking about is actually having the Highway Department construct the sewer lines and the water lines rather than going out to bid, letting our people do it so we can see some revenue from that coming into the City as a revenue source to the Highway Department.

Alderman Greazzo asked and at what point does he plan on starting the project itself?

Mayor Gatsas answered the report that is going to come from the gentleman who is in town is going to come out in the middle or end of September, so hopefully the federal Department of Labor will be releasing that project sometime in October. We are now the last state without one. Wyoming is just about complete and New Hampshire is the last state that does not have a Job Corps Center.

Mr. Anagnost stated just to elaborate a little bit the City would go forward with the Department of Labor's money and construct the offsite improvements. We would potentially get the release in October, go out to bid in November and be in the ground by March.

Alderman Shea stated as a comparative analysis, I happen to have a place in Wells, Maine, and one time I had to go to the York Hospital. They have an urgent care facility in Wells now that handles the type of situation Mr. Anagnost referred to before and it works out very well for the residents there. My second point is I

am wondering about the availability of physicians that will service the new facility. I am not sure exactly whether there will be additional physicians coming in to handle the impact that will be felt or how you have calculated that situation? I am not sure if you hit upon that.

Mr. Anagnost responded there will be a ramp up of services. Right now the urgent care would be staffed with the Elliot's current emergency room doctor staff. As volume grows, additional staff would be added into that area in order to meet the demand. By way of example, in our Londonderry facility we built it to handle roughly 10,000 visits. It is already up to 14,000 visits. We have had to ramp up staff as business increased. The same type of situation would occur here. We are opening it with 20,000 square feet fully fit out as the urgent care portion of it, but it could expand to 40,000 square feet within a 60 day period.

Alderman Shea asked will you be recruiting physicians to service the needs if they increase?

Mr. Anagnost answered that is correct. The existing staff will handle the existing volume as it stands to date and as we assess the growth, additional physicians will be added.

Alderman Shea asked will the urgent care be open 24/7 or is that going to close around 9:00 or 10:00 or 11:00 PM?

Mr. Anagnost answered right now it opens at 7:00 AM and closes at 11:00 PM in the proposed operating hours.

Alderman Shea replied so it won't be open 24 hours.

Mr. Anagnost responded right.

Alderman Shea asked 7 AM until 11 PM?

Mr. Anagnost answered yes. By the way, the facility is designed that it could run independent of the rest of the facility on a 24 hour basis if it needed to. For instance, in case of an emergency like an ice storm it is fully powered and fully generated and essentially a command center for any kind of disaster. It was set-up and designed that way so the urgent care portion of it could be cut out in a box by itself and operate independently of the rest of the facility.

Alderman Shea stated the one in Wells, Maine, doesn't operate 24/7. It operates during the day but I noticed when I drove by the other night that it wasn't open.

Mr. Anagnost responded this one wasn't designed to be that way but in the event of an emergency it could run independently 24/7 on its own power.

Alderman Shea asked do you have to get additional certificates of qualification to open 24 hours?

Mr. Anagnost answered no. The hospital is already qualified to provide care 24/7.

Alderman Lopez stated you touched on it a little bit and Alderman DeVries touched on it...I want to be clear in my own mind about the property taxes. I am sure our Assessors are going to be out there soon watching the project as it goes up. Is there any part of the project and I hope I didn't misunderstand but is there any part of the project that is not going to be taxed?

Mr. Anagnost replied yes. The portion that is the non-profit owned portion of the ambulatory care center. There are four profit portions of the project and then there is a non-profit portion. A portion of the site is owned by Elliot Hospital and the ambulatory care center that is non-profit. So that portion of it doesn't pay taxes.

Alderman Lopez asked is that under state law?

Mr. Anagnost answered yes. Well, actually I am not an attorney.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to point that out for the Assessors.

Mr. Anagnost replied Bill Tucker is the counsel for the hospital that has been working on this project with us and he has a full legal brief on what is taxable and what is non-taxable and what falls into those categories. We are prepared to meet with the Assessors at any time.

Mayor Gatsas stated that doesn't preclude the discussion of in lieu of taxes
Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez responded that is the point I wanted to make and I am sure you will be in discussions with...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I have been in discussions to make sure that we get every tax dollar we can.

Alderman Long stated Mr. Anagnost, I certainly appreciate the economic impact that that project is bringing to both South Elm and the State of New Hampshire. I certainly agree that it will be an area that will stimulate further growth in Manchester, which we desperately need. To be able to do that in these economic

times is even more of a challenge. You have been successful thus far in doing that. My question is...I think I heard that there were 900 plus construction works?

Mr. Anagnost replied 910, of which 846 are from New Hampshire.

Alderman Long responded and one-third of those were from Manchester?

Mr. Anagnost answered roughly, yes.

Alderman Long stated that is what I am particularly interested in. I would be interested to know what their wage was, the Manchester workers, because that is what has a direct impact in Manchester. So it is one-third of the 846 and when I read these wages do they include worker's compensation, FICA, etc.?

Mr. Thibeault responded it is direct wages. It doesn't include the additional benefits or the value of benefits paid.

Alderman Long asked so we are looking at approximately \$55,000 or \$56,000 a year on average?

Mr. Thibeault answered yes and it is based on the New Hampshire Employment Security Wages Paid by Industry within Hillsborough County. You could get variation on either side but it is based on the average wages paid for the construction industry in Hillsborough County. I believe it was 2008 and I added about 2% inflation to that.

Alderman Long asked and that Hillsborough County number is derived from what?

Mr. Thibeault answered New Hampshire Employment Security gathers that data from all employers.

Alderman Long stated I have one other question. The 67% of total project costs in my opinion is a high percentage for labor costs for a total project. I figured it would be 30% or 40%, which is high. Usually the labor cost is a lot less than your soft costs, your materials, etc. Do you know where that 67% came from?

Mr. Thibeault replied I derived it directly from Eckman Construction. Every project is different and I wanted to project specific figures and that was their estimate.

Mr. Anagnost stated and that comes directly off the cost breakdown which I would be happy to share with you at some point.

Alderman Long responded yes I would like to see where that 67% derives from. Also, I know there are some employees of these construction firms that have insurance because their companies provide insurance. For a facility that is a healthcare facility that depends on insurance companies to make their living I appreciate that there are some workers there that are covered by insurance. I certainly would like to see more but I don't sit at the table at Elliot.

Mr. Anagnost replied if I might address that, Elliot Hospital being a healthcare provider requires contractually that all employees on that job have health insurance.

Alderman Long asked so every employee that worked on that job is covered by health insurance?

Mr. Anagnost answered correct.

Alderman Long stated well that is better than I thought. I would like to see that.

Mr. Anagnost responded also we had many discussions with union representatives early on and one of their major concerns was that all workers be covered by healthcare. That was one of the caveats that we went forward with with Suffolk Construction.

Alderman Long asked so all workers on that project were covered by health insurance?

Mr. Anagnost answered correct.

Alderman Long asked not offered health insurance but they were actually covered?

Mr. Anagnost replied I know some might have elected out because they have a different policy with their wives but they were all covered by insurance.

Alderman Osborne asked what part do the pharmaceutical companies play in this project financially?

Mr. Anagnost answered none. Short of the pharmacy stocking various medicines, there is no other pharmaceutical involvement.

Alderman Osborne asked no interest at all with any pharmaceutical companies whether it is Dow or some other one?

Mr. Anagnost replied none whatsoever.

Alderman Osborne asked they have nothing to do with this project?

Mr. Anagnost answered no, although we have a pretty unique feature when you mention pharmaceuticals and that is through their medical record system the pharmacy will be directly connected to every doctor in urgent care and with a stroke of a key on a computer as you leave the facility you can drive to the drive through and pick up whatever you need and it will be ready for you as you walk out of the facility. It is a pretty unique delivery system but the pharmaceutical companies have no interest in the project whatsoever.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you very much gentlemen. We look forward to hearing from you in six months for the next update.

Mr. Anagnost responded in six months you will be attending the opening.

Mayor Gatsas replied well, that is a good thing.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Gatsas 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.

Accept BMA Minutes

- A.** Minutes of meetings held on April 6, 2010 (two meetings), April 7, 2010 (one meeting), and April 20, 2010 (two meetings), May 4, 2010 (three meetings).

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

B. Sidewalk Petitions:

360-364 Concord Street
103-105 Ray Street
225 South Taylor Street
99 Westwood Drive
156 Westwood Drive
160 Westwood Drive
119 Maryland Avenue
274 Ray Street
140 Sewall Street
442 Merrimack Street
30 Young Street

Approve under supervision of the Department of Highways

C. Underground Conduit License Petition and Interim Permit Petition:

Londonderry Turnpike beginning at PSNH Pole #29/7 and ending at PSNH Pole #29/8

Accept and Remand funds for the purpose intended

D. Accept and remand funds in the amount of \$250.00 from US First to be used by the Police Department towards purchasing equipment or supplies.

Information to be Received and Filed

E. Monthly Bulletin from the City of Manchester Health Department for August 2010.

F. Approved minutes from the MTA Commission meeting held June 29, 2010, June 2010 Financial Report, and June 2010 Ridership Report submitted by Michael Whitten, Executive Director MTA.

G. Communication from Mike Whitten, MTA, regarding passes for City Year participants for unlimited rides on the Manchester Transit Authority.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

H. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Six Thousand, Six Hundred and Six Dollars (\$36,606) for the FY 2011 CIP 410711 NH Drug Task Force.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred, Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$380,000) for the FY 2010 CIP 612210 Neighborhood Stabilization Project.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred, Thirty Three Thousand, Four Hundred Thirty Dollars (\$133,430) for the FY 2010 CIP 712910 Energy Efficiency and Block Grant Program.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) for CIP 713510 Annual ROW Improvements.”

“Amending the FY 2008 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Million, Eight Hundred, Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$2,875,000) for CIP 711008 Design & Construction of Incinerator Upgrade at WWTF.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Dollars (\$13,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 612311 Elm Street Banner Pole Installation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ninety Four Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$94,400) for the FY 2011 CIP 511411 Piscataquog Trail Phase IV Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Four Thousand Six Hundred and Thirty Dollars (\$4,630) for the FY 2011 CIP 810711 Moose Plate Conservation Grant Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixteen Thousand Dollars (\$16,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 214211 Youth Opportunities Unlimited.”

I. Resolutions:

“Authorizing Bonds in the amount of Forty-Five Million Dollars (\$45,000,000) for Refunding Certain Outstanding Bonds of the City.”

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

- J.** Communication from the Board of School Committee requesting an expendable trust be established for athletics for the School District’s Athletic Department.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

- K.** Recommending that the request from the Economic Development Director for approval of the agreement between the City and the International Chili Society be approved as amended to incorporate a list of promotional activities within the contract.

The Committee further authorizes the Mayor to execute the agreement subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.
(Unanimous vote)

- M.** Recommending that the request from the Economic Development Director for approval of recent amendment to the Manchester Development Corporation (MDC) by-laws related to marketing and promotional activities be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

- N.** Advising that the request from the Mayor for Committee review of recent P-Card purchases by the Airport has been received and filed.

The Committee further notes that the Airport is required to submit future expenditures to the Mayor in accordance with City policy. Any disputed charges shall be referred to the Committee for consideration.

(Unanimous vote)

- O.** Recommending that the Effluent Supply Agreement between the City and Granite Ridge Energy be approved.

(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman DeVries who voted in opposition)

- P.** Advising that the appeal of the denial of a Peddler's License has been received and filed.

(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

- Q.** Recommending that Petitions for Discontinuance of Lincoln and Hayward Streets, submitted by the Public Works Director be referred to a Road Hearing at a date to be determined by the City Clerk.

(Unanimous vote)

- R.** Recommending that the Communication from Sam Maranto, CIP Manager, regarding the lease of the City owned building at 177 Lake Avenue be accepted.

(Unanimous vote)

- S.** Advising that the request from Marie LaRoche, from the Namaske Lake Association, for \$1,620 from the City, for the milfoil treatment done last month in Namaske Lake (aka Piscataquog River), has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
- U.** Recommending that the donation of a vehicle to the Police Department by the National Insurance Crime Bureau be accepted.
(Unanimous vote)
- V.** Recommending that a request to accept grant funds in the amount of \$4,630 from the NH State Library to be used to restore various records dating back to the 1850's be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- W.** Recommending that a request to accept grant funds in the amount of \$36,606 from the US Department of Justice to operate a multi-jurisdictional drug task force be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- Y.** Recommending that a request to enter into an agreement with the State DOT and to accept trail funds in the amount of \$94,400 for the Picataquog Trail Phase IV Project be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- Z.** Recommending that Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for the increase of the Neighborhood Stabilization Program budget by \$380,000 due to additional funds made available by the NH Community Development Finance Authority be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- AA.** Recommending that Amending Resolution and budget authorization providing for acceptance and expenditure of \$50,000 for the CIP #713510 Annual R.O.W. Improvements be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- BB.** Recommending that a request to accept ARRA funds in the amount of \$2,875,000 from the NH Department of Environmental Services be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- CC.** Recommending that a request for revision of project descriptions for CIP project #710410 Aeration System Upgrade and CIP project #710610 Phase II CSO Engineering Services for Study and Design, to reflect anticipated work, be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

- DD.** Recommending that a proposed policy regarding the use of Volunteers and Unpaid Student Interns submitted by the Human Resources Director be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS

- EE.** Recommending that the previous Committee Report approving project 15 of the Design/Build School Improvement Program be amended to approve project 16 in its place.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON LANDS & BUILDINGS

- FF.** Advising that a communication from the Goffstown Board of Selectmen regarding the Kelly Falls Dam has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
- GG.** Advising that a petition to acquire city-owned land at Raco-Theodore Park on Precourt Street has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

- HH.** Recommending that city-owned land off Gabrielle Street be offered for public sale as recommended.

The Committee further recommends that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen:

- Find the lot surplus to City needs;
- Find that justice will prevail if the lot is acquired by an abutter because it is a landlocked parcel;
- Condition any sale upon its merger with that of the acquiring abutter lot, except in the case of the petitioner, in which case its sale should be conditioned upon its merger with the petitioner's abutting parcels at Lots 33 and 34.

(Aldermen Osborne, Lopez, Shea and Roy voted yea; Alderman Greazzo voted nay)

- II.** Recommending acceptance of a sealed bid from Steven Barriere for property on Island Pond Road.

The Committee further recommends that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen:

- Condition the acceptance of the bid on the merger of the lot with Mr. Barriere's abutting parcel.
- Pass an ordinance authorizing the disposition of the lot in the manner suggested herein.

(Unanimous vote; acceptance of this report will include the attached ordinance which will be sent to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review, or the Board may suspend the rules, place the ordinance on its third and final reading, and ordain.)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH & TRAFFIC

- JJ.** Recommending that the following regulations governing standing, stopping, 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 NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

On Cedar Street, north side, from a point 230 feet east of Beech Street to a point 20 feet east

(Ord. 8551)

Alderman Osborne

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On South Elm Street, west side, from a point 120 feet north of Wyoming Ave. to West Oakwood Ave. (Ord. 8360)

Alderman Shaw

On Priscilla Circle, west side, from a point 215 feet north of Hazelton Court to a point 55 feet north

(Ord. 9904)

Alderman DeVries

On Hanover Street, south side, from Woodland Ave. to Page Street (Ord. 8354)

On Cedar Street, north side, from Wilson Street to a point 95 feet westerly (Ord. 9178)

On Spruce Street, south side, from a point 105 feet east of Cypress Street to a point 75 feet east

(Ord. 9001)

Alderman Osborne

RESCIND 1 HOUR PARKING:

On Beech Street, west side, from a point 40 feet north of Shasta Street to a point 125 feet northerly (Ord. 2648)

Alderman Shaw

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Cedar Street, north side, from Wilson Street to a point 70 feet west

On Hanover Street, south side, from Rand Street to a point 45 feet east
Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Calef Road, east side, from Titus Ave to a point 100 feet south

On Calef Road, east side, from Titus Ave to a point 100 feet north

Alderman Shaw

On Bodwell Road, east side, from a point 345 feet south of West Shore
Ave. to Corning Road

Alderman DeVries

CROSSWALKS – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Kelley Street, east and west of Kimball Street

Alderman Ouellette

PAINTED PARKING STALLS:

Hanover Street, south side, from Woodland Ave. to Rand Street

Alderman Osborne

NO LEFT TURN:

On Massabesic Street at Valley Street – Southbound

Alderman Osborne

**1 HOUR PARKING 8AM-6PM -THURSDAY TO 9PM/ EXCEPT
SUNDAYS AND HOLIDAYS- EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

On Joliette Street, east side, from a point 208 feet north of Kelley Street to
a point 262 feet north

On Joliette Street, east side, from a point 494 feet north of Kelley Street to
a point 24 feet north

Alderman Ouellette

HANDICAP PARKING ONLY– EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Joliette Street, east side, from a point 470 feet north of Kelley Street to
a point 24 feet north

Alderman Ouellette

HANDICAP PARKING ONLY:

On Bowman Street, west side, from a point 72 feet north of A Street to a
point 25 feet north

Alderman Greazzo

AUDIBLE PEDESTRIAN SIGNALS:

Elm Street and W. Salmon Street

Elm Street and Webster Street
River Road and West Webster Street
Alderman Long

STOP SIGNS:

On Jefferson Street at Gas Street – NEC
On Jefferson Street at Hamilton Street – SWC
Alderman Long

STOP SIGNS – 4 – WAY:

On Bartlett Street at Sullivan Street – NWC, SEC
*** *Traffic Division Review attached on pages 4-1 through 4-15*
Alderman Ouellette

RESCIND NO PARKING:

Amherst Street, north side, from Vine Street to Chestnut Street
Alderman Long
ORD 2548

METERS – 2 HOURS:

Amherst Street, north side, from a point 100 feet east of Vine Street to
Chestnut Street
Alderman Long

RESCIND 15 MINUTE PARKING 8:00 AM – 8:00 PM:

Mechanic Street, north side, from a point 145 feet west of Elm Street to
Plaza Drive
Alderman Long
ORD 9059

15 MINUTE PARKING MONDAY – FRIDAY 8:00 AM – 8:00 PM:

Mechanic Street, north side, from a point 145 feet west of Elm Street to
Plaza Drive
Alderman Long

RESCIND METERS – 2 HOURS:

West Central Street, north side, from Canal Street to a point 180 feet east
Alderman Long
ORD 6302

RESCIND METERS – 2 HOURS:

West Central Street, south side, from Canal Street to a point 180 feet east
Alderman Long
ORD 6303

METERS – 10 HOURS:

West Central Street, north side, from Canal Street to a point 180 feet east
Alderman Long

METERS – 2 HOURS:

West Central Street, south side, from Canal Street to a point 50 feet east
Alderman Long

METERS – 10 HOURS:

West Central Street, south side, from a point 50 feet east of Canal Street to
a point 130 feet easterly
Alderman Long

RESCIND STOP SIGN:

On Sullivan Street at Whittemore Avenue – NEC
(Ord. 1427)
Alderman Ouellette

STOP SIGNS:

On Whittemore Avenue at Sullivan Street – SEC, SWC
Alderman Ouellette

RESCIND ONE WAY STREET:

Huntress Street, from Prince Street to Summerside Avenue – Northbound
Alderman Greazzo

ONE WAY STREET:

Huntress Street, from Summerside Avenue to Prince Street – Southbound
Alderman Greazzo
*(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Roy who voted in opposition to the 4-
way stop signs)*

- LL.** Advising that the communication from Jim Brown, Manchester resident, regarding traffic problems on neighborhood streets has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

MM. Recommending that the request from the Palace Theater for free parking on Hanover Street between Elm Street and Chestnut Street on Thursday, September 16, 2010 be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

NN. Recommending that the request from the Library Director for free parking in the Hartnett Lot on Saturday, September 25, 2010 be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

OO. Advising that the communication from the Traffic Division regarding traffic signals at Valley Street at Massabesic Street and Tarrytown Road has been received and filed.

(Unanimous vote)

PP. Recommending that the request from the Parking Manager for public parking at the Canal Street parking lot be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

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

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

J. Recommending that the request from the Board of School Committee to transfer an unreserved, undesignated fund balance of \$864,614 to the expendable trust for health insurance be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Greazzo asked can you tell us, Your Honor, where this money came from? I know I saw the memo from Dr. Brennan about the more than \$800,000 that they didn't use from the loan and I am wondering if this is that money or something completely different.

Mayor Gatsas answered the undesignated fund balance is actually coming from revenues that came into the district. We have decided on the School District side to put them into the expendable medical account so that we can have them there to make sure we have enough money to meet the cliff that is coming in next year's budget in 2012. I guess the other question you had was...we also put I think another \$720,000 in that expendable trust. Those were pharmacy rebates that came forward for 2009, which was about \$360,000 and 2010, which also went into the expendable trust.

Alderman Greazzo replied the reason for my question was the memo I saw from Dr. Brennan about the unused portion of the \$3 million we lent them for books.

Mayor Gatsas responded that is none of this.

Alderman Greazzo asked what is going to happen with that money? Is that coming back?

Mayor Gatsas answered we told them it could only be spent for books. There was \$300,000 that could be spent on computers for the classroom. We will get a report on that after their next meeting so that the Board can see it first and we will see it in the second meeting of this month on what that actual reporting is.

Alderman Greazzo asked so this \$864,000 doesn't have the possibility of coming back to us?

Mayor Gatsas answered no it doesn't. Why? What did you want to do with it? I am just kidding.

Alderman Greazzo replied put it towards the tax rate.

Mayor Gatsas responded well, I think we are going to be fine with the tax rate; we will be at zero. Next year is my bigger concern for tax rates.

Alderman DeVries stated this question is for you or Mr. Sanders. It is my recollection that the surpluses on the School side when we wrote those Resolutions have to come from the specific line item. I am getting a nod already. That was my recollection. So anything going into the health expendable trust has to be a surplus generated from the health lines.

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, responded that is correct, and special education has to come from the special education lines. The reason for this Resolution is that they want to take surpluses that have been generated in other areas and put them into the health insurance trust. So this surplus is after the health insurance line item. It does not include the health insurance line item.

Alderman DeVries asked so this is a one time action that those monies from somewhere else will go into that account?

Mayor Gatsas replied correct. These are monies that came from additional revenues from tuition, state funding and things like that that weren't on the budget line items.

Alderman DeVries stated I heard your explanation but it just didn't jive with my recollection of it being specific to the line item.

Mayor Gatsas responded if they are going to spend it...if they have a line item in their budget of \$1 million, the surplus on that line item can only go into the medical account and it can only come out for medical. It can't come out to a wage line.

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

- L.** Recommending that the request from the Economic Development Director for approval of the temporary lease agreements between the City and the owners of various private parking facilities related to the Chili Cook-off be approved subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman O'Neil who voted in opposition)

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to make sure that I am recorded in opposition to this. I don't believe we should be charging for parking. I believe it was a mistake for us to get into the middle of that for this event and I just want to go on record stating that.

***Alderman Lopez** moved to accept this report and adopt its recommendation.*

***Alderman Long** duly seconded the motion. **Mayor Gatsas** called for a vote. The motion carried, with **Alderman O'Neil** being duly recorded in opposition.*

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

- T.** Recommending that the Mayor, Ward 10 Alderman Phil Greazzo and the Chairman of the Committee on Lands and Buildings meet with the Goffstown Board of Selectmen regarding the former B&M Railroad Trestle and report back to the Board.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Ouellette stated this is regarding the trestle bridge that abuts both Alderman Greazzo's and my ward. I just want to update the Board on the fact that the Selectmen of the Town of Goffstown asked for a meeting. I met with the Mayor and people from the Town of Goffstown to get their input. I thought Alderman Greazzo was invited but in error he wasn't invited. I have no problem if Alderman Greazzo wants to meet with them but this meeting had already taken place with the Mayor and me. Their concern first and foremost was if we are going to connect our trail with theirs. They were asked how much money they were going to put towards the trestle. I believe the Mayor asked that question and they said they had no money for that. The long and the short of it is that we left that meeting with the understanding that if they wanted any information we certainly would provide the Town of Goffstown with that information. They were also concerned with the flooding and the debris that collects at the bottom of the trestle and with the shape of the trestle as well. We said that they could certainly get in touch with Peter Capano and he would share any information that the City had in looking at the issue. That is where we are at. I think the next step forward would be that Parks & Recreation should give an update to the Committee on Lands & Buildings as to where the project is at and what needs to be done next, if anything.

Alderman O'Neil stated the key thing here is that both Alderman Ouellette and Alderman Greazzo should be notified because I think their wards...

Mayor Gatsas interjected one of them is on one side of the bridge and the other is on the other side.

Alderman O'Neil stated right and I think there was one communication involving Alderman Greazzo and another one involving Alderman Ouellette. Moving forward it should include both of them.

Mayor Gatsas responded that is so noted and we will make sure they are both advised before meeting again.

Alderman Ouellette moved to receive and file the report. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

- X.** Recommending that a request to accept grant funds in the amount of \$133,430 from Public Service and National Grid to be used to supplement the Federal Energy Block Grant be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman DeVries stated I don't know who would like to speak to this and maybe they want to head up while I ask my question. Is there anybody who can give me any detail on the dollars? Highway has volunteered. This is \$133,000 coming in from PSNH and National Grid to use to supplement the federal energy block grant and the supporting documents just didn't give me a clue how we hope to spend that.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, responded we have been before the CIP Committee and we are under contract with Aramark who is identifying those projects for us City-wide. We could get the definition of those specific projects to the CIP Committee or this Board.

Alderman DeVries asked so the CIP Committee will be making a decision as to which City buildings would qualify and be best used? Is it only on the City side or City and Schools?

Mr. Sheppard answered I believe we are looking at all buildings, including schools. This was energy rebate money and we want to put that money back into the program to create more savings in the future. We try to maximize our rebates from PSNH and National Grid; therefore, we coordinate all of these improvements with them. Some of these funds came from MST and the improvements that were made there.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think it is important that we identify where the quickest paybacks are and what we can find that is going to come back to the City.

Alderman DeVries asked quickest in long-term reduction of use of electricity?

Mayor Gatsas replied correct.

Alderman DeVries stated I look forward to seeing some of those reports.

Alderman Corriveau asked would it be possible to have that list vetted in a joint meeting of the CIP Committee and the Energy Committee. It seems to me that any sort of energy process should...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I think the Chairman of CIP is sitting right next to you and if that is something that the two of you agree to, I don't have a problem with that.

Alderman O'Neil stated agreed.

Alderman DeVries moved to refer the report to the Committees on CIP and the Committee on Energy and have them report back to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH & TRAFFIC

KK. Recommending that the report approving signage to be placed on Maple and Beech Streets be accepted.

The Committee further recommends that the effects of the signs be reviewed every six months.

(Aldermen Osborne, Long and Shaw voted yea, Aldermen Roy and Ouellette voted nay)

Alderman Lopez stated I pulled this off because I am a little concerned that we are creating signs all over the City and in my opinion unauthorized signs according to what I hear from Traffic. In talking to the City Solicitor, these are informational signs. We start in one ward and continue into Ward 4 and Ward 2 and pretty soon we will have them on the Queen City Bridge. We have so many signs up there and we are just cluttering up the City. I know that ten years ago the Planning Department was going to put up some nice signs and there was enough money and the program went on for ten years and we were ready to implement a pilot program and try to clean up the City signs and they turned the money back in last year for the budget. So ten years went down the drain and we still have a pilot program out there. Now, I understand that the Traffic Committee has jurisdiction over this but in talking to the City Solicitor, this is a Board of Mayor and Aldermen decision because it is informational signs that are going up. I would caution...I am not going to vote for this for the simple reason that I think it is a hazard. I come down Lake Avenue and I am used to seeing green signs or black and white signs and all of the sudden I see these crazy signs. I am sort of looking

at them and it is distracting me from watching where I am going. I don't think they do anything. It is a matter of police enforcement. We spent thousands of dollars buying these portable speed signs. In looking at the data, if people are going 31 and it is a 30 MPH zone I would think the Traffic Committee would look at going to 25 MPH if that is the case or 35 MPH. To put up signs and more signs all over the City is just taking our city, to me, down the drain. I wish it would be defeated and I would like the City Solicitor to comment on this because we have had some conversations on it. I want the whole Board to understand about these signs that people want to put up.

Mr. Thomas Clark, City Solicitor, stated Alderman Lopez has discussed this with me. His question was whether or not this Board has authority to remove the signs if they don't want them there. I informed him that these are not traffic regulation signs. These are strictly informational signs and the Board could take action to remove them if they so wish.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to yield to the Chairman of Traffic who many times has said these are not according to...I forget the terminology but I would call on him to enlighten us on what he has said before.

Alderman Roy stated you have heard me expound on this before. It is the Uniform Traffic Code that was developed federally and adopted by the state. It was also adopted by this Board a few years ago during my first term. Unfortunately, even though we have the studies and there is no suggestion that there are any criteria met, we continually circumvent the rules that we adopted. This is a perfect example of it right here. You are right. These are not traffic signs. In the Uniform Traffic Code, I believe they call it a sign that is the equivalent of a sugar pill in that it is a feel good measure but the true way to handle this if there is indeed speeding is with enforcement. The study that our

Traffic Department and the Police did shows...they took the study in four different sections, two at Beech Street and two at Maple Street. On one section of Beech Street the average speed is 30.1 MPH. The other section of Beech Street is 28.5 MPH. That is the average speed. There are speeders, believe me. You are going to have speeders in there. On Maple Street, one section is 31.2 MPH and the other section is 31 MPH. I am going to be honest with you. When I travel up and down Beech Street I guarantee you that I am one of the people doing 31 MPH because I am always on the edge of that 30 MPH. If they wanted to stop me for speeding they probably could. I don't think that is the issue. The issue is the people who go through there at 90 MPH at a certain time of day and those boxes that you talked about are the tools to correct that. They can put them up. They are the size of a bread box, if you will, and they don't flash or anything. They just pick up the information so that the officers can go there and target those individuals if they are coming by every day at the same time. I agree with you that the way to go is enforcement. As I did in Committee, I will vote against this again tonight.

Mayor Gatsas asked Mr. Sheppard do we have a list of signs in any one place of all signs that have ever been put up in the City? I think that as we go through these traffic reports sometimes we see signs that go up and they are there for three months and they come back down again or they are moved ten feet. Is there any list of all signs in the City?

Mr. Sheppard answered ordinance signs are actually tracked through the City Clerk's office and other signs we maintain.

Mayor Gatsas asked give me an example.

Mr. Sheppard answered No Parking signs and One Way signs.

Mayor Gatsas asked those are tracked through the Clerk?

Mr. Sheppard answered yes.

Mayor Gatsas asked is Slow Children yours?

Mr. Sheppard answered that is not an ordinance sign and would be something that we would put up and track.

Mayor Gatsas asked so we track if those signs are up.

Mr. Sheppard answered we track those signs. We don't drive through the City every year to verify that they are still up but we do track locations.

Mayor Gatsas asked can you get us a list of all signs that you track?

Mr. Sheppard answered sure.

Mayor Gatsas stated and the City Clerk can get us a list of all of the signs they track so we have a list of where those signs are and how many we have in the City. I think it would prove interesting. This is maybe the first experience of what we see and we should go through the ordinances because it reminds me of Concord. Before we create another one we should be pulling some out or removing some. Maybe we put a sign up in a neighborhood for a particular reason and that neighborhood has now changed. If you could circulate that to all of the Aldermen so that they will have an opportunity to look at them, I think it may make sense. Maybe we can change some of those signs and move on from there.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't know where to begin because I have beaten this to death in the last couple of months. Number one, in my ward anyway I have taken out more signs than I have put in. You won't find hardly any Slow signs in my ward or anything else. I cleaned my ward up completely. All I have standing now are the four signs on Lake Avenue and the four signs on Spruce Street. Throughout the years that they have been up to go through this now...and I have gotten a lot of compliments on those signs. They work for some people but of course nothing works for everybody. That is impossible. It is a lot better than what is out there now. They are supposed to work with enforcement. That is the way it should be. When the Police are not there at least the signs are there to remind people that they might be there. So as far as Alderman Lopez saying that there are too many signs out there back 15 or 20 years ago if you went down Maple Street and looked at every sign going down Maple Street you would get in an accident because you couldn't read them all. There are so many of them coming down Maple Street or any of these other streets. So that is not a good excuse. When I went through Ward 2 for Alderman Ludwig, I went through it with the Traffic Department and I looked at all of the signs on Maple Street from Bridge to Webster and from Webster down onto Beech Street. I looked at all of the signs that were there. There weren't many. There are a lot of pedestrian crossing signs there. For the ones that were there that really weren't needed, I recommended that they shouldn't be there because they are useless. Instead of putting one of those signs there, we should put one of the signs I came up with. They wouldn't have to be the same color. I guess they have to be blue and white. They are not the same color as the ones I have on Spruce or Lake Avenue because it meets more of the codes. I cleaned up my ward completely. I have nothing to hide about too many signs. You won't find them in my ward. It is up to the Aldermen what they want to do with their wards. That is what they are there for. If they want to maintain their ward with signs or use 4-way stop signs or whatever it may be, I think they should. I think the people put them in their ward to do

things and if that is what the people want, that is what the people should get. Again, the average speed on those two streets...and I have the reports here myself. You can say 31 MPH but that is taking an average of the ones going 98 MPH along with the ones going under 30 MPH. Of those cars, 55% are going over the speed limit; 55% of them. That is the way I look at it. I could go on and on but I will stop.

Alderman Lopez asked may I respond?

Mayor Gatsas answered I don't mind if you respond but the Clerk just handed me a note to tell me that the report that I just asked for him to send to all of the Aldermen is 800 pages long. So I will suggest that he sends it electronically because I think maybe the signs we don't think we have in the City we do have in the City. We should take a look at all of them and maybe removing some of them.

Alderman Lopez stated I think, Your Honor, that if it is that many pages I wish we would continue to follow the regulations and let Traffic and Highway and the City Clerk take care of these signs. The point I am making here is they are not...these are informational signs that cost more money and more manpower to go out there and do what the Traffic Department has to do now. I mean "Meet the Judge" and all of that stuff doesn't stop people from speeding. It just distracts them from driving down the street. That is my opinion. It is up to the Police to enforce the speed limit. That is the reason they bought these things. We don't need extra expenses in buying and putting up these signs. That is my point.

Alderman O'Neil stated I agree that we have way too many signs up in the City of Manchester. I think the Chief is hearing loud and clear tonight that speed is an issue. It is going to continue to be an issue and your folks need to step it up on enforcement. Not only the people in the traffic division but the route officers need

to enforce the speeding laws in this City. I think the Chief knows that but he needs to remind his people of that. It continues to be an issue city-wide and we need the Police to enforce it. Signs don't do a thing. Signs don't do a thing. I don't need an 800 page report listing all of the signs. I can tell you that. Alderman Lopez talked about the fact that there is a cost and to put one sign and post up may seem minimal but when you start multiplying it...

Mayor Gatsas interjected by 800 pages.

Alderman O'Neil stated who knows what the value of those signs are. I can't believe we are even having a discussion about this. I am going to vote against it. I would encourage my colleagues to vote against it. These signs are not going to improve one single thing on Maple or Beech Street. I travel both of them every day as I live up toward that section of the City. It is about enforcement and about policemen writing tickets. That is what is going to slow people down, plain and simple, and I encourage my colleagues to vote against this recommendation.

Alderman Ludwig stated it is about enforcement. I want to say this quite frankly. We have seen the unit with the flashing sign that tells you how fast you are going out there quite frequently lately on both streets so they are out there. How many tickets do we give? I am not sure. At what speed do we give those tickets? I am not sure. I know that my friends at the State say if you set your speedometer at 74 you won't get a ticket in a 65 MPH zone. That is what I do. I don't know what they are doing on Beech or Maple but I know they go fast.

Mayor Gatsas stated I hope you are not keeping yours set at 74 MPH.

Alderman Ludwig stated maybe the people in Manchester have it figured out. The reports that we get...it is difficult to base the reports on the averages that they spit out in terms of their information. I work on Maple Street quite a few hours a day on I guess the west side of Wagner Park and believe me my weed whacker better not go off the street because it is going to go down the road. They are going faster than 30 MPH. We have done some things and first of all let me say this. I am not for signs. I never have been. I would like to see every dog fouling sign taken down quite frankly because I don't think it is really necessary and I never did as a department head. Collectively this Board over the years put us in the sign mess we are in and no one else. If anybody wants to speak against signs, they should have been doing it for the last however many years they have been sitting here. All of the sudden now we have a sign problem? Do I think this is kind of like making a mockery out of what we are trying to do and enforce something? I think Alderman Lopez summed it up in four words if I counted right: used to seeing signs. Yes we certainly are. Slow, Slow Children, Go Slow Children, Blind Person, Dog Fouling...we are used to seeing them all. So maybe something will change it. My theory here is maybe people coming down Maple Street or going up Beech will see something different and for a period of time they will slow down because of it. I would love to see the package that Alderman Lopez spoke of earlier. If we gave \$70,000 to package up something that would make signage much nicer throughout the City in terms of directing people all over the place I would vote for that in a heartbeat if that was in front of us but it isn't in front of us. This is what is in front of us right now. It is a sign and they are expensive. If we are going to take the 800 signs and multiple that times how much they cost I totally agree it is expensive but when I hear Currier Art Gallery people telling me they can't cross the street unless they put their own crossing guard out there and people have to run across Beech Street or Maple Street to get across and trust me you do. When I am on the corner of Myrtle and Maple Street I have to

sprint across the street when the light changes south of it because I am not going to make it. Somebody speeding...and I don't know what the report says but if we gave more tickets that would definitely help the matter but that isn't where we are at right now. As far as I am concerned you can vote this up or down or vote anyway you want. I am voting it up because I see what is going on in the ward and if someday they are deemed not necessary anymore and they want to take them down or we are going to start enforcing it then that would be a good thing. Today as I am speaking about it it is a problem and for the safety of everybody who is trying to cross Beech or Maple and for my conscience to be clear for future accidents in these two stretches of those streets, I am voting for it. That is all I have to say.

Alderman Osborne stated I am going to kind of end it here. Everybody knows what they are going to do. I am not going to speak because we have been beating this to death. Here is my story. In Ward 5 I had more than the four on Spruce and more on Lake Avenue. I only have four, like I said, on each street now. I took all of the others out. I had one on Tarrytown and a few more on Spruce Street and some on Lake Avenue. I took enough signs down now to replenish Ward 2. In other words, the signs that I had up in my ward would take care of Ward 2, what I took down. What I am trying to do with this is I am trying to make it equal everywhere if somebody else is going to want to use that someday. It has to be a long enough stretch. You only have four signs. They will all be the same and read the same way from the beginning and on all of the streets. It is all in sequence and it all looks neat and everybody understands the situation. These signs are not terribly expensive. I think they were like \$40 a piece or something like that but they are certainly worth it if there is an accident due to speed. I am going to...I want to call for a vote and request a roll call.

Alderman O'Neil stated I apologize that I just thought of this as the discussion was going on this evening but we actually had a discussion about Maple Street several years ago. We were talking about traffic calming measures in the City. One is in Alderman Osborne's ward on Massabesic Street. There is a raised crosswalk. That is a traffic calming measure to slow people down and believe it or not, I think it worked. I think we did adopt some stamped crosswalks on Kelley Street. So there are raised or stamped crosswalks. We also talked about, but failed to implement, what was called a bump out technique on Maple Street. There is an impression that the street is wider than it is, three lanes, so you bump it out. We actually talked about doing it as a temporary measure, maybe in the area of Maple and Salmon or it could be further south of that to give the impression that the road is narrowing. Traffic engineers will tell you that that slows traffic down. We failed to do that. So there are measures we can take beyond signs that will slow traffic down. We just need to carry them out. It is simply move some curbing and you can choke a street down. It is pretty simple. It is not a major expense. Maybe you can lend us some of the money from Massabesic Street. Seriously, we had talked about this and there is actually a report out there. Maybe the Clerk can research when the Board approved these traffic calming measures. We failed to carry them out.

Alderman Shea stated I hate to keep referring to Maine but up in Maine you have to allow people to cross the street. It is the law. If you go to Ogunquit or York or Wells, if you do not allow people to cross the street you will be fined. The point is that it is up to the State legislators to adopt a plan because that is where it should emanate from. In other words, they should adopt a plan to allow people to cross Myrtle Street on Maple Street and if people do not stop they can get the license plate of the car and the police can go after them. That is the law.

Mayor Gatsas responded Alderman Shea that is a law in Manchester and I can tell you if you look out the Mayor's window on the third floor if there was a police officer sitting there he probably could ticket at least 25 or 30 people a day that jaywalk against the lights. I think if they went down one more block they could probably ticket 100 cars a day that don't stop for pedestrians. I think I brought this up when I was an Alderman. I asked a question about how many people we have given tickets out to for jaywalking and the answer was zero. I don't know if that has changed since then, and how many tickets did we give out to cars that didn't stop for people at crosswalks? That was zero.

Alderman Shea asked am I wrong? Does the City of Manchester have a law that says...

Mayor Gatsas interjected it is a state law.

Alderman Shea stated the State has the law but I am not sure if it governs the City.

Mayor Gatsas replied yes it does. In Concord people stop for people in crosswalks. They absolutely stop. They know that they are going to get ticketed if they don't.

Alderman Shea responded I know in Maine they get ticketed but I don't know about Manchester.

Mayor Gatsas stated as I said there wasn't one and I asked for the last ten years had anybody ever been given a ticket or was there ever a ticket issued and the answer was no.

Alderman Shea stated my second point is that if the people in Manchester don't know that there has been a concern about people not observing the speed limits on Maple Street and Beech Street, they certainly know it by now because they have heard about it for the last hour. I say let's take a vote.

Mayor Gatsas stated we have one more speaker and then we can move on the report.

Alderman Ouellette stated I will be brief. I would kind of like to point out that whenever I have issues with speed or lately it has been parking issues, I have called the Chief and he has been very responsive. I don't want this conversation getting to the point where we are saying our Police Department is not being responsive to us. I have had traffic studies done on Amory Street, Bremer Street and Kelley Street and pretty much they paint the same picture. Also, since we have been talking about this for the past three or four months I have noticed around the City a lot more speed traps going up. I think there are speed traps two or three times a week on Huse Road where I travel on my route every day. I believe Alderman O'Neil saw one on Brown Avenue and stopped and thanked the officers for running radar. I think the message is getting out there. If you are having problems in specific areas, call the Chief. He will work with you. He will sit down with you. He will sit down with neighbors or residents having problems. The parking issues are getting a lot better because the Chief is really addressing the issues that are being brought to him. Again, if you are having issues call the Chief. I am voting against the signs because of the reasons stated before. It really helps a lot if you call the Chief and they will work on it. Captain Hopkins is great to work with and Lieutenant Tessier is great also. That would be my suggestion.

Alderman Osborne moved to accept this report and its recommendations.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Alderman Osborne requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Osborne, Corriveau, Shea, DeVries, Shaw, Greazzo, Craig, Ludwig, and Long voted yea. Aldermen O'Neil, Lopez, Ouellette, Arnold and Roy voted nay. The motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I thought you might be taking another step, Your Honor.

Mayor Gatsas responded I appreciate where you are coming from but I think you all know what my feeling is on Maple and Beech Streets. I made that comment when I was an Alderman, that those two streets should go back to two-way streets. That is what is going to slow the traffic down. Beech and Maple Streets should be two-way streets, along with Pine and Chestnut. That is the only way you are going to slow traffic down, the only way. We can put up 1,000 signs but we won't slow anything down. I can tell you that when I go up Blodgett Street, and I am sure Alderman Ludwig will tell you the same thing, when you get to Blodgett and Maple you had better stop. I don't care how long your light has been green, you had better stop because too many times I have watched cars go through that light when I have had the green light going up Blodgett Street and they had a red light at Maple Street. They have just gone right through it. I can tell you that the only way we are going to calm the speed on those four streets is turning them into two-way streets. That is the only way we are going to slow them down. Anyway, I am not going to veto something that the Alderman of the ward voted for.

QQ. Recommending that the request from the Kiwanis Club of Manchester to add road signs at the five locations outlined in the attached document be approved.

(Aldermen Roy, Long and Shaw voted yea, Aldermen Osborne and Ouellette voted nay)

Alderman Ouellette stated this was passed at the Traffic Committee. One of the non-profit clubs was looking to add signs that are again all over the City. I have one question and I don't know whether it was answered or not at Committee. Does the City receive any revenue from allowing these clubs to have signs?

Mayor Gatsas responded no.

Alderman Ouellette asked so these clubs like Kiwanis and what not...I think again we talked about signs and I voted against it because I don't think it is beneficial for the City to have these signs. They are asking us to put up five more signs. I believe there was a moratorium on signs in the City. As I did in Committee, I am voting against this.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think it is important that...some of these groups looking to put up signs I don't think they are looking to put them up at new locations. I think they are looking to put them up on existing locations where you might find a sign from the Lions Club or Rotary Club. They are just looking to add a sign down below those. I can tell you that these clubs do an awful lot of work for the community. Their signs are probably the least obtrusive of any that I have seen. Certainly they are much different than the signs you just discussed for an hour. I think it is important that we give them the opportunity. It is not like they have 1,000 of them up. I think they have them on some main streets as you come into Manchester from the south, north, west and east. I think they are just looking to tell people as they come into Manchester that there is a Kiwanis Club and if you want to join you can take a look at the website and find a location. I hear where a lot of you are coming from but I have had a couple of calls from some of these groups that want to make sure that they can at least be recognized as people are coming into the City so people can call about joining their clubs.

Alderman Osborne stated that is exactly what I was going to say.

Alderman DeVries stated I just wanted to bring to the attention of the Traffic Committee, because I had an item that has been tabled there and should be discussed tomorrow night, that one of the locations that we are adding for the Kiwanis is Brown Avenue, northbound, between the Airport and 293. In that area, and I realize that is Brown Avenue northbound, but I was looking to add some signage to assist with a church that has been relocated that still has many people circling the neighborhood looking for the church. They haven't find out that it has been relocated a few miles down the road. I am looking to piggyback that way finding sign onto something else that is existing and I just wanted to bring to everyone's attention that for \$16.72 the Kiwanis is reimbursing the City of Manchester maybe we can add a way finding sign for that at the same time. We will talk about it again tomorrow night.

Alderman Osborne stated well you just answered my question. This is just a request to replace five signs and not add anymore.

Mayor Gatsas responded it is adding signs that are in these locations now.

Alderman Osborne asked I thought it was existing?

Mayor Gatsas answered some are replacements but some are additions.

Alderman Long stated the five locations already have Rotary and Lion's signs now. They have been approved for the Rotary and Lions Clubs. I checked with Mr. Hoben and he sent me the approvals over the years. There are some signs out there for civic organizations, not the Kiwanis, advocating for Bedford. Those weren't authorized. The way finder sign policy didn't address civic organizations.

It addressed points of interest. Now personally I think a municipality enhances itself when it shows that it has civic organizations and a volunteer system and that the volunteer system is thriving. These organizations, all three of them, have given significantly to the City of Manchester. They help with quality of life issues for our residents. To me, I would love to see one sign with all three of these on it but that couldn't happen. I tried to facilitate that but one of the organizations just couldn't afford it and it wouldn't be fair to ask the other two to pony up for all three of them. Eventually I would like to get there because I think it looks a lot more attractive when you are welcomed to Manchester and you see their signs but we are just not there yet. Whether it is for marketing I don't know. They would like these signs there. They do enough for this community volunteer-wise and help our constituents with quality of life issues. Five signs is the minimum I could do for them.

Alderman Ouellette stated here is my frustration again. Alderman Long asked for information and he got information from a City employee and it wasn't distributed to the rest of the Committee, which we both sit on, and it wasn't distributed to the rest of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. To me it says add location so had I known that there were already signs there maybe I wouldn't have brought it up tonight. Maybe I wouldn't have taken it off the agenda. We are supposed to get information from City staff. City staff gave one Alderman information that the Alderman asked for and it wasn't distributed to the rest of us. That is not right and that is a frustration that I have and that we have talked about before.

Mayor Gatsas replied listen. There is information that is given out to Aldermen that I don't see. If your suggestion is that I send out a memo tomorrow to all departments that anybody that is requesting information send it to all of us. I have no problem doing that.

Alderman Ouellette responded I would appreciate that.

Mayor Gatsas stated okay we can take care of that.

Alderman Lopez stated point of order. It is the policy of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and has been the policy of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that if one Alderman requests information it be given to all of the Aldermen. That has been a policy for five or six years.

Mayor Gatsas asked can we include the Mayor in that?

Alderman Lopez answered we can include the Mayor.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't have a problem sharing everything with you. I will send out a memo tomorrow that information be given to all 14 Aldermen and the Mayor no matter what Alderman has requested the information.

Alderman Ouellette stated I just want to make it clear that I am thanking the Alderman from Ward 3 for getting the information. This is not about the Alderman in Ward 3. This is about the departments not sending out the information.

Mayor Gatsas responded I will send the memo out to everyone tomorrow.

Alderman O'Neil stated this has nothing to do with the Kiwanis Club. We honored two young people earlier this evening that were involved with P.A.L. One of the charities that the Kiwanis have supported over the years is P.A.L. This has nothing to do with Kiwanis. The fact of the matter is that we have too many

signs in the City of Manchester. We have businesses and institutions that just put up signs on their own. There is even one particular place that drove their own stakes to put up signs to get to their institution. The folks at Kiwanis need to know that this has nothing to do with them. Their work and the work that the other civic organizations do is greatly appreciated. I think it would be great, and Alderman Long brought it up, if you go into some communities there is a big sign and it has all of the service clubs on it. That would be great if we could do something like that in strategic locations.

Mayor Gatsas replied if you remember during my time on the Board we appropriated \$70,000 to the Planning Department to get that done and they returned the money.

Alderman O'Neil responded I don't know what happened with that but the bottom line is we have too many signs in the City of Manchester. Somebody once referred to it as sign pollution and I think there is something to that. The folks at Kiwanis need to understand that this has nothing to do with them. Their work is greatly appreciated. This is about too many signs in the City of Manchester.

Alderman Roy stated I would like to ask the Clerk to send out the pilot program that we had on the way finding sign package to all of the Aldermen and the Mayor.

Mayor Gatsas responded it is already in the agenda.

Alderman Long replied great. I have it in one of my other packages that I had from the Committee. I just wanted to say one thing. If you read that, and it is in the agenda package and I didn't read it because I already have it, but it says "the signs that would not normally be provided for are the following: residential

property, individual commercial business, social and sport clubs, hotels, bed & breakfasts, and religious institutions.” Those are the five that we weren’t supposed to do. There is a moratorium on those.

Alderman Shea moved to accept this report and its recommendation. Alderman Shaw duly seconded the motion. Alderman Shea requested a roll call vote.

Aldermen Shea, DeVries, Shaw, Arnold, Craig, Ludwig, Long, Roy, Osborne, and Corriveau voted yea. Aldermen Greazzo, Ouellette, O’Neil and Lopez voted nay. The motion carried.

5. Nomination to be presented by Mayor Gatsas.

Harold Sullivan to succeed Henry Bourgeois (deceased) as a member of the Highway Commission term to expire January 15, 2012.

Mayor Gatsas stated this nomination will layover until the next meeting of the Board pursuant to Rule 20 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Your consideration of this nominee is appreciated.

6. Confirmations to be presented by Mayor Gatsas.

Police Commission

William Clifford to succeed Calvin Cramer (term limited) as a member, term to expire September 1, 2013.

Fire Commission

Verna Perry to succeed Robert Haley (resignation) as a member, term to expire May 1, 2012.

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to confirm the nominations as presented.

7. Nomination of a candidate to the Board of Assessors.

Alderman Roy stated first I want to thank the Committee, Alderman Long and Alderman Arnold, not only for the trust that they showed by making me Chairman but for the hard work they did. We were given the task of coming up with a new Commercial Assessor and we were to do it expeditiously because they are short-handed down there. The Selection Committee for the Commercial Assessor position has completed its process. The Committee received seven applications for consideration and we interviewed five of these candidates. Members of the Selection Committee included myself as Chairman, Alderman Long and Alderman Arnold, and Commissioner Paul Martineau of the Welfare Department. The Human Resources Director Jane Gile assisted the Committee. The Selection Committee is pleased to nominate Robert Gagne as the City's Commercial Assessor contingent up on a satisfactory background check and pre-employment physical. Mr. Gagne's resume was distributed to you last week. He has served as Deputy Assessor for the City of Nashua since February 2008. Prior to that he was employed as a Commercial Appraisal in the City of Manchester. The support of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of this appointment would be appreciated. Mr. Gagne's recommended starting salary will be a Grade 24, Step 9. The Selection Committee members would be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman O'Neil stated I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Gagne earlier along with Alderman Roy. His credentials are very well suited for this job. In my discussion with Alderman Roy, I prefer that we actually lay this over but I understand after talking to Alderman Roy there are some very good reasons why we need to bring someone on as soon as possible. I believe there will be a motion coming forward to suspend the rules and confirm tonight. I hope it doesn't

become a regular practice but I think for this specific situation it is in the best interest of the citizens to approve Mr. Gagne this evening.

Mayor Gatsas asked is Alderman Roy going to make the motion to suspend the rules?

Alderman Roy answered at the appropriate time I would...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I am just checking on the process.

Alderman Roy stated you are correct, and I am the guy who usually sits here and talks about process.

Mayor Gatsas stated I just want to make sure we are all on the same page with process. This is the right thing to do. It all depends on whose eyes we are looking out when we look at process.

Alderman Lopez stated I want to thank the Selection Committee for all of the hard work they did in making this selection. I have been through the process and I know it takes a lot of time. They spent a lot of days interviewing to make their nomination tonight. Yes, Your Honor it is a process. Normally we would lay this over for two weeks. I hope you appreciate that we are down to one Assessor in the City of Manchester right now and the reason to suspend the rules is that there is no question that this individual will be hired by the City of Manchester and we want him to inform his employer and get him on board as soon as possible. In working with the Finance Officer going up to the DRA, I think he is going to be a great help. There are also abatements that have to be done and we are going to be going through a revaluation so time is essential in this particular situation.

Mayor Gatsas replied I met with the individual and it has nothing to do with the individual. It just has to do with process because I know a lot of times that word is thrown around and I just want to make sure that when we throw it around we look at every issue that we address to make sure the process is important. This is important. There are other times that other processes are important and I think we should have that discussion. There is no question.

***Alderman DeVries** moved to accept the nomination of Robert Gagne as the Commercial Appraiser. **Alderman Shea** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

***Alderman Roy** moved to suspend the rules and confirm the nomination of Robert Gagne as the Commercial Appraiser. **Alderman Arnold** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Roy stated I agree with you 100%, Mayor, that the process is important and you know that. I don't want the staff down in the Assessor's to have any idea...I think they are doing a great job but the fact of the matter is that they are understaffed and extremely understaffed right now with only one Assessor. That is the important part and that is why I think there are extenuating circumstances here so that we shouldn't follow the process. Not only are they understaffed but there is a form that I have been told, an MS-1 I believe it is, that has to be in to the state by September 1st signed by two Assessors. We didn't have two Assessors so what we have is a 30-day extension, I believe. This is important going forward to set the tax rate for the City because the State is the one that sets the tax rate as you know. Those are the two major reasons why I think we should proceed tonight and not follow policy in this instance.

Mayor Gatsas replied I am not opposed to it.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor, you seemed to react a little bit on this MS-1 thing. That is not your understanding, that it needed two signatures?

Mayor Gatsas responded I am not sure why we didn't have an Assessor here on September 1st. I guess that is my question. Nobody notified me that...Mr. Hurley can you come up and talk to me about that please?

Alderman O'Neil replied that is one of the reasons I supported suspending the rules tonight. I was told that we need to have two Assessors sign that form.

Mr. Mike Hurley, Assessor, stated last week I got from the DRA an extension until October 8th. It was due September 1st. I sent a fax out to the DRA to ask for that extension due to the abatements and our situation. I believe Thursday I got the fax back that we got an extension until October 8th.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it your understanding that it does need more than one Assessor's signature?

Mr. Hurley answered yes, it needs two signatures.

Mayor Gatsas stated I thought we had two Assessors until September 1st. Didn't we have two Assessors in the office last week?

Mr. Hurley responded yes we did. Thursday was the other Assessor's last day.

Mayor Gatsas asked so why didn't we get the form signed that day?

Mr. Hurley answered because we were still working on our abatement cases. We hadn't finished them yet. We didn't have the numbers and wouldn't have been ready for the MS-1 because we weren't through the abatement cases. We were still working on those and that was the reason we got the extension until October 8th.

Mayor Gatsas stated it is interesting that people were in my office less than two weeks ago and nobody ever said that to me. I guess maybe you can come back and explain to me why it wasn't discussed then.

Alderman O'Neil asked did you talk specifically about this issue; the MS-1 form?

Mayor Gatsas answered we talked about making sure that there were things completed. My concern was that we had two Assessors working very diligently with FairPoint because of the poles and wire situation where we were able to tax the poles and wires starting in July when that legislation sunsetted. I asked that question. I understood that we were having two Assessors in the office until September 1st to complete that work and now I am being told something different. I guess it is a lack of communication with me and some of the departments.

Alderman O'Neil responded in defense of Mr. Hurley that is not what he said. He said they were still completing...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I understand that but that discussion never came up with me. Nobody ever told me that there was a form that needed to be signed and that we would be losing an Assessor in the meantime because the work wasn't completed. We will just leave it at that and continue the discussion.

Mr. Hurley stated Dave Cornell's last day was technically Thursday but he had vacation time so he wasn't in the office all of that last week either.

Alderman Arnold asked haven't we solved the problem?

Mayor Gatsas replied we have to suspend the rules and hire another Assessor.

Alderman Arnold responded I just want to make sure I understand.

Mayor Gatsas stated I understand process and I don't have a problem following through with it as long as I was told that but I didn't even hear that conversation tonight. That was not brought up to me as the reason we were changing the process.

Alderman O'Neil stated it was brought up when I had the chance to sit down with Mr. Gagne.

Mayor Gatsas replied I am sure it was but that discussion never came up with me.

Alderman Ouellette stated what is making me more comfortable, and again, I was really not comfortable with moving forward and suspending the rules, but this gentleman has worked in the Assessor's office before so if he was good enough to work here before I think we should...I feel comfortable suspending the rules tonight.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to suspend the rules and confirm the nomination. The motion carried, with Alderman Greazzo being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman DeVries moved to confirm the nomination of Robert Gagne as the Commercial Assessor. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Gatsas stated congratulations.

8. Update on funding for the Chili Cook-off Parking.

Mayor Gatsas asked Jay do you have a report?

Mr. Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, answered we have no updates on funding for the Chili Cook-Off parking.

9. Petition for Demolition and Removal of a building damaged by fire at 211 Mammoth Road.

Alderman Shea moved to accept the petition. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Ouellette stated I believe we also did the same thing for the 203 Mammoth Road property.

Alderman Shea responded 205. That has already been bought.

Alderman Ouellette asked but has it been demolished yet?

Alderman Shea answered the contractor is coming for a variance on Thursday before the Zoning Board. He talked to the neighbors and so forth. This is the other property next to it.

Alderman Ouellette asked what is the timeframe normally? Is it a couple of months before they actually do the demolition?

Mayor Gatsas responded I think it is going to be sooner than that. Leon, can you answer that?

Mr. Leon LaFreniere, Planning & Community Development Director, stated on 203 Mammoth Road the hazardous materials abatement has begun, as well as notifications to the EPA as required by law. I believe it is the intent of the gentleman who purchased the property to undertake demolition as soon as possible. As Alderman Shea noted, he is appearing before the Zoning Board on Thursday night to ask for relief from some of the conditions regarding the redevelopment of that parcel. If successful he plans on pulling permits immediately thereafter.

Alderman Ouellette asked is the purpose for residential?

Mr. LaFreniere answered yes. His plan is to put three units on that site.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to accept the petition. *There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

- 10.** A Majority Report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Mayor's Senior Luncheon be held annually rather than bi-annually and be renamed to the Annual Mayor's Senior Luncheon.

The majority further recommends that tickets to the event continue to be sold for \$3.00 per person.

(Aldermen Osborne, Corriveau, and DeVries voted yea; Aldermen Lopez and O'Neil voted nay)

A Minority Report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Mayor's Senior Luncheon be held annually rather than bi-annually and be renamed to the Annual Mayor's Senior Luncheon.

The minority further recommends that tickets to the event be sold for \$5.00 per person, increasing admission by \$2.00.

(S/Alderman Lopez)

Alderman Shea stated instead of \$5, I recommend that we charge \$4 and that we approve it to be held once a year. In other words, instead of raising it \$2, raise it \$1 to \$4.

Alderman Osborne asked what is the motion on this?

Mayor Gatsas answered we need a motion. I was just reading the majority and minority report. The first one to come before us is the majority report.

Alderman Long moved to accept the majority report and adopt its recommendations. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like the Director of Elderly Services to come up please.

Mayor Gatsas responded sure and anytime anyone wants to let the Mayor have a say on the Mayor's Luncheon I certainly don't have a problem jumping in on the discussion at any time.

Alderman Lopez stated I think this is an emotional issue. I want all of the members of the Board to realize that we talked about having advice from the Commission. I want every member to realize that I met with the Commission and spent 45 minutes with them as I told the Committee. Barbara Vigneault has been looking at this subject for a number of months. I am going to let her speak in a minute but as somebody who has been directly involved in the Senior's Luncheon, it has dropped off in the last few years and we are trying to do something better and bigger. In talking to the Commission, they were the ones that came up with the \$5 ticket price. It was their idea under the recommendation of the Director. Barbara can you explain why I think it is important for the rest of the Aldermen to understand?

Ms. Barbara Vigneault, Elderly Services Director, responded Chairman Jim Eddinger would have been here tonight but unfortunately he is in the hospital so we wish him well. The Commission thought that it was time after all of these years to raise the fee to \$5. People have mentioned to them and to myself as well that they would probably be willing to give an extra \$2 for the dinner if we were able to get appropriate fundraising done so we could raise the level of the dinner to give larger prizes and have a more expensive meal or things that would make people enjoy that day a little more.

Alderman Lopez stated we also talked about...and the Mayor is probably going to talk about it because they call it the Mayor's Senior Luncheon. It was requested that we maintain the Mayor's Luncheon in order to get donations. The Commission felt that it was very important to have the status of Mayor's

Luncheon in order to go out and get donations. The second point is as we move forward into an annual luncheon as is being recommended by the majority report we can get more people involved in this process. As we learned through this year's process and the Mayor coming forward and saying I didn't know I had that much expense, we found out a lot of things and that is what drove us to review whether we have an annual luncheon and get 1,500 people. It would be a lot better than getting about 400. The cost to the taxpayers to do it is also a concern. Now, some people can say it is fine that we are going to subsidize this but the two events cost us a lot more money than was allocated, which is \$12,000 for two events. I believe that we can do this and I believe that in working with Barbara and other people, including members of this Board, we can help with this luncheon. This is a great thing for the seniors. There is no question about that. The reason that they picked the spring time is because during Christmas time there are lot of functions going on at the center and there are a lot of high rises that have functions. I know the VFW goes down and puts together a luncheon for people in the high rises and places like that. I think the other thing is if you look at this price of \$5, well they are paying \$6 now. So it will be \$1 less. I really don't see the problem in charging the \$5. I think they are still going to need the help of the Aldermen and Mayor and other people in the community to supplement the cost to put on a great Senior Luncheon that we all can be proud of. I have an amendment to the majority report before you take the vote but if others want to speak that is fine.

Alderman Osborne stated I brought this forth in Committee. I appreciate the Committee's response and the Committee's thought and Barbara's thought and everything else. I go along with everything. I brought it up in June, the Mayor's Senior Luncheon and so on and so forth, and also to keep it at \$3 because what is happening now is we are cutting this in half anyway. We are going to have one a year and you are saying we are going to have more people there. The last time I think the count was 450 or 475 so we are talking about a \$900 tag here and I think

we should, like I said in Committee, play this forth a little bit at the \$3 level and leave it alone and let these seniors enjoy themselves. It is really not worth going up to \$5 in my book.

Alderman DeVries stated I look forward to hearing your conversation on this but what I didn't hear this evening that I thought I heard when this was at Committee was a representation from staff that two events were stressing your abilities with your limited staff and that you were going right from one event and turning around trying to get the next event up and organized and completed. With all of the other arenas that you should really be looking at working for seniors, you felt one event was desirable. Did I hear that correctly, that you were overly taxed with two events?

Ms. Vigneault responded it is more at the community level that we are taxed because by the time we book one then we have to look at booking the other one and raising money for that next event. We are going to businesses in the community twice a year instead of once a year for the events. That is part of it. If we got more people involved and if we got Aldermen involved and community people involved and got some major sponsors or looked at other means of bringing funds in for the event then we would be able to afford the expenses to put on a larger event. One of the biggest expenses is the meal and we haven't had the funds to increase that or improve that. We obviously have to go with the lowest cost so that we can get by. It isn't meeting the budget for that dinner.

Alderman DeVries replied thank you for your answer. I guess I can only say that I was not real comfortable with being asked to do away with one of the senior luncheons because for many individuals they anticipate the events and they will miss the second luncheon, and I think we heard one individual this evening, but there are other seniors who are going to miss the second event. I wasn't

exceedingly comfortable with that. I thought I had heard what seemed to be a somewhat compelling request from you that two was just too many for you to handle. It seems a little lukewarm this evening and I am not sure I am as comfortable. That being said, what I did hear at the Committee level was a pretty compelling comment from Alderman Osborne. He indicated that even if we were increasing the number of people the difference from \$3 to \$5 wasn't going to be making up the difference. It is going to be fundraising that has to make up the difference. It is not the money we are getting from the seniors. If today we have 450 people that are coming to the event, and some have expressed that they hope to double that number, but even so that is not going to fill the gap and that is a problem. Obviously we need to do something different. Your Honor, I will segway this because I know you indicated that you wanted to speak to this. I guess I don't understand why this was even at a Committee for Aldermen to vote on. As you indicated, this is the Mayor's Senior Luncheon and I don't understand why you just didn't issue an executive order and make the change. Why are you asking us to do that?

Mayor Gatsas responded I certainly appreciate the ability to make executive orders but when there are two lunches that are planned and they are in that budget and it has been happening for an awful lot of years before I came in June...if this Board wants to allow me executive authority I certainly don't have a problem with that, Alderman. I think you might be the first one questioning me about executive authority.

Alderman DeVries replied the expense I know is in the budget.

Mayor Gatsas answered no it is not. The expense is not in the budget and that is the reason I sent it to the Committee. There is an appropriation of \$12,000. When I looked at the Mayor's Luncheon for June, the \$12,000 had already been spent in

the December luncheon. It is easy to sit here and say that \$3 is a lot and \$5 is too much and let's find a way and we are going to get 1,000 people there...listen I am the first one that leads the charge for seniors. I don't like the idea and I had to negotiate...we used to even pay for parking, which I negotiated out of the contract this year. That is another \$3 and that is where Alderman Lopez came in and said it was \$6 and now it is \$5 so it would be \$1 less. I negotiated the parking out of that contract so that everybody would get free parking. We had to limit how many centerpieces we were going to buy. There are an awful lot of people who contribute donations and prizes and lunches that are distributed through the raffle system but I think it is important and I have no problem calling this the Board of Mayor and Aldermen's Luncheon and finding some of these people on the sub-Committee to go and raise some of the money. I can tell you that we can call it whatever but unless the Mayor is making the phone calls to collect the money they have a very difficult time doing it. How many dollars did you collect this year from however many times you solicited for contributions? Less than \$1,000?

Ms. Vigneault answered yes. It has evolved so now businesses are donating gift certificates and things like that so we are getting fewer cash donations of any large amount.

Mayor Gatsas stated I just want to make sure that when there is an executive order that has to happen. I don't have a problem doing it but I am not about to overspend the budget that is allocated in that line item. I believe that we do it conscientiously when we put a budget together and I sent it to you because this year again I would have two of these, one in December and one in June. I know that \$12,000 after I did this last one in June and my staff worked on it and put as much time in as the Senior Center people did on it, that there is not enough money to do it. If this Board wants to appropriate more funding to do a second one then that is fine. If this Board wants to put a Committee together to go out and raise the

money I don't have a problem with that either. I can tell you that it is not a \$10,000 or \$12,000 cost. The meal is \$25, which is inclusive of gratuities and everything else so I don't have to tell you that if you multiple that by 500 it is \$12,500. If you get 1,000 you are going to be looking at \$25,000 and that is not in our budget. That is why I sent it to Administration to have a collective mind come forward and figure out what we wanted to do. If we want to continue with it, that is fine. If somebody wants to put a Committee together to go out and raise the money, that is fine. I don't have a problem doing that. If we want to charge the seniors...I understand they have a function at the Senior Center and they charge seniors \$10 for the meal. Now you have disc jockeys that are there and centerpieces...I made them waive the rental of the hall this year so the deal we got for one luncheon was much different than what we have had. I had conversations with people in the past who started this function back when Mayor Stanton was in office. There was nothing in the budget back then to run this function. It was all donations. I am sure that was awhile ago and probably the price of meals was much different but they put a program together and the Aldermen went out and raised the money and they had a Mayor's Luncheon. That is how it all started. I guess over the years the Board put \$12,000 in and that was probably enough to do two lunches when lunch was maybe \$12 and it made those numbers work. Well lunch is now \$25 and you have to beg and steal for dessert. They weren't even going to give us dessert. I had to plead and prod them to give us dessert with lunch because we all know that if seniors come to lunch and they don't have a dessert we have a problem. I am the first one to advocate...I don't like to see change but whatever this Board wants to do I thought it was appropriate for the Board to weigh in on. That is my explanation to you and if you would like to be the Chairman of that sub-committee I am sure Alderman Lopez can help you out with that.

Alderman DeVries replied thank you for the explanation. Is the problem with fundraising that the Senior Center...I mean you have been actively fundraising to complete the Senior Center facility so it is not the only thing that the Senior Center raises money for. Is that the problem here? Is that part of why you think you are having a hard time?

Ms. Vigneault responded no, and again, this is not in our budget, but the money is allocated in a separate area under the Mayor's office but I think what happens is that the cost of things goes up and as the Mayor just explained you need to find many ways in which to fundraise. Asking the community to help and asking other people to get involved who have connections and clout also is a way to do it, but the \$2 increase was a recommendation to have seniors be a part of that. You have many ways to raise funds and if you can raise \$1,000 by increasing the price of the ticket it is hard to raise \$1,000 so that was the mindset behind increasing the fee.

Alderman DeVries asked can you tell me the attendance differential between December and June?

Ms. Vigneault answered in the past we have had just a few more at Christmas time than in the summer.

Alderman DeVries responded so we are doing away with the event that has the greater participation?

Ms. Vigneault replied only because there are other opportunities for people to get out at Christmas time. Salvation Army has functions and there are different groups that have senior functions, as Alderman Lopez noted, and there isn't anything in the spring for seniors. You don't have the threat of snowstorms. Those are the things we looked at to say it is better to have it in the spring time

then having it at Christmas time because there are other avenues. Of course we do have things for seniors at the Senior Center all of the time but in the winter it is a little bit hard to be able to give people that opportunity if they are worried about walking and mobility problems in the winter. That is why if you are looking at a large number of people coming out on one specific day you are eliminating that threat of having a weather day. Two years ago we had a storm on the day of the Mayor's Senior Luncheon and that happened to be a really difficult day. We had probably eight inches of snow and there was a whiteout and we had half of the people come and we were not able to return money for tickets because the dinner was a go and we had no way to give the money back to all of those people. We had to have the dinner anyway but some people missed out. Other people did show up and they danced away and didn't worry about the storm but we had to worry about getting people back who were taking the bus, so we did have to contend with some of those issues. There is a problem when you try to get a large amount of people out during one day and having to look at that threat.

Alderman Arnold stated to my colleagues on the Board I apologize that I was not able to sit in on this discussion during Committee. Barbara, did I hear you correctly that you said the Senior Services Commission had taken a vote about this? Is that correct? I ask because I don't see any communication here and it is possible that I overlooked it. If there is no communication I am interested in knowing what the disposition of the vote was. Not necessarily 3-2 but I want to know what was the end result and if they wanted the price to go up.

Ms. Vigneault responded they did unanimously vote that it should be \$5 for the ticket to the luncheon.

Alderman Arnold replied out of curiosity, did they also weigh in on whether or not it should go from twice a year to once a year?

Ms. Vigneault answered they thought once a year. We had discussed it at length and Alderman Lopez had come to the meeting and was there to hear their remarks. It was not a very big concern of theirs. They thought that in representing the seniors that they would be willing to increase the fee. They didn't feel that there would be much negativity because the seniors in the community realize the value of the dinner and they realize what expenses are. They do want to contribute and give back.

Alderman Arnold stated I appreciate that clarification and I thank you for your department's work in planning and organizing the event. I had the opportunity to go to the most recent one with the Mayor and some other members of this Board and certainly the seniors in my ward appreciated it. Thank you.

Alderman Shea stated all I want to do is vote it up or down.

Alderman O'Neil stated Barbara, I am just going to ask this: Is staff is support of having an annual event or one event a year?

Ms. Vigneault responded yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked and the Commission voted and their recommendation is to have one event a year?

Ms. Vigneault answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked and staff is supportive of it going to \$5 per ticket?

Ms. Vigneault answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked and the Commission voted unanimously to increase the price to \$5 per ticket?

Ms. Vigneault answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated to the best of my knowledge you work with seniors every day and the Commission helps you in supporting those services so it is my opinion that you folks have the best read on what the seniors are willing to support. That is why I support the majority report recommendation.

Mayor Gatsas asked does anybody know what we charge students for hot lunch in school?

Alderman Ouellette answered \$1.80.

Mayor Gatsas stated so \$1.80 for lunch at school and that doesn't include dessert and milk. Does it include it all? What about in high school? I think it is \$2.15 in high school for lunch.

Alderman Ludwig asked Barbara, do you do fundraising to support other events at the Senior Center?

Ms. Vigneault replied yes. We raise what we call program money and that helps us to pay for the different things that we do. If we have a dinner or an event and it costs us say \$20, we charge \$10 and that other \$10 pays for the rest of the cost so we can keep the costs lower.

Alderman Ludwig stated several years ago I think the City put the responsibility on you and others, and I think Attorney Dave Nixon took the charge to fundraise significant dollars to offset what the City says we don't have the ability to pay for as related to the completion for payment for that facility. Is that correct?

Ms. Vigneault responded yes. It is a 501C3, Friends of the William B. Cashin Senior Activity Center, Inc. We are having our annual golf tournament on Thursday at the Derryfield Country Club. That raises money. Mike Craig is the Chairman of the golf event and that raises money for the Senior Center capital expenses and things that the Senior Center needs. Attorney Nixon is Chair of the funds.

Alderman Ludwig asked so is the debt paid for now that Attorney Nixon was raising funds for?

Ms. Vigneault answered yes.

Alderman Ludwig asked so that has been satisfied?

Ms. Vigneault answered yes, and the Committee a couple of years ago when they met their goal had voted to continue to help the Senior Center raise money.

Alderman Ludwig asked so the proceeds of the golf tournament today go towards what?

Ms. Vigneault replied it is a 501c3. It is an independent non-profit organization. Alderman Lopez is on that Committee as well. That money is not under my control. Attorney Dave Nixon can sign checks and it is an account that he oversees.

Alderman Lopez stated the 501c3 that Dave Nixon set up stipulates that none of the money can be used for operational expenses. The bylaws and constitution of the 501c3 are very specific. What we have done is paid off the \$500,000 debt that we took on the obligation for. We do have some funds. We bought a 46" TV. We put up a flag pole and bought flags for the Senior Center.

Mayor Gatsas asked would you like to buy lunch?

Alderman Lopez stated when they tear down the building and make it a parking lot we will probably do something in that area.

Alderman Ludwig asked can you tell me the balance of that account?

Alderman Lopez answered it is about \$40,000 right now. This has nothing to do with the luncheons or programs of the Senior Center.

Alderman Ludwig asked why wouldn't it?

Alderman Lopez stated it is a 5013C and it is in the constitution that it can't be used for operational expenses.

Alderman Ludwig responded well first of all the City-owned municipal golf course donates money to that program to the tune of about \$3,000 a year.

Mayor Gatsas replied I certainly appreciate where you are coming from Alderman Ludwig. I know that that discussion has been a spirited one.

Alderman Ludwig stated well I think you just found some money.

Alderman Lopez responded I don't think you found any money.

Alderman Ludwig replied I do. I am not trying to put her on the spot because I know they need every dime they get and fundraising is extremely difficult as we all know. Just ask the Mayor. He does it every day, I am sure, and she has been doing it probably her whole life over there. It is difficult when you get into these economic times but the fact of the matter is Derryfield Country Club has been donating, not the full amount that she earns by renting the golf course, but at least \$3,000 or \$25 times the number of players you get in that tournament. The Enterprise at the golf course donates...which is \$5 million in the hole today, Alderman Lopez, \$3,000 a year.

Alderman Lopez stated I will remind you, Alderman, that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen refused to give \$500,000 and people stepped forward and raised that money for this City.

Alderman Ludwig responded thank God for Attorney Nixon who took that charge. I think there is some money here that may be able to help the seniors with their lunch.

Mayor Gatsas stated I don't have a problem if Alderman Lopez would like to put a sub-committee together for people to go out and raise the money. I think Alderman Osborne and Alderman DeVries would probably like to participate in that. I don't have a problem with that. Let me just tell you that the people who work downstairs in the Information Booth will tell you that I participated. I paid for a ticket for every one of those people because they were coming upstairs wondering where their free tickets were. I can tell you that my staff this year took a different approach to who was going to get tickets and how they were going to

be distributed because there was never an accounting system of whether 400 people paid or 200 people paid. This year I thought it was our responsibility to take control of it. Certainly if we want to have three luncheons, let's raise the money and do three lunches. I don't have a problem doing that. Whatever we can do for seniors is a great thing. I think we should step up and do it. I think that in looking at the reductions we made last year at the Center of New Hampshire they probably don't want to see me coming back.

Alderman Shea moved the question.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman Lopez has asked for the chance to get an amendment in. I will allow him to speak.

Alderman Lopez moved to amend the majority report and increase the ticket price to \$5. Alderman Shea duly seconded the amendment.

Mayor Gatsas stated there is an amendment to the majority report. The majority report had two portions to it. One was to have one annual Mayor's Luncheon and the second portion was to leave the price at \$3. Alderman Lopez came in with an amendment to have one annual luncheon but at \$5 per ticket.

Alderman Osborne asked why don't we just take one motion at a time? Why do we have to have amendments? It is either the first motion or the second motion.

Mayor Gatsas answered he amended it. There was a second on the amendment.

Alderman Osborne asked why do you want to amend it? They both read the same outside the amount of the ticket price.

Mayor Gatsas answered I guess that is the process. I can only tell you what the process is.

Mr. Clark stated Your Honor, as the presiding officer you decide which motions are appropriate. Basically you can move to amend the majority report as has been tried or you can move to substitute the minority report for the majority report or you can just take the motions as they are worded.

Mayor Gatsas stated I have accepted the amendment so if you don't want to charge \$5 you can vote the amendment down. If you only want to charge \$3 then you would vote the subsequent report in its place. The motion before us is to have one annual senior luncheon and charge \$5.

Alderman Shea requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Shea, Shaw, Greazzo, Ouellette, Arnold, Craig, Roy, O'Neil, and Lopez voted yea. Aldermen DeVries, Ludwig, Long, Osborne, and Corriveau voted nay. The motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept the report as amended. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. The motion carried, with Aldermen DeVries, Ludwig, Long, Osborne and Corriveau duly recorded in opposition.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman Lopez, I would suggest that you put a sub-committee together to go out and help raise the money for that function.

Alderman Lopez stated I think Barbara is taking applications.

Mayor Gatsas responded I think you should set up a sub-committee.

Alderman Lopez replied there should be a sub-Committee of the Aldermen so they get involved.

Mayor Gatsas stated well let's set it up and you can nominate people. If I set it up you have to appoint people to it, don't you?

Alderman O'Neil stated you can probably get five volunteers.

Alderman Long stated I would be willing to volunteer for that committee.

Alderman Shaw stated I will volunteer also.

11. Reports of the Committee on Community Improvement.

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that a request from the Police Department to accept grant funds in the amount of \$36,606 from the United States Department of Justice to operate a multi-jurisdictional drug task force, CIP project 410711, be approved.

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

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Planning & Community Development Department and the Highway Department be authorized to enter into an agreement with Pilot Construction in an amount not to exceed \$690,000 for desired improvements to 434 Lake Avenue – Dearborn Hall subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

The Committee further recommends that the Planning & Community Development Department be authorized to revise the NSP Agreement with Manchester Neighborworks to reflect a transfer of \$190,000 from Neighborworks (NSP funds) to the City of Manchester and a reimbursement of an equal amount in City HOME funds.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept this report and adopt its recommendations.

Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Gatsas stated let me just say that I applaud the department for all of their hard work. This was not an easy one. I can tell you that they put this together in a very short time. It is very unusual to see that we can get this many people to participate on this project.

Alderman O'Neil responded it is more than one department. It was Planning & Community Development along with Public Works.

Mayor Gatsas replied I applaud them for their hard work in making sure that this project moves forward because I think it is going to make our lives a lot easier when we come to the CIP budget in January and we start allocating funds to different agencies. I think you are going to find that we can incorporate this building and put a lot of people in there and take away some of those administrative costs.

Alderman O'Neil responded we still have a little bit of infrastructure work.

Mayor Gatsas replied we do but I think we will get there. There is an opportunity for more federal funds. I think you are all aware that I do my darndest to find every federal dollar that we can find and people say that I am supporting candidates who are opposed to taking stimulus dollars, I tell to them I am the

Mayor and I am going to find every dollar I can find that is going to help the citizens of this City and possibly keep our costs down as a Board. So whatever I can do, if they decide that all stimulus dollars throughout the country will be stopped, that is a different story, but right now if they are flowing I am looking for them and anybody that is around I ask.

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

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

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting back to order.

14. Report of the Committee on Finance.

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

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Six Thousand, Six Hundred and Six Dollars (\$36,606) for the FY 2011 CIP 410711 NH Drug Task Force.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred, Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$380,000) for the FY 2010 CIP 612210 Neighborhood Stabilization Project.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred, Thirty Three Thousand, Four Hundred Thirty Dollars (\$133,430) for the FY 2010 CIP 712910 Energy Efficiency and Block Grant Program.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) for CIP 713510 Annual ROW Improvements.”

“Amending the FY 2008 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Million, Eight Hundred, Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$2,875,000) for CIP 711008 Design & Construction of Incinerator Upgrade at WWTF.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Dollars (\$13,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 612311 Elm Street Banner Pole Installation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ninety Four Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$94,400) for the FY 2011 CIP 511411 Piscataquog Trail Phase IV Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Four Thousand Six Hundred and Thirty Dollars (\$4,630) for the FY 2011 CIP 810711 Moose Plate Conservation Grant Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixteen Thousand Dollars (\$16,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 214211 Youth Opportunities Unlimited.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to waive reading of the report.

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

15. Reports of the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance.

There were no reports.

16. Reports of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading.

The Committee on Bills on Second Reading respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendment:

“Authorizing the Mayor to dispose of certain tax deeded property situated at Groveland Avenue, Manchester, New Hampshire known as Map 492, Lots 3A and 3B”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration for enrollment.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendation.

The Committee on Bills on Second Reading respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Section 70.57 Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding section (G) Special Event Parking to allow the Parking Division to charge \$5.00 per vehicle per day for parking in public and private lots controlled by the Parking Division on October 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, 2010”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration for enrollment.

Alderman DeVries moved to accept this report and adopt its recommendation.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman O'Neil being duly recorded in opposition.

The Committee on Bills on Second Reading respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicle and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding a new Residential Parking Permit Zone #8 in Section 70.55 (D)(8) Residential Parking Permit Zone #8 (Central High School area) and (G)(5) Special Restrictions for Zone #8”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration for enrollment.

Alderman DeVries moved to accept this report and adopt its recommendation.

Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. The motion carried, with Alderman Osborne being duly recorded in opposition.

The Committee on Bills on Second Reading respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicle and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending 70.36 Stopping, Standing and Parking by adding Section (E) Overtime Parking and Section (F) Penalty”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration for enrollment.

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

The Committee on Bills on Second Reading respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicle and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending 70.06 Definitions to add the definition of Overtime Parking”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration for enrollment.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to accept this report and adopt its recommendation.

17. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Six Thousand, Six Hundred and Six Dollars (\$36,606) for the FY 2011 CIP 410711 NH Drug Task Force.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred, Eighty Thousand Dollars (\$380,000) for the FY 2010 CIP 612210 Neighborhood Stabilization Project.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred, Thirty Three Thousand, Four Hundred Thirty Dollars (\$133,430) for the FY 2010 CIP 712910 Energy Efficiency and Block Grant Program.”

“Amending the FY 2010 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000) for CIP 713510 Annual ROW Improvements.”

“Amending the FY 2008 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Million, Eight Hundred, Seventy Five Thousand Dollars (\$2,875,000) for CIP 711008 Design & Construction of Incinerator Upgrade at WWTF.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Dollars (\$13,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 612311 Elm Street Banner Pole Installation Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ninety Four Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$94,400) for the FY 2011 CIP 511411 Piscataquog Trail Phase IV Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Four Thousand Six Hundred and Thirty Dollars (\$4,630) for the FY 2011 CIP 810711 Moose Plate Conservation Grant Project.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixteen Thousand Dollars (\$16,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 214211 Youth Opportunities Unlimited.”

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Arnold, it was voted to waive reading of the Resolutions.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Shaw, it was voted that the Resolutions ought to pass and be enrolled.

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Gatsas stated I will refer you to the pink sheet and if you give me a couple of minutes I will go through these very quickly. On September 10th the School District will be having a Remembrance Ceremony of 9/11. You have the information in the packet. September 15th is the Employee Appreciation Barbecue at the West Side Arena. I know that they are looking for contributions to offset that cost. If anybody would like to write a check, I think last year it was \$25 that they were asking from Board members. If you would like to write a check, you

can get it to my office and I will make sure it gets in the proper hands. I think it is something we should all try to get to if we can. There are always an awful lot of employees who participate and we should be there thanking them for their service to this great City. New Hampshire Chili Week is something that we have out there. There are probably seven or eight restaurants that are participating. There is a list as you will see enclosed. It starts this week to talk about the Chili Cook-Off. They are preparing chili in those restaurants for people to go out and taste and come back and tell us who they think is making the best chili around. This is just something that is setting us up for the Chili Festival that is coming in on October 1st, 2nd and 3rd. That leads to the next item regarding tickets. Tickets are available. If any Alderman wants to come in to the office and take 15 or 20 of them and go out and sell them that would be greatly appreciated. It is a \$5 fee; \$1 goes to a charity. There are three charities that are participating with the City in selling those tickets – New Horizons, Families in Transition and the YMCA. So again, if you can come in and sell a few and get them out on the streets that would be a great thing. We also have tickets available for the parking. Last week we had the kick-off for the City Year program that is in five schools in Manchester. We have 56 Corps members that you will see throughout the City. They have been doing a great job already. I know that they have been in some of the schools and painted playgrounds and made the playgrounds look very good. I think it is important that every time you see them you thank them because I think they are going to make a big, big difference in the education and lives of a lot of students in the City. I look forward to working with them during the course of the year and I ask you if you are out and about and visiting Beech Street, Bakersville, Wilson, Gossler or Parker Varney to go and speak to the City Year people because they are in the schools. Not only are they there during the school day but they are in there before school starts and they are there after school ends working with the students there. The other thing is the Exit 6/7 Project/TIGER II Planning Grant is moving forward. I talked to the DOT Commissioner. He has been working hand-in-hand

with me to see if we can get this on the Planning Board agenda and get it moving. If we can get it at least planned out and drawn up who knows? Maybe we will find some stimulus dollars because right now they are talking about more dollars coming into the pipeline to conclude that Exit 6/7 interchange that we are all talking about. I think it is something very important. Alderman Arnold would you like to weigh in on that?

Alderman Arnold stated I will just say that I think you laid out the facts in your letter very well. I appreciate you writing the letter in support of the TIGER II grant and I appreciate all of your efforts to help move this up on the priority scale with the state. Certainly Front Street and 3A are in bad need of traffic mitigation and hopefully with the completion of this project the residents on that side of town will be able to enjoy that. Thank you.

Mayor Gatsas responded hopefully we can move this forward and I am going to look at my colleagues that are in the Senate and House to make sure we can move that project a little closer to the front on that timeline, on that ten year plan for the funding of it.

Alderman Long asked is this where I read that Hooksett wasn't in support of this? I thought it was the TIGER II grant?

Mayor Gatsas answered that was Joint Sustainability.

Alderman DeVries stated while we are talking about trying to bring federal dollars in, I was going to ask Mr. Sanders if he might compile a list for us on all of the stimulus dollars that have been given to the City. It has been awhile since we have seen that and it seems like we are...I thank you for actively pursuing those

but I think we should have a handle on...it's many millions and we should probably know that.

Mayor Gatsas replied we are working on it.

Alderman DeVries stated we have to thank our Congressional delegation for that.

Mayor Gatsas stated there are two more items. Regarding the purchase and sale agreement on the 295 Lincoln Street property, there is a referral to Committee so that we can get that out and then also the purchase and sale for Boston & Maine Corporation for referral to Committee. I told you that when it was drawn up it would be sent to Committee for their review.

Alderman Arnold stated I appreciate that, Your Honor, and I would like to move for discussion if I can. I hope it will be brief.

Mayor Gatsas responded go ahead.

Alderman Arnold stated I want to preface my comments by saying that I support this project. I think it is a badly needed project. I think that just about every member of this Board believes that it has been a long time waiting to see this project materialize. I don't want my comments to be misunderstood as either an opposition to the project or that what I am suggesting will in any way delay the project. What I am suggesting however, and, Your Honor, I am glad to see the draft purchase and sale agreements go to Lands & Buildings to be discussed and vetted there...

Mayor Gatsas interjected it is all about process.

Alderman Arnold replied I can appreciate that as I am sure all of the members of this Board can appreciate that. What I will ask this Board for is an instruction to the City Assessor's office to conduct a summary appraisal of the Lincoln Street property and they can report to the Lands & Buildings Committee at the same time the Committee takes up the draft purchase and sale agreement. We have in-house appraiser and Assessors. They are on the taxpayer dime. I certainly think that a major part of their job is to provide information to this Board so that we can make informed decisions. I think that everyone in this room can agree that by making informed decisions we are doing the best service to the people who sent us here. With that, I will move to refer the purchase and sale agreements to Committee and also ask that the Board instruct the Assessor's office to report to that Committee as I have indicated.

Mayor Gatsas asked are you not comfortable with the outside appraisal? I think the City Solicitor will tell you that based on an arms length transaction with somebody else other than a City department...and certainly I used the Assessors for the Water Works because they were within the City, but I think that taking a look at where the appraisal is on an arms length transaction is a little bit of a different position. We are not authorized as a Board to do anything else other than to get somebody on the outside to do an appraisal on the property.

Alderman Arnold answered as I mentioned I think a major part of the function of the City Assessors...they are, after all, City officers and they are there to be the individuals that are skilled in this kind of professional service. I think they should provide guidance to members of the Board like me. I know that I would feel better sleeping at night having them weigh in before the Lands & Buildings Committee and this Board as a whole. That is why I am asking for it to be done in-house.

Mayor Gatsas replied have you seen the report that was done that was authorized by the Highway Department and ordered by...

Alderman Arnold interjected well this Board has not seen the full appraisal.

Mayor Gatsas asked have you seen the full appraisal?

Alderman Arnold answered I have.

Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion to refer the purchase and sale agreements to the Committee on Lands & Buildings and have the Board instruct the Assessor's office to do an appraisal on the 295 Lincoln Street property and report back to the Committee.

Alderman Arnold stated you actually made my point for me, Your Honor. There is information out there. The appraisal that was done by the outside third party I think should be made to the Board members as well.

Mayor Gatsas responded I think that I said to everybody that anybody who wanted that appraisal would be able to get a copy. I didn't hear that anybody wanted it. Who did you talk to to get the appraisal?

Alderman Arnold replied I don't understand.

Mayor Gatsas stated when we got into the discussion about process I said that if anybody wants to see the appraisal that was done on the property I would issue that copy or they could go down and see Mr. Sheppard at the Highway Department for a copy and I didn't hear from anybody.

Alderman Arnold responded I can appreciate your experience on that but how in any way does that affect this Board's responsibility to get in-house advice?

Mayor Gatsas stated let me have the City Solicitor weigh in because getting advice...if the Assessors come back and say it is worth \$1.9 million is your advice to say we are going to pay more for it?

Alderman Arnold replied my advice would be that this Board not do anything without having all of the information in front of it. More information can never hurt.

Mayor Gatsas responded well it can if somebody says it is \$1.9 million and we have a purchase and sale, and the person says I want to go with your Assessor's number.

Alderman Arnold stated I think that is a legitimate point; however, how could anyone ask this Board to render any decision based on incomplete information? If it is \$1.9 million then it is \$1.9 million.

Mayor Gatsas replied but that is an unfair comment because this Board has always worked on the premise of outside appraisals. Nobody has ever asked for the Assessor to come up when we have asked for properties to be assessed and valued.

Alderman Arnold asked can you explain to me what the harm is of depending on the in-house Assessors?

Mayor Gatsas answered let the Solicitor tell you what the harm might be.

Mr. Clark stated there is no requirement that we have an outside appraisal. There is a requirement that we only pay fair market value. How that is determined...there have been times in the past I believe when it has been determined through the Assessor's office but the majority of the time we do it through appraisals.

Mayor Gatsas responded well I have never been on this Board when the Assessors have come in with a number on a property that we were either selling or buying. Maybe before that it might have been done but not in the ten years I have been here.

Alderman Lopez stated my colleague might have the answer to this but any time that we have asked the Assessors to give us an appraisal they went out and hired somebody and it cost us money to do the appraisal. In the situation we are in now, I don't know if...Mike can you address this as to whether you can do an appraisal of the property that we are speaking of in detail as an outside appraiser?

Alderman Arnold replied just to be clear, I am asking for a summary appraisal. I am not necessarily asking for detailed pictures of all of the comparable properties and all of that, but I do want to give the taxpayers who are already paying these Assessors to be skilled in this area the opportunity to weigh in.

Alderman Lopez responded then the question is what could you give us?

Mr. Hurley replied I would say at this point, considering our staffing, I don't think we could do a full appraisal. We have a lot of court case work coming up. We could probably do a summary report where we could look at the appraisal and see if anything sticks out and I could have the Commercial Appraiser that we have in the office see what information he has on sales for surrounding properties and

put it in a quick couple of pages. The way we are staffed now we couldn't do a full appraisal. We just wouldn't have the time to do that.

Alderman Greazzo asked can you give us some kind of guidance as to what this property was valued at prior to the announcement of this project and what it is worth now?

Mr. Hurley answered I believe it was assessed at \$627,000 from the 2006 revaluation. Our equalization rate is 116.7. Pardon my math but that could be a market value of say \$540,000 off the top of my head or in that area.

Alderman Greazzo asked so in your efforts to compile any information that you are going to forward on to the Committee can you include fair market value prior and post?

Mr. Hurley replied yes. What we would do is try to see what information we have in the office currently and we could do it that way. Again we don't have the manpower to do a detailed appraisal.

Alderman Arnold stated for the members of the Board, I am not suggesting that something is necessarily defective with the third party appraisal. I just simply believe that the more information we have, the better informed we will be to make the decisions we are sent here to make. That is all I am trying to accomplish by having the Assessor's office weigh in on this.

Mayor Gatsas responded it looks like somebody has already asked him to do his homework. He rattled those numbers off pretty quick. Have you had conversations with the Assessor in regards to this?

Alderman Arnold answered I have inquired of the Assessor of their ability to conduct a summary appraisal.

Mayor Gatsas asked so the Assessor has never given you any numbers?

Alderman Arnold answered the Assessor gave me the tax card, which as it turns out wasn't presented to this Board either. Correct me if I am wrong but I think it is public knowledge. Anyone can go down and pick up tax cards.

Mayor Gatsas responded absolutely.

Alderman Roy stated I certainly haven't talked to the Assessor but I did get an e-mail from a constituent and he mentioned numbers very similar to this. I am looking forward to getting all of the information. I love the project so let's get it all together and get it done.

Alderman Shea stated in your opinion, Your Honor, does this waylay the situation? In other words, my understanding is that you have an agreement that we are going to vote on. Does this present a problem in terms of how...

Mayor Gatsas interjected you will have to ask Alderman Arnold that question.

Alderman Arnold responded I would be happy to answer it. I think what the Alderman is asking is does this delay us at all or does it in any way inhibit the project. Is that what you are asking?

Alderman Shea replied yes.

Alderman Arnold stated the answer is no because what I am asking is that the Assessor's Office report to the Lands & Buildings Committee at their next meeting when the Committee will be taking up the purchase and sale agreement.

Alderman Shea asked what are you looking for? I am not quite sure what you are trying to find out that we don't know.

Alderman Arnold answered what I am simply hoping to do is this, Alderman, and I can't speak for everyone on the Board...

Alderman Shea interjected no I am just asking what you are hoping to do.

Alderman Arnold stated well what I am hoping to do is get the Assessor's Office to weigh in because they are City officers and my understanding is that they are at our disposal particularly in instances when we are asked to purchase or sell things that involve taxpayer dollars. I am simply looking for information. I wanted to qualify my comments and say that I am not suggesting that something is defective with the third party appraisal. I just don't see any reason why more information would hurt. It may be that the Assessors come back with a very comparable number but we don't know that until they do it.

Alderman Shea responded I am just trying to figure out exactly where we are in the process. In other words could you fill me in, Your Honor, as to where we are and then I can probably learn more about this? Where are we in the process?

Mayor Gatsas replied I can only tell you that obviously there have been referrals, as I said to everybody that we would send the two purchase and sale agreements - one on this property and one on the B&M Railroad. Are you asking them to do the same thing on B&M?

Alderman Arnold responded my particular interest does not involve the B&M Railroad.

Mayor Gatsas replied but I would think in fairness that we would do them both.

Alderman Arnold stated well I will defer to the will of the Board but my...

Mayor Gatsas interjected in fairness we should do them both.

Alderman Arnold responded as I said, Your Honor, I will defer to the wishes of the Board.

Alderman Shea asked so, Your Honor you made some sort of...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I just referred both agreements like I said I would.

Alderman Shea asked what is the agreement?

Mayor Gatsas answered there is a purchase and sale agreement for \$950,000 on the Lincoln Street property. The appraised value that came in from Fremereau Appraisers was \$1.1 million. I guess what I just heard is a value of \$537,000 based on the Assessor's known value of \$635,000 on the assessed value and then the...

Mr. Hurley interjected the assessment card itself is \$627,000 and if you apply the ratio...that is just what the card says. There hasn't been anything done. The property record card says \$627,000 and the equalizer would be \$537,000.

Alderman Shea asked if he comes in with a figure that is \$300,000 less or whatever does the guy that you are dealing with say forget it?

Mayor Gatsas answered it would be up to this Board. If they say that they only want to pay him \$300,000 then he may say forget it.

Alderman Arnold stated I am in complete agreement.

Mayor Gatsas stated so it would be up to this Board.

Alderman Shea asked and then Water Works would obviously decide to...

Mayor Gatsas interjected no, I think at that point we have a problem.

Alderman Shea stated yes, that is what I was thinking.

Alderman Greazzo asked can we get the same information for the B&M tract of land, what the fair market value was before the announcement of this and what it is today?

Mr. Hurley answered sure.

Mayor Gatsas stated with all due fairness then you should ask the appraiser to come in here because he didn't value the property based on this sale or not. He based it on what the value of the property was. We shouldn't be making insinuations that the value of the property went up because the City was coming to buy it.

Alderman Arnold responded I didn't make that insinuation, Your Honor.

Mayor Gatsas replied well, I think there were discussions around it.

Alderman Arnold stated if I made that insinuation I certainly didn't intend to. I am just trying to get the Assessor's Office to weigh in.

Alderman Greazzo stated that is certainly not my intent. I think that the owners of each of these properties did themselves a good service waiting until this project was moving forward before they decided to sell their own pieces of property. You can't fault them for that. I would just like to see what the values were then and what they are now.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. Hurley, are you going to comment on the appraisal or are you just going to do your own?

Mr. Hurley answered right now my understanding is that we are going to do a summary report, and if we do a summary report, I guess you would have whatever the two numbers come out at.

Alderman Lopez asked apples to apples?

Mr. Hurley answered yes we could. We are just going to come out...like I said it is not going to be detailed. We will come out with a summary report that says the value range would be X and whatever that happens to be versus the appraisal number...

Alderman Lopez interjected so if there is something that you did or your staff did then whoever did the appraisal should come to Lands & Buildings too in case there is a dispute.

Mr. Hurley stated that would be up to the Committee. I have just been asked if we could look at a number and that is the only thing I am going to do.

Alderman Lopez responded I think it would be fair to make sure that your calculations are the same.

Mr. Hurley replied correct.

Alderman Osborne stated for the last ten years anyway any assessed value out there on residential properties like my home, the assessed value is right on the head, just about what it is worth on the market. It is public information. It is something you can go down to the Assessor's Office and find out what any assessment is on the value of a property. It depends on what you want to do and how much you want to spend. That is about it. Did you say \$650,000 was what it was assessed for?

Mr. Hurley responded I believe it is in that general vicinity.

Alderman Osborne asked and are we paying what, \$950,000? It is what you need and what you don't need.

Alderman O'Neil stated what I am hearing...and I apologize because I was out back for a little bit. Is the recommendation to send the two purchase and sale agreements to the Lands & Buildings Committee.

Mayor Gatsas stated that is what I agreed to do at the last Board meeting. We had to make sure that they had an opportunity to look at it.

Alderman O'Neil responded what I am hearing Alderman Arnold asking for is some additional information specifically from the Assessor's Office. It has been suggested that we may want to have...did the same firm do both appraisals?

Mayor Gatsas answered no. There was no appraisal done on the B&M property.

Alderman O'Neil stated okay. At least the firm that did the appraisal on the one parcel I don't think it would hurt to have them here. From the top of my head I don't know if you sit on Lands & Buildings or not Alderman Arnold.

Alderman Arnold responded I do not.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am sure you would make yourself available to attend that meeting. It shouldn't slow up the project and we should be able to get this done. It is clear that Alderman Greazzo has some concerns. We should just make sure they are answered. I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

Alderman Shea stated to me I think we are probably kicking a can down the street here because to me it makes no sense to delay a process that is so much into the design and other monies that we have laid out for what we are trying to do. In other words it is a delay tactic as far as I am concerned. I don't think it is going to add anything that is going to be positive to the process. As far as I am concerned, I would just as soon not support the proposal made by Alderman Arnold and I ask the Board to vote on it and I request a roll call.

Alderman Arnold stated I would like the privilege of a response, Your Honor. Alderman, I thought that it was clear that there is no delay because what we are asking for and Mr. Hurley has confirmed that the Assessor's Office is capable of accomplishing, is to report to the Lands & Buildings Committee at their next

meeting. It is not like it is something special. I appreciate, Your Honor, that you did bring the P&S agreements that have been drafted by the Solicitor to be referred to Committee. So they were already going to be doing that. I guess I am puzzled as to how this could be described as a delay tactic when all we are asking for is more information to be presented to this Board through the Lands & Buildings Committee when they were going to take the issue up anyway.

Alderman Shea asked may I respond? I think really it is a waste of time because I don't think it makes much sense to delay a project that we voted on. Initially you and Alderman Roy voted to delay the process because of whatever procedures you felt were not done according to what you wanted. The Committee has one vote. If they want to proceed with what you are suggesting that is fine. If they don't want to, then they can vote the other way.

Alderman Arnold answered I can appreciate that but respectfully, Alderman, I can't speak for Alderman Roy but I voted no at the special meeting because I had inadequate information not because I sought to delay the process. In fact, I gave that specific qualification. I said it then and I said it tonight. It is not my intention or my hope that this project be delayed. It is, however, my hope and my intention to insure that this Board gets all of the information that we can possibly get before rendering a decision.

Alderman Shea replied if you feel that way, that is wonderful. I don't feel that way. I feel we have enough information.

Alderman Roy stated my name was brought up so I thought I should respond. That night and we will go back to the word process...

Mayor Gatsas interjected I think that is when the votes were no votes. There were two Aldermen who voted for that same reason. It was process and not anything else.

Alderman Roy stated I want to thank you for getting this and sending it back to Committee because now it is going to go through the process. At the same time, I want all of the information I can gather so when it is in front of that Committee that I sit on I have all of the information and the transparency is there. If it comes in that this property is valued \$50,000 less than I am paying for it, good. I will let everyone know that it is valued \$50,000 less than what I am paying for it because I think it is important to the project. I have no problem doing it. That is why I want that information. It has nothing to do with slowing the process down. I don't want to see it delayed. I was talking with Alderman O'Neil two years ago about the fact that that garage needs to be taken care of. That was a priority. So I want this to go forward as quickly as possible. I just want all of the information. I don't think that getting this information is going to slow that process down whatsoever.

Alderman Osborne stated being the Chairman of Lands & Buildings, I look at it this way. I have no problem bringing it back to my Committee. I don't refuse anybody anything, but I am telling you this: The way I look at it from my perspective is this was appraised for \$650,000 or \$637,000 or whatever you had for a figure there and we had a sales agreement for \$950,000 so all we can say to ourselves is that they got away with not paying the right amount of taxes.

Mayor Gatsas responded no, that is not true.

Alderman Osborne asked no?

Mayor Gatsas replied no because the appraised value in today's market...there is no way that they can go out...there was a revaluation coming. You can say that next year but five years ago that is what they were assessed at. There is no question that maybe values have changed.

Alderman Osborne stated I am just saying when they were assessed five years ago.

Mayor Gatsas stated well that could have been the right number five years ago.

Alderman Osborne stated mine hasn't changed. Not that much. I am just saying that when it was appraised maybe it was a little low at that time. I understand. That is the way I look at it. I have no problem with the whole deal. I am just saying that this is the way I look at it. They were just paying taxes over the past five years for \$637,000 and that is the way it is. That is not anybody's fault. That is just the way it is and we are offering to buy it for \$950,000 and that is the story.

Alderman Shea stated I respect my colleagues as far as the information they need to make a decision. I really respect that. If they want the information they are welcome to get it but to involve the whole Board I don't see that helping me personally because my particular thoughts run along the lines that we have an agreement and I think it is fair. The appraisal has come forth and if Alderman Roy and Alderman Arnold need additional information to make their decision they are welcome to gather that information. I don't feel personally at this time that I need any more information. I am for the project. I think that you went out and made a fair decision and it is up to us to vote that decision either up or down in Lands & Buildings. With that, I hope we can vote now.

Mayor Gatsas responded I certainly don't have a problem with that. I just hope that I don't get a call tomorrow morning and somebody says the deal is off because I don't want to be put through this. If that is the case then I guess we have done what we have done.

Alderman Shea asked can we have a vote on the motion?

Mayor Gatsas replied Alderman Greazzo wants to say something.

Alderman Greazzo stated I actually have to disagree with Alderman Osborne that the assessed value isn't necessarily the fair market value. My property was assessed at \$347,000 at the last revaluation and I couldn't sell it for \$247,000 right now if I wanted to. So my request for the information is to get my head around the correlation between this project being able to increase the value of a property. I wish it had sprung up next to my house. I don't fault anybody for taking advantage of that. I would just like to be able to see that on paper what the value was on the card and what fair market value is. That is really my concern.

Alderman Arnold stated just to respond to your comment, Your Honor, I think there are a lot of "what ifs". The Lands & Buildings Committee may take a look at the purchase and sale agreement and have other questions. That is the purpose of it going to Committee.

Mayor Gatsas responded then I am going to suggest that the Highway Department right now stop because right now they are moving on a dime that they don't have. So we should stop until you get the information that you feel comfortable with on this project.

Alderman Arnold stated I disagree.

Mayor Gatsas stated well don't disagree. Let's ask him. How much is left in that account to be spent? You are just about moving forward to spend money that you don't have.

Alderman Arnold asked how does this Board getting additional information in any way cause delay for the Highway Department?

Mayor Gatsas answered I certainly appreciate you asking me the question but I guess you could have asked me that question in the last two weeks because you were searching for information and if you had come to me I probably could have had that discussion with you but it looks like you wanted to do it publicly. These two things that I put on under new business were going to the Committee. You could have gone there and addressed that in Committee. Right now we have a seller who is a very key person in moving this project forward.

Alderman Arnold responded I agree with that statement. I think that the Lands & Buildings Committee, in doing their due diligence just as all of us would, will take a look at all of the information and then vote on it.

Mayor Gatsas replied I agree but I think right now we have to stop the project because if we don't have these people...

Alderman Arnold interjected well that might be your opinion but it is not the opinion of this Alderman and I don't know if it is the opinion of this Board.

Mayor Gatsas stated why don't we hear from the gentleman who is running this project and moving it forward? Would you like to hear from him because we heard from the Assessor? Let's hear from Kevin Sheppard because I didn't know

that discussion on this was coming up. Let's find out how much money he has left before he is going to be coming to this Board.

Alderman O'Neil responded in defense of this discussion that could be true. These documents need to go to Lands & Buildings and that discussion could happen there and the Committee could have a problem. This is all part of this process and I think it is a little unfair to be taking shots at the Alderman who made the suggestion.

Mayor Gatsas replied I think the important issue is that they can happen there and if somebody says we don't want to go along with B&M's request and B&M doesn't want to make any movement, then that project moves out. If the Committee wants to change the other document on the other piece of property and the gentleman says no then I guess we need to start again on where we are moving to. I think having this discussion publicly when somebody tomorrow can say, 'Guess what. I don't even want to talk to you guys anymore.'

Alderman O'Neil stated this discussion could happen at Lands & Buildings.

Mayor Gatsas stated it could but I think we are doing it today outside of the speculation of where it could be. We don't have the appraiser in here telling us how he came up with the value of \$1.1 million.

Alderman Arnold stated in defense of why it is coming up in public tonight versus having a private conversation with you in your office, it is my understanding that in order for the Assessor's Office to do anything on behalf of this Board it should have an instruction or mandate from the Board.

Mayor Gatsas responded no I think the Chairman of Lands & Buildings can ask for that

Alderman Arnold replied okay. It is my intention to not delay the project at all and obviously if the Lands & Buildings Committee wanted the Assessor to weigh in I am sure it would take them a little bit of time to get the information. This way, it is all ready for the Lands & Buildings Committee at their next meeting.

Alderman Lopez asked do we know when the next Lands & Buildings Committee is?

City Clerk Matthew Normand answered it is September 20th.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make a comment. I think the vote was 12-2 to move forward in good faith. I think that Mike, knowing about this project and the value of that property is it true or not true that when something is driven the value of the property might be more than it is assessed for or market value?

Mr. Hurley responded sure. There could be plenty of variables. It could be that a shift since the 2006 revaluation hasn't occurred in that area. That is a possibility. Another thing to consider is the fact that the seller knows that the project is going in. That might be a tough thing to put into an appraisal because he already knows. There are multiple variables that could come through.

Alderman Lopez stated that is what I want everyone to keep in mind. Let this go to Lands & Buildings but understand that people know this project is driven. Kevin Sheppard can't go forward in looking for a project manager. On the 21st I will be appointing five Aldermen to a Committee to oversee this project. Let's get

whatever information the Alderman wants but I think we have to evaluate this so that the project can move forward.

Alderman Arnold replied I completely agree with you that the project has to move forward. If no one else wishes to be heard, I would like a roll call vote.

Mayor Gatsas asked what is the motion?

Alderman Arnold answered that the items be referred to the Lands & Buildings Committee.

Mayor Gatsas stated that has already been done. What is the motion on what you want to do?

Alderman Arnold responded I didn't realize that it had already been done.

Mayor Gatsas replied it is right in front of you that I am referring those two purchase and sale agreements to Committee. Do you have a separate motion over and above that?

***Alderman Arnold** stated yes. The motion would be that this Board instruct the Assessor's Office to conduct a summary appraisal of the Lincoln Street property and report to the Lands & Buildings Committee at their next meeting.*

***Alderman Roy** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Roy stated I would like to amend the motion to include the B&M property as well.

Alderman Arnold responded that is fine.

Alderman Roy stated I wanted to agree with Alderman Lopez that this is driven. There is no doubt about it. I want to make the point that the reason I voted against this last time, and I was talking about process, was I was afraid that something like this was going to come up and we didn't...we voted on the purchase and sale last time without having it in our hands. I appreciate that it is going to go through the process now but we are having this discussion and we probably could have avoided it.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote. Aldermen Arnold, Craig, Ludwig, Long, Roy, Osborne, Corriveau, O'Neil, Lopez, DeVries, Greazzo and Ouellette voted yea. Aldermen Shea and Shaw voted nay. The motion carried.

Alderman Shaw stated I have a question. I don't want my neighbor to get angry but the Fire Prevention Parade is going to be on October 3rd and that is the same day that the Chili Fest concludes. Is this going to interfere? Are there going to be problems with traffic or whatever?

Mayor Gatsas responded I can only tell you that the conversation we are having is that the parade I think goes up Merrimack Street. I think in the past it went down to Central Street and up but if we can move it up Merrimack Street I think that would be fine. I think it will just bring more people downtown and get them to the Chili Cook Off afterwards. I know the breakfast is at 9 AM. The parade kicks off at noon time and usually takes about an hour. I think we will be fine.

Alderman Long stated Mr. & Mrs. Rosenthal spoke at public participation about 189 and 193 Cedar Street. There has been a long history of...they own the apartment building next to it where they live. There has been a history of

problems with their neighbors who are renters. I tried forever to get in touch with the owner who lives in Mount Vernon. I had an initiative with the NET team but due to enforcement issues there were things like the Health Department not visually seeing the problems so they couldn't put a fine on it. Knowing that now the building has been closed and unoccupied and water shut off, I don't understand how we could allow these people to remain living in this apartment building. Obviously it is not adding to the quality of life in that neighborhood. I don't understand how they are legally allowed to be living there.

Mayor Gatsas asked do you want to ask the Chief?

Mr. David Mara, Chief of Police, stated it would have to be a joint venture for us to get involved in that. If people are there who are not supposed to be, we can enforce the law and it would be criminal trespassing. If somebody is in there who has no legal right to be in there we can certainly take action but we need a victim. I think that based on what you just said it has to do with violations of having someone in there without an occupancy permit or without any lights or water. I think we could go after them on two fronts but I would have to look into it.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think what we heard Chief was the building has been...has the Fire Department deemed it uninhabitable? I think what we heard was the water has been turned off and there are people living in there who shouldn't be in there because the building is actually...you can't get into it and maybe we can sit down tomorrow and get some clarification.

Mr. Mara responded with those facts we certainly could take action for criminal trespassing as well as making sure that the building is posted.

Alderman Long replied there is an X on the building from what I understand. They have already posted.

Mr. Mara stated well it shouldn't be a problem for us to enforce it. If somebody is in there then we can take action under state law.

Alderman O'Neil stated I thought we were doing a lot better with the Neighborhood Enhancement Team but it appears there has been a recent breakdown. Can we just remind...and I will make a motion so there is a vote of this Board, that we expect full cooperation of all departments. They have to communicate with each other. I know we have talked about trying to come up with some kind of tracking system and Jennie tried to come up with something where they all can go on it and know what each department is doing but it is clear that if what the gentleman who spoke earlier said is true that there is a breakdown in communication in City government.

***Alderman O'Neil** moved to remphasize the importance of the Neighborhood Enhancement Team stating that all departments are expected to fully cooperate with each other on this. **Alderman Ouellette** duly seconded the motion. **Mayor Gatsas** called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

Mayor Gatsas stated I have one other thing before we conclude. There is a fitness challenge that is coming to the City. It is coming very soon. If I have to participate because my office is getting involved in this we will look at the rest of you to also have to participate. It starts on Monday. Alderman Craig is the first one to lead us on the charge I know. On Monday, 9/13, we will be starting and we will be in touch to let you know what some of the things are. I know that one of the challenges is if somebody sees me taking the elevator I have to give them \$1. So that means the stairs will be used.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Ludwig**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk