

**SPECIAL MEETING  
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN  
(Called by the Mayor)**

**April 8, 1996**

**6:30 PM**

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

Mayor Wieczorek called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Ald. Domaingue.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

Mayor Wieczorek advised that he was calling it a special meeting of the Board as an emergency session to try to discuss and he would need unanimous consent to do so because the Board was supposed to be meeting at the Committee on Finance noting he was doing so because of the fast moving events regarding CenterPlex notably things that had occurred Friday and this afternoon and they had to be meeting with them again tomorrow afternoon, so he wished to bring the Board up-to-date on what was happening which was the reason for deferring the Committee on Finance for a half hour or so until they could address this item.

The Clerk called the roll. There were twelve Aldermen present.

**Present:** Ald. Wihby, Elise, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Soucy, Shea, Domaingue, Pariseau, Cashin, Hirschmann  
Ald. Robert arrived late.

Mayor Wieczorek stated things were moving rather quickly noting there had been items in the paper of such and wanted to bring the Board up-to-date as to what was happening because some of the events had just taken place early this morning and afternoon and there were still some things they needed to prepare for tomorrow and asked Mr. Clougherty to bring everyone up-to-date as to where they were at.

Mr. Clougherty stated the legislation was being entertained in Concord noting it had passed the Senate and was in the House Economic Development Committee and there had been a hearing on the bill which was then referred to a sub-committee of Economic Development (Commerce). At the sub-committee meeting late last week there were a couple of significant items which were discussed with the sub-committee. First of all, the sub-committee unanimously voted that the CenterPlex project was a project of significant Statewide economic importance and thought there was support of the project and the

concept overall. There was a second vote by the sub-committee that they were unanimously supporting the idea of a binding referendum in the City of Manchester so that local taxpayers would have an opportunity to voice their concerns or support for the project. The third item that they discussed was the financing and how the project could be accomplished but what some of their concerns were with respect to what had been the approach to date. Those concerns were: first, how the debt would be treated by the credit rating agencies, would it be seen as direct debt or contingent debt of the State. Second of all, they were concerned about the guaranteeing mechanism in the bill and the perception that they were guaranteeing something for the City of Manchester that nobody else would get. In other words, if they went ahead with a guarantee of the bonds somehow Manchester would be likely to get its Rooms and Meals and somebody else wouldn't. They were also concerned about the State's debt ratio and how that would be considered which was a concern of the State Treasurer. After discussion, the committee stated they really needed to rethink the guarantee approach and they wished that the City would go back and meet with the Treasurer and see if there was some different tact that could be taken. At the same meeting, the Treasurer gave them something which was particularly important being that the credit rating agencies had determined that it would be a direct debt of the State because it was Rooms and Meals revenues and no matter how a guarantee were to be structured or how they would put in reserves, it would be perceived by those agencies noting they had some definitive rulings from them as direct debt. They had always been trying to structure the project as a contingent debt situation where the State would be guaranteeing something that the City would be issuing. What they then did was to talk to the Treasurer telling him to take the issues one-by-one and see if they couldn't do something that could benefit both sides and see if there was some area at the request of the committee to do something different. If it were to be treated as direct debt by the credit rating agencies, then why not treat it as direct debt right off the bat instead of trying to structure all of the different types of reserves and bond funds would the State be interested in issuing the bonds directly as direct general obligation of the State. If the State did so, then the need for a lot of the additional financing costs they've talked about would be reduced significantly. So, that was one issue - would the State look at the different concept if it was direct debt then you issue the debt for the public side of it and let's see what effect that would have. If the State were willing to do that, then the City would still, from the State's perspective have to pledge Rooms and Meals dollars to the extent that those are available going forward understanding that the State at any time could change that formula or change that tax. At the same time, they looked at the affordability concerns of the Treasurer and of the State and said what size bond issue can you issue for a project that would still guarantee or still provide for the regular, routine State projects, capital projects and not bump you over your debt ratios for credit rating purposes. What they've come back with after doing some numbers last week and over the weekend noting they had met again this morning was that it seemed as though the State could issue \$35 million in direct debt, still be able to do its regular program or capital projects and not exceed its debt limits which was a concern to the people in Concord as it

would be a concern down here. If they went with a \$35 million direct issuance because they wouldn't have to do a lot of the financing, roughly \$32 million would be available for direct project costs. The net result was that the debt service required for that type of an effort would then be \$2.6 million a year as opposed to what they'd been looking at which was about \$4.3 million a year. So, they'd cut back the amount of commitment which would have to be taken up by the Rooms and Meals dollars significantly. If they were to go forward with that type of proposal they would still want to see a 70/30 type of arrangement public/private, would still be City ownership of the facility, would still want private management of the facility and in that regard there was some discussion late this afternoon about the commission structure where currently in the law there was a commission made up of four members, a five-member commission with four appointed locally and one by the State. What they had talked about this afternoon was making it a 3-2 arrangement with three from the City and two from the State. If the project were cutback to get within their debt affordability constraints and to have them issue the direct debt they would still see the same level of private investment, they were fairly close to the project size which was originally contemplated by the consultant with the difference being about \$5 million; that the original consultant's dollars had money in there for land acquisition and had improvements to the facade if put in the elbow of that building down on Granite Street. If that approach went forward, the challenge to the City would be to try and do a project along the same scale but they would probably have to take a look at trying to maximize the federal and state money and if that weren't available then taking a look at putting it on existing City land in order to avoid perhaps the acquisition costs and instead of nestling it into an existing building they would probably be looking at something which was more of a free-standing structure. If the City were to go this route the other thing they would like to see is in the event that the project were to be tremendously successful and it could be structured in such a way that they were able to put aside money for the operations and the maintenance of the building that any excessive profits would go back into the project, it would be used to deal with debt service or to make improvements to the building which was not dissimilar to what they had structured the Airport. What the City would have at risk would be its Rooms and Meals dollars. If the City were to agree that it was something to pursue and it was put into the legislation, remember that once the legislation passes there was still no commitment for spending anything locally. They would still have to come back through the commission, work out a specific plan for a site and a building that would show you what the revenue streams were, and come to a deal. If the legislation passed it would allow to move in that direction. If you're not able to come up with something locally that doesn't meet requirements for taxes and everything else as a consideration then it dies. The Treasurer would not go out and issue bonds for a project which would not have the support locally. Conversely, if the City were to get to that point and see some legislation passed, get out and develop a project which was acceptable to the Board and the taxpayers given the referendum question then the State would still have to have Governor and Council approval for a bond issue as they did of all others. So, there was that control at the State

as well. What it tried to do was to address all of the concerns that were raised and to take into consideration the reality of the financial situation of the State. Clearly, the message they were hearing was that the State needed revenue and that the prospect of their continuing to see that ambitious Rooms and Meals money coming back to the State to the tune of four or five million was not likely. But, if they were able to reduce it or change it then they would still be within certain parameters for the \$2.5 million which seemed to be a more acceptable financing level for the State. So, at this point the State Treasurer, the committee this afternoon said if you're willing to pursue this path then have your bond counsels get together, make the necessary changes to the legislation, try and develop better numbers than what we've been able to put on the table simply because we've been involved in so many discussions we've not had the time to go back and pull out some of the numbers and that was where it was left today.

Ald. Elise stated she needed to have Mr. Clougherty reexplain it.

Mr. Clougherty stated in terms of what was being proposed is that instead of the City issuing bonds and then asking the State to guarantee that they would give the City a flow of funds to pay it, the State would issue the bonds directly and it would be their obligation. The City would, and because of that you avoid some of the financing necessities for reserves and don't have to issue as many bonds which meant that there was less debt service and the amount of money that needed to be pledged from the Rooms and Meals tax was less. The City would still, as part of it, have to pledge all of its Rooms and Meals at this point understanding that when the final deal was on the table everybody understood what was being pledged and had to evaluate it from their own concerns. But, at this point, that was what was being referred back to us. If you were, and again the size of the bond issue was \$35 million which was to get within the debt affordability ratios of the State in order to do that it was not the total amount that the City had requested originally, but it was an amount that could be absorbed in a project if you were not to put the building structurally in the elbow of something else or attached to another building but put it free-standing on land where there are no acquisition costs. It would be a challenging project but the perception was that it could be accomplished.

Ald. Soucy stated the difference would be about five million, the difference between what the original \$42 million proposal and how would it translate out into what the debt service difference would be because if they were bonding \$60 million they were looking at over a hundred million through the debt service payment and beyond and asked what would it look like 25 years out.

Mr. Clougherty replied it would be \$2.6 million a year for 25 years and unfortunately they did not have a lot of the pro formas as they were still working on them with bond counsel and would hope that they would have them prepared for tomorrow's meeting. In the original proposal from the City it had been stated that the project would have to be

\$42, but the actual cash you would need to do that would be \$39 which was the size of the bond issue and again if you issue \$39, you can invest that money so you don't have to issue the 442, so they were always looking at the \$39 million dollar range which was in Hunter's report. In this case, what the State was saying was that they were willing to issue \$35 million and because it's a direct obligation of the State, of that \$35 you'd probably have \$31-32 available, so it was a difference between the \$39. Included in the \$39 was acquisition costs and costs for improvements to that building if you put it in there. So, if you take those out and were to put a free-standing building from what they understood from architects and people they'd talked to you'd still have sufficient funding to do that as a free-standing element. The other side of it was the private dollars. Certainly, if the City were able to maximize more than what had been talked about on the private side then perhaps some of those dollars could be used to offset part of that gap and that would be what they were talking about.

Ald. Soucy stated when the commission would come up with a final deal asked what deal would the voters be voting on if there was going to be a final deal or what proposal would they be submitting to the voters if they hadn't finalized or did they intend to have everything finalized.

Mr. Clougherty replied that had always been somewhat of a dilemma because from their standpoint it had always been do the referendum when you have the actual final deal. But, on the other side if you needed to get the project initiated and get something started and you needed the referendum before the legislation was passed to show that there was a commitment locally then that was a broader issue and the question was a different one and the question was for example, would you do this if there is no tax impact. If the referendum passed and they said they didn't want a tax impact then certainly that would have to be built into any final deal and if they couldn't do it then it wouldn't get done. So, there were different parameters on it and it wasn't really a financial question as they had always been of the opinion that if you could get to that point where you got the deal that would be the best thing but you may not be able to get to that point until you do the referendum up front to see if there's a general interest and frame that question in such a way that it puts general parameters on how that final deal can be developed in terms of tax impact and in either event you're able to proceed and move forward.

Ald. Soucy stated in reference to the flow of Rooms and Meals noting the State was in pretty dire straights revenue wise today, next year they start out with their budget, they're having a real problem and they freeze Rooms and Meals where it is what then happens to this proposal. Without a State guarantee in place, with the City reimbursing the State and pledging the City's Rooms and Meals if at any point before they were to reach the \$2.6 what would happen if the State said we're sorry cities and towns we're giving you as much as we can, but we can't afford to give out more from this tax.

Mr. Clougherty replied it's general obligation debt of the State if's it issued before that time, it's their requirement, the State's requirement to pay off that debt, and they understand that taxes change, that they control the tax, the City doesn't and if they reduced it and were not able to provide revenue then that's a policy that they've made.

Ald. Soucy stated theoretically the City could make a couple of payments towards the debt and then the State would be on the hook for the next 23 years and picking up the balance of it under the proposal, there's no mechanism in there unlike the reserve funds or some of the other clauses in there.

Mr. Clougherty replied they would control that flow of funds, they control the Rooms and Meals tax, it's a tax that the State controls and if they were to change it in whole or in part or make any adjustments they'd make that at their own risk understanding that they've endorsed a Stateside economic development project for a certain amount of dollars.

Ald. Domaingue stated taking a little bit more optimistic approach and assuming that the State does find itself in a position to freeze that revenue asked are we talking about with this proposal the City of Manchester putting forth the same percentage of Meals and Room tax that they were talking about with their initial proposal.

Mr. Clougherty replied that was a two-part question. Number one, the likelihood of the State not addressing that flow of funds over the next few years was pretty remote, they really were in a revenue situation and whether they take it all or part thought was a likelihood. As far as what was on the table from the State standpoint the State had always seen all of the Rooms and Meals tax on the table because that was their tax and it certainly was within their rights to do it. From the City's side we've always seen just the increment and again even if it were worded the way it was for the legislation it really came down to what the final proposal was and what the final plan was. If the Board of Aldermen did not want to pledge any or all of the revenues that would be you're decision unless, of course, they've taken away everything that they give us.

Ald. Domaingue asked do I hear you telling the Board that the State can, if it finds itself in such a position, request that the City pledge not only the increment which was originally promised but also all of the other available revenues generated from Rooms and Meals.

Mr. Clougherty replied he thought the State would like to see that language in there so that it would be a consideration, but just because it was in the legislation did not bind this Board from pledging that noting they would have to look at what the State wanted on the table, what this Board was willing to put there but not commit to that because it goes back to the final proposal. If, for example, the legislation passes, you have an affirmative vote of a referendum and then go out and put in place a proposal we thought worked well,

but given the parameters of the referendum and didn't want to put that at risk and they felt it was important well, maybe that was a deal breaker and it didn't work, but the City still reserved the right to negotiate the pledge of its revenues once we knew what all was on the table and what the final plan would be.

Ald. Domaingue stated when the people go out to the referendum to vote asked will they have all of the pieces in place to be able to make the determination as to whether or not it was something that they would like to see happen or are they going to be making that determination based on the information they have at the time without seeing a final negotiated settlement in terms of funding.

Mr. Clougherty replied that's for you to determine; that was the issue or one of the issues. Certainly, it could go out in advance and lay out the legislation saying under this legislation this is what's available or you could try to get a more definitive deal which would take you a little bit further out in time, but again you don't get to ask that question if the legislation doesn't pass and the legislation did not pass in his opinion if you weren't willing to consider what the State was asking or look at it from their perspective somewhat.

Ald. Wihby stated we've always looked at it as a partnership with the State in one form or another and it was an economic tool and if they were to wipe away all of the Rooms and Meals money they would do that, they would still get their Rooms and Meals money but they would still recognize that by doing that they would still be on the note or the bond and would still have to be payable so they could still get some money out of it if they needed some, but yet they'd recognize that it was an economic tool and it was a chance they took noting it didn't benefit just Manchester, it benefited all of New Hampshire so they had to look at that when they do it and recognize it so if they change something they would know what that effect is and when they change it they will know what they're going to get out of it because they know what they're on the hook for and asked is that true.

Mr. Clougherty replied, yes and thought that the sub-committee had voted unanimously that it was an economic development project that they liked but before and when you say "they" you have to look at who is "they". At this point in time, it's the legislature looking at the enabling legislation and that was one part of the State which would say, okay within these parameters we think you should go out and try and pull together something that would be good for the City and the State. At that point in time, "they" becomes the Treasurer, their financial advisors and bond counsel and any other State people that might be involved, maybe DRED or whatever looking at the actual plan and what the size of it is, where it's going to be located, what the architectural fees are, engineering and everything else and that's more of a staff issue. If you cross all of those hurdles and those people feel, at the end, that you have a definitive program that works then it comes back

up after and it could pass muster with this Board then it still had to go up and "they" becomes at that point Governor and Council because at that point they're responsibility to protect the State is to make sure that this deal is something that is affordable and reasonable and they go through their response end. So, there's still the same players that have to be involved, there is still the checks and balances and hurdles that have to be passed over the life of this thing, it just is a different approach than the guarantee, we're going to a more direct approach. Now, our bond counsel and the State's bond counsel prefer this proposal to what we've been talking about before because it is from a marketing standpoint much cleaner. This is State debt, they've got this revenue, it's under their control and there may be some of these other private issues but the credit is really what they're pledging. So, it's a much cleaner approach for the credit rating people for issuance purpose.

Ald. Wihby stated it sounds like it's a win/win situation because you're getting the same size facility and it's costing us millions of dollars less, we're moving it and taking some land but as far as the size of the facility goes, we're still following a Hunter recommendation.

Mr. Clougherty stated it will not be without challenges. From the State's perspective you have to realize that they are in a very tight financial situation and for them to make a decision to allocate some funding for an economic development project at this time is not an easy decision for the State to make and that's really something that we've been aware of for a while. But, I think the willingness of this committee to be upfront and say the guarantee is not something we want to do, is there some other way to do it and their willingness to look at these other issues, the willingness of the Treasurer to sit down and give us a considerable amount of time over the last couple of days to structure something that meets her concerns thought was indicative of the fact that if there's some way when this is all said and done that they can get a bill that allows them to get to a table and really see what's out there for these private dollars and what the true costs would be and what the true sites are thought that was a much as they could hope for.

Ald. Shea asked how much do we now receive in Rooms and Meals tax, do you have a figure.

Mr. Clougherty replied it was \$812,492 with \$357,565 was a new increment. One of the things they had to get over initially with the group up there was the spread sheet and the numbers and the question of noting many of you may perhaps have been following the news which states the State revenues are off noted it did not mean that they were not growing. Last year the tax was about a hundred and seven and they used a projection of one hundred and sixteen with the budget being one hundred eighteen and some change. The projection was that they'd be off by about \$3 million from their project of \$118 and change which would bring them just about to the number they had talked about to Charlie

Connor about which was the right number that the legislative people were forecasting initially last year and thought we were in the ballpark and it was not a question of their challenging our numbers, but it really came down to can the State afford to give this magnitude of money to the cities and towns given its financial condition and how they go about changing that flow either taking it all away or saying okay we don't want to go to a 60/40 split as it is currently but maybe we go to 80/20 noting those were the things they were really wrestling with reiterating that the State was in a tough situation noting there were people working day and night trying to figure it out.

Ald. Shea stated assuming eight hundred and twelve thousand were returned asked what percentage of what amount of that would go towards the building of CenterPlex, in other words per year.

Mr. Clougherty replied that's this year, that amount grows to a million two. If the formula doesn't change, it goes to a million two, then a million six, two million one, then two million five, then three million, then three million four, so it keeps growing and the amount that would go depends on when the bonds were issues and what the structure of the debt service was.

Ald. Shea stated it was conceivable that all of that money could go.

Mr. Clougherty replied it was conceivable that the State would want to see that go. Once you'd know what the final deal was and how much you would have to issue for bonds and when you'd issue and bonds and what the prevailing rate were, you'd know what the flow was, you'd also have the flow of funds from that point under the current stream or under a revised stream if it had been revised and at that point then the State would have to say all right what do we want pledged and the City would have to make a determination about what it's willing to pledge and if you can't resolve that difference then the deal doesn't go forward.

Ald. Shea stated so any Rooms and Meals taxes that Bedford gets, that Nashua gets, that Concord gets would not be affected by this particular project and asked if any State law such as RSA 530-8 affect that at all.

Mr. Clougherty asked for clarification of the RSA.

Ald. Shea replied he had asked Tom to look it up as he had been lead to believe that that might have an impact on it.

Mr. Clougherty stated he would be happy to research the RSA and get a definitive answer on what it was noting he was drawing a blank now on exactly what it was.

Ald. Domaingue stated given the economic picture for the State noted they were being quite sensitive to the partnership with the City of Manchester and found that to be very refreshing and supportive, but wished to go back for a moment as she wished to understand as an Alderman that the initial proposal that had been mapped out talked about the new increment as being used to fund the bonding mechanism for the project which left a balance, judging from the two numbers given her of about \$454,000 which the City would have received and would have been returned to the City of Manchester. Should the State find it necessary to require Manchester to pay the full amount of the monies derived from it where would that \$454,000 have gone to the City of Manchester, what would the City have used it for and what projects might be affected if the State of New Hampshire decided they needed all that money to be able to fund that bonding.

Mr. Clougherty replied if the State of New Hampshire decided it wanted to take back all that money for whatever reason, they could do so. The City deposited it into the general fund but was not earmarked for any project in particular or specific, but merely part of the general fund. If the State wanted to put it on the table as part of the bill it didn't require the City to agree to that when you'd get to the final deal and again you'd be trying to put in place a mechanism which would allow for the process to move forward to a level where you could start to talk about some definitive decision-making.

Ald. Domaingue stated the answer to her question that the half million dollars or nearly half million dollars was, in fact, money which would have been returned to the general fund to pay for whatever the City of Manchester needed it for.

Mayor Wieczorek stated there should be some idea as to what they would want to be bringing back to the sub-committee tomorrow.

Mr. Clougherty stated from our standpoint we've put together a proposal, we've explained it, we understand what the State wants to do and it's not originally what we had envisioned but it was a compromise they'd like to see initiated to move to the next step and if the Board was willing to do that then they'd pursue it with bond counsel and would try to work out the details to get it to the next level.

Ald. Wihby moved to endorse the new concept. Ald. Robert duly seconded the motion.

Ald. Soucy asked hadn't you already proposed it to the Commerce Committee anyway.

Mayor Wieczorek replied there had been other things they needed to be back and get done and go back again tomorrow.

Ald. Domaingue asked that the motion be read.

Mayor Wiczorek replied the motion was to endorse the new concept, the downsizing dollar wise of the project.

Ald. Wihby stated the idea that the City was going to pledge the part we said we were never going to pledge noted the vote did not necessarily speak to that was what the City was willing to do.

Ald. Soucy replied it did as that was what the State was recommending.

Ald. Wihby stated just because the Board passed it and kept going it did not mean that when it came back to the City and the bottom line was that the City had to pledge that money noted they'd all been on record saying if it affected the tax rate they would not do it.

Ald. Soucy stated any of it would affect the tax rate in that you couldn't use the money to change the tax rate, if they were committing the money in way, they'd be affecting the tax rate.

Ald. Elise asked for the time table once again.

Mr. Clougherty stated they'd been asked to go back to the sub-committee tomorrow at three to see if it could be accomplished and if they could have the necessary changes by then noting there were two other changes also. One is where they would put in requirements dealing with competitive bidding and an ethics requirement under the Procurement Code and if they were to be put in and get it all accomplished language wise they wanted to see City representatives tomorrow at three o'clock noting the sub-committee had a deadline of Wednesday the 10th to get it to the floor indicating it was his understanding that if it passed the House on the floor it would then be referred to the Finance Committee where there would be further discussions with that group and if they were able to clear the Finance hurdle then because it had been changed in the House they would have to have a House Senate Committee of Conference and if they agreed it would go forward to both bodies having to agree with the Committee of Conference and then it would go to the Governor.

Ald. Wihby stated the Board had said they would only touch the increment and if more than the increment were touched the tax rate would be affected and if in fact they passed it tonight the Board was not saying to them that they were going forward with the project as it still had to come back to the Board noting the Board at a later date would decide whether or not they would want to change their mind and fund the whole thing or just take the increment or forget the whole project if there's no other way to go. So, a vote today ultimately will kill this thing any further if we vote against this today. If they let it

go, let the negotiations take place, have them come back to the Board later there was still a chance that if it was going to take more than the increment to vote it down.

Mr. Clougherty stated from a technical standpoint the money comes to the City, would go into the general fund as it always had and the Board still reserved the right ultimately not to do it if it so chose, but that was a consideration.

Ald. Elise commented that Mr. Clougherty had stated that at that particular time with the State going through their economic situation it was difficult for them to make a decision on that type of a bond, but what the City was going through right now with the budget and the City's economic and revenue situation and having to face right now raising fees for a lot of different things and raising taxes and the thought of having to commit all of the Rooms and Meals taxes was more difficult for the Board to make that decision right now without really thinking about it and evening deliberating and felt the Board was being asked a lot this evening and recommended that they have some time to think about it.

Mayor Wiczorek noted there was no time to think about it as the 10th was coming which was Wednesday.

Ald. Soucy stated the Committee would act regardless of what the Board did anyway.

Mayor Wiczorek stated he did not see anything wrong with moving it along at this point so they could continue to work their way through from the place they started noting they'd come a long way and with the things that the State was doing they'd also come a long way also.

Mr. Dastin stated they would not be unwilling to update the Aldermen tomorrow evening if that was what they wished.

Ald. Domaingue in addressing Mr. Dastin asked if the Board were to vote in the affirmative asked what message would he bring to the Committee tomorrow.

Mr. Dastin replied that the City of Manchester was prepared to go forward and engage in further discussions and that having committed nothing to the legislature in terms of what the Board was prepared to do noting that they had always maintained even 14 months ago that if it didn't make any sense at any point along the way either the Mayor would kill it, CenterPlex Committee would recommend to the Board to kill it or the Board would kill it, they merely needed more room to negotiate a little more and see where that would take them and it could end up to be a pretty good deal.

Ald. Wihby stated a voted this evening did not say that they were committing any additional funds.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Ald. Soucy duly recorded as abstaining.

There being no further business to come before the special meeting of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, on motion of Ald. Reiniger, duly seconded by Ald. Pariseau, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk