

A special meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Thursday, January 2, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

President Lori Wilshire presided; City Clerk Susan K. Lovering recorded.

Prayer was offered by Steven Bolton, City Counsel; Alderman David C. Tencza led in the Pledge to the Flag.

President Wilshire

Before I ask the Clerk to take the roll, Alderwoman Shoshanna Kelly and Alderman Richard A. Dowd is participating by telephone and under the terms of the State law that allows them to do that, they need to explain why they can't attend, if they can hear us, and who they are with, if anyone.

Alderwoman Kelly stated the reason she could not attend, confirmed that she could hear the proceedings, and stated who was present with her.

Alderwoman Kelly

I am at out of town, I can hear you and I am not with anybody.

President Wilshire

Thank you Alderwoman Kelly.

Alderman Dowd stated the reason he could not attend, confirmed that he could hear the proceedings, and stated who was present with him.

Alderman Dowd

Yes I am also out of town and I am by myself and I can hear you fine.

The roll call was taken with 14 members of the Board of Aldermen present: Alderman Lopez arrived after roll call. Alderwoman Kelly and Alderman Dowd were not in attendance but participated in the meeting via telecommunication.

Mayor James W. Donchess and Corporation Counsel Steven A. Bolton were also in attendance.

President Wilshire

I just got a text from Alderman Lopez, he is on his way. Before I do Communications, I told the Mayor I would let him address the Board and then Alderman Clemons may have a motion.

Mayor Donchess

Thank you Madam President. Well, I know I am outnumbered, I see 15 Aldermen, 6 or 7 people from the Police Department. But I am asking the 20 people that are here, to consider compromising and working with me on this. Now we had two contracts come before us and I expressed reservations about those contracts for reasons that I have explained, but I will briefly go into.

We had two contracts before us and we, at the same time, are facing a serious problem with healthcare. We now project \$6 million dollars over two years; that alone is 3% on the tax rate, a 20% increase in a single line item. This puts serious pressure on the budget. Last year you saw the taxes go up, the rest of the budget, except for this one line item was up only 1 point and $\frac{3}{4}$. This line item pushed the entire budget up to 3% so it has a serious impact on the budget.

One thing that I am concerned about is building into our budgets increases that at the end of the day we cannot sustain and will in the end of the day result in reduced services. If we can only increase a budget 2 ¼, 2 ½% in order to keep the tax rate at a level we think is acceptable, but we've built budgets that have to go up 3 or 4% in order to sustain current conditions, we now have an unsustainable budget. It will result in service reductions because there won't be enough to pay for the services that are currently being provided.

We have been talking about this increase in healthcare for quite some time. It is not a surprise that Fiscal 21 is going to go up a lot again. Ms. Kleiner and the City's expert went to the Budget Committee on July 22nd, just the 22nd day of the Fiscal Year and projected a major increase for Fiscal 21. So we know we've got a serious problem that is more than one year, two years and it could go beyond that.

In addition to that, you remember in the escrow process, we talked about this again. We put \$2 million dollars of funds in the escrow process into healthcare. Then, when we got the money from the State, we put another \$900,000.00; so the idea that this is going up, shouldn't be a surprise to anyone. In addition to the non-sustainable budgets, we have raised a couple of other issues. Number one, these two contracts together definitely create a precedent, and although some people have said, "OH well, it doesn't matter", it does in terms of negotiating other contracts which are in negotiations right now. Plus we have got groups in City Hall who are seeing what is going on and they are beginning now to petition through grievances for higher wages and other things are going on.

I guess I am asking, are you sure that we are wrong about all of this? Are you sure that when I say that this is establishing a precedent that we are going to have to follow with other employee groups, are you sure that I am wrong? And are you sure you don't want to take the time to, if you don't believe me, to talk with the people who negotiate these contracts and find out? That could occur, discussion regarding negotiations could occur in a non-public session. And are you sure, one thing I want to add is that as we look at this budget and the next ones, I think people are going to see that to sustain what we have, we are going to have tax rates, at least in this coming year and if you do this enough, for a series of years that go up far more than people are used to.

Some of you have not been in an environment where the tax rate becomes an issue, because I think we have maintained some degree of stability and we have exercised fiscal discipline to that we haven't seen the tax rate become an issue. But if it goes up 4 or 5% a few years in a row, my experience tells me it will become an issue. So are you so sure we are wrong? I am trying to work with you and I am trying to compromise with you. You approved two contracts I said we should limit to 2%, OK. I didn't Veto one of them, the Officers, we have a great Police Department, I don't argue with any of their Police activities; they are doing a fantastic job. I am just thinking about the financial management of the Department and the City.

Are you so sure that this has to be rushed through now? You sure you don't want to take the time to at least hear from the people who do negotiations in Public Works, in the Fire Department, in City Hall, to find out before you make the decision that I am absolutely wrong? Are you sure that you don't want to talk to them? And if you think that I am wrong about the tax rate, are you sure you don't want to bring in CFO Griffin, Ms. Kleiner, Dave Fredette and the other people who work on the budget to kind of explain and we can give you figures, projections as to what you are looking at? Are you so sure you want to decide so quickly that we are wrong? I am trying to work with you. OK we let the Supervisors go through; but creating two precedents is worse than one.

I do question the Police Commission here, you know, they are fine citizens and they are trying to do what they think is best for the Department. But I raised an issue about the extension of an unfunded liability which is the payouts for sick time; we pay at a certain level but the City fought for 20 years to bring that expenditure, that unfunded liability, meaning a commitment that has no money behind it, bring that down. It started around 2001, for 17 years the City fought. So when the bill came before us last year and again when this Commission agreed to extend, in the first version of this contract, the unfunded liability, almost doubling the City's obligation to pay out when people resign or leave for retirement.

The proposal was to give them about 1/3 third of their pay in payout of unused sick time as a maximum; I've raised that for a long time as a problem. So you balked at that, because this came up right in November or late October, you balked at it. I said, you should, some of you agreed, at least at that moment, so the contract was not passed, was not rejected but it wasn't passed. It was sent back to the Commission. Then they removed most of that, there is still a little bit of an increase which we could get into that; but they removed most of that. But then increased the wages from a little over 9% to a little over 11%; I mean is that a reasonable approach? Shouldn't they have at least have come back to me or you and said, "Well which one, we can do one or the other". I mean the first contact was clearly better than this one for the City. So we are now faced with a worse contract because we balked at increasing the City's unfunded liability.

So look, I am trying to work with you, I am trying to compromise, I'm trying to be reasonable, I am trying to tell you what I think is coming. If you don't believe me, if you just think it is all hogwash, tax rate is not going up, healthcare is not a problem, this doesn't create any type of precedent; are you sure you want to reach that conclusion without hearing the people who are actually involved in these issues? So based on that I am asking you to work with us, you can still pass it next year. If you listen to people who are knowledgeable about all this and you think they are all wrong, or if you disagree that, you know, it is important to give this raise regardless of the consequences, holding this until next year is not the end of the world. So that's all I am asking, I know I am outnumbered 20 to 1. Some people said I shouldn't bother with any of this, why fight with the Aldermen and the Police Department? Not a bad point. But I am trying to work with you, I am trying to do best, but overall I am looking out into the future about what might happen with the taxes and what the City can afford and what is likely, you know, what the voters and people who pay for all of this are likely to think, reach a reasonable balance between raising taxes and paying people correctly and delivering services. So that's my pitch, I did go on longer than I expected, but I am just trying to consult you as a partner in City Government.

President Wilshire

Thank you Mayor. Alderman Clemons?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO AMEND THE AGENDA BY OPENING UP A PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

ON THE QUESTION

President Wilshire

So the motion is to add a 15 minute public comment or typical public comment period. That's the motion. Discussion on that motion; to allow a 15 minute comment period?

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Ald. O'Brien, Ald. Gidge, Ald. Harriott-Gathright, Ald. Dowd Ald. Klee, Ald. Laws, Ald. Lopez, Ald. Caron, Ald. Kelly, Ald. Jette, Ald. Melizzi-Golja, Ald. Tencza, Ald. Schmidt, Ald. Clemons Ald. Wilshire	15
Nay:	0

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Wilshire

I would welcome the public to give public comment, we have a 15 minute period. Give your name and address for the record, please?

James Tollner, Nashua Police Commissioner

Jim Tollner, 1 Sequoia Circle. I'll just take about two minutes. I would like to start by thanking all of you for being here tonight to vote on this contract and those of you that are on the phone. This contract consists of 16 FDE's and it is two fiscal years in arrears, having expired in July 2018. The first proposal was vetoed last year around this time.

I will be brief as the Chief will go over what he has been asked to do and the changes that took place during these lengthy negotiations, so I will not duplicate his points. I would like to clarify a few comments that are out there. The Police Commission followed the required process that has been used by the City Administration in previous Police Department Commissions, so over the last 20 years in negotiating and communicating these contracts. During this process Corporation Counsel was involved; it was sent to Finance to cost out, to Finance & Administrative Service processed this information with the Administration. We have never, never circumvented the process regarding this particular or any other contract during the numerous discussions and meetings that we have had with staff and the Mayor's Office over the last 18 months.

I think we all would agree that the rising cost of healthcare has been a constant. It was an issue when I was an Alderman 14 years ago; it is not going to change. But the one thing I want you to know is that the Commissioners are tax payers as well and we share the same concern that the Board of Aldermen does and the Mayor. It is also our responsibility like each of you around this horseshoe as the Mayor has stated and I quote, "To protect the citizens of Nashua by being mindful and appreciative of the outstanding service that all of the Nashua Police Department provides to our great City".

To be clear, the Commission Chairs and concurs with the Mayor's comments regarding future budget concerns, stating such at the Police Commissioner's Meeting on December 16th and again via voicemail on December 19th. I communicated to the Mayor that he had the commitment of the Commissioners and the PD that we will support his efforts and manage this, finding a balance moving forward. We welcome the opportunity to participate in future discussions, working in unison with the Mayor's Office, the Board of Aldermen and the Unions in addressing the challenges that lay ahead. And the new contracts, new contracts that will come before.

In closing, at the last Board of Aldermen Meeting you voted 15 nothing to approve both of these Police Contracts. You also voted 15 nothing to approve three bonding projects. Nothing has changed since that vote regarding either the bonding projects or the Police Contracts. We would respectfully request that you move forward and reconfirm your vote again, that you vote again supporting these contracts. Thank you very much.

Michael Carignan, Chief of Police

Good Evening, my name is Michael Carignan, spelled C-A-R-I-G-N-A-N, I am the Chief of the Police for the Nashua Police Department. First of all I'd like to thank you for coming tonight, I know it has been a very busy Holiday Season and this is a special meeting, not on your agendas for normal. I really appreciate you taking the time to come, to listen and consider the issue.

As most of you know, this is my sixth time in front of you regarding this particular contract. I will be brief. I believe you all know me and know that I also believe that as issues arise, I try to discuss and reach mutual acceptable compromises on everything. I've explained my rationale and answered every question to the Budget Review and full Board, receiving unanimous approval at each. Nothing has changed from a week and a half ago.

I would like to briefly address a couple of points in a Veto message we have all received and was recently referenced in several media outlets. I will gladly answer any questions you have regarding this contract at any time tonight.

One issue I would like to address is the point regarding statements made by the Police Department that they had not been told about the problem of healthcare costs before negotiations are not accurate. These statements were accurate; the UFPO Contract which is in front of you tonight has been outstanding for over a year and a half. I've been in front of you all five other times. We've been given guidance from the Mayor and from the Aldermen many times, never once have we discussed the cost of healthcare concerning this contract with the exception of the last Aldermen Meeting.

Regarding the Supervisor's Contract which was recently approved; submission to the Board of Aldermen was 12/19/2019. The contract negotiations were finalized on August 28, 2019, the Union voted to approve 33 to nothing on 9/8/2019. The contract was red-lined, finalized on roughly October 17th. It was sent to CFO Griffin shortly thereafter, we received the costing back from the City on November 12th. A week later representatives from the Mayor's Office came to the Commissioners Meeting and spoke about the sick buyout and the preferred raises. Nothing was said at that meeting that night about issues involving healthcare costs and the impact that this would have on the overall City Budget.

General statements made at State of the City speeches or City Budget speeches that healthcare is an issue for us moving forward does not really qualify to me as direction on how we negotiate contracts or what percentages should be. Furthermore, regarding the knowledge of a 19% increase in our healthcare budget is not really a fair statement due to the way our budget is prepared. The benefits are removed from the budget calculation of percentage increases, therefore we did not analyze the benefits, pension or FICA, Medicaid accounts. The budget calculation in the management for health benefits for the Police Department are not done by the PD Financial Services Division, they are managed by the City.

The second point I'd like to discuss is the point when the Police Commission re-submitted the contract, we did not simply remove unused sick time buyout provisions as requested. Instead we raised the wage increase from 9.5 to 11.25% over the four years. I'd like to address this issue by stating that I have been in front of you five times. When I initially proposed this contract in front of you, I was operating under the guidance of the Mayor's wishes to stay with under the proposed spending cap. I was able to do that using creative methods in which I have done for two other contracts which were both approved. The night I submitted this the first time, there were some issues involving other City Employees that came to fruition as a result the contract was tabled.

I was asked to reach a compromise; come back, talk to them, reach a compromise, I did that. I came back with a sick buyout program that was half of what every other member of my Police Department was receiving. They agreed to do so; they worked with me. I again proposed that to you, it was accepted through the Budget Review Process. It was stalled again at the Full Aldermen Meeting due to some concerns and issues that came up that it was not enough; sick buy out programs result in long-term, unknown costs to the City and are not good. I was told by several Aldermen that they would consider wage increases much better than they would like to see the sick buy out programs. I was told by the Mayor at a meeting that he believes we should pay the employees more, not use a sick buyout program.

So I went back to the table and we came back with a compromise and we took the majority of the sick buyout program away. So the program that every employee in my PD has with the exception of members of this Union are no longer able to use that. Instead we gave up that program with the exception of changing just retirement to retirement and resignation after 15 years. This was consistent with other contracts in the City and it is 5 years more than those contracts; they can resign after 10 years and get their sick buy out packages. For us it is 15 years and it currently affects one employee.

As a result of being asked to look at increasing the wages as opposed to using a sick buyout program, I went back to them and we did that. We came back with wage increases which I thought were very reasonable. We did, in fact, go from 9.5 to 11.25 over the life of the contract. I did that based on what you asked me to do. That contract we are talking about 1.75% over four years. That's less than half a per cent per year, for these people. You asked me to come back with wage increases because they gave up that very lucrative sick buyout program that had future unknown costs to the City. They did that, they did it willingly and I came back then with a 1.75 increase over four years; again that's less than ½%.

I think that is very reasonable, I have tried very hard to work with all of you to value your wishes, and to be fiscally responsible to the City of Nashua. I very much admire the Mayor, I agree with the programs he puts forward. I am more than willing to work with him on anything he does. I want to thank you very much for your time, I appreciate it. Have a great New Year.

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Lori Wilshire, President, Board of Aldermen
Re: Special Board of Aldermen Meeting

There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the communication, placed it on file.

From: Jim Donchess, Mayor
Re: Veto of R-18-102

There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the communication, placed it on file.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO RECONSIDER R-18-102 AMENDED BY ROLL CALL

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Jette

Point of order. Could you explain to us what this process, I think I understand it but I just want to make sure that by moving to reconsider what we are doing is we are dealing with the Mayor's Veto and if we vote to reconsider then that would, if that does not pass, then the Mayor's Veto is sustained. If it does pass, then we vote again on whether or not to sustain the Mayor's Veto. Am I correct on that?

President Wilshire

Yes.

Alderman Jette

So again looking for your guidance, is this the time that we discuss whether or not we agree with the Mayor or not?

President Wilshire

No not until the motion passes to reconsider, because it is not on the table.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah just to make it little bit more clear, the motion to reconsider for all intents and purposes put the Resolution back on the table and then at that point I intend to make a motion to override the Veto. And I would think that at that point we would discuss the merits.

Alderman Jette

I see Attorney Bolton shaking his head, could we ask him why he's shaking his head?

Steve Bolton, Corporation Counsel

Back on the table is the wrong expression, it would be more proper to say “back on the floor” or “back before the Board of Aldermen for its consideration”. Tabled is where things are put pending further action at another time. So there was just a misuse of the phrase, but essentially the explanation was correct.

Alderman Jette

Ok thank you.

President Wilshire

Anyone else? The motion is to reconsider Resolution 18-102 amended by roll call.

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Ald. O’Brien, Ald. Gidge, Ald. Harriott-Gathright, Ald. Dowd Ald. Klee, Ald. Laws, Ald. Lopez, Ald. Caron, Ald. Kelly, Ald. Melizzi-Golja, Ald. Tencza, Ald. Schmidt, Ald. Clemons Ald. Wilshire	14
Nay: Ald. Jette	1

MOTION CARRIED

R-18-102, Amended

- Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire
- Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O’Brien, Sr.
- Alderman Richard A. Dowd
- Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws
- Alderman Jan Schmidt
- Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright
- Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja

APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NASHUA BOARD OF POLICE COMMISSIONERS AND UFPO LOCAL 645 PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES OF THE NASHUA POLICE DEPARTMENT FROM JULY 1, 2018 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2022 AND AUTHORIZING RELATED TRANSFERS

- Mayor Vetoed – 12/30/19

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO OVERRIDE THE MAYOR’S VETO OF R-18-102, AMENDED, BY ROLL CALL

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Jette

I voted in favor of this the last time we voted, the time before that I voted against it. And I voted against it because at that time the contract provided for allowing employees who were hired after September 16, 2003 to have unlimited sick leave. If you may allow me to explain, my understanding is that prior to that, back in 2003 as the Mayor had explained, the City was trying to reduce the amount of sick leave that employees could cash out upon retirement or death. On other issues I think I have explained to you my feeling about sick leave is that it is designed to allow employees to take time off when they are sick and to be continued to be paid so that they and their families do not suffer financially because of their illness and I fully support that.

What I don't support is the ability of employees to cash out that unused sick leave. I think if you are sick, you should use the sick leave; if you are lucky enough not to be sick, I don't think you should be able to cash that out. It's like an insurance policy, if your house burns down unfortunately the insurance comes in and pays to rebuild the house. If your house doesn't burn down, the insurance company doesn't pay you a bonus for your house not burning down. That's the way I view this benefit for our employees.

The City had this policy where employees could accumulate a maximum of 135 days of sick leave and upon death or retirement they could cash that out up to 90 days. So in 2003, the City made a change and said for people who were hired before that time, that would stay the same. The people who were hired after that the amount that they could cash out would be limited to 20% of their unused sick time, up to 90 days and in exchange for that, that limitation, they were given an unlimited amount of sick leave. They could accumulate an unlimited amount of sick leave, so that if they became sick, as much sick leave as they had, they could use, they were not limited. Not to introduce a volatile phrase but a quid pro quo, that was the quid pro quo in exchange for limiting the amount that they could cash out, they would the ability to use their sick leave in an unlimited fashion if they were sick.

This contract that came before us in September increased the amount from 20% to 35%; this is for the employees hired after September of 2003. It increased the amount that they could cash out from 20% to 35% and that is why I was against it. And six others of you voted the same way and I am assuming that you had the same reason.

So when this came back to us this time, I was under the impression that this had been fixed. My bad, I didn't really review the contract in detail, and I know the Mayor talked about it but I really, I didn't review it myself, I wasn't sure about it, so I voted with the rest of you to approve it. Now that the Mayor has vetoed it, I have gone back and looked at this contract in detail and I see that what we have before us now, the 35% has been changed back to the 20% that existed before but it added not only can they cash out at death or retirement, but they would be able to cash out if they resign after 15 years of employment, if they choose to resign.

Now I've been, up until now, I won't be any longer, I was the liaison to the Police Department and I've heard them talk about how difficult the situation they find themselves in where they have got good people that go through the excellent training that the State Police provides and we provide internally. After they have had some experience with what is recognized as one of the best Police forces in the country; they then find a better position somewhere else, they resign and leave. And to allow them to cash out their unused sick time in that situation seems, you know, it seems like we are not doing ourselves a favor by allowing people to resign and get this cash payout. I would think that we would want to discourage them from resigning. So I don't understand why we would be doing that.

As I look at this and I hear the Mayor talking about how if we sustain his Veto we will be continuing to negotiate with the Police. You know I've heard the Police Chief talk in more detail than ever before about the contract and the reasons that he has presented what he has presented. As the Mayor says, if we sustain the Veto we will still have the opportunity to explore this in more detail, get more information and not necessarily by sustaining the Veto, we are not necessarily rejecting the efforts of the Chief to try to bring this to a resolution. I think it will keep the door open; I hear what the Mayor is saying about the demands on our budget going forth, largely because of the health costs going up. I hope that we can come up with some way of dealing with that.

Personally I have to take the side of the Mayor on this one and vote to sustain his Veto and keep the door open for further negotiation.

Alderman Tencza

Thank you. And so I too when this contract first came around was concerned about the payouts for the sick leave bank and I don't think that is a trend that is sustainable for the City. But as I look at this contract now, first I think these are civilian employees. I think right now the Police Department has a tougher time training

and retaining Police Officers who are not covered under this contract. But really for me the reason that I think that we should just approve this tonight is because as I look at the numbers for what the salary increases would be per year, the difference between a 2% increase for these 16 employees versus a 3% increase for the employees which the contract offers them is about \$10,000.00 per year, a little over \$10,000.00 per year.

The Police Department's Budget is \$31 million dollars per year; I think this can easily be absorbed within the budget and I trust that the Commissioners and the Chief will find a way to do that without coming back and increasing their budget more than what we are going to have to ask them, the small amount we are going to have to ask them to increase their budget in the future.

The other thing I would say is that you know the healthcare costs are factored into that; the healthcare costs are going to go up regardless of what this contract is. That is a much bigger issue that we need to work on and tackle, but given the limited scope of this contract, I think it is fair based in, like we said, like the Chief said, based on the benefits that other people within the Department receive. I am sympathetic to the Department Heads who are in the process of negotiating with different Collective Bargaining Units. I think that is something that we have also talked about at the Board of Aldermen as you know how we can be more uniform across the board for folks. But again, this contract is not going to fix that. We are going to have to, as Alderman Dowd always tells us, we are going to have to take a look at every contract as it comes before us on whether we can afford it. Although I respect the Mayor's position on everything, I will support this contract moving forward.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. This Resolution is R-18-102, R-18-102. This came to the Board in 2018. We are in 2020; to say that there hasn't been enough discussion on this contract is just plain false. How can that be? How can something that has been on the table and back and forth in different reiterations, coming to us in different forms and shapes and to the Budget Committee and everything else. How can we say that it needs to be discussed more? It doesn't need to be discussed more. We had a version of it which I actually preferred and this Board made the decision to go along with the Mayor and not approve that version, which is fine. We tabled this and they came back with a different version; and then even that version was changed on the night that we took it up at the Budget Meeting.

As my colleague just stated, the difference in price or cost is \$10,000.00. In the grand scheme of a \$250 million dollar plus budget, if that is too much to ask, then we really shouldn't spend money on anything moving forward. Because if we can't afford \$10 grand, then we need to step back and we need to look and really dig deep. But see I don't think that that's the case. I am saying this because why was one contract which had a 3% raise not vetoed, but this one is? If the problem was cost, the both of those should have been in front of us tonight. So I am not sure where the disconnect is but I am going to support these employees because they deserve to have a contract. These are 16 men and women that serve this City well, that have been doing their job without a contract since July of 2018. They've been numerous iterations of this, it has been sitting, going back and forth between the Budget Committee and the Board of Aldermen and the Mayor's Office and a number of different places for years, literally years. Now is the time to act and I hope you all support me in overriding the Mayor's Veto.

Alderman Klee

Thank you. I think I am just going to basically be saying me too. And I do want to echo what Alderman Tencza and Alderman Clemons said and in some cases kind of what Alderman Jette said. I do agree with what you said about the sick leave. That does bother me, I think it is time for us to kind of, if what we want to do is go back to what they had said about the 2003, we do need to hold our feet to the fire. But when I look at this contract and the previous contract for the Police, what Alderman Clemons said was the point that I was going to make when I first raised my hand, and that this started in Fiscal Year 2018. We first heard about this and the word "3% raise" my hackles went up and I went, "I'm Social Security and I got a 1.6% raise this year" and that was a big one because we haven't seen that big one in a long time.

So part of my was like "Well I'm only getting 1.6 why should they get 3?" But just because I only get 1.6 doesn't mean somebody else doesn't deserve something better and more. They are hardworking employees and there are 16 of them. And if it is \$10,000.00 more, I think every penny counts. So I don't want to say \$10,000.00 is only a little bit of money because it is \$10,000.00 here and \$10,000.00 there. But I look at as that we have to do the right thing. For two years they haven't had a contract and for two years we have been going back and forth. And maybe it has only been this past year that we really have been going back and forth, but I think it is time to do it. This contract ends in Fiscal Year 2022 and I think at that point, then maybe we really do need to renegotiate all of these healthcare issues straight down the line and stop playing this game of "Well this Union gets it, and this Union doesn't get it".

In the meantime, let's just move this forward, keep our word and we said a couple a days ago. And I agree with what Alderman Clemons said, I respect the Mayor and I don't disagree with some of the issues he is saying. At first I did say, maybe we should hold off on this and speak to others, what harm would it do? But these people have been waiting a long time and I think it is time to move forward so thank you.

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Ald. O'Brien, Ald. Gidge, Ald. Harriott-Gathright, Ald. Dowd Ald. Klee, Ald. Laws, Ald. Lopez, Ald. Caron, Ald. Kelly, Ald. Melizzi-Golja, Ald. Tencza, Ald. Schmidt, Ald. Clemons Ald. Wilshire	14
Nay: Ald. Jette,	1

MOTION CARRIED TO OVERRIDE THE MAYOR'S VETO

Mayor's Veto of R-18-102, Amended, declared overridden.

Resolution R-18-102, Amended, declared duly adopted

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN THAT THE JANUARY 2, 2020, SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED BY ROLL CALL

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Ald. O'Brien, Ald. Gidge, Ald. Harriott-Gathright, Ald. Dowd Ald. Klee, Ald. Laws, Ald. Lopez, Ald. Caron, Ald. Kelly, Ald. Jette, Ald. Melizzi-Golja, Ald. Tencza, Ald. Schmidt, Ald. Clemons Ald. Wilshire	15
Nay:	0

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting was declared adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Attest: Susan K. Lovering, City Clerk