

A regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Tuesday, March 12, 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 Jan Schmidt 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 Kelly were recorded absent.

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

***There being no objection, President Wilshire suspended the rules to go out of order to Canvas the Votes from the Special Municipal Election held March 5, 2019***

### COMMUNICATIONS

From: Patricia Piecuch, City Clerk

Re: Canvas of Votes – Special Municipal Election

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARON THAT THE RESULTS RECORDED ON THE CITY CLERK'S RECORD OF RETURNS FOR THE ALDERMAN-AT-LARGE RACE AT THE SPECIAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION ON MARCH 5, 2019, BE DECLARED FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE, AND THAT BENJAMIN M. CLEMONS, HAVING RECEIVED THE LARGEST NUMBER OF VOTES CAST, BE DECLARED ELECTED TO THE OFFICE OF ALDERMAN-AT-LARGE FOR A TERM TO EXPIRE JANUARY 5, 2020  
MOTION CARRIED**

President Wilshire declared Ben Clemons duly elected to the Board of Aldermen for a term to expire January 5, 2020.

Oath of Office administered by Corporation Counsel.

### REMARKS BY THE MAYOR

#### Mayor Donchess

First I want to congratulate Alderman Clemons on being elected and now sworn in as our 15<sup>th</sup> Alderman, of course he's been before and he is familiar with the role, but it is nice to have you join the Board. So the main issue tonight is the Budget which I am going to discuss in a little bit of detail in a moment but I have to apologize first because I need to leave after my remarks and after we recognize Ms. Giannelli because my wife had eye surgery today and the doctor says not to leave her alone for any extended period of time so I wanted to come in and least to talk about the budget, see if you had any questions or comments at this point. But if not, after Ms. Giannelli is congratulated, then I will have to depart. So I apologize for that.

As I said before in the State of the City and elsewhere, the Budget is up at little less than 3%. The main cause of the increase is that we were hit with an 11% increase or about \$3 million dollars in the cost of health care for City employees. As I am sure you know the City is self-insured, so this is based upon our experience this year working with our consultant and projecting into next year. This \$3 million dollar increase creates of course a lot of pressure across the City budget so I have proposed a budget which maintains the quality of services and increases them to some degree I think, but in essence holds the line and the bottom line being that we need to deliver a tax increase of 3% or less.

As a result of this pressure and a result of the need to keep the tax rate as low as we possibly can, I requested of the Departments that they provide budgets of 2.25%. Many of the Departments did that but the major Departments didn't think they could do that so they proposed budgets higher than that number. So our major Departments, which of course are School, Police and Fire, my budget reduces their request to something at or

somewhat above the 2.25% guideline. The major issues in the three departments; in the School Department what is required or what is being requested is that there be ELL teachers added to the budget number one; number two that school psychologists be added to the budget; and number three that paras for the Kindergarten program be added, Kindergarten paras for the Kindergarten classes that were expanded a couple of years ago.

Now my budget increases the School Department by 2.25% but in addition because of the very eloquent case that many people have made for the need for ELL teachers, it also includes in addition to that, \$200,000.00 in contingency designated for School ELL teachers so that if the School Department wishes to use those funds for that purpose, they could be released by you either during the budget process or afterwards to help meet that ELL need. And that would provide enough funds for 4 additional ELL teachers.

In the Fire Department the major challenge has been dispatching. The number of calls has grown exponentially over the last few years with no increases in dispatchers. They are now up to 11,000 plus calls that they are fielding every year. In last year's budget increased the number of dispatchers by 4, in other words enough to add one person all shifts, expand from 2 to 3 shifts. This budget continues that but it also collects revenue from the ambulance contract. We believe, we are highly confident that we can negotiate a payment of approximately \$350,000.00 from the ambulance company which is kind of now standard in the industry to help defray the cost of the additional dispatchers, because they do help to dispatch medical calls, of course.

In the Police Department the major challenge is the number of officers, they have been down for some period of time, usually because they are not able to fill all the positions. As a result there is some accumulated funds in the payroll account which they've been able to use. Now they have a plan and I am sure they will explain it to you to get to full complement, which would not be fully possible with the budget increase of 2.25%. I think we can make progress and certainly maintain the number of officers we have and maybe increase a little bit, but we may not in one year be able to get to the full number that are authorized which is 179.

All of these issues, of course, will be discussed in detail I'm sure at the Budget Hearings, Alderman Dowd has already scheduled the Hearings for the next couple of months and I, of course, will be available to discuss any questions or comments that you have at various times during the Budget Review Process. Additional items within the budget include the changes that were recommended in the Assessing Audit, the position of Chief Assessor does not appear in the budget as I said the audit recommended that be eliminated, but in exchange the position of Administrative Services Director which I think we discussed in some detail last Thursday night has been returned to the City Budget, that was a position that was in City Hall in management of Assessing and other related functions for some decades and was removed back during Mayor Lozeau's term, but the audit and recommended and the budget suggests that that position be reestablished.

And of course we discussed all of this in some detail on Thursday, but if necessary we could bring KRT to help with management of the assessing function under contract basis, but that may not be necessary and the budget suggests that we sort of proceed with caution with respect to that and make decisions as we get into it. There are two positions in the budget that have not been there before; both I believe are positions that will pay for themselves. As I said in the State of the City there is an Energy Manager Position that would review energy saving projects in detail and those can be extremely complicated if you want to do them right, with City Officials and with the School Department to try to realize savings both in school buildings, city buildings and also generate other, potentially energy-generating projects that we could undertake. And they are split with the School Department, they put in half the money and this budget puts in half is I think it is \$30,000.00 on each side, is a Grant Writer Position. The City does not have a Grant Writer and we think that both the School Department and I believe that we could bring in funds, significantly more grant funds than we do now if we had someone who was looking in detail at grant opportunities.

The School Department had one for a little while but that was phased out because of budget needs and having now discussed this with the Superintendent, Dr. Mosley, we have agreed that we would split the cost and then jointly utilize the person to try to bring in additional funds, again, a position that I believe can ultimately pay for itself.

Those are some of the major outlines of the budget, again to return to the main point, the budget is up slightly less than 3% without this \$3 million dollar increase it would be less than 2%, without the \$3 million dollar increase in the health care which is of course a fixed cost. The budget would be up again less than 2%. So I think it is a tight budget, but one that attempts to meet some significant needs like the ELL teachers, like the dispatchers and the other issues that I've mentioned.

So Madam Chair or Madam President that is a summary of the budget and I'm certainly available if anyone wishes for questions or comments now, but as I said, as we give Ms. Giannelli, Lola, her Certificate and we congratulate her pass the resolution, I do have to leave as a result of my wife's surgery.

RESPONSE TO REMARKS OF THE MAYOR - None

RECOGNITION PERIOD

**R-19-106**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Board of Aldermen

**RECOGNIZING LOLA GIANNELLI AS NEW HAMPSHIRE'S FIRST KID GOVERNOR**

Given its first reading;

***There being no objection, President Wilshire suspended the rules to allow for a second reading of R-19-106***

Resolution R-19-106 given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN KLEE FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-19-106  
MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-19-106 declared duly adopted.

READING MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

**There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the minutes of the Board of Aldermen meetings of February 26, 2019, accepted, placed on file, and the readings suspended.**

COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRING ONLY PROCEDURAL ACTIONS AND WRITTEN REPORTS  
FROM LIAISONS

From: Larry D. Goodhue, CEO, Pennichuck Corporation  
Re: Pennichuck East Utility, Inc. – Request for Approval of Term Loan with CoBank, ACB

***There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the communication, placed it on file and referred it to the Pennichuck Water Special Committee***

From: Andrew J. Lavoie, Chief of Police  
Re: Resolution R-19-120

***There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the communication, placed it on file and referred it to the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee***

PERIOD FOR PUBLIC COMMENT RELATIVE TO ITEMS EXPECTED TO BE ACTED UPON THIS  
EVENING

Adam Marcoux Adam Marcoux, 4 Jolori Lane, I'm here on behalf on the Nashua Teacher's Union as their elected president. The last time I was here I was not the most controversial item on the agenda. I like that.

I am also tonight not the most controversial on the agenda. I am here to speak on behalf of the Food Service Workers and their contract. It is a 3 year deal, this group again as I said about our secretaries the last time, when you think of school you think of teachers. But behind the scenes you don't see food service, they are in the cafeteria, many parents and public officials don't see them because you are in the office or in the classroom. Without these people our kids don't eat. And for those of you who don't work with kids, a hungry kid is an angry kid and that's where the term "hangry" came from, probably from a little 6 year old. These ladies and one gentleman work very hard at all 17 schools to make sure these kids are fed every day. We may not like what they feed us, but that is the Federal Government's fault and not ours. I like to remind the students of that.

This was I would have to say one of the more enjoyable negotiation sessions we have had. There are a lot of things that we came together on right away and said "this is important" including more professional development for the food service workers in line with what we are doing with the teachers, the paras, the secretaries and the other staff within our building and it is important to recognize that they are part of our school community and I think this may be a major step towards that along with some other things that were mutually beneficial to improve working conditions for this group of people. I'd like to thank the Budget Review Committee for their quick 10 minute work of this proposal at their meeting and I ask for the full Board's approval. Thank you.

Paula Johnson I guess I should grow a little bit, I'll just hold it. My name is Paula Johnson, 15 Westborn Drive. I'm going to speak here regarding R-18-073. I forgot to bring something up on the last comment period, I forgot that and I had mentioned it to the President of the Board, you did have an Alderman at one time and it should really state that in the City of Nashua there was an Alderman that had a Massachusetts Driver's License and lived in Nashua. Where was his residency, was the residency in Massachusetts or was the residency in New Hampshire. And some people might remember the Ward that he was in and unfortunately who knew where he actually lived, was it in Massachusetts with the license or was it New Hampshire here? Ward 8 former Alderman from Ward 8, that whole big controversy back then. So I think when Mr. Teeboom says who qualifies and who should be stated exactly what where they are, I think it should be to make sure it says a resident of the City of Nashua. So we don't have this mistake again, because that was a big mistake.

The second thing is, I'd like to speak about is the downtown parking fees that we are raising here. I am a little bit concerned about that. We are going to raise it and I guess it is going to go to the Downtown Improvement Committee again for the parking garages. That money should be put into the general fund and be used that way. It is for downtown, no. When those parking meters were put in and we raised everything it should have been general fund, not going just for the downtown because I had just mentioned to the Alderman from Ward 8, I never realized that on Daniel Webster Highway there are no cross walks. Do you know how busy that is? Does everybody go down to Daniel Webster Highway between Spit Brook and Daniel Webster Highway? You can't get across, it's like dodge car. They used to play dodge ball, dodge car. And somebody is going to get hurt eventually because now it is getting worse. And plus you've got the lights are not synchronized anyplace in the City. It is a disgrace, it is a disaster because I work down in that area. And I see the cars lined up and I was noticing the other day that this gentleman was trying to get across the street. And I'm waiting for the cross walk signal. There is none, they have it on West Hollis Street where I live because my Alderman did it several years ago, Mike Tedasco, and I am asked him – we don't have it at a busy intersection, are you kidding me? So why don't you take that money, change the ordinance, take that money that goes to the downtown improvement committee and take it and put it where it needs to be in the City so our taxes don't go up any higher for this nonsense. You know there's other places in the City where we need work done and crosswalks and it is not just downtown because the action is down at the Pheasant Lane Mall on the south end of town in Ward 8. So I would ask that we please take care of that area on Daniel Webster Highway and start getting crosswalks and get some pedestrian walk signals. Thank you.

Tim Sennott Hello again, thank you, Timothy Sennott, 62 Underhill Street, I neglected to mention earlier that I am a Selectman in Ward 7. Just to speak a little bit more on R-18-073, I do believe that before this resolution passes this Board tonight additional consideration should be given to the language of the Bill.

We did hear from Mr. Lisle earlier this evening regarding a proposal that he had presented to the Board. I feel that there is some merit to that in treating replacements for vacancies on elected Boards the way we would treat appointed officials where they are brought forth by the Mayor and then vetted by those respective Boards. I am not opposed to changing the method in which we do fill these vacancies, just having sat for a single two year term it is clear to me that what we are doing is not working. My Ward for the Board of Education saw 157 voters for the election last week, we saw 450. That is a long 14 hour day. I don't mention this because I dislike the work or I dislike the burden, I actually quite enjoy it, I sought out this position having never served at the polls before sight unseen. It is something I enjoy I just feel that there is a solution beyond what we have written in the current resolution that can serve better the City's finances as well as the people of the City as a whole. Thank you.

Fred Teeboom Fred Teeboom, 24 Cheyenne. First I would like to say that there's a difference between public hearing and public comment. This is a public comment, public hearing you can ask questions, the public can ask questions, public comment all you do is make comment. Now all the, I don't normally come up and talk about appointments, but I'd like to do it in this case. You have an appointment of MaryLou Blaisdell. Now we just went through a whole so-called assessment of the Assessing Office and found it to be seriously lacking and the Chief Assessor incompetent, I don't know all of the details I didn't sit in last Thursday. The assessment has been a disaster. The person who blew the lid on this whole thing was Laura Ortolano.

Now on the appointment you will find Marylou Blaisdell being reappointed to the Board of Assessors. She's been on the Board of Assessors for many, many years, at least 20, maybe longer. Frankly as I understand it, I didn't talk to her directly, I don't really know the lady but she really didn't want to serve again. The person that wanted to serve on the Board of Assessors was Lori Ortolano. Lori Ortolano blew the lid on this whole assessment fiasco evaluation. Lori Ortolano asked the Mayor, she told me this herself, asked the Mayor to be appointed to the Board of Assessor. I cannot think of anyone more qualified. She put in an enormous amount of time looking at the disaster of this evaluation, spent a huge amount of her own money looking at cards and all the dollars for cards you have to pay for. And when she asked the Mayor he declined to appoint her. And the he reappointed Marylou Blaisdell probably against her own wishes.

In fact Marylou Blaisdell is being appointed also to the Performing Arts Center and she runs a business because he doesn't want someone on the Board of Assessors that does the kind of thing that Lori Ortolano does. And I don't understand that. In fact the entire Board of Assessors ought to step down in shame because they have an overview position and they did nothing absolutely nothing. So they can serve the time but if there's a vacancy on the Board of Assessors than certainly that out to be Lori Ortolano. So I am asking you when that appointment comes up this evening, you vote in unison to take the appointment back to the Personnel Committee or Administrative Affairs Committee as they call it and reevaluate that appointment.

I'd like to make one another point, I understand the parking fees are being raised, that's about the dumbest thing you can do. I never shop in downtown and I know lots of people that don't shop in downtown because why should you pay parking fees? Instead of lowering them, you are raising them, that's a sure way to have people not shop in downtown. It's a pain. You shouldn't be doing it, you should be lowering parking fees, this amount of money you are collecting, I bet in the budget is miniscule.

And one final thing I want to say I didn't get a chance because Madam President you didn't call the second opposition period during the public comment there were 3 Aldermen that went to jail in 1993 because of corruption with the votes. And when I was an Alderman one Alderman, Ward 8 went to jail in Massachusetts because of repeated drunken driving. You don't want an appointed Alderman to become a felon for whatever purpose. If he is elected, that's one thing, appointed that is a serious problem. Thank you.

**COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRING FINAL APPROVAL**

From: Lori Wilshire, President, Board of Aldermen  
Re: Revised Committee Assignments

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND APPROVE THE REVISED COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS AS PRESENTED  
MOTION CARRIED**

From: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Re: Contract for 2019 Paving Program – Arterial Roadways Construction

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN JETTE TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND AWARD THE CONTRACT TO BROX INDUSTRIES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,853,473**

**ON THE QUESTION****Alderman Jette**

If I could just comment, so you know we've all heard complaints about the condition of the roadways, this is part of the program that the City has undertaken, bonded amount to repave. Last year we repaved I think like 25 miles of roadway.

This and the other thing that is coming up right after this one, will contract another \$10 million dollars to repave another approximately, it's over 20 miles of more roadway. So for those people who have been wanting us to repair the roads, this is the money that we are spending to do it.

**MOTION CARRIED**

From: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Re: Contract for 2019 Paving Program – Local & Collector Roadways

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAWS TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND AWARD THE CONTRACT TO SUNSHINE PAVING IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,350,642  
MOTION CARRIED**

From: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Re: Contract for 2019 CIPP Lining Project

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN HARRIOTT-GATHRIGHT TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND AWARD THE CONTRACT TO KENYON PIPELINE INSPECTION, LLC, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,825,135  
MOTION CARRIED**

From: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Re: Contract for 2019 Sewer Replacement Construction

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO ACCEPT, PLACE ON FILE AND AWARD THE CONTRACT TO N. GRANESE & SONS, INC., IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,001,888  
MOTION CARRIED**

PETITIONS

The following Petitions were read into the record:

- Petition for Street Acceptance: Adelaide Avenue
- Petition for Street Acceptance: Pendant Lane

***There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the Petitions for Street Acceptance, referred them to the Committee on Infrastructure and scheduled public hearings for Wednesday, April 24, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber***

NOMINATIONS, APPOINTMENTS AND ELECTIONS

Joint Convention with Woodlawn/Pinewood Cemeteries Board of Trustees

**There being no objection, President Wilshire declared that the Board of Aldermen meet in joint convention with the Woodlawn/Pinewood Cemeteries Board of Trustees for the purpose of electing two trustees and called for nominations.**

Niles Jensen, 4 Catalina Lane I am Chairman of the Board of Trustees for Woodlawn and Pinewood Cemeteries. Our Board of Trustee want to re-nominate Howard Frizzell and Daniel Buslovich for 5 year terms to expire in 2024.

Trustee Jensen nominated Daniel Buslovich and Howard Frizzell for terms to expire March 31, 2024

**There being no objection, President Wilshire closed the nominations.**

A viva voce roll call was taken on the appointment of Daniel Buslovich and Howard Frizzell which resulted as follows:

- |      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| Yea: | Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Harriott-Gathright<br>Alderman Dowd, Alderman Klee, Alderman Laws, Alderman Lopez<br>Alderman Caron, Alderman Jette, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja<br>Alderman Tencza, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Wilshire<br>Trustee Buslovich, Trustee Coulombe,<br>Trustee Frizzell, Trustee Jensen | 17 |
| Nay: |  | 0  |

**MOTION CARRIED**

President Wilshire declared Daniel Buslovich and Howard Frizzell duly appointed to the Woodlawn/ Pinewood Cemeteries Board of Trustees for terms to expire March 31, 2024.

Oath of Office administered by Corporation Counsel.

**There being no objection, President Wilshire declared that the Joint Convention now arise.**

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

Budget Review Committee..... 02/25/2019

There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the report of the February 25, 2019, Budget Review Committee accepted and placed on file.

Committee on Infrastructure..... 02/27/2019

There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the report of the February 27, 2019, Committee on Infrastructure accepted and placed on file.

Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee..... 03/04/2019

There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the report of the March 4, 2019, Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee accepted and placed on file.

Finance Committee..... 03/06/2019

There being no objection, President Wilshire declared the report of the March 6, 2019, Finance Committee accepted and placed on file.

CONFIRMATION OF MAYOR'S APPOINTMENTS

***President Wilshire stated that the Appointment of Mary Lou Blaisdell to the Board of Assessors has been withdrawn***

Conservation Commission

Sherry Dutzy (Reappointment) Term to Expire: December 31, 2021  
18 Swart Terrace  
Nashua, NH 03064

***There being no objection, President Wilshire confirmed the reappointment of Sherry Dutzy, 18 Swart Terrace, Nashua, to the Conservation Commission for a term to expire December 31, 2021***

Cultural Connections Committee

Margaret Loret (New Appointment) Term to Expire: February 1, 2021  
4 Cimmarron Drive  
Nashua, NH 03062

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

***There being no objections, President Wilshire confirmed the appointment of Margaret Loret, 4 Cimmarron Drive, Nashua, and Suzanne Harvey, 8 Crawford Lane, Nashua, to the Cultural Connections Committee for terms to expire February 1, 2021, and March 1, 2022, respectively.***

Oath of Office administered by Corporation Counsel.

Downtown Improvement Committee

David Grebowski (Moving to Full Member) Term to Expire: December 31, 2019  
172 Main Street  
Nashua, NH 03060

Mary Lou Blaisdell (Reappointment) Term to Expire: December 31, 2020  
32 Webster Street  
Nashua, NH 03064

Richard Lannan (Reappointment)  
7D Taggart Drive  
Nashua, NH 03060

Term to Expire: December 31, 2020

***There being no objection, President Wilshire confirmed the appointment of the following individuals to the Downtown Improvement Committee: David Grebowski, 172 Main Street, Nashua, for a term to expire December 31, 2019, and Mary Lou Blaisdell, 32 Webster Street, Nashua, and Richard Lannan, 7D Taggart Drive, Nashua, for terms to expire March 31, 2020***

Oath of Office administered by Corporation Counsel to David Grebowski.

Mine Falls Park Advisory Committee

Nicholas Serpa (Reappointment)  
9 Joston Place  
Merrimack, NH 03054

Term to Expire: December 31, 2019

***There being no objection, President Wilshire confirmed the appointment of Nicholas Serpa, 9 Joston Place, Merrimack, to the Mine Falls Park Advisory Committee for a term to expire December 31, 2019***

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-18-073, Amended**

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

Given its sixth reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-18-073, AS AMENDED, AND PURSUANT TO RSA 49-B:4-a, I (b), INSTRUCT THE CITY CLERK TO SUBMIT WITHIN 10 DAYS THE PROPOSED CHARTER CHANGE TO THE STATE AGENCIES FOR REVIEW**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Klee

I just kind of want to address some of the comments that were made, while I think all of them are very constructive and so on, I did speak to our City Clerk and kind of did a little homework and one of the things that was brought to mind was if we went with the idea that the person got appointed whether by the Mayor or the Board then would have to run for election at the next effective and regular election, I apologize for my word search here, that we would possibly be expiring a term before it was official expired.

So in other words in the case of the Board of Education if we did it at the next election that had one more year to go and that may go against State regulation and so on. So something like that may not be able to happen. So I just wanted to kind of make that comment for those that are better listening and so on. While I think that everything can always be improved upon I think this is the best method or way to go.

Alderman Jette

I would like to move to re-refer this to the committee. We've had the public hearing, people have made comments and we've also received some written correspondence and you know I think the Committee ought to have the chance to discuss those comments and make any changes, if any they feel is appropriate. I know that the people that work at the polls in my Ward, the moderator and the selectman, the poll workers feel very strongly that we need to do something different than what we've been doing because of the time that they have to spend and the turnout has been awful.

While I'm very sensitive to the idea that people ought to be elected, they ought to run for positions and get elected to these positions, when you have a turnout of less than 10% or less than 7% in this last time, you know at a cost of over \$30,000.00 to the City and a cost in the lives of these poll workers who are essentially, they get paid a small amount, but it is essentially volunteers. They are there and it is very discouraging for them to be there all day with such a poor turnout. I'm sensitive to that but I see a change needs to be made and I think that Mr. Lisle who has been working on this for a long time has some ideas at least worth considering about how to best solve this problem. So I've spoken to the Chairman of the Committee, she's amenable to having her Committee consider these things and look at it again. So that's my motion.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN JETTE TO RE-REFER R-18-073, AS AMENDED, TO THE PERSONNEL/ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**ON THE QUESTIONAlderman Clemons

Thank you I just have a question, a point of clarity I think. I know what the original proposal was, what has been amended?

Attorney Bolton

What was amended was portions of the language that is to be stricken because the charter had had a previous amendment that added a provision that had not been captured in the certification. So essentially most of the language of the existing section including the language that had been added by the most recent amendment, is to be deleted. So in order to make the resolution accurate, it was an amendment to show the correct version of the language to be stricken. So it essentially makes no difference in what the proposal is.

Alderman Clemons

So please correct me if I'm wrong, then what this proposes to do is to allow a majority of the elected Board to appoint a member to fill a vacancy until the next regularly scheduled election. Is that correct?

Alderman Klee

It's not of the next regularly scheduled but it's of the term expired, correct? That's how I read it, it was when their term expires, so in other words, if in the case of the Board of Ed that we just recently had, when his term expired, it was 2 years not at the election which really was a State election.

Alderman Clemons

What I meant is the next regular City election, so in the case of this last special election, if somebody had been appointed, they would have been appointed to the term to fill out the end of the year and then somebody would run because that's when the term was up so they would run in that election. Is that how that would work?

Alderman Klee

At the end of their term.

Alderman Clemons

Let me further clarify, if there was 3 years left, let's suppose there was 3 years left on the end of Alderman McCarthy's term, we would be, the vacancy would only be filled until this Fall?

Attorney Bolton

That is not what the current proposal is. The current proposal is for the election of someone by the remaining members of that body to be for the remainder of the unexpired term. Then what you suggest is a possible alternate arrangement but that is not the proposal before you now.

Alderman Clemons

Then I certainly will support Alderman Jette's motion to send it back to Committee.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you I am going to defend the pending motion that I made given that to remind this Board we are on reading number 6. This has been read before this Board 6 times. If we look at tonight's agenda, we see a lot of people who are volunteers that have come up and run for various importance, I know someone in our audience that they don't care about some other boards and put a degree of importance but I think anybody who volunteers and theoretically re-volunteers times to times to be on the Board of Aldermen because of our commitment to this City. And it seems that these people who seek or get asked by the Mayor and get called to serve, it seems we have a very good, excellent track record with this. We look by in tonight's agenda just how many people are reappointed to the Boards.

So I feel extremely confident that through a proper vetting process that members of this Board, and keep in mind, when people who are appointed, they are vetted by the Personnel Board. So I imagine that procedure would be much the same when they come up with the name of an Alderman, and then it would come before the full Board to recognize and vet it again on that. So I think we have done more than our due diligence with that. And keep in mind I can't through a séance or anything have the intentions of my good friend and Alderman Brian McCarthy. But has having many discussions with him, one must remember this was the way the Board used to do it. It is protected by a past practice from what I've come to understand. So the thing is by coming up with this idea, I think we are following much in the way that our predecessors had basically brought a name and nomination.

Now we could discuss it all night but the thing is this when it comes down to it, we are talking the rarity of somebody moving out or whatever is their personal reasons or perhaps as we tragically suffered with the death of our President Brian McCarthy, I hope that never happens again, I'm sure we all do. But these are very rare circumstances. And they key of this is look to run a special election is \$30,000.00 within by one

of the gentlemen who testified this evening reminds us that we've had 3 special elections, that's \$90,000.00 that we have spent in special elections for an extremely low percentile that has come up.

Now we can have a combination system, but if we really are going to do due diligence to the tax payer, I think we can just ruffle through and go by proper vetting procedures, pick a candidate that was willing to serve on this particular Board, or any Board that comes under this and to have them fill out the remainder of that particular term and then allow it to go to the regular type of race. And save, save, save, because it happened three times, the tax payers of the City of Nashua a special election.

#### Alderman Klee

I want to address two things to answer Alderman Clemon's comments on the three years and going to the term. I'm not sure we can change the term. In other words if we went to the next election we may be expiring the term before it does and I'm not sure that we can do that but I don't know that for a fact, it's just kind of in conversation so that's why I made that comment. And then there was other comments that were made about that the second next vote getter get something a comment that was thrown around.

In many cases, even on this Board, they run completely unopposed and I can tell you from lived in this City long enough you would see pick 3 and there are only 3 people to pick, that seems to be what happens here. The second person just because of the second vote getter doesn't really mean that it is the feeling, so I really would not be in favor of the second person in charge getting something like that. If we were to elect an alternate that might be something different in that case.

As far as the other Board members that were brought up, they are appointments they are not elected and that's the way it is. I agree with my colleague here to my left that we have bantered this long enough and I would like to a final vote on it and move it forward.

#### Alderman Dowd

My one concern, if the majority of the Board wanted to go back I think you can discuss it all you want but I can tell you that 16 years ago, myself and Julia Ward were selected by the Board of Ed to fill two vacancies and I think the two of us did a hell of a job serving on the Board of Education and so I think that process works.

#### Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Thank you. I have a question for Attorney Bolton and then a comment. Attorney Bolton, would we indeed, if it came to filling a vacancy on any of the elected Boards, would we indeed be referring those people to the Personnel Committee?

#### Attorney Bolton

Well this Board wouldn't, as to vacancies on other Boards....

#### Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Elected Boards.

#### Attorney Bolton

Right the other elected Boards would be filling their own vacancies, however they chose. Now this Board could devise its own process, it could be considered the vacancy could be considered by the Board as a whole on a single evening; it could bring up names on one evening, refer all of them to Committee to do whatever procedure desired as far as interviewing or checking credentials or otherwise learning about the various nominees. So it would be up to the Board as to how to conduct itself.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

But currently in the proposed legislation that's not part of the process and my experience when something happened on the Board of Ed, the Board of Ed just handled that and appointed someone. So the people from the various elected Board, unlike the number of appointed Boards we have, would not be obligated to refer people to our Personnel Committee. They would handle it within their own ... ok thank you.

I guess I actually support this piece of legislation and I totally get because I have been there as a Selectman being there and no one is there and it's kind of like when you work in retail and you are working at an ice-cream shop or hot dog stand, the most boring thing in the world is not have anything to do. And it is a very long, tiring day which becomes longer and more tiring, when you only have 100 people show up. So I totally understand the need to look for another process. Mr. Lisle have had multiple conversations about this and my concern about nominations from the Mayor to the Board of Aldermen for their approval and if they don't approve then the vacancy continues is that when you don't have smooth sailing between the Mayor or among the members of the Board of Aldermen, that could become very contentious and could also look like cronyism. And so I worry about what we would end up with that process.

I think several of us here have lived through changes in this process and I feel like this is like doing a contract, a labor union contract, it's like there's never a win, we live with it for a while and then we seem to come back and revisit it. But I do support what we have before us; that being said, like Alderman Dowd, if people would like to send this back to Committee, I am willing to support that, only for the reason that the public hearing has been held but the Committee has not had an opportunity to respond to that and if the Chair if that Committee who is nodding her head yes to me, is comfortable and believes that would be the process to have it come back to Committee, then I am willing to support it going back to Committee with the understanding right now I'm good with it.

Alderman Laws

I too have a question for Corporation Counsel, sorry for peppering you with this, you pantomimed earlier that what we previously did in these situations with the City is a little different than what is proposed in this and I am just curious what the difference is and why we are going with this?

Attorney Bolton

Previously in the event that the remainder of the term of the official who had vacated the office extended beyond the next municipal election, the vacancy would only be filled until the next municipal election whereupon there would be an election to fill the vacancy for the remainder of the term, essentially the ensuing 2 years plus.

Alderman Laws

Thank you I like that comment for all of the reasons, welcome by the way Ben. Alderman Clemons and Alderman Golva said I completely understand your frustration Alderman O'Brien and this got to be a thorn in your side, but we are dealing with this, this is sacred, this is democracy here and we are talking about the will of the people and I feel like if there is any doubt then there is no reason not to send it back to Committee. And we don't need to expedite this because we have until November, right?

Alderman O'Brien

Point of order if I may. Do I have a right to respond to my personal feelings and frustrations?

President Wilshire

No.

Alderman Lopez

So first I'd like to thank Attorney Bolton for coming on his death bed.

Attorney Bolton

You're welcome.

Alderman Lopez

Everybody is working at the polls, like Mr. Sennett, they are doing it because they care about our City and because it is not a career position, they are paid barely enough to apologize for being there all day. So I want to recognize that happens and it is important for us to make a decision that doesn't cost the City unnecessary money and also acknowledges the position the position that people who are running the polls are in. I also want to recognize the roll that the public plays in this; it is not, getting to the polls is not an even race for everybody. Some people are walking from a distance, some people are taking buses, some people are taking time off of work, they are juggling children.

So it is a challenge, so we've talked at length about poor voter turnout but at the end of the day there are like 2 people to vote for on one position so it is difficult for the individual voter to show up for a special election. So I'm in favor of changing this system. I don't have a problem with the amendment that we have at the moment because it is as fair as you can get given the circumstances, I can't agree with the logic of just picking the next runner up, because those situations vary wildly. I believe this special election we just had, the next runner up would have been Chris Williams, regardless of whether he was still interested in the position, regardless of how the community felt, we can't just default to the next runner up. As Alderman Klee referenced, if we have right now many uncontested elections, someone just has to put their name in a hat and regardless of whether they are actually knocking on doors or really making a go of it, all efforts are not equal. Therefore, they shouldn't be treated equal.

So I'm not in favor of entertaining the next runner up just as an auto choice. I do appreciate the effort that Mr. Lisle put into considering an amendment of his own. I think we should review it, because while it seems problematic from what Alderman Klee and our City Clerk said, we have to be careful that we don't accidentally offset the balance of elections. There may be some opportunity there. But finally and I think this is most important, we just heard a lot of public comment about it tonight so the larger public hasn't had a chance to review what is going on in the hearing, consider it and then give their feedback too. So to Alderman Laws' point, I think we can't speed past this, we need to do our jobs and our due diligence. Alderman O'Brien is right, we've gone over this over and over again, but that doesn't mean that new information wasn't presented tonight that we could be reviewing.

President Wilshire

I just want to ask the City Clerk if we re-refer this, what is the time frame for this getting where it needs to be on the ballot.

Patricia Piecuch, City Clerk

Thank you Madam President, I would need it probably back, no later sometime in June because it needs 45 days in order to be sent – the Secretary of State Department of Revenue Administration Attorney General's Office has 45 days to respond back to it. When their response comes back, then the Board will have 7 days after that response in order to decide whether they order it to the ballot or not

President Wilshire

Thank you very much.

Alderman Tencza

Just a logistical question for Corporation Counsel on a 15 member Board if someone steps down and there is a tie 7-7 as to who is going to fill the open position, who breaks the tie?

Attorney Bolton

Someone would have to get a majority so if it stays 7 to 7 you haven't elected anyone.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you just briefly the only reason that, well the reason I am supporting sending this back to committee is because I don't support the way that it is currently written. I think that the way that we did it prior to having a special election is a better way to do it because it promotes democracy and it promotes making sure that the public is involved as much as the public can be involved in a democratic process.

So you know my suggestion would be to go back and change this to the way that we used to do it prior to the charter change with the election because that way we are never appointing somebody more than 2 years to a term. I think that would be a better balance and would balance the public's right to vote on their representative with the expediency of filling the vacancy. So for those reasons, are the reasons I think we should send it back in addition to the fact that clearly from what I can see here tonight there still is some debate that should be had on it.

Alderman Harriott-Gathright

Actually I feel the same way that it should go back I agree with Alderman Jette, Ben Clemons and who else, Alderman Laws. I agree with them all; I was one of the ones that did not care for it in the very beginning when we first started this process. So for me, I am glad that it will go back, I am really happy that people came out and spoke about their concerns with this particular bill. So maybe we can all do a little more diligence in changing it to something that is more amicable to everyone basically.

Alderman O'Brien

I would just like to say that we are not on any uncharted waters here or on legalities or anything else like that. Many States, when a Senator steps down the Governor appoints, there is no special election. And I think, I do trust my colleagues here on the Board to make the proper choice. If you want to usurp your authority that is up in a way to you but I think this bill was brought together by good intentions and legal means and I think we lost sight of the goal of saving the tax payer the undue expense of \$30,000.00 per election.

And yet may I remind that from I hear in some testimony my brother Alderman Laws says that kind of a little bit of term what was the term? Frustrated. I am not frustrated, I think the proper term definition would be perplexed. And the reason I am perplexed is as well as myself, let me read to you the endorsers and the endorsers of this bill is the late Alderman-at-Large Brian McCarthy; Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly; myself Alderman O'Brien; Alderman Schmidt; Alderman Lopez; Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws; and Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja. So I am perplexed. Where was the vetting, if this is the 6<sup>th</sup> reading, where was, this is the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, I hope we can get this done by June to perhaps to get it on the charter, but this is the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, parachute that got thrown right about here.

Alderman Dowd

Two quick things; if it gets referred back I would ask that the Chair of that Committee, Alderman Caron call a meeting as soon as possible and not necessarily if it's not for 2 or 3 weeks, wait that amount of time.

President Wilshire

The next meeting is April 1<sup>st</sup>.

Alderman Dowd

Yeah I would move it up if it was my call. The other thing is I just want to tell you that voter turnout is a real bugaboo with me and even in regular City Municipal Elections it just fries me because it should be much higher than we have. I'll give you a quick story, the date of the special election I had "I Voted" sticker on my coat and I went back to a Village at Kessler Farm Board Meeting, we have 7 members. All of the 6 asked me what election is that? No one even knew about it. The City makes a very poor, if you are not on Facebook or City Sounding Board, and you know, it just doesn't get the word out, number one. Number two, it was fairly chilly that day although the sun was shining but people are not going to take time off from work or make a special effort unless they have some interest in the election. Fortunately Alderman Clemons had a lot of support so all those people came out to support him. But the turnout was ridiculous and for us to be spending \$100,000.00 plus in the last 3 years is to me ridiculous. We could either reduce the City budget by \$100,000.00 or we could add another employee. But we certainly could spend the money in a much better way because I'll tell you the budget this year is tight and to be spending it to get a few hundred people out to vote is crazy.

Alderman Caron

So first of all I don't think anyone that wants to send this back to Committee is looking to continue running special elections. I think for me personally because we had this meeting before we had the public hearing, I think it is important that we take some of what they've said, whether you like it or not, and really evaluate it and maybe we have to make some changes. I myself, I've worked the polls, and been there and gone crazy because no one shows up and I think that if appointing someone for a short period of time works, I think we can do that. But my question, Madam President to City Clerk, if we hold this Personnel Meeting April 1<sup>st</sup>, is that too late.

Ms. Piecuch

No it's not.

Alderman Caron

So Alderman Dowd, sorry but April 1<sup>st</sup> will be the day.

Alderman Dowd

It has to come back to the full Board too.

Alderman Caron

Right but it would be within 2 weeks. So my thinking is that everyone has some ideas and questions and concerns. I think the place to do it is at the Committee on April 1<sup>st</sup> and let the Committee put something together that is conducive and a compromise that fits everyone. I certainly don't want to see us spending thousands of dollars for nothing, but let's make sure that we have everything in place so that legal can say "yes it's concise" and we don't have any problems up in Concord.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

Yes thank you just to address Alderman O'Brien's point about being perplexed and for others who may be listening because I did support that. As I stated earlier I was here ready to vote for that, but as I also stated earlier, we had the public hearing, we got feedback and as Alderman Caron said, I think we have an obligation to respond to that. And so again, I will be supporting it going back to Committee. Thank you.

Alderman Klee

Two things; one is I am not opposed of it really going back to Committee, I was just hoping that we could move it forward. I'm not sure that there will be changes, but I do agree that the public has spoken and we should listen and perhaps the comment that Alderman Clemons had made of doing the term can be acceptable, we may just have to do a little bit more homework on it. But the other thing that I want to state is that I make a joke every election, that I want Ward 3 to beat Ward 1 as far as voter turnout and it just ain't gonna happen. But however I do want to make a comment, percentage of voter turnout, we nailed it at 11.something% which is really sad

Alderman Lopez

I had a question for Attorney Bolton, if we do alter the amendment do we have to have another public hearing.

Attorney Bolton

It depends how extensive the amendment is. If it is what I've heard being espoused by Alderman-at-Large Clemons, I would recommend that we have another public hearing.

Alderman Lopez

Ok and then for myself I would just say that this isn't the first time I've actually voted to table, postpone or alter a piece of legislation that I sponsored. Because when I look at it and I have my initial impression of what it is, that is just my impression and it looks like something I want to move forward to discuss. I think that we have a process for discussion at the Committee level and for particularly important pieces of legislation we have public comment and we have public hearing. We have to be receptive to that. The first time that I changed my opinion on a piece of legislation I sponsored I was called dishonorable. In my opinion it is my responsibility to hear more than just what my initial impression is and to move forward with it. I have not actually changed my opinion of the legislation, I just think it is important that information that has just been proposed that is valid, in my mind and at least should be reviewed by the public before we move forward with something that affects their ability. So I just want to have a little bit more of a Hearing on this, I don't necessarily plan to pivot and completely change my opinion.

President Wilshire

Further discussion on the motion to re-refer.

Alderman O'Brien

Move to motion.

President Wilshire

Ok.

Alderman O'Brien

Could you refer the motion because there was another subsequent motion made by parliamentary inquiry we are voting on the motion that I originally made, correct?

President Wilshire

No we are voting on the motion to re-refer.

Alderman O'Brien

So the motion to re-refer has the higher priority motion? Ok.

President Wilshire

The motion is to re-refer Resolution R-18-073 as amended back to the Personnel and Administrative Affairs Committee? Further discussion on that motion?

Alderman Klee

Just one more comment and this is again to Attorney Bolton in reference to Alderman Lopez's comment. If we hear this on April 1<sup>st</sup> would that be a public hearing at that time or is that just a discussion and then whatever comes out of that, then it goes to a public hearing? I just want to make sure that we get a little timeline I'm a little concerned about the June date.

Attorney Bolton

Where you are now, you are simply sending it back to Committee, you are not scheduling another public hearing.

Alderman Klee

If it gets changed as perhaps was discussed, then it would be best to have a public hearing correct?

Attorney Bolton

Yes

Alderman Klee

And then that would take so much time and then we would vote on it on the same day like we are doing it today? Is that the way it would work?

Attorney Bolton

If that's the will of the Board, sure.

Alderman Klee

I just want to make sure that we are meeting the time line.

Attorney Bolton

We'll know that as things progress I guess. It is certainly possible that you can still meet the timeline.

Alderman Klee

Ok thank you.

President Wilshire

The motion is to re-refer Resolution R-18-073 to the Personnel Administrative Committee. Further discussion.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-18-073 re-referred.

**R-19-103**

Endorser: Alderman Ernest Jette

**AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF DISCONTINUED PORTIONS OF CONANT ROAD**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN JETTE FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-19-103**

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-19-103 declared duly adopted.

**R-19-104**

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NASHUA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE NASHUA TEACHERS' UNION, LOCAL 1044, AFT, AFL-CIO, UNIT D, FOOD SERVICE WORKERS FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 2018 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2021**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-19-104**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Dowd

This bargaining unit, their funding comes from the revenues generated through the food sales and federal funds, no City funds. So it's sort of self-funding, they are certainly not the highest paid people by far anywhere in the City. So it is a very fair contract, it went through the Budget Committee with unanimous approval.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-19-104 declared duly adopted.

**R-19-107**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
 Alderman Jan Schmidt  
 Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
 Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
 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.

**RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$50,250 OF UNANTICIPATED REVENUE FROM FUND #1000 "GENERAL FUND", ACCOUNT #43295 "REVENUE FROM FEDERAL GRANT" INTO FUND #7074 "SCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND"**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SCHMIDT FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-19-107 BY ROLL CALL**

Yea: Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Harriott-Gathright  
 Alderman Dowd, Alderman Klee, Alderman Laws, Alderman Lopez  
 Alderman Caron, Alderman Jette, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja  
 Alderman Tencza, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Wilshire 13

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-19-107 declared duly adopted.

**R-19-113**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
 Alderwoman-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 second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF R-19-113  
 MOTION CARRIED**

Resolution R-19-113 declared duly adopted.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – ORDINANCES**O-18-030**

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright

**INCREASING FEES FOR LEASED CITY PARKING SPACES**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN LAWS TO RE-REFER O-18-030 TO THE PERSONNEL/ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**ON THE QUESTIONAlderman Laws

First of all despite what was said earlier, this only affects the monthly lease fees, just as a point of order, so it's not people who go downtown to shop aren't paying more money to park there and patronize downtown businesses. This is only people who live and work downtown. The entire point of this was just get up to market rate because everywhere around us is charging more than double than we are charging for monthly lease parking. Alderman Jette pointed out that there used to be, previously, or the way it is right now I suppose, there is a disparity between uncovered parking and covered parking and it costs more for covered parking for obvious reasons in New England. This new legislation there is no disparity and so we are going to send it back and amend that and that is what this is all about.

Alderman Lopez

I would like to also note that when we discussed it in Committee we also discussed the preference of many of the Aldermen to consider using it more productively, not necessarily in the general fund but we had talked about possibly a special revenue fund that could support the maintenance or upkeep of the parking garages which if they need it, comes out of the general fund.

Alderman Clemons

I would like to, I think this is a good move and I'd like to get more information myself about what the impact will be on businesses downtown that currently lease or that are looking to lease and that potentially might want to move into the downtown if this would be helpful or a deterrent or what the case might be on that.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Ordinance O-18-030 declared duly adopted.

**O-19-035**

Endorsers: Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly

**RESCINDING THE RIGHT TURN ON RED PROHIBITION FROM THE COSTCO EXIT ONTO DANIEL WEBSTER HIGHWAY**

Given its second reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARON FOR FINAL PASSAGE OF O-18-035**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Clemons

I'm sure my wife is going to be really excited about this one so I am going to say I am supporting it.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Ordinance O-19-035 declared duly adopted.

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-19-114**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Ernest A. Jette  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja

**AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY TREASURER TO ISSUE BONDS NOT TO EXCEED THE AMOUNT OF SIX MILLION DOLLARS (\$6,000,000) FOR THE PHASE III LINED LANDFILL EXPANSION OF THE NASHUA FOUR HILLS LANDFILL, TO INCLUDE ENGINEERING SERVICES**

Given its first reading;

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO ACCEPT THE FIRST READING OF R-19-114 BY ROLL CALL, ASSIGN IT TO THE BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE AND SCHEDULED A PUBLIC HEARING FOR MONDAY, MARCH 25, 2019, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE ALDERMANIC CHAMBER**

Yea: Alderman O'Brien, Alderman Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Dowd, Alderman Klee, Alderman Laws, Alderman Lopez  
Alderman Caron, Alderman Jette, Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Tencza, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Wilshire 13

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**R-19-115**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Ernest Jette  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderwoman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Jan Schmidt

**RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$120,000 OF UNANTICIPATED REVENUE FROM FUND 6000 "SOLID WASTE FUND", ACCOUNT 44286 "COVER MATERIAL REVENUE" INTO FUND 6000 "SOLID WASTE FUND", ACCOUNT 55699 "OTHER CONTRACTED SERVICES"**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

**R-19-116**

Endorser: Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**CHANGING THE PURPOSE OF UP TO TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$10,000) OF UNEXPENDED BOND PROCEEDS FROM THE ROOF REPLACEMENT WORK AT FAIRGROUNDS MIDDLE SCHOOL AND LEDGE STREET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TO PAY COSTS OF ROOF ASSESSMENTS AT MAIN DUNSTABLE, BIRCH HILL, AND BICENTENNIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

**R-19-117**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**CHANGING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR A WASTEWATER FUND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT FROM BRIDGE STREET OVERFLOW DETENTION BASIN IMPROVEMENTS TO WET WEATHER FACILITY SCREEN AND RAKE UPGRADES**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE and the BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS by President Wilshire

**R-19-118**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF UP TO \$218,486 FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES INTO TRANSIT GRANT ACTIVITY "FEDERAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY ("FTA") OPERATING GRANT"**

Given its first reading; assigned to the HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

**R-19-119**

Endorser: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza

**AUTHORIZING PENNICHUCK CORPORATION AND PENNICHUCK EAST UTILITY, INC. TO ENTER INTO A TERM LOAN WITH COBANK, ACB**

Given its first reading; assigned to the PENNICHUCK WATER SPECIAL COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

**R-19-120**

Endorser: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman Ben Clemons

**CHANGING THE NAME OF PANTHER DRIVE TO OFFICER JAMES ROCHE DRIVE**

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

**R-19-121**

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

**RELATIVE TO THE ACCEPTANCE AND APPROPRIATION OF \$43,113 FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE INTO POLICE GRANT ACTIVITY "2018 JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT (MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL)"**

Given its first reading; assigned to the HUMAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

**R-19-122**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess

**DISCONTINUING THREE EXPENDABLE TRUST FUNDS**

Given its first reading; assigned to the BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE by President Wilshire

**R-19-123**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess

Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza

**RELATIVE TO THE ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2020 PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF NASHUA GENERAL, ENTERPRISE, AND SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS**

Given its first reading;

***There being no objection, President Wilshire accepted the first reading of R-19-123, referred it to the Budget Review Committee and scheduled a public hearing for Thursday, May 16, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. at NHS-North Auditorium***

**NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES****O-19-040**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess

Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright

Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws

Alderman Tom Lopez

Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza

Alderman Jan Schmidt

Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**ESTABLISHING AN ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION AND DIRECTOR POSITION**

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

**PERIOD FOR GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lori Ortolano Good evening, Lori Ortolano, 41 Berkeley Street. Just wanted to share my concerns again about this new director position. I hope that there is more discussion about the Assessing Office itself and getting some outside leadership in that office. I just cannot fathom or imagine promoting from within or not having a Chief down in that office given the amount of work that's there. I think that the Mayor's comment on the position, replacing the Chief with this Director position, I really believe there are other positions down there you are missing. I'm not certain why in the 3 months they haven't been identified, but you are definitely short in a few areas and it doesn't seem like we would want to stay in that mode for another entire year but maybe we missed our window.

Regarding the comments at the last week's meeting I really want to offer this challenge out to you and the Mayor. I become concerned when I hear the Mayor say that we are going to reevaluate in 5 years. 5 years is too long, and that what KRT did was sound, everything is equalized, it was a job well done. You know we need to recognize that KRT did the best they could but it was a garbage in, garbage out scenario. And if we can't get down to understanding that the data that they used wasn't necessarily good and resulted in not necessarily equalized evaluations, you know, I certainly won't be on any common ground with this Mayor any time soon. And the case in point for that is what happened on Berkeley Street. And I brought pictures to show you. Berkeley Street is the case street on why the KRT model really didn't work.

So our street gets modeled, they come out with all the new assessments in August and then all of a sudden my husband and I go in and meet with KRT and we ask for our valuation to be lowered to \$517,000.00 based on what was on our street; we didn't use sales data then because we didn't understand that. We just looked at all these very comparable homes and we went in and we had the meeting with Ken Rogers, the President. He offered to come to the house, he recognized the problem with our card, he was the one who identified the sales chasing issue, thought it was that case and off we went.

The next thing you know we don't get Ken or anyone from KRT coming to our home, it is in October that I reach out to KRT and ask why they didn't come and I found out then that KRT was asked by the City to go down the street and reevaluate it again. And they picked 5 homes, so in this revaluation no one on the street knew this was happening. So they pick 5 properties, well they went down the whole street, what I was told after by CFO Griffin was that Rob Tozier came to my office, I gave him 55 property cards, told him drive down your street again, this time really look and fix some stuff.

Now when the Mayor told us that KRT came in and looked at every property in this City because they gave a visual evaluation to everything and built the model, I don't really agree with that. It was a drive-by, it was really a feel of the neighborhood, the concept that they looked at every house was really not the case. And really when you think about it over maybe a four month period, I don't think they really had the time to look at every property, 28,000 parcels. It was really about creating a model and using the sales data to create a model. So they got a feel of neighborhoods I think by driving through, I saw them come through my street and they were going 10, 15 miles an hour, that's slow, but still not enough to really be looking at every house. So I take exception with that. I don't think they had a good visual on every home. But when they came down a second time, the goal of that, unknown to any of us on Berkeley Street was to get a good visual because things weren't right.

And so they came down and they adjusted 5 properties. And in the process of doing that, they found another \$300,000.00 of valuation that they could raise. And they gave a reason for it, they said, "The first property we are going to change it from a Grade C to a Grade B because most of the homes on Berkeley Street are Grade B". The problem was that there were another 7 homes that were still Grade C and they didn't touch those. So out of 55 homes, 48 are Grade B, 7 were Grade C, they change one to up the assessment \$60,000.00 and they don't look at the others that are Grade C and clearly some of them are beautiful homes that the Grade had been done 40 years ago and no one changed. So why did they do that? Why did those homes stay Grade C.

So I looked at that and I said "Well that's kind of crazy" and then on the other homes they went down 13 Berkeley, 17 Berkeley, 46 Berkeley, 50 Berkeley and they raised them anywhere from \$46,000.00 to \$90,000.00 a pretty good hit. And the reasons they noted on those was we've got to justify it, they are being depreciated for unknown renovations. I saw that and I said, "unknown renovations"? How do you create a valuation for something unknown. And these houses that they raised, these 5 houses, they never went to the door, they never knocked on the door and said, "Could we come in" or "We want to evaluate your house". Well none of these had unknown renovations, they had all had permits pulled that were improperly or not captured by the Assessing Department. So in my opinion they weren't unknown at all, you just go look at the permits, they were done.

So here's a model that KRT made and they ran this model and they created valuation and then they come back and they take a really good look and they go, "Hmm, there's another \$300,000.00 over here" and they change it. And that, to me, I was actually shocked that KRT did that because it put them, in my opinion, in a very bad position. They should have said to the City of Nashua, "Hey this is your dirty laundry, you didn't collect this stuff right, you go back in and knock on the door and get in the house and evaluate this stuff and fix it, because now we've got to throw our model to the wind and go back and do your work". And the thing that killed me about their evaluation, the very first home on Berkeley Street, I brought some pictures, it was where they started, is a very old colonial, that has fallen into disrepair, serious disrepair. So KRT starts there and sees a house like this, when you see a house that you know you think there are parts of it you

could put your arm through, you say "well there's some deferred maintenance there". I wouldn't call that a B Grade anymore. KRT looked at this house and said, "Well that's a B". No. And that's worth \$400,000.00. Ok, cool that's fine.

But then you come right up from it, three houses up and you've got a beautiful, painted lady Victorian, a little bit larger, attached two car garage, beautifully done, 8 permits and very well rated and this is \$13,000.00 grand more, with a B Grading? How can that be, how could you look at that house there and basically give it 3% more for this house here? Next to it is a beautifully restored conventional home wrapped in vinyl trim, new windows, very lovely done, this has a Grade C. Now what is it assessed at? \$329,000.00. That's a really nice valuation. How can this be so low and this house that has fallen into such disrepair be so high graded above?

All these homes are down in the block between Courtland and Laton. So land valuation is maybe 20% lower down there. And then you come up to the block where land valuation is higher and these two homes sit next to each other, this is a painted lady Victorian, very nicely done, a lot of exterior work, new kitchen put in, but older, older windows, you know certainly not all restored by any means, but very nicely maintained property and this is sitting at \$410,000.00 virtually the same price as the house at 1 Berkeley Street. The building value on this house is \$250,000.00 and the building value on the first house is \$280,000.00. How can that be? This house next to it just sold. This house the exterior is definitely better than the first one I showed you but if you walk into this house you are in 1945 and it is really 1945. And it just sold to a young couple for \$400,000.00 which was a high price and needs a lot of work but it's hard to believe that KRT would put this house above this house and they are right next to each other, they are right next to each other, they are neighbors.

So I look at what KRT did on our street and I say, "that wasn't well done". And people have abated on some of these changes and I think very legitimately so, I think the second go-around on some of those houses was absolutely uncalled for. And people were irate, because once they put the change on, there was no hearing process anymore, because it was the second go-around. And all they had left was to abate. And you know the Assessing Office is like, "Well what is the problem their taxes went down". The problem is that one of these houses took an \$80,000.00 hit for honestly I even don't know why. You know? So the model shows you right there, there is a problem with the KRT model.

Go over to Monadnock because I talked about Monadnock at the last meeting and if you just – that was an interesting street too. That's a street where the model fails and it's right in the old neighborhood because they had 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 sales and three of them were in the KRT window, where KRT took the data and used it to make their model, they captured the sales data and built their model. Cool. So a house sells for \$355,000.00, it is used to build the model and KRT spits out a price on that of \$269,000.00. That is pretty off from the sale price and that house ends up with a 76% valuation, that's what the model did. Another house sold within the window of their model for \$232,000.00, it comes in at \$200,000.00, it is at 86% valuation. Now their goal was to be between 90 and 110. They have another one that sells for \$230,000.00; it comes in at \$182,000.00 with their model, 79%. They have another one that sells outside of the window, it sells for \$522,000.00; it comes in at \$489,000.00, that one hit at 94%. Everything else hit at 81, 76, 86, 79.

So what does that tell you? Well I don't know. I guess when I bought my house and I said, "Well we kind of overpaid for it" and they said, "No there's no such thing". KRT's model shows me all over the City there is overbought houses. They just, they are not worth what they paid for them and the model will show you, relative to other homes, that's not the valuation they should have. That's fine, I'll accept that, let's apply that to everyone now when we are abating and following our rules, let's apply it to everyone. So that is kind of an interesting thing and so I think we have to recognize that there are limitations in the KRT model and there are plenty of people who don't see equity in that model. And Berkeley Street is a picture street, Monadnock Street is another street that really puts it out there. I think we can say that they did the best they could, it was an inherently flawed system, we don't just want to focus on IT improvements, we want to

focus on the actual development of the card and the modeling that we are using for that card and we want to get rid of practices that weren't good practices to be doing like the way we apply the median ratio and the possibility that we were chasing some of these sales. That is important stuff. And nobody wants to recognize it in the City but boy it is important to me.

So I get worried that every time we talk about bringing in a consultant it is KRT, you know we are bedfellows now with them. Is there anyone else we can use? Should we look at somebody else when we do this big, multi – you know, \$1.5 million dollar contract would we even bid it? Do they now a precedent and they are the ones that come all the time? You know I think we should expand our thinking and I think we should look at other experts too, I think that's a good idea. KRT, to my disappointment, when this happened and they went down the street the second time and I called them in October and I said, "Well you haven't come to my house" and they said, "Well Mr. Duhamel told us you wouldn't let us in so we never showed up". Of course I wanted them to come in I went to the meeting for that. So Mr. Duhamel had a bitterness to him and made certain that KRT didn't come to our house. So that's when KRT said to me, "Hey we went down your street, we took another drive by, the City asked us to do it, we drove down, we raised 5 homes". I said, "Well who did you lower?". "Nobody". How does that work, I said, "What other streets did you go down". "Only yours". I said, "They didn't ask you to go down any other streets I gave a package, I looked at my street behind me, I looked at Concord Street, you didn't look at any other street"? "Nope, just yours the City said just do yours again". That was very targeting; that was really very targeting, that was not a great model approach.

And then when I wrote a letter to CFO Griffin and I said, "Who really authorized this? Why did we do this and who authorized KRT to do this drive by and make these changes" and this appears outside the scope of work well KRT writes back, John Griffin sends them to KRT and KRT writes back to that request that the street was reviewed along with the rest of the City during the evaluation process, the initial process. It was reviewed a second time at the homeowner's request during the peering process, both reviews were part of our contract. So all of a sudden the second review was put on me. And that's why when people on my street called the Assessing Office and said, "Why were we evaluated again". They were told, "Your neighbor complained and she caused the houses to go up". That was not right. I never had a dialogue with KRT. I was never the one in charge of KRT. I didn't order a second go down on the street, it is absurd. And why would I do that and not have them come to my own home that I was trying to reduce? It was really disappointing for me to read that. And it made me think a lot differently about KRT when I did the Right To Know Law and pulled those minutes and saw that was how it was documented.

I've been spending a lot of time reading the IAAO manual and there is a nice one on Standards on Mass Appraisal for Real Estate Property" and it talks about how important it is to value defend your numbers. And this is the guide that everyone here throws at me constantly, the Mayor, CFO Griffin, we follow the IAAO manual. Great; it says that the staff should also be prepared to support individual valuations as required preferably through comparable sales. At a minimum the staff should be able to produce a property record and explain the basic approach used to estimate the value of the property. The property owners should never be told simply that the computer or the system produced the appraisal. In general, the staff should tailor the explanation to the tax payer's knowledge and expertise, equations converted to tabular form can be used to explain the basis for valuation. We could never get anyone to explain our card or have any information brought to us on how it was built. We never got there, we are in abatement without an explanation. And as I read these things and these are the standards we use, I feel that we've got a lot of work to do on these standards.

One last item, I didn't realize Mr. Teeboom was going to talk about the Board of Assessor's seat, the alternate. And I discovered that seat had expired essentially very oddly, I just happened to be going to Board of Assessor's Meetings and they kept cancelling meetings. And I finally went to the Assessing woman, clerk lady, and said, "Why are we canceling, why aren't we calling our alternate in to keep the meetings going" and she said "We don't have an alternate, her seat expired a year ago". I said, "are you kidding me, we are not running meetings because we don't have an alternate". You know, ok, I could do

that job, I said "That is one I'd be interested in, I'd only have a few meetings a year, probably 2 or 3, it is an entry level position that would give me a voice and I already go to the meetings".

So I typed an e-mail to the Mayor and I said, "This seat is open, no one is on it, I'd be interested in it". I ended up reaching out to Patricia, I was traveling she called me back on a Monday and she said, "Oh just to let you know, the person who had it prior wants to do it again, the seat is not available, she's going to receive the seat". I said, "Ok that's the way it is". And then I decided to go meet the individual who was supposed to have the seat and talk to her and I asked her if she knew what was going on in the Assessing Office and the answer was no, had she kept up, does she receive the packets, no, did she ever receive the packets, no. And she said to me, you know, "I made it clear that if the Mayor could find somebody else to do this job, I really am very busy with my downtown work and I really don't want to do it, I will only do it if he can't find somebody else". Well that was a little different from what I had heard.

So I typed an e-mail and I went back to the Mayor and I said "Hey, I really would be interested in the seat, and just to let you know, to my disappointment, I am not upset that I didn't get the seat, it's obviously not the place for me, that's fine, this is not my hill to die on, maybe my best work is done on the outside". It was just an entry level you know foot in the door, maybe go to three meetings, I'm there anyways, maybe have a voice on some things, but he gets to pick it, it's his to pick.

I am disappointed that he did not have the courtesy to respond to my e-mail at all, nothing. It just went into vapor space. And I am disappointed that he doesn't take these seats seriously, these seats that he has to fill. We have a little bit of a crisis in that department and we have some weaknesses in that Board and we could really use a Mayor who is using his expertise and reaching out to try and fill these seats with the best people possible and that may not be me. He may have a better person in mind, that's fine, but at least show me you are working at it, you know? Not that it's just let's hurry up and quickly get someone in there and make this person take it if they really didn't want it because they are the best person. So that's a little disappointing, it just shows me how far we have to go to really you know fix things over there. And I would love to see some public positions available, maybe it doesn't have to be anything permanent, but some short term openings where the public could participate maybe in policy creation, a one year seat or panel, discussion group, work with consultants, try and look at better ways of doing what we do down there. I think there's an opportunity for that, that's not a long term position, it would just be a short term thing and that might be helpful, but not my hill to die on, it's ok that I didn't get it. Thank you.

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

##### Alderman Klee

Yes I'd like to make a couple comments, first I'd just like to make a comment about the Board of Assessors and I know, I just recently found out that Ms. Blaisdell turned it down. She thought she had sent out an e-mail so she sent me an e-mail and I know she sent it to the Mayor's Office too that she wasn't interested in the position, I think it was just two days ago that I received that e-mail. So just to get that straight. And the other comment I wanted to make is that I did not sponsor the Administrative Position and not because I don't support it, I do support that and I spoke to Ms. Kleiner earlier today and I have been speaking with her on a regular basis and I said that I am glad that we finished Part 1; but that I wanted Part 2, 3 and 4 and so on and the process and the policy to be completed, timely and so on and I have been assured that they are working on that.

I don't know how that process is going to happen I don't get into the weeds as far as people doing the jobs. But I did want to personally thank Mrs. Ortolano for the work she's done. As she has explained to us and I know she has spent hours of time looking at property cards, educating herself on the process, while I won't speak for anyone else I can say that during this process she did educate me on many of the elements of the cards and I brought this to different people's attention and how it was used to calculate property assessments. And while I truly wish things had been a whole lot less contentious the bottom line is that I really do think we are on the road to resolving the past issues and hopefully, you know, ultimately a better

and more transparent system. And I do want to thank you Lori for the work that you've done. I also want to thank Kim Kleiner and so on for taking this above and beyond her duties of doing this. I think we are on the road and I think hearing from the public of what they want us to do, and how they want us to move forward is important, but ultimately I think as long as we keep an open mind and continue on this road that we will work things out and you know I feel bad that things aren't, haven't always been perfect but I do think we are heading the right way.

#### Alderman Jette

I too would like to thank Mrs. Ortolano for bringing a lot of these issues to our attention and you know she's been very articulate about this whole thing, but her voice is not the only I've heard. A lot of our citizens question the fairness of our current assessment process and I think the Mayor by ordering this audit and I think the audit itself was a step in the right direction. I think we can look forward to some improvements and I think the Mayor has talked about being on board with doing a complete reevaluation, the so-called list and measure I think is what they call it. I support that and I am looking forward to more on that.

I also would like to congratulate Margaret Loret Ward 5 resident on her appointment and I want to congratulate Alderman Clemons and welcome him, maybe he ought to be welcoming some of us since he's been here before, but it is our turn to welcome him. And lastly I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that next week we will be celebrating the feast of that great Saint and Patron of the Christian Church, of course, I am speaking of St. Joseph.

#### Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

I will just follow up and say "Yay" to St. Joseph, my favorite desserts. I too would like to welcome Alderman Clemons and look forward to working with him once again, congratulations. And thank you to all of those who came and spoke this evening during the public comment and the public hearing. One other thing, and Alderman Laws can correct me but I believe next Tuesday at 6:00 GAD is having their Annual Meeting in the Auditorium. Is that correct, before PEDC? Yes so just for anyone who would like attend, Paul Shea will be doing the Annual Meeting for GAD in the Auditorium at 6:00 p.m. and as Alderman Tencza said, PEDC will follow. Thank you.

#### Alderman Clemons

Thank you for everybody's warm welcome. I just want to be brief and say that I will be raising this Sunday for my favorite Saint, which is St. Patrick and I want everybody to enjoy and have a safe St. Patrick's Day. Make sure you have a designated driver or take an Uber or Lyft home or a cab.

#### President Wilshire

I too would like to welcome Alderman Clemons back to the horseshoe, he has been missed, so welcome back Alderman Clemons

Committee announcements:

#### Alderman Dowd

On the 18<sup>th</sup>, we are going to be starting our series of budget meetings, everybody on the Board has got a list of when those occur particularly the Budget Committee, I would like you to study before you come in for that particular department so that you know what to expect and what questions to ask. The budgets pretty much haven't changed except for a few departments and I'm sure you'll hear from those departments when they come through. I will be putting out some other guidance before the first meeting, actually the first meeting I will be occupied somewhere else, I have a previous commitment, but the president of the board will be chairing that particular meeting and I believe it is Public Health.

So get familiar with the schedule, do your homework so that we can review all of the budgets, all the departments as well as we can. Alderman Clemons, welcome to the Budget Committee.

Alderman Clemons

2010 I think was the last time I was on that.

Alderman Lopez

Substandard Living Conditions Committee is meeting this Thursday.

Alderwoman Melizzi-Golja

As I indicated, PEDC will meet next Tuesday at 7:00 p.m. And also I forgot to say in your mailboxes, you will find the most recent magazine that the Chamber has put together. I got some copies of those and thought you might be interested so those are for you. And if you would like more, I'm sure you can contact the Chamber for those. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN THAT THE MARCH 12, 2019, MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED  
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Attest: Patricia D. Piecuch City Clerk