

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

October 21, 1996

6:30 PM

Chairman Sysyn calls the meeting to order.

The Clerk calls the roll.

PRESENT: Alderman Sysyn, Reiniger, Soucy, Domaingue, Robert

MESSRS.: Tom Lolicata, Richard Girard, Ed Poirier, Ernie Chavanelle, Chief Driscoll, Claudia Lee, Lt. Tessier

Chairman Sysyn called item #19 off the table for discussion.

Communication from Building Commissioner Gaudreault, QM Committee Member, submitting a proposal whereby a policy could be established to allow City employees to utilize at no cost, up to 20 percent of the uncommitted capacity in the City's parking garages and lots such spaces being allocated by the Traffic Department on a "first-come, first-serve" basis.

(Tabled 8/26/96 pending further reports from the Building Commissioner, Traffic director, Police Chief, Health Officer and City Solicitor.)

Mr. Lolicata started by saying that with Mr. Gaudreault help they have established a designated parking area for everyone. The only two lots that are involved will be Pearl and Hartnett St. and we will take care of those leases through my secretary because she usually does them anyway. The garages Victory and Canal maintained by Mr. Waldeck from National Garages can validate and take care of these people. Everything is based upon on these garages is a \$20 deposit for the key to get in or the card. Whenever they are through with it, they can return the key or the card to get their \$20 deposit back. It is a deposit deal, that is all it is. They have room established in the bottom of the Canal Lot he has the 40 spaces at the Victory and Mr. Daniels can maintain and take care of Health. I have already spoken to Mr. Rusczek about that. It will be 4 or 5 weeks down the road getting new cards for them. The Health Department has 40 employees going down to the Center. All total we have been working on this and everybody has been talking

about this for years. This is the best we have come up with so far. It is ready to go I can have this going November 1<sup>st</sup>. I am waiting for Mr. Gaudreault to give me some names to go with those numbers and I will be all set. Mr. Waldeck will need names to go with those cards for the other two garages and the same with the Center of New Hampshire. I would appreciate if they have names so when they come to see Denise in my Department so she can take care of them.

Chairman Sysyn stated that actually there would be no charge to them when they get through with the card. They would get there \$20 back when they return the card.

Alderman Domaingue asked if this was indefinite.

Mr. Lolicata responded that yes it was a \$20 deposit and it was indefinitely.

Chairman Sysyn noted until they are no longer working for you.

Mr. Lolicata added that until such time. If we are squeezed out we will have to make some other arrangements.

Alderman Robert asked Mr. Lolicata if this garage set up does your scenario envision housing parking everybody that wants a parking spot.

Mr. Lolicata responded that it did, they are all sporadic.

Alderman Robert continued by asking what is left over for everyone else or people who come Downtown and utilize whatever they are going to do down here.

Mr. Lolicata said that you first of all you are freeing up parking spaces that they are parking right now. You figure 173 spaces now which are being used right now. That's just for starters. New rates are coming into play, pretty soon you will probably get rid of the employees that are working there and they will start going to garages or other places. That is what is going on behind all this.

Alderman Robert asked hypothetically a couple of years down the road. Maybe this Board decides it wants to add another Department or whatever it wants to do and it need x amount of personnel. Are we ever going to squish some of the people who are looking to utilize the Downtown out or are we going to have to build another garage just to house these people.

Mr. Lolicata responded that my only answer to that is let's see what is going to happen first. Let's get the people back Downtown, let's see if this is going to

work. We need to take this day by day. If this thing works and people start coming back Downtown there is going to be plenty of spaces for them. You are changing Elm Street supposing to a different type of parking. You are going to have employees freed up, hopefully going into the garages or elsewhere to park. We are starting with 173 spaces right now. I haven't got a crystal ball, all I can tell you is hypothetically take it day by day. This might work.

Alderman Robert said he had another question, I would like to see the Downtown area booming, vibrant place to be. Do we have areas to support that vitality that I envision? Can we build a garage or park people someplace?

Mr. Lolicata responded that you could. You have room right now, you can expand on our meters. If a garage ever does come you have the provisions were you probably can build one down in the Millyard that was thought of years ago.

Chairman Sysyn stated that you did not need another garage.

Alderman Robert asked there was one possible site down in the Millyard.

Mr. Lolicata said yes there is something there. It is viable, sure.

Mr. Gaudreault stated that there was a study done several years ago about putting a parking deck over Hartnett, a parking deck over where the Federal Building is there are plans for future parking. This parking for the employees is at the city's whim, if the City needs those spaces we are going to find something else to do. That is the understanding we are going in with.

Alderman Robert stated that you are giving these employees cards and two years down the road you are going to tell them they cannot park there anymore.

Mr. Gaudreault responded that if the City needs the spaces, yes.

Alderman Robert asked if everybody had that understanding.

Mr. Gaudreault answered yes. We know we are going into it this way. This is what we brought forward here. We cannot be taking spaces were people want to use them. We are using space that is not being used right now. If ever the need comes to use those then we will have to find something else. This is one problem we face every time something changes.

Chairman Sysyn stated to Mr. Lolicata that she did not even know that there was a basement to that garage. It's empty nobody ever uses it and they are also talking

about on the third floor. All the employees that work there park on the third floor, so they are trying to think of some way to rope off in the morning so it would leave part of that empty so when customers for Downtown they can park at that level and cross right over. Which would be great for Downtown?

Alderman Robert asked if there would be designated parking spots in the garage.

Mr. Lolicata said that Canal and Victory will be designated in the letters.

Alderman Robert said that the best parking should be for customers that come Downtown.

Mr. Lolicata said that in the letter it will tell them where they can park in the garage.

Chairman Sysyn stated that the basement will be in one of them in garages.

Mr. Gaudreault continued by saying that Level 3A and 3B over at.

Alderman Robert stated that we should not put people in the dungeon but we should reserve the best spaces for the customers that go Downtown.

Chairman Sysyn asked if there was any more discussion.

Alderman Domaingue stated that she had a few concerns there is certainly legitimate, I hope. If I understand correctly there is 173 people that you are making parking available to them. The average cost in the garage is \$45 a month. They are not going to be charged a single thing.

Mr. Lolicata said that they were going to be charged a \$20 deposit for the card.

Alderman Domaingue asked they are not going to be charged a single thing for monthly parking is that correct?

Mr. Lolicata said that was correct.

Alderman Domaingue continued by saying roughly if she took 170 people times \$45 I get a monthly figure of \$7,650 in revenue that we don't see and hopefully we will see it down the road as business picks up and the average person comes in to work in the City of Manchester and use those spaces. At that time, we will tell these people you are going to give up your space.

Mr. Lolicata responded that they will be back parking at meters again.

Alderman Domaingue repeated that they will be back parking at meters.

Mr. Lolicata continued by saying that they might be going more easterly.

Alderman Domaingue stated that it is quite possible that trying to absorb all of this in fifteen minutes is a bit much for this Committee member. I might feel better about it if I have time to sit down think about and absorb it, but if you are asking for me to vote on this tonight my vote would have to be no. Because I don't like the numbers that I am looking at. I do not like the loss of revenue. I don't like the uncertainty to the employees, I know they want parking. I do not know what is going to happen Downtown with business and if we need those spaces. We are just going dump them back out on the street.

Mr. Gaudreault said forty-five times zero is zero. They are not being used now.

Alderman Domaingue asked if he was guaranteeing that it is going to be zero for the next two years.

Mr. Gaudreault answered that we will move out.

Alderman Domaingue continued by saying why is it zero for a City employee but it's not zero for any other business in Manchester. I think that is a legitimate question. I know my constituents are asking me, particularly in light of the auto registration fee. They are asking me whether or not the City provides free parking for their employees because they now have the registration fee tapped on to the registration bill to help pay to fix up the garages. I am not saying that I would not come to the same conclusion you have obviously come to. I am just saying that you are not giving me enough time to be able to look at what you have provided tonight. This is not enough time for me, Madam Chairman.

Chairman Sysyn noted that this was discussed the last time.

Alderman Domaingue said that she knows we discussed this last time. But we didn't discuss it with all of these figures in front of us.

Chairman Sysyn said that Ms. Johnson would like to address this for a second.

Ms. Johnson stated that she wanted to say something both as a Deputy Clerk and as an employee. Also being a supervisor of employees that have do not have parking, I guess. Ms. Johnson continued by saying that she has seen this come

before this Committee going back to 1988. It has been an issue that has been heavily discussed over the years. The reason it was initially brought in was because of the inequalities in the system. You have Clerk Typist that is being paid a certain amount of money whether they work for City Hall, Parks and Recreation, Highway or anywhere else in the City. You have a lot employees receiving free parking, all of your employees in the School Department, Highway Department, Parks and Recreation they are all receiving free parking. The only ones that are not, are the ones in the City Hall and City Hall Annex and part of the problem is that they take up metered space. The Department Heads or the Supervisors do not want them to lose time so will tell them you can't park at those meters because I don't want you going out to fill the meters all day. Which is illegal, anyway. I think the employees probably support a heavy portion of that as well. You probably will lose revenues in the parking ticket situation worse than you are anywhere else. Some employees are in fact renting spaces in the garages. I have a couple of employees that have done that. There are others that park at the Pearl Street Lot now without a doubt. They are walking from Pearl Street Lot to the City Hall. The majority of them are out there plugging meters or they are parking way out or they are doing something else. While the person who is paid the same amount money at a different department to do the same job supposedly and we know there is problems with the Personnel system itself or at least there has been comments. The whole idea the reason it was brought in was that it is not a fair system to employees. If somebody is asking you are City employees receiving free parking. Yes, they are depending on what Department they work in. That employee that is receiving the free parking versus the employee that is not that is not a fair system at all. It is very difficult to justify that to your employee when the morale is not at its greatest always. The employee will ask why they have to pay \$45 a month that I can't afford to pay when so or so works four block up the street and she doesn't have to pay a thing because there is parking at her building. She gets paid the same thing, the City doesn't compensate need for that. It just puts it in not a fair status, that is why it was originally brought in, John Hoben started the discussion when he was here quite a few years ago. It is not a new subject and I just wanted to point that out for the Committee's benefit, because some of the Aldermen that are here obviously have not been around since 1988, but it has been around that long. I think that Mr. Gaudreault and a few other people have worked very hard to try to get something to present that they felt was reasonable.

Alderman Domaingue said thank you Ms. Johnson. You have provided the best explanation that I have heard yet this evening. Thank you. Who is going to monitor as business grows in the City of Manchester the need for business people to utilize those parking spaces. I need to know where we turn as an Aldermanic Committee and an Aldermanic Board before businesses start complaining. Who

do we turn to and ask if they have been monitoring the situation and do you know how many spaces have been requested and do we need to look at putting these people back on the street.

Mr. Lolicata said that they are computerized at Canal and Victory and they are monitored daily. There would be no problem whatsoever, same thing at the Center of New Hampshire. We monitor the on street parking lots.

Alderman Robert stated that Alderman Domaingue touched on something. Cost should this be something that is provided for free or not. I've known people to work Downtown. I have known people to complain about the same thing we are hearing tonight. These people who have voice the same concerns that we are hearing tonight have to pay. We may be talking about an iniquity between employees but all the people who work in these buildings, the Banks they pay or they ride a bus, or they walk. It costs them something to park. I think that is the overhaul, that is a greater equity that we really should address. It doesn't make sense, it's not fair for people who work down here to do this.

Mr. Gaudreault responded that they are not your employees. You have to start looking at that you are an employer and you have to start looking at your employees. That is two separate items.

Alderman Robert said that quite frankly there are people in this town that feel that people who work for the City are quite well taken care of. Whether you agree with me or not, it's out there and I represent that group of people.

Mr. Gaudreault responded that was fine.

Chairman Sysyn asked if there was anyone else.

Alderman Soucy said that getting back to the issue of the Downtown if we want to bring businesses in the goal to bring them in is to provide people with accessibility. How many times do people say, I would go to McQuade's on Elm Street but there is no parking. If we are moving some of the people from Downtown off even though the businesses might be paying for parking if we are doing something that benefits their businesses. I think we have accomplished something. As long as we have a monitor in place to make sure that we are not occupying spaces that could generate revenue. I do not see where this experiment is not at least worth trying. I think we owe ourselves that at least give it a trial period.

Alderman Robert stated that this is something that we have been looking at for quite a while. We would like to free up the spaces that some of these people are parked in. I'll be willing to give it a shot but I don't want to give it to them for nothing.

Chairman Sysyn stated what if they paid \$20 a year. I pay for my parking but some of the stores pay for their employees to park in those spots. The employer pays the garage, so it's not as if everybody in that garage is paying for themselves, either. Their employer is paying and we are the employer for the City of Manchester for these people that work at City Hall.

Alderman Robert asked Chairman Sysyn is she worked Downtown?

Chairman Sysyn replied yes she did.

Alderman Robert continued by asking if Chairman Sysyn considered that to be a reasonable number. I understanding what you are saying but are we going to have to walk out there.

Chairman Sysyn noted to Alderman Robert that until she had looked at the whole picture she felt the same way he did. As it was explained to me, if you look at it in Ms. Johnson's perspective and everyone else's. If you go to the School Department these people make the same amount of money that these kids do and they do not have to pay to park. They are making \$15,000 or \$18,000 a year. If they have to pay \$40 a month to park. The average salary sometimes is \$30,000.

Alderman Robert asked is that the going rate to park \$40 a month.

Ms. Johnson responded that it was \$45.

Chairman Sysyn stated that you have people who come to the Y that park on the street because they do not want to walk from the garage. They will tie up that parking meter for 3 hours. I almost got into words with a lady because she was mad we put up the meters. I told her why don't you park in the garage that is what we are trying to do. She said she could not walk that far. She goes to the Y to exercise.

Alderman Robert said that he would be willing to discuss other figures. I am willing to do what is reasonable.

Chairman Sysyn recognized Alderman Domaingue.

Alderman Domaingue said that there was two things. Number one City Government is not a private business and as much as we all hate to think to be reminded that we are not a private business. We do not have the luxury to be able to afford those things sometimes. There is no question about the iniquity, I have a concern left that says if I have department people who are making \$45,000 to \$50,000 a year are they taking advantage of the same benefit? If they are I have a problem with that.

Chairman Sysyn noted that some of them have free parking and some of them are paid.

Alderman Domaingue responded that is part of the iniquity. The argument that I am hearing is that a Clerk in the School Department that makes \$18,000 a year. There is a definite iniquity because you are asking the same Clerk down here.

Alderman Soucy stated that there is even a worse iniquity in that the Department Head works this building who makes \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year has a free parking space behind this building. While the \$18,000 or \$20,000 clerk has to pay.

Alderman Domaingue said that she understood if it were a private business I would probably would not think or arguing the point. The fact of the matter is that when we as Alderman turn around to our constituents the first thing they are going to ask is why is City employees can get free parking in the garages. They are going to have a tough time understanding the explanation.

Chairman Sysyn stated that she never had a problem explaining. People would hit me with different things and I said listen to me for five minutes.

Alderman Robert asked if he could toss out another option. You probably know the going rate better than I do. You mentioned \$20 a year, you also said it was \$40 to \$45 a month the going rate downtown. Why don't we go \$20 a month, it's still a deal. It is something I can defend the people who are going to call me about this.

It's splitting the difference.

Chairman Sysyn told Alderman Robert to explain to them that some people get free parking like at the Highway Department, the School Department and Water Works. They all get free parking. There is only this 10% of the City employees that do not get free parking and rest of them do. Is it fair to discriminate against this 10%. I do not know.

Alderman Robert responded he did not know. We ask businesses to commit themselves to Downtown and parking is a Downtown problem. I believe the City has committed themselves to the Downtown.

Chairman Sysyn added that nobody is going to park in that basement where I work. I did not even know it existed. It is empty. If the day came that you had to have it for Downtown parking, then you would have to look for an alternate way.

Alderman Reiniger stated that he obviously thought that one of the goals is to get more employees off the streets to open short term parking for the stores. I do notice that according to the "Elm Street Improvements Study" most of the garages are at 50%-60%. They are wide open. Your empty spaces are not getting any money from any of those spaces as it is. One way the City has to subsidize for Downtown is to have its offices in the Downtown paying some of the rents. It helps to keep some of the buildings going. So you could view this as another way of subsidizing Downtown by giving free parking. By having the employees park in designated places, off to the side that are not utilized right now. I think in the future it would be a different story, if we became Portsmouth or Concord all of a sudden. It could happen ten years from now, then you would have to reallocate the spaces.

Alderman Domaingue said that she would agree to this if they could get quarterly reports on the status of the occupancy of those garages.

Mr. Lolicata said that he could state that for the last year and half there has been no waiting list at Victory. Canal has been under used there are plenty of spaces down there. The Millyard, half of the Millyard is free parking down there now, till the meters go in. Which you are losing a lot of revenue, hopefully, it will force those people up on Elm Street where they belong. These are some of the other issues that we have put up with here, which we are trying to resolve.

Alderman Domaingue asked if he still will be able to bring quarterly reports of the garages.

Mr. Lolicata responded yes he could.

Alderman Domaingue said so we can know where we are with the vacancy.

On motion Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted that the submitted proposal from Building Commissioner Gaudreault, QM Committee Member be accepted and that a quarterly report be submitted to this Committee.

Alderman Reiniger said he had a question. This is not the recommendation from Dave Wallagher.

Alderman Soucy said that this is the packet from Mr. Gaudreault the QM Member.

Chairman Sysyn called a vote.

Alderman Robert opposed the motion.

Chairman Sysyn called the item #13 on the agenda.

Consideration of Ordinance:

“Establishing the maximum fees which may be charged for towing a motor vehicle without the consent or authorization of the owner or operator.”

A letter has been distributed to the Committee in regards to this from Mr. John Meyer.

Mr. Girard stated that on behalf of the Mayor, he said that he would not read the letter that was addressed to him into the record. I would like it to reflect that it was submitted in the minutes and I would like the letter transcribed into the minutes.

Letter Dated: October 7, 1996

To Mayor Ray Wiczorek  
City of Manchester, NH

Dear Mayor,

My son attends St. Anselm's College in Manchester and will be receiving his degree in science in the spring. He recently visited a local tavern, "Duffy's" in Manchester with several of his friends from the school. He made the grave error of parking his car in the parking lot of a closed office building sometime after 11:00 PM that abuts the Duffy's property. Coming out of the establishment sometime after midnight he discovered that his car had been towed by Mobile One of Manchester. Good riddance one might say, "serves him right" for assuming the owner's of an office building, which had closed some seven hours earlier, would allow such parking.

However, this is where the story turns into an effrontery to the good citizens of Manchester. When picking up the car he was told by Mobile One the original tow would be \$50. Sounds reasonable. However, when my son went to write the check for the \$50. He was told there would be an additional \$25. Because his Ford Bronco has 4-wheel drive. (Never mind that the drive shaft was never dropped). When he went to write the check for \$75. He was told there would be an additional \$25. Storage fee for the full day of Saturday, even though the car had not been towed until 11:30 p.m. Saturday night. Becoming upset, my son began to write the check for \$100. When he was stopped and told that there would be an additional \$25. Storage charge for the full day of Sunday even though it was now very early Sunday a.m. (i.e. \$50. In storage charges for approximately an hour and a half of storage). My son having learned patience from his dad, began to write the check for \$125. When he was told that there would be an additional \$25. Fee for a "gate fee" for opening up the gate. Never mind that the people who "owned" the gate were still busy towing college students' cars from Duffy's and other establishments in Manchester.

Having now been forced to pay \$150. To free his automobile from this obvious trap, side by side with the dozens of other vehicles obviously caught up in the same situation, we decided to make a call to Mobile One to discuss the charges. We were told on the phone that, "no one controls our charges, we can charge what ever we like as we file our charges with the Manchester Police Department and they approve of the charges". Sensing that no Police Department in its right mind would approve of this type of disguised thievery we next called the Manchester Police Department. "Kathleen" in the traffic department told us that they recognize this as a serious problem, as they receive many complaints on this situation, and recommended strongly that I write directly to your office. I was told that you office is in the process of pushing for a city ordinance to regulate the towing companies and their outrageous scam on the people of Manchester.

Please understand that I do not forgive my son for having parked in the parking lot of a closed office building late at night. I do, however, take grievous exception to unethical towing companies preying on the unwary, while holding \$10,000. - \$20,000. Automobiles hostage with the "storage meter running" while charging uncontrolled prices. I note that the good citizens of Manchester will surely find themselves paying \$200. - \$250. For tows in the near future unless and until this business is regulated by your office.

The thought also occurred to me that there is no control on the towing company to stop them from towing without authorization from the parking lot owners. My son put it best when he suggested that any "rogue" towing company could make themselves a cool quarter of a million dollars per year simply roving the streets and towing some 20 plus cars every Saturday night on their own. No one at Mobile One presented any information on who called in the tow originally, if at all.

I would be willing to testify or speak to any group that you might choose in order to move some regulation forward on this issue. Please feel free to contact me at your earliest convenience to discuss if I can help in any way.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

John Meyer  
31 Tamarack Circle  
Holden, MA 01520  
Days: 800-468-9993 ext 302  
Evenings 508-829-9226

cc: 1. Board of Mayor and Aldermen  
2. Lt. Michael Tessier  
Manchester Police Traffic Division.

Chairman Sysyn said that she recalled talking about this before that there should be a maximum.

Lt. Tessier said that essentially over the past several years I have received a lot of complaints about private property tows. When we first looked at the issue because of federal deregulation it removed any authority to set fees for private property tows. In January of this year the Federal Government removed any obstacles for us to that because of issues that happened in Seattle and Houston, Texas. We were looking at our fees in Manchester for private property tows and they were substantially higher than those for regular tows and felt there was an abuse there so that was why Mr. Tom Arnold and Deputy Clerk got to together to work on this. To see that we could set fees, the fees that we are looking at here, I feel are consistent with those of the region throughout the State of New Hampshire and Massachusetts which have a statewide fee set.

Alderman Reiniger said that he felt that this was a very good proposal, the towing and the outrageous towing rates in the downtown have been a problem. We have had many complaints and it has been detrimental to business. I think this is a great step and I definitely would support it. I have one question under section 14-120 under the small letter b. It talks about a \$25 per day storage fee, I wonder if we should consider having a maximum of \$100. There have been some people that have had a problem it's been in storage for a week and they are hit with a whopping bill.

Lt. Tessier said that he guessed he would have to bow to City Solicitor's office to see where he stands, if that is viable or legal.

Alderman Reiniger asked if we could do that.

City Solicitor's office replied that if the Committee wishes we could certainly impose a maximum fee.

Alderman Robert said that his concern with this ordinance. First of all looking at this letter they can be carried away. My concern if we impose limits, especially put them in ordinance, over time inflation tends to go up as opposed to going down. We may get ourselves in a situation where we may not be able to get a vendor to do the towing that has to be done. I am just going to give you a for instance. Maybe some of us can identify with it, in the winter time, in my neighborhood parking is a problem. It has been my experience, particularly with the two sided alternative side parking situation. If you have a bad winter you have to keep up with the plowing, and to keep up with the plowing you have to keep the cars off the road. There are attitudes and other things which we have to deal. There is a place to park for everybody who wants to park someplace, in my neighborhood. I have just found to keep the roads open and passable you have to be aggressive. That may mean, and I've told my constituents, look you call me you get towed were you supposed to be parked there. What time do you get off? What time are you supposed to get your car off the road? Get it off, I tell them. I am just concerned that maybe insurance cost or other things may shrink the pool of vendors that may want to do this over time. We may wind up not having this service available to us. I am willing to talk in terms of limiting certain fees, this and that. I would hate to put into a situation nobody would want to do the work for the City.

Lt. Tessier said that when we looked at this, it falls in line with the contract for the Police Department tows. We recently completed a contract period with similar fees for the basic tow and we picked up two more companies this year. This is separate from the City tows, this is non consensual private properties and these are

the same fees that the entire State of Massachusetts has regulated through, I don't know if its Public Utilities Commission or what. That similar type of branch in Massachusetts, the only thing they have incorporated is if they tow over six miles then there is an extra charge.

Alderman Robert stated to Lt. Tessier that he was setting a dollar limit would not that mean that in over time that people would not want to do this work.

Lt. Tessier said that was correct but this is strictly for non-consensual private tows. Basically, it something like in the church lot somebody wants the cars out of there, they have to make arrangements. There is a slew of State Laws that come into play here to as far as proper posting and things along those lines. These are very competitive rates. What has happened, I could bring in reams of letters and complaints where we have had fees in the \$200 area for a tow. That was on private property and we have someone standing in front of a gate at 1:30 in the morning when they come out of an establishment trying to get there car. Having to come up with \$200 and a check just does not make it. I think that is just a little bit outrageous as far as that goes.

Alderman Robert said that he had no problem controlling it to an extent because I think I have an idea how they work. I hate to lock this in an ordinance. Could we as an alternate maybe set a scale or have it periodically reviewed by the Police Commission and they could change the rate as they see fit. I just want them to be able to do what they are supposed to do. I do know people want to work for the City. They want the Cities' business, but I would hate to see over time all of them would say it's not worth it and I do not want to do it.

Lt. Tessier stated that these are not for the City though, these are for private businesses who contract them.

Chairman Sysyn said that these are for private lots like Mobile One does right now.

Alderman Robert said that was his only concern.

Mr. Girard stated that the only thing that he would add and maybe it would help the Alderman with his concerns. The Mayors' office too, has been buried with piles of paper regarding this topic. As a matter of fact, there was a conversation between the Mayors' office and Lt. Tessier that started the search for some regulatory arm and to his credit he came up with one. Basically, the City is structured the only way you can regulate or impose a fee, is through an ordinance from the City of Manchester. If you wanted to empower the Police Commission

to periodically make recommendations to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen as to what this fee should be so as not run towing companies out of business. I am sure the Police Commission would be more than willing to do that. Given the margins that some of these companies have and there practices we've got letters into the Mayors' office and I think when this originally came to the Board there was some supporting data as to types of instances and fees charged and various fee schedules from around the State. There are instances were towing companies actually pull there cars across the entrance to the parking lot while the tow truck is jacking up the car so that you can't get in and try to get your car out. That is where those \$200 pay offs come in and something needs to be done to regulate this perhaps amending the ordinance that way to have the Police Commission make reports to the Board as needed. But the tow market appears to be rather lucrative and I don't think your concern at this point well founded in fact.

Clerk Johnson noted that the City Clerk's office and the Police Department regularly talk about towing situations because we get a lot of calls on it and went through it the former Traffic Division people and since I've been there it has been a problem. One of the things that the Police Department does to regulate if they do have to have a contract with the tow companies for non-consensual tows in essence in snow removal situations. If they have to have a contract and it's going to have to be higher than the \$25 a day that is showing up here for storage or any of these other fees. If it becomes unreasonable then they are going to have to come back into the Board to get that amendment anyway. I don't think, it is a case, where you need to set by ordinance. If it becomes unrealistic the Police Department is going to come in because they are not going to be able to do their function. They are not going to be able to get a contract. It's automatic it is going to be reviewed when the get contracts, anyway.

Alderman Robert asked why couldn't we have it in there anyway.

Clerk Johnson said that what she was trying to say they are going to through it every time we have a contract and if something is unreasonable they are going to have to come in anyway. They will come into you, I don't think you need in the ordinance to do that. You can add it if you want, Mr. Arnold and I can stop and do up some language.

Mr. Girard stated that is not the concern. The concern is not with the City contracts for tows for snow plowing where not the concerns. It's the private lots where someone has contracted with a private company to tow. I think the Alderman's concern is that he wants to make sure that the market is going to pay a price and the City will allow a price that makes it economically viable for companies for private tows off of private property without the City involved. I

think that is his basic market based concern. I think that the market will more than speak if the fees the City set is unreasonable.

Clerk Johnson said that her suggestion would be that if you want to move it with a recommendation of the added Section c to have period reports from the Police Department on an annual basis. Do you want it from the Police Department or do you want it strictly from the Commissioner?

Alderman Robert replied the Police Department.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to accept proposed ordinance on towing of motor vehicles without the consent or authorization of the owner or operator and to add section c) annual report from Police Department on fee recommendations.

Chairman Sysyn called the item #3 on the agenda:

Ratify and confirm poll conducted October 11, 1996, requesting the closure of Notre Dame Avenue from Amory to Putnam Streets on Thursday, October 17, 1996 from 9:00 AM until 1:00 PM for ceremonies to be conducted by the St. Mary's Bank Charitable Foundation.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to ratify and confirm the poll approving the request.

Chairman Sysyn called the item #4 on the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Hirschmann, requesting that east/west "Stop" signs be installed at the intersection of Mason and Youville Streets as an emergency measure due to the lack of a school crossing guard and the frustration with drivers speed and lack of respect for the guards and children.

Alderman Robert moved for discussion. Alderman Domaingue duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Robert asked Mr. Lolicata is it was a four way stop sign.

Mr. Lolicata said that it did not warrant it. It seems that, no offense Alderman Hirschmann is this a recent problem, from what I understand I just read this you have not gotten a crossing guard now. Is that what it is?

Alderman Hirschmann replied that it has been a problem now for about four years that I know. Knowing that there would be a resistance to a four way stop sign I didn't bring this forward sooner. What I did was caused a School Crossing Guard to quit her employment by not bringing this forward sooner. Now I don't have a School Crossing Guard and I don't have stop signs and we have a severe problem. If someone is hit out there I don't want to be responsible. So as a fiduciary I brought this to this Board to say that I have a serious problem not only to bring it here. I called the Police Department to let them know about it and cannot find a School Crossing Guard there is a lack of them I have a serious situation on my hands.

Mr. Lolicata replied by saying that Alderman Hirschmann was not the only problem that I have to put up with there are two others that are under worse condition. The Wilson School.

Alderman Hirschmann interrupted by saying that's not an excuse.

Mr. Lolicata answered that he knows, he understands that, but I have to stick with one thing that is warrant for stop signs. We have already witnessed a few things that was done years ago. You put a four way up and very shortly they will go through those stop signs.

Alderman Hirschmann said that he has brought nothing to this Committee in his year, nothing, I think this warrants a look. I will take all the heat, it is my ward, I will take all the phone calls, anyone that does not like that stop sign can call me.

Mr. Lolicata said that it's not liking it, the answer is

Alderman Hirschmann added that this is the Public Safety Committee that was consolidated into Traffic. This is Public Safety, it is an emergency request, that is what I am asking for, if you read my letter.

Mr. Lolicata said that the only thing he can ask is that Lt. Tessier tell you if there has been any accidents or if there has been anybody hurt in that intersection the past three years. Now what is the problem there, why aren't they stopping for these children it is the law.

Alderman Hirschmann replied they do not respect them Mr. Lolicata. I have people quitting as School Crossing Guards and I cannot even fill the position.

Mr. Lolicata asked if Lt. Tessier had any input.

Lt. Tessier replied that he spoke with this particular Crossing Guard or my office spoke with her as late as this morning. There is no question we have worked very hard with her recently in trying to resolve some situations over there. We had officers there I had parking control officers in the area. The sole reason for her leaving was not because of the total frustration with that, there were some other factors involved. Yes, we do have a shortage of Crossing Guards. I am down two, I have two part timers one of them doesn't drive and can only walk a certain radius of his house. The other person does not want to work every day and we use him as an alternate. Basically, what it comes down to, is that the Crossing Guard makes \$50 a week after taxes and it takes the morning before school and the afternoon so there days are pretty much tied up doing that. We do have issues where there is a lack of respect for the Crossing Guards and we addressed those issues with my officers that do go out and sit there and wait for situations to come across. Unfortunately, we cannot be every place at all times. There is a congestion in that particular area, especially in the afternoon when school is letting out. We have solicited some help from the Crime Prevention Bureau but they are often tied up at the High Schools and the Junior High Schools. Off the top of my head, I do not remember being any serious accidents there in recent history. I temper that by saying that there is a lot of traffic and a lot of congestion there and a potential for a problem.

Alderman Domaingue said that she was going to try to temper her temperament because this issue more than anything really upsets me. Alderman Hirschmann has gotten an issue that is probably reflected all throughout the City were Schools are concerned. I have it at Highland Goffs Falls, I have the Principal crossing children in the middle of Goffs Falls Road. I have Jewett Street School we all have schools in our areas and I am sure if Mr. Clancy was here we would hear from him. To hear grownups who are supposed to be leaders in this Community talk about because we've never done it that way. We talk about people running stop signs as if it's acceptable even though we know it's not. Alderman Hirschmann has a got a critical situation in his Ward as I do and as many of us do. If we do not start addressing them with real concrete solutions instead of excuses we are going to have fatalities at the intersection. Then the parents are going to walk in the door, they are going to line the room and we are going to have nothing to say in response. Because when we could have make an action, we chose to say, well we really do not have a precedent or he opens a book and says well I can't ordinance a four way stop sign. What am I going to lose?

Mr. Lolicata said that he could Alderman Domaingue.

Alderman Domaingue responded than do it.

Mr. Lolicata said he can do it with warrants.

Alderman Domaingue said then let us do it.

Mr. Lolicata responded that he wanted to go on record as saying that if something does happen when this is put up and somebody does go through them. Which they are going to do eventually in a four way stop and somebody gets killed the City will be liable. You have to have warrants for these.

Alderman Domaingue ask how liable would we be without one?

Mr. Lolicata said that if there is no accident there what is the reason for the stop sign.

Alderman Domaingue ask again how liable are we without it?

Mr. Lolicata said that you are not liable.

Alderman Domaingue said that we are not liable if a child is killed.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that if that sign does not go up, Mr. Lolicata.

Mr. Lolicata replied that if it's put up the same thing as then you are because there are rules to the road that you have to adhere. I'm not voting on this, don't get me wrong, I have to give you my side, the City's side.

Alderman Domaingue said that she understood that, but we need to address this Madam Chairman because there are a lot of schools in the City that have this problem.

Chairman Sysyn said that she has them in her area and she could not get a four way stop sign.

Alderman Soucy stated that Mr. Lolicata's point is well taken but it seems that we have an influx lately of request for stop signs. I know I have gotten a lot of them because of safety issues. They go up and somebody sees them for a little while then after a while. It's true they are wrong and they should not be doing it. I think what is more important is to try to find out why we are not getting more Crossing Guards and look at that issue. A sign is fine, having an inanimate object at a corner that somebody is supposed to obey has some effect. What has more effect people will pay more attention to the Crossing Guard..

Alderman Domaingue replied that people do not pay attention to the Police Officer let alone the Crossing Guard.

Alderman Soucy said then there is nothing you can do.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that he promise this, that if he does not get this sign, and some kid is hit I will testify for the defense that it was turned down. I promise you that. I am a City father I deserve that stop sign. I promise you all that I will testify for the defense. Any kid that becomes run over in that street, I promise you all, that's how mad I am about it. I do not like hearing you cannot do it.

Chairman Sysyn noted to Alderman Hirschmann that we have done four ways before, but some reason they have made it...

Alderman Hirschmann stated that it is what he wanted and it is his Ward, it is Ward 12.

Alderman Soucy said that it really was the best solution but she really felt that the Crossing Guard issue has to be resolved. If there is a speeding issue and a Crossing Guard issue it has to be addressed.

Alderman Robert stated that he remembered his first term. I think the Traffic Committee, I was not on it then, but I think Traffic Committee voted to develop an alternate policy for use of four way stop signs. I was not on the Committee so I guess I was not involved in it. There seemed to be a desire to change the system or to change the way things worked. I am sympathetic to Mr. Lolicata's problems but I think we all have problems that could be address by this control device. If you want to call that, we have four way stop signs on corners where you really wonder why they are there. Then we have intersections that maybe should have them, maybe more deserve it. Why can't we look at that, I've never been really told why we can't. From my discussions with other Board members in the past essentially it's a control thing. We are going to have people over time come to the Committee and come to Board and ask for this sort of device. We are not going to be able to say no for pretty much the same reasons and we are going to have four way stop signs all throughout the City. Maybe, that is true and there is some validity to that, I think we need to strike a new balance. From what I can see they are useful. They have a place but I would like for somebody maybe this Committee sit down and determine exactly what that is. Maybe if we develop a policy of our own, maybe if we knew, we would understand better why we cannot get them now. We would not feel so bad as we do.

Chairman Sysyn asked Mr. Lolicata why we did not do anymore four way stop signs?

Mr. Lolicata said that going back many years ago, before Aldermen came on, most of those signs that you are talking about Alderman were political. They were put up bing, bang, boom because I wanted them. Without giving any regard to having an engineer going down there or anybody else to say that's a minor street, that's a major street and that is why it should be done. Now, I have to go buy a manual myself. As Traffic Director, I have set rules that everybody else in this country goes by and there is warrant for these things. All I am saying to you is don't look at me as the bad guy, I am not adamantly opposed. There are rules telling you when to put a four way up and when it should go up. A couple of warrants are right before signalization, traffic exactly equal from both sides, et cetera, et cetera If you want to put four ways all throughout the City, Alderman, go ahead. All I am stating to you is that I have to take the stand for the City for liability, okay, and it can be dangerous. I have five stop signs at Hayward and Lincoln and everyday three or four cars go through them. Now I am going to tell you Alderman that when you do put this up, and believe me you have the votes, I do not. If somebody becomes killed after they are up, look out, that is all I am going to say. Right now, Alderman, no offense there has been nobody killed, no accidents. I agree with you, people today they have these crazes and Alderman demands corrected doing anything in their power to go through lights and everything. I have to take the stand to go by the a book here for the City.

Alderman Hirschmann stated so is he. The word is pro-active, okay.

Mr. Lolicata said that if they wanted the four way up, please, by all means go ahead and do it. I have to give my side of the story for the City. I have a manual to go by with warrants.

Chairman Sysyn recognized Alderman Domaingue.

Alderman Domaingue noted that she felt that Alderman Robert was correct in that what we need to do. As a Committee how we address this overhaul because this is not the only area. We also need, I would like to hear from Mr. Lolicata, if we were to enact our own ordinance so that it was set as policy for the City around school areas were there are four way. Traffic areas that we have established that we will put up four way stop signs. Would that help us on the liability issue?

Mr. Lolicata replied that on an ordinance it possibly would.

Alderman Domaingue answered that is the direction that we need to go to, Mr. Lolicata. With all due respect, I know you are in a tough position, but when I ask for direction from my Department heads. I want you to tell me how we can get it accomplished. Automobiles, today, are taking over, we know that and we are talking children whom you cannot even see beyond the hood of a car.

Mr. Lolicata agreed. Those children's lives are in the man behind that wheel.

Alderman Domaingue stated that she did not trust the man or woman behind the wheel.

Mr. Lolicata agreed that he did not either. It is getting worse but I have to be careful of what I am saying and doing here for the City. Mr. Lolicata said that they could all vote on it.

Chairman Sysyn suggested that we tried it for thirty days in his area. Do you have an active PTA group.

Alderman Hirschmann said that they must because he has been receiving phone calls over this issue now.

Chairman Sysyn said that possibly he could get some of them to volunteer as Crossing Guards, temporarily. I worked with Mr. Tessier to find Crossing Guards.

Alderman Hirschmann replied that the Principal is out there now, he can't get anybody.

Alderman Soucy asked if it was because we were not paying enough?

Chairman Sysyn replied that it did tie you up. It ties you up at 7:30 AM to whatever time. Then you go home and you have to be back at a certain time.

Alderman Hirschmann noted that one of the worst day of the year is election day. A lot of the votes do not regularly go to the school. They do not respect going into that area. People who go their everyday drive slow but voting season, two weeks from now it is going to be hectic. Primary day is hectic there. School Crossing Guard actually got brushed by a car, I know she will tell you that.

Lt. Tessier said that t the beginning of the school year we started off with our regular nucleus of Crossing Guard. We had every school covered. We had no backups because we could not find people. We had advertised in the paper and we contacted the schools. As the year's gone, we have lost a couple and picked up

some part timers. On more than one occasion we set up training sessions and had three or four people come in. When they find out what the job entails they never start. I am sure, I understand the City's situation, I do feel that part of the situation is the funding issue. Overriding that is the simple fact that someone is not allowed to do a whole lot during those period of times. They are not in a position to go to work at another place in between crossing in the morning and crossing in the afternoon. I have lost people going to work for Dunkin' Donuts and other restaurants who will structure their hours around parents who have children in school.

Alderman Robert addressed the suggested idea of trying. I do not mind trying things but I have a feeling that there is a bit of frustration and there is some energy pent up. Various Aldermen, various neighborhoods, if we were just to try something I think a dam might collapse. Then you would have an influx of people who want things, angry people. I would suggest that we look at this as a Committee so that we can determine what the reasonable thing is to do. The move forward from there so at least when this dam breaks and the energy releases we will be able to control it. It may be something like, well I don't want to say south end issue. People get into parking issues and they can get pretty angry. Generally, speaking any parking issue you make more people mad at you than happy with you and I would just as soon approach it as a rationale perspective.

Chairman Sysyn recognized Alderman Reiniger.

Alderman Reiniger said that there was two things it seems to me I have been following up what has been said. Maybe, we could try to find some criteria were it can be allowed near a school zone or certain types of streets. There is different definitions artery streets, feeder streets so that it doesn't get carried away. Some Alderman would want them in inappropriate areas and they were forced to pick and choose which Alderman get it and which ones don't. We should have a carefully defined set of criteria. Right off the bat these areas make sense to me. There is a high safety factor.

Alderman Robert responded that he liked the approach that he wants to take. I just was thinking that maybe a sub-committee would be appropriate.

Mr. Girard stated that not unless it is appointed by the Chairman of the Board.

Chairman Sysyn stated that why we do not just establish that they we would allow them just in school zones. Like this school area and my school area that I couldn't do it with. I have McDonough School that has been wanting a four way stop sign.

Alderman Robert said just so to make sure we think about it enough. Should we exclude intersections that.....

Alderman Soucy asked within what radius of school? Four blocks out and blocks up.

Chairman Sysyn responded that she thought one would be enough.

Alderman Soucy said that she did not think that they could make a decision without looking at some data and some statistics.

Alderman Domaingue said that why don't we do it enabling as they do with the State and allow each case come before the Committee. We could make it an enabling ordinance that says we will allow it but each incident has to be reviewed by the Traffic Control. This one is being reviewed.

Chairman Sysyn noted just for school zones.

Alderman Domaingue repeated yes just for school areas.

Mr. Girard said that he just had a suggestion that the Committee might find helpful. I know you are dealing with the issue of schools right now but perhaps you could ask the Traffic Director to forward information to the Committee regarding various types of streets that you have in the City what they are defined as and why. Perhaps he would have some recommendations as to what would be an appropriate consideration for a four way stop sign to give the Committee some guidelines to access request by. That could be schools, I don't even now what the terms are but that way you could have the professional staff that understands all this stuff what a warrant is and why the book works that way and give you some guidelines.

Mr. Lolicata responded that he was going to come out with anyway. In the case of, Alderman Hirschmann, you have two minor streets more or less. Two regular streets, I would define that to be only type to do it, because anything from an arterial is a complete no, no from arterial to collectors and a real major street with a minor street. I would give a lot of thought and consideration to that. It's just like saying let us put a stop sign on Elm Street or something, compared to Hanover Street.

Alderman Domaingue said that is why she suggested to make it an enabling and widening ordinance that each case has to come before this Committee. Then you would be hear to give that input.

Mr. Lolicata said that all he is stating, Alderman, is that you people are going to agree upon something. I would suggest that you agree upon something along the line of two minor streets in a school area. I would be very reluctant to go any further than that on one way street or any other major artery. That is all I can say right now.

Chairman Sysyn asked why we could not do that, excluding the arterial and collector streets.

Alderman Domaingue asked if we could have a definition of minor street?

Mr. Lolicata replied that it was any street that has less traffic compared to the other one.

Chairman Sysyn asked the Clerk to read the motion.

The Clerk clarified for the Committee by stating that a section would be added in the regulation to the traffic ordinance to enable four way stop signs in school zones excluding arterial and collector streets which would mean in this instance those are two minor streets. This motion is from Alderman Domaingue.

Alderman Domaingue concurred this was her motion.

Alderman Robert said that maybe he was not the smartest guy in the world but I have never opened up a traffic manual. For some reason, I am feeling that I am not getting the big picture, I do not know what all the options are. I feel if I support the motion it might be wily nilly attempt something right but we may not be doing something with it. I just want to be comfortable with it and if it makes sense I can support it. I can tell my constituents that look this is the way it is.

Chairman Sysyn answered Alderman Robert by telling him that it made sense if you think about it. The minor streets, like he is talking about it, Youville and Mason Streets, you would not want it on Coolidge Ave. You would not want four way stop sign on Coolidge Ave.

Alderman Robert replied yes on Coolidge and Bremer I would.

Chairman Sysyn stated we are talking about school zones. We are only talking about school zones.

Alderman Robert said that this is something, I am sorry, schools important but people's businesses and just an active urban environment. They are important too.

Chairman Sysyn said that could be touchy with four way stops.

Alderman Robert replied that this is what he was trying to say. We should try to look at the big picture. Again, I've never opened up a traffic book, I don't know all the terms and don't know what all the options are. I do not know all the theory. I feel as if I am just doing something wily nilly and patching something together.

Chairman Sysyn said she would like to get a second on the motion.

Alderman Reiniger seconded the motion to enable the four way stop signs in school zones excluding arterial and collector streets.

Alderman Domaingue asked Alderman Robert how he would feel if during the process we would take our time reviewing every single corner of the City you lose a child because we did not do something.

Alderman Robert replied that he was not asking to review every single corner. I am asking for us to develop a reasonable

Alderman Domaingue said that we could expand on this all this does is touch upon small streets in school zones. If you feel a need four way stops in other areas we can take this ordinance further. Right now, we have a critical situations and that is one of them. Unless you have a Crossing Guard in your back pocket so we have time to study this, I think we need to do something.

Chairman Sysyn said that this still will not give her a four way stop because all those streets are collectors.

Mr. Lolicata said that if this is going through he will have it up tomorrow, Alderman. I will get a paper and Mr. Thomas will have it done right away.

Chairman Sysyn stated that we had not voted on it yet.

Alderman Robert said that we are going to be inundated, Ladies and Gentlemen, I see it coming. It's not that I would vote no, not to have this done but I think we really need to think about it. Once it hits the papers we are all going to understand what I am talking about.

Alderman Domaingue responded that is why they pay us the big bucks.

Chairman Sysyn said yea, right.

Alderman Reiniger said that the other option would be to take a little bit more time to have a professional recommendation.

Chairman Sysyn said that in the meantime Alderman Hirschmann is still waiting.

Alderman Hirschmann said he wants to hold off for something in his ward.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the matter. Aldermen Robert and Soucy voted nay. Chairman Sysyn voted yea. The motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to have four way stop signs on the corner of Mason and Youville Streets.

Alderman Hirschmann thanked everyone.

General Discussion.

Mr. Girard asked Chairman Sysyn if before she went on to the next item. He would like to ask the Traffic Director, on behalf of the Mayors office to forward the information that I suggested the Committee ask for and if he wishes to send a copy to the Committee, so be it. These traffic issues are becoming more pressing, so Mr. Lolicata if you would send that along we can get up to speed in all the terms of what we need to know. That way we will be able to comment intelligently on these policy issues as they come forward. I would appreciate that.

Mr. Lolicata said that this is the third time that he has done this in the past six to eight years. I have given copies to the Traffic Committee about warrants and all signs. I'll get them up again, as a matter of fact, I gave some to Alderman Shea this evening in regards to his problem. I will see if I can get them up to you tomorrow.

Mr. Girard said he would talk to Mr. Lolicata, afterwards.

Alderman Domaingue asked if the Traffic Committee always been the same people in the last six to eight years. So, it would not be unlikely that you have to forward another copy.

Mr. Lolicata said that he would not make copies for everybody, Alderman Domaingue.

Chairman Sysyn called the item #5 on the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Shea, requesting that the noise ordinance be reviewed for potential changes to address the needs of residents bordering industrial areas.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Chairman Sysyn asked Alderman Shea if he would like to speak to the Committee on this.

Alderman Shea replied that he would. I would like to preface my remarks by acknowledging the attendance of several people from Shasta Street who border the two Steel Companies. Formerly it was Lyons Iron Works, today there are two companies the Mills Steel and also Chase Steel. The residence can speak for themselves and maybe one or two would like to address the Committee. In essence, what has been happening is that once Lyons Iron Works sold the Steel Company that they owned to the two Steel Companies, Mills and also Chase. The two Steel Companies have been operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week, Sundays, Holidays and so forth. The people really have not had any quality of life. The people who manage the companies in a couple of instances have granted certain concessions. I know that Mr. Poirier mentioned that he has gone over and spoken to a supervisor Mike. Mike has helped the residents by turning down the volume of the radio at 9 o'clock at night till 7 o'clock in the morning. Has cautioned about dropping steel and things of that nature. Because there are two companies there does not seem to be much cooperation on the part of the Mills Company. The people who live right next to it are disturbed at 2:00 A.M., 3:00 A.M. or 4:00 A.M. in the morning by different types of noises that they feel the people really don't take into consideration the residents that live close by. They don't take into consideration that the residents work all day, they get home at night. The residents are certainly reasonable in the sense that they do not mind the companies operating until 8:00 p.m. or 9:00 p.m. in the evening. These companies are operating till 2:00 A.M. to 4:00 A.M. in the morning, they are dropping steel, they are making noises, so on and so forth. I think their quality of life is being effected they cannot sleep, they are awakened at night by noises. They have tried to speak to the people and they are totally ignored. Maybe, one or two of the residents can speak in terms of what there quality of life has been, possibly they could be a little more specific. If you don't mind.

Mr. Poirier started by saying that he lived at 366 Shasta Street. Over the years we have had as Alderman Shea has explained many problems. I think the problem stems from the owners not from the workers. The owners probably living in better

communities. I would like to point out that the homes were there before the businesses. The businesses encroached on the homes. There does not to be any respect number one. Of course, there are no laws prevailing so there will not be any respect. We are hoping maybe you could come up with some sort of ordinance.

Chairman Sysyn noted that there was a noise ordinance but it did not do deal with this.

Clerk Johnson added that there was a noise ordinance but it did not deal with this specific situation. I think the Police Department has been contacted on that issue and the recommendation was to go to Public Safety Committee in quest of change in the ordinance. It is properly zoned for business so therefore, they fall into the criteria of business operations. I think, perhaps, you may want to get some Statute before you look at that any further.

Mr. Girard said that he had a question, Madam Chairman, I do not know to whom to direct it. Are the businesses there as a matter of right, in other words, there in the appropriate zone or are they there under variance.

Chairman Sysyn replied that they were there by right.

Mr. Girard repeated that they are there by right.

Clerk Johnson stated that it is an industrial zone. The suggestion made to Alderman Shea when he initially came to the Police Department with a problem and they could not enforce. Then he talked to me about it, the suggestion was to ask the Board take a look at the change to the noise ordinance to deal specifically with residential district bordering industrial zones. That is the situation they have. The business is located in the industrial zone but it is on the parameters of the residential zone and it obviously affecting them. The zoning ordinance cannot deal with that, so maybe the noise ordinance can.

Mr. Chavanalle said that he lived at 320 Shasta Street. A typical night in our neighborhood, you cannot enjoy the back yard. There is no such thing as a nice cookout. There is no such thing as entertainment. You cannot have people come over because the noise is so terrible. You cannot sleep at night, unless you close up your house and go to air conditioning which a lot of us do not want. It should be our right to be able to come home at night and enjoy our property and have a real nice evening. It has been impossible. No matter what we do it just gets worse, if we say something there is retaliation, there is more noise. These people have no respect for the neighborhood. My question is because something has been

going on for thirty years why can't it be changed? You people change laws all the time. We are asking for a little bit of help 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock at night, quite. It would mean everything in the world to us. It really would, something is going to happen if there is no arrangement is made. We can tell, people are getting mad.

Chairman Sysyn stated whether or not this should be referred to Planning and Police and they could get together on this. I do not know how to solve this.

Mr. Girard said that he was going to make a suggestion Madam Chairman about appropriate City staff to advise the Committee on this matter. I would recommend the Cities' Industrial Agent Planning Director, Building Commissioner and I think that is it. The City Solicitor and the Police Department, also sure.

Mr. Chavanelle asked if he could add something. Our property values are going down. We all try to keep a nice residence.

Chairman Sysyn stated that they were going to have a group of people to address this situation for them.

Mr. Poirier said that he would like to add. We have had several agreements over the years, I have lived there almost 14 years. My relatives and all these people have lived over 30 to 40 years there. As the owner changes or the management changes we have had several gentlemen's agreements. The problem is there are not any gentlemen.

Mr. Girard said that as a procedural matter to I might also note that it might be best for the Committee to refer that recommendation to the Committee on Bills On Second Reading which I believe is the more appropriate to hear these concerns. Matters with zoning and planning are the purview of Bills On Second Reading.

Chairman Sysyn said it will go to Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Mr. Girard replied no, Madam Chairman. Bills On Second Reading is the policy Committee that has jurisdiction in this area.

Alderman Soucy said that the issue before us is Public Safety.

Mr. Chavanelle stated that is was Public Safety seeing that they can't sleep at night. Our idea is why does something has to go on 30 to 40 years without being changed.

Mr. Girard said that he agreed with him that he was just trying to make a Parliamentary point.

Chairman Sysyn asked whether or not Alderman Reiniger if he had one in on the noise ordinance also on this Committee?

Alderman Reiniger said that it was different side of the noise. What he has is the noise coming from restaurants and bars. So I put in an amendment that would allow us to revoke an entertainment license. Perhaps with a business we could either look to see if we can add this to the noise ordinance.

Chairman Sysyn stated that we cannot get the two of them under the same thing.

Clerk Johnson said that what you could do is to send it to these people and then advise the Board to have it referred to Bills On Second Reading so there referral goes back out, does that make sense?

Mr. Girard stated that his only point was that as a policy, noise complaints are a planning issue and you get zoning issues involved here, that really belongs in Bills On Second Reading.

On motion Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to recommend to send the issue to the Board with a recommendation it be referred to Bills On Second Reading and to have staff review the matter and present recommendations to the Committee on Bills On Second Reading.

Alderman Shea ask if they could make a comment to the people who have spent a considerable amount of the evening here what is going to happen so they will understand.

Chairman Sysyn explained that it was being referred to another Committee.

Alderman Shea asked what the other thing was?

Chairman Sysyn continued by saying that it will come back with a report. Let Clerk Johnson explain it to you.

Clerk Johnson explained just for their information. Normally, in order to change an ordinance, it requires a specific set of rules that have to go through by the Board. It is a few months usually, for the Board to go through that process. In essence you are going to bypass some time because the report from the Committee is to the Board saying referred directly to that Committee and let the report from

the Staff come into it. So you probably save 30 days in your process, but it will go from here to Board saying send it to the Bills On Second Reading. They will review whatever the Staff recommendation is and presumably recommends a change in the ordinance to the Board. It will come out in an ordinance format to be adopted. At that point, will go through a few motions of the Board to be passed probably 2 or 3 meetings. The Committee may also come out with a recommendation to change the ordinance, I'm not speaking for the Alderman, do understand that. If Alderman Shea you will be aware when Bills On Second Reading is meeting and perhaps they can be in contact with you or they can contact our office every Friday. We will have a schedule by that afternoon to tell you what is meeting the following week.

Mr. Chavanelle and Mr. Poirier thanked the Committee.

Mr. Girard said that he had a quick question for the Police Chief what his thoughts would be in altering the noise ordinance to allow for fines in a situation like this.

Chief Driscoll replied that he would have to sit with the City Solicitor's office and he did not have an answer for him at this time.

Alderman Domaingue asked if they could have some narrowing of the time frame here. Because I don't think that Alderman Shea and his constituents want to wait a year to get a resolution. I think if this Committee sends a message to have report within 30 days is reasonable.

Chairman Sysyn said she would like to address item #11 at this time. Sister Barbara has been waiting for some time.

Communication from Sister Barbara McLean, Principal, St. Joseph Regional Junior High School expressing concern over various issues pertaining to school bus service, the sidewalk in front of Pulaski Park, Special Services and parking meters.

Alderman Robert moved for discussion. Alderman Domaingue seconded the motion.

Alderman Robert said that some of these are away from the preview of what the Committee does. I guess what we should be focusing in on the parking meters. Could I have my memory refreshed as to why these parking meters are going in.

Mr. Lolicata said that this is in regards to the Committee updating new meters into different locations with the increase 50 cents per hour to new ten hour meters. It

came up in an ordinance to a certain area, look at the map back in April. That is the map they went by and right now what we are doing is getting the pipes ready for the new meters that are coming in. Which we hope will be established some time by November. This will have to be sectionalized besides that. I was thinking about this we did not even go any further up above Union Street. The only help I can give you right now because this is done by ordinance, if you were to walk another half a block or block, there would be free parking for you. There are no meters going above Bridge Street, outside of going into a parking lot around St. George and those areas people park in there all the time. I know you are starting school earlier. Another block, in all honesty, all it is one more block and it's free parking that is where the meters are going to stop. You can go up on Bridge Street another block and its free parking.

Sister Barbara stated that you are saying that and it is easy enough to say. There is a thing that you have educators going in with all their gear and it is an inconvenience. If we had a school where we could have parking which I could easily do by going to get an ordinance to say I will clear the front of the building up. We will make parking in front of St. Joe's Junior High. Then we take away the beauty of that whole area, of either the side or put some parking out in the back between the buildings. If I have an emergency and I have to walk up two blocks going to the hospitals, I just question that. Plus having the teachers coming in with all there thinks like let's say today. What happens to all the kids work?

Mr. Lolicata agreed with Sister Barbara. I see it day in and day out the same teachers that are going to Central walk two or three blocks to Central High. All the kids are taking up the spaces.

Sister Barbara said that when she called Central they told her they had parking.

Chairman Sysyn stated that they had parking on the front lawn.

Mr. Lolicata answered not all of them. Some of them do have like the Principal, et cetera. Yes at some schools.

Sister Barbara asked whether or not he was saying that he was going to give her a special spot.

Mr. Lolicata responded that if he could do it he would. In front of your school they did take that parking away for the safety of children.

Sister Barbara said that he had taken everything away. There is parking behind all those buildings. Every apartment has parking space in the back of there building.

I drove around there this morning. They all have their own parking area. We are not taking away from the people that live there because they have their own parking lots.

Mr. Lolicata said he understood that she was going to be one of many complaints of when the new meters going in, but it was by ordinance.

Chairman Sysyn recognized Alderman Robert.

Alderman Robert asked Sister Barbara if she had her druthers what sort of parking arrangement would you like to see.

Sister Barbara stated that she would like to see the teachers' park around the school. One of my teachers' parks on High Street runs out of the classroom every few minutes to put quarters in the meter. There was one Meter Maid got her for it and so she drove off and came back. The Meter Maid told her she could not do that. So the teacher asked her where do I park? The Meter Maid said she was sorry. The teacher had to park way up the street and beyond. She had a class in her classroom.

Alderman Robert asked if that was it. You want parking on High Street.

Sister Barbara said that she wanted parking on High and on Bridge Street outside the school around that area and halfway up the Pulaski Park area.

Alderman Robert asked if we could do that Mr. Lolicata.

Mr. Lolicata said that no they couldn't, because this was by ordinance. You are going to have to rescind all these things. We have already put time, men and pipe in. There is going to be others coming up Alderman, I'll guarantee it. People are not going to like these meters going in and you are going to have more complaints. I knew this was going to happen. That's up to you people if you want to rescind, I will take them out whatever you want.

Alderman Robert said that he was just concerned, we just allowed City employees to park almost for nothing in the same parking lots. I am not saying what City employees do is not important. These people at the school, they do what they do almost for nothing. Some people put a very high premium on that and frankly I am one of them.

Mr. Lolicata responded that Alderman Robert did not have to convince him. I am just the one putting them up and I did not pass the ordinance. Whatever you want?

Alderman Robert said that what he was asking Mr. Lolicata. You said that we would have to rescind some ordinances can we amend some ordinances to get this going. We have permit parking coming in certain sections of town.

Mr. Lolicata responded that if you do for one Alderman you will have to do for everybody. This is part of a meaning plan for revenue for the City and this is all I can tell you right now.

Alderman Domaingue asked how many more parochial schools are involved. Is this the only one?

Mr. Girard added St. Casimere.

Alderman Domaingue said that I realize the separation of Church and State but is there a discrimination situation here because we don't have any other schools in the City that I am aware of that has this problem.

Mr. Girard said that first of all he would like to correct something that Mr. Lolicata said this is not the proposal that is putting these meters in is not entirely nor was it a revenue proposal nor was it driven by the need for revenue. If you remember, the original plan was initiated though it wasn't adopted in its original form by the Mayors' office. Mr. Lolicata said for revenue. The other thing I want to point out is that you need to take into consideration the characteristic of the neighborhood. If you just decide not to put meters in the areas where Sister Barbara has asked for then that becomes open parking. Along that whole square there are other businesses whose customers are going to come in, if not there employees is going to take that parking too. I do not know what the solution is.

Sister Barbara responded she did not know what businesses he was talking about. The businesses have their parking.

Mr. Girard said that whole stretch of High Street has Doctor's offices and other offices in there.

Alderman Robert stated that if they start school at 7:00 AM in the morning. I think the problem is going to take care of itself.

Mr. Girard said that it may. I am just pointing that out because the Committee may wish to find another solution.

Chairman Sysyn asked how many meters are we talking about five.

Mr. Girard responded no, that he thinks there is a substantial amount in that area.

Mr. Lolicata said between 30 and 40 probably around the whole block.

Sister Barbara said that you are talking about 20 some odd. Seven on each side.

Mr. Lolicata asked if she only wanted Bridge St.

Sister Barbara said that basically Bridge and on the other side. There are parking meters already there now across the street on High Street.

Mr. Lolicata stated that on Bridge Street there is about 18 to 20 meters alone and there is about another 16 or 18 on High Street roughly. The other side of the park, there is about 40 meters we are talking about.

Sister Barbara asked when you say that this is for the Doctors, I beg to differ you on that one.

Mr. Girard said that Dr. Kermas office is right there.

Sister Barbara asked where?

Mr. Girard said that he just saw it this morning.

Sister Barbara said he is up on High Street and he has his own parking.

Chairman Sysyn said that she uses to park in front, I use to go to Dr. Belland and I use to park in front.

Alderman Reiniger said that there could be two other options maybe we could arrange to give them free parking in the Pearl Street lot, which is a block over. Which is plowed and pretty secure or give them a permit parking arrangement to park on certain streets near the school. So then you still have the meters for other people. The problem with permit parking would be that we would have to create a different permit parking system for business or teachers.

Alderman Domaingue stated that since obviously there are too many issues unresolved we are not going to be able to solve this tonight. Could we at least ask the Traffic Director to come back to the Committee with a map of the areas.

Mr. Lolicata responded that he had it right here. It's the only one Alderman.

Alderman Domaingue said well there is five of us on the Committee. I would like to have more time as I stated earlier this evening 15 minutes to review it. So can he prepare it and send it to us for the next meeting and we can have a thorough discussion of what is available and what are options might be. Some suggestions not only from Mr. Lolicata but also from the Police Department. Would that be agreeable?

Mr. Lolicata answered whatever you want.

Chairman Sysyn noted that we would have to cap the meters for now.

Alderman Domaingue said that she did not want to do anything right now, anyway. I think I need to see a map and we need to talk about how much revenue and what our options are possible.

Chairman Sysyn stated that we would have to table this.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was voted to table the parking meter situation on Bridge Street and High Street affecting St. Joseph Regional Junior High School until the Traffic Director provides a map to the Committee members.

Alderman Robert said that he did not mind tabling it to give it a good amount of thought. There are other concerns on here, this whole thing was referred to Traffic and Public Safety would we refer some of these things to a more appropriate department or entity. Parking meters is certainly our issues but there are two School Department issues and snow removal is a Park and Recreation issue.

Mr. Girard said no, snow removal has already been dealt with.

Alderman Robert said it's all set. Could we refer the other things to Board of Mayor and Aldermen for discussion these two options bus service and learning disabilities. The reason being it is a funding issue, it's a little more complicated than that and also speaking from my own point of view. If I give them x amount of dollars I don't know where it is going. I want to fund these two things not that I have any power to do it.

Chairman Sysyn asked if he wanted to refer this to the Full Board.

Alderman Robert thought that he had asked the School Superintendent if this would be taken care of when he came in for his budget numbers. I thought I spoke with the people at Manchester Transit if this would be taken care of but obviously it is not. Some of these people couch their responses to me, sure.

Chairman Sysyn stated that we should refer this to the Full Board for more discussion.

Alderman Soucy said that if we discuss it what type of inclusion of are we going to do. It's really the School Board's issue to deal with.

Alderman Robert said the he understood her point but my thinking is if we refer this to the School Board if falls into the same black hole that it came out of. I had thought and I made a recommendation at the Board level and again it may be beyond my control. Could there be a line item established in their budget? Could we ask that a line be established in their budget to deal with this? They have to add to or subtract from. Anytime I deal with the School Budget I just really do not know what I am voting on. Quite frankly.

Alderman Soucy said that's right the only thing you are voting on is the bottom line.

Chairman Sysyn agreed we do not vote on item by item.

Alderman Soucy stated that is why we have the School Board.

Alderman Robert said that he did not see why we could not discuss it and make some sort of recommendation. The School Board does not have to accept what we do anyway.

Chairman Sysyn asked whether we should do it when we have a joint meeting with the School Board with us.

Alderman Robert stated Committee on Finance, maybe we can get, I'm just thinking out loud. Maybe we can get some sort of recommendation from them, I don't know.

Chairman Sysyn asked the City's or the School Boards?

Alderman Robert responded that he would like to get some input from our Finance Department.

Chairman Sysyn asked if we should refer it to our Committee on Finance?

Alderman Robert responded that it would seem reasonable.

Alderman Soucy said then what you are saying is that it is a financial issue.

Alderman Robert stated that if it is a financial issue and I could be sure that things are being taken care of.

Chairman Sysyn asked if he wanted to do a special meeting with the School Board and us and the Aldermanic Board.

Alderman Robert responded that if the Board felt it was the right thing to do, he would do it.

Alderman Domaingue said that it appears to be a financial issue. The School Board has very specific duties outlined in the State Law. The things that they are responsible for and one of them is obviously is this transportation issue and they are going to look back at us and say you don't give us enough money. Even if we gave them the money our power stops when we hand them the check. If they choose to use it on transportation they can do that. If they choose not to because it is a tough budget year and they want to give \$3000 Administrative pay raises they can do that and we have already seen them do. I understand your frustration with this. I would like to hear more about it from the Committee level. I would like to hear more input in the future, not necessarily tonight on where we are with the School bus issue so that then we as a committee can make a recommendation to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen that they send a message to the School Board. I think that might be appropriate. But to just forward it to the Full Board and then all opinions will be up in the air and we really don't have specifics.

Alderman Robert said that was fine, he'll second that.

Alderman Domaingue said that she would like to see it come up for further discussion I am willing to table that portion if that will help.

Chairman Sysyn asked whether they could have someone from the Transportation Department come to our next meeting?

Alderman Domaingue said from the School Board that would be excellent.

Chairman Sysyn asked Alderman Robert if he wanted to do that?

Alderman Robert said that was great.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted that someone from the Transportation Department from the School Board be invited to the next meeting to discuss Special Services and bus service for students with learning disabilities that attend St. Joseph Junior High per communication from Sister Barbara McLean.

General discussion followed.

Sister Barbara stated that what they did was cut the busing back because of the funds. The reason we start at 7:20 AM is because there is something about the Union on the Bus people. The layover time that they have to pay them because I had requested to start later and get out later. They said they could not do that because of the layover time in between because of the Union. That was one of the thing, because I would like to see us go a longer day. Get more time in on the day, let us start at 7:45 AM put us out at 2:30 PM. They said the were overlapping. They have to be back to pick up the kids in Public Schools. There is some time in between in the morning before they go out, because I see them waiting on the side streets to pick up the Public School kids. The way Mr. Gabbid said there is Union and time overlay that they have to consider. My buses do not come in on time, we have a lot of kids that do not come in because the buses do not make it that early. Some of the drivers have trouble getting there.

Alderman Domaingue said that is the transportation issue. I think what we are wrestling with right now is whether or not the Special Ed issue was a transportation issue.

Sister Barbara said no the Special Ed. Transportation is part of it, was in there, because parents have to transport the kids. Transportation was originally and we kind of gave it up.

Alderman Robert asked if this issue would be better served in the Community Improvement Program. There used to be an old transportation Committee which it sort of was folded in. Would it be better suited.

Alderman Soucy said that transportation was our own fleet of vehicles.

Alderman Robert said that he thinks they kept track of the MTA.

Sister Barbara said that on your LD issue. It is that the increase of Learning Disabled children has grown immensely within the Public School sector as well as in our own. That is one of our biggest concerns. That is why they tried to cut back on the services. They use to service us in the school but now the children have to go to the Public Schools and that is one of the things the parents would complain. You have an LD child and you are moving him around all the time, what is that accomplishing. We have tried to come up with a new plan that some of the services for some of the children would be at St. Joe's. So the parents would have to transport them to St. Joe's.

Chairman Sysyn recognized Clerk Johnson who had a suggestion.

Clerk Johnson suggested that there has been discussion about referring that portion to the CIP Committee who now serves the transportation. The suggestion would be that a recommendation go back to the Board that the CIP Committee meet with representatives of the School Department regarding the bus services and special services so that the Board could have a complete understanding of why the School Department is reacting the way they are, and come up with other recommendations to the Board.

Alderman Robert said that he would move that.

Clerk Johnson said rather than Public Safety because it's not the appropriate Committee.

Alderman Domaingue said that she did not have a problem with that as long as it is addressed.

Clerk Johnson continued by saying that maybe then you could refer both issues or recommend that the Board refer both issues into that Committee that is more appropriate for both.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to recommend that the Board of Mayor and Alderman refer both issues to the CIP Committee with a suggestion that they meet with a representative of the School Department regarding bus and special services and come up with other recommendations to the full Board regarding these issues.

The former motion was rescinded.

October 21, 1996

Chairman Sysyn called the item number 6 on the agenda.

Communication from Alderman Pariseau requesting the Committee rescind its previous recommendation relative to the installation of "Right Turn Only" signs at the intersection of Westwood and Donahue Drives; and further requesting that the "Right Turn Only" signs be installed at the intersection of Sherwood and Westwood Drives.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Clerk Johnson stated that Alderman Pariseau called the Clerks office earlier this evening. He wanted the Committee to know that he submitted this partially because some people had come to a Ward meeting that he had held. Basically, what he was saying is that people were making the right hand turn on Donahue and coming around and just making a circle and coming back. It was felt that if it was put back a block to Sherwood Drive. If the "Right Turn Only" was placed there, people could then make the right hand turn and then if they needed to make a left up Donahue to get up there somehow or other. They would not be going around in circles. That is the way Alderman Pariseau explained it to me. I guess he said there was either 4 or 5 people that showed up at the Ward Meeting complaining about it and suggesting that would make a little more sense. That is about the extent of my knowledge.

Alderman Robert asked if that is what he wants.

Clerk Johnson replied that is what he is requesting the Committee to do that.

Alderman Domaingue said that she has seen Alderman Pariseau twice since that letter was dated and he never said a word to me either about that meeting or that he might want to communicate this to the Committee. So it comes as a little bit of a surprise to me. What the Committee should be made aware of is that the last time we held a Public Forum on this issue both neighborhoods were invited. It was the end of August and a consensus was reached that we would go back out and we would get additional traffic counting numbers from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission who would put back the counters. So we could establish whether or not the signage had any impact on the number of vehicles entering that neighborhood. Those counters were pulled last Wednesday and as far as I know we have yet to receive the numbers from Moni which is not unusual. My point is that we are still of the process that we stood in a Public Meeting with 150 people that we were going to follow through on. While we may come to this

ultimate conclusion that Alderman Pariseau is proposing here tonight, and I will not rule it out. We do not have all of the input. I certainly wouldn't do it without communication to the very people who are going to be immediately impacted and those are the people that are going to live on Sherwood Drive which are now deliberately directing the traffic to go down Sherwood. I think out of respect to their neighborhood we need to let them know that. I am going to ask the committee to table this until we get the numbers, we have an opportunity to digest whether or not there has been any impact. We will talk to the Police, Highway and Traffic Departments and we can go from there. It certainly should not take any longer than 30 days.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was so voted to table this item.

No opposition, motion Carried.

Chairman Sysyn called item #7 on the agenda:

Communication from Officer Guy Tremblay requesting that the Committee address the issue regarding the dangerous intersection at Beech Street and Cilley Road, suggesting that necessary steps to improve safety at this location be taken.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Lt. Tessier requested that the Committee table this so it would allow him more time to work on this particular issue.

Alderman Robert moved to table this item. Alderman Reiniger seconded the motion.

Alderman Domaingue said before we move forward on this motion, I need to ask the obvious. If I might Lt. Tessier, Officer Tremblay made a very convincing argument in his letter to the Committee in terms of sheer numbers of accidents. I understand that you want to work with him and I don't have a problem with that, but come up with a solution cause I'm not living with those figures.

Alderman Soucy stated that he has never recommended anything.

Alderman Domaingue answered no but those are very, very high numbers.

Lt. Tessier stated that there is no question that is probably the worst accident intersection in the City. Mr. Lolicata and I have worked on this issue before.

What I would like to do is sit down with Mr. Lolicata and draw in some more people to be involved. We cannot figure out why this is happening. It is a situation where people are going through red lights. It is not a situation where the time of day where people are being blinded by sunset or sunrise. That doesn't seem to be an issue, we have looked at all the factors involved. We cannot figure out why this is happening.

Alderman Domaingue asked if not wanting to obey the law enter into it.

Lt. Tessier said that he did not think so, Alderman. I do not think so at all.

Alderman Domaingue said that people run that red light but they really want to stop.

Lt. Tessier responded that he did not think they see it.

Mr. Lolicata stated that they are looking beyond it..

Lt. Tessier said that Mr. Lolicata and I looked at it this morning and our last final thing that we can do is shape the green lights down on South Willow. We are going to put louvers on the green lights that face up Beech Street. If they are looking ahead they will not see the green light they will not see anything there. If that is the problem at the intersection. We have moved the lights around, we twisted them, we had the State down there three or four years ago. We moved the lights back around if you noticed the difference down there.

Mr. Lolicata says that you have people on Beech Street that are seeing the traffic on South Willow. You have people on Cilley Road that are seeing the traffic on South Willow and what they are doing is looking beyond the lights there, in a lot of occasions.

Chief Driscoll spoke and said also there is the edge right on the corner. Nobody in their right mind is going to go through that intersection.

Alderman Domaingue said that the people in their right minds already have gone through.

Chief Driscoll said that I think there is a technical problem there.

Mr. Lolicata says there is no technical problem there at all.

Chief Driscoll said that when he says technical problem, I am talking about people looking beyond the intersection.

Mr. Lolicata stated that is a different story. After three years of talking about this intersection and having four lights in one direction, not two, but four. The only thing that we could come up with because of the high ratio after three years and when Officer Tremblay brought up It's what Gemini came up with this past week. There is no other answer right now. You're running a four lights, we are going to try this. It's special lights, we are going to buy two of them and put them down on South Willow Street. We will give that a shot there about \$100 a piece. It will completely oblivate the lights.

Lt. Tessier said that if you notice the green lights on Valley and Elm Streets. If you are heading west bound. There are certain areas you cannot see the green light. We had a problem like that years back on Valley and Willow. It seemed to solve the problem when we louvered the green lights at Elm Street. Granted that intersection is much closer than the one on South Willow is to Cilley Road. Whether it works, we do not know. We will try it.

Alderman Robert asked the it seemed as if these people already knew what they wanted to do? Should we table it or should we consider it case closed? Or what?

Mr. Lolicata said that for this moment this was the only alternative. We noticed that all the accidents that we have come up with on this particular year. They are southbound accidents, 90 percent are southbound. It has nothing to do with East or West, if they are running those lights. Lt. Tessier and I have come to the conclusion we would like to try to take care of South Willow and see if this will help. Have the Police informed once they are put in. Lt. Tessier would do that and then we could see if there is a drop. Let's try it.

Chairman Sysyn said that we probably should receive and file and let them try?

Lt. Tessier said that his hope would be that once this works we will not have the accident volume that we are having. We have tried a series of things over the years.

Alderman Domaingue said that she would support receiving and filing it providing this Committee send communication to Officer Tremblay thanking him for his efforts.

Chairman Sysyn added that maybe someday down the road you could check back with us and let us know how the accident figures are.

Lt. Tessier answered absolutely.

Alderman Robert said that he would rescind his motion.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to received and file the communication and to send a letter to Officer Guy Tremblay to thank him and to inform him on what is being done.

Mr. Lolicata advised he would send a letter to Officer Guy Tremblay.

Chairman Sysyn read the item #8 on the agenda.

Communication from Philip Egan, Principal, Bakersville Elementary School, requesting that the area along Queen City Avenue south of Bakersville School be changed from a "No Parking" zone to one with limited parking, so that parents may wait with their children until they have safely entered the school building.  
Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Alderman Robert moved for discussion. Alderman Soucy seconded the motion.

Alderman Robert asked if this was a reasonable request, Mr. Lolicata?

Mr. Lolicata said that he already had done something about that down there. I would like to see Mr. Egan and talk to him. I guess he is talking about below what we had already worked on. Evidently, they do leave them off on Queen City Avenue down below. There is room down there, I didn't know about this. If you want I will see the Principal and see what he wants and I'll make time if it is possible. We have the room down there to do it. We can make it 15 minutes. They must be letting the kids off on Queen City Avenue, is that right?

Alderman Soucy stated that's all it is. He seems to suggest that the primary reason is that the parents want to watch the children go into the school. If they are there for 5 seconds.

Mr. Lolicata said that he read something about them staying there until the children go into the school, 15 minutes or half an hour.

Alderman Robert asked if we should table this Mr. Lolicata.

Lt. Tessier said that he spoke with Principal Egan and some of the parents were getting tagged. It's a double edge sword and that is why I want Mr. Lolicata to look at it. I would be supportive further down on Queen City Avenue. The problem being as you get closer to the school there is a greater likelihood of a child stepping out between parked cars. That is why we need to be careful with this, if it is a little bit further down on Queen City Avenue so that it could just be a drop off.. If it is appropriate for Mr. Lolicata I have no problem with that. I just have a concern that if people parking directly outside the school so that a child does not walk between two parked cars onto traffic on Queen City Avenue.

Chairman Sysyn asked if we would table this and have them come back to us?

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Robert, it was voted to table this item pending review and report by Mr. Lolicata.

Chairman Sysyn called item #9 on the agenda:

Communication from Patricia Goley, American Towing, Inc.,  
offering to provide their services to the City for all towing.  
Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Alderman Robert moved for discussion. Alderman Reiniger seconded the motion.

Clerk Johnson stated that Lt. Tessier could probably address this. They just entered some contracts.

Lt. Tessier said that they were allowed and welcomed. We recently signed a contract with ten companies. They were certainly welcome to join, they chose to make an alternate proposal, as they do every year or every two years.

Alderman Domaingue asked if this was the bidding process?

Alderman Robert said that it seemed to him like they wanted an exclusive.

Lt. Tessier answered that was correct.

Alderman Robert said that it was his gut feeling that an exclusive contract to do whatever, would not be a good idea.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to mark the communication received and filed.

Chairman Sysyn called item #10 on the agenda:

Communication from Geoffrey Keegan, Grace Episcopal Church, requesting the installation of three 24" x 30" Grace Church signs at intersections outlined in the enclosed.

Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Chairman Sysyn asked Mr. Lolicata what his recommendation would be? Look at the signs they are 24" x 30".

Mr. Lolicata said that his recommendation is like previous. We have been decline them lately, and all churches and except for special ones like Red Cross or any of those. If you want, it is up to you people, that's the way they been doing it lately. If there is room we will do it. I guess that there is about 3 signs from what I just saw here.

Alderman Robert asked what they wanted to do. Was it to put up a sign for the Church?

Mr. Davis said that their idea is that most many towns in the State or you go around Episcopal Churches put up signs. I do not know if any other denominations like to do that or not. You may have noticed anytime you go anywhere you see them. For some reason they have never done it in Manchester.

Chairman Sysyn stated that they turned them down, I guess, that is what happened.

Mr. Davis said that he does not know if they ever requested in the past.

Mr. Lolicata said that he was stating the traffic the past year or so, they have been turning most of them down. That's the request that has been coming in..

Mr. Davis said that it did not think we turned down churches. We turned down the Masonic Home or something.

Mr. Lolicata said that's right. There has been a couple but there was one Church, I believe but he was in Hooksett. The last Church was in Hooksett that is all I can tell you. The one up on 3A as far as the Church, those sites that you already see have been put up years ago by the Lutherans et cetera, et cetera. All I am stating is that in the last year of so I cannot remember anyone, outside of Our Lady of Cedars or somebody. It's been quite awhile Tim. I am not voting on it, I am just

saying this is what the Committee has been doing. Do whatever you want. I will be glad to help the guy up to put them up, whatever you want.

Alderman Robert said let him do it. He's not paying for it, let him do it. It will make it look like we have a lot of Church goers here.

Chairman Sysyn said that it had to go with Mr. Lolicata's specifications, doesn't it?

Mr. Lolicata said that he supplies the signs and he has the right dimensions here anyway 24" x 30". If you want to okay I will speak to the gentlemen and help out.

Alderman Soucy said wait a minute. Mammoth and Wellington on the West bound side.

Chairman Sysyn asked what are you doing all the way up there the Church is on Pine and Lowell.

Mr. Davis said he did not generate this.

Alderman Soucy said you are defending it.

Mr. Davis said that # 1 and #2 are closest to the Church, but #3.

Alderman Soucy stated that she was just trying to figure out where #3 is? Is that the intersection where the Parks and Recreation sign is?

General Discussion.

Alderman Reiniger said that the Episcopalians enter Manchester from Mammoth Road they enter from all different directions. I do not know maybe the need a little guidance maybe they will find their way.

Alderman Domaingue asked whether it would be better to get a unanimous vote from the Committee rather that a split vote.

Alderman Reiniger stated why say no.

Alderman Domaingue said there is a host of Churches in the City and you are not setting any limits.

Alderman Reiniger said that this was his fifth year here and this is only the second request. I have no problem with helping Churches.

General discussion followed where Mr. Davis said that the Church would be pleased with having the first two.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted that the installation of signs for the Grace Church at intersections outlined as:

- 1) The intersection of Elm Street and the Amoskeag Bridge, on the East bound side.
- 2) The intersection of Elm Street and Queen City Ave., on the East bound side.

be approved. Alderman Soucy was duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Sysyn called item #12 on the agenda:

Copy of a communication from Gerard Smith submitting signatures of homeowners in the vicinity of Oak and Belmont Streets expressing their frustration of Chantilly's Pub and Lounge located on Daniel Webster Highway North constantly breaking the City's noise ordinance.  
Ladies and Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Chairman Sysyn recognized Chief Driscoll to discuss this issue.

Chief Driscoll said that these folks have been communicating with repeatedly. This is a situation much like the Amoskeag Inn. They are in a residential area or a border of a residential area. We have had repeated complaints. They have been cited on three separate occasions which was scheduled to court last Thursday. It has been continued. I have spoken with the Smith family and others who live up in that area. They are very aware of what is going on and tend to be there. I suspect that the City, the State will be successful as they were with the Amoskeag Inn. They recently went to court and found guilty on all three counts. Excuse me, they pled guilty on all three issues. I have spoken with Alderman Reiniger today about that. I have written a letter to Paul Bergeron at the City Clerk's Office asking that he enter the three convictions and the letter from the Police Department into their files. So, when they come back on the first of May to apply for a permit again, they will in fact be given a permit to do their business with the restriction that says that they can't do any type of outside entertainment. I am very pleased with what happened. It was a long road and there was some very frustrated people. I know that Alderman Reiniger dealt with at the Amoskeag Inn and I am very pleased with the eventual outcome of that. I think that next year as the weather gets warm we will be able to handle that very well because I do not

think we will have that issue to deal with. I think that this will go the same route and we can enter some type of restrictions against them also.

Alderman Soucy asked what types of limits do we have on how late establishments can stay open?

Chief Driscoll answered that they could only have entertainment until 1:30 AM in the morning.

Alderman Soucy is that a City ordinance?

Chief Driscoll answered yes. Depending on the day of the week, there is a lot of different issues.

Chairman Sysyn stated that we should table this until the courts' decision.

Chief Driscoll said that he talked with the Smith Family and they are very satisfied with what is going on. They know the process that it is going to go through. I think like the folks at Amoskeag Inn, there will be a whole group of people that will go there to show up and testify on the day in question. I am not quite sure when that is because it has been continued.

Alderman Robert asked if everyone was happy the way it's been going. Maybe we should write a letter to the Smiths' stating that we are aware of the situation and that the Police Department and other agencies are working on it. Let it go through the process and if there is a problem after the process is completed to be contacted.

Alderman Reiniger said that his other thought is since this issue is presently being dealt with in Administration as to amending the business license and this is the same issue as the Amoskeag Falls maybe we should refer this petition to the Committee on Administration so they have that information when they deal with that issue.

Chief Driscoll noted that the only difference is that this is inside at Chantilly's and it was outside at Amoskeag Inn. Other than that it is the same.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was voted that this item be referred to the Committee on Administration.

Chairman Sysyn advised that the Traffic Department had submitted an agenda that needed to be addressed as follows:

NO TRUCKS ALLOWED (9:30 PM - 7:00 AM):

ON TAYLOR STREET, FROM CILLEY ROAD TO VALLEY STREET

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

ON RILEY AVENUE, BOTH SIDES, FROM A POINT 70 FEET NORTH OF  
YOUNG STREET TO A POINT 65 FEET NORTHERLY  
ALDERMAN SHEA

ON RUSSELL STREET, EAST SIDE, FROM NORTH STREET TO  
CARNEGIE STREET  
ALDERMAN ELISE

ON CHESTNUT STREET, WEST SIDE, FROM WEBSTER STREET TO A  
POINT 60 FEET SOUTHERLY  
ALDERMAN REINIGER

ON DUBUQUE STREET, WEST SIDE, FROM DURETTE COURT TO A  
POINT 55 FEET SOUTHERLY  
ALDERMAN ROBERT

ON DURETTE COURT, WEST SIDE, FROM DUBUQUE STREET TO A  
POINT 65 FEET SOUTHERLY  
ALDERMAN ROBERT

ON DURETTE COURT, EAST SIDE, FROM DUBUQUE STREET TO A  
POINT 50 FEET SOUTHERLY ALDERMAN ROBERT

PARKING 15 MINUTES ONLY (8AM-11PM):

ON CHESTNUT STREET, WEST SIDE, FROM LOWELL NORTHBACK  
STREET TO A POINT 50 FEET NORTHERLY (REMOVAL OF 2 METERS)  
ALDERMAN REINIGER

PARKING 30 MINUTES (8AM-6PM):

ON CHESTNUT STREET, WEST SIDE, FROM A POINT 60 FEET SOUTH OF  
WEBSTER STREET TO A POINT 50 FEET SOUTHERLY  
ALDERMAN REINIGER

RESCIND PARKING ONE HOUR:

ON CHESTNUT STREET, WEST SIDE, FROM SPRUCE STREET TO CEDAR  
STREET  
ALDERMAN REINIGER

**Addendum**

**STOP SIGN**

**ON ELGIN AVENUE AT CORAL AVENUE, NORTHWEST CORNER  
ALDERMAN WIHBY**

Chairman Sysyn recognized Clerk Johnson to read the additional Traffic items to be added to the addendum.

Clerk Johnson stated in addition to the addendum that you have already received, we also have:

**NO PARKING**

**ON DUBUQUE STREET, WEST SIDE, FROM DURETTE COURT TO A  
POINT 55 FEET SOUTHERLY WHICH WAS REQUESTED BY  
ALDERMAN ROBERT**

**RESCIND NO PARKING:**

**ON CILLEY ROAD, NORTH SIDE, FROM TAYLOR STREET TO A POINT  
235 FEET EASTERLY WHICH WAS REQUESTED BY  
ALDERMAN SHEA**

Chairman Sysyn recognized Mr. Lolicata who had an additional item.

Mr. Lolicata said he had one more to add for Alderman Soucy for a stop sign on the corner of Winflower and Meaghan Drive. He would send the request to Clerk Johnson when he had the correct information.

Alderman Reiniger asked Mr. Lolicata about the Candlemaker on Chestnut Street. She said there is no parking 60 feet South Webster. Does that mean no parking in front of her house.

Mr. Lolicata said it was just above her. It was an ordinance of 60 feet it's all driveway.

Chairman Sysyn asked if she had a motion on the Traffic Department's agenda, excluding the discussion item.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Soucy, it was so voted to approve the Traffic Department's agenda.

Chairman Sysyn said she had a woman here from First Night who would like to speak about Streets closings for First Night.

Ms. Lee stated that basically it was a request for permission to hold First Night Concord - Manchester on Tuesday, December 31<sup>st</sup> from 3:30 PM till Midnight. This would be the first celebration for Manchester, the thirteenth for Concord, which is going to take place in both cities. I think addressed the Aldermen a couple of weeks ago. The celebration will include fireworks at 5 o'clock and at Midnight. What we are requesting is to be able to possibly put the vendors into place at 8 AM before the business day starts. It is a Tuesday that the event takes place on. We would like to get them in place and then close the streets down around 2:30 PM to 3:00 PM. From Elm Street to Merrimack to Bridge Street and then block the Elm Street of Spring, Mechanic, Stark, West Merrimack, Lowell, Concord, Amherst, Hanover, Manchester and Merrimack Streets.

Mr. Lolicata said that this would be the same as Thursday Night Live they had Downtown this summer. If I remember correctly it is the same area.

Chairman Sysyn said that Clerk Johnson had a question in regards to the Street blocking.

Clerk Johnson noted the vendors were not regulated by this Committee. Have you applied for a Fair license.

Ms. Lee replied that she had.

Clerk Johnson said that if you are closing the streets at 8:00 AM in the morning your Fair License will cover the vendor set up issue.

Ms. Lee replied okay.

Clerk Johnson said so what you really are asking this Committee is to close those streets during those hours, noting it would be subject to a report of the Police Department.

Lt. Tessier stated that they had already had one meeting and they have another one scheduled tomorrow.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to recommend approval of the street closures under supervision of the Police.

No opposition, motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn called the item for discussion on the traffic agenda:

DISCUSSION:

**TRAFFIC PROBLEMS CONCERNING GOFFS FALLS ROAD AND JEWETT SCHOOL  
ALDERMAN DOMAINGUE**

Alderman Domaingue stated that on Friday night she went out to the Jewett Street school. Southside Junior High School because on Jewett Street, I am told that four times a year they hold a dance. When they hold a dance, there is a considerable number of automobiles in the area. I said sure that happens. They also have a daytime problem. It appears we have parking on both sides of Jewett Street and we have two lane traffic trying to go by, four cars, and trying to fit through Jewett Street. We have an Officer station for these dances that is only four times a year. His responsibility is to monitor the students both inside the school and immediately leaving so he makes sure that they are accompanied by an adult when they leave the premises. His job is not traffic enforcement, so I am just alerting this Committee that I may come back with a report, hopefully from the Traffic Department and possibly from the Police Department for a resolution which we will ask for you to approve. I do not know what that is, but I am bringing it forward now because I was asked to do so by some residents. Goffs Falls Road, we have a Principal again, same issue as we had with Alderman 12 Wards. The principal is out in the middle of Goffs Falls Road attempting to direct traffic in the morning. That is unacceptable. If we do not have a crossing guard then we better get a Police Officer, because if I have a Principal go to the hospital, you are really going to see a situation. He shouldn't be out there, no, number one it's not legal as I understand it.

Lt. Tessier said that's true.

Alderman Domaingue continued by saying number two Goffs Falls School has one in and one out. The issue for Goffs Falls School is the same issue for these four dances at Southside. When you can't get an emergency vehicle in because something has occurred to block that area. I would not want to be the City of Manchester with a big liability suit because you are going to get it.

Mr. Lolicata said now you are getting it.

Alderman Domaingue said right Big L. That School has one entrance and one exit. If you get an automobile accident in the middle of that driveway and you

can't get an emergency vehicle in there. I would not want to be the City that has to explain it. Again, I am just letting the Committee know that these are critical issues that need to be addressed. I will be working with the Traffic and the Police Department to see if we can come up with some solutions.

Alderman Soucy asked if it was a problem during the day on Jewett Street as well? With parking on both sides.

Alderman Domaingue replied yes it was.

Alderman Soucy asked if it was just during the peak, in and out of school hours.

Alderman Domaingue said that it was an overflow traffic problem that we have. That issue is for school hours, but you are having the same problem there that we have in the neighborhood as I live in. As we have had with most of the School areas, parents are just such a rush. I am not sure we have the solution, I know we do not have the solution tonight or even if we have ultimately have the solution. They are not slowing down and kids are going to be at risk. You are going to have a fatality, I'm willing to put money on it. If you don't take a significantly strong stand pretty soon in the future. You are going to have a fatality with a child and nobody wants that.

Chairman Sysyn asked how come you have parking on both sides of the street. At Central High, during school hours, in front of my house one of my kids got tagged for parking on the street. There is no parking.

Alderman Domaingue said that is one thing she wants to take up with the Traffic Director Mr. Lolicata. My understanding was that it was an ordinance at one point that there was no parking on one side of Jewett.

Mr. Lolicata replied that it was an ordinance.

Alderman Domaingue stated that the signs apparently not there or they are not visible.

Mr. Lolicata said that they were there. There is a certain section.

Alderman Domaingue said whatever is needed. These school issues like with the sidewalk issues. Other areas I can understand if we want to take our time and look at maps and discuss it with other Committees. Schools are critical, you are dealing with small elementary children that are not visible by drivers.

Mr. Lolicata said that it's on the side of the school. It starts on one side of Weston and goes around the curb and goes up so many feet and then I believe there is no parking buses after that if I remember right.

Alderman Soucy said then it does not go as far as the school, though?

Mr. Lolicata responded that he thought it went below it. I think there is a time limit.

Alderman Domaingue stated that at the dance she observed both sides they were parking and they actually were blocking driveways. Drivers were in the car and they sat there which was a period of 30 minutes. As long as you did not have to get an emergency vehicle from 9:20 PM to 9:45 PM down South Jewett Street on that Friday night you were fine. I cannot imagine were those cars would go, if you had a fire or you had an ambulance need. It's critical.

Alderman Shea said that he wanted to make a comment that he was down at Dunkin' Donuts when there was an open house at both Southside and Jewett. A fire truck went down North on Jewett and some guy came running in and said "How's that truck going to get by there's no room?" I do not know how that truck got by, but that is when they had the open house. I want to mention that I live on Vinton Street and it is total kayos when the kids are getting out of Jewett. I mean people are shooting down Street they park and turn into peoples' driveways. It is unbelievable and there are no sidewalks on Vinton Street that is another concern. There really is a problem there.

Alderman Domaingue noted that they should look to have them come back with a solution. Thank you Madam Chairman.

Chairman Sysyn asked if there was anything else.

Clerk Johnson said the Amendment to the Traffic Ordinance. We sent out a memorandum to the Committee amending the Traffic Ordinance. Basically I am looking over the Traffic Ordinance concerning the new parking plan for the Downtown area for the fifty cent meters and so forth. In order to ordinance those we looked at the section that we normally would tag up. We found that there was still some requiring like three hour zones to have painted., the poles had to be painted blue, two hour zones the poles have to be painted green. We thought it was time to update that sectional a little because I do not think the town of Manchester or anyone wanted the poles painted those colors. It would not be enforceable otherwise. We looked at that section and a couple of other sections dealing with meters in general. We sort of did some general clean up more than

anything else. The only authority that was taken out was removing the surveyor and inserting the Traffic Director and the Committee on Traffic because those are the responsible parties at this point. We did in fact share it with the Police Department and to my knowledge they were satisfied with the changes. Mr. Tom Arnold and myself worked on the changes and we would like a recommendation or a finding by the Committee that it is approved by the Committee and recommend that it be referred to Bills on Second Reading.

On motion of Alderman Soucy, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to approve the amendments to the Traffic Ordinance, and recommend they be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading.

Clerk Johnson stated that they would advise the Committee that once this has been submitted to the Board that we would also intend to submit the Ordinances adopting some of those parking meters as the Traffic Department has those sections ready and those poles up. You will just see those reports automatically appearing because the Committee has already approved it all, anyway. Except for I guess maybe the St. Joe's area is going to come back. We will not put those through but everything else we will.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Robert, it was voted to remove item #17 from the table.

Communication from Mary McKillop, Optima Health Visiting Nurse Services, requesting that the alley (Chandler Street) behind their location at 1850 Elm Street be changed to a one-way running from north to south.  
(Tabled 6/4/96)

Chairman Sysyn asked Mr. Lolicata if they were holding this for some reason.

Mr. Lolicata asked was not this taken care of. I thought two meetings ago I had come back with Donna Laney and Chandler Street who was against this and the Traffic Committee went along with this. They were saying to abide by her. She was the only one who lived on this street and she was never approached first of all. I think you denied it because of the woman. Somebody was supposed to get back to the people up there not to do that to Chandler Street, that was my understanding.

On motion of Alderman Reiniger, duly seconded by Alderman Robert, the communication from Mary McKillop, Optima Health Visiting Nurse Services was marked received and filed.

## TABLED ITEMS

A motion is in order to remove any of the followings items from the table for discussion.

15. Communication from Alderman Reiniger submitting proposed revisions to existing City ordinances.  
(Tabled 2/26/96)
16. Communication from former Chief Favreau, requesting consideration that 10-hour meters along the south side of Manchester Street, between Pine Street and the driveway to the Police station be installed.  
(Tabled 5/21/96)
18. Discussion with Highway and Police Departments regarding the development and/or recommendations for methods of slowing down traffic on certain neighborhood streets.  
(Tabled 8/26/96)

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee