

## BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 1, 2020

A meeting of the Budget Review Committee was held Tuesday, December 1, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. via teleconference.

### Chairman Dowd

As Chairman of the Budget Review Committee, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

Providing public access to the meeting via telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

To access Zoom, please refer to the agenda or the City's website for the meeting link.

*To join by phone dial: 1-929-205-6099 Meeting ID: 812 6461 7360 and Passcode: 315866*

*The public may also view the meeting via Channel 16.*

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, through public postings. Instructions have also been provided on the City of Nashua's website at [www.nashuanh.gov](http://www.nashuanh.gov) and publicly noticed at City Hall and Nashua Public Library.

If anybody has a problem accessing the meeting via phone or Channel 16, please call 603-821-2049 and they will help you connect.

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting via the methods mentioned above, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled. Please note that all votes that are taken during this meeting shall be done by roll call vote.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. When each member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-To-Know Law.

Alderman O'Brien called the roll and asked them to state the reason he or she could not attend, confirmed that they could hear the proceedings, and stated who was present with him or her.

The roll call was taken with 7 members of the Budget Review Committee present:

Alderman Richard A. Dowd, Chairman  
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons, Vice Chair (arrived at 7:11 after roll call)  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman Ernest Jette

Also in Attendance:

Sarah Marchant, Director of Community Development  
Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager  
Alderman Elizabeth Lu  
Dorie Clarke, Deputy Corporation Counsel

---

ROLL CALL

Alderwoman Kelly

Here, I am alone and I can hear everyone.

Alderman O'Brien

Alderman-at-Large Michael O'Brien is present, I can hear and I am alone.

Alderman Wilshire

I am here, I am alone and I can hear everyone.

Alderman Jette

I am here, I am alone and I can hear the proceedings.

Alderman Schmidt

I am present and I am alone in the room.

Chairman Dowd

Yes, I can hear everyone and I am present and I am alone.

Alderman O'Brien

Mr. Chairman, you have 6 members in attendance.

Chairman Dowd

Ok, thank you. Also in attendance are Director Marchant, Director Sullivan and Alderman Lu and Attorney Dorie Clark.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Laura Colquhoun My name is Laura Colquhoun. I am at 30 Greenwood Drive. I am really very interested on why Alderman Dowd has authorized this reduction of the variance application fee to widen the 16 Hideaway Road. This is not something that the Charter usually allows and I want to know why because a lot of other people may want to get this reduction in future application fees. I will let Alderman Dowd address that issue. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

It's going to be, I believe, the second item on the Agenda and the Reader's Digest version is because there was an error during the ZBA when they went for their variance, it was filed later and the applicant has to go back for a second time and you will see why we are going to discuss waiving the second fee, not the original fee. Any other public comment? Seeing none – Communications?

COMMUNICATIONS - None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-20-095**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderwoman Elizabeth Lu  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Skip Cleaver  
Alderman Ernest Jette

**AUTHORIZING THE EXPENDITURE OF UP TO TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$10,000) FROM THE CONSERVATION FUND ON CONSULTING SERVICES WITH THE NASHUA REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

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

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Dowd

Ok, the motion on the floor is for final passage of O-20-095. Director Marchant, did you want to address this?

Sarah Marchant, Director of Community Development

Very briefly yes and I will pass it over to Manager Sullivan. So the Conservation Commission has been working very hard, there's substantial land that they have in their jurisdiction to make sure that we comply with the State NRO's which includes management planning of that, stewardship planning and also taking care of all their trails. So this is an effort to meet some of those goals. And with that, I'll hand to Matt Sullivan, our new Planning Manager.

Chairman Dowd

Welcome back again.

Matt Sullivan, Planning Manager

Thank you, I appreciate that Alderman Dowd. I'll provide a brief background on this but to sort of capture the essence of it, my name is Matt Sullivan for the record, the Planning Manager for the City of Nashua. I am here this evening on behalf of the Conservation Commission to present a request for a not-to-exceed of \$10,000.00 to enter into a technical assistance contract with the Nashua Regional Planning Commission, who you may all be familiar with. The Commission actually voted unanimously at its November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2020 regular meeting to make this request to you. After a detailed discussion with Planning Commission representatives about a proposed scope for the contract which is obviously still in the process of being developed.

You may be familiar with NRPC, they provide technical assistance to not only the City of Nashua in the past, but also other regional communities and are really a direct conduit to many of the Regional and Statewide best practices when it comes to natural resource planning and other conservation commission practices. That's really the reasoning for our interest in working with them as a Commission. As Sarah mentioned the Commission has made substantial progress in land conservation efforts over the last 20 years particularly. It is now beginning to turn its attention to really three primary new areas I think of focus, when they look at their work program moving forward.

The first of which is really management and monitoring of the existing land that has been put into conservation. The second is enhancing the public's access to that land, having the land is one piece but certainly providing public access and the ability to recreate on it is a critical piece of that. And the third plays a role as well and that is marketing the existing infrastructure to not only residents of the City of Nashua but also visitors or guests that might come to the community. There are many pieces involved with that including making maps, providing information on the web and other resources that need to be developed. But really in order to make progress on those areas we do require a certain level of expertise. As a result, there's a need to partner with an organization like the Regional Planning Commission to really enter into four specific areas and that is, again, forest and land management planning, technical assistance to trail mapping and wayfinding signage efforts, development of enhanced maps for existing and those resources. And of course, support of the existing easement monitoring methods some of which are required per State Law as well and based on funding.

I am happy to answer any questions related to this request this evening, but if approved, we do plan to move forward and to contract finalization as soon as possible. And I am happy to answer any questions that you might have. Thank you so much.

Chairman Dowd

Any of the members of the Committee have questions? Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

Not so much a question but a comment. As liaison to the Conservation Commission, I want to point out to my fellow Aldermen that this \$10,000.00 is not new money, it's coming from the Conservation Fund which if I understand correctly has about \$1.6 million dollars in it. So this \$10,000.00 would not be the expenditure of new tax revenue, but it's money that they already have and they are just asking for your approval to spend it for the purposes provided and explained by Mr. Sullivan.

Chairman Dowd

Thank you, Alderman Jette. Any other questions? If not, would the Clerk please call the roll?

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

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd 7

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Dowd

And Alderman Clemons did join us. Was he here for the question?

Alderman Clemons

Yes and I vote yes.

Alderman Dowd

I know Director Marchant and Mr. Sullivan have to leave for other meetings, unless you want to stay for the next one, that's fine.

Alderman O'Brien

Mr. Chairman, for clerical reasons may I record that at 7:11 p.m. Alderman Clemons has joined the meeting.

**R-20-096**

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**AUTHORIZING A REDUCTION OF A \$330.00 VARIANCE APPLICATION FEE TO WIDEN DRIVEWAY AT 16 HIDEAWAY ROAD TO \$50.00****MOTION BY ALDERMAN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE BY ROLL CALL**ON THE QUESTIONChairman Dowd

Ok the motion is to recommend final passage of R-20-096 and I'd like to explain. This is nobody's fault but the people from 16 Hideaway Road went into the ZBA for a variance. They went through the process of getting the variance to add on to their garage and expand their driveway into the garage and it was passed unanimously. I sent everybody a copy of the minutes from that meeting and I have also had conversations with Director Marchant and Mr. Sullivan. When they went out to inspect the property after the approval of the variance, they found out that there was another driveway that wasn't removed and because of the expansion of the existing driveway and the small driveway, they exceeded the 24 feet allowed. So they said to the homeowners, Oh you have to go back for another variance. So they would be charged another \$380.00 for basically correcting the oversight from the first variance, which intrinsically is not fair; it should have been caught and it wasn't. And it wasn't mentioned, as you noticed in the minutes that I sent you about an hour ago in the Zoning Meeting.

The applicant has no problem going back to go in for Zoning again for another variance, but they don't feel that because of the oversight that they should have to pay \$330.00; they'll pay the \$50.00 application fee. The Planning Department can't waive the fee; the only people that can waive the fee are the Board of Aldermen. So that's the Legislation; if anybody would like to see a picture of the property I can bring it up on my screen. No? OK. Any questions about this? Alderman Clemons?

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I have no problem with this, it is common sense and I am happy to do it. What I would like to see is maybe we can get a process in place that doesn't have to be so cumbersome to go through the Board of Aldermen, that we can administratively make decisions like that. Because to me, you know, why should it have to come all the way up here for something that's common sense. But certainly I will support this. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Yeah, I don't where the – maybe Attorney Clarke knows, I don't know where the rules lie on that but I do know it is not the first time it's been done. So we are not setting new things here. It's been done before, maybe a couple years ago, same type of thing. Attorney Clarke, do you know is that part of an Ordinance or is part of an RSA?

Dorie Clark, Deputy Corporation Counsel

It's really just connected to the fact that the Aldermen as the ones who set the fees in the first place. So if there's a request to waive it completely or lower it, that's why it needs to come back to you. And the one that you were thinking of, Alderman Dowd, that I looked at when we were working on this one was a situation where somebody had applied.

And then before they did the work, the applicant passed away so the work wasn't going to end up being done and the Aldermen ended waiving the fees, actually it was a refund of the fees in that case.

Chairman Dowd

Any other questions about this? Seeing one, would call the roll Alderman O'Brien?

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

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd 7

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**R-20-098**

- Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess
- Alderman Thomas Lopez
- Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright
- Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza
- Alderman Richard A. Dowd
- Alderman Patricia Klee
- Alderman Jan Schmidt
- Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
- Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
- Alderman Skip Cleaver
- Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE AND U.A.W. LOCAL 2322 CLERICAL AND TECHNICAL UNIT FROM JULY 1, 2020 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2024 AND AUTHORIZING RELATED TRANSFERS**

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

ON THE RECORD

Chairman Dowd

OK. Attorney Clarke, I know that you negotiated the two that we have on our plate this evening together. Do you want to take them together or do you want to take them separately, they are pretty closely identical in the wording I think? How would you like to proceed with that?

Attorney Clarke

Yeah, I mean I think the conversation for both of them will be the same. The language in the Collective Bargaining Agreements is identical in the two of them. The real differences are just the employees, the job titles that are covered by each one and the salary schedules at the end.

Chairman Dowd

OK, yeah because there are different levels of people. So I would say voting on them separately but if you are asking questions, if we could just sort of from a question standpoint take the two of them together. And by the way, and I'm looking for Kim Kleiner to wave her head yes, that both have agreed to the new City Health Plan, correct. Good answer. OK. Questions?

Alderman O'Brien

Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Do you want me to read R-20-099 with the pending motion in case we need discussion?

Chairman O'Brien

Just to keep it clean we will vote on them separately but we don't need to go through a lot of discussion on the second because they are pretty close together, as far as the wording is concerned. The only difference is the levels of pay and the job titles. But the rest of the bulk of the information is pretty much identical.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I agree. My question is, do you want a motion of final passage?

Chairman Dowd

Does anyone have a question by the way? Alderman Jette and then Alderman Lu?

Alderman Jette

If someone could tell us for each bargaining unit, how many people are we talking and could you generally describe who they are, what they do for the City and can you summarize what the increases are going to be and could you explain how the healthcare portion, the high deductible healthcare portion, how is this different from the firefighter's contract that the Mayor, the portion that the Mayor just vetoed. How is this different than that?

Chairman Jette

The costing sheets are in the Legislation, but if you want it summarized, I am sure Attorney Clarke is well aware of it.

Attorney Clarke

I'd be happy to go through the brief summary of the cost item changes, there aren't that many and then maybe while I'm doing that I can ask Kim to just double check the numbers in the different units and we can briefly describe which groups of employees are in each one. So in terms of the cost item changes for these two CBA's, the way I did it in my Memo is by Article so I'll just quickly go through that. In Article 20, Tuition Reimbursement, we agreed to continue to fund the joint tuition account for both units together in an annual amount of \$10,000.00 with an extra \$3,000.00 if they run out. And what we ended up doing is that Tuition Account is an expendable trust fund so it rolls over and it hasn't been used a lot the last couple years. There was some money in there that we ended up agreeing with the Union to transfer out of the Tuition Account and use it for a one-time set of some grade and step adjustments to the lowest paid employees in the Clerical Technical Unit. That was a little under \$38,000.00. I'll mention those adjustments when I get to the wages briefly.

Article 23, which is health insurance, these two units agreed to make the same changes to health insurance that the unaffiliated have currently whereby the HMO co-pays, the deductibles are increased and we put the language for the high deductible plan in the contracts. So that was specifically the insurance changes that the Mayor and the Administration were looking for. In the Mileage Reimbursement Article, so there are some employees in this group that have been looking over the last couple cycles for some City vehicles to be able to use. Some of the strongest advocates have been in the Building Inspection Department who, they currently use their own vehicles, but they have been asking for some City vehicles for the last couple of cycles to be able to use for work purposes instead of using their own vehicles and getting reimbursed mileage.

For this cycle, we agreed we are going to – there's going to be four used Police Department Vehicles that instead of being traded in, we are going to bring them over to City Hall and have them be available to UAW employees, as sort of a pilot program. We are not going to do any guaranteed replacement but thought it was a way to see if some of these vehicles that would otherwise be traded in, we could get a couple years out of and have some more cars available for these UAW employees.

Chairman Dowd

Just for the sake of the public, we are taking all the equipment off them.

Director Marchant

Yes, yes, I believe they still will be marked as City of Nashua, Building Department or Community Development markings.

Chairman Dowd

They won't say "Police".

Director Marchant

But yeah, they will not still appear as Police Vehicles. They actually – my understanding is they were unmarked Detective vehicles, they weren't patrol cars, I guess I'll just say that. So they don't have quite the wear and tear that the patrol vehicles would have.

For wages, we agreed to a 4-year contract. For this group, they have salary grids at the end of their contracts. The way they generally operate is in a given year if you get a Passing Performance Evaluation, you get a step, if we negotiate it. The steps are roughly between 2% and 2.1%, the difference, we are trying to get everybody to just 2% steps but there are some grandfathered employees on some older grids. So that is the background. What we agreed to is for Fiscal '21 a step which will be retroactive to July 1, 2020. In Fiscal '22 we are going to do that one time set of grade and step adjustments for the lowest grade employees. These are employees and Kim can speak to this, that there was some trouble with hiring and retention. And what would happen is we would hire them and then other City jobs would open up and they would apply and take them because they were just, you know, better paid. So we were trying to make some of our lower paid employees, some of them – like motor vehicle clerks and staff in the City Clerk's Office, increase those starting wages a little bit so that we can keep some people in a few of those positions.

And like I said, the entire package of that was a little less than \$38,000.00 so it wasn't a huge revaluation of the wages but some adjustments. And then the entire group would get a step plus 1% on July 1, 2021. So approximately 3% but that was the year we were also getting the insurance changes. In Fiscal '23, a step plus a point, 5% cost of living increase on the salary grids and the same in Fiscal '24, a step plus a .5% increase on the salary grids. And then each July 1<sup>st</sup> of the contract cycle, we are going to take the very lowest step from each grade and add a 2% step at the top of each grade and that just keeps the employees on a grid. The last few items, we've got a new Article to create an incentive program for a compressed natural gas fuel system inspection certification, which just was an incentive to have a couple of the employees, mechanical kind of employees to become certified to do CNG fuel system inspections so we could have them do that for our CNG vehicles we have here in the City so that we don't have to bring them out, like have outside inspectors do that. It just saves us money and time.

Then we added in for earned time and the individual sick leave pools that this group has, we agreed to add a payout if the employee dies while they are employed with the City. So that is sort of a run through of the cost item changes. And then I might just, yes, see if Kim can briefly speak to the number of employees and roughly what positions they are.



Kim Kleiner, Director of Administrative Services

Sure, thank you Attorney Clarke. So these unions like Attorney Clarke mentioned are very diverse, they run across the City. In your Clerical and Technical group as of November you have approximately 77 employees. These range everything from custodians to motor vehicle clerks, permit technicians in the community, development right across the board to a purchasing agent. So I mean it is a really diverse group and you will find them across the City. With your Professional Group, you have approximately 42, same diverse across the City. You are actually getting people that – your Assessors in Assessing to Accountants in Finance or your Planning people in Community Development. So it is a wide range of positions across the City.

Just to give a little bit more detail on the order on the vehicles, so I would thank to our Police Department. This was a great collaborative effort. We contacted them and we asked them what they had available. They had a number of vehicles both unmarked and marked. We agreed that the unmarked Detective cars that they would be trading in were the ones that we should look at; they are 2009, 2010 years. They have about 80,000 to 90,000 miles on them. Normally they would only get about \$1,500.00 in trade. You'll find that these will be on the Agenda tomorrow night for the purchase of these vehicles, so there may be a little bit more discussion. But for \$1,500.00 for these, it's relatively low trade-in. So it was a good deal on behalf of the City to give this pilot program to our employees.

The salary and grid changes that Attorney Clarke spoke to, that was a number of us Directors getting together, speaking with all of the Department Heads. We had positions within the Clerical and Technical Unit where we see significant turnover year after year after year. These are positions that generally require some amount of training. So the City is investing in these employees. And just for an example, I will take Motor Vehicle Clerk. Those clerks have to go through a pretty extensive training with the State to get a license to use the Motor Vehicles software. So you are investing money and because they were so lowly paid, you are seeing them generally if we were lucky enough stay within the City and go to another job or leave the City entirely.

We did reach out and do a salary study and we reached out to some of our municipalities, Rochester, Bedford, Durham, Londonderry, Somersworth, Manchester and I'll just take one for instance where we were starting at \$14.96, a community like Manchester was starting \$16.49. So we looked at these other communities for these same jobs that we were looking to adjust and we really did see that we were low. The important parts to note with these grid changes is that \$38,000.00 is coming from an Education Trust Fund that the Union has already had. The money has already appropriated, it's already been put in this Education Trust Fund for the Union to use. They haven't had much use over the past 4 years. They have agreed to fund these changes out of that Trust Fund. So that \$38,000.00 really isn't coming out of our Fiscal'22 Budget sort to speak.

The other item that I think you had questions on was the healthcare which has been quite the topic of discussion. We looked at the savings to both the City as well as the employees and the changes that we have asked them to make. So for instance, for the HMO your deductibles are going to change for in-office medical visit, you are going to pay \$25.00 versus \$20.00. The largest change is your out-patient, in-patient surgeries and care which normally you would have paid \$250.00 or \$500.00 and now you are going to pay \$1,500.00 or \$3,000.00 and that's the largest change. And then you have the Tier Pharmacy benefits, \$5., \$15., \$35., going to \$10., \$30., and \$50.00. The important thing to note is by the Union accepting these charges their employees are going to see a little over a 20% reduction in their premiums out of their paycheck. So there is a savings to the employee. The City is going to see a substantial savings in our Health Benefits Fund. We estimate that yearly savings to be a little over \$260,000.00.

So this is an important change, it's one that the City feels very strongly about. We want to say that the negotiations with UAW worked very well and we want to thank the Union. Everybody realized that we are in a tough financial position, especially going into the Fiscal '22 Budget. They also realized that the amount we had in contingency and we were working with for Fiscal '21 was very tight where we settled with the 2% for the step. And we can say that both John Griffin and I have gone over the costings and all of that would fall well within our Budget.

Chairman Dowd

OK, thank you Mrs. Kleiner. Any other questions?

Alderman Jette

Could I follow up, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Dowd

Follow-up go ahead.

Alderman Jette

So I also asked what the difference was between this high deductible insurance plan and the one that was vetoed by the Mayor for the firefighters? And also, speaking of firefighters, I notice that the Fire Commissioners had to approve one of these contracts. So do I understand that there are people that work for the Fire Department that aren't represented by the Firefighter's Union, they are represented by this other Union that represents a broad spectrum of employees?

Director Kleiner

Very good question Alderman Jette. So there are a couple positions at the Fire Department, Administrative Assistants that are within the UAW Unit and that is why the Fire Commission had to approve the deal which they did last Sunday afternoon. The other question regarding the high deductible plan is, and this something that the unaffiliated signed on to as well. You will notice we are talking about the distribution in two installments, one July 1<sup>st</sup>, one on October 1<sup>st</sup> and then we talk about after July 1<sup>st</sup> that those City contributions will be prorated. That's important when you run into whether someone is meeting their limit for the year which is set by the IRS. So those are important changes that you don't see in the...

Chairman Dowd

Director Kleiner, isn't the biggest difference the fact that the high deductible language in the Fireman's contract calls for a salary increase if they reach certain levels which is not in any of these other contracts.

Director Kleiner

That is true Alderman Dowd. There are no incentives for employees to join in the Health Savings Account or High Deductible Plan in the UAW Contracts. There isn't one.

Chairman Dowd

Anything else, Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

No, thank you very much.

Chairman Dowd

Alderman Lu?

Alderwoman Lu

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have about 3 questions if I could ask through you to Director Kleiner.

Chairman Dowd

Can you get closer to your microphone? It's hard to hear you.

Alderwoman Lu

Director Kleiner, when we talk about this group has gone with the high deductible, do we mean we've accepted it as one of the three options that they are offering? Or are we saying that every employee in this Union has agreed to go with the high deductible.

Director Kleiner

So this is important to note, the City in the past has not documented the high deductible, the Health Savings Account plan in the contracts to the extent that we are now. So we've said another City alternative and we haven't actually laid out all of the details of that plan. That's what we mean by we are including that language in the contract, important to note what that does is that now memorializes that City contribution of \$1,500.00 or \$3,000.00 and it makes that a negotiable item going forward, where that hasn't been memorialized before.

That is not to say these employees do not need to switch to the Health Savings or High Deductible if they choose not to. They can stay with the HMO, they will now have the cheaper rates, but they will have the changes to their deductibles as of next July.

Alderwoman Lu

Ok, thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Any other questions Alderman Lu?

Alderwoman Lu

Yes just another – something I noticed and it may just be a typo but I wanted to ask about it. It's Article 20 of the Professional Contract on Page 18. And I just wondered if this purposeful or not that, it just seems to me, let's see at June 30<sup>th</sup> of the year, right before the new \$10,000.00 contribution is made you look at the fund and if it is empty, then you throw in another \$3,000.00. It just seems like the years were not updated properly, because I see the years as that's going to happen in June 2020. Oh is it?

Chairman Dowd

Attorney Clarke?

Attorney Clarke

Yes, I am looking at that right now and I think I understand what Alderwoman Lu is getting at. If we are putting the \$10,000.00 on July 1, 2020 we look to see if was all spent by June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021, so I think that yes there's four years, the June 30<sup>th</sup> dates need to be all kicked up one year. And I am looking at the Clerical / Technical Contract so I think that it needs to be fixed in both of them.

Alderwoman Lu

I just wasn't sure if there was something substantive that was included there. That's all thank you.

Attorney Clarke

That's a good catch, we will have to fix those years, thank you.

Alderwoman Lu

OK, thank you.

Chairman Dowd

So Attorney Clarke will those be fixed when we go to the Full Board? Do we have to amend anything tonight or just go to the Full Board with a Golden Rod Copy?

Attorney Clarke

Yeah, I think I can, that probably is easiest, I can probably do a Golden Rod Copy for the next Full Board Meeting.

Chairman Dowd

Because it's pretty much a clerical issue.

Attorney Clarke

It is.

Chairman Dowd

I have Alderman O'Brien and then Alderman Clemons.

Alderman O'Brien

Well I was just going to say our job is to look at something different, we aren't part of the negotiations so we can't make changes to the contract. Like maybe if it is an oversight, a clerical issue that perhaps maybe needs to come back to us. I think it can forward to the next Aldermanic, but I think we are on dangerous ice if we make the change.

Chairman Dowd

That's why I was asking the question, I don't if it came across right. It's not a cost item and we have no authority over anything that's not a cost item. Alderman Clemons, did you have something?

Alderman Clemons

Yeah, I was wondering if the reason that it was June 2020 was because this was a retroactive contract?

Attorney Clarke

Hi Ben. I think actually it looks like the June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020 date was actually in the prior contracts, I have it as one of my strikeouts as well. So I think I just put the wrong years in when I was doing the red line.

Alderman Clemons

OK so that contribution already happened then if there was one to be had.

Attorney Clarke

Exactly and actually there wasn't. They didn't spend the \$10,000.00 so we didn't add the extra \$3,000.00.

Chairman Dowd

So I'm guessing if it is a clerical issue, you can just get the Unions to say that change is fine and when we come to the Full Board ...

Attorney Clarke

Yes.

Chairman Dowd

Because, again, the reason I brought up – we can't do an amendment which is what I was trying to get at because it's not an item we have any control over. OK so any other questions concerning the two contracts; and we will read them separately. No? OK, Alderman O'Brien call the roll on R-20-098.

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

Yea:	Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire, Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd	7
Nay:		0

**MOTION CARRIED**

**R-20-099**

- Endorsers:
- Mayor Jim Donchess
  - Alderman Thomas Lopez
  - Alderman Skip Cleaver
  - Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright
  - Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza
  - Alderman Patricia Klee
  - Alderman Richard A. Dowd
  - Alderman Jan Schmidt
  - Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
  - Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
  - Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE AND U.A.W. LOCAL 2322 PROFESSIONAL UNIT FROM JULY 1, 2020 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2024 AND AUTHORIZING RELATED TRANSFERS**

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

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

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd 7

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES - None

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

**R-20-016**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderwoman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**AMENDING THE PURPOSE OF A FISCAL YEAR 2020 UNLIKE ESCROW FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

(tabled at 4-20-20 mtg)

**R-20-017**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderwoman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Skip Cleaver  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$50,000 TO FUND A FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE FUTURE REUSE OF THE ELM STREET MIDDLE SCHOOL BUILDING**

- Requires a Public Hearing which has not yet been scheduled

**R-20-028**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman-at-large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Patricia Klee

**AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF NASHUA TO ENTER INTO A MASTER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH LANSING MELBOURNE GROUP, LLC.**

(re-tabled at 8-12 mtg)

GENERAL DISCUSSION - None

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN

Alderman Schmidt

Mr. Chairman, we have a birthday tomorrow. Michael O'Brien, Sr.'s birthday is tomorrow. So we should all sing Happy Birthday.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Alderman Schmidt I appreciate it. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

I'll notify Nashua Fire Rescue that there may be a lot of flames at that address.

Alderman O'Brien

That has happened before, thank you. Yes.

Chairman Dowd

Congratulations, Mike.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Alderman Dowd.

POSSIBLE NON-PUBLIC SESSION - None

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO ADJOURN BY ROLL CALL**

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

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd 7

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 7:49 p.m.

Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Committee Clerk