

A regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Tuesday, February 26, 2019, at 7:30 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

President Lori Wilshire presided; City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch recorded.

Prayer was offered by City Clerk Patricia D. Piecuch; Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws led in the Pledge to the Flag.

The roll call was taken with 12 members of the Board of Aldermen present; Alderman Gidge and Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja were recorded absent.

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

## REMARKS BY THE MAYOR

### Mayor Donchess

First I wanted to mention R-19-113, which is the resolution which we are sponsoring to put before you the recommendations of the Energy and Environment Committee. You may remember that after the United States withdrew from the Paris Agreement that I became a Climate Mayor and we formed the Energy and Environment Committee to begin to look at ways to meet certain goals regarding saving energy, saving funds, saving monies and reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. As you will see from the resolution, the recommendation of the committee is that we seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 25 percent by 2025, vehicle emissions by 25 percent by the same year and to ultimately derive 100 percent of our energy from renewable, clean energy sources by 2050. We've already made quite a bit of progress in terms of reduction of energy use, which I discussed at some length in the state of the city last week. As I said then, I will be recommending in the budget coming up that we have an Energy Manager because as you get into this in some depth, these projects are very involved, very detailed and require someone with a lot of expertise to make sure that we get as much as we can out of any energy saving projects. I'm sure that will be referred to committee, and I hope you will act favorably on it.

Number two, at the next meeting on March 12, I will be proposing to you the city budget. As I again mentioned last week, the biggest challenge facing us this year is that the health care costs for city employees are up about 11 percent, which we will get into more details later, but translates to about \$3 million. This creates a budget challenge if we are going to keep the tax rate to a reasonable level. This will require that we be very cautious regarding increases in the remainder of the budget. As you will see, and as the budget committee will see once this gets proposed, we will need to exert quite a bit of discipline to make sure that any tax increase does not exceed the percent cap that I proposed in the State-of-the-City.

Number three, Friday we expect that the audit being conducted by CFO Griffin and Chief of Staff Kim Kleiner will be issued and will be sent to you, to the Board of Assessors, to the public. Of course, they have been asked to look into the organization, the processes, the procedures, the management, the organization of the Assessing Department. I think you will find ultimately their work to be very thorough, and they will have a number of recommendations for the city to follow including issues relating to technology. That will be interesting, and I think ultimately we should follow up on their recommendations and implement the suggestions and recommendations that they make in the audit.

Finally, there was some good news on in the State legislature on the rail front. The full Senate passes what's called SB241, which is the bill that would insert federal funds back into the ten-year transportation plan which Commissioner Sheehan, and she met with us, has accurately called the final project development phase of the Capital Corridor Project. That was good news. It is now through the Senate, it goes to the House. I'm sure our very able representatives under the leadership of Chair Jan Schmidt will work hard to try to accomplish the same goal in the House. Once that occurs, we will then be on the way to completing this planning phase and looking seriously at how to implement rail in the future. I thought that was good news and thought I would mention it. I testified in favor of SB241. I think Alderman O'Brien did as well in the

Senate, and Tracy Hall did as well. So, there was a good representation of Nashua as well as both of our state senators did. We had a good representation of Nashua people at the committee where SB241 was heard.

#### RESPONSE TO REMARKS OF THE MAYOR

##### Alderman Lopez

I was curious about the manner in which the audit would be dispersed. Is it going to be emailed, hard copied, on the website if it is going to be on the website, the Civic Sounding Board?

##### Mayor Donchess

In your case, I'm sure we will email it to you. It will be given to the newspaper. It is a public document so anybody will be able to get it. We may be able to put it on the website as well. Whether it will appear on the website on Friday, I'm not sure, but it will be readily available for anybody who wants it on Friday.

##### Alderman Lopez

If it is in the paper, everybody will see it probably.

#### RECOGNITION PERIOD – None

#### READING MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

**There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the minutes of the Board of Aldermen meetings of February 19, 2019, accepted, placed on file, and the readings suspended.**

#### COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRING ONLY PROCEDURAL ACTIONS AND WRITTEN REPORTS FROM LIAISONS

From: Len Fournier, Superintendent, Woodlawn/Pinewood Cemeteries  
Re: Request for Joint Convention with the Woodlawn/Pinewood Cemeteries Board of Trustees

**There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the communication, placed it on file, and scheduled a Joint Convention with the Woodlawn/Pinewood Cemeteries Board of Trustees on Tuesday, March 12, 2019, at 7:30 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.**

#### PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT RELATIVE TO ITEMS EXPECTED TO BE ACTED UPON THIS EVENING – None

#### COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRING FINAL APPROVAL

From: Celia K. Leonard, Deputy Corporation Counsel  
Re: Environmental Indemnity and Release Agreement

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE, AND AUTHORIZE THE CITY TO ENTER INTO THE ENVIRONMENTAL INDEMNITY AND RELEASE AGREEMENT  
MOTION CARRIED**

#### PETITIONS – None

NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS

The following Appointments by the Mayor were read into the record:

Board of Assessors

Mary Lou Blaisdell, Alternate (Reappointment)                      Term to Expire: April 24, 2021  
32 Webster Street  
Nashua, NH 03064

Cultural Connections Committee

Suzanne Harvey (New Appointment)                                      Term to Expire: March 1, 2022  
8 Crawford Lane  
Nashua, NH 03063

***There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the Appointments by the Mayor as read and referred them to the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee***

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Finance Committee..... 02/20/2019

There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the report of the February 20, 2019, Finance Committee accepted and placed on file.

CONFIRMATION OF MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS – None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-18-073, Amended**

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy  
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja

**PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY CHARTER RELATIVE TO FILLING VACANCIES ON ELECTED BOARDS BY MAJORITY VOTE OF THE REMAINING MEMBERS OF THAT BOARD**

- Amended and Tabled pending Public Hrg scheduled for 3/12/2019 at 7 PM in the Chambers

**R-19-110**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF NASHUA TO ENTER INTO A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH MAKEIT LABS, CORP. FOR 25 CROWN STREET**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN TENCZA FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-19-110  
MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-19-110 declared duly adopted.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – ORDINANCES – None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-19-113**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Ernest Jette  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright

**ADOPTING ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Given its first reading; assigned to the PERSONNEL/ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

**O-19-039**

Endorser: Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright

**AUTHORIZING STOP SIGNS AT THE INTERSECTION OF FAIRMOUNT STREET AND  
CHARLES STREET**

Given its first reading; assigned to the COMMITTEE ON INFRASTRUCTURE by President Wilshire

PERIOD FOR GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

Laurie Ortolano, 41 Berkeley Street. I wanted to get back to you a little bit on some of the work that I've been doing and continue to do with the assessing issues; looking forward to seeing the report coming out on the first. I wasn't expecting it out so soon so that's great. I did file my PA71 with the State and I got my abatement in. I went to the Board of Assessors and they said – Well you know it would have been nice if you had waited until the City had filed their report. But I had a deadline both at the State level and with my abatement. So I had to have my report in to the State by the first of March and I had to have the abatement in by the 1<sup>st</sup> of March so I can't wait for a City report to come out. I want you all to know that, that wasn't an option at the State level for me either. So that is why I moved forward.

I am looking forward to seeing the information with the changes to potentially the technology and how we can access information because I see that as obstacles. But I am not going to tell you that I don't see some really significant personnel issues as well and those aren't up for discussion; I understand that. But the technology isn't going to fix the issues alone because it is the people behind it that make all the difference in the world and I cannot overlook that given what we have gone through and given what I see in there.

Regarding the technology and having finished out abatement process I really came to an understanding a lot about this abating process and I think it is so flawed for the homeowner or taxpayer to carry the burden of proof, you know? It's up to us to prove that our assessments are too high and to do that we need access to the data and for us, you know, a benchmark point was the effect of your build issue on our property card and that data isn't available publicly at all on the website, on the computers down inside the office, on your home computer. It required the printing of the property cards and I went after like 100 because I was trying to look at my neighborhood, first of all, all of Berkley Street to look at where I fell out, that is 55 cards right there. Then I didn't want to just say I am only looking at Berkley because people would think – I was afraid they would say – you are being too narrow. So I grabbed Chester, I grabbed Raymond, I grabbed a few on Concord and all of a sudden you are up to \$200.00. I don't think that's right. I mean that information should be readily available and you can't tie the EYB to the grade either. The grade is not available on the web site down in the office for you to look at the cards as well.

When I started this process I did send an e-mail to Mr. Duhamel and I asked him if he would be willing to help me or give me the grade information for Berkeley Street and I did not receive a response back. It was really the State that said to me – Ask him to give you that data, that's a reasonable request so that you have access to it. And I never got it; so I ended up going in and printing it all. So I hope that we are able to create, you know, a system where the accessibility is better. I'd love to be able to print out a property card without paying a dollar and really have the information on the property card. I really learned to read those and understand them much better than I did four months ago. You've got to have the card to really look at the houses and make the comparable.

Also I think the search data base for abaters who go in and use the sales data is not very good because you can't narrow the search fields to the year the house was built or pick a range. So we live in an old neighborhood, I went in and helped a neighbor who had a colonial house, I wanted to grab colonial houses sold over the last two years; it came up with like 221. I can't narrow the field because there is no date range that you can put in. So that's a lot of data to cull through and it is pretty easy now to add a couple fields that narrow a search and give us a little more flexibility mostly so that when we are picking houses and people are that they are picking houses that are the age that their home is and a good comparable; that they are not looking at something that is 1995 when they are 1925. So it is just better for the assessors to get an abatement done to that level of quality and it is better for the property owner to be able to access data like that. So that's that.

The last time I was here I talked to you about equalization ratios and I had done a little research down in the office and I had only looked at some commercial properties and I found a commercial property that or any of the commercial properties that had representation, namely CPTM up in Manchester or tax consultant. The equalization ratio was being applied but when the property owner did not have representation and was on their own, the assessors were not applying the ration. I actually spoke to somebody about that in the office and they had questioned it as well and the answer was, from the assessor was – the people don't know the difference so it doesn't matter. Well I beg to differ on that. That is a ratio produced by the State and I have had extensive conversations with the State and their position is the ratio is applied to everybody. It sets the equalization for the data base. The last couple of days I went in and started looking at residential properties and how we handle the equalization ratio for 2015 and 2016. I hadn't had time to do it before because I was so busy with my abatement and my paperwork for the State, I had to push that aside and I said – Ok when I get that done I am going to back and take a look at that.

I pulled 10 abatements for 2015 from one assessor, 4 of them were fire issues, so there was a different proration form that is used for a fire, it is not the same as a typical abatement form so that knocked 4 data points out. The other 6 I grabbed, 3 of them received the ration, 3 of them did not. But the paperwork is all done, the math is all there where the assessor takes the homeowner's value, gives it the 88.5%, they put down their value of what they believe the property should be, they give it the 88.5% and

then they do the abatement on 100%, they give that property owner 100%, they don't give the abatement amount, they don't give the equalization ratio and their refund is minimized. When I looked at these properties, you know, one homeowner is shortchanged \$860.00. Another homeowner is shortchanged \$1,994.00. Another homeowner is shortchanged \$1,293.00. Another homeowner is shortchanged \$1,969.00. I don't consider that token; I consider that significant. And if that's what the ratio said it should be then that is what we should be refunding.

I have started to reach out to more industry people around the State because I've had time. When I started this some Alderwomen said to me – Have you looked at what other towns do. I don't have time for that, but now I do and I connected with an industry expert 27 years who served on the ASB up in Concord. I had a good 30 minute talk with him and I shared my concerns about this. He was so outraged he said – I don't know why your lawyer hasn't filed a criminal lawsuit and I don't know why those people haven't been stripped of their certifications. He said – It is outrageous to me. It is not even an option.

Now here is what I am going to tell you. This ratio is a relatively unknown entity to the homeowner or even a lot of small business people because it is not on the abatement form. The only thing you ask for on the abatement form is the market value. So everyone of us out there, us lay people who aren't wrapped in the law of property are being told – Give me the sales the data, tell us what you think the sales number is. That's fine, we depend on the expertise of those in the office who are certified by the State to apply the law the way the law is supposed to be applied. And when they are not doing it because we are too stupid to catch it, it just burns me. It just seems so wrong and it just – yeah. That's what I found in the last couple of days. I am going to go back in and look some more, but I don't like what I am seeing. I asked you the last time I came here to stop this practice and let these assessors know that the ratio should be applied to everyone. Right now we just went through equalization; we don't have a ratio produced by the State yet, the number isn't out. It is kind of late this year and I called them and it may not be out until the end of April. They haven't even started Nashua's data; normally we would have it in February.

Because we just did equalization and we just did a full City-Wide reassessment they can use one. And that is going in as one, but in any other year, like last year, if the ratio wasn't out, then the law says you just apply the ratio from the year before. So you don't not apply anything; there is always a ratio to apply and until the new data comes out you use the old data. Right now we are allowed to use one because we did equalize and we don't know what the number is, we will know soon. But anyone who is putting in an abatement they have the right to say – Don't use my multipliers one, let's see what the number comes out as. If it comes out at 95% then they get on a \$400,000.00 market value, they would be assessed at \$380,000.00 – 20% less, 5% off every \$100,000.00. They have the right to have that because that is the equalized number and I almost feel that some of the assessors feel like – I don't want to give them that number, I don't want them to be that low, I don't want to refund them that money. Last year it was 79.1%, you don't have a choice. It's not something you get to pick and choose that you don't want people to get that money. And Mr. Duhamel's position with me when I pointed it out was – Hey I'm here to save the City money, that's my job. I beg to differ; I've read your mission many times and those assessors aren't there to save the City money. They are there to create equity for all of those, horizontal equity for all of us.

So that just really disappoints me that that is the case and we haven't fixed that – or that I had to go to the State to even have these discussions. I am going to continue to reach out. I stopped at several small towns around here, met with Chief Assessors and technicians today and I asked them – Do you use the ratio for everyone. They were like blown away – of course it is not an option, everyone gets a ration. It is not an option we do it. I talked about sales chasing, I talked about how they handle sales chasing, how they protect against it, how do they correct data with MLS information. That is another issue I have raised was the sales chasing issue, that is a complex issue. The State has been very helpful. KRT was helpful too, and they wrote some interesting e-mails to John Griffin about this issue. Several of the e-

mails they wrote to John was – You should reach out to Chuck Reese up at the DRA and get his input on this issue.

I called Chuck and he never had a reach out from John. Never had a conversation with him about this issue and I wonder who is the City talking to about this? They seem to be hunkered in going – we don't do it. But it is an interesting discussion point, there is a lot there to look at. And the basis of that issue for me was this whole EYB. I started looking at properties that for some reason the Assessing Office corrects them very hard on sales data. They take a property, they view it as renovated or restored and they drive the EYB up to 1995 or 2000. They pull all the depreciation out of the home or a vast amount of it and they can move an assessment \$100,000.00 or \$150,000.00. On our house it moved it \$160,000.00, that's a lot of money. So out went the depreciation, in went that new EYB and our assessment went Poof – right through the roof.

But then I started, I pulled all those property cards and I found 27 homes, I pulled 100. I found 25 that were corrected hard and graph out with EYB here and then a big gap in the EYB here after they sales adjust. Then I found 27 that I pulled up all the MLS pictures and they weren't corrected, but they were very well done homes, meaning they got to stay at 1965, 1969 and not adjusted. One of the homes I found, you will know Madam Chair, is 19 Monadnock. That was an interesting property because I pass it every day going to and from Amherst Street. That was a property that sold for \$260,000.00. At the time it sold it was assessed for \$147,000.00. The assessors look at the MLS data, they raise it \$10K, they bring it to \$157,000.00 a year and a half, two years ago. They don't touch the EYB, but the property was very nice, had leaded doors, side lights, newer windows, granite posts, granite steps; inside nicely done. It was not a 1965 or it might have even been 1959, it wasn't that old a house, it wasn't touched.

So KRT comes around and does the reassessment, this house sold for \$260,000.00. In their model it came out to \$208,000.00 is the new value. It's quite a bit lower than what it sold for because none of that – all that interior work was grabbed by the assessors and raised in an EYB assessment. They got to go without any adjustment at all. What I took is I looked at all those 27 homes that didn't get adjusted, well KRT ends up rating them like 7% lower on overall pricing because the City doesn't use the data to correct those properties. That is where I question – are some of us being chased? Really I have said to you, don't use that EYB anymore, make your MLS adjustments on the quantitative data number of bathrooms, basement finished, the attic is finished; but when you go after the qualitative factors like grade and EYB you are really messing with assessments. You have to make certain you are doing it to everyone and they are not.

That is my issue. One of the assessors was asked to present to the Board of Assessors, they were very smart about saying – Explain to us MLS. And I didn't go to that meeting I was traveling but I read the minutes after and I wrote a letter to the Board because I said – You were not given accurate information; your assessor is telling you we are changing the number of bathrooms or basements that are finished. They never mention that qualitative data and they are changing that too and that is what is driving a lot of these disproportion assessments when it is not done fairly.

I have held steadfast that we should not do that and I am talking to other towns about that. And the State has been very open in addressing the fact that that is an issue. I don't know what to tell you except I, you know, regrettably there is no one here to talk to in the City. There is absolutely no one for a person like me to engage in a conversation with in this City; 5 months and I have never been invited into a meeting to sit with anyone to really come forward. I remember Brendan when Rob Tosier came in and some of you Aldermen got to sit in on that and you said to me – I really wished you had been there, I think you could have asked a lot of good questions and gotten answers. That option wasn't available to me. No one invited me there; it's never been an option. And that is a very big regret of mine and I hope someday the City figures out how to handle people like me and find a place for us to bring our questions so that we can get some answers. I think I deserve that; I think anyone with the kind of questions I've had deserves that kind of information.

I want to end this by talking about property card at 4 Rockland Street and I want to bring it up again because I really think – you came out with the papers and said there's no merit to favoritism and you know it is all unfounded. I didn't even know how you could make that statement and maybe the papers misquoted you, they don't do a – they don't always get it right. Because my issues of favoritism I wrote a pretty extensive letter to the Board of Assessors. They have not reviewed the letter. I didn't really take it anywhere else, I sent it to the Board. I'm sure it has made its way around City Hall. The Board of Assessors has not addressed it so when I went to the meeting on Thursday I was surprised in the paper earlier in the week that the Mayor had come out with the comments that Mrs. Ortolano's findings are unfounded or don't have merit. Because then I sit there and say – 1) Did my Board of Assessors meet in a non-public session to address this issue? Did they conclude it was unfounded and go to the Mayor and say – She's all wet none of this makes sense? Where are the conversations taking place and no one said anything to me.

I approached the Board after the meeting, I said – Have you reviewed this? No. Have you spoken to the Mayor about this? No. They were adamant that they had had no conversations. I'm not certain if your role is really to not be involved in these assessing issues or to be involved, you certainly seemed very involved in ours publicly. And when you make statements to the paper that these issues I raise are baseless, I am trying to use a chain of command to take these issues to Board of Assessors because they are the group that, the State says they are the ones who are supposed to address it. I am trying to work through that avenue and you know it just seems like you are not making the right statements to the press that maybe - Hey we've got an internal report that is going to be released soon, Mrs. Ortolano is working through the proper channels with the Board of Assessors and they will make a determination on her issues; whatever. But it seems like it comes from you and as a citizen or a resident I never get the courtesy of somebody coming to me and telling me. I guess the newspaper has been a great avenue for me because I seem to get my questions answered through the newspaper when you speak. But I don't think that's the one we should count on.

So regarding your property card and I know it brought a nice big smirk on your face but here is an issue when I look at that when it comes to favoritism, it is not about you personally, let it be known I don't think Jim Donchess had anything to do with the assessment of his property. This is all on the assessors and how they are looking at any individual; not on the property owner. Jim, Vicky, they weren't responsible for this. It is all on the assessors, they are certified, they are trained and they are supposed to be fair. But when I looked at your card, I went today and I printed two of them because the notes on the card said the EYB was 1970 but the card, when I printed it out, the EYB said 1979. And I didn't have time to research it weeks ago and I said – What did they type 0 and they meant a 9 I don't even understand this. But I noticed your depreciation just didn't change much, you didn't pay much for the change in the house because the depreciation didn't change, hardly at all.

And so I went today and I said – Well print me the 2012 and the 2014 cards. Those were the cards, 2012 was when the file was officially closed, the EYB was done. And when I printed those cards, the EYB was 1970. And in 2014 it was 1970. Somehow in 2018 when I raised the question somebody changed it to 1979. And I am really curious who manipulated that data. And I am telling you that because there is no note in the comment section that an EYB change as made. How did that happen? There should be documentation. That file should have a marked up card that says their rules are their rules, pencil marked up EYB was changed in 1979, the old card and the new card stapled and it is in the file. It's not there. There is nothing in the file. Who manipulated that card to change the EYB to 1979? And why was that done? It is so curious to me. And really why I believe there is favoritism is because I've compiled all this data and when I look at properties like yours, that went through a heavy demolition and renno, Jim up in the north end I can't find one that they kept at EYB at 1970 that was all done, where the walls were opened up and plaster was taken out and sheetrock was put up. I mean I can think of Hall Street went to 2000; Webster Street went to 1995 or 2000; Courtland went to 1999; Chester went to 1995; I went to 1994; neighbor went to 1994. You went to 1970.

That's where it stands out. I think it is reasonable to point it out. It's not you, it's them. So think about that. Thank you.

#### REMARKS BY THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN

##### Alderman Jette

The ordinance that I proposed raising the age to which people can buy tobacco related products, raising it from 18 to 21, is going to be heard by the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee on Monday night. Anyone who wants to be heard on that issue, they are welcome to come Monday night. As a matter of information, there was a Senate Bill in the New Hampshire State Senate to raise the age from 18 to 21 statewide. That was before the Commerce Committee. The Commerce Committee voted to hold it in committee. I haven't been able to find out what the discussion was or why they did that. I just know that Senator Waters, who sponsored it, said that the effect of that is it is still alive but will not be acted on until next January. As far as raising it statewide for the time being and for the foreseeable future that's not going to happen. We in Nashua, if we want to, we can do it here in Nashua. It will be before that committee Monday night, at 7 p.m., here in the Aldermanic Chamber.

##### Alderman Caron

I would just like to say thank you to the Citizens Advisory Committee for working very diligently last Thursday to put together the numbers for the agency requests that came in this year. The Mayor was working on a timeline, and we promised that we would get all the numbers to his office by Friday. They worked very diligently to do this. Without the help of the community, the citizens, these agencies, they would not know how hard these agencies work, so I really want to say thank you to all of them for the time during the last three months that they have put in for this project. Thank you.

##### Alderman Lopez

I had a lot of constituent feedback regarding the proposed resolution that Alderman Jette referenced. I do plan to ask the committee to hold it until April because there are more people that want to participate that aren't able to make the March meeting. I just wanted to make it clear that we weren't forgetting them.

Additionally, I wanted to remind everyone of the Special Election on March 5. JajaBelle's is hosting both of the candidates. Tomorrow Fred Teeboom will be there from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Ben Clemons will be there the day after.

##### Alderman Klee

Ordinance 19-039, I know is going to Infrastructure. Do we have a schedule on that?

##### President Wilshire

It's in Infrastructure. I don't know when the next meeting is.

##### Alderman O'Brien

Tomorrow night.

##### Alderman Klee

Will it be before you tomorrow night? The reason I'm asking is I have a lot of constituents that want to know.

Alderman O'Brien

You just filed this, so it needs to go through the administrative process. It will probably be next month.

President Wilshire

I just wanted to congratulate the Nashua Housing and Redevelopment Authority. We received a school of 100 percent for their Section 8 management. They don't get a lot of kudos in this city so when they do something well, I like to bring it up and give them kudos. One hundred percent for excellence in Section 8 management is really good.

Committee announcements:

Alderman O'Brien

Tomorrow night at 7:00 p.m. is Infrastructure, here in the Chamber, all are welcome.

Alderman Caron

Personnel is Monday, the 4<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m.

Alderman Jette

Can I just clarify that the ordinance regarding tobacco is going to be heard by the committee Monday night and again in April?

Alderman Caron

It's scheduled to be heard next Monday, whether it is heard will depend on whether the committee decides to move forward or table it until April. That's not my decision, but it is on the agenda for Monday.

Alderman Lopez

People can comment on it Monday, but if the committee decides to table to April, they will also be able to comment on it on April.

Alderman Caron

Yes, they can comment prior to.

Alderman Jette

I just wanted to clarify that people who are planning on coming this coming Monday will have a chance to say something, for or against.

Alderman Caron

Yes, they can speak.

Alderman Jette

And it is possible that it would be tabled and heard again in April.

Alderman Caron

Right.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN THAT THE FEBRUARY 26, 2019, MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED  
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Attest: Patricia D. Piecuch City Clerk