

**COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS,
ENROLLMENT, & REVENUE ADMINISTRATION**

June 18, 1996

5:45 PM

Due to the absence of Chairman Elise, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann it was voted that Alderman Shea act as Chairman Pro Tem.

Chairman Pro Tem Shea called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

PRESENT: Alderman Shea, Alderman Pariseau, Alderman Hirschmann
Chairman Elise and Alderman Soucy arrived late.

MESSRS.: Kevin Clougherty, Randy Sherman

Chairman Shea addressed item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Chief Favreau recommending an increase in
Animal Shelter Fees.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to approve the increased fees and recommend referral to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for ordinance preparation.

Chairman Elise arrived at the meeting and took over the chairmanship.

Chairman Elise stated that we were going to go to item #6 on the agenda and then we are going to take item #9 just to a recognition that there is not enough time to discuss the whole agenda.

Alderman Pariseau said that we could run through this without any problem.

Chairman Elise addressed item #6:

Report regarding accounts receivable write-offs.

Chairman Elise recognized Ms. Parsons.

Ms. Parsons stated that last year I had begun a process of reviewing the City's receivables for age and we did quite a cleaning of outdated and uncollectible receivable. Most of which were beyond the Statute of Limitation being able to collect them anyway. What I have tried to do is to review this on a monthly basis in a conjunction with the departments. In light of that we have done a really good job, the departments have done a really fine job, of staying on top of the Cities receivable as they occur. In light of that, what you have in front of you is that which is in my opinion uncollectible. They are collection agency fees there, there are some outdated receivables some due to the Statute of Limitation, some due to bankruptcy filings. The businesses are just not in the City anymore. At the bottom of the that, I think that Mr. Sherman will have to address that, the Workmen's' Compensation. There are a number of cases that have been on the Cities books for quite awhile and we have added those to this list, this year, in order to clear the receivable.

Alderman Pariseau asked whether we list these deadbeats anywhere? I mean if they should come back and have their cars registered or do anything else in the City Hall. Is there a place where the Clerk can look?

Ms. Parsons answered that we do not have a central system. Another good argument for getting a good computer base. The one thing that police and fire both do is they do keep tabs on the boxes, the fire boxes and the fire alarms. Mr. Paul Beaudoin keeps a list of those for extra duty. If they aren't paid and then we end up having, oh I got one, if we end up having to write them off or they go to collection agency. The departments keep a list of those that are forwarded. In fact, I don't forward anything usually without going through them first for verification.

Alderman Pariseau asked what the Workmen's' Compensation?

Mr. Sherman replied that when someone goes out on Workers' Comp, while their case is being determined or whether they are going to accept it or not. They are eligible to collect sick pay.

Alderman Pariseau said from the City.

Mr. Sherman repeated from the City or sometimes it's vacation pay. In some cases, it's even the sick leave bank that we have. What happens is once there Workmen's' Comp is settled they owe us that sick and vacation pay back. That's what this is. We have a hard time collecting that.

Alderman Pariseau asked why do we want to write these off? I mean Chandonnet is up in Pittsburg, Lacombe is in Manchester, Previe, I do not know where he is, Vanderputten. Why do we want to write off \$15,519.12 from Chandonnet?

Mr. Sherman stated that in some of these cases and I know Chandonnet and Lacombe are certainly in this category. I am not sure about Leblanc that is the other big one. They have not received their final benefits. In order for them to receive their final benefits they have to pay us back the dollars that they owe us. So it's one of those they owe us, we owe them.

Alderman Pariseau asked how much do we owe?

Mr. Sherman said that in Lacombe's case we owe him more than he owes us. In Chandonnet's case it's the opposite.

Alderman Pariseau said out of the \$15,000 how much do we owe him \$8,000.

Mr. Sherman replied that we owed him about \$9,000. It's one of those he is not paying us...

Alderman Pariseau asked why not apply it to the \$15,000 and write off the difference.

Mr. Sherman said that's what it is. We just have these receivables on the books. Your right, on the flip side, we have some payables on the book that we would end as well. It's one of these you have no recourse..

Alderman Pariseau said that instead of showing a write off \$39,368.39 you might be able to get it down to \$25,000.

Mr. Sherman said that we could amend that to make it to that number. If you prefer we can do that.

Alderman Pariseau said well no, I just don't know how?

Mr. Sherman responded that the problem is that the receivables on the books as these amounts. So, we really need to write off these as the receivables. If you want the number stated as a net, I can give you a list of that.

Alderman Pariseau said then if they should pay you have to go through the accounts receivable re-billing. Whatever, I will make the motion...

Alderman Hirschmann said he had a question. A lot of these pertain to fire, I'm assuming they are fire inspections of permits, or something to do with fire alarm systems. Some of these are not that old. I mean, there old, some of them are coming up on a year, like 6/'95, 3/'95. These people are definitely deadbeats, but why are we going to write them off?

Mr. Sherman said to keep in mind, what we are writing off is the amount that is in the right hand column, which is just the collection agency fee, in most cases. So they paid the original amount, but they refuse to pay for the collection agency.

Alderman Hirschmann said that leads him to his second question. Is our policy for the fire too tight that's resulting in these collection fees, should we change some things?

Mr. Sherman replied that we give them 60 days to pay. Then we send it to collection.

Alderman Hirschmann stated what is the sense of having a policy if you are going to write it off. That's what I am saying, I mean, they are hitting us hard, either make them pay or change the policy.

Mr. Sherman said that what happened, how much did we write off last year?

Ms. Parsons responded \$128,000.

Alderman Pariseau said that we should not issue them permits anymore, either.

Alderman Hirschmann said that he knew the companies. Like, Cote Electric, Central Signal, Connelly Electric, I know all these guys. It it's \$15 they should pay.

Ms. Parsons said that the problem with that is that by law you cannot collect the agency fee. Unless you have a signed contract that is not what these receivables are about. You cannot take them to court to collect it. In their mind's eye, they have paid the \$480.00 or they have paid in full when they have written that check. Now, is it right and proper that they not make that check payable to the City within 60 days. No. So, the only recourse we have is to pass those own to Collection Agency. Sometimes just seeing that letterhead is enough to say, all right I don't need this problem and they write the check. The policy of the Collection Agency that we deal with is that they bill or invoice them for the full amount plus the fee. By law they do not have to pay the fee and some of them know this.

Alderman Hirschmann said there was one on there from Autofair \$480.00.

Ms. Parsons answered yes.

Alderman Hirschmann continued by saying that's a municipal gamal blocks annual fee. Did they go out of business or why are they not paying?

Mr. Sherman answered that they paid the \$480.00 it's the \$105.00 they are not paying which is the collection fee.

Ms. Parsons repeated its the \$105.00 they are not paying. Now, if you look at the age of that, it's one that I missed last year. When I was going through all the old ones and they haven't done that since because they'll go and get the box. They really are doing a fine job in the departments, and the police they are doing a fine job of keeping tabs on these things.

Alderman Hirschmann said so you are just asking for help to clean this up and we should not see all this.

Ms. Parsons said no, and every year you are going to see some element of it, because they are some of those you are just never going to see. The percentage on here is very small, very small, in light of what we have. It really is.

Alderman Shea said excuse me. What I was going to as is does the Collection Agency receive any money at all? I mean, in other words.....

Ms. Parsons answered that if they collect it.

Alderman Shea said they collected it. What I mean, is did they receive any money for collecting it for the City?

Ms. Parsons replied yes.

Alderman Shea said they have.

Ms. Parsons answered yes. What they do is they remit it the net difference to us. That's why these open receivables stay on the books.

Alderman Pariseau said so they probably got \$105.00.

Ms. Parsons replied that was right.

Alderman Pariseau continued by saying right off the top. They sent the City the \$375.00 or whatever.

Mr. Sherman said what they do is send the Collection Agency this one for Autofair for \$480.00 they us \$480. Collection Agency then goes after Autofairs for \$585.00 if they collect the \$585.00 the keep \$105.00 and we get our \$480.00. If they only collected \$480.00 what happens is they still get the \$105.00 and we....

Alderman Shea asked so this figure \$5,580.03 is really what we are still owed.

Mr. Sherman said that was right.

Chairman Elise asked Alderman Pariseau if he wanted to make a motion.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was voted that the listing of the accounts receivable write-offs be approved.

Chairman Elise advised that due to time constraints, Item #9 would next be addressed.

On motion of Ald. Pariseau, duly seconded by Ald. Shea, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion.

Discussion relative to a parking proposal affecting the
Downtown and Millyard areas with a proposed new rate structure and devised
parking system.

(Tabled 5/28/96)

(Note: Report of the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety advising of their
recommendation adopting parking plan changes as outlined.)

Chairman Elise stated members had received a revised report of the Committee on
Traffic noting the Finance Department

Ald. Pariseau moved to recommend to the full Board that the report of the Committee on
Traffic relative to the parking plan and fees outlined be received, accepted and adopted.

Mr. Clougherty stated Mr. Sherman had more updated information and requested he be
allowed to present it to the Committee. When they had presented it to the Committee on

Traffic, they had been discussing 2 mills noting they had since gone back to look at other scenarios that they would now present to this Committee.

Mr. Sherman said that one of the concerns that had been raised by the Committee on Traffic. In charging the 2 mill rate, they asked if they would be in essence creating this "cash cow" rather than just covering the City's costs. They would start to generate too much money, realizing that in the first year, yes they had some major capital expenses they were covering. But in future years it was the Committee's thoughts that there would be excess funds. They took the 2 mill rate and took the expenses and revenues that would be generated by the garage and from the mill rate and ran the numbers out five years. That in the last line during the first year there would be about \$67,000 going into the Trust Fund and at the end of five years there would be almost \$1.2 million in the Trust Fund. That going back about six or seven years ago there was about close to \$2 million in the Trust Fund noting that the \$1.2 million was not outrageous, but that is the amount that would be going in. They went down and knocked the mill rate down to 1.5 mills or 1 mill; that in knocking it down to 1.5 mills what would happen would be that in the first year there would not be any money going into the Trust Fund. That there would be \$635,000 being spent on capital. If they went back up to the 2 mill rate, they would be spending \$751,000 so they would need to defer about \$116,000 in expenses. As there just wasn't the revenue in the first year; that they took \$116,000 and moved it into 1998 and in 1998 under the 1.5 mills they'd have \$21,000 going into the Trust Fund. Then after the 5 years you would have \$128,000 in the Trust Fund. Not a lot of money, not a lot of wiggle room, if you are spending a little more money or you are bringing in a little less money. It's a real touch and go in there but, the 1.5 mills certainly doesn't create a "cash cow". It covers all your capital needs. I think is probably doable. Once you get down to the 1.0 mill rate and you see you get no money going into the Trust Funds. If you look across the capital expense lines it's woefully short from where it was in the other two scenarios and you are still running deficits of \$800,000. Which means that was funded out of property taxes and again you haven't covered all your capital needs.

Alderman Pariseau asked in the year 2001, that Trust Fund closing \$1.1 million that is after expending all the \$2,000.....

Mr. Sherman replied exactly.

Alderman Pariseau asked if they have already spent \$1.0 Million in capital expenses, improvement to the parking garages and whatever.

Mr. Sherman said actually over the 5 years.....Right....

Mr. Clougherty stated that the theory here is your taking care of your current expenses plus putting aside something to take care of replacement costs down the road.

Mr. Sherman continued by saying what happened a few years ago when you had the \$2.0 million, you set your parking fees and you have not touched them in about 8 years. So, what is happened over that period is you've drawn down on that \$2.0 million to cover your operating expense. You have not had any money for capital. That'd the problem your at now, your no longer covering, nothing in the Trust Funds, your not covering your operating expenses out of current revenues. You are not funding any of the maintenance, or...

Alderman Pariseau added that currently we are covering from hand to mouth. As far as parking garages.

Mr. Clougherty said there is nothing in your hand going to your mouth.

Chairman Elise asked Mr. Sherman if he was suggesting that the Traffic Committee suggest the 2.0 mills. Are you suggesting...

Mr. Sherman said that the Traffic Committee adopts their recommendation on board is 2.0 mills. What they did not have available to them was working out 5 years. I guess what the issue is whether you feel comfortable with the 1.5, which again will reduce what everyone has to pay here. With the 128 again is that enough or stick them with the 2.0 mill rate where the Traffic Committee is.

Alderman Soucy asked on the garage revenues there is no projection for any increase whatsoever and those are flat, straight across. An increase in garage revenues would result in increase money in the Trust Fund. The auto registration revenue projection is that on the basis of the same number of vehicles over the next 5 years or did you project an increase in the number of vehicles.

Mr. Sherman replied that they did not project in a number of vehicles, but in the value of the vehicles. The Chevette you buy this year is \$10,000, next year it will \$10,500. So every year when you bring in new vehicles.

Alderman Soucy said so you have a price differential.

Mr. Sherman answered what they did not have projected in there is another dip in the economy. I mean we are going up about 5 percent every year if you go back to 1991, 1992 period when people stopped buying new cars. That is not in here, that's what I mean under the 1.5 you have got no room for any of those things to happen. On the flip side, your right, the garage revenues are flat, you've got no projections in there.

Alderman Hirschmann so there is no forecasted bait, spiked with consumers going the other way, too. There is no down or up side.

Alderman Soucy said right. Also, in the garage revenue there is no projection of increase usage of the garages due to an increase in the parking meter fees. Which is what we hope, in theory, will happen.

Mr. Sherman said actually there is, I mean, the Traffic Committee adopted the meter rates. The 1997 garage projection does include more people going in there. No Hesser Colleges moving in or excess usage.

Chairman Elise said that she knows Aldermen Hirschmann and Alderman Shea want to ask questions. In terms of the rest of the proposal regarding rates from parking, lots, parking garages and meters are you going to get to that later?

Mr. Sherman responded that he can. What Traffic has adopted will leave the lease rates and garage rates alone right now. They want to study those, in town manager wants to study before he feels comfortable making a recommendation. The meter rates have gone from .25 cents to .50 cents an hour and there are more meters that are going to be installed in areas now were it is just time limit parking. That is the proposal, there isn't much more to that.

Chairman Elise said she just wanted it clarified. Alderman Shea and Alderman Hirschmann want to be recognized.

Alderman Shea asked if these were added to the auto registration of cars. How much of an increase to that fee? In other words, if somebody buys a \$15,000 car in 1996 how much of a fee would it be?

Mr. Sherman replied that car listed at \$15,000 and it's a brand new car it goes on the list price of the vehicle and the model year of the vehicle.

Alderman Shea asked what are we talking about?

Mr. Sherman said that right now 2 mils would be paid by '97 model years and '96 model years. So anybody with '97, '96, '95 and '94 model years, anybody with a '93 or older would pay 1 mil. They take a list price and based on the list price of \$15,000 no, if they \$2.00 per thousand. So, if it's listed at \$15,000 they pay an extra \$30.00, now the next year, it's not listed at \$15,000 any more, it may only be listed as \$12,000. So they would pay that right now.

Alderman Shea said he another question. The, in other words, is the intent of raising say the rates 2 mil, 1.5 mil as it where, is that to improve the garage situation all at once. Or in other words, is the plan to say to do the Granite Street Garage all at once, one year?

Mr. Sherman said that you have multi-million dollar problems in the garages. What this does is, you have a \$650,000 request for Granite Street Garage, if you looked at it you have big cracks and the whole thing. What CIP was trying to do was bond a portion of it and defer some into next year, we're not sure you can defer anymore. This pays cash for it, get your project done, takes care of the \$95,000 down at the Numerica building and again they had capital needs. They were looking for some money. It eliminates interest cost, eliminates bonding cost that you have. What it does, then it funds \$.5 million every year going forward. Traffic sent me about 20 pages of capital needs that they have in their garages. You are looking at close to \$800,000 at Victory Garage that does not count going in and sealing the floors and you know the basic things.

Alderman Shea said that what you are saying in essence is that the intent is not to repair all the garages but to repair partially the garages out of this...

Mr. Sherman replied that what you would take care of is the Numerica building and Granite Street immediate needs this year. Next year, Tom would have to find his priorities and ..

Alderman Shea continued by saying that what your really talking about is repairing Granite Street rather than...

Mr. Sherman responded right.

Mr. Clougherty noted that going on that line even if you cost it out and try to do everything in the garage..There is only so much that you can do in one year after you go out into the RFP's and your bodies put out. That would maximize the \$1.5 million or the \$1.50 rate maximized the amount that he can spend this year. There is no use raising the money if we can't use it this year.

Alderman Shea stated that there is a perception that if this money isn't raised that it would add to the tax rate. However, does that necessarily hold true, in other words, can the tax rate not be raised necessarily and scale down the amount of work that has to be done. I mean....

Mr. Sherman said that if you look at the amount that is in the auto registration \$1.4 million. It's only gotten \$750,000 for adding to the expense line. You take out the auto registration and defer those expenses. Bonded so there is no current year impact. You

are looking at \$650,000 hole in the budget. There is an impact, if you do not pass it, you have a \$650,000 revenue short fall. What happens is that...

Mr. Clougherty added and you do not do Granite Street.

Mr. Sherman agreed you are not doing Granite Street and you are not paying to the Numerica building. The revenues that are in the budget, the ones at the public hearing, were based on increased meter rates, increased parking and lease rates and 100 percent utilization. They are saying we do not want to do the garages, we do not want to do the leases. We are certainly not at 100 percent utilization and that's the \$650,000 hole that we have.

Alderman Shea said that we have already added something to the registration, right?

Mr. Sherman responded that you added the flat \$3.00 for the auto reclamation.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Hirschmann.

Alderman Hirschmann started by saying that the way it was portrayed the pressure is on us right now. If there is a \$650,000 problem with this budget, I think somebody would be waking up Richard Davis real quick. The pressure should not always be on us. That original plan, they should be prepared to implement some of that, because right now the pressure all on us. I do not think it's right. I think this guy coming in from Ohio, shake, rattle and roll. Figure these parking garage rates out, all this other stuff, \$650,000 is a lot of money. And, yes I'm willing to play ball a little bit here for the goodness of God knows who, not for the taxpayers, for the budget crisis. My question originally was, shifting of the capital expenses is that just to make each scenario look good. I noticed that capital is different in each scenario.

Mr. Sherman said that what he tried to do, is say that you cannot spend more expenses than you bring in the revenues. So when you run into a deficit, reduce the capital and move it to the next year. That's what happened with the 1.5 mil.

Alderman Hirschmann asked so what we decide is like there is a \$2.8 million capital expenses we want, we took that formula and spread over at least 5 years.

Mr. Sherman answered that was right.

Alderman Hirschmann continued by saying that he did not know much about our garages are they in that bad of shape that we have to do this every year. Could we go alternate years? I mean...

Alderman Pariseau said that it's been years that we have not done anything with them.

Alderman Hirschmann said then all of sudden you are going to do it boom, boom, boom.

Mr. Sherman noted that we built Canal Street in the early 80's, in the early 90's you put another \$2.5 million into it.

Mr. Clougherty responded that the reason you are doing that Alderman is because you are not doing the regular maintenance.

Alderman Hirschmann said so we are now playing catch up.

Mr. Clougherty answered that this was a solution, unfortunately what you are faced with is these expenses and these situations in the garages. You can either raise the revenues this way and pledge for that and see that it's done. Raise taxes or defer the actions and those are not three good choices.

Alderman Hirschmann replied that he was not saying defer the action is a good thing. What I am saying is that the people that use these garages should pay a little bit more to use them. I don't use these garages, I never will, I don't want to pay for them for the rest of my life and for everybody else in the world.

Mr. Clougherty stated that there was nothing that says also this is a plan for 5 years that we are looking at today. If the garage study comes in and has a profound effect here then that is something you look at as part of your next year cycle. Then see how that factors in to this one.

Alderman Hirschmann said that he realized the Cities' assets have to be maintained. The plan that went forward to the downtown manager, whatever his title is there, two months ago was not this. We just kind of craftily invented this.

Mr. Sherman said that what his concern is though. You want to get the people off the street and into the garages. You raise the meter rates and instead of paying \$4.00 a day to use the meters. I can go into the garage for \$2.25. Then if you take and make the garages' \$4.00, then they would say why do I want to go to the garage. What he wants to do is, do the meters and get the people into the garages and then study the garage rates and see if the market will bear in it. He's not opposed to the increase, he just doesn't want the two to offset each other and get other benefits from it. So, he wants to do this and study the garages and come back in six months or so. Then, he'd say here is the pattern and the study, we can or cannot go up.

Alderman Hirschmann interrupted like the philosophy for Elm Street. The were going to re-paved it, angle park it, meter it, but it's going to be expensive enough were people are going to probably want to go in the garages and probably park there.

Mr. Clougherty added unless they have quick business in and out, or unless the businesses wanted to do something.

Alderman Soucy said short term versus long term. It's getting long term parker off the street. The people who are going to be there 6 to 8 hours at a job. Those are the people that we are trying to get off. If your coming to shop and you're only going to be there an hour or two.

Alderman Hirschmann asked whether or not we were going to put the meters back in the Millyard.

Chairman Elise wanted to know if the money was only going to be used for the garages, the lots.

Mr. Sherman answered that it was going to be used for the garages and the lots.

Chairman Elise wanted the opinion of the Committee if they wanted to vote on the whole concept or if they wanted to vote on parts of it.

Alderman Shea said he had another question.

Chairman Elise said she would recognized Alderman Pariseau first.

Alderman Pariseau stated that the Traffic Committee recommended the 2 mils, but why can't we just settle for the 1.5?

Mr. Sherman replied that he thought you probably could.

Alderman Pariseau said that we do not have to go for everything "hog wild" at once.

Mr. Clougherty said that in fairness to the Traffic Committee they did not have this analysis at that time.

Alderman Pariseau said that he would go the 1.5 mils, Madam Chairman, if you are looking for a motion.

Alderman Shea asked what is the difference if instead of going for the 1.5 mil we went for the 1.0 mil? I know there is a difference of about what 150 in the Trust Fund?

Mr. Sherman replied that you are running \$800,000 deficit after 5 years. The bottom right hand number, and you are not taking care of your capital needs. You continually defer on that.

Alderman Shea said that's assuming that you keep the 1.0 mil for 5 years. Rather than say 1.0 mil this year, and raise it to 1.5 mil next year.

Alderman Pariseau said that you still would lose the \$801,000 in 5 years.

Alderman Hirschmann said would it help if you had a fourth column and show how it is now. Now we are totally in the.....

Mr. Sherman said that now we are totally in the deficit. You are right. I mean actually the other item that you have on your revenue policy, which says, at minimum every four years you have to come back and look at this thing. I do not think you want to be in every year tinkering with it, because again if it fluctuates with the economy and what not.

Alderman Pariseau asked if he could ask the Financial Wiz of the Board, Madam Chairman of how that 1.5 mil would sit with the projected 3.8?

Alderman Wihby answered it would not affect any. It would still say at 3.75.

Mr. Sherman said the difference between the 2 and 1.5. The only thing it does it reduces the amount that goes into the Granite Street.

Alderman Pariseau said that without it the tax rate would increase to what?

Alderman Wihby replied 4.32.

Alderman Pariseau repeated 4.32.

Mr. Clougherty said and you would not do Granite Street.

Alderman Wihby agreed that you would not do Granite Street.

Mr. Clougherty stated that you would not be able to do the projects. That needs to be considered.

Chairman Elise noted that in other cities Concord, Nashua and Derry there on the street meter are 50 cents.

Alderman Soucy said no. We would be the highest in the State.

Mr. Sherman said that he could not make a statement on that because he did not know.

Alderman Soucy continued by saying that what Mr. Richard Davis said we would be the highest in the State meters.

Alderman Pariseau noted that Concord only had one garage, don't they?

Alderman Hirschmann said that we should be.

Mr. Sherman said that around the State House it's only a quarter.

Chairman Elise asked in Concord their meters are 50 cents.

Alderman Soucy said a quarter.

Ms. Parsons said that if she remembered correctly what they said last week, something about the parking garages being \$70.00 a month.

Alderman Soucy added that the parking garages were more expensive but the on street was cheaper.

Ms. Parsons said that they really enforce it, too, 2 hours and they really enforce it.

Chairman Elise stated that she really felt it was too bad that Mr. Richard Davis was not here to address us about this. We are the ones that have to vote on these particular increases too. The only benefit of this plan that I can see, in terms of maintaining the parking lots, which we all use, meters which we probably all use, and garages which some of us use. That it is spread amongst everybody, not just the property owner. That's the up side of this.

Mr. Clougherty replied that Mr. Rich Davis was here earlier, he said he would be at the full Board meeting. He will be here tonight. He is not here at the meeting.

Chairman Elise stated that the Traffic Committee voted on the whole package. Chairman Elise asked before we voted could she have an example of an auto registration and how much it would cost with the 1.5 mil.

Mr. Sherman answered that on a brand new \$10,000 car it would be \$15.00 plus \$3.00 for the reclamation.

Alderman Soucy added that it would be an additional \$18.00 over what they are currently paying.

Mr. Sherman continued by saying that they would currently be paying \$180.00. So, you would go from \$180 to \$198.

On motion Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to recommend that the auto registration fee be established at 1.5 mil and that the parking meter fees be increased as proposed. Alderman Shea was duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Shea asked whether that motion superseded the other two mills that the Traffic?

The Clerk stated that as long as we present it to the Board. It will be the Boards' decision as to what they want to budget.

Alderman Hirschmann said that he just wanted the Chairman know that in voting for this, I want to see how this works. We definitely reserve the right that in two or three years to revisit this.

Mr. Sherman said that we have explained to Traffic that we need to have a better capital plan going forward so we know where the money is going to be transformed. That's the part to it's just not the revenue side it's the expense side.

Alderman Hirschmann continued by saying that we are trying something.

Mr. Sherman agreed.

Alderman Pariseau said that none of this is cash and concrete.

Chairman Elise recognized Ms. Parson.

Ms. Parson said that I just have some points.

Mr. Sherman said that what Ms. Parsons was handing out is the current year's revenue forecast through the end of the year for this current fiscal year. To give you some ideas as to where we are.

Alderman Pariseau asked whether or not it would take long if we only took item #7 and make a recommendation that it would be the flat rate.

General discussion followed briefly.

Chairman Elise asked Ms. Parsons if she wanted them to hold on to these until the next meeting.

Ms. Parsons said yes she would.

The Committee did not address the following items:

4. Review of quarterly financial statements.
5. Review of report from the Board of Assessors relative to the real estate tax base and abatements for the City of Manchester.
7. Presentation of revenue forecast.

TABLED ITEM

8. Communication from Randy Sherman, Deputy Finance Director, relative to the City adopting vehicle policies and a valuation method in order to adhere to IRS reporting requirements associated with personal use of City vehicles.
(Tabled 3/26/96)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee

