

**COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/
INFORMATION SYSTEMS**

May 21, 1996

5:45 PM

Chairman Pariseau called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

PRESENT: Ald. Pariseau, Elise, Sysyn, Shea, Hirschmann, Mr. Steven Tierney, and Dr. Grace Sullivan.

On motion of Ald. Sysyn, duly seconded by Ald. Elise, it was voted to enter into non-public session (RSA-91:A-3 Paragraph 2 (c) to discuss applications for licenses to operate taxicabs.

On motion of Ald. Hirschmann, duly seconded by Ald. Sysyn, it was voted to re-enter into public session.

On motion of Ald. Elise, duly seconded by Ald. Hirschmann, it was voted to restore the taxicab license to Lorraine Rhodes.

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Ald. Elise proposing that the Dog Fouling Ordinance be amended.

(Note: communications from Health Officer and Director of Parks, Recreation, and Cemetery Department enclosed.)

The Chairman stated that he would encourage the Committee to amend the current ordinance to require dog owners to pick up after their pets. The Chairman asked Officer Dido to brief the Committee on the proposed changes. Officer Dido said his office is conducting a campaign now in some of the city's parks regarding the "pooper scooper" ordinance. He said it was a big problem in the city. On the average, he receives 3 - 4 phone calls a day, 7 days a week. There are some areas of the city hit more often than others. There are a lot of people who will call and voice a complaint. Neighbors are walking their dogs, the dogs are going to the bathroom on their sidewalks or on the property, and they get very annoyed by it. Unfortunately, the way the ordinance is written now it's kind of difficult to enforce. You have to kind of be there. You kind of have to witness the dog doing his thing, approaching the owner, and kindly ask him to remove it. Then if they fail to do so, cite him. That doesn't really happen, and unfortunately it hasn't really happened at all since this ordinance was drafted. This

proposed amendment is right on. You're approaching someone, they don't have any utensil on their persons, that's going to give us the flexibility to cite them for it. Officer Dido said he spoke to the assistant at Crystal this morning, and he said that he was in favor of the ordinance, that we would probably enforce it as diplomatically as we could. Certainly, someone would be approached given a warning, given a scooper, advise them of the ordinance. And the second time offenders would probably be cited.

Ald. Pariseau asked if other private citizens would be able to do anything relative to this ordinance. Along Calef Road, especially along the cemetery area, Pine Grove, it's terrible. I mean the dogs must be awfully big. So would a private citizen have any recourse? Officer Dido replied that he found that a lot of people were reluctant to get that involved. In order for someone to sign a complaint, that means they would have to go to court and testify. And that really discourages a lot of people from coming forward.

Ald. Pariseau asked if an individual walks his dog at 5:30 every evening, and just it do its thing on the sidewalk, could a neighbor or somebody call the Police Department and advise the Police Department that a male walks his white poodle at 5:30 every day. Would the Police Department watch out for that. Officer Dido said, by all means. And actually, we got a call from 346 Paquette Ave. who did that exactly. The person called me up and stated that the neighbors, when they get home from work, let the dogs walk up and down the sidewalks. We did extend our hours in the Animal Control Division; we're on duty until 6:00 during the evening. But yes, the Patrol Division certainly will be made aware of this, we will do a training video encouraging our officers to respond to these complaints and approach people, give them a warning. Second time offenders would probably be cited for it. The whole problem is being there witnessing the dog do his thing. That doesn't really happen. This here will really make the ordinance more flexible and encourage people to follow the rules.

Ald. Pariseau asked if he observed an individual allowing his dog to do whatever, would the Police Department go up to the individual with one of these scoopers. Officer Dido said that himself and his partner, as the Animal Control Officers, would do that. The Patrol Division will not have the scoopers. But they will probably give a verbal warning, perhaps leave me a notice for follow-up.

Ald. Pariseau asked if there were any other questions.

Ald. Elise said that when this ordinance was first introduced in 1992, the city did have a significant problem. As you can see, the literature points back saying that. Places all over the city besides Oak Park, like the cemetery. People have neighborhoods where its worse. And they try to figure out whose dog is coming

in front of their house and it continues to be a problem. When we first introduced this, there was a big education program, and there are a lot of people who are very conscientious of this now. But there are a lot of people who still aren't. And Ron Ludwig feels that actually the problem is worse. There are more dogs, but there still is a lot of people who are conscientious of this. So I would urge the Committee to support this.

Ald. Pariseau asked where the bill would go from hear. Would it go to Bills on Second Reading? The Clerk said, yes.

Ald. Elise moved to pass the ordinance, seconded by Ald. Hirschmann.

Ald Hirschmann said he had some questions and the Chairman recognized him. Ald. Hirschmann said that there were two modified drafts with two different dates. He wondered if the one with the October 13th date is the one being voted on. Ald. Elise said it was. Ald. Hirschmann said he had a dog, and he had a problem with people who are fouling up parks and things. I would prefer to see animals prohibited, by ordinance, from parks, because they poop in the Little Leagues fields, and they poop everywhere in the whole city. But, as part of an ordinance, it says "failure to carry an article or the means to remove any feces left by a dog," that means you have to be walking down the street with one of these scoopers, by ordinance. That's pretty strange.

Ald. Elise explained that it could be anything that a dog owner found more convenient was all right. Ald. Hirschmann stated that it was a violation if you don't have one of those. That means you have to be walking around with a pooper scooper. Ald. Pariseau said that was correct, if you want to take your dog out for a walk. Unless you want to use your handkerchief. Ald. Hirschmann asked if it wouldn't be better to craft the ordinance so that no animals would be allowed on park property. Ald. Sysyn asked what about the sidewalks in front of people's houses. Ald. Pariseau said they have the same thing along the Boulevard on Hampton Beach. You see people with their pooper scoopers. And they take their dog out for a walk for that one purpose...to relieve itself. And unless they bring something, not necessarily one of these, they can bring napkins or use their handkerchief, or whatever, or call the Highway Department and have a sweeper go down.

Ald. Hirschmann asked if it was a \$25.00 fine for walking around and not having one of these scoopers. Ald. Pariseau said Ald. Hirschmann was reading the ordinance too narrowly. It says "fail to carry any article." It could be a roll of paper towels, not necessarily a spatula. Ald. Hirschmann asked, when a dog license is issued, do they give out some type of a warning or statement on the policy. Officer Dido said there is a brochure that the City Clerk's Office has when someone licenses their dog. It lists all the ordinances they have to abide by and all the

statutes too. And the canine waste ordinance is mentioned. What I find a lot of people do is they walk with a simple little plastic bag, Baggies, put it in their pocket. The scooper might be a little cumbersome to carry, might be a little unsanitary sometimes. I probably won't carry it, but a little plastic bag is all right.

Ald. Pariseau stated that some people in Manchester are doing the right thing, picking up their dog's remains. But the majority aren't. They leave it there for other people to walk through.

Ald. Hirschmann said he felt the fines were too low.

Ald. Pariseau asked if he wanted to go \$50.00 for the first offense and \$100.00 for each time thereafter. Ald. Hirschmann said he would be fine with that. Ald. Pariseau said that they would get the message. Ald. Sysyn said that they would get the message at \$25.00. Ald. Elise stated that this ordinance was making some significant changes and suggested that the Committee go with the fines the way they are and that if the Committee feels that the fines should be raised later, they could change the ordinance at that time. Ald. Pariseau recommended going with the \$25.00 and \$50.00 fines. Ald. Hirschmann asked what part of the ordinance wasn't working now. Officer Dido said it was him not actually witnessing the owner or the perpetrator. He said he would respond to a scene, and the incident is done. Ald. Hirschmann said that this ordinance wouldn't change that. Officer Dido responded that he could post someone in Oak Park and advise them that I just received a complaint from a neighbor who saw your dog going to the bathroom, you didn't pick it up with your pooper scooper...and again, this person would probably just get a warning. People who frequent parks often live nearby and have a ritual of going there day after day. We tend to see the same people two weeks later. Ald. Hirschmann asked, so you're asking them the same questions except "Where's your pooper scooper?" Ald. Pariseau said that's correct, but there are no teeth in the current ordinance to eliminate the droppings. Ald. Hirschmann said, so if the guy has a pooper scooper you let him off, and if he doesn't you whack him? Ald. Sysyn said you give him a warning the first time. Officer Dido said there was a lot of frustration because with a lot of people it goes in one ear and out the other and you turn your back and at the next block they're doing the same thing. If you cite someone once, it's a \$25.00 fine. That'll certainly discourage them from doing it again.

Ald. Elise again moved that the ordinance pass. Seconded by Ald. Hirschmann. Motion passed.

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Tom Jordan, EAP Coordinator, submitting suggestions relative to the restoration of the licensing process for positive drug test of City taxicab license holders.

Ald. Sysyn asked if Tom Jordan could speak on the letter. So moved by Ald. Shea, seconded by Ald. Sysyn. Motion passed. Ald. Pariseau said he saw that Tom was suggesting that the person whose license has been revoked be given another chance. Are you one of these "three strikes and you're out" or "one strike and you're out"? The only concern Ald. Pariseau said he had was that if we have a druggie driving a taxicab, licensed by the city, my concern is that if we give him another chance and they get involved in an accident while under the influence and kills a passenger, the city is liable. So Ald. Pariseau said he would go with "one strike and you're out."

Mr. Jordan said that he didn't want to make comments about how many strikes there should be. Ald. Pariseau pointed out that he was suggesting that the Committee go through a long procedure. Mr. Jordan said yes, right away, first time that this is done. You refer them out to someone on a positive test to a certified substance abuse counselor recognized by the state or a reciprocal state, and let them do an evaluation on these people, and a list of the criteria for an evaluation is in the letter that I sent. Some substance abuse evaluation written, oral interviews, mental status exams, and so forth which all these certified substance abuse counselors are familiar with. And then let's get a report back from them on the person's condition and their recommendations for what might resolve that person's problem. And they'll do that as part of their recommendations summary, and then you can take it from there. If they say this person needs in patient hospitalization, send them over.

Ald. Pariseau asked who would be liable to pay for that. Mr. Jordan said they would. The person who would test positive, not the city. Ald. Pariseau said that half of them don't have the financial capability. Mr. Jordan said they make money driving taxicabs. Ald. Hirschmann asked if the Committee remembered the fellow last month who realized he needed help but didn't know where to go and we didn't know where to send him So this is what the EAP is recommending. I think this is all right.

Ald. Pariseau said that they weren't considered city employees. Ald. Hirschmann said, no, but they are license holders. Ald. Sysyn said that Mr. Jordan knows places where he can send these people if they don't have money. Mr. Jordan said that there are avenues through nonprofit organizations in this community where these people can be referred to if they do not have the financial resources available. Ald. Pariseau asked if the referral should be made by the City Clerk's Office. Mr. Jordan said it should be made by the Committee or the City Clerk's Office or a representative of either.

The Clerk said he wanted to clarify this item on the agenda. As Ald. Hirschmann mentioned, we had a gentleman come in who tested positive and the Committee revoked his license and the Committee said come back in six months. We did not have any standards in place or any measures on how to determine whether this fellow had really made any progress. So at that point, our office approached Tom to give us some suggestions and this is a result of that conversation. I don't think Mr. Jordan is proposing this as any kind of ordinance, but merely as a starting point toward developing a policy and the mechanics so that next time we have another individual like that, we have something to turn to. And that's really the reason that Mr. Jordan developed this memo for us.

Ald. Pariseau asked the Clerk what he wanted the Committee to do with the memo. The Clerk said if the Committee wished, our office would appreciate it if the Committee would encourage the Clerk to continue discussing these types of issues with Mr. Jordan, develop policies so that in the future if we do have a situation like we had in the past, we will have guidelines in place to address that problem.

Mr. Jordan said he felt the role of the EAP is where we are dealing with this stuff on an ongoing basis with the Department of Transportation, particularly under the federal regulations and the state, that we could certainly monitor these people that you refer out to get this kind of an evaluation done. If they send that back, it takes me five minutes to shuffle through that kind of paper and make a determination if that person is making progress or not. So you don't have to bring him in here to have an appeal that's ongoing, ongoing, ongoing, unless they would be ready to drive. So I'd be willing to serve in that capacity. I'd also suggest if a person comes up and refuses to take a test, for whatever reason, the federal regulations treat that as an admission of a positive test. If they refuse to take the drug test, that is treated the same as a positive drug test. And there are procedures for that. The revocation would be automatic.

Ald. Hirschmann said that he felt the Committee was trying to be as flexible as possible because the human side is coming into the Committee, and sometimes they have viable excuses and we have to consider them. We don't want to just say it's positive and, you know. There was one this evening that was understandable.

Mr. Jordan he thought it was handled in a proper fashion. But if the person absolutely refuses to go, I think that person should be put under this criteria.

Ald. Pariseau said that if the Committee allowed that person, without counseling or a rehabilitation process -- and even if he is supposedly rehabilitated and goes out and kills a passenger in a taxicab -- that's my concern.

The Chairman then asked the Committee if it wished to take advantage of the offer Mr. Jordan was extending.

Mr. Jordan said that there are no concrete guarantees there, ever. But it is a start to doing something.

Ald. Shea moved that the Clerk's Office continue working with Tom Jordan to develop policies and standards for rehabilitation and relicensing procedures. Seconded by Ald. Hirschmann. Motion passed.

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Lloyd Basinow requesting the Board of Mayor and Aldermen issue appropriate directives and establish a firm City policy relative to funding of abortion counselling.

Ald. Pariseau stated that he didn't think there was anybody more opposed to abortion than Robert Pariseau. But he didn't think that the aldermen have authority to set policy for the School Department or anybody else. Ald. Hirschmann said he did not expect to be talking about this issue at this level, but he did wonder about juveniles being counseled at the school level on this subject. Ald. Pariseau said the letter is not just about schools, Mr. Basinow wants to get everyone, but the Board of Mayor and Aldermen does not have any authority by state statute or city charter to set policy for the School District. None. Ald. Hirschmann asked why it wasn't referred to the School District. Ald. Pariseau said it was. When it came to the Board first, it was sent to the School District. Then Mr. Basinow apparently made a few changes, like involving the Health Department, and everything else is the same. So it was referred back to this Committee by the full Board.

Ald. Sysyn moved to receive and file the communication, seconded by Ald. Shea. Motion passed. Ald. Hirschmann indicated he was opposed just on principle to "receive and file."

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Lloyd Basinow recommending two non-binding referendum questions as follows:

- #1 "Should the City institute at additional cost to the user a Bag and Tag refuse collection method within the City?"
- #2 Should the City construct as environmentally safe refuse incinerator, power generator, and materials recycling processing plant, the cost of which would be spread over a 20-year municipal bonding period?"

Ald. Hirschmann asked if the two items could be considered separately. The Chairman agreed. Ald. Hirschmann moved to receive and file item number one; seconded by Ald. Shea. Motion passed.

The Chairman recommended that this item be received and filed. Ald. Elise so moved; Ald. Sysyn seconded the motion. Ald. Hirschmann stated that he would like to see this go to referendum, saying that no one has ever talked about it. Ald. Elise said that there was no doubt in her mind that Bag and Tag would be back someday, but that proposals for waste management or waste disposal, this field is really going to change over time. And it might really be important for the city to look at it in terms of when our contract runs out, what are we going to do? Continue to privatize it or at that point will it be better for us to retain our recyclables, etc. It's been said that we should maintain an advisory board to continue to watch this whole matter. And I wouldn't be opposed to that, and as time goes by make some recommendations concerning that regarding how we should handle our waste. Does the Highway Commission do this? I think to some degree they do. Ald. Pariseau stated that the Committee had a representative from the Highway Department present and asked Steve Tierney if he was present for this item. Mr. Tierney said he wasn't; he was there for the Traffic Committee meeting. But he did state that the city had one, guessing that about 15 years ago there was a proposal to have an incinerator built at the landfill. Or in the general vicinity of the landfill. Ald. Shea stated that people had been thinking of doing scrubbers at the old incinerator. He added that in certain places, like Florida, there are people developing technology. Ald. Shea said that he didn't think it was this Committee's place to suggest that this go to referendum. Ald. Pariseau asked if he thought it should be referred to the Highway Commission. Ald. Shea said yes, or some advisory board -- as Ald. Elise had recommended -- just to look into the matter. We don't know what technology is going to develop in the next few years, and we shouldn't close our eyes to the fact that, possibly... Ald. Pariseau interrupted, saying that the city had just spent "X" number of millions of dollars to do what we're doing with solid waste now. Ald. Shea said, yes, but you have to plan ahead. We can't just look at 5 years. We have to look at 10 or 15. Who knows what type of materials we'd be using? Ald. Pariseau asked where this item should be sent. Ald. Hirschmann suggested it go to CIP/Public Works for a recommendation. Ald. Elise withdrew her motion; Ald. Sysyn withdrew her second. Ald. Shea moved that the item be referred to CIP/Public Works Committee; seconded by Ald. Hirschmann. Motion passed.

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Continental Cablevision regarding a change in programming in the Manchester area.

The Clerk stated for the record that the Business License office receives all the cable complaints because his phone number is on the bill. We did have two complaints about this change in programming. What it really did was bump Nickelodeon up to a higher tier, took it off basic service, and now the customer has to buy the higher tier to keep Nickelodeon. And it's one of the few children's channels on the basic tier. And so we did have two complaints, and I told both parties that I would let the Committee know that there was some concern about that change in programming. Ald. Pariseau asked if there was any way that Nickelodeon could be put back on basic service. The Clerk stated that his understanding was that they had to put this new channel on basic service. So they took off 21. By putting it there, they only had to move one channel. If they kept Nickelodeon, they would have had to juggle 2 or 3 channels. This is how one of the callers explained it to me, and that was the reason that cable had supposedly bumped Nickelodeon. Ald. Pariseau asked if anyone was present from Cable. There wasn't. Ald. Hirschmann stated that, on the other side, he found that the Red Sox were taken over by a new network, Channel 68, and they made this change in order to give the Red Sox for free. So now it's on one of the lower channels. So I think it was a nice thing to get the Red Sox free. Ald. Elise stated that it was too bad that somebody from the cable company wasn't there. Dr. Sullivan commented that the Committee might have some leverage with Channel 22, the Shopping Channel. This might be something you would want to talk with them about, especially since Nickelodeon is the only channel devoted to children's programming.

Ald. Elise moved to table this item until Mr. Tom O'Rourke from the cable company returned. Seconded by Ald. Shea. Motion passed.

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Continental Cablevision submitting its first annual progress report on capital spending on upgrades and rebuilds.

Ald. Shea moved to receive and file the communication. Seconded by Ald. Sysyn. Motion carried.

Chairman Pariseau addressed item 11 of the agenda:

Estimate provided by Jutras Signs relative to a request by Ald. Elise that the Board make available to the public for purchase a two-color version of the City flag.

Ald. Elise stated that the flags have been a nice ceremonial piece going to some public occasions. They have drawn a lot of attention and people are really pleased to receive them.

Ald. Pariseau said he didn't think the city should put money up front and buy a certain number of flags in the anticipation of a sale. They should be able to deal directly with Jutrus Signs. But you want the City Clerk to have a bunch of flags? Ald. Elise stated that we had a number of flags in the office now. Ald. Pariseau asked if they were two-color flags. Ald. Elise said that judging from the communication, they are advising against a two-color flag. But maybe there could be some leeway in the City Clerk's budget where we could have some of these flags on hand. I guess we have to authorize him to sell them? Ald. Pariseau pointed out if they didn't sell them, we would be stuck with them. Ald. Hirschmann said that he thought the four-color flag is beautiful, but if you want a city flag it's \$45.00. Ald. Elise asked the Clerk if he had any recommendations on how to handle the supply of flags. The Clerk said he really didn't. The Special Projects Account is the account we would draw on for a program like this. For the next fiscal year, the account was cut from \$20,000 to \$2,000 which has destroyed our archives program and a lot of other special projects. There's really no other money available. Ald. Elise asked if the Committee could license Jutrus Flags to sell them. Ald. Pariseau said yes, the City Clerk could have samples downstairs and advise people interested in buying the flags that they are available at Jutrus. Ald. Shea added that maybe Jutrus could make the samples available. The Clerk stated that perhaps through the City Hall Restoration Committee, if Jutrus is licensed to print the seal and make the flags for the City Clerk or the City Hall Committee, then they would be able to sell them at this price or for a dollar or two more and make some money for the City Hall Restoration Project. And they have the funds to do that. Ald. Hirschmann asked, why not turn it into a revenue proposal and send it to Revenue.

Ald. Elise moved that the Restoration Committee be authorized to print and sell city flags. Seconded by Ald. Sysyn. Ald. Elise asked if it should be sent to Revenue. Ald. Pariseau stated that this way, any revenues realized would go toward restoring City Hall. Motion passed.

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

Discussion relative to the establishment of a Board of Directors for Channel 40 as governed by the Continental Cablevision contract.

(Tabled 4/16/96)

Ald. Pariseau introduced Dr. Sullivan. She stated that back in 1990 when Channel 40, Manchester Community TV, was started, it was started because of the franchise cable agreement that she had worked on back in 1988. And the section that the Committee has states that MCTV needs to establish a committee "to further the

purposes herein," which is to set up MCTV, provide public education and government access television. We have in the six years since the agreement was signed and since 1992 when Channel 40 was actually started, been doing what is in the rest of the article, but what we haven't been doing is we don't have an advisory committee. I think that Manchester Community television is growing in such a way as I could never have predicted, and from a very simple idea, has become a pretty sophisticated community networking. And there are a lot of changes in the telecommunications industry now, so that we really need to sit and, in the past it would come before the Committee on Administration if I had to hire an employee. The funding comes Continental Cablevision, it's 1% of the gross that operates MCTV and is administered by Finance through the Administration Committee over to the School Department. And my being an employee of the school department as a teacher, and sometimes directed, we administer the contract. Ald. Elise and I talked about this. We really need an advisory committee because the Administration Committee has a lot of work to do. Establishing an advisory committee would give us the ability to establish a management plan which would clear up my management responsibilities and authority for the MCTV director and personnel. Because everything isn't really clearly delineated. We really need to look at a balance for MCTV among public, education and government access, for the needs of the community. This is not to say that it's geared toward educational access. Right now it's administered as part of the School Department, and sometimes being a school department employee, if the phone rings, and it's one of my direct supervisors involved with the Technology Grant Committee, with teaching at lots of different levels, something I might be doing for City Hall gets put on the back burner because I have to deal with people who are directly above me in terms of evaluation. And I feel that as MCTV grows and the needs of the city grow for communication, I think we need to look for balance, and that's what an advisory committee could help MCTV with. Financial operations and franchise fees are something that we talked about. Right now I have to spend the 1% gross that I get every year, by the end of the year, or it goes back to the cable company. What happens is that at the end of the year I end up buying equipment so I don't lose the money to Continental. We've been talking about that with Continental, and they seem to be willing to talk about something like that. But again, if we have a more formal procedure to deal with the Administration Committee, that would move things further along. Number 4, I think, is the most important thing because of the new telecommunications law that's gone into place. The phone company, the public utilities, is now able to offer cable television and Internet communication. And that's where the money's going to be made as we go into the 21st Century: the Internet communication. We're going to be able to put MCTV product not only on videotape and ship it, which we do now, and we sell a lot of videotapes to C-SPAN and public health departments around the country. We're going to be able to send it to a web page. And because of that, when the phone company

gets into this business, we need to have policies in place to make sure we get the percentage of the gross to go not only into the city coffers, but into MCTV. And I look at Portsmouth, and they get 6% of their cable gross. Manchester gets 4%. 1% to our operation and 3% to the city. We're at a crossroads here. With this telecommunications bill, we could get lost in the shuffle. But if we have an advisory committee and I'm directed to be able to spend some time on dealing with this issue, I think this is really important. Not only in terms of funding revenue, but on our ability to get information out of the city to sell it, whether it's someone up in Concord who wants a real estate plan -- to be able to ship it over the Internet -- and to be able to make money on that product. And those are the kinds of things we need to be looking at. The other thing is that we are coming up with cable franchise negotiations by the year 2000. We're going to have to start looking at that. In the law, we have to start looking at that in 1998. There are a lot of other things I want to do, like set up a three-camera switching unit in the newly renovated city hall so that we can connect that back and do live programming and live aldermanic meetings -- and yes, those still are one of our most popular shows. Unsurpassed only by Miss New Hampshire. I also want time for our committee to help secure funding to build an on location production unit. I spent this past year in Leadership New Hampshire, which is the NH Charitable Foundation. They chose me to be in that program. I'd like to be able to take what I've learned in the past year and go out and secure money for MCTV for protection, for when things happen at MCTV. I'm very good at that. In the past, whether it's the Technology Grant Committee -- it's funds that are helping the whole school district, but at the same time I think we should be looking for funds to help MCTV and also policies and procedures. What I'm really looking for is your input as to the type of advisory committee we need to have. And this last page is really wide open. And if you have any ideas, I will get back to you and ask you if you have any ideas. Because I think this is really a very important thing that we should start doing.

Ald. Pariseau asked if this item should be put back on the table because Ald. Sysyn had to get to her Traffic Committee meeting. Ald. Elise said she felt an advisory board would help MCTV out greatly. Ald. Pariseau asked if another meeting could be scheduled on an open date next week. Dr. Sullivan said that would be great, because the structure of the advisory committee needed to come from Administration, because this is the committee that administers the cable service contract. Ald. Elise asked if the Committee should first come up with a concept and then the next step would be to develop a plan.

Ald. Elise moved to accept the concept and ask Dr. Sullivan to come back with other recommendations based on other community television, seconded by Ald. Shea. Motion passed.

Ald. Hirschmann said that he would prefer to talk about it, that he would like a subcommittee to do it and that he didn't want to create other layers of city government. Ald. Shea said that he felt it was important to have on the committee, people who are knowledgeable. Ald. Hirschmann suggested that this item be sent over to the School Board to let them make a decision. Ald. Elise suggested that Dr. Sullivan come back before the Committee so that the subject could be discussed in greater detail. The Chairman instructed the Clerk to inform Dr. Sullivan when the next meeting would be scheduled.

There being no further business to come before the Committee on Administration/Information Systems, on motion of Ald. Elise, duly seconded by Ald. Shea, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Leo R. Bernier
Clerk of Committee

