

A special meeting of the Board of Aldermen was held Tuesday, April 19, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Acting President James R. Tollner presided; City Clerk Paul R. Bergeron recorded.

Prayer was offered by City Clerk Paul R. Bergeron; Alderman Deane leading in the Pledge to the Flag.

The roll call was taken with 13 members of the Board of Aldermen present - Alderman Vitale, Alderman LaRose, Alderman Gage, Alderman Cardin, Alderman MacLaughlin, Alderman Deane, Alderman Plamondon, Alderman Shaw, Alderman Lozeau, Alderman Dion, Alderman Rootovich, Alderman Johnson; Alderman Bolton and Alderman McCarthy were not in attendance.

His Honor, Acting Mayor Brian S. McCarthy and Corporation Counsel David R. Connell were also in attendance.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DEANE TO AMEND THE AGENDA AFTER UNFINISHED RESOLUTIONS AND ADD PUBLIC COMMENT PRIOR TO ADJOURNMENT

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Rootovich

I support the motion, but I would ask that it be amended to have the public comment prior to unfinished business with any comments relative to R-04-121. If we could hear those comments prior to voting and not after.

Alderman Deane

I would accept that. I would just assume put it in both places in case somebody else came in late.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DEANE TO FURTHER AMEND THE MOTION BY PLACING PUBLIC COMMENT BEFORE UNFINISHED BUSINESS RESOLUTIONS AND IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING UNFINISHED RESOLUTIONS

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman LaRose

I don't see why we should have public comment before or after. We had a public hearing on this and no one showed up. The only person that came, he was late, and we were finished our business. I noticed this evening that there are two people in the audience plus the member from The Telegraph and Dot Nice who is always here watching to make sure we do the right thing.

Alderman Plamondon

I would just assume have before adjournment an amendment for comments of the Board of Aldermen.

Chairman Tollner

In addition to Alderman Deane's?

Alderman Plamondon

In addition.

-

Chairman Tollner

I guess what you are saying is run it like it was like a regular meeting.

Alderman Plamondon

Okay.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. I don't have a problem with comments before or after the vote. I think it is very important that our constituents voice their vote on how they feel. I don't remember it being that well publicized the last public meeting nor the special Board of Aldermen meeting. I had someone call me up today saying they couldn't even find it in the paper. I guess I have to question how well publicized it was just so people would be out here to speak on it. I don't have a problem with the people speaking. Thank you.

Chairman Tollner

If I understand the motion and the amendments to the motion, we are to add public comment after communications? Correct? And then public comment when we are finished the meeting after unfinished business and also add an opportunity for any member of the Board of Aldermen to provide comment at the very end of the meeting. Is that what everybody understands?

MOTION CARRIED

COMMUNICATIONS

-
MOTION BY ALDERMAN SHAW THAT ALL COMMUNICATIONS BE READ BY TITLE ONLY
MOTION CARRIED

From: Acting Mayor Brian S. McCarthy
Re: Veto Resolution R-04-121

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN ROOTOVICH TO ACCEPT AND PLACE ON FILE
MOTION CARRIED**

From: Members of the Board of Aldermen
Re: Special Meeting of the Board of Aldermen

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN ROOTOVICH TO ACCEPT AND PLACE ON FILE
MOTION CARRIED**

From: Members of the Board of Aldermen
Re: Additional Signatures Calling for a Special Board of Aldermen Meeting

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN ROOTOVICH TO ACCEPT AND PLACE ON FILE
MOTION CARRIED**

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Tollner

I there anybody out there that would like to provide public comment? Step up to the mike, state your name and address for the record.

Eric Wilson

Eric Wilson, 12 Adella Drive. It's been 10 years since I've sat on this Board. It takes a lot to get me out to City Hall now with 2 young children. I've been following the actions of the Board, the actions of the City we're spending. Everyone I talk to are quite concerned with the direction of spending that the City is going in. Ten years ago I think the budget was around \$103 - \$104 million. It took 150 years of the City's existence to get it to \$100 million and it has taken less than 10 to double it. It is quite concerning.

With respect to the veto of the resolution that was passed by the Board of Aldermen. Alderman McCarthy I've known you for quite a long time and not directing any particular issues at you, but my reading initially when you took over as Acting Mayor while Mr. Streeter was on vacation you suggested on no uncertain terms that you would take pretty much no action and only if called upon you would take action if needed. By vetoing the legislation, that's certainly not consistent with what you told the voters of the City of Nashua. In addition to that, that was an act, which I don't think in acting capacity as Mayor for a week or two that that was appropriate. I followed the articles. I followed your comments regarding the basis for you vetoing the legislation. Based on what you said, I think you can come to two conclusions. One that you don't trust the fellow board members

that you serve with. Either you are questioning their integrity or ulterior motives; or two, the citizens of Nashua are not sophisticated enough to chart their own future. I think certainly any time we've got legislation then go to the voters of the City. In my mind it would be very hard pressed not to forward that on to the voters. I am very concerned with the way spending in this City has been going on.

Issues that I read with the Board of Education, and I'll be brief. About a month and a half ago there was an article suggesting that the School Board was going to spend \$33,000 or \$34,000 for a search committee to pick a new superintendent. We've got 9 educated people on the Board of Education. I'm not certain on that Board, but I think it is 9. \$35,000 is a lot of money. A couple of people – David and Jim, when we served together I used to always bring this up at the budget meetings. That's my entire street's taxes. Everybody that lives on my street just paid their taxes to pay for a search committee that the School Board, in my estimate, has the power and the intellect to do. You don't need to pay a committee or a search firm in the Midwest \$35,000. When you're talking in millions and millions of dollars it doesn't seem like a lot, but ask somebody that had to pay their taxes. That is quite a bit of money. We're just paying the search firm \$35,000 to pick a superintendent when I think the School Board has the capability, the intellect to do that. Just advertise nationally and they'll be able to go through those things. A couple of weeks later I hear that the superintendent position is going to be bumped from \$125,000 to \$150,000 to \$175,000. Without a blink of an eye, they just apparently passed some type of resolution or approve that they are going to advertise for that position.

The budget we've got these issues with the budget and health care costs. Pretty soon okay we've built these for hundreds of millions of dollars we've built these new schools but we are going slash the budget and slash various aspects of the budget and say these nice new high schools people are going to have to walk to or cut spending for athletics. That is just a knee jerk reaction to get people's dander up. There are a number of areas. You can come up with \$35,000 for a search committee and come up with another \$50,000 in your budget to raise a salary that you did anticipate coming up with, then you've got plenty of money to continue with busing, and you've got plenty of money to continue with sports and extra curricula activities. From somebody that is just sitting back and watching what is going on, I'm very concerned with the amount of spending and deeply concerned with what has happened in the last week. I would urge the Board of Aldermen to send this issue to the voters. It is up to ultimately to decide who sits in these 15 chairs, and it is up to us ultimately to see where our spending goes. I appreciate it. Thank you.

Unidentified Male Speaker

Good evening members of the Board of Aldermen. I hadn't intended on speaking out tonight, but I...

Chairman Tollner

If you could just state your name and address for the record please.

A. David Pierce

I'm A. David Pierce. I live at 13 Manchester Street in Nashua. I'm a native of the City of Nashua. I've been taxes since I was 15 years old (inaudible) property. Now I can no longer afford it because of the overriding of the spending cap consistently because of the interpretation of the law – the spending cap. I strongly recommend that you change it to make sure that you give the voters a chance to speak out once again and there will be no doubt as to what the interpretation of the spending cap law. While it is too late for me, I stand to loose my home. I'm behind on my taxes, and I can no longer afford to live in the City of Nashua. I'm a native and I love Nashua. Please, think about the elderly; think about people on fixed incomes, make sure that this law passes the way it should the original tender the cap by 10 votes and 10 votes only. Thank you.

Chairman Tollner

Thank you. Any further comments?

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN ROOTOVICH TO RECONSIDER R-04-121

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Shaw

Did you call for any nay votes?

Chairman Tollner

I apologize.

MOTION CARRIED

R-04-121 (AMENDED)

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Paula I. Johnson
Alderman-at-Large Robert A. Dion
Alderman-at-Large David Rootovich
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane
Alderman David D. Lozeau

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY CHARTER RELATIVE TO PROVING FOR A VOTE OF AT LEAST TEN (10) ALDERMEN TO EXEMPT ALL OR ANY PART OF PRINCIPLE AND INTEREST PAYMENTS OF ANY MUNICIPAL BOND OR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FROM THE LIMITATION ON BUDGET INCREASE DEFINED IN CHARTER PARAGRAPH 56-C

MOTION BY ALDERMAN JOHNSON TO OVERRIDE THE ACTING MAYOR'S VETO OF R-04-121 BY ROLL CALL

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Johnson

Thank you Mr. Acting President. I was kind of shocked when I got a called from Andrew Nelson last Friday regarding the veto. I never thought in a million years when 12 members of this Board voted to send a piece of legislation to the ballot that I'd ever an acting mayor or even a mayor veto something as important as this. So when I picked up the paper on Saturday and I read City's Acting Mayor takes veto power for a spin, I think a lot of members of this Board really did take a spin. When we don't allow our voters to cast their votes at the polling place – it is okay for them to cast whether or not they want to us in office, but on something this important and I had been at all the time for the spending cap. I feel that our democratic rights is taken away and it becomes more dictatorship now. Our voice is taken away and the voice of the people is taken away. That's not what it is all about. They have the right to vote on this, and they should have the right to vote on it. If the people chose that they don't want an alderman to be here to vote, then they won't accept this and they will vote against it. It is so important for people to be out there voting. We talk about other countries about their election process and what they go through, and then we take a look at us here in this City and we're going to take it away from the people. It is a shame. It is a shame. When I ran for election and I got elected here, I came in here because I wanted to give the people the right and the choice to vote on legislation. It has been a shame that over the years – in the 4 years I've been sitting on this Board, that that spending cap has been overridden year after year after year. The taxes in this City are sky high. So I will hope that my fellow colleagues will join me in casting a yes vote to send this to the ballot so that people have the right to vote on this. Thank you.

Alderman LaRose

Thank you Mr. President. I believe that the Mayor or the Acting Mayor has a right to fulfill his duties. If he feels that this legislation should not pass, he has the right to veto. The rest of us have the right to overturn his veto. I don't believe that the Acting Mayor should be criticized for vetoing this piece of legislation. What we need to discuss is this legislation right. Not that he vetoed it. Is this right for the citizens of Nashua? That's what we should be discussing. Thank you.

Alderman Vitale

I agree with what Alderman LaRose just said. I've looked over this piece of legislation a number of times. I've thought about it on both ways. I'm somewhat of a mixed opinion. On one hand I agree that giving our voters the ability to vote on something has its place. I did vote the other day to send it to be voted. Today I am going to say no to the vote. The reason I do that is because I'm opposed to the way the legislation is. I think there is a couple of circumstances where we would find ourselves not passing something. Just for an example, this is the way I think of it, right now our acting president is acting mayor which if we were voting right now, he would not be voting for

the budget. If there was somebody else out at this time, and we've had people that have been sick recently, that they would also be out. You're not having the same type of discussion among the Board members that you would have if you had the ability to have 15 people here. You could conceivably very easily take 2 people out the next. When you go to look up 10 affirmative votes out of them maybe 13, it is a whole different type of discussion than it would be where you could have 10 out of 15. It makes me (inaudible). I think that a 2/3 vote of the majority of the members here is very reasonable for the citizens of this City. It's not a simple majority. It is 2/3. I think that if you come into a situation that you are looking for 10 affirmative votes and there is a couple of people that have gone not for vacation reasons, but for other reasons, then you can definitely stall our vote on the budget. We've already seen it happen for reasons that were only vacation reasons. I think that is one flaw. There are others that have been mentioned, but that is the one that I can see very reasonably happening. I think it makes the whole discussion about the budget entirely different. That's where I stand on it. Thank you.

Alderman Deane

Thank you. I looked at the current language and it's quite clear to me that 2/3 of 15 is 10. It always has been; it always will be. Although I appreciate some of the examples given by the former speaker, it works both ways. I would not sit here and question any member's integrity of their reasoning behind whether they were here or whether they were not. I think it is up to the citizens to decide what 2/3 of 15 is. Let them vote on it. Thank you.

Alderman Cardin

Thank you. I don't necessarily agree with the legislation, but I do as Alderman Johnson said I do agree with sending it to the voters. I don't see anything wrong with that. I agree with some of the things Alderman Vitale said and certainly what Alderman LaRose said. I think first and foremost I have no problem sending this to the voters. I think the people of this City are wise enough to make the right choices and decisions. They put us here didn't they?

Alderman Plamondon

Thank you, Mr. President. Not to reiterate, but I share a lot of the comments that have already been stated on both sides of the vents. I, too, think the legislation is flawed however I was on the Board as with many of you others when the cap went through and the ruling of counsel then and now a ruling where it takes 10 of us present to vote on the budget. I think that differing opinion should be cleared up and should be done so by the voters and get this resolved once and for all. Therefore, I will support the legislation to go forward in a referendum so that the people can be heard. At some point, I would also like to ask you, Mr. President, to ask through the Acting Mayor if he would like to weigh in on any committee comments as well in the discussion.

Alderman Rootovich

Thank you. The greatest responsibility this Board has to the citizens of Nashua bar none is passing a new school budget every year – far none. It's not about stop signs; it's not about the little

things that we talk about; but it is the budget. It has the greatest impact on the citizens of Nashua. It is their pocketbooks. I don't see anything wrong with the administration and the division directors convincing 10 members of this Board that that budget they put before us is worthy to be passed. I don't buy the argument at all whether there's 13 aldermen here, whether there's 11 aldermen here, or 14 aldermen here. The fact remains that the administration again and the division directors need to convince the members that are here that that budget is worthy of being passed. The budget is not decided on the night that we vote. The budget is decided during the build up, during the committee meetings, during the conferences with the Mayor, during our own discussions with the department heads and division directors. The only reason that I can see why one would want to have 15 members here is because somebody is polling certain people on the phone whether they are going to support the budget or not support the budget. That's not what government is all about. The government is about having whatever members are here to convince the members that are here, which would take 10 votes. Again, being the largest responsibility bar none that we have and being held accountable each and every one of us for what we pass. There is nothing wrong with having 10 members. I support it for that reason, and I also support it overwhelmingly that this decision would be made by the taxpayers. They are the ones that put us in this office. They are the ones that pay the tax bill. They are the ones who should decide whether it takes 10 aldermen. I don't see anything wrong with that, and I support that overwhelmingly.

Chairman Tollner

Thank you Alderman Rootovich. Acting Mayor would you like to comment?

Alderman LaRose

This is a Board of Aldermen meeting. In all due respect to the Acting Mayor, he sent us a notice of veto message. We know what his position is. It is the 15 aldermen or the aldermen that are present to discuss this in the aldermanic forum. The Mayor is not part of the discussion. So as much as I respect the Acting Mayor, I don't think he should be part of the discussion of this piece of legislation.

Alderman Deane

I agree. I'll make a motion not to allow the Acting Mayor to speak.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DEANE NOT TO TAKE COMMENTS FROM THE ACTING MAYOR ON THIS LEGISLATION

Chairman Tollner

Alderman Plamondon, I think you suggested that the Mayor may want to speak. I wasn't sure. I didn't take that as a motion. I'll look over at the Mayor and ask him if he wants to speak. Alderman Deane has put a motion on the floor. So I guess that takes precedent, correct?

Unidentified Male Speaker

The same issue, you're just going to put it in positive or negative form so take a choice.

Chairman Tollner

If I can lean on Alderman LaRose's comments because...

Alderman Plamondon

Point of order.

Chairman Tollner

Yes, Alderman Plamondon.

Alderman Plamondon

I believe there is, in fact, a motion on the floor made by Alderman Johnson to override R-04-121.

Chairman Tollner

Correct.

Alderman Plamondon

In which case there is a motion on the floor already. I don't believe in Robert's Rules you can have two motions at a time.

Alderman Johnson

This is Mason's.

Alderman Plamondon

Mason's Rules, sorry.

Chairman Tollner

I guess the motion on the floor is Alderman Johnson's, correct?

David Connell

That's the main motion. You could have various subsidiary procedural motions. The Chair can invite the Mayor to speak and there'd be an appeal. Then there'd be a vote. You cannot invite the Mayor to speak and move on.

Chairman Tollner

Okay. There's a lot of hands up.

Alderman Deane

I will withdraw my motion and ask that you as Acting President not offer the Acting Mayor an opportunity to speak. Thank you.

Alderman MacLaughlin

Thank you, Mr. President. When I issued a call last week for the Acting Mayor to give us an issue to rally around, this isn't exactly what I had in mind but it will do. Because what it will do is it will reinforce those of us who know that this legislation is appropriate and that it is right. My reasons in support of it are diametrically opposite of the Acting Mayor's reasons for vetoing it. I do not wish to make more spending easy. I wish to make it harder. I hear from taxpayers all across Ward 8 who are fed up with ever rising taxes and evermore spending. We have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. Unless the Acting Mayor was able to address that adequately, and I don't believe he can because I disagree with the veto, I think that was a terrible call on his part. I can read his memo here. I don't need to have a rehash of it. I'm ready to vote. Thank you.

Alderman Gage

Thank you. I would agree with Alderman LaRose and Alderman Deane. First I saw this I read it in The Nashua Telegraph, and this is the first time I've seen the letter. I did have a discussion with the Acting Mayor on the phone. He did apologize for not having this to us. He expected that that would reach us. I was here on Friday afternoon and ran into him but nothing was mentioned. I know where he stands. I know his reasoning. After reading it in The Telegraph and having a discussion with him, I don't think we need to have any further discussion about it from the Mayor's office. Thank you.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. I have no intention of supporting having the Acting Mayor speak tonight. I agree with Alderman Gage. This is the first time I've seen a hard copy of his veto. It all came through electronically. This is our meeting as Alderman LaRose said. This is our meeting. This is where we have the right to make the discussion. He made his point perfectly clear in the memo. I saw the hard copy today. As far as I am concerned, this is around the Board of Aldermen. He's here because he invited to the meeting like the regular Mayor is and his comments have already been given to us. Matter of fact I'm still shocked and appalled by the veto. I guess the stroke of the pen means a lot in this City. Thank you.

-
Alderman Cardin

I'm a little surprised at this. First of all, we added two, not one, two public comment periods. We added a Board of Aldermen comment period, and we don't want to hear from the one person we are here to discuss what went on and that's why we're here. Shame on us.

Alderman Rootovich

Mr. President, I was going to move the question.

Chairman Tollner

Motion on the floor which is a non-debatable motion is to move the question and if I have it down correctly, the question by Alderman Johnson to override the Acting Mayor's veto.

Alderman Plamondon

Could we vote (inaudible) to move the question?

Chairman Tollner

Right. I'm saying but I just want to make sure the Board knows. Move the question so everybody knows what it is.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN ROOTOVICH TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION CARRIED**

MOTION BY ALDERMAN JOHNSON TO OVERRIDE THE ACTING MAYOR'S VETO OF R-04-121 BY ROLL CALL

NAY: Alderman Vitale, Alderman Cardin, Alderman Shaw

YEA: Alderman LaRose, Alderman Gage, Alderman MacLaughlin, Alderman Deane, Alderman Plamondon, Alderman Lozeau, Alderman Dion, Alderman Rootovich, Alderman Johnson, Alderman Tollner

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

ALDERMANIC COMMENT

Alderman Cardin

I don't believe what just happened in here. I am troubled by what is going on with this Board. I think the public is troubled by what is going on with this Board. We can't even maintain a decorum amongst ourselves, and we expect the voters to trust us with the biggest decision – the City budget. I think it is wrong. I think what we just did limiting debate on that was wrong.

Alderman Shaw

I'm quite frankly appalled. I think it is ridiculous for us to put some much effort into asking for public commentary on something like this and we are unwilling to either continue and finish out discussion on this motion in front of us, or to have the Acting Mayor speak to us. I think the amount of things done like this only work against us. This is on top of comments that I saw go back and forth and e-mail about the calling of this meeting speaking to division within this Board and insinuations and characterizations of motivations and not sticking to the facts. The fact is this meeting could be called by the Mayor, by the President of the Board, and quite frankly I disagreed with counsel's opinion about your ability to call the meeting. Also or the majority of this Board. The majority of this Board called this meeting for this override. That was well within our rights and what we should allow to happen. Much like it was the right of the Mayor or the Acting Mayor to cast a veto against this legislation regardless if it had been 14 to nothing or any other number. That was the right of that office. WE are following the procedures and the Charter and those that are in front of us. Whether you like it or not, that's what is possible. It is very upsetting to not have a chance to finish out discussion on this motion. I didn't even have a chance to speak to it at all. I think it is incumbent upon us to at least finish out the discussion. We went to the trouble to call a special meeting of this Board, invited public comment, then went around as much as we could to avoid having the Mayor speak, including one motion made and withdrawn. I think it is appalling. I am absolutely disgusted and quite frankly fed up with the attitude of what I've seen tonight. Thank you.

Alderman Plamondon

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm going to take a different note. The public announcement is not on our agenda. I don't know if it has been published by the doors in City Hall. The Planning Board has called a special meeting to finish last week's agenda this Wednesday night in the auditorium at 7:00. This is important because one of the items left on the agenda was the proposed 7,500 foot methadone clinic in the heart of the City. All those people who came out last week I would ask that they come out and more numbers come out to share their opinions on this for their support or not. It is a very important issue coming up before the people of this City, especially downtown. This Thursday night upstairs in the auditorium at 7:00. I'm sorry, it's Wednesday. Thursday in the auditorium is the non-profit group Nashua DOG, which is our Nashua dog owners group. They are the group that is looking for a dog park. As you know, they have been operating in the City. Currently they are at Bellavance. So anybody interested that's at 7:00 as well. It is open to the public.

Finally, I'd like to extend my deepest condolences to the Rollins family who lost their 17 year old son Saturday to a very debilitating disease. I'll just leave it at that. My condolences to the family. Thank you, Mr. President.

Alderman Rootovich

I made the motion to move the question. I have that right as a member of this Board of Aldermen. It is a legitimate motion. It's in our Mason's Rules. I hope that the members of this Board would respect my ability to make a motion as you pointed Alderman Shaw, Alderman LaRose, and

Alderman McCarthy as Acting Mayor has the right to veto the legislation. I respect that he does have the right. I have the right to make that motion. The majority of this Board then voted on it, and voted to pass the motion. I did nothing wrong. It is a legitimate motion. The majority of this Board passed it, which is exactly what this Board should do – the majority rules. Need some thick skin because sitting on this Board as I have for almost 13 years there were many votes that I didn't like and many times that I was stopped, but I accepted it because I respected the opinion of my Board members.

Alderman Johnson

Thank you. I remember last year when we passed the budget, 2/3 of the people who were present and some people were away on vacation, nobody cared. It was a victory to pass that big budget last year. Now we have another big budget this year. I'm really getting appalled of the fact that we're squawking about the fact that this passed 12 to 2, my legislation, and I thanked the members of my Board that signed on to it became co-sponsors of it. It was off and getting ready to go to the voters for November. Then we get a veto, which was the right, I guess, of the Acting Mayor. But it was the right of this Board to come back and pass it again and let the people of the City have the right to vote on it. I have confidence in the people of this City. I really do. When Alderman Rootovich moved the question, we voted to move the question. I mean we could beat this piece of legislation to death like a dead horse or let's get it where it needs to be in November – on the ballot where the people have the right to vote on it again. Thank you.

Alderman Lozeau

Motion to adjourn.

Chairman Tollner

I'd like to comment. This issue was a very contentious issue. It has been a very contentious issue since the ballot was passed a number of years ago. The reason why I supported putting it before the voters is because I truly think that when that ballot question was approved by the voters, in my mind I think the voters believe that it needed to be 10 members of the Board of Aldermen. A short time after that, based upon the opinion of Corporation Counsel, for the most part for the lack of anything else, that ballot question was changed by the opinion of Corporation Counsel to say their 2/3. I've been on the Board 12 years, and I think Alderman Rootovich, Alderman McCarthy, and I have dealt with this particular ballot question every single year whether it is 10 votes, whether it's 2/3, and it's petitioned, and it goes before the voters. Another reason why it passed is because I do think that the voters should decide whether its 10 aldermen that they want to approve the budget or 2/3. That's I think is the decision that the voters need to make. After they make that decision, every single person that's been involved in this question, that's been a volatile question back and forth, and the time that this Board and the City has spent on it will be done. Until somebody comes up with a brand new ballot question, which very well may happen. At least the dialog that has been going on back and forth between lawyers, Board of Aldermen, all different boards, divisions in this City it will be done and it will be decided by the voters.

With regard to moving the question, everybody around this horseshoe has the right to make that motion. It is a valid motion. I personally, and the reason why I voted against that motion is because this is a significant question and pro or con, I think that everybody should have had some time to provide their own personal comments and opinion. That didn't happen. I guess sitting up here the last couple meetings and dealing with the phone calls that I have had the pleasure to take over the last couple of weeks, this is a divided Board. A very divided Board. I didn't get any e-mails as far as this was the cause of it. I think that the Board of Aldermen was very disappointed in the veto by the Acting Mayor, but that's his right. Then we have an opportunity to call a special Board of Aldermen meeting to override the veto whether it was the Acting Mayor or the real Mayor. That's what we did tonight. We really do have to work together as a Board. I know we have very – and I guess when I said divided, our opinions are divided. Our positions are divided. But the City is going to suffer if we don't try and all work together on both sides of the fence to develop some common ground where we can move forward. My biggest concern, the budget is a huge issue. My biggest concern over the next 3 or 4 months is what this Board may put the City through before we pass a budget. I would hope that we start having some serious dialog as far as major items on the budget so that we can come to, I won't say a quick, but a reasonable time frame where we can wrap this budget up. Make no doubt about it, services are going to suffer. So let's not kid ourselves. We make cuts, the services are going to suffer. But on the flip side, if we were to pass a budget of 9, 10, 11 percent or 12 percent, the taxpayers will suffer too. It is our responsibility to find a common ground that will work for both the taxpayer and the City. I'm glad this meeting is over.

Alderman Deane

I look forward to your presence at the Budget Review Committee meetings. It sounds like you have a lot of exciting ideas and perhaps you can help us. I think the Committee is struggling right now. We would like the input from other members as well. If you have some time, we'd like you all to come to the Budget Review Committee meetings so we can get most of the work done there. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DEANE THAT THE APRIL 19, 2005 SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ALDERMEN BE ADJOURNED
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Attest:

Paul R. Bergeron, City Clerk