

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

May 20, 2008
Aldermen Shea, O'Neil,
Sullivan, J. Roy, Ouellette

5:45 PM
Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)

Chairman Shea called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Shea, Sullivan, J. Roy
Alderman O'Neil (arrive late)

Aldermen Garrity and Lopez

Absent: Alderman Ouellette

Chairman Shea addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. The Traffic and Parking Divisions have submitted an agenda which needs to be addressed:

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Cedar Street, south side, from Hall Street to Belmont Street (Ord. 7012)
On Hall Street, west side, from Spruce Street to a point 65 feet southerly (Ord. 8445)
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND COMPACT VEHICLE PARKING ONLY:

On Massabesic Street, north side, from a point 33 feet east of Belmont Street to a point 17 feet east
Alderman Osborne

NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Auburn Street, north side, from a point 60 feet east of Canton Street to a point 35 feet easterly
On Belmont Street, west side, from Cedar Street to a point 95 feet south
Alderman Osborne
On Zachary Road, both sides, from a point 735 feet east of East Industrial Park Drive to the end of the road
Alderman Pinard

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Cedar Street, south side, from Belmont Street to a point 145 feet west
On Cedar Street, north side, from Belmont Street to a point 110 feet west
On Belmont Street, east side, from a point 125 feet north of Spruce Street to Lake Ave.
On Massabesic Street, north side, from a point 33 feet east of Belmont Street to a point 17 feet east
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND 30 MINUTE PARKING:

On Hall Street, west side, from a point 20 feet south of Spruce Street to a point 45 feet south
(Ord. 3077)
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

On Hall Street, west side, from a point 40 feet south of Spruce Street to a point 25 feet south
(Ord. 8414)
Alderman Osborne

RESCIND PARKING 2 HOURS-8AM-6PM:

Mulsey St., north side, from a point 45 feet west of Bedford St. to State St.
(Ord. 7872)
Payson St., south side, from Bedford St. to State St. 8am-6pm
(Ord. 7874)

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING:

Mulsey St., north side, from Bedford to a point 45 feet westerly
(Ord. 7258)

ONE WAY STREET:

Payson Street, from North State Street to Bedford St., eastbound
North State Street, from Mulsey St. to Payson St., southbound
Mulsey Street, from Bedford to Mulsey St., westbound

PARKING 2 HOURS:

Mulsey St., north side, from Bedford St. to State St.
North State St., west side, from Mulsey St. to Payson St.
Payson St., south side, from Bedford St. to State St.

RESCIND METERS – 2 HOURS

From A point 295 feet East of Pine St to Union St Side-North
(Ord. 2879)

ADDENDUM

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Cedar Street, north side, from a point 180 feet west of Beech Street to a point 35 feet west

Alderman Osborne

On Hall Street, west side, from Hanover Street to Manchester Street

Alderman J. Roy

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

On Hall Street, west side, from a point 65 feet south of Hanover Street to a point 30 feet southerly

Alderman J. Roy

STOP SIGN:

Douglas Street Athletic Field Driveway and Douglas Street – SWC

Alderman Ouellette

RESCIND TWO HOUR PARKING – 8AM – 6PM – MONDAY – SATURDAY:

Canton Street, east side, from Auburn Street to Spruce Street (Ord. 8350)

Alderman Osborne

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE

On Zachary Road, both sides, from a point 735 feet east of East Industrial Drive to the end of the road

Alderman Pinard

METERS – 10 HOURS

From A point 295 feet East of Pine St to Union St Side-North
(Ord. 2879)

On motion of Alderman J. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Sullivan, it was voted to approve the Traffic and Parking Divisions agenda with the Addendum.

Chairman Shea addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Kevin Sheppard advising that Robert Landry of the NHDOT will be in attendance to discuss the NH DOT Turnpike Bridge over Black Brook Project.

Mr. Dennis Anctil of the Highway Department, introduced Robert Landry of the NH DOT.

Mr. Robert Landry, NH DOT, stated basically, the state needs to rehabilitate the bridge that carries I-293 over Black Brook between Exit 6 and Exit 7 in the City of Manchester. To do this work safely, we are looking to close the Exit 6 northbound on ramp for both Phase I and Phase II. We're trying to widen the bridge by building the middle section of the bridge first and then trying to shift traffic to that section, and that makes it a very difficult situation to get...and I've got Bridge I right here, and you can see the lack of room. We're filling in the middle of the project on the first phase, with traffic narrowed up on the outside, and then in the next phase putting traffic in the middle and then working on the downstream side.

Chairman Shea asked what is the length of time that you'll be closing?

Mr. Landry responded there are two options we've been looking at. The continuous close would be from June 2009 till June 2010. That would allow us to do Phase I and II. We did also look at another option that would close if from June 2009 to November 2009, open the ramp back up, and then start the close again in March 2010, and close it until about July 2010. There is a pro and a con to both of those options. With the continuous closure you allow people to understand and get used to using other alternatives, in particular the Exit 5 northbound on ramp will be open by this time. We would see most of the traffic using that way. If you do a break in the middle, you're going to need a little bit of that time to show people that the ramp is now closed again for the non commuters.

Chairman Shea asked will you publicize this in the local papers? How are you planning on getting the correspondence out to alert the drivers in this section?

Mr. Landry responded we are going to do it through public meetings just like the one we had a week and a half ago, gathering the public input on that. We would do the exact same thing with news releases as far as shifting of traffic. We'd also look at a pretty extensive sign package to direct the motorists to use Exit 5 northbound on ramp, and I would also assume there would a newspaper article trying to direct that.

Alderman J. Roy stated about the detour, now you're saying that most of the traffic you believe...have you done a study on this, that they are going to use the new on ramp? Is that what you're saying, on Granite Street?

Mr. Landry responded that was the premise behind building the new northbound on ramp and the southbound on ramp. It was to alleviate some of the traffic volumes from the Exit 6 interchange. That's why we worked with the City to make Exit 5 the new gateway into the City.

Alderman J. Roy stated other than that, they would have to travel all the way up Front Street all the way into Hooksett to 93. Is that correct?

Mr. Landry responded that would be another option, yes.

Alderman J. Roy asked have you done any traffic studies on the input that's going to have on that neighborhood? When I say the neighborhood, I say Amoskeag Market all the way up to the old WFEA tower up there.

Mr. Landry responded it's difficult to do until we open up the actual Exit 5 on ramp to see how much it reduces the amount of traffic using the northbound on ramp for that.

Alderman J. Roy asked are you going to do that before this project starts?

Mr. Landry responded we should look at that, yes. I agree.

Alderman J. Roy asked did the scope of this project change recently?

Mr. Landry responded no, sir.

Alderman J. Roy stated it's my understanding that there are some people here tonight that feel that it wasn't explained properly to them, that there is going to be a widening of the highway as well.

Mr. Landry stated there will be an improvement to the northbound on ramp. Today that acceleration lane length is 400 feet, which is substandard, based on values for today. It should be about 1,400 feet. Therefore, that improvement to that acceleration lane goes over the bridge, requiring widening of the bridge of about 16 feet. So it's a safety improvement of the on ramp.

Alderman J. Roy asked were all of the abutters aware of that widening right from the beginning?

Mr. Landry responded there are questions on whether or not the letter came out and said that. It stated safety improvements to the northbound on ramp. It did not specifically state a widening of the Black Brook Bridge.

Alderman J. Roy stated now you said you had a public hearing a week and a half ago.

Mr. Landry stated we had a public information meeting.

Alderman J. Roy stated and I'm sure you were looking for feedback from the residents.

Mr. Landry stated that's correct.

Alderman J. Roy asked out of courtesy to them, is it possible to have another one of those, and you send out a letter stating that there's going to be a widening, that it's not just safety improvements, so there's no confusion?

Mr. Landry responded not a problem. They requested it.

Alderman J. Roy stated let's consider it that I'm requesting it.

Mr. Landry stated that's fine. We'll have one.

Chairman Shea stated I guess the Alderman is making reference to some of the people on the right here, and I'm assuming that after this presentation you may want to meet with them and you can discuss with them. Because I think in this kind of a forum, it's difficult for them to get across whatever they want to say. They may have certain personal items that they want you to address, so you're free to use the room at the right in the rear of the building, and they can congregate with you there and speak to them and so forth. I guess that would give them a chance to express their concerns.

Chairman Shea addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Alderman O'Neil regarding the Traffic Calming Initiative.

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

Alderman O'Neil stated there has been a lot of discussion over the past many years regarding traffic calming efforts in the City. We've been very aggressive in speed enforcement, so a couple of different times I gathered a group of City staff, along with a couple staff members of Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission to see what things we could do regarding traffic calming. I make the three point because they are not the same. They're unique. The first item is we have speed issues in the City of Manchester, and Maple Street is a good example. It's a one way street. The Police write a great amount of tickets up there, but there was a suggestion early on, and this is what really led to trying to bring this group together. Maybe we could do some slight improvements that might give the impression the road is narrowing; therefore people will slow down. It's called bump outs. My understanding is that bump outs will be part of the design on Kelley Street. So, I'm not asking you to take a specific stance. I'm just trying to point out the various issues. In the case of Maple Street, we would probably want

to get Alderman Gatsas involved, and maybe Alderman Roy, who represent up in those areas. The work could be done for minimal costs. The suggestion by staff is that we do a temporary arrangement, collect data before, collect data after, and just see if we actually slow traffic down. So, speed is one scenario. The second one Alderman Jim Roy has been dealing with, and unfortunately he thought he was flying back in on a direct flight on the day we had the meeting, and he had to connect with a flight, so he wasn't able to join us. This is referred to by staff as a volume issue on Maryland Avenue and Rhode Island Avenue. It's not really a speed issue. They're not finding people speeding, but what they are finding is a significant amount of volume on those streets, more than what those streets are designed for. So there has been a recommendation through a temporary pilot program to see if in fact that would change the behavior of the people using those streets. Again, they would need to sit down with Alderman Roy. There was some discussion about getting buy-in from the neighborhood for the pilot program. So that's the second issue. The third issue is specifically regarding crosswalks, and this one we may want to take up some action tonight. There is a design practice out there called epoxy imprint that has been used and will be used on Kelley Street, is my understanding. The suggestion was made that currently Highway is doing some improvements in Ward 5 on Massabesic and Falls Road, and if the Board thought it would be worthwhile for a small amount of money that is already in the budget that the Highway Department could include on Massabesic Street a crosswalk with this technology called epoxy imprint. The intent is that it gives the appearance that the crosswalk is raised and it's really not. We all know that these are issues throughout the City. The City staff has done some improvements on Jobin Drive to try to do traffic calming. We'll see improvements on Kelley Street that affect Wards 11 and 12 that will bring traffic calming, so what I'd like to suggest is to just get some feedback from the Committee, refer these possible pilots to the respective Aldermen. That would be Alderman Gatsas for the issue on speed, Alderman Roy for the issue on volume in his Ward, and then ask the Committee to consider approving this epoxy imprint for a pilot program on Massabesic Street. I think there is some elderly housing right there, and they would cross the street to go to the store. The staff that met included Kevin Sheppard and Bruce Thomas from Highway, Marc Lussier and Jon Hopkins from the Police Department, Pam Goucher from the Planning Department, Tim White and Amy Kizak from the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission. I think one of the keys...and I think Police has pointed this out, is that now with the new speed enforcement devices they have that can collect data, they can put them up and collect data before we do any improvements, and then collect data afterwards and see if these improvements are actually working. With that said, I'd like to move that items one and two be referred to the respective Aldermen, and I'd like to move on item 3 that we improve the imprinted crosswalks, the epoxy imprinted crosswalks. I'd like them to just run it by Alderman Osborne, but in a brief conversation he seemed to be fine with it. My conversations with Director

Sheppard indicate that it's within the budget, so it won't cost us any more money. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Sullivan.

Alderman Sullivan asked Alderman O'Neil, can you explain the bump outs? I think I know what you're talking about.

Alderman O'Neil responded if you can picture Maple Street especially north of Bridge, it would take a small section of the corner, and the whole east side is actually parking, if you can picture it, it's very similar to what has happened on Elm Street where they bumped out some of those curbs a little bit and it gives the appearance of what some people interpret as a three lane roadway up on the north end of Maple Street to a true two-way roadway that it is, and it gives the impression that the roadway is narrowing and therefore they slow down. Apparently it was Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission that brought that suggestion forward, that there had been other parts of the state as well as the country that have tried it successfully.

Alderman Sullivan stated let's consider the possibility of adding Pine Street to the list at some point, because I've heard a number of complaints. I live a block off of Pine, so I speak from experience.

Alderman O'Neil stated again, the intent of starting this was to get it to the Ward Aldermen and then work with the departments. We really don't have a formal...this is, I guess, our informal committee that was set up. I think Pine Street is very appropriate.

Alderman J. Roy stated it should be said that these are like a pilot program.

Alderman O'Neil stated these are pilots. The intent with these two would be pilots to gather data before, what's the speed and volume of traffic, and then what happens after the temporary improvements are made. And if they don't work, we haven't invested any money for permanent improvements.

Alderman J. Roy stated I can give you somewhat of a report right now about the Rhode Island Avenue area, having been involved with that. Former Alderman Jerome Duval had worked on this during his term, and he was instrumental in placing stop signs on some of those roads. Unfortunately, the stop signs haven't alleviated the problem, and with any of these solutions what you have to do is look ahead because once you think you have a solution, it may create other problems for other areas surrounding your solution, and that may have taken place with the stop signs. That's why we like a buy in idea, with at least 80 percent of the residents buying into it so that we're all on the same page. At the same time, we have to keep in mind the cost. We can't just be throwing money on these pilot

programs. We want to do it as cheaply as possible in the financial situation that the City is in. With the Police Department taking the information in already, before you actually try these little pilots, you're going to have a base line that you can compare it to. I think it's a great idea about reducing the ability of traffic at the north end of Rhode Island and Maryland and what not, eliminating their ability to turn left, which would go over to Wellington Road, because they're using that as a cut-through. That would, hopefully, lower the number of vehicles in that area. As Alderman O'Neil said, speed is an issue at times, but it is on every City street. It's not like every one of those cars going through there is speeding; it's just that the roads are already narrow from their design when they were built, so it gives you a perception that vehicles are speeding when in fact they may not be breaking the legal speed limit. They may in fact be traveling faster than they should on that road, just for safety's sake, but they're not breaking the legal speed limit. With the stop signs what we've observed is people stop and now they're trying to make up time between the two stop signs, so that really hasn't worked out well.

Alderman O'Neil stated the reason those two specific projects were singled out, the one in Alderman Roy's Ward and the one up on the north end of Maple Street is that the neighbors are already involved and have petitions and seem to be interested so it made some logic. Lieutenant Hopkins pointed out at the meeting that the Rhode Island Avenue and Maryland Avenue situation, for some reason there is two to one traffic going north from Hanover to Bridge, which is somewhat unusual. And just to make a follow up on Alderman Roy's point about stop signs, if you talk to some people that live down in Westwood, Sherwood, and Donahue, they have speed bumps, and they've had speed bumps for maybe fifteen years now, and they'll tell you they speed between the speed bumps. I think these are worth trying. I think the Highway Department has some suggestions for inexpensive temporary set ups to see if it works, and then if the data shows success, then we can do the permanent improvements all within house, as well.

Chairman Shea stated I think that the imprinted crosswalks are certainly something that all neighborhoods, I'm sure, after the approval that we give tonight, I think that they could be used in different areas. I know that I'd be looking for research from either the Police or Highway Department concerning other areas of the City that obviously such a program would be implemented. And I'm sure that, depending upon the success of this and the publicity of it, people listening tonight will say, wait a minute, my neighborhood also is impacted by traffic, simply because we don't have enough roads for the number of cars that navigate through our streets. So, I think that starting this is certainly significant, very important, and I think that obviously it should be approved.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think the cost to do the imprinted crosswalks is about \$5,000 to \$5,400. They are able to piggyback doing the one at Massabesic if it's

three of them going in on the Kelley Street project. So, it's good, as projects are considered going forward, improvements to roadways, if we can include imprinted crosswalks on those, and maybe eventually...it's kind of a tough budget year this year, but maybe establish a fund to do some of these in other sections of the City. They're not cheap to do, unfortunately. They could be, if I understood Mr. Sheppard correctly, just stand alone to bring in the contract to door, about a \$10,000 crosswalk. But, if they're successful, it's a great investment.

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

Chairman Shea addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, requesting to extend the Parking Control Officer Pilot Program until September 30, 2008.

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

Chairman Shea addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Communication from Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, proposing a plan for New Residential Parking Permit Zone and Expansion of the Blue Zone Permit Area.

(Note: If the Committee so desires, the Parking Manager requests that a recommendation to the BMA include consideration of a suspension of the rules.)

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated the subject line and the agenda item said that part of this plan was the extension of Blue Zone Permit Area, and that has actually been pulled out of this proposal, so what we're trying to do is change the three streets in question to one way streets with angled parking, make them two hour limit, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, establish a new residential parking permit zone, and allow the people who are abutters to those streets to get those permits.

Chairman Shea asked does that change what you originally intended in your revenues and so forth, or is that something I'm getting mixed up on.

Ms. Stanley responded it has no effect.

Alderman O'Neil asked have you spoken to Mr. Sheppard about this at all?

Ms. Stanley responded I've not spoken to Mr. Sheppard but Bruce Thomas over at the Highway Department did the drawings for me.

Alderman O'Neil asked and are we okay? The last time we tried to do some one ways with angled parking we ended up with narrower streets than we intended and all that.

Ms. Stanley responded these streets are not going to be as wide as our ordinances are. Both the parking spaces and the streets are going to be short by one foot a piece, so basically they are actually larger than the angled parking spaces on Commercial Street by about a foot. The other reason we didn't think this was a big concern was because it is a residential...it's not exactly a cul de sac but it is a closed loop, and there's no through traffic there. So it's mostly the people that live there. They can more easily navigate a narrower street, so we didn't think that it would be too much of a problem.

Alderman Sullivan stated this is an old neighborhood, as you're going to find, in Ward 3. It's kind of tucked off to the side. The big issue here was parking on baseball game nights. The residents were having trouble finding a place to park, so this will alleviate their concern.

Ms. Stanley stated we've also requested in the letter to see if we could suspend the rules and Enroll tonight at the full Board, if this Committee is willing to do that.

Deputy City Clerk Matt Normand asked are we amending the original?

Ms. Stanley responded no, we don't have to amend it. I actually pulled the ordinance out before it was published, so the only ordinance that's attached to this is the two hour and the residential permit. There's no expansion of the Blue Zone permit area included on the agenda.

Deputy City Clerk Normand stated so 70.55 is not being amended tonight?

Ms. Stanley responded 70.55 is going to be amended with the residential parking permit zone number seven.

Deputy City Clerk Normand asked is that what is going to the full Board tonight?

Ms. Stanley responded yes. And the other part of it is the adding and rescinding of the traffic ordinance, changing the streets to one way. I just forgot to take the Blue Zone permit expansion area off the subject line of the letter.

Alderman Sullivan moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Shea addressed item 8 of the agenda:

8. Communication from Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. regarding additional pavement markings and traffic signs on South Willow Street, Driving Park Road, and LeClerc Circle.

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

THIS IS INAUDIBLE.

Mr. James Winn, professional engineer for Greenman-Pedersen, stated I'm here on behalf of the Burger King/Citizens Bank project. As part of our approval process, there were two issues related to traffic mitigation. One was replacement of the existing signs that were out there at LeClerc Circle and adding additional pavement markings. Currently if you're going south on Route 28, South Willow Street, there is left hand restriction into the Burger King site. It's just signs. There's no pavement markings. ??????????????

Alderman O'Neil stated I didn't give much thought to the clearance of seven feet on the right of way, which is the sidewalk, correct?

Mr. Winn responded it's actually six feet from the curb line to the ????????

Alderman O'Neil stated the height of the sign. Has Highway cleared that? Are there any issues with sidewalk plows or anything?

Mr. Winn responded well that's one of the things that they wanted to be sure that we provide as much clearance as possible. We have five feet from the edge of the foundation to the curb line and that is one of the things???????

Alderman O'Neil stated my bigger concern is in the documentation you provide is the signs with language specific to the businesses. The reason I say that is a year or so ago we adopted a way finding program, not specifically South Willow Street, but has tried to decrease the number of signs in the City, including those, not necessarily spelling out businesses, but spelling out religious or civic or arts facilities. I have some concern with putting signs up that indicate businesses. To the best of my knowledge we haven't approved anything like that recently. I have no problem putting the signs up that just indicate...that's actually around Wendy's, is that correct?

Mr. Winn responded exactly.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't necessarily have a concern with that. I do have a concern with listing Burger King or Citizens Bank. We don't, to the best of my knowledge, unless you can tell me there are other examples of it in the City, I can't think of any off the top of my head.

Mr. Winn stated I can't think of any. I know one of the big concerns in the review process was that specifically people know how to get into Burger King. ??????????

Alderman O'Neil asked was that part of the approval by the Planning Board. Did they direct you to do those signs?

Mr. Winn responded absolutely.

Alderman O'Neil stated but yet to do those signs you need approval from us. Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. Winn stated that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated I still have an issue with those specific languages for businesses. I can't think of another situation in the City where we do that, and I wonder if we're opening up a door we don't want to go through.

Alderman J. Roy stated I sit on the Planning Board, and I remember this project coming before us. We were very concerned about the exterior of the buildings fitting into the neighborhood. The designs had to come back several times before we got something that we approved. However, I don't recall ever seeing anything about signs that were going to be off-site, if you will, about the businesses. I may be wrong, and I know that the Planning people aren't here, but they will be in about a half an hour, and I'm certainly going to ask them. I'm pretty sure there was never a discussion about signage off site. There was discussion about signage on site and on the buildings because we're very, very stringent and for a good reason: we don't want billboards everywhere. I don't recall approving something like that, and I would have spoken against it then. I'm going to speak against it now. I don't think it's appropriate to have any of the signs that say Burger King or Citizens Bank or anything else. You said there are current signs. If my memory serves me right, the current signs say LeClerc Circle, Second Right – something to that effect. I might be off on the verbiage but I'm pretty sure that's what it is. So I won't vote to approve this for the signs for the businesses themselves.

Mr. Winn stated this point was ??????????

Chairman Shea stated prior to the meeting I spoke to Mr. Hoben and he indicated that we don't have any precedent for this at all. If it were to be adopted by this Committee, then we could open up unintended consequences, obviously, because everyone else would then reason that they would want to have the same privilege. So basically, I feel too that we're really in uncharted waters, and I would feel uncomfortable doing something like this.

Mr. Quinn stated if I could make a recommendation...Would it be acceptable if it were more generic and not ????????

Chairman Shea stated we're just discussing this now so you'd have to come back at some other time.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't necessarily have a problem with what you referred to as the green signs, directional signs. I don't think we're necessarily opening any door there, so if you're asking us to approve that, I'm comfortable with the height and all the other parts you talked about. What I am uncomfortable with, and I concur with Alderman Roy and Chairman Shea, we haven't been down this road before and I could just see the floodgates opening if we do this. We've tried to reduce the number of signs we've had in the City for civic and religious and cultural facilities, and that's a program we've actually adopted. So if you tell us it's a deal breaker, then it's a deal breaker. If you ask us just to approve the directional signs, I'm comfortable with doing that. So you tell us what we need to do.

Mr. Quinn....

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the directional signs only, for Left Turn Second Right and for left turn next right. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Shea addressed item 9 of the agenda:

9. Petition from residents in the Brown Avenue/Calef Road area requesting replacement of signage from I-293 to West Baker Street and Brown Avenue/Calef Road stating "No Trucks Allowed".

Alderman Garrity stated some months ago I was approached by some of the residents on Calef Road and Brown Avenue. Tom, the gentleman in the audience, was nice enough to get all these petitions. There concerns down there are a number of things. It's a residential zone. There are no commercial properties on this street. Excessive speed of trucks is an enforcement issue, so we are trying to address that. But the noise is unbearable to the residents of Ward 9 down in that area. And the fumes, these folks can't even keep their windows open in the summer, so they have to keep

their windows closed. This would run from I-293 to West Baker Street, No Trucks Allowed. There was another piece of material that went to the Committee separate from the agenda. It listed all the areas in the City that had No Trucks Allowed. And there are a number of them throughout the City, on probably over 100 streets. So I would kindly request that the Committee approve this request.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy.

Alderman Sullivan asked does this only affect from the interstate back toward downtown, not the commercial district going toward the Airport?

Alderman Lopez stated I don't have any major objection. I was just wondering about the enforcement. If we have all these streets as so indicated, which is about two and a half pages, are we enforcing No Trucks Allowed signs in the City of Manchester? Can anybody answer that question? We don't give any tickets to truck drivers, I guess.

Alderman Garrity stated Gold Street is No Trucks Allowed, and they do ticket.

Lieutenant Jon Hopkins stated we do ticket when appropriate when we do see violations. I can't tell you how many we wrote in the last year. We get complaints from time to time. Avery Street, we've had enforcement there. Gold Street and some of the other busier streets in the City.

Alderman Lopez stated I know up on Boynton Street it's posted No Trucks Allowed, but trucks still go up there and stuff like that. I'm not objecting to it; I'm just saying we make these policies but you don't have time to enforce them.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated nobody's saying we don't have time, Alderman. When we see it happen, we enforce it. And sometimes we have special enforcement to address specific problems.

Alderman Lopez asked is it possible to find out how many trucks got cited in the City last year?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded I can try to find that out for you if you'd like and get it to you.

Alderman Lopez stated I'd like to know. It would be nice, because we get complaints all the time about trucks.

Chairman Shea stated I know that on this sheet the latest time is 1990. Many of these have been in 1978, 1971, 1973. So I'm sure that years back they were obviously approved but I don't know of any modern times that we've not allowed trucks. It's not that I'm for or against. The only concern that I have, and I think we've kind of discussed this, if there is some sort of a problem on I-93 and these trucks are stuck in traffic, is there a provision where in an emergency they can ever use this? In other words, let's say there is a back up on I-93, trucks are backed up because of an accident and so forth, either they wait there for two or three hours, or they can take this particular area. Is that going to be an impact or not, in your opinion?

Lieutenant Hopkins responded I had some concerns I spoke to Alderman Garrity about just a few minutes ago in the hallway, about the impact of forcing the trucks onto the highway and off into other intersections to get to Elm Street and north. We keep an eye on it, and if we see any issues, we can certainly come back to the Board and let you know that there's a problem. If there was a problem on I-93 or I-293 and we had to detour traffic, that's what we'd do, we'd send the trucks through the neighborhood because it would be an emergency.

Chairman Shea asked prior to this was there a problem with trucks on that road called to your attention?

Lieutenant Hopkins stated I'm only aware of speed. I've never had a complaint about trucks on the street.

Alderman J. Roy stated this is a pilot program, correct?

Chairman Shea responded no.

Alderman Garrity stated I think it's only fair that we probably try it for 90 days. If they're backing up on Queen City Avenue we might have to make some adjustments.

Alderman J. Roy stated and I say that just in case there are some problems. We'd have to come back here and make sure that we made it permanent if it works out.

Chairman Shea stated I don't mind if it's a pilot program. But a permanent program, sometimes... I don't know, I mean, in other words, **Arah** Street is a real problem. We all have problems like that, not that I don't want to help them. Don't get me wrong. It's just the idea that if we make something permanent, then somehow or other, there's going to be an impact on other areas and they're going to come and start hollering, and they're going to get a petition, and they're going to come before us, and we're going to say, well...we've done it on one area but we can't help you because we don't want to leave trucks out of the City. I mean, we are in 2008 and trucks are

going to be moving in our City. But, again, I don't mind this being a pilot program, seeing how it works, monitoring it and so forth.

Alderman O'Neil stated one of the things I've found with Lieutenant Hopkins is he's very good. He's kind of quasi-traffic engineer for the City, especially with his new equipment for gathering data on speed and volume. I don't think they break down the difference between a truck and a car, but maybe at some point they can do some observations out there when they're doing some enforcement, and just collect some data. It's good for us to know what they're finding when they're out there, and he's been excellent on identifying volume problems in the City as well as speed problems. So maybe there's a way, if they are doing some enforcement, they can make some notes about how many trucks they are seeing.

Chairman Shea stated this is what I was trying to say. But he can't do that if we don't...

Alderman O'Neil stated by the way, he's not getting any extra money for being the traffic engineer for the City!

Chairman Shea stated but if we close it off, he's not going to be able to do that, because basically we're not going to allow trucks to go there.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's true, but he can make observations on what's happening in other places too.

Alderman Garrity stated I don't think there is anybody who is going to deny there is truck traffic in the City. What's important to point out on this particular area is it's a strictly residential zone. I believe it's R1B Zone, with the exception of the apartment buildings on Calef Road. We can compare it to other spots in the City, but this is strictly residents. There is only one business on the street and that's Manchester Monuments that's been there for years which doesn't produce a lot of traffic. So I think we really need to make that distinction when we compare it to other streets in the City. I'm not denying that there are a lot of trucks in the City, but this an R1B Zone and it's just strictly residential, and it's become unbearable for the residents.

Alderman Gatsas stated I know Wellington Road is a non-truck street because it's all residential. My interest would be to see how many tickets have been given there in the last ten years on Wellington Road.

Lieutenant Hopkins stated I don't know if I can give you the stats for ten years but I'll see what I can do.

Alderman Gatsas stated if you could get them for the last two years...

Lieutenant Hopkins stated one way you can look at it is it's positive that the signs are working.

Alderman Gatsas stated my bet is that maybe the enforcement isn't there, kind of like jay walking and crosswalk stops because we don't have but one ticket in both of those venues in the last year. Maybe they've increased since we've done the zebras, I don't know. But my concern is that you've got three major businesses, one which is Manchester Redi-Mix, the other is Velcro, the other is Irving Oil. With the price of diesel being \$4.50 I don't know how much of a detour we're putting them through. Certainly the effectiveness...and I don't disagree that it's certainly a residential neighborhood, but they've been traveling those streets for probably the last forty years. And to get off there on that exit, you only have one light to get to your destination. To make them go all the way around and get off on Queen City Avenue and come up Queen City Avenue...I don't know how much of a detour that is and what that cost would be to those businesses.

Alderman Garrity stated I don't think there is any denying that it's a detour for the businesses. I don't think it's an outrageous detour. Basically what they'll have to do is go down 293, cross the river, and get off on Second Street and come up Queen City Avenue and they're at their businesses. We have to take the quality of life issues into account for our folks that live in Manchester.

Chairman Shea stated you indicated that they would do what?

Alderman Garrity stated basically what they do is get off at 293 at the Brown Avenue exit. They go down Calef Road, take a left on West Baker, South Elm Street and they're at their businesses. Here they would have to continue on 293, cross the river, and as soon as they cross the river, come up the Everett Turnpike and I think it's the first exit. Then they get off and cross Queen City Avenue and they're at their businesses. Part of the problem too is with Dead River. You've got tanker trucks full of heating oil and things like that. I think it's just unsafe for the neighborhood. And that's basically what Calef Road is, it's a neighborhood.

Alderman J. Roy stated just an observation, having lived down there for a while and having worked down there for quite a while. Most of the traffic for Velcro doesn't come up Calef Road. They're the big box trucks and it's a very difficult neighborhood to maneuver those box trucks in. They can't really get around on Baker. The bulk of the trucks, and Alderman Garrity is absolutely right, during the day there is a significant amount of traffic that I've observed down there from Redi-Mix and Dead River or Irving, whichever it is. They're going directly down to 3A to go to an area that they have to service, and they would have to divert around on the highway in order to get there. But the big trucks, the big tractor trailers and the long,

long tankers already do, I believe, go up Queen City Avenue just because they can't really maneuver in that tight neighborhood down there. Just an observation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we've found, since we've given the Police Department, especially the Traffic Division, some additional bodies, they've done a great job with speed enforcement, noise enforcement, and I think this is something that we'd like Lieutenant Hopkins to consider, putting some kind of initiative on the trucking on these streets. I'm sure he'll take our comments and start working on it.

Chairman Shea called for a vote on a motion to approve this request, stipulating a 90-day pilot program, effective the day the signs go up.

Alderman Garrity stated and then we would have a grace period for the trucks.

There being none opposed, the motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman J. Roy stated I'd have to thank Brandy Stanley for working on this to date. I talked to her the last couple of days, and after those conversations, I'd like to get a motion to:

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE

8AM-5PM/Monday-Saturday, on Bridge Street, north side, from a point 60 feet east of Union Street to Union Street Eastback;

ADD 15 MINUTE PARKING 8AM-6PM

On Bridge Street, north side, from a point 60 feet east of Union Street to Union Street Eastback.

Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea stated this has been cleared by the people that reside there.

Alderman J. Roy stated I talked to the landlord of the property. They're the ones who brought it to my attention, that it had been changed, and it wasn't working out for them. And I also talked to the people that own the business that these spaces are directly in front of their front door to make sure they are on the same page. This is what they both want.

Alderman Shea called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

TABLED ITEMS

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

This item remained on the table.

11. Report from Police and City Solicitor regarding commercial vehicle definitions, if available.
(Tabled 12/04/2007; Note: Response from Deputy Public Works Director enclosed.)

This item remained on the table.

12. Communication from Mitch Sawaya, owner of the Strange Brew Tavern at 88 Market Street, requesting that he be allowed to temporarily close a portion of Franklin West Back Street each week from Thursday through Saturday between the hours of 5:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m.
(Tabled 2/19/08 – to provide time for the abutters and Mr. Sawaya to work out an agreement regarding his request and return to the Committee.)

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee