

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN**

September 21, 2010

7:30 PM

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

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.

Ratify and Confirm Poll Conducted

- A. Ratify and confirm poll conducted of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on September 10, 2010 accepting the report of the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic recommending that the request from Intown Manchester for free parking at the Victory Garage, on Elm Street and adjoining side streets off of Elm Street from Orange Street to Lake Avenue, during their annual Taste of Downtown Manchester Event to be held between the hours of 5:00 pm and 8:00 pm on September 15, 2010 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

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

- B.** Sidewalk Petitions:
85 Westwood Drive
246 Ashland Street

Approve under supervision of the Department of Highways

- C.** Pole Petitions:

11-1282 (1) 251 Villa Street
11-1277 (1) Campbell Street

Information to be Received and Filed

- D.** Approved minutes from the MTA Commission meeting held August 3, 2010, July 2010 Financial Report, and July 2010 Ridership Report submitted by Michael Whitten, Executive Director MTA.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

- F.** Bond Resolution:

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

- G.** Recommending that a request for sewer abatement for 105 Brae Burn Drive be denied as recommended by EPD.
(Unanimous vote)

- H.** Recommending that a request for sewer abatement for 20 Milky Way #2 be granted in the amount of \$2,454.34 as recommended by EPD.
(Unanimous vote)
- I.** Recommending that a request for sewer abatement for 257 Ledgewood Road be denied as recommended by EPD.
(Unanimous vote)
- J.** Advising that the petition to release and discharge from public servitude a portion of Schuyler Street submitted by Jeanniffer Mills of Notre Dame Avenue has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)
- K.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization appropriating funds in the amount of \$25,000 for the FY 2011 CIP 612411 Façade Improvement Project be approved.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Greazzo who voted in opposition)
- L.** Recommending that the ARRA Recovery Zone Facility Bonds allocation of \$8,966,000 be used towards the four qualifying projects outlined within.
(Unanimous vote)
- M.** Recommending that the request from Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, to set up a separate fund to accept contributions from participating businesses for the cooperative marketing program be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- N.** Recommending that the request from the Planning & Community Development Director to accept grant funds in the amount \$5,000 from the New Hampshire Department of Justice to be used to conduct alcohol compliance checks CIP project 410211 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- O.** Recommending that the request from the Planning & Community Development Director to accept grant funds in the amount \$5,000 from the Endowment for Health and \$15,000 from the Bean Foundation to fund the development of a new five year strategic plan CIP project 214511 be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

- P.** Recommending that the request from the Planning & Community Development Director to rescind \$590,000 of the Bond Resolution for Annual ROW Reconstruction Program, CIP 711209 be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

- Q.** Recommending that the request from the Planning & Community Development Director to revise the City's current agreement with NeighborWorks of Greater Manchester so that applications for assistance by owner occupied property owners could be processed through their organization be approved.

The Committee further recommends that the Planning Department provide updates quarterly.

(Unanimous vote)

- R.** Recommending that the City accept a partial payment of \$3,000 of the \$15,000 balance owed to discharge the mortgage for property located at 140 Conant Street.

(Aldermen O'Neil, Ludwig and Shea voted yea; Aldermen Craig and Greazzo voted nay)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH & TRAFFIC

- S. 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 ANYTIME:

On Lincoln Street, east side, from Amherst Street to a point 120 feet north (Ord. 3233)

Alderman Roy

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Beech Street, west side, from a point 100 feet north of Myrtle Street to a point 40 feet north

Alderman Ludwig

On Hanover Street, south side, from a point 308 feet east of Mammoth Road to a point 27 feet east

Laurel Street, north side, from Hall Street to Wilson Street

Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME – (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

On Central Street, south side, from Cass Street to Kenney Street

Alderman Osborne

HANDICAP PARKING ONLY – (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

On Dearborn Street, west side, from a point 117 feet south of Summer Street to a point 25 feet south

Alderman Osborne

ONE WAY STREET – (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

Monadnock Lane, from Union Street to Pine Street – Westbound

Alderman Long

RESCIND METERS – 2 HOURS:

Manchester Street, north side, from Elm Street to Chestnut Street

Alderman Long

ORD 9579

METERS – 2 HOURS (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

Manchester Street, north side, from Elm Street to a point 567 feet easterly
Alderman Long

RESCIND METERS – 2 HOURS:

Manchester Street, south side, from a point 50 feet east of Elm Street to
Chestnut Street
Alderman Long
ORD 9580

METERS – 2 HOURS (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

Manchester Street, south side, from a point 143 feet east of Elm Street to a
point 424 feet easterly
Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING:

Manchester Street, south side, from a point 50 feet east of Elm Street to a
point 55 feet east of Nutfield Lane
Alderman Long
ORD 3289

NO PARKING (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

Manchester Street, south side, from Elm Street to a point 68 feet easterly
Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

Manchester Street, south side, from a point 20 feet east of Elm Street to a
point 30 feet east
Alderman Long
ORD 6484

**NO PARKING LOADING ZONE MONDAY – FRIDAY 8:00 AM –
5:00 PM (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):**

Manchester Street, south side, from a point 68 feet east of Elm Street to a
point 39 feet easterly
Alderman Long
ORD 6484

**IN-STREET SCHOOL PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SIGN
PLACEMENT:**

Union Street and Merrimack Street - St. Casimir School
Agreement attached
Alderman Long

**RESCIND NO PARKING DURING SCHOOL HOURS –
EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

On Briar Ave., south side, from Michigan Ave. to Briar Ave. (Ord. 8516)
Alderman Corriveau

**NO PARKING 7 AM – 3 PM ON SCHOOL DAYS – EMERGENCY
ORDINANCE:**

On Briar Ave., north side, from Beaver Street to Michigan Ave.
On Beaver Street, east side, from Sanford Street to Olive Street
Alderman Roy
On Briar Ave., south side, from a point 168 feet east of Michigan Ave. to
Beaver Street
Alderman Corriveau

NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Briar Ave., south side, from Michigan Ave. to a point 48 feet east
On Briar Ave., south side, from point 114 feet east of Michigan Ave. to a
point 54 feet east
Alderman Corriveau

**NO PARKING-PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF ONLY – 7 AM -3 PM –
SCHOOL DAYS- EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

On Briar Ave., south side, from a point 48 feet east of Michigan Ave. to a
point 66 feet east
Alderman Corriveau
(*Unanimous vote*)

- T.** 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
--

STOP SIGNS – 4 WAY:

On North Adams Street at Appleton Street – SEC, NWC

***Review attached

Alderman Craig

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

- U.** Recommending that the request from the Strange Brew Tavern to extend the hours of the currently approved street closure of West Franklin Back Street to 11:00 p.m. be approved and further that the program be extended to include Monday through Thursday nights.

(Unanimous vote)

- V.** Recommending that the request from Migma Systems, Inc. to install a pedestrian detector system at the Foundry Street and McGregor Street intersection be approved as a pilot program for a period of 18 months.

The Committee further recommends that the Deputy Traffic Director bring forward a contract to include:

- Migma Systems, Inc. will be responsible for liability of the system, ongoing maintenance and removal or reimbursement of removal, if needed
- The City's Traffic Division will be responsible for the installation of the System

(Unanimous vote)

- W.** Recommending that a moratorium be placed on handicap parking regulations in residential areas and further to grandfather in any existing regulations.

The Committee further recommends that the City Solicitor provide a review to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at their next meeting on September 21, 2010.

(Unanimous vote)

- X.** Recommending that the request from the Parking Manager to change Lake Avenue between Elm and Chestnut Streets from District 26 to District 27 be approved and further that the Ordinance be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

(Unanimous vote)

- Y.** Recommending that the request from Alderman DeVries on behalf of an Olmstead Avenue resident that a directional sign be placed on Brown Avenue before the Manchester-Boston Regional Airport intersection, to indicate to travelers that St. Francis Parish & School is three miles away be approved

(Unanimous vote)

- Z.** Recommending that the request from Llyod Doughty, Verizon Wireless Arena Security Manager, for 70 parking permits for SMG, Monarchs and Aramark staff for streets around the arena for September 23, 2010 through October 4, 2010 be approved.

(Unanimous vote conducted via phone poll on September 15, 2010)

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SOLID WASTE

- AA.** Recommending that the recommendation from the Public Works Director that permits for the Dunbarton Road Drop-off Facility be transferrable among different vehicles of a household be adopted.

(Unanimous vote)

- BB.** Advising that the communication from the Recycling Coordinator regarding the Downtown Recycling Program has been accepted.

The Committee further requests that the Recycling Coordinator continue educating the downtown businesses to determine how many business are participating and submit quarterly reports to show the progress of the program. *(Unanimous vote)*

- CC.** Recommending that the Mayor be authorized to go out for an RFP for recycling and trash collection in Manchester.
(Unanimous vote)

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

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to reconsider the Consent Agenda motion.

E. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 214511 Manchester Health Dept. Strategic Planning Process.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 410211 Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 612411 Façade Improvement Project.”

A Resolution “Rescinding \$590,000 of Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases of a Bond Resolution for 2009 CIP 711209 which authorized \$3,211,500 of Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases, so as to endorse the issuance of a bond authorization in the amount of \$2,621,500.”

- P.** Recommending that the request from the Planning & Community Development Director to rescind \$590,000 of the Bond Resolution for Annual ROW Reconstruction Program, CIP 711209 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman DeVries stated I would like to discuss items E and P as they are related. Within item E there’s rescinding \$590,000 of bonds, and after consultation with the Mayor, we are asking if we can table this to allow further discussion. The thought is if this has already been wrapped into our debt we might be able to utilize the money if it is already in our debt factoring for our tax rate this year. We might be able to pre-spend something to make better use to prepare for next year’s budget. We need to obviously do a little bit more background on this. So today I would like to table the \$590,000 out of Items E and P and hopefully have it come back to the next meeting.

Alderman DeVries moved to table only the Resolution in item E, A Resolution: “Rescinding \$590,000 of Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases of a Bond Resolution for 2009 CIP 711209 which authorized \$3,211,500 of Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases, so as to endorse the issuance of a bond authorization in the amount of \$2,621,500.”

Mayor Gatsas stated just for clarification, if I understand you correctly, the Resolution in Item E takes it out so what we want to do is leave it in for this time and table that portion of the Resolution?

Alderman DeVries stated just table that one portion of \$590,000.

Mayor Gatsas stated after consulting with the Finance Officer, Alderman DeVries had talked to me about it last week. I just talked with the Finance Officer. I believe that in our debt service, and he's going to check this week, the amount to pay the bond. It's already allocated into the debt service. So even if we remove the bond and don't float the bond, that amount that we have in the debt service might be negatively affected, we may be able to bond the \$590,000 on an item that we may be looking for in the 2012 budget. So it is just a matter of taking a look at what the consequences would be if we didn't do it, and Mr. Sanders will look at it and we will take it off the table one way or the other at the next meeting.

Alderman Lopez asked that is item P?

Alderman DeVries replied you would see that in item E, the Resolutions, the fourth Resolution was rescinding in it, just that one piece of it.

Alderman Shea stated this is to be referred to Committee, Item E. That's nothing that we're discussing tonight. That's simply to refer to the Committee on Finance.

Mayor Gatsas stated, right, but that Committee is meeting this evening. She is just tabling it before we go into Finance.

The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette and it was voted to table the one Resolution in item E.

- X.** Recommending that the request from the Parking Manager to change Lake Avenue between Elm and Chestnut Streets from District 26 to District 27 be approved and further that the Ordinance be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman DeVries stated I would ask that the Parking Manager come forward. My concern is whether or not there would be any impact on courthouse parking. It is closed now. You did a study, but I believe your review might have been while the courthouse has been shut down. Knowing that Hillsborough North will be back in that area looking for parking, I didn't know if that had been part of the consideration with your recommendations.

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated the courthouse will be a major consumer of parking in that area, but it's mostly going to be inside the parking lot. The street outside has two meters on it and we wanted to make sure that the rate structure matched what was in the lots so that we could use those meters for inside the lot. Otherwise we would have had to spend another \$25,000 in meters to put inside the lot.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess my concern is the customers served trying to find their way into the court. Will they be impacted? Will they see a rate increase?

Ms. Stanley replied generally no, because most of the customers that went into the courthouse already parked on Central Street, which has basically always been 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM, and with the rest of the City almost two years ago, going to the \$.75 an hour, so I don't think they are going to see a whole lot of a change.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic.

- V. Recommending that the request from Migma Systems, Inc. to install a pedestrian detector system at the Foundry Street and McGregor Street intersection be approved as a pilot program for a period of 18 months.

The Committee further recommends that the Deputy Traffic Director bring forward a contract to include:

- Migma Systems, Inc. will be responsible for liability of the system, ongoing maintenance and removal or reimbursement of removal, if needed
- The City's Traffic Division will be responsible for the installation of the System

(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Shea asked could we get a little bit more of an explanation than we received in our agenda? Is there anyone here that could help us with that?

Mayor Gatsas stated I assume it's coming from Traffic.

Alderman Shea asked Ms. Stanley, could you explain really what the purpose of it is and what the intent is? I listened on TV, but I couldn't get the full gist of it. The gentleman speaking obviously gave a little bit of a detailed explanation, but could you elaborate a little bit on what the intent is and so forth.

Ms. Stanley replied sure. This particular request came after the deadline for the last Traffic Committee and was somewhat time sensitive. Basically what S & G is requesting is parking for their...

Mr. Kevin A. Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated this is my item. This came before the Traffic Committee. What this is is actually a new way for detecting pedestrians in crossings. We had a company come forward that wants to

pilot test. They are working with the Federal Highway Administration, they want to pilot test this at this intersection in front of CMC. It will be installed at no cost to the City. If we have any issues with it, it will be removed at no cost to the City. If we like it, then we get to keep it at no cost to the City.

Alderman Shea asked is this for people when they cross the street?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct. It will detect them as they're crossing the street and if they get halfway across the street for some reason and they are still within the crosswalk and the crosswalk is timed out, it will detect that someone is in the crosswalk and extend the cross time.

Alderman Shea stated we had a discussion at the last Board meeting regarding the crosswalks. I did check because I had a little disagreement regarding the ordinance, which we do not have. We have a State statute, but we do not have a City ordinance, so if people are standing not in the road but in the sidewalk area, people in Manchester do not have to stop. The only reason they stop is when people begin to cross the street. Now you can check, but that's the rule that we have here, as it is different from Maine where if you stand on the sidewalk in Maine vehicles have to stop. So there is a distinction and we discussed this at the last... What I'm trying to say is if somebody is standing on the sidewalk where you're implementing this, cars do not have to stop. An individual then, when they start in the road or in the gutter, they have to stop. Again, I'm not sure whether or not that is going to be clarified. That's exactly why I bring this up.

Mr. Sheppard stated what this will do is it will turn the walk signal on. So if there is someone there, it will turn the walk signal on to allow that person to cross.

Alderman Shea asked so there will be directional for them to cross?

Mr. Sheppard replied there will be crossing signals.

Alderman Shea stated I wanted to make that distinction, Your Honor, because we had explained that at the last meeting.

Alderman Ouellette stated I think the difference between the situation that my colleague from Ward 7 is trying express, and what we talked about at the last meeting, was more of crosswalks that didn't have a traffic light and traffic signals like this intersection does. This is the intersection right in front of Catholic Medical Center. This intersection was picked basically because it's one of the more busily used walk signals in the City. So that's why they thought it was a good idea to have it there. I asked at the meeting to have the Deputy Traffic Director get in touch with CMC. He has done that, and they reviewed the plan and approved it. So they would like to see the plan move forward.

Alderman Greazzo stated Mr. Sheppard, I'm kind of interested in functionality. Let's say we have people streaming in that crosswalk for a while, does the light stay red.

Mr. Sheppard replied no, it actually times out. We can set a time-out for it. For example, if we say a typical crosswalk to cross the street is 15 seconds, and then we find other pedestrians in that crosswalk, it may extend to 30 seconds and then we can time it out at that point and the crosswalk will start going back to "Do Not Cross" and then it will open the traffic.

Alderman Greazzo asked so the system wouldn't be indefinite? As long as there are people in the crosswalk it wouldn't just keep the light red, it would still have a time limit?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct.

Alderman Shaw stated I also just wanted to add it is for visually impaired individuals. It will assist the people who are visually impaired or physically handicapped and will detect them as they approach the intersection so they will not be fumbling for the button or whatever.

Alderman Roy stated the only thing I can add...the other Alderman explained it very well, thank you, is that this is totally free, and not only are they going to put it up and maintain it for us, but if it doesn't work out, then they take it down, they are going to pay for taking it down too. I think it is a win all the way around.

Alderman Osborne stated just to answer Alderman Shea's concerns, as you know, Alderman, we have pedestrian signs all the way up Valley Street. Okay. Those are State law. If anybody steps their foot out off that curb, they had better stop, or if there is enforcement there, it is \$1,000 fine. It is a State statute and I think they supersede a lot of the City, so I think that is your big answer there. The signs are there. If they don't abide by those signs, it is a \$1,000 fine if an officer sees them. The pedestrians like the elderly up on Massabesic Street, if they are unable to cross...they get their foot out off that curb, the cars had better stop. If somebody is watching them, it is \$1,000.

Alderman Shea stated the complaint that both of us received was on Cypress Street, as you recall, where the gentleman was standing on the sidewalk and he repeatedly called because cars weren't stopping, and then he was told to start walking across the street, if you recall. So, you have to physically be in the street in order for cars to stop.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't believe that. I think it is once their foot is out in the street. We can argue that back and forth. But the whole thing here is enforcement.

Alderman Shea stated basically we could go on forever, but the point is, Your Honor, this particular situation is very good. I'm not sure if they're going to do that as a test pilot and then go to other sections of the City, or is it just simply what's going on.

Mayor Gatsas stated well if it is free, we'll take it everywhere.

Mr. Sheppard stated this is one location and we'll see how it works and we'll work with them.

Alderman Shea asked if it is successful there...

Mr. Sheppard interjected I'm not too sure they will expand their test.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Shaw, it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic.

- Z.** Recommending that the request from Lloyd Doughty, Verizon Wireless Arena Security Manager, for 70 parking permits for SMG, Monarchs and Aramark staff on streets around the arena for September 23, 2010 through October 4, 2010 be approved.
(Unanimous vote conducted via phone poll on September 15, 2010)

Alderman Long stated I know there was a phone poll and I voted yes, but after thinking about it a little longer, is there any alternative with respect to 70 parking spots to not have them on prime street spots? I don't get that.

Mayor Gatsas replied my understanding, Alderman, is they have been doing this for the last nine years in the same location, so for the last nine years we have survived with these spots.

Alderman Long asked they've been doing this for the circus?

Mayor Gatsas replied yes.

Alderman Long stated we have the Chili Cook-off and we have the circus. I'm thinking we're looking at 70 prime parking spots to give to employees where I'm battling downtown businesses to get their employees off from Elm Street so that customers can use it. It doesn't appear like I have too much support here.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think the reason why they're asking for it is because of the large amount of trailers bringing the animals in, displace the parking for the employees on the upper lot, so they place those big tractor trailers in there and they don't have a spot for them to go for those three days. As I said, they have done it for the last nine years.

Alderman Long asked could we get them into Rockwell or somewhere off the streets and leave the patrons?

Mayor Gatsas replied remember Rockwell I think we're using as a \$5.00 charge for our Chilifest parking.

Alderman Long asked how about street parking? Will there be any charge on street parking, Brandy?

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, responded no.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to refer this item to the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic.

CC. Recommending that the Mayor be authorized to go out for an RFP for recycling and trash collection in Manchester.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Corriveau stated thank you, Your Honor. Just a general inquiry for Alderman Craig about where we stand maybe legally in terms of with Corcoran. I know where we want to go, but just a recap maybe.

Alderman Craig replied the City's contract with Corcoran Environmental Services was rejected at the beginning of August. Based on the emergency provisions of the procurement code, we entered into an interim agreement with Pinard Waste Services to continue with dual-stream recycling and yard waste pick-up. And, at the last Committee meeting for Solid Waste, it was a unanimous vote for us to proceed with an RFP for single-stream recycling and yard waste. In conversations with Kevin Sheppard, we discussed how we would set up the RFP in a three-phased approach or include three components. Entities could bid on collection only, they could bid on collection and/or marketing of the materials or just the marketing of the materials. So that is the RFP process. For our next Solid Waste Committee meeting, what I'm going to do is have Concord Co-op come forward and present what their capabilities are. The Co-op right now is a non-profit municipal entity. They were formed in 1985 with their goal of long-term

solid waste disposal, and what they're turning towards now is single-stream recycling as a cost-savings measure. So what they're doing is allowing other communities to participate because they don't have enough recycling to cover what they need. It is something that Manchester should look into, and there is a question as to whether or not they can participate in the RFP proposal process. So I just want to make sure that our Committee is knowledgeable about what they are providing.

Alderman Corriveau stated just a last question about the RFP process. So the RFP may, in fact, be amended depending on what happens?

Alderman Craig replied I'm not sure what you mean by amended.

Alderman Corriveau replied depending on what happens with Concord Co-op, for example. Would the RFP be rescinded and then reissued or could it?

Alderman Craig replied they are two different...parallel. We're going to move forward with the RFP, but we're also going to educate ourselves on other things that are out there that may not be able to participate in this process. So there may be a company that comes forward that can do it all; there may be a company that can do a component and we would have to figure out another way to dispose of it or market the materials, for example.

Alderman Corriveau asked and Public Works will be taking the bids from the RFP to your Committee?

Alderman Craig replied yes.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think what Alderman Craig is talking about is bringing the Concord Co-op into the subcommittee to do a presentation.

Alderman Craig stated correct.

Alderman Roy stated early on in this process I had asked for information on how much money we get per ton for single-stream as opposed to double-stream, so that we could make a decision on what was most financially advantageous for the City. And other information that would play into that would be the increase in participation from a city like us whether we go to single-stream or double-stream. I haven't seen any information on that yet, and I'm just wondering if anybody has that. Kevin might have that or Alderman Craig may have it, and I know that when I talked to Alderman Craig before I heard some information about how towns that go to single-stream have an increase up to 40 percent participation. Do we have any numbers on towns that go to dual-stream and what their participation went up to?

Alderman Craig responded we can get you that information, but what we can tell you today is that we have about, I believe, a ten percent return for recycling on dual. Then what we had talked about are towns like Laconia, Quincy, Braintree, that had a 40 percent increase in participation when they went to single-stream. So that's sort of what we're saying. But even if we go to single-stream and get 20 percent diversion from solid waste, that would save us over \$300,000.

Alderman Corriveau stated I know there is going to be huge savings and I appreciate that. Do we know the difference in the monetary value of the tonnage between single-stream and dual-stream?

Mr. Sheppard replied based on today's market, and today's market I'm just going to base it on what we pay for the downtown single-stream recycling, I actually gave that number to Alderman Craig today. For solid waste we're paying somewhere between \$68 and \$70 per ton, and for the downtown single-stream we're paying \$10.98.

Alderman Corriveau asked so we're paying the facility that's taking in \$10.98?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct, for single-stream. Right now there is revenue for paper, I believe, and the mixed. There is actually a charge for that.

Alderman Corriveau asked if it was dual-stream what would you be paying?

Mr. Sheppard replied again, dual-stream meaning what we're doing today, I don't know what the per ton cost is, but for the co-mingled material, the plastics and glass, there is a charge for that, I believe, and for the paper there's actually a revenue for that. I can get that information to you. I apologize but I think we had presented some information to the Solid Waste Committee regarding your question in the past, but perhaps we haven't.

Alderman Corriveau stated I know there is reduction in what we can get, or in this case, how much we're going to pay, because once you mix the glass in with the paper, your paper isn't worth as much, and that's my question. Which is more advantageous for us?

Mr. Sheppard replied I will make sure we have that information.

Alderman Craig stated to give you an example, with Concord Co-op, they're saying that they would pay between \$20 and \$30 per ton for single-stream, so we can use that as a comparison as well.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a clarification...Alderman Craig threw out some percentages. I understand our dual-stream participation is about ten percent.

Alderman Craig replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked did you say 20 percent for Laconia, Braintree and Quincy?

Alderman Craig replied 40 percent.

Alderman O'Neil asked that's 40 percent from the base number or do you happen to know were they at dual-stream? How many guesses from the base number of solid waste probably?

Alderman Craig replied I don't know.

*On motion of **Alderman Craig**, duly seconded by **Alderman Roy**, it was voted to refer this item to the Special Committee on Solid Waste.*

5. Nomination to be presented by Mayor Gatsas

Mayor Gatsas stated pursuant to Section 3.14 (b) of the City Charter, please be advised of the following nomination:

Stephen Patterson to succeed himself as member of the Revolving Loan Fund Board of Trustees term to expire June 1, 2010.

This nomination will layover to the next meeting of the Board pursuant to Rule 20 of the Board of Mayor and Alderman. Your consideration of this nominee is appreciated.

Alderman O'Neil asked that's a reappoint, correct? He's already serving.

Alderman O'Neil moved to suspend the rules on the nomination of Stephen Patterson to succeed himself as member of the Revolving Loan Fund Board of Trustees, term to expire June 1, 2010 and confirm his nomination. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Roy. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

6. Confirmations to be presented by Mayor Gatsas

Highway Commission

Harold Sullivan as a member, term to expire January 15, 2012.

On motion of Alderman Craig, duly seconded by Alderman Ludwig, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Harold Sullivan as a member of the Highway Commission, term to expire January 15, 2012.

- 7.** Review of the recommendation from the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic that a moratorium be placed on handicap parking regulations in residential areas submitted by the City Solicitor, if available. (Note: Requested by the Committee on Public Safety, Health and Traffic on September 8, 2010.)

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

Alderman Craig stated there was nothing included in our packet, so I was just curious.

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated I don't think there was a response in writing. What I would tell the Board at this point is that I don't believe there is any prohibition on placing a moratorium on designating individual spots as handicapped in response to a request from a resident or otherwise. Keep in mind, of course, that the City has to meet the requirements of the ADA.

Alderman Corriveau stated I guess that was my question at the Committee level. We did put the moratorium on, so now we're not going to have any more handicapped parking. Are we going to have a problem with the ADA or anything like that? You're saying it looks like we're not going to have a problem with anything like that.

Mr. Arnold replied my understanding was that the inquiry was in response to a request by individual residents for a handicap spot to accommodate their needs. That spot would, of course, be open to anybody but a handicapped person could use it. What I was saying is a moratorium on that type of designation would be permissible. However, again, given the requirements of the ADA and the duty as to handicapped spots citywide in general, you of course have to meet that. But the inquiry I think was oriented towards an individual request.

Alderman Roy stated you're correct. It was toward the individual request and we wanted to make sure that we weren't doing anything wrong. Obviously we're

going to have to have handicapped spots around the City in different applications whether required, but in this case we can have this moratorium, you're saying.

Mr. Arnold replied yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I couldn't hear the whole conversation. There would be no moratorium? Is that correct?

Alderman Roy replied there is a moratorium right now.

Alderman Lopez asked I if somebody did need a handicapped space in a residential area, would they go before the Traffic Committee?

Alderman Roy replied we would probably tell them that there is a moratorium on it.

Alderman Lopez asked even though they might be in a wheelchair and they have a ramp in front of their house?

Alderman Roy replied even though they would have a wheelchair and have a ramp, we could say that, yes. The problem arising right now is all of a sudden everybody is coming forward and they want a handicapped parking space in front of their house. They feel that that is their own personal parking space, but that isn't the case. Anybody with a handicap sticker can park there, so then we could get a call back saying, 'I don't have my handicapped space'. Eventually we would have nothing but handicapped spaces out there and there would be a problem. That's why I asked him to check on it to see if we could have this moratorium and he said yes. Obviously where there are extenuating circumstances, we could lift that moratorium and give them a parking space like that.

Alderman Lopez stated okay. That's all I was concerned about.

Alderman Osborne stated Alderman Roy answered a lot of it for me at the end. A handicapped parking space is a difficult situation. I have had a couple in my ward, and it is hard to say no. But, as Alderman Roy said, if you put a handicapped parking space in front of their house because they have the need for it, they have to understand that anybody or any handicapped person can park there on their block. So it defeats the purpose. I think when it comes to a wheelchair or a handicap ramp that they have at their house and they have to come down that ramp and they have no way at all to get onto a vehicle, a handicapped vehicle, then of course it could be done in a different way, whereas there would be no parking in between signs. That way nobody could park there, but they have the room to get off that ramp and get into that handicap vehicle. That's the best way of doing that one.

Alderman DeVries stated just to the Traffic Committee Chair, if I might...Are you going to continue to evaluate if there is another process that might make more sense, something that might be akin to a yearly residential permit but it would be something that causes the re-validation of need?

Alderman Roy replied we will explore every avenue. But here is a case where a student has a wheelchair. Do we want to put no parking in front of the house, all that kind of stuff? No. What we'll do is we'll put a No Parking Loading Zone during certain hours so that when that student is being picked up and dropped off from school, that space is open for them to get off and on. There are other ways to approach it than just having a handicap parking space.

Alderman DeVries stated if I could follow up. Part of the point was that the handicapped individual may move out of the residence and there is no tracking. It was to that point that I'm wondering if the Committee is going to spend any time looking for a mechanism that might allow some sort of a renewal and tracking of the need so that we don't shift from streets full of handicap parking to streets full of loading zones.

Alderman Roy replied absolutely.

Alderman Long stated actually Alderman Roy mentioned the fact of tracking. We have handicapped parking on streets for residents who no longer live there. Not only that, I was asked by one asking for a curb cut where this handicap parking is. I would think that if we gave them the handicapped parking that we should be responsible to give them a curb cut. There are requirements within the City downtown as to how many you should have. Within residential units the landlord is responsible to find accommodations. If they have a parking lot, they need to give them accommodations in the parking lot. This is just opening up something that I think will dig us in deeper as we progress. If there is a greater need, I'm sure the Committee will consider that.

Alderman DeVries stated one final question, if I might to the Chair...The grandfathering of the existing lots in places is still part of the motion. Is that correct?

Alderman Roy replied that's correct.

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

8. Communication from Michael Hurley, Board of Assessors, requesting authorization to execute a contract with Vision Appraisal Technology to complete the 2011 citywide revaluation.
(Note: A copy of the proposal for revaluation update services from Vision Appraisal Technology is available for viewing at the Office of the City Clerk.)

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Lopez stated as we do an update revaluation during the budget process, we have the bonding money for this. They've been working on moving forward for an updated revaluation, and with that I'll let Mike Hurley explain the details or answer any questions on it, but something has to be done.

Mayor Gatsas stated just for some background on it, I think four or five years ago we spent over a million dollars for revaluation of the City. This year, I think you have within your packet, a reduced amount. We're down to about \$532,000 roughly with the photos. So, that number is down considerably from where that million dollars was some four or five years ago.

Alderman Lopez stated and the point being too that this is an update versus a complete revaluation and measuring and you might get into that Mike, so everybody understands the update versus what we had before.

Mr. Michael Hurley, Board of Assessors, stated this time around in 2005 we had the vendor come out and they measured and inspected every property in the City. This time around the only properties that will be visited will be building permits and sales properties. Over the years, since the last revaluation, we've found and the State has found that the quality of our data is very good, so there wasn't a need to go in and measure every single property again because there just weren't many

changes being made. That's basically why you see such a big price difference, the fact that we're only going to be measuring sales properties and just doing the building permits.

Mayor Gatsas asked but they're also taking pictures of every property?

Mr. Hurley replied yes, they will also be taking pictures. I think the pictures were 15 or 20 years old. So we'll be updating those also.

Alderman Lopez stated the other question, we had some conversation about. Will they do the abatements in the end? Part of this contract versus the last contact?

Mr. Hurley replied yes, that is part of the contract. They will be doing the abatements but they will go through the Board of Assessors because we'll have to sign off on it.

Alderman Craig stated I have just a quick question regarding the photos. When we did it the last time, five years ago, new photos were taken. Correct?

Mr. Hurley replied no, they weren't. The only photos that were taken were under construction photos. If a house drastically changed physically, we just updated the photos at that time. So we didn't do a full photo in 2005.

Alderman Craig asked if a property looks like it does when you get onto the Vision Appraisal website, you'll still be taking a new photo of that or will they only be taking photos of buildings that have drastically changed?

Mr. Hurley replied they will be taking photos of every parcel in the City.

Alderman Shea stated my question is sort of a generic question. If somebody's house was assessed for \$150,000 in 2005, and knowing that the value of property has gone down, will that same property be assessed for the same amount or is there some sort of formula whereby maybe they won't be taxed as high?

Mr. Hurley replied yes, basically we're starting from scratch. Right now our ratio is about 16.7, which means we're about 16.5 percent above market compared to where we were the last time. So when we do this update, we're going to be using sales from April 1, 2010 to April 1, 2011, which will be setting the new values. So if properties are selling for \$200,000, they would be assessed at \$200,000, again, depending on what the market says. It can be inferred that yes the property values will be dropping.

Alderman Shea asked and that would be for new purchases, but what about other purchases that aren't really being done during this cycle?

Mr. Hurley replied it will be all the current sales, and once the analysis is done of all of the sales that occurred in that period, the new values will be applied to every property in the City. We've got approximately 33,600 total properties and all of the values will change based on the current market.

Alderman Corriveau stated you mentioned you'd be doing physical assessments of places that conduct sales. What types of sales? Could you elaborate on that? Commercial or industrial?

Mr. Hurley replied it will be all sales. It will be any sale that has occurred in that one-year period - residential, commercial, industrial, or condos. The contract is to put a new value on every single property: commercial, residential, industrial.

Alderman Corriveau stated my other question is if the last revaluation was in 2005, since 2005, and Manchester hasn't been immune to it, the country's obviously undergone a foreclosure crisis. I said Manchester isn't immune to it. Due to the increased numbers of foreclosures, what effect will that have on this revaluation?

Mr. Hurley replied the revaluation is actually...we start in 2005, but it is actually 2006, which is why we're going for 2011. They go every five years. You have to use what they call arms-length sales, and foreclosures are not considered arms-length sales. Now it would have a bearing on the market because now those arms-length sales are competing against foreclosures, so they would have an effect.

Alderman Greazzo stated Mr. Hurley, could you please explain for the public the process of abatement under this contract. What do they do if they disagree with their valuation?

Mr. Hurley replied it is the same process they go through now. Once you get your second half tax bill, you can file for an abatement. We have forms at the office. Nothing is going to change about the way it is done now except for the fact that instead of the Board of Assessors dealing with all of the abatements, we will be having help from Vision Appraisal, so there will be no change. Your second half tax bill comes out, you can either get it off the website or come down to the office and we'll have the abatement forms and it can be filled out by the taxpayer.

Alderman Greazzo asked under this contract are they required to get their own home appraised?

Mr. Hurley replied that usually helps. Some taxpayers can go out and Vision Appraisal has a website where it has a sales search right on it, so that a homeowner can actually go in. Say for example, if you have a 1,300 square foot cape, you can actually go onto the website right now, key in, 'I want to see capes that are sold in this specific date range, at this specific size', and it will spit out all of the sales that are in the database.

Alderman Greazzo asked how many requests for abatements did you have from the last revaluation?

Mr. Hurley replied the last revaluation I think we had about 1,225.

Alderman Greazzo stated there were a lot of people who weren't necessarily in agreement with what their valuations were set at.

Mr. Hurley stated a lot of it had to do with the fact that their values were raised 80 percent, because at the time that it was done in 2001, so by the time 2006 came we were at the peak of the market. I don't think that we will hit that number now because with our ratio being so high, the values are going to come down. I think that will kind of lessen the abatement load. That's just a guess, but based on my experience doing revaluations throughout New England, that's usually what happens. It is usually tied with how big of an increase you have in value.

Alderman Greazzo asked usually how long does the process take from the beginning, from somebody wanting to abate their taxes if they don't necessarily agree with what they're assessed at? They start the process, they go to the office, they fill out the paperwork, how long does it typically take before they get an answer?

Mr. Hurley replied it could take anywhere from five to six months. The deadline is March 1st. By then basically our office is trying to get the first half tax bills out. We probably really don't start looking at them until May or June, so May, June, July and August are usually the months that we're looking at all of the abatements and trying to get them all answered by September. Obviously the goal is July 1st, but with the vacancies on the staff, we get a little behind so it takes us a little longer.

Alderman Greazzo asked if they are not satisfied, is there an appeal process?

Mr. Hurley replied right. They can file with the Board of Land and Tax Appeals or Superior Court by September 1st.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to accept this communication and execute the contract with Vision Appraisal Technology.

9. Communication from Thomas Clark, City Solicitor, requesting specialized legal counsel be hired to assist the City Solicitor's Office and other City staff in matters concerning the proposed Municipal Complex.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we know the budget? Is there a budget?

Mayor Gatsas replied it's not coming from his budget. It will come from the municipal complex budget, but certainly there will be an RFP that will come back to this Board so that we can see it and then certainly move forward with it. My

suggestion was that we don't hire somebody on an hourly basis. It would be on a contract basis.

Alderman Greazzo asked City Solicitor, what is the need for additional legal counsel on something that we're building?

Mayor Gatsas replied I think this project, being a \$43 million project, I want to make sure that we have somebody onboard that is going represent us and protect us and has insurance in case there is a mistake. Obviously if there's a mistake made our City Solicitor, there's not any opportunity to go back and ask for our own insurance.

Alderman Arnold stated thank you, Your Honor. I certainly support the idea. Just out of curiosity, is there any concern as to whether or not we'll get many bidders on a flat-fee basis rather than an hourly basis, or is the scope of the representation going to be sufficiently articulated?

Mayor Gatsas replied that is a good question. I had that conversation with Mr. Clark. He thinks that there will be sufficient bidders coming in on the flat-fee basis and if there aren't, we can always go out on an hourly basis, so we can look at it both ways.

Alderman Long stated just for Alderman Greazzo, the Solicitor is a municipal contract lawyer. It appears to me over some of the contracts that we have had, there's a lot of gray area. This construction litigator will be more specific. The secret is to be as black and white as we can, so that everything is black and white, there are no gray areas. That is why I was in favor of getting a construction litigator to view our contract or write some of the language.

Alderman Shea asked can you recall whether we had a lawyer other than the City Solicitors handling our affairs when the Verizon was built?

Mayor Gatsas replied no, we didn't. We didn't do anything there; we didn't do anything with design/build, not outside counsel.

Alderman O'Neil stated we did. We had bond counsel. They did all the contracts. We had counsel for the Housing and Redevelopment Authority.

Mayor Gatsas stated but the City didn't have anybody. Did we have somebody, Tim?

Mr. Tim Clougherty, Deputy Public Works Director, replied Ropes and Gray. They were our bond counsel at that time.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's when I asked him if he had E&O insurance. If I remember, I was an Alderman at the time, on a couple of different matters.

Alderman Shea stated I just have a comment. I think it's a good idea to have an outside, contractual lawyer. I don't know if somebody else wants to approve it, but I will.

*On motion of **Alderman Shea**, duly seconded by **Alderman Lopez**, it was voted to accept this communication and hire specialized legal counsel to assist the City Solicitor's Office and other City staff in matters concerning the proposed Municipal Complex.*

10. Communication from Mayor Gatsas, requesting approval to send out a Request for Proposals for legislative tracking services beginning January 1, 2011.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think the House, if I'm correct Alderman Long, they have already had the ability to start processing or submitting legislation. This would be the same process as what we did last year. It would go out and come forward. I think last year we looked at a number that was \$10,000. That is what we put into the budget, or it might have been \$15,000. I think it was \$15,000 that was in the budget that we looked at, but certainly we'll send it out and see what we come back with and go from there.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Craig, it was voted to accept this communication and send out a Request for Proposal for legislative tracking services beginning January 1, 2011.

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

Mayor Gatsas called the meeting back to order.

13. **Reports of the Committee on Finance.**

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

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 214511 Manchester Health Dept. Strategic Planning Process.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 410211 Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 612411 Façade Improvement Project.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to accept the report of the Finance Committee and adopt its recommendations.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration that a Bond Resolution:

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

ought to pass and layover.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted that the Resolution ought to pass and layover.

14. Reports of the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration.

The Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendments:

“Amending 70.57 Motor Vehicle 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 parking lots controlled he Parking Division on October 1st, 2nd and 3rd, 2010.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicle and Taffic of the Code of the 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) and (G) (5) special restrictions for zone eight.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled

Alderman Ouellette stated I’m the Committee Chairman. We voted to just make sure that these were properly enrolled. We weren’t really voting on the actual items.

Alderman Ouellette moved to suspend the rules and place the Ordinance on its third and final reading. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Long.

Alderman O’Neil asked if I vote against it, does it defeat the purpose you guys are trying to suspend?

Mayor Gatsas replied it does not, Alderman, at all.

Mayor Gatsas called for a vote on the motion to suspend the rules and place the Ordinance on its third and final reading. The motion carried. Alderman O’Neil was duly recorded in opposition.

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted that the Ordinance be Ordained. Alderman O’Neil was duly recorded in opposition.

15. Reports of the Committee on Lands and Buildings.

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the lease agreement between the City and Manchester Community Resource center for the City owned property located at 177 Lake Avenue be approved.

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

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the draft purchase and sale agreement for the Boston and Main Corporation property be approved.

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

Mayor Gatsas stated we still have to go through subdivision on that property. Is that correct? Alright. The piece runs all the way to Valley Street, and we as the City must go through the change according to just cutting it off at the property that we need.

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the revised draft purchase and sale agreement for the 295 Lincoln Street property be approved.

The Committee further advises that the Assessor's Summary Appraisal of \$1 million has been accepted.

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

Mayor Gatsas stated I'd like to thank Mr. Marion for coming in today. I know it's been a trying couple of weeks, but I'm glad to see you here and we're going to try and move forward.

16. Reports of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems.

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the attached Development Plan for projects approved for funding through the Recovery Zone Facility Bonds be approved.

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

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Parking Manager be authorized to execute a contract with Standard Parking for the Chili Cook-off.

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

A Minority Report of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request of Information Systems to enter into a contract with Innoprise Software for the purchase, implementation, and ongoing maintenance of a new Enterprise Management System, be approved.

City Clerk Matt Normand stated I would just mention that the majority vote of the Committee was to reject that request of the IT Director to enter into that contract.

Alderman Lopez stated normally I would not bring out a Minority Report, but I believe that the IT system in the City of Manchester is very, very important. Over a number of years we have complained that we can't get this particular item or this particular program, or whatever the case may be. Back a while ago this item was tabled to review and set up a committee. A committee was set up as indicated in your packet: Matt Normand, Leon LaFreniere, Jane Gile, Kevin Sheppard, Tom Bowen, Bill Sanders and Jennie Angell. The question I have for those if they want to speak is do they disagree with the IT Director bringing the contract forward or are they in total support? If they are not, let them speak now.

Mayor Gatsas stated I'm going to bring them up here so that they can speak. This was not something that was taken on lightly.

Alderman Lopez stated if you want to bring them up and back up the IT Director, I support it wholeheartedly. Mr. Sanders, since you are an Officer of the City and the Chief Finance Officer and you were on this committee, can you give your comments please?

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, replied certainly. I think it is probably fair to say when I entered this process back in April, Jenny referred to me as cautious, I think I would refer to myself as very skeptical that we were going to be fortunate enough to get off this HTE system and into a system that was going to cost us essentially what we're paying for HTE maintenance today. I expressed that skepticism and concern in the various meetings that we had, of which we had many – five or six. I participated in all the meetings; I have come away not entirely without some skepticism. I think that's the nature of Information Technology Systems and implementations, and I would be the last person to tell you there won't be a bump in the road somewhere down the road. But I would say this, that this is a unique opportunity that the City of Manchester has to enter into

this agreement with Innoprise. Our reference checking was very good. Once again, never perfect, but it was very good. The price is immensely below anything we could see. To think that we could do this for less than \$3, \$4 or \$5 million and a considerable amount of effort on the City side, that is our option. So I voted in the affirmative for Innoprise. I think that we do need to get off from HTE. Since I came three years ago, if there is anything that I see that most department heads and staff and Aldermen agree with is that HTE is unacceptable in its current form. I believe...and I've said this in the meetings as well, that this Committee is more than just a selection committee and these department heads, and myself included, are responsible for more than just casting a vote and pitching it to Jenny to get it done. That is only going to get done if every department head in the City, and certainly the selection committee stands behind this and works it and works these issues, and keeps this on track. I would strongly recommend that the Board of Aldermen vote in favor of this contract. I regret any communication errors that were made. I immensely regret them, and they were not done purposefully at all; they were an oversight that if we could change it today, we would change it immediately. But we can't and the mistakes were made in that regard, but I think we had a robust selection process and I think the conversations in the room were candid and direct on many levels. I think that the Aldermen would be doing a favor and a good thing for the City of Manchester, for the employees of this City, and for people that want to go on the Internet and pay their property tax bills or see anything else on the Internet of City government, a real plus by approving this Innoprise contract.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is a shot at the Aldermen. The questions that were brought up had nothing to do about the need for the system. That's a shot at those that did not vote for this. I take exception to that. This is not what was discussed. What was discussed was the process and the lack of information, and I take some exception if department heads are going to comment about this. They don't take

an oath to the people. I take an oath to represent them. They don't belong in this discussion tonight because it is not about their work; it's about was a process followed and was information provided. That's what this is about. I don't need to hear from all the department heads that they think this is the greatest thing in the world. They obviously had a lot more information than I did. So we don't need to make a circus out of this hearing from every department head.

Mayor Gatsas stated now if you will at least extend the same courtesy.

Alderman O'Neil replied I will, Your Honor.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you very much, Alderman. Certainly we just passed a few minutes ago a \$550,000 contract with Vision Appraisals. I asked the question, 'How many people went to the City Clerk's office to read that contract?'

Alderman you probably did, so I respect you for that, and certainly I took the time and I met with them and I went through it. I can tell you that when I first met with Mr. Sanders in April, I can tell you just for him to have the discussion with me was kicking and fighting, and I can tell you before that, the discussion that I had with Jennie Angell, because I watched the State institute a new financial program three years ago. I watched it, and I think Alderman DeVries will probably agree that she probably heard me say many times that that program was dead on arrival. And why was it dead on arrival? Because the department heads didn't buy into it. It was pushing and pulling the entire way at the State level. So I thought it was appropriate that people who are going to use this product, not me because I don't know anything absolutely about IT. I at least admit my shortfall. I could sit here for four weeks and try and have them drum something into my head, and again it's about turning on the computer, reading it, and deleting it. That's as far as I go. At least I admit that. I think it is important that the decision makers in this City, that we pay an awful lot of money to, respect and ask them for their views on subject

matters sent in, and not on one meeting, because I told them it wasn't going to happen with a decision on one. They sat and went through this process and bought into it. The discussion I had at a department head meeting just a couple of weeks ago that if we move forward with this IT program and instituting new software, that it had to be a buy-in by all departments. It could not be a push-back because that's when it doesn't succeed. I think it is important that when we rely on people in different departments to give us their information...when people say that they are selling this product on the open market at \$3 million and we as a City are looking at for less than \$1 million, I look at it and I think that certainly I know that we all respect every one of our department heads, and I think everybody will agree that Mr. Sanders is probably the most conservative department head we have in this City. I can tell you that if somebody thinks they are going to come to me and put forward an overtime schedule for implementing this, it is not going to happen. This is about a buy-in; this is about how do we do water and sewer bills on the same bill and only send out one of them and not have to put two stamps on two different envelopes when it is going to the same house. Those are discussions that we have had during this process. You are right, the NET team had the ability to do anything. This allows them to do their work. This allows the efficiencies that happen in this City. So, again, I'm not going to parade every department head up here because I don't think their answers or their discussions are going to be any different than what Bill Sanders said. I certainly would hope that everybody on this Board, if they have discussions, let's have them. I don't have a problem with that discussion process. But I don't think that anymore information that's going to be given to us today versus in two weeks is going to change anybody's mind. I don't think that we're going to read into a contract other than maybe to the two lawyers that we have sitting here that may say this T was crossed or that I was dotted. But with that, I'll open discussion.

Alderman Lopez stated I had the floor. And in all fairness to our Director of IT, I'd like her to come up here for a second, please. I think it is very important. She has worked very, very hard on this project, and I think that if we do not move forward, it's going to put us back quite a ways. I give her an opportunity to make her appeal to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Ms. Jennie Angell, Director of Information Systems, stated thank you. First I want to apologize to any of the Board members who think that they didn't get the communication that would have helped them, and next time we'll make sure that that doesn't happen. We have a proposal before you that gives the City the opportunity to move forward, improve efficiency, improve customer service, and with the department heads, the steering team that we put together, as Bill indicated, we had a lot of very, I would say, animated conversations about this, but in the end we all came to the agreement that this is a phenomenal opportunity for the City to move forward. The software is new, state-of-the-art. It will allow the City to take advantage of all the new innovations that are going on. It will allow the inspectors, if we decide that Smart Phones is the way to go for certain mobile employees, we will be able to have apps that get loaded on Smart Phones so that they can do what they need to do. The NET team will be set up. With this software we can implement it in any order that we want, so if there were certain things that needed to get done early on because they are new and we don't have them, we will be able to do that. That includes things like the NET team, which includes citizen access, so the citizens can enter the cases on the Web if that's what the City wants. It will allow citizens to look at, through the Web, the status of Code enforcement, building permits, and licensing. It will allow the inspectors to have remote access to the system with handheld devices. The system provides imaging so invoices and contracts can be dragged in and attached to the records as supporting documents, so it reduces the amount of staff time required to handle these documents, and it includes setting a thing called workflow, which helps the

City be more efficient. But one of the really big parts of this is not only do we get the software for the cost of what we're paying for maintenance, we also get 1,000 days of consulting and support services from the vendor to help us analyze what we're doing for processes, to help us streamline processes, so we can become more efficient, and they will also help provide information about what is going on in other communities that has worked well, so we'll have that benefit.

Mayor Gatsas asked how many people replied to your RFP?

Ms. Angell replied four. We had four who replied to the RFP, including Sungard, New World, and Munis.

Mayor Gatsas asked can you give me some idea of what they quoted for pricing?

Ms. Angell replied yes. New World quoted \$1.9 million, but they do not do tax billing, fleet management, special assessments, loans, and assessment management for hydrants. All of that would have to be purchased separately and we would have to be paying \$224,000 a year to Sungard for the three years it would take us to migrate. Tyler appeared to have all the modules; their quote was \$2.3 million, and we also would have to be spending the \$224,000 for Sungard for at least three years for that.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's up to about \$3 million.

Ms. Angell replied yes. So with this proposal from Innoprise, we're talking about, its actually 68 months, and the reason is that it was five years and I wanted to get the first year of maintenance past the five years, I wanted it locked down on a contract, so it ended up being 68 months is \$1.15 million. Then we have the option to extend the maintenance, and it's the City's option, not Innoprise's

option. We locked in maintenance for years seven through eleven at \$123,000 a year, and that is 55 percent of what we're paying now.

Mayor Gatsas stated in all fairness though, the \$1.1 million, we still must pay \$123,000 a year for the Sungard maintenance. Do we have to pay anything to Sungard?

Ms. Angell replied no.

Mayor Gatsas asked we pay nothing?

Ms. Angell replied we've got \$24,000 in licensing that I'm going to have to pay for a couple of years until we get off the licensing to Sungard, but that is it.

Mayor Gatsas asked but the \$223,000 that we were paying with the other two quotes is not part of this quote?

Ms. Angell replied no, it is not.

Alderman Lopez stated I'll let other people speak, but when the time comes, I'd like to have a roll call vote.

Alderman Shaw stated there is no doubt from what I have read of this and listened to, that the Committee has done their homework and they've done a really good job with this. I think the underlying resentment on the part of many of the Aldermen is that this is not the first time that we have not been informed in a timely manner of things that are coming up for major decisions. I think that when you have something of this magnitude that there should be the respect of our positions here that we should have adequate information, and I hope in the future

this maybe will be resolved by this controversy here that some of the Aldermen have with the information part of this, that we be better informed when the time comes to make these decisions. I think this is definitely a very valuable asset to the City and I think that the department heads did a great job, but we are part of this decision and we should get the courtesy of having a much more timely presentation of the facts and the contracts.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you for your thoughts, Alderman. I certainly have never been opposed to meeting with Aldermen and relaying information, but I think that you all know that every time we meet in small groups, follows a right-to-know request, wanting to know what we talked about and what we did. Again, I certainly never have a problem ever meeting with Aldermen to relay information to them. But I think all of you are sick of that same process of having to go through emails and deliver them because people have a meeting or talking about a situation. So, with that, I certainly would love for everybody to have as much information as I can possibly give them, but the information that I had before me was the same information that this Committee got.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor, come on.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman O'Neil, I got no more information than that.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor, you admitted in negotiating that you didn't have any more information.

Mayor Gatsas stated I negotiated off the list of points that you saw. They were no different than what you saw. Jenny, is that true or false?

Ms. Angell replied yes, you got the list.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you very much.

Alderman Osborne stated Your Honor, I made the motion in Committee to accept, I am making the motion now to accept at the full Board level.

Mayor Gatsas stated I'll accept that motion once we allow the speakers.

Alderman Arnold stated I'm going to echo Alderman O'Neil and Alderman Shaw and here is why. None of this, and I want to say this to Jenny as well as to all of the department heads that participated in this process, what the Aldermen are saying, and I don't think I'm speaking out of turn here tonight, the individuals who are supporting the majority of the Administration Committee in voting this proposal down at this time, are not in any way suggesting that the department heads did not follow the letter of their responsibility. I acknowledge that you guys did a tremendous amount of work. Your Honor, it sounds like you did a tremendous amount of work as well, and I appreciate that. I'm sure the other members of this Board appreciate that. That having been said, and also I guess I don't think any of the Aldermen that do not support this proposal at this time have anything against the company, but as Alderman Shaw brought up, there is an issue in City government right now about information getting to this Board. I think we've seen that it is far more pervasive than just every once in a while. It is an issue that I've brought up on several occasions, Your Honor, as you know, and here we see it again, and I pose this question to the Board that if these sorts of proposals that we receive with very little time to digest the information, I realize that there are individuals in City government that had the information, but the members of this Board didn't have the information. If we support these proposals and merely say we need to be kept in the loop, I don't understand what the deterrent is. I don't understand how we can expect the people that work in City

government to provide us the information if they, regardless of whether or not we get it far enough in advance or the day of a meeting or four days before a meeting, if we're just going to say this looks like a good deal, let's go with it, and Your Honor and to Jenny as well, I think from everything I've heard it sounds like a great deal, and yet the problem I think is in the breakdown of the process. It could be the best thing since sliced bread, and I still don't think that's okay to say here we want you to approve this, oh it turned out to be good, no harm, no foul. I cannot understand that and I echo Alderman O'Neil with the sentiment that we took an oath to represent the people who sent us here. I cannot see how we are living up to that responsibility if we are condoning this type of process. Your Honor, if I could ask a question. I don't know if it is to you or the City Clerk. It's my understanding that the proposal agreement came into the Clerk's office on the 16th, and I could have sworn that this Board, and Your Honor in particular, issued a policy about when items had to be received in order to be discussed on the agenda. My question is, when was the agenda compiled for this meeting, and if it was before the 16th, why does this Board have to vote on it tonight? I don't know who that question is directed to.

Mayor Gatsas replied that is a great question because I think that there was an election on Tuesday.

City Clerk Normand stated that's correct. Tuesday the 14th.

Mayor Gatsas stated I can tell you that I think that City Clerk Normand was, at that time on Wednesday the 15th, in Concord, and I can tell you that this came in on the 16th and normally everything that comes before us on that agenda has got to be in here by Wednesday. We extended it a day to Thursday, to get it out to the Board members.

Alderman Arnold stated I have to disagree with you, Your Honor, because I distinctly remember getting an email, and I don't remember if your was your office or the Clerk's office, that said emphatically that because of the election, we had to have all information for the agenda in before the election.

Mayor Gatsas stated department heads.

Alderman Arnold asked how did I get the email then?

City Clerk Normand replied I'd like to answer to help clarify the situation. The agenda deadline for this particular agenda, because of the election, was Friday. Obviously we had the election, and the agenda was prepared in pretty much draft form on Friday. All we did on Monday was copy it for distribution. Obviously we had the election, and it was very busy. The contract came in on the 16th. I knew that the item was on the agenda in Administration, there was no attachment to it. It was a letter from Jennie Angell, I think, with bullet points. But I knew that it was important to get that out to the Board so it went under separate cover with the agendas the following day.

Alderman Arnold stated I appreciate the clarification, Your Honor, but I guess I still don't feel that that adequately gives an answer to my question. I don't understand how this process is acceptable.

Mayor Gatsas stated he just gave you the explanation, but it doesn't seem like you're satisfied with his explanation.

Alderman Arnold replied I'm not satisfied with the process, Your Honor. I accept the explanation of the Clerk; I'm not satisfied with the process. I will just reiterate that I think this is a good proposal in front of us, and I don't think that

I'm putting words into Alderman O'Neil's mouth. I think in Committee he was willing to consider the proposal as well. What he was asking for in Committee was more time to digest it, to be able to review the contract, and as Alderman Shaw pointed out that the Committee had done their homework, a majority of the Administration Committee voted to not accept this contract at this time. I'll defer to other members of the Board, but that's my position.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is about process. My colleague from Ward 9, a lot classier than I could, I think, summed this all up. I think Barbara did a great job. It is about keeping the Aldermen involved, and I think there have been too many instances lately where the Aldermen aren't involved in the loop. And you know what, we have a Mayor, we have department heads, but the people of the City elect 14 Aldermen and the departments have to remember that. I specifically asked Mr. Howard, and Mr. Connelly is sitting here and I'll ask him again if he wants to get up here. I was willing to make the motion to refer it to the October 5th meeting. I wasn't looking to table it or anything else. Send it to the October 5th meeting to just give time. It wasn't the contract I was looking for; it was references. I have no idea what cities they do business in now. Now Bill, this is not taking a shot at you, but you made these comments. You said you did a reference check. We have no idea what was involved with that reference check. We're not questioning the...but who did you called?. We have no knowledge of that, and you said it was communication errors or oversight. In my opinion it was a failure, and failures are unacceptable in City government. This is not about the needs. I think Aldermen old and new will agree, because we hear from the departments regularly, that our current HTE system is not serving City government well; therefore, it's not serving the people we represent well. We are all aware of that. This is not just about price, and I understand this is a good financial deal for the City. This is about process and we don't sell out our process. What really set me off tonight more than anything else was when I was told

tonight that we needed to approve this tonight because this company needs a contract tonight so that they can get a check tomorrow. That's what was said in the Committee meeting, and I'll tell you folks, that's wrong. That is wrong. So I would encourage my colleagues...I don't know, Mr. Connelly, do you want to get up and answer the question? You are here and you are representing the company; you came to the meeting. Mr. Howard is here, the 'H' of HTE. I learned that yesterday, Your Honor. Mr. Howard you may get another chance here, but it's up to you.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's not necessarily true, Alderman, because there are 14 votes in this.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's true, Your Honor. Thank you for that. I asked you a question in the Committee meeting. I was willing to approve the contract and the process with your company and forward it to the October 5th meeting to keep this process going so that we had a chance to learn about what communities you are currently in. I don't know...is it nine or ten? I have no idea what communities you currently serve. I don't know because I wasn't given that information. I'm going to ask you again, is the deal off the table if it is not approved tonight? Mr. Howard is that a yes or a no?

Mr. Howard replied I had some time to think about it. What I want to do is make a counter proposal to say first of all it has never been a matter of the timing. So that, in and of itself, whether you take two weeks, a month, three months, that's never been an issue. The issue is that there was a lot of negotiation that took place, and there were things that I wanted in this contract that are not there that are significant. So in the interest of time, we agreed to that. So first of all, the issue of when it gets done and does it materially change is not a point, because we can always come back and rework a few items and come back on whatever time you

want, because I'm assuming if you are going to put it off two weeks, that you're going to try to change it anyway. That's really what the issue is, so we have the deal that we agreed on or is it going to change some more. We have been negotiating in good faith and going back and forth for months. So that's not an issue. The other thing I wanted to offer is this... So the answer to that ultimately is yes you would have a deal in two weeks. So that's not a question of whether we are going to walk away or whether we need something approved now; it's a matter of my credibility with my team and my people where I have negotiated this and basically it could be all out the window. People start reading it, say I want to change this word and that word, so the real issue is, and in the meantime the City, you talked about HTE, in the meantime the City is still paying THE. You're going to have to write another check to them because you're paying \$17,000 a month for nothing.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I guess that if City staff would have briefed us on this, we wouldn't be having this discussion.

Mr. Howard stated I get that and I feel so bad.

Alderman O'Neil stated we wouldn't be writing that check, so I don't feel accountable for that, I blame City staff for that.

Mr. Howard stated right, and that's the point. I flew in here from Boise, I'm working on a \$3 million deal with the City of Boise, but I had to decide yesterday whether it was more important to be here in Manchester or to be there with my team, and I made the decision to be here. There are a number of reasons for that. First, I'm from here. So when I come to New Hampshire, this isn't just another city to me. I own this company and making things right for what you have been through with HTE system with my name on it, it means something to me.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Howard, we agreed on that. We agreed that there have been problems with HTE; we agreed that you're going to make it right. That's not what the discussion is.

Mr. Howard stated I did everything that I was asked to do, and I was told that I had jumped through all the hoops and done everything and all these other steps. So to answer your question, if you need two weeks, that's not an issue. If you need two weeks to change the deal, that's what I meant. But I can offer you something else. I can offer you something else. I'll give you 30 days to unwind the whole thing if you don't like it. So if there's anything that comes up, I'll go and put the words in here right here tonight that says that if for any reason anyone on this Board or the Mayor or anyone else finds any problems or anything that you want to revisit, I will basically tear the thing up.

Alderman O'Neil stated my concerns are not about the contract, Mr. Howard. My concerns are if somebody tomorrow asked me in the City of Manchester what can you tell me about the company, I can't even think of the name of your company without looking down at my notes. I can think HTE pretty quick. I have no idea other than I think I read tonight you are headquartered in Colorado, I had no idea until you just said it now that you are in 100 cities. I have no idea what those cities are. From my position I have no information on your company. None. If I wanted to pick up the phone and call somebody, I might know Joe Smith or Mary Brown in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, where you're working, I might know them and want to pick up the phone and call them.

Mr. Howard stated all of my customers are on the website, is all I can tell you, every single one. All I know is that I went through a process and I followed all your rules. They weren't my rules...I have another agenda. But I want you to

know, Sir, I have an item on the agenda for more money than this one in Sugarland, Texas, tonight and I'm here. This is telling you about...

Alderman O'Neil interjected because you're here doesn't mean I'm going to sell out on what I believe is the correct process. He is making the points and I'm going to respond to them. I appreciate you being here, that you thought Manchester was important enough to be here. But we have a process to follow and you need to understand that. Unfortunately the people you are working with didn't lead you down the path of the proper process. My question is, if we refer this to the October 5th meeting, is the deal still on the table that was presented tonight?

Mr. Howard replied yes. No changes at all. Yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated from my perspective, no changes. I don't want to speak for the Mayor or my colleagues. So the answer is yes, the deal is on the table if we referred this for a final vote on October 5th, and I give you my word that I will vote favorably for you on October 5th. I'm giving you my word tonight.

Mayor Gatsas stated there are 14 Aldermen.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm talking about myself, Your Honor. I'm not talking about the rest of them.

Mayor Gatsas stated I understand that, but you're holding a gun to a guy's head for your vote.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm not holding a gun to his head; I had several guns held to my head in the Committee meeting, including by Mr. Howard, so don't...

Mayor Gatsas interjected Alderman, let's make sure that the quorum comes back.

Alderman O'Neil stated Your Honor, I'm probably the one, and maybe Alderman Shea, who goes back to when HTE was implemented, and I remember overtime for Deputy Director's and all that stuff. That question was asked and nobody would answer it. You've got to have a proper process.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's what you're saying. I understand your vote; we all understand where you are at. There is no question, but there are other Aldermen in here tonight who might want to move the article. I don't have a problem with where you are at. I understand it.

Alderman Shea stated all I've got to say is there are 14 Aldermen here and every one of us has a vote. We only have one vote. We can either vote yes or no for tonight, and the point of the matter is we went through a process. I don't want to open up a can of worms, but we were in a process two weeks ago and we came up with pretty much the same vote that we took tonight regarding the municipal complex. I mean, two weeks, I don't know what people have to study because basically... I may be a fast learner here.

Mayor Gatsas stated you brought something up, Alderman. You know what? We should broach that. Mr. Marion was here; he left. For two weeks Aldermen didn't hear about it, but he is looking for a different number. He was looking for an appraisal number and then he was looking for an assessor's number. He's asking why I am selling it less than what your assessors appraised it for. So if we want to cost taxpayers more dollars, that's fine. Maybe we should change the process and maybe we shouldn't do anything until Aldermen bring processes forward.

Alderman Shea stated I don't know what process means, Your Honor, in terms of disseminating information. You read something, you make a judgment. If you have information that you can add to it, you add to it. I'm just nonplussed here.

Mayor Gatsas stated I just don't want us to see this costing us another \$1.5 million on this process.

Alderman O'Neil asked so you're willing to sell for a price the process of City government? That's lousy, Your Honor.

Alderman Shea stated basically I don't know what the process is because process is looking at an individual's interest in a particular process. Every one of us has his/her own processing abilities to process information. Some of us may process to the left, some to the right, some in the middle, and I think we get caught up on the fact that we are so important in City government. I mean, we're just people who make decisions. That's all we make. We're elected by people who select us on the basis of what information we can disseminate in terms of their needs and their desires and their wills. We please some of the people and we displease other people. It is a 50/50 or 60/40. That's when we're elected, and that's when we're not elected. The point of the matter is, we discuss things here about process, and I'm getting a little bit in the process I'd like to add to the fact that we make a vote either up or down. If people want to vote process, let them vote process during the two weeks from now, make the same decision we're going to make tonight, there won't be any difference made two weeks from now than tonight.

Alderman Greazzo stated if I may, I'd ask the City Solicitor his opinion of this contract.

Mr. Arnold replied when you say opinion of the contract, Mr. Clark did review the contract as to its form and content and found it acceptable in meeting the City's needs.

Alderman Greazzo stated I think I've heard the word process tonight more than I've ever heard it, and I got a very quick lesson on process in our very first meeting. And since that point the process in this room has been ad hoc. It's been good for this and let's change it for that, and let's suspend the rules here, and let's do this, so I'm not really concerned about process at this point for all intents and purposes. I'm really more concerned about the issue, and I agree with the other Aldermen. Things come up last minute and we're expected to make a serious decision on something that we really haven't gotten all the information on, or had time to digest it as some people have said, and there was the process of having these things come up and then layover and then come back up at the next meeting for a vote. I had other points to make. I've had several discussions with you about the water and sewer bill being on one bill. I've wondered for years, and I've talked to many of my neighbors about why we can't just have it all on one side of the paper for the water and the other side for the sewer, save the City and the departments that much time and effort generating two bills and then having to send back two bills, and if we can do it online and not even have to have the paper, I'm all in favor of that. So my thoughts have gone in different directions listening to everybody talk, but as far as process goes, we either need to get a process or just make it up as we go along because right now that's pretty much what's happening.

Alderman Ouellette stated I'm kind of having a little bit of deja vu as we're sitting down and we're talking about how wonderful or, I'm being facetious obviously, but what kind of nightmare the HTE system has been. I remember somewhere back around 1999 or 2000 when Superintendent Tanguay sat right in one of those seats over there and was trying to explain to the Aldermen that the

HTE system just wasn't working. It wasn't coming up with the numbers of the reports that they needed to get accurate information. He then overspent his budget because the HTE couldn't give accurate information, and the Aldermen at that time, this Board, chastised him and basically ran him out of town. I feel tonight he has been vindicated a little bit with some of the discussions in this room. Whether I am sitting on the school side or this side, sometimes things come up at the last minute and you know what, sometimes you just have to roll up your sleeves and trust the people that you're paying to give you their hard earned faith and value and something that is this important. You kind of have to take them at their word as to saying how much they really need this system, how good this system is, and that they feel that they're all going to make it work. I'm not willing, process or no process, to spend one more penny on the HTE system and I'm hearing tonight that we're going to cut a check for \$17,000 for something that we're not going to use. That is taxpayers' money, ladies and gentlemen. We have a very difficult budget facing us right in the face for next year, and we're going to take \$17,000 and just throw it out the window? Not only that, the savings that this is going to have in the long run towards that year's budget. So yes, the process is skewed. Yes, sometimes it happens, but I just hope that at end of the day when the vote does come, that you make the decision, not in the best interest of this Board all the time, but in the best interest of the citizens of Manchester who we do serve and who we do represent and who do elect us in these seats. I do agree with Alderman O'Neil. Yes, we do get elected and we need to make decisions on the broad picture and the broad scope. Am I upset about this? Absolutely, no question, but tonight I'm going to support this to move this forward so we can get this system implemented as soon as possible, and if there are any other bugs that need to be worked out, let's get them done as soon as possible as well and support these people who need this system to move forward. Thank you, Your Honor.

Alderman Roy stated I should have put my hand up before Alderman Ouellette because I think he's reading my mind this evening. First of all, moving forward, let's say we put an Alderman on all of these committees. We probably wouldn't be having the discussion like this right now because that information would have been spread around. I know when I have meetings, one of my favorite questions is who isn't here that should be, and apparently in this case it was an Alderman on that committee. Maybe even somebody from the Solicitor's office could have been on that committee. Listening to all of this, Alderman Ouellette is 100 percent right. It started in 1997, and I wasn't on this Board but I was around at that time, and I've never heard anything good about HTE. From day one there was nothing but complaints from every department. As far as I'm concern, we can't get rid of that quick enough. \$17,000 a month, I don't think we should be spending that on what I think we should get rid of as quick as we can. And not only is it going to save us money, this is going to improve customer service across the spectrum in this City. I have great faith in that committee that was formed, and they're saying that it is going to improve customer service across the spectrum. The department heads want it as soon as possible so they can improve their customer service. I have to go with it. Thank you, Your Honor.

Alderman Craig stated thank you, Your Honor. There are three things that Jenny had said. One is that we have buy-in from all department heads. The second is that we'll have more efficient constituent services. The third is that it is in the best financial interest for the City, and for those three reasons I am voting in favor of this.

Alderman Arnold stated I'd like to ask Mr. Howard a question, if I might. Mr. Howard, I apologize in advance; I entirely appreciate that in some regards you're a victim of circumstance here tonight. I do want to ask a couple of questions

though. First of all, were you the principal individual who was negotiating on behalf of your company?

Mr. Howard replied no.

Alderman Arnold stated may I ask, if it wasn't you, was it someone else here?

Mr. Howard asked do you mean here onsite? Yes.

Alderman Arnold stated you were negotiating with the City of Manchester. May I ask who it was that you were negotiating with?

Mr. Howard replied I had a meeting with the Mayor who basically beat me up.

Alderman Arnold stated I appreciate those comments more than you probably know. My last question, I think is, was it represented to you at some point that whatever contract got hammered out between you and the City, had to be approved by this Board, that it was subject to final approval by this Board?

Mr. Howard replied yes.

Alderman Arnold stated okay. I guess based on that answer I don't understand some of the comments about...I appreciate you were negotiating in good faith and that means something to me. However, apparently everyone was on notice that this Board had to give the final okay. I will leave it at that, Your Honor.

Alderman Corriveau stated thank you, Your Honor. In my nine months on this Board during the Committee on Administration hearing I was thinking about three contracts our Board has had to make decisions on. The MCAM and MCTV

contract, the ambulance contract and this contract. Now I was one of the only ones to vote against terminating the MCAM and MCTV contracts, not because I disagreed fundamentally with the action, but because as a new Alderman who had just been on the job, I'd never seen those contracts and I was being asked to terminate them. A loss that happens, okay. The contract for the City EMS providers was a very, very different story. There were two hearings at the Committee on Administration on this contract. There was an ad hoc committee just like this one with Aldermen. I think Alderman Roy's points are very, very well taken. In the time that we considered that contract I was provided the opportunity to ask questions of members on that committee including Alderman Roy and Alderman O'Neil. Because I was granted that opportunity, I trusted the opinion of that Committee. I don't just give my trust because someone happens to be a department head. No matter how good a job they do. That isn't what I was elected to do. Our job is to make an informed vote. I had questions at the Committee on Administration today. Alderman O'Neil spoke first, asking questions about why this couldn't go to the October 5th meeting. I had that same exact question. We were told there has to be a check issued tomorrow and you can either take this contract or leave it. A gun was put to the City's head and I think we resented that. At least that was our impression. We resented that, and I'm glad you've clarified that and I appreciate it. But I had lots of questions in Committee. It was the first opportunity I had to ask them. I had questions about the duration and the type of a contract, the appropriations process, the vetting process, and what other cities use this company. I asked if this motion, if this particular motion, was going to be voted on October 5th, then in between now and October 5th, if the company would be happy to provide information about the company itself, the cities it services, letters of recommendation's from those cities. I appreciate Mr. Howard being here and I appreciate the work Innoprise is doing and I appreciate the committee's work, but I'm just supposed to say okey-dokey, I accept your word tonight and let's get this all done right away. It is being called

process a lot here tonight, I think it's about character, not just process. And in that respect if there is the opportunity for this vote to be taken on October 5th, I have questions. Alderman Arnold just asked questions, and he may have others too. In our opportunity to evaluate this company, every single Alderman on this Board may have further questions, but between getting an agenda on Friday night, one Committee hearing a couple of hours before being asked to take a final vote, I'm sorry. I don't believe that reflects well on the way our City does business.

Mayor Gatsas asked Jennie, did any Aldermen call you yesterday or today for any information? Did you hear from anybody about concerns of what recommendations were or who this company was?

Ms. Angell replied Alderman Lopez and Alderman Craig sent me an email with some questions.

Alderman Lopez stated with all due respect to all my colleagues, Chairmen can't read people's minds. When you get something... had I gotten a call from anybody saying could you provide us reference on these people, I'm sure Mr. Sanders could have done that. I'm sure that anybody would have called the department head, like I do all the time, and many of you do. Many of you call other department heads and get information, so I wish that, and I say this respectfully as Chairman of the Board, when we get the documentation that people work on for six months or the City Clerk gets it out to us as fast as he can, take a little time and if there are some questions, I would only advise that you call the Chairman of that Committee or call the department head and tell them that you do have questions about this. We cannot wait, and I hate to use the word, it has been used 80 million times tonight, but process, we can't wait until we get to the Committee meeting and say, 'Oh I have a question'. If you have a question, call

the department head. That's what they get paid \$100,000 for is to answer your questions.

Alderman Shaw stated thank you, Your Honor. I just wanted to clarify that my points that I made I firmly believe in and I think in the future, I don't know if I can vote for something unless information is presented in a timely manner, but in this particular case, after reviewing what I see here, after looking it up online and the importance that this is to the City, I will have to vote for it. And I wanted to clarify that because I didn't want anyone to get the impression that I was not going to support it even though my comments that I made I firmly believe in also.

Thank you.

Alderman DeVries stated I will admit that I was caught a little bit off guard that this was moving forward to tonight's meeting, and maybe I missed it somewhere. I've tried to review the separate cover piece that was sent to us with the contract and it didn't seem to suggest, usually in a cover letter if something is being fast tracked, the cover letter indicates that to us. I would have thought at the very least, that would have been called out for special attention. Normally the due diligence that we have the opportunity to do is to have that Committee meeting and to hear the presentation and to format where our questions are. Not for every item are we going to know our questions before we get a presentation or have a discussion. Many of those discussions are formed this evening. I haven't heard, and actually some of it I brought up in the Committee, the implementation, we all know the rocky history of implementing previously the cost to the City, and we're headed into tough budget years the next couple of years. We haven't heard about how the department heads plan to work this seamlessly into their budgets, and now the Mayor weighing in that there won't be any ability to come back for overtime; they will be absorbing cost. I would have loved to have heard the department heads' side of that from other department heads. More importantly, and it's a

piece I've watched Alderman O'Neil do over the years, that he does extremely well, find people in other cities, not necessarily the contacts that you were giving us to reach out to, but reach out to other department heads in other cities, at random, so they aren't coached, to find out how seamless the implementation was for them, and what kind of problems they've had with the system. We all know we don't want to replicate the difficulties that we have had with the past software, and I hope we are on the horizon of moving away from that and onto something else. But not knowing that this was being fast tracked this evening, not spending the time yesterday, being prepared that it was being fast tracked, to have done that additional due diligence, you're asking an awful lot of us to get to a yes on this tonight. That's the difficulty we know.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess my concern is...you made a comment about why we didn't we call Jennie; why were Aldermen Craig and Lopez the only ones that called her. I get this Friday night, I try to look at it at some time over the weekend, and nowhere in Jennie's letter does she make a reference to wanting the approval to execute this contract immediately. I might have read it, but traditionally if departments want some other action, like we'd like to get it to the Committee, ask Committee approval and refer to the full Board the same night, they usually say that. So maybe it's not the best written letter.

Alderman Lopez stated I'd like clarification of your comment so I understand. Are you saying it's not in the contract? I just want to make sure I understood you correctly.

Alderman O'Neil replied it's not in her cover letter she wrote.

Alderman Lopez stated yes, it is, in the last paragraph.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have no idea what he's talking about.

Mayor Gatsas stated it is in the last paragraph of the letter.

Alderman O'Neil stated right. That's what it said, but it doesn't say she was looking for action tonight. That's not what I read. I don't know. Alderman Lopez I guess I didn't have the privy to the education you had or something. That's not what I read. I don't need him to tell me what I read.

Mayor Gatsas stated okay, let's just stop.

Alderman Lopez stated all you have to do is read the last paragraph.

Mayor Gatsas stated that is enough. Let's just move forward. Please

Alderman O'Neil stated I do believe that this is one of the most important votes this particular group is going to take in two years. This is important. We need the systems to work in the City. I'm more than optimistic that this vendor is going to provide a good quality product. I think Mr. Howard, listening to him at the Committee meeting, has a little bit of fire in his belly for HTE. That's not a bad thing; I'll take him on my side for that any time. I think that's a good thing, and I think he and his firm are going to stand behind this, and if we're having issues, they are going to help address them. And I know they have a commitment to open an office in the City, not only to serve the City of Manchester, but other potential clients. The departments know to call us for many smaller things than this, and it just bothers me that they didn't call on this. It bothers me greatly, and to be honest with you, I'm not going to be able to let it go for a while.

Mayor Gatsas stated well Alderman, I know that you're like I am. You forgive and forget and we move process in this City...

Alderman O'Neil stated no, we have a saying in Ireland, Your Honor, we forgive, but don't forget.

Mayor Gatsas stated that's fine and that's okay, and certainly maybe I can buy you a pizza or clams at Cremeland and we can both forget and move forward.

Alderman Long stated thank you, Your Honor. There was a perception thrown out tonight that if we vote on this today, that we're not making an informed decision. I certainly didn't read the whole contract because there are parts of it that I will never understand and I won't even attempt to. I look at the ends; there are a couple of issues in contracts that I look at to make sure that they are there. The cover letter, to me, was very informative. I called a couple of department heads because I knew that they would have to work with it, and we've had problems in the Committee on Accounts with this THE. I just wanted to be assured that they felt comfortable with this company. They met with the company. So I am making an informed decision. I'm not about to call a city that I was set up to call. I don't know anybody in any other city that I could speak to and trust that I'm getting the right answer. I think that's a great scenario; however, I don't work with enough cities throughout the country to have that relationship. But I just want it known that I am making an informed decision tonight, and my informed decision is to support passage of this tonight.

Alderman Shea stated I was taken aback by a comment that was made, Mr. Howard, in terms of guaranteeing within 30 days that if something were not to be according to the contractual agreement or this agreement, you would be very

willing to sign some sort of an agreement that you... You would put that in the contract?

Mr. Howard replied yes. I'm not trying to back everyone in a corner.

Alderman Shea stated I'm just asking if you would put that in the contractual agreement.

Mr. Howard replied yes. The issue was that I didn't want to change everything; that was the whole issue.

Mayor Gatsas stated Alderman Shea, I thank you for that because I never heard that, but after I heard it tonight, that would have been my closing remark to approve it. So I appreciate you for coming forward.

Alderman Shea stated there was a book, and I'm going to quote because it was written long ago, not to deceive the elect, and that was a book written, and I'm sure that you do not intend to deceive the elect here tonight. In other words, you want to be as honorable and as truthful in your discussion with us as you can possibly be. Let me make a final comment. I respect all my colleagues here. Some of us make judgments predicated...I used to play chess and I was a quick chess mover; I never contemplated my moves too much, and therefore, I'd win some and I'd lose some. But you know we have to make decisions on our judgment, on our intellectual abilities, and whether we think something is right or wrong and that's the way we have to make decisions, and some of us make decisions quickly and others have to analyze things and I respect them. That's their nature and they should do that, but the point of the matter is that we have to make a decision tonight and I would respect whatever my colleagues decide, but I

would be in favor and I would urge my colleagues, taking a page from Dan O'Neil, Page 2, that we support this. Thank you, Your Honor.

Alderman Greazzo stated I certainly support this but the gentleman also did say that he wouldn't mind holding this over until the next meeting, so maybe we could table and vote this for the next meeting.

Alderman Osborne asked Your Honor, how much are we going to lose if we wait until the next meeting or ten days and all of this stuff? Are we taking a vote here?

Alderman Lopez stated I'd ask the City Clerk and I'd call for a roll call.

Mayor Gatsas stated you're not asking for the minority report; you're asking that we vote in favor of this contract this evening.

Alderman Lopez stated that's correct.

Alderman Osborne moved to execute the contract with Innoprise Software. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Lopez.

Mayor Gatsas stated with the addition that in 30 days, if for some reason this Board wants to rescind it at any time, it has that ability.

Alderman Greazzo stated just a clarification, Your Honor...Ms. Angell had mentioned that if this for some reason wasn't accepted tonight, we would make a \$17,000 payment.

Ms. Angell replied we would have another month of maintenance with Sungard.

Alderman Greazzo asked and that would be because by the time we got to this next month we would have that payment due?

Ms. Angell replied yes.

Alderman Lopez requested a roll call vote on the motion to execute the contract with Innoprise Software.

City Clerk Normand asked Your Honor, does this include the 30-day rescission?

Mayor Gatsas replied nobody made the amendment; I can't make it.

Alderman Shea stated I will make the amendment.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion. Aldermen Corriveau, O'Neil, DeVries and Arnold voted nay. Aldermen Craig, Ludwig, Long, Roy, Osborne, Lopez, Shea, Shaw, Greazzo and Ouellette voted yea. The motion carried.

Ms. Angell stated thank you. If any Alderman would like more information, if they want to give me a call, I can provide them whatever they are interested in.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is a little late for that, Jennie.

17. Presentation of the Manchester Municipal Complex

Mr. Sheppard stated at a previous meeting of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, I believe the Aldermen asked for us to keep the Aldermen updated. What we wanted to bring forward tonight is just showing you, the second page of the handout that you received, the revised layout based on keeping the Water Works

building. If you'll look at the screen, the Police Department is still staying at the corner of Maple and Valley Streets; the Highway Department is at the corner of Valley and Lincoln Streets; vehicle maintenance staying in the same location; Water Works, now that existing building is staying, our vehicle storage has moved to the east a little bit, it used to be over in the location where Water Works was; and the property shown is the property the City is currently working on a purchase and sale to purchase as part of the project now. That's where our shop buildings will not be located in this area. The main site has not really changed. It's really the Water Works property as well as the used office furniture property that the City is looking at purchasing. We are moving forward on that. As far as schedule goes, we're still working with four construction managers at this time. We did receive one round of pricing; the problem is the round of pricing that we received was based on the old plan. So the pricing that we received really wasn't a good gauge as to where we stand with the construction numbers on this project. We expect the second round of pricing to come in on October 1st. Alderman Long sits on the committee. On October 6th the committee will be reviewing the second round of pricing that comes in, the second round of proposals that come in from the four construction managers and at that point, we anticipate there may be the possibility that we'll narrow down the four construction managers down to two or three, and either request an additional GMP from the construction managers or start negotiations with a couple of the construction managers.

Alderman Osborne stated Kevin, I was just wondering how many parking spaces are there going to be for the employees.

Mr. Sheppard replied that seems to be one of the biggest questions I've been receiving lately. Some employees feel they are not going to have parking and I don't want to seem too hard, but I don't guarantee parking to any employee, and I guess I'll preface it by that. If you receive any calls, I'm not going to guarantee

parking to any employee as part of this project. We are still working on this area over here, maybe lay down, or it may be some employee parking. We've got the old railroad bed, so I don't have that answer for you tonight, and won't until we start getting into the final details with the construction manager.

Alderman Osborne asked what about in between the Water Works and the shop buildings? How much space is between there that you couldn't angle park some of them in there?

Mr. Sheppard replied actually there is going to be some outside vehicle parking right in that area, and we will be looking at employee parking if possible. We will be maximizing parking onsite, but believe it or not, that seems to be the biggest question I've been receiving from people on a project that consists of all of these major buildings, where will our employees be parking.

Alderman Osborne asked will there be much space where Lincoln Street was when that is cut off now from Valley Street? How much room is between these two buildings? They still have ten feet on each side, probably about 60 feet between these two buildings or so?

Mr. Sheppard asked between the DPW administration building?

Alderman Osborne stated between the Water Works building and then we have Lincoln Street.

Mr. Sheppard replied I still anticipate that being about 50 feet. We have to take a look at Water Works customer parking and the potential for maybe employee parking, but on this side of vehicle maintenance, those are exterior garage doors for pulling vehicles in and out.

Alderman Osborne stated we also have some more space in back of the Water Works. Is that right? There is quite a bit of land there, I noticed.

Mr. Sheppard replied right, and that will be for their employee parking and their garage is right there as well.

Alderman Osborne stated it may not take all of their employee parking. We would probably be able to find something somewhere between everything I think.

Mr. Sheppard stated we're doing our best to maximize parking on the site.

Alderman Osborne stated thank you.

Alderman Arnold stated Kevin, I know you said this already, but can you repeat again what is the status of the selection of the construction manager.

Mr. Sheppard replied we are down to four construction managers. They received the last set of plans last Wednesday. They are not 100 percent construction documents, they received the latest updated plans last Wednesday, and October 1st we're expecting them to be submitting their current gross maximum price for this project.

Alderman Arnold asked so we'll be narrowing down that field of candidates to something else when?

Mr. Sheppard replied the committee I believe would like to at least narrow that down to two or three and potentially go out for another GMP before the November timeline that we're looking to go out for bonding.

Alderman Arnold asked there is an Alderman on that committee?

Mr. Sheppard replied yes, that is Alderman Long and he's very active on the committee.

Alderman DeVries stated Kevin, you can't expect to lob out there, the pricing came in on the old plans but you're waiting for the new plans to give us an update without expecting us to ask, 'What did you see there?'

Mr. Sheppard replied we actually saw a variety of pricing. We saw some construction managers including some items in their GMP; other construction managers did not include some things; some construction managers are making some assumptions, while other construction managers weren't making assumptions. So it was difficult to make an apples to apples comparison. We're working diligently actually at this point so the next round that comes in October 1st we can make a good apples to apples comparison on this project. I know I kind of sugarcoated that description, and I figured you'd be asking that question tonight because it is a good question, but it is difficult to say and quite honestly to release or to say some of those numbers tonight may not be proper in this forum.

Alderman DeVries stated you'd want to be in non-public session, I think is what I'm hearing, and that is fair enough.

Mr. Sheppard stated right.

Alderman Shea stated Kevin, when will the project begin to come to fruition? In other words, when is the initial down to earth digging and so forth?

Mr. Sheppard replied we're hoping some demolition can start this winter.

Alderman Shea stated you're going to start demolition this winter, so that would be the beginning of the process. And then for the sake of the few listening audiences that haven't been drawn away from our situation tonight, how long do you expect it to last and when do you expect it to be concluded?

Mr. Sheppard replied actually that's a good question, because we had an original schedule that we had thought and we're actually looking to consolidate that schedule back. So that's actually coming up as part of the second round. It could be anywhere from 24 months out to 36 months.

Alderman Arnold asked could I ask a question of the Chairman?

Mayor Gatsas replied yes.

Alderman Arnold stated to the Alderman Lopez, I don't know if we're going to get to this later in the evening about the oversight committee appointments, but either now or then could you provide an explanation as to what the scope of that committee will be doing? Is it just to approve change orders after a certain time, or is it going to be...

Alderman Lopez interjected the way I understand from the instruction from the Board is once the project manager is selected by the selection committee, then the department head and the project manager, whatever contract is available, will report to the oversight committee on any issues.

Mayor Gatsas stated and then the oversight committee would report back to the full Board.

Alderman Lopez stated that is right, back to the Board.

18. Discussion regarding former MCAM Inc.

Alderman Lopez stated I've had some conversations with all the Aldermen, the ones I could reach in reference to MCAM. I talked to Mr. Sanders today, and I'll let him elaborate on his letter as to we move forward and hope that by the next Board meeting we will receive something. One of the technical questions that I had for Mr. Sanders is, in a letter received from the Community Access, somebody personally deposited \$100,000 into the account. Could you clarify that?

Mr. Sanders replied that is what the letter says. I did not talk to Mr. Infantine about it, but I believe it is a typing error. I believe it is \$100 and there was an extra zero put at the end. Getting a copy of the final dissolution report that's filed with the Attorney General I think would clarify the matter, but I'm not aware that they owed \$100,000 to anybody. I think we took all the \$100,000 obligations they had.

Alderman Lopez stated the other comment I have, Your Honor, I think by the next Board meeting that we need to move forward on a courtesy letter that you're sending now for him to provide the necessary accountability. Is that correct?

Mr. Sanders replied yes, that is correct. We sent a letter last Friday. I sent him a letter and he has contacted me. Mr. Infantine contacted me yesterday and said he's putting some things together. He indicated at that time that he might have it by Wednesday or Thursday of this very week, and so I told him I'm around so I hope to hear from him.

Mayor Gatsas asked what would you like to do with the correspondence or is that just for information purposes?

Alderman Lopez replied I think it is for information purposes. The Chief Finance Officer is on top of it.

Mayor Gatsas asked we don't need to take an action?

Alderman Lopez replied not unless somebody wants to do that.

19. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$20,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 214511 Manchester Health Dept. Strategic Planning Process.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 410211 Enforcing Underage Drinking Laws.”

“Amending the FY 2011 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY 2011 CIP 612411 Façade Improvement Project.”

A Resolution “Rescinding \$590,000 of Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases of a Bond Resolution for 2009 CIP 711209 which authorized \$3,211,500 of Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases, so as to endorse the issuance of a bond authorization in the amount of \$2,621,500.”

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

Mayor Gatsas stated the fourth Resolution has been tabled.

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

Mayor Gatsas stated you will see a letter that I sent everybody in regards to I've been getting a lot of inquiries about Halloween. I know we turned it over to the Chief as an ordinance for him to have jurisdiction, but I think it was important that we look at the surrounding communities and the times that they are having Halloween. I know that the Chief has already set a time from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM; my letter is asking that he would go to 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM just so that we could get closer to where the other communities are at based on the calls I've been getting in the office from constituents saying Halloween is Halloween and we should have it at night. I'm not too sure if it was during my tenure on this Board or before it when that times was changed, so it's not anything that I'm looking for this Board to change, because the Chief does have it. I just had the conversation with him. I don't know if this Board wants to weigh in on any of that.

Alderman Shea asked are you planning on going Trick or Treating too?

Mayor Gatsas replied I don't know. They have me walking stairs and walking the streets and who knows, maybe I'll go Trick or Treating if I can get a chance to get some candy.

Alderman Greazzo stated thank you, Your Honor. I've be an advocate for actually having holidays on the actual holiday, and I know it is up to the Chief's discretion. Last year Halloween fell on a Saturday, and we had a Haunted Hollow in Ward 10, and we'll do the same this year regardless of what date the Chief says.

Mayor Gatsas stated the Chief has already selected Halloween, the 31st of October. He's selected a time of 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM; I'm just asking that maybe we get to where, if you take a look at the communities of Bedford, Hooksett, Goffstown, Nashua, are basically on that 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM schedule.

Alderman Greazzo stated it is on a weekend.

Alderman Lopez asked will the Chief give us an answer soon?

Mayor Gatsas replied I guess maybe he might be interested in where this Board would like to see him go. I know where he's at, and I don't think we have the ability to make it go one way or the other, but I would think that maybe a recommendation if the Board wants to see it from 4PM to 7PM or a different, 6PM to 8PM. Without taking a vote or just....

Alderman Lopez interjected I'd like to give the opportunity to the Chief to analyze this one more time and maybe in October or before then he can make his decision. If he decides to go 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM, it's okay with me.

Alderman Shea stated I think the kids really enjoy going a little bit later. It is spookier and it's a little bit more than when they go out during the daytime hours. I think some of us that had children that went out; I think they enjoyed getting dressed up and getting a little bit spooked on that night. I would think that 4:00 PM to 7:00 PM is good or 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM or whatever.

Alderman Osborne stated Your Honor, I think the way things are in Manchester right now and the way things are really in the country, I think 1PM to 4PM is fine. I wouldn't go beyond that. I think it's a lot better. I know I was the same way, I

liked nights too when I was back there in the 50's or 40's or wherever you want to go. It doesn't matter. I think the way it is today, 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM, has been fine.

Alderman DeVries stated thanks, Your Honor, and I'm not going to help the Chief out at all as far as suggesting a time, but just to remind him and the rest of the Board that the Fire Department has always hosted, there is a retiree that hosts the Halloween and they supply cider and candy, so don't forget to coordinate with the fire stations and Chief Burkush. I'm sure he can assist with that. If there is a time change and the retiree doesn't know it, he's going to show up at 1:00 PM as he does every year.

Alderman Shaw stated as the mother of three, who won't be Trick or Treating at this point, I think it should be half and half so that you get it from like 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM so that you've got partial daytime and partial night. So those that want to take their kids out in the daytime can go out in the lighter hours and then the later hours would be for the older kids, but I think 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM makes more sense than later or earlier. I don't like the 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM, but I like 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

Alderman Corriveau stated Chief, whatever time you choose, I just would like to commend you for having Halloween on Halloween. It's a wonderful gesture and I'm glad to see it happen. Thank you, Chief.

Mayor Gatsas stated I have a couple of housekeeping items. You will all see before you that you have a VIP pass and tickets. The VIP pass will get you into the VIP events and you're invited to judge the chili contest for the Chili Fest. Anybody who wants to be a judge, certainly we're looking for people to enter that and the schedules are on the back side of the VIP ticket. If you have friends or

relatives who are looking to buy tickets, certainly call the office and we certainly will provide them for you. There is going to be entertainment. There are going to be cooks that are going to be everywhere. Everybody will have an opportunity to try some of the best chili in the country. I can tell you that people are starting to call the office and people are coming in that are going to be participating. They are excited about what we're doing. I can tell you that Saturday and Sunday two of my staffers were out putting up 4X8's in various parts of the City. If you've got a good location that somebody will allow us to put a four by eight foot sign to advertise it, give us a call and we'll see if we can't get somebody else to go out and do it instead of Sam and Carrie, because I know that they were pretty beat on Sunday night with that ten pound sledge hammer trying to drive in those stakes. If you've got locations, call us please, because we want to get it up. Even if it's out of town, in a different community; you may have a friend or somebody that you know that we can get it up to make sure we get as many people into Manchester as we can.

Alderman Roy asked during that weekend, are our services, Aldermen, going to be needed during that weekend?

Mayor Gatsas replied I can tell you that certainly we would ask everybody that wants to do something, we will get you a list if you want to come into my office and talk to either Sam or Carrie, or downstairs in the Economic Development office for what is available. If people want to do something, certainly I can tell you that we're going to need as many volunteers over that three day period as we can find.

Alderman Shaw stated I already turned my slip in to be judge for all of them. I hope somebody else joins me.

Alderman Shea stated this is a different subject. Can I go into a different subject?

Mayor Gatsas replied I can only tell you this is a special meeting, unless it is unanimous consent. Maybe you can give me a hint of what it might be.

Alderman Shea stated these are two announcements. Nothing special.

Mayor Gatsas stated announcements are okay.

Alderman Shea stated first of all there is a Neighborhood Watch meeting tomorrow night at Engine 7 at 6:30 PM. Second, the Aldermen are invited to the dedication of the Hallsville Court, which is the former OLPH Church site. They are going to dedicate that on September 29th at 11:00 AM. Any Alderman who is interested in either affair is welcome to come. Thank you, Your Honor.

Alderman DeVries stated Your Honor, it's not an announcement but it was on the schedule. I briefly wanted to ask you if you would discuss with us item 18, which was on MCAM. If I recall earlier this evening, a member of the public indicated that there are people who have personal items that they wish to retrieve from the building. I just didn't know if you had a comment on how that should be approached, who those individuals should reach out to in order to facilitate that cure.

Mayor Gatsas stated certainly I think that City Clerk Normand and Mr. Sanders have been the lead on this issue. Certainly I don't know if they've heard from anybody, but nobody has contacted my office. The City Clerk's office would be the place to call if anybody has any questions.

Alderman Ludwig stated I just want to announce that on Tuesday, September 28th, Alderman Corriveau, Alderman Roy and myself will be holding a little public gathering to let people weigh in on the Wellington Hill purchase and sale agreement that was in front of us back on July 6th. It will be at Hillside Middle School on Reservoir Avenue, the time is 6:00 PM and the general public is invited.

Alderman Long stated I didn't realize it was a special meeting, but I don't know if I could bring up the four by eight foot political signs that are at residences. We have an ordinance that says that's not allowed, and I've been approached by a couple of people who have had to knock on their door and they took their signs down. I'm wondering if there's a follow-up on the rest of them that are out. Are you hearing anything, Your Honor, with respect to removal of those four by eight foot signs?

Mayor Gatsas replied I think that what you will hear from the Attorney General and all the way up, is that somebody can put whatever sign they want on their lawn, whatever size, I certainly will let the Clerk weigh in on it.

City Clerk Normand stated State law doesn't define size. That may be a zoning issue, but in terms of how long they can stay up, the State law says it is a week after an election, on public property. Where they have gotten permission and if they are not collected on public property, they can be collected by the Public Works or law enforcement.

Alderman Long asked from what I'm understanding is there is an ordinance that doesn't allow a four by eight foot sign?

Alderman Lopez asked can we get unanimous consent? This is important.

***Alderman Long** moved for unanimous consent for further discussion. The motion was duly seconded by **Alderman Craig**. The motion failed, with **Alderman O'Neil** duly recorded in opposition.*

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

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk