



COUNCILMAN
WILLIAM G. BRADSHAW
632 Angell Street
Providence, R. I. 02906

Mr. Vincent Vespia
City Clerk

CITY OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND . MAYOR VINCENT A. CIANCI, JR.
~~MAYOR JOSEPH A. BIGNARDI, JR.~~

Vincent Vespia
 City Clerk

—
 Clerk of Council

—
 Clerk of Committees



DEPARTMENT OF CITY CLERK
 CITY HALL

March 25, 1975

Rose M. Mendonca
 First Deputy

—
 Michael R. Clement
 Second Deputy

The Honorable City Council
 of the City of
 Providence, Rhode Island

Honorable Councilwoman and Councilmen,

I submit, for your consideration, that record of the Public Hearing held on March 25, 1975 on the allegation that Councilman Anthony C. Merola was in violation of the dual office holding provisions of the City Charter, said record establishing the fact that he was found not to be in violation of Section 3.9 of the said Charter.

Very sincerely yours,

Vincent Vespia

Vincent Vespia
 City Clerk

VV:ja

IN CITY COUNCIL
 APR 3 1975

READ:

WHEREUPON IT IS ORDERED THAT
 THE SAME BE RECEIVED.

Vincent Vespia
 CLERK

Councilman
WILLIAM G. BRADSHAW
632 Angell Street 02906
DEPUTY MINORITY LEADER



Committees
City Property
Claims and Pending Suits
Finance
Public Welfare
Licenses
Bicentennial Celebration
Declaration of Independence

CITY OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

March 4, 1975

Mr. Vincent Vespia
City Clerk
Providence City Hall
Providence, Rhode Island

Dear Mr. Vespia:

Pursuant to the filing, on February 18, 1975, of an indictment and record of conviction of a felony of Councilman Anthony Merola, I further charge that he is guilty of a dual office holding in his capacity as a teacher in the Providence School system.

Section 3.8 of the City Charter states in part:

"...No member of the council shall hold any other public office carrying a salary, whether municipal, state or federal..."

also:

"...he shall immediately forfeit his office."

and in Section 3.9:

"...the council shall set a place and time for holding a public hearing thereon..."(within five days).

Sincerely,

WILLIAM G. BRADSHAW
Councilman

WGB:vas

IN CITY COUNCIL
MAR 20 1975

READ: and Public Hearing Ordered Be
Held on Tuesday,
March 25, 1975 at
7:00 o'clock P.M. (E.O.T.)
Vincent Vespia
CLERK

DEPT. OF CITY CLERK
PROVIDENCE, R.I.
MAR 4 4 23 PM '75
FILED

City of Providence
OFFICE OF THE CITY CONTROLLER

MEMORANDUM

TO: William Bradshaw, Councilman
FROM: Norman K. Di Sandro, City Controller
SUBJECT: Anthony Merola

DATE: March 4, 1975

In accordance with your request this will certify to the following data.

Payrolls of the School Department, City of Providence reveals Mr. Anthony Merola of 190 Knight Street, Providence, Rhode Island, employee #89162 to be employed at the Samuel Bridgham Middle School as a Vocational Teacher at an annual salary of \$12,510.00. Mr. Merola commenced employment with the Providence School Department September 1972.

Also according to our payroll records Anthony Merola commenced as a councilman with the City of Providence effective January 6, 1975; he retains the same employee #89162.



LOUIS A. MASCIA
CITY SOLICITOR
RONALD H. GLANTZ
DEPUTY CITY SOLICITOR
JOHN CAPPELLO
JOSEPH A. FLORIO
STEVEN S. SABER
ASSISTANTS
HENRY J. ALMAGNO
SPECIAL COUNSEL
ROBERT J. PACI
CLAIMS ADJUSTER

LAW DEPARTMENT
CITY HALL, PROVIDENCE
RHODE ISLAND 02903
421-7740 EXT. 381
AREA CODE 401

MAYOR
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
VINCENT A. CIANCI, JR.

March 24, 1975

Councilman Robert J. Haxton
c/o City Clerk,
City Hall,
Providence, R.I.

Dear Councilman Haxton:

The words "public office" and "public officer" are sometimes of uncertain import. They have been defined in various terms. It is well to note that public offices are created for the purpose of effecting the end for which government has been instituted, which is the common good and not for profit, honor or private interest of any one man, family or class of men.

The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts reflects the view that a "public officer" is a person to be elected or appointed solely with a view to the public welfare. Brown v. Russell, 166 Mass. 14, 25, 48 N.E. 279. Within this light, usually, one who has a public duty, charge or trust, conferred by public authority, for public purposes, which is not transient, occasional, or incidental, but durable, permanent and continuous is considered a "public officer." (State v. Bates, 101 Fla. 361, 134 So. 219.

Therefore, it is often necessary to determine whether the performance of certain services, or whether a particular position, is an office or a mere employment, or to do specified work under a contract of employment by statute, charter, ordinance or otherwise; In re Advisory Opinion to Governor 153 Fla. 650, 15 So. 2d 765, for all who are in public employment are not public officers and do not hold public office within contemplation of law. People v. Knox, 236 App. Div. 490, 247 NYS 731.

Section 3.8 of the Ordinances of Providence provides no member of the Council shall hold any other "public office," carrying a salary....

Councilman Robert J. Haxton,

March 19, 1975

#2.

The distinguished Chief Justice Marshall of the United States Supreme Court has said:

"Although an office is an employment, it does not follow that every employment is an office"

United States v. Maurice, 2 Brock 96, 102, See also Greenclinning v. Curry, 153 Fla. 398, 14 So. 2d 794.

The essential characteristics which differentiate a "public office" from "mere employment" are said to be:

1. The authority and manner of their election or appointment;
2. The time when the appointment or election is to take place;
3. Tenure of office;
4. Manner of filling vacancies of office;
5. Method of removal or suspension from office;
6. The law under which the office or situation created by statute, ordinance or charter;
7. Purpose and function of office;
8. Qualifications of the officer;
9. Public place of the occupant;
10. Personal liability of the officer;
11. Requirement of bond or oath of office; and,
12. Compensation or salary and source of payment.

See McQuillin, Municipal Corporations, 3rd Ed. Rev., Vol. 3, Sec. 12.30-12.31, pages 173-182.

The above is only a random selection of some of the more important characteristics of a "public officer."

Councilman Robert J. Haxton,

March 19, 1975

#3.

To the issue at hand, we look to the leading case of State v. Small, 103 Ohio App. 214, 145 NE 2d 200, in a quo warranto action; suit was brought to determine whether a teacher was entitled to the office of Councilman at large. The Court of Appeals held that a teacher in public school system did not hold "public office" within the meaning of statute forbidding member of Council to hold any "public office", and that therefore, a teacher was eligible to hold office of Councilman.

In syllabus of the court's reasoning, the term "public officer", imports an office wherein certain independent public duties, a part of the sovereignty of the state, is appointed to it by law, to be exercised by the public officer by virtue of his election or appointment to that office, and not as a mere employee, subject to the direction and control of someone else.

It is therefore the position of this office, as a result of the far-reaching analysis above, and the Small case in Ohio that a school teacher does not come into conflict with Section 3.8 of the Ordinances of the City of Providence.

Very truly yours,


LOUIS A. MASCIA,
CITY SOLICITOR

LAM:RAF

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

CITY OF PROVIDENCE
CITY COUNCIL

* * * * *

PROCEEDINGS AT HEARING: *

IN RE: CHARGES BROUGHT BY *
COUNCILMAN BRADSHAW AGAINST *
COUNCILMAN ANTHONY MEROLA *

* * * * *

MARCH 25, 1975
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
PROVIDENCE CITY HALL

Mr. FARGNOLI. The Council will be in order. Will the Clerk please take the roll.

(ROLL CALL OF COUNCIL:

Council President Haxton, Absent
Acting Council President Fagnoli,
Present

Councilman Addison, Present
Councilman Ahern, Present
Councilman Almagno, Present
Councilman Bradshaw, Present
Councilwoman Brassil, Present
Councilman Cirelli, Present
Councilman Cola, Present
Councilman Crowley, Present
Councilman Flynn, Present
Councilman Garan, Absent
Councilman Gorodetsky, Absent
Councilman Henries, Present
Councilman Johnson, Present
Councilman Lynch, Present
Councilman Mansolillo, Present
Councilman McKiernan, Present
Councilman Merola, Present
Councilman Pearlman, Absent
Councilman Petrosinelli, Present
Councilman Salvatore, Absent
Councilman Stravato, Present
Councilman Tomasso, Present
Councilman Turchetta, Present
Councilman Xavier, Present)

Mr. FARGNOLI. There are 21 present and 5 absent, and we have a quorum. Councilman Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. President and Members of the Council, for purposes of identification, inasmuch as we have a stenographic reporter present, I am Councilman Robert F. Lynch, the Majority Leader of

the City Council. As you understand, and as we know, the City Clerk is in receipt of a letter from Councilman William Bradshaw stipulating certain charges against Councilman Anthony Merola concerning various sections of the Charter, and at this time, I would request that the City Clerk read the communication from Councilman William G. Bradshaw.

The CLERK. The date is March 4, 1975, it is addressed to Mr. Vincent Vespia, City Clerk, Providence City Hall, Providence, Rhode Island.

"Dear Mr. Vespia: Pursuant to the filing, on February 18, 1975, of an indictment and record of conviction of a felony of Councilman Anthony Merola, I further charge that he is guilty of a dual office holding in his capacity as a teacher in the Providence School System.

"Section 3.8 of the City Charter states in part: '...No member of the council shall hold any other public office carry- a salary, whether municipal, state or federal...' also: '...he shall immediately

"forfeit his office." and in Section 3.9: '...the council shall set a place and time for holding a public hearing thereon...' (within five days). Sincerely, William G. Bradshaw, Councilman."

The subject communication was in City Council on March 20, 1975; it was read and a public hearing was ordered to be held on Tuesday, March 25, 1975 at 7:00 o'clock P.M. Eastern Daylight Time. This is the day certain, which is today.

Mr. BRADSHAW. Mr. President, if I can make a statement. The position I take is that the Councilman should not be receiving two salaries from the City's -- what do I call it? -- the City's budget.

I would like to read into the record these comments in regards to Section 3.8. Obviously, it is how we interpret the word "public office." How inclusive is this? Does it include a teacher? The Charter, Section 3.8 emphasizes payment of a salary as the important test. That is, the provision is designed to prevent an individual from

earning a salary from both the legislative and the executive branches of government. Section 3.8 makes an exception for members of the state militia and members of the military, Navy or Reserves of the United States. Thus, if the National Guardsmen are excluded, certainly a school teacher should be excluded. That language indicates that the legislature intended a very broad meaning to the words "public office carrying a salary."

The provision may also be designed to prevent a conflict in which a member of the Council is voting on the budget for the department in which he is an employee. Councilman Merola maintains he wouldn't vote on the school budget; however, he should probably be disqualified from voting on any portion of any department's budget or sitting on any committee considering the same. The reason is that the Providence Charter prohibits deficit spending. Once revenues for the succeeding year are estimated, each department must share in that aggregate amount. If Mr. Merola votes to cut other departments' budget,

he is protecting the school department budget and possibly his own city job. It would follow because the City Council must approve the entire budget. The legislature intended that no beneficiary of that budget sit on the Council, thus, public office should be construed to include teachers.

It is my position that if he is receiving two salaries from the City taxes, he is a dual office holder and should relinquish one or the other.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. President and Members of the Council, I would like to point out this is strictly Mr. Bradshaw's opinion. He can speculate all he wants as to where the emphasis is placed in the City Charter as to what wordings are concerned and I can differ with him strongly, but inasmuch as it is only an opinion that he is rendering, I don't see any point in arguing.

At the last meeting of the City Council, when this communication was considered, I also made a motion requesting that the City Solicitor -- or that the President of the Council request of

the City Solicitor -- an opinion as to the charges that have been placed against Mr. Merola, and I understand that the City Clerk is in receipt of a communication from the City Solicitor concerning this case, and I also understand that he has copies available for all members of the Council. I request at this time that the City Clerk distribute these copies to the Councilmen and Councilwoman and that he also read the communication from Mr. Mascia.

The CLERK. I have a communication dated March 24, 1975 addressed to Councilman Robert J. Haxton, c/o City Clerk, City Hall, Providence, Rhode Island.

"Dear Councilman Haxton: The words 'public office' and 'public officer' are sometimes of uncertain import. They have been defined in various terms. It is well to note that public offices are created for the purpose of effecting the end for which government has been instituted, which is the

"common good and not for profit,
honor or private interest of any
one man, family or class of men.

"The Supreme Judicial Court of Massa-
chusetts reflects the view that a
'public officer' is a person to be
elected or appointed solely with a
view to the public welfare. Brown
v. Russell, 166 Mass. 14, 25, 48 N.E.
279. Within this light, usually,
one who has a public duty, charge or
trust, conferred by public authority,
for public purposes, which is not
transient, occasional, or incidental,
but durable, permanent and continuous
is consisted a 'public officer.'
(State v. Bates, 101, Fla. 361, 134
So. 219.)

"Therefore, it is often necessary to
determine whether the performance of
certain services, or whether a particu-
lar position, is an office or a mere
employment, or to do specified work

"under a contract of employment by statute, charter, ordinance or otherwise; In re Advisory Opinion to Governor 153 Fla. 650, 15 So. 2d 765, for all who are in public employment are not public officers and do not hold public office within contemplation of law. People v. Knox, 236 App. Div. 490, 247 NYS 731.

"Section 3.8 of the Ordinances of Providence provides no member of the Council shall hold any other 'public office,' carrying a salary...

"The distinguished Chief Justice Marshall of the United States Supreme Court has said: 'Although an office is an employment, it does not follow that every employment is an office...' United States v. Maurice, 2 Brock 96, 102, See also Greenclinning v. Curry, 153 Fla. 398, 14 So. 2d 794. The essential characteristics which differentiate a 'public office' from 'mere employment' are said to be: 1. The

"authority and manner of their election or appointment; 2. The time when the appointment or election is to take place; 3. Tenure of office; 4. Manner of filling vacancies of office; 5. Method of removal or suspension from office; 6. The law under which the office or situation created by statute, ordinance or charter; 7. Purpose and function of office; 8. Qualifications of the officer; 9. Public place of the occupant; 10. Personal liability of the officer; 11. Requirement of bond or oath of office; and, 12. Compensation or salary and source of payment. See McQuillin, Municipal Corporations, 3rd. Ed. Rev., Vol. 3, Sec. 12.30-12.31, pages 173-182. The above is only a random selection of some of the more important characteristics of a 'public officer.' To the issue at hand, we look to the leading case of State v. Small, 103 Ohio App. 214, 145 NE 2d 200, in a quo warranto action; suit was brought to determine whether a

"teacher was entitled to the office of councilman at large. The Court of Appeals held that a teacher in public school system did not hold 'public office' within the meaning of statute forbidding member of Council to hold any 'public office', and that therefore, a teacher was eligible to hold office of Councilman.

"In syllabus of the court's reasoning, the term 'public officer', imports an office wherein certain independent public duties, a part of the sovereignty of the state, is appointed to it by law, to be exercised by the public officer by virtue of his election or appointment to that office, and not as a mere employee, subject to the direction and control of someone else.

"It is therefore the position of this office, as a result of the far-reaching analysis above, the Small case in Ohio that a school teacher does not come into conflict with Section 3.8 of the Ordinances

"of the City of Providence. Very truly
yours, Louis A. Mascia, City Solicitor."

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. President, Members
of the Council, in order that the Council
Members may have a chance to familiarize them-
selves with the communication from Mr. Mascia,
I make a motion that the Council stand in re-
cess for ten minutes.

Mr. FLYNN. I second the motion.

(MOTION MADE AND SECONDED
AND CARRIED)

(TEN MINUTE RECESS)

(MEETING RECONVENED AT 7:55 P.M.)

Mr. FARGNOLI. The meeting will be
in order. Will the Clerk take the roll.

(ROLL CALL OF COUNCIL:

Council President Haxton, Absent
Acting Council President Fargnoli,
Present

Councilman Addison, Present
Councilman Ahern, Present
Councilman Almagno, Present
Councilman Bradshaw, Present
Councilwoman Brassil, Present
Councilman Cirelli, Present
Councilman Cola, Present
Councilman Crowley, Present
Councilman Flynn, Present
Councilman Garan, Present
Councilman Gorodetsky, Present
Councilman Henries, Present
Councilman Johnson, Absent

Councilman Lynch, Present
Councilman Mansolillo, Present
Councilman McKiernan, Present
Councilman Merola, Present
Councilman Pearlman, Absent
Councilman Petrosinelli, Present
Councilman Salvatore, Absent
Councilman Stravato, Present
Councilman Tomasso, Present
Councilman Turchetta, Present
Councilman Xavier, Present

Mr. FARGNOLI. There are 22 present and 4 absent and we have a quorum. Mr. Lynch.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. President and Members of the Council, I think the opinion as rendered by the City Solicitor is very concise and to the point. I think it points out very clearly the opinion that is shared by a great number of the Members of the City Council and I don't think there is any point in belaboring the action any further. As I stated, I think it is pointed out very clearly by Mr. Mascia in his letter to the City Council and therefore, I make a motion that the Council accept the written opinion of the City Solicitor dated March 24, 1975, which was filed with the City Clerk, and that Councilman Anthony C. Merola be found not in violation of Section 3.8 of the City Charter, and that this

Council take no further action concerning

Mr. Bradshaw's communication.

Mr. ADDISON. I second the motion.

Mr. STRAVATO. I'd like to be recorded
as seconding the motion also.

Mr. TOMASSO. Second.

Mr. FLYNN. Second.

Mr. TURCHETTA. Second.

Mr. ALMAGNO. Second.

Mr. XAVIER. Second.

Ms. BRASSIL. Second.

Mr. CIRELLI. Second.

Mr. AHERN. Second.

Mr. CROWLEY. Second.

Mr. PETROSINELLI. Second.

Mr. HENRIES. Second.

Mr. MCKIERNAN. Second.

Mr. MANSOLILLO. Second.

Mr. GORODETSKY. Second.

Mr. COLA. Second.

Mr. GARAN. Second.

Mr. FARGNOLI. Second.

Mr. STRAVATO. Mr. President, as many

of the Councilmen here, and Councilwoman, that are here this evening are fairly new to the Council, as I am -- although I am not new to politics -- I am kind of saddened at what I see happening in the City Council, saddened to the effect that if Councilman Merola supported Mayor Cianci during the recent election, we wouldn't be here this evening charging him with what we are charging him, and if Councilman Merola voted with the Mayor since his recent election, he wouldn't be here this evening, and I would charge my -- in all due respect to my Brother Bradshaw -- I would challenge that it is his opinion. I say it is the Mayor's opinion, that the Mayor ordered Councilman -- my Brother Councilman -- Bradshaw to present these charges to the City Council.

This points out that in spite of the Mayor's claim that his Administration is above any political manuevers, this Administration of Mayor Cianci is as political minded as any other Administration and the Mayor is all politics, all day long. It shows you right here

this evening. I again challenge that it is the opinion of Councilman Bradshaw, with all due respect to my Brother, and I say that it is the opinion and the charge is right direct from the Mayor's office.

Mr. FARGNOLI. Councilman Bradshaw.

Mr. BRADSHAW. Mr. President, I have served on the Council some eight years. There is one thing we Republicans learn, you don't gain anything by nit-picking. Sooner or later you get put off in the corner and your effectiveness is completely dulled and you are of little value to your constituents.

I have made it my purpose, only to rise and speak on anything which I, in my mind, feel needs to be mentioned. I am nobody's man. When I got myself a job teaching, I purposely went and got one in the private school area so that if I ever ran for Council, I would not be in conflict with my duties as a Councilman.

To other Councilmen who are in the same circumstances, Frank Caprio, Don McKiernan, I am not questioning whether they had a legal

right to serve in both areas. It was never challenged at the time, but I have read the City Solicitor's opinion and it doesn't seem to me to get to the nub of the question.

Now, this section is very clear to me. It says, "No member of the Council shall hold any other public office carrying a salary..." That is what counts. How can you serve as a Councilman and be a teacher in the Providence School System and not have a conflict there, especially when you are dealing with the City budget?

I can see the perfect situation where we are discussing the City budget, open to any Member of the Council, the problem comes up, teachers' salaries -- they say the more money you pour into education, the better education you get -- we in Providence know that the Providence School System stinks. I have said this before. However, Mr. Merola, sitting as a Councilman, considering the City school budget, could very well make sure that the teachers get a raise. He could argue strongly for it. He

says he is willing to not take part in debates in this area; he is still in conflict. You cannot get two salaries from one payroll, one City payroll. I still take my position he is a dual officer holder, he is taking two salaries and he should resign from one or the other.

Mr. TOMASSO. Mr. President and Members of the Council, I must state a certain amount of pleasure in agreeing with Councilman Stravato, my Brother Councilman this evening, when he said we should not be here this evening. There is no question we shouldn't be here and I was one of the leaders who came out on the Council floor last week and said we shouldn't be here. I researched the problem and fortunately our City Solicitor and I concur in the definition of a "public officer," so that Mr. Merola is not a dual officer holder.

Many many times Mr. Merola and I do not vote the same on an issue, but I am willing to go to bat for a fellow Councilman when he is in the right, and I defy most of the other people of

this so-called majority of the Democratic party to tell me who forced us here tonight. Was it the minority or the majority?

Mr. LYNCH. I'd like to answer a few questions briefly, Mr. President. I think the person that forced us here tonight, Mr. Tomasso, is none other than Councilman Bradshaw who introduced this action in the first place. It was on the opinion of the City Solicitor, among others, that we felt that this hearing should be held in order to clear the air as to whether there was any conflict with the City Charter, and I, as you, agree with the City Solicitor, and I did beforehand.

My thought was that being a school teacher, although it is a fine profession and they are public servants, that it does not constitute holding public office. That is the reason that we are here tonight.

I get a kick out of Mr. Bradshaw in his presentation. He -- strictly opinion again -- but he says that the Charter says that no Member of the Council shall hold any other public office

carrying a salary. He put the emphasis on "salary." I don't see "salary" underlined in there. I think that the emphasis should be placed on the fact that no Member of the Council shall hold any other "public office" carrying a salary. Entirely a different meaning, if you want to stress certain words in opposition to others.

The point is that we have been informed by the City Solicitor that the role of teacher does not constitute a role of public office, and, therefore, Mr. Merola is not in violation of the Charter.

Inasmuch as Mr. Bradshaw brought the name of former Councilman Caprio into the public record, concerning this, I would like to stand here and question the fact that why, since Mr. Bradshaw feels so strongly about the case of Mr. Merola, that he did not at the time while serving for four years with Councilman Caprio raise the point at that time?

I am inclined to agree with Councilman Stravato's point that this is strictly at the

behest of Mayor Cianci that Mr. Bradshaw introduced this in the first place.

Mr. FARGNOLI. The motion has been made and seconded. All in favor? Opposed?

Mr. BRADSHAW. No.

Mr. MEROLA. I'd like to be recorded as not voting.

(ALL OTHER COUNCILMEN PRESENT
VOTED YES)

Mr. FARGNOLI. The motion carries.

Mr. McKIERNAN. I'd like to raise one point, Mr. Acting President. We are now faced with a very interesting situation and I think more than anything else what Mr. Bradshaw did show the need for the appointment, or election of, a special Charter Review Commission to really go deeply into this Charter and clear up some of the things that over the years have become questionable. The next step in this case is, of course, an appeal to the Court after the decision of this Council is made. However, I do not believe Mr. Bradshaw can make that appeal since he would appear now to be an aggrieved

citizen. I believe the appeal must be made now by the Mayor and the only way the Mayor can make that appeal, according to our Charter, is that he must direct the City Solicitor to go into the Courts and argue this case on his behalf that Mr. Merola is in violation of the City Charter, when in fact another section of that Charter we have just used says that the City Solicitor shall render to the City Council opinions and he has just rendered an opinion exactly opposite of the opinion he might have to argue in Court if we follow this City Charter.

I only bring this out -- I don't think we will go to Court -- but this is just one of the many problems in this Charter and I think we should really, in the coming months, address ourselves to thinking about finding some real qualified legal scholars and putting them to work on this Charter to see if we can clear up some of the inaccuracies in it.

Mr. FARGNOLI. Councilman, I recommend you put that into a resolution, forming a committee to review the Charter.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. President and Members of the Council, there being no further business to come before the public hearing, I now move that the Council stand adjourned.

Mr. ADDISON. I second the motion.

Mr. FARGNOLI. Before we adjourn, the Finance Committee and Urban Renewal Committee will meet in the Conference Room. The meeting is adjourned.

(VOTED TO ADJOURN AT 8:10 P.M.)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Elaine T. Grenier, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true, accurate and complete transcript of my notes taken at the time of the above-entitled hearing.

Elaine T. Grenier

ELAINE T. GRENIER, SHORTHAND REPORTER