

BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE

MARCH 9, 2026

A meeting of the Budget Review Committee was held Monday, March 9, 2026 at 7:30 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber and duly noticed in two places, including the City's website, in accordance with the requirements of RSA 91-A:2 II.

Alderman Richard A. Dowd, Chairman, presided.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance.

Members of Committee present: Alderman Richard A. Dowd, Chairman
 Alderman Tim Sennott, Vice-Chair
 Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
 Alderswoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly
 Alderman-at-Large Alicia Gregg
 Alderman Derek Thibeault
 Alderman Paula Johnson

Members not in Attendance:

Also in Attendance: Alderman Patricia Klee
 Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director
 Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director
 Krystal de Gray, Chief Operating Officer
 Mario Andrade, Superintendent of Schools

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Lisa Fauteux, Director of Public Works
Re: Referral from Board of Aldermen - R-26-007

From: Tim Cummings, Director of Administrative Services
Re: Communication seeking an amendment to R-26-001 & seek a favorable recommendation relative to the approval of 2 CBA agreements

From: Deb Chisholm, Sustainability Department Manager
Re: R-26-012 Relative to the Supplemental Appropriation of \$600,000 of Assigned Fund Balance into Fund #7064 "Hydropower Reserve Fund"

There being no objection, Chairman Dowd accepted the communications and placed them on file.

COMMUNICATIONS REQUIRING FINAL APPROVAL

From: Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director
Re: Arts Commission Spending Recommendation

MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO APPROVE \$30,000 TO ARTS RELATED GRANTS AS OUTLINED IN THE FEBRUARY 3, 2026 MEMO FROM DIRECTOR LIZ HANNUM ON BEHALF OF THE ARTS COMMISSION

ON THE QUESTION

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director. I am the staff liaison for the Arts Commission, and they get an allocation of about \$40,000 every year with the general fund budget, and we're looking for more visibility, and to work with the Aldermen more, and so we are now making recommendations for how to spend the \$40,000 to you for your approval as opposed to just doing things kind of in a vacuum. So we're looking for approval for \$30,000 worth of the \$40,000. So we have not decided what to do with that other \$10,000 yet. That will be tomorrow morning but we're looking to give grants

to local arts organizations for project specific events, and activities, and programming, and you have on the memo is the breakdown of how much is going to each organization, and just so you know that the Arts Commissioners did want me to - they couldn't be here tonight - but they wanted me to say that we had more than twice, I think, there was \$57,000 worth of asks out of the \$30,000 that we allocated to grants. So we know that there is an increasing in need. We normally see a little bit more than what we are allocating but double the amount is new so just so you're aware as we go into this budget cycle what other organizations are seeing.

Chairman Dowd

Okay before we take final approval on this action is there any questions?

Alderman Klee

Thank you. It's not so much questions as it is comment to add to this. I am the alternate liaison to the Arts Commission and last year one of the things that I, or I should say, in calendar year 2025, I asked that they, you know, their approval process and so on that they have to report back, which they do and so on. So they get an update as to how the monies were used, and so on, and that becomes part of the record, and to be very honest with you, I don't see this being all that different than when the Human Affairs gets more asks for the money that we have to allocate out. It's pretty typical.

So my question to them was if they don't get everything that they ask for can they still go forward with the project or are we kind of wasting giving them a grant and the answer was yes. They have another alternative to supplement what we can't give them otherwise, they don't get the money. That's part of the application and so on. It's a very thorough application that they have to fill out and so on. So while I don't get to vote on this Committee, I just wanted to add my voice to it that I think that they've gone through all of the processes and trust me, I questioned them thoroughly and we had a lot of meetings, including with Legal and so on to make sure everything was above board and that we were doing it proper. So thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Any other questions? If none, we'll be voting on final approval of the 30K for the Arts spending recommendations.

MOTION CARRIED

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

Chairman Dowd

If there's no objection, I'm going to delay R-26-001 the collective bargaining agreement until the end of the meeting because the Board of Ed. – the School Department wanted to be here to explain the contract and they have a public hearing on their budget this evening. So they asked if we could take this up last. If they don't show up, we'll wing it.

So we'll go right to R-26-010.

R-26-010

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman Derek Thibeault
Alderman Tim Sennott
Alderman Thomas Lopez
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

INCREASING THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE AMOUNT IN THE SNOW REMOVAL EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND AND MAKING A SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$500,000 OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE INTO THE SNOW REMOVAL EXPENDABLE TRUST FUND

MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE

ON THE QUESTION

Alderwoman Kelly

Thank you. I think Director Fauteux is still here. I had a question but I wanted to hold it til Committee. You were talking about the cost of salt having almost think doubled is what I heard. I know that we started doing the brine. Has that had any effect on our ability to kind of come down and how much salt we can have?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

It has. Brine – the Superintendent is here could probably even speak to this better, but we're somewhat limited on the use of brine, especially this winter. It was a very, very cold winter and brine doesn't work all that well when it's very cold but yes, it absolutely does help to reduce the amount of salt that we utilize.

Alderwoman Kelly

Great.

Chairman Dowd

Any other questions? Seeing none.

MOTION CARRIED

R-26-012

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$600,000 OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE
INTO FUND #7064 "HYDROPOWER RESERVE FUND"**

MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Dowd

All right. I think we heard quite a bit in the public hearing. Are there any additional questions anyone might have? You don't get to ask a question. Just kidding.

Matt Sullivan, Community Development Director

If I may just address Alderman Johnson's question. There's \$450,000 in the account right now. However, we have a contract going to Finance, I believe, at the next meeting and then another contract probably two weeks after that. Together, those contracts are about \$290,000. So we'll have 160 left in the account once that effort's underway. Those contracts are both related to the fish passage project that we've been talking about for a long, long time. So I just wanted to clarify that.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Chairman Dowd

Yep, no problem.

Alderwoman Kelly

Don't sit down. So I read the memo that Director Chisholm. It's not Director. I can't think of her title. (inaudible). She talks about the projects that are happening but she didn't necessarily specify how you came up with the

\$600,000. Like was there a discussion that was had? I didn't see like an actual bid sheet or anything in there.

Matt Sullivan, Community Development Director

Yes, the \$600,000 is actually based on an estimate from Essex Hydro Power who has contracted with Fairbanks, which is a basically a fabricator of turbine blades. But to be clear, the estimate for the piece itself is really more around \$400,000, and then there's labor on top of that, and then there's some contingency built in. That's why I'm suggesting there is some space in there and that will likely lapse back to the fund. So there's certainly space in that \$600,000 but one of the things here is that we actually have to lift the roof off of the facility. So I'm hoping to actually to go down there when they're doing this work and we just don't know what exactly we're going to find once we've been there because it's actually been quite a bit of time before we've been into the full gamut of the facility.

Alderwoman Kelly

Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Therein lies the term "unknown unknown".

Matt Sullivan, Community Development Director

Correct.

Chairman Dowd

And I'm glad we didn't get it right to the penny because then you end up with additional expenses and have no way to spend.

Alderwoman Kelly

Then you have to give it back.

Chairman Dowd

Any additional questions? Seeing none.

MOTION CARRIED

R-26-013

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman-at-Large Alicia Gregg
Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Amber Morgan
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$280,000 OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE INTO DEPARTMENT 168 "SOLID WASTE", ACCOUNT #55520 "NHDES SURCHARGE FEE"

MOTION BY ALDERMAN THIBEAULT TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE

MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES - None

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

MOTION BY ALDERMAN THIBEAULT TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE R-26-003 RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$200,000 OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE INTO DEPARTMENT 194 "CONTINGENCY", ACCOUNT 70100 "GENERAL CONTINGENCY" FOR THE INTENDED PURPOSE OF COVERING EXPENSES TO CLEAN UP MAIN STREET AND THE RIVERFRONT

MOTION CARRIED

R-26-003

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman Derek Thibeault
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderwoman Vengerflutta Smith
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien
Alderman-at-Large Amber Morgan
Alderman Thomas Lopez
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$200,000 OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE INTO DEPARTMENT 194 "CONTINGENCY", ACCOUNT 70100 "GENERAL CONTINGENCY" FOR THE INTENDED PURPOSE OF COVERING EXPENSES TO CLEAN UP MAIN STREET AND THE RIVERFRONT

Alderman Thibeault

I'd like to amend it but I'd like Director Hannum to come up because I have a question about what Dory sent me and I want to make sure it's very clear what we're - what I'm going to try to amend it to.

So at the end of her Resolution that she made up at the bottom, it's covering the expenses related to the cleanup and maintenance of Main Street, the Riverfront, and the Library Walk. Does that Main Street cover those side streets? Because I remember you saying that they would also be doing the side streets but it doesn't say that in what she sent and so we specified - she specified the Riverwalk and Library Walk but didn't specify, you know, the side streets relating to it.

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

Yes. Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director. Yes and I think Director Fauteux is here as well in case we have operational questions. But we have narrowed it a little bit from when I was - then when we were talking about expanding it but side streets are will be included in this as well.

Alderman Thibeault

So when we say Main Street, any side street connected to Main Street up to a certain wherever the points...

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

Yeah...

Alderman Thibeault

You're not going all the way down to South Main Street is what I'm saying.

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

Roughly West Hollis to the Library Hill area.

Alderman Thibeault

Okay. So I'm ready to make the motion then. I'll try to go slow for you, Mike. It's got a few things to it. So I'd like to make the motion relative to the supplemental appropriation of \$15,000 instead of the \$200,000 - I mean, yeah, instead of the \$200,000 of assigned fund balance into Department...

Chairman Dowd

You said 15?

Alderman Thibeault

15 for starters. Yep.

Alderman Klee

We have it in our packet.

Alderman Thibeault

Yep. Oh, it is in the packet? It's in the packet.

Alderman Klee

Yeah.

Alderman Thibeault

I didn't get it on my desk that's why I'm reading it from the - so I'll read it and it's in the packet. There you go. Okay. So relative to the supplemental appropriation of \$15,000 of assigned fund balance into Department 161 - Streets, 51300 Overtime, and \$40,000 of assigned fund balance into Department 177 Parks, Account 51300 - Overtime, for the intended purpose of covering expenses related to the cleanup and maintenance of Main Street, the Riverfront, and the Library Walk, and I'd like to talk to it.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN THIBEAULT TO AMEND R-26-003 TO READ AS FOLLOWS: "RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$15,000 (INSTEAD OF THE \$200,000) OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE INTO DEPARTMENT 161 "STREETS", ACCOUNT 51300 "OVERTIME" AND \$40,000 OF ASSIGNED FUND BALANCE INTO DEPARTMENT 177 "PARKS", ACCOUNT 51300 "OVERTIME" FOR THE INTENDED PURPOSE OF COVERING EXPENSES RELATED TO THE CLEANUP AND MAINTENANCE OF MAIN STREET, THE RIVERFRONT, AND THE LIBRARY WALK"

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Thibeault

So after listening to our meeting last time and hearing the feedback we got, I talked to the Mayor, Director Fauteux, , Director Hannum, and obviously took the input of the advice that people gave here. They were able to tell us that the \$200,000 was really left on there from previous and that at this point, we don't need the whole \$200,000. We could - a slight - and by the time this one actually would get approved because obviously, it's going to need a public hearing again. Cut it down to \$55,000 total. Split between the departments listed, which are different than the departments that were originally listed in the original motion.

And then there's also a memo that was attached that I believe was sent to the Budget Committee. I don't know if you guys received it as well but it was from Director Hannum and it states the following. So it was sent to us on February 17th and the memo was supposed to be part of this. "Following the discussion at the Budget Review Committee meeting on February 12th, 2026, the purpose of this memo was to provide additional information and clarification on R-26-003. We understand there were questions about the legislation's language and the scope of work. After further reviewing the Budget Review Committee's request, our team recommends amending the appropriation from \$200,000 to \$55,000 with an implementation date of April 1st.

Adjusting the implementation schedule to April 1st reduces costs because snow removal at that point won't be necessary. This allocation will cover the services until the end of the fiscal year. Funding for FY2026 will be used for overtime expenses for existing DPW employees at their current overtime rate of pay. DPW estimates a need of \$15,000 for the Street Department and \$40,000 for Parks. The two DPW Departments will determine exact deployment schedules and will be responsible providing the following service." So the scope of work is "pickup of random litter and trash, power washing as needed, graffiti removal services on city-owned infrastructure, monitoring the condition of tree wells, removing trash, feces, and conducting light landscaping therein. Report lights or other public amenities in need of service. Wiping down public furniture and fixtures as needed. Wiping trash receptacle tops and outer surfaces as needed. Disposing of hypodermic needles. Training provided by the Risk Department. Maintain water, fertilize, weed city-owned planting beds to keep planted areas clean, healthy, and thriving throughout the seasons, and leaf removal downtown as needed." So that was by Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director.

So hopefully, we've been more specific. Again, based on - and thank you for the feedback that was given here in the chamber - but hopefully, that's more specific, and has less money, and less months, and remember, voting for it today sends it back to another public hearing, and then back to this Board to then send it - maybe send it to the Board of Aldermen. So, thank you.

Chairman Dowd

If this passes, it will refer to another public hearing, and then go to another Budget meeting, and then go to the full Board. Questions?

Alderman Gregg

Yeah, I just have a question. So it still seems like where exactly are you going to be cleaning? Like because saying okay, well some side streets or whatever. I think we should have like a is there like a definite like this is the grid where you're going to be doing it that we can talk about or because it seems pretty loose just from what you said.

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

Sure. We had originally included a map, but it was a little bit too broad, I think, of a map and so talking with Director Fauteux and Parks, we decided to narrow it down really to Main Street, the side streets, and some of the alleyways, and then the Riverfront as well. So it's really just down Main Street and the side streets,

Alderman Gregg

Like a block or two blocks? Like how far into the side streets?

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

I think we went probably to about Walnut Oval. So it's almost two blocks on the east or the west side of Main Street and then about a block on the east side of Main Street. So not every location will need to be done every day, but that's about the boundary and we are - we wanted to stay flexible too because there might be other hotspot areas that we have missed, or that we want to add in later, or spots within that area that that don't need the support. So we wanted to be a little bit flexible in the actual footprint of it but that is the basic plan is Main Street with the side streets.

Alderman Gregg

Okay.

Chairman Dowd

So assuming this passes, once you expire the funds, you stop.

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

Correct.

Chairman Dowd

Alderman Gregg follow up?

Alderman Gregg

Yes, follow up. So when we first talked about this, I believe it was last fall because it was when I first came on. So there was no snow or anything yet. So why the big difference from \$200,000 to \$55,000 because we weren't talking about snow then either. So what's the - why the big price difference?

Liz Hannum, Economic Development Director

So we - I think there was a misunderstanding on my part because I thought we were talking about snow. So I thought that clean was any type of clean not just trash and things. So we included pretty much a full-time person for that nine months. So now we're down to just three months with no snow and so we're about a quarter of the cost that we thought so.

Chairman Dowd

All set?

Alderman Gregg

Yeah.

Chairman Dowd

Other questions?

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to take a moment just to take Attorney Clarke out of the flow of traffic in case anybody had any qualms with the way the amendments were written. It was actually my handiwork that I submitted to her and she gave the thumbs up too. So appreciate her input on that.

And just to go back to the Library Walk, that was actually included along with language about maintenance versus just cleaning with input in Director Fauteux. But, you know, if there's any qualms with the way that the new language is written, I'll take him.

Chairman Dowd

Okay.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you very much. I remember when we were at the last meeting that was February 12th because that night I wrote you a memo. You know just to kind of because I was all confused in what we were talking about. Nobody had an idea and I just kind of put it into writing just to figure out where we were going with it.

But I have a question, Mr. Chairman to Director Fauteux?

Chairman Dowd

Yes. Okay. Director Fauteux.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. Every year on Main Street doesn't - is it the Parks and Recs or Parks and Recs I think does the planting down there?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

We do. We have done some. Morin's did some as well but yes, we do maintain the planting of the beds.

Alderman Johnson

So why are we transferring it kind of right now into this?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

Well...

Alderman Johnson

Where was the plantings done?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

...so this is a little bit different. So there's a couple of things going on here. The Street Department cleans in the barriers and on Main Street a couple of times a week. So that would cover that portion of what they do. The Parks Department is very short-staffed. We've added the Riverfront. We've added a lot of the Library Walk and we've always maintained some of Main Street. We've always done graffiti removal. We've done pressure washing. We do sweeping, planting beds as you mentioned, trash pickup on Main Street but we really haven't ventured out into the side streets, or the Library Walk, or the Riverfront. So this is something additional that we'll be doing and we're very taxed to begin with. So this will help us to be able to do it.

Now this isn't this isn't a lot of money. I mean we're talking about probably four hours a week of a foreman and three or four people, but this will really help to supplement what we're already doing downtown and then we're hopeful in the next budget that we'll be able to get some additional staff in our Parks Department to do this on street time.

Alderman Johnson

May I have a follow up?

Chairman Dowd

Yes, follow up.

Alderman Johnson

Now do you feel where originally we were talking about Main Street, Riverwalk, and the Library to clear that up at the beginning because we all got confused with the other streets. Do you think by adding West Hollis Street and some of the side street do you think that's going to be too much for your staff?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

I'm concerned, yes. I mean we're going to do the best we can but that's a lot. Yes, it is.

Alderman Johnson

May I do a follow up?

Chairman Dowd

Follow up.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. Do you think that maybe as you start getting into it if you feel that it's going to be too much or you don't need to, you're going to scale back if need be so we don't overtax our - your crew?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

We're going to do the best we can. I think we can do a relatively good job. I don't think everything will need to be done, you know, every day or maybe even every week. So we'll just kind of keep an eye on it and there'll be - there are problematic areas that we know about. West Pearl is one that needs some help. So I think, you know, our focus is going to be Main Street, Riverfront, the Library Walk but we'll do the side streets as best we can. But I think we can do a reasonably good job.

Alderman Johnson

Well I'm sure you can, but it's going to be those side streets will be...

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

But it's a lot.

Alderman Johnson

...more as needed type of thing. That if you see a problem area, you'll get out there but if it's okay, then you won't concentrate on it as much.

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

That's correct, Alderman Johnson. Yes.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you very much.

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

You're welcome.

Alderwoman Kelly

Yeah, actually the question for Director Fauteux, etc. You started to answer it but the question I had when we had this in Committee last was are we planning for this as an ongoing expense because it's not just going to go away?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

Correct. That's correct. So this is as Director Hannum mentioned, this will be April 1st through June 30th this funding and then after that, we're hoping - and we did actually put in our budget two full-time Parks employees to help maintain this throughout the year, and also we have one Parks employee funded through the TIF that we're proposing.

Alderwoman Kelly

Okay, thank you. Can I do a follow up?

Chairman Dowd

Follow up.

Alderwoman Kelly

This may not be for you. I heard needle pickup mentioned. I thought we had a specific like outsourced group of people who do needle pickup.

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

We do. It's a company called Revive. So if we see a large quantity of needles, we'll certainly call Revive and ask them to pick it up. But if we - I anticipate if we see 2, 3, 4, we're going to pick those up because we don't we don't want anybody get injured and we are actually in the process of training our staff now. Parks, I believe, is being trained tomorrow.

Alderwoman Kelly

Thank you.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to add another thought that came to mind. Reference was made to a memo from Director Hannum that I don't believe has made it into the packet or to the full Committee. I was hoping that can be provided to be added to the minutes.

Chairman Dowd

It will be because I was looking for it. I didn't find it either so we'll make sure that that's added.

Alderman Klee

Thank you. Again, more comment than question. When it comes to the side streets considering that we reduce this and we're only looking at April 1st to 6/30, I don't think I would want those side streets to be listed just in case and as was previously spoken by another Alderman, the as needed I think would be more appropriate. So while I do think that West Pearl and even some of the other streets whether it be Factory or so on or there's going to be some issues on those. I would not want it to be so specific to have to list every single side street because then we're tying their feet to the fire, and tying their hands that they have to do it, and I believe we will run out of the \$55,000 really quick.

So as again as I don't get to vote here, I do appreciate the specificity but not so much that we can create an issue. So, thank you.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you, Mr. Chair. So just so we know, when I got the memo on the memo itself in the Word document, it says to Budget Review Committee. So I can't send it to y'all. So that was up to Director Hannum. So sorry about that, that it didn't get. I just assumed it got to everybody but whatever.

And, you know, I just hope when we got million dollar things in front of us, we fight it as hard as we're fighting this \$30,000, \$40,000, whatever it is, \$55,000, whatever. It's such a small dollar amount for something that's going to go to something good in the city downtown, and they probably will run out of the \$55,000, and that's fine, and my question - I got a question to Director Fauteux actually. This overtime - are you forcing people to do this overtime?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

No.

Alderman Thibeault

Okay. So we're not taxing anybody that doesn't want to go out there and do the work, right, because it's overtime?

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

That's correct.

Alderman Thibeault

All right so that's what I'm trying to get at.

Lisa Fauteux, Public Works Director

We the only overtime we can force is snow.

Alderman Thibeault

Right. So I just wanted to make sure that people knew that. You're not forcing people out there. If they're going to take the overtime, and we'll still probably blow through it because I mean people like money like anybody else, and it's probably easier than doing snow that's for sure. So, yeah, I just like I said, I just hope when it comes to budget and we really dig into these thousands, you know, million, \$2 million, \$32 million. I hope we're asking questions because we're asking a lot of questions and doing a lot of work on \$55,000.

Alderman Gregg

Thank you and I respect my colleague and his opinion on, you know, that we're debating this. I think we're asking for clarification because certainly when it comes to the Main Street area, we hear a lot like, "Wait a second, they're doing this sidewalk, not this." We get - I get more questions on that Main Street area, so I think clarification is really helpful in this because otherwise somebody's going to be like, "Well, this didn't happen here and why is it not happening?" So it's not that I'm fighting it. I think it's good but I do think we need clarification and not having the memo in front of us makes a big difference.

Alderman Kelly

I was just going to comment on that as well. That I was happy that we did ask for clarification and something that was going to be \$200,000 is now \$55,000. Big difference.

Chairman Dowd

Alderman Sennott I know you did a lot of work on this so.

Alderman Sennott

I did. Thank you.

No my issue was never with the ticket price. My issue was always with the clarity of the legislation. I thought from the

very start that the legislation was vague. It was incomplete and I think what we have in front of us now is much more concise and much more specific. So I'm happy to support that.

Chairman Dowd

Any additional questions.

Alderman Thibeault

Yeah, I mean I think the original ticket price obviously was also more months because it wasn't going to start till April. It was going to start almost right away.

And yes, the \$200,000 was also snow and so when we say stuff like, "Well, you know, the original ticket price." Well the original ticket price was for different things that were no longer part of this, right? There's no snow pickup. It's not till April. So it's a lot less than now. So that's why it's been amended and I think, I guess you didn't see the memo. That's not my fault. I can't send it to you guys. I can't so per the RSA. So it's very specific. I read it to you guys. It's clearly specific. So I don't think, you know, to Alderman Klee's point, I don't think we can put every single street on there. If they don't go all the way down Temple Street to, you know, West Pearl, to Temple Street, all the way down, there's got to be some boundary somewhere. Again, we can set the boundaries. You have the boundaries north/south but to put every street in there, again, do we want to table it to start putting every street in there that we're going to touch and which parts of the street we're going to touch? They're not going to go all the way down here but we're going to go down here.

I mean now we're starting to get a little crazy. Again, on - this is a pretty simple, simple bill compared to what we're going to see in budget and I'll tell you, we push, push things all the time; \$5 million - everybody's got their hand up. \$5 million - let's go. But we have to - I mean we approved \$600,000 today. We could have cut that down to \$500,000. We could still pay for that turbine easily, and we still had some money in there, and I would have supported that but we all raised our hand and just said, "Go, it's okay." So, \$600,000.

Chairman Dowd

I'm sure that what they're going to do with the money is they're going to identify the worst spots, and the track hit them first, and I'm sure that they'll...

Alderman Thibeault

I want specifics. I want a specific list like I just gave you guys for this \$55,000. I want every single thing that's going to get touched before I vote on it again.

Chairman Dowd

On those spots, there will be specific things that they...

Alderman Thibeault

I'll be voting no next time it comes up.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. We could beat this thing to death, you know. But I'm going to support this and I don't support a lot of with the spending because I feel this is worthwhile. Because I feel that downtown Main Street, we have a lot of homeless people that are going to start coming out again. They're hibernating right now wherever they're going and I have a lot of my constituents wanting to know where they're going to go after April 15th when we close down their warming shelters. So we know the needles are going to start showing up again. I don't want to see anybody in this city get hurt by any. I don't want to see our employees, number one, get stuck by a needle because that's the worst thing that can happen.

I feel it's worthwhile but I'm going to agree with Alderman Klee, and she agreed with me, and the thing is here, the priorities is Main Street, Riverwalk, and the library, and then as needed, the other streets. If they get a complaint, or they go down there, and they just take a quick look, and that's fine. But we have to set priorities because it's only what \$55,000 and it's not going to go a long way but we've got to be prioritizing everything here. I'm the one who's a conservative really on this Board and I voted for that \$600,000 because I felt those turbines were important enough because that's a revenue producing. If you shut down your revenue, it's it weighs out.

So I'm going to support this. I don't want to see any of our Parks and Recs or any of our staff get injured on this. So I'm looking for high precautions into this and I think I said that at the last meeting. I questioned all about the needles. So we have to be very vigilant on this right now, especially where the warm weather is coming and our homeless population is going to start coming back.

Chairman Dowd

Any additional questions? Seeing none.

MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

R-26-001

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman Derek Thibeault
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien
Alderman-at-Large Alicia Gregg
Alderman John Sullivan
Alderman Tim Sennott
Alderman-at-Large Amber Morgan
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

APPROVING THE COST ITEMS OF A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NASHUA BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE NASHUA TEACHERS' UNION, LOCAL 1044, AFT, AFL-CIO, UNIT E, INTERPRETERS FOR THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING AND UNIT F, FAMILY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATORS FROM JULY 1, 2025 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2028

MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE

ON THE QUESTION

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

Hi. Good evening, Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer, School District.

Mario Andrade, Superintendent of Schools

Mario Andrade, Superintendent of Schools.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

All right. So just some, I guess, some historical information. So this is a new collective bargaining unit. All of these employees prior to actually sat in our non-affiliated contract. There's about 32 of them. So they have gone ahead and created a new unit with the combination of both sign language interpreters and family engagement coordinators.

Just a couple things to note. So you'll see that in Fiscal Year '26 - so we'll have to do some retro payments once this is fully executed. But in Fiscal Year '26, it does look a little higher from an overall increase standpoint because one of the population's family engagement coordinators actually did not receive an increase last year because they were starting to unionize. So we did go ahead and mutually agree that they would get a small stipend increase of \$1,250 and then in Fiscal Year '27 and Fiscal Year '28, you're looking slightly right around a 3%, of course not including the benefits piece. And again, there's about 32 of them that are in the unit together. Did I miss anything?

Mario Andrade, Superintendent of Schools

No. Just in general, we really want to thank the NTU, our family engagement coordinators, the 16 employees in that unit. Again, I think we know the importance of building a bridge with our community, and our families, and the family engagement coordinators do a great job in that aspect, and we have 16 sign language interpreters. So that is the total. So it's 16 family engagement coordinators really building that bridge with the community, and 16 sign language interpreters, and sign language interpreters are working. We are - if you don't know, only one of two schools in the State districts in the State that actually offer signs of learning programs pre-K through 12. So we actually, it's a revenue that

comes in. We receive students from other Districts that come to Nashua to be in schools at New Searles, McCarthy Middle School, and in our high school. So we're thankful for both units in the NTU. This was a great negotiations. It's one of those you don't see a new contract come at the beginning or from the start. It's usually a rollover. So I really, again, want to thank the NTU for their collaboration.

There was, I think, you received a memo from us and just there was a - it didn't change the bottom line but there was some change in the language, especially when we were looking at insurance packages. So again, I think I want to thank the city because they actually saw when they were doing the legal review that what we negotiated actually was costing our employees more in insurance. It was a an additional add but again, it didn't impact the bottom line on the insurance from the city side. But I think we're doing right by these employees. So again, just really want to thank the NCU for their collaboration and coming out with this contract.

Chairman Dowd

So first order of business is everybody get a copy. When those changes came through, a goldenrod copy was changed. So I'll make the motion to amend the R-26-001 with the goldenrod copy.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE OF R-26-001 AS AMEND WITH THE GOLDEN ROD COPY
MOTION CARRIED

Chairman Dowd

And just two other things. One, the contract itself was structured from the Paras contract, correct?

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

That is correct. Yeah, the majority of what they utilized was from the Para contract.

Chairman Dowd

Okay. Questions?

Alderwoman Kelly

I will apologize if I missed it in the memo, but I was just I was looking at the most significant change is the benefits here. I had a few questions around that. So question one. The way it's written it makes it seem like you could use any carrier. Are you still using city insurance?

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

Yep, absolutely. So yeah, we're still using city insurance. So where the confusion really came from is if you actually look at the costs that the para educators pay for like a family plan or anything that's not a single plan, it is more of a cost item on the employee versus the employer. So when we move this contract forward to Dr. Andrade's point, the benefits team here at city and the Legal team actually saw that some of these employees - there's about six of them - that would have been impacted by us moving forward with that new benefit, I guess, requirement.

If you look at the benefit language that should be in front of you now, that is the current benefit language that they have in the non-affiliated contract and when we do the costing sheet, there's usually a representation of like it's an aggregate average of who takes benefits. So it's not like we go through and say every single employee - say there's 32 of them, right, it's not like we say okay, there's 50% taking a family plan, and 25% taking a single plan, and vice versa.

Alderwoman Kelly

Follow up?

Chairman Dowd

Follow up.

Alderwoman Kelly

So the other question I had - well I have several more but they're all around this. Previously, we didn't outline specifically co-pays and deductibles and they're in here now. So I'm just surprised that like it seems like it was a little bit more vague so that things could be but this is like to the dollar in here.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

I think I would have to see exactly what you're referring to because I didn't think we were going ahead and putting the exact.

Alderwoman Kelly

On page 15, it says, "the following copays and deductibles below will become effective..." - and this is my other question - on July 1st, 2022. So were we retroactively addressing that in 15 of our goldenrod copy?

Chairman Dowd

Krystal, do you full copy of the?

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

I was going to say, I wonder – so you guys have the most recent one that - can I see what you're looking at? I'm sorry.

Chairman Dowd

Here's the right copy.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

I apologize. I just want to make sure we're talking (inaudible). Yeah, so this is - so I wonder why it says effective July 1 of 2022?

Alderwoman Kelly

You can keep it. I can pull it up on my computer.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

Because it truly should show - this should be effective July 1st of 2025 because we're going to retroactive them. So they're currently included. I bet you they lifted and shifted...

Chairman Dowd

That was a leftover from I'm sure from the paras contract.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

Yeah. So what we're going to have to do with the - so right now the ones that have elected health insurance, they're still being covered. So what we'll do with the benefits team, the suggestion of the city was to go ahead and leave them under the benefits per se under non-affiliated until July 1st of 2026 and then pull them basically out of the benefits into their own union. So the cost should be net neutral. It's almost like you're just moving the money out of non-affiliated and putting it into this new contract.

Alderwoman Kelly

Okay, so it sounds like we need to update that date.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

Yeah, I'll verify the red line...

Alderwoman Kelly

Okay.

Krystal De Gray, Chief Operating Officer

...when we get back.

Chairwoman Kelly

Yeah, that's it.

Chairman Dowd

I believe if that passes tonight, it's going to come up at the meeting tomorrow because we have a time limit. The Union's already given us a favorable delay, so I think it's coming up tomorrow night for final approval so.

Alderman Kelly

Should we make the motion to change that date now or do you want to...

Chairman Dowd

I think we ought to make a motion to further amend the goldenrod copy to change that date. If you could just specify that, they'll pick it up in the minutes.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO FURTHER AMEND THE GOLDENROD COPY TO CHANGE ON PAGE 15 THE FOLLOWING LANGUAGE: "THE FOLLOWING CO-PAYS AND DEDUCTIBLES BELOW WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE ON JULY 1, 2025:"

Alderman Kelly

Okay.

Alderman Klee

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Klee

Can we amend a contract that the Union has approved?

Chairman Dowd

They're amending it. It's changing - it's not amending the contract per se. It's correcting a problem on a date, which is just a clerical. It's not changing any of the terms of the contract.

Alderman Klee

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Klee

While I 100% agree with everything you just said, I just didn't know what the legality of us changing a document that has been approved by the Union whether or not we'd be violating that because we've always been said we could not change

it. So I'm just - I don't want it to go all the way to the Board of Aldermen and then we find out we can't do that so.

Mario Andrade, Superintendent of Schools

If I just may? Can I make a suggestion if we can contact Attorney Bolton for his advice before we make any...

Alderman Kelly

Yeah and just have it by tomorrow.

Chairman Dowd

It can always be brought up tomorrow night with his approval, so.

Mario Andrade, Superintendent of Schools

I can outreach to Mr. Hoffman to make sure it's more clerical.

Alderman Kelly

As a matter of fact, that's (inaudible) thing. We're changing it.

Chairman Dowd

Mr. Hoffman contacted me this afternoon and said that he appreciated this contract and was fine with the contract.

Alderman Kelly

Okay.

Chairman Dowd

Any other questions?

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. I just want to thank the Superintendent for taking my call today and kind of going over all these numbers here earlier today to understand the 5.8%. To me, it's a 6% and I couldn't remember if this was one of the groups that we had to go out and use an agency to kind of fill some of the positions that time because when I was on the Board, there were certain positions we couldn't fill, and so I'm not a big person to vote on contracts as everybody knows but I think this, you know, for the deaf and hearing impaired where we have a hard time securing teachers for them, I think that this contract is a very important contract because it helps out kids who have a disability with hearing and plus we're bringing other kids in from other Districts that help deflate the costs here a little bit. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Any other questions? Seeing none. The motion on the floor is for final recommended the full Board final approval of R-26-001.

Alderman Sennott

Mr. Chair?

Chairman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Sennott

Isn't it to amend with the goldenrod copy?

Alderman Kelly

I already did that.

Alderman Klee

Hmm mm.

Chairman Dowd

I was just going to say that.

Alderman Sennott

I don't know if we took that vote yet.

Alderman Klee

You did.

Chairman Dowd

Yeah, we did.

Alderman Sennott

You made the motion.

Alderwoman Kelly

I think we did.

Alderman Klee

You did not vote on the...

Chairman Dowd

The motion on the floor is to recommend – I'm pretty sure we did - using the goldenrod - approving the goldenrod copy with the changes.

Alderman O'Brien

You did. You did make it.

Chairman Dowd

Yeah.

Alderwoman Kelly

We did that.

Chairman Dowd

It's already been voted on.

Alderman O'Brien

Yeah, he did make it. I have it. Alderman Dowd to recommend passage of R-26-001 with the goldenrod copy.

Alderman Sennott

But did we take a vote?

Alderman O'Brien

That motion passed.

Alderman Sennott

I guess I'll have to watch the video. I don't recall.

Chairman Dowd

You can vote on it again just to be safe. All those in favor of the goldenrod copy.

Alderman Johnson

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Dowd

Is it on the goldenrod copy or something else?

Alderman Johnson

It's on the goldenrod copy. Since that error was brought up by Alderman Kelly for the year the 2022, should we be voting on it with the - to amend it or because there's that error? Because if we vote on that goldenrod copy, we're voting on it with the wrong year and we can't do that because other than that, that means that we're accepting the year and it could hurt us if for the back date on that contract.

Alderwoman Kelly

So I feel comfortable putting the goldenrod copy in for tomorrow. It sounds like we can get a memo to the Board about changing the date because I do agree that there could be some issues. We're not really supposed to tell you what to do with it and don't need you to go back to the table just to change a date.

Chairman Dowd

Yeah, any of the changes we'll work through Corporation Counsel to be sure we do it correctly. So just to be safe, all those in favor of the substituting the goldenrod copy signify by saying "aye". Aye. Opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED

Chairman Dowd

Now the recommended final passage of R-26-001 as amended by the goldenrod copy.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE OF R-26-001 AS AMENDED WITH THE GOLDEN ROD COPY OF AMENDMENTS AND DATE CHANGE ON PAGE 15

MOTION CARRIED (Alderman Johnson opposed)

Chairman Dowd

Thank you. I know you guys have had a long day.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Alderwoman Kelly

I just wanted to know if you have a sense of budget calendar yet and when we're going to start doing that.

Chairman Dowd

Donna Graham is working on the dates as we speak. We should have the Mayor's budget on April 14th.

Alderman Kelly

Okay.

Chairman Dowd

And the meetings will start shortly thereafter, and she's having to contact each one of the Divisions so that there's no conflict on the dates that we bring them in.

Alderman Kelly

Okay, thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to thank Alderman Johnson for supporting something I know she didn't really want to support. I appreciate that and I look forward to working with her on the budget because I think we'll have some good discussions on some of this money that's going out that we really need to scale back on some stuff so. Thank you.

Alderman Johnson

Yes, I just want to thank my colleague for Ward 8. I look forward to working with you too.

Chairman Dowd

Okay if there's nothing else.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting was declared closed at 8:19 p.m.

Alderman Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Committee Clerk