BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

December 15, 1998 **7:30 PM**

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

Mayor Wieczorek called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Pariseau.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

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

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Klock, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, Shea, O'Neil, Girard, Rivard, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann

Presentation to the recipient of the December Spirit of Manchester Award.

Mayor Wieczorek stated the Spirit of Manchester Award Committee recently convened and selected an organization to be honored in the month of December for outstanding service to the City of Manchester. The parameters of the award state that the recipient should "have contributed to the improvement of the quality of life in Manchester" performing acts that are clearly "above and beyond the call of duty". This month's winner is the Manchester Christmas Parade Committee.

This volunteer effort has staged this event for ten years. The first parade was run on a total budget of $3,500 and secured 30 entries. Since that time, the local fundraising has grown to approximately $6,000 and has attracted as many as 92 entries. The task is difficult to organize not only due to size of the event and constant concern about weather, but is also challenged with funding not available until late in the process. The volunteer committee is currently exploring creative ways to address future funding and is also reviewing feedback from this year's event to improve next year's parade.

The award and commemorative pins will be presented by Alderman Bill Cashin. Here to accept the award for the Committee is Mike Lopez, Georgina Regan, Robin Descouteaux and Tricia Piecuch. A special thanks to Mike who has served as parade Chairman for six of the ten years the parade has been held and served in other parade capacities during each of the other years and I ask the recipients to come forward and be recognized for their efforts.

Mr. Lopez stated I want to thank you very much. First of all, I'd like to thank all the help for this year's Christmas Parade especially the people who have given an hours time, two hours time, or eight hours time for the first year and especially a special thanks publicly to Dave Boutin who played a very, very important role in the Committee this year and hope that he remains with the Christmas Parade. I also want to thank all the sponsors who came forward to give the money to make us really good going into next year, we have two major sponsors. We have Fleet Bank and Merchants Motors who are major sponsors for next year's Christmas Parade and last I would like to say to you, you have only 16 more days if you want to take tax deductions for the 1999 Christmas Parade, please make a donation if you have some loose change. Thank you very much.

Mayor Wieczorek stated Mike could probably give you a number of organizations he's associated with to do the same thing because he's got a lot of that. But, the Christmas Parade has always been a little shaky every Christmas and toward the end it kind of seems to come together. Hopefully, Mike, there will be a long-term solution to the Christmas Parade, but a job well-done by you and your entire team.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Wieczorek advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

Ratify and Confirm Poll Conducted:

Approving a request of Jim Ballard, JC Penney for the distribution of discount coupons to City employees for one day only (Sunday, December 13th).

Approve Under Supervision of the Department of Highways:

B. Bell Atlantic petition #921925

Informational to be Received and Filed:

C. Minutes of meeting of MTA Commissioners held on October 27, 1998 and the Financial and Ridership Reports for the month of October 1998.

D. Copy of a communication from Lloyd Basinow to the Attorney General's Office regarding the proposed civic center and the State's authority to build by statute.

E. Communication from Ryann Healy a 5th grade student at Jewett Street School regarding support of the proposed civic center.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

H. Communication from Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department requesting that funds in the amount of $1,400.00 from Allied Domecq Retailing be accepted and placed in the FY99 cash account for the Fun-in-the-Sun Program.

I. Communication from Attorney Andrew Bauer on behalf of SNHS Management Corp. requesting that the City release the reversionary interest on property located at 214 Spruce Street.

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

J. Communication from David Jenkins, Moore Center, requesting the placement of agency signage on poles located at the corners of South Beech Street/Titus Avenue and Calef Road/Titus Avenue

K. Communication from Joel Gardner McKay, North Eastern Institute of Whole Health, Inc., requesting the placement of four (4) street signs within City limits as enclosed herein.

L. Communication from William Stergis seeking revision of the City ordinance relative to prohibiting scavengers going through garbage.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

M. Advising that it has reviewed and approved proposed Ordinance:

> "An Ordinance amending Chapter 35, Finance, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester, by increasing limits on Sec. 35.097, Small Purchases, under the provisions of the City Procurement Code."

and recommends same be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

N. Advising that it has reviewed and approved proposed Ordinance:

> "Amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Sections 111.45(C)(1), Amusement Device License and Fees, providing for an increase in license fees."

and recommends same be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

O. Recommending that the City participate in BlueCross BlueShield litigation against major tobacco companies to recoup health care costs, and that the City Solicitor be authorized to coordinate such activities.

P. Recommending that revised By-Laws of the Non-Affiliated Employees Sick Leave Bank be approved.

Q. Recommending that a request of the Health Officer to extend the work week of two sanitarians from 35 to 40 hours per week and establish a 14-hour per week public health specialist position through the EPA Child Health Champion Community Grant be granted and approved.

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

R. Recommending that certain regulations governing standing, stopping and parking be adopted and put into effect when duly advertised.

HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN O'NEIL, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN THIBAULT, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.

F. Communication from the Deputy Finance Officer inquiring of the Board's interest in pursuing an amendment to the State statutes (RSA 80:52-c) relative to accepting credit card payments for City services.

Alderman Shea stated I would just like to point out to the members of the Administration/Information Systems Committee that there is a sentence that he has included that bears watching on your part, if you would, and I will state as follows: "The loss in payment from the credit card company 'may'" and I repeat 'may' "be offset by the fact that the credit card payment would be received by the City faster than by processing a check." In essence, he indicated that if somebody were to pay $100 the city would receive back approximately $96 or $97. So, again, it's something for the Committee to consider when they do make a decision concerning whether to accept credit card payments in lieu of checks or cash, your Honor, and moved that Item F be referred to the Committee on Administration/ Information Systems. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

G. Communication from the Public Works Director informing the Board of on-going discussions regarding the CSO Program and seeking authorization to formally enter into negotiations with Alliance Resources and the Pichette's for the acquisition of environmentally significant land (Hackett Hill).

Alderman Shea stated in a recent newspaper release the Finance Officer stated that our general obligation funds would not increase because of this $58 million program and the question is how will this expense be bonded and this will be bonded through revenue funds; that is sewer rates will be increased for each household in Manchester...$10.00 per year for the next ten years and remain at that level and I assume that subsequent costs to complete this program whose

costs right now are unknown at this time but might be approximately $31 million more will also cause additional rate increases. So, that should be noted when we do decide to bond this particular issue; that it will increase the sewer rates on every household in Manchester and moved that Item G be referred to the Committee on Community Improvement. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mayor Wieczorek made the following nomination:

Highway Commission:
William F. Kelley to succeed himself, term to expire January 15, 2002.
Catherine A. Schneiderat to succeed herself, term to expire January 15, 2002.

As per rules of the Board, these nominations will layover until the next meeting of the Board.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I also have one other nomination I am making that does not require any Aldermanic approval that being the reappointment of George Copadis to succeed himself as a member of the Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority, term to expire December 31, 2003.

7. Confirmation of nominations to the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Commission, term to expire July 7, 2001.

Joseph Sullivan
Russell P. Ouellette
John Trisciani

Alderman Thibault stated before we get into these nominations, I wonder, I'd like to take the time of the Board and the Mayor before we take the vote. At this time, I have talked to Mr. Ouellette and I would like to withdraw his name from nomination and ask all of my people that were helping us with Mr. Ouellette to please vote for Mr. Sullivan. Thank you.

Alderman Pinard withdrew John Trisciani's name.

Alderman Girard moved that the Board confirm the nomination of Joseph Sullivan to the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Commission, term to expire July 7, 2001. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

8. Confirmation of the nomination of Raymond W. Provencher to succeed himself as a member of the Water Commission, term to expire January, 2002.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Raymond W. Provencher to succeed himself as a member of the Water Commission, term to expire January, 2002.

9. Confirmation of the nomination of Michael Lopez to fill the unexpired term of the late James J. St. Jean as a member of the Fire Commission, term to expire May 1, 1999.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Rivard, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Michael Lopez to fill the unexpired term of the late James J. St. Jean as a member of the Fire Commission, term to expire May 1, 1999.

OTHER BUSINESS

A report of Committee on Administration/Information Systems was presented recommending that the staff group working on cable franchise renewal negotiations be authorized to hire a consultant to advise and assist the City in its negotiations with MediaOne for the renewal of its cable franchise. The Committee further recommends that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen appropriate the sum of $20,000.00 to pay said consultant through the end of the present fiscal year and that the Finance Officer be directed to locate the $20,000.00 appropriated from among the various city accounts as he deems appropriate.

Alderman Thibault moved to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked when the phrase is made for the City Clerk to find resources from any means possible...

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Finance Officer.

Alderman Shea asked what does that really mean for him “to find”.

Mr. Clougherty replied what I’ve always interpreted it to mean is I’ll go back and look at the various accounts, see if there’s balances other than contingency. There is always contingency that would be the logical account that we’d look into, but depending on the nature of what’s happening here it might be something that’s a bond issue or is eligible for federal dollars. So, we’ll explore all of those. If contingency is the way it should be done then we would be in with a contingency resolution for this Board to act on at the next meeting.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

11. Communication from the Deputy Finance Officer inquiring of the Board's interest in pursuing legislation which would allow the City to issue bonds to finance the unfunded pension liability for the "Old" System.

Alderman Rivard moved to pursue the legislation. Alderman Wihby duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated, Mr. Sherman, I understand what you have here, I guess I just don't understand why you want to do this, why you would suggest the Board do this.

Mr. Sherman stated right now the "Old" pension system is considered debt on the City's books, the rating agencies...Wall Street...they all consider that debt. We've got the ability to bond that unfunded portion, set that aside in a trust fund and actually reduce the annual payments that the City would make going forward. The only reason you would do it would be to actually come up with a budgetary savings. If all you were doing were swapping equal payments, it wouldn't make any sense to do. But, because we can borrow at tax-exempt rates and then turn around and actually invest that at high rates we can get a little turn around there and reduce the budget that you have every year.

Alderman Girard stated so this amount of money then is going to be counted against the City's general fund bond obligations.

Mr. Sherman replied against our debt limit, yes. The way the legislation is written it would not be against the debt limit.

Alderman Shea stated I would like to ask would this be tax-exempt bonding or taxable bonding.

Mr. Sherman replied possibly taxable, but actually if I can call on my bond counsel who happens to be here tonight. Taxable, thank you. But, we still think that we can get...if you look at the taxable rates that we just got on the Airport versus what the treasury is getting on our investments we're still getting a premium there. But, again, what the legislation requires is at the point where we'd be to adopt a bond resolution, we would need a new actuarial, and we would have to come in and actually have those numbers in place to determine whether it was doable or not.

Alderman Shea asked could you explain again, would that be revenues...bonding or would that be a general obligation.

Mr. Sherman replied it would be general obligation.

Alderman Shea stated so that would be added to the tax rate, right.

Mr. Sherman stated the principle and interest would certainly be added to the tax rate, but the principle and interest would be less than you're currently budgeting for the "Old" pension system.

Alderman Cashin asked what's the cost to the bond $24 million.

Mr. Sherman replied right now the unfunded liability is about $23 million. Some of that though is for Water and some of it is for EPD, so they would actually be covering their own portion if they chose to partake in that. We've actually been in discussion with EPD that they may actually want to try to fund theirs out of cash rather than bond it, but you actually wouldn't fund the whole liability because you get that increment between the investments and the borrowing rates...you probably would come in with a lesser amount.

Alderman Cashin stated it would be somewhere in the vicinity of $23 million.

Mr. Sherman stated it probably would be in the $18-$19 million range by the time you went through the legislation and were actually ready to do anything.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

12. Communication from the Executive Director of the Manchester Employees' Contributory Retirement System on behalf of the Board of Trustees urging the Board to contact the Manchester Legislative Delegation relative to amendments made by the City to the Retirement System through Charter Amendment since 1979 are all invalid.

Alderman Thibault asked does this mean that everything that has been done in the last 20 years would revert back to the "Old" system.

Mayor Wieczorek replied it looks to me like anything from 19...not from the "Old" system, no because the "Old" system was changed in '74 and this was in '79, but apparently all of the things that have been done were done without proper authority.

Alderman Thibault stated so what they're doing here now is they're asking the legislative delegation to look into this and see if they can't come up with an answer to this problem.

Mayor Wieczorek replied yes, as a matter of fact, I spoke to the new Senate President Blaisdell who with Senator-elect D'Allesandro and Senator King are going to be working to get this legislation through for us as quickly as possible. Perhaps, before the end of January.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the request from the Executive Director of the Manchester Employees' Contributory Retirement System. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

13. Communication from the Chief of Police requesting a transfer of $25,401 from Contingency funds as a local match for the 1998 Local Law Enforcement Block Grant.

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to approve a transfer of $25,401 from Contingency funds as a local match for the 1998 Local Law Enforcement Block Grant.

Alderman Girard asked how much is left in contingency.

Mr. Sherman replied that is the first time we've hit it all way and we started with $125,000, so you're just under $100,000 now.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we had actually put a hold on this amount because we were sure they were going to get the grant.

Alderman Girard stated I remember that, I just wasn't sure if it had been used yet.

14. Bond Resolution:

> "Authorizing the Financing of the City's Share of Development Costs for a Civic Center through the Issuance of Bonds, Notes, Certificates of Participation or Other Forms of Indebtedness, Which Financing May Utilize a Lease/Lease-Back Financing Vehicle, in an Amount Not to Exceed Fifty Million Dollars ($50,000,000)."

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted that the bond resolution be read by title only, and it was so done.

Alderman Wihby moved that the bond resolution pass and be enrolled. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I may, your Honor, I'd just like to make some general comments. To start off with, these comments are scaled down and I'd like to thank the Sisters of the Precious Blood for that. Two weeks ago, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen voted to approve the Staples site. Tonight, we're being asked to approve the bonding of the project. There is no explanation to where these funds are going which...architects, consultant or consultants, commissions (and I got that from *The Union Leader*)...we've been given very little information unless we specifically asked for it. Most information I get from the newspaper. Over the summer I asked for information on how other cities have developed their civic center projects, I've asked for information on site selection, management companies, funding, etc. I'm still waiting for that information today. Several Aldermen have voiced concerns about parking, but I believe that as of today none of us have heard a response from either the MDC Civic Center Committee or City staff with some solutions. Two weeks ago, I asked if we had a developing game plan with

regards to the blocks that are adjacent to the site. As of today, I haven't heard from anyone. I believe that the MDC Civic Center Committee and the City staff aren't particularly concerned about my vote, therefore, aren't worried about my concerns with the project. Two weeks ago, the full Board had bond resolutions before us that hadn't passed the CIP Committee, how did that happen, more importantly why did it happen. We now have a very successful Airport, but never developed a plan for how we would get people in and out of the Airport. In the meantime, the residents of south Manchester paid for this lack of vision. The BMA didn't give the MDC Civic Center Committee nor City staff a rubber stamp for this project. We have a Subcommittee of this Board, let's use it. I ask that they please provide us with detailed information throughout the development of this project. I'm tired of getting my information in the newspaper. Sometimes I think that Mike Cousineau and Kathy Marchocki know more about the project than anyone else. Starting tomorrow let's develop a game plan with regards to parking in the area and let's start to develop a blueprint for the surrounding area. Let's do this project right. I'd still be interested in an explanation of the $2.5 million or so that we're being asked to approve, I'd like some explanation with regard to reading this in the paper, commissions for the luxury seats or luxury boxes, and the last issue I'd like to throw out is whether or not we could have any consideration with a job agreement to make sure that this project is built by local people. Thank you, your Honor.

Alderman Shea stated in the agreement there's a phrase called "lease/lease-back financing vehicles", could someone explain that to the Board what that means.

Mr. Clougherty stated I would like to introduce Rick Manley who's Bond Counsel for the City who designed the resolution and talk a little bit about the lease/lease-back and what option...

Mr. Manley stated the lease/lease-back arrangement is a fairly common financing technique used in the issuance of certificates of participation. Effectively what it is is a method for doing the financing on a revenue style basis. We have a resolution before you here this evening that talks about a number of different vehicles (i.e., lease/lease-back, bonds, revenue bonds) various things like that. At present, it is intended to be very broad as we try and figure out which technique is in the City's best interest going along in terms of economy, legal provisions, and so forth. I'd be happy to talk to you more about this technique, in detail, if you'd prefer.

Alderman Shea asked simply, what is lease/lease-back.

Mr. Manley replied effectively what we do is the City acquires an asset, it then leases the asset to a corporate trustee or a non-profit corporation, the corporation then leases the asset back to the City at a rate of interest equivalent to the debt service on certificates of participation that are issued to the general public to raise the capital that's use to finance the facility.

Alderman Shea asked when it's leased back to the City is that in terms of one year, 30 years, 15 years, how does that...

Mr. Manley replied what happens is the asset is leased initially from the City through a corporate trustee at a nominal rate, say a dollar per year or something like that. The lease is actually to a trustee or a non-profit corporation. This trustee or corporation, in turn, as you will lease the asset back to the City for the length of time over which the financing will be accomplished.

Alderman Shea stated let's be specific. This is going to be leased to the Manchester Development Corporation, is that correct.

Mr. Manley replied that is one possibility, that is correct.

Alderman Shea stated to my knowledge that's the only possibility, maybe there might be others that I am not aware of because obviously I do get my information as my colleague here from the paper, but basically we'll assume that it's leased to the Manchester Development Corporation, okay. So, the City then when it leases it...that is to say that this Board here at that time when they lease it they in turn relinquish all the obligations of responsibilities that go along with their particular role. In other words, the lease then makes the Manchester Development Corporation the people that are going to be in control of all of the working aspects of the Civic Center, is that correct.

Mr. Manley stated I think that that is an implication of this that is somewhat to the side of the vehicle called the lease/lease-back financing scheme. I believe that ultimately that is something that's being considered for the actual running of the facility. I think that's correct. But, in fact, what will happen is the facility leased to the corporation say leases then back to the City and then the City has an obligation which it pays under the lease which will pay the debt service on the financing certificates or instruments that are sold to the public. The actual operation of the facility, the oversight of the facility, that sort of thing happens somewhat to the side of this technical lease/lease-financing, it is somewhat of an additional aspect of this. I think that it would probably would be...that would be a decision to be made along the line as to all the wrinkles that are involved in that. But, the lease/lease-back arrangement merely is a vehicle by which the City an actually set up a limited obligation tied just to Rooms & Meals revenues as opposed to pledging its full faith and credit as it would do in a normal context. So, this is a technique whereby the City can actually do that...applying only limited revenues to this particular financing as opposed to all of its revenues.

Mr. Clougherty stated it's the sequencing in which all of this happens that's important too because the lease-back isn't going to happen now and you're going to let them take off that would be the financing back here after you're provided...you're meaning "the Board"...with all of the certifications and all of the things that Mr. Stern has mentioned through the course of all of this. This project has to come together before so you know what the deal is before you go ahead and get into this type of...

Alderman Shea stated my concern is once this particular $50 million bonding is completed then the...in other words I'm asking who will make the decisions for selection of say an architect or a bonding company or the contractor's for the particular project or the insurance company...who is going to make that if we have leased this particular bonding to the Manchester Development Corporation.

Mr. Clougherty replied in order to get to the point that you are today we've had to make decisions about the architects and the underwriters and those have all been issued in the form of RFP's, competitive proposals and those selections have been made by the Development Corporation who you will recall in Phase I was authorized to do that.

Alderman Shea stated so the first phase of it was in the hands of the Manchester Development Corporation, is that correct.

Mr. Clougherty replied, right.

Alderman Shea stated so in a sense the second phase will be in their hands as well, won't it.

Mr. Clougherty replied it's in their hands to the extent that they can approve contracts and bring things back to you, Alderman. As I said, a lot of what's going to have to happen is you have to understand that this Board has a lot of control over the Development Corporation. The Development Corporation can only do what the Board tells it to do. So, as we go along in the sequencing of this deal that may culminate in this financing method or other you're going to have to understand and have presented to you what the different contractual arrangements are for the deal to go forward in terms of its operation.

Alderman Shea stated already an architect has been picked for this, we didn't have any decision on that.

Mr. Clougherty replied yes you did because you asked under Phase I for...in order to move ahead with this project you have to have an idea as to how big the project is going to be and some of the information you needed to develop to get to Phase II. So, as part of Phase I you needed to bring on board an architectural team and as part of that phase you did go through an RFP process.

Alderman Shea stated basically if we are allocating $2.6 million...an architect has already been selected, who did the selecting. We approved the selecting but the selecting was actually done by the Manchester Development Corporation, is that correct.

Mr. Clougherty replied the selection was done by the Development Corporation and they had assistance from a number of staff departments at the time who were also asked to participate.

Alderman Shea stated all we did was approve that.

Mr. Clougherty replied, right.

Alderman Shea stated I have another question or several, your Honor. In terms of the agenda on page 14 and it begins...and I have read through it, your Honor, and in Section 6 if I may read that, it says and I quote

> "That the certificates of participation authorized to be used by this resolution shall not constitute a pledge of the full faith and credit of the City, but shall be payable solely from revenues..."

Now, my point is why isn't that Rooms & Meals revenue and not just the word revenues, if I may ask and I'm not sure who should answer that. If we are paying by Rooms & Meals revenues why isn't that included there.

Alderman Wihby interjected keep reading it talks about it. The next sentence talks about Rooms & Meals.

Alderman Shea stated no, right at that stage right there..."which may be appropriated by the City in any fiscal year..." and it doesn't say anything about Rooms & Meals revenue at that stage.

Mr. Manley stated if I might, what we intend here is to make available revenues limited by the amount of revenues that are actually received from the State on account of Meals & Rooms Tax because, in fact, what happens is they come directly from the State to the City treasury so they're not isolated, per se, but rather identified here in the level an amount in any given year tired specifically to what, I think is generally referred to as the additional increment of the Rooms & Meals Tax.

Alderman Shea stated other items are included such as "additional increment" in Section 7 and that's identified, but the word "revenues" is a term that obviously is broad in its input.

Mr. Manley stated there will also be revenues...when we draft these things we try to write them as broadly as possible to pick up things that we don't foresee...there could very well be contributions on account of the project from the State down the line, we don't know, from additional funds that may come from the private end of the development of this project. There could be a number of things, but I think the purpose or at least the intent that we're trying to reflect here is that we are pledging particular amounts of revenues in the event tied to this dedicated Rooms & Meals revenue stream or to the best that we can dedicate that level of funding.

Alderman Shea stated I hate to contradict you but the phrase "which may be appropriated by the City" that has nothing to do with what we receive from the State.

Mr. Manley stated I think I would differ because when the funds come to the City, they need to be made available by the City in the normal appropriating manner, I believe, and I think that is what we are really trying to get at is that having the monies here doesn't get from the City to the project.

Mr. Clougherty stated it has to be appropriated by the Aldermen.

Aldermen Shea asked could you point out in this right here where specific references is made to Rooms & Meals revenue being the sole source of payment for the proposed Civic Center.

Mr. Steve Stern stated Ropes and Gray, Mr. Manley and his colleagues are going to provide an opinion on this transaction, are going to write the documents and he is the one with the kind of feedback from Kevin's office and myself and Richard Tortora the Financial Advisor worked on this resolution. We had been explicitly directly by you and the way I read this and what I expect the documents to read and what I expect his opinion to be and what I expect the bond insurance policy to say which I believe is the only way given your direction and even the voter's direction in November that we can do this is that this transaction and this arena will be financed from the increment from the Rooms & Meals Tax revenue and I believe that this is what this Section 6 says, that's the way I read it. I don't know any other way of financing it given what this says.

Mr. Manley stated it can't exceed that amount as described, I think, in the next sentence.

Mr. Stern stated that's what it tells me I have to work with.

Alderman Shea stated what it says also here is that the incremental amount of money will be put into a revenue bond trust in Section 7; that it seems that it would be possible to also use these incremental funds if solely needed to help with payment because of their intended designation in a revenue bond trust. Now, we were led to believe that any incremental amounts of money beyond a certain point would be used to help with the taxpayers of Manchester and not be used as far as a revenue trust. In other words, you guys are putting this into a revenue bond trust in case I would assume something were to happen and that's not what the intent was, that's not what the intent.

Mr. Stern stated nor if we do it under the Municipal Revenue Bond Act we will do what...we will come back to you with the specific language that says what we said we would do; that is money will go into that trust, incremental Rooms & Meals Tax money will go into that trust and will pay the debt service on the bond and the rest will stay back in the general fund.

Alderman Shea stated this revenue bond trust is a little bit confusing, could you explain what a trust is.

Mr. Clougherty replied the reason you put it into a trust is because it gives investors some sense of security that that money can't be used for something else. The reason we put the increment in there is so that the whole increment would go into, be used for the debt service and then the balance would come out afterwards. You have to go into the protection of the trust first to give that type of a security to the bond holders.

Aldermen Shea stated this isn't what we were told. We were told that there would be a certain amount of money that would be used to pay for the bonding and that any increment...

Mr. Clougherty stated just because it goes into the trust doesn't mean it can't come out from the trust.

Mr. Stern stated there is no conflict at all between...it's a common, common security feature in bond issues especially in revenue bond issues because when there's a revenue stream from a specific project it's a gas tax or a water and sewer charge or whatever that all of the revenues from that type of charge go into the trust until the bonds, that year's debt service and then no more revenues from that source go to the trust until the next year starts.

Mr. Clougherty stated the reason they do that is because you have an independent third party taking that money and making sure that those payments are made before they discharge the balance and that's what gives the bond holder the security that the City isn't going to be using it for something else or using it for other purposes. Once you get into an agreement to issue the bonds that way you really have to fall through and make sure there are precautions there that are industry standards that the investor's are going to be comfortable with.

Alderman Shea asked have we received a letter of intent from any insurance company to protect the taxpayers.

Mr. Stern replied I wouldn't know what to write to ask them. We don't know how we're going to issue the bonds yet.

Alderman Shea stated so we really have no letter of intent from any insurance company, at all.

Mr. Stern replied absolutely not.

Mr. Clougherty stated this is Richard Tortora our Financial Advisor.

Mr. Tortora stated we have met with the insurers on numerous occasion related to the City's GO bond issue and most recently the Airport issue. They're all very aware of this project and two firms specifically have expressed interest in insuring it. So, we're very confident that we can secure bond insurance and we know that the referendum requires that these bonds be insured with insurance, so that's something that we will not go forward unless the deal is indeed insured.

Alderman Shea stated could I ask a specific question. Let's assume that within three years the Rooms & Meals revenue dries up. In other words, the State Legislature says look we have a problem with educational funding, they're cutting back from 8 percent to 7 percent June of '99, so we're going to lose one percent coming back, I think we're all aware of that. Let's assume that this runs out, you're telling me that some insurance company is going to guarantee, in writing, that they will pay 26 or 25 years the total amount due on the bonding, that's what you're assuring me.

Mr. Tortora stated what I'm telling you is that the insurance...

Alderman Shea interjected I'm asking you if you can give me any assurance.

Mr. Tortora replied yes, I'll give you what I think is an appropriate response to that. The insurance companies make a business decision based on the facts that they have in hand at the time they make an insurance commitment. So, we suspect that we will be in a position in say the next six to nine months to go to the insurers, tell them the story of the Manchester Civic Center, discuss our revenue stream as they then exist, our private contributions as they then exist and then they make a business decision whether or not they'll insure this issue. If indeed they do insure it and they've given us every indication as of today and the set of facts that are before us today that they're interested in entering into that kind of business arrangement with the City, once indeed they sign on the dotted line then they indeed are on the hook and committed to pay debt service going forward in the event the City does not.

Mr. Stern replied the answer is yes, that is the way we're going to do the bonding.

Mr. Clougherty interjected or they don't get done. If that guarantee isn't there that's fundamental of this Board's direction to the people putting together this plan and that has to be there. If that isn't there and again the sequencing of how these events take place as we're going forward is important because as we're going forward there is going to be some solution to the Claremont and the lawsuit and to the funding issues, the court has made that clear to the Legislature, so we're hoping that a lot of these things are answered so that that business decision that Rich is talking about can be clearly explained and can be made by the insurance companies and if they are not prepared to step up and do that then this Board and, I think, the electorate has said we're not doing this.

Mr. Stern stated let me give you a little bit of comfort on the larger issue, not so much the Manchester Rooms & Meals Tax and bond insurance, but I'm working on another arena anchored by a minor league hockey club and we're doing a refunding set of COP's as it happens, not bonds and there some new money in it and we expect to sell those bonds on January 6th, mail the preliminary official statement next week, we expect to receive the written or the committee vote on the insurance tomorrow...the insurer's AMBAC...it's an appropriation

risk like exists in this, it's a local hotel tax, hotel fee exactly like this. It is, if you will, an off-balance sheet financing exactly like the certificate of participation issue that's been discussed previously and it is for an arena occupied by a minor league hockey team and we're going to get the bond insurance on that tomorrow. So, it does happen, it isn't "pie in the sky", instead of a 30-year issue that's a 27-year issue.

Mayor Wieczorek asked are you all set, Alderman.

Alderman Shea stated I'd just like to finish, your Honor, if I may. I receive the local newspaper today and I was quite taken up by an article in the newspaper by a junior from Memorial High School by the name of Laura Murray and she indicated that and I think that we should bear this in mind that if you predicate the assessed property value of Joe Kelley's Downtown establishment at $153,000 in order to make up for the tax revenues that we hope to receive you would have to have 671 Joe Kelley's equivalent to get the tax revenue required to cover the annual payments of the bond and also we would probably need six to eight NYNEX buildings, we would probably need 1.5 shopping malls similar to the one on South Willow Street to gain the taxes that we hope to gain from building the Civic Center. So, hopefully, there'll be a lot of development in the Downtown and then I would like to remind the public as far as bonding is concerned I alluded to the $58 million that the CSO will mean which will be a tax rate increase, possibly $11 to $12 million for the Hydro Station. $6.2 million for the Riverwalk, the implementation of the Yarger Decker Classification and Compensation Study...all department head contracts expire in June of '99 except for the Principal's contract, we need funding for the School program, and possibly adverse financial ramifications in regards to the lawsuit they're filing. We have possible additional expenses relating to trash disposal for '99, Mr. Thomas indicated in the Highway communication that he's running approximately a $120,000 deficit because of the additional tonnage that is being generated in the City, we're going to have a reduction in the Rooms & Meals revenues from 8 to 7 percent in June of '99 and there is the uncertainty as to what the State Legislature plans to do with Rooms & Meals revenue because of the law with the educational funding and with that, your Honor, I appreciate your giving me the time. Thank you.

Alderman Girard stated as a member of this Board I have experienced a number of different situations, a number of different emotions, and I'm sure I've caused a few, but I think I can sit here honestly and say that this is the first time that after to listening to some of my colleagues speak that I am truly disappointed by what I've heard. I'm not sure that the comments were meant or intended as at least I interpreted them, but to somehow suggest through questioning that the folks who pulled together this proposal under very specific direction of this Board and its predecessor have somehow developed language that's going to allow the taxpayer to horn swaggled or this Board to be tricked, I find that terribly disappointing. To suggest that this process has somehow lacked information and that members of the Civic Center Committee have somehow not been forthcoming with detail, I find not only terribly disappointing, I find myself at a loss of words on how to express...and that ought to tell you something...there have been

comments made about people having to read information in the newspaper and none of what I've read in the newspaper has been new to me. It seems to me that in the many presentations that this Board has been given and the report that the Committee presented to this Board...all of the details that were in yesterday's newspaper were there. So, if there's anything that surprises anybody, I guess the person who's surprised is at fault for not either reading the material or paying attention during the presentations and to somehow suggest that there are questions out there that haven't been answered I'm sure they haven't but I remember some of those meetings and I remember the question being told that it's simply not a practical type of information to be able to get and develop particularly when you're working with a volunteer committee that has put an enormous amount of time and effort and energy. Not only into developing this proposal, your Honor, as this Board has directed, but has answered every single question in public and in private that I and other members have put to it. I think it's terribly unfair and I'm just disappointed by that type of thing. And, the last point I would have to make on this, your Honor, is the issue of parking and the issue of placement and the issue of the neighborhood. Certainly, we are all concerned to see that those issues are resolved and resolved appropriately, but to somehow suggest that it needs to be done before we cast any votes on a bond, on a project that is not going to open its doors for about two years is a bit facetious, it's a bit absurd. We have been wrestling with parking problems in this Downtown since long before everybody perhaps, except Alderman Cashin, were in office and probably back when Alderman Cashin was first elected there were issues then too.

Mayor Wieczorek interjected "they had cars then".

Alderman Cashin stated "you know what they say about payback".

Alderman Girard continued by stating I mean that with all sincere respect to my colleague from Ward 10, but the fact of the matter is that whatever problem we have with parking now is a problem of supply which given the recent years past we've struggled with is a nice problem to have, but I have every confidence that this Board, its Committee's, its staff, and anybody else that needs to get involved are going to work with the neighborhoods, the businesses, and anybody who needs to be worked with to resolve this thing and I can't express enough how disappointed...frankly, I take a lot of this as a low blow and during those comments I saw the expressions on the people who have worked so hard to not only bring this proposal to us but to answer our questions and to work with us to address the concerns of the citizenry and I think it's terribly unfair and we ought to get on with the business of this vote and do what the people have said they want us to do.

Alderman Wihby stated I said this two weeks ago and I want to just reiterate and I think we're going to turn this into a personality problem in a few minutes. I think that...not that I don't disagree with Alderman Girard because we all know that I agree with him all the time, but I think we have to move this issue and we have to move this issue today and we have to take the vote today. I think there are some unanswered questions as Alderman O'Neil has stated. I've

told him that we would work with him, he's on the Committee and the Committee will look at it and I think if you sat down with anybody from MDC they're going to tell you the same thing that they don't have all the answers right now; that they're going to get them for us and they're going to work with us and so before we take this to another level and start talking about personalities and if, in fact, the questions were answered or not, let's get back to the issue of if it's right for Manchester or not and the people have spoken, I think the majority of the Aldermen have spoken. We all agree there should be a Civic Center. I think Alderman O'Neil's questions are legitimate and they should be answered before we proceed and I don't think anybody on that Committee has a problem with answering those questions. But, let's take the vote today, let's pass this project, and then we could sit down knowing that we're going to have a Civic Center in Manchester and proceed with answering all the questions that are unanswered.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I want to assure the voters in my ward that every bit of study possible that could go into this project has gone into this project; that there has been more public hearings and more public testimony on this one project than there probably has ever has been in the City of Manchester including the Subcommittee on the Civic Center who have had five public hearings and the public referendum...every bit of business with this project was done in public. Some of us had the luxury, I had the luxury of serving on the last Board of Aldermen which gave the direction to the MDC Board, gave them their goals of what we wanted in this project and they fulfilled what we asked them. They put together the team, they picked the architect, they brought the architect back to the Board of Aldermen and said this is who we think could do the job, a national firm HOK Sports who otherwise interacted with a local architect, Mr. Brensinger's firm Lavallee Brensinger and everyone on the team was picked and the RFP process, the Finance Department shepherded through the MDC Committee...all aspects of this process. So, the City had their hands in it, the Aldermen had their hands in it, the voters had their hands in it, the MDC Board had their hands in it, and there's more people in this town that want this project to go through than there are those that don't want it to go and I think it's the most important thing that we'll vote on in this term and I think it's one heck of a good project and a good vision for Manchester and I just want us to keep a level head. If there's a parking problem, let's solve it, if there's any other problems that need to go to a Traffic Committee let's solve them. Let's just be respectful of the voters and pass this project. Thank you, your Honor.

Alderman Thibault stated I would also like to take the time to let the Board know that in Ward 11 the citizens of Ward 11 voted by 213 votes to let this go through. If I'm a representative of Ward 11, I have to go by what they've told me to do and evidently they want a Civic Center. Do I have any questions, yes, I still have questions and I'm sure we will until it's completely built and maybe even after it's open we'll still have questions. But, I think that as a Board we should be able to answer those questions...I have to agree with my colleague here that we should be able to answer these problems. I've been on this Board ten years before this, your Honor, and we had many problems years back too. This just didn't start yesterday. We've had problems for the last 50 years. But, I think that we can solve them and I'd like to see this go ahead myself and I still do have some questions. As a matter of fact, one that I'd like to ask

now. The gentleman that was just talking about the insurance...if, in fact, you find an insurance company that will insure this kind of bond from a revenue stream that we have no control on when they insure this do they insure it for the 30 years or did I just heard 27 years.

Mr. Tortora replied that was a different issue he was speaking on. They would indeed insure it for the life of the bond issue.

Alderman Thibault asked can you tell me would they ever have a chance to up their price on that insurance, say in five years from now or ten years from now.

Mr. Tortora replied no. What they do is a fixed rate, it would be expressed in basis points, percentage. What they'd do is look for one premium, typically paid upfront at the time the deal closes based on what they're insuring which is total principle and interest during the life of the issue and once they give you the commitment then you pay the premium they are locked into cover that.

Mr. Tortora asked could I add a point, your Honor, on the Alderman who addressed the debt question because I think that's a very important one for us, if I could.

Mayor Wieczorek replied go ahead.

Mr. Tortora stated the question you had asked with regard to the amount of debt that the City currently has outstanding, the amount of the debt that they may need to issue in the future that is something that we pay very close attention to as the City's Financial Advisor. One of our financial responsibilities is maintaining the relationship between the City and the rating agencies. The City is rated double A, double A2 actually, so we were just upgraded earlier this year and one of the components of the City's overall status in terms of its credit rating is debt, it's one of the four components that the rating agencies look at and while the City does have significant debt outstanding, certainly, a lot of the debt is excluded from the City's debt limit because it's self-supporting (i.e., aviation and recreation)...we also look at and tell the rating agencies, we look at a 10-year snapshot of the debt that's on the books of the City and we see that two-thirds of the debt is going to be paid off over the next ten years and actually over the next three years including the current fiscal year about $40 million in principle will roll off, so even though there is more debt to be issued on an on-going basis in Manchester or in any other municipality the fact that you have an aggressive repayment rate of your existing debt makes the rating agencies comfortable that you are very able...based on your wealth levels and the various revenues that the City has at its disposal to pay up their debt and keep that double A rating.

Alderman Shea stated let's assume that the City has to use the insurance company to pay off the debt. In other words, the City cannot meet it's obligation through the Rooms & Meals revenue to pay off its debt, how does that affect the bond rating.

Mr. Tortora replied actually it really doesn't because what would happen is the rating would be attached to that issue if it indeed is a revenue issue, let's say. The rating would be attached to that one issue. If indeed the Rooms & Meals Tax revenues...there was a shortfall and then the insurance had to step up and pay principle and interest it would be a reflection certainly on the City because the City's name is associated with the debt issuance, but that in and of itself would not cause a downgrade certainly.

Mr. Clougherty stated the important piece of that is disclosure. We have to disclose to the people who may be potential buyers of what the risk is and we have to explain to them all of the things that you've raised tonight in terms of the volatility of the funding source, we have to make sure that that is fully disclosed to investors and we've got to make sure that that's disclosed to the insurers or that's fraudulent and that's what these consultant's here and what the bond counsel is going to do when he writes up his opinion. He's signing off that we have fully disclosed the risk associated with this so that when an insurer comes in they can't come back later and say gees, I wish somebody had told me this. We're going to have to make sure that we do a complete disclosure upfront of all of that and then we can feel comfortable when they sign.

Alderman Reiniger stated I have just a quick question for Jay Taylor, if I may. Some of the residents of the neighborhood, I think, had been hoping that this Staples location would once again become a major retail spot, hopefully have another grocery store and has been reported in the paper that there have been discussions with WalMart and I understand you've had an opportunity to contact WalMart and if you could shed some light on this issue, is there interest by WalMart or what's the story.

Mr. Taylor stated within the last ten days, I guess, I have spoken with the Real Estate Director for the Northeast for WalMart Corporation and put to him the question “are you currently looking at a specific site in Manchester or greater Manchester for a new WalMart store”. The answer I received was “we are looking at the greater Manchester area as a market that we are interested in for one or more stores, however, he assured me that they are not focusing on any particular site at this time, that’s not to say they won’t in the future, but as I spoke with him ten days ago he disavowed any interest in a particular site in Manchester or greater Manchester, for that matter. So, that’s about as specific as he was going to get at this time.

Alderman Reiniger asked have you also had an opportunity to speak to the present owner of the property about any recent interest by any grocery chains/stores.

Mr. Taylor replied we spoke informally to the owner of the property a week or so ago and we did talk about this potential interest in grocery stores in part of the building. His statement was that they had made offers to a number of grocery chains over the past four or five years on extremely favorable terms and received no takers for a grocery store and I think that in itself speaks for the attractiveness of the market Downtown for a grocery store. There apparently is none.

Mayor Wieczorek stated when talking about the rent, I know when I spoke to the owner of the property they offered free rent for five years and I don’t think you can hardly get a better deal than that, they worked very hard to try and get a grocery store in that particular location.

Alderman O’Neil stated one of the things in the discussion with Mr. Ashooh and Mr. Clougherty before the meeting is we need to get better information than we’re getting, all we were provided was a start up form on the $2.6 million. We really can’t treat this project as putting park benches, it needs special attention as we’ve been treating the Hackett Hill, a lot of background information when we received the support the project and I think that important to be included with this. One question of Kevin or maybe Steve. If there isn’t a deal cut on the $10 or $11 million can’t the City or if MDC can’t reach an agreement are we locking ourselves out of one hundred percent funding of this.

Mr. Ashooh replied I know we’ve had this conversation before and the City has always had the options...Steve, correct me if I’m wrong, to finance this facility 100 percent themselves and take all the revenues, that’s never been an exclusion. This happens to be the deal that we were asked to bring, to seek significant private investment, but if this Board were to vote to fund this facility 100 percent that option has always been available.

Alderman O'Neil stated that doesn't have to happen tonight, though. Obviously, the negotiations with Ogden are not going to happen for a period of time here. There are obviously concerns about what Ogden wants as part of that no operating deficit. If there cannot be an agreement on that it would be sad to walk away from this at this point and I'm just wondering are we locking ourselves into this 80/20 or is there an option there of six months or a year from now for the City to finance it one hundred percent and reap all of the benefits.

Mr. Clougherty replied in terms of the resolution what bond counsel said earlier is that we're trying to put before you a resolution that keeps all of our options open, so that if this Board decides that it wants to look at different approaches other than the way you've told us to do it that you can pursue those under this resolution and we'd have to have that action from the Board.

Alderman O'Neil asked at what point do we lock ourselves in.

Mr. Ashooh replied when you sign the contracts and let me say the original negotiations we had when we did the RFP to select the building manager a year ago includes a management contract that did not include...it included a guarantee against operating deficits, but not the capital investment they made and that was because what the City was seeking was a riskless position. We thought that this was the best way to achieve a riskless position. So, if we were to go back to Ogden and offer them a management contract, sure, that option is always available to us up until the time we negotiate a contract and this Board accepts it, I don't think we're really locked into anything...we're in negotiations.

Mr. Stern stated I may be repeating what Kevin and Skip have said...we could bring back to you the proposal of the type that you've suggested so long as it doesn't exceed $50 million because this is only authorizing $50 million.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's my question, Steve.

Mr. Stern stated we can't bring back anything, I don't think, that authorizes the issuance of more than $50 million of bonds secured by the Rooms & Meals Tax period. Now, if it's a $50 million arena we could theoretically bring that back to you, but I'm not interested in going back to the voters a second time.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we are limiting ourselves, we have to reach an agreement with Ogden on this or this deal will not happen.

Mr. Stern replied no, if we can't reach a deal with Ogden/Enron at least two other possibilities exist in my mind. One, if we have what we believe is the right kind of public/private deal and these people for whatever their own reasons can't come to the table and we believe knowing the

market that the deal that we are putting together is still a market deal, we'll go out and find somebody else to come to the table or two, we build a smaller building.

Alderman O'Neil stated, Steve, my question is if there is...if we can't reach an agreement with Ogden on this 80/20 deal and there is a change in philosophy here that we want to fund this thing a hundred percent and reap all of the benefits, all the revenues possible can we do that.

Mr. Stern replied so long as you don't issue more than $50 million in bonds.

Alderman O'Neil stated so that's my question. We are somewhat limited if we do not reach a deal. We may have to scale down the size, thank you very much, as Alderman Rivard says "just give me a straight answer".

Alderman Girard moved the question asking for a roll call.

Alderman Cashin stated I'm not going to change any votes here tonight, I could write down on a piece of paper exactly who's going to vote how. However, as I've said publicly and I'm not going to get involved with what Alderman Shea said because I agree with a lot of the things he said. I am very concerned about the bonded indebtedness of this City right now. It's the highest that we've ever had in the history of the City to the best of my knowledge. Now, it okay to say that you've got a higher budget so, therefore, you can have a higher bonded indebtedness and that's okay because it equals out and all that stuff. Well, maybe that makes some sense to the finance people around here but I look at it in my own personal life if my expenses in my household go up and my budget goes up that does not legitimize my going out to borrow more money. If that doesn't put you on a collision course, I don't know what does. That having been said, I'm not going to discuss the project whether it's good, bad or indifferent. It may be the best thing that could happen to the City of Manchester and there's no one on this Board that's been involved in more development in the City of Manchester than I have. This may be the best project that we've ever been involved with, I don't know. But, I know this, we have trouble with the educational system today, we have debt with the educational system today, that has got to be addressed and that's the responsibility of this Board. Now, I'm sure that the argument could be made well, now if you don't go ahead and invest in things like this then you can't compensate for the educational costs and everything else and those are all valid arguments, but I think just to close this this may be a very good opportunity for the City, I don't know. I just don't think, in my personal opinion that we can afford it at this point in time and I honestly believe that and I would be irresponsible if I didn't say it. Thank you very much for the time, your Honor.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion. A roll call vote was taken. Aldermen Girard, Rivard, Pariseau, Thibault, Hirschmann, Wihby, Klock, Reiniger, Sysyn, and Pinard voted yea. Aldermen Cashin, Clancy, and Shea voted nay. Alderman O'Neil had a question before casting his vote.

Alderman O'Neil stated question, your Honor. Kevin, we talked earlier...there is another process that has to happen at the next meeting, is that correct.

Mr. Clougherty replied what the vote tonight is as I understand it is just on the bonds. This isn't the vote on how you're going to spend the $2.6 million; that has been discussed in the CIP Committee, that will be referred to the next meeting and it can only come through a Finance Committee meeting.

Alderman Cashin stated, Kevin, the commitment is being made tonight, isn't it.

Mr. Clougherty stated, Alderman, if you make the commitment tonight I think it's serious and you've made a statement that you're going to move forward and the $2.6 million, I think what you want to look at is to make sure that for that phase it includes those items that you feel are appropriate to that and that they're going to be properly administered.

Alderman O'Neil voted yea. The motion carried.

Mayor Wieczorek stated a milestone for the City of Manchester tonight.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman O'Neil stated back in July or August and it's kind of appropriate with the Civic Center now, the Administration Committee voted on developing a policy with regards to city departments and manpower, concerts, trade shows, whatever. I don't think we've heard back. It all had to do with the Concert in the Park and looking for a policy and I know it's going to come up again as they're trying to develop concerts next year. What are the costs, it can't be...we can't wing it every concert or trade show and say well, you're going to have five this week, five cops and ten firefighters and next week...we've got to have a policy that's consistent and I think it's very appropriate for the Civic Center. So, if we could direct the Clerk to see where that is. And, secondly, your Honor, I know we were told we were going to get some sort of report from the Peoria fact-finding trip on the civic center, riverwalk, public transportation is that coming sometime in 1998.

Mayor Wieczorek replied yes there will be a report coming, I talked to Tom Schwieger last week.

Alderman O'Neil stated the sooner the better, I think with all of the activities we have going on.

Mayor Wieczorek stated I will make sure you have that you have that soon.

There being no further business to come before the Board, on motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk