

BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 28, 2005

A meeting of the Budget Review Committee was held Monday, March 28, 2005, at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

Alderman-at-Large Steven A. Bolton, Chair, presided.

Members of Committee present: Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane, Vice-Chair
Alderman David D. Lozeau
Alderman Lori Cardin
Alderman-at-Large Paula I. Johnson
Alderman Robert G. Shaw, Jr.

Members not in Attendance: Alderman David MacLaughlin

Also in attendance: Alderman-at-Large Brian S. McCarthy
Alderman Richard LaRose Alderman
Kathryn D. Vitale
Christine Hagan, Director, H.R., School District
Scott Cote, Board of Education

Alderman Deane

Mr. Chairman I received a phone call from Alderman MacLaughlin. He has some serious water issues in his Ward that he is dealing with. He stated that he will be a little late.

-

COMMUNICATIONS

-

From: Joseph R. Giuliano, Superintendent of Schools
Re: Non-Affiliated Salary Range Adjustments

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DEANE TO ACCEPT AND PLACE ON FILE

-

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Deane

I notice that Christine Hagan is here in the audience. Is this the meeting that she was going to be available to answer some questions or do you want to do this at another time?

Chairman Bolton

This is fine.

Alderman Deane

-

There was an ad in the paper for the Transportation Director position.

Christine Hagan

That is correct.

Alderman Deane

What is that being advertised at the top of the range that you currently have here of the previous ranges?

Christine Hagan

Yes it is the previous ranges, and I believe we put the actual range in there the \$50,000 - \$66,000. We didn't advertise an exact salary.

Alderman Deane

How did you calculate these increases?

Christine Hagan

This is a straight 9% increase with the exception of the Superintendent's salary, which you noticed has not been adjusted. It is the actual high end range so if you look at the Assistant Superintendent and the Business Administrator you see the lower range is the same at \$75,000 – 9% was added to the upper range. That \$95,000 would become \$103,550. That is a 9%. That was 9% added to all of the higher ends of the ranges.

Alderman Deane

What does the 9% represent?

Christine Hagan

Traditionally the Board of Education every year approved a 3% annual increase to the non-affiliated group. At this point, we have 11 employees that are not getting the full 3% because they are at the top of their range. I believe the Board of Education's thought process behind a 9% would be that we could go forward at least through the next two years without having to come back and continually ask the Board of Aldermen for further adjustments.

Alderman Deane

Are there any proposed adjustments in the budget that has been presented – somewhere to account for these proposed increases that you are bringing forward here?

Christine Hagan

Again I can't speak for Mark Conrad, but I believe that there would have been at least a 3% increase. For the past 4 years that I have been employed it has been a standard 3% increase.

Chairman Bolton

I think Scott Cote who is the Chairman of the Board of Education's Budget Committee may have some knowledge of what has been budgeted for.

Scott Cote

-

It has. What has been budgeted for is that traditional standard 3% increase that you normally see throughout that group has been budgeted for.

Alderman Deane

So that is included in this year's budget?

Scott Cote

It is in this year's budget right.

Alderman Deane

Is it in the separate lines or in an adjustment line?

Scott Cote

It is within the – I believe it is salary contingency negotiation. I think all increases get essentially placed in there.

Alderman Deane

The increases will go out as stated in this?

Christine Hagan

No one will get 9%.

Scott Cote

No.

Alderman Deane

No I understand it is over a period of three years. That much I grasp. I am just saying that the – no one is going to get any more than 3%?

Christine Hagan

No one at this point – what we are asking for is the adjustments so that the people that should have received 3% last July can indeed get that increase. We're asking if we can at least get those 11 people where they need to be due to these ranges – the Board of Education as Scott well knows they have the option – they could say 2% on July 1, but again looking back in history – over time I have never seen more than a 3% increase to the non-affiliated rank.

Alderman Deane

Is any of this money retroactive back to the prior year?

Scott Cote

It would be only for those individuals who have bumped into the top of that salary range that haven't gotten an increase back to last July.

Alderman Deane

What is that amount?

Christine Hagan

For the eleven people that would be just - \$15,716. Some of them I should clarify got for example maybe 1%, but we couldn't give them the full 3% because it would have brought them over their range.

Alderman Deane

So it is \$15,716 times 11 employees?

Christine Hagan

No that is the total cost. That is the total cost for those 11 employees.

Alderman Deane

That is 11 employees - \$15,716 will be divided amongst 11 employees right?

Christine Hagan

Right.

Alderman Deane

The way the Board of Education sees fit?

Christine Hagan

Well as per where they are now and how close they were to getting that 3% increase. Some got very close to it. We have one person that would get \$76 to put them at 3%. We have other people that would get \$2,160. It really depends where their last salary was. Again we had to stop. Nobody went over their current range. In order to make that adjustment to give them a full 3% we need to adjust the ranges.

Alderman Deane

In order to do a range adjustment don't you have to go through the process of their PDF and everything? Doesn't that have to be re-calculated when you look at their description? Doesn't that have to go through that process?

Chairman Bolton

I don't think they are changing the job descriptions they are changing – they are just adjusting the dollar amount paid for that great rank basically that grade level and time in, but I don't even think they have that concept among most of these jobs – it is just somewhere between the low and the high and people have bumped up against the high.

Alderman Deane

Thank you.

Alderman Lozeau

May I ask how long it takes to get from a bottom of a range to the top of the range?

Christine Hagan

That would be solely dependent on where you started out as an employee of the district. If we just took the Director of Transportation position that will be open on July 1, that range right now starts at \$50,000 and goes to \$66,000. Depending on someone's years of experience and their education and background they may start at \$50,000 and obviously it would take them many years to get through that cycle. If they are very experienced and they have the education and background that we need the Superintendent has the discretion to start them higher than the \$50,000.

Alderman Lozeau

When they start at a range what drive – is it just time that drives a 3% increase in their salary? Does it include evaluations and things like that?

Christine Hagan

Everybody is evaluated. We do have an evaluation system, but the annual increase percentages are set by the Board of Education. Again if I go back to the Director of Transportation – if we hired someone let's say today to start in that position it is unlikely that they would get a 3% increase in July because they wouldn't have a full year in with the district. Again if they start on July 1 they start at whatever salary they have then a year would go by. Most administrators that are on the non-affiliated wage scale and the budget are also tied into that July 1 timeframe so if there is a turnover in an administration position generally it is out on June 30th starting on July 1.

Alderman Lozeau

An employee that does well on an evaluation can they step – go skip steps during the process?

Christine Hagan

There is currently no defined steps. These are ranges. Again I can tell you the past three years I have not seen higher increases than 3% for non-affiliated ranks with the exception of if we have done a wage adjustment because we reclassified a position. That would be true of some – as an example my Assistant Director of Human Resources – at one time her job was classified as a supervisor – we did a wage study, a job description study, and she was reclassified more than Assistant Director so that moved her up. That type of thing does happen.

Alderman Lozeau

On the other end, if someone does badly on an evaluation do they not get a percentage increase?

Christine Hagan

I have to this day not seen all of the evaluations – I guess I should clarify – the evaluations that I see are not directly tied into what the Board gives for annual percentage increases. I have never seen anything lower than 3% although I have seen people put on maybe what we call a plan or a mediation where it is delayed – they get zero now and if they show improvement within the next 6 months then at that time they get their increase. I have seen that.

Alderman Lozeau

Thank you.

Alderman Johnson

Which are the 11 non-affiliated employees who did not get the increase?

Christine Hagan

That would be Systems Administrator, ICS Specialist – that is a curriculum specialist, I have another Systems Administrator, an Assistant Systems Administrator, one Headmaster, two food service Site Coordinators, our adult & Community Education Director, another Curriculum Specialist and the two Assistant Superintendents.

Alderman Johnson

Do all of these people get healthcare coverage do you happen to know?

Christine Hagan

To be honest with you I don't know if they all take it, but it is sure all offered to them because they fall within the non-affiliated ranks.

Alderman Johnson

The number of reclassifications over the last three years? If you want to if you don't have it on you, you can just e-mail it and to the rest of the Board. IF you can e-mail me the 11 affiliated so I can go through that again.

Christine Hagan

Sure. The reclassifications wouldn't have been done without the approval of the Board of Aldermen. We did come to this Board and those reclassifications were approved. I can certainly send those to you again.

Alderman Johnson

Could you because this is like a year behind.

Christine Hagan

This was back in the fall of probably 2003 was the last time we came to this Board.

Alderman Johnson

If you could just e-mail it that would be fine.

Chairman Bolton

Just to clarify – what we are discussing now is 100% unaffiliated groups so none of these positions are part of any bargaining unit that is union represented.

Is there any further discussion? The motion as made was to accept the communication and to place it on file. Obviously the Board of Education is seeking approval of the new salary ranges that they have set forth here. We can do that. We don't have to do it. The motion currently does not do it. Right now the motion before us is to accept and place on file. Is there any further discussion?

MOTION CARRIED

DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS

Great American Downtown

Review & Comment Annual Allot (505)

Why don't we just say money?

Alderman Deane

What if somebody was to give us a piece of land?

Chairman Bolton

Money or other things of value?

Alderman Deane

This is a very – I didn't make it this way our legal team on the third floor did. When I asked for a simple explanation of the use of funds from an expendable trust fund I got a 15-minute dialogue on the dictionary. By the time he was done I had to go back to the yes or no question.

Chairman Bolton

What are they suggesting up there? They wrote it this way.

Alderman Deane

I know they did, but if the circumstances come up where you want to use this money for another purpose it has to be accepted in a certain manner. That is my understanding. It has to be accepted as a gift in order to file legislation to take it back out and use it in another area such as they want to do with Tinker Road – it has to be accepted as a gift not a donation or contribution. That is the way it was explained to me.

Chairman Bolton

Isn't what is really going to happen is that people as a condition of their Planning Board approval of something or other are going to be told that you are going to put so much money into this fund and you will get your site plan for your department store up there on Amherst Street? I don't know that gift or donation..

Alderman Deane

Would extortion be more ...

Chairman Bolton

You can say there is a nexus there that they will create a demand for fire services, and therefore they will pay a fair share of what the costs of those fire services are.

Alderman McCarthy

I was going to comment that property would probably in fact be handled entirely differently than the trust fund would. Your suggestion of money may be the ...

Chairman Bolton

We get property we can put it somewhere else rather than in this fund.

Alderman Lozeau

I am wondering are we talking about voluntary contributions or are we talking about impact fees?

Alderman LaRose

Voluntary contributions. An impact fee would be throughout the city, and that is not what I am trying to establish. The reason I am trying to establish this – we all know that we need a firehouse in the Amherst Street area. We do have a piece of land that is owned by the Fire Department although at this point in time it is being used as a play area, but it is still under the jurisdiction of the Fire Department. One of the reasons that I didn't specifically state Thornton Road for the fire house was that I didn't want to get into the problems that we may have if for some reason the Fire Department happens to be able to get a more suitable piece of land on Amherst Street or whatever. The other reason that I brought this forward was that – I don't know if we are all aware but some of us are aware that the State of New Hampshire is going to be widening Amherst Street/101 A from Southwest Parkway to the Merrimack town line, and that the city is being asked to manage the project. There is legislation that should be coming in front of us to affect that.

That being said, we know that the widening of Amherst Street is going to be taken care of and there are a few major spots that can be developed along Amherst Street specifically in the Trafalgar Square area, along the Southwest Parkway and a couple of spots on Amherst Street. I just thought that it would be time for us to see if we can get some voluntary contributions from developers towards a fire house since previous developers have contributed towards the roadway of Amherst Street and some of the things have happened with their funds and there is still some money left in escrow for doing things on Amherst Street. That is why I brought this in. I don't know if changing the word contribution to donations makes much of a difference because as Alderman Deane said we are trying to get some monies from the Amherst Street trust fund to do the Tinker Road – the city has sent a letter to Target asking if we could use some of those funds and Target answered yes they would be amenable for us to transfer monies to the Tinker Road. There should be a resolution coming in to try to do exactly that.

My gut feeling is that I don't expect monies as contributed towards the fire station to go for some other project. I don't think it is probably. Is it possible? Anything is possible. That would happen in the future. I would have to assume that as we know the cost of building a fire station would not be – it would not be inexpensive. I would assume that any monies that we would receive as

contribution would not cover the full cost of a firehouse in that area.

Alderman Deane

My concern with these expendable trust funds is now we have the administration writing letters to the developers to redirect the funds that we told them were needed for other purposes. I don't know how the State feels about spending tens of millions of dollars on the Amherst Street corridor when we are sitting on money that was taken for impacts to that area that these developers were told were going to happen – the wear and tear on that area that was also going to happen due to the fact that they were being granted a permit to build whatever they were in front of the Planning Board for. Currently the Amherst Street trust account has \$486,000 in it. My biggest problem with that was that the Public Works Department was in looking for \$350,000 of it when in turn they sat there and said they only needed \$60,000 to do the project. I don't know why they needed an additional \$290,000. That is when I had questioned the Mayor about that because they were ready to transfer the funds and do what they felt was appropriate. I thought it was inappropriate.

It turned out that legislation has to be filed in order to move those funds out of that expendable trust account for another purpose whereas all we would have to do here would be to write to the developers tell them we weren't going to build a fire station, get their approval, and move the funds elsewhere. That is another issue that I think really has to be looked at because once we retain those funds from the developers and we file legislation and it is signed into law and the money is put into an account we now own the funds. I don't think it is a good business practice to tell people you need money for one thing and turn around and spend it on something else, which is basically what we are doing. I didn't want the administration to set precedence by doing that. If funds are needed for something then that is fine, but to take them, sit on them, and use them for other purposes. Low and behold I think we were lucky that the State was going to come through and do all of that work on Amherst Street. I guess the administration feels that the funds are no longer needed for any work on Amherst Street because of the project that the State is putting forward. The language could be a problem. That is all I am telling you.

Alderman Shaw

I appreciate the point that Alderman Deane is making, but I think Alderman LaRose helped clarify it that at least in this case I think the only intent would be that it would be to be used for a fire station, and that we really shouldn't need to allow for the possibility of the monies going to something else and being redirected. I think if I understood everything regarding the definitions and that part of the discussion I would say it seems to be perfectly acceptable to leave the language here as contribution, and that the intention and the only intention ever would be for this to be funding that fire station. Again I think as Alderman LaRose explained it is not broad enough even to allow for the possibility if it is a different piece of land then that ... **tape flipped** ... paid for perhaps as we go forward and continue to perhaps see more of these expendable trust funds that language is going to be important or that we have things pretty much understood in terms of the way they define what categories they go to. Thank you.

Alderman Johnson

I understand both point of views here, but if we are going to assume that people in the near future might not try to use this money for other purposes. The wording really should be put in here to be used only for in this instance because I look and see what is happening now – money that is appropriated for one type of project should stay for that type of project and should not be expended to anything else. You never know what is going to happen in the near future. We in this City are so fast to move sometimes money around that we forget if an emergency arises we have to scramble then for money. I am not really comfortable leaving an open door policy in legislation because I don't feel it is right to be able to start moving money that is appropriated for one project into another project. Thank you.

Alderman LaRose

Let's be clear. We are not taking monies from one project and sending it to another without the consent of the donor. The donor understands what we are using that money for. It is another road project. It is not something that is not germane to a road project on Amherst Street. Some of the reasons that we are using it is to help alleviate some of the traffic on Amherst Street, which would give people in that area access to the turnpike without going to Amherst Street and access to other businesses. Let's not kid ourselves that other businesses aren't going to benefit from this. I believe that we're probably better off to leave the word contributions. As I said I don't expect the monies for the fire station to go anywhere else. If something should happen and someone in the future has a plan that is similar to this and they believe that they could use some of this money the donor has to give them permission just like we had to get permission to use the money for Amherst Street. Had they said no we donated that money for Amherst exclusively we wouldn't be using that money. I think there is a safeguard by using this word contribution.

Chairman Bolton

We are getting a little far up field of the actual resolution that is in front of us. That being said...

Alderman Deane

I am all set. When the new legislation comes in to take money to use it for another purpose that is when we will have this discussion. Thank you.

Alderman Johnson

I would like to amend this legislation to have it say establishing an expendable trust fund for accepting contributions from developers and others solely for a fire station planned to serve the Amherst Street corridor and other northerly portions of the city

MOTION BY ALDERMAN JOHNSON TO AMEND R-05-190 BY INSERTING THE WORD “SOLELY” BEFORE THE WORDS “FOR A FIRE STATION”

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Bolton

Let me point out Alderman Johnson you are reading the title. If you want to make an amendment that will have any force of law you ought to be amending the body because that is what counts. I don't have that in front of me and I don't know if you do. Before we willy nilly go amending things that we are not even reading I think that we ought to consider what we are doing. That having been said what do you want to do?

Alderman Johnson

Does anybody have a copy of the legislation?

Chairman Bolton

I will tell you it is not necessary to do that. Doing that does not make it any less subject to a vote of the Board in future years changing it.

Alderman Deane

Absolutely.

Alderman Johnson

Then I will withdraw it that is all. I am not going to sit here and hassle about it. I am just sick and tired. I am just going to make my comments. I am sick and tired of moving money from one place to the other to serve people's needs in this city. I will discuss that when that piece of legislation comes down also.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Chairman Bolton

The motion is to recommend final passage of R-05-190. If there is no further discussion...

MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES - None

-

HELD IN COMMITTEE

Resolutions

R-04-163

Endorsers: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter

Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane

AGREEING TO WAIVE COLLECTION OF THE SUM OF \$56,705.50 FOR LABOR AND MATERIALS PROVIDED BY THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC WORKS TO THE CONWAY ARENA PROJECT IN EXCHANGE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW LOCKER ROOM AT CONWAY ARENA VALUED AT \$62,825 FOR THE USE OF THE NASHUA NORTH HIGH SCHOOL HOCKEY TEAM

R-05-184

Endorser: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter

RELATIVE TO THE ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2006 PROPOSED BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF NASHUA GENERAL AND ENTERPRISE FUNDS

R-05-185

Endorser: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter

ESTABLISHING THE USE OF UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE FOR TAX RATE

Ordinances

O-04-45

Endorser: Alderman Marc W. Plamondon

REQUIRING THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT TO CHARGE A

FEE TO NON-RESIDENTS FOR RESERVATION OF CITY-OWNED PARKS AND

SPORT FIELDS

O-05-76

Endorser: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter

RELATIVE TO DISCONTINUING THE SCHOOL BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION

CAPITAL RESERVE FUND

O-05-77

Endorser: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter

ESTABLISHING A NEW "SCHOOL BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION, ADDITIONS AND RENOVATIONS CAPITAL RESERVE FUND"

-
DISCUSSION

-
Alderman Deane

I had sent an e-mail out requesting that Maureen Lemieux appear before us. You had stated that she would be here on the 30th.

Chairman Bolton

To talk about the healthcare costs yes.

Alderman Deane

I also had mentioned the – what their plan was – their comprehensive budget strategy, and now things have changed dramatically from when they first submitted this budget. Is she going to be prepared to discuss the two ordinances that they brought forward along with R-05-185?

Chairman Bolton

I will ask her to be prepared to discuss all three of those when she is here on Wednesday.

Alderman Deane

I never...

Chairman Bolton

I will ask the Mayor to come as well.

Alderman Deane

She never responded to the e-mail that I sent and neither did the Mayor.

Alderman Johnson

I might not be here on Wednesday or Thursday night. I am just going to let everybody know because from the votes that will be going on in Concord regarding HB616 – the education funding. Although it is very important for me to be down here I think it is just as important for me to cast my vote that will have a lot of benefits or lack thereof if we lose money in this city. I am just letting everybody know. I am hoping when Dawn hears this that I can get some type of minutes from Wednesday and Thursday's meetings so I will have something to review.

I just want to say that with the Mayor's proposed budget – what he gave us and the issues that have arisen from it, my feeling is that I think that we should send the budget back to the Mayor and let him recalculate his figures and send it back to us when everything is put back into the budget that way it is. I think it was a sloppy mess what happened here. I don't think it was right that the Mayor sat here with Mrs. Lemieux and Mrs. Anderson, we go through his department presentation, he gets up and leaves, and then we are left with this mess on healthcare – the shortfall. I don't think it was right what he did. I think he should have sat here and told us what went on rather than leaving it to these fine ladies who are getting the brunt of it right now.

My feeling is I think this budget should go back to him, let him sit down with the budget again, and send us a budget that really reflects the numbers that were supposed to be in the budget rather

than sending it to us and leaving information out and saying to us figure it our Aldermen. That is just my opinion. I just wanted it on the record because in case I am not here everybody understands what I feel. Thank you.

Alderman Lozeau

Mr. Fredette handed out a spreadsheet tonight. Can I assume that is the recommendations of the Review & Comment?

Chairman Bolton

Yes.

Alderman Lozeau

Thank you.

Alderman Shaw

I guess I would like to raise another general topic at least similar to -- what we received last year and had discussion about, but I don't believe I have seen anything that aligns with this, and that is information regarding projections for the next 5-7 fiscal years out. Last year we had a lot of opportunity at least to be trying to look at what happened beyond FY '05 where we -- increases we at least expected or could project. While this year obviously has proven to be quite challenging I still think the more we have some sense of where this budget might put us in terms of the set up for the FY '07 and out, I would at least like to request that we get some similar information like that from the administration again that might help us in the context of our discussions. Again, I don't know if I have missed previous discussion about that or if it is something that still might be forthcoming, but I do think it is hard often times to get out of what we are looking at for the current year. If you Mr. Chairman can help us in getting that request or I can just make that request directly.

Chairman Bolton

I will be talking to Mrs. Lemieux, and I can ask her if they have that available in a similar format to last year. I think they probably do.

Alderman Shaw

Thank you.

Alderman Deane

I have a copy of that if you could like one.

Alderman Shaw

You mean last year's or a current one?

Alderman Deane

This was done on 3-9-05. I am sure there has to be some updating to it, but it goes out through projections right out through FY '13. I know Mrs. Lemieux has to do a little updating to it, but I can get you a copy if you would like.

Alderman Shaw

Thank you.

Chairman Bolton

I had sent an e-mail to all of you and in fact the whole Board I think on Friday raising what – where President McCarthy had sent out back in November about how we expected all of the Division Directors and Department Heads to be here while we are doing these what we term the wrap-up sessions of the budget – essentially what we would expect to begin Wednesday and continue until the committee has come to some point where it is forwarding something on to the full Board. I think I recognize that is quite a lot to be asking of all of these people given the situation we are currently in, and frankly I don't know that the end of this committee's work is in sight yet. I wanted to get a sense from all of you – do we expect to have someone here from each and every department and agency that we may act upon at any given time? The alternative would be if a question arises, if someone remembers the Police Chief saying one

thing and someone else remembers him saying something else that we do not just go ahead and act, but we either submit a question to be responded to in writing or ask that someone from the Police Department be here at the next meeting or 1, 2, or 3 days hence. I think in fairness, one of the problems is if we don't have people here and we just act on these things out of – well I remember what I heard and that allows me to make the motion to cut so I am voting to cut as opposed to getting the answer when there is a true disagreement on what the impact will be. Of course a majority of the committee can do anything a majority wants any day it wants, but those are the advantages and disadvantages of having people here to ask questions at a moment's notice. Does anyone have any thoughts on this subject?

Alderman Cardin

I think it is a lot to expect people to sit here hours on end and possibly not have any questions for them at all. I think in all fairness to the department heads I think in the form of a written question and response for the next meeting is fine. I think it has worked in the past and I don't see why it wouldn't continue to work.

If there is something that we can't agree upon maybe we could invite them to the next meeting for clarification if it is not something that we want to get in writing. I think for the most part to expect people to sit here for hours on end and possibly not have any questions for them is a little unreasonable.

Alderman Deane

I can say this much – I agree with Alderman Cardin. Quite frankly I think once we get done with our review on Wednesday from Mrs. Lemieux we will be looking at the tune of 13-14% increase in the tax rate. We will have to be doing something. I understand there are tough decisions to make that are going to have to be made, and I am not going to be sitting here hemming and hawing with department heads. We have to do what we have to do. Motions will be put up on the table and will either go up or down and yes there are going to be significant impacts. We discussed some of this the other evening. Let's not fool ourselves some of this budget has to be cut. We are left to do it because the administration couldn't. It is unfortunate, but that is how I see things going. If it gets to a point where people want to have further discussion with department heads and bring people in then that is fine, but I don't want to turn this – I would like to turn this over to the full Board as soon as possible and allow the rest of the Board to do what they see fit with some of this.

Alderman McCarthy had sent a letter out. If there are other members of the Board that want to come too I will gladly make whatever motions through my committee membership that they want

to do. I would like to get more members of the Board here to start getting involved in this budget because we have a lot of work to do on this. As Alderman Bolton said Thursday is not the last day. We are going to be here for quite some time I think. As far as sitting here with department heads night after night or having them sitting here I agree with you I don't want to do that.

Alderman Shaw

I also agree. I think it would be burdensome. I don't think it would be very efficient for the majority of the department heads to be here on an ongoing basis. I think we certainly would have opportunity to – if there is potentially disagreement based on information each of us brings here, we certainly have the opportunity to follow up with a respective division and can always reconsider whatever action we took or not. I guess I think it is also probably wise on our part if we do have outstanding questions that we do try to basically work the dialogue either in advance of meetings where we realize that maybe we didn't get all the information or ask the right question through some of the process we have been through already whereas other things might come up. If the opportunity presents itself where we think it would be reasonable to maybe have a session where we pretty much ask the majority or all of the departments to come back in and be available or given a night or two that is perhaps also something we can do. I guess if we can be a little bit flexible as well as how we work communications to get the information from the various departments I think hopefully we can avoid essentially wasting a lot of people's time that might sit here and not be able to contribute or take anything from the meeting.

Alderman Lozeau

I agree. Most of the department heads have already been grilled. If we feel strongly about something or we have a question we should direct that question to the department head and expect a response in a reasonable amount of time. I would definitely not ask department heads to show up here every night. Thank you.

Alderman Johnson

I don't think so either. They are just basically an e-mail away. As we are asking questions and if we have any questions that we need answered Dawn can just send them an e-mail or Sue can and ask them to please respond by our next meeting. If we have another question and it is not answered 100% then I think that is the time to bring them in. I think there is a lot of work that really needs to be done on this budget this year. I for one think I will have to bring a bed in here and sleep here. The meetings might go late for us, but I don't think it is right to bring them in for

the late hours.

Alderman McCarthy

I think having sat through what we have gone through in the process so far this committee needs a substantial amount of time to look at the budget on its own. I agree with Alderman Deane that there will be things that the committee undoubtedly wants to discuss. I think the issue with the Division Directors was my recollection of last year's process is I think somewhat keener than my recollection of some of the discussions were when we had it. We came to a number of places in wrap-up where there was a motion made and there were several different recollections of what the item under discussion was, none of them correct in many cases. I guess what I would caution us to do is basically – I think it is incumbent on us in some of those things to put off taking action until we actually can have a discussion with the Director about those. I think there will be a tremendous number of items that want to be discussed by the Budget Committee alone.

Chairman Bolton

Is there anything further that we can do this evening?

ADJOURNMENT

-
MOTION BY ALDERMAN CARDIN TO ADJOURN
MOTION CARRIED

The meeting was declared closed at 8:22 p.m.

-
Alderman-at-Large Paula I. Johnson
Committee Clerk
-