

## BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE

MAY 29, 2019

A meeting of the Budget Review Committee was held Wednesday, May 29, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Alderman Richard A. Dowd, Chairman, Chairman, presided.

Members of Committee present: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire, Vice Chair  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien  
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly

Also in Attendance: Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Ernest Jette  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright (7:02)

---

### PUBLIC COMMENT

#### Alderman Dowd

Name and address for the transcription.

Margo Bell 15 Briand Drive, Nashua, New Hampshire. Hi how are you tonight, am I close enough I hope. I am the Executive Director of the Nashua Senior Activity Center. We are so proud to be a self-standing organization in Nashua for the last 41 years. Since 2006 we have been fortunate to be housed in a beautiful 23,000 square foot Nashua City Building. This allows us the ability to provide quality programs and services to area seniors. I want to thank you all for believing and partnering with the Senior Center over the last 5 years. In 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018, legislation was put forth to allocate funds for the Senior Activity Center. Each year of those funds \$5,000.00 has been put aside in a contingency fund. The remainder is to be used for building improvements for our City Building. The Legislation has made a powerful impact on our program. In 2018, we were able to do numerous repairs, front door hardware, painting of downstairs function rooms, steam cleaning of kitchens and bathrooms, carpets were steam cleaned, upgraded computer memory, LED lighting, refinishing of wood floor, upgrading our phone system, stripping and waxing function room floors. Those are just to name a few of the things; all of these things have made the Senior Center a more welcoming place for folks that come in to use our facility. I appreciate your support on this Legislation. I also would like to introduce the President of our Board because he is here tonight, Barney Barbera and I don't know if he would like to say a few words?

Barney Barbera I just want to thank you for your continued support. Barney Barbera, Birch Ridge Trail, Nashua. I want to thank everybody for their continued support of the Senior Center.

#### Alderman O'Brien

Yes thank you, sorry for the interruption Mr. Chair but I would like to announce that Alderman Harriott-Gathright has joined us at 7:02.

COMMUNICATIONS - None

Alderman Dowd

If there are no objections with the Committee, I'd like to take R-19-141 out of order so that we can do that before getting into the budget wrap up.

NEW BUSINESS RESOLUTIONS

**R-19-141**

Endorsers Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman Mary Ann Melizzi-Golja  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**RELATIVE TO THE TRANSFER OF \$25,000 FROM DEPARTMENT 194 "CONTINGENCY", ACCOUNT 70100 "GENERAL CONTINGENCY" TO DEPARTMENT 109 "CIVIC & COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES", ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION 56 "OUTSIDE AGENCIES" FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING FUNDING TO THE NASHUA ASSOCIATION FOR THE ELDERLY**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Clemons

Just briefly I want to say that I am happy to support this Legislation, I think it's good. I think it is a worthy cause and I am happy to support it.

Alderman Caron

Yes thank you. Well Ms. Bell took the fire out of my speech. I just want to say that I appreciate the fact that the Board has continued to give us that \$25,000.00. As you know, I have been on that Board since 2011 and without this money they would not be able to maintain the facility as well as they have been able to do it. One of the big things that they did and this was based on former Alderman David Deane's request, was to put a divider between the dining room and the common area. This allows them to utilize that common area more often, even those Meals & Wheels are there Monday through Friday.

The other important part of this is that we try not to take the whole \$25,000.00 and utilize it. We decided as a Board of Directors that \$5,000.00 would be put away in contingency for emergencies down the road. I also want to say we want to thank Jay Hunnewell from Building Maintenance. When Margo calls him, because there's an issue with the doors or the lights or things like that, he is well versed, he comes right down. If he can't fix it, someone else will. I think that shows how important our senior population is to the City of Nashua, even though they are not an agency within our Department. They have worked really hard to provide activities, programming, and a place for people to go during the day. So I appreciate all of you for be willing to support this \$25,000.00 again this year. Thank year.

Alderman Wilshire

I think this is short money for the bang we get out of it. I think providing services and everything that they do over at the Senior Center for our older population is wonderful. I think the Director and the Board President, I know some of the Board Members as well, they are very involved, very invested in how this goes. So thank you for what you do, happy to support this.

**MOTION CARRIED**WRAP-UP SESSIONAlderman Dowd

This evening, this is the first and possibly the only, we'll see, Budget Wrap Up for the 2020 Fiscal Year Budget, R-19-123. We have with us the Mayor, the CFO, the Treasurer and Mrs. Kleiner. If you'd like to come up?

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO TAKE FROM THE TABLE R-19-123****MOTION CARRIED****R-19-123**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess

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

- Public hearing scheduled for 5/16/2019 at 7:00 p.m. at NHS-North Auditorium

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE**ON THE QUESTIONAlderman Clemons

Thank you. So I think we've had a pretty good budget process, we've asked some really good questions and we've gotten some good feedback. I had a series of questions that I asked CFO Griffin and Treasurer Fredette this morning. They sent their ...

Alderman Dowd

If I could just politely interrupt I want to do something before we get any further. That is, based on the letter that was sent to us by the Mayor on 24 April 2019 asked to increase his budget request by \$51,550.00 to cover the cost of a City Grant Writer for the Administrative Services Department 106. The other half is already being covered by the Board of Education. So I'd like to make a motion to include that in the Mayor's Budget. Any discussion?

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO ADD \$51,550.00 PER THE MAYOR'S REQUEST TO THE BUDGET FOR A CITY GRANT WRITER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE DEPARTMENT 106.**ON THE QUESTIONAlderman Tencza

One question with that Mr. Chairman, I know that you have told us many times that if the budget increases even by \$1.00 it will have to be approved. Will this amendment also require that same approval at the full board?

Chairman Dowd

Good question, no. This is the Mayor's Budget, he's adding it to his budget, it's only if we increase his budget.

**MOTION CARRIED**Alderman Clemons

So you know we had some great discussions here and there were some concerns surrounding the Police Department Budget and the Fire Department Budget. So I had some questions that I asked the CFO and the Treasurer today and they basically said that it would be better to discuss those here. So I am just going to I guess go into a general discussion. So the Police Department said that they were underfunded by about \$113,000.00 and that they were going to have trouble with some overtime and things like that. The concern that I had with the Fire Department was the fact that they needed another Fire Inspector in the Fire Marshall's Office as well as a new study for updating a Fire Service Plan throughout the City. Those two items I think would roughly cost about \$150,000.00. So my question was the following: If we can go to Page, in the Budget Book, let me see where it is at, Page 275 which is the Capital Improvements. My question is if we took, if you look in column Fiscal Year 2020, if we took the \$122,500.00 from the airport and we took the \$225,000.00 from the Court Street roof replacement and we re-allocated those funds to the Police in the amount of \$113,000.00 and the Fire Department in the amount of \$150,000.00. Then we put the remainder in the contingency for those 2 purposes and bonded the rest of the money, what impact would that have on the budget next year. So I am going to, that's my question.

Alderman Dowd

Mr. Mayor, do you want to address that, or CFO Griffin?

Mr. Mayor

Sure I can address it. Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the Committee for inviting us in. I did give you an overview of my perspective on the Budget at the Public Hearing so I won't repeat any of that. So the question is if we reduced the Capital Improvement Budget by basically \$350,000.00 and added it to the Operating Budget, and bonded those \$350,000.00 that currently are in the Capital Improvements Cash Budget sort to speak, what effect would it have? I don't think it is a wise thing to do for the following reasons. Our Budget, there has been a lot of pressure over a long time, and there still is and if anything we underfund, within this budget as I proposed it and I realize this but we are trying to provide services and reach a tax increase of no more than 2.9% of 3%.

In this Budget we basically underfund Capital items; Capital Improvements Contributions towards the Building Fund for the schools, for the Fire Department for city buildings and CERF, Capital Equipment Reserve Fund which pays for equipment. And I think we've gone about as far as we can in that regard. Our practice for the last 2 or 3 years has been when we come up with a surplus at the end of the year, which the portion of the surplus that consists of unexpended revenue, we have principally reallocated that money into these capital accounts to help kind of backfill for the fact that we haven't budgeted really enough in the Operating Budget. So we kind of backfill with the money that's left at the end of the year.

Now the problem with, and I appreciate Alderman Clemons' intent in wanting to help some of our departments; we have many needs. It is that now we enter next year with a \$650,000.00 Capital Improvement Budget instead of \$1 million. And \$1 million is low; given the size of our budget. There are many Capital Improvements that we should be doing. So in order now to get us back next year to the \$1 million dollar level from the \$650,000.00 we have this year, we have to raise taxes next year by \$350,000.00 just to get to the level that is proposed here. So in essence, we say that next year, we are referring a tax increase now and it will hit us next year.

I mean I think if the Board or if the City wants to increase the budget I'm not saying I agree or disagree with any specific proposals at the moment, but bite the bullet, just increase the budget. Don't take it from the Capital Account and just create problems for us later. Now that is my opinion and my approach towards this. Obviously the Board of Aldermen makes its own decisions. But you asked for my perspective and if the Treasurer or the CFO have a different, or wish to offer additional comments, of course they can do that.

John Griffin, CFO

Yes I can offer some comments. As you know, the Mayor and I and Mr. Fredette, Ms. Kleiner and Ms. Evans worked on balancing this very difficult budget. One of our principles going in was to have \$1 million dollars in capital to use on what I would call one-time items. For example the Airport comes in with a project, we fund 5% of that dollar value. I wouldn't recommend bonding that for 5% of a \$4 million dollar runway expansion or apron or whatever they call it out there. In addition, the Court Street roof, as you know, that is 2/5 of the cost of the roof that needs to take place over there. It is my understanding that there may be other costs needed.

So that's one-time cost in a Capital Program for one-time long-lived roof replacement. So those two items although they look attractive to bond, we also have pressures on the debt service which you've heard Treasurer Fredette and Mayor Donchess speak of. Now the reason why, I just want to close the gap on, the reason why it was \$872,000.00 last year is as you recall we spent \$200,000.00 on Solid Waste; a roof to cover the electronics over there. So there is some of that plus the \$872 is over \$1 million. Why that is important is the General Fund subsidizes or pays for things at the growth and the Solid Waste budget. So from the perspective of trying to cover some costs with cash as the Mayor indicates and having us monitor and manage to the best extent possible the debt service, this is what I would recommend to happen.

As the Mayor says, that's why I have my kind of big lap top here I can give you the tolerances. But from a general perspective, every \$2.2 million that we add in the budget is 1% on the tax rate, because the budget is \$270 million and it has grown since I first got here. It used to be \$1.8, then \$2 million, now \$2.2. So every \$220,000.00 is 1/10<sup>th</sup> of 1% on the tax rate. So those are kind of the tolerances that we deal with and we are right up to right now with the \$51,550.00 that you could add for the Mayor's proposed half of a grant writer, that we are up at 2.97% increase. So that is kind of, we are right at the kind of the tipping point to get over 3%. Thank you.

Alderman Clemons

May I continue. So this is why I had also asked where we thought we would be with the budget surplus. And I know that you got back to me and said you weren't aware of where we would end up or where we would be with that. But what I was thinking, my line of thinking there is that would there be an opportunity through the escrow process to fund those extra costs, particular for the Police Department to add to their budget for overtime later in the year once we have a better handle on what that surplus is. The question being though that we have to have kind of an idea of where we will be now to sort of know what we can anticipate in the future. I mean typically you know, I don't know what we normally have, but we have, we usually have what \$2 million, almost \$2 million in escrows? \$1 million?

Mayor Donchess

It's usually between \$1 million and \$2 million.

Alderman Clemons

So I mean that's a lot of budget surplus. So I don't know what, Mr. Mayor what you have planned there or what your ideas are there. My idea is that we can help these departments. Let me just go into a little bit of why I am concerned. First of all I am concerned about the Police Department because they run a very tight ship over there. If the Chief is telling us that they are going to be \$113,000.00 short, I have no doubt about it. And the reason for that is because I have seen us in the past, I've been on the Board of Aldermen in the past when we've underfunded the Police Department and the next thing you know, they are here and they

are asking for money because they are going to overrun their budget and there is nothing they can do. I mean we have to take care of the problem. So we can either do it now or we can you know have a crisis on our hands later on. I just have a lot of confidence that what the Chief is saying, I believe him. And I don't, I'm not it's not a criticism on the part of anybody who crafted this budget, but I just think they know what is needed.

The second point with regards to the Fire Department is that Chief Rhodes mentioned that without a new Fire Inspector, we are impeding private business from coming to Nashua and opening up shop because we are not able to go out and do the inspections in a timely manner to do the things, get the occupancy permits out there in a timely manner. And that concerns me; and if we are making it difficult to do business here, that's not good for our bottom line. We want to create an environment where companies want to come in, they want to move in, that increases our tax space, that is better for everybody. So if we spend a little bit more by adding a person there who is going to help generate more tax revenue for us, then I think that's what we should be doing. So those are my concerns and I am wondering if the answer is not to take it from Capital Improvements, which I can certainly understand why that would be the case then is there an opportunity later on in the year to fund those two things?

### Mayor Donchess

Well a few thoughts. It really has the same effect as what I was just describing but let me get to that in a minute. I mean obviously the Police Department does a great job. They have met the challenge of the opioid crisis in spectacular fashion. They have made a lot of arrests they say and I totally believe and endorse the idea that they have made dealing in opioids or fentanyl or any of these illegal substances, you know, this is not the place to do that. Now what has happened over the last few years is that the Police Department has not been able to hire enough officers. So with tight budgets and this budget does include, as I proposed it, the Police Department's budget is increased by 2.25% to \$31 million and some hundreds of thousands. The way they have dealt with budget pressure in part just through necessity or just through reality, is that they are usually down a few officers because they haven't been able to hire them. The budgets have been tight, the budgets have gone up every year but they have been tight. They were never really confronted with the issue of "well what do we do" because they could never hire enough people to even spend the money we gave them in essence.

Now the Police Department has decided to change its hiring practices in order to reach full compliment. And I just want you to have a perspective and a clear understanding about that. So what they have decided to and I think they've said this publicly so I don't think I'm revealing any secrets or anything like that. They have decided that from now on they will hire Police Officers from other Police Departments in New Hampshire which they have not previously done, which will enable them then to go to full compliment. It is the decision to alter the hiring practices, put more officers on the payroll that is resulting in this shortfall. Now since we are dealing with \$113,000.00, if instead of going from 174 as an example, 173 to 179, if they got to 177 and they go from 174 to 177, instead of 179, the budget will work. It's just that final decision to go to full complement which they have not been at for a number of years that is causing this \$113,000.00 difference.

Now when I was an Alderman, I wanted them at full complement so I get where you are coming from. But now I am the Mayor and I am trying to deliver you a budget that will achieve at 3% tax increase. We have a \$3 million dollar increase in health insurance. So the budget is tight in various respects; this being one of them. It appears across the budget, I mean the School Department didn't get everything that they asked at least as I've proposed it. The Fire Department kind of did except for this other position. Secondly to the Fire Department more briefly, you know, I don't agree with the idea that not having this person is slowing down private economic growth because I hear like constantly that Nashua is very easy to deal with. I was just meeting with one of the mill yard property owners today "Oh Nashua is really good to deal". I've never heard of any project that has said "Oh I can't go forward because we couldn't get a fire inspection". So I think it would desirable to have that, but I am not sure in a year when things are tight it is totally, totally necessary.

The third question having to do with "why don't we take it out of escrow"? That could be done but it does have the effect of then to reach that budget level next year, we already built in a next year's tax increase just

to stay where we are. So in a way we just say “we are deferring a tax increase until next year and we are going to make it a little this year but then next year it will higher than it could be because we’ve made that type of decision. So I am still saying that the budget should be, at least my perspective, you know is bite the bullet. If that’s the decision that the City makes and I’m not saying again whether I agree or disagree, it depends on what you do but it does have that effect.

Alderman Clemons

Well the bottom line here is that the Police Department needs to have that funding, we do need a full complement because we have the Chief making decisions like taking officers off of the street, walking the beat downtown to cover other areas and things like that. It’s just not what we should be doing. You know we’ve gone for years under this strangulation I call it of the spending cap. It’s not that I want to go and spend millions of dollars over and things like that. But there comes a point in time when you can’t budget by attrition anymore and you start cutting into muscle. You know they say “trim the fat” but we’ve cut into muscle now. Nashua is a growing City, our population is growing. We need more Police Officers, we need, as the economy grows, we are going to need another Fire Inspector, we are going to need somebody to go in and be able to inspect these properties and things like that. So you know if we are going to sustain the kind of growth that I think Nashua wants, then we need to be ahead of the curve and be prepared for it when it comes, rather than deal with it as an after the fact or we need to catch up. So I am going to make a motion to add \$113,000.00 to the Police Department budget and \$150,000.00 to the Fire Department Budget.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO ADD \$113,000.00 TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET AND \$150,000.00 TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT AMENDING THE MAYOR’S BUDGET**

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Wilshire

Do we know if there was any funding left in the Police Special Revenue Fund?

Mayor Donchess

John can get the answer but it is in the vicinity of \$100,000.00.

Mr. Griffin

Might be a little less than \$100,000.00.

Mayor Donchess

That’s an overtime reserve account.

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you.

Alderman Dowd

I believe when they came in they said that was one of the reasons they were concerned because it was getting so low. Any other ... so the Motion is to increase the Police Budget by \$113,000.00 and the Fire Department by \$150,000.00.

Alderman Clemons

If I can just speak to that, the \$50,000.00 there is for replacing the 1986 study of the, I forget what they call it, the Fire Service Study and updating that. According to the Chief, that is going to cost about \$50,000.00.

Chairman Dowd

Just one item on that particular part of it, I know that the Fire Chief and the Deputy have been working with Director Marchant on looking at potential ways of having that funded by a grant. If we approve the grant writer that's the person that will be doing it and that would be one way to cover that without having to expand that out of our operating budget.

Alderman Clemons

Then I will reduce my amount for the Fire Department by \$50,000.00, so it's \$113,000.00 for the Police and \$100,000.00 for the Fire Department.

**AMENDED MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO ADD \$113,000.00 TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET AND \$100,000.00 TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT BUDGET**ON THE QUESTIONChairman Dowd

Any additional comments on the motion?

Alderwoman Kelly

I was going to ask this a couple minutes ago. Let me start by saying I appreciate all the hard work that has been put into this by everyone sitting around, including the Mayor and Kim. My question is since I've been sitting here for 2 years now. I've heard the same kind of conversations two years in a row. So to Alderman Clemons' point, a lot of times we hear, "I've been level funded". The Fire Department has been level funded for 14 years. So are there ways that we are consistently looking at the School Department, that is completely underfunded and understaffed as well which is I think something that we haven't talked about that's really important. So are there ways that we are looking at addressing that, because I do think that the Fiscal responsibility which is very important that we've talked about and the Spending Cap has put us in a position where we have a Fire Department that has had the same level funded budget for 14 years. I mean our City has changed drastically in 14 years. And I'm sure the School Department and the Police Department, we've heard over and over again are in a similar place. So how do we start to address that slowly so that it's not consistently what we hear year after year.

Mayor Donchess

In this context, of course level funded means the budget goes up but the level of services is maintained constant. There are no additional people and for the last few years we have, in the face of I think significant budget pressure, been able to maintain the quality. In other words, the constant service, the budget has gone up enough to maintain the same level of service but often not to increase it. In the schools, we did add Kindergarten for all 5 year olds; so in some respects services have increased and there are other places where that is the case.

Of course, you ask a good question. And the hand we are dealt is a State system that continues to push more and more cost over the year, on to Cities and Towns in various respects. The biggest one, and this not the only, the biggest one for Nashua and all other cities and towns has been the violation of the commitment and promise by the State of New Hampshire to pay 35% of pension costs, which we have discussed and which induced us to join the pension system. That has cost the City of Nashua a cumulative

total of almost \$50 million dollars in cash. With that money we could make all of these improvements times 10 and we would be able to lower the tax rate.

So all of the improvements that Alderman Clemons has proposed, times 10 – and you know cut the tax rate. So we are faced with the not-so-wonderful situation of having to decide how much people can afford and how much service we can provide. That is a decision about which in the law they say reasonable people can differ, because it's a balance. One person can say well we should balance here and the next person could say we could balance up here or down here.

There is possibly and I'm looking over to our State Reps over here and over here, there is possibly some light at the end of the tunnel because the House, thanks to the strong advocacy of all of the people on our delegation, especially those in the room who sit on the Board of Aldermen. In the House side has increased municipal aid considerably, especially for schools. If that budget survives in the Senate or anything like it, if it's signed by the Governor, it will enable us to improve, maybe do a combination of easing off the tax rate a little bit but also improving services at the same time. If that happens of course that will be a great opportunity to make some of these improvements. But I again want to reiterate that at least I and I think the citizens who understand what's going on, really appreciate the efforts of our Legislators and this is the first break in this cycle in like decades and the first possibility that we might see something significant. So I appreciate it; but that hasn't been passed yet. Alderman O'Brien as well, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Harriott-Gathright, Alderman Klee, not everyone is here. So there is not an easy answer to that, I mean that could provide some relief but in the end and the answer to Alderwoman Kelly's question, the answer is you either decide to raise taxes more kind of than inflation, or you work to try to maintain quality services within kind of an inflation type of budget and inflation type tax increase.

#### Alderman Wilshire

What was the amount ... did we add money to the Fire to add positions, dispatchers?

#### Chairman Dowd

There was an issue the way the budget was formulated where the funding wasn't there originally to continue to fund the additional dispatchers that we gave them last year at the last quarter. It was just the way the thing got the math. Those were funded by the new ambulance service that we passed last night by the way and that revenue is going to fund the dispatchers. So the Fire Department is just happy to have the dispatchers and I think that having talked to the Chief and the Deputy Chief, I think this year they understand the budget and they are willing to stick with what they have been offered?

#### Alderman O'Brien

I would just like to comment and a lot of I agree with Alderman Clemons and particularly for my old alma mater the Fire Department. But I mean working for the City for 35 years, 25 of that Nashua had a spending cap. For the people that support it, maybe that was a lot of fun, but now Nashua has a hangover from it. It is a big hangover and that ain't going to cut it. It's just not the Fire Marshall's position that was cut actually it was two. There was also an additional lineman that worked to secure the electronic system, wires and everything else that was through the City and I think also a mechanic for a while. So I mean for a Department the size roughly of about a couple hundred people, they took a significant hit. I was a Deputy Chief, traditionally the Deputy Chief has a technician that is assigned to him to drive, he's sort of like my eyes and ears because in the command structure, like being a general, my job was to stand in front of the building to be in the central location so people could come up if something awry happened during that particular fire. My wandering eyes and ears were that technician. That was cut.

So you look at all the different things that have happened over the years, and I think this is true with the School Department, I think it's true with Public Works. It is true throughout the whole City. Don't let the tax payers think for one second that the spending cap was the panacea. Something fell off the radar. I'm looking at spending right now, what are we doing, a million dollars for a turbine to work at Jackson Mills?

All these things, I mean did the turbine break because of lack of maintenance because we had a spending cap and we couldn't spend the money to do it? So I don't know with this potential hangover, I agree, but I don't know. I think we've got to take these small incremental steps to get back to where we were. And this wasn't done under one administration, this started with Mayor Streeter and it went through other administrations that occurred. Now we have a court case that is pending; we will see, the cap may come back maybe, it may not. I hope it doesn't because we didn't benefit from it, not when we were the discussion of trying to supplement Police & Fire Department. And we are having a discussion like Alderwoman Kelly to the schools which is equally as important as the life safety and the protective services. My God. So what did we get from the spending cap? A headache, a hangover and I don't know. I really just want to say caution, the taxpayers can't really afford to make it up in one shot, although I wish they could. But I don't think that they can so we have to take these incremental steps. I would caution to say smaller steps into this but have a plan to come up to rebuild the City that unfortunately we were the ones who were taking it apart, our predecessors. So keep that in mind. Thank you.

#### Alderman Klee

I'm not on the Committee so I appreciate you taking my question and I guess this is kind of for the Mayor and anybody out there. If the State does come through with those funds, how would that work because obviously we will have already passed the budget and started on our merry way. If we did get all or part of what is, I won't even say numbers, that is being how would we deal with that. You mentioned that, well then we could do this, we could do that, would we have to come back in and re-budget? How would something like that work?

#### Mayor Donchess

Well of course it depends when we get the money and I don't know when under the House Proposal the money would actually come in, but often it doesn't actually come in until the next fiscal year. So if it didn't come in until the next fiscal year, we are really talking about how we would deal with next year's that would FY21 Budget. If it did come in during this fiscal year, I think it would add to surplus and I think there are some service improvements that we could make during the year at that time. For example, the two that Alderman Clemons has mentioned. Hiring additional teachers or something might be more difficult because in the middle of the year it's very difficult, teachers are all committed for a year. So there are certain things that could be done. Maybe we could make some one time, if we got money this year, which I think we are talking a very unlikely scenario, but if we did, maybe we make some service improvements, maybe we do some one-time Capital Improvements, maybe save some money for next year. Different things, I mean you could do a combination of things but I think we are talking about, I mean even if we get money next year, the next fiscal year, that would Fantastic, with a capital "F". So the idea that we might get money this year might be just too much to hope for. I don't know what you think.

#### Alderman Klee

I may be wrong but I think at least some would be coming this year, but I won't put anybody's hopes up. But I do have a follow-up question on that. If the lawsuit went the wrong way and the spending cap came in and this money came forward, how would that affect us being able to use that money.

#### Mayor Donchess

Well you certainly could use it with 10 votes; there was always the possibility of exceeding the spending cap with a 10 vote majority.

#### Alderman Klee

Ok so the Aldermen would take ...

Mayor Donchess

It was called, there was a very elaborate way where it was done, you would vote to exempt certain debt from the calculation, that kind of thing. That's why the court on its own volition invalidated the cap because there was no straight-forward override mechanism. But there were, if you did the right thing, if you exempted the right part of the budget with 10 votes you could in essence not exceed really the spending cap but exempt certain parts of the budget from it for that year.

Alderman Klee

And then you'd be able to spend the money. Thank you.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. So I just want to go back to some math here. So and please correct me if I'm wrong. As I understand it with the \$50,000.00 that we did approve earlier in the meeting, we are at a 2.97% increase, is that correct.

Mr. Griffin

That's correct.

Alderman Clemons

And you said \$225,000.00 would add a 1/10<sup>th</sup> of a per cent to that figure?

Mr. Griffin

John Griffin, CFO. That's correct.

Alderman Clemons

If my math is correct then if we were to pass my amendments here, we would be looking at 3.07% of a tax increase next year. The benefit being that we get to hire a new position in the Fire Department which we've obviously been underfunded for years and we can ensure that the Police Department can become a full complement, which I think we can all agree on is a goal that we should be going for. So I agree with Alderman-at-Large O'Brien in that we should be taking small steps. I think this is a small step that the Board can take to kind of move beyond the status quo of we are just going to provide people with the same services. So the way I look at is we are going to provide people the same services and increase your taxes 2.97%. Or we could give them an extra position in the Fire Department, we could give them a full complement Police Department for 3.07% and say now you are paying more in taxes yes, but you are visibly getting something out of it as opposed to just the same stuff. So I think for a 10<sup>th</sup> of a percent on people's taxes, I think this is a worthwhile cause.

Mayor Donchess

I think Alderman Clemons' math is correct. I would only add that there are some service improvements in the budget. For example there are 4 ELL teachers that didn't exist before, in the contingency account.

Alderman Clemons

Agreed.

Mayor Donchess

And we are adding an Energy Manager, which I think can improve our energy picture and we have a Grant Writer. So there are some improvements, that's my only comment.

Alderman Clemons

Agreed.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you. To consider more of what we are doing here, on the two departments, we have pending before us or I think we are currently in negotiations with some of our unions and I see was tabled R-18-102. We are in negotiations with the Uniformed Police Officers Local 645 and I think we are currently in negotiations with the Fire Fighter's Association Local 789. Any of these adjustments to the budgets, could that affect any potential negotiations that are currently pending right now?

Mr. Griffin

John Griffin, CFO, as you know, we understand that we have the supervisors at the Police Department coming up. We have the Fire Fighters and there might be a few others. But what we do in the development of the budget we put what the expectation is for increases and it has been past practice to take those values out of the budget and move to contingency for negotiation. Now to the extent that the negotiations lead to greater than what is budgeted, then obviously we have to figure out how to true that up. But the good news is the Police Department and the Fire Department and others, they basically give us what they truly believe is a good number for negotiations. That wasn't the Finance Department or the Accounting Department, it is them telling us what they think the number is.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you Mr. Griffin and through the Chair if I may, I do have a technical question if I may through the Chair to Alderman Clemons. You mentioned the Fire Department for that position, you designated \$100,000.00 for that particular position. In looking at it, I think that the position is covered somewhere within the Lieutenant's Salary which is \$86,442.00. Do you want to go for the \$100,000.00 or do you want to amend it to that particular salary range?

Alderman Clemons

Do we know that? I mean yeah.

Mr. Griffin

Whenever you add an individual employee you need to account for the salary, the FICA, the Medi, Pension, Benefits so it's, the \$100,000.00, I watched that meeting, I'm not sure if the Chief indicated that \$100,000.00 would cover an entire employee. Generally speaking it would 30% to 35% to 40% of salary to cover those values. I think the Fire Department number is a little over 30% of salary to cover the pension, the employee portion of the pension. So they could probably make it work at \$100 but I'm not sure. They could make it work I think without the \$100 but I think if they got the \$100 they'd probably, you want to complete the exercise soon. They've got a multi-million dollar budget I think that could work. I wouldn't try to calculate with specificity all those numbers at this point.

Alderman O'Brien

If I may, regardless it's a Clerk's question it is basically if the motion passes, to make sure that it's adequate you know is what I'm saying. I was looking at the salary and it was less. I understand the cost but is it enough and that's what the question is.

Alderman Tencza

May I make a comment on another topic or would you like to ...?

Chairman Dowd

Is it related to the motion.

Alderman Tencza

It is related to the motion. As far as Alderman Clemons I mean I appreciate the fact that we want to get every department up to full complement. You know as I look at the Police Department budget, they are adding 5 full time patrol officers in this budget. The patrol officers that they are going to be able to add because of the changes that they are making, having already been through the academy, are going to be able to hit the streets. We are not going to have to pay for the training, they are not going to be in the office for 3 or 4 months before they got to the academy. So for this year at least, I feel comfortable and I am willing to go forward with the amount as set, the amount of full time positions, without allocating more money to the Police Department to see how it goes. Now if next year the new Chief comes back and says "We really need that" or has a specific program in mind that will benefit the City as far as Community Policing, then I'd consider increasing that or potentially we don't have to even increase it if we are able to allocate in the budget. So I wouldn't be, at this point, willing to support that motion or that amendment. And then as far as the Fire Department, I'd like to see a little bit more specific numbers about what exactly we would need to do and I'd like to see if there are other ways that we could raise revenues in order to help fund that position; whether it is increasing inspection fees for businesses or something like that.

Alderman Clemons

With all due respect to Alderman Tencza, the point at least in regards to the Fire Department, the point of adding the position is to make it easier for businesses to come into the City and do business. Raising fees is not conducive to that. So that is something that I fundamentally disagree with. I think we and I just wanted to make that point.

Chairman Dowd

A couple of things before we go too far, one thing for everybody watching at home, the biggest increase in our budget this year was the \$3 million dollars in insurance which we have little or no control over. I know that Mrs. Kleiner is working on reducing that for next year. I have also asked her to have that company come in and give us an overview, it will be after the budget, but as to why the insurance costs are as high as they are. So that being said, that's a \$3 million dollar hit, which is causing the constraint in other areas.

The other thing is that in talking to a number of people in the City of Nashua, with all that has gone on with the assessing and the increases, putting a tax increase over 3% to them is, I think, asking too much. So in that regard, I would be looking for a compromise, something in the order of in the Police Department maybe giving them \$50,000.00 and I haven't made a motion yet; and/or hiring not both but hiring the Fire Marshall half-way through the year, cutting that amount in half, which again would be \$50,000.00. I think we could live with \$50,000.00 either one, but not both. We can have more discussion but I may be making a motion to amend.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I think this goes back to the Mayor's original point which was that regardless of when we add something to the budget, it is going to increase the budget next year. I appreciate what you are saying. My personal opinion is that .07% over 3% is not too much to ask our citizens when you put into perspective that the things that we are asking them to increase are things that go directly to their safety, the safety of the City and in addition to that a position that will not only increase safety but also help expand our tax base in a better and more efficient way. So again I go back to the reason I made the motion was I agreed with what the Mayor had said which was regardless of when we add these positions, we are going to have to raise the money to do it, and we are going to have to raise taxes to do it.

Right now the economy is strong and it is never popular to raise taxes, I understand that. But regardless of whether or not we add these two, whether or not we say yes to this motion or not, we are raising taxes. So you know if we pass the Mayor's budget as is, we are raising taxes, we are just raising it .1% less than what I am proposing right now.

Chairman Dowd

Just one other bit, Mr. Griffin, you and I talked about Hillsborough County hasn't passed their budget and how would that impact the tax rate?

Mr. Griffin

Treasurer Fredette is our expert I would say locally on taxes but he would argue that there are a lot of moving parts on revenue, county tax, overlay, things of that nature. The only thing that when we file our MS Files to the State, is this budget number and the State Revenue that we get. They plug those numbers in, but Mr. Fredette makes me aware that this is not the final set of numbers. What we try to do is give you just under 3%, this is what the Operating Budget would be. I've got 3% in here for the County Tax, I don't know if it's 3% or 4% or 5%, but I've seen it higher than 3%, very rarely have I seen it lower than 3%. But those are variables and we are trying to isolate on the variables we know and one of the things that we do know is that if we pass that budget, that's locked in on the MS Forms. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Any other discussion? I talked to all the Department Heads and of course if we could give more money to the School Department, Fire Department, Police Department, you know, that would be great. Not a lot but for the reason that have all been brought up; however I still feel very concerned about passing any kind of a tax rate that is over 3%. It seems like an arbitrary goal, but it's a perception thing as well as anything else. So in that regard, I am going to make an amendment to Alderman Clemons' motion to allocate an additional \$50,000.00 to the Police Department and no additional funds to the Fire Department.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO FURTHER BY ALLOCATING \$50,000.00 TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND NO ADDITIONAL FUND TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT**ON THE QUESTIONAlderman Clemons

With all due respect can we just vote on my motion and then if it fails ....

Chairman Dowd

I amended your motion.

Alderman Clemons

Is that in order?

Chairman Dowd

A motion can be amended.

Alderman Clemons

So you can amend my motion?

Chairman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Clemons

Well with all due respect, I wish you would withdraw that motion and we could just have a straight forward vote.

Chairman Dowd

If the amendment fails then your motion will be back on the floor.

Alderman O'Brien

Parliamentary inquiry?

Chairman Dowd

Sure.

Alderman O'Brien

I think you could withdraw if you so wish, let his motion stand. You could make a subsequent motion on your own after that, after you make his if his motion should fail.

Chairman Dowd

If his motion passes then I do just a new motion to cut it but either way it's the same thing. If the amendment passes, then that is what people want to do, if they don't, then ...

Alderman Wilshire

I'm not going to support Alderman Clemons' motion only because with the revaluation this year and a lot of people saw an increase in their tax bill. It's not a good year to go over 3% and even 3% for some people is going to be a stretch. And you know I support the Police and Fire and Schools; I always have. However, the Fire Department has some new dispatchers and the Police, if they need the money, will have to come to us. You know, it's like snow, you have so much of it, you got to keep taking care of it, right. Crime and snow, they are kind of the same for budgeting anyway. For those reasons I can't. I think the Fire Department was OK with us not adding that other position this year; maybe next year because they got dispatchers. And the Police Department, we have to fund it. I mean if they have to come back to us, they will have to come back to us. There is not much we can do with that so for that reason I am going to support Alderman Dowd's motion.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you. To echo our President, I do say that because in the previous motion that was made for the grant writer, that could be extra money that we are talking about for the Fire Department. And what the intention was for the grant, if we think about what is the grant that we want to see coming up over the horizon and that is another study of the Fire Department where additional personnel. That report may come back, we may have to shutter the doors after we read that report and find out "Oh we are that far behind" you know? And that's what that report might give us legit mate. So I'm OK with pending off for a year although I show some disdain because I too support the Police and Fire and of course the education and our Public Works. I support the whole City but the thing is I am willing to wait until we get this report.

Then we could look in the better light with the report and the shame was, the study that came out years ago was ignored by this Board under the auspices of the spending cap. I hope that never happens again; another thing that contributed to the hangover. So I am kind of hoping that when this report comes in, I think that might be a more valuable time to look at every position and find out what we are going to do here.

Chairman Dowd

Just one thing before we go too far, when I said I talked to all the Department Heads, I talked to all the Department Heads. Director Marchant would like additional Code Inspectors and other personnel. She was very, very happy to get the Master Plan funding so we can get a better plan that hasn't been updated for 20 years and find out where we are going before we go too are. BPW pushed off two major pieces of equipment in the CERF fund until next year and hopefully, we can't push them any further. And BPW has a number of funding issues that are going to be downstream but even today they could increase. So it's not just Police, Fire and Schools, the budget has been tight for the reasons mentioned for all Departments. So is there any other discussion on the amendment.

Alderman Schmidt

I have to say that I can't support anything higher than what we've got in the budget right now. I know it is really important to make sure that everything is covered. I think it was fairly done, I really do. And I know there are things that we could do, but between the recession and the cap that we had to live with and the downshifting from the State; we just can't do it this time. We are trying very hard to make sure that the City is treated more fairly by the State, but until then I think we need to stick with this budget.

Alderwoman Kelly

I had a question for clarification we've just been talking about it for so long. Your \$50,000.00 amended, what is that going to for the Police.

Chairman Dowd

The \$50,000.00 for the Police would be to the bottom line.

Alderwoman Kelly

Just to the bottom line not specifically looking at one of the line items that they talked about?

Chairman Dowd

No.

Alderman Klee

I just have a couple of I think comments. When I look at the overtime that they put into their budget and what the Mayor had put in his budget, it is always so much less than what the reality of it is. But the reality is that they were shorted staff before, they are getting a larger staff, to partial complement and so on. But one of the things about doing overtime is that number of hours we are not paying benefits, we are not paying all of those other things of healthcare costs and so on. It is already with that same body. So I am a little confused to how much they really need where they have been doing it through attrition and so on. I am just curious about that.

Chairman Dowd

In talking to the soon-to-be new Chief Carignan, they in the past have managed their budget by not being fully funded and therefore not having officers that they had to pay because they couldn't hire them. That's the reason that the Police Commissioners have changed the way of their hiring practices. Now when they bring an officer in from another Department, they give them the vacation that they'd been used to and the benefits and the funding level that they were at. Before, all the new officers came in at the bottom and there may be variations of what I just said. But basically they are hiring experienced Police Officers, which by the way do not just go out on the street, they have to spend those few months learning how Nashua does things I was assured of that. So if we do give them the \$50,000.00 it helps them to manage the other \$63,000.00 via that people coming and going. It's a little easier to do than the \$113,000.00 in which case they wouldn't be fully staffed. All of you get the reports every single day on arrests, I mean it is not like these guys aren't doing anything. They are risking, like the Firemen, risking their lives every day but when I propose the \$50K as a compromise. If the Budget Committee and the Full Board is willing to keep it just where it is, at the Mayor's budget, that's fine, but I do not want to go over 3%. Any other discussion.

Alderman Klee

Just kind of a follow up on that. With the extra 5 officers that they are going to do in a different way and so on, do we know how close to full does that give them?

Chairman Dowd

In talking to Chief Lavoie and acting Chief or soon-to-be Chief Carignan, they are fully intending to hire full complement.

Alderman Klee

And if that's the case then would this overtime, because the overtime still increased significantly from what they requested last time and half of what they actually used.

Chairman Dowd

The overtime is a variable and when things happen, as an example, that episode in Manchester where they had almost their entire force there 24 hours, a lot of that was overtime. Our people when they went up to help the Manchester team, the City of Nashua had to pay for our guys. Just like if the Manchester Police came down here to help us, they'd be paying for them. Things like that are unknown unknowns. If things are very well and then it's easier to manage their overtime budget, but at the beginning of the budget season when they addressed the Mayor, they said that "Hey based on where our budget is, we can't fund the Stroll, it's \$18,000.00 overtime". The Mayor put that in another part of the budget and they are covered for that. But they overtime events all the time. For instance they have set aside money for major crimes. If there is a major crime, murder or we don't need to speculate, they have the monies to cover that but it is other overtime events, major fire, you know, whatever that they don't know. And they feel that it is going to be very difficult to manage with the funding level that they have because they sort of planned in their budget to be as close

as possible. So again what I propose is a compromise. Any other discussion? Alright, the motion on the floor is to amend Alderman Clemons' motion to make \$50,000.00 increase in the bottom line of the Police Budget and no additional funding to any other department. If there is no further discussion?

**MOTION FAILED TO ALLOCATE \$50,000.00 TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND NO ADDITIONAL FUND TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT**

Chairman Dowd

Ok fails. So now the motion on the floor is to add \$113,000.00 to the Police Department and \$100,000.00 to the Fire Department which would push us way over the 3%. Any further discussion on that motion?

**MOTION FAILED TO ADD \$113,000.00 TO THE POLICE DEPARTMENT BUDGET AND \$100,000.00 TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT BUDGET**

Chairman Dowd

That fails. We are back to the original budget.

Alderman Clemons

So I did a little math here in my head and I've been on the Board of Aldermen on and off since 2008. I voted for the budget in 2008, 2009, and 2017. I voted against it in 2010, 2011 and 2016. Every single time I voted against it, I voted against it because we haven't funded the budget enough. 2017 was a little different; I voted for it because of the law suit that we were under at the time. However, had I had my druthers I would have voted against that too because it cut some staff over in the School Department in the way of the custodians. In fact, out of the budgets that I have voted against the custodians has often been the reason why I voted against them, because we have continually beaten them down, that union. So I guess I will 4 for 3 now because I am going to vote no on the budget because I don't think it does enough and I don't think that 3.07% was too much to ask. And so for those reasons, while I appreciate what the Mayor has done and I think there are very good things in this budget, I don't feel that it goes far enough because I don't think it takes care of the business community and I don't think it takes care of the Police Department very well.

Chairman Dowd

Other discussion?

Alderwoman Kelly

Hi me again School Department girl. I appreciate all the discussion that has happened and I think that we all kind of understand where we are with the budget. I am going to continue to advocate for the School Department. I know that we struggle in this Chamber because we can't tell them specifically what they can spend the money on. But I would like to move to give them \$65,000.00 which would cover two paras, that's my suggestion and the one social worker that they had to take out of the budget.

Chairman Dowd

Is that a motion?

Alderwoman Kelly

That is a motion yes.

**MOTION BY ALDERWOMAN KELLY TO INCREASE THE BOTTOM LINE OF THE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET BY \$65,000.00**

ON THE QUESTIONChairman Dowd

Recall we can talk to it but we cannot mandate what they do with that money.

Alderwoman Kelly

Right and if I could talk to it for a moment, I think all of the Departments are deserving of more money, I know there is a lot of things going on. But for the School specifically they have to hire them pretty quickly to be ready for the school year. I know in the last two years we have brought on full day Kindergarten and they have still been struggling very much so with not having enough paras in the classroom. So I think to the conversation that has happened, the bang for the buck for this is definitely worth it. I have seen myself and heard from constituents a lot of people moving out of district because of the school departments and not having the staffing or not feeling like they were where they wanted to be. So I think this go a little way in helping retain people. And if I could remind people that one of the big things that the School Department talked about and we got some numbers on, is that we are spending \$6 million dollars in out-of-district placement. So I think as we start to chip away at these things, not that necessarily 2 paras is going to make the difference in that, but I think we have to start thinking about what those programs look like, what does our staffing look like so that we can start to pull that back in.

Chairman Dowd

So the motion is to add \$65,000.00 to the bottom line of the School Department Budget. Any further discussion?

Alderman Wilshire

I appreciate that motion, however, hiring paras right now, I mean the unemployment rate is so low, we are having difficulty hiring people at an entry level kind of position. So even if we funded it, I'm not sure they could find people to do it. I appreciate the motion though I do.

Chairman Dowd

Any other discussion?

Alderman Tencza

Thank you. So I would support the motion and I would wonder if Alderwoman Kelly would agree to, and I'll allow her to make this amendment to the amendment to her motion if she'd like to, agree to add that to contingency fund for the ESL teachers that has already been included in the budget so that the money goes specifically for those positions?

Alderwoman Kelly

Is that something that we can do? I know that we've set up a contingency specifically, is that something we could add?

Mr. Griffin

We named that particular account "school related items" so you could add, that was specifically for ELL teachers but you could add the \$65,000.00 to that account, not the School bottom line but to that contingency amount, changing it from \$200,000.00 to \$265,000.00.

Alderwoman Kelly

Can I ask another question? So that represents the line item that the School Board together. Am I remiss in missing benefits for them? I know that most of them are part-time.

Mr. Griffin

That \$200,000.00 my understanding was the \$50,000.00 each ELL teacher not including benefits; so it didn't true up the benefits.

Alderwoman Kelly

So if I follow on, they are picking up the benefits is what is happening?

Mr. Griffin

Just further dialogue on that, they attribute the benefits to the School District, we would have to offer full-time ELL teachers benefits. If they take it, it is coming out of the City Self-Insurance Fund. They never, when they make hiring decisions, they don't take into accounts the benefits, but with specificity when we know who the person is and what they are taking, we charge the School Department that amount.

Chairman Dowd

So just how that contingency works is when they have someone that they are ready to hire, they will come to us and ask us to transfer the money from contingency for the full cost of that position to their account and then they will hire the person.

Alderwoman Kelly

So, that would mean that if they trouble hiring either the paras or the ELL that money would go back to the budget line at the end of the year, correct? Because it wouldn't be spent?

Chairman Dowd

That money would stay in contingency and not be spent.

Alderwoman Kelly

Correct OK. That makes me feel better so I am happy to make the motion, to put it in with the contingency.

**AMENDED MOTION BY ALDERWOMAN KELLY TO ADD \$65,000.00 TO THE CONTINGENCY-  
EDUCATION PRIORITIES LINE ITEM FOR THE SCHOOL DEPARTMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF  
ADDING TWO PARAPROFESSIONALS**

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Dowd

Ok by the way does the Clerk have the motion?

Alderman O'Brien

Yeah my question through the Chair to CFO Griffin, what line item would that motion be under?

Mr. Griffin

It would be page 271, 70112, I stand corrected, it is Contingency/Education Priorities.

Alderman O'Brien

Contingency/Education Priorities.

Mr. Griffin

So your motion would be to add \$65,000.00 to that number.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I'll support this motion to amend the budget, it doesn't change my position on the overall budget, but I'd rather see a budget with this in it than a budget without it. So I will support adding this to the budget.

Alderman Jette

As you well know I am not on the Committee so I don't have a vote but I would like to, I appreciate the sentiment behind the motion, however, I would like to point out that the budget that was submitted to us by the School Department is a budget that they voted on. And they didn't fight for this increase, what they submitted to us was something; I understand that they worked out with the Mayor to allow for the ELL teachers to be put in contingency. When they appeared before us, this was the budget that they had agreed upon, that the School Board had voted on and I feel that, I'm not saying I would vote against it if it gets to the Full Board level but I'm wondering if we are not substituting our judgment for the School Board's judgement. I just wanted to make that remark.

Chairman Dowd

So the Mayoral Budget Adjustment to their budget was \$729,000.00. So they had put in a budget \$729,000.00 more than they are currently getting. Did they agree with it? Well it all depends on how you define "agree" I guess. But I mean there are other things that they wanted to do that they can't do. We just can't possibly afford that additional amount of money.

Alderwoman Kelly

Thank you if I could talk quickly to how I arrived at that. After the School Board Meeting I asked for a number of different documents based on how they made the decision and we got some information on what they out-of-district placement were as well as what they cut from the budget. In that list there was kind of a reasoning beside each thing, like "Oh we are deferring it" or "We don't have enough time to hire this teacher" but those two items had nothing and I feel very strongly that the paras are needed. I know I specifically asked the Board President and Dr. Mosley if the pie in the sky what would you feel and I believe that her response was "I would like 12 paras and ELLs". So if I can give her two I would like to do that.

Chairman Dowd

As much as I am concerned about increasing the budget, I can tell you I have a lot of people I know in the School Department and liaison to the Board of Ed Budget as is Alderman Schmidt, my back up. They have always been short paras. When they have teachers out, sometimes the paras if they are qualified have to take over teaching the class, then they are short more paras. A lot of the paras that they hire, are mandated by Federal Law, so those paras are usually one-on-one, I am sure Mrs. Kleiner knows as well are one-on-one with students and they can only focus on that one student. It is good that it is in contingency for the reasons that President Wilshire said, it could be tough to hire them, they are having trouble hiring. But trust me, they could use as many paras as they could get.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah I just want to follow up and say in response to one of the remarks that was made. There used to be a time when the School Board would present a budget that they felt was correct and they would present that and the Mayor would, in most cases, cut it. Then the Board of Aldermen would fight over it and that would be that and they would get a bottom line and then they would go and re-write it based on what that bottom line was. Mayor Lozeau took a different approach to that where she wanted them to craft a budget that was going to come in that she thought was fair and that the City could anticipate what the costs and things like that were going to be. Since that time, that has sort of been the approach, both by her and the current Mayor and I kind of agree with it because we know what we are putting in and they know what constraints are there. So they submit a budget that's \$700,000.00 above and then the Mayor comes back and says "OK we can't do this realistically, where are your priorities, how can we negotiate a better budget".

So it's not necessarily that we know better than them, it's that we can't afford to do all the things that are necessary to give children a quality education in this City. So we have to make do with what we have. I was here at the meeting, I heard what Dr. Mosley said and Alderwoman Kelly is 100% correct when she says that is what they asked for. So like the Police Department asked for more money here at this Committee, and like the Fire Department did as well, we've done our homework, you know? I've done my homework it is clear that Alderwoman Kelly has done her homework, we've done the work as a Committee. So these aren't just things that we want to have or nice things. These are things that are coming from those departments.

Alderman Jette

I re-checked the number and I wrong, you are right, they asked for \$700,000.00 or so more. So I withdraw my objection.

Chairman Dowd

Does the Mayor want to address anything relative to the School Board budget?

Mayor Donchess

I think what happened is that yes they submitted the original and then I spoke with them similar to what Alderman Clemons said and I said "Well I think we can afford X" and then they said "OK we will submit a budget for X" and they came in with the \$2.25 but because they were pretty persuasive in terms of the need for these additional teachers, I, in the budget, include the \$2.5 but also because they had especially plead for the ELL teachers, I put that in contingency. I think that's the events.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you and through the Chair to CFO Griffin, this pending motion of \$65,000.00 will bring us up to what now?

Mr. Griffin

3.0%.

Alderman O'Brien

Zero even? Ok.

Chairman Dowd

Any other discussion? So the motion on the floor is to add \$65,000.00 to the bottom line of the School Board Budget in contingency to be allocated upon them telling us that they had someone they would hire for those positions. Any additional comments or discussion? So the amendment is to add \$65,000.00 to the bottom line School Board Budget under contingency.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Dowd

So the motion on the floor now is to, unless there are additional changes to pass the full budget with the addition that was just added. And can you give us an update, you said 3% and the dollar amount?

Mr. Griffin

Certainly. On the budget as amended the new appropriation amount would be \$270,384,074.00.

Chairman Dowd

We need to get rid of that \$74.00. Ok so the motion on the floor is to pass and recommend final passage to the budge for FY2020 in the amount of \$270,384,074.00. Any further discussion? Seeing none I think we ought to take it by roll call.

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

Yea: Alderman-at-Large O'Brien, Alderman Jan Schmidt, Alderman-at-Large David Tencza, Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshana Kelly, Alderman Richard Dowd	5
Nay: Alderman-at-Large Wilshire, Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons	2

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Dowd

So the motion passes and we will send a recommendation on to the Full Board for a budget of \$270,384,074.00.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES – None

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

**R-18-102**

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws  
Alderman Jan Schmidt

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

- Tabled 1/17/2019

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Alderman Clemons

I just want to thank everybody for their time this evening, coming here. I know that the Bruins are on and I don't want to delay this any further. But I do appreciate everybody's time and I think even though I am not supporting the budget, I think it is a relatively good budget. It's only a few hundred dollars off from what I wanted but you can't have everything.

Alderwoman Kelly

I just wanted to point out that it is also opening night for the Knights and I would there if I wasn't here.

Alderman Clemons

Me too, trust me.

Chairman Dowd

Yes they are always good entertainment.

Alderman Wilshire

Like I said earlier about the budget, I didn't want to go to 3% and that's the only reason, I want Police and Fire in there and I want School in there. But after the revaluation this year and people's tax bills, I just think 3% is more than I want to do. In most part because of everything else that's going on, I mean we are doing a Performing Arts Center and we've got the revals and we've got all this other stuff, to add more to people's plates financially it just didn't make sense to me right now.

Chairman Dowd

Yeah I was thinking amending it and cutting \$5,000.00 from that so it would stay under 3% but I figured, nah. But at the School Board level we could do that.

Alderman Wilshire

I might have supported that.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN - None

POSSIBLE NON-PUBLIC SESSION – None

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO ADJOURN  
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 8:38 p.m.

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