

**JOINT SESSION
COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE
&
COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

January 27, 2003

6:00 PM

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order in joint session with the Committee on Administration/Information Systems.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Lopez, Sysyn, Pinard, Shea, DeVries, Gatsas, Osborne, Forest

Absent: Aldermen Guinta, O'Neil

Messrs: Mayor Baines, R. MacKenzie, L. LaFreniere, V. Lamberton, B. Jabjiniak, J. Hills

Chairman Lopez advised that the purpose of the joint session is discussion relative to a restructuring proposal of the Economic Development, Planning and Building Departments.

Mayor Baines stated I appreciate the opportunity to come before you once again with an opportunity to look at perhaps a different way of doing things, a more effective way of doing things and a more efficient way of doing things in City government. It is ironic, I find it, that we have a President of the United States talking about new ways of doing things with his efforts around Homeland Security and combining all of the agencies and more efficient government, and we have a new Governor in office and I was just listening to him on the radio say that we all need to look at ways of doing things in a different way, and governments all across the country are looking to bring about greater efficiencies that here we are once again with another opportunity that I hope meets with the approval of this Board so we can begin to move forward with greater efficiency in government. Let me talk basically about economic development. It is the one of the most important things, obviously, we do in government. When I became Mayor I found very soon after meeting with various people who were trying to do business with our City – real estate people, development people and others concerned about economic development in the community a bureaucracy that they found was not very friendly towards them in terms of moving projects through the process. They also

talked about some of the gaps that exist and as a result of that we formed the Manchester Economic Development Action Team, which brings together all of the different agencies around major projects and we have been able to bring cohesiveness to some of the major projects in the City, most notably the PSNH project that we used that process on initially and we have used it since successfully. The other gap that we found was that no one was focusing on downtown. As we know, the issue of downtown resulted through years, I believe, of neglect and also because of some of the challenges of our economy and we brought forward again with the suggestion of a lot of people the Destination Manchester Coordinator position, which does not cost the taxpayers \$1. It is funded through CDBG funding and we worked with the HUD officials who gave us examples of how that funding was used across the country to spur economic development. Several months ago I asked the three leaders of the three entities that are most responsible for economic development activities in the City – Leon LaFreniere of the Building Department, Jay Taylor of MEDO and Bob MacKenzie of Planning to sit down and see how their three units could work more efficiently and more effectively on behalf of all of the activities in City government. I did not put any constraints on them in terms of costs. In fact I said to them I thought this might be one effort that perhaps would not save any money but might, in fact, strengthen our economic development efforts. So, there were no restrictions on them whatsoever and no superimposed ideas. It was simply that I thought the three of them could come up with a structure that would allow them to work more efficiently and more effectively together. That was it. They came forward with the proposal that you are going to receive tonight having been given those guidelines – not to save money but to spur additional economic development activities to help people through the Planning process and also deal with the issues of the Building Department. I can tell you as Mayor that I spend a vast majority of my time, which is the correct thing to do, on economic development activities in the City. I am the person that people come to when they are having problems with the bureaucracies or seeing different things that are not happening with the different agencies in City government – perhaps roadblocks that are there or perhaps lack of communication on different issues. I cannot tell you how many times I have had to get involved where simply we have one agency of government saying one thing to someone who is trying to develop a property or deal with a project with another aspect of City government saying just the opposite creating all kinds of frustration and concern about development here in the City. You are going to deal with a project or proposal tonight that number one brings about strengthening, not diminishing it in any way whatsoever. No diminished in any way. It creates two new positions in the Economic Development Office so that we have now four people working on economic development activities, keeping the Destination Manchester Coordinator position because I think it has proven to be, I believe, one of the most effective offices we have established to focus on downtown activities and I think the record of achievement that that has brought

forward is certainly worthy of commendation and recognition. Mr. MacKenzie will bring you through a process that will talk about how the professional staff will be utilized to strengthen our economic development activities and also in the end because of shared administrative staff, actually brings about a cost savings of approximately \$60,000 as well. That does not diminish that staff that will be in place to deal with economic development. We do not need to fund another high paid department head position in the City. What we need are people out there working – worker bees who are out there doing economic development activities. As Mayor, I have personally visited over 80 different businesses since I have been Mayor. That is a very important aspect of economic development; going out and meeting with businesses and learning about businesses and their different problems or challenges they are facing and providing them with a format to deal with issues that might impact their consideration to make sure they stay in Manchester, grow their businesses in Manchester and again allow us to expand our tax base. I realize with any proposal that comes forward...I realize that Mayor Wieczorek said it best the other night in talking before the Charter Commission about why government is so expensive and he talked about it being politics because it seems to me that every time we try to make a change or do something different everybody has another opinion or another idea and they know somebody here or they want to help somebody there or protect a position and, therefore, nothing changes. We have a Charter Commission that is going back to 1983. We need to look into 2010 and 2015 and beyond to position our City, not going back 20 years. We need to look at new ways to do things to move this City forward, especially around economic development. If there is one challenge that we have in this City and all of you know it, it is expanding our tax base. With this structure that I believe we should put in place, we will be putting the necessary hands on the deck to do the grunt work of economic development which to be quite frank has not been in place in this government for a long time. I hope you keep an open mind. I hope that if you have been lobbied around a position that you will dispense with that and keep an open mind as to what we are talking about. We are talking about greater efficiency, effectiveness and not diminishing in one way, shape or manner the influence and the impact of the economic development office. It puts it in a structure that allows projects to have a coordinated approach to deal with the number one frustration of developers dealing with the City. If you would like to bring in developers and talk about the frustrations they have, it is the lack of a coordinated effort to guide projects through the process, to have agencies interacting with each other on a daily basis, planning, building and economic development which are forces that if you bring them together will unleash the potential of the interest in development of the City. Do not stay with the status quo. Don't go back 10 or 20 years. Let's look to the future. Having said that, I would like to turn it over to Mr. MacKenzie to make his presentation and I will also be available later on to answer any of your questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. MacKenzie stated good evening Committee members. Joining me tonight is Leon LaFreniere, the Building Commissioner. We actually have a very short presentation. I think it is only a five slide PowerPoint presentation. We did want to leave adequate time for members of the Committees to ask any questions that they have of us. First I wanted to show you an organizational structure, as we would propose it. This focuses primarily on the Planning and Development Department as we proposed. The Building Department will remain fairly much the way it is now. I am primarily focusing on this organization. As you can see on this chart the policy and daily directives are given by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen. There are also a number of boards and committees that we provide staff support to and under the proposal would provide support to – the Planning Board, Manchester Development Corporation, Heritage Commission, Conservation Commission and the Millyard Design Committee. There are also a number of Aldermanic committees that we report to and provide information to. Generally we would have four working groups within this department – Growth Management, which would deal with primarily supporting the Planning Board subdivisions and site plans. There would be a Long-Range Planning Group to deal with such things as the City's Master Plan or area development plans, such as the civic center area. There would be a Community Development Group, which would be the CIP Program and there would be an Economic Development Group, which would be the existing program, which would be merged with the department. The physical location would remain the same. We did look at various options but we believe that it is a good location on the first floor of City Hall to be a marketing tool of the City and there really are no, as we see it, issues with having two distinct locations. Two new items on here will be a Special Projects Team. If the Board directs us or requests us to do a special project or to work on a special development project, we would draw actually from all four groups in order to perform this Special Projects Team. Frequently it does take a coordinated group using both the regulatory tools, planning tools, funding tools and economic development tools to accomplish a project so we would be tapping into all four groups to create these special project teams. The other primary change is off to the side here. We show a Plan Review Team. One of the things that we have worked on over time is finding a way that we can have basically one plan review so the applicant knows the issues of the Building Department, the Planning Department and the Fire Department and we are going to talk a little bit more about that in just a minute. There are eight primary goals that we will be talking about for this new organization. I am going to start with the coordination of municipal real estate functions. Right now, the City does own a number of properties, either tax deeded or surplus City properties that are surplus to City needs. There is nobody in City government, however, that deals with disposing of these properties. There are groups by ordinance that we get together that will work on these, including the Tax Collector, the Assessors, the Planning Department, the Solicitor's Office and others who review these but there is no

person in City government dealing with it and as such disposing of properties can take a considerable amount of time. We are proposing that at least a portion of one of the people's time deal with that so we can get properties back on the tax rolls, get both the revenues from the immediate sale but also the new property taxes. We are going to be proposing some additional business development programs. In the past there have been two professional staff and one administrative staff in the Economic Development Office. That is far smaller than most cities have and we believe it is very important to develop additional business development programs. Certainly if you look 10 years down the line and say how are we going to pay our bills, the prime way to do that is through increasing our tax base and really the best way to do that is through good planning and developing new businesses in the City. Integrated redevelopment activities. We are getting to the point where we have a lot of projects. We need a new coordination tool to help between our office, Building, MEDO, the Destination Coordinator and MHRA. There are a lot of activities going on and these have to be integrated. Early coordination of major development projects. This is perhaps one of the critical factors of a new organization. If a company has any interest whatsoever in the City, in locating here for example, frequently they either go to the Economic Development Office first or our office or the Building Department. We are looking to find a way that once we have a lead for a perspective business that we can sit down as a larger organization and say okay here are your economic development opportunities. We will then review some of the potential obstacles and ways to overcome them. In essence we can give them an early snapshot of what they can expect in the City and what opportunities there are. Sometimes developers come into the City and they don't find until too late that there might be difficulties or zoning problems. We think it is very important that they know those up front and be willing to work towards achieving or overcoming any obstacles. The next three I am going to ask Leon LaFreniere to discuss a little bit. The first one is simplified plan review of private projects.

Mr. LaFreniere stated one of the things that we realized early on in taking a look at the regulatory process at it deals with construction inspections was that if we were to structure a process that created genuine efficiencies, we needed to look at departments other than just the three that were together looking at this proposal in the form of economic development planning and building and most notably that is the Fire Department. We look at the construction inspections from the standpoint of building codes and the Fire Department looks at the same construction from the standpoint of fire codes so the potential for either conflict or miscommunication at times does exist and any effort that we can undertake to try to streamline that process we felt was an important goal to achieve. In this particular proposal we are looking at formalizing what is now currently an informal process with regard to stationing an inspector from the Fire Prevention Bureau of the Fire Department within the Building Department for specific office hours. This is an effort that I

have discussed at length with Chief Kane. He is supportive of this initiative. Our goal here is to provide an opportunity for a single point of contact for a property owner, developer or contractor who may want to come in having to deal with ultimately each department – both Fire and Building, in their efforts to bring a project together in the form of construction activities. This single point of contact will allow an opportunity to ask questions and insure that the responses that are provided to an applicant are coordinated and not in conflict with one another because of the different codes that are administered by the City. This next bullet deals with the coordination of the Zoning Administration. Currently the Zoning Administration is split between the Building Department and the Planning Department. The Building Department administers the up front aspect of what an applicant has to deal with when they negotiate the ZBA process. The Building Department does a zoning compliance review. It denies a permit, which is a formal requirement per the statutory structure of zoning boards empowerment. It deals with the preparation of the Zoning Board application forms and coordinates all of the material that is necessary to be submitted to the Zoning Board to be considered for a variance and then takes that package and moves it to the Planning Department and Kathy Payne over in the Planning Department specifically, who provides administrative support to the Zoning Board itself. Kathy then takes the process...develops abutters lists and notifies abutters and puts together the agenda for the meeting and provides the administrative support in the form of secretarial responsibilities to the Zoning Board. She takes care of the minutes and so forth. We have looked at this process for some time. It is a process that is typically in my experience something that is coordinated within a single department in other jurisdictions. In taking a look at this you have to realize that aside from registering ones car or paying property taxes a trip to the Zoning Board may be the only other significant interaction that some citizens have with the City so we feel it is very important to make that process as user friendly as possible, reduce the number of people that an applicant has to see and hopefully provide an easier and more comfortable process for the applicants to negotiate. The next bullet deals with coordinated inspections. In this case...this is very closely related to the simplified plan review bullet that I spoke about earlier. Also with the Fire Department we find that in the construction regulatory administration the first stage is to do the plan review to insure that the plans as proposed meet the City standards. The second stage is to go in and make actual field inspections to insure that the installations meet those same standards. With this particular goal we are trying to attempt to coordinate that process again with the Fire Department so that the inspections as they are requested from various entities, the inspections as they take place on the various aspects where there is overlap – those being the fire protection systems, alarm and detection and exit ways and the various areas where there is a significant overlap between the fire codes and building codes we feel we can provide an opportunity to add additional coordination to the inspections to

once again make the process something that is easier to negotiate for people who have to use it.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the final organizational goal is integration of natural resource protection. Currently there is one employee who is not part of a department. That employee is funded through an agreement with the EPA related to a court case. That person works with the Conservation Commission, with the State and with the EPD. As some of the natural resources should become more important, such as Hackett Hill, Crystal Lake and Lake Massabesic we think that this position should be integrated with the planning and development so that the future of the natural resources are protected but they also work closely with those other issues that are coming up with the City. I am going to move to the next slide, which focuses a little more on what would happen with the Economic Development group. Currently there is...I think as of next week there is one employee in the Economic Development Office and she is here tonight. Previously there were three employees. We would be proposing that one additional professional staff be added. In effect, they would have three and a half employees. The first position, and again some of the functions here might be swapped back and forth depending on the type of people that apply and their capabilities and what opportunities we would have but let me run down the various functions that we believe are important to accomplish. Position One we would see primarily focusing on existing businesses, including business retention, business visitation, working with and supporting the Manchester Development Corporation, working with the Economic Development administration of the Federal government in handling their program, managing the small business loan fund and working on workforce development. Position Two would be a new position focusing on development projects outside of the downtown. The Destination Manchester Coordinator would remain focused on the downtown, but there are a tremendous amount of economic development opportunities outside the downtown. Certainly Hackett Hill is an example but the Airpark, East Industrial Park, and South Willow Street are all areas that have economic development potential. So this position would be based on project development, assistance to MHRA in carrying out redevelopment projects and activities to maximize economic opportunities related to our parking program. Again, there is tremendous need for time spent in dealing with businesses who may want to come in to Hackett Hill but there is also the development portion of it, which will take a lot of time. Clearly there will be a demand for more staff in terms of economic development than we have now.

Chairman Lopez asked do you have a handout on that.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes I will have the Clerk hand it out. The handout does have four key pages of this presentation. The third professional staff person would

focus on a couple of things that we do not currently do. One is business recruitment and actually going out if there are leads provided to us by the State, such as DRED or others. We would actually actively recruit. If there is a particular retail operation that people think should be in the City, we would recruit them. This has not happened in the past. Primarily we have relied on the State Department of Resources and Economic Development in recruiting either regionally or nationally. This person would work on business recruitment activities, marketing materials, networking for generating leads and assistance and would also work on the other function I discussed before, municipal land sales and real estate negotiations. Those activities there certainly would fill a full-time staff position. The office would be supported by a shared administrative staff. Right now the Planning Department is down two people. One of those is an administrative position and we would be proposing that the Economic Development Office and our office would split one of those administrative staff persons. Also, we can work on the phone issue. If there is no administrative staff there, there would be three employees at least and any overflow phone calls would come in to our department. Again, we are proposing a fairly significant increase in the number of hours that would be devoted to economic development. Finally, I wanted to talk a little bit about the budget. The combined budget of the two departments this year is \$1,160,000. If you just look at a maintenance budget for next year, in other words the same number of employees and the same operating expenses and only granted those raises that were granted by the Board, the maintenance budget would be \$1,265,000. The proposal that we are putting forth is about \$110,000 less than the maintenance budget. I would caution though that half of that is actually savings. The other half would be the zoning function that would be moving over to the Building Department so that would not technically be a saving to the City. That would just be moved from our department into Building. There would be savings of close to \$60,000 as a result of this proposal. That is a very brief description of what we are proposing. At this point, Leon and I and the other people here would be happy to answer any questions from the Committees.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to go to objective five in terms of the Review Board with the Building and Fire Departments. It is my understanding that we have a Technical Review Board in place right now. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied correct. The Technical Review Board only meets once a month, however.

Alderman Shea asked but that has to do with site plans and regulations and that is dictated by the State, correct.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked and the Highway Department is involved in that particular situation, are they not.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked why wouldn't they be involved in the weekly meetings.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Technical Review Committee would continue. We found that their input on a monthly basis and as needed works fine. They typically look at the roads and utilities provided for a site plan but there is a lot more attention required for the zoning and building codes, subdivision and site plans and that is basically between the Building Department, Planning and Fire. The Technical Review Committee would remain. Our working relationships with the Highway Department, Water Works, Police Department, Traffic Department and Fire Department would remain the same.

Alderman Shea asked so what you are indicating is that you do not need anyone on this particular review team from the Highway Department.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Plan Review Team would focus on just the building and the site, not on the off-site utilities or the roadways.

Alderman Shea asked so in your judgement you wouldn't need anyone from Highway.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is correct.

Alderman Shea asked when you have someone from the Fire Department and they are full-time either in your office or in some space where it is provided for them, who is going to pay them – the Fire Department, the Planning Department or the Building Department.

Mr. LaFreniere replied we aren't actually proposing a full-time position. The person that would undertake this duty would have other duties within their scope of responsibilities with the Fire Department but would have some fixed office hours that they would undertake in the Building Department. They would remain a Fire Department employee and be paid from the Fire Department. There would be no financial impact on that. We would just provide them with a place where they could meet with people in coordination with our own planning review functions so that function itself could be coordinated.

Alderman Shea asked it wouldn't be a chargeback then.

Mr. LaFreniere answered no.

Alderman DeVries stated maybe I can continue that line of questioning. When you are talking about the Fire Department coordinating their codes along with the building codes currently there are times when the two systems of codes will be in conflict and you are looking to overcome those or streamline the process of approval. I don't understand how if the codes are in conflict you will streamline it.

Mr. LaFreniere replied we have actually undertaken some significant steps in my mind in that direction by virtue of this Board adopting the 2000 National Building Code about a year and a half ago now. We are actually in the review process with the updated codes as we speak. What that has done is by adopting a current contemporary code is allow us the opportunity to coordinate the standards themselves the best that we are able to under the statutory framework. That said, we are dealing with two separate code entities and occasionally there are conflicting standards. It doesn't necessarily mean that the standards are structured such that one is more stringent than another. It falls under the heading of more than one way to skin a cat sometimes. The fire code may require something to be done in a certain manner and the building code anticipates a different manner. What this process will allow us to do is identify those issues as they come up at the time that the application is made to the department and at the time when the applicant comes in to the process so the coordinated City response will be determined then and there. What we are anticipating is that we won't have the potential or we will minimize the potential for conflicting standards to be identified further into the process where they then really pose difficulties and challenges in real dollar costs to developers.

Chairman Lopez stated the Destination Manchester Coordinator is paid for with funds other than City funds. How do you see...first of all I think it is a great thing that you are doing here but I am interested in the staff that you want to put in...what grade structures are we talking about and if this remains a good way to go and you are going to do all of these things the Destination Manchester individual does he go through the process at the same time? Is there any delay factor? How does he play into this or does he play into this?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we do not see any change to the Destination Coordinator. He is staff to the Mayor. The Mayor requires his assistance on a lot of specific downtown projects, primarily getting those projects going. We will be called in as a department if this proposal went through to assist the Destination Manchester Coordinator on specific projects and we would probably request his assistance at certain times.

Chairman Lopez responded I understand all of that and maybe the Mayor can answer this. Why wouldn't the Destination Manchester Coordinator fit into this particular plan and still accomplish the same thing that he is accomplishing now?

Mayor Baines replied my response is that we feel that we have collectively as the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at the Mayor's suggestion created an office that is working and working quite effectively in terms of focusing the attention and also his ability because he works directly for the Mayor is outside the bureaucracy if you will, which gives that position a lot more flexibility that is working directly on behalf of the Mayor, which is very important when you are working with developers and others to put the different pieces together. Also he deals with the structure of the Federal government in terms of requirements that they have for the different funding mechanisms, the contact that you have with the different agencies that you have, having somebody work directly for the Mayor has proven to be very effective in terms of addressing the redevelopment issues and looking at the building issues that we are dealing with and now we are moving into certain housing issues and the complexities of funding on Bridge and Elm, which have presented some challenges and the fact that he has been able to stay on top of those issues and access people on behalf of the Mayor has proven to be very effective. I don't think this is the time to really mess with that, if you will. I think we need to leave that alone and let it function around this coordinated effort, which will provide coordination to be honest with you that has been really absent simply because of the lack of resources with the present economic development structure.

Chairman Lopez asked is there any way that we can use money as we fund the Destination Manchester Coordinator's position...can any of the professional staff positions be funded not using funds from the operating budget.

Mr. MacKenzie answered we have looked at that. I think at this point though if you take money away to fund those positions you will also be taking money away from the CIP program. It is possible to do but that means there will be less money for CIP projects.

Chairman Lopez asked but isn't it true for all of the money we do get that we have an administrative...what percent is for individuals to run these programs.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. We are fairly close to that administrative cap that HUD has so you could not fund both new positions out of that. What we do is take that administrative money and we are allowed to put it directly into projects from improving streets or the park projects so we take whatever is left over from an administrative cap and put it into actual projects.

Chairman Lopez asked and the person who is in the division now would remain there at that particular grade. What grade structure do you have for these positions?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I have spoken briefly with Ginny but have not gotten to her the more detailed descriptions. I have not spoken with the existing person enough to determine what future position she would have out of these. We are looking generally about Grade 19 or 20 for the two new positions. I feel that based upon the type of work proposed, the salary and what other people are being paid that that would be in the ballpark.

Alderman Shea stated when I first became an Alderman in 1997, I think there were probably five people in your department, Bob. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no. Actually in 1997 there were 12 people, which is what we have now.

Alderman Shea asked there were 12. Are you sure? I have documentation I thought that in 1996 or 1998...my figures could be wrong. How many people are in your department right now and what are their job classifications?

Mr. MacKenzie answered we have a normal complement of 13.5 people. We are down 1.5 people right now so we have 12 staff people.

Alderman Shea asked you are saying normal. Who determines a normal staff leveling for your department?

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Board does.

Alderman Shea asked which Board.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Alderman Shea asked so you are saying the Board of Mayor and Aldermen determines how many people work in your department and you are saying that normally you are short one and a half because the Board at one time granted you that many employees. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is correct.

Alderman Shea asked do you have job classifications for those people in your department. Are they all classified?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman Shea asked and your department expenditures for the last few years...do you have documentation as far as how much your budget has increased during the last three to five years.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. I don't have it right here on the screen but we do have that.

Alderman Shea asked would you say it has increased how much.

Mr. MacKenzie answered again I don't know those numbers.

Alderman Shea asked has it gone from \$300,000 to \$500,000 to \$600,000. I know you had figures here of \$1.6 million. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. Our current operating budget is about \$900,000. That has not fluctuated a lot other than the raises that have been granted by the Board.

Alderman Shea stated one of my concerns about adding new individuals to any department...I know in the Assessor's Office we are cutting back. In your department we are adding on so to speak. My concern is why can't certain responsibilities be delegated to people now involved in your department? In other words if you have the insight to know what should be done why can't the people who are now there be given certain responsibilities that they are not given in order to increase the workload. Obviously and I don't want to interrupt but I believe that we did increase the hours of individuals in all departments from 35 to 40. Is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Shea stated I am sure that impacted your department as well as every other department but we really haven't seen a substantial in my judgement, difference as far as additional responsibilities. Could you explain that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied we basically have three wings to our department now. We have the CIP program. We have growth management, which works with the various boards and commissions and we have a long-range planning and special projects. Basically right now we only have one person in the long-range planning/special projects and that person is focused on the geographic information system. We do not have, at the present time, adequate staff to do for example the

Master Plan update. The problem has been the tremendous demand on staff time for the new development projects and those are anywhere from the Ledgewood Housing Project to expansion of the Mall of New Hampshire. Most of our staff or close to 40% of our staff time had been assumed by increasing complexity and increasing difficulty of projects. When you look at even one project – the Shaw’s Supermarket off of South Willow Street, there have been various suits and counter suits involved and various groups that have certain interests. Our role there has been pretty much as a solution team trying to find solutions to these things. When you have a lot of different players, a lot of different lawyers and a lot of different engineers involved we have to use a tremendous amount of staff time to resolve the problems so the amount and complexity of projects has increased significantly in the last four years. At the present time we don’t have enough staff, really, to handle all of the projects the way that I would like to see it done. There has also been an increased role at the Planning Board. They have made increased demands on the staff and specific requirements that they want to see done. The other group is the CIP program, which has remained relatively constant in size over the last 10 years. Again, the demands on that and finding creative ways to solve difficult funding problems or coordinate between different groups has increased but the staff size has not. Our staff capability in assuming any additional programs is just not there right now. Our staff has been running at 110% and we could not assume any more economic development functions in the Planning Department.

Alderman Shea stated my concern when Yarger Decker came about was we were told what it was going to cost in the year that it was implemented but not in the years following. You indicated here this evening how much it would cost in 2004 but with additional personnel being involved it will add a significant amount of money in my opinion if three people were added to any department, whether it be yours...you are saying you are one and a half short, which means that even with these people you would still be one and a half short because they are not doing what you said normally is being done. In essence, how much would you project that your budget would increase in 2005? \$200,000? \$300,000?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the only budget that we would request would be based upon the raises granted by the Board.

Alderman Shea stated you are adding two people though so you would have to add those salaries as well.

Mr. MacKenzie replied but we are proposing an actual \$60,000 decrease off the maintenance budget. We are proposing a decline and how we are doing that is not filling...recently we had a person leave and that person was working on special projects such as trying to get the rail terminal back to Manchester, which I think is an important long-range goal for the City. What I would propose is that we would

have the people in the Economic Development Office...as needed we would tap them on to the special team as I talked about, the special project team to get a project done. That is how I propose saving the money. We would not fill that position but we would tap the expertise in the whole organization to do the special projects that might be requested by the Board.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to see a breakdown for this reorganization in terms of the impact that assigning responsibilities to existing members of your staff would have on the input of work or the amount of time before we make a judgement on adding new individuals. In other words, using your present staff and giving them the responsibilities that would be given to the two new hires to see what impact that would have.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I can tell you right now that we cannot do it. With the staff hours as required by law on items such as the Planning Board or Zoning Board of Adjustment or the Conservation Commission or the Heritage Commission we would have to significantly reduce services, which would automatically delay projects.

Alderman Shea stated well that is something you would have to list. I want to know what the full impact would be.

Chairman Lopez stated just for clarification, the \$1,154,000 includes those two positions.

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is correct.

Chairman Lopez stated to clarify something else, the Building Department remains separate. They are just working with the Planning Department on these issues, is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that is correct.

Chairman Lopez stated I just want to clear that up because there was some debate there.

Alderman Sysyn asked would that also mean reclassification of your position, Mr. MacKenzie, because you are talking on more responsibility.

Mr. MacKenzie replied the Mayor just said the answer is no. I have not requested that.

Chairman Lopez stated I think it is a very good question and I would like to ask Ginny is there any law stipulating that anybody who gets more responsibility is entitled to more compensation.

Ms. Lamberton replied no.

Alderman DeVries stated I would like to talk briefly on the Urban Ponds position. Currently that position reports to the Conservation Commission?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it reports actually to three groups. It is paid by the Environmental Protection Division and partly reports to them. That position also reports to the SEPP Committee and to the Conservation Commission.

Alderman DeVries asked so currently it does not report to the Planning Department.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no. The person is physically housed there but does not report to us.

Alderman DeVries asked when that position was created it was part of the CSO agreement. Is there going to be a conflict of interest or a conflict with that agreement by having that position report to other than environmental groups?

Mr. MacKenzie answered no I don't think so. I was part of the negotiations that created the CSO agreement. I understand what they were looking for at the time and I believe that once I get to talk to the State and the EPA that they would concur with the changes.

Alderman DeVries asked have you asked those other environmental agencies their opinion on having this position report to the Planning Department.

Mr. MacKenzie asked the EPA, Conservation Commission and SEPP. No, I have no.

Alderman Gatsas stated in the Economic Development Group you have three positions. What is the current position and grade level of the person that is there now? You have one person there now.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. I believe it is a Grade 22.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the wage amount for that grade.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I do not have those amounts.

Alderman Gatsas asked Ginny do you have that. You are saying that the other two positions would be filled at Grade 20's?

Mr. MacKenzie answered approximately. I would still like to put together the job descriptions and have Ginny review those.

Ms. Lamberton stated I don't know what the step is of the current incumbent but the salary range for a Grade 22 is \$47,934 to a maximum of \$68,342.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is a Grade 20. That is a heck of a range. \$20,000.

Ms. Lamberton answered a Grade 20 is \$41,867 to a maximum of \$59,693.

Chairman Lopez stated the salary for the person in the Economic Development Office is \$67,000 presently.

Alderman Gatsas asked so you are looking to fill those two positions with two Grade 19's or 20's.

Mr. MacKenzie answered correct.

Alderman Gatsas asked so if I picked a median number in between it would be somewhere around \$50,000. What is the total budget of that department now?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I believe it is a little over \$280,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the person who just left was a grade level what.

Mr. MacKenzie answered Grade 26.

Alderman Gatsas asked and what was he at.

Chairman Lopez answered \$88,696.

Alderman Gatsas asked how about the other position that just left.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the administrative staff was Grade 13. I do not have her current salary.

Ms. Lamberton stated the salary range for a Grade 13 is \$26,073 to a maximum of \$37,173.

Alderman Gatsas asked so basically the positions that were there were two positions. We are looking to increase it to three and the wage base is going to be about the same.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the wage base would actually be slightly less.

Alderman Gatsas stated depending on if you fill it at the low range of the two grade 20's you are going to be about \$6,000 less roughly.

Mr. MacKenzie replied most new hires now are coming in at the entry level.

Alderman Gatsas asked so where is the additional \$54,000 savings.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is in the position in our department.

Alderman Gatsas asked which is what.

Mr. MacKenzie answered it was a Planner I position that was our urban designer. That person just recently left and we would be proposing not to fill that position if there was a consolidation.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would think that when we talk about consolidation and when we talk about mergers normally what happens is we start talking about synergies and when you talk about synergies there should be something that would show us the synergies of the departments. Mr. MacKenzie I certainly believe that if the Mayor tells you you are going to take additional employees on that your wages are going up but I would think that at some point when the evaluations come out that something has to happen because if you have gone from 13 employees to 17 employees we reduce somebody's, I think, grade because what they were doing wasn't what we assumed they were doing. If we are decreasing it for less responsibilities, I assume we are increasing it because of more but I would think that we would have some sort of structural chart here that would show us what wages are and what benefits are because I am looking here and saying by the time we look at what we pay in economic development and what is the Destination Manchester Coordinator grade?

Mr. MacKenzie replied Grade 21.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is the salary.

Chairman Lopez stated I don't have that but he is here. What is your salary?

Mr. Jabjiniak replied about \$66,000.

Alderman Gatsas asked what did we start that position at.

Ms. Lamberton answered we started that as a Grade 20.

Alderman Gatsas replied no we didn't.

Mr. Jabjiniak stated I have always been a Grade 21. It is equivalent to a Planner III in Planning.

Mayor Baines replied that hasn't changed.

Alderman Gatsas asked so it is \$66,000.

Ms. Lamberton stated you have a salary grade 21, which is a minimum of \$44,798 to a maximum of \$63,871. However, if an employee works towards and receives an A step they go up to Grade 21A and that range is \$46,366 to a maximum of \$66,107.

Alderman Gatsas stated all I am doing is looking at these numbers and saying we not only have this for economic development but we also have the Manchester Economic Development group that we have at the City level or the level that is at Mr. Ashooh's level.

Mayor Baines replied MDC is all volunteers.

Alderman Gatsas stated I understand that but they take a lot of that responsibility on. They brought the Bridge and Elm Street project forward did they not.

Mayor Baines replied I don't know how you would describe it. They certainly had a role. We all worked on Bridge and Elm.

Alderman Gatsas stated well I would rather find those kind of people who are volunteers to do the work because it reduces the cost to the City.

Mayor Baines responded in all due respect it is a synergy that we have going here and I think this adds to the synergy. MDC certainly has a role and the volunteers work very hard to help us support various projects. They get involved with some of the details of the projects and bring that expertise to the table but to be quite frank with you most of the projects that we are dealing with come through contacts that occur generally with people in City Hall.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have been here for three years and for three years I think we have been talking about trying to sell some real estate. Now I noticed that this goes under the economic development group and I guess I want to look at some specifics on how we are going to facilitate movement of some of that vacant property. I know that in Lands and Buildings every time something comes forward there is a department that says we should keep it. I don't know for what, but we should keep it. So we are taking a person here and telling them that part of their time is going to be devoted to real estate negotiations.

Mr. MacKenzie relied yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am just looking to see...I think we could find some of those synergies by collecting the real estate that we have in the City, hiring a real estate broker, not have to pay him because obviously they are paid by commission and dispose of some of this real estate. In three years, Mr. MacKenzie, I think you will agree that we have sold one piece that I know of and it was a sliver.

Mr. MacKenzie replied if you look at the process of a City disposing a property maybe 10% of that is dealing with a broker to actually get it sold. The problem is going through the various procedures. There has to be an assessment done by the Assessors. The Tax Collector handles the property in the meantime. The Solicitor's Office has to prepare items. The Planning Department has to prepare a report. Sometimes the School Board gets involved in whether they need or do not need the property. The Highway Department reviews it, the Water Works. The majority of time is not spent in the actual sale but reviewing with all of the City departments, tracking the properties, dealing with prospective purchasers and frankly there is nobody in the City now that does that and that is why there haven't been a lot of sales.

Alderman Gatsas asked so we are going to hire somebody in the vicinity of \$50,000 a year to do that. That will be one of their functions.

Mr. MacKenzie replied correct.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess my next question would be the Plan Review Team and when we start talking about the Fire Department and the Building Department having two separate codes I think that is probably the first synergy that we in the City should be looking at that eliminates that because there is no developer that should be coming in looking at a building code coming forward and all of the sudden four weeks down the line the Fire Department says you have to change this. That is wrong. That is a synergy that should be done on the front end before we go forward. I don't see that being eliminated. I just see that as somebody in

your office giving somebody the opportunity to sit there and ask questions when the project has come forward.

Mr. LaFreniere replied we are dealing with codes that are mandated at the State level that are adopted by both the Fire Marshall who has been given the statutory authority to promulgate rules and regulations, as well as the statewide building code, which at this present time happens to be the same code that we have adopted locally. We are attempting with this proposal to do exactly what you are talking about. To try to make sure that people who have to use and negotiate the process don't get two different responses or two different answers. In bringing those two codes and their various requirements together, the best and most effective way that we feel we can do that on a local level is by coordinating our efforts because the statutory responsibility to administer those codes is a framework that is in place and not probably one that is easily changed.

Alderman Gatsas asked is that the same problem that every community has.

Mr. LaFreniere answered to a certain degree, yes. There are a number of communities in the State that have had to deal with this issue and frankly I think we have been more successful than many because...I think that in large measure is to be credited to the personnel from the Fire Department and the personnel from the Building Department who are faced with the responsibility of reconciling any issues as they come up. Chief Joe Kane has made this a specific issue that he has taken a great deal of issue with and again I give him a lot of credit because we realize that there is a potential out there that we don't want to fall into the trap of. So, I think this is the best way that we can deal with this locally. What we are dealing with is the fire codes have a specific emphasis dealing with exits, protection and suppression of buildings and all of the various other requirements dealing with hazardous occupancies in existing buildings. The building code is primarily focused on new construction practices. There is overlap and the overlap is there the potential exists for some conflict that we are trying to eliminate with this proposal. You can't adopt one code in place of the other because they cover different things. The area that we are talking about is the overlap and that is where I think we have been fairly successful and with this proposal I think we can raise that level of success.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you give me an example of the overlap please.

Mr. LaFreniere answered sure. The building code, for example, determines how many exits you have to have in the building and how wide the exit doors have to be and how wide the stairwells have to be to exit a given number of people. It may be that for every 100 people you have to have so many inches of exit width. That standard in the life safety code is because it is promulgated by different

agencies and a different publishing group and a different code writing organization slightly different. So when you go through the process of calculating all of these various aspects of a given proposal or a given exit construction at the end of that calculation the life safety code may say that you need to have two doors of a minimum of 36" wide and a stairway of 44" and the building code may say that you can do the same with a 36" stairway and two doors of a somewhat lesser width. Making sure that the person who has to negotiate the process gets one answer from the City is what is important because the actual cost of buying a door doesn't change dramatically whether you buy a 34" door or a 36" door but it is a substantial burden if that door has to be changed after it is already installed because they were installing to one standard and then they found out that there was another standard that was slightly different. So, coordinating that is what we are trying to accomplish.

Alderman Gatsas asked aren't those standards...I assume when somebody is bringing those standards forward they are an architect.

Mr. LaFreniere answered quite frequently, yes but not in all cases.

Alderman Gatsas stated somebody is not bringing you a set of plans that hasn't been signed off by an architect.

Mr. LaFreniere replied certainly in all major construction projects there are design professionals involved and in this State both architects and engineers are permitted by the licensing entity of the State to practice within their various disciplines to the extent that they feel they are competent so frequently we will get architectural plans stamped by an engineer or engineering plans stamped by an architect. Now when that happens we often have a bit of an education process that we need to go through but they are within their right to do that within their licensing as issued by the State. We are dealing with typically architects and engineers with major construction projects. With smaller construction projects though we are dealing with a person who owns the building, the tenant who wants to occupy the building and we are dealing with people who are non-design professionals and non-construction professionals so we have to provide those individuals with a great deal more guidance than the design professionals.

Chairman Lopez stated at this time I want to recognize that the MDC Chairman did write us a letter. Jane, did you want to say anything to the Committees? I know you were quoted in the paper.

Ms. Hills replied I would just like to say that right now our resources have been severely depleted in our office as Jay Taylor has retired as you know and our Administrative Assistant is leaving and until I can fill that position it is going to be

very difficult to get a lot of the things we should be doing accomplished but that is a short term issue. A lot of cities our size have a much bigger Economic Development Department than we have but I don't imagine in the current financial situation that that is going to happen. The way I look at this proposed consolidation is it is a way for us to maximize the economic development activity that we can do in this City, particularly for the next two or three years or three or four years until the tax base will support City government in a manner better than it is doing at the current moment. I would point out, too, that if we consolidate now it can be a trial run and you can always go back. It is not cast in stone. I am supportive of the consolidation given the financial realities of the City's financial situation today.

Chairman Lopez asked the Clerk to read a letter into the record from Alderman O'Neil who couldn't attend the meeting this evening.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated:

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased that we are reviewing possible consolidation of various City departments. If the City is serious about reducing the cost of government, we must first target the administration of delivering services to the citizens of our City and be very, very cautious in reducing said delivery. As I have thought about the various consolidation proposals, I tried to think about the same three basic questions:

- 1) What is the mission of a department and is it similar to that of other departments?
- 2) Are there opportunities to save money, especially through savings on the administration of those services?
- 3) Will the delivery of services be strengthened or weakened by consolidation?

With regards to the proposed consolidation of the Planning Department, Building Regulations Department and the Manchester Economic Development Office, I am pleased about some of the recommendations, including consolidation of zoning administration to the Building Department, creation of a City Plan Review Team and moving the Urban Ponds Restoration Program to the Planning Department. These are positive moves for the City. I have given a great deal of thought to the proposal to

consolidate the three departments and I have used the three questions listed above to reach my conclusion.

First there is the mission of the departments. I believe that both the Planning Department and the Building Department exist as a check and balance for the Economic Development Office. Merger of these departments might create a conflict of interest within City government. You have a sales office (MEDO) versus two regulatory agencies (Planning and Building). One department should not be responsible for both sales and regulations.

Second are the opportunities to save money. As we are all aware, we need to desperately increase our commercial tax base in the City to lessen the burden on the residential property taxpayer. Reducing staff in MEDO could be penny wise and million dollar foolish. Properly staffing the office will produce no savings at all.

Third is the delivery of services. Although some projects require coordination by MEDO, Planning and Building, others need only support from MEDO and permits from Building (existing buildings/facilities) and even others need only coordination by MEDO and no review/permits by the Planning or Building Departments.

After a great deal of thought and review, I have determined that the consolidation of Planning, Building and MEDO is not in the best interest of government in the City of Manchester or its citizens. I urge the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to defeat this specific consolidation proposal but to proceed with the other recommendations – moving zoning administration to the Building Department, creating a City Plan Review Team and moving the Urban Ponds Restoration Program to the Planning Department.

I want to thank the Mayor, Aldermen and City staff for their efforts on this and other possible consolidations.

s/Daniel O'Neil
Alderman At-Large

Chairman Lopez stated I want to reiterate that the Building Department is going to be separate.

Mayor Baines stated I want to thank everyone that was involved in this effort to work with the departments to bring about a proposal that really takes into consideration all of the concerns that Alderman O'Neil brought forward. We are

not diminishing the personnel in the department at all and I think that has come forward very clearly. We are talking about coordinated approaches. My final plea to all of you would be this - to adopt the recommendations that we have brought forward in terms of the different departments and sunset them after 12 months and establish very specific goals and objectives for these efforts that are measurable and achievable and determine at the end whether, in fact, these proposals and really instead of calling them consolidations, really restructuring and looking at new ways of doing things and are they being efficient and effective and doing what we said they would do. I don't think we should adopt anything and say well this is the end all because I think to any process you are going to learn as you go forward and make adjustments and changes but if you would give these programs and these proposals a chance at least and perhaps put aside the concerns of some of the individuals within the bureaucracy that perhaps the notion that the only fear they have may not even be realized with what we are trying to do. We are trying to bring about strengthening units by getting people working together to crop the boundaries that exist between departments. I think one of the things Seth brought forward in terms of some of the expertise he has brought to our office in terms of his experience was this idea of agility. Having agility between different departments where there is sort of an understanding that we have to compensate for one another and work together across departments. We take expertise that is in one department and use that synergy that Alderman Gatsas talked about to create greater efforts around the different projects and proposal that we have going forward in departments. I think if you look at this particular proposal as the others that we are presenting to you, they are doing both things that we want government to do - be more efficient and more effective and serve the citizens better. All of these proposals combined when you get the next proposal that will be coming forward next week, you are starting to look at significant savings in tax dollars for the community. At the end of the day if we can accomplish that I think we have accomplished what we were sent here to do. So I ask you for your support and I ask you to set aside what I have said earlier on are turf issues that people want to continue to do what they have always done. We are not in a government that can afford to do that any longer.

Chairman Lopez stated Mr. MacKenzie you appeared before the HR Committee before and had a deputy. I didn't see you deputy on this chart. Can you explain that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied sure. As my responsibilities would change I would probably have to let go of some of my responsibilities, particularly dealing with growth management so my current deputy would, in effect, supervise more of the activities of the Planning Board, for example, in particularly which consumes a lot of staff time which would free me up to do some additional supervision.

Chairman Lopez asked so as we created the position of deputy there will no longer be a deputy.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is correct.

Chairman Lopez asked what about the pay structure for the deputy position that was created.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that deputy would have additional responsibilities however. That deputy would be fully in charge of growth management whereas right now I still deal with the various boards. That person would also be supervising the Plan Review Team, which is the interdepartmental team and in effect those two responsibilities would be fairly significant and important to the City.

Alderman Shea stated I think that Kathy Payne is a wonderful City worker and should be in the Building Department because obviously her main thrust has been with zoning and as Alderman O'Neil and the rest of us...I have no objection in adopting the Review Team, however, I believe that there might be some additions made in terms of the expertise from the Highway Department but that is neither here nor there. I leave that to you people. The other recommendation about the person being assigned to your office from the Urban Development Program is fine but the rest I would await job specifications and listings in terms of how really we can plug in these people if we were to plug in these new people. I don't want to make a decision right now that is obviously not well thought out and I am speaking personally from my viewpoint. I would like to have more input in terms of how certain responsibilities might be used. That is my commentary and I am not sure about the other members.

Alderman Pinard stated you know how I feel about the fire station on Industrial Park Drive and you mentioned at the beginning that we might be digging into the CIP funding. If you do will that have any effect on the fire station?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no. The fire station is all fully funded on the capital side. There is not necessarily funding on the operating side but it would have no effect on that.

Chairman Lopez stated I want to make sure of one thing. If we are requesting additional information let's lay it out so we know before we make a decision if that is going to hinder upon the decisions that we are making. If we need those numbers or additional information then let's spell out what we need tonight.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess I am back to the Destination Manchester Coordinator. Can you tell me what we started that position at when we put that into effect three years ago?

Mr. Jabjiniak replied \$56,000.

Alderman Gatsas stated so that is about an 18% increase in three years to the maximum level. I guess what we need to look at because of the question the Chairman asked was I am looking at the Planning and Development Department structure and I see that the responsibilities for the Director are mainly budget, purchasing and personnel. If we are going to put a Deputy Director in place, that Deputy is at what grade level right now?

Mr. MacKenzie replied that box that you saw that says purchasing and budgeting that is actually our Senior Secretary that handles that for me. She is the Office Manager and the receptionist.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the Deputy Director would be at what grade level.

Mr. MacKenzie answered Grade 25.

Alderman Gatsas asked and you are at what grade level.

Mr. MacKenzie answered 29.

Alderman Gatsas asked so with the added responsibilities to the Deputy Director, what grade level do you see her going to.

Mr. MacKenzie answered again I would assume that the grade would stay the same.

Alderman Gatsas asked even with the increased responsibilities.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes primarily because she would have one less person reporting to her. Right now she supervises the Zoning Board of Adjustment Clerk so that would be a decrease in responsibility. I believe those two changes should hopefully balance.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the person that would be in charge of the Economic Development Group would be who.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I would be directly in charge.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the Community Development Group.

Mr. MacKenzie answered there is a Senior Planner who is the team leader of that group but there is no Director of that group.

Alderman Gatsas asked and the Long-Range Planning Group.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I am directly in charge of that.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you give us a specific breakdown so that when we look at the synergies we see them because it looks to me like we have done a flow chart but we haven't added the employees to take some of that undue rest that developers have when they come in to give them a little bit more attention and time. I don't see that happening here.

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is hard to do when we are faced with severe budget issues. We did try to accomplish additional economic development while still reducing the budget and that was our primary goal.

Alderman Gatsas replied right but if we are going to the Economic Development Group and we are adding actually only one new employee there I would think that maybe we should be looking at that where we are reducing...obviously the grade levels are the same grade levels that we have when we are looking for an appraiser and maybe we ought to change that. Instead of looking for two people, maybe we should be looking for four. I don't see those positions at the levels they are at certainly look like almost Director levels and maybe that is the problem that we are having here. Maybe there are too many Chiefs and not enough worker bees.

Mr. MacKenzie responded again even my time is what I call worker bee. I am directly involved in growth management and planning. Those two positions, I think, would be very important positions for the City. One would be handling development projects, such as Hackett Hill and that takes a tremendous amount of expertise to get that done right. If you are looking at perhaps \$150 million of projects up there it is critical that you have someone on the City side that knows what they are doing and can deal with both the businesses and the developers and the construction people and be knowledgeable about it. I think a Grade 20 is not a management level position. It is a mid-range position that would be a worker bee.

Alderman Gatsas replied I can appreciate that but if there is no construction going on at Hackett Hill what is that person going to do for that amount of time that you see in a work week. I am looking at these and I am trying to analyze and I am not looking to micromanage you but I am looking at it and saying okay project development at Hackett Hill, there is nothing going on up there.

Mr. MacKenzie responded right but that would be throughout the City. There are sites in East Industrial Park. There are sites on Wellington Hill. There are sites on South Willow Street, in the Airpark and on the West Side. I used Hackett Hill as an example but there are a lot of projects going on and there are not enough warm bodies to go around.

Alderman Gatsas asked can we get a total breakdown of what it is because when we start talking about building the tax base, the last two large projects that I have seen presented to this Board have certainly increased the tax base but have not increased the tax dollars because we have deferred them so when we talk about building the tax base and trying to get economic development going we can't defer tax dollars just to build an economic base.

Mr. MacKenzie asked was that a rhetorical question.

Alderman Gatsas answered that was a statement.

Alderman DeVries left to attend a Neighborhood meeting.

Alderman Shea moved that Zoning Administration be moved to the Building Department, that a City Plan Review Team be created, that the Urban Ponds Restoration Administrator be moved to the Planning Department and that the rest of the proposal be tabled for further information. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez stated I would like to determine what information you want them to get. I think Alderman Gatsas made one reference. Are you making another reference so they know what they are supposed to do?

Alderman Shea replied I would like to know what the people in the Planning Department are doing now in terms of job specifications and I asked before if we could have a paper developed so we could find out the impact on his staff...he indicated that his staff had certain responsibilities now but if we were to give them these additional responsibilities that he has outlined it would obviously have an impact on other things and I would like that information.

Chairman Lopez asked are you tabling moving MEDO into the Planning Department or do you want that to go forward.

Alderman Shea replied why don't we make one motion.

Chairman Lopez stated let's do a couple of motions.

Alderman Shea responded well the first motion is the motion I made to accept those three things.

Chairman Lopez asked does everybody understand the motion.

Alderman Osborne asked was there a second.

Chairman Lopez answered you seconded the motion. Are you changing your mind?

Alderman Osborne stated I would like to table the whole thing.

Chairman Lopez asked are you withdrawing your second.

Alderman Osborne withdrew his second.

Alderman Shea moved to transfer Kathy Payne to the Building Department, to create a City Plan Review Team and to transfer the Urban Ponds Restoration Administrator to the Planning Department. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Osborne asked what pay grades are we talking here.

Chairman Lopez answered we are just transferring Kathy Payne to the Building Department. It is the same pay grade and everything. She will just work for the Building Department. The Plan Review Team with the Building and Fire Department and I don't know why that isn't being done now but that is besides the point...

Alderman Gatsas interjected is the Planning Department going from 13.5 people to 12 or does it remain at 13.5.

Mr. MacKenzie stated it takes it to 12.5 but then you add in the Urban Pond Restoration person and bring it back to 13.5. There would be no change in the complement.

Chairman Lopez asked does everybody understand the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we are going to do some consolidation and do what Planning Development is looking for and I understand where Alderman Shea is going trying to move one person where they belong in the Building Department but that is probably a separate issue that stands on its own. The Urban Pond

Restoration person probably stands on its own. I would like to see what the concept is that they are bringing forward. I don't think we were asked to come in and pick and choose these situations to put them in. I don't know. Are those recommendations that the two department heads sitting in front of us would like to see? That is the first question I guess.

Mr. MacKenzie responded it would be a lot easier for us if it was a package deal and we could handle it as such. The Board...some of these pieces are free standing and some aren't. I think the three mentioned by Alderman Shea could be free standing changes. It does make life more difficult for us if it is done on a more piece meal basis as opposed to a holistic basis.

Chairman Lopez stated to me I thought some of this was being done in the first place. Moving Kathy Payne to Building should be a no brainer. That should be done and the other two recommendations aren't changing any total structure or adding new people until they get back with the information but to move this process along I think we all agree that she should be with the Building Department and the other two are really an administrative aspect of it. I would encourage you to approve these three things and table the rest if that is the Board's wishes. At least we would move something forward here. Otherwise, we continue to have people work for nothing.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess I have a problem with the Plan Review Team only for the effect that we have two competing codes and if we can't change that those two competing codes are going to continue, I don't care if you have a Planning Review Team there or not.

Chairman Lopez replied that is the whole intent though, Alderman, is to have that Plan Review Team to look at this. Maybe they can't change anything but at least in the process of...

Alderman Gatsas interjected I think it makes no difference if we come forward with an ordinance that says whichever of the two is stricter that was has to be implemented. Now is that normally the case or does that change? I have a problem that a builder comes in and wants to build something and he has a set of plans in front of him and all of the sudden somebody from the Fire Department says you need 36" doors instead of 34".

Mr. LaFreniere replied I don't think that characterizing them as competing codes really frames it well and perhaps I have not explained it adequately to represent how these codes interact and how they work together. In fact, both codes reference each other in various instances. What we are proposing is an effort to achieve what you are looking for, the stricter standard by statutory requirement

does apply. This is a process that doesn't require action by the Board to be quite frank with you. It is a process that is taking place on an informal basis now. We felt that it was something that would be of benefit to the City, of benefit to the process to implement on a formal basis and to make part of this overall plan. It isn't something that I feel is necessarily a component that requires a law or ordinance change. It is something that is designed only as a process improvement to make the entire situation more streamlined.

Alderman Osborne stated getting back to what Alderman Gatsas was saying with the fire codes and so on and so forth, when an architect or an engineer...which codes do they follow when they put together a plan. Whose codes do they follow?

Mr. LaFreniere replied the code that they are following depends on the various aspects of the building that you are talking about. Buildings are complicated systems in the way they function these days.

Alderman Osborne asked don't they check with the City before.

Mr. LaFreniere answered yes and offering them guidance as to which codes to apply is part of what we are talking about here.

Alderman Osborne asked so the Building Department says one thing and the Planning Board says another and so on and so forth...

Mr. LaFreniere interjected in this case we are only talking about construction standards so we are really only talking about things that affect the construction that the Fire Department may have impact on but that in a more global sense the Building Department really affects through the building code, which is a more global document. We are trying to coordinate those two construction standards.

Alderman Osborne asked when they come in to you with this plan and it has the seal of an engineer on it, this is almost like gold isn't it.

Mr. LaFreniere answered we still have to take a look at the construction documents, the design documents, to insure that they do meet those standards.

Alderman Osborne asked but they supposedly have checked with you beforehand and the Fire Department right.

Mr. LaFreniere answered in a perfect world they check with us prior to completing their design. It doesn't always happen that way. We encourage them to touch base with us early in the process to avoid just that.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion to transfer Kathy Payne to the Building Department, to create a City Plan Review Team and to transfer the Urban Ponds Restoration Administrator to the Planning Department. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Lopez stated I just want to make clear one thing while the Mayor is here. Mayor have you discussed anything...I mean if this is going to go on with the Economic Development Office where you have an employee there is she going to be entitled to the department head's pay under the ordinance if we keep her there and don't move her into Planning?

Mayor Baines replied I would say no but basically now we have an office with one person. That is not acceptable with the challenges that we have for economic development. I would hope that we could move quite quickly. I think some legitimate questions have been asked and we are going to provide that information but this is a proposal that came from the departments and I wish people would think a little bit about this, that this is how the experts in their departments are telling you they can make their departments work more efficiently and effectively. I don't know what else we can do in terms of presenting proposals where the experts are saying this is how we feel we can function best. There are some questions that we need to answer but we need to move this along. We need to get staff down there. We have major projects. If you want to come down and take a look at the scope of projects that we are dealing with in City government all across the City, the projects that we have to get off the ground, the issues that are still going on with projects like Bridge and Elm, the riverfront, the shopping centers and supermarkets that are under construction and various other construction projects around the City and then Hackett Hill, which we need to get out there and do the due diligence...we presented to you something that the experts will say makes government work more effectively, efficiently and is more accountable to the public. We have to start moving some of these things alone. We can have 14 or 15 different ideas and we will go nowhere. I am just urging you. Let's get the information but let's not wait another month. We need to get some things moving along here.

Chairman Lopez stated as soon as the information is provided then I will call another meeting. In the meantime, I will entertain a motion to table the rest of it.

Alderman Shea stated before you table it, what information are we going to get.

Chairman Lopez replied Mr. MacKenzie has been writing it down. Would you clarify it?

Mr. MacKenzie responded let me see if I can summarize. I know there was a

request to have more detailed job specifications available for the two new positions with which the Human Resource Director could review in terms of realistic salary grade. There was a request for us to evaluate whether our existing staff could do the functions of the Economic Development Department and there was a request to basically view the entire organizational structure in terms of employees and what their grades were as I understand it.

Alderman Gatsas added and what those grades actually show for wages, along with how we are going to pick up that \$60,000 savings.

Alderman Shea stated maybe this is the wrong time to inject this but I will throw it in anyway. When the Mayor mentioned that we do accept the expertise of different departments there are times when different department heads have come before us and their particular recommendations are not accepted by the Mayor. In other words there are times when obviously the people from the Assessor's Office came before us and the Mayor felt that their proposals weren't according to his way of thinking prudent. I am not reflecting on you at all, Mayor, but there are instances where obviously it is a two way street here. Sometimes the department heads come in and their ideas are accepted and sometimes they come in and they are not accepted by either the Mayor or Board of Aldermen. From that point of view I think that there should be that distinction made, Mr. Chairman, because we don't always think alike.

Alderman Sysyn stated I think we should leave Manchester Development Corporation separate. I am not looking to table it.

Alderman Gatsas replied that has nothing to do with this.

Alderman Sysyn asked why.

Alderman Gatsas answered this is the office itself.

Mayor Baines stated I would like to clarify that again. This has nothing to do with the Manchester Development Corporation.

Alderman Gatsas moved to table the remainder of the proposal. Alderman Osborne duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Gatsas stated I would assume on the other proposals that are coming before us that the same requests for information that we are looking for tonight would accompany those proposals before we come in so we don't have these same questions.

Chairman Lopez replied it is a very valid point because I think in discussions with people this was pointed out to come in with the grades and come in with the structure and the money that you are talking about so we can see it. Apparently, either there is not enough time to do it or whatever the case may be but I think you are absolutely correct. Anything coming forward should come with the money.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion to table. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Baines stated I would like to make one other suggestion that the Chairman of both of these Committees come in and meet with staff to get a review of exactly what is happening and then make sure that the information is there that you want. Countless hours are being devoted to all of these structures and we will provide whatever information you want but if the Committee Chairmen could come in and meet with staff...we have a major presentation for you next week. At some point in time we have to start moving...I think you are starting to see some frustration here, moving some things along here. You know there is a management part of government and there is a policy part of government. Approve structures and let us talk about how we are going to implement things. Dollars and cents absolutely you should have but at a certain point in time...you know now we are starting to recognize why nothing happens but we are willing to sit down with the Committee Chairmen to get the information you need.

Chairman Lopez responded just to make sure there is no misunderstanding, the questions that were asked tonight were asked by this Chairman. I think Mr. MacKenzie indicated that he didn't have time to put all of that together. As a matter of fact he showed up with a new chart tonight that he didn't have when we had our discussion.

Mayor Baines replied again if that was the case maybe we shouldn't have had the meeting. Maybe we shouldn't have the meeting next week if we can't get the information. You can certainly tell me if you are not getting the information you want and I will make sure you get it.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee