

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH & TRAFFIC

May 3, 2022 at 5:45 PM

Chairman Barry called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

Messrs.: A. Aldenberg, K. Clarke, M. Dugas, B. Pratt, E. LeClair, P. Chiesa

1. Presentation from representatives of the NHDOT regarding road safety audits at South Willow Street (NH 28)/Sheffield Road and Cilley Road/Jewett Street.

Kristen Clarke, Department of Public Works, stated good evening. As mentioned in the letter that we submitted, the Department of Public Works applied for two road safety audits through the New Hampshire DOT. Mike Dugas, the State Highway Safety Engineer, is here tonight to give us a presentation on the process, the findings, and what the next steps are as quickly as he can.

Mike Dugas, New Hampshire Department of Transportation, stated good evening and thank you for allowing me to come before you tonight. As Kristen said, I'll present the findings of two recent road safety audits. My agenda will be brief; I'll try to keep this as quick as possible. I'll describe first of all my role at the DOT and the Highway Safety Improvement Program, and what that is and how it is important to these studies. I'll talk about what a road safety audit is as it might be a new term to many of you. Then I'll go into a little bit of detail on the two sites that were studied and the recommendations that came out of those studies. So first of all, as a State Highway Safety Engineer, my principle duty is to deliver the state's Highway Safety Improvement Program. That is essentially the \$12 million, roughly, of federal funds that we receive every year for making infrastructure safety improvements across the state. Those funds are typically 90% federal with a 10% match. Usually the match is state, but there are circumstances that change that. All public roads are eligible. One of the means that we use to identify candidate projects is road safety audits. What is a road safety audit? It is a formal safety evaluation of a site and it is performed by a multi-disciplinary team. It's not simply engineers looking at a site; we also want to involve in this case city DPW, Police, administration folks, neighbors, business owners, etc. to get a comprehensive understanding of the problems at the site and try to capture the full range of possible ways to treat those problems. In this case, we worked with the city and also the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission as part of the road safety audit team. It's important to understand that the sites that we study are selected by the community; both sites here were chosen by the city. The goal of the audit is to improve safety for all users, not only motorized traffic but non-motorized also and in all conditions, so day or night and at all times of the year. The outcome of the audit is a report that documents the existing conditions and suggests a possible range of alternatives and recommends a course of action. The entire process is meant to be consensus-based, so the team is in agreement on the problems and the solutions. I'll talk about the two sites that we studied now. The first site that I'll present is Cilley Road at Jewett Street and South Jewett Street. This is a four-way stop intersection today and traffic volume is just over 6,000 on both axis through the intersection. Some of the history that led to the city's

application for a road safety audit is the crash history shows there were 57 crashes in five years. Of those, two resulted in serious injuries and ten lesser injuries. Some of the common patterns of crashes that we saw out there were right angle crashes. Essentially, a failure to yield or a failure to properly yield or yield long enough resulting in collisions. Usually those crashes involved a southbound vehicle colliding with an eastbound or westbound vehicle. One of the principle hazards that we identified in our review were limited sight lines, principally in the northwest corner of the intersection. There is a retaining wall right on the back of the sidewalk so it's a severe sight constraint. Also, simply in the busiest times of the day, drivers had a difficult chore determining priority and who goes next when the vehicles are arriving simultaneously at the stop signs. A range of alternatives that we presented are here. Customarily, in a road safety audit we will develop these alternatives into three categories. Short-term, which are low cost measures that typically are inexpensive enough that the city could pursue them on their own through their DPW activities. Medium-term options are typically a little bit more costly but may involve more coordination, so for example it might involve coordination with a property owner for property impacts. Then long-term options are typically higher cost but also offer a more comprehensive solution to the issues. Among the short term options, we identified potential improvements to both signs and pavement markings. Medium term solutions could include improvements to the sight distance. In fact, on the day of the audit, Kristen was able to call DPW and have them address some overhanging vegetation that was limiting sight lines. This also identified the possible improvements to a turning path, so redefining the radius as traffic is turning right through one of the corners. Then finally, two long term options were considered: either installing traffic signals to replace the stop signs or installing a roundabout. Roundabouts are our customary consideration at the DOT and have been for a decade or more now. However, as part of this audit we found that a roundabout really didn't fit because of the tight constraints on the four corners and the way we would need to customize or modify a roundabout to have it fit would really be unexpected and unfamiliar to most of the drivers. I don't think it would be a good fit for this location. Ultimately, the traffic signal was identified as the city's preferred alternative for this location. The second site I'll discuss is the intersection of South Willow Street and Sheffield Road. You can see the traffic volume at this intersection is just over 9,000 along South Willow and about 2,600 on Sheffield Road on the east side. It's important to note that in this location, unlike the first site that I described, South Willow Street is state maintained. So this is outside the city's control. Sheffield Road, on both sides of the intersection, is city maintained. Sheffield, as you know, connects from Harvey Road just off the image to the left heading off to the east towards Mammoth Road off the image to the right. The principal turns at the intersection are drivers making southbound left turns from South Willow to Sheffield and then the return movement in the afternoon. Here is a street level view of the intersection looking north and south, and I think what is really noticeable in this photo is how hidden the west side of Sheffield is in both of these images. The crash history that was identified for this site involved 62 crashes over ten years; one resulting in a serious injury and nineteen in lesser injuries. Twenty of those 62 were right angle crashes, so vehicles on South Willow colliding with vehicles turning to or from Sheffield Road. Twenty were rear-end crashes. One of the hazards that was identified, the principal hazard included on South Willow was the lack of left-turn lanes. So anybody that's waiting to make a left turn does not have the benefit or refuge to sit within. Also the high speeds along South Willow Street traffic both north and southbound. Along Sheffield Road, the visibility is quite poor at least on the west side of

the intersection because of the heavy vegetation. Sheffield also has a steep down grade approaching South Willow from the west. The visibility issues are pretty easy to take care of. The grades are much less so. The range of alternatives that were developed, similar in some ways to what was shown at Cilley and Jewett Streets, identify potential changes or improvements to both signs and doing some tree clearing at the intersection. For medium term, and these were really the most interesting alternatives identified, we have the partial or full closure of Sheffield Road on the west of the intersection. That would eliminate a lot of the most hazardous movements that happen at the intersection. Connections would still be available fairly conveniently by Harvey Road just north. Of course, Sheffield is a city street so that decision is entirely the city's to make. A second alternative that was presented was the possible addition of left turn lanes, at least southbound and perhaps even northbound if Sheffield Road remains open. Other potential improvements could include improvements to pavement friction, making it less likely for traffic to slide in the downhill direction coming from the west or make it easier to accelerate as they climb towards South Willow Street from the east. The last medium term recommendation was improving drainage. It was identified that poor drainage leads to icing in the winter which can lead to collisions at the intersection. Lastly, the only long-term option that was identified was improving the approach grade on Sheffield Road from the east so that traffic has a pretty steep grade to contend with as they're pulling out of the stop sign. That's shown as a long term improvement only because of the coordination and the impacts that could result to the neighboring properties as we look to perhaps raise the grade on that side of Sheffield Road. So for potential next steps, we did identify as part of both audits that both sites are candidates for HSIP funding. The critical factor we look at is the benefit to cost ratio. We found in both locations that the benefit of the safety improvement outweighs the cost of the improvements to achieve those benefits. In the case of the first location at Cilley and Jewett, an improvement fully within the city's jurisdiction would typically follow the DOT's LPA, Local Public Agency process, where a project would be managed by the city. In this case the funding for the project would be 90% federal and 10% match by the city. Funds for that project could be available as soon as next year. It really depends on how long the project takes to develop. At the second location, because it is within the state's jurisdiction, it would most likely be a DOT managed project where the state would be the 10% match on the project cost. In this case, because the project is more involved than simply installing traffic signals, the schedule would really be dictated by what alternative is selected. Most importantly, the selected option, if it involves private property, would be more costly and take more time to deliver a project. So really, the project details would dictate how quickly it happens. It could begin as soon as the next several months. Funds are available to begin the engineering for a project in this location. So I present both those locations for you and really the question to the city is do you support proceeding with projects at either or both these locations.

Alderman Long stated thank you for the presentation, that's great. With respect to the city's funding, when would that be?

Mr. Dugas responded it really depends on when the city chooses to move ahead with the project. If we're talking about Cilley and Jewett, it could be as soon as the next fiscal year which for us begins October 2022.

Alderman Long asked if the city approved that we move forward on this, are these in our queue or do we still have to go through the state process and wait for a decision. I'm sure there are a lot of projects that you have to look at within the state and approve who gets what funding.

Mr. Dugas stated right. In this case, we do have funds available partly because the new bi-partisan infrastructure law did add funding to our programs, with safety in addition to that.

Alderman Long stated so we would be in the queue if we approve this. It would be a go?

Mr. Dugas responded right.

Alderman Sharonov stated for the Cilley and Jewett Street intersection, the city would pay the 10% match. Would that be taken out of the DPW's budget or do we need to allocate extra money from somewhere else?

Ms. Clarke answered it would be something we would request from CIP probably next year at this point.

Alderman Sharonov asked do you have a range in how much 10% would be; the dollar amount.

Ms. Clarke stated I can't imagine...for the engineering and the design and construction it would be under \$500,000 total so \$50,000.

Alderman Stewart stated I'm curious to know...I saw the traffic volumes on there too and I just want to clarify that those do justify a traffic signal at that intersection.

Ms. Clarke stated yes. We did a signal warrant analysis in 2018 and it did meet three of the warrants. I think the four hour warrant because of the schools, there is a lot of heavier traffic there at those times, and the crash history warrant. So a signal is warranted and we brought that to this Board and the direction was to try to figure out if there was a way to get any state match to fund it.

Chairman Barry asked Kristen, what would our next step be to go forward with both of them.

Ms. Clarke stated Sheffield and South Willow is ready to go now.

Mr. Dugas stated Sheffield and South Willow would really be in the DOT's hands to create a project and begin the engineering. The details of the alternative would emerge from the typical process that we follow for preliminary design and public outreach for both the city officials and the abutters. That would all be in our hands. For the Cilley and Jewett project, Kristen I believe is familiar with our LPA process, so she would coordinate with the folks at DOT who manage that process.

Chairman Barry stated I'm assuming on Jewett and Cilley, you're looking to install lights.

Ms. Clarke stated yes.

Chairman Barry stated okay so that's your recommendation. On Sheffield what's your recommendation?

Mr. Dugas stated again, that will emerge. That will evolve as we go through our typical preliminary design process. We can't, because we're using federal funds, say this is our chosen alternative. We have to investigate the benefits and costs of the range of alternatives. I would say if I had to guess, it would likely recommend left turn lanes and perhaps improvements to Sheffield on the west. Then again, it's up to the city whether you want to consider closing it partially or fully.

Chairman Barry asked so would it be up to the committee for us to give you the okay to move forward.

Mr. Dugas stated yes it is certainly beneficial to us to have the city's endorsement on moving ahead with the design project.

Alderman Stewart moved to authorize moving forward with the two projects. Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Sharonov stated regarding the cost for South Willow and Sheffield, the state would pay 10% match and the other 90% is federal money.

Mr. Dugas stated that is correct.

Alderman Sharonov replied so it is no cost to the city.

Ms. Clarke stated yes, it outside of the urban compact.

Alderman Sharonov stated okay I'm comfortable moving forward.

Mr. Dugas stated the only potential involvement of city funds is if we have to relocate as part of the project city-owned utilities.

Alderman Long asked with respect to Cilley and Jewett, was the crash history prior to the four-way stop or during the four-way stop. It says 2013 to 2017.

Ms. Clarke stated the four-way stop was there.

Alderman Stewart stated this is a great idea. I love that the state was able to be brought in. I appreciate the work that the DOT has done. To the extent that we can do this more across the city is a good thing. To improve traffic safety has always been a priority of mine. To the extent that the state can be a partner in that, everybody wins. So thank you.

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

2. The Traffic Division has submitted an agenda which needs to be addressed:
NO PARKING ANYTIME
On Lake Shore Road, east side, from Candia Road to 1581 Lake Shore Road
Alderman Sharonov
RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME
On Lake Shore Road, east side, from Minot Street to a point 200 feet north (ORD 10431)
Alderman Sharonov

**SIGNAGE CHANGES TO REMOVE SCHOOL ZONE/PARKING
REGULATIONS AT HALLSVILLE SCHOOL:**

- RESCIND NO STANDING, STOPPING, OR PARKING 7AM-3PM, MON-FRI**
On Jewett Street, east side from Hayward Street to Merrill Street - Busses Only (ORD 10518)
Alderman Heath
RESCIND NO STANDING, STOPPING, OR PARKING 7AM-9AM AND 2PM-3PM, SCHOOL DAYS
On Jewett Street, west side, from Merrill Street to Hayward Street (ORD 10517)
Alderman Heath
RESCIND SCHOOL ZONE 8:00-8:45 AM AND 2:50-3:35 PM
On Jewett Street between Valley Street and Young Street (ORD 10500)
On Hayward Street between Cypress Street and Woodman Street (ORD 10502)
On Merrill Street between Jewett Street and Woodman Street (ORD 10501)
Alderman Heath
RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME (LIVE PARKING ONLY DURING SCHOOL HOURS)
On Hayward Street, north side, from Jewett Street to a point 160 feet east (ORD 9310)
Alderman Heath
RESCIND HANDICAP PARKING ONLY
On Merrill Street, south side, from a point 2015 feet east of Jewett Street to a point 40 feet east (ORD 10628)
Alderman Heath
RESCIND LIVE PARKING FOR PICK-UP AND DROP-OFF ONLY DURING SCHOOL HOURS
On Merrill Street, south side, from Jewett Street to a point 180 feet east (ORD 10626)
Alderman Heath

On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Sharonov**, it was voted to approve the Traffic Division Agenda.

3. Communication from Denise Boutilier, Parking Manager, regarding a request from Kyle Davis of Queen City Pride Festival seeking approval to use the Arms Lot for their event on June 18, 2022.

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

4. Special events update from the Police Department, if available.

Allen Aldenberg, Chief of Police, stated good evening, Aldermen. Special events for the next thirty days. As you know, this Thursday will be the Taco Tour. The EOC will be up and running up at the Fire Department. That will include Fire, Police, and EMS representation in the EOC so we can monitor that event. On May 7 is a ten-miler at Arms Park. That results in some temporary closures on Granite Street. On May 15 is a Walk Against Hunger that will leave from Veterans Park through downtown to the area of 199 Manchester Street. On May 28 is a Walk to Cure Arthritis at the Delta Dental Stadium. On May 29 is a 5k for veterans, again at the stadium. On May 30 is the Memorial Day Parade. I want to highlight, as you know, this past weekend the DEA National Drug Takeback Event took place. I think it is important to highlight the total for the City of Manchester; we took in 23 boxes of prescription drugs which totaled approximately 668 pounds of prescription drugs. Kudos to the citizens of Manchester who took the time to stop by the three locations and discard their prescription drugs that can be of grave harm in the wrong hands.

TABLED ITEMS

5. Communication from Fuss & O'Neill requesting approval for the following in reference to the W. Auburn and Depot Street development projects:
1. Temporary Depot Street Closure for demolition.
 2. Temporary City Lot Closure (Tax Map 930, Lot 6) for temporary contractor parking and material storage.
 3. Dedicated Loading Spaces and Conversion of Depot Street Parking Permit Enforcement Time from 8 PM to 6 PM.

6. Traffic ordinances related to W. Auburn & Depot Street projects:

NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Depot Street, south side, from Canal Street to a point 35 feet east

Alderman Long

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE

On Depot Street, south side, from a point 35 feet west of Canal Street to a point 45 feet further east

Alderman Long

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE 7 AM-3:30 PM, MON-SAT

On Depot Street, north side, from a point 20 feet west of Hampshire Lane to a point 25 feet further west

Alderman Long

METERS- 10 HOURS 8 AM-6 PM, MON-FRI

On Depot Street, north side, Elm Street to Hampshire Lane

On Depot Street, north side, from a point 45 feet west of Hampshire Lane to Canal Street

On Depot Street, south side, from Elm Street to a point 162 feet east of Canal Street

Alderman Long

RESCIND METERS- 10 HOURS 8 AM-10 PM, MON-SAT

On Depot Street from Elm Street to Canal Street, both sides (ORD 8256)

Alderman Long

RESCIND METERS- 10 HOURS 8 AM-8 PM, MON-FRI

On Depot Street, north side, Elm Street to Hampshire Lane (ORD 8397)
Alderman Long

RESCIND METERS- 10 HOURS

On Depot Street, north side, from a point 45 feet west of Hampshire Lane to Canal Street (ORD 8398)
Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING LOADING ZONE 7 AM-3:30 PM MON-SAT

On Depot Street, north side, from Hampshire Lane to a point 20 feet west (ORD 8389)
Alderman Long

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Stewart**, it was voted to remove items five and six from the table.*

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, stated the traffic regulations on item six are actually related to post-construction so those don't need to be expedited. If you're going to approve item five, you want to approve item six but we won't need to report out item six tonight.

Alderman Long asked so we don't have to vote on item six.

Clerk Normand replied items five and six are both together related to the project. They are asking to have item five reported out this evening if this committee approves it tonight.

Alderman Long stated the temporary Depot Street closure for demolition I am okay with. Those cars are parked and where they're going to be demolishing a building, that's not a good thing. Loading space and parking conversion on Depot Street I get. This is in the center city and it's a tight spot for construction. I have a couple of questions for the temporary contractor parking and materials storage if Brian or Eric could step up. So this is the parking lot on Canal and Granite Street correct? My understanding is that we did find UNH a location.

Brian Pratt, Fuss & O'Neill, correct.

Alderman Long asked are the developers paying for those or just paying the addition of those.

Mr. Pratt answered we have explored a few different options. Just to give you some background, there is a parking lot at the corner of Granite and Canal that has approximately 24 spaces in it. Nineteen of those, UNH has been leasing at \$60 a month from the city. We had a few options. We want to use the whole lot for our staging, contractors' parking and whatnot. We reached out to UNH to try to find some options for them to relocate those spaces temporarily while we're doing construction. We explored a few options, and the one that is coming to fruition is working with Southern New Hampshire University. They have a surplus lot at 33 South Commercial. We've been in coordination with them and they are willing to lease 19 spaces directly to UNH for the

same price that they have been paying the city. So we have been doing the coordination and are happy to install and pay for the signage, but UNH will pay SNHU directly the \$60 a month.

Alderman Long asked you're looking for the use of Canal and Granite Street parking lot.

Mr. Pratt responded correct.

Alderman Long asked for free.

Mr. Pratt stated that's the request.

Eric LeClair, JSIP Manchester QOZB LLC, stated at no cost; that's correct.

Alderman Long stated I don't know what the ramification of that is as far as being a liability on us. It is our parking lot.

Mr. LeClair stated we are happy to indemnify or release the city of any liability while we're in use of this surface lot during the time of the temporary closure. That's something we've done in the past with other municipalities. We're happy to do that here as well.

Peter Chiesa, Deputy City Solicitor, stated typically alderman, there will be a Certificate of Insurance that we would require. Perhaps that would be the best mode to insulate the city from any liability that might arise from the site.

Alderman Long asked Peter, if there was a cost associated with this would that also be the same thing or does it worked differently when you lease it.

Mr. Chiesa answered insurance wouldn't be a cost to the city. We would ask that the contractor supply us with a Certificate of Insurance that they have liability insurance for that particular use.

Alderman Long replied so that would be the same process if we were to lease it to them. They would do the same thing.

Mr. Chiesa stated yes; it would be the same as if we charged them.

Alderman Long stated it would be up to the Board. It's tight; it's in the center-city. I worked in areas of major cities where they give out lots to accommodate the construction so it would be up to the full Board eventually. I'm good with the insurance indemnification and letting them use the city lot.

Chairman Barry asked you are going to take over the nineteen spaces plus one at no cost or are you going to pay the city for those spots.

Mr. LeClair stated based upon our conversations to date with city staff, there is no charge for the use of that surface lot during the time of the temporary closure.

Alderman Sharonov stated just to clarify, that's no cost for how long. What's the period of time you're going to be using it for?

Mr. LeClair stated the request is 24 months. If construction can occur in less than that time period then obviously we will alert the city and turn it back over to the city for operational use as a public parking lot.

Alderman Sharonov stated okay+ but the request right now is for two years.

Mr. LeClair stated correct, 24 months.

Alderman Long stated we are losing the revenue because SNHU is getting the revenue. So for two years that's \$29,640 of revenue we're losing. Would you consider giving us a lease?

Mr. LeClair stated based upon the overall cost of the project that we're trying to wrestle down and the mitigants that we're trying to secure to minimize those costs, and the overall economic benefits to the city as well as the future tax revenue, it's something that we've discussed as giving us the ability to have room around our urban site. It's essentially all being developed and we don't have a lot of footprint to maneuver. There are cost effective ways to build the project and there are not cost effective ways when you have to bring in a crane and you don't have the surface area. This gives our construction site some breathing room and flexibility. If there is some compensation that you're looking for, we are all ears.

Alderman Long stated I think it is fair. As far as the parking goes, we're losing minimal revenue on that. It's not closing Depot and West Central to all parking. You've got some loading zones. I'm not looking for that, but we are losing I think \$65 a spot, or \$60 a spot.

Mr. LeClair stated Alderman Long, just to add, there are going to be several hundred construction workers that will be working on the property throughout the 24 months' duration. Those construction workers do need to find parking spaces elsewhere in the city. Once we get to a point where we've engaged and hired those contractors and sub-contractors, they will be spending money as part of the construction plan to park those employees at various lots throughout the city. So although it may be perceived that there is some lost revenue on these spaces short-term, given the amount of volume of construction workers and activity as a result of the actual construction, I don't have a number off the top of my head to relay to you but there will be ample income stream to other businesses and to other city-owned lots as a result of this project being built.

Alderman Long asked the contractor is going to pay for the employees to park somewhere.

Mr. LeClair stated yes. It is the contractor's job to figure out where everyone is going to park and how to facilitate all of that.

Alderman Long stated boy, I never got that benefit when I was working in Boston. I had to pay for my own parking and it was expensive.

Mr. LeClair stated I'm not saying that's the case for every sub-contractor.

Alderman Long stated like I said, the parking, that's not determined. I don't know if there is a likelihood that the full Board would give you the lot. That's what I'm saying. I'm trying to figure it out. We're losing \$1,140 a month. I don't know, do you want to make an offer? Make an offer of zero, then we'll have to make an offer.

Mr. LeClair stated given that it is a month-to-month contract, our understanding with UNH...if there is a number that you're looking to be compensated for we're happy...

Alderman Long interjected \$800 a month. I don't know why I'm negotiating. It should be everybody.

Mr. LeClair stated we hadn't proposed anything because we hadn't had this conversation. We're happy to offer 50% of what you were originally getting if that's helpful.

Chairman Barry stated we could have Denise figure that out.

Alderman Long stated so that is \$650 or so at \$60 times 19. So \$650? Would that be amenable?

Mr. LeClair asked \$650 a month.

Alderman Long responded yes.

Mr. LeClair stated sure. We would be happy to do that.

Chairman Barry stated honestly the way I look at it I think it should be 100% because we're losing nineteen spots. That's what UNH was paying us for. Now they're going to SNHU and paying them so the city is not getting anything. By rights, you guys should be paying the whole thing. That's my opinion. I think it's only fair. We worked with you on this. We wanted to do what we could to get you there but when you're taking up twenty spaces...we've had a hard time in this city the past few years because of COVID that we've lost so much revenue for parking. It's up to the committee but I would make a motion to have them pay 100% because I think it's only fair. We're losing that; if it was an empty lot and we weren't losing any parking revenue at all I'd be fine with it but I don't like the idea of giving away spaces that we were getting money for.

Alderman George-Kelly stated I think that paying the 50% feels like putting forth an effort and contributing something back to the city. I think there is something to be said for the number of parking spaces they're going to have to pay for with all of the employees that are coming in during construction. I think the original ask of zero is not something I'm willing to move forward but I do feel like the \$650 a month is a good middle ground to meet part way.

Chairman Barry asked you guys got a pretty big break with 79-E also, right.

Mr. LeClair responded that's correct.

Alderman Sharonov stated I'm with Chairman Barry on this. It should be 100% compensation for parking. Parking revenues are down as they are. I'm not looking to give any money away. Even \$650 a month...I think it should be 100%.

Chairman Barry stated my understanding is it's \$27,360 for the 24 months.

Mr. LeClair stated okay.

Alderman George-Kelly asked is it accurate to say that our lease with UNH is month-to-month where they can back out at any point.

Mr. LeClair stated that is correct.

Alderman George-Kelly stated if UNH wanted to, they could say next month that they're no longer going to lease those spots from us and we would be in a different situation. I think we can't really be asking...even if construction is expected to be 24 months they could do the same thing and ask for a month-to-month just like UNH has.

Chairman Barry stated they're committed to 24 months.

Mr. Pratt stated one thing I wanted to point out was during our conversations with UNH we understand that they are actively seeking longer-term overflow parking. They're using this lot as an overflow lot. Sometimes they use all 19 spaces, sometimes they don't use any. I know they were considering, before we even approached them, working with the Center of New Hampshire Garage or the SNHU Garage to transfer. Like Alderman George-Kelly said, they could pull out at any time. They are considering some sort of system where they would pay if a student uses the garage. It is something that they are considering. I don't know if it's something that they would have worked out any time soon. Our conversations with them definitely helped them jumpstart some of those talks. They are working on that just to put that out there.

Chairman Barry stated yes but someone else could be looking for those spots also. Like you guys were.

Chairman Barry moved to amend the request to require JSIP Manchester QOZB, LLC to pay 100% of the parking revenue for the 19 spaces on a month-to-month basis for up to 24 months. **Alderman Sharonov** duly seconded the motion. Aldermen Barry, Stewart, and Sharonov voted yea; Aldermen Long and George-Kelly voted nay. The motion carried.

Chairman Barry we'll have Denise get in touch with you, but it looks like \$27,360. I'll have her contact you with what the exact amount is.

Mr. LeClair stated sure and it should be a month-to-month basis for every month that it is temporarily closed.

Chairman Barry stated that would be fine.

Mr. LeClair stated that is what we're committed to. Obviously it's up to 24 months, but if we use it for 18 months we shouldn't be obligated anything beyond that if that's okay.

Chairman Barry stated absolutely. If you're not going to be there and if you get it finished in 18 months, then obviously you shouldn't be charged for the extra six months.

Mr. LeClair stated okay thank you.

Alderman Long stated just so Matt gets it, it was three to two with full price on a month-to-month basis.

Mr. LeClair stated up to 24 months. We need that security that we have access to it for 24 months and for every month that it is not open to the public...

Chairman Barry stated okay and we'll bring this forward to the full Board tonight.

Alderman Long asked on number six do we need a motion to approve.

Clerk Normand stated if you take a motion first to deal with item five, approve that under the recommendations you just made, we'll report that out. Item six is related to the project, you want to approve those but those are post construction regulations so they don't need to be expedited. We'll report those at the next meeting. Mr. Chairman, you just need a motion to approve the request as amended. You amended it tonight to deal with the parking, so just approve the request as amended.

Alderman Sharonov moved to approve the request by Fuss & O'Neill as amended. **Alderman Stewart** duly seconded the motion. Aldermen Barry, Stewart, and Sharonov voted yea; Aldermen Long and George-Kelly voted nay. The motion carried.

On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Stewart**, it was voted to approve the Traffic Ordinances related to the W. Auburn & Depot Street projects.

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

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Clerk of Committee