

## COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

**September 18, 2000**

**5:30 PM**

Chairman Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Gatsas, Pariseau, O'Neil

Absent: Aldermen Thibault, Hirschmann

Messrs: Deputy Chief Robinson, A. Tsoutsas, M. Normand, Alderman Lopez, S. Tellier, Deputy Solicitor Arnold, K. Clougherty, Alderman Levasseur, T. Seigle, G. Sullivan, M. Vandeboceur, J. Cote, W. Robinson, T. Lolicata

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Club Kraze, LLC, and Club Kraze, LLC, d/b/a The Victory Room requesting to extend their hours of operation on Friday nights from 2:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m.

Alderman Pariseau asked have we received anything from the Liquor Commission or the Police Department.

Deputy Chief Robinson stated the Police Department was made aware of this request last Friday. We are against it. I will tell you that it is also against the City ordinance. What they are looking to do is have dancing extend beyond 2 AM and the City ordinance clearly indicates that it is 2 AM. I would also like to give you a little history because we are, quite frankly, a little worried about this particular business. On September 1, I signed a business license. At that time, I gave them a letter outlining some of the City ordinances on police presence, curfew for dances, nudity in places selling alcoholic beverages and I also gave them a copy of the ordinance on exotic or unusual entertainment in places selling alcoholic beverages. Soon after I signed that license, within a day, I received several phone calls and my guess is probably from other businesses, saying that on a Boston radio station Club Kraze was advertising a thong contest to be held the following Friday night. I called the owner and explained to her that we had received this information. She explained to me that although that advertisement had gone out, it was before they had seen the ordinance and talked to me and they had no way of canceling the

advertisement in Boston. I will also tell you that the Chief of Police received a phone call in the middle of last week complaining about some entertainment that had taken place there. That is still being looked into by us. On 9/16 we responded to the club at approximately 2 AM. At that time, we had several units respond to the club. We had approximately 200 individuals in the lot. There were a few pushing and shoving matches going on and some fights. It was also observed that there was a lot of litter out in the lot. That is concerning us. It appears to me that they are trying to hold all night dancing, which we have been fortunate in not doing. I would also explain to the Administration Committee that I get calls from other departments all the time wanting to know how we stop these raves from happening and how we stop all night dancing and how we do it is we have good ordinances. I have been requested and, in fact, have sent out copies of our ordinances to the City of Nashua, the City of Concord, the Town of Bedford, and the City of Portsmouth, all wanting to do the same thing we do, which is control these all night type dances. So, we are against this. We would ask that you not allow it and that we keep the status quo. Also, I have been informed that this coming Friday night they are going to have a dance contest. I just got this information this afternoon. I will be notifying them and I know they are sitting behind me, that is in strict violation of the unusual and exotic entertainment ordinance. If they are having any type of audience participation they need a write-off by the Police Department. A copy of this ordinance was given to them and it was explained to them and they haven't approached us at all. We seem to have several problems with this particular establishment.

Alderman Pariseau moved to deny the request.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we want to hear from the owners.

Chairman Gatsas answered sure.

Alexandra Tsoutsas stated in reference to Deputy Chief Robinson, we had placed an ad with Jammin 94.5 on August 1 and at that time we didn't review any of the ordinances. I didn't hear any of the advertisements that were run on the radio at all. We had sent them the money and between trying to open up the nightclub I wasn't able to review anything that went over the air. When I heard it, I already knew that having a thong contest...I didn't even authorize that. A member of my staff organized that and I had no idea whatsoever. Deputy Chief Robinson had phoned me and I explained to him that nothing like that was going on. I apologized. I called the radio station immediately and told them to change the ad, which they did within a day or two. What had happened was on Thursday night the only type of event that I did have was we asked the women in the audience if they would like to get up and show whatever outfit they had on that night and we had voting by applause who had the best outfit on. There wasn't any type of

nudity. Nobody was flashing anybody. We had told them explicitly that none of that would be allowed or they would be disqualified. Also, I believe there was an officer who came upstairs to attend the event and make sure that we were handling everything as we had discussed with Deputy Chief Robinson. Again, I apologized for that and it was taken care of immediately. As far as being able to open from 2 AM to 4 AM, the only request that I make on that is on Fridays we have a lot of younger kids. They love to come and dance. That is all they want to do. I am featuring some DJ's that I bring from across the country. I had this famous DJ on Friday night and the kids were very excited. At the end of the session she was throwing albums out to the crowd and I believe that one individual elbowed another individual in the face and when they went outside to the parking lot they were still upset about it and I believe that is why the pushing and shoving occurred, but I did not see any brawls or any fistfighting whatsoever. The kids as a whole are very polite and nice. The only trouble I have might be on a Thursday night when I have a hip-hop crowd. They have a totally different attitude, but on Friday nights the kids are wonderful.

Alderman O'Neil stated it sounds like they haven't even sat down and talked. We have one very vague letter from the owners requesting this. I don't even know if it makes sense for them to sit down and talk and have us table this.

Deputy Chief Robinson stated it is against City ordinance to stay open until 4 AM. Our standing has always been not to have anything after 2 AM. It has worked out well for us. We are talking about younger kids until 4 AM. I do see lots of problems with this. Other communities like Bedford and Nashua are having problems right now and they are looking at ways to fix them. To me, this would be a step backwards to allow this and to allow the kids to be down in the Millyard until 4 AM and then dump 200 or 300 of them out into the streets.

Alderman O'Neil stated this Committee couldn't do anything with it anyway. It would have to be referred...there request actually has to go to Bills on Second Reading if they want an ordinance change, correct?

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion to deny the request. Chairman Gatsas called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated if you want the ordinance changed, you have to get it to the right Committee to request that.

Ms. Tsoutsas replied our attorney had advised us to proceed this way. May I also bring up one other point? The Police seem to think that it is a problem having kids out at 4 AM but there is going to be a problem whether a club closes at 10 PM or 12 AM or 2 AM or 4 AM. It is going to happen no matter what time a club closes.

I think it is just an excuse – the 4 AM time. If you have a well-trained staff...on my staff I have a gentleman whose name is James and he was a former US Marshall and worked for the Secret Service. He works in Concord with all of the judges and Senators and he is at the club on Friday nights. I have a registered nurse who is our cashier. She is there on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays to take care of any problems or mishaps. Two other people on my staff were with the Marines and US Army so they are well-trained in how to control large groups. I am very well prepared and very well aware of the problems.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think this is in this Committee because we authorize the license and this would be an amendment to their license and that is what we are denying.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from The Sweet Sausage requesting approval to vend after 8:00 p.m., advising that they have permission to vend in front of Jillian's after their kitchen hours from 11:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Matthew Normand, City Clerk's Office, providing a report on insurance issues for taxicabs.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file this item. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is pretty clear in a lot of communications that we have received in the last few months that the owners of the cabs have to start pushing their drivers to start driving more reasonably. They have poor driving records and that is what is driving these rates up. It has nothing to do with the City's requirements, it is the drivers.

Chairman Gatsas stated Matt, you did a great job on this.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if this is the appropriate time, but I have a question. We had approved up to 7-year-old full-size taxis the last time we changed the ordinance. I had the opportunity to meet with Simon and take a look at a car that would fall within the 7 years now but by the first of the year would be

not eligible. I am just wondering without jeopardizing all of the work that has been done if we may want to consider giving them a little more leeway.

Chairman Gatsas replied I think what we had done was gone from the 9 years to 5 years and then to 7 years.

Alderman O'Neil stated the car Simon presented is certainly more than acceptable. I did make it clear to him that if he lives up to those conditions I have no problem supporting that and the first one I see that doesn't, I will be in here leading the effort to go back to the 7 years. I don't know what the proper process is. I know there has been a lot of work done by Matt and others in the City Clerk's Office to get this updated.

Clerk Bernier replied that ordinance will be presented to the full Board on October 3 and you need to amend that ordinance at that time.

Alderman O'Neil asked is the rest of the Committee comfortable with that.

Alderman Pariseau answered I am after reviewing the vehicle that Simon had. I don't have a problem extending the 7 years back to 9 years.

Clerk Bernier replied that action will have to be taken on October 3, but an endorsement of this Committee would be helpful.

Alderman O'Neil stated, Simon, I encourage you to get together with the other owner and he has to live up to this because I would hate to see him...he could bring you down on this.

Chairman Gatsas stated, Matt, maybe you can help me with this. If a vehicle is registered as a cab and it is 9 years old when the registration starts and let's assume the anniversary date for registration is September and you register it in July and it turns to a 10 year old cab, does that mean that it is grandfathered for that ninth year or are we looking at a 10 year old cab?

Mr. Normand replied if the vehicle is 10 years old at the time of licensing, April 30, then it would be...

Chairman Gatsas interjected let's assume that on April 30 it is a 9 year old car, however, the registration of that car or the manufactured date is September and in September it turns to a 10 year old car.

Mr. Normand responded it would be allowed to continue through that licensing period.

Alderman O'Neil stated the other thing I wanted to comment on was the cages that were put in the cars. I think they are very reasonable, even for large people like myself and having used cabs down in Baltimore in July, it was a lot tighter situation than in our cabs so that was well done by Matt and Mr. Musat.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Vaillancourt requesting the Board adopt a new Rule 27 to read as follows:

“Any alderman requesting permission of the Chair of any standing Aldermanic committee to attend and/or participate in an executive and or non-public session of committee meetings shall be granted such authorization to do so.

Alderman Pariseau stated this item was brought to the attention of this Committee by Alderman Vaillancourt relative to a meeting of the CIP Committee dealing with the MTA I believe. I don't think there is a need for another rule of this Board. If the individual who brought this to the attention of this Committee walked into the Committee room as a gentleman and instead of referring to those members of the Committee as being dishonest or whatever. No member of this Board that I am aware of is dishonest.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file the item. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Lopez requesting that the Board of Assessors provide information over the next 60 to 90 days on processes for updating assessment of City properties.

Alderman Pariseau asked could I get a clarification from the author of this request. I don't understand it.

Alderman Lopez stated the basic idea is that we evaluate every 10 years and other communities right now are starting to evaluate yearly or every three to five years. The basic thrust of this whole idea is to let the City Assessors review all of the procedures and bring back to the Committee an evaluation of whether we want to change our structure in the way we evaluate property in the City of Manchester. If it is okay with you, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the City Assessor to address this particular item.

Alderman Pariseau asked are you saying that we ought to have professional appraisers come in annually to assess all of the properties.

Alderman Lopez answered no I am not. I think there are procedures within the Assessor's Office, if that was the case, for them to do the evaluation without going out and hiring people to do it. Again, if the City Assessors would do that, in conversation with some of the Assessors they would need more people. This is just a staff study so to speak to educate the Board as to which is the best process to follow.

Alderman Pariseau stated I think that in some communities and I don't know if it is legal here in Manchester, but Waterville, Maine for example, the assessed value is predicated on the sale of a home. For example, if I should sell my home for \$100,000 today, the new owners would be paying taxes on that \$100,000. I don't know if we can do that.

Chairman Gatsas asked the Mr. Tellier to respond.

Mr. Tellier stated the understanding that our Board has of Alderman Lopez's letter is to review how the City applies assessments. Currently, we are undergoing a revaluation for an effective date of April 1, 2001. The previous one was April 1, 1991. The previous one to that was in 1971. My understanding from Alderman Lopez and what he has gleaned from the industry is what communities are now entering into is a period or a cycle where they send out data collectors on a constant level of review for a new assessment date, which could be annually in the smaller towns and in the larger communities it is somewhere between three and five years. What they do is they have a period where they review every piece of property in a cycle across the city to keep the data about what people have in their homes, all of the improvements through the city, and then they review all of the sales and this is alluding to what Alderman Pariseau said. The assessments are driven by sales or the income approach or the reproduction approach. So, they review those three approaches to value. They redo all of the tables and they incorporate all of those sales and all of those new levels of income into a new set of assessments. I believe that is what the thrust of Alderman Lopez's letter is and what he is asking the Board of Assessors is to bring forward for discussion to this Committee what sort of resources would be required for us to enter into a cycle or revaluation rather than contracting out every 10 years. It is also probably pertinent in light of the Coalitions lawsuit with respect to the State school funding issue, that this may come about as part of that as well. What we would like to do, Mr. Chairman, is ask for a little more time than this, probably 60 days. The Board of Assessors is presently preparing the warrant for the November bill. We are getting information from the industry and we are getting additional practices from other

communities throughout New England on how they are incorporating a cycle of revaluation as well.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Attorney Stewart Richmond, Jr. requesting Ordinances 90.16(c) and 90.17 be repealed due to conflicts with the service agreement with the Friends of the Manchester Animal Shelter.

Alderman Pariseau moved to approve the request. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Deputy Solicitor Clark stated I would note that Section 90.16(b) also needs to be repealed as reflected in the ordinances that I prepared.

Alderman Pariseau moved to amend the motion to include Ordinance 90.16(b) be repealed. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. Chairman Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communications from Information Systems Director, and the Finance Officer advising of resolutions to the HTE user survey responses.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Communication from Kevin Clougherty, Finance Officer, advising of potential members for a committee to recommend a preferred financial organization of the City.

Alderman O'Neil asked how did this process get started. Was it through the Accounts Committee?

Mr. Clougherty stated you will note on the agenda that there is a tabled item, Item 18. When it was addressed at the Board level it was referred to this Committee. When it came before the Committee, I was asked to make a recommendation. My recommendation was that you get some people other than the Finance Officer,

who are experienced in this area to take a look at this and make a recommendation to you. We have gone through that process. I contacted the State Auditor. He gave us a list of people who were qualified in this area. We contacted them and the list you have before you are people who are willing to sit down and take a look at that issue and give you a recommendation. If it is your pleasure, we will contact those people, have them come before you and try to get you something in the next month.

Chairman Gatsas asked are you saying have all nine of them on the committee.

Mr. Clougherty answered you could do all of them, Alderman, or you could decide on a piece of them. It is up to you how you want to handle it. If you want the Clerk to organize it, that would be fine with us to.

Alderman Pariseau asked are they Manchester residents.

Mr. Clougherty answered I don't know that, Alderman, but I can find out for you and if you want us to get that information to the Clerk, we will.

Alderman Pariseau stated I would probably limit it to Manchester residents.

Chairman Gatsas replied there are three on here who don't appear to have Manchester phone numbers. I don't know if they are residents of Manchester or not.

Alderman Lopez stated I know there is one here who lives in Bedford but has a business in Manchester. I don't know if you want to clarify that, Alderman Pariseau.

Alderman Pariseau asked we don't have any residents in the City who can be on this committee.

Chairman Gatsas answered you may narrow this down if you are looking for residents instead of people who have an office here.

Alderman Pariseau stated it really doesn't make any difference. I just thought that we should give preference to Manchester residents.

Mr. Clougherty replied I will find out and get the information to the Clerk. They have all been contacted and are willing to do the job. We will find out if they have a residence or a business in Manchester.

Alderman Pariseau responded I guess it doesn't make a difference.

Alderman Lopez stated we had some discussion about this in Accounts and maybe you could clear this up. Is the Administration Committee going to take care of this or the Accounts Committee? Who is going to be in charge of this? We had it on our agenda to and we got a little confused.

Alderman Pariseau stated the Accounts Committee is responsible for auditing.

Chairman Gatsas asked, Kevin, where should it go.

Mr. Clougherty answered I could have these people report to both of you jointly. You both have an interest in this and certainly if you want them to prepare an independent report, it can go to both committees.

Chairman Gatsas asked what does this Committee want to do.

Alderman Pariseau answered I think that auditing is under the Accounts Committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would agree with Alderman Pariseau.

Chairman Gatsas stated let's leave it there because everybody seems to want to throw things in this Committee for some reason.

Mr. Clougherty stated so I will take this list, do the checks for the residents and give it to the Chairman of the Committee on Accounts to move forward.

Alderman Levasseur stated we already discussed this in Accounts and it passed. Just because they come from Manchester or not shouldn't matter. There are some pretty heavy hitters here for an advisory board.

Chairman Gatsas replied we are just going to receive and file it.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to receive and file this item.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 11 of the agenda:

Communication from Attorney Guay requesting review of the HTE system as it pertains to EPD billings and questioning why the system appears to be failing in processing invoices correctly.

Alderman Pariseau moved to receive and file this item.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Mr. Seigle, is this the one and only case that you are aware of.

Mr. Seigle answered no. We have had a lot of problems getting the system online, but right now it is pretty much online. This was the case of the warrant where accounts that are delinquent for approximately 60 days are then submitted to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and they go on a warrant and the warrant is then submitted to Tax. There was a glitch in the timing that has been straightened out.

Chairman Gatsas asked I would like to find out from Diane or the City Solicitor where we are at with HTE and whatever bonding suits we are looking at.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered what I have done, Alderman, is I have sent a communication to all of the department heads asking them to provide me with some detail of their experiences with HTE and whether they felt that they were satisfied with HTE or that the HTE system was in violation of the specifications related to their department. I have received back most, if not all, of those responses in varying levels of detail. At this point, I am going through those responses to try and identify the problem areas and compare them against the specifications for the HTE system under the contract to determine where they may be in violation of those specifications.

Chairman Gatsas asked when do you think you might have an answer for this Committee.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered hopefully within 30 days.

Chairman Gatsas asked can we have the Clerk's Office send the Solicitor's Office something in writing saying that within 30 days they will respond.

Clerk Bernier answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion to receive and file. Chairman Gatsas called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 12 of the agenda:

Report of Committee relative to a communication from Alderman Vaillancourt suggesting a Charter amendment be drafted, sent to public hearing and prepared for the November ballot relative to campaign expenditure/donation forms.

Alderman Pariseau stated again I think the author of this request is off base. He considers everyone but himself dishonest and I don't think there is any need for any more paperwork regarding campaign expenditure/donation forms. The City Clerk has a responsibility and they do it to the best of their ability and there is no further need for any more Charter amendments.

Alderman O'Neil moved to receive and file this item. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated there is a State Law that addresses this and I think the Clerk does an outstanding job.

Chairman Gatsas stated I would think that if a Board member is going to make a request to a Committee...I am sure Mr. Vaillancourt is busy but I would think that they would at least come in and take an opportunity to talk about it.

Chairman Gatsas called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 13 of the agenda:

Presentation by Dr. Grace Sullivan relative to the current cable contract negotiations.

Chairman Gatsas stated before you start, Dr. Sullivan, maybe I can make this a little easier for you. I went through your entire outline that you sent us and I can tell you that every one of the things that you are going to tell us that we should talk about or look at has already been discussed or taken care of through the contract. So, all of those things are already done so I don't know if you want to go through this or not.

Dr. Sullivan replied we are here and if you have any questions about it or want to go through it we can do that.

Chairman Gatsas stated I don't know if the members of this Committee or any other Aldermen had an opportunity to look at it, but they are all things that were in the contract that have been negotiated out and the changes were made.

Dr. Sullivan replied with all due respect I think that Marc and Jason have done a very good job putting this together and we won't take up much of your time.

Chairman Gatsas stated as I have always said in the past, I am sure that the people in your department are very well qualified and they do a great job. I don't have a problem listening to the presentation if that is what this Committee would like to do.

Alderman Pariseau stated I have no problem letting her make her presentation.

Dr. Sullivan replied thank you very much. This is the condensed version of the report that came from a working plan. One hundred and thirty-five people got together last year to do a community wide assessment of the needs for the cable contract in regards to MCTV. We looked at five areas and that is the Fiberoptic I-NET or the municipal network, the percentage of the spectrum of the capacity of the channels that we need, the facility/space, the operations and funding. Just to look briefly at the Fiberoptic I-NET, it is 16.4 miles. It was built as a result of the 1990 cable contract and was one of the first Fiberoptic I-NET's built in the country. Currently it is used only by the School district for computer networking and Internet access. There is no ability currently to transmit live video over this system. Back in 1990, we could not get United Cable to agree to hook up all of the schools so currently Bakersville, Hallsville, Highland-Goffe's Falls, Parker-Varney, Smyth Road, Weston and Wilson are not connected to the I-NET. We would also like the schools to be built in the future also to be connected. Also, because it was built in 1992...

Chairman Gatsas interjected that is already in the contract.

Dr. Sullivan asked those schools are going to be hooked up.

Chairman Gatsas answered yes.

Dr. Sullivan replied that is wonderful.

Alderman O'Neil asked aren't there drops at many municipal buildings but the I-NET was never brought into the building because that was our responsibility and not theirs.

Dr. Sullivan answered right. As part of some of the memos that I sent you, we asked for help in getting internal equipment. I don't know the status of that to be honest with you not having been at the meetings.

Alderman O'Neil asked but the drop itself is at every fire station.

Dr. Sullivan answered it is at every fire station, it is at Gill Stadium...

Alderman O'Neil asked do we know other than these schools what buildings do not have drops. Those drops were actually done in 1992, correct?

Dr. Sullivan answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated so it should really fall upon the users at those buildings whether it is the Library, Fire Department or Police Department to come forward and let us know that they want to use the I-NET, correct.

Dr. Sullivan answered correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked so other than the seven schools listed, we have it in every other municipal building in the City of Manchester.

Dr. Sullivan answered right. In fact, if we were to get enough funding for a van, we would love to be able to use that van to cover say the Central/Memorial game on Friday night.

Alderman O'Neil stated so as the Chairman has indicated, this is in the contract so it is more in our lap why the technology hasn't been used. It is not the cable provider's issue, but our issue.

Dr. Sullivan answered the School Department has utilized it to the fullest in terms of computer networking.

Alderman O'Neil stated I remember in 1992 there was discussion about the Fire Department using it for training where they would have a trainer at one site and everybody would sit down in front of a screen and nobody has taken advantage of that. If we get these schools covered, I think the cable provider lives up to their end of the contract.

Dr. Sullivan replied right and what is important is that becomes a loop. Right now, it is just one continuous line. If that I-NET were to loop around...what happens now is if it goes down in one place, the whole system goes down. If it is a loop, there is some redundancy and it all won't go down if it breaks in one place.

Chairman Gatsas stated let me just help you with the possibility of an I-NET expansion. We are in the process of working out the details so that the City will own the I-NET itself because for the provider to put in the new connections, it is much more expensive than what we could find an individual to sub it out and do it directly so we are in the process of the City owning the I-NET and then we can do

the expansions so I will help you with the possibilities for the I-NET expansion. That has been done and it is already in the contract.

Dr. Sullivan replied that is terrific. Thank you very much, Chairman. Going on then to the percentage of Spectrum/Channels, this is conversion from analog to digital. This is something that Marc will talk about.

Chairman Gatsas responded let me talk to you about that because I have done...right now I can tell you that we have negotiated out four channels with a possibility of a fifth depending on where we are going. Just so you know, the basic tier must contain the City program on MCTV. When you go to the digital system, that is random programming, which is already a government controlled situation so looking to squeeze those five channels from five to twenty-five may not be the best system for the City because it does go to a random selection when you go to a digital programming situation. You can't just say we need to go from five to twenty-five and we need to participate in the digital because that may not ever be able to happen because that basic tier at that point may not be...or the MCTV will not be in the basic tier which it must be.

Mr. Vandebocour replied so what you are saying is that the basic tier will, at least for the foreseeable future, remain analog and all of the digital channels will be further up.

Chairman Gatsas responded that is correct.

Mr. Vandebocour asked when the basic tier does become digital our four channels will stay in that basic tier.

Chairman Gatsas answered you have to be careful because that does call for random selection. You can't fix it when you go to a digital system. You can't just say we are going to be on ABC channel or X, Y, Z channel. It is a random selection and that is set by the Federal government and has nothing to do with what we can negotiate in that contract. The Channel 9 issue will be done within the first 14-30 days of closing on the contract so that the seniors out there who use Channel 9 for their security system, this Committee has already taken that into consideration when we negotiated out the contract. Also, the penalty of movement for PEG access locations and interruption of services, that has already been addressed in the contract and will be protected.

Dr. Sullivan replied this is great. I think it is wonderful about the digital. I do hope that we have enough capacity with the digital system. Again, I don't know the length of the contract, but if it is...you know five years is a long time in terms of technology.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you aware of cities where this didn't work out.

Dr. Sullivan answered what we are aware of are states establishing legislation through their PUC's. The State of Vermont, in the springtime, established that in every city and town in Vermont cable providers had to give 10% of the spectrum of capacity to the city. So, a cable company had to give 10%. We are only asking for 5%. There are other states that are putting that in. When we went out and researched this, the Alliance for Community Media, everything that we look at is saying go for a percentage of the spectrum capacity. That is why Marc prepared a presentation on it. It is just that the Fiberoptic I-NET back in 1990 when I did research on it and I went to the Committee on Administration, I didn't know that much about fiber. I didn't know anything about the Internet. I just knew it made sense. The digital capacity issue and the percentage is something that we have researched a lot.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am not asking about states. Is there a specific community that you are aware of and I believe I understand what the Chairman has indicated, that this did not work out and where there was a problem with this?

Dr. Sullivan replied what we are doing is trying to look out to the future in a world of digital conversion so we are saying we are going from analog to digital where AT&T is currently starting to do digital. It hasn't happened yet. Does that make sense?

Alderman O'Neil responded it does and with all due respect I have never found in the City of Manchester that we have been on the cutting edge of anything.

Dr. Sullivan replied we were on the cutting edge with the Fiberoptic Network. We were on the cutting edge with MCTV.

Alderman O'Neil stated we generally have found when we look hard that somebody in someplace across the country has run into this problem before and that is my question.

Chairman Gatsas replied they are addressing this at the Federal level because what they are saying is you cannot select a channel and say MCTV will be on Channel 17 if it is in digital. It will be random selection. Otherwise, you will be in violation.

Mr. Vandebocour asked what happens if they go digital and theoretically there are 500 channels because for every 100 channels you can have 500 digital channels, could they under this Federal law put us at like 498, 497, 496. Something in the

upper tiers where you would have to buy the special equipment to be able to get those channels.

Chairman Gatsas answered again, MCTV, the local broadcasting, must be on the lowest tier so I don't think they can ever...I don't think they can go 100% digital because they are going to affect what tier the local people can receive their programming from. I think they need to leave it on the lower tier so it is probably...I can't tell you what is going to happen in the future. I wish we all had that crystal ball.

Mr. Vandeboccur asked the way the language is written into the contract, is there the possibility that we could say if we wanted to maintain three channels on the local lowest tier but wanted to take one of those channels of the digital spectrum and say convert it to five channels to be used for various purposes for the City...

Chairman Gatsas interjected again because we are looking to protect the lower tier level, that is what you have to be looking at because we are looking at the citizens of Manchester and making sure that they have access at the lowest tier. This digital is going to move it up to any tier because you are going to have to go out and purchase the equipment to get it. We need to make sure that as long as they have to provide a low tier that that is where the channeling for the system in Manchester has to stay for the local people. I don't know how else you change that and say we are going to take one of those channels and say we are going to pick up 10 and say it is going to be 247 and somebody is going to have to go out and pay \$60 or \$70 for a piece of equipment to pick up those local channels. I don't think that is fair to the citizens of Manchester. I don't think that is what we are here to do.

Mr. Vandeboccur replied right. What I am saying is is there the possibility of splitting...I mean we want to keep a public access channel on local tier and an educational channel but I am not talking necessarily MCTV channels. I am talking that in the future at some point the City may want to take one of these channels up in the digital spectrum somewhere like channel 300 and split it into 5.

Chairman Gatsas asked why would we want to do that if the local residents couldn't see it.

Dr. Sullivan answered because what you are doing is talking about telecommunications needs. The I-NET is not utilized for the people to see it. What we are doing is looking at AT&T, which is not just providing cable but providing computer services. So, you might want to have a private City network that is a secure network for moving information around for safety purposes, for

monitoring buildings in terms of fire hazards and that kind of thing. We are just telling you what we researched and what we found out there.

Chairman Gatsas replied I think what this Committee can tell you is that we have looked pretty hard at the digital side with our negotiator.

Alderman O'Neil stated that is why I go back to the question I had earlier. I understand the work that they have done and the research, but are you aware of a City that has a cable contract that has it structured as you are suggesting?

Dr. Sullivan replied all I know is that the State of Vermont and other...

Alderman O'Neil interjected that is not my question. I am looking for a local town or city.

Mr. Vandebocour replied as digital goes in channels, very few place across the United States have digital cable already so you can't really use that example for a community because it hasn't got there yet. We are talking two or three years down the line. When everything is digital, we want to have that option. We don't want to close the doors when you are talking 10 years down the line or 7 years down the line.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand the concept. My question was are you aware of any community that has the capability.

Dr. Sullivan responded no. Back in 1990 or really 1988 when I was studying the Fiberoptic concept, this was something that businesses were using. Businesses are using digital now so the Fiberoptic network was not utilized back in 1990. Nobody had it. We had it. We were one of the first. That is the same. We are just looking ahead to the future. This is a 10-year plan. You are speculating your telecommunications needs in the future. Moving ahead to facility space, the current facility if we could talk about that.

Mr. Vandebocour stated as you are all aware our current facility is located at the Manchester School of Technology. Some of the problems that we are running into now that we have increased public access use is that the public and government access is limited to non-school hours. We are in the process...within two weeks we will be hiring two additional staff members and a third staff member shortly thereafter. There is not a lot of room as you can see in this picture here. We had to stuff three desks into an office space really designed for one. There is inadequate space if someone wanted to do a studio audience forum program or even on the government access side if the Aldermen wanted to hold a committee meeting and have it live on the channel and allow the public in as well as having it

be live on the channel, we would not be able to accommodate that. Evening and weekend accessibility is a problem. Our schedule is basically Monday through Friday and even if we were open every night, eventually we would get to a point where because there is no accessibility during the day because it is blocked out for the video production students at MST, that we would start to run into scheduling conflicts. Of course, there are potential safety problems when you have a lot of people crammed into a small space. What we are looking to do is one of two things. First, upgrade the existing facility to expand on a nationally recognized program. We have won several National awards from the Alliance Community Media. We would like to upgrade the equipment to include digital systems that will help to update the vocational training program to address new technologies. Also, afternoons and evenings would then be able to be available for public and private school program needs. Things like teacher training, interactive parent programs, distance learning and ESL training. A separate new facility for public and government would be the second part of what we are looking to do. Space needs would include 8,000 to 10,000 square feet, which is double or triple what we are looking at now. That would include enough office space for present and future staff. If we were to expand, a garage for security of a mobile production van, which is in our plan to build. A classroom area and computer lab, which is a model that a lot of access centers locally, as close as Lowell, they are not just a television station anymore but are a television station that offers computer training to the public. Storage for portable. If possible, a centralized downtown or Millyard location. A lot of people have expressed an interest in that. If possible, space on the ground floor for easy access by the public. We have many people who do not get around that well. They also need to come in to pick up and drop off equipment and we would like to make that as easy as possible. We would like ample parking for all staff and users. Benefits of this are it would allow for expanded daytime and evening use, which is one of the problems we have with our current facility. Daytime use by public/government access. Also, it would allow City department training and staff development to take place in our facility. We would have the ability to create partnerships with area non-profits who would be using the facilities during the day and it would allow the City to use the MCTV facility to build community pride. An example of this is down in Newton, MA their access facility is part of their community center so it is one of many departments in that building where people go to use community resources.

Alderman O'Neil asked so the intent and what I thought the intent had been there for a long time is to continue with the facility at MST and I don't know how many classes you have...

Mr. Vandebocour answered three classes a day and this year about 25 students in each class.

Alderman O'Neil asked does that facility need minimal upgrading.

Dr. Sullivan answered no. It needs real upgrading. It also needs a bigger space. I am spending a lot of time going through and just moving things aside so we keep an egress to get to the door if anything happens so that the kids can get out safely to be honest with you.

Alderman O'Neil asked we are also talking about a separate facility for public and government access, correct.

Dr. Sullivan answered correct because the video kids go from 8 AM until 2:15 PM and then at 2:30 PM you have public and government folks coming in and the people from other schools that want to use it, not just from the public schools but from the private and Catholic schools. We have Catholic school folks on the waiting list waiting to be able to come in. We would like to be able to do things after school with middle school people and elementary school people and the Catholic school people.

Alderman O'Neil stated the additional facility...I have been over there and have either been a guest or have observed shows where the students have actually done the production, manned the cameras and mics and how does that enter into the additional facility or are they going to be limited to whatever is done at MST.

Mr. Vandebocour replied actually I am going to be moving onto the Educational Access Coordinator position so I will be working more with the schools and with the students. I have plans on how I would like to work that out, but I would like to take...Video I students would be spending a lot of time in that facility but in the new facility I would like to have Video II and III kids.

Alderman O'Neil asked and that would be part of their curriculum.

Mr. Vandebocour answered I would work with the teacher that is there already and take them into the new facility and take them to the next level, which when I was a student there I would have liked to have had.

Chairman Gatsas asked can you just tell me...you have some numbers up there with your graphs and can you tell me how many subscribers are in Monterey, CA.

Dr. Sullivan answered I cannot tell you about Monterey. I can tell you about Newton Highlands. Newton Highlands came in in 1991. Our contract was settled in 1990.

Chairman Gatsas asked just tell me how many subscribers are there now please.

Dr. Sullivan answered half of Manchester. They have about 20,000 and Manchester has about 40,000 give or take.

Chairman Gatsas replied so what you are saying to me is that if I just take this number of \$42.65 and I multiply that times 20,000, then they received about \$853,000.

Dr. Sullivan responded right. The year before, we received \$250,000. So, if we were to go to 1991 standards for Manchester, we would be at about \$1.5 million.

Chairman Gatsas asked can you tell me if Newton Highlands has negotiated a new contract.

Dr. Sullivan answered no. They are a year after us. They negotiated in 1991. We were in 1990. They are in 2001. What I am saying is we got \$250,000 in 1990 and Newton Highlands a year later got \$800,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated you are telling me that they have 20,000 today but how many did they have in 1991.

Dr. Sullivan replied approximately half of Manchester's. That is what these numbers are based on. We are looking back 10 years. We don't know what we are getting this year. We know that we got \$250,000 in 1990.

Chairman Gatsas asked how many subscribers did we have in 1990.

Dr. Sullivan answered 35,000 to 40,000. Newton Highlands had approximately half the amount of subscribers that we had. I went over these figures with Tom O'Rourke from Continental Cablevision who was at MediaOne and is now at Fidelity. I cannot tell you how many in Monterey or Petaluma. Newton Highland is one that really sticks with me because \$250,000 we got in 1990 and they got over \$750,000 so by 1990 standards it was \$1.5 million that Manchester should have gotten.

Chairman Gatsas asked are you aware of the contract that they negotiated in Goffstown.

Dr. Sullivan answered I know what Goffstown negotiated 10 years ago.

Chairman Gatsas asked do you know what the new contract is.

Dr. Sullivan answered I have no idea. I have not been thinking about Goffstown. I work for the City of Manchester and I think a lot about Manchester.

Chairman Gatsas asked so Newton Highlands, MA is something you just threw in there.

Dr. Sullivan answered no. This is nothing that I threw in. In terms of being a qualitative researcher, I don't do a lot of throwing in to be honest with you.

Chairman Gatsas asked but you did not look at Goffstown.

Dr. Sullivan answered I did not look at Goffstown because 10 years ago they got 10% of what Manchester...Goffstown said we are 10% of the population of Manchester so we will take 10% of what Manchester got. That is what I know happened 10 years ago with all due respect, Mr. Chairman. Now it is Jason's turn.

Mr. Cote stated the next section is funding or a dedicated percentage of cable gross. The original intent of the 1984 cable act allowing charging of franchise fees was to fund PEG access. Examples of guaranteed fully funded facilities are Hanover, Goffstown, Newport, Londonderry and Boston. A majority of the PEG access centers across the country use this model for funding. It allows for dedicated source of funding that is given to a separate but tied to operational structure with a board of directors reflecting all constituencies. It guarantees the existence of MCTV throughout the life of the contract and guarantees that local television will always exist in Manchester. It concerns us due to the fact that WMUR was just bought out by a company and might become a satellite station, which means that a lot of the operations will come out of Boston now and won't come out of Manchester, NH. It just worries us that a lot of things are coming in and you don't have a dedicated source. Now we move on to...this chart expresses MCTV's funding at 1%. This is at 1%. We are currently being funded through the FY01 fiscal budget at 2%. This is not a guaranteed funding. I just want to express that in any given year throughout the life of the contract the Board of Mayor and Aldermen can cut or eliminate MCTV funding. That is their option. Without guaranteed funding whatever Board and I am not saying that any of you would but there is always that possibility. That is a scary situation. If you look at the chart itself, at 2% we are still exactly even with the lowest bar on that graph. We are even with the lowest and not even close to making it towards the middle.

Dr. Sullivan stated I am just going to finish up with operations and I know that the Mayor has established a separate committee, chaired by Wayne Robinson and there are a couple of us from School who are on that and for the management structure we are going back to this plan. We are going back to this community

wide assessment. Separate but tied to a non-profit organization. Establish a governing board which represents city, schools, business, non-profits, religious organizations and the general public. We do not have a board that we can go to. We set policies. We write policies and go to the School Board and they approve them or not, but we don't have a separate board that oversees us so what happens is we don't have a board that can set community standards or could set appropriate hours of programming that could help us with doing things like when we have to reprimand people in terms of behavior and I am not saying that anyone needs to be reprimanded but we are just employees. We are not a board. We are not elected officials and we would like to be able to have a governing board that represents the constituencies in this City.

Alderman Pariseau asked what is wrong with this Committee.

Dr. Sullivan answered that is fine.

Chairman Gatsas asked have you ever brought something forward with some sort of structure to anybody.

Dr. Sullivan answered yes we have. We brought this plan forward.

Chairman Gatsas replied I am looking at the management structure. That doesn't tell us...have you come to this Committee looking for that or have you talked to the Mayor about that?

Dr. Sullivan responded we are part of the School District and we have policies and procedures where we go to the School Board. We had policies revised back in the fall and there were a lot of issues having to do with freedom of speech and I spent the summer taking a course in First Amendment rights but I really believe when I look at the majority of places throughout the country that having a board that oversees us that can report back to the funding source...that is just a recommendation.

Chairman Gatsas stated I don't think this Committee or any Aldermen and maybe I should just speak for myself but I certainly don't believe at any point and I think you and I have had lengthy conversations and I told you whatever you thought was the best avenue to operate that department is what you should do because you certainly have done a good job. I haven't seen anything in the past seven months that you have brought to this Committee regarding suggestions of what you would like to do that somebody could either tell you yes or no. My suggestion would be if you could put something down and make a suggestion of how many people you would like on that board I don't think that any member of this Committee or the Board would be opposed to that.

Dr. Sullivan replied to be honest with you, I think this is the committee that the Mayor has established and we have put on paper because we looked at different...Tom Arnold has been at the meetings and we have looked at different structures.

Chairman Gatsas stated I think to make your life a lot easier we need to expedite matters a lot quicker here so that everybody is on the same page and there is a little bit more of a comfort level so that it gets done. Things seem to take an awful long time when they shouldn't to make people's lives a lot easier and a lot less aggravating.

Alderman Pariseau stated Dr. Sullivan I have been under the impression after all of these years that you are, shall I say, the department head of MCTV.

Dr. Sullivan replied I am a Director of MCTV.

Alderman Pariseau stated but you are the department head. If you are looking for disciplinary actions by this Committee or any other Committee, that should be your job as far as being the head of MCTV. There is no structure?

Alderman O'Neil stated to the best of my knowledge, you report to the Superintendent of Schools.

Dr. Sullivan answered yes, I do.

Alderman Pariseau stated well you can make recommendations to the Superintendent of who to can and who not to.

Dr. Sullivan replied this is a very delicate situation.

Alderman Pariseau stated there is no discipline in the School Department.

Dr. Sullivan replied that is not true. I wouldn't say that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I do recognize that there is a group lead by Wayne Robinson working on the structure regarding what is in the best interest of all parties going forward, but I would be interested in and if I understand right, Dr. Sullivan, you have done some research on how other communities have set-up these governing boards. I don't think I would be stepping on anybody's toes if I at least asked for that information and then I could voice my opinion one way or the other regarding what I think would work best for Manchester.

Dr. Sullivan stated we have been working on it all summer long. That is one of the projects that we are working on. Marc, do you want to answer that?

Alderman O'Neil replied I don't want you to have to go through it tonight, but if at the end of the week you could send me something and I don't know if the rest of the Committee members want it.

Alderman Pariseau stated it should be sent to the whole Committee.

Chairman Gatsas asked where are we at for completion.

Dr. Sullivan answered the committee is going to meet Friday at 10 AM and I will tell you we did make a recommendation.

Chairman Gatsas asked, Mr. Robinson, when do you think you will complete this project.

Mr. Robinson answered I would hope by this Friday. I am hoping for some closure. We have two more options on the table.

Chairman Gatsas stated I know that this Committee will call for a special meeting so that we can put this to bed.

Alderman O'Neil asked does in fact this governing board or whatever the structure may be need approval by both the Board of Aldermen and the Board of School Committee.

Mr. Robinson answered I would like to defer that question to the City Solicitor. I think we are talking about a legal issue.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated it depends on the recommendation that they make. I think the recommendation that looks the strongest at this point of a trust and a separate non-profit organization would be approved just by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. That is not to say that you might not want the School Board's input at some point since they have an interest in it.

Alderman Lopez stated first of all I want to thank you for allowing the other Aldermen to participate. I have been with this Committee ever since you addressed the cable contract and I can tell everybody publicly that you were very generous in letting us participate and do a lot for MCTV that hasn't been done in the past. I am curious about one aspect and maybe Wayne can answer this. When you say you are writing things and it certain goes to Alderman O'Neil's question,

did you get any type of policies from other locations throughout the United States regarding the structure of their board and the policies to present to the Board.

Dr. Sullivan replied we have been giving that information to Wayne's committee. He has asked us for information and we have gotten some from Lowell, Prince William County...we have huge packages of information.

Alderman Lopez stated I would like to see those policies because I think it is very important that we don't reinvent the wheel or we are not dictating here in Manchester certain things.

Mr. Robinson replied that is no problem.

Chairman Gatsas asked you don't have a problem sharing that information with the rest of us.

Mr. Robinson answered not at all.

Mr. Vandebocour asked can I address a question that Alderman Pariseau was asking. The reason why we were looking for the board situation is when there are three individuals trying to make a policy, we are so involved in the situations around the station that it is almost like you become blind to the situation itself and it is good to go to a Board and be able to say please help with the problem and be able to talk to them because they have a better view of what is going on.

Alderman Pariseau asked have you as policy setters looked at the possibility of having non-elected officials on public television. It is getting to be ridiculous.

Chairman Gatsas answered let's not go there. Dr. Sullivan, you don't have to answer that question.

Dr. Sullivan replied then I won't use my freedom of speech on this. The last thing in the cable contract is even though we really believe that it would be important to have guaranteed designated funding for the life of the contract or any cable contract, whether it is with AT&T or RCN or whoever is coming in, we would like to have language in the cable contract designating MCTV as the access organization of record if we were in the contract, whether or not it is designated funding at all. If it acknowledges us.

Chairman Gatsas stated the City of Manchester will be the lessor on that contract. Let's just go back to your funding for a second. I think you came to the full Board at one time with a budget and correct me if I am wrong because I am sure you

know your budget better than I do but I think you came to us with somewhere in the vicinity of \$420,000.

Mr. Cote replied \$409,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated and I think in that contract you had somewhere in the vicinity of \$60,000 for lease space. Is that correct?

Dr. Sullivan answered \$70,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated I believe the Board funded you \$350,000.

Mr. Cote replied \$325,000.

Chairman Gatsas stated it sounds like we did that because you were staying in the space you were at until there was an organizational period. I don't think anybody on this Board is trying to shake their position with MCTV or change anything. I think you were funded three extra positions. Whatever you asked for for equipment was totally funded. I think that the issue of lease space certainly would come up in the next budget cycle to put you into a position that once the funds were allocated for equipment and renovation costs that they would provide that certainly it would be taken into consideration for you. I don't think anybody on this Board has ever said that MCTV shouldn't exist or that we should reduce the funding. Basically, I think the funding you received is in excess of \$120,000 from what you have received in the past. Now the funding that you received was based on different numbers than what you were supposed to get while we were negotiating this contract because we are still under the same numbers as we were for the 1990 contract. So, we have given you more money in the first three of four months of this contract than you would have received if we would have left you tied to the contract that we are currently in from a funding basis.

Mr. Cote replied we do not deny that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen have done a wonderful job. \$325,000 minus the amount for lease space was what we came and asked for and we are not denying that. We are worried about the situations that could come up in years to come. Chairman you can tell us that the Board loves MCTV and...

Chairman Gatsas responded let me tell you that the citizens of Manchester love MCTV and whether it be this Board or any future Board, if they ever decided to cut funding to MCTV if they think that the public participation wouldn't have half the City in here complaining that the funding is gone, then I don't think you folks are giving yourselves the pat on the back that you deserve. I would say that a

majority of the citizens of this City are watching MCTV. I would say to you that I don't think any Board is ever going to try and reduce the funding.

Dr. Sullivan replied I would hope that they would love us at 5%, but 2.5% is good, Alderman.

Mr. Cote stated one quick question getting back to the facility. You did mention that the money for a facility lease was cut due to our not knowing what is going to be happening. At this point, do you have...has anybody brought any ideas forward...is there a City-owned or will there be a City-owned space that we might be able to fit into or are we looking at...

Chairman Gatsas replied how about if we wait until we get the organizational structure cleared up.

Mr. Cote responded well it is just a question of depending on where we are going determines how much of that capital equipment may be needed just to put in an HVAC system or put in walls or to put in electricity so in terms of our planning of what equipment we are going to buy, it really does help to know where we are going to be putting that equipment in advance. That is the only reason I ask the question.

Chairman Gatsas replied I think you will be pleasantly surprised with what you get and the funding the way it has been structured.

Dr. Sullivan stated so we have 40 people on the waiting list. Can we tell them that we are going to get a bigger space?

Chairman Gatsas replied I am not at this point going to make any suggestions on what you should tell people and what you shouldn't. I would think that you start people because the funding is there to do what you need to do. If you were in that space for the next six months because of not being able to find new space, I don't think you should put the burden of you not starting new people on because of this.

Dr. Sullivan responded no. We are going to do that because we have new people coming in.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to make sure I am clear on this and I thought I asked the question before. The intent all along has been to have two facilities, but the primary facility will be the new facility and we will continue to have the tie at MST and that will continue to be the classroom for the kids, etc?

Dr. Sullivan replied right. I would like to see, like the van should be a shared resource between both facilities. Again, if you want to give me enough money for three vans, we will be happy but I have a feeling we are just going to be able to afford one.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to make sure that I am clear on this. We are talking about having MST plus another facility somewhere.

Mr. Vandebocour replied we are also going to upgrade the MST facility because it is in very bad shape. We are going to upgrade it to digital capabilities and that will be one of the finest educational facilities for video when we are done.

Dr. Sullivan stated that to me is a real commitment for us. A lot of projects that are being done are being done by students. The event that was done when the Vice President was in town was done by three high school students.

Chairman Gatsas stated thank you for the presentation.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 14 of the agenda:

Note to Committee: Awaiting report from Traffic Director relative to cost of putting poles at three locations, recommendations for nominal fee to hang banners, and clarification on what size and type of banners can be hung per action of 5/16/00.

Mr. Lolicata stated we started off with one location and I now see that we are up to three. Basically, Jim and I came up with the best price from Highway Tech, which I spoke to you about at the last meeting. I am up to \$7,606 for somebody to install this. That is just at one location. That is \$5,606 plus \$1,000 for each foundation. These are 25' strand poles, galvanized which you could paint black. We were thinking about a location on Hanover Street. Based on that, you could put up a regular Glendi sign say, which is not mesh, and these strands would hold it. We are talking about 16' across and 8' high. I wouldn't go any bigger than that. That gives you a 17' clearance. Whether you want the City to pay for something like this for all of these people from races to Glendi is up to you.

Chairman Gatsas asked do we charge for banners currently.

Mr. Lolicata answered no. I don't charge. I have done some favors and put them up to help people out. They usually have to install it themselves.

Chairman Gatsas asked how many banners a year.

Clerk Bernier answered approximately 12.

Alderman O'Neil asked have you identified the three locations.

Mr. Lolicata answered we originally started off with the West Side and Hanover Street and City Hall I am trying to get away from but I would say the West Side near MacGregor Street and Hanover Street and Veteran's Park.

Alderman O'Neil asked the cost of \$7,600 is per site or per pole.

Mr. Lolicata answered per site.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if we are talking about three we are talking about roughly \$21,000.

Mr. Lolicata answered that is correct. Years ago we didn't allow these at all and then all these things came about and we put them up there and it was nice but I can't put anything on Elm Street anymore because there is too much. If you would like to think about one location, that is up to you.

Chairman Gatsas asked when you are talking about Hanover Street, you are talking about Hanover and Elm.

Mr. Lolicata answered I was talking about up above actually. Hanover and Elm I consider City Hall, which I am trying to stay away from because that is the windiest part.

Chairman Gatsas asked are you talking closer to Chestnut Street.

Alderman O'Neil answered between Elm and Chestnut.

Chairman Gatsas asked the archways that are right next door to us here on Stark Street, is that what you are talking about.

Mr. Lolicata answered no.

Chairman Gatsas asked would those be sufficient for you to do what you want to do and is it less expensive to do that. Certainly, they are much more decorative.

Mr. Lolicata answered I don't know what these cost out here, Alderman, and I don't know the thickness. I am going to say probably not. I didn't have anything to do with the ones on Stark Street.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't think the ones on Stark Street were cheap by any means. They were so expensive that they didn't even put the lights in them. Those were supposed to have lights in each one of them.

Mr. Lolicata stated the poles I am talking about are designed for 90-MPH winds.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think Tom should get together with Frank regarding Stark Street. I think we need to do some research and I don't know who should do it, on what is the proper location for these things. Do we want it at the entrance to the City? I don't know. Is Hanover Street enough? Is Elm Street where they belong? I don't know. I think we need to do a little bit of research on how many we need and where they belong.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to table this item.

Chairman Gatsas addressed Item 15 of the agenda:

Note to Committee: Awaiting preliminary report from Solicitors regarding a communication from Atty. Ciandella - state of telecommunications infrastructure describing various approaches which can be used by the City to address these issues.

Alderman Pariseau asked why is this here.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated I got a letter from the Committee with a 26-page part of materials that Atty. Ciandella put together for a presentation he was making asking for a preliminary report. I, unfortunately, was unclear as to what the Committee was looking for in terms of a preliminary report. I have reviewed the materials and they appear to deal with the history of cable franchising. My guess is what was of interest to the Committee is there was reference to a court case, the Rochester case, dealing with real estate taxes on utilities.

Alderman Pariseau stated that was the stuff that was in the Board of Aldermen agenda one time and it was just received and filed.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied it was referred to the Committee.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file this item.

## **TABLED ITEMS**

16. Communication from Alderman Hirschmann requesting the Board adopt a new policy mandating that before any construction project passes through the Finance Committee the Board is made aware (in writing) of any fiscal impacts to future budgets.  
(6/1/00 Tabled – Finance to prepare form)

This item remained on the table.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to remove Items 17 and 18 from the table at the request of the City Clerk.

17. Communication from Kevin Clougherty, Finance Officer relative to a revised policy and procedures manual.  
(Tabled 4/18/00 pending more information from Finance)
18. Ordinance:  
    “Amending the Code of Ordinances of the city of Manchester to provide that the Committee on Accounts shall order the audit of City accounts and shall select the auditor and that the auditor shall report to the Mayor, by deleting section 35.017 subsections (Z), (AA) and (AB) and adding a new section 35.031.”  
(Tabled 6/22/00 pending information from Finance.)

Clerk Bernier stated Item 18 will be addressed in the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration so you can receive and file that.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O 'Neil it was voted to receive and file Item 18.

Alderman O'Neil asked how do all of these account matters end up before us.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered they got referred here originally.

Alderman O'Neil asked how.

Clerk Bernier answered there is a close relationship between the Committee on Accounts and the Committee on Administration.

Chairman Gatsas asked what are we going to do with Item 17.

Clerk Bernier answered that is going to be addressed in the Committee on Accounts also.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to receive and file Item 17.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee