

**Rochester Board of Education
Finance Committee**

**October 12, 2004 5:30 P.M.
Minutes**

Present: Commissioners Bowers, Garcia, Powell, Thompson, Dr. Rivera, Mr. Marini, Mr. Connors, Ms. Tripi, Mr. Hofer, Mr. Silver, Mr. Looby, Ms. Cottrell, Ms. Rohring.

Commissioner Bowers called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

I. Receive and Review Monthly Financial Reports

Commissioner Bowers asked Mr. Marini to explain the financial reports and budget amendment.

Mr. Marini explained that staff felt it prudent given all the changes to the budget since it was originally passed to present the budget amendment now versus December. Staff wanted to do it to capture all the changes, including the \$6.4 M the Board authorized be cut, the additional reductions up to \$13.3 M and the \$20 M spin up money. Since the budget was adopted, the amended budget has gone up \$7.1. We can answer any specific questions you may have.

Commissioner Bowers noted that the budget reflects the fact that we are using the full \$20 M of spin up money. He asked how that will work. There is the law as written and certain political understandings that I am hearing. Does the legislation give us the full \$20M?

Mr. Marini said he hadn't seen the specific language in legislation, but that he understood that there is a cash loan advance of \$20 M and \$2.2 EPE deferment.

Commissioner Garcia joined the meeting in progress at 5:40 p.m.

Mr. Marini said he was unaware of any formal restrictions as to how the loan could be distributed. He noted that there is a condition imposed by Assemblyman Gantt that the money will be withheld pending the outcome of the State Comptroller's current audit.

Dr. Bowers asked if that caveat is in the legislation.

Mr. Marini said \$11.6 M has been set aside in a cash fund balance and reflected in the amended budget. He said it is important to account for the money on both the revenue and expense side.

Dr. Bowers asked when will the District receive the spin up revenue. It is Mr. Marini's understanding that the \$20 M in cash will not come until the last week of June, 2005.

Commissioner Powell asked if we are restoring everything cut in the last round with the discretionary resolution?

Mr. Connors stated pages 1 of 4 and 2 of 4 show the budget adjustments which were actually eliminated. There had been \$6.1 M in reductions with an additional \$1.6 M of revenue recognition for a total of \$7.7 M. On page 3, items that were temporarily frozen have been "unfrozen" in the amended budget.

Commissioner Powell asked if these are the items the Superintendent took action on. Mr. Connors said they would have been added to the cut list, but they remain in the budget today. Page 4 shows the items added to the budget-related to Blue Ribbon commission and related activities that the Superintendent deemed necessary to carry out his programs this year.

Commissioner Thompson arrived at 5:45 p.m.

Commissioner Powell remarked it was difficult to track all the various changes that took place. - I'm not too interested in the Blue Ribbon results which haven't been presented to us. I'm interested in what's being restored to the budget as originally proposed in the spring during the careful budget process. How can we piece all this together compared to where we were in the spring?

Mr. Connors - What you would need to do would be to go through the document pages 1 of 4 and 2 of 4 and add 4 of 4 these are the summary of the changes in the proposed amendment.

Commissioner Powell asked about the librarians. We intended to expand them, but that particular initiative got cut short because of the freeze. We decided not to hire more until the money comes through.

Mr. Connors explained that while there was discussion about whether to cut librarians, they never made a cut or freeze list.

Commissioner Bowers said you can see our frustration. We seem to have a moving target and we are far from the original budget document. It's hard to tell if we are funding librarians or not.

Mr. Connors stated that librarians are funded. They remained in the budget, but with the uncertainty over process, both the Superintendent and HR staff felt it imprudent to hire librarians. They felt it was more important to get school operations up and running and then see where we stood from a fiscal standpoint. The plan is now to go forward and hire/fill those positions.

Commissioner Garcia commented there should be an easier way to present this financial information so Board members can see what we originally approved on one page or two. It should show what was originally proposed to be cut and what we ended up with. It is difficult to go back to other paperwork. I read somewhere that librarians were restored; now I understand they were never cut.

Mr. Marini indicated that the librarians were in the original budget and were never cut.

Commissioner Garcia asked where parent liaisons stand in the budget.

Mr. Connors said there is one in each elementary building. Any above that staffing level were laid off in September per Board action. Superintendent is looking to add some back with different job responsibilities under redesign.

Commissioner Garcia asked for an explanation of why we are cutting parent liaisons?

Mr. Connors noted that 23 parent liaisons were laid off, but that there are plans to hire 11 back at the secondary level. So there are 12 positions lost.

Commissioner Thompson asked for further clarification about the job responsibilities.

Mr. Connors stated that the Superintendent wants to make parent liaisons part of an attendance initiative to improve attendance and academic achievement.

Commissioner Bowers expressed a concern about the way in which the Superintendent and HR cut parent liaisons in order to bring about structural change. He wondered if the Board should direct the Superintendent to restore parent liaisons. He stated that in effect what the District wants to do is get rid of parent liaisons they don't want. He perceives a structural inequity – those rehired will have no seniority and be in a weaker position as employees. They will have no

bumping rights. All these things disappear. Instead of sitting down with the unions, through heavy-handed budgeting, they have eliminated positions. I'm frustrated with those types of behaviors. Project workers and parent liaisons should be brought back in full. There is a lot of money sitting here. Items 6-14 on page 4 of 4 are all new spending. We are paying consultant after consultant after consultant while we reduce union employees. Making cuts through the back door is unconscionable.

Commissioner Thompson noted that the situation is symbolic of problems on a broader scale. If the Board had more timely discussions with Staff and if information sharing occurred routinely, we might have a clearer understanding. As it is, we are confused and uninformed as to where we stand with dollars. This is all part of a larger concern and interest we have in gaining a better process for timely processing of information.

Commissioner Bowers referred to the Dare to Care program. Didn't we put back \$400K on page 3 of 4 on Dare to Care? I'd love to have a program person to answer this.

Mr. Connors - Dare to Care was originally \$1M. On page 1 of 4, we show a \$500K reduction.

Commissioner Bowers confirmed there is now \$400K in the Dare to Care program. But he is concerned whether they can gear up to provide the program. He indicated that his sources tell him that Community Place cannot partner with the District on Dare to Care because they reallocated their funds to other projects. The question is who are we going to partner with to spend that money?

Kim Dyce responded that Freddie Thomas will be running Dare to Care in a different way. The Boys' and Girls' Club did not have funding for it this year. Douglass will also do it in a different way. The program will not be supported at Franklin.

Commissioner Bowers observed that before the administration asks the Board to pass a budget, staff should confirm who our partners are on a program.

Ms. Dyce said that plans call for additional staff to be brought on to support this program. The morning piece has been changed. Schools are now taking the lead on this program. The money will go to teaching staff that will be hired to support.

Commissioner Thompson asked if the money will be used in its entirety.

Ms. Dyce said that if the Boys' and Girls' Club can fund the morning piece from additional funding they get, we will expand. This program now will be held at only two schools, and each will receive \$200K.

Commissioner Thompson noted that the program has been structurally changed, but that the full \$400k seemed accounted for in the budget now.

Commissioner Bowers said that when Dare to Care was originally sold to the Board, social agencies were supposed to take the lead role. Now we won't be using any social agencies, and we will be doing it in house. That's not Dare to Care. It's not the same program.

Commissioner Thompson again noted that it is an information sharing problem. The Board did not receive any background on how the program structure would be changed.

Commissioner Bowers next brought up the Hillside Work Scholarship program. Principally, he endorses the program. However, he is concerned that the Board will be handing over \$300 K which might prompt the private sector to give less. He would prefer that our contribution be a matching grant. He noted that we have responded to pressure from the Rump Group. They expect us to fund this program rather than to seriously consider the right way to do it. Commissioner Bowers wants to be sure that our money does not supplant private sector funding.

Commissioner Thompson said that if the community is serious about the efficacy of this program, maybe the Board should support it, but it should be a real partnership not supplanting what the community gives now.

Commissioner Garcia asked what Title II A Grant supports?

Mr. Hofer said it supports professional development for staffing, generally.

Commissioner Powell observed that the Board takes the heat regardless of what goes wrong. In the case of the librarians, people think the Board cut librarians when, in fact, it gave authorization not to hire right away. If we approve Dare to Care as it stands now, we may take the heat for eliminating partnerships because of all the dicking around with the budget.

One lesson learned is that the issue is clouded who is responsible and who is to blame. It's not you (staff) or us (the Board), but changing circumstances. Blame is going to stick everywhere it will be thrown. We need to be prepared to explain ourselves and what happened to the \$1M for Dare to Care. It's a messy situation. It's difficult for Board members to track it, it might be easier for you guys to track it, but the public will be easily misled when it comes to discussions about this. I wish we had stayed with budget we passed in May.

Commissioner Bowers agreed with Commissioner Powell and thanked her for a point well taken. He then asked for a motion to accept the financial reports.

Commissioner Powell moved to recommend acceptance of the monthly financial reports to the full Board. Seconded by Commissioner Bowers. Adopted 2-1 with Commissioner Garcia opposing.

Commissioner Garcia said he would not vote on something he didn't understand.

Commissioner Bowers noted that the Committee had already addressed Agenda Item No. 3. He then asked for leave to jump to that agenda item for further discussion.

II. Update on Grants – Consolidated Application and magnet Grants

At 6:21 P.M., Commissioner Bowers thanked Mr. Hofer for his patience and asked him to explain the chronology of events and how Title I lays over budget discussions.

Mr. Hofer explained that development began in January –February time frame. Staff assumed 0% increase in Title I revenues for this year. In fact, they were cut by 4.6% this year. Generally, the budget developed included items carried forward. \$30.4 M included \$1.6 of projected rollovers we confirmed because of unused supplemental services. In June \$6.4 M of cuts were made from the May approved budget. In August there were an additional \$13.3 M in adjustments. We had a draft budget which included NCLB and Title I with input from 20 program managers. Given the number of changes and recommended reductions we amended our grant submission. We pulled together and submitted it to State Ed. Planned reductions and substituted items which were determined to meet the title I criteria. Those items were included in May budget as proposed local expense. Parent preference included as Title I expenses in 04-05 budget in May as local expense, but in revised budget as Title I expense as it was in 2003-04.

Line 8 of handout, student support services, psychologist and social workers moved into the revised grant submission.

Commissioner Garcia asked if when we make a reduction in the budget that affects Title I programs, is it reflected in this document.

Mr. Silver explained that there are a number of services paid for by grants and some locally paid for. We decided by program. If funded from local, but if on grant, we had to find something else and pull it into the grant. Every time there was a budget adjustment it affected what we submitted. The District made a recommendation to the State. We have an appointment in Albany at the end of the month. As long as we are within certain parameters they will approve, but we must get their approval.

Commissioner Garcia asked if there was a specific percentage for classroom instruction only.

Mr. Silver said it is excluded. Grants must supplement the regular mission of the District. It can't pay for teachers, but it can pay for a tutor in math after school.

Commissioner Bowers questioned Mr. Silver and Mr. Hofer about the Magnet program. It looks as if we are putting \$400K of the original \$665K back in the budget. What do Magnet funds cover? Are we addressing a broader issue?

Mr. Silver said that each school has to develop a theme and is given a proportionate amount of money and professional development monies.

Commissioner Bowers asked if we have rethought how we are using the \$400K.

Mr. Silver expressed his confusion. Commissioner Bowers agreed. Originally, there was \$665K in the Magnet program. P 4 of 4 restoration shows \$400K not the full "\$665K. What are we using money for? Are we looking at things we could use it for? What are we putting it back for?

Dr. Rivera explained when we made the reduction of teachers, we left \$350k, or 17.5 teachers in the budget. We decided to give schools direction on how to spend money the \$400K – artists in residence, stipends, what I don't know is detailed info how they are using the money within parameters we set.

Commissioner Bowers stated that basically schools are back to where they were.

Dr. Rivera said that they are without some full time staff people.

Commissioner Bowers asked if there were any other questions regarding grants.

Commissioner Thompson asked if there were somehow this information should have been reflected in the financial reports? Simple comparables charts.

Dr. Rivera said that we tried to keep it simple. Maybe we erred. There is was a reduction on June 22 and on August 19. Items were frozen, but not cut. Other items were added or restored. Perhaps what we could have done is a cover description with more detail on why certain items were restored and not others.

Commissioner Thompson said it would be simple to keep the same items on the same line. Little basic things like that enable me to follow.

Commissioner Garcia commented that the political situation was such that we wanted to make cuts painful. My concern now is that it might be still painful if we don't restore some of them.

III. Receive and Review Resolutions for October Business Meeting

Commissioner Bowers noted that there are three resolutions which address the amended budget.

Mr. Marini explained that Staff used the same financial format the District has used for years. We have highlighted major adjustments in grant revenue or local revenue. This is the standard format used in the past. He asked Ms. Rohring if she could confirm that. Ms. Rohring agreed it was the same format.

Commissioner Garcia said it may be the standard format. The problem I have is that we originally passed the budget with some reductions made because of what City imposed. Further reductions were recommended until we found out if we were getting state money. I want to know program by program and position by position what has been restored and the reasoning behind what has not been restored. E.G. parent liaisons. 23 were let go, 11 rehired. Balance not hired. Why? If what Commissioner Bowers implies that it is weeding out people who weren't performing to District standards, I need to know so I can answer what parents ask me when I meet them in schools.

Dr. Rivera responded. We can take whatever time you need to walk through the list of reductions I was authorized to make, what was cut and what wasn't. Regarding the Parent Liaison program. There are currently two different designs on my desk. We had hoped to have it ready for the Board before this meeting, but it's not completed yet. I would be happy to go through it whenever you want to do it. I came in late tonight. This budget process was the worst I have ever been through. The Board accepted the budget, then the City hit us, the County hit us with the Nurses, less than anticipated aid from NYS, and then Assemblyman Gantt and the spin up issue caused even more problems. I can speak directly to why certain things have not been funded and others have.

Commissioner Garcia asked why when we make adjustments he doesn't see anywhere where those people are put back into the budget?

Dr. Rivera explained Staff made their best administrative judgment on those things and given priority to come back on page 3/4 on scaled back alternative program at two schools, one lead teacher is added back, one specialist at secondary level. If the board is now saying they want to revisit the list, we can.

Commissioner Thompson said it might be possible to reduce need to revisit if the Board had information laid out. The Board just needs to have information in a format to compare apples to apples. AIS 5 – vacancy – was that a staffing reduction via vacancy? It would be helpful to know that. In order for the Board to explain the rationale for decisions to our constituents, we need to understand.

Commissioner Powell departed at 6:16 p.m.

Commissioner Garcia said it would not be necessary to revisit every decision made.

Dr. Rivera asked the Board if it would be helpful to provide clarification in a narrative form or description of items that came back into the budget, and rationale for those that did not.

Commissioner Garcia mentioned that the Board passed the budget then had the nursing issue, and the City of Rochester reductions which required further cuts. Now we have \$20 M. Tell us which is coming back and which aren't and provide a small explanation why.

Commissioner Bowers said if we accept the Budget amendments, we will accept information before we understand. Motion to table not available.

Commissioner Garcia asked Mr. Marini if his understanding that the Board could have until November to amend the budget was correct.

Mr. Marini mentioned in the past, the Board usually accepted and approved the budget amendment in December per Board policy. However, the Staff felt it would be prudent to amend now to ensure we capture all the changes.

Commissioner Garcia motioned to table the resolutions on the budget amendment until the next meeting. Commissioner Bowers seconded. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

IV. Finalize DRAFT 2005-06 Budget Process Timeline (6:37 after grants discussion)

Commissioner Garcia asked where the Staff is on synchronization with City of Rochester budget format.

Mr. Marini said he plans to have another meeting with City staff. We've agreed to provide some additional information to City but with different format. They have their narratives within financial data. To do that, we would be going backwards. We take financial info from PeopleSoft system. District will put the narrative in with budget but in its own section.

They've agreed to that. Bottom line increases/decreases in budget. Increases in headcount in each section of each department. They use Lotus as their spreadsheet. Headcount placement in the District budget book is still an open item.

Dr. Rivera noted a timeline was prepared on the issue last spring. In August, when Dr. Rivera met with Mayor Johnson about format, we accelerated based on Mr. Marini's meetings with Bill Ansbro. Essentially, this must be advanced to City Council and Board of Education staff for next step.

Mr. Marini agreed to schedule another meeting with Mr. Ansbro before formally sending a letter of agreement to Dr. Rivera and the Board. Further discussions need to be had in order for everyone to be clearly on the same page. We must discuss in full before we put forth a resolution. It will be clear before we start the budget process.

Action Item: Dr. Rivera agreed to get to Board for action in November. Mr. Marini said he would make sure to schedule a meeting in the next week or so.

Commissioner Thompson commented that the legislative staff will review the proposed changes and develop a joint policy draft for legislative consideration. The District made an announcement and agreement that we will do something to our format which was premature. Predated anything coming before the board.

Commissioner Bowers said we are talking about a different timeline. You are talking about implementation of agreement with City. What I am hearing is that timeline should not impact our budget process timeline. That is a separate item to be addressed outside of this meeting. Yes, you are working on it, but it will not affect our timeline.

If there is no concern over the 2005-06 budget process timeline, I need a motion to send it to the Board for approval.

Commissioner Garcia moved to recommend the budget timeline for approval by the full Board. Commissioner Bowers seconded. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

V. Review and finalize recommended policy amendments and additions

Commissioner Bowers turned to amendment to Board Policy 6630 – different minor amendments in purple; blue acted on by committee in April. Purple are for action tonight.

Commissioner Garcia asked about a comment Mr. Looby made indicating that the request to track contracts under \$25K would be a drain on staff time.

Mr. Looby offered his thoughts about this addition. The practice for the past 6 years for contracts under \$25K has been for the Superintendent or his designee to approve with his discretion to allow District to enter into those contracts. With respect to service providers, the contractor can enter a contract in reliance on that. In the paragraph you are proposing to add, the Board shall require Chief Legal Counsel to provide a report – what does that mean? Will the contracts not be enforceable until the quarterly report has been approved?

Commissioner Garcia commented that there is some concern on part of some Board members that the policy is being violated.

Mr. Looby noted that the Law Department traditionally has been giving a report to the Board on an requested basis. He submitted one to President Thompson on 3/26/2003 and on 4/20/2004.

Commissioner Bowers noted that the policy would require Mr. Looby to provide quarterly reports to enhance fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Looby said he had two other concerns. If you go down to last paragraph, technically, it should read "all resolutions with financial implications in excess of \$25K" Otherwise, you are putting in new language talking about every class of contract.

Commissioner Bowers said the Superintendent's contracts do not come before the Board in resolutions.

Commissioner Garcia moved to strike the language "limit for Board Approval." Commissioner Bowers Seconded. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.

Mr. Marini sought clarification to "all resolution with financial implications." Does that mean all contract resolutions educational facilities, etc.

Commissioner Bowers said the District is not following the policy. If there is a contract for universal pre-k and other things, it should come here. The Committee is the appropriate place to review contracts in advance of board meetings. He questioned whether the administration had been following board policy.

Dr. Rivera responded that the policy would require that the entire board agenda be reviewed by the Finance committee. It begs the question of how we do it. Staff has not been bringing everything in the entire board packet to the finance committee.

Commissioner Bowers noted that the item for discussion is the amended part of the policy. It is not time to review entire policy. He asked if his colleagues had any additional comment or questions.

Commissioner Garcia asked again if the approval of this policy would cost staff an inordinate amount of time to comply with the directives.

Mr. Looby said for all the contracts that come through the law department, we already create a spreadsheet. We may have to revise the matrix. That would be a couple hour's project – not a major issue.

Commissioner Garcia wanted to know who signs a contract under \$25K on behalf of the District.

Mr. Looby said when it's being recommended by a particular department, the forms are signed off by the Division Head or Chief. If it is a contract for work at Franklin, then Michael Robinson signs the contract. The Superintendent signs contracts on behalf of the District.

Commissioner Garcia wanted to know if vendors/consultants begin work before the contract has been executed.

Mr. Looby assured the Committee that typically would not happen.

Dr. Rivera said that several weeks ago he issued a directive that he would sign all contracts under \$25,000. Currently, he is reviewing all contracts with vendors/consultants.

Commissioner Garcia asked if there have been any instances in past where contracts under \$25K were issued to related group with slightly different names but same addresses in defined time period.

Mr. Looby noted that if that were the case, the contract may not necessarily cover the same scope of service. e.g. Looby corporation might have a contract for Marshall, another for a different service at East. A firm retained in January may be offered a new contract for a new project in May.

Dr. Rivera noted that he requested Mr. Looby and Mr. Marini to do an analysis of all contracts under \$25K within the same calendar years, because Board policy requires approval of contracts in excess of \$25K. Staff is working on it.

Commissioner Bowers noted that the Committee wants an opportunity to do its own review.

Commissioner Garcia asked if Dr. Rivera would share the analysis with the Board.

Dr. Rivera agreed to share it as soon as he gets it.

Commissioner Bowers circled back to the 6630 amendments.

Commissioner Thompson said we are not inserting language above \$25K.

Action Item: Commissioner Bowers asked Ms. Rohring, with appropriate finance staff, to come up with amended language to address concerns raised tonight regarding “all resolutions with financial implications” by the December meeting.

Commissioner Garcia motioned to approve language amendments discussed to policy and forward to the Board for approval.

Commissioner Bowers seconded. **Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent.**

Commissioner Bowers noted that 6745 originated in this committee in April but was sent to policy committee and has been brought back to this committee.

He had asked this be an interim policy and include language so it would sunset to assess impact on District. He asked for policy to remain in effect until June 30, 2006 only.

Commissioner Thompson reiterated that there is a need for a contract authorization approval process. Oversight is part of a larger effort the Board should undertake. It is appropriate for QA committee to take the lead in that oversight. We should have a process and an assurance that all systems are working. Generally, she supports the concept to improve oversight function.

Dr. Rivera interjected that he wanted to make sure he understands. Right now, when we have discussions with a potential vendor on a particular service, we sometimes have discussions on scope of service. We try to get a sense of what their costs might be. We enter into non-binding negotiations which sometimes open opportunities to bargain with other vendors. Only when we feel we have something worth pursuing do we enter into one with Board authorization within parameters established by the Board.

According to Dr. Rivera, this policy, as it stands, would hinder the District’s ability to conduct preliminary negotiations and to bargain. He stated it was his feeling that this two step process could be quite cumbersome, especially with an organization as dynamic as the District. He asked for clarification as to whether his assumption that he cannot enter into discussions with a potential vendor was correct.

Commissioner Garcia stated he would not support this policy. He agreed with the Superintendent.

Commissioner Bowers worried aloud whether there may someday be a headline. Approving a blank check is a violation of the Board's fiduciary responsibility. Staff is asking for flexibility in advance. That is the worst form of negotiation. The practice goes on and we are getting our asses in a ringer.

Commissioner Thompson asked if there could be some compromise language that will allow the Board reasonable oversight and that would not be overly cumbersome.

Dr. Rivera wants to understand the Board's position.

Commissioner Bowers said putting forward a resolution when the contract is not finished is problematic. Staff has asserted that we have to know what the Board will approve in advance of negotiating you can damn well be certain that the amount we approve is the amount it will be and that we won't get any savings. You need to prevent us from writing blank checks to vendors.

Commissioner Garcia noted that the policy now talks about contracts of \$25K or less and gives the Superintendent sole authority over that group of contracts.

Commissioner Garcia noted that the Committee will revisit this matter at a later meeting and agree to a resolution that is not so cumbersome.

Commissioner Bowers agreed it would stay in committee.

Dr. Rivera said he would be happy to meet with staff and walk through this. He wondered if this would hamstring staff from having preliminary discussions.

Commissioner Bowers said this policy would provide a check on old boy's network getting their deals because they won't know in advance what they're going to get.

Commissioner Thompson noted it was not ideal for staff to create Board policy, but possibly collaborate with the Board on its own policies.

Commissioner Bowers concurred that Board policy is not written by District staff.

Commissioner Garcia said the Committee is concerned there be no corruption. If rules are not set down clearly, there is room for violation of policy. The practice might be wrong. When I asked why did they say that, well, that's the way things are done, I can't understand that.

Dr. Rivera – if concern is one of perceived corruption or good old boys getting contracts maybe there should be a quarterly review. Policy doesn't need to change. Maybe we should have some regulations that call for review of different contracts on a regular basis. More scrutiny. More suggestions.

Commissioner Bowers wants contract negotiations completed before corresponding resolutions come to the Board. When it (a contract) comes to us it better be ready to be acted on, not approved before you finish negotiations. It doesn't come to us until it's finished. You cut the best deal you can. Not asking for wiggle room. It ought to be finished

Commissioner Bowers said we will hold this matter over until November.

VI: Discussion on lessons Learned from 2004-05 budget development process

Commissioner Bowers asked the committee to agree to discuss this matter at its November meeting. Agreed by consensus.

VII. Next Meeting – November 9, 2004

Adjournment:

Commissioner Bowers asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion made by Commissioner Garcia, Seconded by Commissioner Bowers. Adopted 2-0 with Commissioner Powell absent at 7:30 p.m.

.