

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

February 11, 1997

**5:00 PM
Executive Conference Room**

Chairman Elise called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

PRESENT: Alderman Elise, Alderman Soucy, Alderman Shea, Alderman Pariseau, Alderman Hirschmann, Alderman Reiniger, Mayor Wieczorek

MESSRS.: Kevin Clougherty, Randy Sherman, Joanne Shaffer, Paul Porter, Armand Gaudreault, Leon LaFreniere, Doug Gherlone, Paul Beaudoin

Chairman Elise called the first item on the agenda item #3:

Ordinance amendment to Chapter 13, Article IV, Section 13-214(b) relative to housing code inspection fees submitted by Alderman Reiniger.
(Note: on 9/17/96 Committee directed Finance and Building to develop preliminary plans and/or fee structures based on cost analysis.)

Chairman Elise asked Alderman Reiniger if he would like to come up and discuss this item.

Alderman Pariseau asked whether or not we had accepted the recommendations of the Building Commissioner.

Chairman Elise stated that there were several and that none had been adopted.

Alderman Pariseau said that he thought we had adopted the whole package.

Chairman Elise said no we had not.

Clerk Bergeron said that it was the Clerks understanding that it was sent back to Finance. Finance and Building were instructed to work up a proposal. This is what they have come back with since then.

Chairman Elise stated that Mr. Gaudreault was supposed to go back and return with a whole fee package proposal.

Mr. Clougherty said that his understanding was that the item came before the Committee. The Committee asked Finance Department to work with Building and go back and see what costs were and bring something back. We have, since this has been referred to us, have had people go out in the field and actually go out with the inspectors to find you a full cost analysis. That would be basis for the Committee to come up with a decision. About 3/4 of the way doing that, we expect to have final report over the next ten days. So we could bring that to you. Unfortunately, we could not do that tonight because we are still in the process of pulling that information together and working with the Building Department. We hope we could get that back to you within the next two weeks.

Alderman Pariseau asked from September until now, it's not done.

Mr. Clougherty answered no.

Alderman Pariseau made a motion to table.

Alderman Soucy asked whether you they were looking for just a specific fee or are you looking at other building fees.

Mr. Clougherty answered that it was really just those, but again the Finance Department has several other things that we are doing so we are going as you can. The hardest thing has been to be able to schedule with the Building people and that's the hardest to find the time where they can both together.

Alderman Soucy said she understood, but are you just looking for fees on rooming houses or are you looking at all housing inspection.

Ms. Shaffer said that she believes they were going to do an assessment of all the fees. We were going to start specifically with these items for the cost analysis, because these were the ones who were in question. These were the first ones we were doing, we were hoping to set a model that we would be able to use for all the other cost.

General discussion ensued.

Mr. Clougherty said we are just trying to go in.

Chairman Elise asked if this would go to the Full Board Mayor Wieczorek?

Mayor Wieczorek said that it will after.....

Chairman Elise said that she was instructed by your office that nothing is to come here.

Mayor Wieczorek replied okay.

Chairman Elise continued by saying she wanted some new instructions.

Mayor Wieczorek answered yes.

Alderman Shea said that if your bill was due, say in February, and you pay \$25 per room. The ordinance says that you only pay.

Alderman Hirschmann said how are you guys doing it right now?

Mr. LaFreniere stated that is what this is intended to provide an equitable fee.

Alderman Hirschmann continued by saying and that's were we seem to be having a problem. Every one is complaining that this is not fair that this should be a lot less.

Mr. LaFreniere asked there are those that are complaining.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that they testified in front of us that the department shows up and two hours there gone and you charge them \$1,000 or whatever. That's what it is all about.

Mr. Clougherty said that in order for us to give you information we have to look, not at just one complaint, but to look at all of them. Gathering that data, trying to schedule, time from our people.

Alderman Hirschmann said that he knows, but when you come back with that I just wanted you to know where I am going to be coming from. Two way street. People are coming and telling us (snapping his fingers) slam bam, and then they are given a bill for \$1,000.

Mr. Clougherty said that their commission is to.....

Alderman Pariseau said that he really does not feel bad charging them \$25. They are charging top price for rent.

Alderman Soucy asked for rooming houses?

Alderman Pariseau continued by saying why should we worry about the landlord who has maybe 200 or 300 apartment units, housing or rooming units and they want to get away with \$6.00 for inspection. That's even less than what it will cost the City employee to go there and inspect it.

Alderman Soucy said that it's not apartments. The problem is that we are distinguishing between rooming houses and apartments. Can Alderman Reiniger adjust his proposal since he brought it in?

Chairman Elise responded right. I did ask Alderman Reiniger to do that.

Alderman Reiniger stated that Mr. Gherlone is here and he is the one who came to me. He has a rooming house on 77 Market Street two buildings down from here. It's in excellent shape, he has spent a lot of money fixing it up. He came to basically, he has a 52 - 53 rooms and he also happens to have an apartment building that has the same amount of rooms on the West Side. They both were inspected the same year. The rooming house had a bill of \$1,300.00, the apartment building roughly had a bill of \$300.00. That obviously seems to be inequitable, that is how this has started. This has been going on for a couple of years now. I spoke with Mr. Gaudreault a couple of years back and he said he was looking at it and was going to propose something. Then he got busy and it did not happen. This is been going on for several months, it's been studied since September. I think Mr. Gherlone has indicated that he is going to up again this coming year for another bill. If there is action to be taken it would be good to have it soon.

Chairman Elise stated the basic information that the Finance Department would like to present to us will be ready in about 10 days.

Mr. Clougherty replied that he thinks at the next meeting they will be able to come back and give you a report.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Pariseau asked how many units does he have on Stark Street? And how many in the apartment building?

Mr. Gherlone corrected Alderman Pariseau by saying it was on Market Street. There were 53 rooms.

Alderman Pariseau repeated 53. How much do you charge a week?

Mr. Gherlone responded \$70.

Alderman Pariseau repeated \$70. How about your West Side apartment? How many units are in there.

Mr. Gherlone said there were twelve apartments.

Alderman Pariseau repeated twelve.

Mr. Gherlone added that identical total amount of rooms as on Market Street.

Alderman Pariseau stated that this was for his own information.

Chairman Elise stated that she certainly recognized that there was an inequity here. Between now and the time this issue is resolved we could put a moratorium on people needing to pay this fee. Till the issue is settled.

Alderman Soucy asked since this report has to go to the Full Board is there any reason why since this is just one small piece of what Finance and Building are working on. Why can't we just pass this along contingent upon some finding of the Finance Department?

Chairman Elise asked whether or not they were going to be recommending a fee.

Alderman Soucy responded that they were going to be coming up with some ballpark number. If the number is close enough it's just a matter of changing a dollar amount.

Alderman Pariseau added to let them do their own report back.

Alderman Soucy stated that it's been here since September. In the meantime, every body sits back and waits. There is no reason to keep holding it up.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Hirschmann.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that he was very disappointed with this Committee. I really feel that Accounts and Revenue have done, practically goofs, I am really getting frustrated. Respectfully, I'll wait for Mr. Clougherty, that's all we have to do. I mean thirty days, we have to start getting some stuff done on this Committee. I am just a little dejected that we are getting nothing none.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea said that he wondered when the \$25 fee was set. Was it last year, ten years ago?

Mr. LaFreniere replied that he believed it took place before the Housing Code Department consolidated with the Building Department. I believe it was 1994.

Alderman Shea said that was set by the Board.

Mr. LaFreniere continued by saying that was set by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in that year just before the consolidation of the departments.

Alderman Shea asked whether or not they consider to raise or lower when they do their calculation?

Mr. Clougherty responded that they were going to look at the actual cost. Based on that information then you can make a determination in terms of what to bill, what is equitable and what you feel needs to be. It is a policy decision but at least you will have the cost of the difference and that is what you asked us to do.

Mr. Sherman replied that is what we will have for you at the next meeting.

Alderman Hirschmann said he moved to have tabled.

Alderman Soucy asked whether or not it was possible to have it before the next Board meeting? Could we meet for five minutes before the next Board meeting?

Mr. Sherman and Ms. Shaffer both replied that they would not have it ready before the next Board of Mayor and Aldermen meeting that was next Tuesday.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea wanted to ask Mr. Gherlone that his main concern was could he wait?

Alderman Soucy said that he has waited for years.

Alderman Shea said no, no. I know but it's a yearly kind of fee.

Mr. Gherlone responded no, sir. It's once each three years, it Certificate of Compliance, COC and the City.

Alderman Shea asked when was his Compliance date up.

Mr. Gherlone answered this year.

Alderman Shea said he knew but when?

Mr. Gherlone responded in the Spring, I believe.

Alderman Shea asked April or May? So, it will not make any difference. I make a motion we table it for now and wait for the Finance Department.

Alderman Soucy added that we definitely have to have it for the next meeting. We cannot continue to drag on.

Chairman Elise agreed. She would also suggest that any person who needs a Certificate of Occupancy done in between now and the time we establish the fee. A moratorium should be placed on the person who has to pay the fee until we have established a new fee. I do recognize that there is an inequity here.

Alderman Soucy asked whether or not there were any scheduled at this point.

Mr. LaFreniere said that they are scheduled throughout the year.

Alderman Soucy asked how many rooming houses do you possibly have? Is there any way.....

Mr. LaFreniere responded more that you might think. The concern would be that the ordinance dictates the fee that we charge for the Certificate of Issuance. I guess we would be concerned in the end How we would in the absence of an action to modify the ordinance would we be able to issue the Certificates and maintain the standing of the apartments or rooming units without fees being charged?

Alderman Hirschmann asked if he could make a recommendation. If you propose something like that, it's not a good thing, some people may even insinuate that they are going to get money back. That's not the case, we are going to change a policy effective a certain date. Any fees that are collected and at a certain date in the near future they will be different. Simple as that.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Pariseau ask permission of the Chairman to ask Alderman Reiniger a question?

Chairman Elise responded yes.

Alderman Pariseau asked Alderman Reiniger where did you get that \$6.00, why not \$10.00.

Alderman Reiniger started to respond that was just...

Mr. Gherlone asked if he could answer that. He got that from me.

Alderman Pariseau asked Mr. Gherlone were did you get the \$6.00.

Mr. Gherlone continued by saying he based it on what the City had charged me for inspecting my other apartment building. I took the average rooms per unit and divided into the fee and it came up to approximately \$6.00 per room to inspect. Since the rooming house is by room, I just looked at that, and said if an inspector is going into four rooms into an apartment or 4.3 rooms, whatever the number was, and charging me \$25 for looking at four or four plus rooms. Then would it not apply then that the same dollar amount per room would be reasonable on a per room basis for Market Street that is all separate rooms.

Alderman Pariseau asked whether or not in that same vein are we going to have people coming here with four room apartments saying I want to be charge \$6 a room that would be \$24. and those apartments that have six or eight rooms we charge them \$36 or \$48.

Alderman Soucy stated we currently charge \$25 so if they have four rooms they will pay \$24 that is less than they are paying now.

Alderman Pariseau said but we are making an exception here, rooming house \$6 a room.

Alderman Soucy replied no, we are making it distinctive, because they are two distinctive things. The amount of time it takes to inspect a room, to inspect a kitchen and bathroom facility within an apartment is very different from a rooming house where you inspect individual rooms.

Alderman Pariseau stated that there is not that much difference you still have to check a bathroom facility. I do not think they have kitchens.

Alderman Soucy asked but how many bathroom facilities.

Alderman Pariseau said there maybe be one but a lot of.....

Mr. Gherlone responded that there were nine bathrooms in the particular building. The purpose of doing it that way to find a reasonable approach on a per room basis. Where perhaps I had made a suggestion to the City three years ago to look at doing all rental units on a per room basis because it seemed to be the only legal way of doing it. The City obviously has to pay inspectors and there are in effect back room costs. It was not my understanding that this was a revenue enhancement for the City but rather as a cause of doing business making sure that there was reasonable housing. Which is why if this is supposed to be a revenue plan than you are asking the room house owner to take an unfair share of paying revenue, translate tax. Because for two hours of that inspector's time, I paid \$300 on Notre Dame Avenue, for two hours of that same inspector's time I paid \$1,300 on Market Street, were the inequity comes in.

Chairman Elise stated that she definitely recognizes that there is an inequity. I think..

Mr. Gherlone said that we have to wait ten days. I don't object to the ten days, hopefully the next meeting, the Committee

Alderman Pariseau said that you have till you are current....

Mr. Gherlone responded that he was just sensitive to the fact that.....

Alderman Hirschmann asked what the point was, he knows when fire alarm systems are inspected in the City. The City sends their inspectors from Harvey Road into a facility. First hand experience, they send a fellow over and he does by the hour, there is a set fee of, I forget what it is, per hour. They bill per the hour. These inspectors why couldn't they bill out by the hour, if Mr. Clougherty finds out what the overhead is and everything we could pretty much do that. Couldn't we Mr. Clougherty?

Mr. Clougherty responded that might be one of the options available to you when we get this done. Till we get all the data back.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that would seemingly be more fair.

Mr. LaFreniere replied that it was certainly an approach to consider. We have a total of fourteen pier personnel in various discipline. That would be a new approach but I think that one of the things that we were trying to consider here is how to equitably apply those fees across the Board. As mentioned before construct a model that perhaps could be used to ensure that there was some sort of equitable notation of those fees. I would have no objection to doing that way. Our interest is obviously to ensure that the we have the funding in place and provide the services.

Alderman Pariseau said that the gist of the charges was to take care of the salaries and fringe benefits of those people that were doing the inspection. That's why they are the way they are. If we are going to change rates then the Building Department is going to be short changed come the end of June.

Alderman Soucy stated that we do not know whether or not they were ever calculated on the basis of cost to provide service. They were set on a basis of a round number that was easy to work with charged per unit. It was not on a basis of what it actually cost the Building Department or Housing Services at that time to provide the service. That is what Mr. Clougherty and Ms. Shaffer are looking at specifically.

Alderman Pariseau asked if the fees were not just to increase the revenues on behalf the City themselves. It was to take care of the expenses involved with the Building Department and Housing Development.

Alderman Soucy said that it is quite possible that we might be able to reduce them and still cover our costs.

Alderman Pariseau added that it was also possible that they are going to be short changed.

Chairman Elise stated that is what Mr. Clougherty is going to come up with. There has been a motion to table and this issue will definitely be on the next agenda to make a decision on for us to refer to the full Board.

On motion Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to table item #3 until the Finance Department did a cost analysis.

Chairman Elise called the item #4 on the agenda:

Communication from the Board of Assessors requesting to address the Committee relative to House Bill 331 Optional Elderly Exemption.

Mr. Porter started by thanking everyone to give them the opportunity to explain briefly what has happened. The elderly exemption, there are several different types throughout the State. I believe there are about four different categories. What the House Bill 331 has done has been one standard elderly exemption Statewide so that every Community is on the same type of exemption. To boil down what we are looking at here for a change there are three parts of the exemption these are strictly on the elderly. There is an income level, presently it is \$10,000 net income for single people and \$12,000 net income limitation on married couples. The asset limitation is \$35,000 and the age is at 65 years of age. There are three categories of exemption within the elderly from age 65 through 74 is an exemption of \$22,500 of assessed value. From 75 through 79 is \$45,000 and 80 and over if they qualify it is a \$90,000 assessment exemption. Now these exemption amounts were arrived at back in 1991 when we had the re-valuation. The thought of the Board at that time was to maintain an approximate dollar level that the elderly who were qualifying for the exemption were use to. So we established the exemptions at the \$22,500, the \$45,000 and the \$90,000 amounts. That will not change in terms of the amounts that would be up to the discretion, of course, of the Board. The Board can change any or all amounts listed in the exemption. What this house bill has mainly done, before on the income level may I digress for a moment. We did not count Social Security under the prior Statute Social Security was not considered as income for qualification for the elderly exemption. What this house bill has done is it now requires that we do consider Social Security part of the income. If there is no change made this obviously

would put a lot of people off the exemption because they would no longer qualify. In order to maintain approximately the same number and the same amount of exemption what we are recommending is that the asset limitation of \$35,000 remain the same. Age is something you cannot change that is set by Statute. The other would be the income level. We have done some research into the average income for singles on Social Security that is approximately \$8,400 a year. On the married couples on Social Security that income level would be \$14,400 slightly less that doubles what the single would be. In order to maintain the status quo, and we do not anticipate that it would open it up to more people, we do not know that, but we tried to come up with something reasonable. We recommend that the single level be raised to the \$20,400 level. We arrived at that by taking the average income 7,400 I am sorry \$18,400 for the single that is about the \$8,400 that they are getting in Social Security. Since the single limitation now is \$10,000.

Alderman Pariseau interrupted by saying going back, start over again with that single, that \$18,400 you had it up to \$20,400.

Mr. Porter replied scratch that \$20,400 that's gone. The amount is \$18,400 that was arrived at by adding the \$8,400 a year Social Security income to the old limitation of \$10,000. Therefore, the people who now qualify under the old exemption would also qualify under the new. We do not anticipate that this would necessarily put more people into the qualifying area. Question Alderman?

Alderman Pariseau asked how can we be guaranteed of that?

Mr. Porter replied you cannot.

Alderman Pariseau said in other words, were currently at a \$68.0 million exemption rate for elderly exemptions. I would hate like hell to see that go up to \$80.0 million because it is you and I and those of us that are still working that has to make up that difference. If it's going to go any higher than the current level of \$68.0 million I got problems changing anything. Quite frankly I do not think the paying taxpayers in the City can afford it.

Chairman Elise asked when this went into effect.

Mr. Porter said that it was in effect now. It doesn't have to be voted on, it's mandatory that it would be in effect by January 1, 1998. There is also another part to the Statute that if the City does not act on it. The State will establish the income levels at \$13,400 for single, \$20,400 for married and reduce the exemption to \$5,000 per exemption. Which would reduce.....We are not here to take apart and to recommend more people be put on the exemption or fewer people. What we

are taking is the approach of what we estimate would be a reasonable amount to maintain the status quo. We cannot say for sure because if somebody makes, if this puts more people into the area that we do not know about, because maybe they have not qualified up until now. Maybe this new one would allow them to qualify, we do not anticipate that there will be a lot more. Only because what we are trying to do is add the average Social Security income that is counted to the existing exemption.

Alderman Pariseau asked if this was enabling?

Mr. Porter responded that the portion of the amount of the asset no less than \$35,000 or the amount of the exemptions' \$22,500, \$45,000 and \$90,000 is all enabling. You can set that at whatever you want, however, it must be at or above \$13,400 for single, and at or above \$20,400 for the married couple. That would Go ahead.

Alderman Pariseau said that those individuals that are 65 to 74 we could go and give them a \$17,500 dollar amount exempt. Then those to 75 to 90 a \$30,000 dollar amount exempts, and 80 and over \$60,000.

Mr. Porter said that's correct. That would be done by resolution by the Board, or on a referendum there are different avenues. There are two ways, one is by the governing body or by referendum. Typically it has been done by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, last time was 1991, it was done by them.

Alderman Soucy said that it had to be done by referendum.

Chairman Elise said that what this Committee is to do is decide on the policy, if we want to keep the exemptions with the current exemptions, or equivalent.

Mr. Porter stated that what we are trying to do is kind of give you a benchmark that we think would maintain the status quo without opening up. Certainly and in conjunction with this we are requesting through special projects in the budget for the upcoming year to re-qualify all of the elderly. Up until now none of them have had to show any Social Security income because it was exempted under the Statutes. We anticipate there will be some people who did not qualify that will and we also anticipate there are some people who do qualify that will not.

Alderman Pariseau replied we would have hell to pay. You are not going to take them off.

Mr. Porter continued by saying what that number is exactly we do not know. If we re-qualify them and they do not qualify then we would have to renew. The other option would be simple to change the qualification but grandfather the others in, I am not recommending that and I do not know whether that could be done. But that would open up probably another can of worms. That is why we are trying to present something that will keep in existence the same without making drastic changes either way.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea wondered why up to now Social Security was not included in and now it is, what happened?

Mr. Porter replied that it was State Statute. What happened there are certain facets of the retired people. For example, the B & M Railroad, certain government agencies they did not and do not receive Social Security. Up until a while ago, I think the Police Department, I'm not sure. I think there was an issue awhile back Police and Fire did not receive Social Security. What would happen is a person on Social Security had \$8,000 income but \$12,000 Social Security their income qualification was \$8,000. If a person was a Fire Fighter and received \$13,500 from there pension they did not qualify because it was all considered income exclusive of Social Security. So to make an even playing field for all what they did was decide to change and make one exemption including everything that now includes the Social Security.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Soucy.

Alderman Soucy asked Mr. Porter to what extent was some of this language about assets in there before relative to assets. This really seems to restrict it very much to just the actual income of the person. I mean, they have to be living in there home, they have to own the home, there tangible and intangible assets.

Mr. Porter replied that those have pretty much stayed the same.

Chairman Elise stated that the Committee had a couple of decisions to make. Whether we want to move towards an equivalency formula for the elderly exemption. Whether we feel that we want to recommend that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen make this decision or it does go on a referendum.

Mr. Porter added that they have conferred with other Assessors in other communities. In fact, we were at a meeting today, and a number of them are using basically the same approach that we are on the income level. Is not touching the

assets or the amount of the exemption. That is at the prerogative of the Board, but the income levels were established at \$26,400 and \$18,400 for single.

Chairman Elise asked Mr. Clougherty if he had any comments on the process in which the way these numbers were arrived at.

Mr. Clougherty answered no. It really something the Assessors handle.

Mr. Porter stated that in fairness. Here again we always seem to be in a position of trying to estimate the future and predict the future. Back in late 1990, early in 1991, when we were going through the projection process for what we anticipate. What might be the tax rate, because do not forget with the revaluation property values went from like \$20,000 to \$100,000 and the rate drop from \$112.20 down to \$25.87. The process then was if you had an exemption, at that time the exemptions were \$5,000, \$10,000 and \$20,000. If you took a person who had gotten \$550 the year before and then applied the \$5,000 to the new rate of \$25.87 you can see we are getting like \$130 versus \$560. The Boards feeling at that time was what kind of amount do we come up with for all of the Assessment exemptions. Anticipating a certain tax rate that would come out to roughly the same dollar amount as a credit to the elderly as a subsequent bill. That basically is the genesis of the new amounts for the exemptions.

Chairman Elise asked if Mr. Porter had made a comment in regards to there was no way to estimate if there would be a loss or increase in revenue.

Mr. Porter replied that a loss in revenue, per say, would mean that would occur if the amounts of the exemptions or the number of people who qualify were to increase. It's really not anything we can quantify, it's sort of an estimate and our experiences that we do not anticipate that it would have a major impact one way or the other with the qualification. Do not forget, a single person making \$8,500 would qualify, if they are getting another \$8,000 or \$9,000 in Social Security they will still qualify. Our thought process was that the Aldermen would kind of like to have the same people who do qualify now maintain the qualification. We are not trying to think for the Board. I do know that this was the thinking of the Board back in 1991 to keep the same people on. As Alderman Pariseau said if through an action of the Board it would wipe out 50% of the elderly people that would qualify that would be a problem.

Chairman Elise said that she thinks she could support the equivalency and I do like the fact that you are going to go through the process of re-qualifying people.

Alderman Shea said that we are talking strictly of people who own property and pay taxes is that correct?

Mr. Porter responded right.

Alderman Shea continued by saying that the people are paying taxes now. There is no way of research turning up a number of senior citizen in the City.

Mr. Porter said that they really would not have any knowledge on how old a person is owning a home. Right now there 1,271 elderly exemptions or people who qualify, households. It has to be on the primary residence.

Alderman Shea said that it is conceivable that there are people that qualify that have two residences' one here and one in Florida.

Mr. Porter said no, that would be an asset.

Alderman Shea continued by saying that his opinion is that we should respect the elderly and I think that it would probably a wash.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted that the Committee recommend to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that the communication from the Board of Assessors relative to House Bill 331 be accepted with the equivalency factor.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Pariseau asked Mr. Porter in regard to married couple. Say my wife and I were old, I was called to my maker how does that adjustment or does she stay at the married couple status.

Mr. Porter said that at that point it would revert to the lower income level.

Alderman Pariseau continued by saying that she would go to the Board of Assessors office and say Mr. Porter that my husband died and I am getting \$25,000 exemption that should be down to \$22,500.

Mr. Porter answered that we do that now, because the people who qualify when we receive notice of a death. We either get them in a number of ways through the Board of Health and also through the newspaper. We do look and verify, when we do see that a person is deceased, we try if the spouse qualifies under the age level we maintain the exemption as a single.

Alderman Pariseau repeated as a single.

Mr. Porter replied correct as a single. We do not re-qualify them. We go on the assumption that it would be kind of difficult to call someone in when a spouse passes away and pull there exemption because they dropped down. I do not know, that is certainly something worth thinking about.

Chairman Elise stated that we could arrange that when you pass away.

Alderman Pariseau said he had another question to make sure that it is tightened up to the point where people that shouldn't be getting it aren't. For example, I'm 80 years old, I'm entitled to \$90,000 exemption, I turn the house over to one of my kids. They get the \$90,000 exemption.

Mr. Porter answered that under certain conditions they would. If you make an outright granting of the property to them no they do not. If, however, you as the person remain on the deed #1 you would be then typically joint tenants and would qualify.

Alderman Pariseau asked but what if I am in a Nursing Home.

Mr. Porter replied that if you are in a Nursing Home. If you have in your conveyance a life estate on the property with an affidavit that you and or in the conveyance that you are responsible for the expenses of that property. We would maintain that.

Chairman Elise asked Alderman Hirschmann if he had anything.

Mr. Porter continued by saying that there are not that many in that category.

Alderman Pariseau replied just in case.

Alderman Hirschmann asked Mr. Porter on the 1,271 cases was Alderman Pariseau quote of \$68.0 Million exemption is that right?

Mr. Porter said that he believed that was the total of the elderly and the blind. There was approximately \$63.0 million.

Alderman Hirschmann repeated elderly and the blind. So about \$63.0 million off 1,271 cases and with your proposal you must have done some quantitative thought in your head.

Mr. Porter said that they anticipated that it would be approximately the same amount of assessed value exemption.

Alderman Hirschmann said the same amount, and what about cases.

Mr. Porter replied comparable.

Chairman Elise said with the re-qualifying I think that's the key.

Mr. Porter said that it would be mandatory for us to re-qualify them simply because this is a drastic change. It is not a minor change and I think it would be prudent for the City to re-qualify.

Alderman Hirschmann said that if we just revert to the States mandate \$13,400 and \$25,000 that's quite more conservative than your figure.

Mr. Porter responded right. We anticipate that could possibly, hear again I guess we are simply asked to provide information that we think would be reasonable, we don't know. At least, given our experience if a person was making \$8,500 now that would only allow them \$4,900 on Social Security. If the average is \$700 a month that would put them out of qualification.

Alderman Hirschmann asked whether he felt that, well this Bill was brought in as a balance of the pendulum.

Mr. Porter said correct.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if he felt that anyone was not going to qualify after this.

Mr. Porter said that it was possible. It's possible because it would depend if a single person were making \$8,900 and I say that because now they qualify under the \$9,000. If they were making \$8,900 but were receiving \$13,000 a year. What was the max Tom, do you recall what the max was? If a person had \$8,500 and they were getting \$1,200 a month they would not qualify. So, you could have that situation were they qualify now but they won't qualify after. What we are trying to do is establish the levels were we anticipate the given amounts. These numbers we got were from Social Security we can only go on the averages. You are going to have some who will probably disqualify that are presently getting it and there are some that would qualify that are not presently being qualified to get it. We

really do not know but we do not anticipate that it would make a drastic change. As I said the Board has the prerogative to set those amounts.

Alderman Hirschmann said he only had one more follow up question. In comparison to say Bedford, Londonderry, Auburn and Hooksett are we going to become the gray-aired community. Is our level going to make elderly people come here. I want to be comparable to other cities.

Mr. Porter replied that he did not think so, Alderman Hirschmann. Your right the makeup is a little different the number of elderly exemptions because of qualifications and age in places as Bedford or Londonderry would be much smaller.

Alderman Hirschmann said he just did not want to make it so favorable that we get a lot of exemptions. Like our Special Ed school budget right now is the same situation someone can show up on our doorstep and get an exemption.

Alderman Shea said that they cannot come and qualify for an exemption they have to be here for five years.

Alderman Soucy asked if she could add one thing. It has been my experience serving on the Municipal and County Government Committee and a couple of other taxation committees. The other factor is that they are a fair number of elderly in the community who qualify who based on pride do not apply. Even looking at the numbers across the board. That is why I think moving forward with this and doing a complete re-certification would be very helpful because anyone who is currently border line you will be able to tell.

Mr. Porter said that under the residency just like to make a minor correction. It's not a resident of the Community it is a resident of the State.

Chairman Elise said that we are running short on time. We have several other items to address. I know that Alderman Soucy moved on this seconded by Alderman Shea. Chairman Elise asked for a vote.

Alderman Hirschmann wanted to oppose because of the proposed rate. I would like to see it lower.

Alderman Pariseau also wanted to be recorded as opposed.

Alderman Soucy asked if he wanted to throw people off the roles so they can

Alderman Hirschmann said that if the State is proposing \$13,000 I would like us to be closer to that.

Alderman Soucy stated that it was equalized throughout the communities throughout the State.

Alderman Hirschmann said that if we do nothing the State brings it down.

Alderman Soucy said that's right so you're throwing elderly who are currently receiving the benefit.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the State is. If I do nothing the State is going.

Alderman Soucy replied no you are. Because you had the opportunity to act, so you are if you refuse it.

Alderman Hirschmann said that it's mandate. That is how mandates work. What can I do?

Alderman Soucy said that it's not a mandate it is enabling. It gives you the opportunity to make the decision.

Alderman Hirschmann noted he could have made it less than \$13,000.

Alderman Soucy replied that he could not have. According to legislation its right in there.

Alderman Hirschmann said then let's just say if voted NAY and that's the end of it.

Chairman Elise noted that Alderman Pariseau and Alderman Hirschmann voted no.

Alderman Shea said that you have to break the tie.

The Clerk said you can't go with the majority

Chairman Elise motioned that this be sent to the Full Board.

Alderman Shea asked as it is?

Chairman Elise replied yes. There will be a thorough discussion there I am sure. Chairman Elise called the next item #5 on the agenda:

Review of reports from the Board of Assessors.

Chairman Elise asks if anyone had any comments? I know we just received this tonight. Is there any significant thing that you would like to point out, Mr. Porter?

Mr. Porter said no. Not at this time, we have just about wiped out the 1994 Board of Tax and Land appeal cases, so we are pretty current. We do have 1995's, 1996 appeal period is still not over in Manchester or in any community because the Statute last year extended it to March 1, 1997 for the 1996 bills. At this point there is nothing at the BTLA or Superior Court for 1996. The only cases we have at Superior Court, but we do not have any right now. We do have a couple of cases at the Board of Tax and Land appeals and some cases that are numerated in the report for 1995.

Chairman Elise asked whether there was anything significant that have come on line?

Mr. Porter said not really, not at this point.

Chairman Elise asked if the payments in lieu of taxes these have already been established?

Mr. Porter said yes.

Chairman Elise wanted to know if anyone had any questions?

Alderman Hirschmann asked on the exemption page. It says \$68.0 million for the elderly, \$6.0 million for the blind, \$455.0 million for the veterans and then \$170.0 million for the disabled is that right?

Mr. Porter replied that if you look down below, Alderman Hirschmann, it's a totally used elderly \$63.7 million. That means that if a person receives a \$90,000 exemption, but their assessed value is only \$70,000 they do not get the full \$90,000.

Alderman Hirschmann responded okay. So there is net.

Mr. Porter answered exactly.

Chairman Elise asked if there was a motion.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to send the reports from the Board of Assessors to the full Board for informational purposes. Alderman Pariseau seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea wanted to be clear that you mentioned in 1994 everything has been wiped out.

Mr. Porter replied except for two cases.

Alderman Shea continued by saying in 1995 there is nothing in Superior Court but there are cases pending at the Board of Tax and Land appeal.

Mr. Porter said that was correct and there is a listing of those enclosed with that report.

Alderman Shea added than in 1996 the closing period is actually March 1, 1997 and so far there is nothing in Superior Court.

Mr. Porter stated that the filing period to the local Board is through March 1, 1997. We then have four months to respond and at that point the appellant cannot apply to BTLA or Superior Court until July 1. Then they have the window from July 1 through September 1 to appeal beyond this Board. Right now nobody is allowed to apply at the Board of Tax & Land Appeals or Superior Court for a 1996 case.

Alderman Shea asked if he knew if there whether there would be any?

Mr. Porter said I am sure there will be, but it has dropped steadily.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Pariseau noted that on page 3 what you are saying you have 207 property owners that are appealing their assessment.

Mr. Porter added that they have filed at the local level. We have 105 outstanding at this time.

Alderman Soucy said move over to the right that is what currently is outstanding.

Mr. Porter stated that was the amount of people who have filed, Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Soucy pointed out that this is amount of people that have filed, this is what they have worked on and if you go here this is what they have as of right know.

Mr. Porter noted that we disposed 102 out of the 207 for 1996.

Alderman Pariseau said so you have a balance of 105 for that \$13.0 million.

Mr. Porter responded that was correct.

Alderman Pariseau asked for 1995 you still have 62 cases left representing \$51.686 million. In 1994 you have those two for \$5.171 million for two cases?

Mr. Porter said that one of the assessments is \$3,581,600 and the other one \$1,589,900 for property. Major commercial property.

Chairman Elise called for a vote. The motion carried.

Chairman Elise called a vote on the motion.

Motion carries.

Chairman Elise called next item #6 on the agenda:

Review of revenue forecasts for the first six month period of the fiscal year.

Mr. Clougherty started by saying what they had in front of them was a report finished up today gives you an idea as to where we are with respect to the revenue picture for the City. What we have done is highlight for you those particular items of concern or interest. What we tried to do was take and use the same format consistently, so you see the same format all the time. When we use this, but you have to go over it again. Mr. Clougherty pointed out that the first column gives the line item and what we are talking about. If you go to your Revenue Handbooks, so if you want to find out what is involved in the Boat Tax you would go to the Revenue Handbook. It will give you a description of what it is and its statutory basis and what have you. Then we list out what is included in the budget. We then you give you what has been collected to date for the first six months. We then do a projection of six months based on prior years. Take a look at how that revenue performed in the last six months of the fiscal year over current

periods and gives us some idea of what the average will be, what the performance is. In other words, we take that number to what you already have that should give you a twelve month estimate. That does not always work so you see a column there for adjustments, if for some reason we feel that the first six months would not compare with the projected six months needs to be adjusted. We tell you what that adjustment is and we footnote it and on the last page we explain what that footnote us for you. Then we come to a twelve month amount that the Finance Department feels is where you will likely end up and we tell you in that last column whether you are over or under your estimate. If you are going turn to the last page based on the current projection we are about \$88,000 in the red. Which on \$44.0 million is not a lot of money and at this point and time that's likely to shift on several occasions. We think as we have said right along this is a very tight budget and we expect that you are going to come in pretty close to zero. Now the numbers that you have that are highlighted are the Auto Registration and Parking fees which is \$1.2 million. The Solicitor is currently looking into that.

Alderman Pariseau noted that in looking at that one revenue source #0118. We projected \$1,226,618 as revenue. So far we brought in \$358,300 no five year average. What are you doing with that deducting it from that \$1.2 million?

Mr. Clougherty said no but what we are saying because you have no prior history on this you have to do some type of projection based on what is happening on the first few months. That is what that \$700,000 adjustment is, you have no history. If you were to take the \$358,000 and the \$700,000 you will see what we think a twelve month number \$1,058,300 that is about \$168,318 below the estimate. At this time because you don't have a history.

Alderman Pariseau said that the auto registration parking is going come in \$168,000 short.

Mr. Clougherty said at this point and time given what you have seen. We think that is going change. That's what we are saying.

Ms. Shaffer added that it was partially due to the fact that because of the changes done to the systems. Since, that only began collections in October it is not for the full fiscal year.

Mr. Clougherty noted that another item that is on there is the mechanical devices that are a \$500,000 item. There a question raised at another meeting the other night so we highlighted that.

Ms. Shaffer said those are the Poker machines.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Hirschmann.

Mr. Clougherty said we call them mechanical devices.

Alderman Hirschmann asked the one big one that has zero across the Board is the Kindergarten Program.

Mr. Clougherty replied that what has happened, in their minds, there is an uncertainty as to whether it will have funding. We will know better about that when we see the Governor's budget. It will be released shortly. That is not something that is a formula driven type of thing like the other revenue sharing programs where we can pretty much count on the funds. This is something that requires an action by the Legislature and the Governor in order to get this included for this year. Mr. Clougherty thought it was prudent of the Board to include the \$528,000 in their forecast because at the time this Legislation was on the book. Whether the Legislature will step up in its present health to fund this is a question mark.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if the budget that they are working on is not that for after June. I am confused about that.

Mr. Clougherty responded no.

Alderman Hirschmann asked when does the State budget fiscal year end and start.

Mr. Clougherty said that what we are talking about is whether or not they are going to authorize it for the current year. Whether or not they are going to be able to do this because of their current fiscal position. If that comes forward and we are able to realize the \$528,000 then your bottom line would be about \$400,000 to the good right now.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if there was any read on it?

Mr. Clougherty answered that when you do the revenue forecast. At the beginning of the fiscal year you start to really see these tighten. You can see what is happening in the legislative, you are starting to see seasonal development, when we look at the revenue forecast that we have given you. We take a look at it and say this. We think it's a good report because if you look at the things like Building Permits and economic development types of things, auto registrations, those are up. It looks as if we are going to be okay on those areas. It seems to me that the economy is changing and that is

going to trickle down to some of these others. We have not seen yet, but because they are seasonable you may start to see them in April. Then we will feel more confident maybe adjusting some of those. Right now we have not seen that and we are going to remain cautious and conservative in our estimate. I think there are some good things shown in here. Clearly what is helping you are the income from invested funds and what Ms. Shaffer has done.

Alderman Pariseau interrupted by saying that he wanted to suggest again that Ms. Shaffer has done a superior job with that 0661 with a projected \$1,060,000 so far we have brought in a \$1,225,431.

Mr. Clougherty said that is what Ms. Shaffer does day in and out. Working with the banks trying to get percentage point here and there.

Alderman Pariseau thanked Ms. Shaffer.

Mr. Clougherty continued by saying that we have been able to do some things and realize a couple of things there. The real problems that you have there as you go forward on the revenue side that if Legislatively something comes in to play to effect the revenue as they are projected.

Alderman Hirschmann asked like elderly exemptions?

Mr. Clougherty responded not as much exemption as if there is Legislation to repeal the meters, the millage on the meters. Then that would affect \$1.2 million. It will not only affect you this year but it will also affect you next year do your talking about \$2.5 million.

Alderman Pariseau said that looking at the next year budget. I made the statement before the meeting started that we are looking at an increase of \$20 a thousand. Getting rid of the revenue from poker machines, getting rid of the fees for auto registration, bag in tag, keep the bag in tag the way it is, the apartment things getting rid of that revenue. What do you project the tax increase to be next fiscal. These have not been voted on yet, but I would suspect.

Mr. Clougherty responded that certainly if the Legislature says no longer can you charge the millage, you have to pay people back, right there is a couple of million. That is a big number \$2.5 million. If you add in their video machines that is another \$1.0 million. It's not always you got to make it up this year, you have to make it up next year. It compounds on you, so they double. It does not take you long to get to a \$4.0 million number. Can that be offset with by some of the other things that we are seeing in regards to the valuation. Okay. I think the thing we

are seeing on the valuation side here is better than we have seen it in some time. Mr. Clougherty continued by saying that the other side was the expenses. We will have to you next week your quarterly financial. What we are looking at now is that the departments under this type budget are performing fairly well. We had some concerns with Welfare and I met with Ms. Lafond the other day. I am not going to speak for her, but she thought when we left that there are some things happening that we are trending better than she thought we would. As a result, she thinks that she will be \$40,000 to the good in her budget. That is tight, but it is not a real hard swing that she thought we might be seeing as a result of this Federal trickles down mandates hitting us real fast. For some reason they are not coming that way, the combination of economics is in our favor. So she is not becoming hammered by that right away, that is good news.. Mr. Thomas has not seen a lot of snow, but he has seen a lot of ice, so his salt is getting down. We may have to see some of that shipped over to salt if it continues. Again, we are in better shape than we have been going into the last six weeks of the winter. I think that most of the departments, police and fire, have been looking at good positions with respect to their budgets and we have not seen anything there. Contingency we are still at about \$154,000, I think the budget works, it is extremely tight. We were concerned about school, but some of the things that I have been hearing from Mr. Hobson about Medicaid reimbursement and their ability to do some things there may soften their problem as well. I think the next four weeks is going to tell you a lot as to where you are and where you are heading. This will be in respect to the current year and it's implications for next year. Overhaul we have a lot worse things that we have reported to you.

Chairman Elise stated that at the next meeting we would be going over the quarterly reports.

Mr. Clougherty responded that was right. They would be going over the quarterly reports that is a complete picture of the City in terms of the Financial and Revenues. We will have an update and better revenue numbers for the Committee.

Chairman Elise stated that she knew Alderman Hirschmann wanted to look over some individual departments.

Alderman Hirschmann replied that this report was pretty good this is what they wanted. This is the entire revenue handbook.

Chairman Elise asked if he wanted to suggest anything for the individual departments at this time did you have any comments?

Alderman Hirschmann said not at this time.

Chairman Elise continued that the next time they would be going over the quarterly reports.

Mr. Clougherty added that you may recall that in the quarterly's we break down each department and we give you a five year history. We highlight who is closer or whatever, at that point and time, we try to work with the departments and if we see them having a problem getting close, we contact them. Certainly, if the Board on this Committee wants to look at a revenue or expense closer, we can do that.

Alderman Hirschmann said what he was looking at was school food nutrition. Lunch programs seemed to be off and a lot of their budget seems to be spent at about 2.4, I think they only have about \$400,000 in their budget.

Mr. Clougherty replied that part of the problem, as you know, with school is that it is so unpredictable with respect to special education. They have tried to keep back really the line item so that if they have to transfer to meet those needs. In some respects, when you are looking at that, you really have to understand what is happening. Where they are trying to reserve different capacity. My understanding is that originally there was some concern. I talked to the Mayor again and he said that the Finance Committee on that night was more optimistic that they are going to be okay this year. They are not out of the woods yet. We are going to have to take a hard look at that and at the next meeting we certainly will be able to give you a more detailed explanation of were they are.

Chairman Elise asked if the Financial Analysis had been done on the Special Ed budget?

Mr. Clougherty stated that what has happened with the Special Ed, as you recall, we sat with them. We laid out for them what we thought should be contained in a report for their Board and ours. They gathered that information and prepared the report. The report, I think, is excellent. If you do not have a copy of the report I would suggest you get a copy. It really lays out the history of Special Education and the issues. It lays out a lot of statistics with respect to students, but there is very little in terms of finance. There is one page and it's just the current year. It is mainly because the systems they have, have been unable to track a lot of this information. There is not a lot of financial information. That is why we desperately need to get the system up and running and get them on there moving forward. To spend a lot of time to go back and try to reconstruct is not going to be productive. I think you have to take where they are and build going forward.

Chairman Elise asked whether in terms of that report. Is that report going to be a basis to make recommendations for this coming year Special Ed budget?

Mr. Clougherty replied that what they would like to do is take the numbers that are a good history in terms of the students. Convert those tables that are statistical matrices, you look at them and you do not get a lot out of them. Then convert them to the chart that Mr. Blair does upstairs so you can see the different trends. I think we will get more out of that. So, Mr. Blair is going to do those. Health is going to take a look at the report and consolidate and confirm some of the trends that they are seeing. We will build on that report that is a good report now. I think that is going to help you understand what we are facing in terms of this whole issue. Is it going to be able to give you a good cost analysis of things. It will not, but it will help you get things lined up moving forward.

Chairman Elise asked when that presentation would be ready?

Mr. Clougherty said at least a month away.

Chairman Elise recognized Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea said if the kindergarten money is not forthcoming. Does that adversely affect the revenues?

Mr. Clougherty replied that yes it did, but what we did here Alderman Shea we figured that it was not coming.

Ms. Shaffer said that they had excluded it.

Mr. Clougherty continued by saying that if the revenue from kindergarten does not come you are close to zero. If it does come, then that is a plus.

Alderman Shea asked if the school food nutrition is giving money to the School Department and that is why they show a deficit. Revenue Source 0678, for instance, there is an estimate of \$110,110 short. Do they have any resources from year to year to make up for that shortage?

Ms. Shaffer said that these are just estimates on the revenue collected for lunch. This is based on the amount of lunches that they think they are going to sell and the average price.

Alderman Shea said that basically they are saying right now that there is a strong probability that they are going to be \$110,000 short.

Ms. Shaffer stated that this was based on four months.

Alderman Soucy said that they usually take in more than they have expended. It's been progressing over time.

Mr. Clougherty said you have to see both sides.

Ms. Shaffer said that you do not see that all over here. This is strictly revenues.

Alderman Soucy said that you are going to be taking in \$110,000 less, this is just revenue. If there expenditures are only \$900,000 you are still ahead.

Alderman Shea responded that he saw.

Mr. Clougherty stated to the Alderman that you have to provide these services and we are going to have to pay for it. If the revenue isn't there, what we make in income from invested funds or what we get in overages from other places is going to offset. You have to look at the bottom line. Bottom line is I think tight, you are close and right now barring any legislative action to change these fees your projection is pretty accurate for the budget.

Alderman Shea asked whether the school food nutrition has always come in short or what?

Ms. Shaffer answered historically. They have for the most part.

Alderman Soucy said that they have started closing the gap. They have started to make it more like an enterprise.

Ms. Shaffer agreed that they have. The window is smaller.

Mr. Clougherty said that the other thing, school tuition last year or the year before was off \$1.0 million. It was \$1.0 million off from projection. They have been swings in school, but there have been swings in other departments as well. We loss moneys in terms of the land fill. If you take a look right now, recycling is not performing perhaps the way it was anticipated. Again, you have to look at all of these things, and some of these programs are just getting started. The first year they are not going to be as robust or as healthy as you would want down the road. They are performing and they are doing what we have asked them to do. They will get better as they go along and as the economy changes. Bottom line is that

we are close to zero which is given this type budget is fairly good news. Not to say there are pieces to be concerned with but right now the math is working.

Chairman Elise said that she knew there were items that we wanted to take off the table. We have less than ten minutes left. Do we want to accept this report?

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was voted that the revenue forecasts report be accepted.

TABLED ITEMS

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

Discussion relative to the Recodification of City Ordinances relative to Chapter 8. "Finances".

(Tabled 7/23/96)

Note: Report of Finance Committee recommends review of amendments with report of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading (see letter from Finance Officer outlining amendments.)

Alderman Pariseau asked how important was this recodification? You want that through or what?

Mr. Clougherty replied that they could talk about that.

Chairman Elise asked Mr. Clougherty if he wanted to make any comments.

Mr. Clougherty stated that he did, just so the Board understands what it is real quick. As part of an exercise that the City Clerk started last year they asked for the recodification. Our Section Statute were vintage 1950. We went back we worked with the State and got what we thought was a real good performer on how Finance Department should operate. What types of report should be coming to the Board. We puled that together we worked with the City Clerk and got it to the proper format. We had the City Solicitor's office look at it, if you look at item 7 the last item there is a letter from me to the Alderman Elise that list out some recommendations that Mr. Tom Arnold had and Mr. Tom Clark with respect to it. If we could make those changes that we support to the draft then I would like to move as amended just as long as everyone understands. We agree with what the Solicitor's and make those changes to the draft and it is fine. I think you have a

good document. We can go in and clean up the draft and hand over a clean document.

Alderman Hirschmann asked Mr. Clougherty in regards to his letter #5. How would the change of that language? We would have to ask you to do something rather than you would automatically do it?

Mr. Clougherty delayed answered he had to see what section that was.

Alderman Hirschmann said it says strike the first sentence "Assist the Board of Mayor and Aldermen by supplying analytical reports , adding in its place the following sentence "At the request of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen prepare analytical reports of city programs and functions." It's as if we would have to ask you to do something, instead of you automatically doing it, as you are doing them now.

Mr. Clougherty explained that what he thought they were saying was the concern of Mr. Arnold has is that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen should initiate those types of analytical reports rather than the Finance Officer. That is fine, it wasn't our intent to do that anyway, we always just respond to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. It's a better way.

Alderman Hirschmann continued by saying item #7 is his letter. The last page...

Mr. Clougherty said that they did not have a problem with that, because we would not be going out and doing it anyway. Mr. Arnold thought it was a cleaner way of expressing it and that is fine, we agree with that.

Alderman Hirschmann said that the reason was that he was reading this report and if the headline of that certain day was about the repeal of the mil's tax in the newspaper. I said to myself, man, I am an Alderman of the City and I do not even know what is going on. I am reading this in the newspaper and then I am reading this that I have to ask for the information instead of just getting it automatically.

Mr. Clougherty replied that in this case we are talking about analytical reports. We are talking about if you want us to go into a department and much the same what you have asked us to do with the Building Department. Those types of things should be initiated by you. There are other sections in here that talk about us carrying on a regular reporting dialogue to the Board, in terms of routine reports that you are starting to see now.

Alderman Pariseau moved to recommend that the Recodification of City Ordinances relative to Chapter 8, "Finances", be amended as recommended by the City Solicitor and be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading as amended for ordinance preparation. Alderman Soucy duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Review of policies and procedures relative to enactment of zoning ordinance amendments.
(Tabled 9/17/96)

This item remained on the table.

NEW BUSINESS

Pear Street School Write-Offs

Mr. Clougherty said just a point of information, usually when we are doing write offs, it comes up to this Committee and then it goes referred to Board of Mayor and Aldermen. We just want to remind the Committee that the last meeting that there was an action on the full Board in regards to the Pearl Street property to do some write offs. We are going to go ahead and do them. We do not want you to feel that protocol is being violated. We are doing this because the Board of Mayor and Aldermen took an action and it was the appropriate way to do it. We believe there is no sense in us coming back and have you do another thing and you present it to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. If everyone agrees with that, we will do the write off and we think that is sufficient action. Thank you.

Chairman Elise said that there has been times on this Committee that we have had new information come and you have referred it to the full Board. The previous procedure was that everything was to come from the full Board. I guess at our last Board of Mayor and Aldermen meeting the Mayor has come up with a proposal to change that policy. The Mayor did come in and handed my a new item that has not gone to the full Board yet. I do not feel that.

Alderman Pariseau asked what did the new issue deal with?

Chairman Elise responded that she was not quite sure, it is going to need an explanation. I'm going to leave it in the hands of the Committee to decide whether or not they want to refer to the full Board first and find out the parameters of what is supposed to go the full Board and what is to come to this Committee. Or do you care to take it up now?

Alderman Hirschmann asked if she could read the correspondence to them so they could know what they are talking about?

Chairman Elise said it was a letter from the Mayor and it will need some explanation.

Alderman Pariseau said it was from the Mayor. What does it say?

Chairman Elise read it was from Mr. Paul Beaudoin of the Police Department no Building Services. It's going to require an explanation so I am going to let the Committee decide whether they want to review this item before it goes to full Board. Or do we wait for instructions from the Mayor on how we are to handle things. The rules keep on changing.

Alderman Hirschmann ask again if she could read it to them.

Chairman Elise said that she was not going to hold back business if it needs to be dealt with.

Alderman Hirschmann repeated can you read it to us.

Alderman Pariseau said Madam Chairman. What is it?

Chairman Elise responded I do not know.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if she could read it to them?

Chairman Elise read please include me on the agenda of the next meeting for the Aldermanic Committee meeting on Accounts and Enrollment and Revenue Administration. I would like to request permission from the Committee to forego collecting receipts from an Officer who is scheduled to spend seven weeks in San Diego, California for a Polygraph School. Chairman Elise said she would leave it in the hands of the Committee if they would like to get an explanation and deal with this now.

Alderman Soucy said that any item that we bring in has to go through the Full Board.

Alderman Hirschmann said Mr. Beaudoin your boss just was scolded at the last meeting. You are supposed to go to the full Board.

Alderman Soucy said just ask what the time frame is on this item.

Alderman Pariseau asked if he wanted to refer that matter to the full Board.

Chairman Elise said she was not sure.

Alderman Pariseau asked if he could see it so he could read it.

Chairman Elise continued by saying first of all and procedurally. Would this Committee want to entertain to looking at this now or would you refer it to....

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted that they look into the letter now. Alderman Soucy was in opposition to looking at it now.

Chairman Elise asked to explain this item.

Mr. Beaudoin started by saying that basically we have an Officer who is going away to San Diego for seven weeks to Polygraph School. Considering the City's current policy it would require for him to keep a receipt for every breakfast, lunch and dinner that he has for seven weeks. Which is a stack of paper of about this much. In the past, I have had Officer's that have gone away for as long as a month, six weeks and I have approached the Committee on accounts to ask them to waive the policy for those long trips. It's just a nightmare of paperwork to go through and it really isn't cost effective to use the manpower to go through each individual receipt. \$40 a day for compensation for meals, when gone for seven weeks from the family to California I do not think it's something too terrible.

Alderman Pariseau asked if he was taking his family.

Mr. Beaudoin replied no he is going alone for seven weeks. His wife and children are staying here. He will be a Certified Polygraph operator for the Department.

Alderman Pariseau asked whether or not he could use his credit card and then use that as his receipts when he gets back here and becomes reimbursed. Then he does not have to keep every receipt.

Mr. Beaudoin said that you can but the policy still requires that I go through every one of those receipts to make sure within the guidelines. What I would like to do is give him the \$40 a day total for the number of days he is gone.

Mr. Clougherty asked if he had a credit card?

Mr. Beaudoin said that he was not intending to, I was going to give him an advance for the amount. A lot of times you go to breakfast at Dunkin Donuts or something like that or you go somewhere where they don't take a credit card. You end up taking money out of your pocket.

Alderman Pariseau said that you can get receipts for something like that.

Alderman Hirschmann asked Mr. Clougherty if he had an excess card that could be issued to this individual for his trip.

Mr. Beaudoin replied that he had a card that he could give him from the Department.

Alderman Hirschmann replied that he would have an audit trail on that one card for the trip. It is real easy. That would be my recommendation.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted that the Department issue him a Credit Card to provide an audit trail on the expenses.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee