

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

May 2, 2011

4:30 PM

Chairman Roy called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Roy, Osborne, Long, Ouellette, Shaw

Messrs.: J. Hoben, P. Capano, K. Sheppard, T. Brennan, B. Stanley  
Alderman Greazzo

Chairman Roy addressed item 3 of the agenda:

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

**1 HOUR HANDICAP PARKING – 8 AM – 6 PM – EMERGENCY**

**ORDINANCE:**

On Silver Street, north side, from a point 210 feet west of Beech Street to a point 22 feet west

Alderman Shea

**1 HOUR PARKING – 8 AM – 6 PM – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

On Silver Street, north side, from a point 232 feet west of Beech Street to a point 48 feet west

Alderman Shea

**RESCIND ONE WAY STREET – EMERGENCY ORDINANCE:**

Monadnock Lane, from Union Street to Pine Street – westbound

Alderman Long

**NO PARKING ANYTIME:**

On Ramsey Street, north side, from Calef Road to a point 65 feet east

Alderman Shaw

On motion of Aldermen Long, duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette, it was voted to approve the traffic regulations.

Chairman Roy addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, requesting on behalf of Child Health Services the use of the Pearl Street Lot on Sunday, May 22, 2011, for their annual bike clinic.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to approve the request.

Chairman Roy addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Ray Clement requesting directional signs be placed on South Main Street and Second Street for St. Raphael Church.

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

Alderman Long stated I realize what the request is. Has Alderman Greazzo reflected on this?

Chairman Roy stated Alderman Greazzo hasn't contacted me on this. I don't know if he knows about it or not.

Alderman Ouellette stated he is aware.

Alderman Long stated they emailed him this request, but do we know whether or not he has responded?

Chairman Roy asked Jim, do you have any information for us regarding this issue and if Alderman Greazzo is aware of this request? Before you start, I want to make one point that...

Alderman Ouellette interjected I was going to ask if there was a moratorium on these types of signs.

Chairman Roy stated you are absolutely correct because of the Wayfinder program that we have.

Mr. James Hoben, Traffic Director, stated there is a moratorium on these types of signs. All of the existing ones out there were installed before the moratorium for the Wayfinder program.

Alderman Osborne stated I think we are starting to get enough of these, whereas, I think there is a moratorium and that was put on by the full Board. I think what this Committee ought to do is, if it does come to a point sometime where most of them are approved and some of them aren't, it should go back to the full Board. Let's make sure that we are not the bad guys here. That is the big thing. If we give to one, we have to give to all. It is a hard decision.

Alderman Long asked Jim, were you saying that there were signs there already?

Mr. Hoben replied no, there were not. There are other church signs scattered around the City that go back to the 1960's, which we have maintained.

Alderman Long asked are there any signs now around there for Saint Raphael?

Mr. Hoben replied there were signs put in for Saint Benedict Academy, which I guess Saint Raphael runs. There are no church signs for Saint Raphael.

Alderman Long asked there are Saint Benedict signs?

Mr. Hoben replied yes.

Alderman Long asked are any of those signs on South Main Street or Second Street?

Mr. Hoben replied they are not.

Alderman Long asked where are they?

Mr. Hoben replied they are on Second Street and there is one on South Main.

Alderman Long asked is this a request to add two more?

Mr. Hoben replied yes, to add Saint Raphael Parish signs.

Alderman Long asked so there would be three on South Main Street and three on Second Street, if this were to be approved?

Mr. Hoben replied there would be two.

Alderman Long asked so they are asking for one more?

Chairman Roy stated there is currently one for Saint Benedict, which was put in before the moratorium was put in place. That is for one on South Main Street and one on Second Street. If we were to approve this, it would put another sign for the church on each one of those streets. There would be two signs on each street, for a total of four.

Alderman Shaw stated Saint Benedict Academy is the school.

Chairman Roy stated it is attached to the church.

Alderman Long stated I just don't understand where they would need another sign anyway. There is already a sign on South Main Street and a sign on Second Street. It doesn't specifically say where the sign would be.

Mr. Hoben stated it would be in the same vicinity as the Saint Benedict Academy signs.

Alderman Long asked so it would be near the signs that are currently existing?

Mr. Hoben replied yes.

Alderman Shaw stated they are asking for signs that say Saint Raphael Church. Saint Benedict Academy is the school. They are asking for additional signs that say Saint Raphael Church. From what I understand, Saint Benedicts Academy signs were up before the moratorium, but right now we have a moratorium so we cannot authorize new signs that say Saint Raphael Church.

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to receive and file the request for directional signs.

Chairman Roy addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Discussion regarding proposed site improvements for traffic flow at Parker Varney Elementary School.

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

Chairman Roy asked do we have anyone here who can give us some information on this?

Mr. Peter Capano, Chief of Parks, Recreation & Cemetery, stated we contracted with Hoyle Tanner & Associates to come up with a master plan for the site at the Parker Varney Elementary School. As a result of that procedure, which included a number of meetings with staff at the school and two public hearings, they came up with a recommended option for traffic flow. In addition, recently there were a couple more options labeled 5A and 5B that I suppose are out there for discussion. They differ from the recommended option in that they actually gate the intersection of Lewis Street and James A. Pollock Drive, so that traffic can't go from one to the other, because of commentary from Lewis Street abutters. That is where we are at right now, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Roy stated I don't think we have that option number 5 here.

Alderman Ouellette stated Mr. Chairman, I remember the discussion at the Joint School Buildings meeting, when we talked about spending the \$77,000, I think it was, to do the study. I thought it was just groundwork. I was not under the impression that that study had to do with traffic or traffic flow. What concerns me, Mr. Chairman, is that nobody alerted this Committee that the School Board was going to do a study on traffic flow, when they have no jurisdiction on traffic flow. That should have been funneled through the Highway Department through this Committee. I am not sure that was done. The Building and Sites Committee, if they have an issue with traffic flow, shouldn't be going to the Parks and Recreation Division to deal with it. In my opinion, with us not knowing about this traffic study, I have always known that it was congested there during school hours, but I didn't know about a traffic study until it came up at a CIP meeting maybe two months ago. Has anybody contacted the Highway Department in terms of this traffic study? Has anyone given an okay from this Committee to do a traffic study?

Chairman Roy stated part of that question I would like to have answered.

Alderman Ouellette stated if that came from the Committee on Joint School Buildings... I was under the impression that it was for a new playground and maybe some parking lot issues. This traffic study to me seems like a waste of the taxpayers' dollars, if they did a traffic study without going through the Committee first. I wouldn't have a problem going out for a traffic study, if they had the money to pay for it. But that process, in my opinion, should have gone through the Highway Department and the Traffic Department and then come to this Committee for our recommendation. I wouldn't have opposed the study, but knowing that they kind of put the cart before the horse, in my opinion, they kind of spent money where it probably could have been used elsewhere.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, asked can I just give a history from the beginning so that everyone is on the same page?

Chairman Roy replied please do.

Mr. Sheppard stated the School District, and I am sure that Tom Brennan can correct me if I am wrong, had taken a look at the site for Parker Varney. They had a neighborhood meeting. Alderman Greazzo has been involved in this from the beginning. We brought on the firm of Hoyle Tanner & Associates to work with us to assist the School District to take a look at the site. Some of the issues that came out were traffic issues in front of the school, which is typical in many schools here in the City. What we do is take a look at traffic. We don't necessarily come up with a final recommendation, but the School District liked an option that made some modifications to the street. We talked to the School District and told them they need to inform the CIP Committee, which oversees the City bonds and cash. We did bring it to the CIP Committee. The School District was on board with that. Then it got a little bit more confusing, and it was referred over to this Committee as well. I believe the Building and Sites Committee realizes that they don't make improvements to City streets. Tom can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe the action at their last meeting was that that money is to be spent on-site only, for parking and for the playground.

Alderman Ouellette stated the problem with that is that if I had not made a motion at our last meeting to go back to the Building and Sites Committee, to tell them that they need to come to this Committee, we would have never known about it. I understand why you went to the CIP Committee because that is where the funds were coming from. If there was a traffic study, we would not have known about it. We wouldn't have known about it at all, because they didn't come to the Committee. Nobody came and told this Committee. I am not saying that they overstepped or anybody did anything malicious. What I am saying is that once the traffic issues were coming forward, that is when this Committee should have been notified about this.

Mr. Sheppard stated you are correct. Peter does work at Parks, Recreation & Cemeteries as part of the Highway Department, so that was a mistake on our part. I apologize for that. That was a mistake on our part for not coming to this Committee, because nothing was finalized. They were taking a look at options and that is why we brought it to the CIP Committee, to finalize the option. Then the thought was that it would have to go to this Committee as well and you did make the motion. Nothing had been finalized at that point. A recommendation was coming forward from the Building and Sites Committee or from the School Board, but we were bringing that to the CIP Committee as well. There were still, I believe, five options out there. What we were bringing forward was a School

Board recommended option. So until we had an option that we felt we were going to move forward with, I felt that would be the right time to come to this Committee, once we had a preferred option to discuss.

Alderman Ouellette stated I would just follow up by saying that the discussion at the School Board was that they wanted option A, which included rerouting the road and some Aldermen got chastised for butting in where the School District has jurisdiction, which is totally unfair because it had to go through the CIP Committee, but it also has to come through this Committee. I am not so sure that the Building and Sites Committee on the School Board knew that it had to come here. The way that the conversation went was that they liked one option and it was what they wanted. I don't think that they knew they had to come here. Maybe they did and maybe they didn't. I am not sure, but I think there was some communication that wasn't handled properly. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Long asked the options that we got from Hoyle Tanner & Associates, the package that we have now, how much did that cost? Do we have a price on that?

Mr. Capano asked to produce the study?

Alderman Long replied yes, what did we have to pay them?

Mr. Capano replied \$13,475.

Alderman Long asked the options 5A and 5B, from what you are saying, was that outside of that scope? Do we have to pay them for that, above and beyond the \$13,475?

Mr. Capano replied no.

Alderman Long asked are we looking to make a decision on these options?

Alderman Ouellette replied no.

Mr. Sheppard stated I believe, at this point, there is no funding to do any offsite improvements in that area. The School Board, and Superintendent Brennan can confirm, has taken a vote not to do anything outside of the school grounds. They would basically leave the public's right-of-way alone and leave that up to the City.

Alderman Long asked as far as we know now, the School District has control of this issue? They don't need us for this.

Dr. Thomas Brennan, Superintendent of Schools, replied I believe that is correct in terms of the scope of the work, which is to stay on-site, within the boundaries of the school itself and not to go into the street or any other area. It was to establish the playground area and possible additional paving for staff parking.

Alderman Long asked the \$73,000 was that from the Joint School Buildings Committee release from the design/build?

Dr. Brennan replied I believe it was \$77,000. That was part of the budget that they were looking at, but I do not have the exact source.

Alderman Long stated I was also under the impression that it was for the playground, whatever needed to be designed or whatever. I didn't realize it was a pick-up and drop-off too.

Mr. Capano stated the CIP account was at \$244,300, and out of that came not only this plan, but playground equipment at three schools totaling in the \$165,000 range. That leaves a balance of about \$60,000.

Mr. Sheppard replied I just confirmed that that was from the design/build money.

Alderman Osborne asked is this all on school grounds, this whole drawing that I see in front of me? From Conant Street to Lewis Street, I guess it is. I want to know what is on the other end of this drawing.

Chairman Roy stated you have James Pollock Drive that comes up.

Alderman Osborne asked where does that come out? What streets are they?

Chairman Roy replied Summerside.

Mr. Capano stated yes, Summerside is on the north end, I suppose, and that is Allen Street.

Alderman Osborne asked how much public traffic is there on James A. Pollock Drive between those two streets or is it mostly school traffic?

Mr. Capano replied it is very much mostly school traffic.

Alderman Osborne stated mainly I think the School District should be the ones that should know which way they want to go in and out, as long as there is not a lot of heavy traffic going from Lewis Street to the other street. Have you asked Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission if they would take a look at this situation?

Mr. Capano replied no, sir. We think that the HTA Engineers were very well suited to giving us recommendations.

Alderman Osborne asked the plan now is not working and this is a different one? You have to enlighten me on this.

Mr. Capano replied what is there isn't working. There are real operational problems with parking on both sides of the road, buses...

Alderman Osborne interjected well I guess you are going to have to find a way that it is going to work and the only way you are going to find out is to keep changing until you find something. Speaking for myself, as long as it is not interrupting with public traffic outside of whatever school traffic goes in and out of there, I think that the School District should be able to handle it. That is the way that I look at it. Thank you.

Alderman Shaw stated actually Alderman Long asked the question that I had. I will just sort of wrap it up with a final comment. You have adopted a plan now. Do we have that option here that you finalized? The one that you think is best.

Mr. Capano replied option number one.

Alderman Shaw stated it is strictly the School District that is in charge of it. If there were to be any changes in the road, that would come to our Committee to analyze any road changes?

Mr. Sheppard replied correct.

Alderman Shaw stated I just wanted to clarify what was said. I have my answer. Thank you.

Chairman Roy stated Kevin, thank you for that history. I was sitting in on that CIP Committee meeting and I think Alderman O'Neil put it very succinctly when he said that there are stakeholders and then there are key stakeholders. When you have a public hearing, and we could debate whether that was a true public hearing or not by the way it was advertised to the public, obviously you are going to get a

lot of other people who are not from the neighborhood because there are only seven houses on Lewis Street. So their vote would outweigh the people that are the key stakeholders up there, because they have a problem with people parking in front of their driveways and everything else, at two times during the day and they are hostages in their own neighborhood. The contract that you had with Hoyle Tanner & Associates, did that include the design of the street? I see the street in here with a roundabout.

Mr. Capano replied no, it didn't. They were charged with coming up with conceptual plans and that is all that they did.

Chairman Roy stated whatever they do on-site is going to affect what type of street or what we have to do for access as a City. Was there any thought given to what the design on-site was going to require or limit in the future? Maybe there is another plan that comes up and because of the position of this playground that plan couldn't be enacted. Then they would have to dig it up and place it over again. Maybe Dr. Brennan would know the answer to that, if there was ever any thought given to what the on-site design affect would have on the City street.

Dr. Brennan replied sir, I believe that all of the options have been explored, included the relocation of the playground, so we had a sense, but we also knew that from the discussions that I was privy to, that we were going to be concerned with our site specifically and what we could do and if there were additional phases to be implemented that we would be going through the proper channels to insure that we took the proper action. After looking at it, all but one option really moves that.

Chairman Roy stated that is what I was looking at also. Option number four shows the playground in a completely different area. If we came back and said the street should be a certain way and by the way that playground, where it is now, is in the way. I guess the point I am getting at here is that especially in the future, it would probably benefit us greatly if we got together at the beginning of the whole thing instead of it becoming a little adversarial. Because some of the neighbors felt that they hadn't been heard.

Dr. Brennan stated I couldn't agree with you more.

Chairman Roy asked Alderman Greazzo, would you like to speak?

Alderman Greazzo stated I have spoken with all of the neighbors who live on Lewis Street. If you look at option number one, since the school had already chosen to stick with that option, if we can't come to some agreement, my conversation that I had with the folks on Lewis Street was to move the rotary

closer to the school and dead end Lewis Street altogether, so they don't have to deal with traffic. What the school does in the morning and afternoon for drop-off and pick-up is they block off access from Summerside Drive, so you can't get up to the school anyway. You have to come in and out through James Pollock Drive. All of the residents on Lewis Street didn't have a problem with being disconnected from the school altogether doing it that way. If you look at option number four, it's a good option, but the problem is where they want to put the parking lot it's all sand, so getting that to compact, to be able to put a parking surface that is going to last, I think that is probably going to deteriorate. I have been working on this with Kevin and Peter since the school started having the public sessions on it. It wasn't necessarily a certified public hearing, but there were notices that went out to all the parents and all the neighbors in that neighborhood to come to the meetings and I think there were four or five meetings altogether.

Mr. Capano replied there were just two public meetings.

Alderman Greazzo stated there were more meetings that I went to, but yes, two of them were public. Everybody has had the opportunity to have their say in this at this point. If we want to have a public hearing here at City Hall, I wouldn't be opposed to that. I am more than happy to get as much input as possible because I am not going to pretend to have the solution to this but I am trying to make it work for all the interested parties. That is kind of where I am at on it.

Chairman Roy stated right now Summerside Drive is not blocked off in the afternoon for people exiting the school property.

Alderman Greazzo stated it is.

Chairman Roy stated in the mornings it is block off both ways.

Alderman Greazzo stated for drop-off and pick-up they block off Summerside Drive, and they actually put a person down at the end to direct them around to James Pollock Drive.

Chairman Roy stated in talking to that lady, she told me that they blocked it off both ways in the morning and only going up in the afternoon. A lot of people exited that way. I had a concern for the safety of the walkers. I brought that up at the CIP meeting. You are saying that they have changed that and now they block it both morning and afternoon.

Alderman Greazzo stated it was my understanding that they had completely blocked it off for both drop-off and pick-up.

Chairman Roy asked in your new plan, is there going to be some type of deterrent to stop people from coming up Summerside Drive onto Lewis Street and, as they do now, park and leave their car to go on to school grounds to either drop-off or pick-up their children? In the new plan is this going to be addressed?

Alderman Greazzo replied there would have to be a phased-in transition from having access from Lewis Street. We would continue to block off Summerside Drive in the morning and afternoon. We would direct folks over to James Pollock Drive and they would get used to the traffic flow over there, see that it works and they don't have to walk very far and that they have a turnaround to get in and out of. We would also need to have some law enforcement there, in the beginning, to hand out tickets to the folks that decided to disregard what we have established so that they get used to using James Pollock Drive. Once that happens, it will eventually work itself out. That is the hope anyway. If it doesn't then we remove the emergency gate a Lewis street and then you have full access to both Lewis Street and James Pollock Drive with a roundabout.

Alderman Ouellette stated all that having been said, I think the problem still is that we don't have the money to pay for it. The School District has stated that they don't have the money to pay for it. The issue before us right now is a communication from the Building and Sites Committee to this Board stating that they are not going to request or do any changes to the road. They are just going to do all their work on-site. I think at this point it would be appropriate to receive and file this, until we can come up with some sort of budgetary monies to fix this problem. I know that Gossler Park has been waiting for about five or six years for their traffic congestion problem as well. We just haven't had the money to do it. These projects cost a significant amount of money. We just don't have the money for it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Alderman Lopez stated I understand that it is on school property and a playground is always on school grounds. Whether they have the money or not, if they want to change the scope of the City schoolyard, they are in charge of it. I think although they are adamant in keeping the plan that they have, that is fine; they have made the decision. I would say that we have no authority whatsoever. If they want to go do it, go do it. Find the money and do it.

Chairman Roy stated our discussion is about what would happen once the street needed to be redone and that does have to come through this Committee.

Alderman Lopez stated if you are talking about James Pollock Drive and Lewis Street, I understand that nothing is going to be done other than make a parking lane and you are going to put up some signs. They will have to coordinate with Jim Hoben to get the signs. As far as them moving forward, where they put the

playground and what they do, they have already made that selection. The parking is just going to go up James Pollock Drive and the turnaround is going to be inside the schoolyard and it is not going to touch Lewis Street. I really don't understand, at this point, what we need for the future.

Chairman Roy stated what I asked the Superintendent before is that in the future we all get together before something like this is thrown out there and that way there isn't that lack of communication and we are all on the same page when we start reading plans that have a newly designed road in it. That kind of throws us when we don't know what is going on.

Alderman Osborne asked what is the width of James Pollock Drive?

Mr. Capano replied James Pollock Drive, if I remember correctly, is about 26 feet.

Alderman Osborne stated that is very small, so there is no parking on either side.

Mr. Capano stated and yet there is.

Alderman Osborne asked there is? There is one of your problems.

Mr. Capano replied right. There are just so many parents picking up and dropping their kids off by vehicle.

Alderman Osborne stated you mean just picking them up.

Mr. Capano replied only then, yes. There is no parking other times. The concept showed, as Alderman Lopez referred to, creating a turnout lane. You could actually create three, 11-foot wide lanes, through there. They may be bigger than that. That would allow traffic to continue to flow up and down the hill as students get dropped off and picked up.

Alderman Osborne stated it is funny how they don't think of these things before they start designing things. Then wait until the last minute like this. The picking up problem is a big problem, especially in my ward at Wilson; it is terrible there. Of course that was developed a long time ago, but now with something like this, that should have been all figured out. If they all pick-up and drop-off at a certain area like I had figured out myself at Wilson School, but they didn't follow through with it, Mr. Superintendent. They pick up in the alley. They came across Wilson Street and came across that alley and all the kids would be waiting in the schoolyard, rather than them running all over the streets. In the schoolyard, each car is lined up down that alley, so it gave them plenty of room. They would pick them up and take off. The way it is now it is real congested. Thank you.

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to receive and file the proposed site improvements for traffic flow at Parker Varney Elementary School.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Chairman Roy stated we have a handout. It is something that came in from Brandy late, from the Carpenter Center. They are going to be redoing their parking lot and they want to be able to use spaces between Merrimack and Middle Streets.

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

Alderman Long stated Brandy, we have been quasi charging people for revenue losses. We are doing it on Elm Street. As a policy maker, I believe that we, at the very least, should be doing that. We don't need to be charging full parking, but if we are going to lose revenue... Seeing that we have established some of that, where we charge them for revenue lost... I know here it is \$100, but it is the principle of the policy. Do you think there would be an issue with them paying \$100 to park for free in the streets and the lot?

Ms. Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, replied it is actually a total of 28 parkers. Just a few of them would be going on Franklin Street. The remainder would be going in the Lake Avenue parking lot. To my knowledge, the only reduction in what we have charged for on-street, what would be the equivalent of a pay and display permit, is for the project on Elm Street and that was predominantly because it was such a long project. Other than that, it has either been \$15 per day, per space or free, as per the direction of the Committee. It may be the case that setting a precedent for a reduced rate could open a can of worms with a number of different entities that are seeking to do that. I am sure that they would be willing to pay us for the lost revenue, but it is not a long project. It is just for probably the equivalent of four days and is that a precedent that we would want to set for anyone else that is doing a short-term construction project.

Alderman Long stated the City is looking for money everywhere. We look at \$100, \$1,000 or \$2,000 and we say, yes, let them have it. This particular event is construction; they are redoing their parking lot. I don't have an issue letting them park somewhere else. I do have an issue that for the four days there are going to be some people that are going to be put out, somewhere somehow. I don't think that just allowing that for free, even though it is four days or two weeks, or what

have you... I know at Saint Joseph Cathedral we gave them six parking spots, and with things like that, we ought to not lose revenue at the very least. If it is \$300 or \$500 of revenue, or whatever the revenue is, this is a decision of the full Board, but in my opinion, I believe that at the very least we should be collecting our revenue or projected loss. For this one I am looking for the \$100.

Alderman Ouellette asked Brandy, who would be using these spaces?

Ms. Stanley replied it would be the residents of the Carpenter Center. The ones on the street would be for those that are disabled and use their vehicles. It would be very difficult for them to get to the Lake Avenue parking lot.

Alderman Ouellette asked how busy is this Lake Avenue parking lot during the day?

Ms. Stanley replied we typically have about 80 or 90 spaces open every day.

Alderman Ouellette stated they are open, unused.

Ms. Stanley replied they are unused, correct.

Alderman Ouellette stated Mr. Chairman, this is a hardship on the citizens. The City is here to serve the citizens and the taxpayers. I think that this is not an unreasonable request from the Carpenter Center. Although I understand Alderman Long's opinion, I think, for the four days and the \$100, it will help out a lot of people who would be in a very tough situation trying to find parking downtown. I would approve this. I respect Alderman Long. I respect his opinion; however, I think this warrants a conditioned relief.

Alderman Osborne stated again, what we are trying to do is come up being the good guys and the bad guys. Again, I think we should have some sort of view from the full Board on something like this also, whether it is Saint Joseph or whoever it is. Either we are going to be charging them or we are not going to be charging them. To leave it up to us all the time, makes us the bad guys in some cases and the good guys in some other cases. We should at least pass this along to the full Board to get their opinion on what we should do with this, along with the other issue of the signs. We already know that there is a moratorium. I think it should be done with this as well. That way there it makes it a lot easier for us to decide what to do, how to make the money for sure. The \$100 would be coming if there was a moratorium on that type of thing. We would be getting the \$100 automatically or whatever it might be, instead of us being the good guys and the bad guys by giving to some and not giving it to somebody else. It is not fair. I don't like voting that way. I just don't like it. Sometimes I like to abstain. I

haven't done that in many years. Sometimes I like to abstain from something like that because it is quite a catch 22. I don't know how the rest of the Committee feels about that. Would you like to send it along? You can do what you want this time, but we should send it along to the full Board.

Alderman Long asked Brandy, the Lake Avenue lot, is that part of the \$100?

Ms. Stanley replied no, the \$100 is the on-street spaces.

Alderman Long asked so there is no revenue loss for the Lake Avenue lot so they are more than welcome to park at Lake Avenue. That is not the issue that I have. The issue that I have is with Merrimack and Middle Streets. That is roughly the \$100. There are businesses and there are residents that are already parking there. If we are going to be sending out 28 more vehicles, there is going to be a disruption. As Alderman Osborne said, I agree, we are getting these one at a time and we are deciding whether they are going to pay for the revenue loss or not. On some of them we have charged and some of them we haven't. I agree that we need to make a decision as to whether we do this across the board or we don't charge across the board, either way. The reason why I am going for the \$100, is that we have charged for revenue loss and I don't think it is fair to charge some and not others. Merrimack and Middle Streets will be disrupted for those that are currently parking there now, businesses and residents. That's why I thought at the very least, for their sake, let's get the revenue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Shaw, it was voted to approve the request from the Carpenter Center for the use of Franklin Street spaces between Merrimack and Middle Streets as well as spaces in the Lake Avenue Lot free of charge, for the week of May 9, 2011. The motion carried, with Alderman Long being duly recorded in opposition.

## **TABLED ITEMS**

7. Discussion regarding a revised Ordinance proposal related to commercial motor vehicles.

*(Note: Tabled 1/3/2011; the Parking Division, Traffic Division and City Solicitor to meet with Committee representatives.)*

On motion of Alderman Shaw, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Ouellette stated I think on two separate occasions you have asked for input from the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. Brandy, have you received and input from any other Alderman on the commercial motor vehicle ordinance?

Ms. Stanley replied no.

Chairman Roy stated as a matter of fact, we had a meeting downstairs at the Finance Department with a lot of department heads and nobody else showed up.

Alderman Ouellette stated I think that hopefully next month we can move that forward for some sort of recommendation.

Alderman Shaw stated I feel the same way as Alderman Ouellette and as I count the pages, times 14, that we get every month, we could save 100 sheets of paper if we got this straightened out. I would like the members of this Committee to consider the five points that are listed under the current Ordinance. I would like to eliminate number four. We would have numbers one, two, three and then number five would become number four. I think that we should stay with the 26,000 for commercial vehicle and leave it at that. If there are other issues that come up in regards to nuisance of a beeping noise or things like that they could be considered in other ways. I think as far as the determination of a commercial vehicle it should have those bullet points, one, two, three and the fifth to become number four. I would like to make that a motion, but I would like to have you think about it for a month or whenever and then at the next meeting, vote on this one way or another.

Alderman Ouellette asked if we vote on this tonight, maybe the Clerk can help me with this, that would come forward at not tomorrow nights meeting, it would come two weeks after that. It would go to the full Board. I think that would give ample time, since we have talked about it before and no one has come forward. I think what you have is a great idea and if that is a motion I would second that.

Alderman Shaw moved to remove number four from the commercial motor vehicle Ordinance. Alderman Ouellette duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Roy stated in a brief conversation with Alderman Shaw, before this meeting, I thought it was a good idea. We would have to look into it and try to craft it a little tighter because until recently I was of the same mindset as Alderman Shaw, but there is a closed neighborhood in my ward. It is a dead end street that someone with a flatbed tow truck has moved into an apartment and they cant turn around on the street. They have to back all the way down from the main street with the backup alarm going all times of the night, disrupting everybody. That vehicle wouldn't be covered if we just eliminated number four. There is an exception there. I don't know how we could craft the words to make sure that that

is still illegal to do, because it doesn't meet the 26,000 pound rule. Maybe we can look for input for next month and try to craft that a little bit tighter.

On motion of Alderman Ouellette, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to retable this item.

8. Communication from Joseph Parrotto, Beaver Street resident, regarding traffic issues in the area of Candia Road and Hanover Street.  
*(Note: Originally tabled 12/6/2010. Retabled 1/3/2011 with a recommendation to be submitted by NHDOT. A review from NHDOT submitted on 2/28/2011 is attached. Communication from Alderman Corriveau is attached.)*

This item remained on the table.

9. Communication from Brandy Stanley, Parking Manager, submitting an amendment to Ordinance Section 70.55 expanding Residential Parking Permit Zone #2 to include the Gaslight District.  
*(Note: Tabled 4/4/2011)*

On motion of Alderman Shaw, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Alderman Long stated this is creating a new zone, zone #2. I spoke with the businesses down there. There are a couple other businesses that are going to be adding apartments and there is only paid parking in that area.

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

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee