CITY COUNCIL MEETING

MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, PORTSMOUTH, NH
DATE: MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2019            TIME: 7:00PM

II. CALL TO ORDER [7:00 p.m. or thereafter]
III. ROLL CALL
IV. INVOCATION
V. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

VI. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES – MAY 20, 2019 AND JUNE 3, 2019

VII. RECOGNITIONS AND VOLUNTEER COMMITTEE REPORTS

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

IX. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND VOTES ON ORDINANCES AND/OR RESOLUTIONS

Public Hearings on 2019 Proposed Charter Amendments #1 and #2

A. Public Hearing on 2019 Proposed Charter Amendment #1

The Municipal Charter of the City of Portsmouth, Section 4.6 – Compensation of City Councilors is hereby amended as follows (deletions from existing language stricken in red; additions to existing language bolded in red; remaining language unchanged from existing):

SECTION 4.6 – COMPENSATION OF CITY COUNCILORS

Each City Councilor shall be compensated at a rate of Seventy-Five ($75.00) Dollars for each regular Council meeting in which that person is in actual attendance. However, no City Councilor except the Mayor shall receive more than Fifteen Hundred ($1,500.00) One Thousand Six Hundred Fifty ($1,650.00) Dollars during any calendar year.

If authorized by referendum vote at the municipal election scheduled for November 5, 2019, this amendment to become effective on January 1, 2020.
B. Public Hearing on 2019 Proposed Charter Amendment #2

The Municipal Charter of the City of Portsmouth, AMENDMENT E – POLICE DEPARTMENT (POLICE COMMISSION) is hereby amended as follows (deletions from existing language stricken in red; additions to existing language bolded in red; remaining language unchanged from existing):

**AMENDMENT E – POLICE DEPARTMENT (POLICE COMMISSION)**

**APPOINTMENT/ELECTION TERMS**

Should an elected Police Commission be approved on November 5, 1991, the Mayor of the City of Portsmouth shall appoint the first board of three Commissioners who shall assume office commencing on January 1, 1992 through January 1, 1994. In order to establish legal and proper cycle of election in accordance with New Hampshire law, hereinafter, the first elected Board of Police Commissioners shall be elected in November 1, 1993 as follows:

Two candidates receiving the highest and second highest number of votes shall assume terms of four years. The candidate receiving the third highest number of votes shall assume a term of two years.

Thereinafter, each Commissioner shall be elected for a term of four years. All Police Commissioners elected from 1993 and onwards shall be elected at large and without party affiliation and may be elected for more than one term of office. In the event a vacancy should occur on the Board, then the next runner up candidate established out of the last, most recent Board election, shall assume the balance of the vacated term. In the event that the list of candidates from the last election available to fill vacancies becomes depleted, then the Mayor shall appoint any necessary Commissioners the vacancy shall be filled by appointment of the City Council until the next regular municipal election.

If authorized by referendum vote at the municipal election scheduled for November 5, 2019, this amendment to become effective on January 1, 2020.

(Sample motion – move to place the proposed Charter Amendment #1 Compensation of City Councilors on the November 5, 2019 ballot)

(Sample motion – move to place the proposed Charter Amendment #2 Police Commission Vacancies on the November 5, 2019 ballot)
C. First Reading – Annual Omnibus Ordinance

First Reading of Ordinance Amending Chapter 7 – Parking Omnibus (Sample motion – move to pass first reading of the annual omnibus set of ordinance recommended by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee, and schedule second reading and public hearing for the July 15, 2019 City Council meeting.

X. MAYOR BLALOCK

1. Appointment to be Considered:
   • Appointment of Stephen Pesci as a regular member to the Parking & Traffic Safety Committee
   • Appointment of Jonathan Sandberg as an Alternate to the Parking & Traffic Safety Committee
2. City Manager Search Subcommittee Update

XI. CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

A. ASSISTANT MAYOR LAZENBY

1. Portsmouth Community Coordinated Response to Substance Misuse
   • Request for City Council to endorse establishment of Steering Committee
   • Request to appropriate $4,000 towards facilitation costs of initial process
   • See Attached Letter Re: Matching Funds from Portsmouth Rotary

B. COUNCILOR DENTON

1. Distribution of Single-Use Disposables Ordinance (Sample motion – move that the City Attorney review and provide a report back on the amended Distribution of Single-Use Disposables Ordinance)

XII. APPROVAL OF GRANTS/DONATIONS

A. Acceptance of Donation by West End Studio to the Police Explorers Post - $55.00 (Sample motion – move to accept and approve the donation to the Police Explorers Post in the amount of $55.00 from West End Studio)

XIII. CITY MANAGER’S ITEMS WHICH REQUIRE ACTION

A. CITY MANAGER

1. Request for Public Hearing Re: Various Bonding Resolutions for projects identified in the FY 20-25 Capital Improvement Plan
2. 162 Daniel Street (McIntyre Federal Building) Re-Zoning Request
3. Proposed Work Session on June 24, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. Re: McIntyre Project and Special Meeting on July 1, 2019 Re: Action on this Matter
4. Sale of Surplus Water Meters
5. Request for First Reading Re: Ordinance Amendment to Chapter 7, Article III, Section 7.328 - Limited Parking – Three Hours – Raynes Avenue and Vaughan Street

XIV. CONSENT AGENDA

(ANTICIPATED ACTION - MOVE TO ADOPT CONSENT AGENDA)

(There are no items on under Consent Agenda this evening)

XV. PRESENTATION & CONSIDERATION OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS & PETITIONS

A. Presentation – Preliminary Results of 2019 Statistical Revaluation – Rosann Lentz, Assessor (Request to Suspend the Rules to Bring Presentation Forward)

B. Presentation Re: 2019 Street.life! Annual Dinner

C. Email Correspondence (Sample motion – move to accept and place on file)

XVI. CITY MANAGER’S INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

XVII. MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS INCLUDING BUSINESS REMAINING UNFINISHED AT PREVIOUS MEETING

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT [at 10:00 p.m. or earlier]

KELLI L. BARNABY, MMC, CNHMC
CITY CLERK

* Indicates verbal report
CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Blalock called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mayor Blalock, Assistant Mayor Lazenby, Councilors Roberts, Pearson, Dwyer, Denton, Perkins, Raynolds and Becksted

II. INVOCATION

Mayor Blalock asked everyone to join in a moment of silence.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Blalock led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES – MAY 1, 2019 AND MAY 6, 2019

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to accept and place on file the minutes of May 1, 2019 and May 6, 2019 City Council meetings. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer and voted.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

Debbie Jennings – spoke opposed to the 27 Thaxter Road Involuntary Lot Merger and reviewed the handout she distributed to the City Council outlining her reasons.

Lee Roberts – thanked Councilor Pearson for bringing the Carey Cottage issue to the City Council and encouraging efforts to save it from demolition. She spoke to the importance of keeping our historic charm and to seriously consider a public/private partnership as this was the location of the Portsmouth Peace Treaty signing in 1905.

Ben Schopick – stated he recently discovered the cottage and spoke to the beauty of both the home and the land surrounding it. He urged the Council to find an alternative to demolition.

Kerry Vautrot – Chair of Portsmouth Advocates – thanked the Council for their letter of support and listening to the public outcry against demolition of Carey Cottage. She stated it has been suggested that the city take over the property and she encourages the city to look into any and all options.

Paige Trace – stated that the budget affects everyone in the city as it continues to go up and she urged the Council to go back and think about a zero-based budget. She also spoke opposed to the proposal to close Marcy Street to a food truck festival for Prescott Park Arts Festival, stating that they were allowed to defer a $20,000 payment to the City but taxpayers don’t have that option.
Petra Houda – stated she has attended most of the budget work sessions and has looked at the increases to see if there were places to save, but because salaries are already negotiated, that is where most of the increases occur. She stated she then looked at other operating expenses and saw that there are accounts that have budgeted amounts in previous years with actual spent at zero but then are budgeted at that same amount again. She stated that this looks like the budget is cut and pasted every year and urged the Council to scrub the numbers for additional cuts and savings.

Stephanie Seacord – spoke in favor of saving the Carey Cottage from demolition and thanked the Council for their recent letter of support. She noted it’s place in history with the Peace Treaty signing and stated it would be a shame to go into the city’s 400th anniversary having demolished this building.

Mark Brighton – first acknowledged an error he had made regarding the inflation figure he was using versus the City Manager’s figure stating that he was citing the March-March and the City Manager cited the November-November. Secondly he stated that it is a misconception that the tax rate is what matters and that it is the residential valuations that are exploding with commercial values not keeping up so when the revaluations happen, the money comes from the residents pockets.

Esther Kennedy – stated she is concerned with the budget continuously going up and the money that is in there but isn’t being spent. She continue that she wants the Council to look at positions in the city as people leave and whether they need to be replaced, especially in middle management.

Chris Mulligan – representing Chad Callahan – owner of 27 Thaxter Road – asked the Council to approve the restoration of 2 lots as recommended by the Planning Board and Planning Department. He stated that Ms. Jennings arguments against do not support denying this request.

Lisa Maflouze Oakes – thanked Councilor Pearson for taking up the cause against demolition of Carey Cottage. She stated she grew up in that area and it has a rich history. She stated that once the building is gone it is gone and doesn’t like what has happened in the city over the last 20 years.

Sheridan Lloyd – urged the Council and City to acquire the Carey Cottage property through eminent domain and cited several reasons why they could do so. She gave Wagon Hill Farm in Durham as an example of this being done with positive results.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND VOTES ON ORDINANCES AND/OR RESOLUTIONS

A. Public Hearing on Resolution Re: Construction of Senior Center

Resolution Authorizing a Bond Issue and/or Notes of up to Two Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($2,500,000.00) for costs related to Construction of a Senior Center
PRESENTATION

Senior Services Supervisor Brinn Sullivan gave a brief power point presentation stating it is the same as presented at the May 6, 2019 Council meeting. Ms. Sullivan reviewed the goals for the present and future:

- Inviting, inclusive & comfortable drop-in space for informal gathering
- Extensive array of programs for all interests and abilities
- Safe, well organized, fun space for activities both indoors and outside
- Programming to include Arts & Culture, Health & Fitness, Diversity, Educational, & Social
- Vibrant, modern hub for seniors and the community to gather
- The senior subcommittee supports a vision for a 50+ activity center serving both the current senior population and the soon-to-be senior. To continue to building membership and serve 5 decades of older adults. This innovative and inclusive philosophy encourages a multigenerational environment which offers layers of support and creates a dynamic atmosphere.

Ms. Sullivan reviewed the timeline moving forward with the Council:

February 2019: Acquisition of 125 Cottage Street property
April 2019: Asbestos Abatement completed
Spring 2019: Bid documents publically noticed by the City
Summer 2019: Commence construction
Spring/Summer 2020: Completed construction

Finally, she recognized the members of the committee in attendance in the audience.

CITY COUNCIL QUESTIONS

Councilor Dwyer stated there is some confusion in the public as to if we will be keeping the Senior Center at the Community Campus as well and also if this is going to include housing of some kind.

Ms. Sullivan stated they will relinquish the lease at the Community Campus once this center is open. She continued that she is glad to clarify that there is no housing of any kind at the new facility and that it is not going to be an adult day care which requires supervision. She stated this is an independent activity center.

PUBLIC HEARING SPEAKERS

Mayor Blalock read the public hearing notice and opened the public hearing:

Dianne Stradling – stated she teaches yoga at the senior center and asked the Council to fund the Senior Center.

Nancy Anderson – stated she has lived here for 50+ years and was a member of the original senior committee and is pleased with the progress made by the city for this permanent space. She commended the City Manager, Rus Wilson and Brinn Sullivan and feels that this will evolve into a multi-generational center.
Maureen O'Leary – spoke in favor of the Senior Center and stated she currently works with the National Council on Aging. She cited various issues facing the 65+ population which continues to grow and will double over the next 3 decades. She stated this center will improve the quality of life for the citizens of Portsmouth.

Nancy and Brian Johnson – spoke in favor of the Senior Center stating they are members of the current center which is an inviting place.

Paige Trace – spoke in favor of the senior center stating that we are a “city” but we are also a true community and she is happy that we are caring for our senior citizens.

Seeing no one else wishing to speak, the Mayor closed the Public Hearing. He also thanked former Assistant City Manager David Moore for his many years of work on this project.

- ADDITIONAL COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DELIBERATIONS

Councilor Becksted moved to adopt the Resolution as presented, seconded by Councilor Pearson.

Councilor Becksted stated he has been on the Recreation Board and is the Council representative to the Recreation Board and has been working on this for several years and is glad that it is moving forward. He stated he agrees that this will save money once we are no longer paying rent at the community campus. He stated he hopes that the intent of this becoming a community center for all ages is what will happen.

Councilor Raynolds stated he agrees with Councilor Becksted and also hopes that this will be more than a senior center and be a multi-generational facility.

Mayor Blalock passed the gavel to Assistant Mayor Lazenby.

Mayor Blalock stated that although he is technically a “senior”, he will look at this as a community center and thanked the committee for their work on this project.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby returned the gavel to Mayor Blalock.

Motion passed on a 9-0 roll call vote.

B. Public Hearing – Billiards and Bowling Hours

Public Hearing and Second Reading of Ordinance amending Chapter 6, Article II, Section 6.202 – Billiards and Bowling Hours

- PRESENTATION
- CITY COUNCIL QUESTIONS

There was no presentation or questions.
• PUBLIC HEARING SPEAKERS

Mayor Blalock read the public hearing notice and asked if anyone wished to speak.

Bart Madeiros, owner of Bowl-O-Rama – explained he recently purchased the business and became aware of the ordinance which restricted bowling prior to 1:00 p.m. on Sundays. He stated he receives many requests for birthday parties, etc. for Sunday mornings and requested the change to the ordinance.

Seeing no one else wishing to speak, the Mayor closed the public hearing.

• ADDITIONAL COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DELIBERATIONS

Councilor Becksted moved to pass second reading and schedule a third and final reading for the June 3, 2019 City Council meeting, seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby.

Councilor Becksted stated he had been unaware of this ordinance restriction and explained his history and memories of Bowl-O-Rama.

Motion passed.

C. Public Hearing on Resolution Re: Supplemental Appropriation for Greenland Well Source Water Protection Land Purchase

Resolution Authorizing a Supplemental Appropriation from Water Fund Net Position for Greenland Well Source Water Protection Land Purchase for the sum of up to Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars ($220,000.00) *(Sample motion – move to adopted the resolution as presented. This requires a 2/3 vote for passage)*

• PRESENTATION

Al Pratt, Water Resource Manager, gave a brief power point presentation.

• CITY COUNCIL QUESTIONS

Councilor Dwyer asked that given the concerns of water in Greenland, are there no regulations on development near wells or are there any state regulations that would override this.

Mr. Pratt stated there is a rule now for new development near potential water supplies.

Councilor Dwyer asked if this should not have been a buildable lot.

Mr. Pratt stated it was already there.
• PUBLIC HEARING SPEAKERS

Mayor Blalock read the public hearing notice and asked if anyone wished to speak. Seeing no one, the Mayor closed the public hearing.

• ADDITIONAL COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DELIBERATIONS

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to adopt the resolution as presented. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer and passed on a 9-0 roll call vote.

D. Public Hearing on Resolution Re: Elementary School Facility Improvements

Resolution Authorizing a Bond Issue and/or Notes of up to Two Million Dollars ($2,000,000.00) for costs related to Elementary School Facility Improvements

• PRESENTATION

School Superintendent Zadravec explained that this is the last of the Elementary School improvements which will be for New Franklin.

• CITY COUNCIL QUESTIONS

Councilor Raynolds asked if this will include a high-efficiency HVAC. Superintendent Zadravec stated yes.

• PUBLIC HEARING SPEAKERS

Mayor Blalock read the public hearing notice and asked if anyone wished to speak. Seeing no one, the Mayor closed the public hearing.

• ADDITIONAL COUNCIL QUESTIONS AND DELIBERATIONS

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to adopt the resolution as presented. Seconded by Councilor Pearson and passed on a 9-0 roll call vote.

E. Third and Final Reading of Ordinance – Rezoning of 15 Middle Street

Third and Final Reading of Ordinance amending Chapter 10 – Zoning Map 10.5A21A by changing the property with the address of 15 Middle Street from Civic District to Character District 4 and amending Zoning Map 10.5A21B by changing the height requirement area for the property’s street frontages on Porter Street and Maplewood Avenue to 2-3 stories (40’)

Councilor Perkins moved to pass third and final reading of ordinance as presented, seconded by Councilor Denton.

Councilor Becksted stated he doesn’t feel it is appropriate to rezone this to CD4 and that it is spot-zoning. He continued that this will now be a high-usage building with a hotel and restaurant and there are no other CD4 zones in this area. He stated that some things
have been approved by the land use boards even though there was doubt. He stated he is concerned with there being no parking at this site and having it be valet parking and he will be following this through the rest of the process. He concluded stating that the 27 million dollar parking garage was built to subsidize the parking of tomorrow.

Councilor Perkins stated that Maplewood Avenue is in that area and has CD5 zoning which is more intensive. She stated that the parking garage was intended for this type of usage.

Councilor Denton stated that repurposing of the building is a welcome addition.

Councilor Becksted clarified that there are no CD4 properties south of this building.

Councilor Roberts stated he feels this is a good use of this building and that we cannot force the Salvation Army to continue in this building.

Councilor Raynolds spoke about the comments regarding the parking garage stating that the city does build garages for this type of purpose as it is more cost and space efficient way of controlling parking. He stated it is not a giveaway to businesses and we do not want parking lots next to every business.

Councilor Becksted stated he was one of 3 speakers who spoke opposed to the parking garage stating that this was not supposed to subsidize businesses.

**Motion passed on an 8-1 roll call vote. Councilor Becksted voted opposed.**

**VII. APPROVAL OF GRANTS/DONATIONS**

A. Acceptance of Donation from Micum Davis – Cornerstone Tree Care to the City Tree Trust - $610.00

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to accept the donation of $610.00 from Micum Davis of Cornerstone Tree Care for the City Tree Trust, seconded by Councilor Dwyer.

Councilor Pearson asked what is the circumstance for this donation.

City Manager Bohenko explained that Mr. Davis and Cornerstone Tree Care donate their services every Arbor Day to various areas in the City and also donate matching funds to the City Tree Trust. He stated he is proud to say we have been a “Tree City USA” for 19 years.

Mayor Blalock stated we have great “Tree Guys” in the city who are very knowledgeable and dedicated and not only do they do pro-bono work, they also give demonstrations, etc.

**Motion passed.**
VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

Councilor Perkins moved to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented, seconded by Councilor Pearson.

Councilor Becksted stated that he would like to ensure that the City Manager will be approving the signage for Babe Ruth at the field as this is important to their funding. City Manager Bohenko stated yes he will be approving the signage and has only required that the signs are uniform in color.

Motion passed.

A. Request for License to Install Projecting Sign for James McSharry & Joel Harris owner of Dos Amigos Burritos, LLC d/b/a Mr. Kim’s for property located at 107 State Street (Anticipated action - move to approve the aforementioned Projecting Sign License as recommended by the Planning Director, and further, authorize the City Manager to execute the License Agreement for this request)

Planning Director’s Stipulations

- The license shall be approved by the Legal Department as to content and form;
- Any removal or relocation of projecting sign, for any reason, shall be done at no cost to the City; and
- Any disturbance of a sidewalk, street or other public infrastructure resulting from the installation, relocation or removal of the projecting sign, for any reason shall be restored at no cost to the City and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works

B. Request for License to Install Projecting Sign for Lia Cote owner of Lia Gormley Fine Jewelry for property located at 18 Ladd Street (Anticipated action - move to approve the aforementioned Projecting Sign License as recommended by the Planning Director, and further, authorize the City Manager to execute the License Agreement for this request)

Planning Director’s Stipulations

- The license shall be approved by the Legal Department as to content and form;
- Any removal or relocation of projecting sign, for any reason, shall be done at no cost to the City; and
- Any disturbance of a sidewalk, street or other public infrastructure resulting from the installation, relocation or removal of the projecting sign, for any reason shall be restored at no cost to the City and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works

C. Letter from Chris Curtis, The Music Hall requesting permission to close Chestnut Street for the Telluride by the Sea Film Festival on Friday, September 20, 2019 through Sunday, September 22, 2019 (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)
D. Letter from Mike Young, Portsmouth Babe Ruth requesting permission to place 15 outfield signs on the outer perimeter fencing facing inwards towards Leary Field beginning on June 1, 2019 through August 30, 2019 (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)

E. Request from Girls on the Run New Hampshire to hold the Portsmouth 5k on Saturday, June 1, 2019 at the Pease Tradeport (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)

IX. PRESENTATION & CONSIDERATION OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS & PETITIONS

A. Email Correspondence

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to accept and place on file. Seconded by Councilor Pearson and voted.

B. Letter from Ben Anderson, Prescott Park Arts Festival requesting permission to host a Food Truck Festival on Saturday, August 10, 2019 and temporarily closing Marcy Street between Court Street and Hancock Street

City Manager Bohenko stated that Ben Anderson approached him with this idea and he is asking that if the Council approves the request, that it only be closed up to Mechanic Street and not Hancock Street, but he is not making a recommendation either way regarding approval.

Mayor Blalock stated there has been some pushback on this and wonders if there is another way to have a Food Truck Festival without closing the street.

Councilor Pearson suggested holding it on Peirce Island.

Councilor Denton suggested using the parking lot near the bridge.

Councilor Pearson moved to suspend the rules to allow the Council to address Ben Anderson regarding his request. Seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby and voted.

Mr. Anderson explained that they have been wanting to do this for many years and now seemed like a good time. He stated they are looking at August 10th as a tie-in to the Matinee of Beauty and the Beast.

City Manager Bohenko asked if they could do the event in the parking lot instead. Mr. Anderson stated yes. City Manager Bohenko stated he feels this would be a good way to try it out the first year.

Councilor Becksted suggested Water Street.

Mayor Blalock stated that Water Street is used by other entities such as the Gundalow Company.
City Manager Bohenko stated he agrees with Mayor Blalock and will figure out a configuration.

Councilor Becksted asked if this will come back to the City Council.

City Manager Bohenko stated no.

Councilor Becksted stated he wants a report back.

Councilor Perkins stated she feels the proposal should be left alone and not be in the parking lot as there would be more of a festival feeling in the street.

City Manager Bohenko stated he will work with Mr. Anderson.

**Councilor Denton moved to refer to the City Manager with power with guidance to hold event in another location and not to close Marcy Street, seconded by Councilor Pearson.**

*Mayor Blalock passed the gavel to Assistant Mayor Lazenby.*

Mayor Blalock stated this is a great idea but there has been some pushback against closing Marcy Street. He stated he understands Councilor Perkins’ point, but doesn’t want it to affect other entities and this is a good way to try it the first year.

*Assistant Mayor Lazenby returned to gavel to Mayor Blalock.*

Motion passed.

C. Letter from Mark Puffer, PretiFlaherty regarding Gosling Road Fuel Line Crossing License Agreement

**Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to refer to the City Manager power. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer and voted.**

X. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY OFFICIALS

A. CITY MANAGER

1. 145 Brewery Lane Easements and Deeds

*Councilor Denton recused himself from this item and left the dais.*

City Attorney Sullivan explained why this issue is being presented in this manner, stating as part of the approval process for a site plan at 125 – 155 Brewery Lane, which includes a 92-unit, 4-story residential apartment building with a building footprint of 18,430 square feet, the applicant is required to submit new deed easements to the City for the community spaces. Furthermore, the developer must relocate the sewer line currently crossing the property, because its current location interferes with the proposed apartment building. Similarly, the drainage easement from Plaza 800, owned
by the Griffin Family Corporation, must be relocated. He stated that there are various pieces to this which are outlined in the City Manager’s comments.

City Manager Bohenko further explained that the sidewalks will have access easements to the city and will be maintained by the City. He stated that they will also be insured under the city’s liability coverage.

Councilor Dwyer stated she is concerned with how the public will know which spaces are considered community spaces and which are private in these developments and feels that there should be signage accordingly.

Planning Director Walker stated that there are no signage requirements during the Planning Board review but agrees it is a good idea.

Councilor Roberts asked if this will affect traffic on Brewery Lane.

Planning Director Walker stated there will be no parking on one side of the street so it will not affect traffic flow.

Councilor Roberts moved to authorize the City Manager the authority to negotiate, discharge and extinguish the following:

- **Any outstanding easements which may interfere with the proposed development, as approved by the Planning Board;**

- **Any easements that might be necessary to allow the development of 125-155 Brewery Lane as outlined in attachments 1-4 prepared by Portsmouth West End Development, LLC and as recommended by the Planning Board**

Seconded by Councilor Pearson and voted. Councilor Denton abstained.

2. **Report Back Re: 27 Thaxter Road Involuntary Lot Merger**

Planning Director Walker explained that this doesn’t have to go before the Planning Board but is good to do because it allows a public hearing and notification to abutters. She reviewed the Planning Board process stating the Planning Board held a public hearing on this request at its April 18, 2019 meeting. At that time, the Board voted to recommend that the City Council restore the lots to their premerger status with the stipulation that Planning Department Staff meet with one of the abutters to go over her concerns raised during the public hearing. After meeting with Ms. Jennings, the Planning Department staff is recommending restoring the lots to their premerger status of two distinct lots (after the garage was constructed in the 1940s.)

Councilor Becksted stated he feels more digging needs to be done on this and he doesn’t know the cost of going through this process versus going to the Board of Adjustment to divide the lot.
Councilor Dwyer stated that the intention of the law and legislature was to bend over backwards to unmerge lots. She stated she appreciates what Ms. Jennings presented, but the compromise would be to merge 2 lots instead of 3 based on the intent.

**Councilor Dwyer moved to restore the two involuntary merged lots at 27 Thaxter Road to their pre-merger status, seconded by Councilor Raynolds.**

Councilor Becksted reiterated he is uncomfortable with this without more analysis.

Councilor Roberts asked if the concern is that this will create a buildable lot.

Councilor Walker stated this is not doing away with the zoning requirements and it will not be a buildable lot. She stated they would still need to go through the land-use approval for the lot-line revision.

**Motion passed on a 6-3 roll call vote. Councilors Denton, Becksted and Mayor Blalock voted opposed.**

*Mayor Blalock called a brief recess at 8:55 p.m. Meeting reconvened at 9:05 p.m.*

3. Proposed Charter Amendments

City Attorney Sullivan reviewed the 2 proposed amendments and the process to move forward to put them on the November 5, 2019 Municipal ballot.

Councilor Dwyer asked for clarification as to why this only addresses filling the Police Commission vacancies.

City Attorney Sullivan explained that is the only Commission addressed by the Attorney General.

Councilor Denton stated that unrelated to these amendments, what is the timeline for submitting petitions for other ballot questions.

City Attorney Sullivan stated it would be the same timeline. He stated that any proposals, whether petitions or from the City Council, will need to be not later than the June 17th Council agenda in order to meet the 45 day deadline required for review by the State. He then addressed the confusion surrounding the issue of the McIntyre Building petition stating that it was reported that a petition would compel the Council to put it on the ballot, but it would only compel the Council to vote on putting it on the ballot.

Councilor Becksted asked for clarification regarding the intention of the Police Commission vacancy question and if it will also allow the Commission to meet with only 2 members until the vacancy is filled.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby asked about getting the Keno initiative on the ballot as well as there is a petition drive going on for that issue.
City Attorney Sullivan stated that the previous City Council voted to not put the Keno issue on the ballot but they could be compelled to vote on the issue again if a petition is presented. He stated they would also need to meet the deadline.

Mayor Blalock clarified that the previous Council voted to not put the Keno question on the ballot, but it was not a yes or no vote to Keno itself.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby asked for a report back regarding the Keno issue.

Councilor Dwyer moved to establish a public hearing on proposed Charter Amendment #2, Police Commission Vacancies, on June 17, 2019 City Council meeting, and further, vote on Charter Amendment #2 to be placed on the November 5, 2019 Municipal Ballot no later than the June 17, 2019 City Council meeting. Seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby and voted.

Councilor Denton moved to establish a public hearing on proposed Charter Amendments #1 Compensation of City Councilors on June 17, 2019 at the City Council meeting, and further, vote on Charter Amendment #1 to be placed on the November 5, 2019 Municipal ballot no later than the June 17, 2019 City Council meeting, seconded by Councilor Raynolds.

Councilor Dwyer stated she is agnostic about the result of this, but is concerned with the wording and that this will draw negative attention from the public.

Mayor Blalock explained that the City Council meeting calendar is approved annually.

Discussion ensued regarding clarification that this is regarding regular City Council meetings which are defined in the City Council rules as occurring the first and third Mondays of each month which usually totals 22 meetings per year. The Council is currently paid for 20 meetings per year.

Councilor Denton moved to amend by striking the second sentence in its entirety, seconded by Councilor Raynolds.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby suggested amending the amount from $1,500.00 to $1,650.00.

Councilor Denton and Councilor Raynolds agreed to withdraw motion to amend.

Councilor Denton moved to amend by keeping the second sentence and changing the amount from Fifteen Hundred ($1,500.00) Dollars to Sixteen Hundred Fifty ($1,650.00) Dollars during any calendar year, seconded by Councilor Pearson. Motion passed on an 8-1 vote, Councilor Roberts voted opposed.

Main motion as amended passed unanimously.
Councilor Dwyer stated that the issue mentioned by Councilor Becksted regarding the Police Commission being able to meet with 2 Commissioners still needs to be addressed and asked if this could be done by Council policy prior to the Charter Amendment.

City Attorney Sullivan stated if the Charter amendment passes the Council can make a policy, but if it does not, then they cannot as the Charter is currently written.

**City Manager’s Informational Items:**

1. Upcoming FY20 Budget Work Sessions

Councilor Denton asked City Manager Bohenko to reach out to the Director of Market Square Day and asked that they find options to the balloon arch as balloons are bad for the environment.

Councilor Becksted moved to suspend the rules to move up item XI.D.1. Seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby and voted.

**D. COUNCILOR PEARSON**

1. City Options to Obtain Carey Cottage

Councilor Pearson stated that May is Historic Preservation Month and acknowledged the many different aged speakers who spoke in favor of saving Carey Cottage from demolition. She continue that she is looking for how the Council feels about the issue and the option of partnering with a non-profit group as has been done with a number of other properties in the City of Portsmouth and is a win/win. She asked that in tandem with the conversations with the Forest Society, that the City Manager explore options and resources to acquire the building and a non-profit partnership.

City Manager Bohenko stated we are still waiting to hear more from the Forest Society as they are in talks. He stated he and staff have discussed what would happen if it doesn’t work out, but he feels that we should let the process play out. He concluded we are prepared to move if we have to.

Mayor Blalock agrees with City Manager Bohenko stating he has met with the Forest Society twice and they have indicated they do have some options, but he also agrees that this needs to be saved at all costs.

Councilor Dwyer stated that it would be helpful to review the criteria set previously regarding infrastructure stabilization and the minimum cost required. She stated that we also don’t own this particular building which is different than the other buildings referred to previously.

**B. MAYOR BLALOCK**

1. Appointment to be Considered:
   - Reappointment of Cyrus Beer to the Historic District Commission
   - Reappointment of Martin Ryan to the Historic District Commission
The aforementioned appointments were considered and will be voted at the June 3, 2019 City Council meeting.

2. Appointments to be Voted:
   • Appointment of Jeffrey Mattson as an Alternate to the Building Code Board of Appeals – term to expire July 1, 2024.
   • Reappointment of Margot Doering as an Alternate to the Historic District Commission – term to expire June 1, 2022.
   • Reappointment of Reagan Ruedig to the Historic District Commission – term to expire June 1, 2022.
   • Reappointment of Jonathan Wyckoff to the Historic District Commission – term to expire June 1, 2022.
   • Reappointment of Kory Sirmaian to the Recreation Board – term to expire June 1, 2022.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to approve the aforementioned appointments. Seconded by Councilor Becksted and voted.

C. COUNCILOR ROBERTS

1. Parking & Traffic Safety Committee Action Sheet and Minutes of the May 2, 2019 meeting

Councilor Roberts stated that these minutes have not yet been approved by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee.

City Manager Bohenko stated that these can be accepted pending approval by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee.

Councilor Roberts moved to approve and accept the May 2, 2019 Action Sheet and Minutes of the Parking & Traffic Safety Committee meeting pending approval by the committee, seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby.

Councilor Roberts reviewed an item of interest in the minutes was the approval of metered parking on Raynes and Vaughan Streets to take effect after the AC Hotel opens.

Motion passed.

Councilor Perkins asked for an update on the Neighborhood Parking Pilot Program.

City Manager Bohenko stated that his office did receive the petition last week and he will be meeting with the City Clerk and Parking Director regarding the confirmation of the signatures and then will report back to the Council.

D. COUNCILOR PEARSON

1. City Options to Obtain Carey Cottage (previously considered)

E. COUNCILOR DENTON
1. Proposed Rule Change – Rule 7 Order of Business

Councilor Denton moved to accept the proposed attached Rule 7 Order of Business amendment to take effect at the June 17, 2019 City Council meeting, seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby.

Councilor Denton explained the goal of the rule change and cited the example this evening of the Carey Cottage issue under Councilor Pearson’s name and that people were waiting in the audience for this to be discussed. He stated this will be a pilot and will take effect starting the meeting of June 17th.

Councilor Becksted stated he is okay with the rule change, but similar to what was done this evening, the Council can suspend the rules to take things up out of order.

Motion passed.

2. Destination Electric Initiative

Councilor Denton explained that Destination Electric is meant to highlight the availability of electric car charging stations and the businesses who support electric vehicles. He stated that there is no cost for participating in the program and businesses get free publicity online throughout the summer. He stated that the city offers electric vehicle charging stations at City Hall, the High-Hanover and Foundry Place garages.

XI. MISCELLANEOUS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Councilor Denton stated he has distributed a letter of response from the Joint Task Force regarding the resolution on off-shore wind turbines previously passed by the City Council and sent to the Governor.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Councilor Becksted moved to adjourn at 9:50 p.m. Seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby and voted.

Respectfully submitted:

Valerie A. French, CNHMC
Deputy City Clerk
At 6:20 p.m. a Public Dialogue Session was held.

**Public Dialogue Session – One Group**

**PRESENT:** Mayor Blalock, Assistant Mayor Lazenby, Councilors Roberts, Pearson, Dwyer, Perkins and Becksted

The members of the public were asked to introduce themselves and begin discussing their concerns and/or questions related to their individual topics.

**Wes Tator** said he would be presenting a Resolution for the City Council to consider endorsing regarding Energy Climate Change. He spoke to the Resolution being bi-partisan and the need for us to start pricing carbon.

**Erik Anderson** spoke to the budget process and suggested providing a less compressed time line. He stated there was no improvement to allow the public to speak during the work sessions and there was only one public hearing. He further stated that the City has a spending problem and it needs to stop. He said that there is needed relief to the taxpayers and would like to see new revenues investigated. Mr. Anderson spoke regarding the revaluation process and how that will impact the taxpayers.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby said having another public hearing on the budget makes sense for the future. He said the longer process worked well but would like to hear more from Mr. Anderson regarding the revenue prospects the City Council did not pursue.

Councilor Dwyer said the whole State is working on changing the rooms and meals tax. She also indicated that the Fee Committee recommended many increases to fees this year.

Mr. Anderson said he has some suggestions but not in this setting. He would like to see a dialogue created on that matter.

Councilor Dwyer said she would like to hear more specific details from Mr. Anderson.

**John Mikolajcyk,** Manager of the Portsmouth Elks, spoke in support of bringing Keno to Portsmouth. He said he would like the question placed on the ballot for the voters to decide. He said that having Keno in the City will have little impact.

Councilor Dwyer said it does not bring any revenue to the City.

Mr. Mikolajcyk said it would increase the revenues in the City.

Councilor Dwyer said the legislature voted that it would not go to the kindergarten fund any longer.

Mayor Blalock said we should vote whether to place the item on the ballot. He said he would support placing it on the ballot for the residents to decide.

Mr. Mikolajcyk said the State did a poor job last year explaining how Keno would work in the City.
Eli Sokorelis said he has Keno at one of his establishments and it works well. He recommended placing the question on the ballot.

Mr. Mikolajcyk said it helps businesses, non-profits, the local sport teams receive contributions from businesses that have Keno.

Councilor Roberts asked how much money goes to the establishment and what goes to the State. He said you are taking money out of the City and giving it to the State. He said he would consider placing the question on the ballot for the people to vote.

Elizabeth Bratter, resident of Dover, NH but property owner in Portsmouth said she missed the public hearing on the budget and is concerned about taxes. She said there are young couples that have seen a 30% increase in taxes in the last ten years. She said home insurance is increasing because assessments are climbing. She said we need to consider how many residents are tax free and are developers getting special deals. Ms. Bratter asked the City Council to do its homework before hiring a new City Manager and suggested comparing communities and what they pay their City Manager’s. She said administrators should be hired at the lowest level and the Council needs to consider the benefits provided to employees. She stated the City needs to advertise more for providing assistance to seniors which will allow seniors to stay in their homes.

Councilor Dwyer said we have salary schedules and they’re bench marked against other communities. She spoke to the tax exempt status to properties.

Petra Huda said she was surprised that another work session was not held after the May 22nd session. She said with the revaluation taxes will increase. She indicated that there were no cuts in the budget. Ms. Huda said that the revenues for the last six years were under estimated by $8 million which cause an increase in property taxes. She stated that property taxes have increased by 54% in the last ten years. She said that the City was over budget and the City should look at revenues because money is being left on the table.

Councilor Pearson said we are all residents and one thing explains the last ten years, there has been a down shift in costs from the State and the City has had to absorb those costs.

At 7:05 p.m., Mayor Blalock closed the Public Dialogue Session.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Blalock called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mayor Blalock, Assistant Mayor Lazenby, Councilors Roberts, Pearson, Dwyer, Denton (via conference call), Perkins, Raynolds (7:20 p.m.) and Becksted
III. INVOCATION

Mayor Blalock asked everyone to join in a moment of silent prayer in memory of the Virginia Beach shooting victims.

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mayor Blalock led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to suspend the rules in order to take up Item X.B. – Letter from St. John’s Capital Campaign/Grant Funding Committee seeking City Council endorsement of St. John’s rehabilitation and restoration project. Seconded by Councilor Pearson.

On a unanimous roll call vote 8-0, motion passed.

X.B. Letter from St. John’s Capital Campaign/Grant Funding Committee seeking City Council endorsement of St. John’s rehabilitation and restoration project

Barry Heckler, St. John’s Capital Campaign/Grant Funding Committee spoke to his letter and scope of the project. He said when they file the LCHIP for grant funding for the project they need to answer a question whether the City Officials have support for the project. He said that this is an historical resource for the City and it is a resource of a vibrant community. He spoke to the various parts of the project. He thanked the Chamber of Commerce for sending out a letter in support of the church.

Councilor Pearson moved to support and endorse the capital campaign for the grant funding for the St. John’s Church. Seconded by Councilor Becksted.

On a unanimous roll call vote 9-0, motion passed.

V. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES (There are no minutes on for acceptance this evening)

VI. PUBLIC DIALOGUE SUMMARY

Assistant Mayor Lazenby gave a brief summary of the topics discussed during Public Dialogue which included Climate Change Resolution, Budget Process, Adding another Public Hearing to the Budget Process, Increase in Costs and Revenues not Pursued, Keno Question on Ballot and Revenues being Properly Estimated.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to suspend the rules in order to bring forward Item VII. B. – Third and Final Reading of Ordinance amending Chapter 6, Article II, Section 6.202 – Billiards and Bowling Hours. Seconded by Councilor Pearson and voted.

VII.B. Third and Final Reading of Ordinance amending Chapter 6, Article II, Section 6.202 – Billiards and Bowling Hours

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to pass third and final reading of the Ordinance. Seconded by Councilor Roberts.
On a unanimous roll call vote 9-0, motion passed.

VII. VOTES ON ORDINANCES AND/OR RESOLUTIONS

Adoption of Proposed Budget Resolutions:

A. Adoption of Budget Resolutions for Fiscal Year July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020 (FY20)

City Manager Bohenko said there are six Resolutions and they have been reviewed and adjustments were made. He stated the first Resolution is on Fees and we raise 1% of the general fund revenues. He reported that one major new revenue is for a Fire Inspector which offsets the cost of adding the position to the budget.

Resolution No. 8-2019 – Municipal Fees

Councilor Dwyer moved to adopt Resolution #8-2019 – Municipal Fees. Seconded by Councilor Raynolds.

Councilor Dwyer said all fees are reviewed and changed over a cycle. She indicated the fee charged needs to have a direct relationship to what it costs to administer the fee.

Councilor Becksted said we are not doing our due diligence in changing fees. He recommended changing the fee for a developer to use city owned space for parking which use to be 15% per square foot and it was lowered to 5% per square foot. He said the key is to have the work finished as soon as possible. He said we needed to not make the fee punitive before the fee went into place.

Councilor Raynolds said that the fee being charged prior to lowering it was disproportion. Councilor Becksted said the fee should be reconsidered next year. He said people are willing to pay whatever they need to.

Councilor Dwyer said we know what it costs to take up a metered space.

Councilor Raynolds said it is not the developer’s ability to pay, you can’t charge more than it costs to administer the fee.

Councilor Becksted spoke to impact fees that are charged by other municipalities and asked why we do not have impact fees.

Councilor Dwyer explained that we use extractions versus impact fees. She said impact fees may be great for a certain development in the City of Dover.

City Manager Bohenko said we have extractions and impact fees must be spent for what you fund and for a particular development. He said if all the money is not spent it is then returned to the developer. He further stated communities have had to pay back impact fees because they were not spent for their purpose.
Councilor Roberts spoke to Sidewalk Obstruction Licenses and the placement of flower boxes on City sidewalks which under the Ordinance and application is a $75.00 fee. City Manager Bohenko said we have been silent on that and allowed businesses to put those decorative boxes out. Councilor Roberts said we need to make it clear that we do not charge for flower boxes on sidewalks. He would like guidelines and power to the City Manager to remove it from the requirements.

On a roll call vote 8-1, motion passed. Councilor Becksted voted opposed.

Resolution No. 9-2019 – General Fund Expenditures

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to adopt Resolution #9-2019 – General Fund Expenditures. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer.

City Manager Bohenko spoke to the adjustments made to the budget this year. He reviewed the revised Proposed Operating Budget and revised Proposed Non-Operating Budget.

FY20 Total Proposed Budget – Revised as of May 22, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjustments from the City Manager’s Recommended Budget</th>
<th>Recommended Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>($261,132.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Operating</td>
<td>($1,140,188.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>($1,401,320.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% change from FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>($1,401,320.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed Budget</td>
<td>$118,638,630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase</td>
<td>$4,343,423.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues: Additional Use of Unassigned Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$650,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Tax Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$16.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase from FY19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Councilor Becksted said at the May 22\textsuperscript{nd} Budget Work Session City Manager Bohenko spoke to the rate of inflation being based on November to November. City Manager Bohenko said we do not need to use the CPI for adopting a budget, it is for illustrated purposes only.

Councilor Becksted said he would like to reduce $500,000.00 from the operating side of budget to bring the increase to the rate of inflation which is 3.1%. City Manager Bohenko said that this is the first time he has heard this number from Councilor Becksted.
Councilor Pearson said that this is a generous budget and we are able to get more essential personnel up to levels we had in the past.

Councilor Raynolds said that this is a good and reasonable budget. He said we have added 5 positions and we still are only looking at having a 3.8% increase with the overall amount of the budget.

**Councilor Becksted moved to have $500,000.00 reduced from the operating side of the budget. Motion received no second.**

Assistant Mayor Lazenby said we have had a detailed process and the tax rate increase is below the rate of inflation.

Councilor Becksted said the numbers changed each work session and he feels we are over spending when it comes to certain items. He asked why the City Manager’s salary is in the budget when he is leaving. City Manager Bohenko said you will still be required to pay a new City Manager.

**On a roll call vote 8-1, motion passed. Councilor Becksted voted opposed.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>$20,343,714.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>$11,647,381.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>$9,232,857.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>$49,612,427.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Indoor Pool</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Prescott Park</td>
<td>$89,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining Contingency</td>
<td>$1,120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Operating</td>
<td>$26,443,251.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$118,638,630.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resolution No. 10-2019 – Sewer Fund Expenditures**

City Manager Bohenko said when the plant is completed we will start to use net position so we do not have a spike in rates. He said we are receiving some State aid to offset costs. He said we hope to continue to have a stable and predictable sewer rate. He spoke to the program for assistance provided to residents for both water and sewer.

**Councilor Pearson moved to adopt Resolution #10-2019 – Sewer Fund Expenditures. Seconded by Councilor Perkins.**

Councilor Becksted said in December we received a premium and asked if any of that can be used to offset this budget. City Manager Bohenko explained the use of the premium. Finance Director Belanger said the bond premium was used for annual sewer line replacement and then money on the water side will be used for something on that side. Councilor Becksted said he would like to see where the money is being used. City Engineer Desmarais said funds are used for annual water and sewer line replacements. City Manager Bohenko explained we had a public hearing and we had a Resolution that outlined the projects for the premium. He said the public hearing was advertised and passed with a two-thirds vote of the City Council.
Councillor Becksted said he would not support the Resolution.

On a roll call vote 8-0, motion passed with Councillor Becksted abstaining from the vote.

- Appropriated sum of $14,202,023.00 to defray expenses for the operations of the sewer system
- Cash requirements of $18,869,274.00 to defray expenses for the operations of the sewer system
- Sewer user rate effective July 1, 2019 is $13.77 per unit for the first 10 units of consumption per month, and $15.14 per unit for all used thereafter to yield a portion of revenue to meet the cash requirements for the operation of the City of Portsmouth’s sewer system

Resolution No. 11-2019 – Water Fund Expenditures

City Manager Bohenko spoke to the Water Fund Resolution. He said we have been stable and predictable.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to adopt Resolution #11-2019 – Water Fund Expenditures. Seconded by Councillor Raynolds.

Councillor Becksted said he would like a clarification on what the premium funds were used on so the taxpayers are aware of where the monies went. He said he would support the Resolution.

City Manager Bohenko said that was FY19 and a public hearing was held with funds being used as designated in the Resolution.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby commended City Manager Bohenko and Public Works Department for stable and predictable water and sewer funds.

On a unanimous roll call vote 9-0, motion passed.

- Appropriated the sum of $9,080,801.00 to defray expenses for the operations of the water system
- Cash requirement of $10,505,793.00 to defray expenses for the operations of the water system
- Water user rate effective July 1, 2019 is $4.32 per unit for the first 10 units of consumed thereafter to yield a portion of revenue to meet the cash requirements for the operation of the water system
- Water irrigation user rate effective July 1, 2019 is $5.20 per unit for the first 10 units of water consumed per month, $9.81 for consumption over 10 and up to 20 units consumed, and $12.11 per unit for all units consumed thereafter to yield a portion of revenue to meet the cash requirements for the operation of the City of Portsmouth’s water system.
Resolution No. 12-2019 – Special Revenues, Debt Service, Fund and Committed Fund Balances for Necessary Expenditures

City Manager Bohenko explained that this Resolution allows for expenditure of Special Revenues, Debt Service Fund, and Committed Fund Balances. In addition, it allows the City to expend from donations, State and Federal Grants as they are accepted and received, pay principal and interest associated with Betterment Assessments, from a Debt Service Fund, and expend from committed fund balance.


On a unanimous roll call vote 9-0, motion passed.

Resolution No. 13-2019 – Investment Policy

City Manager Bohenko explained the Resolution adopts an annual investment policy as required by State law.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to adopt Resolution #13-2019 – Investment Policy. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer.

On a unanimous roll call vote 9-0, motion passed.

At 8:10 p.m. Councilor Denton left the meeting via the conference call.

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. Seconded by Councilor Raynolds and voted.

A. Request for License to Install Projecting Sign for Bangor Savings Bank owner of Bangor Savings Bank for property located at 100 Market Street (Anticipated action - move to approve the aforementioned Projecting Sign License as recommended by the Planning Director, and further, authorize the City Manager to execute the License Agreement for this request)

Planning Director’s Stipulations

- The license shall be approved by the Legal Department as to content and form;

- Any removal or relocation of projecting sign, for any reason, shall be done at no cost to the City; and

- Any disturbance of a sidewalk, street or other public infrastructure resulting from the installation, relocation or removal of the projecting sign, for any reason shall be restored at no cost to the City and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works
B. Request for License to Install Projecting Sign for Kelly & Gary Cargin owner of Winter Worx LLC d/b/a The Zulu Hut for property located at 67 Bow Street, Unit 2 *(Anticipated action - move to approve the aforementioned Projecting Sign License as recommended by the Planning Director, and further, authorize the City Manager to execute the License Agreement for this request)*

**Planning Director’s Stipulations**

- The license shall be approved by the Legal Department as to content and form;

- Any removal or relocation of projecting sign, for any reason, shall be done at no cost to the City; and

- Any disturbance of a sidewalk, street or other public infrastructure resulting from the installation, relocation or removal of the projecting sign, for any reason, shall be restored at no cost to the City and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works

C. Request for License to Install Projecting Sign for Sarah & Eric Amsden owner of Red Rover Creamery for property located at 142 State Street, Unit 150 *(Anticipated action - move to approve the aforementioned Projecting Sign License as recommended by the Planning Director, and further, authorize the City Manager to execute the License Agreement for this request)*

**Planning Director’s Stipulations**

- The license shall be approved by the Legal Department as to content and form;

- Any removal or relocation of projecting sign, for any reason, shall be done at no cost to the City; and

- Any disturbance of a sidewalk, street or other public infrastructure resulting from the installation, relocation or removal of the projecting sign, for any reason, shall be restored at no cost to the City and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works

D. Request for License to Install Projecting Sign for Lindt & Sprungli owner of Lindt for property located at 1 Congress Street *(Anticipated action - move to approve the aforementioned Projecting Sign License as recommended by the Planning Director, and further, authorize the City Manager to execute the License Agreement for this request)*

**Planning Director’s Stipulations**

- The license shall be approved by the Legal Department as to content and form;

- Any removal or relocation of projecting sign, for any reason, shall be done at no cost to the City; and
• Any disturbance of a sidewalk, street or other public infrastructure resulting from the installation, relocation or removal of the projecting sign, for any reason shall be restored at no cost to the City and shall be subject to review and acceptance by the Department of Public Works.

E. Letter from Jylle Nevejans, Bottomline Technologies requesting permission to hold their annual 5K Race on Saturday, September 28, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)

F. Petition and Underground Utility License for #200 and #210 Swett Avenue to install one (1) new pole and conduit (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)

G. Letter from Nick Diana requesting permission to hold the 3rd annual Road Race on Saturday, April 11, 2020 (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)

H. Letter from JerriAnne Boggis, Black Heritage Trail of New Hampshire requesting permission to hold the annual Juneteenth Celebration at the African Burying Ground with a music celebration on Wednesday, June 19, 2019 from 2:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Anticipated action – move to refer to the City Manager with power)

X. PRESENTATION & CONSIDERATION OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS & PETITIONS

A. Email Correspondence

Councilor Perkins moved to accept and place on file. Seconded by Councilor Roberts and voted.

XI. REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY OFFICIALS

A. CITY MANAGER

1. Purchase of Property Map 232, Lot 8 at the end of Lois Street

City Manager Bohenko advised the City Council that the City has entered into a Purchase and Sales for the parcel on Lois Street. He said the Conservation Commission reviewed the request and authorized the expenditure of $30,000.00 from the Conservation Fund to support the acquisition. In addition, the Conservation Commission requested that the City place the property within the Conservation Ordinance along with finding a means to recognize and balance the municipal needs and potential uses for a small portion of this parcel at the end of Lois Street as a potential vehicle turnaround.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to authorize the City Manager to finalize and execute all necessary documents to acquire property at the end of Lois Street identified as parcel 232-0008-001 from Alden-Watson Properties, LLC for $60,000.00, and to recognize differential between that amount and the market value of the property as part of the transaction. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer.
Councilor Becksted asked if our consulting attorney had any issues with acquiring the property. City Attorney Sullivan said our attorney had no concerns with the acquisition of the property. Councilor Becksted said he is concerned and feels that this is a mistake and would not support the motion.

City Manager Bohenko said that the acquisition of this property will protect the wetlands.

Councilor Pearson said property lines do not necessarily mean where a wetlands ends.

**Motion passed with Councilor Becksted voting opposed.**

2. **Greenleaf Recreation Center Concession Agreement**

City Manager Bohenko said Operation Blessing is requesting, and City staff recommends, that the term of the agreement be extended to April 15, 2020 under the same terms and conditions which have been in place since April 2016.

**Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to authorize the City Manager any and all necessary action to extend the term of the concession agreement with Operation Blessing covering the Greenleaf Recreation Center to April 15, 2020. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer.**

Councilor Dwyer asked why Operation Blessing did not ask for a longer agreement. City Manager Bohenko said he did not want to encumber the City and this agreement provides more options.

**Motion passed.**

3. **Request for First Reading for Annual Omnibus Ordinance Change, Parking and Traffic Safety**

City Manager Bohenko advised the City Council that this year’s omnibus addresses changes to parking in loading zones, prohibitions against mopeds and bicycles parking against monuments, no parking spaces, speed limits and one-way streets.

**Councilor Roberts moved to schedule first reading for the June 17, 2019 City Council meeting regarding the annual omnibus set of ordinances recommended by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee. Seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby.**

Councilor Dwyer asked if all of these changes have been put in place. City Manager Bohenko said they are all in place. He further stated that a presentation will be held at the next meeting on the ordinance and the amendments.

**Motion passed.**

**City Manager’s Informational Items**

1. **Public Tour of the Peirce Island Wastewater Treatment Facility on Thursday, June 13, 2019**

City Manager Bohenko announced a tour of the Peirce Island Wastewater Treatment Facility will be held on Thursday, June 13, 2019 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.
2. Re: Keno Question on Ballot

Assistant Mayor Lazenby said if we were to consider a ballot question September 3rd is the latest you could vote to put the question on the ballot.

City Manager Bohenko said if the Council votes to place the question of Keno on the November 5, 2019 ballot, a public hearing should be held no later than Monday, October 21, 2019 but no earlier than Sunday, October 6, 2019.

B. MAYOR BLALOCK

1. The City Manager Search Subcommittee:
   - Recommendation of a Search Firm
   - City Manager Residency – Charter Amendment Discussion

Mayor Blalock said the Subcommittee has a recommendation of a search firm for a new City Manager. He said they interviewed two firms and the Subcommittee was impressed with one firm. He advised the Council that the Subcommittee is recommending GovHR USA.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to hire the firm GovHR USA to engage in the City Manager search process. Seconded by Councilor Pearson.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby said the submissions were not public and out of respect for the other firms a Non-Public Session was held and the recommendation of the Subcommittee was unanimous. He said the costs were similar and cost was not a factor. He stated in reviewing all of the submissions the time frames we developed was clear.

Councilor Roberts asked how much this will cost. Mayor Blalock said there is a base amount of $20,500.00 which was much lower than what was budgeted. He informed the Council that we can add a number of additional services which would increase the costs.

Motion passed.

Mayor Blalock said the search firm raised the issue in the Charter that if we hire a new City Manager the person shall live in the City within a year. He stated the search firm said it may limit our pool of candidates and if a change was to be made to the Charter it would take a year.

Councilor Perkins said she is in favor of this Charter change and she feels we would limit our pool of candidates that would apply, at this stage we need to consider the cost of homes here.

Councilor Becksted spoke against the change for requiring the City Manager to live in the City. He said the City Manager should be part of the community and live in the City.

Councilor Raynolds said we should stick with the requirement to live in the City.

Councilor Roberts said he would like to have the City Manager living in the City. He said State law would not require the City Manager to live in the City.
City Attorney Sullivan said there is a case in State law that residency requirements are unconstitutional. He also advised the City Council that of 11 cities in the State, 6 required residency.

Councilor Pearson said in terms of residency we need to see what the community wants.

Councilor Dwyer said presence is important and being available for all kinds of things. She said we might consider someone that might live in a 50 mile radius.

Mayor Blalock passed the gavel to Assistant Mayor Lazenby.

Mayor Blalock said to hire a City Manager like this, the person should live in the community. He said the City Manager needs to be intimately involved and he would not support a Charter amendment.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby returned the gavel to Mayor Blalock.

Councilor Perkins asked when does the City Council need to make its decision regarding this matter. City Attorney Sullivan explained the lengthy Charter Amendment process and advised the Council you would need to vote this evening for a public hearing to be held on June 17, 2019.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby said he would not move ahead with a Charter change this year.

Councilor Pearson said that this is enough change and it is too rushed and would taint the process.

2. Appointments to be Voted:
   - Reappointment of Cyrus Beer to the Historic District Commission
   - Reappointment of Martin Ryan to the Historic District Commission

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to reappoint Cyrus Beer to the Historic District Commission until June 1, 2022. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer and voted.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby moved to reappoint Martin Ryan to the Historic District Commission until June 1, 2022. Seconded by Councilor Dwyer and voted. Councilor Becksted voted opposed.

3. Resignation of Shari Donnermeyer from Parking, Traffic & Safety Committee effective July 15, 2019

Mayor Blalock and City Councilors expressed their thanks and appreciation for Ms. Donnermeyer’s eight years of service to the PTS Committee.

4. Establishment of Vaughan Mall Blue Ribbon Committee

Mayor Blalock announced he is establishing the Vaughan Mall Blue Ribbon Committee. The membership will be Councilor Doug Roberts, Councilor Nancy Pearson, Councilor Ned Raynolds, Peter Vandermark, Sam Winebaum, Ellen Fineberg, Brian Murphy and Ex-officio staff member to be appointed by City Manager Bohenko.
Councilor Becksted asked what the Charge of the Committee is. Councilor Roberts said revitalizing the area.

Councilor Dwyer said that she would like the Committee to have a presentation on the area and review the revitalization of the plan. She said this is a follow-up to the larger committee that looked at the Vaughan Mall, Bridge and Worth lots.

Councilor Perkins spoke to the report by the earlier committee which left some areas to be addressed phase by phase.

Councilor Pearson said the point of bringing this back up is as the buildings come on line down Maplewood Avenue this is property we can control and will open green space.

XII. MISCELLANEOUS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Councilor Pearson spoke regarding a piece of propaganda made by the GSA and not the City Council.

Councilor Roberts said he spoke with the Post Master and they are moving out on August 31st. He said they will be relocated to Heritage Avenue and will be open 24 hours.

Assistant Mayor Lazenby announced a week from Saturday, June 15th, the Stiletto Race will host a team from the City and that this is a fundraiser for Big Brother Big Sister.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:10 p.m., Councilor Perkins moved to adjourn. Seconded by Assistant Mayor Lazenby and voted.

KELLI L. BARNABY, MMC, CNHMC
CITY CLERK
LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Public Hearing will be held by the Portsmouth City Council on Monday, June 17, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., Eileen Dondero Foley Council Chambers, Municipal Complex, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, NH on proposed Charter Amendment #1. The complete proposed Charter Amendment is available for review in the Office of the City Clerk and Portsmouth Public Library, during regular business hours.

2019 PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT #1

The Municipal Charter of the City of Portsmouth, Section 4.6 – Compensation of City Councilors is hereby amended as follows (deletions from existing language stricken in red; additions to existing language bolded in red; remaining language unchanged from existing):

SECTION 4.6 – COMPENSATION OF CITY COUNCILORS

Each City Councilor shall be compensated at a rate of Seventy-Five ($75.00) Dollars for each regular Council meeting in which that person is in actual attendance. However, no City Councilor except the Mayor shall receive more than Fifteen-Hundred ($1,500.00)-One Thousand Six Hundred Fifty ($1,650.00) Dollars during any calendar year.

If authorized by referendum vote at the municipal election scheduled for November 5, 2019, this amendment to become effective on January 1, 2020.

BRIEF EXPLANATION

In the Municipal Charter as it is currently written each City Councilor is limited to receiving a maximum of $1,500.00 per calendar year for compensation due to attendance at Council meetings. Passage of this Charter Amendment would eliminate that limitation so that each Councilor would receive compensation at a rate of $75.00 for each Council meeting in which that Councilor is in actual attendance up to a maximum amount of $1,650.00 per calendar year.

Kelli L. Barnaby, MMC, CMC, CNHMC
City Clerk
LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Public Hearing will be held by the Portsmouth City Council on Monday, June 17, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., Eileen Donadio Foley Council Chambers, Municipal Complex, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, NH on proposed Charter Amendment #1. The complete proposed Charter Amendment is available for review in the Office of the City Clerk and Portsmouth Public Library, during regular business hours.

2019 PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT #1

The Municipal Charter of the City of Portsmouth, Section 4.8 – Compensation of City Councilors is hereby amended as follows (deletions from existing language are struck through, additions to existing language are bolded in red; remaining language unchanged from existing):

SECTION 4.8 – COMPENSATION OF CITY COUNCILORS

Each City Councilor shall be compensated at a rate of Seventy-Five ($75.00) Dollars for each regular Council meeting in which that person is in actual attendance. However, no City Council except the Mayor shall receive more than Five-Hundred ($500.00) Dollars during any calendar year.

If authorized by referendum vote at the municipal election scheduled for November 5, 2019, this amendment to become effective on January 1, 2020.

BRIEF EXPLANATION

In the Municipal Charter as it is currently written each City Councilor is limited to receiving a maximum of $1,500.00 per calendar year for compensation due to attendance at Council meetings. Passage of this Charter Amendment would eliminate that limitation so that each Councilor would receive compensation at a rate of $75.00 for each Council meeting in which that Councilor is in actual attendance up to a maximum amount of $1,650.00 per calendar year.

Kelli L. Barnaby, MMC, CMC, CNHMC
City Clerk

[Signature]
LEGAL NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Public Hearing will be held by the Portsmouth City Council on Monday, June 17, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., Eileen Dondero Foley Council Chambers, Municipal Complex, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, NH on proposed Charter Amendment #2. The complete Charter Amendment is available for review in the Office of the City Clerk and Portsmouth Public Library, during regular business hours.

2019 PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT #2

The Municipal Charter of the City of Portsmouth, AMENDMENT E – POLICE DEPARTMENT (POLICE COMMISSION) is hereby amended as follows (deletions from existing language **stripped in red**; additions to existing language **bolded in red**; remaining language unchanged from existing):

AMENDMENT E – POLICE DEPARTMENT (POLICE COMMISSION)

APPOINTMENT/ELECTION TERMS

Should an elected Police Commission be approved on November 5, 1991, the Mayor of the City of Portsmouth shall appoint the first board of three Commissioners who shall assume office commencing on January 1, 1992 through January 1, 1994. In order to establish a legal and proper cycle of election in accordance with New Hampshire law, hereinafter, the first elected Board of Police Commissioners shall be elected in November 1, 1993 as follows:

The two candidates receiving the highest and second highest number of votes shall assume terms of four years. The candidate receiving the third highest number of votes shall assume a term of two years.

Thereinafter, each Commissioner shall be elected for a term of four years. All Police Commissioners elected from 1993 and onwards shall be elected at large and without party affiliation and may be elected for more than one term of office. In the event that a vacancy should occur on the Board, then the next runner-up candidate established out of the last, most recent Board election, shall assume the balance of the vacated term. In the event that the list of candidates from the last election available to fill vacancies becomes depleted, then the Mayor shall appoint any necessary Commissioners the vacancy shall be filled by appointment of the City Council until the next regular municipal election.

If authorized by referendum vote at the municipal election scheduled for November 5, 2019, this amendment to become effective on January 1, 2020.
BRIEF EXPLANATION

Since 2015, a conflict has existed between the language of the City Charter which requires that vacancies on the Police Commission be filled by “the next runner-up candidate established out of the last, most recent Board election, [who] shall assume the balance of the vacated term.” And, in an opinion issued by the Office of the Attorney General of the State of New Hampshire addressed to the Secretary of State, William Gardner, which indicates that in the opinion of the Attorney General State law requires that “when a vacancy occurs on an elected Police Commission, the vacancy is filled by appointment of the municipality’s governing body until the next regular municipal election, RSA 105-C(3); (l).” If adopted, this Charter amendment would resolve that conflict in favor of the position taken by the Office of the Attorney General.

Kelli L. Barnaby, MMC, CMC, CNHMC
City Clerk
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Public Hearing will be held by the Portsmouth City Council on Monday, June 17, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., Eileen Dondero Foley Council Chambers, Municipal Complex, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, NH on proposed Charter Amendment #2. The complete Charter Amendment is available for review in the Office of the City Clerk and Portsmouth Public Library, during regular business hours.

2019 PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT #2

The Municipal Charter of the City of Portsmouth, AMENDMENT E – POLICE DEPARTMENT (POLICE COMMISSION) is hereby amended as follows (deletions from existing language underlined, additions to existing language italicized):

AMENDMENT E – POLICE DEPARTMENT (POLICE COMMISSION)

APPOINTMENT/ELECTION TERMS

Should an elected Police Commission be approved on November 5, 1991, the Mayor of the City of Portsmouth shall appoint the first board of three Commissioners, who shall assume office commencing on January 1, 1992 through January 1, 1994, in order to establish a legal and proper cycle of election in accordance with New Hampshire law. Subsequently, the first elected Board of Police Commissioners shall be elected in November 1, 1993 as follows:

The two candidates receiving the highest and second highest number of votes shall assume terms of four years. The candidate receiving the third highest number of votes shall assume a term of two years.

Hereinafter, each Commissioner shall be elected for a term of four years. All Police Commissioners elected from 1993 and onward shall be elected at large and without party affiliation and may be elected for more than one term of office. In the event that a vacancy should occur on the Board, that the next run-off candidate established out of the last, most recent Board election, shall assume the balance of the unexpired term. In the event that the last candidate to fill vacancies becomes disqualified, the vacancy shall be filled by appointment of the City Council until the next regular municipal election.

If authorized by referendum vote at the municipal election scheduled for November 5, 2019, this amendment to become effective on January 1, 2020.

BRIEF EXPLANATION

Since 2015, a conflict has existed between the language of the City Charter which requires that vacancies on the Police Commission be filled by "the next run-off candidate elected from the last, most recent Board election," and, in an opinion issued by the Office of the Attorney General of the State of New Hampshire addressed to the Secretary of State, William Gardner, which indicates that in the opinion of the Attorney General, state law requires that "when a vacancy occurs on an elected Police Commission, the vacancy is filled by appointment of the municipality's governing body until the next regular municipal election, RSA 185-C:3(3)(i)." If adopted, this Charter amendment would resolve that conflict in favor of the position taken by the Office of the Attorney General.

Kelli L. Barnaby, MMC, CMC, CNHMC
City Clerk
ORDINANCE #

THE CITY OF PORTSMOUTH ORDAINS

That Chapter 7, VEHICLES, TRAFFIC and PARKING of the ordinances of the City of Portsmouth be amended as follows by deletions from existing language stricken and highlighted in **red**; additions to existing language bolded and highlighted in **red**, remaining language unchanged from existing:

[Explanatory note not part of ordinance. The following amendments to the parking ordinance were either implemented by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee on a trial basis last year or are part of ongoing improvements to the parking ordinance and are forwarded to the City Council for approval. Each ordinance change is shown on diagrams attached hereto.]

A. **Amend:** Chapter 7, Article III – TRAFFIC ORDINANCE, Section 7.330: No Parking

Section 7.330: NO PARKING

A. Unless otherwise designated by ordinance, parking shall be prohibited at all times in the following described streets and locations:

11. Brewster Street:
   a. westerly side from Islington Street to McDonough Street.
   b. easterly side, one parking space southerly from the corner at the intersection of Brewster and Hanover Street.
   c. easterly side, no parking in front of Map 138, Lot 11, except from a point beginning 108 feet from the northerly curbline of Islington Street, and running 20 feet in a northerly direction.

58. Highland Street: westerly side, beginning at the southerly curbline of Middle Street and running southerly for a distance of 90 feet.

59. Hill Street: Both sides, entire length between Bridge Street and Autumn Street.

67. Langdon Street:
   a. entire easterly side from McDonough Street to north of Islington Street.
   b. entire westerly side, north of McDonough Street.

133. Wentworth Street:
   a. easterly side, entire length.
   b. westerly side, beginning at the southerly curbline of Pleasant Street
and running southerly for a distance of 215 feet.

B. **Amend:** Chapter 7, Article III – TRAFFIC ORDINANCE, Section 7.336: One-Way Streets.

    **Section 7.336: ONE-WAY STREETS**

    2. Brewster Street: northerly from Islington Street to McDonough Street.

C. **Amend:** Chapter 7, Article V – BICYCLE REGULATIONS, Section 7.510: Unattended Bicycles

    **Section 7.510: UNATTENDED BICYCLES**

    No person shall park a bicycle in a manner that:

    G. At no time shall bicycles be secured to or parked against a fire hydrant or monuments.

D. **Amend:** Chapter 7, Article VI – TRUCK LOADING/UNLOADING ZONES ESTABLISHED

    **ARTICLE VI: TRUCK LOADING/UNLOADING ZONES ESTABLISHED**

    **Section 7.601: LIMITED HOURS TRUCK LOADING/UNLOADING ZONES**

    The following locations are established as exclusive “**Limited Hours Loading Zones**” during “**Loading Zone Hours**” which are defined as Monday through Saturdays between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. or as otherwise described below. With regard to any particular location, during **Loading Zone Hours** these times only trucks, vans and other licensed commercial–delivery vehicles, vehicles marked for commercial purposes and unmarked noncommercial vehicles with **Loading Zone Permits** may utilize **Limited Hours Loading Zones** for up to 30 consecutive minutes if actively engaged in loading or unloading of product, merchandise or equipment. (meaning that no more than 10 consecutive minutes pass without loading or unloading activity) may park. Such vehicles may park at the designated locations for a period not to exceed 30 minutes. Unless otherwise determined by ordinance, all other times these **Loading Zones** shall be open parking for all vehicles.
1. **Bow Street:** northerly side, **beginning starting** 40 feet west from Chapel Street and **continuing extending** west for a distance of 70 feet. In addition to Monday through Saturday, this location shall also be a **truck** loading zone from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Sunday.

2. **Brewster Street:** easterly side, beginning 40 feet north of the northerly curbline of Islington Street and running 40 feet in the northerly direction, between the hours of 7 AM and 3 PM, Monday through Friday.

3. **Congress Street:**
   a. northerly side, beginning 9 feet west from the intersection of Fleet Street and Congress Street running for a distance of 136 feet.
   b. southerly side, beginning 130 feet east from the intersection of Fleet Street and Congress Street running for a distance of 49 feet.

4. **Daniel Street:**
   a. northerly side, 123 feet east from Bow Street for a distance of 45 feet
   b. southerly side, **beginning** 37 feet west from Penhallow Street for a distance of 80 feet.

5. **Deer Street:** southerly side, west from Market Street a distance of 60 feet.

6. **Hanover Street:**
   a. northerly side, **east beginning** at a distance of 106 feet from the western most point of the southwesterly curbline of Market Street for a distance of 45 feet.
   b. southerly side, **beginning at the westerly curbline of Fleet Street and running westerly for 90 feet** first two spaces west from Fleet Street, from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.
   b. c. **all parking spaces on the northerly side between Portwalk Place and Maplewood Avenue from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.**

7. **High Street:** easterly side, in a southerly direction from Ladd Street a distance of 50 feet.

8. **Market Street:**
   a. easterly side, south for a distance of 50 feet, beginning at Commercial Alley
   b. easterly side, south for a distance of 40 feet, beginning at Bow Street from 6:00
b. a.m. to 7:00 p.m. In addition, from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., Monday through Sunday, this area shall be designated as a taxi stand per Section 7A.408.

c. westerly side between Russell Street and Deer Street, from November 1st through March 30th, 2:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday-Friday, 2:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Saturday.

9. Pearl Street: easterly side from a point thirty feet (30’) north of Islington Street to a point seventy feet (70’) north of Islington Street.

10. Penhallow Street: westerly side, beginning at north from Commercial Alley and running northerly for a distance of 45 feet. In addition to Monday through Saturday, this location shall also be a truck loading zone from 6:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Sunday.

11. a.——State Street:
   a. northerly side, beginning 40 feet east from Pleasant Street for a distance of 420 feet. In addition, from 7:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., Monday through Sunday, this area shall be designated as a taxi stand per Section 7A.408.

   b. southerly side, beginning 20 feet west from Atkinson Street for a distance of 57 feet.

Section 7.602: 24-HOUR TRUCK LOADING /UNLOADING ZONES (24 HOURS)

The following locations are established as exclusive “24-Hour Truck Loading Zones” at all times, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Only licensed commercial vehicles, vehicles marked for commercial purposes and unmarked non-commercial vehicles with Loading Zone Permits may utilize the 24-Hour Loading Zones for 30 consecutive minutes if actively trucks, vans and other commercial delivery vehicles actually engaged in loading or unloading of product, merchandise or equipment. may park in the designated locations. Such vehicles may park at the designated locations for a period not to exceed 30 consecutive minutes. No other vehicles may utilize the 24-Hour Loading Zones.

1. Ceres Street
   a. westerly side, beginning 27 feet from Bow Street for a distance of 25 feet.
   b. easterly side, beginning 95 feet from Bow Street for a distance of 40 feet. Pleasant Street: westerly side, south from State Street a distance of 50 feet.

2. Chestnut Street: westerly side, south from Congress Street for a distance of 100 feet.

3. Daniel Street: northerly side, beginning 123 feet east from Bow Street for a distance of 35 feet.
2. Haven Court:
   a. both sides, entire length

5. Maplewood Avenue: easterly side, beginning 35 feet north from the intersection of Congress Street and Maplewood Avenue running for a distance of 70 feet.

6. Penhallow Street: easterly side, 100 feet north from the intersection of State Street and Penhallow Street running for a distance of 28 feet.

76. Pleasant Street: westerly side, beginning 21 feet south from the intersection of Pleasant Street and State Street running southerly for a distance of 30 feet.

87.
3. Porter Street
   a. northerly side, beginning 15 feet west from Fleet Street for a distance of 40 feet.
   b. southerly side, beginning 145 feet east from Middle Street for a distance of 45 feet.

4. State Street
   a. southerly side, 20 feet west from Atkinson Street for a distance of 29 feet.

Section 7.603: LOADING AND UNLOADING OF LIVE PARKED VEHICLES.

1. Middle Street: easterly side, beginning 188 feet southwesterly from intersection with Miller Avenue, for a distance of 20 feet (in front of 375 Middle Street). Court Street: southerly side directly opposite the easterly line of Chestnut Street extending easterly along said southerly side of Court Street for a distance of fifty (50) feet.

2. Middle Street: easterly side, beginning 188 feet southwesterly from intersection with Miller Avenue, for a distance of 20 feet (in front of 375 Middle Street).

Section 7.604: COMMERCIAL LOADING ZONE PERMITS

The Director of Public Works may issue a Loading Zone permit to allow unmarked noncommercially marked vehicles to utilize Limited Hours Loading Zones and 24-Hour Loading Zones for 30 consecutive minutes the purpose of actively engaged loading or unloading of product, merchandise or equipment. The issuance and use of such permits shall be in accordance with Article VI and the following terms and conditions:
a. The permittee shall be issued a commercial Loading Zone Permit from the Parking Clerk’s Office for a fee to be determined in accordance with Chapter 1, Article XVI.

b. Each Loading Zone Permit would be valid for one calendar year, January 1st through December 31st, and will require annual renewal.

c. Each Loading Zone Permit is non-transferable and is valid for only one vehicle per application.

d. The vehicle must prominently display the commercial Loading Zone Permit on the vehicle’s dashboard.

e. In the event that the permittee secures the use of the commercial Loading Zone Permit through misrepresentation, the permittee shall be subject to a fine of one hundred dollars ($100.00).

f. Any person using a commercial Loading Zone Permit other than at the times or manner specifically authorized by the Department of Public Works shall be subject to a fine of two hundred dollars ($200.00) per use, per permit, of such unauthorized use.

E. Amend: Chapter 7, Article XI – SPEED LIMITS, Section 7.1100: Speed Limits

Section 7.1100: SPEED LIMITS:

E. Speed Limit: 25 MPH

3. Dodge Avenue

F. Amend: Chapter 7, Article XVII – MOPED REGULATIONS, Section 7.1702: Parking

Section 7.1702: PARKING:

F. At no time shall a moped be secured or parked against a fire hydrant or monuments.
Section 7.330: NO PARKING

11. Brewster Street:
   a. easterly side, one parking space southerly from the corner at the intersection of Brewster and Hanover Street, entire easterly side north of Sudbury Street.
   b. easterly side, one parking space southerly from the corner at the intersection of Brewster and Hanover Street.
   c. easterly side, no parking in front of Map 138 Lot 11, except from a point beginning 108 feet from the northerly curbline of Islington Street, running 20 feet in a northerly direction.

67. Langdon Street:
   a. entire easterly side from McDonough Street to north of Islington Street.

Map prepared by Portsmouth Department of Public Works, 07 May 2019
Map document: U:\Projects\0263 Parking Traffic & Safety\Traffic and Parking Ordinance Changes\2019
Section 7.330: NO PARKING

58. Highland Street: westerly side, beginning at the southerly curbline of Middle Street and running southerly for a distance of 90 feet.
Section 7.330: NO PARKING

59. Hill Street: Both sides, entire length between Bridge Street and Autumn Street.
Section 7.330: NO PARKING

133. Wentworth Street:
   b. westerly side, beginning at the southerly curbline of Pleasant Street, running southerly for a distance of 215 feet.

Section 7.330: NO PARKING

133. Wentworth Street:
   a. easterly side, entire length.
Section 7.336: ONE-WAY STREETS

2. Brewster Street: northerly from Islington Street to McDonough Street.
PROPOSED LOADING ZONE CHANGES
CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Date: 5/22/2019
Section 7.1100: SPEED LIMITS:

E. Speed Limit: 25 MPH

3. Dodge Ave
Committee: Parking & Traffic Safety

Name: Stephen T. Pesci

Telephone: 603 502-5086

Could you be contacted at work? ☑

If so, telephone # 603 862-4207

Street address: 200 Thornton St

Mailing address (if different): PO Box 96

Email address (for clerk's office communication): stevepesci@gmail.com

How long have you been a resident of Portsmouth? 30 years

Occupational background:

Regional, land-use and transportation planning profession for 25+ years. Degree in Community development (BS) and Public Administration (MPA)

Please list experience you have in respect to this Board/Commission:

Currently work primarily in transportation & streetscape/landscape issues at UNH. Chair UNH transportation & safety Committee. Ongoing involvement in related issues.

Resume Attached

6/27/2012
Have you contacted the chair of the Board/Commission to determine the time commitment involved?  YES/NO

Would you be able to commit to attending all meetings?  YES/NO

Reasons for wishing to serve:

I think my experience and community interest would make me a constructive voice on the Committee. Desire to keep Portsmouth safe & mobile and unique.

Please list any organizations, groups, or other committees you are involved in:

New Hampshire Planners Association (member)
American Planning Association (APA) (member)
Ward 1 Selectman (2017 elected)

Please list two character references not related to you or city staff members:
(Portsmouth references preferred)

   Name, address, telephone number

2. Joan Seaver 431-8578 17 Whidden St
   Name, address, telephone number

BY SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION YOU UNDERSTAND THAT:

1. This application is for consideration and does not mean you will necessarily be appointed to this Board/Commission; and
2. The Mayor will review your application, may contact you, check your references, and determine any potential conflict of interests; and
3. This application may be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at the Mayor's discretion; and
4. If this application is forwarded to the City Council, they may consider the application and vote on it at the next scheduled meeting.
5. Application will be kept on file for one year from date of receipt.

Signature: [Signature] Date: [Date]

If you do not receive the appointment you are requesting, would you be interested in serving on another board or commission?  Yes  No  X

Please submit application to the City Clerks Office, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, NH 03801
6/27/2012
Stephen T. Pesci
PO Box 96
Portsmouth New Hampshire 03802

voice: (603) 502-5086
e-mail: stevepesci@gmail.com

Education:
University of New Hampshire, Durham:
1992 Master of Public Administration, Department of Political Science (GPA 3.77/4.00)
1987 Bachelor of Science, Community Development (GPA 3.12/4.00)
Department of Resource Economics and Community Development

Employment:
Special Project Director: University of New Hampshire, Durham
- policy, technical and planning for Campus Planning, Transportation Services, Vice President for Finance & Administration and University Sustainability Institute.
- development of transportation demand management (TDM) strategies - transportation system infrastructure improvements, feasibility studies for parking and transit expansion, consultant oversight/coordination for Campus Master Plan, traffic modeling and wayfinding programs
- design, development and tracking of alternative fleet fuel programs, emissions inventories
- grant coordination and project management of FHWA, FTA and DOE projects totaling over $12 million. Coordination with NH DOT, Environmental Services and Energy and Planning

2001- current Independent Consultant
- technical and project assistance to consulting firms, Universities, DOTs and municipal clients in the fields of emissions inventory, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, rail, community design and transportation/parking demand management

1999-2001 Asst. Director/MPO Coordinator: Strafford Regional Planning Commission, Dover, NH
- oversight of transportation planning, budget and policy work for a dual agency Metropolitan Planning Organization in southeastern New Hampshire
- coordination of staff in implementation of ISTEA/TEA-21 requirements among 35 communities including development of Long-Range Plan, Transportation Improvement Programs and ongoing public involvement, education/outreach efforts
- technical and managerial experience in air quality conformity; pedestrian and bicycle planning, rail station development, transit system analysis, travel demand forecasting and consultant selection/project management

1992-1993 Project Manager: Fugro-McClelland - Portsmouth, NH; Struktor - Fortaleza, Brazil
- GIS/LSI project management for multi-national engineering consulting firms focusing on municipal government and natural resource systems

1989-1992 Senior Planner: Strafford Regional Planning Commission - Dover, New Hampshire
- environmental, transportation, community planning, capital improvement programs and economic development projects, reports and analyses
- GIS/LSI Specialist - data development and output in coordination with NH GRANIT

- administration and planning at a 5000 watt, non-commercial, community radio station

- designed research/survey instruments/develop & present analyses for clients

State, Community and Professional Service:
leadership and NGO development training in Latin America and the Caribbean
Cooperative Alliance Seacoast Transportation (COAST): Board Member (1990-1995)

Languages: English (native), French (basic) and limited Brazilian Portuguese
Software: Windows/Mac os X Office, Box, Meridian and web/media software, FTA grant management

fall 2016
Stephen T. Pesci  
PO Box 96  
Portsmouth New Hampshire 03802  
voice: (603) 502-5086  
email: stevepesci@gmail.com

Recent Project Management and Consulting (2000-present):

Town of Moultonborough, NH:  
Facilitator for Town Master Plan Committee (2014)

Yale University:  
Consultant to the Transportation Policy Committee (2006) developed TDM Roadmap

Alta Planning + Design:  
City of Saco, Maine, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan - Project Management (2004)  

University of New Hampshire:  
Intermodal Rail Station Expansion Design Study (project oversight) 2014-2015  
Campus Master Plan Update, (2012 and 2004) consultant oversight/transportation studies  
$9 million CMAQ and Transportation Enhancements (TE) project oversight including Main Street redevelopment projects, rail station renovation, alternative fuel fleet  
Transportation Policy Committee reports and TDM Policy Development, (2001-2015)  
Consultant oversight on Durham-UNH traffic model (2008-2013)  
Traffic and Parking Structure Feasibility Studies (2002-2014)

Strafford Regional Planning Commission:  
City of Dover – Master Plan Transportation Chapter - primary Author and Mgr, 2000  
US 4 Safety Study – Project Manger for FHWA Corridor Safety Study, Durham, NH, 1999  
Newmarket New Hampshire Town Planner and Master plan editor (1994)

Related Transportation and Community Work/Involvement:  
Traffic Safety Committees Durham, NH (UNH representative) and University of New Hampshire (Chair)

Amtrak Downeaster (Northern New England Passenger Rail Authority):  
George J. Mitchell Award for Excellence & Commitment (2014)  

New Hampshire Community/Legislative:  
Co-developer of slide lecture on Rural Traffic Calming Techniques and Issues (1998)  
Co-author New Hampshire Local Auto Fee legislation - passed (1999)

Professional Memberships:  
1989 -current American Planning Association/New Hampshire Planners Association  
2002 - 2004 National Association of Rail Passengers, Board of Directors

Professional Presentations, Publications, Conferences and Lectures:  
2015 “Seacoast Transportation – New Modes of Getting Around” PS 21 Portsmouth panelist  
2013 “Evoking Sustainable Transportation Systems”, University of Rhode Island, Kingston  
2010 “Coordinated Community Transportation”; Community Transportation Forum, Concord NH  
2009 “TDM and Sustainability Integration”; Northern New England APA Conference, Belfast, Maine  
2008 Transportation and Sustainable Campus Communities – Island Press, contributing author  
2007 “TDM and Successful Transportation Alliances in a Town-Gown setting”, New England Parking Council,  
2006 “Creating an Energy Star Label for Fleet Procurement”, (AASHE), Tempe, Arizona  
2005 “Curbing the Automobile at UNH”, Northeast Sustainable Energy Conference  
2004 “Transportation/TDM Systems in a Niche Market”, Transportation Research Forum, New York City  
Ongoing graduate and undergraduate guest lectures at the University of New Hampshire, Durham

fall 2016
To: Mayor Jack Blalock, City of Portsmouth NH  
c/o City Clerk  
From: Stephen T Pesci  
Re: Parking & Traffic Safety Committee - Board and Commission Application  
Date: November 13, 2017

Congratulations on your reelection as Mayor!  
It looks like a great team for the incoming Council.

I am pleased to submit my Board and Commission application for the Portsmouth Parking and Traffic Safety Committee. I believe my 30 years of Portsmouth residency, professional background and personal interest in community transportation issues would make me an ideal candidate to serve on the Committee.

The Committee has great opportunities and challenges in keeping neighborhoods safe, accessible and welcoming while protecting the unique characteristics of our traditional New England character. I believe we can accommodate our new opportunities and demonstrate best practices for safety, mobility and accessibility in a balanced manner.

As a 15-year resident in the Christian Shore neighborhood (and prior to that the South End and Little Harbor neighborhoods) I have an appreciation for the distinct transportation challenges in several areas of the City. My current work at UNH, and prior work at dealing with transportation issues on a regional and state level inform my insight as well.

I look forward to consideration of my application should there be an upcoming vacancy on the Committee.

Feel free to contact me at any time. Best wishes in the new Council term.

Stephen Pesci  
200 Thornton Street  
603-502-5086  
stevepesci@gmail.com
CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, N.H.
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Instructions: Please print or type and complete all information.
Please submit resume' along with this application.

Committee: Parking and Traffic Safety
Name: Jonathan Sandberg
Telephone: 603 828 9583

Initial applicant

Could you be contacted at work? YES NO If so, telephone # Same as above

Street address: 160 Bartlett Street Portsmouth NH 03801

Mailing address (if different):

Email address (for clerk’s office communication): ifsandberg@yahoo.com

How long have you been a resident of Portsmouth? Since 2000

Occupational background:

Para-professional at Portsmouth High School since 2006
Teacher at PEAK afterschool program at New Franklin School 2004-2010
Docent at Jackson and Longan Houses in Portsmouth 2004-2011

Please list experience you have in respect to this Board/Commission:

I have served on the board of PS 21 for the past two years and have studied best practices for transportation planning by reading books and listening to lectures by world renowned experts.

5/14/2019
Have you contacted the chair of the Board/Commission to determine the time commitment involved? **YES**

Would you be able to commit to attending all meetings? **YES**

Reasons for wishing to serve: I have been extremely engaged in civic activity in Portsmouth. I attend many meetings, write letters to the editor of the Herald. I also listen carefully to the opinions of others. I very much want to improve the state of transportation in Portsmouth.

Please list any organizations, groups, or other committees you are involved in:

- **PS21 (Portsmouth Smart Growth)** Board member since 2017
- **Community Development Block Grant Citizens Advisory Committee** Vice Chairman
- **Portsmouth Historical Society Buildings & Grounds Committee** Chairman 2008-2014
- **Portsmouth Listens (Many sessions, many years)**

Please list two character references not related to you or city staff members:
(Portsmouth references preferred)

1. **Doug Roberts** 47 Richards Ave (603) 431-1925
   - Name, address, telephone number

2. **Nancy Pearson** 104 Lincoln Ave (603) 572-3953
   - Name, address, telephone number

**BY SUBMITTING THIS APPLICATION YOU UNDERSTAND THAT:**

1. This application is for consideration and does not mean you will necessarily be appointed to this Board/Commission; and
2. The Mayor will review your application, may contact you, check your references, and determine any potential conflict of interests; and
3. This application may be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at the Mayor’s discretion; and
4. If this application is forwarded to the City Council, they may consider the application and vote on it at the next scheduled meeting.
5. Application will be kept on file for one year from date of receipt.

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 5/20/19

If you do not receive the appointment you are requesting, would you be interested in serving on another board or commission? **Yes** ✑ **No**

Please submit application to the City Clerk’s Office, 1 Junkins Avenue, Portsmouth, NH 03801

5/14/2019
### City of Portsmouth – City Manager – Proposed Recruitment Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>Consultant meets via teleconference with City Manager Search Committee to discuss search process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to June 27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consultant on site to meet with City Council, Department Heads and attends Public Forum to discuss recruitment profile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consultant submits draft Position Announcement and Recruitment Profile for review. Position Announcement and Recruitment Profile are approved by City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of July 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consultant places ads for position and starts outreach process. Recruitment profile is sent to potential candidates and posted on GovHR website and also provided to City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Deadline for resumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; to September 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consultant reviews resumes, interviews candidates via Zoom, conducts background reviews, due diligence, etc. Consultant narrows field to 8-12 candidates for further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consultant submits Recruitment Report to City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of September 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Consultant meets with City to review candidates and select candidates for the interview process. (CC Non-Public Work Session 9/16 at 5:30; potential 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; interviews (phone/Skype) 9/18 or 9/19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks of September 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and October 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>City conducts final interview process (10/1, 10/2) and makes selection. Contract negotiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November - December 2019</td>
<td>Candidate starts employment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECRUITMENT BROCHURE DISCUSSION OUTLINE

CANDIDATE EXPERIENCE AND BACKGROUND:

• Type of Experience Required/Preferred:

• Management Style:

• Qualities and Traits:

• Necessary Skills:
INTERNAL/ORGANIZATIONAL CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

- Short Term – within the first year:

- Longer Term – two to five years:

EXTERNAL/COMMUNITY ISSUES CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

- Short Term – within the first year:

- Longer Term – two to five years:
OTHER COMMENTS

Name: _________________________________________________________________

Phone number or email for follow up: ____________________________________
Cambridge City Manager – Position Profile Survey – City Employees

*DRAFT*

The City Council requests your feedback regarding the position of City Manager. With the pending retirement of Mr. Rossi, the City Council believes it is important to solicit feedback from the City staff regarding the characteristic and traits the new City Manager should possess as well as the opportunities and challenges he or she may be faced with when assuming the position. Please provide responses to the following questions by June 22, 2016. Thank you for your participation in the survey.

1. In what department do you work?
   a. ____________________

2. Which three of the following leadership traits abilities do you believe are most essential to perform the work of City Manager?
   a. Inspirational
   b. Approachable
   c. Visionary
   d. Courageous
   e. Empathetic
   f. Ethical
   g. Communicative
   h. Other ____________________

3. Which three of the following management style skills do you believe are most essential to perform the work of City Manager?
   a. Strategic
   b. Decisive
   c. Collaborative
   d. Coaching
   e. Proactive
   f. Innovative
   g. Anticipatory
   h. Other ____________________

4. Which three of the following abilities and skills do you believe are most essential to perform the work of the City Manager?
   a. Ability to interact regularly with a wide variety of stakeholders
   b. Skill in municipal finance
   c. Ability to work with a multi-member board
   d. Ability to supervise staff, some of whom work in different locations
   e. Skill in making oral presentations
   f. Skill in communicating with diverse groups and stakeholders
g. Other

5. Do you think it is necessary for the new City Manager to have had previous experience as a manager of a local government?
   a. Yes
   b. No

6. Do you have any other comments related to the recruitment?
Creating a Portsmouth Community Coordinated Response to Substance Misuse

The Current Challenge
Overdose deaths from opiates and from other substances such as crystal meth are now one of the greatest public health risks in the U.S. eclipsing AIDS and gun deaths as one of the leading causes of death. From 2013 to 2016 opiate related deaths in New Hampshire tripled and in 2016 the death rate was 3 times the national average. The death rate has remained close to 400 persons per year in 2017 and 2018, remaining one of the highest rates in the nation. Not only is this a personal and community tragedy, it is placing increasing demands on already strained resources. There is a substantial economic and social impact. The CDC estimates that the total "economic burden" of prescription opioid misuse alone in the United States is $78.5 billion a year, including the costs of healthcare, lost productivity, addiction treatment, and criminal justice involvement.

The Need for a Coordinated Response
Some of the most hopeful responses to this challenge have come from communities that have taken a comprehensive, trauma-informed approach to care. Communities are recognizing that many of the challenges in addictions and co-related mental health issues have their roots in childhood adversity and trauma and cannot be effectively addressed unless the root causes are acknowledged and addressed. In the words of a recent policy paper on trauma-informed care and addiction, the most effective programs recognize “that no single institution in the community can, by itself, effectively address the causes and effects of childhood adversity, [and] are creating broad coalitions that bring together the many different institutions in the community – the schools, law enforcement, health and mental health, businesses, the courts, and others – to develop and implement comprehensive community-wide trauma-informed initiatives.”

Creating a Coordinated Response Plan
Preliminary conversations among participants from many organizations across the community and with personnel from Pinetree Institute which specializes in planning and trauma-informed care have suggested that engaging in a formal planning process would be helpful in creating a coordinated plan for action. This planning process would look at the requirements for coordination across the various agencies and sectors that provide services and are impacted by the substance misuse crisis. It would also specifically address requirements across the full range of contributory solutions: prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery and reintegration.

Pinetree Institute is able to provide a facilitator to work with a Steering Committee and larger group of stakeholders to determine the present level of need, identify gaps and overlaps, understand the needs of each sector of the community and help to create a plan for coordinated action. This plan would also include recommendations on how best to manage coordination in the future since coordination requires active participation on the part of all stakeholders.

Objectives of the Planning Process:
- Create an initial analysis of current needs and existing services as well as known service gaps.
- Engage key stakeholders and decision makers in a dialogue about areas for potential coordination.
- Provide information on successful strategies to address the substance misuse crisis in other parts of the U.S., particularly trauma-informed strategies that provide a base for cross-sector collaboration.
- Recommend steps for future action including service gaps and overlaps to address, plans for community-wide dialogue and education and mechanisms to ensure coordination can be built into on-going operating plans.

1 “Trauma-Informed Approaches Need to be Part of a Comprehensive Strategy for Addressing the Opioid Epidemic” CTIPP (Campaign for Trauma-Informed Policy and Practice) Policy Brief, June 2017.
Proposed Planning Steps

- Cooperate with members of the Steering Committee representing 10-12 key agencies and organizations and identify other stakeholders to be included in the planning process.
- Create initial analysis of current needs and status of services including meetings with key service providers, stakeholders and client groups and review of existing data to create a “snapshot” of current state. (Note: this is not a comprehensive needs analysis but a rapid collection and organization of existing data from important stakeholder groups.)
- Meet with Steering Committee to review current status and identify participants to be included in coordination discussions.
- Hold discussions with individuals and groups identified by the Steering Committee. Some conversations would be one-on-one, some would be small groups.
- Create a draft plan and recommendations. Based on the broader stakeholder discussions, identify key themes, findings and recommendations for next steps.
- Conduct review meeting with Steering Committee to approve recommendations and agree on next steps.

Pinetree Institute will provide the services of Dr. Larry McCullough who has extensive facilitation experience and who has worked with issues of service integration and cross-agency collaboration. Dr. McCullough is also well informed about the requirements of trauma-informed care and best practices that are being implemented in other parts of the U.S. and will bring that perspective into the discussion and planning process.

Portsmouth Community Coordinated Response to Substance Misuse -- Proposed Steering Committee Members:

- Portsmouth City Council – Cliff Lazenby, Assistant Mayor (Committee Chair)
- NH State Senate – Martha Fuller Clark, Senator District 21
- NH Superior Court – Tina Nadeau, Chief Justice
- Child Advocacy Center, Rockingham County – Maureen Sullivan, Executive Director (also Portsmouth Rotary)
- Rockingham County Department of Corrections – Stephen Church, Superintendent
- Portsmouth Police Department – Robert Merner, Chief; Darrin Sargent, Lieutenant, Investigative Division
- Portsmouth Fire Department – Todd Germain, Chief
- Portsmouth School Department – Stephen Zadravec, Superintendent; Christine Burke, Wellness Coordinator
- Portsmouth Hospital – Grant Turpin, EMS/Outreach Director; Stephen Curtis, Behavioral Health Director
- Safe Harbor Recovery Center – Heather Blumenfeld, Director
- Granite Pathways – Patricia Reed, NH State Director
- HAVEN – Kathy Beebe, Executive Director; Sarah Shanahan, Program Director
- Portsmouth Housing Authority – Tammy Joslyn, Residential Services Coordinator (also ED, Operation Blessing)
- Chamber Collaborative of Greater Portsmouth – Valerie Rochon, President

Facilitator: Dr. Larry McCullough – Executive Director, Pinetree Institute
Portsmouth Community Coordinated Response to Substance Misuse

Proposed Time Estimates and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Steps</th>
<th>Estimated level of effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create initial analysis of current needs and status of services including meetings with key service providers, stakeholders and client groups and review of existing data to create a “snapshot” of current state. (Note: this is not a comprehensive needs analysis but a rapid collection and organization of existing data from key stakeholder groups.)</td>
<td>2-3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with Steering Committee of 10-12 key stakeholders to review current status and identify participants to be included in coordination discussions (includes meeting planning and follow-up).</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold discussions with individuals and groups identified by the Steering Committee. Some conversations would be one-on-one, some would be small groups.</td>
<td>3-5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a draft plan and recommendations. Based on the broader stakeholder discussions, identify key themes, findings and recommendations for next steps.</td>
<td>1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct review meeting with Steering Committee to approve recommendations and agree on next steps (includes meeting planning and follow-up).</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total estimated days: 8-12 days

Agreed to maximum cost: $8,000.00

Pinetree Institute will provide the services of Dr. Larry McCullough who has extensive facilitation experience and who has worked with issues of service integration and cross-agency collaboration. Dr. McCullough is also well informed about the requirements of trauma-informed care and best practices that are being implemented in other parts of the U.S. and will bring that perspective into the discussion and planning process. Pinetree Institute will discount its normal non-profit consulting rate to $1,000 per day and will also agree to cap the cost at a fixed fee of $8,000. Any time over 8 days will be contributed at no cost as an in-kind contribution from Pinetree Institute.
May 21, 2019

The Hon. Jack Blalock, Mayor
The Hon. Cliff Lazenby, Assistant Mayor
Members of the City Council
One Junkins Avenue, City Hall
Portsmouth NH 03801

Dear Council Members:

The Rotary Club of Portsmouth is committed to leadership in key areas of education, literacy, economic development, maternal and child health, disease prevention and cure. This winter and spring we have worked with other Seacoast NH Clubs to sponsor a series of forums about substance misuse, and ways communities can collaborate for prevention, treatment, recovery, job re-entry and a peaceful, productive community.

Several of the members of our Recovery Committee attended the Pinetree Institute’s May 3 day-long seminar on ACE’s and trauma-informed care, and nearly 30 Portsmouth-area people took part in a break-out session as part of that program. This led to discussions with Pinetree Institute’s Larry McCullough and Assistant Mayor Lazenby, and now to a proposal for partnership among the City, Pinetree Institute and Portsmouth Rotary to map out a coordinated response plan for our community.

Our board has approved a resolution offering to co-sponsor this planning work and to fund up to $4,000 of the cost. Separate documents describe the scope and execution we propose. We ask the support of the City Council, and a “matching” $4,000, to advance this work. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Cleo Villaflor, President
Rotary Club of Portsmouth

cc: City Manager John Bohenko
Creating a Coordinated Response to Substance Misuse

The Current Challenge
Overdose deaths from opiates and from other substances such as crystal meth are now one of the greatest public health risks in the U.S. eclipsing AIDS and gun deaths as one of the leading causes of death. From 2013 to 2016 opiate related deaths in New Hampshire tripled and in 2016 the death rate was 3 times the national average. The death rate has remained close to 400 persons per year in 2017 and 2018, remaining one of the highest rates in the nation. Not only is this a personal and community tragedy, it is placing increasing demands on already strained resources. There is a substantial economic and social impact. The CDC estimates that the total "economic burden" of prescription opioid misuse alone in the United States is $78.5 billion a year, including the costs of healthcare, lost productivity, addiction treatment, and criminal justice involvement.

The Need for a Coordinated Response
Some of the most hopeful responses to this challenge have come from communities that have taken a comprehensive, trauma-informed approach to care. Communities are recognizing that many of the challenges in addictions and co-related mental health issues have their roots in childhood adversity and trauma and cannot be effectively addressed unless the root causes are acknowledged and addressed. In the words of a recent policy paper on trauma-informed care and addiction, the most effective programs recognize “that no single institution in the community can, by itself, effectively address the causes and effects of childhood adversity, [and] are creating broad coalitions that bring together the many different institutions in the community – the schools, law enforcement, health and mental health, businesses, the courts, and others – to develop and implement comprehensive community-wide trauma-informed initiatives.”

Creating a Coordinated Response Plan
Preliminary conversations among participants from many organizations across the community and with personnel from Pinetree Institute which specializes in planning and trauma-informed care have suggested that engaging in a formal planning process would be helpful in creating a coordinated plan for action. This planning process would look at the requirements for coordination across the various agencies and sectors that provide services and are impacted by the substance misuse crisis. It would also specifically address requirements across the full range of contributory solutions: prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery and reintegration.

Pinetree Institute is able to provide a facilitator to work with a Steering Committee and larger group of stakeholders to determine the present level of need, identify gaps and overlaps, understand the needs of each sector of the community and help to create a plan for coordinated action. This plan would also include recommendations on how best to manage coordination in the future since coordination requires active participation on the part of all stakeholders.

Objectives of the Planning Process:
- Create an initial analysis of current needs and existing services as well as known service gaps.
- Engage key stakeholders and decision makers in a dialogue about areas for potential coordination.
- Provide information on successful strategies to address the substance misuse crisis in other parts of the U.S., particularly trauma-informed strategies that provide a base for cross-sector collaboration.
- Recommend steps for future action including service gaps and overlaps to address, plans for community-wide dialogue and education and mechanisms to ensure coordination can be built into on-going operating plans.

1 "Trauma-Informed Approaches Need to be Part of a Comprehensive Strategy for Addressing the Opioid Epidemic" CTIPP (Campaign for Trauma-Informed Policy and Practice) Policy Brief, June 2017.
CHAPTER 3
PUBLIC HEALTH

ARTICLE X: DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE-USE DISPOSABLES

3.X01: PURPOSE
The City of Portsmouth recognizes that limiting the distribution of single-use disposables is necessary for the protection of both the environment of the municipality and the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens.

3.X02: DEFINITIONS
For the purpose of this ordinance Section, the following definitions apply:

Composting Facility: a solid waste compost facility pursuant to the Maine Solid Waste Management Rules: Composting Facilities, 06-096 CMR 410 or equivalent; the Maine Hazardous Waste, Septage and Solid Waste Management Act, 38 M.R.S.A. §§ 1301 to 1319-Y or equivalent, and Maine's other Solid Waste Management Rules or equivalents.

Cost Pass-Through: the cost which must be collected by retailers from their Customers when providing a Single-Use Carryout Bag Recycled Paper Bag or a Single-Use Cup.

Customer: any Person obtaining goods from a Store.

Food Service Establishment: any restaurant, take-out food establishment, or any other business that is required to obtain a valid food service license from the Public Health Department of the City of Portsmouth. Food Service Establishments do not include Nonprofit Food Establishments.
Medical Facility: a business or nonprofit that has a primary purpose of providing medical services.

Nonprofit Charitable Reuser: a charitable organization or a distinct operating unit or division of the charitable organization, that reuses and recycles donated goods or materials and receives more than fifty percent (50%) of its revenues from the handling and sale of those donated goods or materials. To be considered a Nonprofit Charitable Reuser, the entity must meet the terms of section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)).

Nonprofit Food Establishment: a charitable entity that prepares or serves food directly to the Customer or otherwise provides food or meals for consumption by humans. The term includes central food banks, soup kitchens, and nonprofit food delivery services. To be considered a Nonprofit Food Establishment, the entity must meet the terms of section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)).

Operator: the person in control of, or having the responsibility for, the operation of a Store, which may include, but not be limited to, the owner of the Store.

Person: any natural person, firm, corporation, partnership, or other organization or group however organized.

Pharmacy: any Store where prescriptions, medications, controlled or over the counter drugs, personal care products or health supplement goods, or vitamins are sold.

Prepared Food: foods or beverages which are prepared on the premises by cooking, chopping, slicing, mixing, freezing, or squeezing, and which require no further preparation to be consumed. Prepared Food does not include any raw, uncooked meat product or fruits or vegetables which are chopped, squeezed, or mixed.
Produce Bag: any bag without handles used exclusively to carry produce, meats, or other food items to the point of sale inside a store or to prevent such food items from coming into direct contact with other purchased items. A Produce Bag is not a form of Single-Use Carryout Plastic Bag.

Retail Establishment: any commercial establishment that sells perishable and nonperishable goods including but not limited to, clothing, food, and personal items directly to the Customer and is located within or doing business within the City. Retail Establishments do not include Food Service Establishments, Nonprofit Charitable Reusers, or Pharmacies.

Reusable Plastic Bag: a sewn woven or non-woven nylon, polypropylene, polyethylene-terephthalate, or Tyvek bag capable of being used one hundred (100) times, is machine washable, and has stitched or woven handles that are not fused. A Reusable Plastic Bag is a form of Reusable Bag.

Reusable Bag: a bag capable of being used one hundred (100) times, is machine washable, and has stitched or woven handles that are not fused. Reusable Bags include Reusable Plastic Bags. a bag that has handles that is specifically designed and manufactured for multiple reuse and meets all of the following requirements:

- is machine washable or is made of material that can be cleaned or disinfected;
- has a minimum lifetime of one hundred twenty-five (125) uses, which for purposes of this subsection, means the capability of carrying a minimum of twenty-two (22) pounds one hundred twenty-five (125) times over a distance of at least one hundred seventy-five (175) feet;
- if made of a plastic, it must be at least two and one-quarter (2.25) mil thick; and
- does not contain lead, cadmium, or any other heavy metal in toxic amounts, as defined by applicable State and Federal standards and regulations for packaging or reusable bags.
**Single-Use Carryout Bag**: a bag other than a Reusable Bag made of plastic, paper, or other material that is provided by a Store to a Customer at the check stand, cash register, point of sale or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the Store. Single-Use Carryout Bags include Single-Use Plastic Bags and Single-Use Recycled Paper Bags. Single-Use Carryout Plastic Bags do not include Produce bags, Reusable Bags, or bags without handles provided to the Customer to hold prescription medication dispensed from a Pharmacy:

- to transport produce, bulk food, or meat from a produce, bulk food, or meat department within a Store to the point of sale; or
- to hold prescription medication dispensed from a Pharmacy; or
- to segregate food or merchandise that could damage or contaminate other food or merchandise when placed together in a Reusable Bag or Recycled Paper Bag.

**Single-Use Compostable Plastic Container**: a container that is composed of one hundred percent (100%) Polylactic Acid and distributed for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Compostable Plastic Container is a form of a Single-Use Plastic Container.

**Single-Use Compostable Plastic Cup**: a cup is composed of one hundred percent (100%) Polylactic Acid and is distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Compostable Plastic Cup is a form of a Single-Use Plastic Cup.

**Single-Use Compostable Plastic Straw**: a disposable tube that is composed of one hundred percent (100%) Polylactic Acid and is distributed to transfer a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion. A Single-Use Compostable Plastic Straw is a form of a Single-Use Plastic Straw.
**Single-Use Cup:** a cup that is distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store.

**Single-Use Plastic Bag:** a bag that is made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, and is provided at the check stand, cash register, point of sale or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the Store. A Single-Use Plastic Bag is a form of a Single-Use Carryout Bag.

**Single-Use Plastic Container:** a container that is made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, and is distributed for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Plastic Container is a form of a Single-Use Container.

**Single-Use Plastic Cup:** a cup that is made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, and is distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Plastic Cup is a form of a Single-Use Cup.

**Single-Use Polystyrene Container:** a container composed of synthetic aromatic hydrocarbon polymers that is made from the monomer styrene and distributed for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Polystyrene Container is a form of a Single-Use Container.

**Single-Use Polystyrene Cup:** a cup composed of synthetic aromatic hydrocarbon polymers that is made from the monomer styrene and distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Polystyrene Cup is a form of a Single-Use Cup.
**Single-Use Plastic Straw:** a disposable tube made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, that is distributed to transfer a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage. A Single-Use Plastic Straw is a form of a Single-Use Straw.

**Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag:** a paper bag provided at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the establishment that contains no old growth fiber and a minimum of forty percent (40%) post-consumer recycled content; is one hundred percent (100%) recyclable; and has printed in a highly visible manner on the outside of the bag the word “Recyclable,” the name and location of the manufacturer, and the percentage of post-consumer recycled content. The Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag is capable of composting, consistent with the timeline and specifications of the American Society of Testing and Material (ASTM) Standard Specification for Compostable Plastics D6400, as published in September 2004. A Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag is a form of a Single-Use Carryout Bag.

**Single-Use Straw:** a disposable tube that is distributed to transfer a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion. Single-Use Straws include a straw made from both plastic materials and non-plastic materials such as paper, pasta, sugar cane, wood, or bamboo.

**Store:** any Food Service Establishment, Pharmacy, or Retail Establishment located within the City. Stores do not include Medical Facilities.

### 3.X03 CARRYOUT BAGS

A. Prohibited Carryout Bags:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Carryout Plastic Bag to a Customer, at the check stand, cash register, point
of sale, or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting
food or merchandise out of the Store except as provided in this
ordinance Section.
2. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Carryout Plastic Bag at any
City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or
City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also
otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Carryout Bags:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use
   Carryout Recycled Paper Bags or Reusable Bags to Customers for
   the purpose of carrying away goods or other materials from the
   point of sale, subject to the terms of this Chapter Section.
2. A Customer shall be charged a minimum of a ten cents ($0.10) Cost
   Pass-Through for each Recycled Paper Bag provided by the Store.
   The sale of each bag shall be separately itemized on the sale
   receipt. The Cost Pass-Through will remain with the Operator of
   the Store.
3. All Stores must keep records of the total number of Recycled
   Paper Bags provided, and the total amount of monies collected for
   providing Recycled Paper Bags. Such records must be made
   available for the City Manager, or his/her designee, to review
   within a reasonable period of time upon request. These records
   may be kept at the retailer’s corporate office.
4. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use
   Carryout Plastic Bag inventory.
5. Nothing in this Chapter Section prohibits Customers from using
   bags of any type that they bring to the Store themselves or from
   carrying away goods that are not placed in a bag, in lieu of using
   bags provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute only Single-Use
   Recycled Paper Bags or Reusable Bags to Customers for the
purpose of carrying away goods or other materials from the point of sale, subject to the terms of this Chapter Section.

2. Food Service Establishments on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Plastic Bags to Customers only for the purpose of safeguarding health and safety during the transportation of Prepared Foods, including take-out foods and liquids intended for consumption away from the food provider’s premises, subject to the terms of this Section.

3. A Customer shall be charged a minimum of a ten cents ($0.10) Cost Pass-Through for each Single-Use Carryout Recycled Paper Bag provided by the Store on City property. The sale of each bag shall be separately itemized on the sale receipt. The Cost Pass-Through will remain with the Operator of the Store.

4. A Store on City property may provide a Customer participating in Special Supplement Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) with one (1) or more Single-Use Carryout Recycled Paper Bag or Reusable Bags at no cost.

5. A Store on City property may provide a Customer with (1) Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag 6 inches across or less without handles at no cost.

6. Single-Use Carryout Plastic Bags may be distributed to Customers by food providers for the purpose of safeguarding health and safety during the transportation of Prepared Foods, including take-out foods and liquids intended for consumption away from the food provider’s premises.

3.X04 DISPOSABLE CUPS

A. Prohibited Disposable Cups:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Plastic Cup to a Customer, at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting a beverage that
will be drank inside or outside of the Store except as provided in this Chapter Section.

2. No Store shall provide a Single-Use Polystyrene Cup at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting a beverage that will be drank inside or outside of the Store.

3. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Plastic Cup or Single-Use Polystyrene Cup at any City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Disposable Cups:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Cups to Customers for the purpose of transporting a beverage that will be drank inside or outside of the Store, subject to the terms of this Chapter Section.

2. A Customer shall be charged a minimum of a ten cents ($0.10) Cost Pass-Through for each Single-Use Cup provided by the Store on City property. The sale of each Single-Use Cup shall be separately itemized on the sale receipt. The Cost Pass-Through will remain with the Operator of the Store.

3. All Stores must keep records of the total number of Single-Use Cups provided, and the total amount of monies collected for providing Single-Use Cups. Such records must be made available for the City Manager, or his/her designee, to review within a reasonable period of time upon request. These records may be kept at the retailer’s corporate office.

4. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use Cup inventory.

5. Nothing in this Chapter Section prohibits Customers from using cups of any type that they bring to the Store themselves they would otherwise be allowed to bring under the Ordinances of the City of Portsmouth in lieu of using cups provided by the Store.
C. Exemptions:

1. The only Single-Use Plastic Cups that Stores on City property are allowed to distribute are Single-Use Plastic Compostable Cups if the Store on City property provides customers the option to dispose of the Single-Use Compostable Plastic Cups in a specifically designated composting receptacle that is both on the premise and its contents will be transported to a Composting Facility to be composted.

2. A Store may provide a Customer participating in the Special Supplement Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) with one (1) or more Single-Use Cup at no cost.

3.X05 DISPOSABLE CONTAINERS

A. Prohibited Disposable Containers:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Plastic Container to a Customer, at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food that will be consumed inside or outside of the Store except as provided in this Chapter Section.

2. No Store shall provide a Single-Use Polystyrene Container to a Customer at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food that will be eaten inside or outside of the Store.

3. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Plastic Container or a Single-Use Polystyrene Container at any City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Disposable Containers:
1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Containers to Customers for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food that will be eaten inside or outside of the Store, subject to the terms of this Chapter Section.

2. All Stores must keep records of the total number of Single-Use Containers provided. Such records must be made available for the City Manager, or his/her designee, to review within a reasonable period of time upon request. These records may be kept at the retailer’s corporate office.

3. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use Container inventory.

4. Nothing in this Chapter Section prohibits Customers from using containers of any type that they would otherwise be allowed to bring under the Ordinances of the City of Portsmouth to the Store themselves in lieu of using containers provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. The only Single-Use Plastic Containers that Stores on City property are allowed to distribute are Single-Use Plastic Compostable Containers if the Store provides customers the option to dispose of the Single-Use Compostable Plastic Containers in a specifically designated composting receptacle that is both on the premise and its contents will be transported to a Composting Facility to be composted.

3.X06 DISPOSABLE STRAWS

A. Prohibited Disposable Straws:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Plastic Straw to a customer for the purpose of transferring a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of the Store, except as provided in this ordinance Section.
2. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Plastic Straw at any City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Disposable Straws:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Straws to Customers for the purpose of transferring a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of the Store, subject to the terms of this Chapter Section.

2. All Stores must keep records of the total number of Single-Use Straws provided. Such records must be made available for the City Manager, or his/her designee, to review within a reasonable period of time upon request. These records may be kept at the retailer’s corporate office.

3. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use Straw inventory.

4. Nothing in this Chapter Section prohibits Customers from using straws of any type that they bring to the Store themselves in lieu of using containers provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. Stores on City property are only allowed to distribute Single-Use Straws at the explicit request of the customer for the purpose of transferring a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of the Store.

2. The only Single-Use Plastic Straws that Stores on City property are allowed to distribute are Single-Use Plastic Compostable Straws if the Store provides customers the option to dispose of the Single-Use Compostable Plastic Straws in a specifically designated composting receptacle that is both on the premise and its contents will be transported to a Composting Facility to be composted.
In addition to any other penalty or remedy permissible by law for violation of this ordinance Section, the following shall apply:

1. If the City determines that a violation of this Chapter Section has occurred, he/she will issue a written warning notice to the Operator of a Store on City property and the potential penalties that will apply for future violations.

2. Upon a second or subsequent infraction of this ordinance Section, the City is authorized to issue citations to persons, firms, or corporations violating this ordinance Section in accordance with the ordinances of the City of Portsmouth. The amount of the fee that will accompany the citation will be determined by the Fee Schedule Study Committee of the City of Portsmouth.

3. The City Attorney is authorized to file any appropriate legal proceedings, including but not limited to requests for injunctive relief, necessary to prevent violation of this ordinance Section.

SEVERABILITY

Any portion of this ordinance that is found to be void shall be unenforceable without invalidating the remainder of the ordinance.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall take effect twelve (12) months after it passes third reading on December 31, 2019.
CHAPTER 3

PUBLIC HEALTH

ARTICLE X: DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE-USE DISPOSABLES

3.X01: PURPOSE

The City of Portsmouth recognizes that limiting the distribution of single-use disposables is necessary for the protection of both the environment of the municipality and the public health, safety, and welfare of its citizens.

3.X02: DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this Section, the following definitions apply:

*Composting Facility*: a solid waste compost facility pursuant to the Maine Solid Waste Management Rules: Composting Facilities, 06-096 CMR 410 or equivalent; the Maine Hazardous Waste, Septage and Solid Waste Management Act, 38 M.R.S.A. §§ 1301 to 1319-Y or equivalent, and Maine's other Solid Waste Management Rules or equivalents.

*Cost Pass-Through*: the cost which must be collected by retailers from their Customers when providing a Single-Use Carryout Bag or a Single-Use Cup.

*Customer*: any Person obtaining goods from a Store.

*Food Service Establishment*: any restaurant, take-out food establishment, or any other business that is required to obtain a valid food service license from the Public Health Department of the City of Portsmouth. Food Service Establishments do not include Nonprofit Food Establishments.

*Medical Facility*: a business or nonprofit that has a primary purpose of providing medical services.
Nonprofit Charitable Reuser: a charitable organization or a distinct operating unit or division of the charitable organization, that reuses and recycles donated goods or materials and receives more than fifty percent (50%) of its revenues from the handling and sale of those donated goods or materials. To be considered a Nonprofit Charitable Reuser, the entity must meet the terms of section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)).

Nonprofit Food Establishment: a charitable entity that prepares or serves food directly to the Customer or otherwise provides food or meals for consumption by humans. The term includes central food banks, soup kitchens, and nonprofit food delivery services. To be considered a Nonprofit Food Establishment, the entity must meet the terms of section 501(c)(3) of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)).

Operator: the person in control of, or having the responsibility for, the operation of a Store, which may include, but not be limited to, the owner of the Store.

Person: any natural person, firm, corporation, partnership, or other organization or group however organized.

Pharmacy: any Store where prescriptions, medications, controlled or over the counter drugs, personal care products or health supplement goods, or vitamins are sold.

Prepared Food: foods or beverages which are prepared on the premises by cooking, chopping, slicing, mixing, freezing, or squeezing, and which require no further preparation to be consumed. Prepared Food does not include any raw, uncooked meat product or fruits or vegetables which are chopped, squeezed, or mixed.

Produce Bag: any bag without handles used exclusively to carry produce, meats, or other food items to the point of sale inside a store or to prevent such food items from coming into direct contact with other purchased items. A Produce Bag is not a form of Single-Use Plastic Bag.
Retail Establishment: any commercial establishment that sells perishable and nonperishable goods including but not limited to, clothing, food, and personal items directly to the Customer and is located within or doing business within the City. Retail Establishments do not include Food Service Establishments, Nonprofit Charitable Reusers, or Pharmacies.

Reusable Plastic Bag: a sewn woven or non-woven nylon, polypropylene, polyethylene-terephthalata, or Tyvek bag capable of being used one hundred (100) times, is machine washable, and has stitched or woven handles that are not fused. A Reusable Plastic Bag is a form of Reusable Bag.

Reusable Bag: a bag capable of being used one hundred (100) times, is machine washable, and has stitched or woven handles that are not fused. Reusable Bags include Reusable Plastic Bags.

Single-Use Carryout Bag: a bag made of plastic, paper, or other material that is provided by a Store to a Customer at the check stand, cash register, point of sale or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the Store. Single-Use Carryout Bags include Single-Use Plastic Bags and Single-Use Recycled Paper Bags. Single-Use Carryout Bags do not include Produce bags, Reusable Bags, or bags without handles provided to the Customer to hold prescription medication dispensed from a Pharmacy.

Single-Use Compostable Plastic Container: a container that is composed of one hundred percent (100%) Polylactic Acid and distributed for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Compostable Plastic Container is a form of a Single-Use Plastic Container.

Single-Use Compostable Plastic Cup: a cup composed of one hundred percent (100%) Polylactic Acid and is distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Compostable Plastic Cup is a form of a Single-Use Plastic Cup.
**Single-Use Compostable Plastic Straw:** a disposable tube that is composed of one hundred percent (100%) Polylactic Acid and is distributed to transfer a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion. A Single-Use Compostable Plastic Straw is a form of a Single-Use Plastic Straw.

**Single-Use Cup:** a cup that is distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store.

**Single-Use Plastic Bag:** a bag that is made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, and is provided at the check stand, cash register, point of sale or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the Store. A Single-Use Plastic Bag is a form of a Single-Use Carryout Bag.

**Single-Use Plastic Container:** a container that is made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, and is distributed for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Plastic Container is a form of a Single-Use Container.

**Single-Use Plastic Cup:** a cup that is made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, and is distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Plastic Cup is a form of a Single-Use Cup.

**Single-Use Polystyrene Container:** a container composed of synthetic aromatic hydrocarbon polymers that is made from the monomer styrene and distributed for the purpose of transporting Prepared Food on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Polystyrene Container is a form of a Single-Use Container.
**Single-Use Polystyrene Cup:** a cup composed of synthetic aromatic hydrocarbon polymers that is made from the monomer styrene and distributed for the purpose of transporting a beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of a Store. A Single-Use Polystyrene Cup is a form of a Single-Use Cup.

**Single-Use Plastic Straw:** a disposable tube made predominantly of plastic derived from either petroleum or a biologically based polymer, such as corn or other plant sources, that is distributed to transfer a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage. A Single-Use Plastic Straw is a form of a Single-Use Straw.

**Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag:** a paper bag provided at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the establishment that contains no old growth fiber and a minimum of forty percent (40%) post-consumer recycled content; is one hundred percent (100%) recyclable; and has printed in a highly visible manner on the outside of the bag the word “Recyclable,” the name and location of the manufacturer, and the percentage of post-consumer recycled content. The Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag is capable of composting, consistent with the timeline and specifications of the American Society of Testing and Material (ASTM) Standard Specification for Compostable Plastics D6400, as published in September 2004. A Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag is a form of a Single-Use Carryout Bag.

**Single-Use Straw:** a disposable tube that is distributed to transfer a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion. Single-Use Straws include a straw made from both plastic materials and non-plastic materials such as paper, pasta, sugar cane, wood, or bamboo.

**Store:** any Food Service Establishment, Pharmacy, or Retail Establishment located within the City. Stores do not include Medical Facilities.
3.X03 CARRYOUT BAGS

A. Prohibited Carryout Bags:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Carryout Bag to a Customer, at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or other point of departure for the purpose of transporting food or merchandise out of the Store except as provided in this Section.

2. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Carryout Bag at any City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Carryout Bags:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Carryout Bags or Reusable Bags to Customers subject to the terms of this Section.

2. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use Plastic Bag inventory.

3. Nothing in this Section prohibits Customers from using bags of any type that they bring to the Store themselves or from carrying away goods that are not placed in a bag, in lieu of using bags provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute only Single-Use Recycled Paper Bags or Reusable Bags to Customers for the purpose of carrying away goods or other materials from the point of sale, subject to the terms of this Section.

2. Food Service Establishments on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Plastic Bags to Customers only for the purpose of safeguarding health and safety during the transportation of Prepared Foods, including take-out foods and liquids intended
for consumption away from the food provider’s premises, subject to the terms of this Section.

3. A Customer shall be charged a minimum of a ten cents ($0.10) Cost Pass-Through for each Single-Use Carryout Bag provided by the Store on City property. The sale of each bag shall be separately itemized on the sale receipt. The Cost Pass-Through will remain with the Operator of the Store.

4. A Store on City property may provide a Customer participating in Special Supplement Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) with one (1) or more Single-Use Carryout Bag or Reusable Bags at no cost.

5. A Store on City property may provide a Customer with (1) Single-Use Recycled Paper Bag 6 inches across or less without handles at no cost.

3.X04 DISPOSABLE CUPS

A. Prohibited Disposable Cups:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Plastic Cup to a Customer, at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting a beverage that will be drank inside or outside of the Store except as provided in this Section.

2. No Store shall provide a Single-Use Polystyrene Cup to a Customer at the check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting a beverage that will be drank inside or outside of the Store.

3. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Plastic Cup or Single-Use Polystyrene Cup at any City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Disposable Cups:
1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Cups to Customers for the purpose of transporting a beverage that will be drank inside or outside of the Store, subject to the terms of this Section.

2. A Customer shall be charged a minimum of a ten cents ($.10) Cost Pass-Through for each Single-Use Cup provided by the Store on City property. The sale of each Single-Use Cup shall be separately itemized on the sale receipt. The Cost Pass-Through will remain with the Operator of the Store.

3. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use Cup inventory.

4. Nothing in this Section prohibits Customers from using cups of any type that they bring to the Store themselves they would otherwise be allowed to bring under the Ordinances of the City of Portsmouth in lieu of using cups provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. The only Single-Use Plastic Cups that Stores on City property are allowed to distribute are Single-Use Plastic Compostable Cups if the Store on City property provides customers the option to dispose of the Single-Use Compostable Plastic Cups in a specifically designated composting receptacle that is both on the premise and its contents will be transported to a Composting Facility to be composted.

2. A Store may provide a Customer participating in the Special Supplement Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) or the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) with one (1) or more Single-Use Cup at no cost.

3.05 DISPOSABLE CONTAINERS

A. Prohibited Disposable Containers:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Plastic Container to a Customer, at the check stand, cash register, point of
sale, or any other location for the purpose of transporting Prepared
Food that will be consumed inside or outside of the Store except as
provided in this Section.
2. No Store shall provide a Single-Use Polystyrene Container at the
check stand, cash register, point of sale, or any other location for
the purpose of transporting Prepared Food that will be eaten inside
or outside of the Store.
3. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Plastic Container or a
Single-Use Polystyrene Container at any City facility, City-
managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted
event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to
in this Section.

B. Permitted Disposable Containers:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use
Containers to Customers for the purpose of transporting Prepared
Food that will be eaten inside or outside of the Store, subject to the
terms of this Section.
2. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use
Container inventory.
3. Nothing in this Section prohibits Customers from using containers
of any type that they would otherwise be allowed to bring under
the Ordinances of the City of Portsmouth to the Store themselves
in lieu of using containers provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. The only Single-Use Plastic Containers that Stores on City
property are allowed to distribute are Single-Use Plastic
Compostable Containers if the Store provides customers the option
to dispose of the Single-Use Compostable Plastic Containers in a
specifically designated composting receptacle that is both on the
premise and its contents will be transported to a Composting
Facility to be composted.
3. X06  DISPOSABLE STRAWS

A. Prohibited Disposable Straws:

1. No Store on City property shall provide a Single-Use Plastic Straw to a customer for the purpose of transferring a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of the Store, except as provided in this Section.

2. No Person shall distribute a Single-Use Plastic Straw at any City facility, City-managed concession, City-sponsored event, or City-permitted event unless a Store on City property is also otherwise allowed to in this Section.

B. Permitted Disposable Straws:

1. Stores on City property are allowed to distribute Single-Use Straws to Customers for the purpose of transferring a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of the Store, subject to the terms of this Section.

2. All Stores may distribute their remaining 2019 Single-Use Straw inventory.

3. Nothing in this Section prohibits Customers from using straws of any type that they bring to the Store themselves in lieu of using containers provided by the Store.

C. Exemptions:

1. Stores on City property are only allowed to distribute Single-Use Straws at the explicit request of the customer for the purpose of transferring a beverage from a cup or container to the mouth of a person drinking the beverage on a single occasion inside or outside of the Store.

2. The only Single-Use Plastic Straws that Stores on City property are allowed to distribute are Single-Use Plastic Compostable Straws if
the Store provides customers the option to dispose of the Single-Use Compostable Plastic Straws in a specifically designated composting receptacle that is both on the premise and its contents will be transported to a Composting Facility to be composted.

3.X07 PENALTIES AND REMEDIES

In addition to any other penalty or remedy permissible by law for violation of this Section, the following shall apply:

1. If the City determines that a violation of this Section has occurred, he/she will issue a written warning notice to the Operator of a Store on City property and the potential penalties that will apply for future violations

2. Upon a second or subsequent infraction of this Section, the City is authorized to issue citations to persons, firms, or corporations violating this Section in accordance with the ordinances of the City of Portsmouth. The amount of the fee that will accompany the citation will be determined by the Fee Schedule Study Committee of the City of Portsmouth.

3. The City Attorney is authorized to file any appropriate legal proceedings, including but not limited to requests for injunctive relief, necessary to prevent violation of this Section.

SEVERABILITY

Any portion of this ordinance that is found to be void shall be unenforceable without invalidating the remainder of the ordinance.

EFFECTIVE DATE

This ordinance shall take effect on December 31, 2019.
At the May 28th, 2019 Police Commission meeting, the Board of Police Commissioners approved and accepted the following donation:

1. Grants & Donations:
   a. Donation of $55 made by West End Studio. The donation will support our Police Explorers Post.

We submit the information to you pursuant to City Policy Memorandum #94-36, for the City Council’s consideration and approval at their next meeting. We respectfully request this item be placed on the City Council meeting agenda for the next regular City Council meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Kathleen M. Levesque
Office of the Chief

Attachments: Award Notice of Prospective Award
PORTSMOUTH POLICE DEPARTMENT

DATE: April 8, 2019

TO: Admin. Mgr. Karen Senecal/Accounting Assistant Tammie Perez

FROM: Kathleen M. Levesque

---

CHAIN OF CUSTODY MEMO

On this date, $55 in cash was given in-hand to Karen Senecal/Tammie Perez. The donation was made by West End Studios from the production 'Poster #528', part of the "Elephant in the Room Series". The Portsmouth Police Department was chosen as the production’s collaborating partner and beneficiary.

Given by: Kathleen M. Levesque

Signature/Date: 4-8-19

Received by: Karen Senecal or Tammie Perez, Signature/Date: 4/8/19

Enclosures: $55 in cash, Playbill, Cash Envelope
Poster #528
A Collection of Readings on School Safety

Compiled by Genevieve Aichele
with Tim Barretto, Kolby Hume,
Rochelle Navelski, & Catherine Stewart

THURSDAY, APRIL 4th

TOPIC
School Safety in the 21st Century

Collaborating Partner

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Supported By

[Logos of supporting organizations]
Portsmouth Police Department
3 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Kathie

From: Rochelle
4/5/19 1954hrs

Received on 4/4/19 2/26hrs West End Station
Portsmouth Police Department
3 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, NH 03801

RECEIVED
APR 8 - 2019

opened & counted by EF
in dual custody with Karen Leneve

Kathe

From: Rochelle
4/5/19 1452hrs

Received on 4/9/19 2726hrs West End Studios

$55.00
Date: June 13, 2019

To: Honorable Mayor Jack Blalock and City Council Members

From: John P. Bohenko, City Manager

Re: City Manager’s Comments on June 17, 2019 City Council Agenda

Non-Public Session

1. City Manager Search Committee Report Back

2. Collective Bargaining Agreement Negotiation Status – Schools (4) and SMA


Presentation

1. Preliminary Results of Revaluation Efforts  Annually, the City Assessor’s Office reviews and updates property assessments throughout the City. Annual adjustments provide a vehicle for the assurance of current, accurate and equitable property assessments. If property valuations are accurate across the entire City, inefficiencies and inequities in property taxation are greatly reduced.

This year the City will be conducting a Full Statistical Revaluation for Tax Year 2019/Fiscal Year 2020 per RSA 75:1 and RSA 75:8-a. A Full Statistical Revaluation adjusts property values to market value (full and true value). This revaluation will update all taxable and non-taxable properties in the City using existing property data to arrive at market values as of April 1, 2019.

The 2019 Statistical Revaluation will be conducted by Vision Appraisal and the City’s in-house assessing staff. The assessing staff will be utilized in various aspects throughout the revaluation to assure assessments are accurate, equitable and in compliance with all revaluation standards.
The Council presentation on June 17, 2019 will go over the preliminary sales analysis conducted by Vision Appraisal. This analysis will be the basis for adjustments to property values throughout the City.

Public relations will be ongoing throughout the revaluation process utilizing the City’s webpage, Council presentations, and if necessary, public forums. Individuals with questions can contact the Assessor’s Office at any time. The revaluation time line is tentatively scheduled as follows:

- Start-Up Meeting – March 2019
- Sales Review and Analysis – April 2019 through June 2019
- Assessor Review of Values – June 2019 through August 2019
- Presentation to the City Council on Preliminary Analysis – June 17, 2019
- Taxpayer Notice of Preliminary Assessments – Week of July 8, 2019
- Taxpayer Forum – Tentatively July 18, 2019 – Library Levenson Room 6 p.m.
- Taxpayer Hearings – Beginning July 22, 2019 through August 2, 2019
- Presentation to the City Council on Final Analysis and Results – August 12, 2019
- Final Notices if Changes to Preliminary Values – Week of August 19, 2019
- MS-1 – City Valuation – September – October 2019
- Tax Rate Set – October 2019
- Tax Bills – November 2019 (Reflecting New Assessments)

Public Hearings & Votes on Ordinances &/or Resolutions

1. **Public Hearing Re: 2019 Proposed Charter Amendments #1 Compensation of City Councilors and #2 Police Commission Vacancies** The City Council has authorized the process to commence on placement of two proposed Charter amendments to be put on the ballot for referendum vote at the municipal election schedule for November 5, 2019. The authorizing determination and the proposed amendments are as follows:

   Proposed Charter Amendment #1 - Compensation of City Councilors

   At the City Council meeting on February 4, 2019, the Council voted to commence the Charter amendment process with respect to deleting from the Municipal Charter the last sentence in section 4.6, which reads “However, no City Councilor, except the Mayor, shall receive more than Fifteen Hundred ($1,500) Dollars during any calendar year.”
Proposed Charter Amendment #2 - Police Commission Vacancies

On January 22, 2019, after voting to appoint Stefany Shaheen to fill a vacancy on the Police Commission, the City Council discussed the process for filling vacancies on the Commission. Apparently, without taking any formal vote, the Council then requested a proposed Charter amendment to reconcile the process of filling vacancies on the Police Commission with State law as opined by the Office of the Attorney General in 2015. The Attorney General opinion was based upon the provisions of RSA 105-C:3 (attached), a statute relating to statutory police commissions in towns. That opinion calls for vacancies on the Police Commission to be filled by vote of the Council, whereas the Charter looks to the last election to fill vacancies.

PROCEDURE

The process which governs the handling of the proposed amendments by the Council is described in state law RSA 49-B, relevant portions of which are attached (RSA 49-B:4-a and RSA 49-B:5 I). Briefly, the statute requires that if the Council wishes to proceed with these proposed amendments, it shall provide for notice and a public hearing. The notice must be published in the newspaper at least seven (7) days prior to the hearing. The notice must contain both the text of any proposed amendment and a brief explanation. Subsequent to the public hearing, if the Council wishes to proceed with any amendment, the City Clerk shall be so advised and she should report to the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, and the Commissioner of the Department of Revenue Administration under RSA 49-B:4-a. Within seven (7) days of receiving approval from the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Department of Revenue Administration under RSA 49-B:4-a (see below), the City Council may order the proposed amendment to be placed on the ballot at the next regular municipal election held not less than sixty (60) days after that order is passed.

STATE APPROVALS

After the City Clerk files a report with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Commission of the Department of Revenue Administration, those officials “shall review the [proposed Charter Amendments] to ensure that [they are] consistent with the general laws of this state.” If any of those officials do not approve, the proposed Charter Amendment(s), “shall not be placed on the municipal ballot.” However, “failure to specify objections to a proposed Charter or Charter Amendment within forty-five (45) days shall constitute approval by the Secretary of State, Attorney General or the Commissioner of the Department of Revenue Administration.”
TIMELINE

For Council guidance on the timing of its actions regarding Charter amendments, please be advised of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Time Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. City Council vote to hold a public hearing</td>
<td>Seven (7) day notice required plus two (2) days to place advertisement in newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Notice to State Agencies</td>
<td>Fourteen (14) days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. State Agency Response</td>
<td>Forty-five (45) days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that the City Clerk must file her final ballot form for printing no later than September 10, 2019, the first step in the foregoing process must take place prior to July 4, 2019. Given the current schedule of City Council meetings it would appear that the last possible regular Council meeting date at which the Council must vote on a specific Charter Amendment in order to meet the foregoing timeline is June 17, 2019.

The foregoing assumes the minimum possible deadlines for achieving the various actions required by statute. It assumes, for example, that the City Clerk can get a notice of hearing published in two (2) days and not three (3). Thus, in order to allow sufficient time for every step to be taken and still have some time to accommodate procedural issues which might arise, it is recommended that the City Council vote on any proposed Charter Amendment no later than the Council meeting of June 17, 2019.

Attachments:

(1) Proposed Charter Amendment #1
(2) Proposed Charter Amendment #2
(3) RSA 49-B:4-a
(4) RSA 49-B:5 I
(5) RSA 105-C:3

The City Council may vote to place the proposed Charter Amendments #1 Compensation of City Councilors and #2 Police Commission Vacancies on the November 5, 2019 ballot.

2. First Reading of Annual Omnibus Ordinance Change, Parking and Traffic Safety

Attached are the annual omnibus ordinances recommended by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee. This year’s omnibus addresses changes to parking in loading zones, prohibitions against mopeds and bicycles parking against monuments, no parking spaces, speed limits and one-way streets.

By way of background, on March 29, 2000, the City Council adopted Ordinance #4-2000 under Chapter 7, Article 1, Section 7.103 of the Vehicles, Traffic and Parking Ordinance.
This ordinance was adopted in order to be more responsive to the changing parking needs of the downtown. Before its adoption, it often took three readings of the City Council to simply change a parking space from a 2-hour time restriction to a 15-minute restriction. This process would often take 4 – 6 months to complete.

The current ordinance authorizes the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee to recommend temporary parking and traffic regulations to the City Council for its approval in the form of its monthly meeting minutes. Once the Council approves these minutes, the temporary regulations are in effect for a period not to exceed one year. During that year, the Council and the public have the benefit of seeing how a temporary regulation works before adopting it as a permanent change to the parking ordinance. These temporary regulations are presented at one time to the Council for its consideration.

The attached amendments to Chapter 7, Vehicles, Traffic and Parking for the Council’s consideration summarize the temporary parking regulations implemented by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee last year.

I recommend the City Council move to pass first reading of the annual omnibus set of ordinances recommended by the Parking and Traffic Safety Committee, and schedule second reading and public hearing for the July 15, 2019 City Council meeting.

**City Manager’s Items Which Require Action**

1. **Request for Public Hearing Re: Various Bonding Resolutions for Projects Identified in the FY 20-25 Capital Improvement Plan**  I am requesting that the City Council establish a public hearing on each of the proposed Resolutions for July 15, 2019 City Council meeting for projects identified in the FY 20-25 Capital Improvement Plan (respective element sheets are attached).

**GENERAL FUND**

**Citywide Streets, Sidewalks, Bridges and Facilities - $10,550,000**

a. Citywide Facilities Capital Improvements - $1,000,000  
b. Citywide Sidewalk Reconstruction Program - $800,000  
c. Citywide Bridge Improvements - $2,000,000  
d. Maplewood Avenue Bridge Replacement - $500,000  
e. Cate Street Connector - $1,500,000  
f. Street Paving Management and Rehabilitation - $4,000,000  
g. Pease Tradeport Street Rehabilitation - $750,000
WATER FUND

FY 20 Water Projects - $4,623,000

   a. Annual Waterline Replacement - $1,000,000
   b. Reservoir Management - $600,000
   c. Madbury Wells - $750,000
   d. Water Transmission Main Replacement - $250,000
   e. Pleasant Street Water Mains - $823,000
   f. Maplewood Avenue Area Construction - $1,200,000

SEWER FUND

FY 20 Sewer Projects - $7,145,000

   a. Annual Sewerline Replacement - $1,000,000
   b. Consent Mitigation - $4,400,000
   c. Pleasant Street Sewers - $770,000
   d. Maplewood Avenue Area Reconstruction - $975,000

I recommend the City Council move to authorize the City Manager to bring back for public hearing and adoption, the various proposed CIP projects to be bonded, as presented, for the July 15, 2019 City Council meeting. (Please note that Bonding Resolutions require a public hearing and adoption).

2. **162 Daniel Street (McIntyre Federal Building) Re-Zoning Request** On April 5, 2019, Revisit McIntyre submitted a letter to the City Council requesting that the property located at 162 Daniel Street (McIntyre Federal Building) be re-zoned to Natural Resource Protection District or Municipal or a combination of both.

   At the April 15, 2019 City Council meeting, the Council voted to refer this request to the Planning Board for a recommendation.

   **Planning Board Review**

   Request to Re-Zone to Municipal District

   The stated purpose of the Municipal District is as follows (emphasis added):

   “To recognize areas that are in municipal ownership for governmental, civic, service, educational or recreational use.”

   Lots and buildings in the Municipal district are exempt from all dimensional and intensity regulations (e.g. building coverage, height, setbacks, etc.) and land uses on these properties are not subject to the City’s off-street parking requirements.

   This property is not owned by the City, therefore, it is not eligible to be re-zoned to Municipal.
Request to Re-Zone to Natural Resource Protection
The stated purpose of the Natural Resource Protection District is as follows (emphasis added):

“To recognize areas that are in governmental or nonprofit ownership and are dedicated to protection and enhancement of the City’s natural resources and ecology.”

Land uses permitted in the Natural Resource Protection District include tree farms and related forestry activities, wildlife refuge, public parks and playgrounds, public nature trails, and uses expressly recognized in a conservation easement by which the City of Portsmouth has acquired conservation rights.

Lots and buildings in the NRP district are required to have a 70’ front, side, and rear building setback from lot lines, have a maximum building height of 35’ and a minimum open space coverage of 95% (95% of the lot must be open space).

The NRP district, as described in the purpose and the list of allowed uses is intended for properties that are in current use as a park or natural resource area and/or have already been protected through a conservation easement. This property does not currently fit any of those descriptions and therefore would not be eligible for re-zoning to Natural Resource Protection District.

Planning Board Recommendations
The Planning Board held a public hearing on this request at the May 16, 2019 meeting. At that time, the Board voted unanimously not to recommend approval to the City Council of this zoning amendment.

I recommend the City Council vote to accept and place on file the request from Revisit McIntyre to re-zone the property located at 162 Daniel Street (McIntyre Federal Building) to Natural Resource Protection District or Municipal or a combination of both.

3. Proposed Work Session on June 24, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. Re: McIntyre Project and Special Meeting on July 1, 2019 Re: Action on this Matter

The McIntyre Committee recommends the City Council move to schedule a work session on June 24, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. Re: the McIntyre Project and a special meeting on July 1, 2019 Re: Action on this Matter.

4. Sale of Surplus Water Meters The City currently has old water meters with a total weight of 9,200 lbs to dispose of. The meters are outdated, and it is the opinion of the water department that its greatest value is as scrap metal. The bundled value is believed to far exceed $500.00.

According to City Ordinance Section 1.505, any sale of property valued at or above $500.00 must be authorized by the City Council and may be conducted by competitive
bidding, public auction, or any other means authorized by a two-thirds vote of the City Council.

As in the past, we have disposed of the surplus equipment/cars through a sealed bid process or through GovDeals, an online auction site in which the surplus equipment/cars are sold to the highest bidder.

After researching the GovDeals website, it appears that old water meters are sold as scrap metal. As we have used GovDeals in the past and it has shown that the City receives more money for our surplus property than through a sealed bid process, we request to use GovDeals to dispose of the old water meters.

I recommend the City Council authorize the City Manager to dispose of the surplus water meters through GovDeals.

5. **Request for First Reading Re: Ordinance Amendment to Chapter 7, Article III, Section 7.328 Limited Parking – Three Hours – Raynes Avenue and Vaughan Street**

The Parking and Traffic Safety Committee voted to erect parking meters with a three (3) hour limit on Raynes Avenue and Vaughan Street at their June 6, 2019 meeting. The attached amendment to Chapter 7, Article III, Section 7.328 reflects the vote of the Committee.

I recommend the City Council move to schedule first reading for the July 15, 2019 City Council meeting to amend Chapter 7, Article III, Section 7.328 Limited Parking – Three Hours – Vaughan Street.
**BI-01-PW-34: CITYWIDE FACILITIES CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (ongoing or programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study: Facility Condition Assessment 2015  
  - Satisfy: Y
- Improves Quality of Existing Services  
  - Satisfy: Y
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Description:** The Public Works Department is responsible for the maintenance of all municipal facilities. These facilities are wide ranging and serve multiple uses. Due to age and usage, many facilities need to be updated.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Homepage
- FY19-24 CIP page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/ Lease</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,080,000</td>
<td>$4,080,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TSM-95-PW-59: CITYWIDE SIDEWALK RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Construction or Expansion of a Public Facility, Street or Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (ongoing or programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study: Sidewalk Condition Index 2018 (in development) **Y**
- Improves Quality of Existing Services **Y**
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need **Y**
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Description:** The Public Works Department created and conducted a conditional sidewalk assessment of City maintained sidewalks. The assessment contains detailed information on 77 miles of sidewalk, not including those within parks, fields and other City maintained facilities. The results give City staff a clear depiction of the overall conditions. This project consists of sidewalks identified as being in poor to fair condition. Reconstruction work is based on need and coordinated with other street improvements.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Homepage
- FY19-24 CIP page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/ Lease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$4,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSM-95-PW-59 : Citywide Sidewalk Reconstruction Program

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS – SIDEWALKS
Fiscal Years 2020 and 2021

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS ON EXISTING SIDEWALKS:

- Bartlett St.
- Creek Area
- Kensington Rd.
- Lawrence St.
- Maple Haven Area
- Pannaway Area
- State St.
- Summit Ave
- Willard Ave
- Miscellaneous

The list above represents a backlog of high priority sidewalk projects as identified by the Conditional Sidewalk Assessment and other capital projects. The amount of work completed depends on available funds and construction bid prices.
TSM-18-PW-64: CITYWIDE BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (ongoing or programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified in Planning Document or Study: Citywide Bridge Master Plan (in development)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** This project provides for the maintenance of City bridges. Typical bridge maintenance activities include sealing the concrete surfaces, replacing the pavement surfaces, replacing the bridge membranes and replacing, maintaining or upgrading railing systems and fences. The FY20 funds are based on the Bridge Master Plan recommendations for the highest priority repairs including Kearsarge Way Bridge and Market Street Bridges over North Mill Pond.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Homepage
- FY19-24 CIP page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$2,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$2,850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSM-10-PW-65: MAPLEWOOD AVENUE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

**Department:** Public Works  
**Project Location:** Maplewood Avenue  
**Project Type:** Rehabilitation of a Facility  
**Commence FY:** 2020  
**Priority:** A (needed within 0 to 3 years)  
**Impact on Operating Budget:** Negligible (<$5,001)

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study: Citywide Bridge Master Plan (in development)  
  - Satisfies: Y  
- Improves Quality of Existing Services  
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services  
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need  
  - Satisfies: Y  
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs  
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies  
  - Satisfies: Y  
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development  
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement  
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Description:** This project is the replacement of the Maplewood Avenue Bridge at the North Mill Pond. Previous planning for this project as an out-year has been expedited due to the critical need for replacement identified in the Bridge Master Plan. The City is working to obtain the 80% DOT state bridge aid funds for this project. If state bridge aid funds are not available, general obligation bonding will be needed to complete this project. It will include new sea walls and replacement of water and sewer utilities, which are covered in other element sheets.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Homepage
- FY19-24 CIP page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>Fed/State</th>
<th>Bond/Lease</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY20</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

FY 20-25

117
**TSM-19-PL-67: CATE STREET CONNECTOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Planning Department &amp; Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Cate Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Other (Explained Below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Moderate ($50,001 to $100,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified in Planning Document or Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** This project will provide direct access from Bartlett Street at the Railroad Bridge to Route 1 Bypass at Borthwick Avenue traffic signal. Providing this connector will eliminate an existing truck route and reduce through traffic in the Creek Neighborhood.

**Useful Website Links:**
- [Public Works Homepage](#)
- [FY19-24 CIP page](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed/State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TSM-94-PW-73: STREET PAVING, MANAGEMENT AND REHABILITATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (ongoing or programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study: Pavement Management Index 2018 (in development) **Y**
- Improves Quality of Existing Services **Y**
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies **Y**
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Description:** The City began a Pavement Condition Management Program in 1993. An annual report updating the City's pavement management system is completed as part of this program. City road conditions are evaluated, the road network conditions and budget requirements are analyzed, and road-paving programs are developed. The report provides recommended funding to maintain street conditions at the current level. These are capital costs. They are implemented over a two-year period with an expected life of 20 years. The Public Works operational budget includes maintenance work costs with an expected life of 10 years.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Homepage
- FY19-24 CIP page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/ Lease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$20,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,000,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

FY 20-25
TSM-94-PW-73 : ROADWAY: Street Paving, Management and Rehabilitation

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS – STREETS
Fiscal Years 2020 and 2021

STREETS LISTING:

- Banfield Rd.
- Bartlett St (Islington St. to Dennett St.)
- Chapel St. (Daniel St. to Bow St.)
- Clough Dr.
- Creek Area
- Dennett St. (Woodbury Ave to Maplewood Ave)
- Edmond Ave
- Gosling Rd (Rte 16 to Woodbury Ave)
- High St.
- Ladd St.
- Little Harbor Rd.
- Market St. (Railroad to Submarine Way)
- Michael Succi Dr.
- Morning St.
- New Castle Ave.
- South St. (Junkins Ave to Marcy St.)
- Union St. (Middle St. to Islington St.)
- Miscellaneous

The list above represents a backlog of high priority pavement projects as identified by the Pavement Management Index and other capital projects. The amount of work completed depends on available funds and construction bid prices.
### TSM-11-PW-74: PEASE INTERNATIONAL TRADEPORT ROADWAY REHABILITATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Pease International Tradeport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (ongoing or programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified in Planning Document or Study</th>
<th>Satisfy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Description:
Per the Municipal Service Agreement between the City of Portsmouth and Pease Development Authority, the City will provide public work services in the non-airfield area of the Pease International Tradeport. Services include maintaining and repairing roads, streets, bridges and sidewalks. On the following page are the streets and roads that need improvements.

#### Useful Website Links:
- Public Works Homepage
- FY19-25 CIP page

#### Capital Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY’s Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$5,750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$5,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TSM-11-PW-74: ROADWAY: Pease International Tradeport Roadway Rehabilitation

PEASE INTERNATIONAL TRADEPORT
Fiscal Years 2020 and 2021

STREETS LISTING:
• Arboretum Dr.
• Airline Ave.
• Durham St.
• International Dr.
• Manchester Square
• New Hampshire Ave.
• Newfields St.

• Pease Blvd.
• Rochester Ave.
• Rye St.
• Miscellaneous

The list above represents a backlog of high priority pavement projects in the Pease International Tradeport as identified by the Pavement Management Index and other capital projects. The amount of work completed depends on available funds and construction bid prices.
V. ENTERPRISE FUNDS

WATER
**EF-02-WD-78: ANNUAL WATER LINE REPLACEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (Ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study – [Water System Master Plan 2013](#)
- Improves Quality of Existing Services
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Satisfy**

- Y

**Description:** The water distribution system consists of more than 150 miles of pipe. Many of the older pipes are 50 to 100 years old, undersized and at the end of their design life. Pipes are replaced programmatically as part of water specific capital projects, roadway reconstruction and prior to annual paving. This item will fund the purchase of pipe, valves and associated materials used to replace those pipes. Bond funds for large full road reconstruction projects.

**Useful Website Links:**
- [Public Works Homepage](#)
- [Water Department](#)
- [FY19-24 CIP page](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$4,650,000</td>
<td>$7,650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$15,240,000</td>
<td>$18,240,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**EF-15-WD-80: RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (ongoing or programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

| Identified in Planning Document or Study – Water System Master Plan 2013 | Y |
| Improves Quality of Existing Services | Y |
| Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services |   |
| Addresses Public Health or Safety Need |   |
| Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs |   |
| Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies |   |
| Provides Incentive to Economic Development |   |
| Responds to Federal or State Requirement | Y |
| Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability |   |

**Description:** This project consists of the study, design and implementation of measures to ensure the sustainability of the dam and the Bellamy Reservoir, which is the surface water supply for the Portsmouth Water Treatment Facility in Madbury. This includes an engineering assessment of the condition of the Bellamy Reservoir Dam and the design and implementation of measures to improve the dam structure, the design and construction of an improved outlet flow structure, water quality improvements and the purchase of land or conservation easements for the protection of the Bellamy Reservoir.

**Useful Website Links:**
- [Public Works Homepage](#)
- [Water Department](#)
- [FY19-24 CIP page](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY’s Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/ Lease</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EF-18-WD-81: MADBURY WELLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Construction or Expansion of a Public Facility, Street or Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified in Planning Document or Study – Water System Master Plan 2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** The project consists of well improvements at the Madbury Water Treatment Plant. This includes a new well #5 building to house meters, controls, valving and chemical feed equipment and improvements to existing wells and buildings for well #3 & #4.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Homepage
- Water Department
- FY19-24 CIP page

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$750,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$750,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$750,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EF-18-WD-83: WATER TRANSMISSION MAIN REPLACEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study – [Newington Transmission Main Alternative Draft Report 2017](#) **Y**
- Improves Quality of Existing Services **Y**
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement **Y**
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Description:** This project consists of design and construction of water transmission mains beneath Little Bay to replace existing mains, which are over 60 years old. Preliminary investigations of the existing water mains and valves have identified degraded conditions. Due to the importance of this water main, this project is necessary to ensure water is continuously supplied from Madbury to Portsmouth and service is not disrupted.

**Useful Website Links:**
- [Public Works Homepage](#)
- [Water Department](#)
- [FY19-24 CIP page](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EF-18-WD-87: PLEASANT STREET WATER MAINS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Pleasant Street (from Court Street to Marcy Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study
- Improves Quality of Existing Services
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies: Y
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement: Y
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability

**Description:** The City bid the Pleasant Street reconstruction project in the spring of 2018. The project includes a number of side streets (Livermore, Wentworth, Melcher, Franklin, Whidden and Richmond), which also require utility replacement. This project builds off of the recently completed roadway project. The available budget from previous years’ capital funds only covered the costs to build Pleasant Street. These funds will be used to complete construction of the side streets and will be shared with the sewer enterprise fund.

**Useful Website Links:**
- [Public Works Homepage](#)
- [Water Department](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY’s Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$823,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$823,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,423,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$823,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$823,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,423,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN FY 20-25
### EF-20-WD-88: MAPLEWOOD AVENUE AREA RECONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Maplewood Avenue Side Street (Cutts, Central, Leslie, Beechwood, Ashland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluation Criteria

| Identified in Planning Document or Study: | Satisfy |
| Improves Quality of Existing Services | |
| Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services | Y |
| Addresses Public Health or Safety Need | |
| Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs | Y |
| Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies | Y |
| Provides Incentive to Economic Development | |
| Responds to Federal or State Requirement | Y |
| Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability | |

---

**Description:** The City bid the Maplewood Avenue Reconstruction Project in the spring of 2018. The project originally included a number of side streets (Cutts, Central, Leslie, Beechwood, Ashland) which also require utility reconstruction. The available budget from previous years’ capital funds only covered the costs to build Maplewood Avenue. These funds will be used to complete construction of the side streets and will be shared with the sewer enterprise fund.

#### Useful Website Links:
- Public Works Homepage
- Water Department

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/ Lease</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. ENTERPRISE FUNDS

SEWER
### EF-12-SD-92: ANNUAL SEWER LINE REPLACEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Upgrade of Existing Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>O (Ongoing or Programmatic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified in Planning Document or Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description

The wastewater collection system consists of more than one-hundred fifteen (115) miles of pipe. Many of the older pipes are fifty (50) to one-hundred (100) years old, undersized and at the end of their design life. Pipes are replaced programmatically as part of sewer specific capital projects, roadway reconstruction and prior to annual paving. This item will fund the purchase of pipes and associated materials used to replace those pipes.

### Useful Website Links:

- Public Works Department
- Sewer Department
- FY19-24 CIP page

### Financial Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY’s Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/Lease</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
<td>$4,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$10,750,000</td>
<td>$13,750,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EF-18-SD-93: CONSENT DEGREE MITIGATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Other (Explained Below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** The City of Portsmouth entered into a Consent Decree with the Environmental Protection Agency in 2009. The City moved forward with the requirements of the Consent Decree and had to modify the final schedule for the required expansion of the Peirce Island Wastewater Treatment Facility. As a result of this modification, the City committed to certain projects. Capital projects include implementing a $500,000 green infrastructure stormwater project (previously funded) and construction of a low-pressure sewer system on Sagamore Avenue north and south of Sagamore Creek.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Department
- Sewer Department
- FY19-24 CIP page

### Capital Improvement Plan FY 20-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>Fed/State</th>
<th>Bond/Lease</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>FY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$5,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$5,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EF-18-SD-102: PLEASANT STREET SEWERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Pleasant Street (from Court Street to Marcy Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Satisfy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identified in Planning Document or Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Quality of Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Public Health or Safety Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Incentive to Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to Federal or State Requirement</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** The City bid the Pleasant Street reconstruction project in the spring of 2018. The project includes a number of side streets (Livermore, Wentworth, Melcher, Franklin, Whidden and Richmond), which also require utility replacement. This project builds off of the recently completed roadway project. The available budget from previous years’ capital funds only covered the costs to build Pleasant Street. These funds will be used to complete construction of the side streets and will be shared with the water enterprise fund.

**Useful Website Links:**
- Public Works Department
- Sewer Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GF</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>Totals 20-25</th>
<th>6 PY's Funding</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/ State</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond/ Lease</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$1,195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**EF-20-SD-103: MAPLEWOOD AVENUE AREA RECONSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Public Works</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Maplewood Avenue Side Streets (Cutts, Central, Leslie, Beechwood, Ashland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of a Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commence FY</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>A (needed within 0 to 3 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Operating Budget</td>
<td>Negligible (&lt;$5,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

- Identified in Planning Document or Study: Y
- Improves Quality of Existing Services: Y
- Provides Added Capacity to Existing Services: Y
- Addresses Public Health or Safety Need: Y
- Reduces Long-Term Operating Costs: Y
- Alleviates Substandard Conditions or Deficiencies: Y
- Provides Incentive to Economic Development: Y
- Responds to Federal or State Requirement: Y
- Eligible for Matching Funds with Limited Availability: Y

**Description:** The City bid the Maplewood Avenue Reconstruction Project in the spring of 2018. The project originally included a number of side streets (Cutts, Central, Leslie, Beechwood, Ashland) which also require reconstruction. The available budget from previous years’ capital funds only covered the costs to build Maplewood Avenue. These funds will be used to complete construction of the side streets and will be shared with the water enterprise fund.

**Useful Website Links:**
- [Public Works Homepage](#)
- [Sewer Department](#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>Fed/State</th>
<th>Bond/Lease</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>PPP</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100% $975,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY25</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FY's Funding</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$975,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ORDINANCE #

THE CITY OF PORTSMOUTH ORDAINS

That Chapter 7, Article III, Section 7.328 – LIMITED PARKING - THREE HOURS sub-section A of the Ordinances of the City of Portsmouth which shall read as follows (deletions from existing language stricken; additions to existing language bolded; remaining language unchanged from existing):

Section 7.328: LIMITED PARKING - THREE HOURS
A. No person having control or custody of any vehicle shall stop or cause the same to stop or park for longer than three hours at any time between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and between 12:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. Sunday, Holidays excluded, on the following streets and locations:

Raynes Avenue: entire street, both sides
Vaughan Street: entire street, both sides

The City Clerk shall properly alphabetize and/or re-number the ordinance as necessary in accordance with this amendment.

All ordinances or parts of ordinances inconsistent herewith are hereby deleted.

This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage.

APPROVED:

Jack Blalock, Mayor

ADOPTED BY COUNCIL:

Kelli L. Barnaby, City Clerk
June 11, 2019

To: John P. Bohenko, City Manager

From: Rosann Lentz, City Assessor

Re: 2019 Full Statistical Revaluation

John:

Annually, the City Assessors Office reviews and updates property assessments throughout the City. Annual adjustments to assessments provide a vehicle for the assurance of current, accurate and equitable property assessments. If property valuations are accurate across the entire city, inefficiencies and inequities in property taxation are greatly reduced.

This year the City will be conducting a Full Statistical Revaluation for Tax Year 2019/ Fiscal Year 2020 per RSA 75:1 and RSA 75:8-a. A Full Statistical Revaluation adjusts property values to market value (full and true value). This revaluation will update all taxable and nontaxable properties in the City using existing property data to arrive at market values as of April 1, 2019.

The 2019 Statistical Revaluation will be conducted by Vision Appraisal and the City’s in-house assessing staff. The assessing staff will be utilized in various aspects throughout the revaluation to assure assessments are accurate, equitable and in compliance with all revaluation standards.

The Council presentation June 17, 2019, will go over the preliminary sales analysis conducted by Vision Appraisal. This analysis will be the basis for adjustments to property values throughout the City.

Public relations will be ongoing throughout the revaluation process utilizing the City’s web page, council presentations, and if necessary public forums. Individuals with questions can contact the Assessor’s Office at any time. The revaluation time line is tentatively scheduled as follows:
Tentative Time Line

Start Up Meeting – March 2019

Sales Review and Analysis – April 2019 thru June 2019

Assessor Review of Values – June 2019 thru August 2019

Presentation to the City Council on Preliminary Analysis – June 17, 2019

Taxpayer Notice of Preliminary Assessments – Week of July 8, 2019

Taxpayer Forum – Tentatively July 18, 2019 – Library Levenson Room 6PM

Taxpayer Hearings – Beginning July 22, 2019 thru August 2, 2019

Presentation to City Council of Final Analysis and Results – August 12, 2019

Final Notices if Changes to Preliminary Values – Week of August 19, 2019

MS-1 – City Valuation – September - October 2019

Tax Rate Set - October 2019

Tax Bills - November 2019 (Reflecting New Assessments)
June 11, 2019

Mr. John P. Bohenko
City of Portsmouth
1 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Dear Mr. Bohenko,

The Music Hall and The Chamber Collaborative of Greater Portsmouth respectfully submit this request to The City of Portsmouth to grant approval for the closure of Chestnut and Porter Streets on Thursday, July 25th for the Chamber Collaborative of Greater Portsmouth’s annual dinner, street.life! The event itself will begin at 5pm and conclude at 9pm. We request that Chestnut Street be closed from 10am to 10pm and Porter Street be closed from 4pm to 10pm on July 25th.

In addition to the closure of streets, we request the approval for beer and wine to be served on Chestnut Street under The Music Hall’s liquor license. Beer and wine would be served only by professional, T.E.A.M. certified bartenders and service would be monitored by professional security staff. With the event concluding at 9pm, alcohol service would cease at 8:30pm. The expected attendance for this private event is 425 guests.

A live band would perform on Chestnut Street, requiring minimal amplification and no staging. They require a small footprint. This is not a sit-down dinner event. High-top tables, folding food service tables, and portable rolling bars will be the only items on the street. Catering would be provided by Foster’s Clambake, serving finger-style food only.

In 2012 the Chamber Collaborative held the first street.life! to “Celebrate Portsmouth Business” with a catered sit-down dinner and a fully licensed bar on Pleasant Street with almost 500 business leaders as guests. We recreated that event on Pleasant Street again in 2014. Our street.life! celebration has become an annual tradition much anticipated by our member businesses and other guests, always in a unique Portsmouth location, and always celebrating our business community and the great city in which we live, work, and play.

The collaboration between The Chamber Collaborative and The Music Hall’s professional event team will ensure yet another smooth, well-run event with proper safety procedures and protocols put in place.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Patricia Lynch
Executive Director, The Music Hall

Valerie T. Rochon
President & Chief Collaborator, The Chamber Collaborative of Greater Portsmouth
Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Scott Fales (sfales@hotmail.com) on Tuesday, June 4, 2019 at 15:28:09

address: 151 Aldrich Road

comments: Construction has commenced on Islington Street and signs have been installed designating Aldrich Road as a detour for the Islington Street project. On the first day of this detour, the volume of traffic has increased significantly. The problem is not the increase in traffic volume, but an increase in the number of vehicles that are breaking the 20 mph speed limit on Aldrich Road. I respectfully request the City Council to address the speeding issue by allocating any appropriate funds to our outstanding Police Department so that they may enforce the 20 mph speed limit on Aldrich Road so that everyone is safe. Thank you.
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Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Sampo Kaasila (skaasila@hotmail.com) on Wednesday, June 12, 2019 at 06:55:57

address: 265 Islington St

comments: Dear Mayor Blalock, and City Council Members,

We live at 265 Islington Street, and our building is on the corner of Cornwall and Islington. This means we are in the Islington Creek neighborhood between Islington and the train tracks. It has come to our attention that we are not included in the parking program and we cannot get parking permits even though we do live in the Islington Creek neighborhood!!

If the pilot program starts, we will not even be allowed to park even next to our own building on Cornwall street! Those with permits will be able to park next to our building, but we cannot. There has to be some common sense and fairness to this process, and residences at least on the train track side of Islington St must be considered part of the program. The reason given to us, at the Tuesday meeting, for not getting permits and not being part of the household count was that Islington St already has parking regulation. This regulation is a two-hour limit on the parking, so that should be added reason for us being part of the area and program and not reason for being removed from the process and parking pilot.

We attended the parking meeting last evening June 11th at city hall where the focus and goal was to reduce the number of “legal single-family households to 192 or less, so the 144 collected petitions would constitute 75% or more. The focus was so strong the city manager even mentioned that if they were a few votes too low he would allow the proponents to go out and find those votes. We brought up the fact that they are missing households, but this was outside of the scope of the meetings goal. One gentleman told us that he has been fighting for this for years and years and that we could organize our neighborhood for a permit parking program in the future. We live in his neighborhood, there is no other neighborhood we could do this in. This is why we are now reaching out to you.
What does this mean for us? It means that we can't park on Islington Street because it is a two-hour parking zone, and now it also means that we can no longer park on Cornwall, Rockingham and surrounding neighborhood streets because we cannot get a parking permit. We ask you all, where do we park? This parking situation will be a problem for all residents that live on Islington Street in the Pilot permit area. No one will have anywhere to park.

So we ask, shouldn’t Islington Street residents get a vote? At the very least, if this program is pushed through and it is evident it will be, shouldn’t we be able to get permits to park in our own neighborhood? As tax paying Portsmouth residents, we believe we should.

We are reaching out to you for help.

Sincerely,
Mary Ellen and Sampo Kaasila

PS: We are confused because when the initial questionnaire was sent out with questions, about the program we did receive it, completed and returned it. This gave us the impression that we would be included in the program should it be implemented. Then we heard that people would be canvassing for a vote about the program through a neighborhood email chain we are on. We signed up for this email chain when the neighborhood had a neighborhood get together in Rock Park. However, no one ever came to take our vote. After doing a little research we realized that we are no longer part of the program because we have a front door and address on Islington Street address.

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ken Goldman (barbken@comcast.net) on Wednesday, June 12, 2019 at 10:34:49

address: 271 Islington Street, Portsmouth, NH 03801

comments: City Council
Portsmouth City Hall
1 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Dear City Council Members,

I will be following up on this email with a letter to the City Council, City Manager and the Mayor.

In September of 2018, we purchased a house on Islington Street, between Rockingham and Cornwall Streets, in the Islington Green community. One of the things that attracted us to this neighborhood was the availability of parking on Rockingham and Cornwall Streets. Since we have moved in, this free and open parking has provided spaces for our overnight guests, contractors performing work on our house, and for our cars when contractors needed to use our garage while performing their work. When the Islington Creek Neighborhood Parking Program was proposed, we assumed that, as we are part of the neighborhood, we would be included in the program.

We learned at the meeting on 11 June 2019 that we are not. The specific streets the program applies to are McDonough from Salem to Brewster; Cabot from Islington to the Railroad tracks; Rockingham; Cornwall; Langdon, wrapping around to Brewster; Brewster, wrapping around to Langdon; Sudbury; Hanover from Brewster to Bridge; Rock Street from Islington to the signage at Heinemann; Pearl Street; Parker Street; Tanner Court; Hill Street. The program does not apply to the houses on Islington Street!
We are at a loss to understand why this is so. It does not make sense to us that we are not considered part of the neighborhood. The houses on the adjacent side streets, including houses in our community, are included, while we are not. As the parking in front of our house on Islington Street is also limited to two hours, we are now unsure as to where to tell visitors and contractors to park if they will be at our house for more than two hours. If the Neighborhood Parking Program is approved, and we continue to be excluded, we are left without any options. In addition, we believe that the loss of this resource can only act to devalue our property. From our perspective, the decision to exclude the houses on Islington Street seems to be arbitrary, punitive and patently unfair.

The Neighborhood Parking Program (NPP) General Parameters-Islington Creek state that “...the City Manager shall have the authority to make necessary changes throughout the pilot period to accommodate unanticipated circumstances.” Therefore, we respectfully request that, under this authority, and should the Islington Creek Neighborhood Parking Program be implemented, that our house, and all the houses on Islington Street in the Islington Creek Neighborhood be included in the program.

If you would like to contact us to discuss this, we can be reached at 603 501-0709 (home), 301-523-4239 (cell) or at barbken@comcast.net.

Thank you,

Yours truly,
Kenneth R. Goldman
Barbara S. Sadick

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ellen Small (esmall2001@hotmail.com) on Wednesday, June 12, 2019 at 18:06:53

address: 207 Holly Lane
comments: Hello,
So many towns in NH have paved rail trails for bicycling and walking. Wouldn't this be a great idea for Portsmouth? I have not found a safe place to ride my bike except at Pease on the weekends. I think such a trail would bring more business to Portsmouth and would be wonderful for the citizens of Portsmouth. It also is a great way to get people to exercise. Thank you, Ellen Small

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Dave Watson (ddpkwatson@comcast.net) on Thursday, June 13, 2019 at 08:01:01

address: 275 ISLINGTON ST
comments: Good Morning
Islington Green Condo are a 14 unit town house complex 4 on Cornwall, 3 on Rockingham and 7 on Islington. All of use share the same driveway that enters from Cornwall and exits onto Rockingham. Because our front door faces Islington we are not conceded to be in the Islington Creek neighborhood so the 7 of use are not included in the Parking pilot program. Can someone please tell me what neighborhood we are in. And where should we park since we are not included in the neighborhood I thought I lived in. In the Neighborhood Parking General parameters-Islington Creek states that the city manager shall have the authority to make
necessary changes throughout the pilot period to accommodate unanticipated circumstance. I believe this is a unanticipated circumstance.

Dave Watson
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New content begins:
Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Dan Umbro (umbro.daniel@gmail.com) on Thursday, June 13, 2019 at 09:22:15
address: 30 Elm Court

comments: Councilors - I'm emailing in regards to the NPP petitions submitted by the Islington Creek neighborhood. I was in attendance for the meeting Tuesday night and have a few thoughts that I hope you will consider before coming to a decision.

- I find it extremely frustrating that this group is suggesting that businesses and their customers are required to obey the parking restrictions, but not have a say in whether they want them. Is that even legal? This is especially disappointing (but not surprising) coming from this group, who has excluded businesses and neglected to gather input from them during this entire process.

- Similar to above, I think its wrong that boarding house residents would be required to obey parking restrictions on their street but not have a say in whether they want them.

- If there was any confusion about what constituted a household then that should have been handled by one of the IC members long before Tuesday. I wonder if there were any attempts made to gather petitions but were abandoned?

- We should acknowledge that efforts taken to get ahold of residents. If door knocking, waiting outside people's homes, neighborhood meetings, many emails, flyers and direct mail wasn't enough, then it's my opinion those people didn't want to be bothered. They exhausted their outreach efforts and still fell short.

- At one point I heard that the police department would be following up on signatures, but Tuesday it sounded like the Parking Director would be making those calls. This is in part why I asked at the meeting whether or not the petitions would be made public. I think if someone saw their name as a supporter of the program, and they were in fact not one, then they would be able to come forward on their own. I have serious doubts that all 144 signatures will actually be confirmed.

- I just want to add that sitting through that meeting was a reminder of how contentious this program is. Hearing neighbors included in the program tell other neighbors not included that "oh well that's how the city drew the lines" made me squirm a little. That attitude is extremely self-serving and shows that the city is enabling some residents to put themselves above others. How can the city help push this program through, without the required petitions, when it's clearly pitting people against each other? It's not healthy. That said, why can't we include all residents in the program? It seems to me that it would make the people opposed to this program satisfied.

I appreciate your time and am available if you would like to discuss further.

Thanks,
Dan
Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Arthur Bruinooge (abruinooge@me.com) on Thursday, June 13, 2019 at 14:20:39

address: 291 Islington St

comments: Dear Mayor Blalock, John Bohenko, City Manager and City Council Members,

We were very surprised to learn that our residence has been excluded from the Islington Creek Pilot Parking Program. We live at 291 Islington St, on the corner of Rockingham and Islington. We have a household of three adults, each with a car. When we first moved into our new home in March of 2016, parking was never a problem. We have a two stall garage and parking spots were open in front of our home and alongside on Rockingham St. Last year restrictions were put in place on Islington St, limiting parking to only two hours. Parking was less convenient but still good enough to fit our needs.

When the pilot parking program was first introduced, we didn’t feel there was a parking issue that needed to be addressed. However, after attending some neighborhood meetings we learned that residents on other streets and in other areas experience some difficulties. We signed a petition to go forward with the program since as presented it didn’t necessarily hurt us or help us. Now that we are excluded from the program it definitely hurts us. We never would have voted yes on the petition. If this plan goes forward we can’t park in front of our home on Islington St or adjacent to us on Rockingham. We can’t even park in our neighborhood. Our guests and visitors now have a parking problem as well.

This is not fair and we ask the you include all Islington Creek neighborhood residences in the pilot program. This should be an easy problem to fix, just include homes along the north side of Islington St.

We look forward to hearing from you as well as a solution to this problem

Sincerely,

Arthur Bruinooge (abruinooge@me.com)
Barbara Bruinooge (bbruinooge55@gmail.com) Briana Bruinooge (bruinooge6386@gmail.com)

291 Islington St
Portsmouth NH, 03801
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Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Sampo Kaasila (skaasila@hotmail.com) on Friday, June 14, 2019 at 08:00:31

address: 265 Islington St

comments: Dear City Council Members,

There is a huge problem for with the proposed Islington Creek Pilot Parking Program as it stands now.

We cannot understand how it can be justified that we will not be allowed to park on the street right next to a wall of our own building on Cornwall, while someone that lives on Tanner street six blocks away will be allowed to park there. My building faces both Cornwall and Islington. One simple way to solve the problem is to draw a line down the middle of Islington and including everything between that and the train tracks, this way half of Islington would be in the area.
The whole idea behind the resident parking program is to allow residents in the neighborhood to be able to park on the streets close to their homes. When defining a neighborhood, you must include the buildings and condo complexes facing that street if both the left and right side of a street is taken to be part of the area. The parking program cannot annex whole streets without including the buildings and condo-complexes on it.

About the argument that we should have reacted earlier: We received surveys about the program that we responded to, and emails etc., and we were all thinking we were part of the area. We also know of at least two condo owners in our condo complex that voted for the program that also have a front door on Islington. They voted for the program so they could get the parking-permits. Now they deeply regret voting in favor, since they now understand that their current free right to park will be revoked instead of getting parking-permits. We could not even imagine the actual intent. Please help make this right.

Sincerely,
Sampo Kaasila and Mary Ellen Kaasila

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Steven/Sharon Spinney (4spinn@comcast.net) on Friday, June 14, 2019 at 11:27:07
address: 281 Islington Street
comments: We are owners at 281 Islington Street and write to strongly support and reiterate the request made by the Kaasila, Bruinooge, Watson, Goldman families also on Islington. As taxpayers living in the area affected, we should be part of the program! Please acknowledge receipt of this email. Sharon & Steven Spinney 603 553-0665. Please note we cant attend the 6/17 meeting due to a planned surgery, otherwise weâ€™d be there.

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Charlie Armenti (armeca@comcast.net) on Friday, June 14, 2019 at 11:36:46
address: 30 Cornwall St, Portsmouth NH 03801
comments: Dear City Council Members,

This letter is in response to the proposed Islington Creek Neighborhood Parking (NPP) program and specifically those Islington St residents that are not included in the proposed Islington Creek neighborhood street map.

My name is Charlie Armenti and I am the President of the Islington Green Condominium Association, located on Islington St, across from Goodwin Park.

We are a registered entity with the State of New Hampshire, (aka “Islington Green Condominium Assoc, LLC”) and are subject to maintaining By-Laws and operational rules and regulations that apply to all 14 units in our association. The Association consists of 14 units (aka residences), with 7 units located on Islington St, 3 on Rockingham St and 4 on Cornwall St.

We are proud to be part of this historical community located within the proposed Islington Creek neighborhood and street map and we want all residences to be represented.
As the President of the Association, I am respectfully requesting that all “14 of our condo units” be included in the proposed Islington Creek neighborhood and street map. Specifically, to add the 7 units located directly on Islington St.

The Islington Green Condo Assoc is at a loss to understand why the 7 Islington St residences were not included in the Islington Creek petition. It does not make sense to us that, all 14 condo units are not considered to be part of the neighborhood. The 7 units located on Rockingham St and Cornwall St are included in the NPP pilot program but the 7 units on Islington St, were not. Excluding these 7 units located directly on Islington St and eliminating their ability to park for more than 2 hours on any of our side streets is arbitrary, punitive and patently unfair.

As I understand, the Neighborhood Parking Program (NPP) General Parameters-Islington Creek state that “...the City Manager shall have the authority to make necessary changes throughout the pilot period to accommodate unanticipated circumstances.” If the Islington Creek Neighborhood Parking (NPP) Pilot Program does move forward and is implemented, I respectfully request that, under this authority, that these 7 additional units, within the Islington Green Condo Assoc, LLC, be included in the Islington Creek Neighborhood parking program.

If you would like to contact me to discuss, I can be reached at (603) 531-8689 or armeca@comcast.net.

Please be sure to share this request and information with the City Council members and any other interested parties.

Thank you,

Charlie Armenti
President, Islington Green Condo Assoc. LLC
30 Cornwall St
Portsmouth NH 03801
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Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Arthur Bruinooge (Abruinooge@me.com) on Sunday, June 16, 2019 at 21:22:52

address: 291 Islington St

comments: Portsmouth City Hall
City Council
1 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Date: June 16, 2019

Re: Islington Creek Pilot Parking Program

Dear Mayor Blalock, John Bohenko, City Manager and City Council Members,

Please include this letter and my June, 13, 2019 email to the Mayor, City Manager and the City Council as part of the permanent record relative to the issue of the Islington Creek Neighborhood Pilot Parking Program (NPP). I plan to attend the City Council meeting on Monday evening and will register to speak and share my concerns.
My name is Arthur Bruinooge and I live with my wife Barbara and daughter Briana at 291 Islington St,
Portsmouth NH. Our condominium unit is located at the corner of Islington and Rockingham and it is part of
the 14 unit Islington Green Condominium Association. This association includes 5 buildings with half of the
units on Rockingham and Cornwall and the other half on Islington. We have three drivers in our household
along with three cars, one of which is always parked nearby on the street. I wish to address the problems that
are created by the proposed parking program as well as possible solutions to these problems.

I have seen two responses from City Council to my initial email dated 6/13/19. Rebecca Perkins responded
and recommended that I ask City Council to amend what it previously approved to ensure that it includes my
address and any other constituents that feel they have been excluded. So, solution number 1 is to amend the
program to include the 7 Islington Green Condominium units with addresses at 261, 265, 271, 275, 281, 285,
and 291 Islington St. We are the only excluded residences belonging to a condominium association that has
ownership interest in common area and limited common area within the currently defined area of the NPP.
Our taxes include the value of that common and limited common area.

The second response that I saw from City Council is from Doug Roberts. While sympathetic to our concerns
he was skeptical of our request. One reason he cited is that the NPP neighborhood has several abutting
streets with many residents beside ourselves and that on Islington Street there appears to be an additional
30-35 households that could make the same request to be included in the program. I walked the entire NPP
area and found that the abutting streets have nearby adjacent open street parking outside of the defined
NPP areas. Islington street residents have restricted parking on all sides and must now park in another
neighborhood. The north side Islington street is a common sense boundary to the neighborhood. Walking
along the Islington St boundary I counted 14 buildings, including 8 businesses and about 26 households. So,
solution number 2 is to include the north side of Islington St and give all of us an option to be included. This
does not seem to be an unreasonable request and certainly would be fair for everyone.

Mr Roberts also outlined the program hours and mentioned that our condo association has off-street parking
and that our concerns are generally about daytime parking for our guests. If guests need more than 2 hours
of parking time they apparently can park in other neighborhoods or go to the parking garage. I walked the
area and noted that most residences in the area have off street parking with anywhere from 1 to 4 available
spaces. It is a few streets with multi-tenant buildings that experience the biggest parking problem. The
assumption that our concern is primarily about guests is 100% wrong. We have three drivers and three cars in
our household and others on Islington also have multiple cars and drivers as well. Many of us have grown
children and young grandchildren that visit and always bring a carload of stuff during their visits. Parking in
other neighborhoods just doesn’t make sense. So to be fair, solution number 3 is to amend the program
for everyone that has off-street parking, restricting the number of parking permits by giving credit for the off-
street spaces they already have. If you have one off-street parking space you can secure two parking permits.
If you have two spaces, you can secure one. Three spaces or more, none. Everyone is still in the program and
can secure a guest pass as well the four monthly 24 hour event passes that are available.

As I stated in my 6/13/19 email, I did not feel that there was a parking problem in our area, however after
attending the neighborhood meetings I heard about the parking issues by other residents living on Hanover
St and Hill St. After being lead to believe that the north side of Islington St was included in the NPP, I
completed a questionnaire and voted Yes on two petitions that were presented to me. It was shocking to learn that the approved plan now excludes us. In doing so you are trying to solve some
constituents problems at the expense of others. You are just moving the problem to another group. If forced
to park in other neighborhoods that will just expand the problem to yet another neighborhood. I also feel
that if this plan becomes permanent, our property value will be adversely affected and our tax valuation
should be adjusted downward. So, solution number 4 is not really a solution but our last resort. Should the
City Council choose not to act on this matter and continue to exclude the 7 Islington Green condo units, we
will be forced to organize all of the Islington Street residents and continue our fight for fairness at City Hall. I
hope that this is not needed since there appears to be some very easy and fair ways to address the problem.
I look forward to your fair and equitable resolution to this matter. Hopefully you can resolve it at the meeting tomorrow evening.

Thank you,

Arthur Bruinooge
291 Islington St
Portsmouth NH, 03801

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Anne Donaldson (donaldsonanne@aol.com) on Saturday, June 15, 2019 at 12:21:37

address: 42 Orchard Street, Portsmouth, NH

comments: To Portsmouth City Council
Attn: Councilors Lazenby, Reynolds, Roberts and Becksted,

I have before me your letter to the Editor dated Dec. 12, 2017.

At that early time you urged patience in the process of developing a plan for the McIntyre land. Many months and many meetings later..today, June 14, 2019...,with a big push from the business community and little regard to the residents, the City Council is proposing a conglomeration of huge brick buildings with too little parking and too little green space.

Please consider what Citizens accomplished in establishing the Music Hall and Prescott Park!

Sincerely,
Anne Donaldson

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Barbara Bruinooge (Bbruinooge55@gmail.com) on Monday, June 17, 2019 at 11:22:51

address: 291 Islington Street

comments: City Council Members,

It has recently come to my attention that my home and six other homes with front doors on Islington Street will not be included in the pilot parking program.

Our condominium complex “Islington Green Condominiums” consists of 14 units with property located on Islington, Cornwall and Rockingham. We are part of the Islington Creek Neighborhood and pay taxes for the said land with all 14 units.

We have signed two petitions to be included in the 75% of household signatures to get this program started. These were signed in good faith, as we are Islington Creek residents. We are not alone in signing the petition as our neighbors with address on Islington Street have also signed. Had we known we would be excluded, I am sure we would not have voted to approve something that would so impact our Association and our neighbors.
There has been so much information passed around that it was not clear to us that we in fact would not be included. Upon reading some of recent emails sent to the city council and the response it is also confusing.

A reply from Doug Roberts suggested other parking options, “You could park on State Street, a 2 minute walk, or on Cabot or Summer”. My first thought is you now have moved our neighborhood parking problem to their neighborhood. I am sure if those residents were aware of this suggestion they would not be approve.

Mr. Roberts also stated that he is sympathetic but skeptical of our request to be included as their could be up to 30-35 household that could make the same request. Well, they should make the same request if they are part of the “Islington Creek Neighborhood “ They probably don’t realize they are excluded because of all the misleading documentation.

In summary, I am asking you reconsider your exclusion of 7 of the 14 units known as Islington Green Condominiums. Said units located in the Islington Creek Neighborhood. I believe the name alone speaks for its self, Islington.

I would like to thank you all for your hard work you do for our city and for considering my request.

Kind regards,

Barbara Bruinooge
291 Islington Street
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