

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

August 30, 2010

6:00 PM

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Lopez, Osborne, O'Neil, DeVries, Corriveau

Messrs: Mayor Gatsas, J. Minkarah, B. Stanley, B. Vigneault, D. Mara,
C. Boyles Lane, T. Arnold

Chairman Lopez addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Communication from the Board of School Committee requesting an expendable trust be established for technology for the School District.

Chairman Lopez stated in talking to Mr. Sanders, he is in the process of reviewing the trust funds that we do have with the School District. I think some of the older Aldermen might know that in 2008 we lowered the trust funds down to \$5,000. We are getting all of that material and that will be coming at the next meeting, so I am asking this to be tabled until the next meeting.

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

Chairman Lopez addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from the Board of School Committee requesting a transfer of unreserved, undesignated fund balance in excess of \$864,617 to the expandable trust for health insurance.

Chairman Lopez stated I am making the recommendation that we go along with the School Board. I have watched the presentation and building up the trust fund and the health fund is going to be major going into 2012. Therefore, I make the recommendation to the Committee to approve this request.

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

Mayor Gatsas stated there was an opportunity by the School Board to bring something forward to full Board, asking this Committee to take a look at the formation of another sub-trust for IT, so that funds could be moved into the IT funding for future years. At this point, there is no money in the budget to allocate for the IT trust fund. They are looking to set up the IT trust fund in case there is any surplus this year.

Chairman Lopez stated Your Honor, this is in reference to the \$864,000 going into the health insurance fund.

Mayor Gatsas stated thank you for the clarification. I apologize. The School Board voted to move those funds into the reserve account for medical. I can tell you that is something that I advocated for, to make sure those funds were there going forward for next year's budget. Also for the \$4.2 million we will be looking for, to avert that clip from happening with the federal dollars that will no longer be available to us in the future.

Alderman DeVries stated Your Honor, I am not sure if you would know the specifics of what they already have in their expendable trust.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think we made one allocation during the course of a year of about \$500,000. This is an additional \$800,000 that came forward. Some of those funds, Alderman, were because of receiving prescription drug rebates. I think we got about \$720,000 over the course of the year in prescription drug rebates. Those now will be coming in on a quarterly basis at about \$90,000 per quarter. So the \$720,000 comes from 2009 and 2010, which were not paid to the School District at the time. Those are just from the arrears that would go into that account.

Alderman DeVries stated the amount of money that was allocated in the budget for the Schools go into...

Mayor Gatsas interjected this is additional funding that came in. It was money that I had found during the discussions of health insurance, and I had the insurance company pay us those funds over the course of last year.

Alderman DeVries asked are you familiar with a rate increase that they had on the school side?

Mayor Gatsas replied I believe they saw a rate increase. Their utilization is much less than the city side so their rate increase was less.

Alderman DeVries stated in your opinion, from what I heard from you, the majority or actually the \$720,000, of the \$1.3 million approximately that is going into the trust fund, is coming from the additional rebates that were captured. It is not because we are charging too much.

Mayor Gatsas stated that is correct. I think a lot of it also had to do with the additional funding that was surplus that didn't necessarily come from medical. It was in the budget as surplus. The allocation of those funds has been designated to go into the medical reserve account for the years coming in the future. It was not medical funds that were surplus. It was actually additional tuition that came in that we allocated to the reserve account.

Alderman DeVries stated thank you for that clarification because I couldn't remember if they could capture the additional line surpluses to go into any of their expendable trusts or if it had to be from a dedicated line.

Mayor Gatsas stated well it is actually additional revenue that came in from other sources.

Alderman Osborne asked does that make it a total of around \$1.6 million?

Mayor Gatsas stated I think it is pretty close to that number, Alderman. I can't give it to you off the top of my head but I think you are very close with that \$1.6 million number.

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

Chairman Lopez addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Request from Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, for approval of the attached draft agreement between the City of Manchester and the International Chili Society for hosting the upcoming World's Championship Chili Cookoff.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman Lopez stated Jay, in my conversation with you, I understood that this is a standard agreement and it went through the City Solicitor but you might want to highlight some things and answer any questions the Committee has.

Mr. Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, stated thank you. This is basically a standard agreement that they enter into with the host communities. The points that you see in here are points that we were aware of. They essentially mirror what was in the Request for Proposals. When we originally made our proposal these were the terms that we did agree to. Of course there are some details in there that we worked out with them, particularly things related to the City's insurance but this is essentially the overall agreement. In a nutshell, we as the host city agree to basically provide the venue for the event and incur the costs of providing what we call the infrastructure for the event: the tents, the staging, the security and conducting the overall event. I would be happy to answer any questions about any of the specifics.

Alderman DeVries stated you were just touching on some of the costs. By this point in time you should have it pretty well narrowed down. What do you guesstimate the actual cost to the City is going to be?

Mr. Minkarah stated right now, our estimates are between \$150,000 and \$160,000.

Alderman DeVries asked is that being covered by a combination of the sponsors?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes, it will be covered by a combination of the sponsors, the admission tickets, beer sales and vendor receipts. We are at about \$85,000 in sponsorships now. We will be clearing \$4.00 a ticket. We estimate around 20,000 to 25,000 people attending the event. That would be over \$80,000 in ticket revenue. We are being more conservative than that in our budgeting but we do figure that we will clear at least \$100,000 between the ticket sales, the beer sales and the vendor receipts. That is fairly conservative. We are very comfortable that we can meet that dollar amount.

Alderman DeVries asked have you had a response on the parking yet? That's dedicated parking going out for sale.

Mr. Minkarah replied we have. I think it has been pretty limited at this point. We put that out fairly recently. There hasn't been a lot of publicity. Brandy could probably clarify but if I recall we have gotten just over \$100 in on that. That has not been a huge response yet. We expect it will build. Posters and some of that information are going to go out probably next week so we are going to start to generate a whole lot more publicity.

Alderman DeVries stated if you could, take a look at the termination clause that has been negotiated. It doesn't seem to have an out if there is, say, a hurricane that causes a cancellation of the event. That is a force of nature.

Mr. Minkarah stated there actually is but it's a little bit further down in your material. Number 14 is a force majeure clause.

Alderman DeVries asked does that mean that we do not have to pay the \$100,000 for the termination if we are not able to provide?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes, if it is a force beyond our control.

Alderman O'Neil stated you mentioned sponsors will generate about \$85,000 and admission about \$80,000. How about the vendors?

Mr. Minkarah replied we are trying to be conservative on our estimates there. I think we will probably be closer to \$40,000 on that but we are estimating we will clear around \$20,000 on beer sales. Again, that is still something that we are trying to estimate conservatively. On vendors we probably won't clear more than around \$5,000.

Alderman O'Neil asked our total expenses are somewhere between \$150,000 and \$160,000?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked is the budget something that you can provide to us tomorrow?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes, I can do that.

Alderman Corriveau stated looking at Schedule A, I have a question about electric generators. Thinking back to the windstorm that we had this winter, I know that was a big topic of conversation. Is it safe to assume that we are okay in terms of how many we have and how many we would be supplying?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes, in fact we were just out on the site this morning meeting with the electrician. We were going over what we have available and there appear to be ample outlets available to us in the park and around the park. There are some boxes that we can tie into. We are very comfortable.

Alderman Corriveau asked on page 5-10, the Infrastructure and Equipment Items, does the City own all of those things or would we be renting these things?

Mr. Minkarah replied almost everything that you see in there, we are leasing. We put out a Request for Proposals to cover all of those items together.

Alderman Corriveau stated okay, thank you.

Alderman Osborne asked Jay, are all liabilities in place for this event?

Mr. Minkarah replied almost. Of course we have the City's coverage generally but we are purchasing a separate insurance policy for the event. We don't yet have that policy but we are working through Harry Ntapolis to obtain that policy. We will be fully covered.

Chairman Lopez stated Jay, I had a conversation with you in reference to approving this contract. Isn't there another contract in reference to parking?

Mr. Minkarah replied there is, if I may bring that up now.

Chairman Lopez stated yes, would you explain that? The Board has already approved it so I don't think there are any major problems. I know one Alderman voted against it but I think it is important that we can move forward with this event.

Mr. Minkarah replied yes, as part of the parking plan that was approved previously, we are going to be utilizing private parking lots. In order to do that, we do need to enter into temporary leases for the three-day event with each of those individual parking owners, so we do have an agreement proposed for that purpose.

Chairman Lopez asked has it been through the City Solicitor?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes, it has.

Chairman Lopez asked City Clerk, do we have a copy?

City Clerk Matt Normand replied we do have a copy.

Chairman Lopez stated why don't we get those out to the Committee and take this item at the same time. I don't think there are any major problems since the Board has already approved the authorization for parking. At least the Committee will have a copy of the documentation. I apologize to the Committee but I told him to bring it in. Jay, can you just highlight it so that we understand it? I think this is probably a standard contract.

Mr. Minkarah replied it is fairly basic. It allows us to utilize the property for the duration of the event. I don't think there is anything there that would surprise anybody. You will notice that there are some attachments referenced. Exhibit A, Premises, is not provided because that is going to be a different one for each of the individual property owners. Again, I am happy to answer any questions and of course Brandy is here also if anyone has any questions on the execution.

Alderman O'Neil asked how many of these contracts do we expect to have?

Mr. Minkarah replied I would actually have to defer that question to Brandy. I don't think it will be more than half a dozen. I think there is some conversation going on right now with some of the property owners, so that may vary between now and then. Brandy could probably answer more specific questions.

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated we expect to be signing these contracts with almost all of the Millyard owners. I would say there are probably about ten of them, maybe a few others somewhere else. I wouldn't say more than 20 and probably a few more than ten.

Mr. Minkarah stated we have had a few parties come forward and offer the use of their lots recently. We expect we will probably enter with those downtown lot owners as well.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we contracting with a parking operator?

Ms. Stanley replied that was part of the initial plan. One of the problems that we have is that we are going to be operating a number of parking lots that are in the Millyard and some of the others ones that have offered their services. We simply don't have enough people. We will need some help. We are asking the charities to provide volunteers to help as well. At this point, we don't know exactly how many people we are going to need but we do know that we are probably going to need some help.

Alderman O'Neil asked so we are not hiring a company?

Ms. Stanley replied yes, we would be if we needed additional help over and above what we have on staff. We think we are going to be operating about 30 parking lots that are mostly in the Millyard. I have 20 people on staff and that is a little bit difficult to operate that many lots with the number of people that we have on staff.

Alderman O'Neil asked how are we procuring a parking operator?

Ms. Stanley replied what we are doing right now is talking to all of the parking operators that operate in this area. We anticipate the contract is probably going to be a little bit less than \$5,000 so we will get quotes according to the procurement code.

Alderman Osborne asked the additional insurance will be in place before this is all executed?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes.

Alderman DeVries stated Brandy, I see that we are responsible for losses and damage on the lot. How are we establishing a baseline? Is someone photographing? Is that overkill?

Ms. Stanley stated it is not overkill. What we are planning on doing is attaching that under the contract under premises. We are actually going to put the tax map with an outline of the parking spaces that we are going to have. On as many as we can, we are going to walk the lots with the property owners on Thursday night or Friday before we take over, so we know what condition the lots are in. We are certainly going to take some pictures.

Alderman DeVries stated item 5, Promotions, says the host shall undertake commercially reasonable efforts to promote throughout New England and New York State. What is commercially reasonable?

Mr. Minkarah replied essentially we take that to mean what we can realistically afford with our budget. We have been in close consultation with them as to what our plans are. We certainly are not going to be doing any television advertising, although hopefully we can get some assistance with WMUR. We do have radio station sponsors so we will be doing radio promotion throughout New Hampshire and at least into Massachusetts. I think our reach will go a little bit into either side of New Hampshire as well. We are going to have a billboard, which should be going up shortly on I-293. We have our website up. We are doing social media and we will have posters and other forms that are going out. That is consistent with what the document calls for.

Alderman DeVries stated it looks like because they are specifically calling out New York State, that there may be an expectation. Are you clarifying that with ICS to make sure that our understanding is the same as theirs?

Mr. Minkarah replied it is certainly my understanding that we have done that but we will continue to clarify that. We will have some reach to New York State. We will have some reach outside of New England, especially through the west. Of course most of our concentration is going to be closer to the event.

Alderman DeVries stated the conversation that you are having seems like it could be right because it is all verbal for conflict. I am wondering if there should be some detail of the expectations of both sides or something that is penciled. The same way that we are initialing the liability or the termination clause to be sure that we have perfect clarity as to who is responsible for the \$100,000 if we don't fulfill the expectation of ICS. It seems like there should be also a little bit of detail. Why wouldn't you want that?

Mr. Minkarah replied we certainly could attach a schedule that outlines our marketing plan, which I think would cover that, where we specify what we intend to do.

Alderman DeVries stated I think it might be helpful.

On motion of Alderman Devries, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the contract for the International Chili Cookoff, with the agreed upon attachment for the Promotions section of the contract.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Corriveau, with Alderman O'Neil voting in opposition, it was voted to approve the contract for additional parking in private lots for the International Chili Cookoff.

Chairman Lopez addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, requesting approval of a recent amendment to the Manchester Development Corporation (MDC) By-Laws.

Chairman Lopez stated I think this is very important. Alderman Long and I both sit on the Manchester Development Corporation (MDC). I was not able to make it to the meeting. I think Alderman Long was there. Jay, can you give the principal reason as to why we have to do this?

Mr. Minkarah stated originally this came about due to the Chili Cookoff. We had approached the State Division of Tourism out of DRED (Department of Resources and Economic Development) to see if we could get some assistance and out-of-state promotion by applying for a JPP grant. The JPP grant is basically a matching grant program to do out-of-state promotion aimed at tourism. We discovered as a municipality, we were not eligible to apply. Only non-profit corporations that have out-of-state tourism promotion in their mission can apply. For those reasons, we approached the Manchester Development Corporation and asked if they would be willing to amend their mission statement, which is of course focused on economic development, to essentially add that line so we would be eligible. Of course this is not just for promoting this particular event but for any wide variety of marketing efforts that we do out-of-state, this would allow us to apply for those matching grants through the MDC.

Alderman Corriveau asked assuming this is approved by the next meeting of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, the MDC can immediately apply for JPP grants with DRED?

Mr. Minkarah replied yes.

Alderman Corriveau asked is that the intention?

Mr. Minkarah replied that is absolutely the intention, yes.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Corriveau, it was voted to approve the amendment to the Manchester Development Corporation by-laws.

Chairman Lopez addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from Mayor Gatsas requesting the Committee review the correspondence from the Finance Department regarding disputed Aviation/City Business P-Card purchases and make a recommendation.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to discuss this item.

Chairman Lopez stated we have received a lot of correspondence in reference to this particular item. The bills have already been paid. There was some misunderstanding to a degree. I would like to have this received and filed at this time and if situations like this come up, the Airport is to notify the Committee

through the Mayor. If the Mayor disagrees with what is going on, that will come before this Committee and give them an opportunity to readdress some of the things that the Enterprise systems has versus what the regular departments have.

Alderman DeVries stated I think I would like to hear from the Airport Director. Where does this leave us as far as the particular charges?

Chairman Lopez stated the charges have already been paid. It is a question of after the fact, were the policies complied with or not.

Alderman DeVries asked the motion to receive and file will not disrupt the finalization of those charges?

Chairman Lopez stated that is correct. It will still have to go through the Mayor's Office and if there is a disagreement they will come before this Committee before they spend the money.

Alderman DeVries asked in the future?

Chairman Lopez replied yes, in the future.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to receive file the correspondence from the Finance Department regarding disputed Aviation/City Business P-Card purchases, with the understanding that in the future the Airport Authority is to notify the Committee if there is a disagreement with the Mayor before money is spent.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to applaud the Airport for their work on the strategic plan including the senior staff. I thought it was nice work done. Congratulations.

Chairman Lopez stated thank you very much for bringing that up, Alderman O'Neil. I had a note here. It slipped my mind. Maybe some of this documentation that the Airport has can be given to the HR Director. There is a lot of information in here that I think the other department heads in the City could probably tweak a little bit and get some value out of it. It talks about interviewing and types of questions that you can ask. I would like the Airport Director to work with the Human Resources Director and assist them in going over those documents.

Chairman Lopez addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Mayor Gatsas requesting the Committee conduct a review of the Mayor's Senior Luncheon and propose any future changes deemed appropriate.

Alderman Osborne stated I would like to make a motion to hold the Senior Luncheon annually in June, at a \$3.00 charge.

Alderman O'Neil asked is the \$3.00 reasonable today? Locking into a price...

Chairman Lopez interjected Barbara, why don't you come up and address the Committee. So that the Committee is well aware, I did attend a Senior Services Commission meeting. They discussed this particular issue. They had some of their own ideas and I would like Barbara to share them with the Committee.

Ms. Barbara Vigneault, Senior Services Director, stated we did discuss the Senior Luncheon. One of the things that we talked about was that it would probably be advisable to have one per year and that way we could spend more time making it a bigger and better dinner. We may be able have better prizes and get the community more involved and perhaps be able to do more fundraising to help with the cost. When we discussed the name change, we also thought that there was one point that should be brought out. The name change would probably affect the prestige of the event. Calling this event the Mayor's Senior Christmas Luncheon or the Mayor's Annual Senior Luncheon has a little bit more prestige, so people are more likely to want to attend with a prestigious name. That is something the Commission wanted the Board to take into consideration.

Chairman Lopez stated the Commission did vote on this at the meeting that they would prefer to have the name be the Mayor's Annual Senior Luncheon to keep the prestige and entice people to go. The Commission also voted, at the meeting that I was at, that they have one luncheon a year. They could probably get 1,500 to 2,000 people there. Like you said you would be able to get more prizes. The Aldermen can participate a lot more and more information can be dispersed to department heads. Just so the Committee members know, once they start those conversations, the conversations drive around the fact that once they have the spring luncheon, then they start working on the Christmas luncheon. Around Christmas time a lot of the high-rises start booking parties and the VFW has parties, so that is why one event per year came up.

Alderman O'Neil asked Barbara, I apologize if I missed it but has there been any discussion by the Commission regarding the price? I know in the Mayor's letter he indicated that \$3.00 is not going to sustain the event. Is there any feedback on that?

Ms. Vigneault stated we did have feedback. The Commission felt that a slight increase in the fee would be appropriate because it hasn't been raised since... I believe Mayor Stanton's terms were the ones that increased the fee from a donation of a good to a monetary fee. It has been that way since. I do believe that it is probably time to increase it and I don't think people have a problem with that, especially if we make it bigger and better. They will be getting more for their money. I don't think a slight increase will be a problem. I think the Commission felt the same way when we discussed that.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Osborne, you had included that the price remain at \$3.00 in your motion.

Alderman Osborne stated I figure we leave it at \$3.00. We are going from two events a year to one event a year. What is the admission, about 500 people?

Ms. Vigneault replied right, between 500 and 600.

Alderman Osborne stated I don't think that going up \$1.00 or \$2.00 is going to make a big difference. I think if you keep it at \$3.00 you will find that more seniors appreciate it and I think we can substantiate that a little bit where we have been substantiating it for who knows how long, twice a year. I would like to see it stay at \$3.00 and take it from there. As far as the name you can stick Mayor in there, the Manchester Mayor's Annual Senior Luncheon. That is up to you people.

Chairman Lopez stated the point that I would like to make on the \$3.00 is the fact that, I know myself and there are other Aldermen who probably do the same, I usually buy about 30 tickets and give them out to senior citizens. A lot of companies do that as well. In talking with the Commission, correct me if I am wrong, they agreed that the price should go up. That was their recommendation, so I want the Committee to know that.

Alderman Osborne asked what is the price? They say go up. Go up to what?

Ms. Vigneault replied it is \$3.00 currently. They discussed around \$5.00, which would be a \$2.00 increase.

Alderman Osborne stated seeing Alderman Lopez is going to be buying 30 or 40 tickets, I think we should go up to \$10.00.

Chairman Lopez stated that is fine too. Another point that you make, Alderman, I think the Aldermen have to be a lot more involved. That gives the whole year to get the Aldermen involved and use our resources to help senior citizens have a good time. I can remember when I was on the Parks Commission there were some cases where we had 1,500 to 2,000 senior citizens at these functions. The last time we had the function there were around 400 in attendance, correct?

Ms. Vigneault replied correct.

Chairman Lopez stated I think it will be great to hold the event once a year.

Alderman Osborne stated I agree with that. I would like to see the rate stay at \$3.00.

Alderman O'Neil moved to hold the Mayor's Annual Senior Luncheon once a year at a \$5.00 charge. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated I realize we can change this any year when it comes back to the Committee. I guess what we are saying is that this was operating at a loss and has been operating at a loss of thousands of dollars for the last few years at least. You would like the opportunity to bridge that gap. Will you come back to the Board and advise us? I wouldn't be locking you into a price at all though I would be very disgruntled if it did climb much above that \$5.00 level. I would prefer it at \$3.00 myself.

Ms. Vigneault stated we help administer the program but the Mayor's office has authority over this program. We don't have authorization over the funds. We help with the fundraising but that is also within the realm of the Mayor's office. They are involved in that. They do a lot of that. They send out the letters. Each administration has been different, so it really depends on what you get in from the community to help substantiate that cost. The \$3.00 is really a token of something that the seniors are giving because of their appreciation. It is something they are giving back. From what I hear from them, they want to do that. They feel good about purchasing their tickets, so it isn't something that they are not willing to do. They are very understanding of that issue.

Alderman Osborne asked do we have any figures here at all?

Ms. Vigneault replied yes, in the packet.

Alderman Osborne asked what are we short? If the price stayed at \$3.00, what would it cost us?

Ms. Vigneault replied you need twice as much money as you have in the account in order to break even. Coming down to one event per year will help meet that, of course. Also getting the community involved and getting more fundraising capability over a year. Companies are asked sometimes twice a year. Asking them once a year, they may be better able to give to an annual event versus a semi-annual event.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have heard from the Director who spoke on behalf of the Commissioners as well, that \$5.00 is reasonable. I believe they sought some input from those that attend and again they believe \$5.00 is reasonable. We know it is loss money. It can't be sustained under \$3.00. We are not doing the seniors the proper service by continuing to lose money.

Alderman Osborne stated I think what we are talking about here is \$1,000 or under that \$900 maybe, with 450 people attending at \$2.00 a piece brings it to about \$800 or \$900. I don't think it is a good gesture to put out there right now until we find out exactly what's going to happen after this first time around. I think we should leave it at \$3.00. That is my suggestion.

Chairman Lopez stated I am going to support the motion of charging \$5.00 only because the Commission and the Director did study this. The motion is \$5.00 for the Annual Mayor's Senior Luncheon.

Alderman O'Neil moved to hold the Mayor's Annual Senior Luncheon once a year at a \$5.00 charge. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. Aldermen Osborne, Devries and Corriveau voted in opposition. The motion failed.

Alderman DeVries stated what I see as the deficit is not going to be made up with a \$1.00 or \$2.00 increase. Certainly we need to work with you to try to come up with other sponsorships. I think that is the action that should happen. \$3.00 is a token purchase and \$5.00 annually might be a token purchase for some. It may be a breaker for others but it is not going to close the gap of the deficit that you are seeing, which is up to \$7,000. Alderman Osborne is absolutely correct. Let's work with you to find some sponsorship and to do this properly once a year. If it doesn't work at \$3.00 and if we aren't able to come up with sponsorships, you will be back in front of us. I am sure you will. I am hoping that once a year is a charm for you.

Chairman Lopez stated I think it is a mistake but the vote was three to two, so that is fine. The Commission has agreed to it as well. Barbara can tell you but they had a dinner there just over a couple months ago and I think everyone paid \$10.00. Is that correct?

Ms. Vigneault replied yes.

Chairman Lopez asked how many people did you have in attendance?

Ms. Vigneault stated the one that you are talking about was during the day and there were about 133 people in attendance.

Chairman Lopez stated there were no problems whatsoever with the price. The seniors are not the problem here, believe me. I wish that someone would reconsider here and go along with the five Commissioners that spent 45 minutes on this subject and support them and the Department Head. Is there any consideration of this? Seeing none, the vote is three to two. I would like a minority report sent to the full Board.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted that the Mayor's Senior Luncheon be held annually and the charge be \$3.00.

Chairman Lopez addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Communication from Alderman Arnold regarding tax exemptions for individuals.

Chairman Lopez stated I have had some discussion with the Alderman and I asked him if he had any problems with me tabling this at this time because we are in conversations with the Assessors. With the Assessors in the situation they are in, I want to give them some time to completely understand the tax exemptions. Therefore, I am asking for this to be tabled.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to table this item.

Chairman Lopez addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. Communication from Matthew Normand, City Clerk, regarding a proposed Municipal Banner Policy.

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

City Clerk Normand stated this draft banner policy too comes out of preparations for the Chili Cookoff. As the Committee is aware, the Board approved two banner poles being added to Elm Street. Banner requests throughout the City have been recurring to this Committee, specifically Hanover Street. The Committee has struggled at times to determine which banners are up and who has made requests. I think the hope is that this banner policy would create a more effective administration process of those banners. As attached here, there are a number of guidelines. I researched many communities across the country and tried to boil down those policies to present something here tonight for the Committee to consider. I would point out that on page 10-7 are the application fees for the three banner locations in the city. There is a price. I am well aware that the Committee had received and filed a previous request from an Alderman to assign a fee for Hanover and Kelley Streets at the time. This is put here to bring to the Committee's awareness that there is a cost that is borne by the City on these banners when they are hoisted and removed. The cost is approximately \$120 in labor costs borne by the Highway Department. Those figures that you see there are for no other reason than to bring that to the Committee's awareness. Of course, if the Committee chooses not to charge for this, that is certainly their prerogative. I am not aware of any insurance that is presented at this time. This process would now schedule these banners. The City would receive a copy of insurance covering each application and as I said would hopefully make more of an effective application process.

Chairman Lopez asked who would do the scheduling?

City Clerk Normand stated as it is written today, the applications would come through the office. We have requested in this proposal a six week lead time, so that would allow us to get it before the Committee on Administration. The Committee on Administration has all power to review and either approve or deny each banner, similar to the policy that we have now, today. What I have seen in other communities is an actual calendar right on their website that has them scheduled and lets people viewing the website know exactly which banners are where and during what times. This would allow for a two-week hanging period maximum, which would allow for other organizations to participate.

Alderman O'Neil asked Matt, is there anything pending that we need to approve this for?

City Clerk Normand stated I believe the Chili Cookoff committee is working on a banner and again that was related to those two poles that were just added to Elm Street. Certainly, this Committee does not have to act on this policy. They have approved them before in the past, for the 15 years that I have been here, so it doesn't require a policy.

Alderman O'Neil asked we have already voted on approving the banner for the Chili Cookoff, correct?

City Clerk Normand replied I believe so.

Alderman O'Neil stated I like the work you did here. Honestly I haven't had a chance to look at it in any detail but if there is no need to approve it tonight, I would like to look at it.

Chairman Lopez stated there is a fee associated with the request. If we table the whole thing tonight then there won't be a fee for the banner.

Alderman O'Neil asked for what banner?

Chairman Lopez stated I don't know when the poles are going up. Does anybody know that?

City Clerk Normand stated I believe they are up or they will be shortly.

Chairman Lopez stated the point that I am making is that is the poles are up, there won't be a fee structure in place. If we are going to table it, I would like to see what the fee structure would be.

Alderman O'Neil stated the Chili Cookoff could make a donation in lieu of the City having the fee set up.

Mayor Gatsas stated I think those poles are going up within the next week so that the banner can be up at least two weeks before October 1st, 2nd and 3rd. I certainly don't have a problem. We can make a donation in-lieu-of to get it started.

Chairman Lopez stated it would be our banner anyway.

Mayor Gatsas stated correct. Well, it would be the Chili Cookoff's banner.

Alderman Osborne stated I think it is going to take some time to come up with these fees. Whether it is one day, two weeks or three days, how are you going to come up with a rate of \$150 for how long? So it will take a little time get that schedule going.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think the work of the Clerk is done.

Alderman Osborne stated you can't charge them \$150 to have it hanging up there for six months. That's what I am saying.

Alderman O'Neil stated the fact that it has no impact on the Chili Cookoff, I move to table the policy.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to table the proposed banner policy.

Chairman Lopez addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Appeal of the denial of a Peddler's License.

City Clerk Normand stated there was a family emergency related to this request so all parties involved are okay with this going to the next Committee agenda.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to receive and file this item.

TABLED ITEMS

12. Presentation by Robert Cote, President of Brattle Consulting Group, Inc., regarding SubItUp.com and its impact on the Manchester Police Department.

(Note: Tabled 04/20/2010; no representative present.)

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to remove this item off the table.

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mr. David Mara, Chief of Police, stated I brought Lieutenant Bartlett with me. He suggested that we get some software program to make scheduling easier. He subsequently got involved with this Brattle Corporation. They came and made a presentation to us. They proposed that they were going to make us the first police department to try this software. It is at a very low cost of \$50.00 a month. For the patrol division, it does our rosters and also if somebody is making a swap with somebody or somebody is on a vacation day or personal day, it will come up. This would eliminate doing the scheduling by hand. I guess Brattle Corporation had sent some correspondence to the Board of Aldermen about making a presentation. The reason I gave you that email is because you had asked me earlier in the spring what we thought about the program. I asked our captain in charge of patrol to check with all the officers in charge and ask them how they felt about it. He summed it up in that email. The email, in his opinion and in my opinion, is still accurate. It is helpful. There are some bugs that still need to be worked out. We are getting cooperation from the company to do that. At this point, I am not willing to say that I would recommend it. They are a very helpful company and if we have a problem they do respond quickly.

Alderman O'Neil stated I met with the gentlemen back in the springtime. I think this is a great service. They are a Manchester-based company. Their offices are on Elm Street. I think we should be taking advantage of everything we can do with them. I think the costs are minimal. I hoped that maybe the Fire Department could use this as well as the scheduling of Parks. I am all in favor of this. I hope it goes beyond the patrol division, Chief, if there are other opportunities to use it with details or whatever. I hope that we would take full advantage of it. I think the president relocated back here too. I think he is a native from Manchester. I think anything we can do with this company, has my full support.

Chairman Lopez asked how long would you like to evaluate it, Chief?

Mr. Mara stated I would like to go the rest of the year. I can tell you to get something like this from another company, an established company that has been doing this, it would be considerably cost prohibitive. It is an opportunity for us. Like I said, there are some bugs but I am very pleased with the way they respond to our concerns.

Chairman Lopez stated my recommendation is that we table this and get a report at the end of the calendar year.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to table this item with a report to come from the Police Department in December.

City Clerk Normand stated the Solicitor has informed me that there is somebody here for item number 13.

13. Communication from Connie Boyles Lane, Orr & Reno, regarding the Effluent Supply Agreement between Manchester and Granite Ridge Energy.

(Note: Table 04/20/2010, awaiting an update from the City Solicitor. An updated agreement from the City Solicitor is attached.)

On motion of Alderman Osborne, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to remove item 13 from the table.

Ms. Connie Boyles Lane, Granite Ridge Energy, stated Granite Ridge Energy has an effluent agreement with the City of Manchester that dates back to 2000. They recently went through a refinancing. Their lender has requested that the City of Manchester consent to the financing. I have been working with Tom Clark in the Solicitor's Office to come up with a consent, which I think you have before you. Essentially what the lender would like to know is that the City knows it is around and in the event of default that the lender can step into the shoes of Granite Ridge Energy.

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

Alderman DeVries stated when this was before us previously, Attorney Clark knew that I had some concerns with the way the requirements were on the City to provide a continued flow, if you would, of effluent coming from the sewerage treatment plant. There were some damages or other responsibilities for the City. I apologize, I didn't pick up that there was a change in this to have read that. Maybe we can just try to bold that in our tabled items in the future so that we know we are dealing with it.

Ms. Boyles Lane stated the contents of the effluent agreement were not really being negotiated, the substantive agreement. All that was before you was to consent to the fact that a lender is coming in and in the agreement itself it anticipates that the City would consent in that event. So the substantive terms of the effluent agreement were really not being negotiated.

Alderman DeVries stated my concerns were we are undergoing substantial upgrades at the treatment plant. My concern was that we wouldn't be able to fulfill the terms of the agreement and why would we want to reenter into a new agreement if we thought that there was going to be a break of our ability to

continuously supply? Has anybody had that discussion? I just don't want to see us sign on the dotted line and incur an expense for the City when the opportunity is before us to avoid it.

Ms. Boyles Lane stated this agreement does not anticipate any of that and I have never heard anything about that piece, the issues that you are raising. All this agreement does is say that in the event of default by Granite Ridge, if the lender took over and stood in the shoes of Granite Ridge that the City would not object. It really doesn't change the agreement or the terms of the agreement. It wouldn't renew it in any way. It would just continue to exist as it exists now.

Alderman DeVries stated I would still say that we are missing an opportunity to...

Chairman Lopez interjected is this time sensitive?

Ms. Boyles Lane replied yes, we first asked for this in April and have been waiting to come before the Board since that time.

Chairman Lopez asked who have you talked to?

Ms. Boyles Lane stated I have been dealing with the Solicitor's Office and I have been on the agenda for a while but it got pushed back because there were other, more pressing matters before you.

Chairman Lopez asked Tom, why didn't this go before the Energy Committee and why would we approve this tonight?

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor stated I couldn't speak to why it didn't go to the Energy Committee. I could just say that it came to this Committee for approval because it is merely a consent to an assignment. As Connie pointed out, there is no change in the substantive agreement. That agreement remains the same and as a matter of fact, that agreement itself calls for the City to cooperate in matters such as this in refinancing and agreeing to a sense in pledges collateral.

Chairman Lopez stated that is the reason why we should approve it.

Alderman O'Neil stated there is no change in anything. The effluent is still available from the waste water treatment plant.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Corriveau, the motion carried, with Alderman DeVries being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman O'Neil stated this will be coming to the Board next Tuesday night, so you should be here and you should make sure that Alderman DeVries' questions are answered.

Alderman DeVries stated it is Section 2.1 as well as Section 2.4, Interruption of Service, that I had questions on.

Ms. Boyles Lane asked is there anyone on staff that I should be speaking with?

Chairman Lopez stated yes, Fred McNeill, Timothy Clougherty, Kevin Sheppard and the City Solicitor can help you.

14. Communication from Jay Minkarah, Economic Development Director, recommending that the City enter into a proposed Water Line & Sewer Line Extension Agreement with the U.S. Department of Labor related to the Job Corps Center construction off of Dunbarton Road.
(Note: Referred by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen on 05/04/2010. Tabled 5/18/10 at the Department Head's request.)

This item remained tabled.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee