

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

September 20, 2010

5:15 PM

Chairman Ouellette called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Ouellette, DeVries, Long, Roy, O'Neil, Lopez

Messrs: K. Sheppard, L. Sorenson, W. Sanders, J. Gile, R. Robetas

Chairman Ouellette addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Department travel/conference summary reports submitted as follows:

- Samuel Maranto (CIP)
Lead and Healthy Homes Grantees Conference
New Orleans, Louisiana
April 26, 2010 to April 30, 2010
- Stephen J. Adams (Airport)
82nd Annual AAAE Conference
Dallas, Texas
May 14, 2010 to May 20, 2010
- Thomas Malafronte (Airport)
Jumpstart Air Service Conference
San Diego, California
June 6, 2010 to June 9, 2010
- Wayne Robinson (Airport)
AAIA Preconference Board Meeting & Annual Conference
Des Moines, Iowa
June 26, 2010 to June 30, 2010

- Sally Fellows (City Clerk)
Joint Meeting of COSA, NAGARA, and SAA
Washington, DC
August 11, 2010 to August 13, 2010
- Mark Brewer (Airport)
NEC/AAAE 52nd Annual Conference
Burlington, VT
August 14, 2010 to August 18, 2010
- Kevin A. Sheppard (Public Works)
American Public Works Association
International Public Works Congress & Exposition
Boston, Massachusetts
August 14, 2010 to August 18, 2010
- Michael J. Venti (Airport)
FAA GIS Conference
Arlington, Virginia
August 25, 2010 and August 26, 2010

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to receive and file the travel summary reports.

Chairman Ouellette addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Lisa Sorenson, Financial Analyst, submitting Finance Department reports as follows:
 - Department Legend
 - Accounts Receivable summary
 - Open Invoice report over 90 days

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman DeVries stated I'm just wondering if there are thoughts that the Finance Department has on how we might better go about some of our receivables, collecting them in a more timely fashion. We understand the economy; things are starting to lag it would appear for collectables, and I just don't want, for lack of our asking, to not implement something that you believe we should.

Ms. Lisa Sorenson, Financial Analyst, replied I know that each department does follow up with each of their customers and will send letters. I also run statements every month and will send statements to any of these accounts that are still overdue.

Alderman DeVries asked so the answer is you think that we're not missing any?

Mr. William Sanders, Finance Officer, replied not that is obvious to us. We believe we are in a good relationship with our collector when we turn things over to the collection agency. I think if you look at Page 4-2, when you look at the over 90-days accounts, there are about six of them that make up about 60 or 70% of the balance, which we believe we have a reasonably good handle on and the courts, in a couple of cases, hold the key to whether we're going to collect some or all of that money.

Alderman DeVries asked would that be the bankruptcy court?

Mr. Sanders replied yes, that's correct. The short answer to your question is that we don't have any hidden key here that's going to bring us to zero. I expect we're probably doing as well as most, maybe not as well as everybody, but I think we're doing a pretty good job with it. We could maybe show you some historical information at the next meeting that would just compare over the last five years how we have done in terms of collecting these receivables. We are open to any suggestions or ideas that you might have.

Alderman DeVries stated I'm not looking to create work, if you don't think it's justified. If you believe that the trend is such that we need to move in a different direction or do anything or be aware of, by all means.

Mr. Sanders stated we'll include a schedule from now on in the monthly reports where we're showing an historical trend of how our collections have gone and particularly focus on the 90-day group and how we ultimately collect or not collect them. We do charge interest so we're not losing interest, assuming we can collect them.

Alderman Long stated I spoke with Lisa earlier. Just for example, I haven't had the opportunity to call Kevin to find out about the National Grid's \$42,000. From what I understand some of that payment has been made.

Ms. Sorenson stated yes, there have been a few small payments that have been made against this account since I ran this report on the ninth. The \$42,000 was not paid in full. It was a couple of small dollar amounts

Alderman Long stated on Line 15 they paid \$1,017. That's where I have an issue is on companies that have a relationship with Manchester, and have a consistent relationship with Manchester and on a daily basis pretty much need Manchester services, why they are not paying in full and what we could do to get them to pay in full. I don't like to see an outstanding balance of \$42,000 from a company that is still in business, still using our services. Actually if Kevin could add to this conversation, that would be helpful.

Mr. Kevin Sheppard, Public Works Director, stated I believe what you're seeing is the roadway degradation fee. They posted a bond for that amount to cover any fees that are billed against them. Should they not pay, we do have a bond, and at this time Attorney Arnold could speak to it. But they are actually challenging that in Concord as well as Manchester. We feel we stand pretty strong but they are challenging it. But they do have a bond to cover those costs.

Alderman Long stated after speaking with Lisa I got a lot of relief on a lot of the questions I had and I'm wondering...this is a public document, so when you look at its face, \$374,900, that is a problem. The \$42,000 is on Page 4-22. If we could sort of get explanations for these high-end numbers, like with the Fire Department there are a lot of businesses that are still active that are doing good business in Manchester and not paying the alarm fee. Why? Do they just sit on it and hopefully it's going to go away? I don't understand why we could get up to these numbers. Like with the Fire Department it is \$29,000; Planning and Community Development is \$34,000. I understand some of that is at a certain point where we'll be spending more money to collect what is owed to us. The other one was the Fairpoint Communication. There is a pre-petition and a post-petition, so this \$32,000, I know their plan is to pay it. Is that open ended? With the pre-petition, do we get the full amount in a pre-petition for their bankruptcy filing or do we get what the court decides we get? And the post-petition, is that the same amount or...?

Mr. Sanders stated I would have to defer to Attorney Arnold on a portion of that question.

Mr. Tom Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, asked Alderman Long, what would you like to know?

Alderman Long stated on Fairpoint Communications in this report, they owe \$32,000. There is a pre-petition that the City filed and a post-petition. From what I understand the pre-petition is about \$18,000 of this.

Mr. Arnold replied it's in that area. There have been some discussions over the exact amount. That ranges, if I remember correctly, between \$16,000 and \$18,000.

Alderman Long asked on a pre-petition has the court decided what percentage we're going to get of that or are we getting the full percentage? There's a pre and a post. Is there any difference with how much we're going to be getting?

Attorney Arnold replied I couldn't answer the post-petition. The pre-petition I believe their plan does provide for them to pay 100% of the claim. As I said, there has been some going back and forth about the actual amount to the claim. The actual amount varies by what dates you use, essentially, not the validity of the debt, so to speak.

Alderman Long asked is there a timeframe with which they have to pay?

Attorney Arnold replied not that I could relay to you off the top of my head.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think just listening to the discussion and looking at the codes, these six items kind of represent a broad spectrum. Are we putting anything into place regarding issuing new permits? For instance, I don't know if Kevin is issuing permits to National Grid to open up the street?

Mr. Sheppard replied as I explained, we are issuing permits. We actually stopped at one point because they have a performance bond that leaves us with \$15,000. We stopped issuing them permits, they contacted us, and they increased their performance bond amount, which just is covering any costs that they have incurred on any work that they are doing. So we feel comfortable issuing permits beyond the performance bond should they not do the work and that will cover the cost.

Alderman O'Neil asked any thought what a dollar amount we're going to let them get to before we call the bond?

Mr. Sheppard replied, again, maybe Attorney Arnold could speak to that. They have taken them to court.

Mr. Arnold stated there is pending litigation dealing with the validity of the roadway degradation fee, the fee that's paid by square foot when National Grid or any other utility opens up a roadway. It is based on a degradation to the integrity of the roadway. As I said, that's presently in litigation before the Superior Court. We entered into a stipulation with National Grid that allows them to post the bond

and continue to draw permits until the validity of the fee is determined by the court. I couldn't give you a timeframe for that, but that's where that stands.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand the court case, but at some point we have to draw a line in the sand. We can't let this go indefinitely waiting for a court that could rule three months, six months, or a year down the road. This is in your budget.

Mr. Sheppard stated it is in our budget that shows as revenue to the City. Again, I feel comfortable with the performance bond from a contractor. We consider them our partners along with other utilities within our right-of-way, so we are issuing a performance bond. I think you understand, Alderman, that the performance bond guarantees payment for work.

Alderman O'Neil asked but at what point?

Mr. Sheppard replied I don't disagree with Attorney Arnold regarding working through the court dates and then at that point see what occurs. I'm not too sure of the timetable, how long a case takes.

Mr. Arnold stated it is unclear these days given the funding situation at the court. But, again, this particular litigation was over the validity of the fee. They are saying they don't have to pay it at all, which led to the stipulation that we entered into.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand that, but nobody has answered at what point... this could go on through the fiscal year. What is the number you carry? Something like \$250,000? Somewhere in there? It's not all attributed to National Grid, but are we going to wait until the end of June? I don't know if the Finance Officer wants to jump in on this. At some point we have to draw a line in the sand whether there is a pending court case or not.

Mr. Sheppard stated I can say it does go into a special revenue account and the Finance Department has a person to contact. I believe it goes into that account and there is a CIP that we started up directing that revenue. So this revenue is recognized in that CIP account, and not just for National Grid but them all, for roadway degradation. Should we lose the court case, yes we won't have that revenue.

Alderman O'Neil stated I do agree with you Mr. Sheppard that they have been a partner, and a very good partner and a very important business in the City, but they have to meet their obligations. I know they disagree with the legality of this,

but they have to meet their obligations. So I think we need to somehow convey that to them.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I recall, Fairpoint had come a long way based on some past reports. That number was high and they had gotten it down fairly low, and I don't want to get into a whole discussion about pre- and post-petition. What has led to that number going back up again?

Ms. Sorenson replied since the last reports that you looked at, their services have been billed by the City, so they have incurred additional charges. They did make payments on their past due invoices prior to going into bankruptcy.

Chairman Ouellette addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from the Finance Officer, submitting the City's Monthly Financial Report (unaudited) for the two months that ended August 31, 2010.

On motion of Alderman Long, duly seconded by Alderman Ouellette, it was voted to discuss this item.

Mr. Sanders stated on page 5-1 is a summary of the financial information that's in your agenda material. Just quickly, referencing the letter, this report is through the end of August. We're only two months into the year, so it is early to draw any conclusions on any of the information, but by and large all departments came through in pretty good shape. We only have two departments that are showing incurred expenses significantly over the benchmark. One is Information Systems, which encumbers and records obligations for equipment that ultimately during the year will be reimbursed by the departments. That's proven to be accurate and true in the past. I would expect it will be true this year and Human Resources is somewhat over the 83% benchmark, and that is because they have encumbered the \$20,000 fee to Workplace Benefit Solutions, our healthcare advisor, and also to the new organization, Employee Management Resource for about \$80,000, which is the replacement for the old employee assistance program that I think the Aldermen are aware of. One line item that continues to be challenging is the healthcare line item. For July and August the City has incurred about \$2.3 million of healthcare expenses. This is about \$370,000 over what our budget is for two months. If you annualize that, you would come to about a \$2 million number for a full-year basis. Some good news, I don't want to understate that being over budget is not a good place, but one thing that will be different this year from last year, is the Aldermen did approve as part of the budget process, transfers to our reserve, our health insurance reserve account. During the last four or five months

we have right now \$3.7 million in our health insurance reserve account, so if you look back a year ago when we were \$800,000 over after two months, we only had \$1.2 million in our health insurance reserve account, so it was a very serious situation a year ago on this line item specifically. So, not to understate the \$370,000, we at least have some cushion to protect us if costs do not return. We're doing better than we did last year, but our budget was still tight on the general fund side, and we need to continue to watch that number closely. Overall for all expenditures through August, we're actually tracking better this year as a city with an unencumbered amount of 81.4% compared to 80.95% a year ago. So we're doing a little better this year than we were doing last year at this time overall. Revenues are doing better this year overall than they were a year ago. We have a small decline in auto registrations and our State revenues are down, but we do have higher building permits, workers' compensation reimbursements from the State and school chargebacks this year than we had a year ago. So overall through August, the City is doing well from a budget point of view and a revenue point of view, and we will be starting up our monthly forecast process for the October meeting, so next month we will have a forecast with a balance of the fiscal year by department as we have done for the last three or four years. Hopefully we'll have more visibility as to what department heads think about where they are going.

Alderman Long stated every report we get has the same verbiage after them, "Recorded obligations for equipment" and "Reimburse departments receiving the equipment". Is this new stuff? Are we closing out what they are already owed from the last fiscal year and we're beginning again?

Mr. Sanders replied this is a new year. They're issuing new purchase orders for computers or whatever, various technologies. This is new items for fiscal 2011.

Alderman Long asked so these encumbrances aren't from the prior fiscal year?

Mr. Sanders replied no, we record encumbrances at the end of the fiscal year and we hold those prior encumbrances open to cover lagging things. These are new items.

Alderman Long asked in the health insurance budget, the \$370,000, is it the Primex insurance? What is that insurance that we're paying the employees to get the lower cost health?

Mr. Sanders replied this would be Compass.

Alderman Long asked does this \$370,000 figure the Compass in?

Mr. Sanders replied yes, the \$100 that we pay to employees, that factors in. That all gets charged to our healthcare line item, just as do the savings, which are not recorded, but we're realizing the savings in this line item.

Alderman Long asked so that savings is figured into this \$370,000?

Mr. Sanders replied yes it is.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to accept the report.

Chairman Ouellette addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from the Human Resources Director, requesting approval to establish a special account for funds to resupply employee identification/access control badges.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman O'Neil stated I apologize that I didn't have a chance today to email or call the department just to get some background, and I happen to have some air about it and you didn't necessarily have a lot of information. I apologize that I'm asking these questions. Let me just preface my comments by saying it appears to me that we're doing a chargeback and we have too many chargebacks in City departments. We have created too many accounting positions, etc., etc. All we're doing is taking out of one pocket and putting it in the other. With that said, any idea what the budget would need to be annually for this? Is this a \$1,000 item, a \$10,000 item?

Ms. Jane Gile, Human Resources Director, stated to get a little bit to your first question and then I'll get to your other questions. We have CIP funding this year, and it will cost us about \$6,000 to do the badges and the control access identification badges for employees. Currently what's happening is departments are charged through a third party \$20 for those badges. We can do them in-house for a lot less than that, and what we're proposing is that instead of any of the revenue that would be achieved from that, that it would go into a special account that we charge departments \$8 per badge, it would go into a restricted account to be used only to replace badges that have been broken, for new employees, etc., and that we would draw from that account in the future instead of having to go in the budget process on a year-to-year basis. It would be a self-sustaining account.

We also see that it would be a cost savings for the City because we're going to be doing it in-house and not through a third party.

Alderman O'Neil stated we're talking about two different things. I agree with the thought of doing it in-house and the savings there. What I don't agree with, and to be honest, I never knew departments were charged \$20 per employee. Is that for new or replacement?

Ms. Gile replied those are for new and replacement.

Alderman O'Neil stated I was not aware of that. The bottom line is that it is still coming out of the taxpayers' pocket, whether it's an appropriation in your department or it's an appropriation in the various general fund departments, I guess the enterprises would be a little different, but we're still paying for it in our water rate, sewer rate, parking fees, whatever. If you were putting in a request, what would be the annual cost to do this?

Ms. Gile replied I guess it's dependent on the year. And I can tell you right now, there are about 350 badges at the Highway Department that are just about ready to go, so if they were to be charged by a third party at \$20 a badge, that would be \$7,000, and what we're proposing is that it would be \$8 a badge and that would be \$2,800. There is a \$4,200 savings right there. We would put that \$2,800 just in a restricted account that we can draw on in future years.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't disagree with that, what I disagree with is that I'm paying the Highway Department in my tax bill whether I pay you or them. It seems like we're creating more of an issue than we need to. That's why I'm asking. What's the number you need a year?

Ms. Gile replied that's what I was trying to answer. Right now there are 350 badges that are waiting to go.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's because Highway employees have never had badges before.

Ms. Gile stated that's at the Highway Department. On an annual basis we probably, with new employees, broken badges, people that change positions, change titles, that need a different access badges, it would probably be in the vicinity of about 100 or so a year.

Alderman O'Neil stated so you need about \$800. Why don't we just appropriate \$800 in your budget?

Ms. Gile replied we can do that this way; it was just another way of looking at it. It was just another way to say instead of having to appropriate the money on a year-to-year basis and trying to anticipate, then we would just have this reserve that we can work with in terms of the maintenance, any of the printing equipment, and anything else that needs to be maintained, that we would have that account that is restricted only for that purpose and that's all.

Alderman O'Neil stated my personal opinion is it is the cost of doing business. Again, I wish we could get rid of the chargebacks we have, I understand why we have them with the School District, but chargebacks have created some issues in the City. So, in my opinion, if we can just budget it in the Human Resources Department, that's the right thing to do.

Alderman Long stated I agree with respect to the chargebacks. I'd like to get away from that. That way we know on its face what it is costing us. But I understand this dedicated account is also going to be used to maintaining whatever equipment you are using also, so if it was a budgeted item, then we would need all of that, not only the \$800, what you anticipate for maintenance, but I'd much rather see that than a chargeback scenario. That costs us extra administration and that's not an efficient way. Getting away from chargebacks would be a goal that I'd like to see happen.

Chairman Ouellette stated I think in a way I understand why she would rather do it this way because in the years where you need more badges, it is going to come out of her budget and she is going to have to come back to the Board. I know it is going to be a small number, a small item, but in the long run, the years she needs to run 50 badges, that's going to end up coming out of her budget. As long as this Board knows that going forward, and if she has a problem, she can come to the Board, I have no problem with it the way the Committee wants to do it. I understand why she is trying to protect herself. Her budget is very tight; she doesn't have a lot of wiggle room.

Alderman O'Neil stated again, for me it's the cost of doing business. They have to advertise for vacant positions. Jane, help me out. There are other items that you do for all departments. We're not charging back all of those to departments. It is the cost of running an HR department, it's the cost of managing HR and a large organization. That's all I'm looking at here. I guess I look at the 350 badges at Highway, I don't want to call it a one-time expense, but I don't believe they have badges now. They are not going to need 350 badges every year.

Chairman Ouellette said like I said, I agree with you Alderman, but there are going to be times where she is going to have to come to the Board, not every year. We're building a new complex, or hopefully we're building a new complex, and that year

we're going to need a lot of new badges. You're right, it is the cost of doing business; the Board just has to recognize that, and when she asks, hopefully in a timely manner, we'll be able to handle the problem. That's all I'm saying.

Alderman Roy stated I apologize for being late. Jane or Red, do these badges have a shelf life? I'm just looking so we can all look ahead and say okay, if they do, and we know that they're going to stop working in five or ten years, we can come up with a formula so that we can fund it the way that Alderman O'Neil has talked about.

Mr. Red Robidas, Security Manager, replied generally they do not have a shelf life, but a lot of them may get broken. It is more that idea than badges themselves expiring. As an example, mine is 11 years old and is still functioning. Some others sometimes have replaced them because they have broken or some other circumstance where they have to be changed. Generally they can continue to run for an extended number of years.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would fully support...my guess would be that the departments did not budget for this. They budgeted for the equipment, which I applaud them on the savings opportunity there. Somehow if we've got to move some money to help support them, I think we work that out with the Finance Officer. If it is \$800, to be honest, I don't know what your budget is off the top of my head, but we've had discussions about much higher numbers and telling departments we have your back covered at the end of the year. So I would rather see you try to absorb it in your budget, and if you can't, we're certainly aware of it going on record tonight and with some report to the full Board. It's almost like we're making things a little more bureaucratic than we have to. It's the cost of running an HR department.

Chairman Ouellette asked what is the pleasure of the Committee?

Alderman Lopez stated I think the comments from both parties are correct. The problem lies in the budget process. That's the most critical time. It's easier for a department to get \$20 in order to make a card. If we do not, I repeat do not, put money in the HR's budget, whether it is \$6,000, \$8,000 or \$10,000, and I know we stripped them very heavily because we said let the departments take care of it. They are hiring the employees and that's always been the argument. As you make your decision, keep that in mind that she would need to come up with a budget in her budget in order to take care of these cards for the departments. The other side of the coin is the departments can easily handle it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't disagree with what the Chairman of the Board just said, but we're now passing burdens onto the departments that are tight. There isn't a department that got what they wanted or what they believed they needed for a budget amount. They are all operating very, very tight. So we treat this as we have treated direction to the Highway to put people on as appropriate, as we've directed Police and Fire to maintain X number of vacancies and then put people on. I think we've just got to manage it as with anything else.

Alderman O'Neil moved to refer this to the Finance Department to have a discussion with the Human Resources Department to see where they are with their budget and report back to the Committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated if there are budget shortfalls with any department, the Finance Officer is going to have to report back to us when he becomes aware of those situations. I think two months into our fiscal year is a little early that there is a shortfall.

Alderman Roy asked Jane, is this time sensitive or can it wait?

Ms. Gile replied it is not time sensitive at this point.

Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated Jane, what I haven't heard, and I've heard the suggestion, that the bureaucracy that is being created with going back and asking for reimbursement out of the departments is going to have an expense attached to it. I don't know that I've heard you make the counter-point that by not doing that you're saving money. It would be a natural assumption. Is there going to be bookkeeping if you set up the system that you have proposed?

Ms. Gile replied sure. We just invoice the departments for how many badges that we had to do in a particular period of time. I don't think it's going to be that difficult.

Alderman DeVries asked if we say we want to and in one fell swoop take care of this in the budget, is there a savings? Is there less bookkeeping? I guess that is my question to you.

Ms. Gile replied I think there would be savings to the department, but to the HR department you'd have to understand that it will be an increase to our budget in order to put another line item in that budget so that we would have to appropriate more funds in the general fund in order to accommodate any badges that we do.

This was just a way to offset that increase to our budget. It was just another way to look at it. That's all.

Chairman Ouellette called for a vote on the motion to approve this item and to have the Finance Officer discuss with the Human Resources Director and report back to the Committee. There being none in opposition, the motion carried.

Chairman Ouellette addressed item 7 of the agenda:

7. Chairman Ouellette advised that ordinances are to be considered for consistency with the rules of the Board and requests the Clerk make a presentation.

Ordinances for consideration:

“Authorizing the Mayor to dispose of certain tax deeded property situated at Groveland Avenue, Manchester, New Hampshire known as Map 492, Lots 3A and 3B.”

“Amending Section 70.57 Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding section (G) Special Event Parking to allow the parking Division to charge \$5.00 per vehicle per day for parking in public and private parking lots controlled by the Parking Division on October 1st, 2nd and 3rd, 2010.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicle and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding a new Residential Parking Permit Zone #8 in Section 70.55 (D) (8) Residential Parking Permit Zone #8 (Central High School area) and (G) (5) special restrictions for zone eight.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.36 Stopping, Standing and Parking by adding Section (E) Overtime Parking and Section (F) Penalty.”

“Amending Chapter 70: Motor Vehicles and Traffic of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending Section 70.06 Definitions to add the definition of Overtime Parking.”

Deputy City Clerk Kathie Gardner stated there are five ordinance amendments presented here for your consideration. They have been through the proper committee process, noticed to the public, and the public has had an opportunity for comment and input. Therefore, in the Clerk's opinion, they have been properly enrolled.

On motion of Alderman DeVries, duly seconded by Alderman Roy, it was voted that the Ordinances be enrolled.

TABLED ITEM

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. Retabled 2/22/10 until the implementation of new software is completed.)
On file for viewing with Office of the City Clerk, One City Hall Plaza.

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee