

**COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT AND
REVENUE ADMINISTRATION**

May 19, 2009

5:30 PM

Chairman Sullivan called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sullivan, Lopez, M. Roy, Ouellette

Absent: Alderman DeVries

Messrs.: W. Sanders, T. Arnold, L. Sorenson

Chairman Sullivan addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Department travel/conference summary reports submitted as follows:

- Mark Brewer/Tom Malafronte, (Airport) US Airways visit, Phoenix, AZ.
(March 10, 2009 to March 11, 2009)
- Brian Keating, (Planning) National Community Development
Association's CDBG Basics Training for Practitioners, Raleigh, NC.
(April 8, 2009 to April 10, 2009)
- Teresa Avampato, (Airport) PFC and Rates and Charges, Chicago, IL.
(April 14, 2009 to April 16, 2009)
- Carlton E. Braley, Jr., (Airport) 43rd International Aviation Snow
Symposium, Buffalo, NY.
(April 25, 2009 to April 30, 2009)

Alderman M. Roy stated I just want to reiterate for everyone, one of these is for Planning. My understanding was that all non-Enterprise departments were shut down for travel.

City Clerk Matthew Normand responded the motion of the Committee the last time they addressed this was that all travel had to be approved by the Mayor's Office. It is assumed that these went through that process.

Alderman M. Roy asked has anyone confirmed that these have all been approved by the Mayor's office?

City Clerk Normand answered I don't know.

Chairman Sullivan stated I will see if I can get an answer from Sean Thomas.

Alderman M. Roy stated actually I am going to make it more formal. If we could have the Clerk get all of the travel requests since we last made that motion and have them reviewed by the Mayor's Office. If they have been reviewing them it will be a simple, yes we have and if they have not, then we will discuss it.

Chairman Sullivan asked is that in the form of a motion?

Alderman M. Roy answered yes.

Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion. I think the Mayor can review these as the Clerk said and I think there was something about the Enterprise system versus the tax portion of it. I want to make a comment. I have made it before and I just want to have some discussion. We go through the process of having individuals going away to learn something like the Airport Director going to Phoenix, Arizona. Some of the departments are responsible for their personnel when they send these people. I want to know what is accomplished by all of the paperwork that has to go through departments. What are we getting out of it? Am I missing something? If a department head is sending somebody, I would presume that that department head is responsible to review the request and make sure that the training the individual receives is in accordance with the rules and regulations of the City. I am just curious. Are we causing a lot of work here by printing this up? What are we doing with it? We receive and file and move it on. Do we have to have a complete report every time somebody goes to the bathroom so to speak?

Chairman Sullivan replied if I may Alderman Lopez, I do appreciate receiving these reports so we can at least maintain some level of accountability so we know what the departments are doing in terms of sending people to these conferences. If we didn't receive them in this kind of a format we may lose control of the process at some point. I have faith in our department heads that they are trying to keep a handle on this and they are not approving anything that is not essential but I think it is helpful as a management tool that we have these reports coming forward that at least outline what the purpose of the training sessions were and what they hope to achieve. Right here we have someone from Planning who went to a CDBG planning sessions. That is something I think that is not a bad idea right now. That is a program that might actually help us bring in some additional funding and manage the funding that we do receive from the Federal government. So that may be something that actually helps us save money in the long term. It helps us differentiate between that and something that is non-essential.

Chairman Sullivan called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman M. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to receive and file the travel/conference reports.

Chairman Sullivan addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from William Sanders, Finance Officer, submitting the City's Monthly Financial Report (unaudited) for the ten months ended April 30, 2009.

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, stated you have the report for the ten months ended April 30 included in your agenda material. There is not a great deal new to report on the expenditure side. The departments by and large continue to operate within what you would expect through the month of April. I have noted four or five departments that have shortfalls. They have all been noted in prior months, the largest of which is the Highway Department and obviously with the winter weather that gave rise to issues there and I think the Aldermen have been aware of that for some time. I would point out as I do in the letter that our healthcare costs through April are about \$9.7 million and we are about 14% above our operating budget for healthcare. If this continues and it has been continuing through the month of May, we will probably be approximately \$800,000 to \$1 million over on our healthcare budget.

Chairman Sullivan asked what is the number again?

Mr. Sanders answered \$800,000 to \$1 million over the budgeted amount for healthcare. This is one of the accounts that has a reserve fund associated with it that we established in prior years when our healthcare costs had been lower. That account has about \$1.5 million in it today so we would have enough money in that account to square up the healthcare budget at the end of the year but it certainly is a concern and something that the Aldermen need to be focused on as we work on the 2010 budget.

Chairman Sullivan asked what is driving that increase? That is pretty substantial.

Mr. Sanders answered our trend rates are high. I think we are probably in the 10% to 11% just year over year trend. I think when we originally set the budget for this past year we thought it was going to be more in the vicinity of 7% or 8%. Of course, once our premiums are set with the employees, to the extent that there are any excess costs or utilization of the healthcare plan, that all falls to the City. Last year we implemented a settling up between the general fund and the Enterprise fund so there is a possibility that some of this overage or some of this excess cost will also be allocated off to the

Enterprise funds because they participate in our overall plan. The percentages I am using and the number I am giving you does not assume that there will be any additional cost to our City Enterprise funds.

Chairman Sullivan asked this is assuming that it is all coming from the City?

Mr. Sanders answered correct.

Alderman M. Roy stated that was pretty much my question. The other was Bill could you start noting that maybe on the bottom of our next month's projection so we can see it tracked?

Mr. Sanders replied sure.

Alderman Lopez asked on the \$800,000 that we have in the reserve fund, when you balance the books at the end of June we will not necessarily take all of the money out of there if you are short in healthcare? It is possible that we may have other surplus correct?

Mr. Sanders answered well actually we would go to the healthcare reserve fund first, which we are obligated to do under the ordinance that the Aldermen established. Any other surpluses would go to reduce our revenue shortfall that we are going to have this year. So there are four accounts that we have a special reserve for – health insurance, the two worker's compensation accounts and the general liability insurance. So any shortfall we have in health insurance we would first go to the reserve account and the projection that I have been preparing and we will go through one this evening, does not include the shortfall from the health insurance because the health insurance would be charged to the reserve. The only reason I would show it would be if we had exhausted the health insurance reserve then I would have to show a deficit to make-up the balance of whatever was left in health insurance. This is similar to when we have a surplus in health insurance, which we have had. That is not part of the surplus of the general fund. That immediately gets put into this special reserve for situations such as what we are experiencing.

Alderman Lopez asked so in 2010 we would have to increase our reserve fund?

Mr. Sanders responded the reserve fund increases if we have surpluses in the health insurance line year over year. There is no obligation for the Aldermen to fund the reserve. It gets funded by virtue of if we set in the budget \$10 million for health insurance and the actual expenditures come in at \$9 million then we put \$1 million into the special reserve account for health insurance. There is no additional appropriation that I am aware of that has ever been made to that account.

Chairman Sullivan asked so the entire amount that is in there right now is actually from past years where there has been a surplus?

Mr. Sanders answered that is correct.

Alderman M. Roy asked Bill, the projection in the Mayor's budget of the \$11,290,000 what is your feeling between the time that budget was crafted and today?

Mr. Sanders responded it needs to be increased. I think I have mentioned that to Aldermen that I have met with. I have a projection that I have received from WBS, Workplace Benefit Solutions, our healthcare consultant that is an estimate of about \$12.5 million for next year. I have been urging Aldermen to try to get that healthcare number up to \$12 million from the current \$11,290,000.

Alderman M. Roy asked Bill, looking right now you said we are 14.6% over?

Mr. Sanders answered right for what you would expect through the end of April.

Alderman M. Roy asked and that total is...

Mr. Sanders interjected the total is about \$9 million.

Alderman M. Roy asked could you have Mr. Ntapalis give us a breakdown of what our medical benefit is and what would fall under worker's compensation or employee injuries?

Mr. Sanders answered sure.

Alderman Lopez stated he has already provided that to us.

Alderman M. Roy asked based on that yearly number?

Mr. Sanders stated once again the worker's compensation would be going to a second account. There is no worker's compensation included in that \$9 million. There is a separate worker's compensation medical account. If you look at Page 4-5...

Alderman M. Roy interjected so the worker's compensation is under restricted items?

Mr. Sanders responded yes that is it. It is the sixth line down from "restricted items."

Alderman M. Roy asked and that would include all health benefits as well?

Mr. Sanders answered that includes the health portion and you will see the second line under restricted items is worker's compensation salaries so any salary we are paying is in that line and the worker's compensation health is further down.

Alderman Lopez stated there is a percentage in the reserve fund that they actually say we should have in that fund is correct. Do you know what that number is?

Mr. Sanders answered no.

Alderman Lopez stated I will get it from Harry. I know that in worker's compensation and in other reserve funds sometimes he has 70% or 80% and they actually say he should have X number of dollars.

Mr. Sanders replied we do get an actuarial report for the worker's compensation balances at each June 30. We can't book to their amount necessarily but yes basically they want a reserve for all open worker's compensation claims that we have. Keep in mind that what we show in our budget is what we are actually paying out but if I am on worker's compensation for a long period of time you might be paying me worker's compensation for ten years presumably and the actuary would expect you to fund that ten years. Over this year we will also draw down on the worker's compensation reserves as well.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to accept the report and forward it to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen for informational purposes.

Chairman Sullivan addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from William Sanders, Finance Officer, submitting an updated budget forecast for FY2009, if available.

Alderman Lopez asked can we have Mr. Sanders give us a brief presentation?

Mr. Sanders stated if you look at the second page, the detailed number page, we are currently projecting based on the department head projections that were received about a week ago that the general fund operating deficit for this year will amount to \$1.8 million shortfall. That is made up of the \$3.2 million revenue shortfall and that has been offset by what we are now projecting to be a \$1.4 million expenditure surplus as the departments continue to manage their budgets frugally. As I have noted in prior months, the likelihood that we are going to receive our revenue sharing payments that are due in September or any time during FY2010 are becoming increasingly unlikely as time passes as I understand it. I have not yet incorporated that shortfall in my forecast pending what the Senate may or may not do in the next few weeks but assuming that the changes that have been recommended by the Governor and approved by the House pass, our shortfall

would increase by \$1,997,000 if we don't receive the revenue sharing and our net shortfall for the year will be a little bit of \$3.8 million.

Chairman Sullivan asked in layman's terms that means our current deficit would double?

Mr. Sanders answered that is correct and that \$3.8 million as we discussed in prior meetings would be charged to the rainy day fund that the City has and the rainy day fund has a balance today of \$9.2 million. So we would be able to cover that so to speak.

Chairman Sullivan asked what is the balance again?

Mr. Sanders answered \$9.2 million. The biggest change in this month's projection from last month is actually our expenditures have improved but the biggest change was actually a reduction in our revenue projections as a result of the River's Edge project. We continued with the expectation that we would receive about \$650,000 of building permit fees from this project and the Planning Department is now advising that they are of the understanding that that is not going to happen so we have incorporated that.

Chairman Sullivan asked have the builders pulled all of the permits...do they anticipate pulling any further permits this fiscal year?

Mr. Sanders answered not for River's Edge. Hopefully that will be an opportunity for next year's budget.

Chairman Sullivan stated I can remember having this conversation about a year ago.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. Sanders you have the combined total of \$1.18 million. Could you make a note next time how much of that is in the Parking Division?

Mr. Sanders answered about \$600,000 of that is in the Parking Division and about \$600,000 of that is interest income.

Alderman Lopez asked we lost \$600,000 of interest income?

Mr. Sanders responded yes. The interest rates have dropped.

Alderman Lopez stated we keep hearing a lot of things about parking and I am just trying to keep track of the projections they had. How does that fit in? Have you looked at that? Are their projections \$600,000 short?

Mr. Sanders replied yes. I think when the original budget for FY09 was put together there were some...and obviously you need to keep in mind that at that time the economy was behaving very well if you go back to the spring of 2008, they pretty much had

shortfalls in most of their revenue categories. Their interest income is much lower on their cash balances, substantially lower. They have also had lower revenues on meters and permits and that sort of thing.

Alderman Lopez stated I am just trying to get a handle on the revenue going into FY10. It would help...I know she has given us a lot of reports and sometimes they are two or three pages. I would be interested in knowing the total revenue that was projected and where the \$600,000 shortfall comes in. I know we gave \$500,000 from the one time account to buy the kiosks. Maybe a one page thing on revenue and expenses for FY09 and then the revenue she has projected for FY10.

Mr. Sanders responded okay.

Chairman Sullivan stated you mentioned interest income. How has that been trending the last month or two? The reason I ask is I met with the Library Trustees the other day and they indicated that they have seen some and I am not going to say great but some bottoming out of the picture. Are we still on the downward trend or have we leveled off? Where do we stand?

Mr. Sanders replied the trust funds, I think it is true for the Library as it is for the trust fund that the City has for cemeteries and that sort of thing, are invested in securities that would be similar to mutual funds so there is an equity component to their returns. For the City's general fund cash we only invest in collateralized bank overnight deposits so they are fully secured by Treasury notes and Treasury obligations and because of the City's investment policy we are not permitted to do anything other than that and I wouldn't suggest doing anything other than that.

Alderman Lopez stated I do have one more question. Can you explain MCTV? I am a little confused there. How can they over spend?

Mr. Sanders responded they didn't over spend, the Finance Officer under budgeted. When we put the FY09 budget together, the assumption was that we would be paying them approximately \$400,000 but the final contract that the Aldermen had approved for them stipulated that they get 2% of the 5% that the City receives from Comcast so it is not based on budgets for their requirements for money. They just get a flat 40% of whatever we get from Comcast. What they were actually due this year was \$537,000 and that is what we had to pay them under the contract where we had only budgeted \$400,000, which was what they actually spent in the prior year. I hope that wasn't too confusing.

Alderman Lopez asked but they are paid?

Mr. Sanders answered yes they were paid in July. If I could just leap to the budget for FY10 for a second on that issue, under the contract with MCTV for next year they would be due about \$837,000 between MCTV and MCAM. The Mayor's budget provides that they will receive \$500,000 if you recall under the presumption that the contract between MCTV, MCAM and the City would be changed. That needs to happen or that \$500,000 I am going to be coming to you in July and saying well the contract says I owe them \$837,000. Now I suppose the Aldermen could direct me not to pay it but that contractual situation that exists between MCTV or actually between the School District and the City there is a contracted liability there that would be in excess of \$800,000 between MCTV and MCAM.

Chairman Sullivan asked as it stands now contractually what amount will be going to MCTV and what amount will be going to MCAM? How does that work?

Mr. Sanders answered MCTV would get 2/3 of it so they would get about \$625,000 and MCAM gets 1/3 so that would be about \$275,000 approximately.

Alderman Lopez stated but right now it is \$500,000 in the budget and the same situation could happen in FY10 because we have a \$500,000 budget but we still have a contract. I don't know if you want to weigh in on this Tom. Have you reviewed those contracts? It is going to be an issue coming up. If we continue on the course that we are, which is underfunding MCTV and the contracts are legal I guess we would have to pay them regardless of what number we have in the budget. Is that correct?

Chairman Sullivan asked Dr. Grace Sullivan if she would like to come forward.

Alderman Lopez stated I am asking Tom Arnold.

Mr. Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated under the City's current agreement with the Board of School Committee, it calls for the City to pay 2% of the 5% franchise fee that we receive from Comcast to MCTV, whatever that number is. The contract of course does not have a specific number in it. It has the 2%. That is our agreement with the School Board.

Alderman Lopez asked and if we only put \$500,000 in does that take our obligation away?

Mr. Arnold answered it would probably be breaching the agreement you have with the School Board.

Alderman Lopez asked is that the same thing with MCAM?

Mr. Arnold answered MCAM is slightly different. They get 1% if I remember correctly of the 5% that we get from Comcast. They get that so long as they are the public access provider. Whether they remain the public access provider or not is within the discretion of this Board but likewise the agreement contingent on their being the public access provider provides that they will get 1% of the 5% franchise fee. Again, it does not mention a specific number. It just says 1% of whatever the 5% we receive is.

Alderman Lopez asked are you indicating that if the Board of Mayor and Aldermen decided that we wanted to take MCTV and make them the public access provider we can do away with the 1%?

Mr. Arnold answered in a roundabout way, yes. As I said, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen can decide that MCAM will not be the public access provider and if they are not the public access provider then the agreement, if I recall correctly, terminates and they would no longer be entitled to the 1%.

Chairman Sullivan asked if that were the case, speaking hypothetically if we were to transfer the public access function from MCAM to MCTV would MCTV then be the recipient of the share that is now allocated towards MCAM as the public access provider?

Mr. Arnold answered not automatically, no.

Chairman Sullivan asked we would have to approve them as...

Mr. Arnold interjected if what you are asking me is would MCTV then become beneficiary of the MCAM contract my answer is no.

Chairman Sullivan asked so the money does not necessarily follow the function?

Mr. Arnold answered that is correct. If you...and I am again relying on my memory here, which I often say is dangerous, but if you decide that you are not going to designate MCAM as the public access provider, the agreement with MCAM terminates. It does not get transferred to any subsequent organization or entity that may provide public access.

Alderman Lopez stated you don't have to do it now, Tom, but I would suggest that you review those contracts and have the correct...I think you have the correct information now but I think paperwork wise because it is going to be a discussion at some point and you might as well get ready for it.

Mr. Arnold replied as I said, I don't have the contracts here in front of me but I have reviewed them and I believe the information I have given you is correct. Obviously just prior to that topic coming up I would review them again.

Alderman Lopez stated I am not insinuating anything or making any decision. This has just been a discussion that some of the Aldermen have been having. It is what it is at the present time but I just want to clarify that if we put \$500,000 in the budget that is one issue and the second issue is the contract and we have to honor that and that is a legal issue. If the legal people are telling us that we have to honor that contract then we tell the Finance Officer to pay them. That is the procedure. Now the other procedure is yes there will be a shortfall in 2010 if that is the case but we will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Alderman M. Roy stated this question is for Finance or the Solicitor. With the proposed budget that is on the table, have any talks taken place to rectify this problem with MCTV or MCAM that you are aware of?

Mr. Sanders answered not that I am aware of.

Alderman M. Roy asked has any City staff asked either of your departments to solve what could be a \$337,000 deficit?

Mr. Sanders answered they have not directed me. I have been telling interested people that we need to send a letter and create a document trail here of what our intentions are.

Alderman M. Roy asked looking at how we set our rate in November with DRA should this deficit have affected our rate back in November and the second part of that question is looking forward if MCTV and MCAM were funded at the \$500,000 rate would that rate be adjusted in November or would it be a deficit come this time next year?

Mr. Sanders replied it would be the latter, Alderman. Once you appropriate the money, when we go up to see DRA in November the appropriation is the appropriation. This is what the Aldermen approved. The only issue with DRA is how are we going to raise the money. So if you appropriated \$500,000 but it actually cost us \$800,000 we can only raise taxes to get the \$500,000. The shortfall of \$300,000 we will have to get out of other expenditure line items just as we are doing with the \$137,000 this year.

Alderman M. Roy asked so looking at that does that stand for all contractual relationships or just MCAM?

Mr. Sanders answered it stands for everything that is an expenditure of the City which is included in the appropriation. Once the Aldermen approve the appropriation or accept the Mayor's budget on the second Tuesday in June that is the appropriation for next year and there are very rare circumstances that would permit the Aldermen to change the appropriation. That would be very, very unusual.

Alderman Lopez stated I think this is going to be a discussion at the full Board in the Finance Committee when we start discussing the budget.

Alderman M. Roy asked is this getting referred to the full Board this evening?

Chairman Sullivan asked is there a motion to accept and refer to the Board?

Alderman Lopez moved to accept the report and forward it to the full Board for informational purposes. Alderman M. Roy duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sullivan called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sullivan addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Sharon Wickens, Assistant Director of Treasury, submitting Finance Department reports as follows:
 - a) Department Legend;
 - b) Open Invoice report over 90 days by fund;
 - c) Open Invoice report all invoices for interdepartmental billings only;
 - d) Open Invoice report all invoices due from the School Department only;
 - e) Listing of invoices submitted to City Solicitor for Legal Determination; and
 - f) Accounts Receivable summary.

Alderman M. Roy moved to accept the reports. Alderman Ouellette duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sullivan called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Ms. Lisa Sorenson stated Sharon Wickens submitted the reports in my absence but I am here to answer any questions.

Chairman Sullivan asked is there anything noteworthy in terms of bankruptcies of any of the creditors that we should know about or are we pretty much where we were last time we met?

Ms. Sorenson answered Corcoran Environmental has filed bankruptcy, which I believe Tom has been looking into and working on. I don't have any further information. They owe about \$62,000.

Chairman Sullivan asked where do we stand as a creditor with them? Does anybody have any idea in terms of preferences in bankruptcy?

Ms. Sorenson replied Tom would have that information.

Mr. Arnold stated we are basically an unsecured creditor. However, we have had discussions with Corcoran and with Pinard. It is our understanding at this point that Corcoran views this contract as important and they would like to accept the contract as opposed to reject it. If they do that under the law they have to cure any defaults. So as it looks now and it is still very preliminary, we will probably come out okay on it but that is kind of a prediction of the future, which is like my memory always dangerous. We have been paying close attention to it.

Ms. Sorenson stated I just want to make a correction. The total amount Corcoran owes is \$68,000. I believe I previously stated \$62,000.

Alderman M. Roy stated and that is climbing every month under our contractual agreement.

Ms. Sorenson stated they are being invoiced monthly, yes.

Chairman Sullivan stated on a somewhat related note, while I have everybody, I have heard rumblings about the Manchester Place Project and that there may be some changes in their financial status. Does anybody have any information in terms of a possible foreclosure over there? That is the rumor that I have heard. I want to make sure that if there is...

Alderman Lopez interjected rumors are bad.

Chairman Sullivan stated rumors are bad but not having information is worse. If we are going to get hit upside the head...

Alderman Lopez interjected there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. Sanders stated I think the Solicitor has something to say.

Mr. Arnold stated talk to me after the meeting.

TABLED ITEMS

7. Update on the status of Policy and Procedure manuals for each department.
(Note: The Committee has requested that all manuals be completed by June. Tabled 1/06/09)

This item remained on the table.

8. Communication from Kevin Buckley, Independent City Auditor, submitting the P-Card Program Performance Audit.
(Tabled 11/25/08)

This item remained on the table.

9. Communication from Kevin Buckley, Independent City Auditor, submitting an audit of the Office of the City Clerk, Business License and Enforcement Division.
(Tabled 10/21/08)

This item remained on the table.

10. Communication from Kevin Buckley, Independent City Auditor, submitting an audit of the VISTA program and updating the committee on the status of pending and future audits.
(Note: Tabled 2/4/08 Copies of the audit and supporting documentation previously sent to the BMA and Committee members; Remained tabled 3/4/08; Updated communication between Kevin Buckley, Internal Auditor, and Janice Lopilato, State Program Specialist of the Corporation for National & Community Services attach; Tabled 3/11/08; Internal Auditor to present the attached Business Expense Policy as amended.)

On motion of Alderman Sullivan, duly seconded by Alderman M. Roy, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Chairman Sullivan stated I think we have addressed most of the proposed reforms in the report. I don't think there is a need to keep this sitting on the table any longer. Kevin gave us a good package of reforms on that when the report first came out and we have addressed a number of them.

Alderman Lopez stated weren't there some recommendations on that though?

Chairman Sullivan responded there were but that is what I am saying. We have moved forward on a number of those recommendations and I don't know if it is necessary to keep it sitting on the table any longer. The big recommendation that hasn't been addressed is the fraud reporting system and Kevin has been too wrapped up with other responsibilities to hit that one yet. That is something that he will get around to at some point in the future. If you want to leave it on the table that is fine. I am just trying to do a little house cleaning.

Alderman Lopez stated the only thing is if you could talk to Kevin and tell him to review it and give us the recommendation that has not been implemented.

Chairman Sullivan replied I will get in touch with him and get a breakdown on that.

This item was returned to the table.

11. Copy of a communication from Alderman Lopez to Committee on Community Improvement requesting the BMA to ask the Finance Officer, City Solicitor and Bond Counsel (if needed) to review the possibility of using Rooms and Meals Tax money in the future for Storm Water Utility/Sidewalks/Streets.
(Tabled 09/25/2007 pending further information from the Finance Department. Retabled 7/07/08.)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion Alderman M. Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee