

## COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

**December 15, 2009**

**3:00 PM**

Chairman O'Neil called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O'Neil, Arnold, Pinard, Osborne

Absent: Alderman Garrity

Messrs: T. Brennan, T. Arnold, T. Clougherty, P. Capano, J. Angell, T. Clark

On motion of Alderman Arnold, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to recess to meet with legal counsel.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Dr. Thomas Brennan, Superintendent of Schools, requesting approval of all expenditures related to the renovation of MCTV studios, if available.

Chairman O'Neil stated thank you for your patience. Dr. Brennan, we invite you to come up. I know you provided a handout to the Clerk, which everyone should have in front of them.

Dr. Thomas Brennan, Superintendent of Schools, stated as indicated in the material that you received, I am seeking approval to pay for work that was done for the upgrade to the MCTV studio and, if willing, to authorize the expenditure for the incomplete project. Within the packet of information, you have work that has been done to date as well as the work that is being considered for future renovations for that site.

Chairman O'Neil stated Tom, I want to make sure we have our dollar amounts correct. The amount of work done to date is what? The things we have received invoices for?

Dr. Brennan replied we have received invoices for a total of \$107,856.55. That would be the initial work that has already been completed. To complete the work we would be looking for an addition of funds totaling \$28,000, which would bring the total cost of construction up to \$136,000. As you can see, the total work is \$107,000. There is also a fee regarding the administration of that work for total work in place and CMP of \$114,000. We have already authorized the payment of \$19,000. Before it can be mobilized or remobilized, we would need \$95,327.95.

Alderman Pinard asked is the figure that you gave us a complete figure for the job to be completed?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir. On the last page in the packet, you'll see that the total amount to be paid would be \$136,988.62.

Alderman Osborne asked is there any final payment that is going to be held back before this is going to be finished? What is held back—10%, 20%?

Dr. Brennan replied approximately 10% by the construction manager.

Alderman Lopez stated you mentioned a figure of \$28,000 to complete the project. Is that in addition to the \$136,000?

Dr. Brennan replied it is \$136,000 total, sir, to complete the project. When you include the total work that has been done to date, plus the construction management fee, that figure is \$114,000, less the payment of \$19,000. What they are saying is, for them to remobilize, they would need at least one check of \$95,327.95. In order to complete the project they need a total authorized value of \$136,988.62.

Alderman Lopez asked the \$28,000...just so I know where the Committee is going, are we approving the completion of the work by approving the \$136,000 instead of what has already been spent?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir.

Alderman Lopez asked are you making the recommendation that the work be completed?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, I am.

Alderman J. Roy stated the monies for this project were set aside several years ago. Correct?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir.

Alderman J. Roy asked is it a capital account?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir. It is in a separate account.

Alderman J. Roy asked is there enough money in there to cover this?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, there is.

Alderman O'Neil asked what account was that first payment of \$19,000 paid out of?

Dr. Brennan replied it was paid out of the reserve account. Nothing came out of the general fund.

Alderman Osborne stated I want to crossfire the 5% that we are talking about. None of that is the 5%?

Dr. Brennan replied from my understanding, this was all a special account. It was an initial grant that was awarded for approximately \$432,000. That is the account that this would be drawn down from.

Alderman Lopez asked do you directly supervise MCTV?

Dr. Brennan replied I am responsible for...

Alderman Lopez interjected who directly supervises?

Dr. Brennan replied Dr. Grace Sullivan.

Alderman Lopez asked is Dr. Grace Sullivan only accountable to you?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, sir.

Chairman O'Neil stated I'm going to ask the City Solicitor to read a suggested motion. I want to make sure that the dollar amount should be \$136,988.62. Is that correct?

Dr. Brennan replied that is correct.

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated the proper motion would be to authorize a payment to AW Rose totaling \$136,988.62. The authorization of this payment is not a waiver of the City's right to terminate this agreement under any

applicable reason specified in the agreement. It is not a ratification or approval of any past payments that have already been made for this construction or renovation work. It is merely an acknowledgement that there is a contractor who has performed substantial work who should be paid.

Alderman Pinard made the motion to authorize a payment to AW Rose totaling \$136,988.62. The authorization of this payment is not a waiver of the City's right to terminate this agreement under any applicable reason specified in the agreement. It is not a ratification or approval of any past payments that have already been made for this construction or renovation work. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Arnold.

Chairman O'Neil stated this will go to the full Board tonight. My recommendation would be that we take no further actions beyond that, pending the investigation by Mr. Buckley that is currently going on.

Dr. Brennan asked with the audit?

Chairman O'Neil replied correct.

Alderman Osborne asked that's less 10%, right?

Dr. Brennan replied yes, there is a hold back.

Alderman Osborne stated you mentioned the \$136,988.62, less 10%. You are going to hold back 10% until it is finished?

Dr. Brennan stated yes, they are.

Chairman O'Neil asked but is the total amount still that number?

Dr. Brennan replied if all the work is completed to satisfaction, then that total amount needs to be paid.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Arnold, it was voted that the Committee take no further action until the audit report has been received by Kevin Buckley.

Chairman O'Neil addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Communication from the Highway Department regarding a recommendation on Excavation Permit fees.

*(Note: Referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on November 24, 2009)*

Chairman O'Neil asked does everyone have the packet prepared by Highway? Tim, I don't know if you have a formal presentation or just some points you want to go over.

Mr. Tim Clougherty, Deputy Public Works Director, replied I can give you a brief synopsis of what the thought process was behind the excavation permit fee recommendation if that pleases the Committee. The Highway Department has oversight on all of the rights of way. That includes sidewalks, any boulevards between sidewalks and streets, as well as streets. Any contractor wishing to perform excavation within that right of way must obtain an excavation permit from the City which would necessitate proper insurance, bonding and a \$200 fee. The \$200 fee covers our administrative costs, which includes the cost to process the permit, engineering evaluations that may come up, as well as the inspection to ensure that all of the City standards are met as outlined in our specification for road, drain and sewer construction. Whenever a roadway is excavated degradation occurs. I think that anyone who drives down one of our City streets...if you recognize what a new patch or an old patch looks like, especially an old patch, you'll see that a very substantial portion of the poor condition of any roadway exists primarily because of excavations that have occurred at sometime in the past on that roadway. That is exactly what this policy attempts to correct. The degradation fees will attempt to recover the costs due to pavement degradation over the long course. Basically, anyone who wants to cut into our City streets currently...say it is a ten by twelve space to cut a valve into a natural gas service for a single family residence would be \$200. If you go down North Commercial Street there is a large trench about 1,000 feet long. That was also \$200. The gas main extension that was recently done on Blodgett Street runs for several City blocks and that was \$200. This policy attempts to recover some of the costs that are a result of the degradation of that roadway over a long period of time. We've done some research. This isn't an uncommon occurrence. There are several cities across the country where it is becoming very common. Most recently, the city of Concord, New Hampshire has adopted such a policy to try to recover some of the costs associated with fixing these roadways. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Arnold stated I thank you for the communications that you have sent me off the record to help me better understand what this is about. I wonder if you wouldn't mind tell me where the rates and fees that you proposed originated from. The \$5 per square foot of paved and then \$1.50 per square foot of unpaved area...is that something you got based on what other towns and cities are doing?

Mr. Clougherty replied it was a combination of a couple things. I was asked a question by Alderman Arnold yesterday on this agenda item and I forwarded to him the package that should have been distributed this evening. There was one typo in the memo, but other than that, it is the same. Basically, we looked at fees across the country using the American Public Works Association as a gauge to see where these fees should be. Then we did our own empirical analysis. You can see in the package that there is an excavation permit fee calculation. That substantiates the \$200 and shows you how we arrived at the \$200 administrative or inspection fee. On the following page, it shows how we arrived at the \$5 per square foot roadway degradation fee. There we looked at some of the projects that we bid out over the past two years, looked at the cost per square foot for gravel as well as laying pavement and resetting curbs and things like that. We summarized the ancillary costs, general conditions if you will—Police detail, mobilization, engineering testing, traffic control—and came up with a cost per square foot. We have empirically derived the number that we came up with. Consequently, Concord came up with a similar number. I think it was just a little bit less than \$5, but I think they are calling it \$5. It might have been \$4.60 or something like that.

Alderman Arnold asked off the top of your head, how many roadway excavations do you expect in any given period?

Mr. Clougherty replied there are roughly 700 excavations taken out annually.

Alderman Arnold asked if we don't have the excavation degradation fees implemented, then the City is still footing the costs for the degradation at some point?

Mr. Clougherty replied that's correct.

Alderman Arnold asked by implementing the excavation degradation fee, the burden is being assumed by whomever is responsible for the excavation?

Mr. Clougherty replied that's exactly right. These degradation fees would be intended to supplement existing and future funding for road construction.

Alderman Lopez asked how are you including the Police in here?

Mr. Clougherty replied on the bottom of that page, the miscellaneous costs, we assume the detail.

Alderman Lopez asked you are not indicating that \$.27 is going to come out of there? You're just indicating a \$5 charge, but not the \$.27 that will come out of the Police detail.

Mr. Clougherty replied no. The Police detail would essentially be unaffected moving forward. We're saying that there is a cost associated with having a Police detail when the roadway is excavated.

Alderman Lopez asked where did you get the number \$50.23?

Mr. Clougherty replied I believe that is the rate that is currently being charged as of January.

Alderman Osborne stated over the years I have been noticing that on different streets where they have been dug up, some streets are a lot worse than others. What is the ratio, if they have dug up one block for gas or water, of deterioration of the street? We have to resurface this. That's a lot more money. What is the age of something like that versus something that has never been touched by any excavation at all? If you were to take one block and dig it up in six different areas over the last 30 years, isn't it costing the City more money because they come behind you all the time? It happens all the time when a street is just paved and they are suddenly digging it up again.

Mr. Clougherty replied according to the American Public Works Association, the estimated reduction in the life of payment can be as high as 60%.

Alderman Osborne stated it is more of a burden to the taxpayer than the people who are doing this to run their business whether it is bringing gas to a home or whatever it might be. The taxpayer is eating up that portion a lot more than the \$200 charge for you. That's not figured in, so how do you figure something like that for the future?

Mr. Clougherty replied right now we don't. That's why the policy is sitting in front of you. Without putting words in Alderman Arnold's mouth, I believe that was the point that he was getting at. Right now, the burden is being placed on the taxpayer or whoever is providing funds for the roadway resurfacing and restructuring.

Alderman Osborne stated I used to get mad at that all the time. I know it has to get done, but a nice tarred street and all of a sudden they are digging it up in three or four sections.

Mr. Clougherty stated we're in a cycle right now that would have us repaving and resurfacing streets around a 40 to 50 year cycle. The recommendation is more along the lines of 15 to 20 years, so this will help us get closer to that.

Alderman Osborne asked there is no notification from utilities letting you know three months ahead of time that they are going to be doing something? They don't bother with that?

Mr. Clougherty replied I wouldn't say that. We do work closely with the utilities, including city-owned utilities. However, when we do a roadway resurfacing there is a three year moratorium. When we do a restructuring there is a five year moratorium, but sometimes there are issues, such as a break in a gas line, and we have to allow them to excavate the street.

Alderman Osborne stated well, I can see that if it is an emergency, but I've seen it happen.

Mr. Clougherty stated after those five years, we don't have a lot of teeth in our regulations that allow us to recover any of the costs associated with the damages that are done to the roadway by the excavation.

Alderman Osborne stated you've taken in most of the long term things. In other words, large borders they have that are going to be renewing on the street...If it is an emergency they don't need notification at all.

Mr. Clougherty stated I don't think they have to provide us with notification for emergencies.

Alderman Osborne stated I'm more worried about the others.

Alderman J. Roy stated Tim, you mentioned the five year moratorium. There is a policy right now that if someone gets permission to open up a road, not under an emergency, that they have to close that road in a different manner. There is a different method to matching the pavement together. Is that right?

Mr. Clougherty replied I'll let our Chief Inspector Peter Capano answer that.

Mr. Peter Capano, Chief Inspector, stated indeed, that is correct, Alderman Roy. We have a couple of different methods that we can use. One of them is an infrared to let the patch sit during the winter and try to loose the seams by heating them up and blending the patches together. We can ask for an entire overlay of a street given the length. One that works pretty well that I use on occasion is to come back after a period of time, say six months, and mill out an inch and a half around and drop new surface pavement into it. That tends to last and ride a lot better.

Alderman J. Roy stated the reason I asked that question was because you piqued my interest. I'm wondering if the road degradation is different if a road is within

that five year moratorium versus one that isn't. Is there a difference in degradation?

Mr. Clougherty replied there is. What we are saying is that anytime the roadway is excavated, there is degradation that is going to occur, regardless of the methods that are used to rehabilitate that road. The quality of the rehabilitation will certainly affect the quality of the road, but merely the fact that you are cutting into the roadway causes degradation.

Alderman J. Roy stated my next question would be, is it appropriate for us to put a policy in place that makes them adhere to that higher standard all the time with the excavation fee so that it will maintain our roads for a longer period of time?

Mr. Clougherty stated I believe the subjectivity that exists in the current policy allows us that latitude. We take a look at the condition of the existing roadway before we enforce things that are more stringent than are otherwise necessary.

Alderman Pinard stated I'm looking at a picture here. On Merrimack and Lincoln Streets there has been a hole there for months. I travel there every night after the Board meetings. Is there a time limit for a construction company, after they dig a hole, to come over and patch it properly? I think Alderman Roy probably knows the one I am talking about because it has been there for a long time. Is there a time limit that the Board should set up for the construction people?

Mr. Clougherty replied there are time limits that are recognized in our current policy and we do our best to enforce those policies. We recognize that during the construction season, a lot of the utilities might have a lot of patches out there and it is not economically feasible for them to have a patching crew going out to do three patches. I think they try to hit them when they have multiple patches. If you have specific instances where you know a patch has been deficient for a period of time, please give us a call and we can make sure we are following up on it.

Alderman Pinard stated I thought I would bring it up because I travel that after every meeting and it seems to me that it has been there for months.

Chairman O'Neil stated Alderman Pinard, for the record, can you clarify the intersection that you were talking about?

Alderman Pinard replied it is in the street between Merrimack Street and Manchester Street. I think Alderman Roy knows exactly what I am talking about.

Alderman J. Roy stated just north of Merrimack Street they took a piece of equipment out, a pressure regulator that used to whine all the time.

Chairman O'Neil stated I have a couple of questions, too. Any idea what the projected revenue might be? If it is in your letter I missed it.

Mr. Clougherty replied in the package, we have projected revenues from 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010. They would be anywhere from \$379,000 in 2007 to \$979,000 in 2009.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is my understanding that the intent of this would be to go to a dedicated fund for resurfacing. Correct?

Mr. Clougherty replied that would be our recommendation. Of course, that would be up to the BMA.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is my understanding that we have done one of these previously and up until this year we adhered to it. That had to do with auto registration.

Mr. Clougherty stated it is our understanding that a certain portion of auto registrations are intended to go to roadways. How that statute or provision is interpreted is best done by the City Solicitor.

Chairman O'Neil stated it is my understand that up until this year we did not fund resurfacing in the Public Works budget.

Mr. Clougherty stated that's correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated I think we need to be cautious of that fact that we tried this dedicated route before. I think it has generally worked up until this year. We need to be cautious of that and make sure it goes towards its intended purposes. This is more an editorial than anything else. This is a pass through. You are going to pay it in the utility bill. Kevin walked me through a great example when I had to get my sewer replaced a couple years ago. I didn't pay. The excavator contractor paid a permit of \$200. If we use that same excavation today under this proposal it would cost \$500. Most likely, there was a markup at the time, but my wife and I were more concerned about getting our sewer replaced. I'm sure the plumber marked up the cost along with the excavator. It is a pass through. We're all going to end up paying for it somehow. Peter, you talked about the existing criteria for when you can require them to overlay or you talked about another technique where you come back in the spring. Is that something at a later date that you could share with the Board? Does it have the teeth that the department needs?

Mr. Capano replied yes, I think so. Like most regulations, there is a clause in it that says we reserve the right to make up the rules as we go. I think it is there.

Chairman O'Neil asked am I correct that in the past that previous director, Frank Thomas, has withheld permits when contractors have fallen behind with meeting their obligations?

Mr. Capano replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked is this time sensitive for you folks? Does it need to go to the full Board tonight or can it wait until the January meeting?

Mr. Clougherty replied we would prefer that it goes to the Board soon rather than later, but of course, that is up to the BMA.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to send this item to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

## **TABLED ITEMS**

5. Policies and procedures for compliance with Red Flag, State Statute and Payment Card Industry requirements submitted by Jennie Angell, Director of Information Services.

*(Note: Attached is a letter from Jane Gile, Human Resources Director, regarding the Sensitive Information Policy and Program. Tabled 11/9/09. Updated information from Jennie Angell on December 1, 2009 has been attached.)*

On motion of Alderman Arnold, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Chairman O'Neil stated Jennie has been before us for a couple of months and is looking to get approval to get going on some of this training. Can you give us the Cliff's Notes version of what we are trying to accomplish?

Ms. Jennie Angell, Director of Information Services, replied after the last meeting, you asked me how much time these trainings were going to take. We went back and developed a curriculum for the standard user on all the items we feel we need to cover to figure out how much time. It includes things like email and what to do with email, what not to respond to, where to put your files and what type of data they are. We're covering a lot of different things and we're estimating that it would take about an hour and a half per user. We would like this to be all computer users. This would put us in compliance, as I said last time, with state and federal statute and PCI requirements for credit cards. I know that there is concern that we are taking employees out of their work place for an hour and a half. First off, we will work with department heads and work around their schedules. I'm guessing it will take about six months to get through everyone. There are a couple

things happening and I want to give you some examples of why we need this training. In some ways, this training can help the employee and save them time, so it is not all lost time. They could become more efficient. I know most of you read about the emails that happened over Thanksgiving weekend. It wasn't 600,000, but we sent out over 400,000 emails. That was a very specific thing that happened that caused those emails to go out. It was in that training curriculum that I put together. That was a user error that caused that. I have another example of something that happened today that can help to save City resources. There was an email that came out from someone, of course they are not suppose to send this kind of email, but if no one has told the employee they are not going to know. It was something about dogs that needed a home. The employee sent the email out to everyone. We have 1,000 email accounts. Someone responds to everybody and then someone else responds to everyone. There were five responses to this email that shouldn't have gone out to begin with. When you add up the time of all 1,000 people opening up and reading this email, we lost one full time equivalent of one week for the email. If you don't tell the employees what is appropriate and what isn't appropriate you can't hold them accountable. This training, while there is a cost to it for the City and their time, I think there is a value in the long run and we'll gain more time. I'm asking for the ability to train the employees.

Chairman O'Neil asked before I entertain questions from the Committee, wasn't there a second part? Weren't you looking to train the trainer?

Ms. Angell replied yes. We are looking at two different types of users. We have the general user and that is the hour and a half. In each department of the City we also have what we call a security administrator and they are the people who are authorized to tell us who should have access to what. We would be looking to give them a little more in depth training. Those are the people who we would train to know what to do if there are incidents and give them a little more information on the statutes. That would take about an hour. At minimum, it would be one person per department unless they wanted an extra person.

Chairman O'Neil stated that is not a bad idea.

Ms. Angell stated that would be up to the department head's discretion.

Chairman O'Neil asked would you be okay with having it passed as two people from each department?

Ms. Angell replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated if you have an illness or extended vacation it could be anything.

Ms. Angell stated it is recommended that there is at least one back up security administrator.

Chairman O'Neil stated I know we had a number of presentations and I know you consolidated them.

Ms. Angell stated yes, a data security program. There are a lot of programs that would cover state statutes and payment cards so it makes sense to take them together because the policies overlap.

Chairman O'Neil asked would that include the credit card?

Ms. Angell replied we are going to introduce the credit card, but the credit card has a whole long list of things. We only have a few departments doing credit cards so we are going to single them out and do credit card training just for them. As departments are adding credit cards, we will address those as they come in.

Chairman O'Neil asked do you have a ballpark hour timeframe for the credit card training?

Ms. Angell replied we haven't done up the curriculum, but I'm guessing it would be about an hour.

Chairman O'Neil asked is that something you could forward to the Committee? I think we should approve it today, but keep the next Committee up to date.

Ms. Angell stated it makes sense to do the credit card training for those who need it.

Alderman Arnold asked the security administrator/manager for each department, is someone currently assigned that task?

Ms. Angell replied we have a security administrators group and we have been doing this from the very beginning. Every department has at least one and a back up. The larger departments have multiples. Those people are the ones who are authorized to give access to so and so. If you lose your password and call me and say that you need to get on...for example, for the Board, Matt Normand is the security administrator and I have to talk to him before I can do anything.

Alderman Arnold stated there is already someone in each department.

Ms. Angell stated it is updating. We are updating where the rules are now and we're accustomed to it.

Chairman O'Neil stated correct me if I am wrong, but all general computer users will get standard computer training, which is an hour and a half.

Ms. Angell stated yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked this whole thing is going to be coordinated so that we don't have whole departments away from performing their functions?

Ms. Angell replied we will work with the departments.

Chairman O'Neil stated the Committee will also recommend that two staff members from each department will be trained as security administrators. And that is an hour training program?

Ms. Angell replied yes.

Chairman O'Neil stated the director should be allowed to move forward on credit card training and she will update us as the curriculum is developed.

Ms. Angell replied I will.

Chairman O'Neil stated we will report this to the full Board tonight.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Arnold, it was voted to have general computer users go through a training program and security administrators also go through a training program, with two members from each department being security administrators.

6. Communication from Jennie Angell, Director of Information Services, updating the Committee on the current status of credit card acceptance and requesting a recommendation from the Committee on moving forward.  
*(Tabled 11/9/09)*

On motion of Alderman Arnold, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Osborne moved that the Information Systems Director proceed on credit card training and keep the Committee updated on curriculum progress and come back with a RFP. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Arnold.

Ms. Angell stated we are not looking for the Board to authorize any expenditure of money and I think you kind of voted on it, but we are looking for your nod that you want us to pursue credit cards. If you say yes, Finance will work on getting

out an RFP. At this point, we don't know all of the costs and all of the issues until we put one out. We want to know that this is the direction that you want us to go. Before we do anything that could cause any contractual agreements for the City or expenses to the City, we would come back to the Board.

Chairman O'Neil stated this is to allow you to go through the process and see what is out there. Before anything is committed to, it comes back to the Board for approval.

Chairman O'Neil called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Ms. Angell asked will this go tonight?

Chairman O'Neil replied it can. Would you like it to?

Ms. Angell replied that would be great, so we can start in January.

7. Recommendation from Matthew Normand, Acting City Clerk, regarding a policy for street closures and license events.  
*(Tabled 03/16/09)*

This item remained on the table.

8. Communication from Thomas Clark, City Solicitor regarding a Naming Rights Policy.  
*(Note: Referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on 2/3/09. Tabled 03/16/09)*

This item remained on the table.

9. Communication from Barbara Potvin, New England Sampler, requesting the City hold a public forum to discuss the process of closing off city streets and the impact that these closings have on local small businesses as well as the benefits drawn by the City of Manchester and its local citizens.  
*(Note: Referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on 10/21/08. Tabled 11/24/08 recommendation to be submitted by staff)*

This item remained on the table.

## NEW BUSINESS

Chairman O'Neil stated I know the Clerk has an item. I think we need to go into non-public session. Tom, what would the motion be for the taxi cab license?

Mr. Thomas Clark, City Solicitor, replied yes, it would be for non-public. It should have the specific section from the Charter. It is 91-A: 3 II (c), matters which discussed in public would adversely affect the reputation of any person, member of a body, or agency itself.

As required, a roll call vote was taken to enter into non-public session. Aldermen O'Neil, Arnold, Pinard, and Osborne voted yea. The motion passed, and the Committee entered non-public session.

The Committee returned to public session.

Mr. Clark stated the recommended motion is that the City Clerk reissue the taxi license discussed in non-public session, including the conditions stipulated in that discussion.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted that the taxi license discussed in non-public session should be reissued with the stipulations discussed in non-public.

Alderman J. Roy asked will that go to the Board tonight?

Alderman O'Neil replied that does not have to go to the Board. We would like to thank Alderman Pinard for his many years of service on the Administration Committee.

Alderman Pinard stated it was a pleasure and an honor to serve with you as Chairman of this Committee. I think in the three years I have been with you and the members of this Board, we have accomplished honest policies. I would like to take the opportunity to thank the City Clerk's office for looking over me. The age is there, but there is a lot of respect. It is a lot of fun and I'm going to be missing this. I thank the people of Ward 6 for supporting me for all these years.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Arnold, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee