

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

August 23, 1999

5:15 PM

Chairman Pariseau called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Pariseau, Rivard (late), Thibault, Girard, and O'Neil

Messrs: D. Hamel, P. Borgo.

TABLED ITEM

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion:

Communication from Deputy City Clerk Bergeron submitting proposed changes to the Taxicab Ordinance.

Chairman Pariseau stated, I don't know what your intents are but we do have a list from the City Clerk's Office for proposed changes to the Taxicab Ordinance. Do you want to go through them individually or do you just want to make the motion as a whole and incorporate the new proposed changes?

Alderman Girard moved the changes to the Taxicab Ordinance submitted by Deputy Clerk Bergeron for discussion. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Thibault asked that all of the items be gone through to make sure that the taxicab operators as well as the people understand exactly what we are looking at unless there is something that I don't understand.

Chairman Pariseau replied it is our responsibility...not that we are the bad guys but they are the other guys. You don't let a parolee set-up parole conditions. We represent the citizens of Manchester. On their behalf, we will direct taxicab operators on how they should operate their equipment. Do you want to go to 118:01 Definition? Disqualifying Criminal Conviction. If any taxi operator has any felony convictions or any convictions involving a controlled substance or violence, or may include any additional measures of criminal convictions, which

may be established by the Committee on Administration. Does anybody have a problem with that?

The Committee answered no.

Chairman Pariseau addressed Disqualifying Motor Vehicle Convictions. That is still under 118:01 Definition. Conviction as a habitual offender by the Division of Motor Vehicles of the Department of Safety, conviction for operating after certification as a habitual offender, reckless driving, driving to endanger and/or operating under the influence, or may include any additional measure of motor vehicle convictions which may be established by the Committee on Administration. Does anybody have any problems with that definition?

The Committee answered no.

Alderman Girard stated perhaps it would speed things along if we only addressed the proposed changes rather than reading through everything as it is and everything as it would be. It is at the discretion of the Chair. I just thought I would make the suggestion.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron stated that perhaps he could clarify the presentation. What we did in this presentation here was take the original language, the way it appears in the Code of Ordinances now. What you see struck through are the words that we would like to remove from the current ordinance and the words in italics would be the words we want to add so that you are able, by looking at this, to see the way it is and the way we are proposing it should be.

Chairman Pariseau replied so the way I was reading it was the revised way. I left out all of the struck out things.

Alderman Thibault responded I don't see any other revisions. Those are the only revisions. The rest of it is nothing that is revised.

Chairman Pariseau addressed the definition of "Taxicab." Any motor vehicle having a manufacturer's rated capacity of not more than seven passengers, used in the call and demand transportation of passengers from within the limits of the city to a destination inside or outside of the city, for compensation to or from points chosen or designated by the passengers and not operated on a fixed schedule, between fixed termini, or any such vehicle leased or rented, or held for leasing or renting, with or without driver or operator. This definition shall not include: a motor vehicle subject to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission of the state;

sightseeing buses or limousines designed to carry eight persons or more from a fixed place to places of interest about the city; or motor vehicles collecting fares by tickets or coupons sold for interstate transportation. Does anybody have a problem with that definition?

The Committee answered no.

Chairman Pariseau addressed 118:16 Suspension or Revocation of License, (D)(10) Engaged in any loud argument, fight, or other disturbance; harassed, threatened or assaulted another person; intentionally damaged destroyed or threatened to damage or destroy any property; or in any other manner engaged in conduct detrimental to the safe and efficient transportation of passengers. That is all new. Does anybody have a problem with that?

The Committee answered no.

Chairman Pariseau addressed 118:16 Suspension of Revocation of License. (E) Exception. Notwithstanding the above, if the City Clerk determines that the immediate suspension or revocation of any license granted under the provisions of this chapter is warranted to protect the life, health, or safety of the citizens of Manchester, he may suspend or revoke any license without a stay, pending reasonable opportunity for the licensee to be heard before the Committee on Administration. Does anybody have a problem with that?

The Committee answered no.

Chairman Pariseau addressed 118.37 Records Requirements. (A) Each duly licensed taxicab company or taxicab dispatch company shall be required to keep a log detailing all requests for services as received and shall contain not less than the following information: date and time received, address of caller, destination, cab to which call was assigned, the time the cab returns to service, and the fare charged therefor. The log shall be maintained in order by date at the principal place of business of each duly licensed taxicab company for the current calendar year and for the calendar year immediately preceding the current year and shall be made available upon request, for review by any law enforcement agency or by the office of the City Clerk. A taxicab dispatch company shall maintain such records in such a manner that the activity of separate taxicab companies and/or leased vehicles is clearly identified. Does anybody have a problem with that?

The Committee answered no.

Chairman Pariseau addressed 118.42 Prohibited Conduct. (G) Operate or allow the operation of a taxicab in which any passenger is riding adjacent to the driver, in a front seat of the vehicle, when room is available in the rear seat. Do we really need that?

Alderman Thibault replied we passed it last year and I thought it was a good thing.

Alderman Rivard stated I can't support that. I won't vote for that. If I get in a cab and I want to sit in the front, why do I have to sit in the back? What is the reason?

Alderman Thibault replied I guess there have been some problems in the past.

Chairman Pariseau stated I think it should be up to the fare.

Alderman Girard stated I personally don't have a problem with this provision and I don't have a problem with it for a couple of reasons. One, as Alderman Thibault has mentioned, this Committee has heard cases where drivers have acted inappropriately toward their fares and we also have some instances where the fares have acted inappropriately to drivers and I don't think we need to go into details of some of the specifics of what we have heard. Clearly having the driver in the front seat and the fare in the back seat whenever possible is in the best interest and safety of both the driver and the fare. We have all, I am sure, had the opportunity to travel. I have had the opportunity to live in other cities and there is no other city that I have ever been to or been in a cab in where you are allowed to sit in the front seat. In my experience the cabbies would not let you sit in the front unless the back seat was taken by other passengers. I think for the safety of the driver and the passenger, we ought to keep people as separate as possible.

Chairman Pariseau stated over the years, we have only had one incident of molestation. If it is a continual thing than maybe we can come back and look at it.

Alderman Rivard asked how do you enforce this. If I am getting in a cab and I get in the front seat and the guy says that I have to get in the back are we going to have an argument and a fight? What is going to happen? Is the guy going to throw me out? I feel comfortable in the front. I have sat in the front seat in Florida and in New York and in Boston.

Alderman Girard replied I have sat in the front seat too, when the back seat was taken.

Alderman Rivard responded I am talking about when I was alone.

Alderman Rivard moved to strike this and leave it up to the individual.

Chairman Pariseau asked the cabbies at the meeting what they thought.

Mr. Dennis Hamel stated the experience in the City of Manchester is probably a lot more important than experience in other places. I grew up in a city very close to the same size as Manchester and I frequently tell people that Manchester has 10% of the crime, 10% of the dirt, 10% of the problems of a little town in New England and because of those features, we have different things. I heard something in one part of the ordinance that says a cab driver can't argue with people. You build this thing in and as Alderman Rivard pointed out it is another opportunity for an argument. His point is true. I work nights and you have the drunks coming out and they are set in what they want to do. They feel like you are discriminating against them if you force them into the back seat. There is a general feeling that they don't want to be back there. I think it should be left up to the person.

Chairman Pariseau replied you could use a little diplomacy if you didn't want a person sitting in the front seat. You could show them the back.

Mr. Hamel responded that it possible but you are talking about people making decisions about what they want to do and in some cases, for instance, in my cab I maintain the City requirement for it to be smoke-free. Occasionally I have people who get upset because they can't smoke in my cab. I tell them all the same thing and sometimes they get completely unleashed. Now there are fines associated with smoking but to my knowledge it has never been enforced but I am not willing to take that chance.

Mr. Peter Borgo stated I agree with what Mr. Hamel said plus it is a very difficult thing to enforce and it does become another provocation issue. I think Manchester is pretty safe. We might have had one incident. I hope we don't change the whole system just to correct one incident. We should leave it up to the customer.

Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion to remove Section 118.42 Prohibited Conduct, as written. Chairman Pariseau called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Girard being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Pariseau addressed 118.99 Penalty. (C) If in the opinion of a police officer, a taxicab is determined to be unsafe for public transportation, then the officer is authorized to order the vehicle to be taken off the road and to confiscate the vehicle license, effectively suspending the license until the circumstances

which led to the suspension are corrected. I think I need some clarification. If a police officer is out on the road and the guy has a defective headlight, is this what we are talking about?

Deputy Clerk Bergeron replied I believe so. The Police Department asked for this language. We questioned them as to why can't they do this now anyway and they felt that it would strengthen their position.

Chairman Pariseau stated they do that anyway with a private vehicle so why don't they follow the same procedure as they would for private vehicles. Instead of automatically taking the license away, they could issue a repair order or something within a time period.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron replied I don't disagree. I haven't seen any instance where this might apply.

Alderman Girard stated it has been a while since I have spoken with the Police Department about this and I am disappointed that they are not here tonight, but I believe their rationale for putting this in was more to protect the City than anything because we license the vehicles, we are responsible for allowing the vehicles to travel on the road and we require that they be maintained in certain conditions. I think the Police Department was looking for an ability, under the regulations that we provide, to make sure that if they are not in conformance with the regulations they could be pulled so that we are not liable if anything happens to anybody in one of those cabs.

Chairman Pariseau responded this would be something different from the recent inspections. If I am a police officer and I have a heartburn with Mr. Hamel and one of his cabs comes down my way and he has a headlight out and he has a fare in the cab, this is saying that as a hard-nosed policeman I can tell that cab driver you are not leaving that here so I inconvenience the cab and the fare. That is what that is saying.

Alderman Girard replied I understand your concern but I don't see where having a headlight out would fit the bill for unsafe for public transportation and that is the wording here. I don't know that having a headlight out, unless both were out, would render a cab in and of itself, unfit for public transportation. In other words, I think the example that was used was not appropriate. A front end smashed in might be a reason to pull a cab off the road. A headlight out would not be. I don't think this is geared toward minor stuff.

Alderman Thibault stated it is at the discretion of the police officer and that is where I have a problem. If it is something, as Alderman Girard says, if there is a smashed front end or rear end where there are no tail lights and all that than okay but I think it leaves it to the discretion of the police officer and I don't think that is where it should be. It should probably be a small citation like State Police issue stating within a certain amount of time you have to get this fixed.

Alderman Rivard stated I believe that in the last year I have seen articles that addressed safety of the vehicles. Don't we have an ordinance in place that allows the Police Department to go in and inspect these vehicles and pull them off the road if they are not safe? Is that correct?

Deputy Clerk Bergeron replied I believe they rely on the State regulations to do that.

Alderman Rivard asked what regulations are they asking us to change. State regulations?

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered honestly I never understood what they were asking for here. All the Police Department indicated was that they felt it would strengthen their hand. At the time this was drafted the Committee had directed that our office work with the Police Department.

Alderman Rivard asked so there is a process in place that allows the Police Department or Motor Vehicle Department to come in and assess the condition of the vehicles and take it off the road, correct.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered I believe there is. That is what we just did a couple of weeks ago.

Alderman Rivard stated so they don't take it off the road for a light being out. They take it off the road because it is dangerous so we don't need another statute or ordinance or whatever you want to call it to give somebody another opportunity, like the Chairman said, to yank somebody at 2 AM because the light is not working because he had a bad day.

Alderman Rivard moved to remove 118:99 Penalty. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Girard being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Pariseau stated the other item deals with 118:39, which deals with fares, or do we want to continue with 118:15 License Fees.

The Committee decided to continue with 118:15 License Fees.

Chairman Pariseau asked does anybody have a problem with that. That is just setting the fees at \$400.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered that is actually no change in the fees. What is being changed is what is in italics about 10 lines down where it is a request to have the vehicle numbers identified on the corners of the vehicle. This series of amendments was pieced together by Alderman Girard in conjunction with the Police Department.

Chairman Pariseau stated I would like to take a look at 118:39 Condition and Appearance of Vehicles. You cabbies have to admit that some of the cabs you have on the streets of Manchester are horrible. I wouldn't even step in them. I think you have to be made aware that you are City ambassadors. New people coming into the City for the first time, you people are our representatives. To see the junk that travels the highways and by-ways of the City of Manchester is an insult. I just hope that we can enforce this condition in appearance but you are going to have to do it yourself. Some of these cabs are awful.

Mr. Borgo stated I agree but there is a history and a reason for this. I think that our situation at the moment is we are playing on an unlevel playing field. We must service the City of Manchester and we have people working at the Airport and the Airport does not require their cabbies to be drug tested and does not require the drivers to have a certificate from the City. The less protection you have, we have to survive and the more you encroach on our territory, the less of the pie we can share. I work for the City and the Airport taxicabs are stealing our business. We can't survive because they are taking our money and, therefore, we can't put any investment back into the company. We can't pick up at the Airport unless we are licensed there. Right now you have 50 cars at the Airport and the City cars are getting smaller. Our insurance rates keep going up also.

Alderman Girard stated this problem that you brought up with the condition of the cabs existed long before the Airport had its current regulations and it has been an ongoing problem for a long time. The fact is that one of the requirements the Airport has for people to be able to service the Airport and be licensed to do business out there is the appearance and condition of their vehicle and I daresay, particularly with 15 of the City's 20 or so cabs having been towed off the street the other day, I dare say that they can't get licensed out there because their vehicles are not appropriate to be ambassadors for the City and the Airport would be embarrassed as you said to have them out there. If he wants to talk about the need for additional revenue when we address the part on rates and fares, that is fine, but to somehow pawn off the shabby condition of these vehicles...which ultimately

the City is liable for because we permit them to be on the road as -- oh well the Airport cabbies are blowing us out of the water -- well perhaps if their vehicles were in better shape more people would feel better about stepping into them because I know I won't get in one.

Chairman Pariseau stated I just bring up an incident at Shop n' Save on John Devine Drive. It was a circus. The poor lady couldn't get into the back seat of the cab because the seat wouldn't stay down. If I was the lady I probably would have walked home instead of wasting 15 or 20 minutes trying to lock the back seat into place.

Mr. Hamel stated I have two points that I would like to make. First of all, there is the issue of permit differences between the Airport and the City of Manchester. For \$400, plus another \$50 plus another \$80, I am able to operate a taxi here in Manchester without any protection against people coming in from the Airport using scanners in many cases to take our business. My point is that what we pay the City doesn't buy us the kind of protection that \$300 buys at the Airport. I face \$1,000 fine at the Airport if I pick-up somebody without an Airport sticker. The Airport stickers are no longer available. I opened my business in October and I did not wish to be part of that. I saw 15 guys start with Grand Marquis and Lincolns which by the way are not suitable for City cab work because of the repair parts and the endurance of those cars versus the Chevrolet Celebrities. Another point I want to make is that I distributed to everyone here a description of the so-called inspection that took place last week. My cars were pulled off the road and I am here to tell you that my car is not junk. It is parked outside and you can come out and inspect it if you want. I want to tell you that when people get into my car they comment about how nice it is, how clean it is and how it smells clean. This particular car was put in service less than a month ago and had new shocks, new tires, new struts, and new brakes including rotors and drums. This car was as safe and clean as it could possibly be. It is a not a new car. By the way, gentlemen, the average car in the City lasts six months. When we purchase the vehicle, we can't anticipate that it is going to be gone in six months. This City is hard on vehicles. My last point is insurance costs.

Chairman Pariseau stated you have to remember that this is not a public hearing. If you want to have a public hearing, we will bring everyone in and get the other side. I gave you two minutes.

Alderman Girard stated again maybe my experience in other cities is different, but to say that somehow large cars are not suitable for the taxi business is...I don't think and I don't know about this gentleman's particular cab but to say that large cars aren't suitable to taxi driving...I don't know what car I have ever been in other than Manchester where I see mid-size cars like Celebrities and Luminas

being used as taxis and if big cars aren't suited to heavy duty like that then why are we buying Ford LTD's and Caprices for our Police Department? I would venture to say that those probably get much harder duty than a taxi cab and I would venture to say that they are on the road every bit as much. This gentleman, if his car is as he says, should have no problem with these regulations.

Alderman Thibault stated the only problem that I would have and that Mr. Hamel brought up is why is there a different fee structure for the Airport than there is for the City cabs. If these guys were only operating out of the Airport and to the Airport than I could understand, but if in fact I hear them right they are coming into the City and picking up their fares. That is wrong. If, in fact, they are Airport cars and they are going to take people to the Airport or pick them up at the Airport that is one thing, but if they are coming into the City and picking up their fares besides, I think they are taking their bread and butter.

Chairman Pariseau asked if those cabs that are licensed in the Airport are also licensed in the City.

Mr. Borgo answered no they are not licensed in the City but they work in the City.

Chairman Pariseau stated they shouldn't be able to work.

Mr. Borgo replied I understand that and we all understand that.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron stated just a clarification. State law permits a community to regulate taxi cabs that pick up passengers within their City. It doesn't allow us to regulate taxicabs that drop off passengers in the City. The issue that Mr. Borgo is raising, I believe, is that some of these cabs will come into the City to drop off a fare and then pick-up a fare to return back to the Airport. Under City regulations they are not supposed to do that and we have to catch them doing that to fine them.

Alderman Thibault asked how would you police that.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered the Police Department has to be watching for it. Sometimes we set-up stings but not too frequently and they are not always effective.

Alderman Thibault stated there is something wrong with that and we have to tighten up that regulation somehow. We are taking the livelihood of these guys here and giving it to somebody else.

Chairman Pariseau stated I want to make sure that I understand this. You (Deputy Clerk Bergeron) agree that those Airport licensed cabs should not be picking up fares in the City and delivering them elsewhere in the City?

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered if they are picking up fares in the City they need to be licensed by our office.

Chairman Pariseau stated I don't want this to become a thing, but if you are aware of that type of situation, I wish you would call the City Clerk's Office and relay that. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. They supposedly get the cream of the crop at the Airport so let's fight back. Are we all set with 118:30?

Alderman Thibault asked isn't there some way that we could emphasize this to the Airport cab people that if they get caught picking up a City fare to go anywhere in the City that they could, in fact, be fined and maybe we should levy some type of fine on these people that would discourage this. If they pick up a City fare and deliver them in the City. I am not talking about bringing a fare from the Airport and pick one up to go back, I don't know how we could police that but if they come into town and pick up somebody at that place and bring them to 539 Elm Street or whatever that is what they are talking about and we should have some way of regulating that.

Chairman Pariseau asked why don't we make a note of that and have it for our next agenda item for the Committee on Administration.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron asked would you like me to invite a representative from the Airport.

Alderman Thibault asked shouldn't we have the Police here too. I think he wants to say something else. I don't know if you want to recognize him. The Chairman recognized Mr. Borgo.

Mr. Borgo stated drug testing. We are regulated by drug testing but the Airport cabbies are not. Now someone could fail the drug test in Manchester and go work at the Airport.

Alderman Girard replied that speaks to the Airport. I think so far you have only taken motions to strike things out and my guess is that your intent is to approve everything that is not stricken afterwards so we would not have to approve this separately.

Chairman Pariseau stated this is a new one. We are doing everything.

Alderman Girard asked are you asking for a motion to pass everything that hasn't been stricken.

Alderman Girard moved to accept 118:39. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Pariseau called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Pariseau addressed 118:42 Prohibited Conduct. The holder of a license to engage in the business of operating a taxicab business or taxicab dispatch company and the holder of a license to drive a taxicab shall not: (G) Sound the taxicab vehicle's horn, any time day or evening, to alert a fare of the taxicab's arrival.

Alderman Rivard moved to strike 118:42. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Pariseau stated I don't go along with that.

Alderman Rivard stated we have an ordinance in place now. It is a disturbing the peace ordinance. How are they going to enforce this anymore?

Chairman Pariseau stated the way things are happening now and we have the Police here for this, is you have cab drivers that are in cahoots with a drug dealer or whatever.

Alderman Rivard replied that is not true.

Chairman Pariseau responded yes it is.

Alderman Rivard stated I asked the police if every guy blowing his horn is delivering drugs and they laughed. Of course not. It is a case that they are developing. Why don't we eliminate horns on cabs then? Why don't we make sure that all of the cabs, when they get inspected, have the horns removed? How are we going to enforce this? This is a joke.

Chairman Pariseau stated the situation does warrant...

Alderman Rivard interjected you don't have enough time to convince me. You could be here for three years. I am against it.

Alderman Girard stated this is something that I worked with the Police Department on a long time ago to put into the ordinance. There are a couple of reasons why this is here. First to answer Alderman Pariseau's concern about why

don't we just take horns out of cabs. Horns are there for emergency purposes and as you stated earlier the Police have made a case to this Committee that cabbies using their horns have done so to alert drug users or drug dealers of their presence. Let me tell you (Alderman Rivard) something, maybe you should recuse yourself since you rent to cab companies. You have a conflict of interest here.

Alderman Rivard replied that has nothing to do with it.

Chairman Pariseau asked what happens with a tie.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered it would stay on the table. I don't think the Committee will have the time to address all of the items on the agenda tonight so anything that is not addressed will just stay on the table until a future date.

Chairman Pariseau asked if it is a 2-2 vote, what happens to the motion.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron answered it just stays. It doesn't go anywhere. Action has to be taken to move it in one direction or the other otherwise it remains on the table.

Chairman Pariseau asked so it would be best to table this.

Alderman Thibault asked for clarification. If two members of the Committee which is not a Committee of the whole here, if two members of the Committee vote and second, the Chairman cannot break that. It is not a tie.

Alderman Girard answered the Chairman can vote any time he wants. He doesn't vote only in the case of a tie and under Roberts Rules of Order, if the Chairman wants to he can vote to make a tie. I have a few quick points that I would like to address on this. The Police came to this Committee and made a case about how the horns are used at drug houses and they drafted it. As someone who has lived next to three drug houses in the last year and a half, I can tell you how the horns are used but even when they are not being used for that purpose last night as a matter of fact at 11:20 PM there was a cab sitting in front of the building next door to me and nine times they hit the horn. He didn't come into the neighborhood and tap the horn a couple of times. Nine times leaning on the horn until the fare showed up. This happens routinely around the City. It would probably be less offensive at 11:20 AM but when it is 11:20 PM I don't see why...if somebody calls a cab, they are expecting a cab. Why the cab has to sit out there and honk the horn until the fare shows up knowing that it has been called to that location blows my mind. There have been cabs that have been there for 10 or 15 minutes honking before they give up and go away.

Chairman Pariseau asked when you were a kid didn't you call a cab company and send them to a neighbor's house just for laughs.

Alderman Girard answered no I never did. The problem is that while it is convenient for the cab to sit there and honk the horn, it is very inconvenient for everybody who lives in the neighborhood to have to put up with. Now some neighborhoods are more severely affected by it than others but it is not like the horns are being used for an emergency purpose. Here is how you enforce something like this. Here is why the Police can't do it. The Police are going to have to catch you in the act of doing it, but if we are successful and it seems that we may be in altering the markings of the cab, if I could have picked up anything that identified the cab last night, I would have tried to call it in. You can't see the cab license numbers. You can't see the car numbers. That is why these regulations are in here. If someone wants to take that and say at such a date and time the cab was over in front of this building honking the horn, they have to because of the logging requirements we have here, have to tell where they are going, where they are picking up the fare, when and where they drop off. There will be a record as to whether or not that cab was there. They won't be able to say they weren't there. If you get the cab license number, you have got it. I am sorry. This happens at all hours of the night and it is enough.

Alderman Rivard stated if this was such a major issue, during those years when you served as Deputy Mayor for the City of Manchester, why didn't you correct it then. I am sure you had all of these phone calls and people complaining about the horns, etc. The only reason you have a problem is because it is happening around your house. I don't like the airplanes making noise over my house. Let's ban airplanes from making noise that wakes me up at 2 AM or 3 AM.

Alderman Thibault stated there is no doubt that there is abuse. There almost is in anything that you can make a law for. I can remember even as a little boy cabs coming in front of my neighbors' house and toot the horn. So what if a cab toots the horn because a fare is not waiting outside. At nighttime, I would think it is an abuse but how do you regulate that?

Alderman Girard replied at 3 AM it is an abuse. You have a lot of neighborhoods affected by this.

Chairman Pariseau moved to put this item on the table. The Clerk explained that there was already a motion by Alderman Rivard to kill the proposed amendment and that it was seconded. The Chairman stated that a motion to table takes precedence. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Pariseau called for a vote. The motion failed with Alderman Rivard and Alderman Thibault duly recorded in opposition. The item remains deadlocked and on the table. Chairman Pariseau addressed the letter from Dennis Hamel to change the taxicab structure. I don't have a problem other than with the time charge. The way the City is currently...we do have traffic problems like Brown Avenue and South Willow Street and to charge people \$.25 a minute when it would take them 20 minutes just to get to the nearest intersection is not right.

Alderman Thibault replied other than that maybe I would agree with you on that one but it has been four or five years since they had their last rate increase. Also, the price of gas going to where it is now compared to a few months ago. I certainly would have no problem supporting this. That time charge is something that I am not sure about, but the rest of it I certainly support.

Alderman Girard moved the changes with the time charge taken out. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. Chairman Pariseau called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Borgo stated we don't pick the traffic, the traffic comes to us and we have to pay for that. This is something that we have to live with. We don't choose to go to Brown Avenue.

Alderman Thibault asked in other cities and I am sure you and Mr. Hamel would probably know, do they charge a time charge.

Mr. Borgo answered yes.

Alderman Thibault stated so we are the only city in the country not to have a time charge.

Chairman Pariseau replied I am not afraid to be alone.

Alderman Girard asked are you going to take a motion to accept everything we didn't approve. We have taken three actions. We have eliminated two items and we have approved one, but nothing else has been acted on.

Alderman Girard moved to accept everything not eliminated and refer same to the Board. Alderman Rivard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Pariseau called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Girard requested a minority report recommending that the Board consider the items that this Committee eliminated.

Chairman Pariseau asked why do you want to do that.

Alderman Girard answered because I would like the Board to consider those items.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron stated if the Committee votes, it is such.

Alderman Girard replied the Committee does not have to vote to refer a minority report. If it did that, there would never be a minority report that saw the light of day.

Deputy Clerk Bergeron asked is it Alderman Girard's intent in itemizing those issues that the Committee eliminated, is it his intent to also put on that minority report the time charge.

Alderman Girard answered no, not the time charge just the items that we specifically eliminated here.

Chairman Pariseau asked do you want me to rescind my motion to table the horn blowing issue and eliminate it so that you can put it on the minority report.

Alderman Girard answered sure.

Chairman Pariseau rescinded his motion to table 118:42.

Alderman Rivard moved to eliminate Section 118:42. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion. Chairman Pariseau called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Girard being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Pariseau stated so Alderman Girard's minority report will include 118:42, 118:99, and 118:42. There are two G's for 118:42.

Chairman Pariseau asked Deputy Clerk Bergeron to send a memo to the Police Department expressing the Committee's disappointment in there being no representation from them at this meeting.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee