

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

October 30, 2007
Aldermen Osborne,
O'Neil, Shea, Roy, Long

3:30 PM
Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)

Chairman Osborne called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

Messrs: T. Soucy, A. Thomas, J. Hopkins, D. Albin, T. Arnold, J. Hoben,
and K. Sheppard

Chairman Osborne addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Chairman Osborne advises that due to time constraints the following departments will make a presentation only (question and answer period to be held at a later date):
 - a) Health
 - b) Police
 - c) Fire

Mr. Tim Soucy, Public Health Director, stated good afternoon. Anna Thomas, who is the Deputy Public Health Director, will be providing this month's update.

Ms. Anna Thomas, Deputy Public Health Director, stated thank you Tim. Just very quickly and for the sake of time, we wanted to give you a very quick overview of some of the work that we've gotten involved in as far as our newly formed division of Chronic Disease Prevention and Neighborhood Health, and all of the work that we've been involved in with the Weed 'n Seed strategy as well. For quite some time we've been really working at, not only a neighborhood level, but a resident level, to try to find innovative ways for residents to get involved in public health activities and other community improvement activities. You're all very familiar with the work of the Neighborhood Watch groups and we are very fortunate to have an Americorp Vista member Tracy Deggs, who is also here today, who has been tasked in the next year to help mobilize and organize the

watch groups and find ways for residents to be plugged into neighborhood activities. So we wanted to kind of keep you in the loop on all of that work in hopes that you could help further our efforts and generate ideas for us. Some of the things that we're now trying to do is provide monthly training for residents and a forum where they could get information and actually find ways to organize. Whether it's actually doing active patrols in the neighborhoods or other community revitalization projects, we wanted to be able to give them a nice menu to choose from. In some cases some residents don't want to leave their homes; they just want to be part of a communication channel from their homes or from the organization that they work within. This is sort of the work right now, trying to organize that and different levels of participation. We're also in the midst of trying to get these watch groups registered on the national website of USA on Watch, which would allow us to then compete for additional monies to support the work of the watch groups. That's our hope, to be able to apply for some grant dollars and bring that into the community. It's an exciting time just because there has already been some great success in a very short period of work. We really just wanted to let you know about that activity and offer any opportunities for you to get involved or other Aldermen to recruit residents and then to certainly find a way to make sure that we have all the wards represented and all the neighborhoods represented in the community. So just for points of contact, both Tracy Deggs and Nicole Rawler, our Weed and Seed coordinator, are housed at the Health Department, even though they work collaboratively with the Police Department in this effort. And certainly I'm at the Health Department as well if you need to get a hold of us. Either way we'd like to be able to keep you apprised of our work and how we're doing with those numbers and give you a nice inventory of the activity that we hope to accomplish in the next year.

Lieutenant John Hopkins, Police Department, stated I just wanted to talk to you guys briefly about the winter parking ban, to remind the public that it takes effect November 15th. It's the odd/even system, which means that whatever the date is at midnight is the side of the street for you to park on. So if it's the 16th at midnight you should park on the even side of the street. The only exception is a street where it is posted no parking for the entire street; then you can park on the side every night that it is posted for parking. The fine is \$25, which goes up to \$50 after seven days. And this will go till April 15th.

Alderman O'Neil stated just a quick...It's not a question, just a comment. Just quick. Just recognize Lieutenant Hopkins and his division for their efforts on speed enforcement. We've been on them and they're writing a lot of tickets, and making our neighborhoods safer. I think John and his division, as well as the Patrol division, deserve some recognition for that. They're doing a great job.

Chairman Osborne stated oh sure, I'm not against that at all. I'm just trying to keep the time down a little bit, that's all.

Alderman O'Neil stated it took 20 seconds.

Chairman Osborne stated that's okay. I appreciate it; he does too.

Deputy Chief David Albin, Fire Department stated good afternoon and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today. I'll keep it in probably four areas if I can. The general overall condition of the budget: we're four months into the fiscal year and we're running pretty much consistent to where we should be at that time. We're spending at about 8.33 percent per month and we're pretty consistent with that in both salaries and overtime. The one place where we are spending a little more money is in vehicle maintenance. We've had some pretty big hits this year in regards to maintaining some of the older fleet. So we're spending a little bit more money than usual for this time of year in that. All other budget lines are consistent with the expectations for this time in the fiscal year. The same goes for revenues. Generally we don't see any changes in our revenue lines until after the first of the calendar year. That's when the billing cycles go out for the major accounts that we bill for. The fleet conditions in update: the past two meetings I was telling you about Truck One, which is the snorkel truck that's located down on Merrimack Street at Central station. It went out for repairs down to Alabama. It's still in Alabama but things are going a lot better than we thought they would. I spoke to the maintenance superintendent this morning and he advises me that the truck should be back in a couple of weeks. The body is back on the truck. They're going to be doing final ladder testing. All of the stuff is warranty work, so when it comes back here it should be in top shape and we look forward to getting it back in service. Truck 2, the ladder truck that was on South Main Street, was sent out for some bodywork from some previous damage that occurred in accidents and also some rust repair that needed to be done to maintain the turntable. That has since been returned to service and it's working. It's located over at South Main Street again. Engine 4, the truck on Hackett Hill, they're still running a spare. We don't know how long it's going to be till we receive funding to repair that truck. We just don't have the money in the budget to do it. Last month I mentioned that aerial testing will be in November and that will probably be the last two or three weeks of November that they're planning to do that type of maintenance. On the training front, the EMT classes are continuing and certifications are happening usually every Saturday. The out of town team comes in and they evaluate our people and re-certify them. We expect those will be done by the 15th of December. We, along with the Police, implemented a new computer aided dispatch system and a records management system. Part of that is a device called Netviewer, which allows the outside companies and anybody else who's hooked into the system to see what the status of the fire apparatus is and get your

times and things like that. They've been installed at the Elliot Hospital and at CMC. It's an efficient method for the people who are working on the ambulance to get their times for their run sheets and also enter reports. And those went on line last week, so it eliminates some phone calls back to the fire alarm office and frees up a dispatcher to take emergency calls, so they're not on call giving out telephone times and things along that line. So we're very happy about that; it's working well. The fire prevention front: The parade and muster was held on the seventh of October. It went off pretty well considering that it was a gloomy day in the morning, and that usually keeps a lot of people in, but the sunlight broke about noontime and everything seemed to turn out all right. We had a pretty good crowd at the station and everybody seemed well served. Also in that vein, daylight savings time ends on November 4th at 2 AM. We urge all the public to go out and check their smoke detectors. If they still have battery operated smoke detectors it's a good time to change the battery, and if you have hardwired smoke detectors it's a really good time to maybe take a vacuum or a whisk broom to it and make sure everything is nice and clean and that they're working. Fire activity for the month of October: As I mentioned, we're on Firehouse now which is a new records management software. It's a pretty neat system. It enables us to track calls and do things a lot more efficiently than we did before. We answered 1,400 calls for service in the past 30 days. When you sit there and play with it a little bit, you get to find out things that you never really knew before. The busiest days for the Fire Department are on Mondays and Fridays, and the slowest day of the week for the Fire Department is on Tuesday. The rest of them are all kind of spaced out equally. There's not a giant differentiation there, but it's just something no one ever knew. And on the personnel front, we have six vacancies: one captain, four firefighters, and one administrative services manager. That's it.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Discussion relative to parking of commercial vehicles on City streets requested by Alderman Duval.

Alderman Duval stated thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the indulgence of the Committee to get into some discussion relative to this topic. It seems that...and perhaps we need further clarification of exactly what the ordinance applies to, but it seems that if you have a vehicle that's being used for commercial use, such as, we'll take landscaping operation as an example, and it's parked on a City street with a trailer attached, perhaps with equipment or landscaping material, that type of vehicle can be stored on City streets, or a number of those vehicles can be parked on City streets overnight, but they're a commercial application obviously. Because of the cumbersome trailers that they have, they can take up a lot of space; they're unsightly usually. My understanding is unless they have a commercial decal on the vehicle, or the truck is of a certain

size, a certain weight, there really is no way for the Police Department to address the situation. I know we have situations in Ward 4; I've had residents continue to call me and it's kind of interesting: You can have a truck the size of Alderman O'Neil's with a commercial decal on it and that vehicle could potentially be ticketed. Yet, you could have a full-sized commercial vehicle being used daily in a residential area and those vehicles, they can't touch them, including trailers. Alderman Roy and I have had discussions relative to some residents' complaints up in his area. It's a difficult thing for us to get our arms around. And I'm wondering if perhaps we can tighten the ordinance to address it. We're basically looking to the Committee for guidance in terms of what we can do to respond to those types of complaints.

Chairman Osborne stated I think what we should do is bring it back. Are we talking vehicles with commercial plates as well?

Alderman Duval responded well, no, Alderman Osborne. These would be vehicles that don't have commercial plates. I'm using landscaping companies again as an example. They don't have commercial plates and if they have the magnet decals on the doors they can take them off at night, and I don't think that even with trailers in tow that there's an ordinance that addresses it. Maybe Alderman O'Neil can expound on it and shed some light.

Chairman Osborne stated so what you're trying to say is you think they're putting these decals on and they're trying to circumvent the situation.

Alderman Duval stated that might be happening. I'm not for certain, but it seems that that's what might be going on.

Chairman Osborne asked do you want to get input from Lieutenant Hopkins first to see what he says about what you just came up with before we go to the Committee?

Alderman Duval stated if there's something that I'm missing, if there's clarification, whichever...

Chairman Osborne stated Lieutenant Hopkins can give us the clarification. If we come up with a new ordinance, maybe we can, but it's something that has to be thought out. We couldn't do it tonight.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated when I was on the midnight shift not too long ago, this was an area that we found hard to distinguish between the commercial and someone's residential truck. What we ended up doing is we had to look at the vehicle closely to see if it had tools in the back, a ladder rack, things of that nature. A truck parked on the side of the road with a trailer attached, it's hard for us to distinguish whether that's a commercial vehicle or not and that's where there's a gray area, if you could tighten that up and give us some direction it would be helpful.

Chairman Osborne stated Lieutenant, if you're running regular plates on a truck and using it commercially, don't you have to register it as a commercial vehicle if you're using it commercially?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded no. That's a question for the registry. I don't think so.

Chairman Osborne asked who has to register commercially and who doesn't with a truck?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded I don't know.

Chairman Osborne stated well I guess we have to find all that out.

Alderman Roy stated I can answer that. If the truck is owned by a commercial entity or is over a certain gross vehicle weight, then it would have to be registered commercially but like myself as a sole proprietor, I take my truck and my dump trailer and it's considered a residential vehicle or a vehicle I can park on any City street in residential areas. If I was to add my company name to a door or a window, then in the eyes of the Police Department it becomes a commercial vehicle. The problem that we're finding in many residential neighborhoods is you have people that are using their vehicles as commercial entities. Landscapers are the most obvious because you have the trailers with a number of commercial, not homeowner, mowers, but you have plumbers, other companies that are not resorting to magnetic signs on their doors, so during business hours they can put the sign on their truck or vehicle and then when they come home at night, to avoid the \$25 ticket, they throw the logo off the vehicle and throw it in the front seat of the car. And that's where I think Alderman Duval is getting is there's really no way the police can make a distinction because, as the Lieutenant said, we haven't set down a clear set of boundaries of what's a residential vehicle and what's a commercial vehicle.

Chairman Osborne asked so there's nothing the State has to say about the weight of any vehicle? If you owned a large truck like what he's talking about, and trailers and everything else, that's not commercial?

Alderman O'Neil stated the weight of the vehicle, if I may, Mr. Chairman, is what comes into play.

Chairman Osborne stated what he's talking about sounds like a large vehicle but evidently not. Is it 10,000 pounds to be commercial?

Alderman O'Neil stated yes. A one-ton dump truck is a little bigger than a pickup truck.

Alderman Duval stated if I might add, the flip side of that is I actually have a resident who worked for...a young gentleman who works for Kelly Construction. Think of Kelly Construction, a white truck with a green K, and just because it's got the green K he was ticketed. It's a truck no bigger than Alderman O'Neil's. He's given tickets all the time on Arlington Street. It just doesn't seem right. Now, his vehicle is sometimes parked in the street and sometimes in his driveway. If by chance he leaves it on the street at night because he's got company, he will get ticketed. He's gotten ticketed often. And it just doesn't seem right, when in fact those neighbors really have no problem with that kind of truck. It would be like, you know, if Alderman O'Neil decided to have an electrician, you know, Dan O'Neil, Electrician magnet on his truck door, I think he's probably get a ticket. And it just doesn't seem right. It seems like we're missing a significant number of trucks out there that are being used in commercial applications in residential areas that are getting away with something, and residents that are trying to do their best that are getting ticketed.

Chairman Osborne stated I just want to ask Mr. Arnold, can we get a little study on this and get some information from Concord and put something together here? Can we make laws here or would this have to be State statute?

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, responded I will attempt to do that, certainly. You asked me if I could get some information out of Concord.

Chairman Osborne asked does this have to be State, if we made any changes in the truck sizes?

Mr. Arnold stated and again, I would have to look at the State statutes in order to determine that.

Alderman O'Neil stated as part of the balancing, and I certainly support where Alderman Duval is going with this, we also need to balance...and I think of an employee who maybe works for Keyspan and is on call at night, or an oil burner man. Are we doing a disservice to the citizens by now allowing these people to take home...or a plumber...to take home trucks at night and weekends that are on call to respond? I know from personal experience over the years, your furnace doesn't always break down Monday through Friday, 8 to 5. It's usually at the worst time on the coldest day. So, I think we need to balance this, but to be honest with you, my observation is that there are some that respect to get their vehicle off the street, do it right, and then there are others like hauling trailers and all that stuff into the neighborhoods, and that's wrong, so I think any clean up we can do of the ordinance would be appreciated and common sense needs to prevail.

Alderman Shea stated I'd like to know how many complaints you do get. Do you get a minimum complaint? Is it like five or ten?

Alderman Duval responded it seems to be the same offenders. It's in different parts of Ward 4, and again, it's coming from, at least in my area, it seems to be coming from these landscaping operations that have sprung up. They operate out of their homes, naturally, because they're not a commercial setting. They probably started the business out of their home, so to speak, but then they end up growing and they have all this equipment. It's stored on trailers. The trailers are attached to trucks, trucks that don't have commercial decals.

Alderman Shea asked I mean, are you talking about 15 complaints or five or three or eight?

Alderman Duval responded it's relating to the same areas, Alderman Shea, that come routinely because I can't respond. There's nothing we can do. We can't cure the problem. And they take up a lot of space in the streets. Trucks generally aren't very appealing because they're banged up. They're landscaping trucks; they're work trucks; it's understandable. And you have all this equipment on these trailers. The trucks leak oil and the motors leak oil and everything else. They create quite a mess, actually.

Alderman Shea asked now are they in front of their own homes?

Alderman Duval responded yes, well sort of parked along side streets nearby their homes.

Alderman Shea stated or in front of their homes or near their homes. So the people that are concerned are abutters that feel that it's degrading to the neighborhood?

Alderman Duval stated exactly.

Chairman Osborne asked Lieutenant, is there anything on the books that you can leave a trailer hooked up to a vehicle like that? I thought you couldn't do that, and leave a vehicle like a boat hooked up to a car and leave it on the street like that overnight and stuff like that.

Lieutenant Hopkins responded I don't think so. If you have a trailer hooked up to your car overnight on the street I don't think it's a real problem. If it's going to be a continuing issue we'd have to look into it.

Alderman Roy stated just to respond to Alderman Shea's question, I have gotten complaints, probably four to five a month. During the winter when we have the parking ban and we have more patrols is when I tend to get calls from people who have lettered vehicles that have received a ticket for having a commercial vehicle on a residential street, but through the summer months, as Alderman Duval was saying, I get a number of complaints regarding commercial entities on residential streets. So it is something that deserves attention.

Chairman Osborne stated yes it is, and I think we've got to do something because everybody is going to have decals and no more printing on their trucks, is what's going to happen. It's a Pandora's box, so something has got to be done. We've got to look into it somehow. It's only fair to the residents that live on these streets that parking is at a premium right now, and I can see where a trailer takes up quite a bit of parking on the streets so, can we put something together, Lieutenant and maybe Mr. Arnold, get together and see what we can do legally and what we can't do, and what you have on the books already in that aspect? And we'll come back with it. Can we put it on the agenda for next time, Carol?

Ms. Carol Johnson, Deputy City Clerk responded yes, we can. Have the Lieutenant and the Solicitor's office work together?

Chairman Osborne stated let's see if we can get a report back of some sort of a study...what we do have and what we don't have rights to. Are you all set Mr. Duval?

Alderman Duval responded thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Whatever effort we can make I'd appreciate that.

Chairman Osborne stated we'll work on it and see what we can do. It's a tough one, but I can see where everybody's going to run out and get a decal now.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Ms. Brandy Stanley, parking Manager, has submitted the following items for discussion and action by the Committee:
 - a) Ordinance amendment relating to parking garage rates;
 - b) Ordinance amendment relating to Residential Parking Permit Zone #6 to include 41 Mechanic Street;
 - c) SCORE Parking Decals.

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated thank you, Alderman. This first request is partial housekeeping for the Victory Garage. We have current operating hours and procedures which are not accurately reflected in the current ordinance. The operating hours and procedures were changed when the Saturday parking and the parking till 10:00 on the street was rescinded. However, the ordinance was never changed for the Victory Garage. So we are currently operating till 10:00 PM Monday through Friday, and that's not what the ordinance says, so I'm asking that the ordinance be changed to reflect what we're actually doing. Items 7 and 8 on this ordinance...item 7 is called the lost chip fee. Basically, with the money that was given to us as part of the CIP program we have ordered new revenue control equipment, Gate Arms Card Readers, Spitters, what-not. That is due to begin being installed on November 13th. The system that we ordered does not actually have parking tickets, paper parking tickets. It has plastic chips with RFID tags in the middle. So instead of...when you come into the garage, press a button, instead of giving you a ticket, it's going to give you a token, if you will. We call it a chip. This system was about \$17,000 cheaper than a ticket system, and the cost of ownership in terms of maintenance over the long term is going to be substantial. Unfortunately, these chips cost between six and eight dollars apiece, so we wanted to make sure that if someone actually lost their chip that the City was compensated for the cost of replacing that chip. That's what item 7 is. We're asking for, if they lose a chip we don't have any way of figuring out how long they've parked in the garage, so what we do right now is we charge the daily maximum rate in the garage, which is six dollars. And we're proposing to add ten dollars onto that parking fee to compensate the City for the replacement of the lost chip, which is where you get the sixteen dollars. We are also, on item 8, we're also currently charging a daily maximum rate of six dollars, and that was not actually in the ordinance, so we're trying to put it in there, again, to reflect what's currently happening in the garage.

Chairman Osborne asked what do you need from us this evening?

Ms. Stanley responded we just need to...it would be nice if the Committee would pass this and send it forward to the full Board for passage.

Alderman O'Neil stated Brandy, this is not related to your recommended changes, but it got me thinking about the monthly rate. That was out of date for many, many years; it was at \$40 for many years and we put together a \$5 increment to get it up to the \$70, I believe. But it has been at \$70 now for three or four years, maybe. Have you had a chance to take a look at maybe when would be appropriate to adjust that rate? And the only reason I ask is when we did make those changes the business community just asked, because of leases being involved, that we gave them plenty of lead time on it. I know we're going to have to do maintenance again to the garage. Is the reserve in good shape to do the maintenance and do we need to look at adjusting that rate sometime in the future?

Ms. Stanley responded the Parking Division has no capital reserves. They were never set up, as far as I know. There are no capital reserves. In terms of increasing the rate or setting the rates in garages downtown, I think that is something that would require a much broader and more complex discussion than just trying to say, you know, the market rate is \$85; the City should follow the market rate. I think there are other issues involved in that and it needs to be thought through carefully before...

Alderman O'Neil stated I agree. My problem is I don't want the ball dropped on the Board at some point saying, we need to make an adjustment because we've got to spend a million dollars to rehab the garage. We need to start maybe...and Wall Street is a lot different than Victory. Wall Street, we own and we don't own. Victory we clearly own and we need to make those adjustments to address capital improvements for the garage. It might be something to bring back a year from now, six months from now, but I think we need to start thinking about that so we don't fall into the same issues that we had five or six years ago where for seven or eight years it had been at \$40 and it wasn't keeping up with the needs of the facility. Just for the future down the road.

Alderman Long stated just quickly on that, what Alderman O'Neil had stated, the Victory Garage, in the long term, we're not getting our full use out of it right now, with the parking needs that we have here because of lighting and other issues. So you're absolutely right. We need to look at how we could get the full complement out of the Victory Garage, especially with the parking need that we have downtown.

Chairman Osborne stated now that you've mentioned the lighting, what happened to the lighting? I know we approved this at one time.

Ms. Stanley stated as I'm sure you know, the lighting in the garage was redone when the City did its aggregation program. I don't remember how long ago it was. I want to say three or four years. I obviously wasn't here when this happened. The result of that program in the Victory Garage is that the lighting is nowhere near what it needs to be and nowhere near what the recommended engineering standards are for lighting in parking garages. We requested about \$100,000 last fiscal year to upgrade the lighting to a point where the City was not going to be at such a high degree of liability for safety issues within the garage. That was approved and then the CIP committee referred it to the fiscal year '08 budget and for one reason or another it was not included in the CIP funds.

Alderman O'Neil stated clarification on that Mr. Chairman...Brandy do you know, was that intended to be a General Fund...

Chairman Osborne stated I thought it came from her fund.

Ms. Stanley stated it was intended to come out of...

Alderman O'Neil asked do you have it? Do you have it in your fund?

Chairman Osborne stated not any more.

Ms. Stanley stated not this year, no.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's why, to follow-up on Alderman Long, we need to start building up a reserve for the specific projects like the lighting.

Chairman Osborne stated there's a lot of liability there.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know what it takes to set up a specific reserve for that facility, but Attorney Arnold, is that something you can get back to us on?

Mr. Arnold stated I can speak to Finance about that. I presume it will not be a problem.

Chairman Osborne stated that's quite a liability.

Ms. Stanley stated according to a letter that Red Robitas wrote me with some legal precedent in terms of how parking garages are considered from a legal standpoint. It is actually a fairly large liability.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve the proposed ordinance amendment relating to parking garage rates.

Chairman Osborne asked can we go to item b)?

Ms. Stanley stated item b) is a proposal to include the north side of Mechanic Street into one of the Residential Parking Districts within the downtown. Predominantly it is a street that is a hole in the coverage for the residential parking programs downtown, and recently it has come to our attention that there is actually a need for residential parking for the 41 Mechanic Street address, which is the New Hampshire Institute of Art. They have approximately 104 dorm rooms and a limited number of students actually bring their cars to school and they have no place to park because they're not eligible for residential parking permits. What we're proposing to do is to add this into one of the residential parking zones, which will allow them to get residential permits and park on the east side of Elm Street, not on Elm Street but from Pine Street up to Union Street. That is the zone that we're proposing to put those students in.

Alderman Long moved to approve this item. It was duly seconded by Alderman Roy.

Alderman Long stated Brandy, though I support this action, I guess the question would go to our attorney. Being property specific, one address, versus a zone, are we opening ourselves up for any liability or a precedent that we don't want to open ourselves up for?

Ms. Stanley stated if it helps, the only address on that block is 41 Mechanic Street. The rest is, there's two parking garages and there are no other addresses, nor will there probably ever be.

Alderman Roy stated while Attorney Arnold is looking for that answer, could we pass this with just a provision that when it goes to the full Board that it may be the block and the side of the street versus a specific address? It accomplishes the same thing but I don't want Boards five or ten years from now to be looking at this saying we were property specific. And I think that would meet the Institute's need.

Chairman Osborne asked do you want to put the amendment to that? Is that what it is?

Alderman Roy responded just if the maker of the amendment would...I think it's just a safer alternative.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated the Clerk is looking for some clarification because we do have other sections of residential zones that have specific addresses included in them. The Canal Street area had a similar issue. And I just want to be clear on what the amendment is because I'm not sure what the motion was because we got into trying to answer the first question that came up.

Alderman Roy stated the amendment would just be that the geographic location of the block versus the actual street address be used. And if the attorney could just give us some indication as to the other addresses and if it opens us up for any liability down the road.

Mr. Arnold stated I believe that within the ordinance there are other specific addresses listed and given that this is a residential address on that particular box, I wouldn't foresee it opening up any problem areas. The other thing I would mention is I would have to go back and look, but I know that we have ordinances dealing with student parking in terms of residences and when they qualify for a parking permit that may be applicable here.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we're going with the specific address.

There being no opposition, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed item c).

Ms. Stanley stated in my letter to the Committee last month I had two items. One was passed, and that was providing additional parking on the street for Verizon Arena during a circus. This other item, the SCORE is a small business counseling center that is located in the Norris Cotton Federal Building. They provide a fairly substantial service to the community's small businesses and they do purchase parking passes from the Parking Division for the Pine Lot. Unfortunately they have a large number of SCORE counselors, any one of which may be in the office one or two days a month. Currently what they're doing is they purchase a limited number of parking passes and they give those passes to each one of those counselors on the days that they come in. Since the Federal Building has remodeled they have moved their main building entrance to Chestnut Street and their practice of shuffling permits around between all these various counselors requires them to park their car in the lot, walk all the way around the building, go through security and the metal detectors, walk up to the office, get the permit, walk back down, out through security, out through Chestnut, all the way back around the building, put the pass in their car and then repeat the whole process again. It doesn't work very well operationally for them. What they've asked me to do is to allow them to have their counselors park with a decal on their windshield in lieu of the parking permit. It will make a lot more sense for the

volunteers. In principal I don't have a problem with it because we know how many permits they have purchased. My PCOs, when they go through the lot, can count the number of decals that they see on the dashboards and make sure it does not exceed the number of permits they've purchased. I don't feel that I have the authority to grant that so that's why I wanted to get the Committee's input.

Chairman Osborne asked would these be for this lot only?

Ms. Stanley responded they would only be for the Pine Street parking lot.

Alderman Shea made a motion to approve this item. It was duly seconded by Alderman Long.

Alderman Roy stated Brandy, on page three is the actual decal. Could we have 'SCORE Volunteer' on that just so these aren't used elsewhere by other people?

Ms. Stanley responded sure.

There being no opposition, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Chairman Osborne advises that the Parking and Traffic Divisions have submitted agendas, which needs to be addressed as follows:

STOP SIGNS:

On Agnes Street at Pinard Street, NWC
Alderman Smith

NO RIGHT TURN ON RED:

On Beech Street at Cilley Road, southbound
Alderman Garrity

TWO-HOUR PARKING (8 AM – 6 PM):

On Spruce Street, north side, from Hall Street to Massabesic Street
Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Notre Dame Avenue, west side, from a point 180 feet south of Amory Street to
a point 73 feet southerly
Alderman Thibault

NO PARKING ANYTIME (EMERGENCY ORDINANCE):

On Lincoln Street, west side, from Lake Avenue South Back Street to Spruce Street
Alderman Osborne

On Exeter Avenue, west side, from a point 112 feet north of Harvard Street to a point 21 feet northerly
Alderman Shea

NO PARKING - LOADING ZONE:

On Arms Street, east side, from a point 127 feet north of Stark Street to a point 18 feet northerly
Alderman Long

On Belmont Street, east side, from a point 58 feet north of Summer Street, to a point 20 feet northerly
Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING (8AM-5PM/MONDAY-FRIDAY):

On Michigan Avenue, east side, from a point 45 feet south of London Street to a point 25 feet southerly
Alderman Duval

NO PARKING (PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF ONLY):

On Foster Avenue, east side, from Valley Street to a point 56 feet southerly
Alderman Shea

RESCIND NO PARKING - LOADING ZONE:

On Arms Street, east side, from a point 127 feet north of Stark Street to a point 145 feet northerly
Alderman Long

On Belmont Street, east side, from a point 45 feet north of Summer Street to a point 40 feet northerly
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND NO PARKING – LOADING ZONE (8AM-5PM/MONDAY-SATURDAY):

On Pine Street, east side, from a point 30 feet south of Hanover Street to a point 25 feet southerly
Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING (8AM-5-PM/MONDAY-FRIDAY):

On Michigan Avenue, east side, from London Street to a point 115 feet south
(Ord. 8987)
Alderman Duval

RESCIND 1-HOUR PARKING (8AM-6PM):

On Spruce Street, north side, from Hall Street to Massabesic Street (Ord. 6167)
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND TWO-HOUR PARKING:

On High Street, north side, from Union Street to Pine Street

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

On Somerville Street, from Porter Street to Maple Street
Alderman Shea

10-HOUR METERS (8AM-8PM/MONDAY-FRIDAY):

On High Street, north side, from Union Street to Pine Street

RESCIND 2-HOUR METERS:

On High Street, north side, from Pine Street to Union Street

ADDENDUM

Rescind 15 Minute Parking

On Kelley Street, north side, from Hevey Street to a point 50 feet easterly
(Ord.8875)
Alderman Forest

Rescind No Parking November 15 - April 15:

On Orange Street, south side, from Union Street to Chestnut Street (Ord. 8963)

No Parking November 15 - April 15:

On Orange Street, south side, from Chestnut Street to Pine Street
Alderman Long

Rescind 1 Hour Parking 8AM – 6PM:

On Elm Street, east side, from a point 100 feet south of Welch Ave. to a point 20
feet south of Sterling Ave.(Ord. 2950)
Alderman Long

1 Hour Parking 8AM – 6PM:

On Elm Street, east side, from a point 100 feet south of Welch Ave. to a point 124 feet north of Welch Ave.

Alderman Long

No Parking Anytime:

On Elm Street, east side, from Sterling Ave. to a point 55 feet south

Alderman Long

Rescind Accessible Parking Space:

On Wheelock Street, west side, from a point 20 feet south of W. Hancock Street to a point 20 feet south

Alderman Smith

Alderman O’Neil asked can I just ask why we keep getting addendums every month, why it’s not getting on the regular agenda?

Chairman Osborne stated I think Mr. Hoben can answer that one.

Mr. Jim Hoben, Traffic Department Director, stated these came in after the agenda was submitted on Tuesday.

Alderman Long stated I know mine were submitted on Thursday.

Chairman Osborne stated we’re trying to accommodate everybody because it takes a month and a couple of weeks after that sometimes to get everything going.

Mr. Hoben stated they were passed by the Committee chairman also for his approval.

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to approve this agenda, including the Addendum.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Wayfinding Sign Package submitted by the Director of Planning and Community Development.

Chairman Osborne noted that Mr. Robert MacKenzie was not here to present this item.

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

Chairman Osborne addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Intown Manchester requesting curtailment of parking enforcement during the Downtown Shopping Night to be held on Thursday, November 29th from 5 till 9 PM and on each Thursday during the month of December from 5 till 8 PM.

Alderman O'Neil stated we've done this in the past, I think, or similar.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to approve this item.

TABLED ITEMS

9. Communication from Alderman Shea proposing the establishment of a *Manchester Crime Prevention Committee*.
(Tabled 12/12/2006)

Chairman Osborne noted that this has been tabled since 12/12/2006.

Alderman Shea stated I think it's very significant to keep it there.

Chairman Osborne asked wouldn't it be better to take it off and bring it back in?

Alderman Shea retorted what's the difference? I mean, if we keep it on there. The point is that there is a lot of discussion at this time about establishment of a precinct on the West Side, which I brought up about a year and a half ago. Everyone is jumping on that one now, which is a good idea in my judgement. And also, the Police Crime Prevention Committee is very significant. I'm still waiting for a report that was going to be held at the State level between the Mayor as well as Chief of Police, that was going to come back, hopefully, with ideas concerning how. And my thoughts run along the lines that we do have a serious crime problem. There is mention of gangs being in the City and so forth. And I don't think that we should do away with this until there is a meeting of different individuals from the City here and the State Attorney General's office in order to make sure that we get a handle on crime. We're doing everything to treat the effects of crime but not the causes of crime, and until we find the causes of crime and work on that, then we're wasting our time in my judgement, adding more and more money to the effects of crime. So I think this is one way as a community

that we can get down to the nitty-gritty of what's causing crime, what are the causes, where it's occurring, go to the locations where there may be crime being perpetrated and find out what's going on in those areas and concentrating then our efforts on trying to do other things. Proposals are being suggested by both of the mayoral candidates, and maybe some of those thoughts and ideas could be incorporated. So I want to leave that on the table for the time being.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Shea brings an issue forward. He has asked to table it because others are working on it, and then nobody gets back to Alderman Shea or the Committee. It's not right. Somebody has got to respond at some point here, whether they agree with Alderman Shea's recommendation or not. Somebody has got to get back to Alderman Shea and the Committee.

Alderman Shea stated I agree with you and I thank you for that support because basically we're the aldermanic board that approves or disapproves certain funding, and when people come before us and ask for funding we're very receptive for their needs, and they come before us and they say they need this and that for guns and for drug fighting and so forth. But when we as an aldermanic board suggest certain things for them to be the initiators of it, as Alderman O'Neil says, they really don't get back to us and they figure, well, we can blow this away because maybe it's going to entail a little bit more work on their part in order for us to get a full bearing on what's going on. And I will keep this on the table until we do get responses and so forth.

Chairman Osborne stated okay, on this particular item it says here, the establishment of a crime prevention committee. There was no committee put together, was there?

Alderman Shea responded because the police did not want to put a committee together. That's the point. But the point of the matter is, at that same time there was a discussion that was going to be held at the State level involving Police Chief Jaskolka and Mayor Guinta. They were going to discuss different ways of handling crime. And this was going to then come back to us. We've never received anything, and that's why I want to keep this here, and these are representatives from the Police Chief down to the New Hampshire State Police, to the Sheriffs Department to the Manchester Police Commission to the DEA, the FBI, and so forth. We have a problem in Manchester concerning crime. These are the people here who have insight into what is involved in crime. These are the different areas that could be looked at in terms of trying. The utilization of local colleges for resource purposes... You know, all of these things are significant in my judgement and I say that I'm not going to give up the fact that because they didn't want to establish a committee that we couldn't as an aldermanic committee

say we want a committee. We want you to start working and get back to us and form a committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman, I was just going to make a simple vote, not a detail, but do I need to make a motion to take this off the table to make that vote?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded yes.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to take this off the table.

Alderman O'Neil made a motion that the Mayor and/or the Manchester Police Chief get back to this Committee with a response on Alderman Shea's request, what the status is of the involvement on the State level and where that whole thing is going by the next meeting. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Shea.

Alderman Shea stated but also to maintain that we keep this committee involved. I don't want to remove that committee either.

Alderman O'Neil stated but we haven't actually set it up yet.

Chairman Osborne stated we have no committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated out of a courtesy I think we agreed to table it to hear back from what they were doing. That's all I'm saying is report back. If they don't want to report back, next meeting we'll set up the committee, plain and simple.

There being no opposition, the motion carried.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson asked may I just ask for one clarification? Was it the intent to have that remain on the table, pending that report as well?

Chairman Osborne responded yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated it certainly was, Carol.

Alderman Long stated in that same letter of November 28th of 2006, it says no later than March 2007 there would be a report submitted to the Board.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't see anything.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 10 of the agenda:

10. E-mail communication from Jennifer Drakoulakos expressing her concerns regarding traffic flow and parking problem on A Street.
(Tabled 04/17/2007)

Chairman Osborne stated I just have a question here on item 10. It has been on here too...Lieutenant Hopkins, are all the concerns on A Street been taken care of so we can take this off the agenda? I think they have.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated A Street was done several months ago, almost immediately after we got that letter. A speed survey was done, grade hours down on the street, a meeting was held with the residents, some ideas were taken and put in place by the Traffic Department. I would take that off the agenda.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to receive and file item 10.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 11 of the agenda:

11. Communication from Deputy Chief Lussier submitting information relating to tasers and responding to questions raised regarding the department's priorities.
(Tabled 07/10/2007)

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to take item 11 off the table.

Alderman Roy stated because I honestly believe this Committee is well versed in what that letter represents and what it says about the process of requests from the Police Department I would ask that it be sent to the full Board and if the full Board would like to receive and file it at that time, at least they will have reviewed it.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to send this letter to the full Board for the Consent Agenda as a communication for informational purposes.

There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 12 of the agenda:

12. Ordinance amendment relating to restrictions on registered sex offenders.
(Tabled 09/04/2007 – pending further research by the City Solicitor office.)
This item remained on the table.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 13 of the agenda:

13. Communication from Jim Hoben, Deputy Traffic Director, seeking clarification from the City Solicitor regarding any liability issues associated with placement of nonstandard MUTCD signage and seeking the committee's direction in the installation of such signage.
(Tabled 09/04/2007)

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to take this item off the table.

Chairman Osborne stated I couldn't get this through last time on the last meeting that we had. Mr. Arnold, I did call you on this issue about liabilities and so on and so forth on this particular situation here and you said there were no liabilities, but I guess... Jim Hoben...where is he? Jimbo? Do you want to clarify this tabled item from last time? We couldn't get to it.

Mr. Hoben stated as I stated before, the City has adopted the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, which is put out by the Federal Highway Administration. We've try to strive to stay with it so that everything is uniform State-wide, City-wide and internationally they use the same standards. Some of this other signage isn't in the manual which we subscribe to, and the issue came up and in speaking with Kevin Sheppard of the Highway Department you wanted the issue brought forward. Therefore I wrote the letter to the Committee.

Chairman Osborne asked how many signs out there now do you feel are not standard?

Mr. Hoben responded there's probably 50 out there.

Alderman Shea stated I know that in my ward recently there was a problem and when you called me concerning that, I indicated to you that the best policy is to follow whatever policy is in existence at the City level and the State level. Could you comment on that particular situation in terms of whether or not this is the best procedure to use in terms of a sign being placed in a certain area?

Mr. Hoben asked which location?

Alderman Shea stated well you know where I'm talking about. Foster Avenue.

Mr. Hoben stated that would fall within the manual. That was a case of putting a No Parking sign up and the person couldn't get out of his driveway.

Alderman Shea stated yes but that person's sign you said was made...in other words the City...when I said the City's sign should go there in case of liability, right?

Mr. Hoben stated there's some extra verbiage on there...

Alderman Shea stated that's right. That's what I'm trying to tell you. Because the City would be held liable in case there was some sort of a problem that might exist because of that extra verbiage on that sign. Is that correct?

Mr. Hoben responded it's a possibility, yes, correct.

Alderman Shea stated well all right, that's what I'm trying to tell you, that the City should follow certain signage that is consistent and not have individuals or groups put up a sign that isn't in conformity with the City ordinance. I mean, that's common sense, isn't it?

Mr. Hoben stated it makes sense to me. I think they should stick with the manual.

Alderman Shea stated thank you.

Chairman Osborne asked are there any liabilities for the sign we're talking about here, on thirteen?

Mr. Arnold stated I believe that the particular wording placed on a sign, whether that is standard or concerns a topic that is not contained in those standards, doesn't create liability. That you've got to keep separate and apart from, for instance, where the signs are placed or how large they are so they don't block views or something like that. But the mere language on the sign I don't think creates liability.

Chairman Osborne stated okay, so I guess that answers that. So the only other thing...I guess I have to update my committee here on what's...Do you all know what's trying to be done here? Did you go through this whole memo, what I'm trying to do here on Spruce and Maple Streets? Did you go through it all? Let me clarify it. What I put in for, well I asked Mr. Hoben to put up, because it doesn't

require an ordinance, is on the corner of Spruce and Maple, there's been a lot of accidents there over the years. I've done a lot to that corner from the strobe lights to No Turn on Red to clearing the corner for parking and a lot of things I've done there and it's coming along quite well, I think. I haven't taken the last statistics on it from the Police Department. I think there's less accidents than there used to be anyway. But I was thinking of using a sign on top of the arm on that intersection reading Smile: You Could Be On Camera. Not candid camera, just camera. The reason for this is we have to use, again, reverse psychology. In other words when somebody sees this, today there's cameras everywhere, in every state and every town and every city the size of a pin. They can put cameras up there you could never see. So to keep...you know we've been talking about different things with Lieutenant Hopkins here to keep it pretty legal, that by putting the sign up here is a good pilot program to see how it would work because coming up Maple Street you have the strobe lights, and then you see that sign also, and then going all the way up Maple Street you get to the DW Highway, they would be on call on caution to this because they would remember that wording, Smile, You Could Be On Camera. So, if you're on camera, it's kind of hard to not know whether you are or you're not. All I was trying to do there is to start a little pilot thing. I know Mr. O'Neil doesn't like signs, but we don't have all the enforcement that we should have. It's not the policemen's faults but it's just the way it is. So we have to do something.

Alderman O'Neil stated two points, if I may. We certainly wouldn't want to put a sign up when I happened to note the last few weeks the police have been putting some of their efforts on Maple Street north of Bridge Street, and there was nothing more pleasing than seeing an officer stepping out with...He didn't tell them 'smile you're on laser radar' but he was, and the day I stopped by when he was doing it, he stopped at least one car at 52 miles an hour. So there's nothing that is going to have more of an impact than a police officer writing a speeding ticket.

Chairman Osborne stated I realize that, Mr. O'Neil. You keep coming up with this one thing, and they're not out there 24/7. They can't be.

Alderman O'Neil stated speeding signs don't slow them down.

Chairman Osborne stated so what I'm trying to do here is have that sign working 24/7.

Alderman O'Neil stated I also want to go to a second point, and that's on my crusade with the STOP signs. Mr. Hoben makes a statement that we follow the standards per the book on all our regulations, but yet in my little bit of a crusade on our-way stop signs, we're in violation with probably three quarters of the four-way stop signs. So we don't follow the standards. Many of our four-way stop signs are up illegally. They don't meet the standards that we've adopted.

Chairman Osborne stated that's why I asked how many different kinds of non-standard signs were out there.

Alderman O'Neil stated if we're going to say we're going by the book, the standard, then we need to go by the book and take down these illegal four-way stop signs because there's a criteria you have to meet to put up a four-way stop sign. We failed to do it.

Chairman Osborne stated it would be kind of hard to take them all down now because people are creatures of habit.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand that, but if we're following the book there should be a recommendation that says this needs to meet the standards. We use them when it's convenient to us and we don't use them when it's not convenient to us.

Chairman Osborne stated my Ward is all set. I don't need another four-way stop sign in my Ward that I can see. Believe me I know my Ward quite well, so I'm all set. You can check all the other wards if you want but I'm all set, Mr. O'Neil. I'm just asking for this other sign which I think will work quite well on that street. I know it will because people are cautious of that. So anyway, that's the story of what is here. That's all I'm trying to say.

Alderman Shea stated I know that the Chairman mentioned about the accidents that were on the corner there. Are there other places in the City to your knowledge where there are more accidents than on the corner of Spruce and Maple Streets? In other words, I don't know if the police could run a check and so forth.

Chairman Osborne stated I could tell you that, Mr. Shea. There are other places like Bridge and Beech. There's Cilley and Beech. There's a lot of accidents there too. If you would like to put one of those on all of those I don't mind that either.

Alderman Shea stated no, I don't want the whole City smiling, but I'm just saying, the point is that if it's a detriment, fine, but if it's not a detriment...

Chairman Osborne stated it would be a nice city if they did, wouldn't it?

Alderman Shea responded oh, a beautiful city if we all smiled, and I think we should smile more than we do, but I'm saying that if a sign is not going to fulfill a purpose, then I don't know whether it's necessary. If it is, that's fine.

Chairman Osborne asked how can you say it's not going to fill a purpose?

Alderman Shea stated well like I said before, if there were 20 accidents on the corner of Spruce and Maple, and because of what you've done, it's reduced it to two or three, then a sign saying Smile, You Could Be On Camera is not going to do that much good. However, if there were 20 accidents and now there are still 18 or 16 then putting an additional sign would add a little bit of credence to your thoughts and process. But I'm just saying if you reduced it to a point where there isn't any or very few in comparison to what there were, it's apparent that what you have employed there is working and therefore there isn't, in my judgement, the need for an additional sign. That's all I'm saying.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman you're to be commended for your efforts trying to come up with a solution. You put up that flashing red strobe light. That worked. It appears to, based on the statistics that have been presented. We've cut the accidents down to almost nothing there, from what I understand.

Chairman Osborne stated what I'm trying to do, not only for that corner, because the strobe lights are there, that sign is going to go up there and it's going to cover all the way up Maple Street. I'm not trying to protect just that one corner. Seeing the strobe lights are already there, it draws attention to the people that see that all the way down to South Willow Street, you can almost see those stobes running. So when they get to that corner they're going to see that sign along side of the strobe lights, and by seeing that sign, eventually we'll probably have cameras going up Maple Street, but in the meantime, when? That's their guess. So this keeps people on their toes, is all I'm trying to say. It keeps every corner going up Maple Street; it's worth a try; it doesn't cost hardly anything to do it. And there's no law against it. I don't see any problem with it, so that's all I'm asking for. If you can come up with something better let me know.

Alderman O'Neil stated a cop writing tickets, that's better.

Chairman Osborne stated that's true. I agree with you there. But they're not there 24/7 is all I'm trying to say.

Alderman Roy stated I have a request for Lieutenant Hopkins. Could you put together a list of technologies that are out there? I know the Mass State Police use a license plate identification to find stolen cars. I believe there are cameras that can be mounted at intersections that click a license plate picture at a certain speed. Could you put together a short list of technologies that are out there that may replace the 24/7 patrol officer, and maybe some type of compromise for this Committee, possibly for our next Committee meeting? And it doesn't have to be anything formal. It can be printed out Web pages, stapled and handed out to the Committee, if you'd like to do some research.

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. O'Neil, do we have a motion on this?

Alderman O'Neil asked for what?

Chairman Osborne asked Mr. Hoben what kind of a motion do you need here? You need some direction, right?

Mr. Hoben stated I'm looking for direction and approval to install the sign.

Chairman Osborne stated we're talking one sign now. We're not talking...but eventually this is what it's going to lead to. We're going to have cameras all over this City eventually. Maybe we won't still be Aldermen, but at least we're trying now to get this thing implemented where it has some powder behind the bullet, you know.

No one made a motion on this item.

Chairman Osborne addressed item 14 of the agenda:

14. NO THROUGH TRUCKS:

On Front Street from the I-293 On-Ramp to Goffstown Road, southbound
Alderman Forest
(Tabled 09/04/2007)

Chairman Osborne asked what's going on with Front Street Mr. Hoben?

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to take this item off the table.

Alderman Roy stated if I could speak to this. This was somewhat reactionary to the solid waste discussions we were having and it was tabled at that point. At this point the recycling center does not appear to be going on Dunbarton Road so if we could receive and file that, that would be acceptable to the Alderman in that Ward.

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

Alderman Roy stated and just on a side note, if for some reason discussions were to turn back, it can be brought up at any time and put back on our agenda for the next meeting so some residents don't feel that their voice is not being heard.

Chairman Osborne stated oh sure, you can do that any time.

Alderman Shea stated the only thing that I'd like to mention is we have a parking situation going into effect and I feel and I guess Lieutenant Hopkins mentioned about, is it the 15th of November that...and I feel that obviously in my particular Ward there are concerns about the fact that it is implemented prior to any kind of bad weather being involved. And again in the spring it's carried over, so I would like to make a motion that it's not implemented till December 1st at the earliest and that would allow people on Thanksgiving who are visiting and so forth, not to be concerned about being ticketed when it's odd/even and so forth. So I don't know if people agree or disagree with that, but that's what my thoughts run along the line.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Deputy Highway Director, asked was it regarding waiver for Thanksgiving?

Alderman Shea responded yes, waiver until December 1st rather than...because Thanksgiving is coming and there's a lot of implications with people visiting from out of town and people getting ticketed, particularly in areas where there are limited parking spaces. Obviously if there's a major snowstorm there could be a change, but I'm just saying that in fairness to people who come and visit for the Thanksgiving holidays from out of town, it's not fair to them to be ticketed if there's no reason, weather-wise.

Mr. Sheppard stated during that weekend, typically we'll provide a waiver for Thanksgiving weekend where there are a lot of out of town people, especially if there's no reason for that.

Alderman Shea asked now how about between the 15th of November to the 22nd? How about that?

Mr. Sheppard stated the only concern I would have with that is people are used to the November 15th date. If we start moving that date around...Most people are used to that November 15th date, but that's the prerogative of the Board. If we do move that date, obviously no tickets will be issued, so if people are used to that date, that's not going to be a problem. We've always got the right to call a snow emergency where no vehicles are parked in the streets.

Alderman Shea stated well no, but my thinking is if people are used to it, they will then park accordingly. So it wouldn't have any impact on them. The people who aren't used to it, they would be the ones that would be impacted. I mean, people who move in from out of town and move into apartments and so forth, you know they park on the street where they're coming from and if there's no snow or any kind of adverse conditions, and they start parking and they get ticketed because you know they're saying, I'm not aware of this. I think that there could be notices given as there are now, that the parking ban would go on December 1st. But that's just my thinking. If nobody agrees that's fine, but I'm bringing it up because I feel that I have a responsibility to my constituents who in the past have indicated to me that the time of this...and I think somebody wrote a letter too indicating...

Chairman Osborne stated I'm going to get to that in a second.

Alderman Shea stated but anyway, that's a discussion among the Board. Members have a way of voting up or down on a motion.

Chairman Osborne stated Mr. Sheppard, we had something last meeting. I called you on it, and this Luke Gutelius here on Lake Avenue had a recommendation and you were supposed to come back with some sort of a report on it, and I guess we spoke...We had an idea of coming up with maybe a first snowstorm or something like this. But anyway, what's your outlook of what he had to say?

Mr. Sheppard stated I think he obviously has some good reasoning in his letter, but I think the easiest way to work out some emergencies is to keep it simple. Once again, what we've done is we've kept it from November 15th until the springtime. There's a couple of reasons for that: People get used to it. If we move the snow emergency time to during the daytime there's more traffic on the roads. That's why we've always kept it on the odd/even. It's at night so that we can do cleanup on the opposite side of the street if need be. We use it for sweeping in the springtime, the odd/even during the nighttime when there's less traffic on the roads. If the odd/even goes into effect during the days as suggested, our concern is the amount of traffic that is on the roads. We're doing a lot of our cleanup at night. And we're not always calling a snow emergency at night. We try to minimize the amount of nights we call a snow emergencies to keep the cars off the street. We may have trucks out at night but not have a snow emergency for

cleaning up of the streets. I think the other thing is his suggestion is to maybe define that outside the school zones and the downtown area, and again I think that could confuse the residents of the City trying to define those areas even though we can define those areas, to get that information on to the residents would be very difficult.

Chairman Osborne stated okay, so you feel it should be left just the way it is.

Mr. Sheppard stated I think it has gone this way. People are used to this. I think it has worked out very well. The inner city is very difficult for parking. I don't disagree with that fact. But I think people have learned to work with that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I happened to be on the Board when we made the change to the odd/even parking and that was...prior to that you couldn't park on the street from November 15th to...I don't think it was April because I don't think street sweeping was a consideration, but into the spring you couldn't park at all on the City street. So this in the late 80's I believe it was, maybe early 90's was changed to help accommodate as best we could. It's certainly not perfect but it's a step in the right direction and I would be very concerned about changing that now. As Frank has said to me numerous times, he's retiring the end of December, we're going to get walloped with snow and all that this winter. That's when this creates a major problem by allowing parking on the streets. So I think the odd/even was a compromise. It was to help out the residents. And I think to do anything different...I myself have lived in situations with no place to park, and for the...how many times did we have a snow emergency last year, five, six?

Mr. Sheppard stated if that.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is a convenience for a limited number of days but it also helps the Public Works Department in trying to keep the streets in as best shape as possible and as wide as possible in the wintertime.

Alderman Shea stated I believe that the even/odd is very good. There's no question about that. But we have to consider we're in the year 2007 with global warming and other concerns coming about. We know that there's been drastic changes in our environment, and we know also that there has been additional motor vehicles on the road now with limited parking because of additional places being added to three story buildings which now occupy five and every home has maybe two vehicles and sometimes three, and who knows how many more. So what I'm just indicating is that we should consider the fact that between November 15th and December 1st over the past four or five or ten years I'm just wondering how many snowstorms we've had that would cause inconvenience on the part of your department visa vie the difficulties that are encountered by

constituents that have again, not the provisions that some of us who live in outlying areas of the City have. So I'm just saying maybe we shouldn't change it; maybe we should. But we should start looking at it as we do other things in order to make sure that we're providing the best quality of life for all the people in our City, and that's all I'm saying. So that if we don't do anything we're going to keep the same situation going in the year 2020 because basically we, you know, and I'm not saying that, you know, obviously who knows what's going to happen, but I'm just saying that why don't we look at it because people in different Wards have requested changes and so forth and I think that we should listen to them because they're making up our City. Thank you.

Mr. Sheppard stated that is one way to maybe look at the odd/even parking and I can get some information on that regarding the snow, and typically the snowstorms during November, you'll get a melting and you'll get a warm day and I don't disagree with that. I can get further information. I know the past two years November hasn't been... We may get a light snowstorm, but in previous years we have. But I can look a little bit further into that.

Alderman Shea stated we can always remember as kids that there was snow on Thanksgiving but now who knows what it's like, rain or maybe sunny skies and so forth. We do have the benefit of different types of weather reports coming through so that we know pretty much in advance whether or not a week or five days following are going to be good for climatic conditions, so using modern technology as Alderman 1 has indicated for traffic, we could use it for other things as well, which would mean that your department...

Mr. Sheppard stated which we do. We've got all that.

Chairman Osborne stated okay, it stays as it is. Thank you, Mr. Sheppard. I just want to get Brandy up and give her a few minutes on this request from Brandy Stanley for clarification for us...responsibilities between the Parking Division and the Highway. I guess we should clear that up, huh Brandy?

Ms. Stanley stated thank you, Alderman. We wrote this letter because over the past year there have been some conflicts and some overlaps between the Highway Department and the Parking Division. So there's two components to this letter. One is maintenance and funding for repairing and reviewing the structures that the City owns. Currently the City owns three parking structures: the Victory garage, the Rines Center garage and the Central High School garage. Right now all three garages are under a maintenance contract, a structural engineering contract through HTA. HTA reviews all three parking garages every year and makes recommendations on capital improvements. Last year there were some issues in terms of who was supposed to pay for capital improvements on the Rines Center

garage. The ordinance very clearly exempts the Central High School garage from responsibility. However, it does make sense to have all of the facilities under the same engineering contract. There were a couple of capital improvement contracts that did not get funded because the Parking Enterprise didn't submit CIP funding and neither did the Health Department. What we're looking for is some direction from the Board in terms of who pays for capital improvements and who administers the contract. What we've recommended is that all parking facilities should continue to be covered by the Parking Division with the oversight of the Highway Department in terms of engineering and projects, as is the Board's directive for all of the City's structures, whether they're parking garages or not. Funds for the maintenance of revenue generating garages should come from the Enterprise, but it should be clearly understood that funds for the maintenance of the Rines Center garage should not be from revenue but from the CIP program. And funds for Central High School garage should be from the School District. And then all garages will be covered under the structural engineering contract with HTA, with the cost of any major project charged accordingly. And lastly that funds from the general structural review of all the garages, which is something that happens on an annual basis, will be paid for from garage revenue funds, as it may be too cumbersome to divide these costs which are fairly insubstantial. So that's the first thing that we'd like to recommend in terms of clarification of how to deal with the three parking structures. The second is...

Alderman O'Neil asked can we take them one at... 'cause I don't have the letter, so I'm just going completely off what you're... so, I don't think it's in our packet, Mr. Chairman. It was sent out under separate cover.

Alderman O'Neil stated so just quickly, we will continue under whatever contract they have. Public Works will be involved in assisting on engineering and construction.

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

Ms. Stanley stated second, some conflicts have arisen in relation to ordinance and parking changes for City streets outside the downtown core. The ordinance when the Parking Division was created states in letter E of the ordinance that the Parking Division shall 'manage and operate all on street parking within the City of Manchester.' That particular item raises some conflicts because we are fairly certain that the intent of the Parking Division was to manage all revenue-generating spaces, and presumably that's in the downtown core. Metered spaces, whatnot. The way it's written it can be interpreted that the Parking Division has responsibility for all parking spaces whether they're metered or not, throughout the entire City.

Chairman Osborne asked, can I stop you there for one second? Is that because of Kay? Is that why it's worded that way, because Kay has the authority to go out there and ticket cars outside of the downtown area?

Ms. Stanley replied honestly Alderman, I don't have any idea.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman. I'm just going by memory. I just don't think we put a specific request...For me it wasn't the intent that Brandy be involved in a No Parking zone on Bodwell Road or Hackett Hill Road. That wasn't the intent. So maybe we need to clearly define it. I think she does bring some expertise in areas...I know she's assisting the special committee that was set up regarding high school parking. That's very appropriate, but I think with the workload Brandy has the last thing she needs to be involved in is parking beyond the core of the downtown area unless there's a specific issue that may come up that she can be of help to. So, whatever the wording can be to help clarify that I think that would be...and it certainly should not affect, in my opinion, the ability of, whether it's Kay in the vehicle or Maureen on the bicycle, for some reason to...or her enforcement officer...

Chairman Osborne interrupted you're going to have to separate those two, you know, Kay and the meter maids or whatever it might be.

Alderman O'Neil responded but if they can get out to help out other sections of the City...They've done that previously, so I don't see that's an issue.

Chairman Osborne asked what's your recommendation, Brandy?

Ms. Stanley responded what our recommendation is is that we'd like to suggest that all parking issues outside the downtown core be referred to the Traffic Division, with the caveat that both divisions will continue to share resources as each situation warrants. Item F in the ordinance code says basically that if there's any other services that are requested of the Parking Manager that they'll certainly comply, which I think is of benefit. However, there have been some conflicts in terms of what I've been doing and what Jim Hoben has been doing and we've been overstepping each other's bounds and we do a very good job of communication; however, it would be easier if it was just in general, unless it was a special situation, if it was outside of downtown, it could be referred to the Traffic Division. If it was inside in terms of ordinance changes, it could stay with the Parking Division.

Chairman Osborne asked is this something you could work with, Mr. Arnold? Is this something you could get it clarified, which is what?

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman, I can think of an example that came up a year ago or so when they were moving the pre-cast in over on Main Street for CMC. It became very, very confusing for the construction company who to coordinate everything with and finally it came under the Director of Public Works to clearing under the law some temporary action, which solved the whole thing. But it got passed around, not intentionally; it just got passed around by a number of different departments and when on for a number of days and that's, to be honest with you, I'm not sure Brandy...She didn't ask to get involved but she was brought in, and I think it went to you to begin with, when really it was a Frank Thomas issue to address.

Chairman Osborne asked Brandy, can you work with Mr. Arnold, tomorrow or whenever, give him a call and work this out together and then bring it back to this Committee so we can get this thing clarified to the tee, you know with Kay or these maids or that maids?

Alderman Roy stated seeing that they're going to work out the issues, can we refer this to the full Board so that it doesn't take another month to clarify this?

Chairman Osborne responded no I think Brandy can talk to him tomorrow and bring it back...well you mean before we...

Alderman Roy stated if it goes to this Committee and then it has to go to the full Board, we could be a month, month and a half out. We're all members of the full Board so we can review it again then with a final proposal and that way it's also not on your next agenda.

Alderman Shea stated sometimes we use polling as well in order for it to come from the Traffic Committee to the full Board so that if you could work something out maybe between now and the seventh...My suggest is we have a poll, and if we all agree that it should go to the full Board under the new situation that's been adopted by you and Tom Arnold, and maybe if Jim Hoben has to get involved, or the Highway, then we would have then the notification as a Committee in order for it to go to the full Board.

Chairman Osborne stated but it may take more questions than you think. When they call you on the phone they tell you what they've come up with, I think it takes quite a while...

Alderman Shea stated then you're not in favor...

Chairman Osborne stated I think it should come back...How much is this pressing? What's the time? Is there a time on this thing? No.

Ms. Stanley responded I don't think it's particularly pressing. We're operating just fine now.

Chairman Osborne stated I think we should come back to Committee with it. That's what I think.

Alderman Shea stated whatever the Committee wants to do.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted to have this item brought back to the Committee.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee