

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRAFFIC

February 28, 2006

6:00 PM

Chairman Osborne called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Osborne, O'Neil, Shea, Roy, Long

Messrs.: F. Thomas, J. Winters, R. Hobbs, D. Smith, Lt. Valenti, J. Hoben,
L. LaFreniere, J. Ferrer, T. Arnold, J. Plourde, K. Clougherty,
P. Borek

TABLED ITEMS

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to remove the following item from the table.

11. Chairman Osborne advises that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Country Club Drive, west side, from Front Street (south entrance) to Front Street (north entrance)

Alderman Forest

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME (6 PM-7 AM/NOVEMBER 15 THROUGH MAY 15):

On Country Club Drive, east side, from Front Street (south entrance) to Front Street (north entrance) – ORD. 8559

On Country Club Drive, east side, from Front Street (north entrance) – ORD. 8604
(duplicate on record)

Alderman Forest

Chairman Osborne asked can we get some enlightenment on this and start from the beginning.

Frank Thomas, Public Works Director, stated Washington Park, Country Club Drive is a street that has 36' of pavement and has parking a lot on both sides. The northerly section of Country Club Drive is rather steep in grade and has bends to

it. Over the winter months we have difficulty maintaining the streets with cars parked on both sides. It is difficult to get our plows through. As a result I believe Alderman Forest proposed restricting parking on the East Side of the street during the winter months during the overnight time period. However, we have found that this really hasn't worked. When we call a snow emergency we have had times when we have been forced to deal with 50 to 60 cars parked out on the street. The last two snowstorms have been a lot better. I think during the last snowstorm there were maybe 24 or 25 cars on the street that had to be towed and during the previous snowstorm there were about 16 if I remember correctly.

Chairman Osborne asked what do you think the reason is for that. Why the decrease?

Mr. Thomas answered I think part of the reason is we are getting later into the winter and people are starting to realize that when there is a snowstorm there is potentially going to be a snow emergency called and when there is a snow emergency called we are either going to tow or ticket. As you know, the ticket violation if your car gets towed during a snow emergency has gone up this year to \$75 and then the towing charge is \$110. One of the reasons why we are proposing further restrictions out there is as I mentioned the restriction that Alderman Forest had placed limiting it only to the winter months and at night doesn't seem to be working. So what we are proposing to do is restrict parking all year round on the westerly side of the street and permit parking on the easterly side of the street except during snow emergencies. We will continue in future winters, the remainder of this winter, to call snow emergencies and if necessary we will focus on towing cars that may be illegally parked on the side that has the restriction in place all year round. One of the reasons why we have to address this is we have very limited resources as far as towing ability both with wreckers and areas to impound these cars and when we have to deal with 50 or 60 cars that are illegally parked on one street during a snow emergency we are diverting our limited resources from the rest of the City that have similar areas of narrow streets. So we hope that by putting a year round restriction of no parking on one side that the residents in that area will get used to the fact of staying off that one side and parking on the opposite side of the street and if we don't have enough wreckers that we can focus on just the westerly side and get that open now we have a street that is at least wide enough for us to be able to get our plows up and down. Again, the issue that we are faced with is a safety concern. We want to make sure that we can maintain those streets. We want to make sure that they can be maintained in a manner where emergency vehicles such as a fire truck or ambulance can get up there. That is why we are here tonight.

Chairman Osborne stated Lt. Valenti said it was 30' and you are saying 36'. What is the street curb to curb? 30' or 36'?

Mr. Thomas answered I believe it is 36'.

Alderman Forest stated I called the Highway Department last week and talked to Bruce Thomas. He took out the plans and said from curb to curb it is 36'.

Mr. Thomas responded that is correct but again when you have snowbanks on either side of that street and parking on either side of that street you don't have much of a travelway in between. Two automobiles passing at the same time with those conditions is very difficult. Then what compounds it are the bends in the road and whatnot. Again, during the winter months when we have had parking on both sides we have not been able to get plows up that street.

Lt. Valenti stated I know we had a problem early on as Frank was mentioning with plowing the streets up there. During the first storm we had to go up there with contingent wreckers to tow quite a few cars off the street and during that time we had road blockage so that was a big problem up there. You know wreckers, police officers, people trying to get in their car and move it during that time...if there was an emergency in the complex there certainly would have been a problem for fire apparatus or other emergency personnel to get up into that area. Also there was talk at that time that if we didn't clear the street we would have a problem with icing up in that area. It is very hilly.

Alderman O'Neil stated at some point I would like to hear Alderman Forest's recommendation on this.

Alderman Long stated from what I am understanding was there a meeting set-up with the management – with yourself Frank and Lt. Valenti.

Mr. Thomas replied it was more or less a staff meeting with Highway, Police, and Traffic and we invited the management company from Washington Park as being the larger property management company up there because some of the issues that we had heard related to their plowing of their parking lots and forcing some of their tenants out in the street at certain hours and whatnot we wanted to discuss some of those issues that had occurred over the years and that is why that particular company was invited. Yes, we are aware that there is another condominium complex there. I talked to Mr. Hobbs on several different occasions. He has assured me that his development has adequate on-site parking and without quoting him he has concerns about the parking on the streets if there are emergencies up there similar to us.

Alderman Long asked were there any possible solutions that the management company gave you. Were there any ideas to rectify the problems?

Mr. Thomas answered again the issues that we raised such as the plowing of their lots and forcing their tenants out on the street right at 7 PM during a snow emergency was lifted. That was an issue that we heard about and they assured us that that was not their practice and typically they plow at 9 PM or 10 PM and they do it by lots. They weren't giving a directive to all of their tenants to park in the street. We then talked about if we had to have restrictions of no parking on one side of the street year round what would be the best side. Because of bus stops, driveways, and curb cuts the maximum amount of on street parking is to have one side.

Alderman Shea asked is this problem just unique to this section of this City or has it occurred in other sections of the City.

Mr. Thomas answered this is a problem that we have in other areas of the City where we do have high density, multi-family complexes. This street is a little bit more unique I guess because of the fact that there are curves in the road that make driving vehicles a little bit harder. We do tow cars out of some of these other areas on the East Side and West Side.

Alderman Shea stated what I am trying to get at is similar problems that you have encountered have been handled the way that you are suggesting this is to be handled. Is that what you are indicating?

Mr. Thomas responded we have utilized parking restrictions in some of these other areas but they are not at the magnitude of the problems we have on Country Club Drive.

Alderman Shea stated my point is that any decision we reach I want it to be as fair in dealing with this particular situation as other situations have been dealt with. That is my point in terms of how we treat the residents in this area of the City.

Chairman Osborne asked I would like to know how many of you are here to speak. Please state your name and address for the record.

Joel Winters, 10 Country Club Drive, Manchester stated:

I have copies of my testimony for the Committee if they would like. You just heard that Country Club Drive is 36' wide. I went out and measured some other streets to compare. Some of the other streets in Manchester are Cedar Street, which is 33' wide; Vinton Street which is 30' wide; Beacon Street which is only 24'2" wide. Country Club Drive is 36' wide and was designed to have parking on both sides and two-way traffic. During a normal day...pictures were taking last Monday and there is not a problem with parking on the street. Most everybody is

at work. Only after a snow emergency when the lots are being cleared is when we park on the street as these pictures will show you. The day after a snow emergency is when we desperately need to park on the street. I spoke to several of you on Sunday. I had to move my car to my lot at 1 PM. There were no parking spots for ¼ mile in either direction of my building. So if you can parking on one side of the street I don't know how far we will have to work. There are elderly people who live in my building. I don't want to see them have to walk up and down icy roads because they can't park on one side of the street. The last comment I want to make is last week Alderman Forest suggested that the average fire truck is 16' wide. I called the Fire Department and spoke to Keith in the garage who told me that the average fire truck is closer to 8' wide, just wide enough for three people to sit side by side by side in the back of the cab. Again, Country Club Drive is 36' wide and is plenty wide for parking on both sides. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Russell Hobbs, 23 Country Club Drive, Manchester stated:

I don't have too much more to say other than what I spoke about last week.

Chairman Osborne responded can I ask you a couple of questions then. Number one, you seem to know quite a bit about this particular condominium complex.

Mr. Hobbs replied I do. In fact, I am the person who has been after the Aldermen to make sure the cars were towed.

Chairman Osborne stated I tried to get the management company down here this evening but for some reason they would not come down.

Mr. Hobbs responded are you talking about the management from CPP. They are separate from us.

Chairman Osborne stated what I wanted to know is the parking spaces that you do have off street up there how many are there.

Mr. Hobbs responded we have 121 parking spaces.

Chairman Osborne asked how many condos are there.

Mr. Hobbs answered there are 80 units.

Chairman Osborne asked so what does that break it down to, about 1 ½ per unit.

Mr. Hobbs answered that is what the rule was when the buildings were built although we do have about eight unit owners who go to Florida for the winter so during the winter time they are not...

Chairman Osborne asked how many different parking lots are there.

Mr. Hobbs answered we have one continuous parking lot.

Chairman Osborne stated I know the big problem when they have a snowstorm is to get that cleaned out so that you people can get back in there again but is there anyway they can plow half of that...of course it is hard to get people to do this. I had this problem up on Tarrytown Road. I had this same situation. They had to go out on Auburn Street and Tarrytown Road and so on and park out there and some were parking in no parking zones, you name it. I know what it is like to have to go out in the cold and move your car. It is not an easy situation.

Mr. Hobbs stated the bigger problem is if people would cooperate and be ready to move when the plow comes. I have talked to the contractor and we have a very good contractor doing a fantastic job. He said it is going to be a bad problem because if I get up there and try to clear one side of the lot and then people have to move their cars they don't move them. This is why we have told people you have to leave when it is snow removal time. You have to be out by 10 AM.

Chairman Osborne stated it has been doing well on that street recently so where have they been parking.

Mr. Hobbs responded during the week they are at work and it is not as bad. The weekends are the worst. When we do it they just park wherever they can or they go to the mall or do whatever they can. The biggest problem is not during snow removal. The biggest problem I have observed are the cars that are not moving for snow removal. It is a headache. I have talked to the Highway Department and I have talked to my Alderman. I suggested why don't you raise the parking fee to a couple of hundred dollars and hit them in the pocketbook. We talked to an attorney when it comes to enforcement of our condo rules and he said if you want to enforce your rules you make them pay. They won't do it more than once and they will pay attention to the rules. My proposal is if you did the same thing – if you gave them a parking ticket and make it stiff enough that they are going to do it once and that is it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a question for you, Mr. Hobbs. You are saying increase the fine for what, parking on the street?

Mr. Hobbs responded well the Highway Department said that there are so many cars to tow that they are not going to tow anymore up there. They have told me that every time I talk to them. So if they are not going to tow them, then raise the fee or the other thing you might do is I think the City gets something like \$25 off a tow. Raise it up.

Alderman O'Neil stated we did just this year raise the fee to \$75 for towing. If they don't tow a car during a snow emergency a Police Officer puts a ticket on that car and it is a \$75 fine.

Mr. Hobbs replied some people look at the \$75 and say it is cheaper than towing so we will leave the car there.

Alderman O'Neil stated but we did take a step and it has actually helped in other parts of the City to be honest with you.

Mr. Hobbs responded we very seldom have to tow a car because they don't move for our snowplow but it costs \$135 whenever the private company comes up and tows a car. We have had three cars during the first three storms and since then we haven't had one towed.

Alderman O'Neil stated let me make sure I understand this if I can. If a car is left in a parking lot as part of this development and they tow it they charge the owner \$135?

Mr. Hobbs answered that is not...with a private contractor it is private property. We have Dan's Auto City and he charges something like \$100 and if he has to open the car to get in it is another \$35 to unlock it so it is \$135.

Alderman Roy stated just so that I am aware and the Committee is fully aware, you are one building out of how many.

Mr. Hobbs responded we are two buildings. I think there are 16 or 18 buildings total.

Alderman Roy asked so as far as you are concerned and the condominium association that is there, are you speaking for the entire Board or just yourself.

Mr. Hobbs answered we have nine members on our Board and in fact two of the Directors are here tonight.

Alderman Roy asked so the Board is in favor of closing down the East Side of the street.

Mr. Hobbs answered no because then if they close down the East Side of the street then you have a problem...what are you going to do when you have to get out to move the cars not just for snow but in the spring time it is to sweep the lot and like this past summer we had repairs. So occasionally we have to close our lots for maintenance. I don't really think it is necessary.

Alderman Shea stated up until more recently the policy has been to leave the lot and go onto the East Side or West Side of Country Club Drive. Is that correct?

Mr. Hobbs responded either that or go wherever you want to go.

Alderman Shea stated when I talked to Mr. Winters today my thinking went along the lines of if it can be resolved in sort of a compromise sort of situation where possibly people would be able to go out into that area for a limited area if that were possibly in order for the elderly to be accommodated as well as other people but not to allow them to stay there for two or three days as it were but allow the Highway Department to plow that area initially if that were possible. Somehow if that could be worked out so that cars could be removed from the area where obviously the condominiums are and then the next morning or within a short period of time allow them to go back in so that it doesn't present a major congestion problem as far as traffic and other things are concerned. I am not sure how that would work out. What is your opinion of that?

Mr. Hobbs responded actually it does work out now because our people when they do move out for snow removal it takes an hour or an hour and a half to clear the lots and generally within a reasonable time after that the cars are right back in the lot. They don't like to stay in the street because they know that there are people across the street that have to move their cars. Our people don't tie up the street for more than say a couple of hours.

Alderman Shea asked is that proposal or that suggestion any different than what is happening now or do people abuse the fact that they are...

Mr. Hobbs interjected that is about what is happening right now. The problem is the number of cars that are parked...if you go up any night on one side of the street especially on a Saturday or Sunday if you go up there at 10 PM or 11 PM the parking on one side of the street is all taken up. For some reason or other there is a huge number of cars. Renters park on the street on a regular basis. I don't know if they are not using their parking space per say. They have a little different policy than we do. For a one bedroom they allow one parking space. We allow two as long as the spaces are available. We have never denied anybody. We have three cars that have a permit to have a third vehicle. The Board has even looked

into the situation and we have identified where we can put 14-16 more spaces if we need to. Now if something could be worked out with Washington Park management so they could see where they could find additional parking spaces for all of these cars that are always parked in the street. I must say, too, that there are probably 20 cars that don't move unless they get towed. You go there and they are parked there day after day without moving. Alderman Forest told me that there is a law on the books that you are not supposed to park for over 24 hours in the City without moving your car but that is the situation.

Alderman Shea asked but you don't anything about who these people might be – they are not related to your condominium.

Mr. Hobbs answered no. We have separate stickers on our cars and if they have a blue sticker that says WPCA we know they are one of ours. We have one or two cars that once in awhile might park on the street but that is about it.

Alderman O'Neil asked regarding the condos if it is one-bedroom there are two parking spaces per. Are there more than one-bedroom units there?

Mr. Hobbs answered there are one and two bedrooms.

Alderman O'Neil asked how many spaces for a two-bedroom unit.

Mr. Hobbs answered for two-bedroom units we allow two.

Alderman O'Neil asked and for one bedrooms you allow two.

Mr. Hobbs answered yes we allow the two because we haven't had any problems with parking spaces. We do allow a third vehicle with a permit. We charge them \$10/month.

Alderman O'Neil asked did you say and I don't know if you were specifically talking about the condos but during that era when it was built the requirement was only one space per unit.

Mr. Hobbs answered from what I understand it was 1 ½. I went to the Planning Board and Building Department. CPM just built a new condominium down there and I went there because of this situation with parking on the street and I appeared before the Planning Board. I said now you are building another unit and they said well now the rules have changed and it is two spaces per unit.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you happen to know or maybe...Mr. Winters lives in the rental section. Do you happen to know what their requirements are or maybe we can get Mr. Winters to ask what they are allowed as rentals.

Mr. Hobbs answered I can't tell you what they are today but six or seven or nine years ago...we lived there for five years and at that time the rule was one space for a one-bedroom and two for a two-bedroom.

Alderman O'Neil asked can I get Mr. Winters to answer that question.

Mr. Winters stated we are allowed one space for a one bedroom and two spaces for a two bedroom.

Patricia Caller, President of the Board at Washington Park, Country Club Drive, Manchester stated:

I am concerned with, in our two buildings with 80 units, I know especially in my building I would say half of the people fall into the mature category. I would say we have 20 units who have people 50 years of age or older. We have probably 15 that are retired people. It is a real burden or will be a burden in snowstorms if they have to walk up the hill in order to get to their car and it will be...I don't know how far they will have to go. It will be a massive problem for them. They will probably have to move. It really is an, I think, unreasonable burden. I am just reiterating what others have said.

Alderman Forest stated I will try to make this short. For me, the problem up here at Country Club Drive started last winter. There was one snowstorm around Christmas if you all remember and then the next day it froze. The Highway Department couldn't get up there at all, mainly because of cars that were there. I proposed last year to make the East Side of the street a no parking zone. We had a committee meeting on it. The manager was Dan Blair at the time. We discussed it with him and came up with a compromise to make it a no parking zone only for the winter months and only from 11 PM until 7 AM. Well that has not worked. We have had snowstorms and the snowplows can't get up there. Contrary to what Mr. Winters said I called Chief Kane and the largest truck they have is 16' wide and that is the big ladder truck. An ambulance is almost as wide. I have a Ford Explorer. I was there two snowstorms ago and I couldn't make it out of the south entrance or the north entrance. I had to back up because of cars. This has been an ongoing thing. I don't want to be the one to call one of their relatives because an ambulance hasn't been able to make it up because there are cars there. I think this is a safety issue. We had a meeting with the new management of CPM. These people here, again, they have a legitimate complaint maybe but they are two buildings out of a complex of maybe 20. The majority of the people there feel that is what should be done. The management feels that is what should be done and

that is the agreement we came up with. That is why Frank Thomas and I have proposed that we make the West Side of the street no parking because the East Side has the most parking. There are fewer driveways on the East Side and in snow emergencies the lots are plowed at 10 AM or 11 AM and management doesn't force everybody to move out into the street. They have a way to move in order to get the lots plowed and come back. It may inconvenience a few people but I don't want to notify anybody that somebody died because an ambulance or fire truck can't make it up there and that is why I have requested this.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Forest it seems to be in conversations with Highway and Police...you are saying that the snow removal on the private property doesn't happen until the morning.

Alderman Forest answered right.

Alderman O'Neil asked why over the years is there such an emphasis in the middle of the night to tow cars. Doesn't the company tell the tenants that they have to be out of there even though the snow removal doesn't happen until 10 AM?

Alderman Forest answered they have a written contract and I am sorry I didn't bring it but they have a written contract with their tenants that says during a snow emergency the next day after the emergency they do the lot. They start at 10 AM. If the snowstorm continues, they won't do the parking lots until the snowstorm stops. Nobody is forced to go out and empty all of the lots. This is one of the reasons we tried the 11 PM to 7 AM because CPM said that they would do the lots at night and it didn't work. They were still parking...again I think during one snowstorm we towed 19 cars and the last one was 24 from what I heard. They are still parking on the street. This is one way to keep one side of the street open.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if I am a renter up there currently and there is a snow emergency overnight I do not have to get my car out of that lot until 10 AM the following morning.

Alderman Forest answered correct. If they call a snow emergency, the management doesn't require you to get out of the lot. You stay in the lot and they will plow the lot the next day starting at 10 AM and they do one lot at a time.

Alderman O'Neil asked so is this the recommendation of Alderman Forest and the Highway Department and the Police Department.

Chairman Osborne answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the traffic regulations as submitted. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Shea being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Robin Bonneau requesting the use of Arms Park and the Notre Dame Bridge for the 15th Annual WGIR/FM Memorial Weekend fireworks display on Sunday, May 28, 2006 with a rain date of Monday, May 29, 2006 and requesting set up on Saturday, May 27, 2006.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Shea it was voted to adjourn.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from David Smith, MTA Executive Director, seeking input regarding where and how a bus transfer point might be located in downtown.

David Smith, MTA Executive Director, stated with me tonight is Evan Rosette, Operations Planning Manager for the Authority. In November we presented to the Committee preliminary discussion of the need for a broader transfer point downtown. At that point in time, we had just initiated what is called a comprehensive operations analysis. The analysis was funded partially with federal funds and sponsored by Southern NH Planning Commission. KKO Consultants was hired to do this. It was really a street level operations analysis of routes and schedules and done for the first time in great depth in five or six years. Our objective in the comprehensive operations analysis is to really make the system as productive as it possibly can be and effective for users. One observation we have made over the past five or six years is that a transfer between routes – that is being able to move from one part of town to another, is difficult and inconvenient for people traveling from some parts of town to other parts of town. The roundtrip running times on the routes are not all the same. They don't all meet downtown at the same time and as a consequence passengers that wish to transfer from one part of town to another may wait as long as 45 minutes between buses. The idea that was presented by the consultant and that we asked to be looked at was to bring more buses together at the same time so that people would have ease of transfer and we would encourage ridership on the system and improve our patronage as a result. At that point in time, as I said the study had just started and we had talked to Tom Lolicata at the Traffic Department about some preliminary ideas. At that time when we made the presentation to you, two locations were identified as opportune. One was Veteran's Park and Center of NH on both sides of the street

and one that Tom suggested we looked at was one at Elm and Spring Street. When we looked at Elm and Spring Street operationally it did appear to be a problem for us and as well I had some safety concerns about pedestrians on that shaded side of Spring Street where it is always shaded from sun. So we are really looking, I think at Veteran's Park and the Center of NH at this point. The consulting project is only partially done. The data collection part is virtually finished and there will be a presentation on March 14 for the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and the MTA Board and members of the Southern NH Planning Commission to bring people up-to-date on the findings of that analysis and to present some preliminary ideas or at least get some input from key policy makers and users as to what direction we should take. This is an interim report. We did meet with Sgt. Bartlett at the Police Department who feels that the best location would be at Veteran's Park and the Center of NH feeling that that is a very open place and the street is wide at that point and buses parked on either side would not interfere unduly with traffic and that it is a wide open area conducive to that kind of use. We did also talk briefly with Steve Tierney at Highway and at this point they have no objections to our going forward with that idea. At this point, because the routes and schedules have not been pulled together...we still have that public meeting to go, it is not determined how many buses would be brought together at the same time. We have 13 routes and it is not likely that all of them would come together at the same time so we don't have an exact count or an exact idea of the need for space at this point in time. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Alderman Shea asked for my own information how many buses do you feel need to be coordinated at one time in order for transfers to be enacted and so forth. Are we talking about six from the east and six from the west or have you no idea preliminarily?

Mr. Smith answered the maximum number that we now have is five – three in one direction and two in the other. That is not...it is felt that that doesn't serve passengers well and there should be more. As I said I can't determine at this point, not knowing what the roundtrip running times will be determined to be or what the routes will be how many we will be able to coordinate at the same time but certainly perhaps more than five.

Alderman Shea asked do you have any idea what you would like to see. Would you like to see five and five or six and six or four and four?

Mr. Smith answered at the most currently during the peak hour we have 13 buses on the route, one on each route basically during each trip. I am not sure that...because the route running times are so different, they range from 35 minutes to an hour right now, I am not sure how feasible it is to get all of them to meet. I

would think that the number would certainly be less than 13 at one time but perhaps more than five.

Chairman Osborne asked do you need some sort of direction from us this evening.

Mr. Smith answered no this is just an interim report.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I recall from the last time you were here to brief us on this one of the advantages of Veteran's Park and Center of NH...one there is no parking on a good portion of both of those blocks. I believe on the Center of NH side there is no parking from Pleasant Street all the way to Granite Street and if you go on the east side there is limited parking, maybe five or six spaces from Central to a point somewhat north. So that would be the only, if you wanted to use the term disruption, might be the elimination of a few parking spaces on the East Side. Is that correct?

Mr. Smith responded I believe there are six or eight on that side.

Alderman O'Neil asked so generally speaking that works out better than any other part of downtown Manchester – keeping you on Elm Street.

Mr. Smith answered yes and it is close enough to the center of downtown. Of course there is a lot of space on South Elm but that is not close enough to the center.

Alderman Roy stated I would ask Dave to possibly work with Traffic. It is my understanding that the meters along Merrimack Street were removed after the fire, the building that is now J.W. Hills, and we have been without that parking for three years now.

Lt. Valenti stated that has already been discussed. When Sgt. Bartlett met with MTA that was one of their discussions. If we lost parking on Elm Street we were going to utilize the space on the north side of Merrimack Street to make up the spots. Currently the meters were taken out as you all know for the renovation of that building. They were utilizing that to park a dumpster. I talked to Mr. Hoben briefly and he said the metered spots were going back in. I believe there are four spots there. We would probably remove six on Elm Street if need be but some of those spots on Merrimack Street were dedicated to Intown so they would have to take up two of the spots that we would be moving over to Merrimack Street.

Alderman Roy asked but the net loss would still only be two spots.

Lt. Valenti answered correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked am I correct, Lieutenant, that getting those meters back up on Merrimack Street doesn't need to wait until the study of the bus routes comes back. That could or should happen as soon as possible?

Lt. Valenti answered yes. It is in the works right now.

Alderman O'Neil stated I will be honest. When I drive by the two spots that were dedicated to the Visitor's Center, I think it is, I don't see cars parked there a lot so I don't know that it is actually working. We maybe need to get some information on how often they are actually using those spaces.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from residents of Amherst Street submitting a petition requesting to amend the Residential Parking Permit Ordinance.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Hoben can you enlighten us a little bit on this. I think this came up...I wasn't Chairman then but did this come up last year on the Traffic Committee agenda at all.

James Hoben, Deputy Traffic Director, stated residential parking permits are handled through the Ordinance Violations Division of the Police Department.

Lt. Valenti stated in talking to the OVB Supervisor, Dale Robinson, apparently when we changed the ordinance Amherst Street was inadvertently left out of that zone. That current zone runs from Concord Street north to Blodgett, Union and down to Chestnut.

Chairman Osborne asked what is your recommendation.

Lt. Valenti answered my recommendation is that we allow residential parking on Amherst Street.

Alderman O'Neil moved to amend the Residential Parking Permit Ordinance to include Amherst Street.

Alderman O'Neil asked does it go any further south. Where does it pick up again?

Lt. Valenti answered that would be the south border.

Alderman O'Neil asked isn't there residential parking down on Auburn and Cedar or maybe south of Valley I am thinking then. There is Belgrove and Green. There is definitely residential parking there.

Alderman Roy stated those are different zones.

Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 6 of the agenda:

E-mail communication from Julia-Estelle Ferrer regarding housing code needs within inner-city dwellings.

Chairman Osborne asked, Mr. LaFreniere, can you enlighten us on this particular request.

Leon LaFreniere, Building Director, responded I can try. I am not sure how adequately I can represent Ms. Ferrer's concerns. I have read the correspondence. Ms. Ferrer alleges, somewhat I would consider very serious charges regarding corruption and a callous disregard for human life, which I would actively dispute. We have had some interactions with Ms. Ferrer in the past in the residence that she was occupying. I believe that she was not satisfied with the limits of the code application as we were able to apply it. The housing code is a minimum standard that is designed as a balance between housing standards and life safety standards. With regard to that, we do apply the standard in a consistent fashion. I would be happy to try to work with Ms. Ferrer to address the concerns they have if that is possible. In reading through her communication though, it is difficult for me to respond because there are no specific allegations to respond to. I would be happy to sit with Ms. Ferrer and try to better understand the nature of her concerns if the City should so wish.

Chairman Osborne stated it seems that we are running out of time again this evening. It seems like we can't get through an agenda but can I call Ms. Ferrer up.

Alderman O'Neil stated there is no meeting after this. They cancelled the Lands & Buildings meeting.

Chairman Osborne asked, Ms. Ferrer, what is your main concern. I won't say complaint, I will say concern. What is your main concern? Break it down to one thing.

Julia Estelle-Ferrer, 521 Pine Street, Manchester stated:

The fact that it took this long for Mr. LaFreniere to offer to meet and speak with me about these issues.

Chairman Osborne asked what issues.

Ms. Ferrer answered the issues I had then and since then...other people who have contacted me about their concerns about the safety of where they live and the non-code compliance that is ongoing for not days, weeks and months but years. I went on the air at MCTV to address these issues because I didn't know where else to go or what else to do. I receive calls all the time. I go to the different places. I have seen the non-code compliance, mostly from disabled people and in one instance a newborn baby.

Chairman Osborne asked can we stick to one particular address or something.

Ms. Ferrer answered I didn't want to name building addresses because they already know. I went to City Hall last week and the week before and I looked in the files of these addresses.

Chairman Osborne asked can you tell me what street it is on.

Ms. Ferrer answered Douglas Street is one building. There have been five no shows of the person that owns that property who lives in Hudson to meet with the inspector for whatever reasons they were supposed to meet. The thing is I received a call from a woman who had a daughter and a grandson living in that building and there was not enough heat in the apartment and the building was roach infested and when she called notes were made in the file, the same references that she made to me, that when the inspector went there he told us she had to take care of the roach situation and that there was a heating unit at the very front of the apartment, which did not heat all the way through to the apartment.

Chairman Osborne asked so we are getting to cockroaches. This is the first thing? You are going from heating to cockroaches?

Ms. Ferrer answered heating and the forced hot air furnace that is literally poisoning the area inside the apartments, especially if people...

Chairman Osborne interjected was the Health Department involved at all.

Ms. Ferrer responded I have no idea. I know the Fire Department was. The cited that location twice for dangerous steps and loose floorboards, etc.

Chairman Osborne asked what does this all boil down to. What are you looking for? I know we have Certificates of Compliance and everything.

Ms. Ferrer answered but those certificates are like a free pass. You have to go there and see the buildings. You have to be inside those apartments. You have to be there when there is no snow removal because the landlord refused to comply, especially for a disabled person.

Alderman O'Neil stated Ms. Ferrer with all due respect I am an At-Large Alderman now but I did represent Ward 4, which is an inner City ward and I have found the Building Department to be one of the most responsive departments and if there are specific accusations...you are here taking a lot of liberty but give specific addresses and I am absolutely fully confident that Mr. LaFreniere and Mr. Kula will make sure that they follow-up on them. I am aware of situations where they have brought in in the past when they thought it was a little bit beyond their scope, the Health Department to help address issues. They brought in the Fire Department because that was the appropriate agency. I would just appreciate it if you could give Mr. LaFreniere or Mr. Kula the specific addresses in question. I have full confidence that they would take care of them. I am aware of the Police Department passing on concerns of living conditions to their department and their address. The Fire Department when they answer medical calls or fire alarm calls. I will say in my opinion the Certificate of Compliance Program has been extremely successful in the City of Manchester. It has improved the living condition and more importantly has improved the safety of the citizens of this City.

Ms. Ferrer asked do you really think I would be sitting here and fighting for five years if that were absolutely true.

Alderman O'Neil answered I don't but somehow there was a breakdown of communication. I think if you can give specifics...you are sitting here tonight and you are not willing to give specific addresses.

Ms. Ferrer stated yes I am. I giving you the best that I know how to give you. 254 Douglas Street is one building.

Alderman O'Neil responded that is great. I am sure they will be on that tomorrow.

Ms. Ferrer stated 433 Beech Street but I no longer live there. I lived there for eight years and I almost died in that building from the indoor air pollution, not to mention the absolutely cavalier manner of the owner of the property. I am not the only tenant that happened to. A woman in the next apartment who was more

disabled than myself, her thermostat was totally disengaged. She almost froze to death in that apartment that winter.

Alderman O'Neil replied I am not saying that things are absolutely perfect in the City of Manchester but I will defend the department that any time I have contacted him based on complaints, they have followed through and the improvements have happened almost immediately. They do, on occasion, get landlords who just don't care and they have to drag it out. They have taken them to court in the past but I think it is important...you gave some specific addresses. I am sure they are going to be working on it right away.

Chairman Osborne asked can you give the Building Department a list of the addresses. Are you willing to do this?

Ms. Ferrer answered yes.

Chairman Osborne stated well at the beginning I asked you and you wouldn't give them to me.

Ms. Ferrer stated I am here to do no harm except to try to get...

Chairman Osborne interjected I know but we want to get to the issues here and we can't if we don't know where they are.

Ms. Ferrer stated I wrote to Mr. LaFreniere in 2004 and to the Mayor's Office. I wrote to Al Kula. I even wrote to HUD in Boston and they came. First of all they do not address the tenants at all during that inspection. The tenants do not receive a copy of the outcome of the inspection like Section 8 offers in the event that something doesn't get repaired the tenant has some remedies. Nobody knows what page anybody is on as far as the Building Department is on because...

Chairman Osborne interjected whatever requirements there are I am sure the Building Department will do so. If they aren't required to then that is the way it has to be I guess. Can you give all of the addresses to the Building Department and they will act on all of these and get back to us.

Alderman Shea stated I want to thank you for coming, Ms. Ferrer. I think that whatever happened in the past we should leave it there but I believe that your communication should be with the Building Department. In the event that you contact them, then you should reappear before this Committee within a certain length of time and say look I followed your suggestion at the meeting that you had on February 28 and nothing has resulted or I am not back again other than to say that since that meeting I have worked with them, listed certain complaints that I

have had and they have responded to those complaints. I think that is where we should start. In other words, whatever happened in the past is in the past so we can't really undo the past but we can...you can work together with these individuals. You have testified this evening concerning your particular frustration with the process up until now but I believe that you have to work together with them at this stage in order for improvements to be made for those people that you have nobly represented – the disabled and the people that you feel are not being entitled to a certain amount of improvement within their living conditions. The only problem is that tenants that live within different residences...I am not sure if the responsibility on the part of the Building Department is to them or to the owners of these properties. I am not sure if there is a certain amount of confidentiality. Maybe Leon you can address that.

Mr. LaFreniere stated I will try. Certainly when we are dealing with issues related to a property, we are dealing specifically with the property owner who is responsible for addressing any issues.

Alderman Shea asked is there any responsibility towards the tenants.

Mr. LaFreniere answered absolutely. We receive complaints from tenants frequently and that is one of the events that initiate our process to start an inspection. The other being the normal inspections that we schedule.

Alderman Shea asked is there any obligation on your part to notify the tenant.

Mr. LaFreniere answered all of our records are public records and are made available to the tenants upon request.

Ms. Ferrer stated the thing is that most tenants do not know what is available to them by way of protecting their circumstances. I didn't know about the Variance Board until 1999. Then I started learning how to ask for whatever it was but even with that a year later the same violation of code was still unremedied by a landlord that has absolutely no compulsion to follow the rules.

Chairman Osborne stated well I think they are going to do their best now.

Alderman Long stated Ms. Ferrer I believe this is the start of something new here. This Committee is aware of what your claims are and we believe this is the start of your communications with the Building Department with respect to what the problems are and how to solve them. You have the ear of this Committee from this day forward. I would with an open mind want to resolve these for the citizens that you are concerned about and with an open mind know that they are going to work with you and if they don't you have our e-mail.

Ms. Ferrer replied I understand that and I appreciate that and I told you before all of this began that I didn't want to hurt anyone, I didn't want to direct focus on any particular individual but this is really so much more than what we discussed here. If somebody would just take a tour one day of some of the apartment buildings to see how they really are as opposed to the way they are represented it might cast a different light on things. I don't go around attacking people and I certainly don't make things up. I am very clear headed about rights and I just don't get it. I really don't.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think there is an elected official who believes that people don't deserve to live in a safe house or apartment. I think we will do anything in our power to correct wrongs and I give you that commitment. We need to know the exact addresses because unfortunately that is the only way we can send inspectors out. Again, my history with the department is any time I have called them over my many years here they have addressed...without question they have addressed the concerns. The Highway Department...I can remember we had a large tenement building on Pearl Street that today you wouldn't even know it is the same place because of a coordinated effort led by the Building Department but working with several other City agencies to cite the owner and it finally got the owner's attention and you wouldn't know it is the same building today. The living conditions there have greatly improved.

Ms. Ferrer responded but you are a person of the City. Most tenants are pretty invisible people and nobody will pick up the phone and answer to a tenant otherwise I wouldn't be here.

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

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from Attorney Bruce Kenna, on behalf of Alan Dary requesting exception to the Residential Parking Permit for Zone #1.

Chairman Osborne asked is there anyone here to speak on this item.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to understand this. The reason he can't get a permit is because he doesn't have his license currently is that correct? If he had his license there would be no issue with him getting the permit?

Chairman Osborne responded yes that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am not sure why there is a need...

Chairman Osborne interjected I guess the Solicitor can help us out with this one.

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor stated I only know what it is written in the letter. The ordinance does require the production of a driver's license when you apply for the permit. I think obviously that is because we don't want people getting residential parking permits and taking up that parking space if they don't have a license to drive. Unfortunately this particular individual does not have a license to drive because he has lost it. You can see from the letter he wants to park his car in the street so other people can drive him around but I would note that the requirements of the ordinance are that you produce a driver's license at the time you apply for the permit.

Chairman Osborne asked does it have to be valid or just for identification.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered it says you have to produce a driver's license.

Chairman Osborne asked a valid driver's license.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered I would presume so yes.

Chairman Osborne asked what would be your recommendation.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold replied it depends on what the Committee wants to do.

Chairman Osborne stated we want to do everything that is legal.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated the Committee, if it feels it is appropriate, could ask that the ordinance be amended but I would not recommend that you grant this particular request in violation of the ordinance.

Lt. Valenti stated when we were looking at residential parking permits and the issuance of such prior to the current ordinance, it said that you had to have a NH driver's license. We loosened it up a little bit to include out-of-state students who may come into Manchester and rent an apartment. Now this particular individual lost his license. He doesn't have a license and for him not to have an automobile at his access I certainly would not be in agreement with that. The other issue is that if we are allowing him a residential parking permit and he does park on the street if we should have a snow emergency or a need to move that vehicle and he doesn't...you know he is not available or doesn't have a license to move it then there is going to be a problem. I would recommend that the Board not grant a residential parking permit.

Alderman O'Neil asked if somebody has a permit and loses their license what happens.

Lt. Valenti answered we don't rescind it because we don't keep track of who loses their license.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated the permit and I could stand to be corrected but I believe they are issued on a yearly basis and of course if it came up for renewal and they still didn't have their license they would not be able to get a permit but I think in so far as I know Lt. Valenti is correct that there is no active effort to monitor who may no longer have a license while the issued permit is still in effect.

Alderman Shea moved to receive and file. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion. Chairman Osborne called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Communication from Cathy McDonald, Treasurer of Marcel's Way, requesting the use of Arms Park on Saturday, April 29, 2006 from 10 AM until 4 PM with a rain date of April 30, 2006, in conjunction with a walkathon to help raise awareness of mitochondrial disorders.

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

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from Jason Plourde advising of a proposed gasoline station, convenience store, car wash facility redevelopment project to be located at the intersection of Second Street, South Main Street and South River Road.

Mr. Hoben stated this is a meeting we had...currently this is all part of a project that is currently on the table of the Planning Board. Greenman-Pedersen Engineers came in with this proposal as part of the gas station at that corner and what they want to do is coordinate the signals with the signal in Bedford down at the Hannaford there. What they want to do is tie in their signals with our signals and have a coordinated system all along River Road. I had a conversation with Tom Clark. He had no objections to it as long as we had a valid agreement with the Town of Bedford that would state that they would hold the City of Manchester harmless for any liability issues. It wouldn't cost the City any money on our end.

They are also proposing a crosswalk on South Main Street at Hale Avenue. It is all part of the Planning Board process.

Alderman Long asked are we going to get a letter from Bedford on a commitment with respect to this traffic signalization.

Mr. Hoben answered there will be a proposal forthcoming if it passes the Planning Board. This is information only for the Committee. Jason Plourde is here.

Alderman O'Neil asked is the Planning Board looking for a vote from us on this.

Mr. Hoben answered I don't believe so at this point. This is for informational purposes only.

Alderman Shea moved to table.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe Mr. Plourde can tell us whether or not they are looking...

Chairman Osborne called Mr. Plourde forward.

Jason Plourde, Project Manager, Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. stated what we have done is we have prepared a traffic study for expansion to the existing gas station at the intersection of Second Street and South Main Street. One of the biggest problems we have seen in talking to City officials and to the Town of Bedford officials is that the amount of traffic that is traveling south from Manchester into Bedford and back from Bedford to the Colby Court intersection...the two signals are not talking to each other right now so what is happening is you have a lot of cars stacking up or queuing up into Manchester and it is really affecting the signal at our project. Whether our project goes forward or not we strongly recommend that the City work with the Town of Bedford to clean up the traffic there.

Alderman O'Neil asked is this and I have read about it in the Planning Board minutes but I haven't actually seen a map, is this the current gas station and convenient store...what I would call the point between Main and Second Street.

Mr. Plourde answered that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated so you have curb cuts both on to Main and on to Second Street.

Mr. Plourde responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated you said when you are heading southbound on Main or is the worst on Second.

Mr. Plourde responded the worst is on Second Street.

Alderman O'Neil asked so you are saying that...do you happen to know if this is a condition of the Planning Board as part of your approval process.

Mr. Plourde answered everything is kind of up in the air right now. One of our recommendations and commitments is to coordinate the two signals. Based on our meeting where Jim was in attendance and Dave Winslow as well with Jim Stanford from the Town of Bedford, what the understanding was is that the Town of Bedford would be taking over the coordinated system. They would be maintaining it to make sure that there was no liability to the City. Once we do receive the Planning Board approval, that is the next step. To get a letter from the Town of Bedford and make sure that we work it out with the City because one of the hardest things is to try to get traffic signals in two different municipalities who is going to be maintaining it and what is going to happen. It seems that both municipalities are eager to see this project done.

Alderman O'Neil asked how many times a day does Second Street southbound fail at that intersection currently.

Mr. Plourde answered right now what we have noticed is that during the AM commuter peak, the PM commuter peak and also during Saturday midday. Those are the biggest times of the week in a typical day that it is backing up.

Alderman O'Neil asked does Main Street southbound fail.

Mr. Plourde answered yes. The right turns coming out of South Main Street definitely are having a problem.

Alderman O'Neil asked and that is at similar times.

Mr. Plourde answered yes and it is all because they can't move through the signal. What we are also proposing are some modifications to the phasing out there in order to allow...when the main line left turns are running to have the side street right turns as an overlap so they can proceed at the same time.

Alderman Shea stated I was listening on TV to the discussion concerning this particular project. My thinking on it is it is not resolved at all at this time with the Planning Board so...the timing itself is it germane? Can this particular item be

tabled and discussed when the Planning Board comes back? My thinking is we would be somewhat premature jumping ahead of this particular situation.

Mr. Plourde responded I would agree. We are not looking for any kind of decisions. This is just for information.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would have to say I appreciate it. We don't get enough of these.

Alderman Long stated I represent the Aldermen on the Planning Board and the public concern was traffic right now. They have done a study that is contingent on working with Bedford to have everything go smoothly. It isn't through the Planning Board as of yet.

Chairman Osborne stated down further on Second Street...I know I go there a lot myself to Marshalls and so on and it is always lined up heading into Manchester like from your gas station on down. What about the lights that are further down by Applebees or the intersection of the turnpike there? It seems like they are holding up down there more so than it is at the other end.

Mr. Plourde responded there are a lot of problems along that corridor. I am not going to lie to you. A lot of the issues are maybe there is not enough right-of-way in order to put in proper turn lanes or additional through lanes.

Alderman Osborne stated I think it is backing up further down more so than it is where you are.

Mr. Plourde responded right but if we can clean up the corridor that is further south so that it is not backing up where it is an existing condition right there in front of our door maybe it will clear it up at the other signal. I am not saying that it will but maybe it could. I do have some handouts if the Committee would like to see them.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think your discussion about issues further down...Alderman Shea was just pointing out I think it is Harvell Street that is right by Dairy Queen. There are issues there. There are no signals but people have a hard time coming off 93 Southbound trying to get out and Alderman Smith has brought up issues further north. It has nothing to do with this gentleman's project but that Second Street corridor might need some consideration by us in the future.

Chairman Osborne stated it is synchronized right now. You are talking about just synchronizing the signals and not adding a signal correct?

Mr. Plourde responded that is correct. There are no new signals.

Chairman Osborne stated I think we should receive and file it and then come back to the Committee after they get through with the Planning Board.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it is my understanding that the discussion is on synchronization not so much putting up new traffic lights and I believe that the Traffic Department would have to work further with Bedford and get something in writing. So you could either request something in writing or get the Traffic Department to come back when they have further information from the Town of Bedford and something in writing to come back to the Committee with.

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

Chairman Osborne addressed Item 10 of the agenda:

Revised Draft Downtown Parking Study.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I may I know that the Economic Development Director and the Finance Director are here amongst other City staff. We really should have...I don't know if it is this Committee's responsibility or the full Board but we spent some money for that study and we have done nothing with it. We tried to tie it together with a number of other issues but we really should have a dedicated night or a dedicated hour or hour and half to have the consultant in and go through it. We have not given that thing its fair due. I think there are some controversial recommendations but there is also an awful lot of good information in there that we could put into action sometime over the next few years.

Chairman Osborne stated well since they have been here most of the evening I would like them to give us a bottom line here and we can set up a meeting for more time in the future.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it our...is it in the Traffic Committee's jurisdiction.

Chairman Osborne answered I don't see why it wouldn't be. It is public safety and traffic. It would go from this Committee to the full Board anyway. I think it would be nice to start in Committee rather than go to the full Board. That is my opinion.

Alderman O'Neil stated my only concern is if we are going to have to get the consultant back one more time we aren't going to get him twice – once before the Committee and once before the full Board.

Chairman Osborne responded I have watched it myself on TV and I think I have a pretty good idea about what is going on but maybe the rest of the Committee hasn't.

Kevin Clougherty, Finance Director, stated as Alderman O'Neil said we had the parking study. It had about 40 recommendations in it. Some received more attention than others but I think the consensus of the City department heads is there are some pieces worth further exploring and in order to do that what we have tried to do in this letter was to say take those 39 recommendations and get it done to maybe eight or nine categories to help understand what the study was recommending in terms of the transition of responsibility to a central department. It is all over the place right now. Nobody has the central responsibility for parking. It is too big of a responsibility to just have it so diluted among the departments. The other thing was to take a look at whether the Board was interested in bringing in a parking manager and putting them in charge of this so we can get control of it and if we can get control of it how would that be structured and what are the possible paygrades. There is a lot of additional information that needs to be flushed out on those proposals to make sure that they can be accomplished. That was the purpose of the letter, to just try to keep the study and some of these pieces in front of the Board so this doesn't become one of those investments that the City has made that gets stuck on a bookshelf somewhere because there are some practical applications that relate to a very serious priority that the City has to deal with. As Alderman O'Neil mentioned we did talk to the consultant and he said he would pick up the staff time to come and talk to us if we would pick up the cost of the expenses to get here. The flight is what we are looking at to have him come here. He is not going to charge us hourly or anything like that. Whether he comes once or twice we think that is a worthwhile investment and we are just looking for the Committee to give us some direction that you are alright with us making those arrangements and give us some idea as to whether you want him to come initially to the Committee level and talk about...set aside one night to get into the mechanics of what that study was and how it could be done...

Chairman Osborne interjected what would this cost be.

Mr. Clougherty answered it would be the cost of his flight here.

Chairman Osborne responded what is that, just the flight.

Mr. Clougherty replied yes and if he is here for the day or overnight it might be his room and it might be his meals but just his cost to come here. He is not going to charge us a fee for his salary or anything like that. It is his out-of-pocket expenses to come here and further talk about the study that he has done, which we thought was reasonable.

Alderman O'Neil asked the consultant regarding the number of meetings with the Board and that, they have lived to their commitment.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked so anything above that is really our responsibility and unfortunately the night that this was scheduled to get its own attention there were three or four or five other things thrown on the agenda and it never got the attention it deserved.

Mr. Clougherty stated there are some pieces that are important to proceed on and that the staff needs some direction from the Board on. Again, I think if we could have Chris come here and if you want him to meet with the Committee that is fine and we will schedule it with the Clerk.

Alderman Shea stated my own thoughts run along the lines of taking this eight or nine items and having that particular individual react to them. In other words why is it a good idea to assign the responsibility to one department and why is the authorization of hiring a parking manager in the right vein. In other words not just having him come and at that time present something. If these particular questions are germane to improving our parking situation then let's have him come with the idea of answering these questions for the benefit of the full Board.

Mr. Clougherty asked so you want something in writing in advance so that you can look at that before he comes.

Alderman Shea answered yes and have it before he actually makes the presentation so that it is in the hands of the Aldermanic Board so they can get some idea rather than coming that night and just doing it. That would be my suggestion and if he is willing to come back at the expense of a flight and maybe taking him to Burger King or wherever...I think it would make a lot of sense and then having the Traffic Department here at the time. You know Mr. Lolicata who is quite experience and will be leaving us unfortunately but having his input at that time. I think that makes a lot of sense.

Chairman Osborne asked what happened to the parking garage situation. I don't see that in one of the nine? The parking garage they were talking about in the City.

Mr. Clougherty answered that was the idea of having the park and ride with the state. Again, that is...what we tried to do is lump the recommendations into different groups. I think that might be in Table 21 or in Table 7. It was recommendations 18-20 where that parking garage was. We can go back and have him address that too, Alderman, if that is something specific you wanted to look at. We can have him look at that and respond to it in advance.

Alderman Long stated it seems to me that this Committee has the responsibility for this parking study. Before we bring in the consultant I think there are some things that we can siphon out here as far as what is a potential go ahead and what has to come off the table so that when we bring the consultant here we have a vision of where we are going. Right now everything is up in the air.

Mr. Clougherty responded I know that tonight you have had a lot of other things but if you want to have a night just so that staff can go through that and narrow it down before we bring back the consultant we are willing to do that. If you want the consultant to respond as Alderman Shea said to this so that you could chew on that a little bit and then meet with him...there are different wants you can go here. We just don't some of these recommendations that might be helpful to us in dealing with parking, which is a big issue, to just kind of gather dust.

Alderman Long stated I am getting several calls daily on the parking situation that some of these recommendations address.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to agree with Alderman Long. At least weekly somebody is grabbing me whether in the Millyard or downtown and saying are you going to do anything with this parking study. I think it is a very important issue that we need to address.

Mr. Clougherty responded he did a lot of work and put in a thought and has given some direction, which I think is helpful. Not everybody agrees with all of the recommendations but there are some that there is consensus on and we should try and take advantage of them and move forward.

Chairman Osborne stated from what I gathered and what I watched there is enough parking in the City of Manchester. True? It might be spread out but there is enough parking in Manchester.

Mr. Clougherty responded no that is not true, Alderman.

Paul Borek, Economic Development Director, stated I just want to echo what Alderman O'Neil and Alderman Long said. In my role as Economic Development Director I meet with business owners and building owners on a regular basis and I, too, hear constantly about the need for addressing the recommendations of the parking study and addressing the various parking needs that the City has. Many building owners are unable to complete leases because of the inability to address the parking issue in a manner that may work out. It may or may not be that we have to provide every parking space but it may be that there is a logical sense to managing parking and making business owners and building owners aware of a scenario of parking opportunities. I think that is very important. In any event, I am encouraged by business owners and building owners on a regular basis to push forward and consolidate our parking system just to make what we have manageable let alone address our future needs.

Alderman Shea asked would reacting to these questions on the part of the people preparing the study in your opinion be beneficial as well as any additional questions that you in conferring with these business people have that they call to your attention. Do you think that would be helpful and then we could present it to the Board?

Mr. Borek answered I believe it would be helpful to maybe focus the nature of our problems and our interest and our costs after having heard the presentation. I think it might be helpful or it would be helpful to focus the consultant in advance of his visit as to what we believe is important and what we feel needs to be addressed on all fronts.

Mr. Clougherty stated the issue from our perspective is this is a huge economic development issue for us and it is a stepchild. It does not have a champion. It does not have a daily focus. I think Carol has done some studies over the years and we have done some stuff and Parking has done stuff and everybody has done some stuff. We really need to get some advice as to what the structure should be and how we are going to create that structure and fund it and do it and get somebody who is out there...you know from the time they come in in the morning until the time they leave at night working to make sure that traffic is moving and that people are treated fairly in the system and we don't have that now. To the extent that we could have the consultant come back if everybody is okay with that and give us some advice on how to do that to us that is one of the priorities.

Chairman Osborne asked did they mention much about the private sector taking its course. Why is it always the City that has to come up with all of the parking garages and all of these other things?

Mr. Borek stated that is a good point. In regard to providing additional capacity, one of the many suggestions I think that the consultant pointed out in terms of successes in other cities has been looking at different forms of funding parking not unlike condominium spaces and working to try to sale in advance condominium spaces in your areas of highest demand. So I think we could ask the consultant to focus more on private options and how to manage those and how to solicit those. If I could I wanted to get back to one more comment made earlier in regard to new capacity or not. Even if you didn't address new capacity, just managing what we have better – one department and one location would be a benefit to businesses that rely on public and private parking capacity.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we intent...is the intention that this Committee will work on this issue for a number of months.

Chairman Osborne answered I hope it isn't for a number of months.

Alderman O'Neil stated why I say that is I am in favor of bringing the consultant back and I look for efficiencies with it so if we have him come back to meet with the Traffic Committee and it is not the same night it is going to the full Board then we are going to have to bring him back a second time I think to answer questions for the full Board. That would be an additional expense.

Chairman Osborne responded true but I think it is a little more condensed this way than to bring it to the full Board. How many questions is he going to get with all 14 Aldermen?

Alderman O'Neil stated I just look at how we handled the Parks Master Plan. That was presented to the full Board. There was only the expense of the consultant coming in once instead of the consultant presenting it to the CIP or Lands and Buildings Committee and then referring it to the full Board. That is my concern.

Alderman Shea stated before I made a suggestion and I would like to move that we have the consultant come back and respond to the questions and to any concerns that have been raised by the Economic Development Director in his relationship with the business community, set up a meeting and have a presentation made but prior to that questions answered so that members of the Board can have this available.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Osborne asked do you this done at the Committee level.

Alderman Shea answered no to the full Board.

Chairman Osborne asked didn't they send that here.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered yes they did. The parking study is sitting in Committee. I guess from the Clerk's perspective I am a little confused as to what exactly the Committee is looking to do. I think there are three issues that are going about here or have been suggested. One, Alderman Long was saying that we need to go through this study itself piece by piece and see what we think can be implemented and what can't on our own. There are Aldermen that have questions, specific questions I think with regards to the study and then thirdly is that everybody feels that the full Board should be involved in some kind of a presentation with answers being prepared. I guess given that it may be beneficial to first have a meeting that focuses first on the parking study itself and go through what specific questions or what specific things the Committee is willing to move forward with. Secondly, bring the consultant back to answer questions but perhaps have some questions prepared by individual Aldermen submitted to the Clerk that can be submitted to the consultant ahead of time because I think you are looking for specific answers to some things.

Alderman Shea stated I am not confused at all. My recommendation is that he respond to the questions that are on the agenda plus any questions that any Alderman may want to have answered plus the Economic Development Director and to have the people who are responsible for this study come back and prior to that time make a written presentation prior to that meeting so that the Board members can review it and then make a presentation to the full Board. If any Alderman on this Committee wants to submit questions through you that is fine but that is the way I would word that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I seconded his motion.

Mr. Clougherty stated we will get to the Committee the arrangements to have him fly out and let you know what the expenses are and things like that but we are authorized to go ahead and make those arrangements as part of the motion correct.

Alderman Shea answered yes.

Alderman Long stated my idea was to build consensus before we bring the consultant in because now we are going to bring the consultant in, we are going to build consensus, we are going to figure out what we think is doable and what we don't think is doable and then we are going to need him to come in again because with respect to what we believe is doable for us we are going to need his input on doing that. I think we need to establish whether we want the parking system as a self-supporting enterprise...just basic...

Chairman Osborne interjected what you are trying to say is that you would like to have it come back to this Committee first and iron it out a little bit and then go to the full Board from there. Is that what you are saying?

Alderman Long responded yes just fine-tune it instead of keeping it open ended.

Alderman Shea asked so if they make a presentation then we as a Board decide as to whether or not we want to adopt anything. We don't adopt something, have them come...in other words when you say make it doable I am not quite sure how I follow your logic. What do you mean by making it doable?

Alderman Long answered they have already given us their recommendations, Alderman. These are all of there...they have 39 recommendations. The Police, Highway, Traffic, Solicitor, MEDO and Fire met and formulated eight recommendations. Now this Committee...we don't know what direction we want to go in.

Alderman O'Neil stated what I believe they did and maybe they can correct me but these eight recommendations are the consultant's recommendations. All you said was these are the ones that we probably should act on first am I correct? These are his recommendations and we need him to justify it not the staff.

Mr. Clougherty responded he hasn't said I will just come back once on this. He has put a lot of work into this study and obviously has some passion about what he did here. If he has to come up twice, once to meet with the Committee and once to the meet with the Board, as long as we are willing to pay for the two flights he will come. The cost of getting him here from Florida or Michigan is...we already spent \$125,000 for the study. To pay another \$1,000 for flights to have him come here for a couple of meetings to explain and help you implement it seems not unreasonable.

Alderman O'Neil stated and this is not unusual. We did that with our CSO master plan. The consultants were back before us a number of times.

Alderman Shea stated I see somewhat the benefit of him coming back after the full Board responds because we may get more ideas rather than him coming first and then going before the full Board. That is what I am trying to indicate. In other words, if the buck stops with this Committee then we should allow all of the members of the Board to get exposure to it so that when he comes, say for the first meeting, he can explain some of the questions and so forth. That germinates certain ideas and thoughts and then they can give that information to us and if we

need to have a second meeting then that person would come and that seems more for the timing purpose to make more sense to me.

Chairman Osborne stated I think what Alderman Long is trying to say is to have a little bit of input here from the Committee without the consultant here. In other words, us ironing it out with a little more time with the City staff and then go from there and refer it to the full Board. Is that what you mean?

Alderman Long responded yes.

Chairman Osborne stated he didn't mean bring him here twice. He meant have us try to iron it out a little bit, what we have in front of us, and then when it is time for the consultant to come he would come before the full Board.

Alderman Shea stated my motion is to have the fellow come and make a presentation and if in the meantime you want to have more input from the group that made the recommendations that is fine too. I don't mind that. We could schedule them as part of another meeting before we get the consultant here.

Chairman Osborne asked do you want to move on Alderman Long's recommendation.

Alderman Shea answered I am including that. That is what I am trying to tell you.

Chairman Osborne stated I think we should do his first and then we can deal with yours.

Alderman O'Neil stated he is saying don't bring the consultant up right away.

Chairman Osborne stated you can't make that in the same motion then.

Alderman O'Neil responded he is just amending his motion and saying let us work on it a little bit and then bring the consultant in.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I just want clarification. You want a meeting of the Committee to go through the eight items that have been presented with staff as well as bring the consultant back to meet with the full Board and when you talk about justification, I was looking for questions. You were referring to the recommendations, Alderman Shea?

Alderman Shea replied yes.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated that is what confused me because you were referring to them as questions and I was looking for a list of questions and I couldn't find them.

Alderman Shea responded they are in the agenda.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated those are the recommendations that you are referring to.

Chairman Osborne asked so it is going to come back to the Committee before it goes to the full Board.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated yes but I believe the Finance Officer is being directed to make arrangements to have the consultant come back to meet with the full Board. We will work with the Mayor and Finance to see if that should be at a special meeting or how they want to arrange that.

Alderman Roy asked just so I am clear on what we are asking them to justify or be ready to justify, are we talking about the eight or nine recommendations that came from staff or all 39 recommendations that came from the plan itself.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered it is my understanding that the eight recommendations that came out of staff are basically recommendations from the parking study that the staff feels should be addressed first. That is the way I am understanding it. These are not staff recommendations. They are recommendations of the parking study that the staff says you should address first or at least get something moving and these are the eight priorities they have listed. Kevin could probably address that for you better.

Alderman Roy stated my concern is if we are going to bring him up here and we are going to grill him or talk to him or look for suggestions I would like to be able to open that up to all 39 recommendations, not just the eight that were brought down to the lowest denominator of what could get accomplished. I would look to open that up to all 39 not just the 8 in the letter.

Mr. Clougherty responded when he responds to the recommendations we will make sure that he is prepared to speak to all of them but we will say that the Committee has focused on these eight areas that the staff has talked about and we will help him to try to tailor his presentation to those areas so we can have discussion with him at the Board level. In the meantime we will schedule a meeting to flush out those eight with the staff and with this Committee to make sure that when he gets up here we have all of the bases covered. We appreciate you taking the time to do this. We know a lot of studies get done and this is extra

time you have to put in on this but as a staff we see this as a priority and we really appreciate you taking the time and setting up these two meetings to do this.

Alderman Roy stated and the reason I want to be clear about and so there is no mistaking, in the A recommendations there is very little language or no language regarding any of the private partnerships or condominium parking structures so I would like him to be able to address all 39 because that may shift some burden off of the taxpayer and to private developers, which are things that we have been talking about in other Committees that can easily be reinforced with some of his views on parking and parking management. If he is ready to address that when he comes that would be appreciated.

Mr. Clougherty asked if it is all right with the Committee we will add that as Item 9 to deal with private partnerships.

Alderman Shea stated you folks along with anyone else are going to meet with this Committee prior to the submission of these particular items to that consultant and, therefore, some of these things can be flushed out at a future meeting that we have plus Paul has talked to developers too and obviously your input is certainly going to be appreciated as well. I am not sure about the timing and whether that could be in April or May or whatever the time is. It is now March almost but what we have to do is have another meeting with this Committee and then from there make preparations for that person to come.

Mr. Clougherty responded my understanding is you want us to bring back to you the letter that I am going to send to the consultant saying this is what we want you to look at and make sure that we have everything in there so that he can get...we will give him a heads up tomorrow to get started on some of this stuff but we will also try to make sure that at the end he has a complete list and responses and we will ask him how long and set up a meeting with the Board.

Alderman Shea asked now in terms of your particular situation, when would you like to see him come.

Mr. Clougherty answered I would like to see him take the time to do it right. If he says I need a month to take a look at this and think about it then I would like him to be thoughtful about it. I really don't have a time. We all know that parking is something urgent that needs to be taken care of. To the extent that he can address some of these things earlier, we will talk to him about that.

Alderman Shea stated the only thought I have is I am not sure how the Mayor's budget or the Aldermanic budget would be impacting such a situation so obviously we have to decide on something before June 6 or so.

Alderman O'Neil asked are any of these time sensitive that if we don't get approved for the budget process we are going to have to wait an entire year.

Mr. Clougherty answered some of them may be that is why we are here before you tonight asking to try and move it.

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

Alderman O'Neil stated I have two quick things. Under new business at the last full Board meeting I brought up a couple of issues related to the storm and all of this addresses public safety so maybe it could be reported back to us. Was the emergency center opened and if it was what type of services and coordination was it providing and secondly I think there was a significant issue with street closures where the utilities were making decisions without consulting the Police Department and in some cases they let police officers go from the detail and streets remained closed for a significant amount of hours after that. Those are two things related to the storm that I think would be appropriate for this Committee to address. The second thing I brought up...I have a personal concern that the police officers are making a decision do I work a construction detail for four hours with little or no headaches or do I work a bar deal in some of these clubs where we have problems where I am going to be possibly making an arrest. I guess what is happening based on the rate of pay being the same for either detail is the police officers are taking the construction details and we may not be filling all of the club details that we really need to and we may have to come up with a rate for the clubs and nightclubs that is separate from the other detail.

Chairman Osborne asked is that your recommendation.

Alderman O'Neil answered sometime I would like to see us have a discussion about those things. I don't think I need to make a motion. Can we get them on the next agenda?

Deputy Clerk Normand stated I will take care of it.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee