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CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

This is the first full year annual report under the new Council-Manager form of government. I am pleased to report a number of accomplishments by your new government as well as continued progress on some long-term projects. I think the citizens of Rochester will find the Council-Manager form of government to be a capable and beneficial servant based on equitable and professional standards of service. As with anything new, there will be a period of time needed for the system to get established and the people to get acclimated to how it works. During its infancy adjustments have and will continue to be made in order to best meet the needs of Rochester.

Some of the highlights of the year were the following:

*Centennial Celebrations were a major part of the year’s activities. 1991 marked Rochester’s 100th year as a City. Hats off to Mayor Roland Roberge, City Councilor Terry McGarghan (Chairman of the Celebrations), and citizen volunteer Adrian Chasse for a tremendous job in coordinating, managing, and raising the funds for the multitude of events throughout the year.

*The City established the Ice Arena Advisory Commission and moved towards taking over the Ice Arena from the YMCA. This became a necessary action in order to keep ice hockey alive in Rochester. The YMCA could no longer continue operation of the arena due to financial constraints; however, the City could make it a viable operation because of the City’s favorable insurance rates and other factors which the YMCA did not have available to it.

*The City began its curbside recycling program through a lot of effort by the Recycling Task Force. At this same time, we were able to negotiate a very financially favorable solid waste collection, disposal and recycling contract with Waste Management, Inc. to provide these various services.

*The Coldsprings Park Neighborhood Coalition was formed through the work of the City and neighborhood residents to clean-up the area and combat negative influences on the neighborhood. Anne May of the City’s Drug Abuse Prevention Office is to be commended for her tireless work in organizing this effort.

*The City’s first comprehensive employee handbook and merit plan was completed and forwarded to the City Council for review. This plan established job descriptions, employment rules and regulations, and a pay scale.
The Cocheco River clean-up by volunteer City Employees and the crew of the submarine USS L. Mendel Rivers.

The new Fire Chief and Police Chief started their positions.

Public Works, Fire and Police collective bargaining contracts were settled.

The City received the following grants: Governor's Recycling Grant, Energy Audit of Public Buildings Grant, Emergency Shelter Program Grant, and several others which will appear throughout the annual report.

The City continues to face negotiations with the State and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency over the need for an Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant on the Cocheco River to replace the current Secondary Level Facility. This will be an important and expensive decision for the City of Rochester. Work is still on-going to correct the City's Water and Sewer Fund deficit situation and to improve the City's general financial position.

Despite many hard issues and a poor regional economy, the City of Rochester has fared well and will continue to be a major force in shaping the growth and prosperity of the area. As always, I encourage you to familiarize yourself with the various accomplishments of the departments presented in this report, and to take the business of your government seriously. You must as a citizen be involved in your city government if you want it to be responsive to your needs. The elected officials and employees of the City of Rochester are here to serve you in the best possible manner, let us work together to keep Rochester a great city.

Sincerely,

Reynold Perry
CITY GOVERNMENT
As Organized January 1, 1991
MAYOR ROLAND ROBERGE

CITY COUNCIL

Ward One - Harry Germon, James McManus, Jr.
Ward Two - Sandra Kean, Daniel Moynihan
Ward Three - Janet Pelley, Alan Reed-Erickson
Ward Four - Richard Creteau, Bernard Veno
Ward Five - Charles Grassie, Jr., Terrence McGarghan
At-Large - Daniel J. Harkinson, Lucien Levesque

Reynold Perry, City Manager

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1991

Codes & Ordinances Committee: Sandra Kean, Chairperson; Charles Grassie, Jr., Daniel Moynihan, Alan Reed-Erickson, Janet Pelley
Fiscal Affairs Committee: Roland Roberge, Chairperson; Sandra Kean, Lucien Levesque, Janet Pelley, Richard Creteau, James McManus, Jr.
Harry Germon
Public Safety Committee: Lucien Levesque, Chairperson; James McManus, Jr., Bernard Veno, Terrence McGarghan

SPECIAL COMMITTEES, 1991

Centennial Committee: Terrence McGarghan, Chairperson; Alan Reed-Erickson, Charles Grassie, Jr., Daniel Moynihan

Opera House Committee: Alan Reed-Erickson, Chairperson; Terrence McGarghan, Richard Creteau, James McManus, Jr., Daniel Moynihan

JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEES, 1991

Gonic School Addition: Harry Germon, Alan Reed-Erickson, James McManus, Jr.
McClelland School Addition: Harry Germon, James McManus, Jr., Alan Reed-Erickson, Janet Pelley
New Middle School: James McManus, Jr., Alan Reed-Erickson, Terrence McGarghan, Janet Pelley, Bernard Veno
High School Renovations: Daniel Moynihan, Chairperson; Richard Creteau, Charles Grassie, Jr., Sandra Kean
Vocational School: Sandra Kean, Chairperson; Richard Creteau, Charles Grassie, Jr., Daniel Moynihan
**PERSONNEL**

City Treasurer & Business Administrator - Richard Larochelle  
City Clerk - Gail M. Varney  
City Solicitor - Danford Wensley  
Tax Collector - Marianne Douglas  
Commissioner of Public Works - Bert D. George  
City Engineer - David Bulva  
Fire Chief - Mark Dellner  
Deputy Fire Chief - Francis Carpentino  
Police Chief - Kenneth P. Hussey  
Captain of Patrol - David Winship  
Assessor - Brett Purvis  
Building Inspector - John Stowell  
Planning & Development Director - Peer Kraft-Lund  
Economic Development Director - George Bald  
City Physician - None  
Health Officer / Code Enforcement - John Stoweli  
Welfare Director - Jane Hervey  
Recreation Director - Brent Diesel  
Librarian - Tedine Roos  
Animal Control Officer - None  
Custodian of City Hall - Patricia McLaren  
Custodian of East Rochester - Lorraine Brooks  
Custodian of Gonic Town Hall - No Custodian Gonic Town Hall, Closed

**BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, 1991**

Board of Assessors: Brett Purvis, Chairperson; Victoria Lambert  
Board of Health: Dr. Thomas Moon, Chairperson; Dr. James DeJohn, William Keefe, John Stowell  
Licensing Board: Reynold Perry, Chairperson; Kenneth Hussey, Mark Dellner  
Planning Board: Neil Lachance, Chairperson; Matthias Marquardt, Maurice Gagne, Phillipe Scott, Dorothy Callaghan. Officio Member: James McManus, Jr. Alternate Members: Roger Larochelle, Jr.; Kevin Jones, Kenneth Ortman, Eugene Henry, Leonard Jerabek  
Welfare Appeals Board: Janet Poulin, Chairperson; Nancy Morneault, Mary Flynn. Alternate Member: Anthony Coraine  
Conservation Commission: Arthur Birch, Chairperson; Edward Moody, Richard Dame, Prisco Diprizio, Lorraine Whaley, George Bailey, Roger Griffin
**Economic Development Commission:** John Dulude, Chairperson; Danford Wensley, Charles Sherman, Terrence Dunn, Janet Davis, Robert Silberblatt, Phillip Drapeau, Robert Gustafson, Daniel Hussey

**Police Commission:** Roger W. Beaudoin, Chairperson; Ronald G. Lachapelle, Leslie G. Horne, Jr.

**Recreation Commission:** Alfred Benton, Chairperson; John Connelly, David Tinkham, Jerold Barcomb, Judy Beaudoin, Charles Grassie, Jr., Fred Chisholm

**Strafford Regional Planning Commission:** Sherman Reed, Matthias Marquardt, Warren McGranahan

**Trustees of the Public Library:** Jeremiah Minihan, Chairperson; Nancy Hubbard, Ann Marie Casevechia, Diane Breenan, Natalie Wensley, Harry Rose, Rev. David Peason

**Trustee of the Trust Funds:** Kennett Kendall, Jr., Dr. Gus Hoyt, Gerald Janelle

**Utility Advisory Board:** A. Raymond Varney, Jr., Chairperson; David Berry, David Harrington, J. Barry Baughman, Roger Levesque

**MAYOR’S TASK FORCE, 1991**

**Rochester Substance Abuse Prevention Task Force:** Linda Navelski, Chairperson; Paul Asbell, Alfred Benton, Daniel Bernard, Dawn Bragg, Robert Brown, Mary Burch, Rene Cardinal, Robert Carignan, John Connelly, Anthony Coraine, Richard Creteau, Sharon Croft, Brent Diesel, Tanya Fisher, Rebecca Follum, Breck Gervais, Charles Grasse, Jr., Thomas Hart, Nancy-Jo Higgins, Dr. Wallace Hubbard, William Keefe, David Lynch, Anne May, Rebecca Nevejans, Sheldon Parshley, Kay Pieroni, Raymond Porelle, Patricia Rainboth, Alan Reed-Erickson, Robert Tarlton, Rev. Sherwood Treadwell, Steven Warshaw, Susan Williamson, Brian Whitworth, Dr. Raymond Yeagley

**Resource Persons:** Jennifer Jenne, Clifford Germaine

**Chemical Awareness & Planning Advisory Committee:** Edward Dupont, Terrence McGarghan, Geoffrey White, Robert Jeffries, Robert Tait, Charles Clement, Patricia Vermette, Stanley Bobbie, Michael Haley, Harold Kreger, Craig McKenzie, Michael Bennet, John Wheeler, John Stowell, Bert George, Frank Carpentino, John Cook, Phyllis Hayward

**Recycling Task Force:** Janet Pelley, Chairperson; Susan Bailey, Kathy Brunson, Susan Dole, Maurice Gagne, Cindy Harrington, Haven Johnson, Tracy McMath, Kenneth Ortmann, Robin Brown, Dorothy Callaghan, Joanne Hack, Daniel Hussey, David McCallister, Richard Morris, Cindy Radey, Karen Savard, Jennifer Stuart, Senator Edward Dupont, Sandra Keans, Alan Reed-Erickson

**Resource Persons:** James Pappas, Dale Henderson
ELECTION OFFICIALS, 1991

Ward One - Arthur Birch, Moderator; Nancy Jo Higgins, Ward Clerk; Caroline Boyle, Checklist Supervisor; Austin Grant, Karla Quint, Laura Wyatt, Selectmen

Ward Two - Brian Brennan, Moderator; Lorraine Morin, Ward Clerk; Jo-Ann Focht, Checklist Supervisor; Julie Brown, Norman Labrecque, Betty Pallas, Selectmen

Ward Three - Scott Wensley, Moderator; Karen Grossman, Ward Clerk; Muriel Gagnon, Checklist Supervisor; Stuart Fanning, Tanis Hatt, Priscilla Fanning, Selectmen

Ward Four - Arleen Clark, Moderator; Jeanne E. Sylvain, Ward Clerk; Jacqueline Peters, Checklist Supervisor; Lillian Boudreau, Barbara Harrison, Mary Sylvain, Selectmen

Ward Five - Danford Wensley, Moderator; Jana Megee, Ward Clerk; Gertrude Brigham, Checklist Supervisor; Warren Buchanan, Cindy Corriveau, Marjorie Rodis, Selectmen
AMENDMENT TO ZONING ORDINANCE
RELATIVE TO BED AND BREAKFAST ESTABLISHMENTS

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 42 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as presently amended, be further amended as follows:

I. That Chapter 42, Section 42.6 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Definitions," be amended by adding to subparagraph (a) thereof, the following new sub-subparagraph, to be inserted in proper alphabetical order and assigned an appropriate sub-subparagraph number:

(6a) Bed and Breakfast Establishment. A single family or two-family dwelling unit in which up to five (5) rooms, each intended for occupancy by no more than four (4) adults, and are without associated individual kitchen facilities, are rented to transient guests, provided, however, that no such guests shall stay in such establishments for more than fourteen (14) consecutive days or more than twenty-one (21) days in any calendar month. Any dwelling unit operated as aforesaid shall be occupied by its owner or by a live-in manager. Food service shall be limited to paying guests.

II. That Chapter 42, Section 42.9 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Off-Street Parking and Loading," be amended by adding to subsection (b) thereof the following sub-subsection, to be designated as sub-subparagraph (18) of Section 42.9 (b):

(18) Bed and Breakfast Establishment. One (1) space for each rented room; two (2) spaces for owner occupant/live-in manager.

III. That Chapter 42, Section 42.14 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Permitted Uses - Table 1," as presently amended, be further amended by adding to subparagraph (b) thereof, entitled, "Commercial Uses," the following sub-subparagraph to be designated as sub-subparagraph (18a) of Section 42.14 (b):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONING DISTRICTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) COMMERCIAL USES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18a) Bed and Breakfast Establishment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. That Chapter 42, Section 42.15 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Permitted Uses - Detail," be amended by adding thereto the following subparagraph to be designated as subparagraph (k) of Section 42.15:

(K) Bed and Breakfast Establishment.

(1) On-Site Septic Systems. A design permit from the New Hampshire Water Supply and Pollution Division, that the on-site septic system is adequate for the total maximum amount of occupants including guests of the premises.

(2) Exterior Design Standards. Minimal outward modification of the structure or ground may be made only if such changes are compatible with the character of the area or neighborhood.

(3) Intensity of Use. The Bed and Breakfast shall not use more than 50 percent of the floor area of the principal residence.

(4) Sign. The sign shall identify, not advertise, shall be unlighted, and shall not exceed two square feet in area and three and one-half feet in height.

Passed October 2, 1990

Roland Roberge, Mayor

AMENDMENT TO GENERAL ORDINANCES
OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER
ESTABLISHING AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That in order to provide for the public interest and the general welfare of the citizens of Rochester by facilitating and encouraging economic development within the City of Rochester, Title I of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester entitled "Administrative Code," as presently amended, be further amended as follows:

I. That Chapter 1, Section 1.2 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Administrative Departments," be amended by adding to said section the following subparagraph to be known as subparagraph 17 of Section 1.2:
II. That Chapter 2 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Municipal Departments," as presently amended, be further amended by adding thereto the following new section to be known as Section 2.17:

2.17 Economic Development Department

(a) The Economic Development Department shall be under the immediate supervision of the Economic Development Director and shall consist of such personnel as may be provided for in the annual departmental budget appropriation. The Economic Development Director shall be appointed in such manner and for the term provided in Sections 15 and 18 of the Rochester City Charter.

(b) The Economic Development Department shall perform the following functions.

(1) Promote the City of Rochester, through advertising, prospect development, and other means, as an attractive location for industrial and commercial location and expansion;

(2) Assist prospects interested in evaluating Rochester as a potential industrial or commercial location;

(3) Undertake appropriate actions to encourage the continued availability of marketable industrial and commercial sites within the City;

(4) Utilize available industrial and commercial development financing programs to provide a source of financing for local plant construction and/or expansion;

(5) Act as the City's liaison with businesses and industries located in the greater Rochester area, to insure maintenance of good relations, encourage the City's responsiveness to industry needs, and to foster expansion of the City's established industrial and commercial base;

(6) Formulate economic development policy for the City of Rochester, in conjunction with the Rochester Economic Development Commission, and implement the same;
(7) Perform all other related functions as required.

Passed November 13, 1990

Roland Roberge, Mayor

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE
RELATIVE TO TAXICAB INSURANCE

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Section 66.3 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester be amended by deleting therefrom subsection (b) entitled "Insurance" in its entirety, and by inserting in its stead the following subsection to be known as subsection (b) of Section 66.3:

(b) Insurance. Before any permit is issued, the City Clerk shall insure that the applicant has provided a certificate of insurance for each vehicle, the minimum limits of liability acceptable shall indemnify the applicant and owner in the amount of $125,000.00 for injury to one or more persons, and $50,000.00 for property damage in any one accident. The applicant shall continue such insurance during the period of his permit and it shall be his obligation to turn in his operators and all taxicab permits upon receiving notice of cancellation of said insurance. It shall further be the responsibility of any insurance company or agent to notify the City Clerk within ten (10) days prior to any cancellation of any such policy.

Passed November 13, 1990

Roland Roberge, Mayor

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE
RELATIVE TO FEES FOR BUILDING PERMITS

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 40 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as presently amended, be further amended by deleting subsections (a) and (b) of Section 40.16, entitled "Permits," in their entirety and by inserting in their stead the following subsections, to be known as subsection (a) and subsection (b) of Section 40.16:
(a) On proposed work, the fee of Four Dollars ($4.00) per thousand dollars of the estimated cost of work, or any portion thereof, with a minimum fee of Ten Dollars ($10.00).

(b) [Subsection deleted [November 13, 1990]

Passed November 13, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS RELATIVE TO MINIMUM WATER AND SEWER USERS' RATES

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

I. That Chapter 16, Section 16.15, subsection (e) of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Minimum Fee," be amended by deleting said section in its entirety, and by adopting in its stead the following provision to be known as Chapter 16, Section 16.15, subsection (e) of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester:

(e) Minimum Fee. Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (a) of Section 16.15, any metered industrial/commercial and/or residential wastewater user shall pay a minimum quarterly wastewater users' charge at the rate of $12.50 per quarter per unit without exemption and $10.00 per quarter per unit with exemption.

II. That Chapter 17, Section 17.30, subsection (a) sub-subsection (5) of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, entitled "Minimum Fee," be amended by deleting said provision in its entirety, and by adopting in its stead the following provision to be known as Chapter 17, Section 17.30, subsection (a), sub-subsection (5) of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester:

(5) Minimum Fee. Notwithstanding the provisions of sub-subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subparagraph (a) of Section 17.30, any metered industrial/commercial and/or residential customer of the City of Rochester water system shall pay a minimum quarterly water charge at the rate of $12.50 per quarter per unit without exemption and $10.00 per quarter per unit with exemption.

III. These Ordinance Amendments shall be effective as of October 1, 1990.

Passed December 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor
AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 17 OF THE GENERAL ORDINANCES
RELATIVE TO WATER SERVICE AND BILLING

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

I. That Chapter 17 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by deleting subsection 17.2 (k) thereof in its entirety, and by inserting in its stead the following subsection to be known as Subsection 17.2 (k) of Chapter 17:

(K) Water Service. The pipe extending from the distribution water main to the customer’s property line.

II. That Chapter 17 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by deleting subsection 17.3 (d) thereof in its entirety, and by inserting in its stead the following subsection to be known as Subsection 17.3 (d) of Chapter 17:

(d) Customers shall be billed in accordance with the provisions of Section 17.16 of this Chapter.

III. That Chapter 17 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by deleting section 17.7 thereof in its entirety, and by inserting in its stead the following section to be known as Section 17.7 of Chapter 17:

17.7 Service Installation and Repair. The Water Department or its agent shall install all new water services and make all necessary repairs to existing services up to the customer’s property line. The cost incurred for the repair and maintenance of all existing water services up to the customer’s property line shall be the responsibility of the Water Department. If new services are installed by a developer or property owner, the Water Department must approve all materials, inspect the installation, provide and install the meter, and do the water main service tapping. All charges incurred during this work are the responsibility of the developer or property owner.

Any contractor or company installing or repairing any portion of the water system must receive written authorization from the City of Rochester and provide a performance bond or escrow account in the name of the City for the total (100 percent) of the estimated cost of the work.
Annually before any contractor or company shall install or repair any portion of a water and/or sewer system within the City of Rochester, such contractor or company shall obtain a permit from the Commissioner of Public Works of the City of Rochester authorizing such contractor or company to perform installations of or repairs to such water and/or sewer systems within the City of Rochester, or to both such systems. The Commissioner of Public Works shall issue such permit(s) only to such contractors or companies as demonstrate the ability to perform water and/or sewer installations and repairs in a workmanlike manner, consistent with the standards maintained by the Rochester Water Department and the Rochester Sewer Department in performing their own installations of and repairs to their respective water and sewer systems. The Commissioner of the Department of Public Works shall establish an annual fee for such water and/or sewer installation and repair permit, provided that the annual fee for each such permit shall not exceed $100.00 or $200.00 for a combined permit.

The Water Department and its agents shall have an easement ten (10) feet on each side of the water service for its entire length for the installation or repair of the service.

The customer shall be charged for all materials and labor associated with the initial installation or subsequent repairs due to negligence of the customer. The Water Department shall do its best to return the easement to its prior condition; however, it will be the customer's responsibility to repair and replace any damaged property within the aforementioned easement.

Ordinarily, no new service pipes or extensions of mains will be installed between December 1 and March 31 unless the customer shall defray all extra expenses incurred. An additional minimum charge of Two Hundred ($200.00) Dollars shall be applied to the customer for road maintenance during these winter conditions if service or extension is allowed.

IV. That Chapter 17 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by deleting section 17.9 thereof in its entirety, and by inserting in its stead the following section to be known as Section 17.9 of Chapter 17:

17.9 Meters. All services are to be metered. Every owned structure or unit shall be metered. A common meter will be provided for rented units. All meters will be purchased, installed, owned, and maintained by the Water Department, but the customer will be charged for any damage to
meters caused by abnormal conditions, i.e., freezing, fire, tampering, etc. The Water Department will set only one meter on any one service and the owner of the premises shall be liable for the entire amount of water used on the premises irrespective of leases of individual consumers.

Meters are installed for measurement of all water supplied to consumer. Customers shall provide a clean, dry, warm, and accessible place for installation of a meter.

All persons shall avoid unnecessary waste of water. Water shall not be left running to prevent freezing unless required by the Water Department. All customers taking water must keep their own fixtures, and service pipes within their property lines, in good repair, and fully protected from injury by frost and all such pipes and connections shall conform to the Rochester Plumbing Code.

When water passes through a meter it may be used for any and all purposes, but no consumer shall supply water through his meter to parties outside his own premises. When water passes through the meter it becomes the property of the owner of the premises.

V. That Chapter 17 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by deleting Section 17.16 thereof in its entirety, and by inserting in its stead the following section to be known as Section 17.16 of Chapter 17:

17.16 Billing and Payment. Water bills shall be rendered to all customers at least quarterly and may be rendered more frequently in the discretion of the Water Department with the approval of the City Manager.

Water bills shall be due and payable upon presentation and shall become delinquent thirty (30) days after the date of issuance. Interest shall accrue on bills not paid when due at the same rate charged by the City for overdue property tax bills. Seasonal customers will not be eligible for service unless the previous year’s bill has been paid in full.

Checks shall be made payable to the City of Rochester and mailed to the Tax Collector’s Office in City Hall. Remittance sent by mail are at the sender’s risk, and if receipts are desired, a stamped, self-addressed envelope must be sent with the remittance. When bills are overdue, the customer will be sent a notice. Bills not paid when due become a lien on the property by New Hampshire Statute.
The failure of a customer to receive water bills does not relieve customer of the responsibility of making prompt payment.

The Water Department, in supplying water, doing work, or furnishing material shall deal with only the customer and the premises, and such customer shall keep the department advised of the address to which bills, notices, and communications may be forwarded. Although the payment for service rates may be assumed by an agent or tenant, the customer of the premises will be held personally responsible for the same. A change in ownership will not relieve the premises from payment of back bills; in case of forfeiture, the water may be shut off, and will not be turned on again until all unpaid charges have been settled in full. A water shutoff notice shall be delivered to the customer prior to shutoff. [See Section 17.19].

Passed March 5, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE REGARDING FOOD SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT LICENSES AND FEES

THIS CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 25, Section 25.16 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by deleting said Section 25.16 in its entirety and by inserting in its stead the following section to be known as Section 25.16 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester:

25.16 Issuance of License and Fees. Every applicant for a license to operate a food service establishment shall make written application therefor on forms provides by the Board. Upon receipt of an application and the designated license fee, and after inspection to insure compliance with the Sanitary Food Code, a license shall be issued to the applicant by the Board if the requirement of this Ordinance have been met. All license issued hereunder shall expire on the first day of July in each year.

FEES

CLASS I  Food service establishments having a seating capacity of 100 persons or more; restaurants with liquor lounges; hospitals; supermarkets; grocery stores with three or more food preparation areas. $200.00
CLASS II Food service establishments having a seating capacity of more than 25 but less than 100 persons; grocery stores with fewer than three food preparation areas; warehouses; distributors; caterers; institutions, service/fraternal clubs with liquor lounges; nursing homes and bakeries. $100.00

CLASS III Food service establishments selling only pre-packaged products; food service establishments with a seating capacity of 25 of less; food service establishments with take-out service and no seating; drive-in movie theaters; service/fraternal clubs; group day care facilities; shared homes; rest homes; sheltered homes; boarding homes; home food manufacturers; bed and breakfast establishments; and mobile food operators. $50.00

CLASS IV Movie theaters selling only popcorn, soda and candy; social clubs; food service establishments at the Rochester Fair; residential daycare facilities. $25.00

CLASS V Temporary food establishments and vending machine operators per location. $15.00

CLASS VI Non-profit charitable organizations not holding a liquor license and not serving meals on a daily basis; public and private schools; government facilities. NO FEE

All applications for food service establishments licenses shall be filed with the Board on or before June 20th of each year. In addition to the fees provided for in this section, there shall be a $10.00 late fee for any renewal application received after June 20th of any year.

Passed March 5, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

ORDINANCE REQUIRING POSTING OF NAMES OF OWNERS AND PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR MULTI-FAMILY DWELLINGS

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 25 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by inserting in said Chapter 25, the following new section to be known as Section 25. 1-A of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester:
25. 1-A. Multi-Family Dwellings, Posting of Owner and Individual Responsible Required.

(a) Purpose. The provisions of this ordinance are adopted pursuant to the authority granted by RSA 47:17 and are intended to promote public health, safety and general welfare by providing a means by which City officials, tenants residing in multi-family dwellings and others concerned with matters of public health and safety relating to multi-family dwellings shall be kept informed as to the name, address, and telephone number of the owner and/or individual responsible for addressing public health, safety and welfare issues arising with respect to such multi-family dwelling units.

(b) Definitions. As used in this ordinance, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

(i) Multi-Family Dwelling. A building designated or used for more than one dwelling unit.

(ii) Owner. The record title holder(s) of a multi-family dwelling is disclosed by the appropriate records of the Strafford County Registry of Deeds, Strafford County Registry of Probate and/or the records of the Rochester City Tax Collector.

(c) Posting of Information Regarding Owner and Individual Responsible for Multi-Family Dwelling Required. The owner of any multi-family dwelling located within the City shall, at all times, have posted in a conspicuous place on the inside of the front door of each dwelling unit within a multi-family dwelling, the name, current mailing address, and current telephone number of the owner of said dwelling unit and the name, current address, and current telephone number of an individual designated by the owner as being responsible for matters of public health, safety and welfare arising with respect to such multi-family dwelling. The owner shall also be responsible for filing the information specified in the preceding sentence with the Code Enforcement Department of the City of Rochester and for keeping said information current at all times. In the event that a multi-family dwelling is such as to contain a lobby or other similar common area open to the public and/or tenants of such multi-family dwelling, the owner shall also post the information specified in the first sentence of this sub-subparagraph in said lobby or other similar area and shall keep said posted information current at all times. The provisions of this ordinance shall not apply to owner occupied multi-family dwellings of less than three multi-family dwelling units.
(d) Effective Date. This ordinance shall take effect on September 1, 1991.

Passed April 2, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE
CONFLICT OF INTEREST PROVISION FOR MUNICIPAL BODIES

THE CITY OF ROCHESTER ORDAINS:

That Chapter 10 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester, as currently amended, be further amended by adding the following sections thereto:

10.9 Conflict of Interest - Municipal Body in Legislative Capacity, Prohibition on Voting. When a municipal body acts in a legislative capacity, no member shall vote on any matter in which he or she has a conflict of interest.

10.10 Conflict of Interest - Municipal Body in Legislative Capacity, Limitation on Discussion. When a municipal body acts in a legislative capacity, a member having a conflict of interest concerning a matter before the body may participate in the body’s discussions concerning the matter, whether in public or executive session, only upon satisfaction of the requirements established by Section 72 of the Rochester City Charter.

10.11 Conflict of Interest - Municipal Body in Judicial Capacity. When a municipal body acts in a judicial capacity, no member shall sit upon the hearing, participate in any discussion, attend any executive session, or vote upon the matter if he or she would be disqualified for any cause to act as a juror upon the trial of the same matter in any action at law. Reasons for disqualification do not include exemption from service as a juror or knowledge of the facts involved gained in the performance of the member’s official duties.

10.12 Definitions. The following words and phrases when used in this Chapter shall have the meanings given to them in this Chapter:

(a) “Conflict of Interest” means direct personal and pecuniary interest.

(b) “Direct” means immediate, definite, and capable of demonstration; not remote, uncertain, contingent, and speculative.
(c) "Member" means a member of a municipal body.

(d) "Municipal Body" means the Rochester City Council, Police Commission, School Board, or Utility Advisory Board.

(e) "Pecuniary Interest" means any advantage in the form of money, property, commercial interest or anything else, the primary significance of which is economic gain.

(f) "Personal" means an interest different from that of any other citizen.

10.13 Conflict of Interest - Procedure. When uncertainty arises as to a member’s right to participate in the municipal body's work, because of Sections 10.9, 10.10 or 10.11, the municipal body shall, upon the request of that or any other member, vote on whether that member should be disqualified. Any such request and vote shall be made prior to or at the commencement of any discussion of the matter before the municipal body. If by an affirmative roll-call vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the members of the body present the body finds that the member has a conflict of interest, that member shall be prohibited from action in accordance with this Ordinance. The challenged member, if present, shall be entitled to vote on the question of his disqualification. If a court of competent jurisdiction subsequently determines that the municipal body erroneously found a conflict of interest to exist, then the member in question may at the regular meeting of the municipal body first following the date of such determination move for reconsideration of the matter. If a court of competent jurisdiction subsequently determines that the municipal body erroneously failed to find a conflict of interest, and the official in question voted in the majority on the matter, then at the regular meeting of the municipal body first following the date of such determination any member who voted in the minority may move for reconsideration.

Passed June 4, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR THE ROCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER

The sum of Eight Hundred Ninety-eight Dollars and Eighty Cents
is hereby appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Police Department fiscal year operating budget, said sum to be allocated to the line-item for Overtime (Account #01-421-150-0000), said sum to be used for personnel costs associated with Special DWI patrols to be conducted in accordance with Highway Safety Project #308-90A-049 Grant, said sums to be reimbursed in their entirety to the City of Rochester by the State of New Hampshire, Highway Safety Agency.

Passed August 7, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION ADOPTING ICMA DEFFERED COMPENSATION PLAN

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

WHEREAS, the City of Rochester (hereinafter the "Employer") has employees rendering valuable services; and,

WHEREAS, the establishment of a deferred compensation plan for such employees serves the interests of the Employer by enabling it to provide reasonable retirement security for its employees, by providing increased flexibility in its personnel management system, and by assisting in the attraction and retention of competent personnel; and,

WHEREAS, the Employer has determined that the establishment of a deferred compensation plan to be administered by the ICMA Retirement Corporation serves the above objectives; and,

WHEREAS, the Employer desires that the investment of funds held under its deferred compensation plan be administered by the ICMA Retirement Corporation, and that such funds be held by the ICMA Retirement Trust, a trust established by Public employers for the collective investment of funds held under their deferred compensation plans and money purchase retirement plans;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Employer, unless it has already done so, hereby adopts the deferred compensation plan attached hereto as: (check one only if Employer is hereby adopting a plan)

(1) Appendix A [X]

or

(2) The plan provided by the Employer which is attached hereto and the Trust Agreement with the ICMA Retirement Corporation (Appendix C)
and appoints the ICMA Retirement Corporation to serve as Administrator thereunder; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Employer hereby executes the Declaration of Trust of the ICMA Retirement Trust, attached hereto as Appendix B.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Business Administrator shall be the coordinator for this program and shall receive necessary reports, notices, etc. from the ICMA Retirement Corporation of the ICMA Retirement Trust, and shall cast, on behalf of the Employer, any required votes under the program. Administrative duties to carry out the plan may be assigned to the appropriate departments.

Passed September 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum to Thirty-nine Thousand Eight Hundred Two Dollars ($39,802.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Police Department fiscal year operating budget, said sum to be allocated to the following accounts and in the following amounts: Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($7,500.00) to the Overtime Account (Account #421-150-0000); Eighteen Thousand Five Hundred Eighty-Five Dollars ($18,585.00) to the Miscellaneous Equipment Account (Account #421-490-0000); Five Hundred Dollars ($500.00) to the Gasoline Account (Account #421-551-0000); One Hundred Seventeen Dollars ($117.00) to the Pager User Fee Account (Account #421-711-0000); Five Thousand Four Hundred Dollars ($5,400.00) to the Vehicle Rental Fee Account (Account #421-712-0000); and, Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Dollars ($7,700.00) to the Incidentals Account (Account #421-791-0000).

The sums necessary to fund said appropriation shall be paid in their entirety to the City of Rochester by the State of New Hampshire from a grant to the Rochester Police Department from the 1990 Drug Control and System Improvement Formula Grant Program. Further, that whereas the grant period for the aforementioned 1990 Drug Control and System Improvement Formula Grant Program grant awarded to the Rochester Police
Department by the State of New Hampshire is from August 1, 1990 to August 1, 1991, so much of the above appropriation accorded to the 1990-91 fiscal year operating budget of the Rochester Police Department, in the aforesaid accounts, as is derived from the aforementioned grant, shall be non-lapsing items in the 1990-91 Rochester Police Department fiscal year operating budget; provided, further, however, that to the extent that said appropriated funds shall remain unexpanded as of August 1, 1991, said appropriation shall then lapse.

Passed September 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO TRANSFER OF FUNDS FOR CHARLES STREET SEWER PROJECT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Five Hundred Thirty-Eight Thousand Dollars ($538,000.00) be, and hereby is, transferred to the 1990-91 fiscal year Sewer Department capital budget for the purpose of providing funds necessary for the Charles Street Sewer Project (Account #20-439-888-1000). Further, that the transfer of sums necessary to fund said transfer is hereby authorized in the following amounts and from the following accounts: Two Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars ($220,000.00) from the 1988-89 fiscal year Sewer Department capital budget, Farmington Road Sewer Project Account (Account #20-439-878-9119); One Hundred Eight Thousand Dollars ($108,000.00) from the 1989-90 fiscal year Sewer Department capital budget, Sewer Growth Impact Account (Account #20-439-889-0999); and, Two Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars ($210,000.00) from the 1990-91 fiscal year Sewer Department capital budget, Sewer Growth Impact Account (Account #20-439-889-1999). Such transfers shall be effective until such time as bonding for the Charles Street Sewer Project is authorized.

Passed September 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF IMPACT FEES

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:
That the sum of Two Hundred Thirteen Thousand Seven Hundred Forty Dollars ($213,740.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Fiscal Year Capital Budget of the City of Rochester for the purpose of providing funds to the Sewer and Fire Departments for the capital projects specified in the following itemization and in the amounts set forth therein, and that the funds for said appropriations be, and hereby are, allocated from the sources set forth in the following itemization:

1990-91 CAPITAL BUDGET

1990-91 Misc. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Proposed Use of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; N Realty</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack &amp; Jill Learning Center</td>
<td>$3,180.00</td>
<td>20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTA, Inc.</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman &amp; Rejane Quirion</td>
<td>$1,060.00</td>
<td>20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management, Inc.</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Shot Billiards</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>20-422-490-1999</td>
<td>Fire Dept; East Rochester Fire Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Land Holding</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>20-439-876-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Lower Salmon Falls Road, Sewer Ext.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passed September 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DONATION OF FUNDS FOR THE ROCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT FROM THE ROCHESTER POLICE BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION AND AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Sixteen Thousand Dollars ($16,000.00), donated to the Rochester Police Department by the Rochester Police Benevolent Associa-
tion on or about July 16, 1990 for the purpose of the purchase of 9mm automatic weapons and related materials, is hereby accepted; and, that the sum of $16,000.00 is hereby appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Police Department fiscal year operating budget, said sum to be allocated to the line-item for miscellaneous equipment (Account #490); and, said sum to be used for the purchase of forty-seven (47) 9mm automatic weapons and related equipment; and, that the funds necessary to fund said appropriation be, and hereby are, allocated from the aforementioned $16,000.00 donation received from the Rochester Police Benevolent Association.

Passed September 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH CONSTRUCTION MAY BE BEGUN ON LOT #7 TEN ROD ROAD INDUSTRIAL PARK

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

WHEREAS, on October 28, 1988, the City of Rochester conveyed Lot #7 in the Ten Rod Road Industrial Park to White Star Design, Inc.; and,

WHEREAS, said conveyance was made subject to the “Declaration of Convenants, Conditions and Restrictions, Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, Rochester, New Hampshire,” dated October 13, 1988 and recorded in the Strafford County Registry of Deeds at Book 1415, Page 114; and,

WHEREAS, paragraph 5 of said Covenants provided that if an owner of a lot within the Ten Rod Road Industrial Park shall not have begun the construction of a permanent building upon said lot within two years after the date of the City’s deed to said lot, “... the City shall retain the option to rescind the transaction, refund the original purchase price paid to the City by the original grantee or its successor in interest, receive a warranty deed to said property from the then owner of said property, and enter into possession of said land”; and,

WHEREAS, said paragraph 5 further provided that the Mayor and City Council may extend in writing the time in which construction of such building may be begun;
NOW THEREFORE, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester hereby, in accordance with the provisions of said paragraph 5 of the aforesaid "Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions, Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, Rochester, New Hampshire," hereby extend the date by which "... construction of a permanent building" upon the aforesaid Lot #7 shall be begun to July 1, 1991, and hereby instruct the Director of Economic Development to notify the owner of said Lot #7 in writing of this extension; provided, however, that nothing herein shall be construed to constitute a waiver of any rights that the City may have under the aforesaid "Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions, Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, Rochester, New Hampshire" as currently amended, and the City specifically retains all rights which it may have under paragraph 5 of said Covenants subject to the aforesaid extension.

Passed October 2, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION
IN CITY OF ROCHESTER GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the Mayor and City Council hereby authorize publicly-elected officials serving on the Rochester City Council, the Rochester School Board and the Rochester Police Commission to be eligible group members in the group health insurance program maintained by the City of Rochester through the New Hampshire Municipal Association Health Insurance Trust; provided, however, that any member of said publicly-elected bodies desiring to participate in said group health insurance program shall be required to pay the entire cost of the premium and any incidental costs associated with their individual participation in said program and that of their qualified spouse and/or dependents, if any.

Passed October 2, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PLANNING BOARD
TO DELEGATE SITE REVIEW POWERS
IN ACCORDANCE WITH RSA 674:43, III

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:
WHEREAS, RSA 674:43, III, authorize the local legislative body of a municipality to authorize the Planning Board to delegate its site review authority with regard to certain minor site plans to a committee of technically qualified administrators under certain circumstances; and,

WHEREAS, the exercise of such authority by the legislative body will serve to lessen the work load imposed upon the Rochester Planning Board, encourage more efficient use of the time of Planning Board members, eliminate administrative delays, and preserve the integrity of the Rochester Site Review Regulations;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester, in accordance with the provisions of RSA 674:43, III, hereby authorize the Rochester Planning Board to delegate its site review powers and duties in regard to minor site plans to a committee of technically qualified administrators chosen by the Planning Board from the Department of Public Works, Engineering, Community Development, Planning or other similar departments in the municipality. This special site review committee shall have final authority to approve or disapprove site plans reviewed by it, provided that the decisions of the committee may be appealed to the full Planning Board upon as notice of appeal is filed within 20 days of the committee's decision. Provided further, however, that prior to exercising the authority herein granted, the Rochester Planning Board shall amend its site plan regulations to specify application, acceptance and approval procedures and define what size and kind of site plans may be reviewed by the site review committee herein authorized.

FURTHER, that in accordance with the provisions of RSA 674:43, II, that the Rochester City Clerk be, and hereby is, directed to record a copy of this Resolution with the Strafford County Registry of Deeds along with a certification by said Clerk of the date upon which this Resolution is adopted by the Rochester City Council. This Resolution shall take effect upon its passage.

Passed October 2, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

LAND SALE POLICY: City of Rochester, NH

1. Policy Statement. It is the policy of the City to return surplus City property to the tax rolls and to obtain fair market value on the sale of all such property whenever possible.
2. Requests to be in Writing. All requests relative to the purchase or sale of City real estate shall be in writing, addressed to the City Manager. All such requests will contain a detailed description of the property and its location, as well as specific information on the intended use of the property.

3. City Manager. It shall be the responsibility of the City Manager to process requests relative to the purchase or sale of City real estate in accordance with the requirements of this policy and to make appropriate reports and recommendations to the Fiscal Affairs Committee. On receipt of requests relative to the purchase or sale of City real estate, the City Manager shall immediately refer the same to the City Assessor for an appraisal. On the recommendation of the City Assessor, the City Manager may order an outside appraisal. The City Manager shall likewise refer such requests to the Planning Director for study. The Planning Department shall, as appropriate, consult with other departments and City agencies, and particularly with the Water and Sewer Divisions to determine if any utility easements are necessary. In addition, requests relative to tax-deeded property shall be referred to the Tax Collector. All reports submitted by the various City departments, agencies, and divisions shall be made in writing to the City Manager.

4. Manner of Sale. All such City property shall be disposed of by public sale unless otherwise ordered by the City Council on recommendation of the Fiscal Affairs Committee. Disposition other than by public sale is authorized only where such is in the best interest of the City, is required by justice, or if other good reasons exist.

5. Report of Fiscal Affairs Committee. Upon completion of its review of requests relative to the purchase or sale of City real estate, the Fiscal Affairs Committee shall report and make recommendations to the City Council on the following:

(a) The market value of the property as reported by the Assessors.

(b) Whether the property is surplus to the needs of the City or if the City has present or foreseeable use for the property.

(c) The method, terms, and conditions of the sale including a minimum bid price where appropriate.

If the method of disposal is other than by public sale, the Fiscal Affairs Committee shall specify the reason or reasons for such recommendation. The report shall address such other considerations as the Committee deems appropriate.
6. City Council. On receipt of the report of the Fiscal Affairs Committee, the City Council shall determine whether the property should be disposed of and the manner of sale. The City Manager shall be authorized to convey the property by deed.

7. Property List. The City Assessor shall compile and maintain a list of all property owned by the City. The list shall contain a detailed description of each parcel and such other pertinent information as is deemed appropriate by the City Assessor or the Fiscal Affairs Committee.

8. Sale Procedure. The City Assessor, at the direction of the City Manager, shall offer property for public sale in the following manner: The City Assessor shall prepare or cause to be prepared a map, clearly showing the location of the property offered for sale and shall cause the map to be available for public inspection at reasonably convenient times and places. The City Assessor shall advertise the sale of property and the fact that the maps, lists of property, and other data are available to the public at the City Assessors’ Office. The publication of the notice shall be at least seven (7) days before the opening of sealed bids. Notice shall also be sent to the direct abutters. Sealed bids shall be opened publicly. Property so advertised for sale shall be conveyed to the highest bidder, subject to conditions hereinafter set forth and with the following exceptions:

(a) Property shall not be sold for less than the City’s cost. No property shall be sold for less than the amount of taxes, interest, and fees charged against the property, except by consent of the City Council.

(b) Previous owners and abutters may be given first opportunity to purchase property. Previous owners, then abutters, may be given first opportunity to purchase any property for an amount equal to or in excess of the total amount of taxes, costs, interest and fees charged against it before its conveyance to the City. This may apply even if the owners or abutters have not submitted the highest bid. The City Council may make an exception to this policy.

(c) Recording of the deed shall be charged against the purchase price of property. The deed conveying the real estate from the City of Rochester to purchasers shall contain a condition that the deed will not be effective to transfer title to tracts conveyed and there shall be no use or occupancy of said premises by the purchaser until the deed has been legally recorded and shall pay the expense of the recording which shall be a charge against the purchase price of the property.
(d) Time Limit for completing purchase. The successful bidder, upon receipt of notification of successful bid, shall deliver to the City Manager the total sum of the bid price by certified check or cash, or a check drawn by a New Hampshire bank, within sixty (60) days thereof. If said sum is not received within such time, the City Manager may terminate the sale.

9. City Manager Shall Execute Quitclaim Deeds. The City Manager is authorized and empowered in the name and on behalf of the City of Rochester to execute and deliver the necessary deeds and documents.

Approved by City Council on October 2, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SALE OF LOT #2
TEN ROD ROAD INDUSTRIAL PARK

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City Manager of the City of Rochester is hereby authorized to convey Lot #2 in the Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, Ten Rod Road, Rochester, New Hampshire, as more particularly shown on a plan entitled "Subdivision of Land, Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, Rochester, NH," said plan being recorded in the Strafford County Registry of Deeds, upon such terms and conditions as shall be in the best interest of the City of Rochester, and, in furtherance of such conveyance, the said City Manager is hereby authorized to execute any and all deeds and other instruments necessary to effectuate such conveyance.

Passed October 2, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PURCHASE
OF FORMER HOLY ROSARY CREDIT UNION BUILDING

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City of Rochester purchase the real estate, with building thereon, located on Wakefield Street, Rochester, New Hampshire and formerly occupied by the Holy Rosary Credit Union, and that the City Manager be, and hereby is, authorized to enter into and execute on behalf of the City of Rochester any and all agreements, including purchase and sale agreements, promissory notes, and/or other documents necessary to effectuate said purchase, on such terms and conditions as may be in the best interest of the City of Rochester.

Passed October 29, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF LAND
SITUATE ADJACENT TO SPAULDING HIGH SCHOOL PROPERTY
ON WAKEFIELD STREET

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City of Rochester purchase property situate on Wakefield Street and known as 182 Wakefield Street, Rochester, New Hampshire, for the sum of Eighty-five Thousand Dollars ($85,000.00), and that the City Manager be, and hereby is, authorized on behalf of the City of Rochester to enter into such agreements, including purchase and sale agreements and other documents necessary to effectuate said purchase.

Passed October 29, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION
FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS ENERGY AUDIT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Seventeen Thousand Six Hundred Dollars ($17,600.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Public Buildings fiscal year operating budget for the purpose of conducting energy audits and energy evaluations of public buildings in connection with the Technical Assistance phase of the Units of Local Government Program Grant received by the City from the Governor’s Energy Office, and that the sums necessary to fund said appropriation be, and hereby are, allocated in their entirety from a Seventeen Thousand Six Hundred Dollar ($17,600.00) grant to the City of Rochester from the Governor’s Energy Office for the Technical Assistance phase of the Units of Local Government Program.

Passed November 13, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EASEMENT
TEN ROD ROAD INDUSTRIAL PARK

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:
That the City Manager of the City of Rochester is hereby authorized to
convey and easement to New England Telephone Company and Public
Service Company of New Hampshire across land owned by the City of
Rochester and known as the Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, for the pur-
pose of constructing and maintaining lines for the transmission of in-
telligence and the distribution of electricity, upon such terms and condi-
tions as shall be in the best interest of the City of Rochester; and, in fur-
therance of such conveyance, the said City Manager is hereby authorized
to execute any and all deeds and other instruments necessary to effec-
tuate such conveyance.

Passed November 13, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATION OF IMPACT FEES

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Seventy-seven Thousand One Hundred Fifty Dollars
($77,150.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropria-
tion to the 1990-91 fiscal year capital budget of the City of Rochester, for
the purpose of providing funds to the Sewer Department for the capital
projects specified in the following itemization and in the amounts set forth
therein, and that the funds for said appropriations be, and hereby are,
allocated from the sources set forth in the following itemization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>1990-1991 CAPITAL BUDGET</th>
<th>Proposed Use of Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannaford Brothers</td>
<td>$47,150.00 20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabletron Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>$30,000.00 20-439-889-1999</td>
<td>Sewer Dept; Sewer Growth Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passed November 13, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION REGARDING SUBDIVISION
OF CHRISTINE E. CHEVALIER AND FRANCES J. SOUCY

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:
WHEREAS, Christine E. Chevalier and Frances J. Soucy have a proposal pending before the Rochester Planning Board to subdivide a 9.67 acre tract located on Blackwater Road into two lots; and,

WHEREAS, if approved, such subdivision will result in a two-lot subdivision with one lot consisting of 7.89 acres and the other lot consisting of 1.78 acres; and,

WHEREAS, it is proposed that the lot consisting of 1.78 acres be used for building purposes and that the remaining 7.89 acre lot be left vacant for the present time; and,

WHEREAS, the existing City water main is located within 200 feet of the boundary of the proposed 7.89 acre lot but is more than 670 feet from the 1.78 acre lot to be created if said subdivision is approved, and,

WHEREAS, Section 5.1.4 of the Subdivision Regulations of the City of Rochester provides that "unless refused" by the Mayor and City Council "... all subdivisions, and portion of which are within 200 feet measured along a street and/or over public land of an existing public sewer and/or water main, shall have all lots connected to the public system(s)"; and,

WHEREAS, Section 17.4 of the General Ordinances of the City of Rochester requires that any building located within 200 feet of a public water system shall be connected to said system, and,

WHEREAS, as proposed, the building in question which will be constructed upon the land to be subdivided in the instant case will be located over 600 feet from the existing public water main;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Rochester, hereby refuse, in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.1.4. of the Subdivision Regulations of the City of Rochester, to require that the two-lot subdivision of Christine E. Chevalier and Frances J. Soucy presently pending before the Rochester Planning Board be required to connect all lots therein to the public water main, and hereby excuse said subdivision from said requirments; provided, however, that this refusal shall apply only to said two-lot subdivision, and shall not be constructed to apply to any building permit request that may subsequently be received to construct a building or buildings on the 7.89 acre lot to be created by the aforesaid subdivision.

Passed November 13, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of One Hundred Sixteen Thousand Six Hundred Fifty-eight Dollars ($116,658.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Rochester School Department fiscal year operating budget, said sum to be allocated to the following accounts in the following amounts:

Fifty-seven Thousand Seven Hundred Sixty-six Dollars ($57,766.00) to the Elementary/Secondary Education Act, Chapter 1, Account:

Thirty-five Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty-four Dollars ($35,754.00) to the Drug Free Schools Account;

Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000.00) to the Teacher Induction Program Account;

Nine Thousand Eight Hundred One Dollars ($9,801.00) to the Elementary/Secondary Education Act, Title II, Account;

Six Thousand Six Hundred Fifty-two Dollars ($6,652.00) to the Literacy Portfolio Account; and,

One Thousand Six Hundred Eighty-five Dollars ($1,685.00) to the Ten Little Indians Preschool Account.

The sums necessary to fund said appropriation shall be paid in their entirety to the City of Rochester from grants and/or awards from the Federal Department of Education, with the exception of the sums necessary to fund the Ten Little Indians Preschool Account appropriation, which funds shall be received in their entirety by the City of Rochester from funds paid by the State of New Hampshire, Department of Education, Vocational Division.

Passed December 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION ACCEPTING GOVERNOR'S RECYCLING PROGRAM FUNDS

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City Manager is hereby authorized to apply for, accept, and expend monies which become available to the City of Rochester during fiscal year 1990-91 from the state, federal or other governmental unit or a private source in connection with the Governor's Recycling Program. Further, the City of Rochester hereby accepts such funds as may become available to the City under the Governor's Recycling Program and in furtherance of said acceptance, authorizes the City to enter into a contract with the Office of State Planning in connection with said Governor's Recycling Program. Further, that the City Manager be, and hereby is, authorized to enter into and execute any documents which may be necessary to effectuate the aforesaid contract.

Passed December 4, 1990
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION TRANSFERRING CAPITAL BUDGET FUNDS

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

WHEREAS, the Rochester City Council appropriated the sum of Seventy-six Thousand Five Hundred Sixty-two Dollars ($76,562.00) as part of the 1987-88 fiscal year City of Rochester capital budget for Library Department equipment and authorized the bonding of said sum by the City of Rochester; and,

WHEREAS, the bonds thus authorized have been issued by the City of Rochester, but no expenditure of the proceeds resulting from the sale of such bonds has, as yet, been made for the purposes for which said debt was incurred;

NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of RSA 33:3-a, the sum of Forty-four Thousand Dollars ($44,000.00) presently appropriated as part of the 1987-88 City of Rochester capital budget for Library Department equipment (Account 20-460-491-8117) is hereby transferred to the 1987-88 capital budget for the City of Rochester for the Public Buildings Account (Account 20-418-491-8117) for the purpose of providing funds necessary for the purchase of a telephone system for the City of Rochester.

Passed March 5, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION REQUESTING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

This is a Memorial Resolution asking Congress to propose a Constitutional Amendment, for ratification by the States, which would specify that the Congress and the States shall have the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the American Flag.

WHEREAS, there are symbols of our national soul such as the Washington Monument, the United States Capitol Building, and memorials to our greatest leaders which are the property of every American and are therefore worthy of protection from desecration and dishonor; and,

WHEREAS, the American Flag is a most honorable and worthy banner of our nation and its ideals and hopes for all free loving people of the world; and,

WHEREAS, the law as interpreted by the United States Supreme Court no longer accords to the Stars and Stripes any reverence, respect and dignity befitting the banner of this great land; and,

WHEREAS, it is only right and proper that people everywhere should lend their voices to a forceful call for restoration to the Stars and Stripes of a proper station under law and decency;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City of Rochester, NH respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to propose an Amendment to the United States Constitution, for ratification by the States, specifying that Congress and the States shall have the power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and all members of the Congregational Delegation from the State of New Hampshire.

Passed March 5, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING TRANSFERS
IN 1990-91 OPERATING BUDGET OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER
IN CONNECTION WITH POLICE DEPARTMENT
UNION EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND AUTHORIZING
APPROPRIATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH SUCH TRANSFERS

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:
That the transfer of the sum of One Hundred Twenty-seven Thousand Seventy-two Dollars ($127,072.00) presently appropriated as part of the 1990-191 operating budget for the City of Rochester Administration Department (Account 01-1417975-0000), is hereby transferred to the 1990-91 fiscal year operating budget of the Police Department of the City of Rochester, with One Hundred Eighteen Thousand Five Hundred Seventy-two Dollars ($118,572.00) of said transfer being allocated to the Salaries, Regular Account of said Rochester Police Department 1990-91 operating budget (Account 01-421110-0000) and Eight Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($8,500.00) of said transfer being allocated to the Educational Incentives Account of said Rochester Police Department 1990-91 operating budget (Account 01-421270-0000), the purpose of such transfers being to fund cost items for the 1990-91 fiscal year of the City of Rochester arising out of a collective bargaining agreement between the City of Rochester, Rochester Police Commission and the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, Local Chapter 580, Rochester Police Department, covering the period beginning on July 1, 1990 and ending on June 30, 1992. Be it further resolved that the funds thus transferred be, and hereby are, appropriated for the aforesaid purposes.

Passed March 5, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR WELFARE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of One Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars ($110,000.00) is hereby appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Welfare Department fiscal year operating budget to be allocated to the line-item for Direct Assistance (Account 01-440954-0000), to cover operating expenses in said account for the balance of the 1990-91 fiscal year, and that the funds necessary to fund said appropriation be, and hereby are, allocated from the Unexpended Fund Balance of the 1990-91 City of Rochester fiscal year operating budget.

Passed March 5, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE WELFARE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:
That the sum of Two Thousand One Hundred Dollars ($2,100.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Rochester Welfare Department fiscal year operating budget, such sum to be allocated to the Direct Assistance Account (Account 01-440-954-0000) for the purpose of providing emergency shelter services in accordance with the requirements of the hereinafter referred to grant. The sums necessary to fund said appropriation shall be paid in their entirety to the City of Rochester from a grant to be made to the City of Rochester by the Federal Government pursuant to the Stewart B. McKinney Emergency Shelter Grand Program as administered by the State of New Hampshire Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services, which grant, in the total amount of Eight Thousand Four Hundred Dollars ($8,400.00) is hereby accepted by the City of Rochester, and the City Manager is hereby designated as the City official authorized to sign any and all documents necessary to obtain the benefits of such grant.

Passed April 2, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION REGARDING TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY TAKEN FOR NON-PAYMENT OF PROPERTY TAXES

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City Manager is hereby authorized to transfer all right, title, and interest of the City of Rochester in two parcels of real estate described as Map 61, Lot 94, and Map 61, Lot 93, by quitclaim deed to William P. Valliere, upon the payment to the City of all outstanding taxes and interest owed to the City of Rochester with respect to such property, title to such property having been deeded to the City by Tax Collector’s Deeds dated December 7, 1987 and recorded at Book 1359, Pages 586 and 587, respectively, for failure of the said William P. Valliere to pay the real property taxes assessed against said property for the years 1984 and 1985.

Passed April 2, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE BY
THE CITY OF ROCHESTER
OF A DRAINAGE EASEMENT ACROSS PROPERTY
OWNED BY THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LOCATED ON BROCK STREET

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City of Rochester hereby accepts from the State of New Hamp-
shire a drainage easement authorizing the City of Rochester to lay, con-
struct, reconstruct, operate, maintain, replace and remove drainage pipe,
including the necessary underground pipes, conduits, manholes, and ap-
purtenances across, over and under property of the State of New Hamp-
shire located on Brock Street, Rochester, New Hampshire, said easement
to be more specifically described in a drainage easement deed from the
said State of New Hampshire to the City of Rochester. Further, that the
City Manager is authorized to sign any and all documents necessary to
effectuate the transfer of said easement from the State of New Hampshire
to the City of Rochester on such terms and conditions as he determines
are in the best interest of the City of Rochester.

Passed April 18, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING
GOVERNOR’S RECYCLING PROGRAM FUNDS

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City Manager is hereby authorized to apply for, accept, and
expend monies which become available to the City of Rochester during
fiscal year 1991-92 from the state, federal or other governmental unit or
a private source in connection with the Governor’s Recycling Program. Further, the City of Rochester hereby accepts such funds as may become
available to the City under the Governor’s Recycling Program and in fur-
therance of said acceptance, authorizes the City to enter into a contract
with the Office of State Planning in connection with said Governor’s Recycl-
ing Program. Further, that the City Manager be, and hereby is, authoriz-
ed to enter into and execute any documents which may be necessary to
effectuate the aforesaid contract.

Passed April 18, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING TRANSFER
IN 1990-91 OPERATING BUDGET OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER
IN CONNECTION WITH POLICE DEPARTMENT NON-UNION COMMAND EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATION IN CONNECTION WITH SUCH TRANSFER

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the transfer of the sum of Sixteen Thousand One Hundred Fifty Dollars ($16,150.00) presently appropriated as part of the 1990-91 operating budget for the City of Rochester Administration Department (Account 01-1417975-000), is hereby transferred to the 1990-91 fiscal year operating budget of the Police Department of the City of Rochester, said transfer being allocated to the Salaries, Regular Account of the said Rochester Police Department 1990-91 operating budget (Account 01-421110-0000), the purpose of such transfer being to fund cost items for the 1990-91 fiscal year of the City of Rochester arising out of salary and related increases for non-union command personnel working in the Rochester Police Department. Be it further resolved that the funds thus transferred be, and hereby are, appropriated for the aforesaid purposes.

Passed May 7, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER
OF CAPITAL BUDGET FUNDS AND MAKING AN APPROPRIATION IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

WHEREAS, the Rochester City Council appropriated the sum of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000.00) as part of the 1987-88 fiscal year City of Rochester capital budget for renovations of the present High School and authorized the bonding of said sum by the City of Rochester; and,

WHEREAS, bonds thus authorized in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars ($600,000.00) have been issued by the City of Rochester, and there remains an unexpended balance of the proceeds resulting from the sale of such bonds in the amount of Sixty-nine Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-one Dollars ($69,281.00);
NOW, THEREFORE, in accordance with the provisions of RSA 33:3-a, the sum of Sixty-nine Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-One Dollars ($69,281.00) presently appropriated as part of the 1987-88 City of Rochester capital budget for renovations to the High School (Account 20-481-975-8119) is hereby transferred to the 1990-91 capital budget for the City of Rochester for the School Department Various School Projects Account (Account 20-481-999-1000) and such sum is hereby appropriated for the purpose of providing funds necessary for asbestos removal at the current Spaulding Junior High School.

Passed May 7, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That a twelve (12) month Community Development budget in the total amount of Two Hundred Sixty-three Thousand Dollars ($263,000.00) is hereby approved for the period beginning July 1, 1991 and ending June 30, 1992. This budget may be reconsidered if Federal funding is changed or if it is inconsistent with the total budget adopted for the Department of Planning and Development.

Passed May 7, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER SCHOOL DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Forty Three Thousand Dollars ($43,000.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Rochester School Department fiscal year operating budget (Account 014-81-000-0000) for the purpose of providing funds necessary for the School Lunch Program. The sums necessary to fund this appropriation shall be received in their entirety from the Federal Government.

Passed May 7, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR LITTLE FALLS BRIDGE ROAD/BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Two Hundred Ninety-one Thousand Three Hundred Dollars ($291,300.00) be, and hereby is appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Rochester Department of Public Works fiscal year capital budget for the purpose of providing funds necessary for the Little Falls Bridge project. The source of the funds for this appropriation shall be entirely provided from funds to be received from the State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation.

Passed June 4, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER POLICE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Eighteen Thousand Eight Hundred Seventy-seven Dollars ($18,877.00) be, and hereby is appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Police Department fiscal year operating budget, said sum to be allocated to the following accounts in the following amounts:

Seven Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($7,500.00) to the Overtime for Grants Received Account (Account 421-112-0000);

Five Thousand Four Hundred Dollars ($5,400.00) to the Vehicle Rental Account (Account 421-712-0000);

One Hundred Seventeen Dollars ($117.00) to the Pager User Fee Account (Account 421-711-0000);

Six Hundred Sixty Dollars ($660.00) to the Vehicle Fuel Account (Account 421-551-0000); and,

Five Thousand Two Hundred Dollars ($5,200.00) to the Incidents [Confidential Funds and Audit] Account (Account 421-791-0000).
The sums necessary to fund said appropriation shall be paid in their entirety to the City of Rochester by the State of New Hampshire from a grant to the Rochester Police Department from the 1991 Drug Control and System Improvement Formula Grant Program. Further, that whereas, the grant period for the aforementioned 1991 Drug Control and System Improvement, Formula Grand Program grant awarded to the Rochester Police Department by the State of New Hampshire is from April 1, 1991 to July 31, 1992, so much of said appropriation accorded to the 1990-91 fiscal year operating budget of the Rochester Police Department, in the aforesaid accounts, as is derived from the aforementioned grant, shall be non-lapsing items in the 1990-91 Rochester Police Department fiscal year operating budget; provided, further, however, that to the extent that said appropriated funds shall remain unexpended as of July 31, 1992, said appropriation shall then lapse.

Passed June 4, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE ROCHESTER DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS FOR WHITEHALL ROAD GRADE CROSSING PROJECT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Fifty-eight Thousand Six Hundred Eighty-five Dollars ($58,685.00) be, and hereby is appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Rochester Department of Public Works fiscal year capital budget for the purpose of providing funds necessary for the Whitehall Road project. The source of the funds for this appropriation shall be entirely provided from funds received from the State of New Hampshire Department of Transportation.

Passed June 4, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE 1991-92 OPERATING BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF ROCHESTER

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That a twelve (12) month operating budget in the total amount of Thirty-
three Million One Hundred Four Thousand Eight Hundred Forty-two Dollars ($33,104,842.00) is hereby approved for the period beginning July 1, 1991 and ending June 30, 1992.

The School District budget appropriation of Twenty Million Seven Hundred Fifty-five Thousand Sixty-seven Dollars ($20,755,067.00) which is included in the above total, is approved by the City Council.

This budget may be reconsidered before the tax rate is set if City, School, and County revenues are changed by the State of New Hampshire or by the Federal Government.

Further, that a twelve (12) month operating budget for the Rochester Water Works in the total amount of Two Million Five Hundred Forty-eight Thousand Five Hundred Eighty Dollars ($2,548,580.00) is hereby approved for the period beginning July 1, 1991 and ending June 30, 1992.

Further, that a twelve (12) month operating budget for the Rochester Sewer Works in the total amount of Two Million Two Hundred One Thousand Seven Hundred Seventy-five Dollars ($2,201,775.00) is hereby approved for the period beginning July 1, 1991 and ending June 30, 1992.

Passed June 24, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING SEWER LINE EXTENSION EASEMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City of Rochester hereby accepts the conveyance by Granite State Business Park, Inc. of the sewer easement, including the right to install, maintain and repair all pump station, pipes, manholes and appurtenances thereto, and the ownership of the same, relative to the sewer addition from Winter Street to the so-called Airport Industrial Park, such easement extending alongs and under land of the Boston and Maine Corporation known as the Conway Branch of the Boston and Maine Railroad. Such acceptance is conditioned upon the obtaining by the City of Rochester a deed or other instrument of conveyance in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor. The City Manager is hereby authorized to sign any and all documents necessary to accomplish the acceptance of said sewer easement.

Passed June 24, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE WELFARE DEPARTMENT

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Seven Hundred Dollars ($700.00), be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 Rochester Welfare Department fiscal year operating budget, such sum to be allocated to the Direct Assistance Account (Account 01-440-954-0000) for the purpose of providing emergency shelter services in accordance with the requirements of the hereinafter referred to grant. The sums necessary to fund said appropriation shall be paid in their entirety to the City of Rochester from a grant to be made to the City of Rochester by the Federal Government pursuant to the Stewart B. McKinney Emergency Shelter Grant Program as administered by the State of New Hampshire Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services, which grant, in the total amount of Eight Thousand Four Hundred Dollars ($8,400.00), has previously been accepted by the City of Rochester.

Passed June 24, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION REGARDING TRANSFER OF REAL PROPERTY FORMERLY OF JULIETTE BILODEAU TAKEN FOR NON-PAYMENT OF PROPERTY TAXES

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That in accordance with the requirements of RSA 80:42, III, the City Manager is hereby authorized to transfer all right, title, and interest of the City of Rochester in a certain tract or parcel of land described as Tax Map 42, Lot 225, by quitclaim deed to Juliette Bilodeau (or her duly appointed guardian), upon the payment to the City of all outstanding taxes and interest owed to the City of Rochester with respect to such property for the tax years 1984 to present, including payments in lieu of taxes and interest for years during which said property was in the ownership of the City of Rochester by virtue of the hereinafter referred to Tax Collector's deed, and upon payment of all unpaid water and sewer charges with regard to such property, including interest and costs assessed by the City of Rochester to the date of such transfer, title to such property having been acquired by the City by Tax Collector's Deed dated September 7, 1988 and record-
ed at Book 1407, Page 699 of the Strafford County records, for failure of the said Juliette Bilodeau to pay the real property taxes assessed against said property for the year 1985.

Passed June 24, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE LEASE AND OPERATION OF ICE ARENA FROM STRAFFORD COUNTY YMCA

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the City Manager is authorized to sign a lease and such other documents necessary to control the operations of the Strafford County YMCA Ice Arena for a period of one (1) year with an option to renew the lease for one (1) additional year.

That an enterprise fund be established to operate the Arena financially independent from the City and that fund have a first year expenditure budget of $185,000.00.

That the City Manager produce the necessary Ordinance Amendment to establish the Arena as a separate department reporting to the City Manager, with an Advisory Commission to assist the Arena Director.

Passed June 24, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING TRANSFERS IN THE 1990-91 OPERATING BUDGET OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER AND AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATION IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

That the sum of Six Thousand Dollars ($6,000.00) be, and hereby is, appropriated as a supplemental appropriation to the 1990-91 City of Rochester operating budget. Of said supplemental appropriation, the sum of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000.00) shall be appropriated as part of and allocated to the Library Department budget, Salary Account (Account 01-460-110-0000) for salaries and One Thousand Dollars ($1,000.00) of said sum shall be appropriated as part of and allocated to the Tax Collector’s...
Department budget, Salary Account (Account 01-416-110-0000). The source of the funds for the aforesaid supplemental appropriation shall be Six Thousand Dollars ($6,000.00) to be transferred from the Department of Administration, Contingency Account (Account 01-447-975-0000) and the transfer of such sum from said account to the Library Department and the Tax Collector's Department as set forth above is hereby authorized.

Passed June 24, 1991
Roland Roberge, Mayor

REPORT OF THE CITY ASSESSOR 1990-1991

Assessor's Inventory

Land Valuations:
- Residential ........................................... $75,767,600.00
- Commercial ........................................... 23,884,200.00
- Current Use ........................................... 1,047,500.00

Total Value of Taxable Land .......................... $100,699,300.00

Building Valuations
- Residential ........................................... $256,846,700.00
- Commercial ........................................... 76,039,100.00
- Manufactured Housing ............................. 43,315,150.00

Total Value of Taxable Buildings .................... $376,200,950.00

Public Utilities
- Gas ...................................................... $ 953,500.00
- Electric ................................................. 6,478,200.00

Total Valuation of Taxable Property .............. $484,331,950.00

Exemptions
- Blind (26) ........................................... $ 389,000.00
- Elderly (516) ........................................... 7,005,800.00
- Physically Handicapped (1) ....................... 5,000.00

Total Amount of Exemptions ......................... $ 7,399,800.00

Net Valuation on which tax rate is computed ...... $476,932,150.00

- Veteran's (2,044) ................................... $ 249,900.00
- Payment in lieu of taxes ........................... + 28,712.00

Tax amount to be Collected ........................ $ 21,908,464.00

Tax Rate 1990 - $46.40

Respectfully submitted,
Brett S. Purvis, Assessor
REPORT OF THE CITY ATTORNEY 1990-1991

The following is a report of the activities of the office of the City Attorney for the year beginning July 1, 1990 and ending June 30, 1991. During the fiscal year 1990-91, the following cases involving the City of Rochester were terminated:

1. Moores Neron, Inc. v. City of Rochester - AAA 11 E 110 00056 91

In addition to the above cases, as of June 30, 1990, the following actions involving the City of Rochester or the Rochester School District were outstanding in various New Hampshire state courts, and/or the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire:

1. City of Rochester v. Mark Huddleson, et als, - 86-E-057;
2. Surette v. City of Rochester, - 88-E-167;
3. Paul Thomas and Anna Thomas v. City of Rochester, - 89-C-116;
4. L.E. Gregoire Const. v. City of Rochester, - 89-E-089;
6. George E. & Carol Pratt v. City of Rochester, - 89-C-778;
8. Midway Excavators, Inc. v. Professional Paving and City of Rochester, Trustee, - 89-C-564;
9. Salmon Falls Nursery v. Professional Paving, Inc. and City of Rochester, - 90-C-021;
10. Richard and Beverly Gleason d/b/a Fire Fab v. Master Builders, Inc., City of Rochester, et als, - 90-E-065;
12. Godin Brothers Drywall, Inc. v. Master Builders, Inc., City of Rochester, Trustee, -90-C-039;
13. George Blaisdell v. City of Rochester, - 90-613;
15. Miltner's Shoes, Inc. v. City of Rochester,
16. Woodland Green Condominium Association v. City of Rochester, -91-E-086

The office of the City of Attorney provided representation to the City in numerous matters before the New Hampshire courts with respect to cases in which the City was a party, as well as before various administrative agencies when necessary. In addition, the City Attorney attended council meetings, as well as meetings of other City boards and commissions upon request. When requested, legal opinions and advice were provided to the Mayor, City Manager, City Council, City Department Heads and the Chairman of various committees and commissions of the City.

Legal instruments, including deeds, leases, contracts, ordinances, and amendments to ordinances and other similar documents, were drafted and reviewed as required during the year and representation of the City was provided with regard to the acquisition and disposition of real estate.

Respectfully submitted,
Danford J. Wensley
City Solicitor

REPORT OF THE CITY CLERK
CALENDAR YEAR 1990
AND
FISCAL YEAR 1990-91

TO THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROCHESTER:

During the CALENDAR YEAR 1990, the City Clerk’s Office performed the following functions (which must be processed on a calendar year, rather than a fiscal year, basis):

Processed the following Vital Statistics Records: 593 Births; 302 Deaths; and 256 Marriages; also process birth-record amendments, including adoptions, legitimations, affidavits of paternity, legal changes of name, and court-ordered paternity decrees; recorded pre-marital age and time waivers; processed vital record corrections/amendment forms; issued delayed certificates of birth; issued burial permits under authorization; of the Board of Health and Health Officer; filed burial permits for all Rochester interments; filed and indexed informational copies of births, marriages, and deaths which pertained to Rochester residents, but which occurred in other communities; provided informational copies of vital record occurrences to
cities/towns whenever persons named in those records were residents of other New Hampshire communities; processed all in-person and mail requests for certified copies of vital records; assisted customers with genealogical research; and, attended meetings relative to vital record regulations and statutes;

Issued 1585 dog licenses and 18 Kennel/Group Licenses, the latter in conjunction with the Animal Control Officer; prepared and distributed copies of the Ordinance governing removal of dog excrement with each license issued; provided dog licensing service at the annual Rabies Clinic held at the Rochester Fairgrounds in April; published all dog licensing reminders and rabies clinic notices;

Recorded and processed 422 Uniform Commercial Code Financing Statements, as well as 288 related termination, continuation, amendment, assignment and search statements;

Accepted declarations of candidacy for the offices of Representatives to the General Court, Delegates to the State Party Conventions, and the Ward 4 City Council vacancy.

During FISCAL YEAR 1990-91, the City Clerk’s Office performed the following functions:

Recorded the votes and proceedings of the City Council at both regular and special City Council meetings; published and indexed the minutes of all City Council meetings in accordance with RSA 91-A:4 [i.e., “Right-to-Know-Law”]; and, provided informational copies of the minutes to all affected citizens, boards, commissions and department heads following every Council meeting;

Compiled the agendas for all regular and special meetings of the City Council in conjunction with the Mayor and City Manager; prepared the agenda binders for all City Council members, the Mayor, the City Manager, and the City Solicitor, as well as identical packets for the media; and, maintained an updated monthly list of City Council Committee business;

Published notices of City Council public hearings, vacancies in elected offices, ordinance amendments, as well as public informational notices associated with City Council actions;

Compiled updated pages for the General Ordinances of the City whenever new Ordinances were adopted or whenever existing Ordinances were amended by the City Council; provided these updated pages to 97 individuals, including all City department heads, elected officials, board and commission chairmen, as well as subscribers;
Maintained an updated listing of elected/appointed officials and distributed/filed all related Oaths of Office;

Recorded jury lists for all five wards in the City and coordinated the jury selection process;

Provided Notarial and Justice of the Peace Services;

Supervised three elections during 1990, as follows: the September 11, 1990 State Primary Election; the September 11, 1990 Special Municipal Election relative to the Ward 4 City Council vacancy; and, the November 6 State General Election; processed and mailed/delivered 638 absentee ballots for those elections (210 for the September 11 Election; 428 for the November 6 Election); oversaw the typesetting, layout, and printing of all official, absentee and sample ballots for the Ward 4 Special Municipal Election; prepared procedure manuals and election supplies for all Moderators, Ward Clerks, Selectmen and Supervisors of the Checklist; recorded the final election results for all elected offices and ballot questions and provided election reports to the City Council, the Secretary of State, and to various State agencies;

Accepted new voter registrations, declarations of party affiliation, and checklist changes in address/ward/name; provided in-home voter registrations for the elderly and disabled; coordinated and attended all sessions of the Supervisors of the Checklist and served as clerk of that Board;

Maintained and updated the City's computerized voter checklist; printed all required checklists; and, produced all magnetic copies of voter files for purchase;

Published all election-related public notices, including notices of Supervisor's sessions, availability of absentee ballots, and polling place locations;

Conducted the 1991 Voter Re-Registration process, in conjunction with the Board of Checklist Supervisors; mailed letters to 3,255 individuals, notifying them of the re-registration requirement. Updated computerized voter files to include all dates of birth and voting records for 1988, 1989, and 1990; published all notices of re-registration Supervisors' sessions and attended all such sessions; provided reports to City Council and Secretary of State relative to the re-registration process;

In accordance with RSA 49-B:5, produced City Charter amendment petitions for use by the Rochester Taxpayer's Association; verified 562 peti-
tions (4,881 signatures) within the time-frame provided by State Law; presented reports to City Council and Secretary of State relative to this issue and scheduled, advertised, attended, and prepared minutes of all related public hearings;

Processed applications for the Adams-Pray Funds;

Issued City Hall parking lot stickers to employees and qualified non-employees;

Processed elderly discounts relative to New England Cablevision;

Recorded and indexed Federal and State tax liens; City liens; writs of attachment; utility pole and conduit licenses; articles of agreement and amendments thereto; City vehicle titles; agreements and contracts; leases; New Hampshire Wetlands Board/dredge and fill applications; litigations; developers’ performance/surety bonds; and, deeds of the City;

Continued organizing and cataloging documents stored in the City Hall vault, in accordance with the retention schedule established by the Administrative Rules of the New Hampshire Municipal Records Board;

Received and recorded cash receipts from various City Departments, including the Welfare Department, the Health/Code Enforcement/Building Inspection Department, the Planning and Development Office, the Zoning Board, the Police Department, the Recreation Department, and the Animal Control Office;

City Clerk revenues for Fiscal Year 1990-91 totalled as follows: $10,948.00 in Vital Record fees; $9,960.00 in Marriage License Fees; $8,395.00 in Uniform Commercial Code fees; and, $2,497.00 in Miscellaneous income. Dog License revenues totalled $6,799.50.

Respectfully submitted,
Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
TO: Mayor Roland Roberge and Members of the Rochester City Council

RE: Report of Filings Received in the City Clerk's Office - Representatives to the General Court and Delegates to the State Party Conventions

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE GENERAL COURT

District 11 (Ward 1, Ward 2, and Ward 5 - City of Rochester)

Republican
James E. Appleby *
Julie M. Brown *
Clyde J. Douglass
Sandra B. Keans *
Ralph W. Torr *

Democrat
Daniel N. Delisle
James F. McManus, Jr.

* Denotes Incumbents

District 10 (Ward 3 and Ward 4 - City of Rochester; and, Town of Strafford, NH)

Republican
Drucilla Bickford *
John G. Richardson, Jr.

Democrat
George F. Brown
Janet R. Pelley *

* Denotes Incumbents

NOTE: Filings from the Town of Strafford are not included above.

DELEGATES TO THE STATE PARTY CONVENTIONS

Republican
Ward 1: Ronald R. Malone
        Sharon E. Malone
Ward 2: Dana B. Gilbert
        Richard P. Green
Ward 3: Andrea M. Dupont
        John J. Grimes
        Daniel J. Hussey
        Thomas R. Verhey
Ward 4: Dorothea M. Kerlee
Ward 5: Mark A. Leno, Jr.
        Monica M. Leno
        Jonathan E. Sindorf
        Jo Ann L. Vatcher
        Danford J. Wensley

Democrat
Ward 1: None
Ward 2: None
Ward 3: None
Ward 4: None
Ward 5: None

Respectfully submitted,

Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
TO: Mayor Roland Roberge and Members of the Rochester City Council

RE: Report of 1990 State Primary Election Returns for the Offices of Representatives to the General Court and Delegates to State Conventions

### REPRESENTATIVES TO GENERAL COURT

**DISTRICT 11 [Ward 1, Ward 2, and Ward 5 - City of Rochester]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPUBLICAN</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James E. Appleby</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie M. Brown</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde J. Douglass</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra B. Kicans</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph W. Torr</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McManus, Jr.</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>7 WI</td>
<td>11 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattering*</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>5 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOCRAT</th>
<th>Ward 1</th>
<th>Ward 2</th>
<th>Ward 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel N. Delisle</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F. McManus, Jr.</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Appleby</td>
<td>36 WI</td>
<td>25 WI</td>
<td>14 WI</td>
<td>75 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Brown</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>18 WI</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
<td>25 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Torr</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>8 WI</td>
<td>10 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Kicans</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Delisle</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond A. Foss</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Callaghan</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattering*</td>
<td>6 WI</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>12 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*"Scattering" = A single vote cast for an individual District-wide, fictitious characters, or incomplete/illegible entries*
**Representatives to General Court/Continued**

**District 10** [Ward 3, Ward 4 - City of Rochester; Town of Strafford]**

### Republican

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drucilla Bickford</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia H. Foss</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar W. Huckins</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Richardson, Jr.</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B. Young</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James McManus, Jr.</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattering*</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals from Town of Strafford Not Included Above**

### Democrat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 3</th>
<th>Ward 4</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan L. Arnold</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George F. Brown</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Brien</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet R. Pelley</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Richardson</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Foss</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>3 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Huckins</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucilla Bickford</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattering*</td>
<td>7 WI</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
<td>11 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals from Town of Strafford Not Included Above**

*"Scattering" = A single vote cast for an individual District-wide, fictitious characters, or incomplete/ illegible entries
**DELEGATES TO STATE CONVENTIONS**

*NOTE:* "Miscellaneous" reflects individual votes cast for persons who do not reside in the applicable ward, who are not registered to vote, and who are not members of the applicable party; also includes write-in votes for fictitious characters and write-in votes where only partial names were given.

**REPUBLICAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 1</th>
<th>Ronald R. Malone</th>
<th>210</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharon E. Malone</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Appleby</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>Dana B. Gilbert</th>
<th>166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard P. Green</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandra Kears</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Harkinson</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roger Boucher</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>7 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 3</th>
<th>Andrea Dupont</th>
<th>154</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John J. Grimes</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel J. Hussey</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas R. VerHey</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecelia Smith</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 4</th>
<th>Dorothea M. Kerlee</th>
<th>137</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 5</th>
<th>Mark A. Leno, Jr.</th>
<th>53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monica M. Leno</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jonathan E. Sindorf</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JoAnn L. Vatcher</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danford J. Wensley</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEMOCRAT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 1</th>
<th>James McManus, Jr.</th>
<th>2 WI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raymond Foss</td>
<td>2 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konstantinos Mantopoulos</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Delisle</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>Patty Frew-Waters</th>
<th>12 WI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Kingsbury</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erich Waters</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norman Labrecque</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfred Ruel</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 3</th>
<th>Janet Pelley</th>
<th>2 WI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Reed-Erickson</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muriel Gagnon</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Callahan</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Brown</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>8 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 4</th>
<th>Donatien Menard</th>
<th>1 WI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roland Roberge</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larry Cook</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pam Cook</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tom Luck</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jerome Lachance</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD 5</th>
<th>Charles Grassie, Jr.</th>
<th>2 WI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carl Highfield</td>
<td>1 WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>12 WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57
VOTER TURNOUT

[Percent voter turnout City-wide = 20.28%]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD</th>
<th># Names on Checklist</th>
<th># Voters*</th>
<th>Percent Turnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2608</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3403</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12,864</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes both regular and absentee voters participating in State Primary

PARTY AFFILIATIONS PRIOR TO PRIMARY: (September 4, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>2,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>3,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>2,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3759</td>
<td>4126</td>
<td>4979</td>
<td>12,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTY AFFILIATIONS AFTER PRIMARY: (September 12, 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>3,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>2,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>2,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>4239</td>
<td>4644</td>
<td>12,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BALLOTS CAST: 1456 Republican Ballots
(1356 Regular Ballots; 100 Absentee Ballots)
1153 Democratic Ballots
(1084 Regular Ballots; 69 Absentee Ballots)

Respectfully submitted,

Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
TO: Mayor Roland Roberge and Members of the Rochester City Council

RE: Report of Special Municipal Election Returns, Ward 4 City Council Vacancy

The results of the September 11, 1990 Special Municipal Election in Ward 4 were as follows:

Selden L. Hannah      161
Bernard J. Veno       311
Scattering             2 WI

The ballots cast in this Special Municipal Election totaled as follows:

Regular Ballots Cast: 481
Absentee Ballots Cast: 25

Number of Voters Participating in this Special Election Who Did Not Also Vote in the State Primary Election: 15

Respectfully Submitted,

Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
TO: Mayor Roland Roberge and Members of the Rochester City Council  
RE: Report of November 6, 1990 State General Election Returns – Representatives to the General Court (Districts #10 and #11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT 10</th>
<th>WARD 3</th>
<th>WARD 4</th>
<th>STRAFFORD*</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drucilla Bickford (REP)</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia H. Foss (REP)</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar W. Huckins (REP)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Richardson, Jr. (REP)</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B. Young (REP)</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan L. Arnold (DEM)</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George F. Brown (DEM)</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O'Brien (DEM)</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet R. Pelley (DEM)</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT 11</th>
<th>WARD 1</th>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>WARD 5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James E. Appleby ** (REP)</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1650  \ 2720  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Appleby ** (DEM)</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1070  /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie M. Brown ** (REP)</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1612  \ 2707  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie M. Brown ** (DEM)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1095  /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde J. Douglass (REP)</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>1711  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra B. Kees (REP)</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1754  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph W. Torr ** (REP)</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>1537  \ 2538  ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph W. Torr ** (DEM)</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>1001  /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel N. Delisle (DEM)</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James F. McManus, Jr. (DEM)</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>1550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Returns from Strafford are provided for information only  
** Candidates' names appeared on both sides of the ballot  
*** Elected (Five individuals were elected in each district)
### VOTER TURNOUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Names on Checklist</th>
<th>Regular Voters</th>
<th>Absentee Voters</th>
<th>Total Voters</th>
<th>Percent Turnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>1,016</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,004</td>
<td>5,787</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>6,158</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRAIGHT-VOTE BALLOTS CAST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>DEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTY AFFILIATIONS: October 27, 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>IND</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>2639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>3467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>2287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>4825</td>
<td>13,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31%) (32%) (37%)

Respectfully submitted,

Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
TO: Mayor Roland Roberge and Members of the City Council

RE: Report of Voter Re-Registration Process

In accordance with RSA 654:39, it was determined that 3,255 voters listed on the October, 1990 checklist would be required to re-register to vote since they did not vote in the November, 1988 election or the November, 1989 election or the November 1990 election.

On April 10, notices were mailed to 3,250 voters [five (5) of the 3,255 voters listed above either died or registered to vote in other communities prior to the mailing]. Of the 3,250 notices, 1,546 were returned by the Post Office as “undeliverable” [no forwarding order/forwarding order expired/moved, left no address]. All 1,546 returned letters were checked against the City Assessors’ list and the current telephone directory in an attempt to locate more current addresses for those voters. Letters were remailed to 118 voters with different Rochester addresses; only 17 of those 118 voters have since re-registered.

On June 1, the names of those persons who did not re-register were removed from the checklist. The attached chart reflects both re-registration activities and usual checklist maintenance activities.

The re-registration period technically concludes on August 1. Additional sessions of the Supervisors will be scheduled in July to accommodate those voters who did not re-register prior to the June 1 deadline and who have since been removed from the City’s checklist. Those individuals can also complete the required form in the City Clerk’s Office.

Respectfully submitted,
Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
## REGISTERED VOTERS AS OF JUNE 1, 1991

### JUNE 1, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WARD 1</th>
<th>WARD 2</th>
<th>WARD 3</th>
<th>WARD 4</th>
<th>WARD 5</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Voters,</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>13,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1990:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Voters:</td>
<td>+69</td>
<td>+34</td>
<td>+116</td>
<td>+37</td>
<td>+54</td>
<td>+310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Deleted,</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>-264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Died/Moved:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Moving to</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Wards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Moving into</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+9</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>+84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Who Re-</td>
<td>+51</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td>+104</td>
<td>+46</td>
<td>+47</td>
<td>+281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered*:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Who Re-</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered in Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Who Re-</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+8</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered from Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wards:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters Not Re-</td>
<td>-568</td>
<td>-486</td>
<td>-780</td>
<td>-551</td>
<td>-574</td>
<td>-2,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Voters,</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>10,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 1991:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals in this column should not be included when computing voters as of June 1; they are already included in the October, 1990 total.
TO: Mayor Roland Roberge and Members of the Rochester City Council

RE: City Charter Amendment Petitions/Rochester Taxpayers' Association

In accordance with RSA 49-B:5, III and RSA 49-B:3, IV, the above-captioned petitions were received in the City Clerk's Office on May 31, 1991, were carefully reviewed, and were found to be "sufficient," as provided by statute (see following summary). A notice to that effect has been submitted to the Petitioners' Committee, in accordance with State Law, with a copy of that notice also being filed with the "municipal officers".

In accordance with RSA 49-B:5, IV the municipal officers "within 10 days of receipt of a report that the petitions are sufficient, shall by order provide for hearing on the proposed amendments." In addition, notice of the public hearing must be published in a newspaper at least 7 days prior to that hearing and must include both the text of the proposed amendments and explanations of those amendments.

Respectfully submitted,
Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
CITY CHARTER AMENDMENT PETITIONS

Each petition required that a voter PRINT his name, affix his/her SIGNATURE, and affix his/her STREET ADDRESS using "ink or other indelible instrument" (as required by Statute).

An affidavit on the back of each petition was required to be completed by the circulator of that petition; petitions were disallowed in instances where the affidavit was not completed.

The three petitions were essentially signed by the same individuals; variations in numbers primarily reflect the petitions which were not counted because the affidavits (noted above) were not completed. Other minor variations contributed to the difference in numbers shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mayoral Veto</th>
<th>Subject Terms of Office</th>
<th>Conflict of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Submitted</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Signatures Affixed</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Voters**</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Number of New Voters included in this total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Registered Voters (disallowed)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplicate/Triplicate Signatures (disallowed)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioned/Challenged Signatures* (disallowed)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signatures that were questioned/challenged (and disallowed) include the following:
  - Signatures written in the same handwriting as the ones immediately preceding (these signatures were also compared to the actual voter registration cards).
  - Signatures with no street address given;
  - Signatures (generally with no middle initials) with addresses different than those shown on checklist;
  - Printed names that were illegible/indecipherable
  - Signatures affixed in pencil
  - Lack of signatures (printed names only)

**Individuals who have registered to vote in the past few months.

Petitions were consecutively numbered, by type, upon receipt and in the presence of representatives of the Rochester Taxpayers' Association. Signatures were first verified with the checklist; with the number of the petition signed by each voter written beside his/her name; all duplicate (and triplicate) signatures were thereby easily identified and, the petitions containing the duplicate/triplicate signatures were noted and cross-referenced.

Due to time constraints imposed by Statute, only those signatures which raised questions were compared with the actual voter registration cards.

Gail M. Varney, City Clerk
REPORT OF THE CODE ENFORCEMENT DEPARTMENT
1990-1991

The Code Enforcement Department has been very active during this 12 months period. As the population of Rochester continues to grow so does the responsibility of the department to enforce the rules and regulations of the City of Rochester. This office remains dedicated to this responsibility and will continue its program of positive code enforcement as a means of ensuring the health and safety of the citizens of Rochester.

The total revenue collected by the Code Enforcement Department was $91,694.00 and is categorized as follows:

Food Establishment Licenses ...................... $16,565.00
Animal Control Fines & Shelter Fees .............. 1,812.00
Code Enforcement Permits ........................ 17,999.00
Building Permits ................................ $55,318.00

$91,694.00

The total amount expended by the department was $151,775.00.

BUILDING INSPECTION

Major duties of the department include the administration of the BOCA Basic Building Code, the review and issuance of building permits, and the inspection of construction sites to ensure their conformance with the Zoning Ordinance, Planning Board approvals, and the Building and Life Safety Codes.

This year Rochester experienced a substantial decrease in the construction of single family dwellings and a continuation of the growth trend in the commercial sector. Prime examples of this commercial growth are the construction of Cabletron’s research and development facility at the Ten Rod Road Industrial Park, major renovations at the Rochester and Lilac Malls including the construction of the new 63,000 square foot Shop N Save Supermarket, completion of Eastern Propane’s gas storage facility and the construction of Waste Management’s material recovery center and leachate treatment plant.

During this year the Code Enforcement Department inspected the construction of the new Vocational and Middle School and the renovations at the Junior High School. The department also initiated a city wide inspection program to ensure compliance with the State of New Hampshire’s smoke detector law.
A total of $1,475 permits were issued with an estimated building cost of $34,729,852. The following table illustrates the continued growth within the City of Rochester during the last ten years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BUILDING ESTIMATE COST</th>
<th>PERMITS ISSUED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81-82</td>
<td>$ 3,086,107.00</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-83</td>
<td>6,620,778.00</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83-84</td>
<td>5,469,322.00</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td>15,161,269.00</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>26,409,601.00</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87</td>
<td>57,445,635.00</td>
<td>1,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-88</td>
<td>34,510,382.00</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>25,946,415.00</td>
<td>1,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>27,395,058.00</td>
<td>1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>34,729,852.00</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HEALTH
The major health related duties of the department continue to be the licensing and inspection of the City’s food service establishment industry. We have worked closely with the owners and operators to ensure compliance with the N.H. rules for the sanitary production and distribution of food. During the year each food establishment was inspected a minimum of two times and as a whole Rochester’s food establishments are in excellent condition.

The department also performed inspections of day care and foster home facilities, investigated housing code complaints and responded to various health related concerns of the citizens of Rochester.

The new Animal Control Officer, Mr. John Fitch, has remained very active. During this year he responded to a total of 554 animal related complaints and impounded 96 dogs. As part of our agreement with the Cochecho Valley Humane Society, 45 unclaimed dogs and cats were brought to the shelter for possible adoption.

The Board of Health has met periodically throughout the year. They remain active in the City’s food service establishment licensing and inspection program and drafted a new licensing fee schedule which was adopted by the City Council.

The Board of Health is comprised of the following members:
Dr. Thomas Moon, D.V.M. - Chairman
Mr. John Stowell, H.O. - Secretary

Dr. James DeJohn, M.D.
Mr. William Keefe, P.D.

CODE ENFORCEMENT

Other general activities performed by the department included inspection and licensing of mobile home parks, inspection of public school buildings and licensing of bowling alleys, movie theaters, pool tables, taxi cabs, junk yards, second hand dealers, video games and hawkers & peddlers.

Respectfully submitted,
John Stowell
Director of Code Enforcement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH/ YEAR</th>
<th>CONDOS &amp; APARTMENT</th>
<th>FOUNDATIONS</th>
<th>MOBILE HOMES</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL ADDITIONS &amp; REPAIRS</th>
<th>NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS</th>
<th>ELECTRICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,690,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>343,900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,710,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>327,420</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,844,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,913,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>294,400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,096,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29,400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,205,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>310,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,246,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>294,400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,412,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300,450</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,490,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,595,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,679,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3,250,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Building Permits Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plumbing</th>
<th>Signs</th>
<th>Pools</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Renewals</th>
<th>Monthly Total</th>
<th>Year to Date Total</th>
<th>Demolitions</th>
<th>Year to Date Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>187,150</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28,907</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,309</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>4,511,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>735</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36,700</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>73,155</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,690</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>213,800</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>167,850</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21,050</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>168,713</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,260,630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21,325</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,810</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,510,883</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>685,570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33,185</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40,850</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17,275</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>88,805</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 207 | 2,692,283| 44    | 65,200| 20    | 117,610  | 64            | 59,911          | 28          | 512,950          | 1,456            | 34,681,002       | 19    | 48,850           |

I submit this fire report for the fiscal year of July 1, 1990 through June 30, 1991 to outline the progress and general areas of concern for our fire protection delivery system.

This fiscal year for our department has begun a slow and progressive change process in how our force performs our mission to the City, due to desire, commitment and participation of our personnel. The period experienced an unusually high level of structural fire and emergency rescue activity to a growing and dynamic City with a population of nearly 27,000 people. The City of Rochester has grown to the fifth largest City in New Hampshire with Rochester surpassing the populations of Portsmouth, Dover and Salem with a fire department size of one-half to one-third the number of full-time personnel of cities with fewer people, significantly less square mileage and less frequency of actual working building fires. These factors of an increased level of fire and emergency activity, combined with the region and City economic conditions have put a true strain on our personnel, resources and operating efficiency.

I am pleased to report however, that while our department does more with less personnel than our counterparts, we are progressing in our internal efficiency and maintaining our level of emergency response for the citizens of Rochester.

ADMINISTRATION

In the fall of 1990, the department implemented a reorganization of the command structure, in effect downsizing the ranks and number of full-time and call Chief Officers. This decision saved the City a good deal of money and enabled us to fill command positions with very qualified and competent personnel from our own department for promotion.

Department personnel (permanent and call), through committee consensus, formed a Fire Department Mission Statement with a set of recommendations for a comprehensive program of goals and objectives which provide a working document from which to develop our department, in order to meet our stated mission.

Our personnel and administrative staff formulated a policy manual addressing rules and regulations, standard operating procedures, organization, job descriptions, and progressive discipline policy.
We conducted a review of the City Master Plan and our needs in the areas of fire department facilities, response requirements, personnel allocations, apparatus and equipment needs and an updating of the administrative documentation processes, streamlining our legal and technical requirements and responsibilities.

OPERATIONS

Significant efforts and improvements were made in addressing the areas of tools, portable equipment and the state of readiness of all department emergency equipment.

The department developed a fluid replacement program for fireground operations, reducing the risks of firefighter dehydration and firefighter injuries, and our personnel formulated a comprehensive and in-depth fire operation plan for the abandoned A1 Gor Shoe building on South Main St.

Emergency response procedures have been developed for all phases of our emergency response activity and adopted the nationally recognized Incident Command System for much improved fireground management of personnel and resources. The adopted Incident Command System has been utilized at many of the cities structure fires and large scale incidents involving mutual aid from other jurisdictions with a great deal of success.

Radio communications has been improved with the purchase of the new fire department radio system, providing all firefighters in all 3 stations with personal pagers and a new high band radio frequency.

January of 1991 saw the installation of a state of the art diesel exhaust system installed in the Central Fire Station, eliminating the large amount of fumes and particles originating from the start up of the large fire apparatus on the floor level and traveling upstairs to the firefighters living quarters.

Arrangements were worked out with the Water & Sewer Department transferring a 1989 Kubota tractor to Water & Sewer in exchange for a 1990 heavy duty truck. The result was they received a vital piece of equipment they needed for their operation and we received a truck that was converted to a new rescue truck. The overall financial impact to each department for conversion to our needs was miniscule compared to the budgeted requests.

Operational concerns that will need further attention include the full-time manning levels as they relate to the type and frequency of calls for
assistance, the sub-standard and ineffective sub-stations in Gonic and East Rochester and the age and condition of the fire apparatus fleet in all three fire stations. East Rochester currently houses a 1949 Maxim pumper which is almost impossible to obtain parts for and is ineffective as a front line fire attack engine. The 1966 Maxim Aerial Ladder stationed at the Central Fire Station is currently in serious disrepair and very unreliable for its needed role in fireground operations. It has often broken down either enroute to an emergency or in situations where we have had to call an outside agency for assistance. The ladder truck is an integral piece of equipment used to ventilate burning structures in a rapid period of time to allow entry of attack line fire personnel. I urge prompt attention in this annual report to you in these matters. With these apparatus factors in mind, I wish to notice that this administration has formulated a preventive maintenance schedule and apparatus replacement program for City Council review so as to keep our apparatus in an improved level of emergency readiness.

FIRE PREVENTION

The cooperation and working relationship between the permanent and call force were commendable in coordination and implementation of the October 1990 Fire Prevention parade & Exposition at McClelland School.

Donations received from the Rochester Elks Club for the “pluggie” robot and Waste Management Inc. for the smoke trailer provided excellent fire prevention public education tools for our department and its residents and school children. Local 1451, Rochester Professional Firefighter Association, contributed monetary donations and free off-duty labor to the Fire Prevention Trailer and the Greater Rochester area businesses donated valuable materials and labor for the effort in the trailer conversion, despite the less than favorable economic conditions in the region. The call force personnel of our department also donated precious time and equipment in this positive endeavor.

Unfortunately, due to limited manpower in the area of City Fire Code Enforcement, many of our goals have not been realized with respect to shift fire inspection programs that would further reduce the possibility of fire associated risks in the business, mercantile and other high risk occupancies. Due to to only one person in that office, we have had to redirect our concentration to the daily needed inspections, plans review, smoke detectors and imminent hazards. This department is fortunate to enjoy an excellent rapport and working relationship with the Code Enforcement Office at City Hall in its follow-up and technical aspects.
TRAINING & SAFETY

Successful fireground and emergency tasks, roles and management, rest primarily with its training programs and administrative commitment. High levels of training for the period include firefighter and fire officer certification levels, Incident Command, leadership, professional development, and medical aid certification, combined with a strong theme of firefighter health & safety.

Also completed were a new training schedule for all personnel, and plans to update and develop a comprehensive fire department training library.

Emphasis was also placed on bringing outside instructors, seminars and courses into Rochester, offering a significant cost savings with new concepts and ideas brought into our operation. Many of our personnel have become state certified Fire Instructors and will further enhance our department training program in upcoming years.

The Training Officer for the department has been appointed as the department Safety Officer and chairs the new Fire Department Safety Committee which reports to the Fire Chief on all safety and health related issues.

Additional plans and research are underway to assist the department in meeting more of the nationally accepted training and safety standards.

SUMMARY

The Rochester Fire Department serves its community well. Our force is comprised of some the most experienced full-time and call firefighting personnel in the region who are not only very talented, but enthusiastic, motivated and dedicated to their public safety role in the community.

It is for this very reason that the City must take a strong view at what resources and commitment it provides for its fire & rescue services, just as important as all other infrastructure improvements invested into the City.

The past year has given some good insight into some of our problems. Many of our fire protection issues needing to be addressed are not unlike many municipalities that have seen growth and change within their community. Our problems are neither insurmountable or impossible. Much to the credit of our personnel, our Mission Statement, goals and objectives target those areas that need to be addressed. However, in reality it must be realized that the best laid plan and goals cannot be fully accomplished, long term or short term, without a realization, understanding or commitment from the legislative body of the community, in our case the City.
Council, City Manager, and Planning Board. Even with full support of these City policy makers, the efforts still cannot proceed unless the public and taxpayers have the same realization and commitment, and of course, carrying the point just one step forward, and probably most important, the City and regional economic conditions must be stable enough to support the required funding.

Therefore, I offer the real point of this summary.

I feel that Rochester City government and the public as a whole, is not lacking in its desire or commitment to improving the Fire protection issues in our community, but at present is experiencing very severe economic troubles felt in all other areas of the region. I hope we can collectively take this to review the fire departments goals and plans for inclusion into the City Master Plan. The Fire Department needs to coincide and combine its future with the many other departments in the City, in anticipation of better economic times. To not, at least, be involved in planning with our various departments in order to develop priorities and strategy during this shutdown of spending, is precious time wasted.

In closing, I would like to thank the various city departments for their assistance over the past year, the employees of this department and the citizens of Rochester which we serve.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Dellner  
Chief of Department

FIRE DEPARTMENT RESPONSE ACTIVITY

EMERGENCY RESPONSE CALLS:

Manufacturing Fires .................. 3
Mercantile Fires ..................... 6
Non-Residential Fires ................ 37
Residential Fires .................... 36
Vehicle Accident Responses ....... 85
Ambulance Assist Calls ............ 101
Bomb Scares ......................... 7
Brush & Grass Fires ............... 52
Car & Truck Fires ................... 44
Chimney Fires ....................... 8
Electrical Problems ............... 54
False Alarms ........................................... 236
False Calls ........................................... 24
Fuel Spills ............................................. 37
Smoke Scares & Honest Mistakes ..................... 101
Investigations Only .................................. 291
Miscellaneous Emergency Calls ...................... 155
Total .................................................. 1,277

NON-EMERGENCY RESPONSE:
Fire Alarm Test ........................................ 419
Alarm Boxes Plugged Out ............................... 325
Day Care Inspections .................................. 15
Fire Drills .............................................. 93
Fire Investigations ..................................... 23
Fire Safety Inspections ................................. 157
Fire Watches ............................................ 18
Foster Home Inspections ................................. 4
Oil Burner Inspections ................................. 86
Public Assist Calls ..................................... 78
Training Sessions ...................................... 182
Woodstove Inspections ................................ 24
Total .................................................. 1,424

Total Response Activity for Fiscal Year 1991 2,701 Incidents


TO THE HONORABLE MAYOR, CITY COUNCIL, CITY MANAGER AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE ROCHESTER PUBLIC LIBRARY:

Library use increased in all areas during FY 1990/1991 as Rochester became the largest municipality in the New Hampshire seacoast area with a population of 26,230. More materials were purchased and circulated and more reference questions answered than the year before. Trustees developed service policies and facilities plans applicable to the community environment in which Rochester finds itself in the 1991.

SERVICES
There were 129,441 items circulated from the Library in 1990/1991. This is 5,953 over the previous year. There were other significant increases in library use as well: Reference transactions increased 48%, attendance
at children's programs increased 36% and interlibrary loan requests increased 36%. For the first time in its history Rochester Library became a net loaner of materials to other libraries.

The Tenth Annual Photography exhibit drew 217 entries. Local businesses and organizations contribute $700 worth of prizes for winning photos. A book discussion series on Latin American writers was held during January, February and March.

The Children's Services department continues to update make available to parents a directory of area child care services. A successful child care open house was sponsored by the library to provide an opportunity for parents to meet and talk with representatives from local day cares. The library is used extensively by early childhood organizations and service providers as well as by parents schooling their children at home.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND AUTOMATION

The regional library automation consortium, Seacoast Area Integrated Library System of SAILS, experienced serious problems in 1990/1991 as it became apparent that the current hardware and software would not be able to carry the circulation of the charter member libraries of which Rochester is one. Back up service by the state automation department became unreliable, the state's cataloging services were slow and maintenance of the regional database sporadic. Larger libraries in the region began to do their own cataloging from OCLC, the national bibliographic utility. This proved to be an expensive for Rochester because of telecommunications costs.

As the year ended regional librarians, although still committed to a regional database, are investigating local stand alone circulation systems. Rochester, like other larger area public libraries, is experiencing increased use and must plan to automate the circulation, billing, overdue collection functions in the near future.

BUILDING AND FACILITIES

The 1990/1991 year was the first year in which library maintenance, repair and custodial care was done by the City Buildings Department. From the library point of view this is an improvement. Repairs were done expeditiously, building department staff people are knowledgeable and cooperative. The public was better served and the library staff was able to devote more attention to delivering library service.
The library was broken into several times during the year. The architecture of the building and the lack of security system make this a frequent occurrence. A security system to be installed in the next year will protect the library and contents from burglary and fire damage.

The library has long since outgrown the 12,000 square feet of space in the existing building. At the request of the Council Space Utilization Committee a preliminary building proposal was prepared in May which detailed the library’s space needs for the next twenty years.

COLLECTION

Over the past year the library non-fiction collection has been systematically evaluated and updated in several areas particularly the applied sciences, business, travel, consumer affairs and education. The increased circulation in these areas indicates a response to the kinds of materials available and the use by citizens of the library for their educational, economic and consumer needs as well as for recreational interests.

INFOTRAC, a CD/ROM version of the Reader’s Guide, was in use most of the last year and has become an essential information source used by all ages.

Nonprint items housed in the library and acquired under unknown circumstances have been inventoried, appraised and decisions made by the staff and trustees as to their appropriateness in the library. Efforts will be made in the coming year to locate donors and/or loaners and to dispose of them according the Museum Property Act.

PERSONNEL

Staff turnover was minimal the past year. One student library page left for college and was replaced by another Spaulding High School Student.

Volunteers from the Alternative School and the Court Diversion program assisted in the children’s department and processing department. Workers receiving public assistance and interested people from the community boxed books and helped at the annual used book sale.

PLANNING

A survey was conducted in April of 1991 to determine who in the community uses the library and for what purposes. The results provided useful information as the trustees and staff plan future services and facilities and developed a new Mission Statement appropriate to the nineteen nineties:
Mission

Consistent with the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and freedom of information, the Rochester Public Library shall provide all members of its community free access to materials which can improve their minds, broaden their lives, and fulfill their educational, intellectual, cultural and recreational needs.

The work done each day by staff and volunteers, the policies and priorities determined by the Board of Trustees endeavor to make the library’s mission a reality for the citizens of Rochester.

Respectfully submitted,

Tedine J. Roos  
Librarian

TRUSTEES

Term to Expire

Jeremiah Minihan, Chairperson ........................................ 1994
   City Manager’s Designate
Harry Rose, Secretary, Ward 4 ...................................... 1993
Ann Marie Cassavechia, Treas., At-large .......................... 1994
David Pearson, Ward 3 ............................................... 1993
Natalie Wensley, Ward 5 ............................................. 1992
Diane Brennan, Ward 2 .............................................. 1992
Nancy Hubbard, Ward 1 .............................................. 1994

STAFF AS OF JUNE 30, 1991

Director ................................................................. Tedine J. Roos
Technical Services Librarian, Head ................................. Roberta Ryan
Children’s Librarian, Head ........................................... Karen Eger
Reference Librarian .................................................. Cynthia Scott
Children’s Librarian .................................................. Marie Bisbee
Library Asst., Head of Circulation ................................. Joan Cranton
Library Assistant ..................................................... Eleanor Berry
Library Assistant ..................................................... Patricia Roese
Library Assistant ..................................................... John Collins
Library Assistant ..................................................... Ruth Clough
Library Assistant ..................................................... Blanche Valley
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**LIBRARY OPERATING EXPENDITURES 1990-1991**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>190,192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, Periodicals, Pamphlets</td>
<td>45,057.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>22,806.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>5,374.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>10,962.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39,144.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodicals and Pamphlets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>5,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>663.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,913.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microfilm, Microfiche</strong></td>
<td>4,308.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database Services and Software</strong></td>
<td>2,073.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio and Video cassettes</strong></td>
<td>7,622.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>4,716.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>923.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>1,982.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,622.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>489.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional and Co-op Dues</strong></td>
<td>265.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td>1,034.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity</strong></td>
<td>4,353.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone and communications</strong></td>
<td>5,830.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel</strong></td>
<td>697.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library maintenance items</strong></td>
<td>885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff development, conferences</strong></td>
<td>1,597.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Events</strong></td>
<td>1,144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td>6,956.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>6,154.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>801.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6,956.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service contracts, office machine maint.</td>
<td>1,272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. (printing, advertising, etc.)</td>
<td>925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>765.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>178.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>943.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rochester Library</td>
<td>3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year end balances - Trust and Special</td>
<td>4,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>286,539.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIBRARY COLLECTION**

- **Books, Added**: 3,736
- **Books, Withdrawn and Discarded**: 3,174

**Microforms**:
- Microfilm Rolls Added: 12
- Microfiche Sheets Added: 902
- Microfiche Titles Added: 1

**Audio Materials**:
- Tape Cassettes Added: 168
- Video Cassettes Added: 229
- AV Withdrawn: 23

**Periodical and Newspaper Subscriptions**: 198

**LIBRARY SERVICES**

- Public Service Hours: 2,987
- Borrowers Registerd 1989/1990: 3,097
- Adult Circulation: 70,636
- Juvenile Circulation: 58,805
- **Total Circulation**: 129,441

**Reference Questions, Adult and Juvenile**: 4,609

**Children’s Services**
- No. of Programs: 203
- Attendance at Children’s Programs: 11,266
- Use of Meeting Rooms (approx.): 2,624

**RESOURCE SHARING**

- Interlibrary Loan
  - Provided to Other Libraries by Rochester: 717
  - Received from Other Libraries: 468
  - **Total Number of Requests Processed**: 1,572
    - (includes unfilled to and from)
LIBRARY INCOME BY SOURCE

City of Rochester - Operating Budget .................................. $260,753.00
Trust Fund Interest ....................................................... 7,308.00
Fines and Fees ................................................................. 8,429.00
Out-of-Town Registrations ................................................ 3,895.00
Gifts .............................................................................. 436.00
Book Sales ................................................................. 1,167.00
Copy Machine Profit ...................................................... 772.00
Misc. Interest, Cards etc .................................................. 1,132.00
Balances June 1990, Trust and Special .......................... 2,640.00

$286,539.00


Fiscal year 1990-1991 was a year of slightly reduced operations within the Application Processing Division of the Planning Department and increased work load within the Long Range Planning and Information Divisions. Our human resource capacity was reduced by one (1) position at the end of the year, but, during the year we were able to maintain a productive and able staff. The government and the land use boards, and we did our best to provide technical and research support when needed.

Our major goals for FY 1992 are to complete the first draft of the Master Plan, to begin the process of creative fiscal techniques to fund the department, to use private sector approaches in our operations, to continue our personnel and concerning method of citizen contact, to carry on our research and development of the information program and to complete the CIP and the Impact ordinance.

DIVISION OF LONG RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION

Although this division of the Planning Department concentrated its operations on two (2) major fronts: the Master Plan and the Information Program, it did spend considerable time in transportation design and planning, and conservation planning.

MASTER PLAN

*Conducted and analyzed four (4) city surveys.
*Maintained the "down-town" office for citizen participation and for receiving the public comments on their government.
*Worked with Transportation, Recreation, Housing, Government, Youth, Downtown, Economic Development and the Conservation subcommittees.
*Produced outline from sections of each of the subcommittee section.
*Introduction of the master plan concept to the Council.
*Conducted field research to enlarge our data base.

INFORMATION PROGRAM

*Research on strategies, hardware and software.
*Conducted a needs assessment.
*Geographic Information System training and development.
*Aerial Photographs taken with permanent ground controls.
*Base map produced.
*Requests for proposals out for different components of program.

THE DIVISION OF APPLICATION PROCESSING

This division of the Planning Department is assigned the task of processing the application which require either Zoning Board or Planning Board approval and requests for information of previously approved applications. Developing and rewriting regulations, project impact analysis, and providing support for the land-use boards are also the duties of this division.

The division wrote and commented on both zoning ordinances, site plans and subdivision regulation.

PLANNING

The regular membership of the Rochester Planning Board for the fiscal year consisted of the following members: Neil Lachance, Chairperson; Phillippe Scott, Vice Chairperson; Dorothy Callaghan, Secretary; Matthias Marquardt, Maurice Gagne, Roger Larochelle, and James McManus, Ex-Officio. The alternate members are Eugene Henry and Leonard Jerabek. I would like to thank all of these members for their attendance at the regularly scheduled planning board meetings, planning board workshops, special on-site visits, and master plan related meetings.

The following table represents the projects workload of the Planning Board for the past three (3) fiscal years:
Limited Subdivision  
Major Subdivisions-Preliminary  
Major Subdivisions-Final  
Applications for License to operate  
a Mobile Home Park  
Site Review  
Excavation Permits  
Lot Line Revision  
Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FYI 1988</th>
<th>FYI 1989</th>
<th>FYI 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited Subdivision</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Subdivisions-Preliminary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Subdivisions-Final</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications for License to operate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Review</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation Permits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Line Revision</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ZONING**

We would like to take this time to thank the following members of the Zoning Board of Adjustment for their dedication and hard work. Sieglinde Fizz, Edward Mullen, Sue Rollins, Warren Ranagan and two new members, Janice Kazlauskas and David Stevens.

The following table represents the applications processed for the year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Denied</th>
<th>Withdrawed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Exceptions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variances</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal of an Administration Decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for a Rehearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE DIVISION OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) is offered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The federal grants are aimed at promoting sound community development. The program provides grants to carry out a wide range of community development activities directed toward neighborhood revitalization, residential rehabilitation, economic development, improved community facilities and services.

The City of Rochester, through it’s CDBG Program, has continued to support these activities by providing administrative, technical, and financial assistance to support adequate supplies of safe, decent, sanitary, and affordable housing for low/moderate income individuals and/or families in Rochester, East Rochester and Gonic.
The Community Development staff provided administrative, technical, and financial assistance to support the rehabilitation of nine (9) single-family, owner-occupied dwellings and one (1) absentee landlord dwelling with four (4) units utilizing CDBG Program funds and the State Rental Rehabilitation Program funding. A total of approximately eighty ($80,000.) thousand dollars was expended to rehabilitate these dwellings.

The CDBG Program has provided administrative, technical and financial support to not-for-profit organizations with goals to provide permanently affordable rental housing to very low and low income households. Approximately fifteen ($15,000.) thousand dollars has been expended for this activity which provided twelve (12) units of permanent affordable rental housing. The CDBG Program has obligated additional funding to support a two (2) family dwelling. Approximately twelve ($12,000.) thousand dollars will be expended for the rehabilitation of this project.

It appears the responsibility for assisting homeless individuals and/or families and the at-risk population will remain at a local level with significant support derived from existing homeless shelters and supportive services. As such, additional shelters will be deemed necessary for victims of domestic violence, sexual abuse, drugs, and alcohol abuse. Supportive housing and services for persons with AIDS, along with supportive housing and services for the mentally ill and those terminally ill. The City has supported five (5) Public Service Agencies in addressing the needs of the above population.

CDBG funding was utilized to support the conversion and rehabilitation of a two (2) car garage into a maternal and well child clinic. The clients in these clinics will be children of the working poor (150% of federal poverty guidelines). The clinic will also offer services to the elderly in need of routine blood testing, etc.

Along with addressing the housing issues and public services, the City of Rochester through it’s CDBG Program, has committed approximately two hundred and three thousand dollars ($203,000.) to make structural improvements to the Rochester Police Station, Rochester Community Center, Gonic Elementary School Playground, Spaulding Jr. High School and the Rochester Visiting Nurses Association to provide handicap accessibility.

Fiscal year 91-92 should prove to be another busy and exciting year for the C.D. Division; along with the continued support of Housing Rehabilitation, Public Services, Handicap Accessible Projects, and Public
Facilities Improvement activities, the C.D. Division is also in the process of redesigning the City’s current residential rehabilitation program. The new design will be enable the program to be self-perpetuation and will enable the City to serve more residents in the rehabilitation of their properties. The City staff is also preparing two (2) new activities to be supported by federal funding. These funds will be earmarked for Industrial/Commercial and Special Economic Development Activities. The funds will be made available to qualified businesses and/or owners and may be used for rehabilitation, acquisition, and/or to purchase machinery or equipment.

Respectfully submitted,

Peer Kraft-Lund
Planning, Development and
Zoning Director

REPORT OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
1990-1991

1990-1991 was a difficult year for New England, New Hampshire and the seacoast area. The City of Rochester was not immune to the slowing economy, but I believe that we still have reasons to be optimistic.

Although many companies were reducing staff, some companies in the City were actually increasing their employment levels. Lydall Technical Papers gradually added staff as did Thompson Tool Co. and Innovative Plastic Technologies. The largest increase came from Cabletron Systems, Inc. The company has continuously added staff since moving to Rochester back in 1985.

Cabletron also finished work on their new Corporate Headquarters in the Ten Rod Road Industrial Park. That brings the total square footage for the company in the industrial park to 185,000 sq. ft. The total for all the park is 285,000 sq. ft. As Cabletron continues to grow, we will do our best to insure that we can meet their needs.

Meeting the needs of our companies and attracting new companies, that is our charge. It is not always easy. Because of the weak economy, the competition with other communities has become very difficult. The price of existing buildings has dropped making new construction less competitive. The banking crisis in New Hampshire has had a dramatic impact on our local companies. If they can’t get access to capital, they will not
expand or create new jobs. I see these problems challenging us for many years to come.

Inspite of some of the problems I've mentioned, I believe the Rochester's future will be bright. We are all in this together and it is the community as a whole that will provide for existing companies and sell itself to new companies. I would like to thank the City Manager and Mayor for their commitment to improving job opportunities for Rochester citizens. I also appreciate the strong support from the City Council for our efforts in economic development. A grateful thanks to all the boards and commissions for their encouragement. A special; thank you to the members of the Rochester Economic Development Commission for their unwavering commitment to excellence in economic development.

REPORT TO THE POLICE COMMISSION OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT FOR THE YEAR 1991

It shall be the duty of the Board of Police Commissioners authorized hereunder to appoint such police officers, constables, and superior officers as it may in its judgement deem necessary and to fix their compensation; and to make all rules and regulations for the government of the police force and to enforce the same.

The Prime Mission of the Rochester Police is public relations, crime prevention, and the protection of life and property.

The basis of all Police Action is the law and the credibility of the Agency. The measure of our service will be judged by the Public in the way we deliver our service. We will hold all personnel to a high level of ethical practices. We will meet this mission through community policing.

The Goals of the Rochester Police Department for 1991 are:

GOAL: Public Relations Program
OBJECTIVE: *To organize and implement positive Police contact. Programs such as D.A.R.E., crime prevention, park and walk, and the school lunch program.

GOAL: Re-Organize the Police Structure
OBJECTIVE: *To establish a system within the organization to reflect a different span of control. An example would be Station Commanders.

GOAL: Develop a Team Management Concept
OBJECTIVE: *To implement a system where input is taken from Officers at every level. Areas that would be discussed are the shift assignments and operating instructions.
We currently have 39 sworn Police Officers, which includes upper Management, i.e., Chief, Captains, Lieutenants, and 9 civilian employees which includes Communications Specialists, Parking Enforcement, and Secretaries.

We have met all, and in some cases exceeded the goals we set for the year. Our Public Relations Program had remarkable success in areas which include the D.A.R.E. Program, the school lunch, where an Officer sits and eats lunch with the students in the cafeteria, the park and walk program, where Officers go to designated areas within the City and park the cruiser and walk in the neighborhoods, meeting and discussing resident’s concerns. The bicycle patrol, the first in the City, takes the Patrol Officer and allows police presence to be more effective in congested areas. The bicycle patrol has also proved to be effective with the students; getting beyond their perceived reserves and allowing them to open up to the Police, and learning what the job is all about. The Community Policing Projects, which is a partnership between the law abiding the citizens in a community and the Police to create a permanent solution to problems and thereby enhance the quality of life in the Community. These were started in the following areas in 1991, Cold Spring Coalition around the Fairgrounds, Academy Street, Field Stone Village, and the Elderly Housing in Rochester, just to name a few. The Department is actively involved in the Senior Citizens Programs in the City, such as the Good 'Ol Sports. The Department has Officer's involved in the Boys and Girls Scouts Programs, and in the Driver's Education Courses held through the School Department. The Officer teaches a class on the motor vehicle laws, and answers questions posed by the students.

Among all of these programs, the primary objective of the Police Department is to protect and to serve the citizens of the community. Our approaches to the reorganization of the Structure, which have included instituting the Station Commander, and the Team Management concept which has included input from Officer's at every level is proving to allow the Department to meet the primary objective to a certain extent.

The City has shown an increase of 2.7% in log activities reported to the Communications Center. Residential burglaries have decreased, however Business burglaries have increased. The number of accidents reported in 1990-1991 have decreased 29.5% over the past two years. The City's population continues to grow, from 21,560 in 1980 to 26,630 in 1990. In the 1990-1991 budget, the Police Commission hired one Police Officer, and a Communications Coordinator. The facility maintenance of all City Buildings was centralized to Public Buildings, under one Department Head. Therefore, even with the addition of the Communications Coordinator, the number of civilian employees remains at nine.

The Rochester Police Department is committed in receiving input from the citizens and developing an open-minded concept of community policing. It will be that team effort between the Police and the Community that we will all live in a harmonious relationship.

Respectfully submitted,
Donald L. Vittum, Chief of Police
Rochester Police Department

Number of Log Activities - Comparison for Past Three Years

Log Activities Up 2.7 Percent (1989 actually FY-89)
Rochester Police Department

Reported Accidents - Comparison for Past Two Years

Accidents Down by 28.6 Percent - Fatals Increased 75 Percent

Accidents

1990: 1,282
1991: 916

Fatal

1990: 4
1991: 7
Rochester Police Department

Growth 1980 - 1990

City Population Continues To Grow (1980 - 1990 U.S. Census Figures)
Rochester Police Department

Number of Personnel - Comparison for Past Three Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Dispatch Coordinator added in 90-91 but Janitor transferred to City (No net Change)
REPORT OF THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT
1990-1991

The responsibilities of the department continue to be the repair and maintenance of assigned City buildings, as well as maintenance of parks and recreational facilities. Staff members include the Supervisor of Public Buildings, the Public Buildings Foreman, one full time maintenance person, three full time building custodians, one contract custodian for the East Rochester Town Hall, and two temporary summer employees.

Major accomplishments for the period include: Repair of boilers at the Police Station and Public Works Garage, replacement of the underground fuel oil storage tank at City Hall, removal of the underground fuel oil storage tank at the Library, renovation of the electrical system at City Hall, installation of handicapped access ramps at the Police Station and Recreation Center, interior painting and floor refinishing at the Library, exterior painting at the East Rochester Town Hall, maintenance of the outdoor swimming pools and snow plowing.

The Department will continue, with the cooperation of the Mayor and City Council, to revitalize the City's physical plants.

Respectfully submitted,
John Stowell
Supervisor of Public Buildings

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
1990-1991

The activities of this department are as follows:

NEW STREETS
Brookfield Dr. 0.2 miles
Tall Pine Lane 0.05 miles
Birch Hollow Lane 0.05 miles
Mountain View Lane 0.15 miles
Weeping Willow Dr. 0.1 miles

0.55 miles

DRAINAGE WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Pipe</th>
<th>Catch Basins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gagne St.</td>
<td>200'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwater Rd.</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Hill Rd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park Dr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall Rd.</td>
<td>250'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perforated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catch Basins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

94
ROAD PAVING
Chestnut Hill Rd. Whitehall Rd.
Cross Rd. Stewart Ct.
Chamberlain St. (from Franklin to Whitehall Rd.) Hancock St.
Rte. 16B Twombly St.
Walnut St. Jefferson St.
Stuart Ln. Berry St.

ROAD SEWER, DRAINAGE
Sidney St. McIntire Ct.
Scott St. Charles St.
Osborne Rte. 16B, Rte. 125

ROAD, WATER, DRAINAGE
Rochester Neck Road (paid by Waste Management)

TREES
73 taken down upon request

STUMPS
31 chipped upon request

FILL
9,514 yards - hauled to dump

PART TIME AUTO BODY SHOP
Dog Warden Car: 1 repainted
Dump Truck: 4 repainted
Highway Car: 1 repainted
Police Cruiser: 1 repainted
Recreation Pick-up Truck: 1 repainted

Gonic Sidewalks - Extensive resurfacing work
Extensive Line Painting and Street Signs installed throughout the City.

SNOW
31½ inches

STORMS
Nine

SALT & SAND
21 days

SALT — 918 tons SAND — 620 tons

Called for after hour jobs — 48

We were first in the REGIONAL SNOW PLOW RALLY and placed second overall in New Hampshire.

Respectfully submitted,
Bert D. George, Commissioner

The activities of these divisions are as follows:

WATER DIVISION
New Water Services 86
Complete Water Relay Services 44
Relays - Main-Stop 46
Relays - Stop to Cellar 39
Services Discontinued 5
Services Repaired 87
Water Turn-ons 113
Water Turn-offs 93
Miscellaneous Water Jobs 192
Road Repairs 64
Water Line Inspections 56
Water & Sewer Estimates 97
Repair, Replace & Relocate Hydrants 9
Gate Boxes Raised 36
Gallons of Water Produced 886,197,000

SEWER DIVISION
Sewer Service Calls 142
New House Services 28
Repairs to Services 41
Miscellaneous Calls 223
Industrial Inspections 22
Gallons of Wastewater Treated 1,298,213,000

In February of 1991, lay-offs resulted in a reduction of approximately 30% of water and sewer personnel. My sincere appreciation goes out to the remaining personnel for their continued commitment to providing quality water and sewer services during these admittedly difficult times.

Respectfully submitted,
Martin Laferte
Director of Water & Sewer

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION
AND YOUTH SERVICES 1990-1991

The Department of Recreation and Youth Services is comprised of three programs: Recreation, Court Diversion, and the Youth Connection. The department is located in the community center on Hanson Street.
The Recreation Program provides a diversified range of activities to meet the ever increasing leisure time needs of the community.

The Court Diversion Program provides an alternative to the Judicial System for selected Rochester youths who have committed delinquent offenses.

The Rochester Youth Connection Program “CONNECTS” mature stable adults with youngsters who need companionship and role-modeling. The program also provides interested youth with the opportunity to volunteer at selected worksites within the community, thus getting valuable work skills for future use. We feel very fortunate that the Rochester Rotary Club has sponsored this program since it started.

The separate programs within the department work very closely with one another to make sure that the youth and adults involved have the necessary support to insure quality in all programs.

The Recreation Program in the City continues to offer as wide a variety of programs for the very diverse community for the youngest to the oldest. We feel fortunate that the City of Rochester has such a volunteer orientated population. We have been able to offer new programs on a consistent basis because of the willing community.

The program continues to work closely with the many youth sports leagues in the City. The efforts of these groups is to be commended. They have been able to build the facilities necessary for the youth in the City without having to depend on tax dollars. We are pleased to be able to offer these groups coaches certification training through the National Youth Sports Coaches Association.

Summer is the busiest season of the year, we are able to teach area youth how to swim at the three outdoor pools, using the Red Cross method of swimming classes. We also offer four playground sites throughout the City for children to participate in on a daily basis, encouraging them to have fun at creative play with their peers, in a well supervised setting. Rochester was also selected to be the host community for the Annual Tate Hershey Track and Field Program, this program brought nearly 800 youth, ages 9-14, from over 40 communities to our City for an all day event. Throughout the year we offer a wide variety of Basketball Programs for all ages, with youth leagues in the winter, camps in the summer, and open gym times for all ages year round. We have been fortunate to have the full cooperation of the Spaulding High School Coaching Staff in running
these very successful programs. The department tries to offer a variety of programs for all members of the community, to name but a few, we include: karate, dog obedience, dance, creative movement, adult volleyball, adult walking club and special trips.


During the past fiscal year sixty-two youths were referred to Court Diversion through various referral sources. Most referrals were from the juvenile officer; some came directly from the schools. The criminal offenses included harassment, false fire alarm, possession of stolen property, criminal mischief, discharge of an air pistol, willful concealment, motor vehicle complaints, burglary, trespassing, shoplifting, theft and possession of alcohol. Three of the sixty-two were repeat referrals for offenses of a different nature. They were accepted due to a combination of factors, including the nature of the second offense, the juvenile’s attitude, the degree of remorse exhibited and the degree of cooperation and preserverance shown while working on the initial contract.

The average age was, again, fourteen; many of these students attended Spaulding High School so that this year we were dealing with both Middle and High School populations on a regular basis. Of this high school population, three students were facing expulsion for the academic year and one student eventually dropped out. Again, approximately one third of the referrals represented female offenders.

Of the sixty-two referrals made, fifty youth successfully completed their contracts. Their contracts represented 1,062 completed community service hours and $1,046.99 in restitution either paid directly to victims or donated to charity. Community service sites and supervision were provided by the Rochester Public Library, Rochester Daycare, Salvation Army, Fellowship Soup Kitchen, City of Rochester Code Enforcement, Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, Recreation Department, Lilac Mall, Rochester Red Cross, Pride Day Staff, Spaulding Track and Field coaches and the Intervale Nature Trail Committee. The wide Diversity of sites gives the program the ability to provide community service that enhances the youth’s strengths and interests and helps to individualize their contract. The site supervisor’s commitment and support continues to be a key factor in the success of this component of a Diversion contract.

Six youths did not successfully complete their contracts. Four youths failed to comply with the terms of the contract and two youths had a subsequent offense while in Diversion. Six youths declined to participate in Diversion after the initial referral.
Four contract committee members were recruited to replace positions vacated by three resigning members. The three committees continued to meet on a monthly basis to formulate contracts; they volunteered a total of 200 hours of their time to this effort. Without their thoughtful consideration and dedication, Diversion could not perform at its current level of success.

This year Diversion also benefited from the able efforts of two senior interns from the UNH Department of Psychology. Their presence made a difference in the lives of many young individuals and helped them to successfully complete their contracts. The interns volunteered a combined total of four hundred and eighty hours of service to the program.

The continued support of the Rochester Police Department through its juvenile officer and of the administrative staff of both the Spaulding Middle and High School is gratefully acknowledged. Also, the community service worksite volunteers, the committee volunteers and many other individuals who believe in the Diversion philosophy and provide ongoing support to our youth.

REPORT OF ROCHESTER YOUTH CONNECTION
1990-1991

In its 5th year, as a response to the needs of local youth, the Rochester Youth Connection was able to “match” 25 city children with adult companions. This represents a 19% increase over fiscal year 1989-1990. A volunteer and child spend 3-5 hours a week in activities they both enjoy. That means adult volunteers donated over 3,700 hours of service to the City and provided guidance, support, and friendship to troubled, at-risk youth. Except in certain cases, these children are referred by the school system, which includes teachers, counselors and administrators. There are presently 15 youngsters waiting for adult companions.

In order to continue volunteer involvement and growth in the program, many special events were held throughout the year. These events included a summer picnic at Fernald Shore, and annual Christmas party, a bike ride at Rye Beach and a trip to a Red Sox Game.

The Youth Connection also administers the Youth Volunteer Program, a program that places youth ages 12 to 16 in community service worksites for 2 to 4 hours per week. Student applicants receive training in interview skills and working habits as well as on-the-job training. The possibility of
paid employment is excellent incentive for youth to do a good job and show their skills. There were 29 youths volunteers over the past year donating approximately 1,200 hours of service to the business community and local agencies.

The Department of Recreation and Youth Services continue to work closely with other City Departments and Agencies. We strive to service the needs of the community as well as maintain a high quality level.

I would like to thank the City Manager, the Mayor, the City Council, all of the various department heads and their personnel, the citizens of Rochester, and the countless volunteers for showing their support and cooperation over the past year and in helping to make our City a healthy place to live.

Respectfully submitted,
W. Brent Diesel, Director

REPORT OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION
1990-1991

The office of Substance Abuse Prevention was established in 1989 to create, support and coordinate programs designed to prevent the abuse of alcohol and other drugs by the citizens of Rochester. The office is staffed by coordinator Anne May and half-time Secretary Terry Connelly and housed in the basement of the Rochester Community Center.

The coordinator worked closely with the Substance Abuse Prevention Task Force to identify community goals regarding substance abuse prevention. Projects included a float in the Christmas Parade and community participation in Red Ribbon Week, a national drug and alcohol awareness program.

The office coordinated the activities of the five teams trained through a grant from the Northeast Regional Center for Drug Free Schools and Communities. In addition, a weekend training was conducted for 27 participants in March 1991. Technical assistance and conference details were orchestrated through this office.

The Rochester Community Partnership was initiated through this office. This group provides support and resources to the Cold Spring Park Neighborhood Coalition.
The Cold Spring Park Neighborhood Coalition is a project started through the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention. The Coalition includes all home-owners, tenants and landlords who live in the four block area surrounding the Rochester Fairgrounds. Members have the following goals:

* To make the Cold Spring Park Neighborhood the place to live in Rochester.
* To empower people to cause positive change in their lives, their neighborhood, and community.
* To make the neighborhood a safe place to live and play.
* To promote educational opportunities so people can improve their lives.
* To beautify the Cold Spring Park neighborhood.
* To create new activities especially for children.
* To form neighborhood support groups.
* To provide opportunities for neighbors to socialize in an alcohol/drug-free atmosphere.

Other projects for the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention included presenting two six week parenting courses, presentations to classes, youth groups and adults and managing the Drug Free Schools and Communities Grant.

This office has initiated a pro-active approach to the issue of substance abuse with the hope that keeping up-to-date on current research in prevention and coordination of school and community effort will pay off in future dividends.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne C. May
Coordinator

REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-1991

The 1990-1991 school year was productive and positive for Rochester Schools. A committee of staff, board, parents, business and community members met in the spring to formulate a strategic plan for Rochester to provide direction for our schools in the coming years. After two weekends of all day meetings, the Committee adopted a statement of fundamental beliefs about education, a mission statement for Rochester Schools, and objectives with timelines for achieving them. The major focus of the work was to improve the education we provide for our students and better prepare them for life after high school. The fundamental beliefs are as follows:
We believe that:

• Opportunities should be provided for all students to achieve their maximum potential in all areas, including, but not limited to academic, social, emotional, physical and intellectual development.
• Schools need to support and enhance the ethical and moral values that are traditionally taught in the home.
• Education is a partnership that requires communication, commitment, and involvement of the entire community, including, but not limited to parents, businesses, students, and school staff.
• Schools need to address the changing world in the use of technology, subjects taught, methods of teaching, and career options for students. Before implementation of innovations, however, careful evaluation of new techniques is necessary in order to avoid potentially damaging educational fads.
• The school and staff must provide a safe environment that addresses individual needs and is conducive to learning.
• The School district needs to provide a staff which exhibits high ethical, moral and professional standards. The school district and its individual staff members are accountable for these standards. Substandard performance has no place in public education.
• It is the schools' responsibility to help prepare students to become contributing members of a competitive and complex society.
• Education is a lifelong learning process. Resources of the schools should be accessible to members of the entire community.

The mission statement for Rochester Schools, which is directly related to the above beliefs is:

As a vibrant and integral part of our community, the Mission of Rochester School Department is to educate by:

• Providing a school climate that encourages all students to achieve their maximum potential and continue individual growth.
• Supporting and enhancing high ethical, moral and social values to prepare students to become positive, contributing members of a complex, competitive, and ever changing society.
• Creating and maintaining a partnership involving a dedicated, professional staff and all segments of the community.

The objectives adopted by the Strategic Planning Committee, and later approved by the School Board, are as follows:
• By September 1992, a job description will have been written for every position in the district and an evaluation process developed which holds employees accountable for the elements of the job description.

• By September 1993, the district will have written and implemented a competency based curriculum, K-12.

• By June 1995, the number of Spaulding students going on to post-secondary education will meet or exceed the state average.

• By June of 1992, the district will implement a working business and school program.

• By June of 1993, the district will develop, implement and monitor a mechanism to determine what academic and occupational skills are necessary for success in college, employment and community life. These elements will be infused into the competency based curriculum.

• Within the next two years, all teachers will have been involved with a cooperative program that will better prepare them to instruct students to become positive, contributing members of a complex, competitive and ever changing society.

• By school year 1993-1994, the district will enhance the current Parent Teacher Organizations and Parent Teacher Association and will have expanded them to the middle and high schools with membership records representing 10% of the total number of students in each school.

• By September 1992, the district will implement a quality communications program through all available media for the entire school system.

As we work toward achieving these objectives, we invite community members to participate in the various committees. If you are willing to serve to help our children, please contact Marilyn Smith at the Superintendent’s office (332-3678) and let her know which strategic planning committee you are willing to help with.

One of the major areas addressed by the Board was construction and renovation of facilities. The various construction projects cause considerable controversy in the community because so much was begun in such a short time. The extensive work was the result of extensive debate and final adoption of resolutions in January 1989, by the School Board and the City Council. As a result of these and related actions, the following projects are completed or near completion:

• Completion of a classroom addition in McClelland School which was fully functional during the 1990-91 school year. The addition included nine large and four small classrooms in addition to a multi-purpose gym/cafeteria and renovations to create a library in the old section of the school.
• Construction of a new vocational center attached to the original Spaulding High School. This facility was built primarily with state funding, supplemented by local dollars. The center was substantially completed by the end of the 1990-1991 school year and occupied in 1991-1992.
• Renovation of the original Spaulding High School building in preparation for its conversion back to a high school, with gym and classroom additions to accommodate an enrollment of 1,600 pupils. As a part of the renovations, the School District was required to remove virtually all of the asbestos in the building.
• Although final action has not been taken by the School Board or City Council, an assumption made in the original resolutions was that the current Spaulding High School would be turned over to the city for municipal functions.

We believe that the new and renovated facilities will provide a better atmosphere for our students and will correct some of the serious difficulties we have had because of the crowded open concept high school and because of recent enrollment growth in the elementary schools and continued growth anticipated in the middle school and high school.

One of the regrettable changes in the school district was the loss of the two year old elementary art program in budget cuts. While art remains in the curriculum in most classes, teachers have expressed their belief that the quality of the program run by specialized art teachers cannot be duplicated in the regular classroom. Several other positions were also cut, resulting in reduced services in some other areas.

Rochester Schools initiated a mentor program for teachers new to the system. The purpose of the program is to improve instruction for students. It does this by providing extra help to the new teachers who, in addition to teaching a new group of students, also have to learn about local policies, procedures and the community. The program should provide the support that is needed to allow these new teachers to concentrate more on student needs and less on the side issues. We are grateful to several businesses in the community that have contributed to this program because funding was not available in the regular budget.

Rochester Schools are in their third full year of a formal substance abuse prevention program. This program has expanded to include school and community based prevention teams in several schools, the D.A.R.E. program, offered by the New Hampshire State Police and Rochester Police
Department, and various student run projects. In addition to the skills needed to refuse drugs, students work on self-esteem, cooperative skills and support, peer counseling and leadership skills. The programs have allowed students to help one another and to work together in changing views about drugs in the schools.

Another successful program was initiated by the crew of the U.S.S.L. Mendel Rivers, a submarine in the Portsmouth Naval Shipyards for overhaul. The crew has volunteered numerous hours in our schools working with students in tutoring, career exploration, and many other valuable areas. Students have benefited from the enthusiasm of the younger crew members, many of whom are recently out of school, as well as the experienced senior officers and crew. The efforts of these servicemen are greatly appreciated by staff and students alike.

SCHOOL BOARD — CITY OF ROCHESTER
July 1, 1990 - June 30, 1991

WARD ONE — Richard Bickford, Frank D. Callaghan
WARD TWO — Stanley Kalishman, Caroline McCarley
WARD THREE — Thomas L. Hutchinson, Richard Sliwoski
WARD FOUR — Raymond A. Lundborn, Mary Lou Asbell (resigned 3/14/91), Robbie Parsons (5/7/91)
WARD FIVE — Fred Chisholm, Bruce Lindsay
AT LARGE — Bert D. George, Scott Wensley, Donna Cochrane

STANDING COMMITTEE
July 1, 1990 - December 31, 1990

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE — Raymond Lundborn, Chair; Donna Cochrane, Stanley Kalishman
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE — Stanley Kalishman, Chair; Thomas Hutchinson, Mary Lou Asbell
BUILDING COMMITTEE — Richard Bickford, Chair; Frank Callaghan, Fred Chisholm
SPECIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE — Scott Wensley, Chair; Bert George, Richard Sliwoski
FINANCE COMMITTEE — Caroline McCarley, Chair; Raymond Lundborn, Richard Bickford, Scott Wensley, Stanley Kalishman, Mary Lou Asbell
STANDING COMMITTEES  

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE — Raymond Lundborn, Chair; Donna Cochrane, Fred Chisholm
INSTRUCTION COMMITTEE — Stanley Kalishman, Chair; Thomas Hutchinson, Mary Lou Asbell
BUILDING COMMITTEE — Richard Bickford, Chair; Frank Callaghan, Fred Chisholm
SPECIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE — Scott Wensley, Chair; Richard Sliwoski, Bert George
FINANCE COMMITTEE — Caroline McCarley, Chair; Scott Wensley, Raymond Lundborn, Stanley Kalishman, Richard Bickford, Mary Lou Asbell

SPECIAL COMMITTEES  
July 1, 1990 - December 31, 1990

DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE — Raymond Lundborn, Chair; Donna Cochrane, Bruce Lindsay
STAFF DEVELOPMENT — Donna Cochrane
LONG—RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE — Thomas Hutchinson, Chair; Frank Callaghan, Caroline McCarley, Mary Lou Asbell
POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE — Richard Sliwoski, Chair; Fred Chisholm, Bruce Lindsay
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (Gonic Addition) — Bert George, Chair; Thomas Hutchinson, Caroline McCarley, Richard Sliwoski, Scott Wensley
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (Vocational Addition) — Mary Lou Asbell, Chair; Stanley Kalishman, Bert George, Raymond Lundborn, Caroline McCarley
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (McClelland) — Richard Bickford, Chair; Frank Callaghan, Richard Sliwoski, Caroline McCarley, Raymond Lundborn, Scott Wensley
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (Middle School) — Richard Bickford, Chair; Fred Chisholm, Donna Cochrane, Raymond Lundborn, Caroline McCarley, Richard Sliwoski
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (Renovations) — Thomas Hutchinson, Stanley Kalishman, Bruce Lindsay, Caroline McCarley, Bert George

SPECIAL COMMITTEES  

DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE — Raymond Lundborn, Chair; Bruce Lindsay, Donna Cochrane
STAFF DEVELOPMENT — Donna Cochrane
RECREATION COMMITTEE — Fred Chisholm
LONG-RANGE PLANNING — Thomas Hutchinson, Chair; Mary Lou Asbell, Frank Callaghan, Richard Sliwoski, Caroline McCarley
POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE — Fred Chisholm, Chair; Mary Lou Asbell, Thomas Hutchinson
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (Vocational Addition) — Mary Lou Asbell, Caroline McCarley, Raymond Lundborn, Stanley Kalishman, Bert George
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (McClelland Addition) — Richard Bickford, Chair; Scott Wensley, Richard Sliwoski, Caroline McCarley, Frank Callaghan, Raymond Lundborn
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (Middle School) — Richard Bickford, Chair; Caroline McCarley, Richard Sliwoski, Raymond Lundborn, Fred Chisholm, Donna Cochrane
JOINT BUILDING COMMITTEE (High School Renovations) — Caroline McCarley, Chair; Bruce Lindsay, Stanley Kalishman, Thomas Hutchinson, Bert George

PERSONNEL

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS — Dr. Raymond Yeagley
ASSISTANT SUPT. OF SCHOOLS — Dr. George S. Reid
DIRECTOR OF PUPIL SERVICES — Diane Lurvey (thru Oct., 1990)
William Miller (Feb., 1991)
TRANSPORTATION COORDINATOR — Dr. George S. Reid
DIRECTOR OF BUILDINGS,
   GROUNDS, AND MAINTENANCE — John Laverdiere
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF BUILDINGS,
   GROUNDS AND MAINTENANCE — Adelard (Joe) Breton
DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL LUNCH — Sherilyn Baribeault
SCHOOL NURSES — Jacqueline Brennan, RN; Sharon Croft, RN; Joanne Clark, RN; Ann Moynihan, RN; Judy Boardman, RN
SUPERVISING PRINCIPALS — Robert Bouchard - Spaulding High School; Paul Asbell - Spaulding Middle School; Michael Hopkins - Allen School; Sally Riley - Chamberlain Street School; Arlene Welch - New East Rochester School; Lynn Ritvo — McClelland School; Robert Rosenblatt - Gonic School

REPORT OF THE WELFARE DEPARTMENT 1990-91

The city initially budgeted $160,000.00 for direct assistance for fiscal year 1990-91. Due to extremely high demands for welfare the Welfare
Department was given a supplement of $110,000.00, making a total of $270,000.00 available for direct assistance. The Welfare Department also received a grant from McKinney Funds in the amount of $2,800.00. This was spent on first months rent and rent to stop evictions as well as payments for utilities to prevent disconnects.

During the year the Welfare Department provided direct assistance to 301 single persons and 312 families for a total of 613 cases. The average length of assistance per case was 44 days. 232 cases were one-time only assistance. Emergency temporary assistance was offered with every effort being made to assist recipients in reaching the goal of becoming independent of city assistance as soon as possible. Guidance was offered in doing job searches, locating housing, budgeting money and applying for assistance from other agencies where appropriate. This office has, again this year, seen a sharp increase in the numbers of people applying for assistance and the amount of funds expended. This increase is consistent with welfare increases throughout the state.

During the year welfare recipients worked a total of 15,462 hours on the city work program, working off $77,310.00 of assistance received. $19,405.23 was taken in reimbursements.

Expenditures for direct assistance were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>$ 7,873.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>6,038.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>210,667.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>7,142.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>12,439.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>614.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$247,049.89</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office expenditures were budgeted at $65,278.00. Total expenditures were $68,461.52.

I would like to express my thanks to the other two members of the Welfare Department - Judith Paradis, Social Worker, and Gail Bennett, Secretary. We have worked together this past year in a team effort with a goal of effectively administering to those in need in the most cost efficient manner possible.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane F. Hervey
Director of Welfare
FISCAL YEAR 1991 FINANCIAL REPORT

I am hereby submitting the City of Rochester's Audited Financial Statements for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1991. The most significant difference between fiscal year 1990 financial statements and fiscal year 1991 is the manner which the City's Fund Balance is being presented in FY91. For the first time, the Enterprise Fund's cumulative operating deficit is reflected in the General Fund's fund balance as a negative thereby correctly representing that fund's inability to meet its current obligations. As in past practice a substantial difference exists between the City's Fund Balance surplus of $859,778. and the more widely recognized Generally Accepted Accounting Principles Fund Balance deficit of $6,376,516. The Enterprise Fund cash shortage of $3,597,492. is included in that deficit.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Larochelle
Business Administrator
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

June 30, 1991

(With Independent Auditors' Report Thereon)
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INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

Honorable Mayor and Council
City of Rochester, New Hampshire

We have audited the accompanying general purpose financial statements of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, as of June 30, 1991, and for the year then ended. These general purpose financial statements are the responsibility of the City's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these general purpose financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the general purpose financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the general purpose financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall general purpose financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

The financial statements referred to above do not include the General Fixed Asset Group of Accounts, as required by generally accepted accounting principles.

In our opinion, except for the effects of the item referred to in the third paragraph above, the general purpose financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, as of June 30, 1991 and the results of its operations, and cash flows of its proprietary and similar trust fund types for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

As discussed in Note 16 to the financial statements, the City will be required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to construct a Wastewater Treatment Plant. The City's cost cannot presently be determined. Accordingly, no provision for any liability that may arise has been made in the accompanying financial statements.

MELANSON, GREENWOOD & COMPANY

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991
### CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

**Combined Balance Sheet - All Fund Types and Account Groups**

**June 30, 1991**

#### Governmental Fund Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS AND OTHER DEBITS</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Proprietary</th>
<th>Fiduciary</th>
<th>Account Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$1,627,464</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$122,126</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>10,007,816</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes receivable</td>
<td>2,639,367</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable</td>
<td>924,017</td>
<td>35,374</td>
<td>16,150</td>
<td>1,475,154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued interest receivable</td>
<td>24,162</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other funds</td>
<td>40,279</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,026,715</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to other funds</td>
<td>4,848,653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from other governments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43,894</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,116,637</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,729</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108,433</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>98,727</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>139,455</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments in fixed assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42,626,710</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount to be provided for retirement of general long-term debt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Assets and Other Debts**

| $20,213,282 | $110,967 | $12,040,069 | $40,448,589 | $180,728 | $1,750,360 | $11,750,379 | $121,064,611 |

#### LIABILITIES, EQUITY AND OTHER CREDITS

**Liabilities:**

| Accounts payable | $505,770 | $22,617 | $1,875,846 | $62,186 | - | - | $2,548,451 |
| Retainage payable | - | - | 1,011,328 | 40,179 | - | - | 1,051,507 |
| Other payables | 128,787 | - | - | - | - | - | 128,787 |
| Due to other funds | 12,026,715 | 40,279 | - | - | - | - | 12,066,994 |
| Advances from other funds | - | - | - | 4,848,643 | - | - | 4,848,643 |
| Accrued expenses | 1,291,881 | - | - | 495,877 | - | - | 1,787,758 |
| Prepaid taxes | 6,503,804 | - | - | 6,503,804 | - | - | - |
| Deferred revenue | 2,417,727 | - | 385,400 | - | - | - | 2,803,127 |
| Escrow deposit - arbitrage | 39,623 | - | - | - | - | - | 39,623 |
| General obligation bonds payable | - | - | 26,651,170 | - | - | - | 26,651,170 |
| **Total Liabilities** | $22,992,307 | 62,896 | 3,272,574 | 31,480,065 | - | - | $61,750,379 |

**Equity and Other Credits:**

| Contributed capital | - | - | - | 14,900,716 | - | - | 14,900,716 |
| Retained earnings | - | - | - | 87,808 | - | - | 87,808 |
| **Fund balances:** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Reserved for advances | 3,569,303 | - | - | - | - | - | 3,569,303 |
| Reserved for inventory | - | 30,729 | - | - | - | - | 30,729 |
| Reserved for endowments | - | - | - | 480,728 | - | - | 480,728 |
| Reserved for encumbrances | 28,189 | - | - | - | - | - | 28,189 |
| **Unreserved:** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Designated | $4,376,516 | 36,242 | 8,768,291 | - | - | - | 8,768,291 |
| Undesignated | ($2,772,026) | 47,671 | 8,768,291 | 41,998,524 | 280,728 | - | ($4,350,525) |
| **Total Equity and Other Credits** | ($2,772,026) | 47,671 | 8,768,291 | 41,998,524 | 280,728 | - | ($2,150,525) |

**Total Liabilities, Equity, and Other Credits**

| $20,213,282 | $110,967 | $12,040,069 | $40,448,589 | $180,728 | $1,750,360 | $11,750,379 | $121,064,611 |

See accompanying notes to financial statements.
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Changes in Fund Balances All Governmental Fund Types

For the Year Ended June 30, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Special Revenue Fund</th>
<th>Capital Project Fund</th>
<th>Totals (Memorandum Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$23,242,594</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$23,242,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental revenue</td>
<td>5,136,743</td>
<td>300,956</td>
<td>3,745,872</td>
<td>9,183,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues</td>
<td>845,754</td>
<td>839,828</td>
<td>10,025</td>
<td>1,695,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>29,225,091</td>
<td>1,140,784</td>
<td>3,755,897</td>
<td>34,121,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General government</td>
<td>4,128,189</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,128,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18,271,180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,271,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td>1,182,046</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,182,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1,650,002</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,650,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>822,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>822,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public welfare</td>
<td>319,540</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>319,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings</td>
<td>195,049</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>195,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>260,424</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance</td>
<td>149,312</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>149,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street and traffic lights</td>
<td>193,535</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>222,140</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatements</td>
<td>112,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School lunch program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>879,174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>879,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td>2,219,575</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,219,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,365,627</td>
<td>17,365,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247,209</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>29,726,387</td>
<td>1,126,383</td>
<td>17,365,627</td>
<td>48,218,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Financing Sources and Uses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond proceeds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,515,615</td>
<td>18,515,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Sources</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,515,615</td>
<td>18,515,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (deficiency) of revenues and other financing sources over expenditures and other uses</td>
<td>-501,296</td>
<td>14,401</td>
<td>4,905,885</td>
<td>4,418,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Equities, beginning</strong></td>
<td>(-2,277,728)</td>
<td>33,270</td>
<td>3,862,406</td>
<td>1,617,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Equities, ending</strong></td>
<td>(-2,779,024)</td>
<td>$47,671</td>
<td>$8,768,291</td>
<td>$6,036,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Other Financing Sources - Budget and Actual - General Fund

For the Year Ended June 30, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual (Budgetary Basis)</th>
<th>Variance (Favorable/Unfavorable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>$ 23,489,449</td>
<td>$ 23,376,073</td>
<td>$(113,376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>5,071,410</td>
<td>5,060,839</td>
<td>(10,571)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>1,291,279</td>
<td>1,524,797</td>
<td>233,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Financing Uses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues and Other Financing Sources</td>
<td>29,962,138</td>
<td>30,071,709</td>
<td>109,571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |              |                          |                                  |
| **Expenditures:**    |              |                          |                                  |
| Current:             |              |                          |                                  |
| General government   | 4,401,042    | 4,128,189                | 272,853                          |
| Public works         | 1,251,341    | 1,182,046                | 69,295                           |
| Education            | 18,111,102   | 18,097,289               | 13,813                           |
| Police               | 1,722,772    | 1,663,786                | 58,986                           |
| Fire                 | 823,450      | 822,949                  | 501                              |
| Public welfare       | 338,578      | 319,540                  | 19,038                           |
| Public buildings     | 196,408      | 195,049                  | 1,359                            |
| Library              | 260,957      | 260,424                  | 533                              |
| Ambulance            | 150,431      | 149,312                  | 1,119                            |
| Street and traffic lights | 202,000   | 193,535                  | 8,465                            |
| Recreation           | 213,529      | 195,365                  | 18,164                           |
| Abatements           | 44,970       | 112,446                  | (67,476)                         |
| Debt Service         | 2,245,558    | 2,219,575                | 25,983                           |
| Total Expenditures   | 29,962,138   | 29,539,505               | 422,633                          |

Excess of revenues and other sources over (under) expenditures $532,204 $532,204

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Combined Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Retained Earnings/Fund Balance - Proprietary Fund Types and Similar Trust Funds

June 30, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proprietary Fund Type</th>
<th>Fiduciary Fund Type</th>
<th>Totals (Memorandum Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>Non-Expendable Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$ 4,219,539</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,219,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and dividends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,678</td>
<td>38,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>102,079</td>
<td>17,082</td>
<td>119,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues</td>
<td>4,321,618</td>
<td>55,760</td>
<td>4,377,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>816,599</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>816,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and equipment</td>
<td>222,011</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>912,574</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>912,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>228,498</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>228,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>24,112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatements</td>
<td>11,089</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>172,271</td>
<td>29,196</td>
<td>201,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>2,387,154</td>
<td>29,196</td>
<td>2,416,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>1,934,464</td>
<td>26,564</td>
<td>1,961,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating Revenue</td>
<td>241,991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>241,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating (Expenses)</td>
<td>(1,909,529)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,909,529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>266,926</td>
<td>26,564</td>
<td>293,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation on assets acquired with contributed capital and municipal investment</td>
<td>321,494</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>321,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase In Retained Earnings/Fund Balance</td>
<td>588,420</td>
<td>26,564</td>
<td>614,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings/Fund Balance, July 1, 1990</td>
<td>(500,612)</td>
<td>454,164</td>
<td>(4,448)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings/Fund Balance, June 30, 1991</td>
<td>$87,808</td>
<td>$480,728</td>
<td>$568,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
Combined Statement of Cash Flows
Proprietary Fund Types and Similar Trust Funds
For the Year Ended June 30, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Enterprise</th>
<th>Non-Expendable</th>
<th>Totals (Memorandum Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>1,934,464</td>
<td>26,564</td>
<td>1,961,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiduciary</td>
<td>912,574</td>
<td>(16,918)</td>
<td>(16,918)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cash Flows From Operating Activities:
- Operating income (loss) $1,934,464
- Adjustments to reconcile net income to net cash
  - Depreciation 912,574
  - Loss on investments - (16,918)
- (Increase) Decrease in:
  - Accounts receivable 338,189
  - Due from other governments 411,525
  - Inventory 12,089
  - Prepaid expenses 3,254
- Increase (Decrease) in:
  - Accounts payable 144,959
  - Retainage payable 66,653
  - Customer deposits 10,848
  - Due to other funds 477,974
  - Accrued liabilities 49,533

Net Cash From Operating Activities 3,141,698

Cash Flows For Investing Activities:
- Purchase of investments - (171,128)
- Proceeds of sales and maturities - 135,929
- Other revenue 241,991

Net Cash Used For Investing Activities 241,991

Cash Flows For Capital and Related Financing Activities:
- Payment of bonds (1,357,716) - (1,357,716)
- Interest expense (1,909,529) - (1,909,529)
- Proceeds of bonds 615,900 - 615,900
- Purchase of fixed assets 928,809 - (928,809)

Net Cash Used For Financing Activities (3,580,154) - (3,580,154)

Cash Flows From Noncapital Financing Activities:
- Fixed assets acquired with contributed capital 196,465 - 196,465

Net Cash From Noncapital Financing Activities 196,465

Net decrease in cash - (25,553)

Cash and cash equivalents, July 1, 1990 200
Cash and cash equivalents, June 30, 1991 $200 $122,126 $122,326

The accompanying notes are an integral part of the financial statements.
1. Definition of Reporting Entity

The combined financial statements present information on organizations and activities of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire for which the Mayor and City Council have oversight responsibility. The criteria for inclusion of organizations and activities in the oversight entity's combined financial statements are: selection of governing authority designation of management, ability to significantly influence operations, accountability over fiscal matters, and scope of public service. The inclusion of organizations and activities in the City's combined financial statements does not affect their separate legal standing. The financial statements of the following entity is not included in this report, as it is administered by boards independent of the City Council and the City does not have the ability to significantly influence operations:

Rochester Housing Authority

2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

The accounting policies of the City of Rochester (the City) as reflected in the accompanying financial statements for the year ended June 30, 1991 conform to generally accepted accounting principles for local government units. The more significant accounting policies of the City are summarized below:

(A) Fund Accounting

For reporting purposes, the financial activities of the City are accounted for through the use of several funds and account groups. Each fund is a separate accounting entity with self-balancing accounts. The following types of funds and account groups are used by the City:

Governmental Fund Types

Governmental Funds are those through which most governmental functions of the City are financed. The acquisition, use, and balances of the City's expendable financial resources and the related liabilities (except those accounted for in proprietary funds) are accounted for through governmental funds. The measurement focus is based upon determination of changes in financial position, rather than upon net income determination. The following are the City's governmental fund types:
The General Fund - to account for all financial activities of the City, except those required to be accounted for in another fund. Most revenues and expenditures of a general governmental nature are accounted for in this fund.

Special Revenue Funds - to account for the proceeds of specific revenue sources (other than expendable trusts or for major capital projects) that are legally restricted to expenditure for special purposes.

Capital Projects Funds - transactions related to resources obtained and used for the acquisition, construction or improvement of major capital facilities are accounted for in Capital Project Funds. Such resources are derived principally from proceeds of general obligation bond issues and from federal and state grants.

Proprietary Fund Types

Proprietary Funds are used to account for the City's ongoing organizations and activities which are similar to those often found in the private sector. The measurement focus is upon determination of net income. The following is the City's proprietary fund type:

Enterprise Funds - Transactions related to the sewer and water departments are supported by user charges and accounted for in the Enterprise Funds.

Fiduciary Fund Type

Fiduciary Funds are used to account for assets held by the City in a trustee capacity. The City maintains the following Fiduciary Fund Type:

Nonexpendable Trust Funds - These funds are used to account for assets held by the City in a trustee capacity. The principal balance cannot be spent, however investment earning may be spent for intended purposes.

Account Group

General Long Term Debt Account Group - This account group is used to account for all long term obligations of the City except for debt issued through proprietary funds.
(B) **Basis of Accounting by Fund**

The basis of accounting used for each fund is as follows:

**Governmental Funds**

The modified accrual basis of accounting is applied in all governmental fund types. Accordingly, revenues are recorded when susceptible to accrual, that is both measurable and available to finance expenditures of the current period. Available means collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to be used to pay liabilities of the current period. For property taxes, the City considers available if received within 60 days after the close of the fiscal year. All other amounts not received during that period are deferred and recognized in future accounting periods. Expenditures, except for interest on long-term debt which is recorded when due, and vacation, sick and pension costs because these amounts are not expected to be relieved within the current accounting period, are recorded when the related fund liability is incurred.

In applying the susceptible to accrual concept to intergovernmental revenues, the legal and contractual requirements of the numerous individual programs are used as guidance. There are essentially two types of these revenues: (1) revenues recognized based upon the expenditures recorded and (2) revenues recognized at the time of receipt or earlier, if the susceptible to accrual criteria is met.

Licenses and permits, charges for services, fines and forfeits, and miscellaneous revenues (except investment earnings) are recorded as revenues when received in cash because they are generally not measureable until actually received. Investment earnings are recorded as earned since they are measurable and available.

**Proprietary, and Nonexpendable Trust Funds**

The accrual basis of accounting is used by proprietary and nonexpendable trust funds.

(C) **Encumbrances**

The City uses encumbrance accounting in its governmental funds as a method of recording commitments under purchase orders and contracts. Encumbrance accounting, under which purchase orders, contracts and other commitments for expenditure of funds are recorded to reserve that portion of the applicable appropriation, is employed in the governmental fund types as a significant aspect of budgetary control.

Uncumbered appropriations which are carried over to the ensuing fiscal year are also reported as encumbrances. Continuing appropriations represent amounts appropriated for specific programs or projects which were not completed during the fiscal year.

Encumbrances are reported as reservations of fund balances in the accompanying balance sheet because they do not constitute expenditures or liabilities. Encumbrances are combined with expenditures for budgetary comparison purposes.
(D) **Vacation and Sick Leave**

City employees are granted vacation and sick leave in varying amounts. Upon retirement, termination or death, certain employees are compensated for unused sick leave which is (subject to certain limitations) at their then current rates of pay. The cost of this unused sick leave which is expected to be paid from future financial resources, is not material.

(E) **Property, Plant and Equipment - Enterprise Funds**

Property, plant and equipment owned by the proprietary funds is stated at cost. Depreciation has been provided over the estimated useful lives using the straight-line method. The estimated useful lives are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Useful Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Services</td>
<td>25-50 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mains</td>
<td>40-100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3-25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tanks</td>
<td>100 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Lines and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumping Stations</td>
<td>50-75 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F) **Total Data**

The total data are the aggregate of the fund types and account groups. No consolidating or other eliminations were made in arriving at the totals thus, they do not represent consolidated information.

(G) **General Budget Policies**

The City legally adopts a formal budget for the general fund and enterprise funds. The budget is originally compiled from requests of the various City departments. These requests are scrutinized and amended by the Finance Committee, residents at a budgetary public hearing, and the Mayor and City Council. The final version of the budget is approved by the City Council.

The approved budget is subsequently reported to the State of New Hampshire on the statement of appropriation form in order to establish the current property tax rate.

The City cannot expend beyond the total annual appropriation. Each department has the authority to transfer budgetary items within their department, if necessary. In addition, the Council may transfer any unencumbered appropriation balance from one department to another. Unencumbered appropriations lapse at year-end.
Budgetary Data

Budgetary data is based upon accounting principles that differ from generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). Therefore, in addition to the GAAP basis financial statements, the results of operations of the general fund are presented in accordance with budgetary accounting principles to provide a meaningful comparison with budgetary data.

The City’s budget as presented in the Statement of Revenues, Expenditures and Other Financing Sources—Budget and Actual—General Fund was developed as follows:

Annual budget $ 29,825,757
Supplemental appropriations and budget transfers 136,381
$ 29,962,138

Several adjustments were made to the General Fund actual revenues and expenditures in order to conform with the budgetary basis of accounting. The following is a summary of the adjustments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revenues and other financing sources</th>
<th>Expenditures and other financing uses</th>
<th>Excess of revenues and other financing sources over (under) expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As reported on page 3</td>
<td>$ 29,225,091</td>
<td>$ 29,726,387</td>
<td>$( 501,296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize tax revenue on an accrual basis</td>
<td>736,618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>736,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse beginning of year appropriation carryforwards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>( 41,181)</td>
<td>41,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add end of year appropriation carryforwards</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,189</td>
<td>( 28,189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation of fund balance</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverse accrual of teacher’s salary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>( 1,221,075)</td>
<td>1,221,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year’s teacher’s salary accrual</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,047,185</td>
<td>(1,047,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As reported on page 4</td>
<td>$ 30,071,709</td>
<td>$ 29,539,505</td>
<td>$ 532,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Investments are valued at cost and consist of debt and equity securities.

Inventory is valued at cost, using the first-in, first-out (FIFO) valuation method.

3. Cash and Cash Equivalents

The carrying amount of the City's deposits with financial institutions was $1,750,360 and the bank balance was $2,841,201. The bank balance is categorized as follows:

Amount insured by the FDIC and FSLIC, or collateralized with securities held by the City in its name $ 200,000
Amount collateralized with securities held by the pledging financial institution's trust department in the City's name -
Uncollateralized (including $140,000 bank balance that is collateralized with securities held by the pledging financial institution's trust department but not in the name of the City) 2,641,201
Total bank balance $ 2,841,201

4. Investments

The City's investments are categorized as either (1) insured or registered or for which the securities are held by the government or its agent in the government's name, (2) uninsured and unregistered for which the securities are held by the broker's or dealer's trust department or agent in the government's name or (3) uninsured and unregistered for which the securities are held by the broker or dealer, or by its trust department or agent but not in the government's name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 200,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,828,574 $ 3,028,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government obligations</td>
<td>2,466,825</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,466,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase agreements</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,514,415</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,514,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,666,825</td>
<td>2,514,415</td>
<td>4,828,574</td>
<td>10,009,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust Funds:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate obligations</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,228</td>
<td>100,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government obligations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154,849</td>
<td>154,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,525</td>
<td>103,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,666,825</td>
<td>2,514,415</td>
<td>5,187,176</td>
<td>10,368,416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Property Tax**

The City bills property taxes semi-annually, in May and November. Property tax revenues are recognized in the fiscal year for which taxes have been levied to the extent that they become available, i.e., due or receivable within the current fiscal year and collected within the current period or within 60 days of year end.

Property taxes billed or collected in advance of the year for which they are levied, are recorded as a prepaid tax liability.

Property taxes are due by December 1. At the time of tax sale, in March of the next year, a lien is recorded on the property at the Register of Deeds. If the property taxes (redemptions) are not paid within two years of the tax sale date, the property is conveyed to the City by deed and subsequently sold at public sale.

**Taxes receivable at June 30, 1991 are comprised of:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unredeemed taxes:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levy of 1990</td>
<td>$1,907,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy of 1989</td>
<td>683,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>30,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,621,491</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Taxes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Taxes</td>
<td>17,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,639,367</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Due From Other Governments**

This account consists primarily of grants due from the state and federal government.

7. **Fixed Assets**

A summary of proprietary fund type property, plant, and equipment at June 30, 1991 follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Total Enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures and land</td>
<td>$7,166,218</td>
<td>$1,733,800</td>
<td>$8,900,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land improvements</td>
<td>609,705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>609,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mains, pump stations and sewer lines</td>
<td>10,499,511</td>
<td>12,110,544</td>
<td>22,610,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>2,764,160</td>
<td>332,732</td>
<td>3,096,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water treatment plant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,453,722</td>
<td>12,453,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>21,039,594</td>
<td>26,689,398</td>
<td>47,728,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less: accumulated depreciation</strong></td>
<td>(-3,104,859)</td>
<td>(-1,997,423)</td>
<td>(-5,102,282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,934,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,691,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,626,710</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Deferred Revenues
Deferred revenues of the General Fund are equal to the sum of all delinquent property and unredeemed taxes at June 30, 1991 less collections for the subsequent 60 days.

9. Long-Term Debt
The following is a summary of debt transactions of the City for the year ended June 30, 1991:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Governmental Funds</th>
<th>Enterprise Funds</th>
<th>Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1990</td>
<td>$25,442,048</td>
<td>$26,772,954</td>
<td>$52,215,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New issuances</td>
<td>18,515,615</td>
<td>615,900</td>
<td>19,131,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirements</td>
<td>(-2,227,284)</td>
<td>(-1,357,716)</td>
<td>(-3,585,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Debt</td>
<td>$41,730,379</td>
<td>$26,031,138</td>
<td>$67,761,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Bonds Payable
Bonds payable at June 30, 1991 are comprised of the following issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding Debt:</th>
<th>Final Maturity Date</th>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>Governmental Funds</th>
<th>Enterprise Funds</th>
<th>Balance at June 30, 1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year change bond #1</td>
<td>March 1991</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$625,946</td>
<td>$9,054</td>
<td>$635,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal year change bond #2</td>
<td>November 1997</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>$2,302,277</td>
<td>$22,723</td>
<td>$2,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School and Alien School Addition</td>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>2,310,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public buildings repairs</td>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #2</td>
<td>September 1994</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td>210,965</td>
<td>49,035</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #3</td>
<td>November 1999</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
<td>1,396,139</td>
<td>78,861</td>
<td>1,475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #4</td>
<td>November 1995</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>690,156</td>
<td>9,844</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #5</td>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>4,554,108</td>
<td>3,795,892</td>
<td>8,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #6</td>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>3,601,691</td>
<td>4,898,309</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #7</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>7,033,483</td>
<td>1,891,517</td>
<td>8,925,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital bond issue #8</td>
<td>December 1996</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>18,515,615</td>
<td>615,900</td>
<td>19,131,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution phase 1</td>
<td>December 1996</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste water treatment plant</td>
<td>July 2004</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer capital improvements</td>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bonds</td>
<td>November 2006</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,055,000</td>
<td>11,055,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Debt</td>
<td>$41,730,380</td>
<td>$26,031,135</td>
<td>$67,761,517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The annual requirements to amortize debt outstanding as of June 30, 1991 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Ending June 30</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$4,731,517</td>
<td>$4,811,366</td>
<td>$9,542,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$4,150,000</td>
<td>$4,443,831</td>
<td>$8,593,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$4,205,000</td>
<td>$4,136,406</td>
<td>$8,341,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$4,260,001</td>
<td>$3,826,593</td>
<td>$8,086,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$4,259,999</td>
<td>$3,533,627</td>
<td>$7,773,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2011</td>
<td>$46,155,000</td>
<td>$21,198,485</td>
<td>$67,353,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$67,761,517</td>
<td>$41,930,308</td>
<td>$109,691,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately $10,400,000 of principal and $1,230,000 of interest on this debt is being funded by contributions from the State of New Hampshire.

Local Debt Limit:

The maximum debt limit for the City under statute is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of</th>
<th>Net Debt Outstanding</th>
<th>State Assessed Value</th>
<th>Statutory Limit</th>
<th>Debt Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>$26,542,879</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>$79,115,175</td>
<td>$52,572,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>15,076,190</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>113,021,678</td>
<td>97,945,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>12,259,277</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>19,778,794</td>
<td>7,519,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53,878,346</td>
<td></td>
<td>211,915,647</td>
<td>158,037,301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Subject to Limitations:

Fiscal year change
- bonds: $2,960,000
- Sewer: $10,923,169
- $13,883,169
- $67,761,515

Overlapping Debt

The City's proportionate share of debt of other governmental units which provide services within the City's boundaries, and which must be borne by the resources of the City, is summarized below (unaudited amounts):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Entity</th>
<th>Total Principal</th>
<th>City's Percent</th>
<th>City's Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strafford County</td>
<td>$3,090,000</td>
<td>22.77%</td>
<td>$703,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This liability is not reported in the accompanying financial statements.
D. Bonds Authorized and Unissued

Long term debt authorizations voted by the City Council which have not been issued or rescinded as of June 30, 1991 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Authorized</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>High School Renovations</td>
<td>$ 400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>Downtown Parking</td>
<td>251,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>Downtown Parking</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1987</td>
<td>Library Land and Parking</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1988</td>
<td>Waste Water Treatment</td>
<td>448,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plant Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,419,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Contributed Capital

Contributed capital consists of funding provided for sewer and water facility construction from state and municipal sources. Changes in contributed capital for the year ended June 30, 1991 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributed capital, July 1, 1990</td>
<td>$ 841,825</td>
<td>$14,188,856</td>
<td>$15,030,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>23,084</td>
<td>168,445</td>
<td>191,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation of assets acquired with contributions (33,446)</td>
<td>(288,048)</td>
<td>(321,494)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed capital, June 30, 1991</td>
<td>$ 831,463</td>
<td>$14,069,253</td>
<td>$14,900,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Reserved For Advances

This represents the portion of the advance to other funds in the general fund not considered to be repaid within the next year.

12. Fund Equity Reserved For Endowments

This represents the principal of the nonexpendable trust fund investments. The balance cannot be spent for any purpose; however, it may be invested and the earnings may be spent.

13. Fund Balances Reserved For Encumbrances

Fund balances reserved for encumbrances are reserved for the following purposes as of June 30, 1991 for the General Fund:

Police - Drug Abuse Programs | $ 28,189
14. Segment Information For Enterprise Funds

The City maintains Enterprise Funds which provide water and sewer services. Segment information for the year ended June 30, 1991 follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$1,858,719</td>
<td>$2,360,820</td>
<td>$4,219,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>79,165</td>
<td>22,914</td>
<td>102,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues</td>
<td>1,937,884</td>
<td>2,383,734</td>
<td>4,321,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>293,369</td>
<td>523,230</td>
<td>816,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and equipment</td>
<td>46,193</td>
<td>175,818</td>
<td>222,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>444,140</td>
<td>468,434</td>
<td>912,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>177,008</td>
<td>51,490</td>
<td>228,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>24,112</td>
<td>24,112</td>
<td>48,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abatement</td>
<td>5,077</td>
<td>6,012</td>
<td>11,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>78,848</td>
<td>93,423</td>
<td>172,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>1,044,635</td>
<td>1,342,519</td>
<td>2,387,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>893,249</td>
<td>1,041,215</td>
<td>1,934,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating Revenue</td>
<td>212,094</td>
<td>29,897</td>
<td>241,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating (Expense)</td>
<td>(817,291)</td>
<td>(1,092,237)</td>
<td>(1,909,529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Loss)</td>
<td>288,052</td>
<td>(21,126)</td>
<td>266,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation on assets acquired with contribution capital and municipal investment</td>
<td>288,048</td>
<td>33,446</td>
<td>321,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase in Retained Earnings</td>
<td>576,100</td>
<td>12,320</td>
<td>588,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings, July 1, 1990</td>
<td>($1,063,400)</td>
<td>562,788</td>
<td>($500,612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained Earnings, June 30, 1991</td>
<td>($487,300)</td>
<td>$575,108</td>
<td>$87,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Segment Information:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current capital contributions</td>
<td>$168,445</td>
<td>$23,084</td>
<td>$191,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed asset additions</td>
<td>869,043</td>
<td>59,766</td>
<td>923,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net working capital</td>
<td>($2,863,719)</td>
<td>($2,105,771)</td>
<td>($4,969,490)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Equity</td>
<td>13,581,953</td>
<td>1,406,571</td>
<td>14,988,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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15. Individual Fund Receivables/Payables

The City maintains several self-balancing funds; however, most transactions flow through the General Fund. In order to obtain accountability for each fund, interfund receivable and payable accounts must be utilized. The following is an analysis of the June 30, 1991 balances in interfund receivable and payable accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Due From Other Funds</th>
<th>Due to Other Funds</th>
<th>Advances to Other Funds</th>
<th>Advances From Other Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>$40,279</td>
<td>$12,024,715</td>
<td>$4,848,653</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Revenue Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,575</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Project</td>
<td>12,024,715</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,187,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,661,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,064,994</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,064,994</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,848,653</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,848,653</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Commitments and Contingencies

The City will be required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to increase the effluent limitations to more stringent standards than currently achieved. The cost of constructing such a treatment facilities has not been determined. Accordingly, no provision for any liability that may arise has been made in the financial statements.

There are numerous other cases pending in courts where the City of Rochester is a defendant. In the opinion of the City none of the pending litigation is likely to result, either individually or in the aggregate, in final judgments against the City that would materially effect its financial position.

16. Defined Benefit Pension Plan

All full time employees of the City participate in the New Hampshire Retirement System, which is a contributory, cost sharing multiple employer Public Employee Retirement System. The City's payroll for employees covered by the System for the year ended June 30, 1991 was $14,115,084, total City payroll for the year was $15,440,108. The plan provides disability, death and retirement service and vested benefits to members and beneficiaries. The New Hampshire Retirement System is divided into two groups: Group I - employees and teachers, Group II - firefighters and police officers. The system's benefit retirement income for Group I members is integrated with social security coverage. Group II members are exempt from participation in social security.

Members with ten or more years of credited service who terminate before qualifying for a retirement allowance are vested in a pro-rated pension at the normal retirement age. The benefit provisions are established by statute.
The Plan is an actuarial reserve system financed by contributions from the member, the state and local employers and investment experience. By statute, Group I members (employees and teachers) contribute 5.0% of gross earnings. Group II members (firefighters and police officers) contribute 9.3% of gross earnings. Contributions required to cover that amount of cost not met by the members' contributions is determined annually by the System's actuary. The state funds 35% of the employer cost for teachers, firefighters, and police officers employed by political subdivisions. The State does not participate in funding the employer cost of other political subdivision employees.

For fiscal year ended June 30, 1991, total employer rates were 2.02% of member gross earnings on behalf of nonteacher Group I members; 1.37% on behalf of teachers of which .89% was paid by the direct employer and .48% by the State; 12.65% on behalf of firefighters of which 8.22% was paid by the direct employer and 4.43% by the State; and 10.22% on behalf of police officers of which 6.64% was paid by the direct employer and 3.58% by the State.

The most recent amount of the actuarially determined contribution requirement for 1991 was $304,099 which represents 2.15% of total covered payroll for the year. The total actuarially determined contribution requirements for all member entities is not available.

The pension benefit obligation which is the actuarial present value of credited projected benefits, is a standardized disclosure measure of the present value of pension benefits adjusted for the effects of projected salary increase and any step-rate benefits estimated to be payable in the future as a result of employee service to date. The most recent valuation of the total pension benefit obligation for the New Hampshire Retirement System at June 30, 1990 was $1,471,877,286. Net assets available for these benefits were approximately $1,600,000,000.

Trend information gives an indication of the progress made in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due. Generally accepted accounting principles require the disclosure of certain trend information for ten years in the Public - Employee Retirement System's financial statements. The financial statements of the New Hampshire Retirement System for the year ended June 30, 1991 include the required trend information for 1988, 1989 and 1990 since those are the only years for which it is available.

18. Cash and Investment Authorization

The City is authorized by State statutes to invest excess funds "in obligations of the U.S. Government, in savings bank deposits of banks incorporated under laws of the State of New Hampshire or in certificates of deposits of banks incorporated under the laws of the State of New Hampshire or in national banks located within the State or the State of Massachusetts".
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Under New Hampshire law the trustees of trust funds may invest:

"Only by deposit in some savings bank or in the savings department of national bank or trust company in this state, or in shares of any building and loan association or co-operative bank, incorporated and doing business under the laws of this state, or in the shares of any federal savings and loan association, located and doing business in this state, or in bonds, notes or other obligations of the United States government, or in state, county, town, city, school district, water and sewer district bonds and the notes of towns or cities in this state; and such stocks and bonds as are legal for investment by New Hampshire savings banks and when so invested, the trustees shall not be liable for the loss thereof; and in any common trust fund established by the New Hampshire Charitable Fund in accordance with RSA 292:23."

The trustees are also required to report annually to the State attorney general any securities retained under the provisions of the statute. All of the investments are uninsured and unregistered with the securities held by the bank in its trust department.

12. Fund Deficit

The deficit reported in the unreserved fund balance in the general fund results from the City's policies raising tax revenue on the budgetary basis and deferring the recognition of teacher's summer salaries until payment which differ from generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). The following is a reconciliation of the City's unreserved fund balance as reported under generally accepted accounting principles and the City's budgetary basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved Fund Balance - GAAP-Basis</td>
<td>$(6,376,516)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred tax revenue</td>
<td>2,417,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued teachers salaries</td>
<td>1,221,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation of advance to other fund</td>
<td>3,597,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreserved Fund Balance-Budgetary-Basis</td>
<td>$859,778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the City of Rochester, New Hampshire
City of Rochester, New Hampshire

We have audited the general purpose financial statements of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire for the year ended June 30, 1991, and have issued our report thereon dated October 18, 1991. These general purpose financial statements are the responsibility of the City's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these general purpose financial statements based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the general purpose financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit in accordance with these standards includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the general purpose financial statements. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

The information in the Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance appearing on page 22 is presented for purposes of additional analysis and is not a required part of the general purpose financial statements. The information in this schedule has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the general purpose financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the general purpose financial statements taken as a whole.

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991

[Signature]

[Company]

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE
Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance
For the Year Ended June 30, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Grantor/Program Title</th>
<th>CFDA Number</th>
<th>Federal Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Housing and Urban Development Direct Programs:</td>
<td>14.218</td>
<td>$247,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>14.218</td>
<td>$247,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Urban Development</td>
<td>14.218</td>
<td>247,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Agriculture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed Through N.H. Department Of Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National School Lunch</td>
<td>10.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodities</td>
<td>10.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>291,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passed Through The N.H. Department Of Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIA Chapter 1</td>
<td>84.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECIA Chapter 2</td>
<td>84.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>84.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education-Basic Grants</td>
<td>84.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>94.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.L. 874</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Passed Through The N.H. Department Of Education</td>
<td>511,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Financial Assistance</td>
<td>$1,050,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Independent Auditors' report on schedule of federal financial assistance.
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL
STRUCTURE RELATED MATTERS NOTED IN A FINANCIAL
STATEMENT AUDIT CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE
WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

To the City Council
City of Rochester, New Hampshire

We have audited the financial statement of the City of Rochester for the
year ended June 30, 1991, and have issued our report thereon dated October

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing
standards and Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller
General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and
perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the
financial statements are free of material misstatement. In planning and
performing our audit of the financial statements of City of Rochester, New
Hampshire for the year ended June 30, 1991, we considered its internal
control structure in order to determine our auditing procedures for the
purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements and not to
provide assurance on the internal control structure.

The management of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire is responsible for
establishing and maintaining an internal control structure. In fulfilling
this responsibility, estimates and judgements by management are required to
assess the expected benefits and related costs of internal control
structure policies and procedures. The objectives of an internal control
structure are to provide management with reasonable, but not absolute,
assurance that assets are safeguarded against loss from unauthorized use or
disposition, and that transactions are executed in accordance with
management’s authorization and recorded properly to permit the preparation
of financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting
principles. Because of inherent limitations in any internal control
structure, errors or irregularities may nevertheless occur and not be
detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of the structure to future
periods is subject to the risk that procedures may become inadequate
because of changes in conditions or that the effectiveness of the design
and operation of policies and procedures may deteriorate.

For the purpose of this report, we have classified the significant internal
control structure policies and procedures in the following categories:

. Treasury / financing
. Revenues / receipts
. Purchases / disbursements
. External financial reporting

For all of the control categories listed above, we obtained an
understanding of the design of relevant policies and procedures and whether
they have been placed in operation, and we assessed control risk.
Our consideration of the internal control structure would not necessarily
disclose all matters in the internal control structure that might be
material weaknesses under standards established by the American Institute
of Certified Public Accountants. A material weakness is a reportable
condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the specific
internal control structure elements does not reduce to a relatively low
level the risk that errors or irregularities in amounts that would be
material in relation to the financial statements being audited may occur
and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal
course of performing their assigned functions. We noted no matters
involving the internal control structure and its operation that we consider
to be material weaknesses as defined above.

However, we noted certain matters involving the internal controls structure
and its operation that we have reported to the management of the City of

This report is intended for the information of the management and City
Council. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of
this report, which is a matter of public record.

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991
To the City Council
City of Rochester, New Hampshire

We have audited the general purpose financial statements of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire for the year ended June 30, 1991, and have issued our report thereon dated October 18, 1991. As part of our audit, we made a study and evaluation of the internal control systems, including applicable internal administrative controls, used in administering federal financial assistance programs to the extent we considered necessary to evaluate the systems as required by generally accepted auditing standards, Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Single Audit Act of 1984, and the provisions of OMB Circular A-128, "Audits of State and Local Governments". For the purpose of this report, we have classified the significant internal accounting and administrative controls used in administering federal financial assistance programs in the following categories:

ACCOUNTING CONTROLS:
- Treasury / financing
- Revenues / receipts
- Purchases / disbursements
- External financial reporting

ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROLS OVER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS
- Political activity
- Davis-Bacon Act
- Civil rights
- Cash management
- Relocation assistance and real property acquisition
- Federal financial reports
- Allowable Costs/Cost Principles
- Drug-Free Workplace Act
- Administrative Requirements

SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS
- Types of service
- Eligibility
- Matching level of effort
- Reporting
- Cost allocation
- Special requirements
The management of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal control systems used in administering federal financial assistance programs. In fulfilling that responsibility, estimates and judgments by management are required to assess the expected benefits and related costs of control procedures. The objectives of internal control systems used in administering federal financial assistance programs are to provide management with reasonable, but not absolute, assurance that, with respect to federal financial assistance programs, resource use is consistent with laws, regulations, and policies; resources are safeguarded against waste, loss, and misuse; and reliable data are obtained, maintained, and fairly disclosed in reports.

Because of inherent limitations in any system of internal accounting and administrative controls used in administering federal financial assistance programs, errors or irregularities may nevertheless occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of the systems to future periods is subject to the risk that procedures may become inadequate because of changes in conditions or that the degree of compliance with the procedures may deteriorate.

Our study included all of the applicable control categories listed in the first paragraph. During the year ended June 30, 1991, the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, had no major federal financial assistance programs and expended 69% of its total federal financial assistance under the following nonmajor federal financial assistance programs:

- Chapter I and
- National School Lunch
- Community Development Block Grant

With respect to internal control systems used in administering these nonmajor federal financial assistance programs, our study and evaluation included considering the types of errors and irregularities that could occur, determining the internal control procedures that should prevent or detect such errors and irregularities, determining whether the necessary procedures are prescribed and are being followed satisfactorily, and evaluating any weaknesses.

With respect to the internal control systems used solely in administering the other nonmajor federal financial assistance programs of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, our study and evaluation was limited to a preliminary review of the systems to obtain an understanding of the control environment and the flow of transactions through the accounting system. Our study and evaluation of the internal control systems used solely in administering these nonmajor federal financial assistance programs of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire did not extend beyond this preliminary review phase.

Our study and evaluation was more limited than would be necessary to express an opinion on the internal control systems used in administering the federal financial assistance programs of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the internal control systems used in administering the federal financial assistance programs of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire.
Also, our audit, made in accordance with the standards mentioned in the first paragraph, would not necessarily disclose material weaknesses in the internal control system, for which our study and evaluation was limited to a preliminary review of the systems, as discussed in the fifth paragraph of this report.

However, our study and evaluation and our audit disclosed no condition that we believe to be a material weakness in relation to a federal financial assistance programs of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire.

This report is intended solely for the use of management and applicable federal agencies and should not be used for any other purpose. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which, upon acceptance by the City of Rochester, New Hampshire, is a matter of public record.

Nashua, Greenwood + Company

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS ISSUED BY THE GAO

To the City Council
City of Rochester, New Hampshire

We have audited the financial statements of the City of Rochester, New Hampshire as of and for the year ended June 30, 1991, and have issued our report thereon dated October 18, 1991.

We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement.

Compliance with laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to the City of Rochester, New Hampshire is the responsibility of the City's management. As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement, we performed tests of the City of Rochester's compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants. However, it should be noted that our objective was not to provide an opinion on overall compliance with such provisions.

The results of our tests indicate that, with respect to the items tested, the City of Rochester, New Hampshire complied, in all material respects, with the provisions referred to in the preceding paragraph. With respect to items not tested, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that City of Rochester, New Hampshire had not complied, in all material respects, with those provisions.

This report is intended for the information of management and City Council. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO NONMAJOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

To the City Council
City of Rochester, New Hampshire

In connection with our audit of the 1991 financial statements of City of Rochester, New Hampshire, and with our study and evaluation of the City's internal control systems used to administer federal financial assistance programs, as required by Office of Management and Budget Circular A-128, "Audits of State and Local Governments", we selected certain transactions applicable to certain nonmajor federal financial assistance programs for the year ended June 30, 1991. As required by OMB Circular A-128, we have performed auditing procedures to test compliance with the requirements governing types of services allowed or unallowed; eligibility; and other requirements that are applicable to those transactions. Our procedures were substantially less in scope than an audit, the objective of which is the expression of an opinion on the City's compliance with these requirements. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion.

Material instances of noncompliance are failures to follow requirements, or violations of prohibitions, contained in statutes, regulations, contracts, or grants that cause us to conclude that the aggregation of the misstatements resulting from those failures or violations is material to the general purpose financial statements.

With respect to the items tested, the results of those procedures disclosed no material instances of noncompliance with the requirements listed in the preceding paragraph. With respect to items not tested, nothing came to our attention that caused us to believe that City of Rochester, New Hampshire, had not complied, in all material respects, with those requirements. However, the results of our procedures disclosed immaterial instances of noncompliance with those requirements, which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs.

This report is intended for the information of management and City Council. This restriction is not intended to limit the distribution of this report, which is a matter of public record.

McLean & Company

Nashua, New Hampshire
October 18, 1991
CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Schedule of Findings and Questioned Costs

For the Year Ended June 30, 1991

Environmental Protection Agency

1. The City has not identified the federal government’s ownership interest in the assets it funded. The situation still exists as of June 30, 1991. This finding was reported as part of the June 30, 1990, 1989, 1988 and 1987 audits.

2. The City has not designated an individual to oversee civil rights compliance as required by federal regulations.

The responsibilities of the tax department consist of collection of property taxes, the proper execution of Tax Liens on delinquent Tax Bills, the redemption of the Tax Liens through the Register of Deeds, on all Tax Liens paid. The proper notification on all properties going to Tax Deed, according to all laws, mandated by State Statue, R.S.A. 80:76. The Tax Warrant for 1990-1991 was $21,888,492.75, resulting in approximately 20,300 Tax Bills.

The collection of quarterly Water Bills, is also the responsibility of this department. We have approximately 5,400 Water Bills, processed quarterly.

This department is also responsible for the Registration and Title applications for all vehicles in the City of Rochester. For the fiscal year we have registered approximately 26,407 vehicles. We have processed 4,547 Titles.

Comparison on the last ten years:

PROPERTY TAX
CARS
WATER
  1980-1981 - 9,500, processed a year, sent out twice a year
  Money collected $336,000.00
  No Sewer collected at this time
WATER & SEWER
  1990-1991 - 20,800, processed a year, sent out four times a year
  Money Collected $4,321,618.00

Our Office is very busy and a challenge every day. With the economy being slow, we are busier than ever, as more people are making partial payments on their bills. This results in the handling of the same accounts many times. So we are actually processing more paper work. This also results in more processing on the computer and more mail to handle.

I wish to express my thanks to my staff, who work well together and under great adversity. They are polite and courteous and render a service and assistance of every kind to the people of Rochester.

Respectfully submitted,
Marianne Douglas, Tax Collector
## ROCHESTER TAX RATES*
1981 through 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>68.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>29.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>30.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>28.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>27.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>37.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As determined by the Department of Revenue Administration, State of New Hampshire.