

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH & TRAFFIC

May 2, 2023 at 6:00 PM

Chairman Barry called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Barry, Long, Stewart, George-Kelly, Burkush

Messrs.: M. Lamothe, A. Aldenberg, P. Chiesa, M. Barter

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

NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Island Pond Road, south side, from the dead-end to a point 190 feet westerly

Alderman Kantor

On Bartlett Street, west side, from Putnam Street to a point 75 feet north

Alderman Gamache

On Bridge Street, south side, from Belmont Street to a point 118 feet west

Alderman Fajardo

STOP SIGN

On Johnson Street at Gray Street, NE corner

Alderman Heath

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Mitchell Street, south side, from a point 100 feet east of Calef Road to a point 150 feet further east (ORD 10532)

Alderman Burkush

On Island Pond Road, south side, from the dead-end to a point 90 feet westerly (ORD9832)

Alderman Kantor

NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Manchester Street, south side, from Union Street to Pine Street

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 125 feet west of Union Street to Pine Street

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

ONE HOUR PARKING

On Manchester Street, north side, from Union Street to a point 125 feet west

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

RESCIND ONE HOUR PARKING

On Manchester Street, north side, from Union Street to a point 145 feet west of Union Street (ORD3281)

On Manchester Street, south side, from a point 282 feet east of Pine Street to Union Street (ORD9823)

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 290 feet west of Union Street to a point 100 feet west (ORD3282)

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 294 feet west of Union Street to a point 96 feet westerly (ORD9847)

On Manchester Street, south side, from a point 175 feet west of Union Street to a point 75 feet west (ORD8487)

On Manchester Street, south side, from a point 210 feet east of Pine Street to a point 72 feet easterly (ORD9848)

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

RESCIND NO PARKING HERE TO CORNER

On Manchester Street, south side, from Pine Street to a point 54 feet easterly (ORD9822)

On Manchester Street, north side, from Union Street to a point 33 feet westerly (ORD9821)

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 260 feet west of Union Street to a point 30 feet westerly (ORD7198)

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 390 feet west of Union Street to a point 30 feet west (ORD3283)

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE, 8AM-5PM, MON-FRI

On Manchester Street, north side, from a point 390 feet west of Union Street to a point 22 feet westerly (ORD9829)

Special Condition Traffic Ordinance

(Note: Special condition regulations will become effective immediately and will remain in effect until official ordinance is passed during regular business of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.)

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Stewart**, it was voted to approve.*

2. Status update from Ryan Cashin, Fire Chief, regarding Fire Station 9.

Matthew Lamothe, Assistant Fire Chief, stated good evening and thank you for allowing me to share the progress of the new Station 9. I am very proud of this project and I can honestly say that without the amazing build team that we have we wouldn't be where we are today. A special thanks to Fulcrum Associates and Matuszewski Architects. They really have been fully committed to the project from day one. They have been phenomenal to work with and they continue to keep the City's best interest as their top priority. Also, thanks to Josh, Eric, and Tara from DPW, Alderman Jim Burkush, Chief Cashin, Chris Blue, and Captain Bob Field from the Fire Department. Here we have the front of the station - two stories and two bays. We were able to move the footprint of the building back about thirty feet, which made for a bigger front ramp which is a lot of safer to turn the fire truck around. We'll no longer have to turn the truck around on Calef Road so that is a huge safety increase. Another big problem with the old fire house was water; water coming off the hill all the time and the basement was always flooded even without rain. When it rained, it was a lot worse. We were able to fix that with this new building by putting it into the hill. So, the water coming off the very small hill in the back now sheds around the building and we put in the proper drainage. This is a shot looking into the apparatus bay. You can see the two doors in the back. Those are the entry and exit to the decontamination room. That's a completely separate area from the rest of the station. When firefighters get back from fires, they enter the door on the left. They can put their gear into an extractor. There is a shower there for them to shower, grab new uniforms, new gear, come out the door on the right ready and clean for service. This is

looking into the front entry, so this would be the watch room. There will be a set of stairs there that go to the second floor. This is the north side of the building, with a pretty substantial retaining wall. Kudos to Captain Plantier who came up with the idea to use that retaining wall as a heights and rope rescue training area. We're going to put in two anchor points at the top there and any company in the city can come down and use that for heights training. Kudos to him. This is the back of the building exiting to grade. That's basically the top of the hill where the park is. This gives us a lot more overlook on the park. Like I said, the water problem is going to shed away from the building. This is the south side of the building where we have the kitchen area on the second floor. They are hanging dry wall. I was there today and a lot more drywall is done. The project is moving along very rapidly. This is one of the six bedrooms. This is the gym area overlooking Calef Road. This piece of equipment is what is known as a joker board. It was developed in 1844 and was used as a means of transporting street box alarms to individual fire stations. The technology was used across the U.S. until the late 1970s. The one you are looking at is currently on display at Station 7. Captain Plantier and Chris Blue were able to find another one at the Manchester Historic Association that was originally from the Vine Street station. They are going to restore it and it will be on permanent loan from the Historic Association to us and on display in the watch room at the new station. It is pretty cool to keep that history alive. The station is scheduled to be finished in early August and is currently on budget.

3. Proposal from the Police Department regarding body worn cameras.

Allen Aldenberg, Police Chief, stated good evening. We have provided some packets so I won't read word for word and insult your intelligence. I want to go through where we are at with our body worn cameras program and a path forward. At the end I'd just be seeking approval to take this to the full Board at the July meeting for a full presentation. That is what I am asking for this evening. I am going to provide a proposal of the strategy we'd like to follow and gain the committee's approval to proceed with. These items are expensive; I completely acknowledge that but they are needed to meet the expectations the community has of its police. In 2019, as you are aware, this Board voted for the implementation of body worn cameras for the Manchester Police Department. This was in response to the public's desire for greater accountability, transparency, and increased trust in policing. We continue our use of body worn cameras in moving to an enhanced phase of their use through initiating a long-term plan for the program including obtaining better equipment. In addition, we'll have a discussion about our taser program. Currently, we have the best less-lethal option for our officers. The community and this Board want us to have the best less-lethal use of force tools. We have countless stories of tasers saving lives and preventing significant injury to both officers and suspects. We want a sustainable plan for continued use of this technology. Finally, I'll touch on a digital evidence management proposal which would be covering a piece of nearly every investigation that we conduct. In 2023, we need the tools to manage this mountain of evidence and we need a tool that is compliant with federal requirements and meets the needs of our investigators, prosecutors, the courts, and defense counsel. In December 2022, we posted a body worn camera request for proposal. The RFP was posted due to ongoing issues that we were having with Utility, the current company that we utilize that outfits our body worn cameras. The department's invitation for bids closed on February 2, 2023. We received a total of six bids. The current contract holder is Utility. The initial contract term was for

December 2019 through December 2024. It was a five-year term. That was a \$1 million cost which we paid in full. The impetus for the department entering the RFP process was ongoing issues that we continue to have with Utility and their product. We are approximately 70% through the initial project that ends in December 2024. Based on the ongoing issues with that product and service, the department felt it necessary to explore other options. Up there you see our current system, and I'll touch on the issues that we're having. As you see on my vest right here, I have my body worn camera attached to my outer carrier. The issue with Utility is that they do not manufacture their own product. They purchase Samsung phones in bulk which are then outfitted with body worn camera software. This requires constant updates for hardware and mounts, and the devices are fixed through our uniform using mounts which is the photo on your left. This becomes an issue when the department sends a device back to Utility for replacement due to damage, which unfortunately occurs. In return, we receive a different version of the phone which requires a different mount. The mounts are not interchangeable with the different phone versions. This is compounded over time and the department recently had four different types of phones in circulation, all with different mounts. This creates significant issues keeping backup hardware in stock and getting the correct versions of the mount from Utility. Utility, the company, has no plans to manufacture their own product so this issue will continue with no proposed solutions from the company. In regards to the initial setup, it was not properly done when we went live with the system in December 2019 through no fault of the department. Our computer dispatch system was not integrated with the cameras properly which resulted in the advertised auto-tagging feature not to function. What the auto-tagging does is ensures videos are retained for an appropriate amount of time and immediately tagged with accurate case numbers. It requires no work on the officer's part; it happens automatically through the system. This was a significant issue that caused numerous videos to be unnecessarily deleted by the software's video retention system. In March 2022, the department requested to change video retention for unclassified videos from one year to three years. This was due to the large amount of unclassified videos the department had due to the issue caused by the poor initial setup. The solution was developed in conjunction with the County Attorney's Office due to cases being lost because of videos being deleted by retention issues. Despite what we felt was clear language allowing us to do this in our contract, Utility refused to change the retention default for unclassified videos. We and our personnel ended up changing hundreds of videos manually to try and resolve this issue ourselves. Another example is in 2021, the department ordered twenty new body camera packages to bring us up to complement. We were initially quoted \$85,000 by the sales vendor contracted by Utility. After our review of that contract, we felt we were being grossly overcharged. They responded with a second quote of \$67,000. Again, after reviewing the contract, we informed them that this was still not accurate. They finally properly quoted us at \$54,000, which was consistent with the contract. I think you're getting my point. We initially started to test body cameras back in 2019 under the prior administration. We had looked at Axon and Utility. Before the Utility contract was signed, a testing and evaluation was done by eight MPD officers both on Axon and Utility body cameras. Seven out of the eight officers who took part in the trial identified Axon as their preferred option and recommended the department purchase the Axon product. Again, in 2022 I decided to go after it again. Due to the ongoing issues with Utility, we conducted a second testing evaluation period with Axon. You can see on the chart, eight officers did it over a one-month period. As was the case in 2019, our officers overwhelmingly chose Axon as the superior product.

All eight officers in the trial strongly agreed that the department should transition from body worn to Axon. This means fifteen out of sixteen officers recommended Axon over Utility. Compared to other products, Axon cameras are easier to use, are durable, reliable, and are a very simple design. It is manufactured by Axon and Axon alone. Simply put, this camera allows our officers to focus on their job and alleviates the constant and ongoing issues that have occurred with the Utility product. It also immediately solves the Utility mount and hardware issue discussed earlier. Axon is the industry standard in body worn camera solutions. For that reason, that is our choice out of all the other bids that were received. Our city, particularly of late – it has been no secret, ask a great deal from our officers. They are regularly placed in life-threatening traumatic situations and expected to perform flawlessly. For the past forty months, our officers have been outfitted with the Utility product. The product has caused a great deal of frustration and angst due to constant performance issues. We are fortunate to have some of the best law enforcement officers in the country. They sacrifice and perform for our citizens on a daily basis. They deserve a top tier body worn product, which is what Axon provides. We have vetted Axon products thoroughly, and we are confident that it is by far the best product available. In your packet, I am providing you with some samples from police officers that have been on the streets for many years and have worn the current system and also some that tested and evaluated the Axon product. I'll leave those for you to read at your own leisure. The second part is the digital evidence management. That is what DEM is. It allows for departments to archive all forms of digital evidence directly to data servers. Currently, MPD officers collect digital evidence on a portable electronic media like a thumb drive. The media is then physically submitted to the evidence unit for long-term storage so that is available to subsequent investigative or prosecutorial efforts. Implementing a digital evidence management system platform would mean officers would no longer have to enclose disks and thumb drives in envelopes and store these in the evidence unit. Instead, they would upload the digital evidence to the DEM cloud server for storage using the same computers they are currently sitting at doing their police reports. Storing our evidence on portable media is an antiquated method to be quite frank. The cost savings alone justify moving to DEM. That coupled with the risk of long-term storage on portable electronic media makes the transition to a DEM platform a necessity. You will see that the cost of portable electronic media which is \$11,000 annually. The internal man hours that are devoted to storing this evidence and making it available to prosecutors, defense attorneys is extensive and quite frankly an antiquated way of doing business. We are wasting the time of our employees when they could be more efficient in other areas. We posted a RFP for a DEM using the same process we did with the body camera. We received the proposals. We come back to Axon as the industry leader, not only in body cameras but many law enforcement technology options. Their products, professionalism, and customer service, research and development are world class. In conjunction with their body worn cameras, our officers would have one website to store, access, and manage body worn camera video footage and all digital evidence. The last part of the package is the Axon taser which we currently have. We began using tasers as a less lethal tool in 2012. Since that time, it has become the department's most used and most effective less-lethal option. It has been utilized in hundreds of incidents as both a deterrent and an effective less-lethal tool for our officers. We currently have the Taser 7, which is on my chest, which we received in 2020. We are in year three of a five-year contract. The final portion of this proposal is a transition from Taser 7 to the latest version which is Axon's Taser 10. I'll discuss those benefits here shortly. The Taser 10 is a significant

advancement from Taser 7 in two critical areas: range and cartridge capacity. Those advancements will allow our officers to deal with armed and aggressive suspects from almost twice as far. We would go to 45 feet as opposed to 25 feet, and we will have eight additional opportunities for successful deployment. By that I mean ten cartridges versus the two that I currently have. This gives you a visual of it. Our officers receive constant and ongoing training in de-escalation, and the use of less-lethal options is a major part of that training. The extra range that Taser 10 provides would give our officers more time to process the suspects actions and use the tool more effectively. We recently sent two officers to the taser master instructor course that Axon provided. Both our officers described the device as a game changer and encouraged us to acquire them as soon as possible. A question I'm anticipating is why now. That's a very fair question, especially as we're in the middle of an existing contract. The response to that question has not been taken lightly. It comes after years of research, internal surveys, testing, and negotiations with our current product. For each item that we propose to purchase, it boils down to the following. Entering into a contract with Utility in 2019 for body worn cameras was a mistake. The product and services have constant issues which have caused a noticeable degradation of our officers' morale. Recognizing our mistake and moving to the product we should have had in the first place would be righting a wrong. Forcing our personnel to suffer an additional 18 months with an inferior product due to no fault of their own is unfair to the men and women who sacrifice so much on a daily basis. In regards to the digital evidence management, moving to a cloud-based digital evidence system from our current usage of portable electronic media will result in a net-savings in the department's operating expenses. It serves to better protect our digital evidence from corruption. It will also bring the department into the modern age of digital evidence storage, something that must happen at some point in the near future regardless of whether or not this specific proposal moves forward. It makes sense to have Axon DEM with body worn cameras as this would allow the department's evidence to be stored in one silo or what Axon refers to as evidence.com. Finally, in regards to Taser 10, with the adoption of both body worn cameras and DEM, the department would be receiving a credit for the remaining years of our Taser 7 contract. Most importantly, we would be one of the first departments in the country to outfit our officers with the Taser 10, which is the most advanced and effective less-lethal tool on the market. The upgrade from the 7 to the 10 alone justify this transition. Also, the fact that we are able to bundle the 10 and contract with the body cameras and DEM, makes it a perfect time to move forward with this transition. Keep in mind that the Taser 7 contract will be expiring in the beginning of 2025. It is highly likely that I'd be coming back to this committee again to request money for a new taser contract in a matter of only months. Cost. Axon is quoting us a six-year contract. This has been months, and honestly some painful months, of negotiations between Axon and ourselves. This contract includes a credit for the two remaining years of our taser contract as I mentioned and a credit on our current taser hardware. As you can see the price there over six years is \$4.2 million. Total savings by doing the bundle is \$808,000. With that, I'll gladly take your questions but like I said in the beginning I'm requesting this evening to take this to the full Board for their consideration as well.

Alderman Long asked are we current in a contract with Utility.

Chief Aldenberg stated yes, we are until December 2024.

Alderman Long asked is there a cost to getting out of that contract.

Chief Aldenberg stated no we have paid it in full. That's part of the painful process. To be frank with you, there are many police departments across the country that are transitioning from Utility and going to Axon. They have many of the same concerns we have. Axon has been trying to work with us to work in some discounts so that we are in a roundabout way recouping some of the money that we've already paid to Utility through built in discounts.

Alderman Long asked what was the yearly cost that we're going to lose to Utility.

Chief Aldenberg stated at this point we're 70% through the contract. We paid them \$1 million. So, we're right around \$300,000.

Alderman Long asked with the six-year contract, what is the life of this equipment.

Chief Aldenberg stated right now it is the Axon body worn camera 3, and they'll be coming out with Axon 4, which would be built into our agreement. So eventually we would get the latest version of the Axon camera.

Alderman Long asked what is the life span. Are they coming out every year?

Chief Aldenberg stated the Axon 3 has been in service in the field for three to four years.

Alderman Long stated the total contract cost is \$4.2 million but if we bundle it is only \$808,000.

Chief Aldenberg responded no; we're saving \$808,000.

Alderman Stewart stated I appreciate the presentation. I want to preface my comments by saying I am very supportive of body worn cameras and less-lethal technology in particular. It increases trust from the public to the department, and accountability for our law enforcement as well to the public. This is a big jump in what we're paying, almost tripling by my account on a yearly basis. I appreciate that often times you get what you pay for. I definitely want that to be the case. With regard to the current contract which you said would be about a \$300,000 loss, since we have paid it in full, it sounds, based on the way you're describing it, that there may be grounds for breach of contract on their part. Can we get any of that money back?

Chief Aldenberg stated we have had those preliminary discussions with the City Solicitor's Office. I don't want to speak on their behalf, but I think that is a long gap to bridge. I think that's a high bar to reach. Maybe Peter wants to jump in. In fairness to him, he probably hasn't been completely brought in on this but I think it may be a difficult thing. It may not be worth the cost to pursue such a thing, perhaps.

Peter Chiesa, Deputy City Solicitor, we are willing to take a look and explore whatever resolutions we can get on the city's behalf. I'm not personally familiar with the contract

but I know attorneys in our office have looked at it and the situation. It is currently under review.

Alderman Stewart stated \$300,000 is a lot of money. I think it would be a good idea to investigate if we could. I'm curious on the taser and the almost doubling of capacity with regard to length from 25 to 45 feet. Certainly, you'll appreciate the non-lethal measures that we can use as a preference for that. Can you tell me would this have made a difference in the recent law enforcement shooting on Mammoth Road?

Chief Aldenberg stated the short answer is no.

Chairman Barry stated I'm sure you're aware that Alderman Long has been working hard on our budget and we're presenting it tonight. This isn't quoted in the budget.

Chief Aldenberg stated it is not. That is why I want to take it to the full Board and maybe have discussions if there is an opportunity to bond this project or at least get the discussion going.

Alderman Long stated I believe it was in the last budget we gave you an IT person to download these cameras. I thought it was in the last budget.

Chief Aldenberg asked you mean the server.

Alderman Long stated yes. We gave you an employee for an IT person to download these cameras into a server. I'm hearing you don't need that.

Chief Aldenberg responded no, I do. He's still doing that work.

Alderman Long stated so the officers aren't doing it themselves. They turn them over to the IT person and they do the download?

Chief Aldenberg stated as the videos are requested by prosecutors, defense counsel, etc., that person is handling that on a daily basis.

Alderman Long stated they are overseeing making sure they are staying in there. I'm hearing you're losing some data.

Chief Aldenberg replied yes.

Alderman Long asked and that is on Utility's cameras.

Chief Aldenberg answered yes.

Chairman Barry asked have you checked with any federal funding or grants that might be used for this.

Chief Aldenberg stated we have and what I have learned is we don't qualify. I know there was some State money that was provided but that is for smaller police

departments and we're way above the threshold. Obviously, we will continue to look but I don't see us qualifying for any of those federal grants.

Alderman Long stated it will have to come after the budget. We're doing the budget tonight.

Chief Aldenberg asked so the July meeting.

Chairman Barry stated our budget has to be done before June 30.

Alderman Long stated it won't be in the 2024 budget but it will be a bonding question put to the aldermen afterwards. It will be a presentation on July 11.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to have the Police Department make a presentation on body worn cameras to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at its July 11, 2023 meeting.*

4. Communication from Allen Aldenberg, Police Chief, requesting support in purchasing video camera trailers to be used at special events in Manchester.

Chief Aldenberg stated I could tell you missed me. I'll be brief because I believe you were provided this letter that I submitted back on May 25. Fortunately, or unfortunately, depending on how you look at it, but I think it's a fortunate thing that our city has seen an increase in major special events which bring a lot of people to our downtown. They enhance our sense of community, bring economic revenue, and make Manchester a destination. The Police Department is proud to be part of supporting those events. Along with that comes some unique public safety considerations. I think you can look around the country and there have been so many concerning incidents at many public events across the country which cause me concern as Chief of Police. They have also caused us internally over the past year to two years when we have large scale events to make sure we have some additional security measures in place; some that are seen and some that are not. The most recent thing was we worked during the Donald Trump's visit about two months ago. On loan, we borrowed a video camera trailer from the University of New Hampshire. The benefits of that trailer, which we found, were real-time situational awareness, deterrents of criminal or potential terrorist activity, ability to provide first responders with detailed information about an emergency, and quick and accurate assessments. Again, that was on loan from UNH. We found it to be very useful and beneficial. We were also able to connect that through the technology we already had on hand. So, we're getting real-time intelligence on the event which can be life-changing and can save lives and make sure we're allocating resources properly. What I am requesting is I think this discussion is important. With any technology that we bring before this board, I think it is important to the public an opportunity to digest this and come back and make public comments as they see fit or appropriate. I think that is fair. That's the practice we want to maintain. I think it is important to remember that this will not be deployed randomly throughout the city nor is it to be used to increase surveillance in certain neighborhoods. That is not the intent here. Like we have done with other technology, we will develop a policy to track the number of deployments, the number of times its deployed, why it was deployed, and for which event it was used. That information would be available to this Board and to the public upon request. I'm

prepared to fund this trailer out of my current FY23 budget. The most recent quote we received is \$40,000 but again I'm prepared to take this out of my budget with this Board's approval. Obviously, I'm not doing that unilaterally. I would like this to be referred out to the full Board for the July meeting as well to give the opportunity to the public to digest this over the next month and to bring in any concerns or questions that they may have.

Alderman Long asked does this cut down on officers' hours. You're not chasing things if you have a real-time camera.

Chief Aldenberg stated no but you can kind of put this maybe where we don't want to put officers. When we used it for the Donald Trump event, we used this and it gave us better eyes on the ground.

Alderman Long stated so you didn't need as many officers.

Chief Aldenberg answered no. Lieutenant Barter was at the EOC over at the Fire Department. He was able to view through that platform what was taking place.

Matthew Barter, Lieutenant, stated for example with the Taco Tour we were able to get a view of Elm Street and Hanover Street. So, we could really understand who was down there for crowd size and also if something were to occur, we'd have that in real-time.

Alderman Stewart stated it is definitely interesting and I can see the benefit of something like this for Taco Tour and other large events because you are right, we have seen across this country a number of very unfortunate and sometimes deadly incidents in big crowd situations. I was pleased to read in the comments and to hear Chief say this won't be deployed randomly for neighborhood surveillance or anything other than big events and also that there will be a policy attached to this. I'm curious when this comes back to the Board next month, will that policy accompany this request so we can see exactly how it's going to be used?

Chief Aldenberg replied we could have a draft policy. If we can't develop a draft policy in thirty days, then we've got bigger problems.

Alderman Stewart stated I think it would dissuade some fears in regard to how and when it is going to be used.

Chief Aldenberg stated the second we violate the public trust we will have issues. I hear you. We will do that.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to approve the request contingent upon the submittal of a draft policy to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen at its July 11, 2023 meeting.*

5. Communication from the City Solicitor's Office recommending that the citizen proposal for an amendment to ordinance Section 71: Snow Emergency Regulations not be adopted.

Alderman Long stated the proposal from the citizen, Ms. Drociak, was what we had discussed for authorized overtime for four officers and authorizes overtime for the Parking Division in enforcing this. It is the same conversation. I did speak with the Solicitor who said that there is somebody in her office that is working on this. In the past when it has been proposed, it goes into statute and other ordinances that would get messed up so they are looking for a clearer proposal to come to us. Would that be coming in the July meeting, Mr. Chiesa?

Mr. Chiesa responded that should hopefully be the case. I know there are ongoing discussions between MPD, DPW, and our office to finalize language. There is proposed language. It just needs to be finalized but I see no reason why it couldn't come before the July meeting.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to table the item.*

6. Communication from Christopher Goodnow, Parking Manager, regarding a request from Chaos and Kindness to use Arms Lot for their Skyshow event scheduled for Saturday, August 26, 2023 (rain date of August 27) with set-up on Friday, August 25.

Alderman Long stated we have two weeks. Well actually we have longer. July 11 is our next meeting. I will approve this contingent upon a meeting with Cotton, Stark Mill, and Common Man. We'll also be inviting the Police to see if we can work out any of the issues that we had last year.

***Alderman Long** moved to approve the request contingent upon a meeting with City staff and abutters.*

Alderman George-Kelly asked to their satisfaction.

Alderman Long stated not necessarily to their satisfaction. Sometimes they ask for a little more. However, we have two weeks. It will be between the next Aldermanic meeting.

Chairman Barry stated we will be able to discuss it again in Public Safety and then bring it to the full Board.

Alderman Long stated no, actually it will be at the full Board. We'll discuss it at the full Board.

Alderman George-Kelly asked do we know if they have enough time to market and be prepared if it's not up for a vote until mid-July. Do we know if that is enough time for Chaos and Kindness to do marketing and planning?

Alderman Long stated that's the normal process. We approve this today, and then at the next meeting the full Board would approve it. My motion is to approve it contingent upon the meeting, which I'm hoping they don't give me hard time about meeting with the businesses and I'll have that meeting prior to our July 11 meeting.

Alderman Stewart duly seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

7. Communication the Parking Manager regarding a request from City On A Hill to use Arms Lot from Thursday, September 14 through Sunday, September 17, 2023, for their Hope Over America event.

On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Burkush**, it was voted to approve.

8. Communication from the Parking Manager regarding a request from Able-NH to use a portion of Arms Lot for their Disability Justice Festival scheduled for October 14, 2023.

On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to approve.

9. Communication from the Parking Manager regarding a request from Millennium Running to use a portion of Arms Lot as home base for their Trick or Trot 3K road race scheduled for October 28, 2023.

On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Stewart**, it was voted to approve.

TABLED ITEM

10. Communication from Christopher Goodnow, Parking Manager, regarding an inquiry from Brad Pernaw in reference to parking in front of the Common Man Roadside restaurant at 451 Commercial Street.

(Note: Items #1 and #3 of the request were received and filed at the 9/6/2022 committee meeting. Item #2 regarding the installation of a park & pay kiosk is the only item on the table.)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Burkush**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.



Clerk of Committee