

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

June 24, 2008

**Aldermen Shea, O'Neil,
Sullivan, J. Roy, Ouellette**

5:15 PM

**Aldermanic Chambers
City Hall (3rd Floor)**

Chairman Shea called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Shea, O'Neil, Sullivan, J. Roy, Ouellette

Chairman Shea addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Presentation by Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, on the Downtown Parking Plan.

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, stated about a year ago we did a similar plan for the Millyard, and we knew at that time that we needed to address the downtown, and we finally have, and this is the plan that we have before you today. As a Parking Division, the underlying motivation for what we do is to provide quality customer service and allocate assets between short and long term parkers. Short term parkers need spaces closest to their destinations. This is controlled through time limits, rates and schedules for paid parking, and enforcement. Long term parkers need consistently available parking in off street lots and garages, ten hour meters, permits, and rates and schedules for paid parking. Obviously, the final thing that we do as a Parking Division is to generate revenues, which go to help offset taxpayer contributions to the City. There are a number of problems with the system we have on the street today. The first is the rates and enforcement. Our policies don't support our underlying goals. We recently did some space counts on the ten hour meters in the City. They are on average, during the peak times, 72 percent vacant. Elm Street is by contrast, just five percent vacant, which is probably fairly consistent with the parking study that was done a couple of years ago. So how do we open up the spaces in the right places for short term parkers? We do it by creating differences in rates, differences in hours of paid parking, and we make sure that we have stable and less expensive options for long term parkers. Obviously, we use enforcement as a tool to enforce progress behavior. The first problem that we tackled was the evening enforcement hours. We asked ourselves why we enforce until 8 PM. The answer is to create turnover

in short term spaces where they are needed. The current policy is not effective, because no matter where you park, you pay until 8 PM. In that case, why wouldn't you park in front of your business or place of work? There's no incentive in here to change the decisions you make in terms of where you park. So our first solution was to stop charging at 5:30 at most of the meters in the City. What this does is it gives long term parkers an attractive alternative to parking in the spaces where we need short term parkers. It's less expensive. They don't have to worry about overtime tickets, and they don't have to feed the meter and move their car every two hours, which I assure you is happening fairly often at this point. By contrast, short term parkers now have an increased chance of finding a parking space in front of their destination. This is a map of the areas. The green shaded areas are the ones that are going to be free after 5:30. As you can see, it basically makes a circle around the downtown core. The Millyard would be free after 5:30. Everything north of Bridge Street would be free after 5:30. Everything east of Chestnut Street, with a couple of exceptions, is free after 5:30, and the Verizon Arena area is also free after 5:30. The areas that would continue to be enforced until 8:00 PM are the Gaslight District and Elm Street between Lake Avenue and Bridge Street, and generally one block in either direction. Those are the areas where we needed to create more turnover. The next problem we tackled was parking meter rates. Again, we asked ourselves why we charge for parking. The answer is to create turnover in short term spaces and obviously to create revenue. Our current policy is not effective because no matter where you park you pay fifty cents an hour. To put this into perspective, monthly garage rates are actually more expensive than if you park on street and move your car every two hours. If you work full time, come to work every day during a month, and move your car every two hours, you're going to end up paying \$84 a month. Most people don't come to work every day. Most people aren't on the street from 8 AM to 5 PM, so it's actually probably significantly less than that. We charge \$70 in the Victory Garage. The Center of New Hampshire charges \$95, and the Canal Garage charges \$85. If it's less expensive to move your car every two hours, why wouldn't you choose to park in front of your business or place of work? We have a couple of solutions for this. In general we wanted to increase rates where we need the turnover and hold fees steady or eliminate them where we don't need the turnover. What we're proposing is the Gaslight District and Elm, plus one block east and west, become seventy-five cents per hour until 8 PM. Everywhere else stays at fifty cents an hour and is free after 5:30. Effectively what this does is it drives the cost of parking on a monthly basis – all day, every day – on Elm Street to \$127 a month, which we hope will encourage people to park in different areas and get into parking garages. This map has three different zones but the one for this particular part of the proposal is the green streets and that's what you want to look for. Those are the streets that we are proposing to continue to charge until 8 PM, as well as charge seventy-five cents per hour. Everywhere else is going to be free after 5:30, and it's going to stay at fifty cents an hour. The next thing we

tackled was Saturday parking. The question was why we don't charge for parking on Saturday, and quite frankly, the answer is we probably didn't do it very well the first time because, once again, we charged every single meter in the City for an extended period of time during Saturday. So, why are we proposing a charge on Saturday now? We did an audit and what we found was 95 to 100 businesses are open in the downtown area every single Saturday. Elm Street parking spaces are over 95% occupied, which is exactly the same as it is during the workday. And many business owners have contacted me and some of my peers saying that they are losing customers because they can't park on Elm Street. So what we're proposing to do is to charge just on Elm Street between Granite Street and Bridge Street on Saturdays from 10:00 AM to 8:00 PM at a rate of seventy five cents an hour. What this does is it means that long term parkers can park around the corner or a block away for free, and all day, just like they're doing now. Short term parkers will now we hope be able to park in front of their destinations, or if they want to park for free, they too can park around the corner or a block away. This map shows the storefronts that are open on Saturdays for regular business hours. It's a map of Elm Street between Bridge Street and Granite Street and basically one block on either side. Almost every single retail establishment that is downtown is open on Saturdays. There are very few exceptions, but almost all of them are open on Saturday. As you can see, they are predominantly on Elm Street, and our space counts revealed that obviously Elm Street is congested on Saturdays. In general the other streets are not, which is why we're only proposing to charge on Elm Street. The next thing we tackled was event parking. By way of background, as I'm sure we all know, neither the arena nor the stadium was built with attached parking. The idea was to encourage walking and retail and restaurant patronage. The result was a dramatic increase in downtown business. The first problem we looked at was that events patrons conflict with the two hour time limit. Basically, if they are doing what we want them to do, which is to come downtown early to go to dinner before they go to a show, or patronize one of the bars or retail establishments, they're going to be in a space longer than two hours, so they have to move their car every two hours, feed the meter, and worry about getting an overtime ticket. That's not reinforcing the philosophy behind which both venues were built. The second problem is that parking rates are the same or free for all events in all on street locations. Once again, this does not create an incentive for people to park near the retail destinations and patronize. There is also a large rate gap between private and on street parking, and lastly there is a revenue stream of \$450,000 annually that is paid to SMG and goes directly to the City's portion of the debt service on the Verizon Arena. We only recover \$100,000 of that \$450,000 that's paid to SMG every year. So we have two solutions: One is to lift the two hour limit on all the meters in the City at 5 PM. This is going to eliminate the problem of people coming down and having to move their car, re-feed the meter, and it's going to help encourage the behavior that we want. The other thing is to implement a one dollar flat event rate on street for both

venues. This event rate would go into effect two hours before the event. It would drop one hour after the event, and we designed the rate zones so they are only in non-destination areas. There is very, very little, if any, retail in any of the zones where we would charge the one dollar. I just want to stress that this rate would be effective for every event, regardless of day or time. So if it's a Saturday or Sunday event, the rate would go into effect for those three hours. Here again is the map. As you can see, the blue area is where we would charge event parking for the Verizon Arena events, and the Red or Pink area is where we would charge the fee for the stadium events. Once again, we designed the zones so that there really isn't any retail draw in those zones. We want to encourage people to park downtown, come early, patronize the businesses, which is why we're proposing this. In terms of financial results, what we're expecting for fiscal year 2009 a net increase in revenue of \$215,000. The 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM area is probably going to generate an additional \$208,000, and that's mostly because of the rate increase. The 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM area, where we're cutting off paid parking at 5:30, we'd lose only \$84,000. Those meters don't generally generate a lot of money after hours. The arena area would generate about \$27,000; the stadium is going to generate about \$16,000, and Saturday parking is a little bit less than \$50,000. That adds up to about \$215,000. In terms of an implementation timeline, we're obviously seeking Committee approval this evening. If it is forthcoming, we would take it before the full Board for their meeting on July 8th. Required ordinances would lay over as needed, and we're shooting for an implementation of the plan on September 1, 2008. When all is said and done, there are a few things that can be take-aways from this plan, because we know it's very complicated. If you pay fifty cents an hour now, you still can. If you park after 5:30, you can park for free. You don't have to worry about overtime tickets after 5:00 PM. You won't have to pay the event rate if you park outside the zone or you come down more than two hours before the event. You can continue to park for free on Saturdays. Ultimately, the City gets more revenue and the parkers get more options than they had before. So that's basically the Downtown Parking Plan. The next thing that we brought to you is...I gave you guys the ordinance for this. The fiscal year 2009 budget included a five dollar per month rate increase for permits and an increase of seventy-five cents per hour in the Victory Garage. This rate increase would be effective for all permits: on street, off street, parking lot, Victory Garage, 1155 Elm Garage. In the Victory Garage we are proposing to eliminate the weekday rate and have all parkers be at \$75. What these increases would do would be to add \$250,000 in fiscal year 2009. And I want to stress that it is already included in the approved budget. The last rate increase for permits was July 2003. The last rate increase for garages was July 2005. I put a little bit of a rate survey in there. I think I sort of went over this. Canal Garage and the Center of New Hampshire Garage are charging \$85 and \$95, respectively. The 1155 Elm Street Garage that we don't own is charging \$75. Of particular interest is the transient parking rate. At the Canal Garage it's \$2 an hour; at the Center of

New Hampshire it's \$3 for the first hour and \$1 per hour after that; and the Victory Garage is currently at fifty cents an hour. Basically the budget included a \$5 per month rate increase pretty much on all the permits and monthly parking contracts we have in the City. I think that's it. Does anybody have any questions?

Alderman O'Neil asked Brandy, on the implementation in changing the garage monthly rate, what would be the effective date?

Ms. Stanley responded it would probably be easier if we made it September 1st just like we did for everything else. That would give us enough time to notify the customers of the garage.

Alderman O'Neil asked what would happen if we pushed it out a little further for the notification period?

Ms. Stanley responded then obviously we would lose the \$5 per month.

Alderman O'Neil stated the reason I say that is when we made the change in July of 2005, the one thing that I recall is that the businesses asked for as much advanced notice as possible, so that they...in some cases, from what I understand, it may be part of leases. So I don't know that three months...I support raising it, and I think there should be an adjustment every other year at least. But I'm not sure that less than three month's notice is satisfactory in the garages. So that's a point on that. I did not see some additional expenses that I'm guessing may be required for either the Saturday parking or the event parking from an enforcement standpoint.

Ms. Stanley stated actually, we are not anticipating additional expenses because we are cutting off paid parking at 5:30 for a majority of our meters, we no longer need the same number of PCO's on the street in the evening. We can enforce what's left between 5:30 and 8:00 with one or two PCO's. What we're trying to do is to take those additional resources and devote those to the events. So we're not asking to hire anybody else, and it's not going to cost any more payroll because we'll be able to reallocate any payroll what we have.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you. As I said to you when we met, and I think you tried to meet with as many of the Aldermen as possible a month or so ago, the Saturday makes sense, the stopping at 5:00 or 5:30 makes sense. I'm still not convinced on the event parking.

Alderman Ouellette stated Brandy, I'm going to ask about the event parking. Would that start at a certain time before an event? Two hours before an event? How is that going to work?

Mr. Stanley responded the event rate would be charged in a three hour window, and that three hour window would start two hours before the start time of the event and it would drop off one hour after the event.

Alderman Ouellette asked how did we come up with the one dollar flat rate? It sounds a little bit too reasonable, I would say.

Ms. Stanley responded it was the result of a lot of discussions with a lot of the stakeholders, and we ended up with one dollar. Even though it isn't very much, it was indicated to us that everybody could live with the one dollar. The other aspect of it is that, as I said earlier, we were covering about \$100,000 a year in event revenue. If we don't put the event charge in, we would lose virtually all of that, because those meters are in the free parking after 5:30 zone. Whatever revenue we're getting now, we would not get. So that's why it was important to get it in here, so that we could support cutting off the meters at 5:30 on a daily basis.

Alderman Ouellette stated I support that. So the dollar is not supposed to be a deterrent to try to get people to park further away, like you talked about earlier. It's really not for that, I would assume, because if they are going to an event, people are going to want to pretty much park as close as they can to the event unless they have plans to go to dinner after, or whatnot. Is that basically to reap something back for the parking?

Ms. Stanley responded I think because we are going to be cutting off paid parking at 5:30 at a lot of our meters, we will be successful in getting some of those people that park way south on South Willow Street to park closer to the downtown area, which puts them closer to the retail and restaurant businesses that we actually want them to patronize. The other thing is that if you come earlier than two hours before the event, you can park for free in those areas. So that's what we're trying to encourage.

Alderman Ouellette asked what about Sunday event parking? Will there be a dollar charged at the same times? So, if you come before two hours prior to the event, you won't be charged?

Ms. Stanley responded that's correct.

Alderman Ouellette asked how are we going to know if somebody got there two hours before or two and a half hours before, rather than an hour before?

Ms. Stanley responded that's an operational issue. There are a number of things that we're planning on doing to manage the event process. First of all, we know

that it's going to take a year, probably two years, to get everybody used to the new system. We're planning for that. When it comes to event parking, included in our numbers are a number of A-frame signs. Instead of permanent signage out on a street, we're going to drive around the streets and put up on the sidewalk the A-frame signs for the event parking rate of one dollar. We'll do that at the point the rate switches over. At the same time, with our PCO staff we will either tire track the cars that are already there, or we'll note the license plate number and the location, so we will know who got there earlier and make sure that we don't ticket them.

Alderman Ouellette asked and how are you going to let the public know about the changes that we're going to make, especially in the event parking area?

Ms. Stanley responded we have gotten assurances from the folks over at SMG and the sports teams that they will help us with making sure...it's in their best interest for their patrons to know what to expect when they come downtown, so they're going to help us with that. I am definite that we're going to get a lot of media coverage from the changes. Our PCO's are also ambassadors. They are going to be equipped with maps and information and all that stuff. While this is going on, we're going to make sure that we have adequate staff on the street to make sure that they can contact a lot of the customers that are out there.

Alderman Ouellette stated I would suggest when they're looking for their renewals for their season ticket holders they may want to put some information in that literature that goes out every year. That's just a suggestion.

Ms. Stanley stated that's one suggestion that they all agreed was a good idea.

Chairman Shea stated I just wanted to add that there are a lot of people who open up their lots for parking around the events, and I think that they charge close to \$10 if I'm not mistaken, so basically this may, again, eliminate some of that problem if, in fact, the people coming to the events are able to park for a dollar rather than ten or fifteen. Wouldn't you think?

Ms. Stanley stated actually, I think it's going to have the opposite effect because right now if you come down for an event on the weekend, parking on the street is free, so people will be...you know, a dollar versus fifteen or twenty dollars probably isn't going to influence them to make the decision to park in the private businesses, but if it's free, people that come down are going to more easily make the decision to park six or seven blocks away as opposed to pay, so I think with the dollar charge it's probably not going to have any effect. With a higher charge it would have a positive effect on those businesses because we're narrowing the rate charge between what we charge and they charge.

Alderman Shea stated yes, but I saying that people who come from out of town don't know that you can park for nothing usually for events. So they park closest to the event. Obviously if somebody is out there and telling them to park in here for ten dollars, they are going to do that. Now people that live in the City who are familiar with the situation may not be influenced. But I'm just saying that I would think it may be advantageous for everyone, not only the local people but out of town people who benefit from that, but then again, that remains to be seen.

Alderman Sullivan stated one thing that I don't think has come out in some of the reports about this plan...all we're hearing about is that it's going to raise the meter rates. I just want to reiterate, does this eliminate paid parking after 5:30 once you get off of the immediate Elm Street corridor, the block either side of it?

Ms. Stanley responded yes it does. All of the areas in the map that are green are going to be free after 5:30.

Alderman Sullivan stated okay, so if I wanted to park in the Pearl Street lot or the Hartnett lot or on Chestnut Street after 5:30, I wouldn't have to pay under this proposal.

Ms. Stanley stated that's correct.

Alderman Sullivan asked in your discussions with SMG and with the other Fisher Cat's management, what kind of response have you had from those entities about the event plan?

Ms. Stanley responded I can't speak for them. We had a number of meetings with most of the parties, and we were given the indication that they could live with the dollar. They wouldn't necessarily wholeheartedly support it, but they did let us know that they could probably live with the dollar charge.

Alderman Sullivan stated so they don't think this is something that's going to negatively impact either the sports franchises or the other events that they have there.

Ms. Stanley stated I'm not an expert in any of that. Based on the information they gave us, we don't necessarily think that's going to happen. If it does happen, then obviously we would want to revisit.

Alderman O'Neil stated Brandy, I just want to reiterate, when I met with you the first time, and tonight, I'm still not comfortable with the event parking without even hearing from the Fisher Cats, SMG or the Monarchs. And it doesn't sound

like they've taken a position one way or the other. Would it still be a step in the right direction if we did the other two approvals? I guess it would be three if we included the monthly, changing the rates. Would those other two steps, the elimination at 5:30 and Saturday parking be a step in the right direction?

Ms. Stanley responded once again, if we cut off paid parking at 5:30 and don't implement an event rate, we're going to lose most of the \$100,000 that we are getting in event revenue.

Alderman O'Neil stated let me ask the question this way: What if we had the event rate Monday through Friday because they are already paying some of that now till 8:00. Correct?

Ms. Stanley responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked what if we just did event parking during the week and not on the weekends?

Ms. Stanley responded that wouldn't necessarily be a problem. One of the things I can think of right now would be that it would be confusing for people because on some days they would expect to pay a dollar and on other days they wouldn't.

Alderman O'Neil stated but that's the same issue today. They go to a Fisher Cats or a Monarchs game on Thursday night they are going to pay, and if they go on a Saturday or a Sunday, they're not going to pay, so I really don't see that as an issue. Although I'm pleased that you've thought through the operational portion of that, I'm hearing that for the first time this evening, how you're going to make that work. I would be apt tonight to approve everything with the exception of the event parking. I'm not willing to kill it. I'd like to learn more about it and think a little more about it, and maybe reach out to the other interested parties as well.

Chairman Shea stated I kind of disagree because I know that the City right now pays \$450,000 and I believe that's the taxpayers' money. Is that correct?

Ms. Stanley responded the \$450,000 varies from year to year but it averages out to \$450,000. That is a guarantee made by the City. Whatever would be a subsidy would be unrecovered in revenue. And as I said before, that revenue is \$100,000 a year. So the \$350,000 is the difference between the two.

Chairman Shea asked and we've been doing that for how many years now?

Ms. Stanley responded since the arena was built.

Chairman Shea stated that's obviously quite a bit of money which obviously the City is losing and people are paying taxes on that money in order for that...When you discussed the parking with both of the enterprises, you mentioned that they didn't necessarily agree and they didn't necessarily disagree. Is that correct? Of is there something else in between. I don't know.

Ms. Stanley responded I don't want to speak for them. What I can say is that, had we gotten an indication from any of the parties that they would strenuously object, then we probably would not be bringing the proposal forward the way we are. Again, I don't feel comfortable speaking for them.

Chairman Shea asked how do you feel that that would impact them, that one dollar? I mean, did they indicate that it would drop...I mean, in other words, that it would be confusing or that people would not want to attend? How did they discuss it with you so that we could get some perspective?

Ms. Stanley responded I think most of the concern was around the sports teams, and lower ticket price that the sports teams have as opposed to the concerts and other things that go on at the Verizon Arena. If you're paying a lower ticket rate and it's a family oriented event, they were concerned that raising the cost of going to the event would deter some people from coming back. That's why we ultimately set it at one dollar because...I can give you my personal opinion that I don't think it's going to adversely affect...

Chairman Shea stated no, right now people are paying \$10 or \$15 to park near the arena. To me it seems as if it would be a much better idea but again, that's just my perspective.

Alderman J. Roy stated my question is for Alderman O'Neil. You said that you weren't convinced about the event parking and I didn't get what the perceived problem was.

Alderman O'Neil stated my exact point is that I'm not sure there is a problem right now with free parking on Saturdays and Sundays for going to the events. Her charge was not to go out and try to recoup that \$350,000. That is the result if we adopt the entire action here, but that was not a charge given to her by the Board, so I don't really think we should be going down that avenue. It is a fact, but she wasn't directed to come up with a source to replace that. I was here when we had Saturday parking. You had to pay to park on Saturday. You had to pay till 10:00 at night. We couldn't change that fast enough. So in my opinion, generally speaking, she has convinced me based on facts regarding the Saturday parking. It makes sense. Stopping meter parking at 5:30 makes sense. The rate changes in the various lots and the garages make sense. I'm not convinced on the event

parking yet. I heard some stuff tonight that I had not heard previously on the operational side. So I'd just like to digest that a little bit. I'm not saying I'd move to kill it, maybe just table it.

Alderman Sullivan asked in the 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM zone, what would be the fiscal impact of cutting that back to 7:00 PM or 6:00 PM? Would that work or would throw the numbers off to such a degree that the whole thing sort of implodes on itself?

Ms. Stanley responded it would be a negative financial impact. I can't give you the numbers off the top of my head, but in some of these areas the peak hours are between 5:00 and 8:00, and if we stop charging earlier than 8:00, you're going to find a lot of those spaces used up by employees and residents that are going to sit in the spaces forever, which is why we are really interested in keeping it till 8:00. We really need to create that turnover.

Alderman Gatsas asked can you go through again the litany of if somebody parks at 6:00? Do they pay or not pay?

Ms. Stanley responded it depends on where they park.

Alderman Gatsas stated they park on Elm Street.

Ms. Stanley stated if they park on Elm Street, where you see the green lines, they would pay until 8:00.

Alderman Gatsas stated and explain to me how your enforcement officers are going to know that I'm there at quarter to six or at quarter past five.

Ms. Stanley responded I'm not really sure I understand your question.

Alderman Gatsas stated for an event.

Ms. Stanley stated if you're parked in the event zone, when the rate switches over two hours before the event, we're going to be placing signs on the streets instead of investing in permanent signage on the streets, which is, by default, confusing. And we're also going to either tire track or take down the license plate numbers of the cars that are already there when the event rate kicks in.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's go a little slower because sometimes I need to go down these streets a little slower. How many enforcement officers do you have?

Ms. Stanley responded I have eight.

Alderman Gatsas asked are all eight of the going to be working on an event night?

Ms. Stanley responded no.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many work on an event night?

Ms. Stanley responded we're probably going to have four working an event, as well as a manager, and I do have some other non-PCO staff that were going to be switching around their schedules, so we'll probably have four, five, six, seven...however many it takes to make sure that this works.

Alderman Gatsas asked how many do you have working during the day? You're going to be paying some serious overtime.

Ms. Stanley stated we're not going to need to pay overtime because all of the streets that are in green are not going to be paid parking after 5:30, so I no longer will need four PCO's on the street between 5:00 and 8:00. I will only need one or two.

Alderman Gatsas asked what do you need between 8:00 and 5:00?

Ms. Stanley stated I have four PCO's on duty at any given time.

Alderman Gatsas stated if you're going to have eight, if you have four during the day and you put eight at night...that's what you just told me, during an event you're going to have eight people.

Ms. Stanley stated but they are not all going to be PCO's.

Alderman Gatsas asked what are they going to be? Are you going to be out there tracking?

Ms. Stanley responded absolutely.

Alderman Gatsas stated okay, just checking. I don't have a problem if you're doing it because you're a salaried employee. That's okay; there's no overtime pay.

Ms. Stanley stated I have a couple salaried employees. I have my parking shift supervisor. Actually, he's not salaried, but he will be reconfiguring his schedule so that he works on the weekends when there are events, without having to pay

him overtime. I also have some other employees that have flexible schedules that we can make sure this works for us.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's go back to your other schematic that you had. How long is it going to take eight people to walk those green lines?

Ms. Stanley responded the green lines don't have anything to do with event parking. That is not an event parking zone. The blue lines do for the Verizon, which is a significantly smaller area. The red lines do for stadium events.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you're telling me that somebody that parks on the corner of Elm and Manchester Street is not considered a Verizon parking person. That's not an event parking?

Ms. Stanley responded what we're trying to do with the event rate is encourage and reinforce the philosophy behind which the arena was built, which was that we wanted people to walk downtown and patronize businesses before and after the event. In the blue streets, there is very little, if any, retail, so we actually are encouraging people to park in the green zone, even if it means they park for free or for seventy-five cents an hour.

Alderman Gatsas asked so what's the parking on the blue zone? What's the cost?

Ms. Stanley responded the cost is going to be a one dollar flat rate two hours before and one hour after the event.

Alderman Gatsas asked and what's the cost in the green rate?

Ms. Stanley responded the green is going to be seventy-five cents an hour, Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM

Alderman Gatsas stated so it's going to be cheaper to park between Manchester and Lake Avenue on Elm Street than it is to be parking down on Valley Street and Willow.

Ms. Stanley responded during an event, absolutely. That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to get people not to park on Willow Street because there is nowhere for them to go and spend time and spend money. We want them to park in the green areas so that they spend time and spend money and patronize the businesses downtown. In order to encourage that, we make it more expensive in the places where we're not encouraging them to park.

Alderman Gatsas stated that's a very confusing business plan.

Alderman O'Neil stated it sounds like...and maybe so we don't spend the night here, it sounds like there is consensus on a majority of the plan. I'm not sure what the Committee feels on the event parking. I still have questions. I'm hearing about people shifting days of the week they're going to work now. I have an issue with that because people took jobs thinking they maybe had a Monday through Friday, with some...Alderman Gatsas was going down the road of some overtime. Now you're telling people they have to work Saturdays and Sundays. That's not what some of them were hired for. I have an issue with that, and that was not presented to us till tonight. So, I'm willing to move on everything else but the event parking, and I think we can fine tune this and work it out a little more.

Alderman Lopez stated I think that in looking at this plan and understanding it, and the issue of the employees, which are exempt employees to that degree. Is that correct? They're not forty hours a week. Could you explain your employees, please?

Ms. Stanley responded our full time PCO's are unionized. I have two part-time PCO's that are not unionized. I have been keeping them in the loop about what's going on with this plan and have told them that we were going to need to shift some hours around. My hope is to do it on a voluntary basis, because I do know that I have several of my staff members who are interested in taking some time off during the week and working on Saturday and Sunday. I have had many volunteers to work on Saturday, but not all of them. Obviously if we had to ask someone to change their schedule involuntarily and they weren't in favor of it, we would look to the union on what the regulations were for doing that.

Alderman Lopez stated so you don't see any major issues with your employees, then, to implement this plan.

Ms. Stanley stated I do not see any major issues with the employees because I've already run it by them, and some of them are interested in working on Saturday and Sunday and some of them are not. It's my belief at this point that we have enough people that are interested in working that we're not going to have to ask anybody to work a schedule they don't want to.

Alderman Lopez stated now I'm looking at the revenue that you're allocated to give to the City in the 2009 budget. Could you explain how that plays a major part in revenue?

Ms. Stanley responded all of the things that we've presented to you tonight are actually included in the approved budget for fiscal year 2009.

Alderman Lopez asked is that for implementation by the first of September?

Ms. Stanley responded actually, when the budget was drafted, it was for implementation on July 1st, so we probably are going to see somewhat of a shortfall, because obviously we can't get it in place by July 1st.

Alderman Lopez stated the only comment I'd make to the Committee is I'd recommend that this moves forward because I think it's a plan that everybody has looking for. The event aspect of it, I think...you know, there was talk about \$2 and there was talk about \$3. And I think that the compromise is a dollar between both. Nobody likes it, but I think the other aspect...I think one of the Aldermen on the Committee brought it up, is all the parking that's happening around the City, which is fine with me. I don't have any major problem with it. With the All-Star game coming here, I'm sure people are going to jack their prices up to about \$20 to \$25 a parking space. I think the Committee recommendation ought to be to look at that also, that we start looking at that to see what kind of revenue we can get. We have all these bills we've got to pay and to include what we have to pay the Verizon, I think we have to move forward and I'd ask the Committee to move forward with it.

Alderman J. Roy stated I have no problem with the event parking. If you're looking for a motion, I'd be glad to make one.

Chairman Shea stated well, we're going to take each one separate, okay? It is a little bit complicated. The Clerk will read and then we can vote on that.

Alderman Gatsas stated if we're talking about event parking. How many events are at the Verizon center on Sundays?

Ms. Stanley responded I'll have to get back to you on that. I know that the Verizon center has an average of about 187 events per year and the majority of them are on Saturdays and Sundays. But I don't have the exact number for Sunday.

Alderman Gatsas asked so is there a reason why in your plan you didn't include Sunday?

Ms. Stanley responded I did include Sunday.

Alderman Gatsas asked so this is included on Sundays?

Ms. Stanley responded seven days a week.

Alderman Gatsas stated so you're going to have those employees working seven days a week because you don't have enough people to do enforcement during the week if you were going to figure 187 additional timeframes that you've got to have people walking to chalk cars and to put up your tents and everything else to tell people that they are in a new parking area. So, I guess maybe the revenue is there, but somebody needs to tell me what the costs are going to be, because if it's not cost beneficial, then maybe we shouldn't be doing it.

Ms. Stanley stated it seems that we have a little bit of a disagreement because we've looked at it and we believe we have the staff we need to have to adequately cover both without increasing costs. I don't need the same number of resources during the week with the new plan as I do now.

Alderman Gatsas stated your plan that you brought forward about paying your parking tickets under that guise of...what did you call it?

Ms. Stanley responded the forgiveness program.

Alderman Gatsas asked that ends July 1st?

Ms. Stanley responded it ends July 15th.

Alderman Gatsas asked how much revenue have you brought in with that program to date?

Ms. Stanley responded the last time I checked was about two weeks ago, and I apologize that I don't have updated numbers because I've been on vacation, but the last time I checked it was about \$125,000 additional that we've brought in because of that program.

Alderman Gatsas asked and what did us cost us to send the notices, at forty-eight cents each?

Ms. Stanley responded it cost us \$8,000, and it was actually less than forty-eight cents a piece because we use a mailing service that gives us a discount.

Alderman Ouellette stated I don't see the Sunday parking in her scheduling issues as quite a problem because schedules for these events come out months in advance. I think that Brandy is more than capable to schedule her staff on a volunteer basis to work Sundays for these events. And again, it's not every Sunday. It may be two Sundays a month for when the teams are in town. They play a lot of road games as well. I don't think we're talking about a whole lot of Sundays, maybe a dozen during the year.

Chairman Shea stated because it's a complicated kind of vote, Matt is going to read each one and then we can vote on them.

Deputy City Clerk Matt Normand stated the first ordinance that was handed out tonight is 70.48 and this deals with eliminating the minimum credit card transaction and restricting the Pay & Display receipt portability to parking districts.

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

Deputy City Clerk Normand stated the second one is 70.64, permit parking in lieu of coin deposit and parking districts, creating new parking districts – 25, 26, 27, & 28, and increasing the parking permit fee by five dollars per month.

Alderman J. Roy moved to approve this item. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Sullivan.

Alderman O'Neil asked Brandy, would the changing of this ordinance be the one related to the garages, the rate in the garage?

Ms. Stanley responded yes. I understand that you're trying to pass each one by a bullet point, but this one, 70.54, also includes the establishment of districts 27 & 28 which are the event rate zones, so if you pass this, you're passing that as well.

Alderman O'Neil stated I have a concern with only two months notification to the businesses that this is going to be implemented as of September 1st. We were successful the last time we did it with a longer lead time. You haven't heard any negative feedback from the businesses about a two month notice on changing the rate in the garages?

Ms. Stanley responded we haven't discussed it with the businesses, so I don't have any input.

Alderman O'Neil stated but this does include the event parking.

Ms. Stanley responded well, it doesn't include the event parking, but it establishes the zone that's associated with event parking.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if I have a concern on the event parking, would I not support changing this ordinance or can I take that up at a later time?

Ms. Stanley responded on this particular one you could probably take it up at a later time. The next one deals with a number of points including the charge for the event rate.

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

Deputy City Clerk Normand stated the final ordinance was 70.57, parking rates. As Brandy indicated, this includes Section (F) which includes on street event parking.

Ms. Stanley stated this one increases the hourly rate in the parking garage from fifty cents to seventy-five cents. It would also be approving seventy-five cents per hour at the meters in the zone, Elm Street and one block on either side, as well as the Gaslight district. It lifts the two hour limit after five, and it lifts paid parking at 5:30 at those meters that we talked about. So, it does all those things in addition to the on street event parking rate.

Alderman O'Neil asked is Section (F) the only part of that ordinance that's related to on street event parking?

Ms. Stanley responded that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked would a motion be in order to approve with the exception of Section (F)?

Chairman Shea responded yes, in a sense, if you can get a motion.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve this ordinance revision with the exception of Section (F). The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Ouellette moved to approve Section (F). The motion was duly seconded by Alderman J. Roy. The motion carried, with Alderman O'Neil voting in opposition.

Chairman Shea addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. The Traffic Division has submitted an agenda which needs to be addressed:

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Candia Road, south side, from Hanover Street to a point 450 feet east
(Ord. 2751)

On Candia Road, south side, from Proctor Road to a point 205 feet west
(Ord. 2755)

On Candia Road, south side, from Sinclair Ave., to a point 190 feet east
(Ord. 8169)

On Candia Road, north side, from Smith's Corner (Hanover Street) to the
Auburn town line
(Ord. 2748)

On Page Street, west side, from a point 500 feet north of Candia Road to a
point 60 feet north
(Ord. 8934)

Alderman Pinard

On McQuestion Street, north side, from Second Street to a point 65 feet
east

Alderman Smith

**RESCIND NO PARKING MAY 1 THRU SEPTEMBER 1 –
EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

On Young Street, south side, from Norris Street to Cypress Street
Alderman Shea

RESCIND 1 HOUR PARKING – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Hall Street, west side, from Lake Ave., to Central South Back Street
Ord. 3078

Alderman Osborne

**RESCIND NO PARKING 7 AM – 7 PM, MONDAY THROUGH
FRIDAY:**

On Hall Street, east side, from a point 30 feet south of Spruce Street to a
point 36 feet south

Alderman Osborne

TWO HOUR PARKING – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Hall Street, west side, from Lake Ave., to Litchfield Lane

Alderman Osborne

**TWO HOUR PARKING – 8 AM – 4 PM – EMERGENCY
ORDINANCE:**

On Hall Street, west side, from Central Street to Litchfield Lane

Alderman Osborne

**NO PARKING – MAY 1 THRU SEPTEMBER 1 – EMERGENCY
ORDINANCE:**

On Young Street, south side, from Norris Street to a point 85 feet east

Alderman Shea

RESCIND STOP SIGN – 3 WAY

On Granite Street at Dyson Street –, SWC

Alderman Smith

NO PARKING ANYTIME:

On Candia Road, both sides, from East Industrial Park Drive to Proctor Road

On Candia Road, both sides, from Hanover Street to the Londonderry Turnpike (Massabesic Rotary)

On Londonderry Turnpike, both sides, from New Hampshire Route 101 to the Massabesic Rotary

Alderman Pinard

On Perkins Ave., - end of street section only

Alderman Osborne

On West Pennacook Street, north side, from a point 275 feet east of Canal Street to a point 75 feet east

Alderman Sullivan

CROSSWALKS:

On Elton Ave., south of Candia Road

On Candia Road, east of East Industrial Park Drive

On East Industrial Park Drive, south of Candia Road

On Candia Road, west of Proctor Road

On Proctor Road, north of Candia Road

On Proctor Road, south of Candia Road

On Hanover Street, west of Candia Road

On Candia Road, north of Hanover Street

On Candia Road, south of Hanover Street

On Farmer Street, west of Candia Road

On Sherburne Street, west of Candia Road

On Fairmount Ave., west of Candia Road

On Bridge Street, west of Candia Road

On Candia Road, north of Bridge Street

On Garvin Ave., south of Candia Road

On Bailey Ave., north of Candia Road

On Peabody Ave., south of Candia Road

On Davenport Ave., north of Candia Road

On Hester Street, north of Candia Road

On Groveland Ave., north of Candia Road

On Lake Shore Road, south of Candia Road

On Candia Road, west of Lake Shore Road

On Springvalley Street, north of Candia Road

On Sinclair Ave., north of Candia Road

Alderman Pinard

STOP SIGNS:

Sherburne Street at Candia Road – NWC
Fairmount Ave., at Candia Road – NWC
Bailey Ave., at Candia Road – NWC
Davenport Ave., at Candia Road – NWC
Springvalley Street, at Candia Road – NWC
Sinclair Ave., at Candia Road – NWC
Alderman Pinard

RESCIND CROSSWALK:

On Candia Road, south of Bridge Street
Alderman Pinard

NO TURN ON RED:

On Bridge Street at Candia Road
Alderman Pinard

RESCIND ONE WAY STREET – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

South Porter Street, southbound, from Weston Road to the dead-end, for a time period beginning Monday, June 30, 2008 through Friday, August 29, 2008
Alderman DeVries

STOP SIGN:EMERGENCY ORDINANCE

On South Porter Street at Weston Road – SEC – for a time period beginning Monday, June 30, 2008 through August 29, 2008
Alderman DeVries

COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE TRAFFIC PROHIBITED – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:

On Lakeside Drive, from the Londonderry Turnpike to the dead end
Alderman Pinard

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE:

On Dubuque Street, east side, from a point 60 feet north of Putnam Street to a point 26 feet north
Alderman Ouellette

On motion of Alderman O’Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Sullivan, it was voted to consider and discuss the Traffic Division agenda as a whole.

Alderman Ouellette asked on **NO TURN ON RED** on Bridge Street at Candia Road, why are we doing that?

Mr. Jim Hoban, Traffic Director, responded all of these in the ordinance were part of the Candia Road project. All the crosswalks, the no turn on red is because of the angle where Bridge Street comes to Candia Road. That was the initial design that the engineers came up with to install it at that signal.

Alderman Ouellette asked so that's there recommendation?

Mr. Hoben responded that's what it was on the plan.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we putting up something that's not enforceable?

Mr. Hoben responded we have them at other places. As long as the police are there, and they get in an accident...If someone takes that right turn on red and gets in an accident, like a truck can't make the turn around, then he's legally responsible for that accident.

Alderman O'Neil asked and this was part of the plan that the City approved with the state?

Mr. Hoben responded that's part of the whole Candia Road project, exactly.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess I don't understand why just at that intersection.

Mr. Hoben stated I think the engineers felt because of the angle of the street where Bridge Street comes into Candia Road, it's a tough turn to take a right.

Alderman O'Neil stated it's pretty close to a 90 degree angle. I do it fairly regularly. If we don't approve this, what happens?

Mr. Hoben responded it's not legally enforced.

Alderman O'Neil stated so there's no issue. Traffic still moves. If there's an accident, the police will cite whoever was at fault.

Mr. Hoben stated unless the person comes back down and challenges it in court, because it's not on the books, legally, until it's ordinances.

Alderman O'Neil asked how is that any different than any other red light turn in the City?

Mr. Hoben responded we always bring them before the Committee, no turn on reds.

Alderman O'Neil stated but I'm saying if we don't put the sign up, how it that any different, that they're going to challenge something. I guess I don't understand.

Mr. Hoben stated if someone looks into it and it's not ordinance as no turn on red, then you can get it thrown out in court, because essentially it's not legal.

Alderman O'Neil asked to take the turn on red?

Mr. Hoben responded to take the turn on red and get a ticket for it.

Alderman O'Neil stated if there's no sign, if we don't approve the sign, legally under state law I have the right to take a right turn on red, unless posted. So if we don't put the sign up, it's not a major issue then.

Mr. Hoben stated the sign is already up, so you'd have to remove it. It was installed during construction.

On motion of Alderman J. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Sullivan, it was voted to approve the Traffic Division agenda with the exception of the **NO TURN ON RED** On Bridge Street at Candia Road.

Alderman O'Neil moved to deny approval of the **NO TURN ON RED** on Bridge Street at Candia Road. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette.

Alderman O'Neil asked for a roll call vote on his motion. Aldermen O'Neil and Ouellette voted yea. Aldermen Sullivan, J. Roy and Shea voted nay. The motion to deny approval failed.

On motion of Alderman J. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Sullivan, it was voted to approve this item of the Traffic agenda. Aldermen O'Neil and Ouellette voted in opposition.

Chairman Shea addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Kevin Sheppard supporting a request from Mr. Mahboubul Hassan, President of the Islamic Society of Greater Manchester, to close Lagrange Avenue for a period of 3 to 4 years.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated as you know the Islamic Society is currently building a facility up in that area. It is taking longer than they had anticipated. They have been working with our Chief Inspector regarding that construction, and they had requested, because they've had some vandalism in the area, and they like to use that street, to block off Lagrange Avenue for a period of

three to four years. Typically, Public Works issues encumbrance permits, whether it's a sidewalk for construction or a street's being worked on, for a week or two, encumbrance permits. I felt it best to run this by the Traffic Committee so that they were aware of this issue. The Inspector has spoken to some abutters in the area. I think it's worth issuing. If there are issues down the road, if it becomes a problem we can always pull the permit.

Alderman Sullivan stated three to four years, I think, is the red flag that went up for everybody here, the length of this thing. When do they expect to actually have this place finished?

Mr. Sheppard responded I think that's the time period.

Alderman Sullivan stated I know Rome wasn't built in a day, and I don't think this is going to be built in a day either, but this seems to be...I know it has been going on for a couple of years now, so we're looking at a six or seven year project by the time this thing is done.

Mr. Sheppard stated I don't know the details, but I'm sure it's funding and a lot of volunteer work. I'd possibly issue this permit on a year-to-year basis, so that they would have to reapply to us at the Highway Department yearly.

Alderman Sullivan asked would that be something that we could do, issue this for one year and then they could come back, rather than trapping ourselves in something that extends three or four years.

Mr. Sheppard stated I have the right to rescind it.

Alderman J. Roy stated first of all, I've got a problem with the longevity of this whole thing. I don't have a problem closing a street temporarily for construction but I find it hard to believe that this street needs to be closed for three or four years to construct anything. Is this really being closed for construction or is it because they say they have a vandalism problem?

Mr. Sheppard responded I think it's a combination of both.

Alderman J. Roy stated my concern is if they've got a vandalism problem, and we're going to start closing roads for everyone that has a vandalism problem, we're going to have a problem.

Mr. Sheppard stated I don't know if you're familiar with the area. I'm sure you probably are.

Alderman J. Roy stated I've been up there many times. And I think I read in here somewhere that there was dumping of trash going on. Well, that's been going on since we were kids.

Mr. Sheppard stated I agree. It's been a hangout for many, many years.

Alderman J. Roy stated the old church up there was occupied every Friday night. We were up there all the time.

Mr. Sheppard stated and that's part of the reason that I support this. I think if we do block that off it will prevent a lot of the people, high school students maybe, who probably go up there and go down to that dead end, or people that go down to that dead end and dump trash.

Mr. Mirsad Jusufovic, ISGM Building Committee, stated I would like to reiterate what the gentleman said regarding the vandalism and the trash. That has been the major issue, why we would like to have that road closed. Yes, the period seems a little long, three to four years, and that's because the project will probably take that long or even longer to finish up, due to funding. Most of our funds have been donations, and as one of you gentlemen mentioned, there has been trashing dumping going on for a while, even before we were there. But vandalism was not an issue. We had four acres of land where there was nothing going on, and the trash didn't bother anybody, and even the vandalism. We have a general contractor who's constantly overseeing this site, and it has been more instances where vandalism has occurred. The trash that's being dumped, we cannot fully control. What we are trying to do on our part is we plan to enclose fully and put up some six foot fences around the property, but we still cannot fully control the vandalism and the trash dumping on the street. Now in your eyes three to four years might be a little excessive but we are controlled by our funding, and it's a slow process.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think a one year approval that could be reapproved makes sense. I never recall we've approved anything for that long of a time period. And I think we need to monitor if it actually cuts down on vandalism and trash.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the closing of Lagrange Avenue for one year at the discretion of the Public Works Director. The motion was duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette.

Chairman Shea stated what we're afraid of is precedent. If we allow you to have it for three or four years and somebody else comes along and says we'd like it for

three or four years, we're really establishing a bad precedent. This is something we want to avoid. So, one year, and then we can renew it every year or whatever.

Alderman J. Roy asked do you own property on both sides of the road?

Mr. Jusufovic responded one side of the property is owned by ISGM. The other side of the property is owned by ISGM members.

Alderman J. Roy stated you said you're going to put a fence around the property. Are you saying that you're going to put a fence across the road?

Mr. Jusufovic responded no, not across the road. We asked for a permit to put a gate, which means to close that street, but right now we will only put up a fence around the ISGM property.

Alderman J. Roy asked and now are you saying that you're going to put a gate up, something to stop traffic altogether on that road?

Mr. Jusufovic responded the only traffic that's been going on as of right now is equipment and machines. As I said, one side is owned by ISGM and the other side is owned by ISGM members. So if you are concerned about anybody else having an opinion or wanting that street open, I don't see that issue because both sides of the street are owned or represented by ISGM members.

Chairman Shea called for a vote on the motion to approve the closing of Lagrange Avenue for one year at the discretion of the Public Works Director. The motion carried with Alderman J. Roy voting in opposition.

Mr. Sheppard asked do you plan on me coming back to the Committee after one year?

Chairman Shea responded yes.

Chairman Shea addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from William Lambert, Traffic Engineer/Administrator, asking the Mayor's Office to send a descriptive letter of request supporting the placement of No Parking signs on Londonderry Turnpike between Route 101 and the Massabesic Circle.

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

Mr. Hoben stated on this item, the initial request was from Alderman Pinard who is experiencing cars parking up on Londonderry Turnpike outside Dunkin Donuts. And so, since Londonderry Turnpike is under state jurisdiction, I emailed Bill Lambert requesting No Parking signs. His policy at the state DOT is to have the cities formally ordain or give the okay for them to post No Parking signs. It's in our Traffic agenda budget. In the Traffic agenda, you'll see the No Parking at Any Time listed, which you passed already. They want to make sure the signs are legal before they go put them up, and they want to make sure that the city government knows they're going to post the area within the City.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Deputy City Clerk Normand presented an item from the Fire Department regarding the change in the International Fire Code from the 2000 addition to the 2006 addition.

Fire Chief James Burkush stated it's basically just an update for the Fire Prevention Code for commercial structures. It's only for new construction. It deals a lot with hazardous materials enforcement, and it's basically a housekeeping item.

Alderman O'Neil asked are there any significant changes that the Board might want to be aware of?

Chief Burkush responded no, there isn't. It has to do with new fuels and other storage issues, but it's all for new construction. There are no significant problems that we anticipate.

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

TABLED ITEMS

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

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

Chairman Shea stated in discussing this I spoke to the Chief and he's aware of the proposal and he said he'd be working on it.

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

8. Report from Police and City Solicitor regarding commercial vehicle definitions, if available.

Note: Response from Deputy Public Works Director enclosed.

(Tabled 12/04/2008)

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

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

9. 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.

Note: Mr. Sawaya to meet with abutters in order to work out an agreement relative to his request and report back to the Committee.

(Tabled 2/19/08)

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee