

**COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY  
(Continuation of 6/3/96 Meeting)**

**June 11, 1996**

**6:00 PM**

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

**PRESENT:** Ald. Sysyn, Soucy, Robert  
Ald. Reiniger and Domainque arrived late.

**MESSRS.:** K. Clougherty, R. Sherman, J. Shaffer, T. Parsons,  
J. Taylor, T. Lolicata, R. Girard, L. Garriott,  
W. Kearney, R. Sidore, R. Davis

**TABLED ITEM**

On motion of Ald. Soucy, duly seconded by Ald. Robert, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion.

Request of Mayor Wieczorek regarding a parking proposal affecting the Downtown and Millyard areas with a proposed new rate structure and devised parking system.  
(Tabled 5/21/96)

Chairman Sysyn requested Linda Garriott to address the Committee on behalf of Mr. Davis who was absent.

Ms. Garriott stated she was the Director of Public Relations and Events for Intown Manchester and read into the record on behalf of Richard Davis the following statement:

Thanks for the opportunity to meet with you again and to share our ideas on a proposed parking system for downtown Manchester. Our previous testimony to the Committee has been supportive of the general objectives of the proposal introduced by the Mayor's Office to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. However, we have concerns about raising the off-street and garage parking rates at the same time that meter rates are increased. We think that this may not achieve either the revenue objectives or the objectives of moving the long-term, daily downtown parkers off the streets and into the garages.

We have said that we believe the objectives of a parking system are to:

- (1) maximize the number of on-street, short-term parking spaces, especially in high-volume retail areas;
- (2) encourage downtown employees and other long-term daily downtown users to park in the off-street parking lots and garages;
- (3) create parking signage which is clearly visible and understandable, in terms of hourly rates and time, and which makes parking as accessible as possible;
- (4) find and implement the best rate structures for both on- and off-street parking to maximize usage. We believe this is easiest to do when short-term spaces are valued more highly. We believe that off-street parking rates should be intended to maximize use of the off-street facilities, and that revenues ought to be enhanced by increasing volume rather than price;
- (5) create a system which is flexible and can be easily adjusted over time, both to accommodate growth and to respond to changes in demand. As part of this flexibility, we would like to see a parking validation program targeted at our downtown merchants for their customers.

There are a number of items that we don't have answers to. We have had some help from Cambridge Systematics in looking at the objectives of the overall parking system, and in responding to the current proposal. But these are the items we don't fully understand, and which ought to form the basis for a longer-term parking management study for downtown Manchester.

WE DON'T YET UNDERSTAND:

- (1) Revenue impacts of increased meter rates and addition of new meters. We believe that the proposed meter rate increases will produce somewhere in the range of \$500,000 additional per year, based on estimates produced by Cambridge Systematics.
- (2) Revenue impact of phased installation of new meters (revenue lost or foregone). Our feeling is that we need to do what it takes to get the new meters put in swiftly, and to start getting the revenue benefits as soon as possible.
- (3) What are the basics of administering an effective parking validation program? The larger question is what are the requirements, costs, and benefits

of an effective parking management program for downtown Manchester. It is generally admitted that such a program does not currently exist.

- (4) What is the most effective strategy to accomplish the goals of maximizing use of the garages and maximizing revenues through increased volume? What are the actual rate structures that should be instituted, for the different garages? How much space should be set aside for short-term parking (and for our validation program) in each of the garages?
- (5) What are the most likely revenue scenarios for the garages assuming optimal parking rate structures?

These are some of the items that we believe a future downtown parking analysis would address.

FOR THE TIME BEING, WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED ON-STREET PARKING METER RATE INCREASES. HOWEVER, WE DO HAVE RESERVATIONS ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE OFF-STREET AND GARAGE RATE INCREASES UNTIL WE BETTER UNDERSTAND THE SHORT- AND LONG-TERM IMPACTS.

WE WILL WORK WITH THE BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN TO CONTINUE OUR EFFORTS IN THIS AREA, AND TO HELP PUT IN PLACE AN EFFECTIVE PARKING VALIDATION PROGRAM FOR OUR DOWNTOWN RETAIL AREAS.

Thank you.  
s/Richard Davis

Ald. Robert asked what will they do for their budget numbers; that it made sense what he was saying; that somebody spoke of a study a while back but did not know what sort of money there was and could even play it by ear.

Chairman Sysyn asked Mr. Clougherty if he had worked with Rich Davis on some of the figures.

Mr. Clougherty replied they had sat down with a little bit broader look to auto registration noting Randy had outlined that a little at the last meeting noting they had updated their numbers and could present them to the Committee; that there were certain sources of revenue which could be used for certain purposes and they wanted to make sure that everyone understood what they were and what the relationship were.

Mr. Sherman stated the first thing they had asked for having to do with the auto registration was that they go back and look at the different mill rates; that the way the auto registration was calculated was based on the value of the vehicle at the time of the registration, and it was also graduated based on how old the

vehicle was; that what they had talked about at the last meeting was the maximum rates which could be charged and in reference to his handout noted they had the model year, the assessed valuations they got off the Tax Collector system indicating that they did depreciate those values because the values they got off the Tax Collector system were for last year, so now when those cars went in to get reregistered they would have a lower value; that they estimated the '97 value to be equivalent to what the '96 value was on last year's values; that in the first column (5 Mill maximum) it allowed to be charged \$5.00 per \$1,000 for the value of the vehicle for the 1997's with the 1996's paying \$4.00 per vehicle per thousand, the 1995 rate was \$3.00 per thousand, 1994 was \$2.00 per thousand, and then anything 1993 or earlier was only \$1.00 per thousand; that on a full year based on those values it would raise just over \$2 million; that the question was what if we said we don't want to do the maximum because the statute actually allows you to reduce those amounts which was their choice, so what they did was they took the 5 and if they knocked down the maximum to 4 and charge 4-4-3-2-1, so in '96 and '97 they would pay 4 Mills or \$4.00 per thousand of value and then '95 would pay \$3.00, '94 would pay \$2.00, and '93 and prior would pay \$1.00, and then again 3 Mill so they'd have 3 years at \$3.00 and then they went a 2 and a 1 and then went to the 2 Mills which would give you 4 at 2, 1 at 1, and then the last column was everybody paying just \$1.00 per thousand dollar value of their vehicle; that what happens is the revenue starts with the maximum of \$2 M all the way down to if you do just the 1 Mill - \$1.138 M; that taking those numbers what they did was...just to refresh their memory what they had the last time was he tried putting all of those individual sheets on one sheet, if you go back and recall what Traffic initially keyed in (requested column) they had parking revenues of \$2,173,100, based on that they weren't putting in any money in the trust funds which they had set up for parking facilities, weren't adding any more money to the budget, their budget was their budget, the difference between that \$2,173,100 and what was currently at the public hearing tonight was \$1.1 M, the revenues in for tonight's public hearing are \$1.1 M more than that and the point we're trying to make there is if you don't want to adopt any fees you've got a \$1.1 M hole in your budget and just wanted to make sure that people understood the consequences of either doing something or not doing something; that further down they thought that one of the issues was the funds for the Granite Street Garage; that under the requested field what was happening was that CIP was giving \$225,000 in bonding capacity for this year and deferring the other \$432,000 to a future period and going down the meter rates stay the same, the garage rates stay the same, the lease rates stay the same, and they're not doing anything with the auto registration; that in the Mayor's he added \$650,000 to the revenues - increasing the garage rates and increasing the meter rates noting it still wasn't enough to get into the trust funds, they didn't touch the expenses at all, the difference between what the Mayor had and what was at the public hearing was now \$450,000 and if they wanted to adopt the Mayor's proposal there was a \$450,000 hole in

the budget and under the Mayor's proposal nothing changed with CIP - they'll bond \$225,000 and deferred \$432,000, but they'd change the meters from 25 cents to 50 cents an hour, the garage monthly rates go from \$45 to \$50 with the hourly rates changing accordingly; that the lease rates it really made the minimum lease rate \$35 noting there was one that paid \$37.50, but all those under \$35 were coming up to \$35.

Ald. Soucy asked if they were variable.

Mr. Sherman replied they ranged anywhere from \$22 to \$25 and thought there were some \$30's.

Mr. Girard interjected that there were 144 at \$20, 348 at \$22.50, 147 at \$25, 176 at \$30, and 24 at \$37.50.

Ald. Soucy stated they were variable by garage.

Mr. Girard replied they were off-street lots and variations of everything, everywhere.

Mr. Sherman stated dealing with their proposal and sitting down with Rich and trying to come up to address their concerns they came in at the last meeting with an Intown plan which put \$4,102,954 in revenues into the budget; that the reason it jumped so much was because there was the auto registration fee included and they were trying to cover all of the expenses they had listed at the last meeting; that in addition to the \$4.1 M, \$431,000 would go into the trust funds, they would be adding \$794,848 to the Traffic budget noting that the \$794,848 would cover the Granite Street Garage, the \$94,000 problem at the Numerica Garage, would reinstitute the money which was taken out of the budget to buy meters, and they also threw in money there to give Tom some help as far as installing the meters; that in order for the plan to work they had to get the meters in; that in addition to that the minus \$35,006 they would be able to either reduce the taxes by that \$35,006 or would give them \$35,006 more in spending noting there were items in the budget that with those revenues they would actually end up with a surplus to cover more expenses and did not have to be traffic expenses because some of the items covered by them really came out of other departments; that it would fund Granite Street with cash, would change the meter rates to 50 cents an hour, no change in the garage rates, no change in the lease rates and as Mr. Davis said at the last meeting he'd like to study that, he was not sure he was opposed to it, he just wanted to make sure before anything was done, so at this point there wasn't anything in there for that and in this stream it would require the full implementation of the full auto registration; that they had adjusted the auto registration revenue for 11 months because at this point they would not be able to implement it for 12, but that would require the full amount; that at the last meeting they presented an alternative proposal which was labeled Alternative 1 this evening; that the amount which went into the budget for revenues was the same

amount as before because the expenses haven't changed, they could only put in enough revenues equal to the expenses they had in there; that they would end up putting more money in the trust funds (\$644,118) but what was added to expenses to cover Granite Street, Numerica and those items stayed the same; that the surplus of \$35,006 did not change, fund Granite Street in total; that the only real difference between this Alternative 1 and the Intown Plan is that they've changed the garage rates and they've changed the lease rates; that to take into account what they had distributed in the first table they were changing the Mill rates and to take into consideration Mr. Davis' concern they came up with Alternative 2 in which the revenues didn't change (\$4,102,954), what went into the trust fund decreases to \$67,703, the expenses stay the same, so they were funding everything fully, \$35,006 was still there, Granite Street still got paid in cash rather than bonding it which gave them more debt capacity for other areas, they've changed the meters, they've left the garages and leases out because that was Intown's concern, but what they've done was to drop the Mill rate down to the maximum of 2, by dropping it down to 2 the only thing that changed between the Intown Plan and Alternative 2 is what goes into the trust funds; that if they felt they needed more money in the trust funds it was really the millage rate they could change.

Chairman Sysyn asked what would happen if they went to \$3.00.

Mr. Sherman replied if they went to \$3.00, by going to \$3.00 to \$2.00 they've given up \$271,890 in revenues and would go into the trust funds; that if they wanted to go up to \$4.00 they'd add the \$135,605 in the next column and back up; that was the difference between the Intown Plan and Alternative 2, they weren't hitting the garages, they weren't hitting the leases and thought they needed to study those, but they'd take care of buying the meters they needed to buy and hopefully giving Tom enough help to get the meters in; that when Richard was doing the Mayor's numbers he tried to discount it knowing that it would take some time to implement it; that because they put that money in thinking they could get it implemented quicker they jacked up the meter revenue numbers from the \$430,000 that the Mayor's Office put in and being closer to the \$500,000 which was closer to Mr. Davis' letter that he thought they could bring in.

Chairman Sysyn stated the \$35,006 stayed the same and they could use it in the budget.

Mr. Sherman stated it could reduce the tax rate or start dividing up the \$35,006 to different departments or whatever.

Chairman Sysyn distributed copies of a listing of vehicle used by Ryder Trucks.

Mr. Sherman stated they had tried to address that issue; that most of their trucks were not new and thought that by moving down to the 2 Mill or the 3 Mill they would not be paying more than 1

Mill on most of their trucks which was a \$1.00 per thousand of assessed value.

Chairman Sysyn stated when Ryder Truck leased to someone the person who leased the truck paid.

Mr. Sherman stated they had tried to extract the information out of the system because even though all of the trucks were listed as Ryder Trucks they didn't know how many other people paid noting with his leased vehicle when he went to pay his registration it stated "Volkswagen" on it, it didn't say Randy Sherman, he was registering Volkswagen's vehicle and had a feeling that the system was doing the same thing, it was picking up all of the Ryder registrations even though Associated Grocers was coming in with the check; that they had tried to extract that information but were unable to get it today; that they tried to address it by knocking the Mill rate down and again it took the money out of the trust funds and they certainly thought the money needed to start going back into those trust funds.

Ald. Domainque stated could they agree that what they were talking about was not a temporary fee, but a fee which would be on-going; that she was looking at revenues included in the budget and was seeing that the \$4,102,954 figure was the same right across Intown's and Alternatives 1 & 2 despite the fact that the Mill rate was reduced and asked if she was missing something.

Mr. Sherman stated when they had put together the other charts they had had the three columns (meters, garages, auto registration); that the auto registration and garages could only be used for parking facilities; that the meter monies could be used to street maintenance as well; that under each of the scenarios was that the meter revenue did not cover all of the expenses; that the garages had a surplus every time, so the most revenues that could be put into the meters was the revenues they would collect; that the most revenues they could put in for the garages was the total expenses, so in every one of the categories the expenses did not change and the meter revenues did not change because they all had the 50 cent increase in the meter fees, so he'd take the maximum revenues on meters and the maximum expenses on the garages which was why it was always the same number; that the only one thing that would change if they gave up some revenue was what would go into the trust fund.

Ald. Domainque stated in looking across at the added expenditures to the budget (\$794,848) was plugged in for what they expected to be next year's real needs, but in doing even Alternative 2 and implementing it at a 2 Mill max when those were done obviously there would be other projects, but they were looking at a cash value of almost \$800,000 that every year they would be able to do that kind of rehabilitation on those types of facilities and asked if those monies could be used anywhere else.

Mr. Sherman stated in the legislation on the trust fund that was set up specifically for Manchester it said that "if the Board

deems that there are excess funds in there" you can use it for anything else.

Ald. Domainque stated there was a real need for this year to take care of some of these things and she had a real problem if they were to begin setting aside a cash cow that was actually hitting the taxpayer with another fee because they'd deemed they'd found another revenue stream when, in fact, she was not convinced that the management of the needs would be as efficient as it should be in coming years; that this current year they had some crises and she did not want to hit the taxpayer up for even a 2 Mill rate if all they were doing was finding a new revenue stream to take care of some of these things when, in fact, they should be doing better management.

Mr. Girard stated for the record the memo that they received from the Tax Collector regarding the meeting with the Mayor wanted to clear up that the Mayor and Ryder Truck and the Tax Collector never met to discuss this proposal knowing the letter sort of implied that, but it was actually a meeting that took place at the beginning of April regarding some State legislation on tractor trailers, so the Mayor never met with Ryder Truck about this proposal and no objections were ever expressed to him by Ryder Truck regarding the proposal; that the second point he wished to mention regarding Ald. Domainque's comments was that one of the problems they've sort of grappled with over the years with the parking garages was not necessarily poor management but that it's been that the City had not committed the funds it needed to commit to make sure that the garages didn't fall apart; that they ended up rebuilding Canal Street because sufficient funding was never given to properly maintain the facility, so they couldn't waterproof the floors, for example, and salt corrosion leaked right through the decks noting that was the problem they were having now with the Center of NH Garage and would probably spend on \$2.5 M over the next three years to correct it before they have to rebuild that garage too; that there was about a 3-year window, so they would need to put some substantial dollars into those facilities to make sure they didn't have to put even more money in almost as tight a time frame.

Ald. Domainque stated she looked at the parking situation of the City of Manchester particularly the lots and garages as having been a real nightmare; that the taxpayers have paid for spaces that they can't even use referencing the Wall Street Garage; that as far as she was concerned she did not want to continue to hit them up with a significant fee if it wasn't to do with legitimate expenditures which were currently necessary she did not want to say here's are projected slush fund and look what we can do noting she did not think the taxpayers would be happy with that; that if they could identify real needs within that definition she had no problem with that and she could go with the 1 Mill, but she had a problem with no charging monthly parkers if they were going to hit the average street person up by doubling up the

meters why were they not hitting up the monthly parkers with all due respect to the fact that Mr. Davis wasn't here and was talking about having to study it longer and thought they'd be letting an awful lot of people off the hook.

Mr. Girard stated no matter what anyone ultimately recommended from a parking study now there would be a difference of opinion and in the Mayor's opinion the structuring of the garage rates and changing the lease rates in the garages and the surface lots still provided more than enough incentive for all-day parkers to use those facilities; that Intown Management had some reservations and wished to pursue them further and no matter what they came up with in the long-term facilities there would always be someone who would complain about it; that before he left he and Mr. Davis discussed a re-orientation of the garage rates and instead of having the first four hours be 50 cents an hour and then 25 cents thereafter as the Mayor proposed, they discussed the possibility of maybe doing the first two hours at 50 cents and then every hour thereafter be 25 cents, but maintain the \$50 lease rate that the Mayor had proposed and still moving to \$35 for the surface lots as the Mayor had proposed; that Mr. Davis had not had an opportunity to comment on that, but he did express an interest in pursuing it, so they still thought that there was an opportunity to pursue that if the Committee wished to act to adjust those off-street parking rates in a manner, perhaps the Mayor's proposal was certainly his prerogative, but they hadn't had a chance to really iron anything out.

Chairman Sysyn asked why they couldn't go with 50 cents an hour now and maybe after they do the study in the fall and then maybe adjust and thought the 50 cents an hour would encourage more people to go into the garage and that was why they didn't want to raise the garage rates noting that was how she felt about it herself working Downtown.

Ald. Domainque stated she did not have a problem with that, but had a problem with setting up a fund taxing people now.

Mr. Sherman wished to clarify that it was for any other capital purpose.

Mr. Girard stated it had been referred to as raising the garage rates, but in looking at the structure that was handed out to the committee previously was really a reorganization of the garage rates moving it to a straight hourly basis away from the hour, half-hour, hour-and-a-half, etc.; that breaking it down to a per hour thing they were talking about an increase of two to two-and-a-half cents an hour on the garage rates; that moving from \$45 to \$50 per month in the garages and also from the various rates mentioned to \$35 in the lease rates it did raise the lease rate but it was still providing anywhere from a 20 to 40 percent discount in those facilities which would often be paid if they plugged a meter or did the hourly rate noting it was a pretty significant discount over which was paid if they wished to be

foolish enough to play tag with the meter maid and plug meters all day; that the other concern they had in not touching the surface lots rate was that the proposal was to have all of the surface lots be four-hour minimum meters at 50 cents an hour and what they didn't want to do was to have spots that they wanted to open up for long-term parkers be taken up by short-term parkers who didn't want to pay 50 cents an hour, so they thought they needed to put some sort of a hedge there to make sure that they didn't have the long-term people they were providing for spots that they wanted them to use noting that was the thought behind the way the Mayor had structured the proposal.

Chairman Sysyn stated they might get more revenue with Rich Davis' plan for plan for selling validation stickers with business people.

Mr. Lolicata stated from everything he'd heard over the last three meetings the two important things he saw were management of the garages which was badly needed noting he was not talking fees or money and the second being it made good sense; that the other part was control, they had to control Elm Street and Downtown; that they did not need a study this coming October noting he'd been here 30 years and they all knew what the problems were and was pretty sure anybody could take a certain meter, put it in a certain place and they'd start getting some control.

Mr. Sidore stated as he understood it, the revenue figures included new meters in the Millyard on Commercial Street; that he could not speak for the southend of the Millyard except as he drove through he saw the same thing he saw in the northend which was one year ago before the meters were taken out, the meters were still there and every metered space north of the bridge and every metered space south of the Waumbec building were empty, nobody wanted to park there; that over a year as people have gotten used to the way things are, those spaces in the northend were 100 percent full and meters on the southend meters all the way down to the old Pandora building; that it was his opinion that (a) the area had not been studied the same way the Elm Street problem's been studied, and (b) if they did make the change down there they would not get any revenues and would go right back to where they were before when people found everyplace else to park and parking in places they didn't belong and did not see any benefit to the City.

Mr. Lolicata in reference to a meeting back then noting that he, Jay Taylor, John Snow and everybody else was presented stated he did not want those meters taken out; that they not only had the Millyard, but UNH and now leasing and what they had down there they were all being used, if meters were put back in there most of them were walking up to Elm Street, parking their cars down there and that was what he referred to as control; that when you give people free parking, of course, they're going to park there.

Ald. Soucy stated in reference to the Mill rate portion which was perhaps one of the tougher parts citing as an example a 1994 car

under the 2 Mill proposal their car was valued at \$10,000 asked how much more would that individual pay.

Mr. Sherman replied they would pay \$20.00 and pay \$10.00 the next year.

Mr. Girard stated the Mayor had received a letter from students at Springfield College complaining bitterly about the fact that the only meters the students had available to park at were two-hour meters; that there were no long-term meter parking for them to take advantage of and that it was not practical for them to come in and out of the building every two hours when they were in an all day class and how disruptive it was noting teachers were having problems with that also; that in looking at what had been done in the Millyard there were lots and on-street leasing right next to free long-term parking spaces noting there were pretty angry people paying for parking when there was free all day parking on streets right next to where they paying for; that the other issue was if you took a look at the plan the Mayor proposed the east side of Commercial Street would be that long-term parking, the west side of Commercial Street would remain short-term parking so they could handle both the long-term and the short-term needs and maybe cool some tempers down there over the fact that there are people paying for leased spaces when there are free ones right next to the ones they're paying for.

Ald. Domainque asked if there were any figures on the implementation of a 1 Mill max.

Mr. Sherman replied he did not have it with him, however, if they went from the 2 to the 1 they'd lose \$400,000 more which would they wouldn't be putting anything in the trust fund and they'd have to either reduce what they'd be putting into the expenditures; that they would lose \$400,000 (revenue) with \$67,000 of them coming from the trust fund with the other \$333,000 would have to either come from expenses or they'd have to raise it in taxes.

Ald. Domainque stated that was where she was stuck, she was stuck with the fact that yes they had these immediate expenses now, but after that there was no long-range planning and so what they've done is propose something that would automatically hit the taxpayer at automobile registration.

Mr. Sherman stated he did not know what the long-term plan was.

Mr. Lolicata stated in reference to long-range planning where they'd already come through with Desmond Associates by doing it and maintaining a certain amount in there they knew that every 8 years, 10 years they'd be spending \$1.5 M one way or another on each garage and by doing it they were keeping that cost much lower noting it was recommended by Desmond that the garages be maintained in that way; that if there was a cap he would say afterwards whatever they would want to use it for, fine, at least

cash wise it would be there, but the other beautiful part he thought was that it saved on the bonding and maybe that was a bigger issue that no one was looking at right now; that if there was \$3 or \$4 M in there after six or seven years there would be enough cash there to maintain something on the next garage which would be due.

Ald. Robert stated he wished to respond to Ald. Domainque's comment about looking for additional revenue, additional ways to hit the taxpayers; that as a Board member for five years and as long as they maintained the present spending priorities that not only this Board but prior Board's have held to for years they had no choice, they would be constantly looking for ways to raise revenues and would always be taking money from things that had to really be done; that he did not like it anymore than anybody else did, but thought that because of the obligations that had been made it was either this or the tax base and they had to throw it on the tax rate, they had to fix this stuff, they had to get the Downtown moving someday, somehow and hoped that in the future his fellow Board members would be more receptive to cost cutting suggestions and maybe scrutinize some of the requests they had for paying benefit items for City employees and thought everybody would be a lot happier in the long run.

Ald. Reiniger stated he agreed with Intown that they should take a little more time to look at the long-term, off-street rates and hopefully lower them to create more incentives to get people off the street and moved to recommend approval of Alternative 2.

Ald. Robert duly seconded the motion. Ald. Soucy and Domainque duly recorded opposition. Ald. Sysyn voted in the affirmative. The motion carried.

Ald. Soucy stated for the record the reason for her objection was to increasing the millage rate and not to the 50 cent parking increase or looking at long-term parking facilities and those rates as well.

Ald. Domainque stated that was her reason as well; that she would have settled for a 1 Mill, but could not see justification on the 2 Mill.

There being no further business to come before the Committee on Traffic/Public Safety, on motion of Ald. Soucy, duly seconded by Ald. Robert, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

  
Clerk of Committee  
