

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

June 4, 2001

6:00 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

Mayor Baines called for the Pledge of Allegiance.

A moment of silent prayer was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Levasseur, Sysyn, Clancy, O'Neil, Lopez, Shea, Vaillancourt, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault and Hirschmann

Absent: Aldermen Gatsas, Pinard

TABLED ITEMS

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to remove Item 4 from the table.

4. Discussion relative to Employee Healthcare Coverage for FY2002.
(Tabled 05/23/01)

Alderman Levasseur moved to keep the employee healthcare coverage that currently exists. Alderman Lopez duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked are you on Item 4.

Mayor Baines stated we are on the Finance Committee agenda.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried. Note: Alderman Wihby was not present for the vote on this item.

Alderman Pariseau asked could you clarify what we just did.

Mayor Baines answered we voted to keep the same arrangement with Anthem Blue Cross.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to remove Item 5 from the table.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to read the resolution by title only and it was so done.

5. Appropriating Resolution:

"A Resolution appropriating the sum of \$3,751,196 from Recreation User Charges to the Recreation Division for Fiscal Year 2002."
(Tabled 5/14/01)

Alderman Wihby stated one of the things that we received today...the actuarial report for Health, it says that in the Parks & Recreation reserve they should have an additional \$10,000 so I would like to move to amend the number to \$3,761,196. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I just want to clarify that the motion on the floor will now be to recommend that the resolution ought to pass and layover as amended.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted that the resolution ought to pass and layover as amended.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to remove Item 6 from the table.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Wihby, it was voted to read the resolution by title and it was so done.

6. Appropriating Resolution:

"A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester Aggregation Program the sum of \$758,516 from Aggregation Fees for the Fiscal Year 2002."
(Tabled 5/8/01)

Alderman Wihby moved that this resolution ought to pass and layover with the directive that it does not exceed \$100,000 and that we take the program, put the person under Finance and use an open position in Finance to have a 50/50 salary share. Whenever they work for Finance they will be paid out of the Finance

Department and when they work for Aggregation they will be paid out of Aggregation money but they can't exceed the \$100,000. We also wouldn't have to spend the \$1.6 million if we don't approve Aggregation in this year's budget. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated my question is what happens to the second person. There are two people in Aggregation. Is that not going to be a position anymore? I don't have a problem with that but is that what we are doing?

Alderman Wihby replied all I can say is that the \$100,000 won't cover two people nor do we need the two people. Highway might be able to use the person.

Alderman Levasseur asked the \$758,516, would that be reduced to \$100,000 or how does that work.

Mayor Baines answered it would be a directive that they can spend no more than \$100,000.

Alderman Levasseur asked so what happens to the \$658,516.

Alderman Wihby stated they would only be able to spend \$100,000.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated you are appropriating \$758,516 but only letting them spend \$100,000. So what happens to the \$658,516?

Mayor Baines replied it doesn't get spent.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked does it sit there and draw interest.

Alderman Wihby answered they can't spend it.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked what is the purpose of doing this.

Alderman Wihby stated if we stop Aggregation all together we will have to put \$1.7 million into our budget this year. If we keep something going in Aggregation in anticipation of something happening in the future...we don't want to spend \$768,516 and get deeper and deeper into spending so if we limit it to the \$100,000 that they can spend in Aggregation knowing that it is not even going to be that because half of the time she is going to be working in Finance. We can keep the Aggregation Program going and not spend the \$1.7 million and have something in place if something opens up in the next two years.

Mayor Baines stated it leaves it alive with the hope of regaining some of that money down the line.

Alderman Cashin asked is it conceivable that she might not even spend the \$100,000.

Alderman Wihby answered yes.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I was under the impression that we had to arrive upon some formula for phasing this out over a number of years.

Mayor Baines asked Mr. Clougherty to explain the financial part of this and why it makes sense.

Mr. Clougherty stated the \$1.6 million can be made up in one of two ways. You can either have the program actually operate and save dollars and have it work that way which you are keeping your option to do or you are going to have to absorb that through an appropriation or through your fund balance. This is the least impact on this year's budget and future budgets and it gives us time to deal with the whole issue of deregulation.

Alderman Shea asked, Kevin, will we be faced with the same concerns next year or will there be some kind of an adjustment made so that some how or other we are not saddled with the same problem in the year 2003 budget as we are in 2002.

Mr. Clougherty answered I think what we have to do is watch what is happening with deregulation and hopefully the action at the state will allow us to get the program running and eat into that deficit and be able to deal with it over the next couple of years.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I wasn't in favor of this four years ago and I am still not in favor of it. I don't know, Alderman Wihby, why this person has to go into the Finance Department. We have safety managers going into departments because we don't know where to put them. We have negotiators in departments because we don't know where to put them and now we have Aggregation people and because we don't know where to put them they are going into the Finance Department. A lot of deals are made by this Board and not a lot of thought goes into them. I don't like this. It stinks. I am not picking on anybody in particular but I am just saying that everyone tries to wiggle and find a way out of their problems and the hole has been dug for the past few years and now we have to keep an employee on just because we can't bite the bullet. How long is this employee going to stay on?

Alderman Cashin stated to try to answer Alderman Hirschmann's question, you can bite the bullet if you want to. All you have to do is pick up the tab for \$1.7 million.

Alderman Hirschmann replied I told you four years ago you were digging a hole.

Alderman Cashin responded you and I both agreed on that. I voted against Aggregation the way you did but we are here now so let's just go from here.

Alderman Hirschmann asked so this person is going to go into Finance and someone from Finance is going to supervise this person and make sure that they are doing some work.

Mayor Baines answered yes.

Alderman Cashin stated I just want to clarify that I worked with Alderman Wihby on this budget and we spent some time today on this and there have been no deals made.

Alderman Hirschmann replied then leave the person in the department they are in.

Alderman Cashin stated there won't be a place for her. She can't stay in Highway.

Alderman Hirschmann asked why.

Alderman Cashin answered because we are trying to take a half a position that is already in Finance to help Finance.

Alderman Hirschmann replied then tell the truth and tell everybody that.

Alderman Cashin responded that is what he told you. I thought you understood that.

Mayor Baines stated I would agree. This is something that we have worked on and come to a consensus that this is the proper way to deal with a situation that I wish we weren't in as well.

Alderman O'Neil stated my understanding is not to save positions for future consideration but it is to start phasing out of Aggregation. It has nothing to do with keeping the positions alive for the future. The intent, I hope, is we are moving out of Aggregation and phasing out of it as opposed to biting the bullet in one year. Am I correct with that?

Mayor Baines replied you are absolutely correct on that.

Alderman Clancy stated we have \$758,516 here. Are we going to recover any of that money?

Mr. Clougherty replied you are not appropriating \$758,516. You would only have the \$100,000 to begin with. Also if you go beyond \$100,000 then we would have to come back to the Board to spend that. That has to be clear. We can't go above the \$100,000 even though the resolution is higher. If the program does start to develop income then that is a plus and you will have that deficit reduced the way it was originally intended.

Alderman Clancy stated as it stands right now we have two people working on that program. How are we going to pay these people, 50% from Finance and 50% from Highway?

Mayor Baines stated we are only funding one position. Hopefully the other person can find another slot that might be open in another department.

Alderman Levasseur stated there are job postings all of the time and moving from one department to another is not as big a deal plus the woman that we are talking about is a very talented young lady and I thought that she would probably be going into Human Resources. I think there was a slot that was open for her there.

Alderman Thibault stated that woman came from Finance to begin with so I think it is appropriate that she go back there. I have no problem with that as long as we keep track of what she is doing.

Alderman Lopez stated as we go along in this process I think we need an update on a monthly basis because this individual is drawing a pretty high salary to be moving into Finance. I just want to comment that we get a monthly report as to what these two individuals are doing.

Mayor Baines replied there is only one.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I agree with Alderman Hirschmann completely. This is simply pouring good money after bad. I think we should bite the bullet. We are only going to end up spending more in the long run doing this and I request a roll call.

Deputy Clerk Johnson requested that the motion be rescinded and that it be dealt with in two separate formats.

Alderman Wihby rescinded his motion. Alderman Pariseau rescinded his second.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there were two separate issues that were raised. One has to do with the personnel issue and the other has to do with the resolution itself. In terms of the resolution, the recommended language would be that expenditures exceeding a total of \$100,000 would be subject to the approval of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen prior to expenditure. That would be the verbiage that would be placed directly on the resolution.

Alderman Wihby moved to amend the resolution to read that expenditures exceeding a total of \$100,000 would be subject to the approval of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen prior to expenditure. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated I understand where Alderman Vaillancourt is going and I am not sure if there is a misunderstanding with Alderman Hirschmann and I want to clarify that. Do you understand, Alderman Hirschmann, that if we bite the bullet now we must pay back the \$1.7 million out of this budget?

Alderman Hirschmann replied you don't want me to answer that.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we going to do everything we can to find someplace in the City for the second position.

Mayor Baines answered yes.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the other Alderman just referred to another employee. Are you taking an employee's position away from them? Are they getting a pink slip by making this roll call? We are about to vote on someone's position going away I imagine.

Mayor Baines replied we are going to obviously make an adjustment of the budget of that department and in doing so it is only going to fund certain positions within that department and there are going to be some people that are going to have to...

Alderman Hirschmann interjected if you are going to send one person packing, why don't you just do the right thing and end this thing. I don't understand it.

Mayor Baines replied I think everyone's position is well known. I am going to call for a roll call starting with Alderman Vaillancourt.

Aldermen Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Wihby, Levasseur, Sysyn, Clancy, O'Neil, and Lopez voted yea. Alderman Vaillancourt, Hirschmann and Shea voted nay. The motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I am not sure how Alderman Wihby wants to word the personnel issue but my understanding is that it would be a directive that one of the positions ends up a shared position with Finance and Aggregation.

Alderman Wihby moved to have one of the positions from Aggregation moved to the Finance Department and be a shared position with the funding coming from Finance and Aggregation. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated the moving into Finance, I don't want that to be permanent. If there is another place for her that can be paid for then we should do that although I guess the understanding is she is still going to work part-time on Aggregation so we are still continuing the program for another year.

Mayor Baines replied right.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Shea, Vaillancourt and Hirschmann duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Hirschmann asked what is this person going to do in Finance.

Mr. Clougherty answered they would pick up some of the responsibilities of the Revenue Administrator where we have lost Jennifer Desrosiers to HR and she would also be working on some of the GASB information doing inventories.

Alderman Wihby moved that the Resolution ought to pass and layover as amended. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated you just mentioned the magic acronym, GASB. What is that again?

Mr. Clougherty replied it is the Government Accounting Standards Board pronouncements.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked is this the same work that Frank Thomas had mentioned when he sat before us and wanted to keep this person on board so that she could do that in the Highway Department so she is just going to be doing the same thing that he envisioned except in your department.

Mr. Clougherty answered in part, yes.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Shea, Vaillancourt and Hirschmann being duly recorded in opposition.

Appropriating Resolution:

“Appropriating to the Central Business Service District the sum of Two Hundred and Five Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty Two Dollars and Ninety Nine Cents (\$205,832.99) from Central Business Service District Funds for Fiscal Year 2002.”

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to read the resolution by title only and it was so done.

Alderman Levasseur moved that the resolution ought to pass and layover. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Bob, is that the revised district.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Resolution:

“Continuation of the Central Business Service District.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to read the resolution by title only and it was so done.

On motion of Alderman Levasseur, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted that the resolution ought to pass and layover.

Appropriating Resolution:

“A Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$114,844,857.”

On motion of Alderman Wihby, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to read the resolution by title only and it was so done.

Alderman Wihby stated I passed out a sheet of paper to all of the Aldermen for the regular budget and included in that were numbers that made the School Department basically and as the Aldermen know what we are doing today is accepting the Resolution and then coming back in five days and making changes or whatever. One of the things in your budget, the \$114,844,857, you also had \$1 million that was in the CIP cash number, which is on the general fund side and my suggestion was and it is on that sheet of paper that was passed out and I don't know if you want to talk about the City budget first or just pass this with the \$1 million in it but for now it would be to take the \$1 million that was in the CIP cash and amend this resolution to make it \$115,844,857.

Mayor Baines stated so we would just include it as part of their budget.

Alderman Wihby moved to amend the Resolution to \$115,844,857. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I find it incomprehensible that you can pass a \$116 million budget and not have discussion. I won't support this. With all due deference to the former Chairman of the Board who worked on these numbers, as I alluded to the other night this is a 7.5% and now more than that increase in the school budget and not only is this for one year but just like we increased the school budget 10% two years ago and another 10% last year, this is something that locks us into this in the future year after year after year. It is not a lock that is firm but you can be sure that once you put all of these new positions in they are going to come back year after year and there is no guarantee that the state is going to be as generous in funding these monies back to the cities and towns two years from now as they are this year. In fact, the NH House passed a bill that will take millions of dollars away from Manchester in a couple of years. The spending formula according to a bill before the Senate by Senator Gordon is probably going to take...I don't know do you know how many millions that is going to take away from Manchester yet? Have those figures finally been released out of the mushroom darkness?

Alderman O'Neil replied no they haven't, but the preliminary numbers I have seen actually stay consistent with what we have been getting but they do need to be confirmed and I think that is very important.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so in other words the amount that Senator Gordon envisions is spending tens of millions of dollars less yet we are locking ourselves into these positions for years and years down the line or at least setting it up to do

that. I say before we do that we should be generous with the School Department and give them something in line with what other districts in the state are getting and double the rate of inflation. As I suggested the other night, a 5% increase would be very generous. We can't always get everything we want whether it be the School or Highway and the fact that in the budget to come up the Alderman from Ward 1 is proposing a 1/2% cut in almost every budget in the City yet to go with a 7% to 8% increase by the School District I think is beyond the pail and I speak as someone who values public education having been educated in the public system. They have to be as responsible as everybody else and they have proven to us that they tend not to be responsible so to reward irresponsibility would in itself be irresponsible.

Alderman Levasseur stated because of the meeting we had on Thursday I am very nervous about the fact that we don't know where they are spending their money or how it is being spent. We don't know what the deficit is going to be. I don't think we have enough information. I don't believe, your Honor, that the Aldermen had a chance to really discuss that as a Board before we know what is going to occur with the deficit and what money they are responsible for so by just passing this blanket number right now I feel like I am being remiss in my duty to protect the taxpayers by just blanketing this number. I was hoping that we were going to get some more information, your Honor, before we got this number. I think I asked how much exactly were the increases that they were stuck with no matter what. They know what their number is and we know we have a 4.5% increase that we voted for and the teachers deserve and we know that the principals got an increase in wages. I would definitely back those increases but I would like to know how much the money was above the increases that you had to give no matter what and then I would have been able to see what the numbers were that were left over. After what we went through the other day with them I don't know if even they know what the numbers are, your Honor.

Mayor Baines stated again we are passing it tonight to lay over and there will be other opportunities to discuss this.

Alderman Wihby stated that is exactly what I was going to say. We are passing a number that you are going to see...if you are against giving them more money...this is just the Mayor's number. We are taking \$1 million and adding it from CIP. It is the same number. If no one has any numbers yet and they want another opportunity, they have another opportunity in five days to make any cuts or make any additions to the number. Basically this is just the Mayor's number that we are passing in a different form and taking it out of CIP and making them accountable for that CIP and letting them do what they want with that \$1 million as far as the maintenance goes.

Alderman Levasseur stated I agree that this resolution appropriates the money. The amendment appropriates the \$1 million into whatever the number should be. If we were only going to vote on putting the \$1 million in that is not a problem because that is a technical change and that will have to be done no matter what number we come up with and I would vote for the amendment to put the \$1 million in but I don't want to vote for the whole number and that is what we are doing.

Alderman Wihby stated we have to do that. We have to pass a resolution today.

Alderman Levasseur replied we have to pass a resolution on a number.

Alderman Thibault stated I agree with Alderman Wihby and what he is doing here. The one thing I would like to caution the Board on is when you look at some of the smaller departments that we have in the City, how that ½% will impact them as compared to a department that has a \$50, \$60 or \$70 million budget. I think that we should give the right to some of these smaller departments to come in and explain just exactly how that will affect them. That is my only comment on that.

Mayor Baines stated we haven't got to that yet. We are just on the School District resolution.

Alderman Lopez stated I think the School Board came to us and presented to me a pretty good budget. They were \$4,189,000 short in their budget with the Mayor's number and they are going to have to make some very tough decisions even with the budget that we are passing now if it remains on the hold over. The \$1 million going from maintenance in there, they will be controlling that also. I think this is in line with what we should be doing.

Alderman Levasseur stated the statement that the Mayor made and I asked him to clarify was the budget that the Mayor has proposed includes no cuts at all in what they have now. Isn't that correct? There are no cuts at all so they are not having to make any tough decisions on whether they have to cut anything. The decision is whether they were going to be able to add extra programs in. I just wanted to clarify that.

Alderman Lopez replied according to the document that I am looking at, that is not totally accurate because they will have to go back and make those decisions on the custodians, technical supplies and everything else with the money that the Mayor put in his budget. They were asking for \$119 million so they do have to make some tough decisions in order to live with what they get.

Mayor Baines stated they may not be able to fund some of the line items to the level that they have been funded this year and continue forward. That is true.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated we all have to make tough decisions. That is what life is all about and that is what being here is all about and I assume that is what being on the School Board is all about. I still haven't got an answer to my question about why there is a 50% increase in coach's salaries. That would be a very decision for me. Just to follow-up on Alderman Thibault's point, I agree that it is much more difficult for somebody to make ½% cut when you are dealing with a much smaller budget. What we are talking about here is a huge budget and we are not talking about a ½% cut, we are talking about a 7.5% increase so if they cannot find a way to cut 2.5% out of their 7.5% increase I don't know how we can possibly ask any other department to take a real cut.

Alderman Shea stated I think we have to keep in mind that the School Department does bring in a substantial amount of revenue. We are not really giving them \$114 million or \$115 million. We are actually giving them whatever they bring in minus the \$115 million. I know that the appropriation that I am looking at here indicates that they are probably going to bring in close to \$80 million or something of that sort. You may know better. Basically we are not really...I mean I want the taxpayers to know that we are not giving them \$114 million or \$115 million. They are bringing in to the City close to \$90 million so the difference between that is what we are giving them as far as the taxes are concerned.

Alderman Levasseur stated I just want to echo Alderman Vaillancourt again. Making a ½% cut in some of these other departments and I have looked at the Highway Department and he gave us an excellent explanation of where it is going to hurt and it is going to hurt in the sidewalks and it is going to hurt in the paving of the roads that need to be paved. Now if we are going to cut Highway...these guys are running the tightest ship. They haven't gotten 10% increases year after year. They haven't gotten a 25% or 27% increase over the last three years and we are going to cut these guys by ½%. It doesn't seem right that we are going to be able to give the School District the Mayor's number and not cut them at all. To me it just doesn't make fiscal sense. We could make a small cut in the School budget and give to the Highway Department and balance the two biggest needs in the City. The Highway Department and the School District to me are the two biggest monsters that have the biggest effect on our City and do the best job and do what most people expect. I don't think that I am going to be going and saying let's give them their full number and then agree to cut the Highway Department's budget. That is not going to happen. I am not going to vote for that.

Alderman Wihby stated I started this conversation by saying that maybe we ought to be taking the City's budget first because there are cuts in the City number that

they are going to have to absorb. There is an \$850,000 number that you had put in to take care of their deficit. That is no longer in their budget number so they are going to have to make up that \$850,000 within the amount of money that is allocated to them. There is also a reserve number of \$500,000 or so and they are going to have to make plans to compensate for the reserves in that number. That is \$1.3 million or \$1.4 million that they are going to have to take and look at. They don't have to do it all in one year but they have to start planning as we do on the City side for these reserves and for this money that is coming out of the deficit so that they can take care of their own problems over there. Either way they still have to make some sort of a plan and that is going to reduce their budget automatically. That is why we didn't take the ½% out from them because it would have been less.

Alderman Pariseau moved that the resolution as amended ought to pass and layover. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried with Aldermen Vaillancourt and Levasseur being duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Levasseur stated no, the amendment passes. Don't try to sneak that through. I made the point that I would vote for the amendment but I didn't say that I would vote for this number to lay over. That is two different motions.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk will clarify.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated the Committee did vote on the motion of Alderman Wihby seconded by Alderman Pariseau to amend the resolution to \$115,844,857. That was the motion and it did carry. There was a call for a vote on the amendment. There was a motion made by Alderman Pariseau seconded by Alderman Thibault that the resolution ought to pass and layover as amended. Alderman Vaillancourt has indicated that he is opposed and anyone else could do so at this time.

Alderman Levasseur stated let me clarify the reason why. My understanding of this and I asked specifically...it doesn't matter if it is \$113 million or \$112 million. The \$1 million out of CIP is going to be added into either number that we decide to give. That decision had to be made. That \$1 million motion had to be made. That is the motion that I believed we were voted on.

Mayor Baines asked so you want to be recorded as opposed to ought to pass and layover.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes.

Mayor Baines stated the record will show that Alderman Levasseur is opposed.

Resolution:

“Raising Monies and Making Appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2002.”

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau it was voted to read the resolution by title only and it was so done.

Alderman Wihby stated if you look at the sheet that was passed out earlier, we can just go through those line items. On the right hand side it shows the changes that were made. If you look at the Assessor's number it goes down by \$47,000 in expenses due to not hiring the new employee. The \$300,000 that we all heard from Building was additional revenue. The City Clerk had additional revenue of \$240,000 but were missing the \$50,000 for archive retrieval. The CGL reserve, when the actuary came back we were high enough as it was and the \$250,000 that was in the City Solicitor's Office we don't need. The position in the Finance Department which we spoke about minus \$25,000 because it is not going to be a full-time position but a part-time position filled by the Aggregation person. In Human Resources we added \$13,000 because they didn't record the revenue from the Park Enterprise funds. There is \$20,000 there to hire a Human Resource Director if the Mayor deems fit. \$95,000 for the retirement number because that increased since we put the budget together and \$20,000 for either testing or wellness. They will have to split it up. As you remember he asked for \$40,000 together but there is \$20,000 together. The health reserve is a minus \$460,000 and the reason why the health reserve is down is because we have an actuarial report and the actuarial report says that we need \$1.546 million total. What we were doing was funding it out of the City side totally but when the actuary came back, out of the \$1.546 million only \$628,000 should come from the City side. Out of the \$628,000 we already have \$674,000 in reserves so we don't have to fund \$460,000 more. The reserve figure on the City side is already high enough. As you know we just amended two resolutions and those amendments are to add the reserve for the resolutions for the Enterprise funds and there are a few more that we are going to have to do later on but if you take that number, the \$1.546 million and take out the City side and the number for the Enterprise funds it leaves a number for schools of \$826,000. Now that \$826,000 is a reserve number that School should have set aside to take care of their problem. They don't have anything set aside and what they are going to have to do is come up with a plan as we have planned in the last four or five years to raise that reserve number up. It is their responsibility to fund that. It is not the City's responsibility. Included in their number even though we gave them the Mayor's number they are going to

have to come up with something out of that \$826,000. It doesn't have to be all of it. It could be half or they could decide that they want to fund it every year but they have to come up with some plan that is going to compensate for the reserves and start collecting on their own. That is where the \$460,000 comes out. The next \$1 million was the Tax Collector's revenue from the license plates. I have added the employee that she wanted based on a chargeback from the School District. If the School District decides they don't want to pay for that person then she won't be able to hire the person but she has it in here in case they will fund it. We added \$150,000 to the Fire Department expense. We added \$100,000 to the Police Department.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked do you want to explain those.

Alderman Wihby answered the Police Department number technically is the same as the Mayor was going to give them but we passed the resolution before we had the change.

Mayor Baines stated if you recall on that the night that the resolution came before us we pointed out an error that had been made by Human Resources in calculating the number. It would have been the number that is now going to be the correct number for the Police Department.

Alderman Shea asked for the Fire Department is that going into diesel and natural gas and expenses for clothing and other priorities that they need.

Mayor Baines replied right it is for public safety issues that were discussed.

Alderman Wihby stated if you remember he was looking for, I think, \$300,000. We talked to the Chief and he knows that the budget was tight and he is happy with the \$150,000. The health salary number of \$40,000 in a letter that was just passed out from Fred Rusczek will be compensated for by the chargeback also that was to increase the salaries of nurses because we can't hire nurses. The \$232,000 for Traffic were revenues when we passed the parking. Welfare if you remember was asking for additional money because she was tight. We added \$150,000 there. The Library had a double accounting of the alarm system where they had it in their budget and the City Clerk had it in his budget so we took it out of that. The chargeback number is adding back the nurses and the \$37,000 for the new employee in case they want to pay for the Tax Collector's position. Under non-departmental we do continue with \$20,000. We added the animal shelter for \$41,000. There was double accounting on the Arts so we took that \$5,000 out. We reduced the salary adjustment account to \$315,000. Basically what we are saying with that...I think the number this year was around \$400,000 but the departments are going to have to live with the \$315,000 and anything else is going

to have to come out of their budget. We took out the \$1 million in CIP cash for the School District. We added two police cruisers for \$50,000. We took out the School deficit of \$850,000. That is another expense that the School District is going to have to plan to take care of their deficit. They can take it out of their budget or come up with a plan to do it over two or three years but somehow they are going to have to take care of their own deficit and it shouldn't be on the City side of the budget. Interest on maturing debt has a savings of \$200,000 after we looked at it. We all voted on the \$20,000 for the MTA. Overlay from the Assessors because of the timing and everything else they felt they could do it within the \$1.1 million. I think they have \$900,000 already so I guess they have \$2 million to spend. The fund balance we added \$150,000 and for evaluation we used the same number as this year of \$35,000. On the right hand side we removed the health reserve again because of the \$460,000. There was \$665,000 set-up. \$460,000 was in that account and \$205,000 was in the departments. That is not really affecting the departments at all. The ½% cut does affect the different departments by \$394,000. We are hoping that what will happen is the departments can go back and reallocate their bottom line based on that ½% cut using any of the line items that are there. They could use the salary account and not fill positions. Also fringe benefits are in there so when they don't fill the position it is not only salary savings they will have but they will also have the savings from the fringe benefits and the health insurance. I think that they will be able to take that ½% and use it for the lapses from not filling positions or delaying filling a position. The bottom line would mean that it is a 2.9% increase on the tax rate. Again, everything is going to change with the new valuation. The tax rate is probably going to end up being \$24 or something like that but if we are trying to calculate it based on what would happen if we didn't have the new valuation, the tax rate would go up about 93 cents if it was a regular year or 2.97%.

Alderman Shea asked, Kevin, in our fund balance are we up to 5%.

Mr. Clougherty answered I will remind you of the auditor's presentation the other night when he said that we were approximating that and hopefully with a good performance by this budget if adopted would get us to that point. We are not there yet.

Alderman Levasseur stated first of all AT&T has just increased the amount of the cable bill by \$1.40 by adding NESN and that was in the paper a few weeks ago. Did you include that number in your budget, Alderman Wihby? That would be an extra \$30,000.

Clerk Bernier stated no we didn't add that. That just happened last week.

Alderman Levasseur replied well that is an extra \$32,000 in revenue.

Clerk Bernier responded I would have to confirm that with the cable contract.

Alderman Levasseur stated it is done. AT&T already said they were adding it into the package. Instead of paying \$10 for NESN you are going to pay \$1.34 and everybody gets it.

Clerk Bernier replied I would have to find out from the provider the actual number.

Alderman Levasseur asked do you get 5% of the total increase.

Clerk Bernier answered I can't confirm your number of \$32,000 right now.

Mayor Baines stated we can investigate that and amend this if we need to.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I wish we could do that but people won't be paying for NESN so I think it is probably an offset. I think AT&T is going to be losing the amount that people are paying what, \$10/month now. I think it is kind of a wash.

Mayor Baines stated Mr. Bernier will research that and come back to the Board.

Alderman Levasseur stated I was looking at the two agencies. The Mayor's recommended number for the City side is a \$774,000 in difference to the Aldermen's recommended number. If we cut the School District by ½% we actually could fully fund the City side budget at \$750,000 and a ½% cut. I believe, your Honor, we cut the City side budget by a 1% last year.

Mayor Baines replied no it was ½%.

Alderman Levasseur responded and we are not cutting the School budget at all and haven't for the past two years and here we are cutting again on the City side and ½% from the School budget could fully fund the City side.

Mayor Baines stated I want to clarify some points that Alderman Wihby made earlier. We are making some adjustments relating to the reserves for insurance and also the deficit reductions that are going to have to come out of the School District budget on their side so they are, in fact, being cut back as Alderman Wihby explained earlier because of some of those adjustments they are going to have make.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much does the ½% decrease off of the City side budget work out to as far as an increase in the tax rate. Would it bring it up to 3.25% or 3.5%? In other words we are at 2.97% right now. If we were to leave it alone...you said it was only \$354,000 so you are talking \$400,000. If you kept the \$400,000 in there what then would be the tax rate instead of 2.97%?

Mr. Clougherty answered we are calculating it.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I don't think we should just vote on a budget of \$120 million without running over it. First of all, I am not sure I agree with the whole process here. We spent several weeks if not months reviewing budgets line by line and then instead of going over them and trying to make adjustments line by line I am not sure that I agree upon the method of simply whacking ½% at the end. It may work out right but then it may benefit departments that somehow manage to get more than they should have and be detrimental to departments who did not get as much as they should have so I am just not sure that this whole procedure is the proper way to go about it. I am a little concerned about the Tax Collector's new employee. That would be for somebody to work at the counter as the Tax Collector said she needed when she was before us and that would be only available if the School Department comes up with the monies to fund that? Exactly how does that work?

Alderman Wihby replied it would be a chargeback.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated and the justification for that is that one of the employees would be doing work related to the School Department.

Alderman Wihby replied collecting taxes for the School Department.

Mayor Baines stated all of the taxes are collected on our side and then we send the money to the School side.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked and if the School says no to that, which they most likely will then you don't get the new employee.

Mayor Baines answered that is correct. By the way, the answer to Alderman Levasseur's question is 3.32%.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so the answer to that question is if the School does not agree to pay for that chargeback then we don't get the new employee at the Tax Collector's Office.

Mayor Baines answered the School is in charge of its own bottom line and they have to agree to the services.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked when will we know if they are going to get this new employee or not. At what time will that be determined?

Mayor Baines answered my guess is when the School Board adjusts its line items to reflect the bottom line. They are going to have discussions on that and it will probably be adopted sometime in July. They have to have a public hearing.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I assume the School Board this year will go back and vote for the budget that we give them, whatever it is.

Mayor Baines replied and they did last year. It didn't occur in 1999.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated so they will determine sometime in July whether or not they are going to accept that.

Mayor Baines replied that is the timeline that I would assume at this point.

Alderman Lopez asked is Public Building Services in with Highway. Did we take ½% out of PBS?

Alderman Wihby answered no. That was mostly contract money so it didn't get cut.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the general public has been watching these proceedings quite intently. I had a meeting in my ward and they asked a whole lot of questions about police cuts last year and about sectors and how many cars are in a sector and why last year's budget ended up cutting police on the west side. It was very hard to explain that so one thing I am going to say is when the Police left this room, what they presented to the full Board is a number of \$17,806,000. That was their request when they left this room and that is what I am supporting I don't care who wants to change it. That is the number I am going with until they write me a memo. They didn't tell me that they wanted a different number. They told Alderman Wihby in a telephone call but if somebody is going to change their request they better come to the full Board.

Mayor Baines asked Chief Driscoll to come forward.

Alderman Hirschmann asked \$17,806,000 is the number you asked for right.

Chief Driscoll answered yes it is.

Alderman Hirschmann asked do you still want that. I need some police on the West Side of Manchester so I am ready to support that number.

Alderman Cashin stated let's get something straight here. There is not going to be any cut of policemen on the West Side. Is that right, Chief? A yes or no is all it takes, Chief.

Chief Driscoll answered we will do the absolute best with the resources allocated to the department.

Alderman Cashin asked is that a yes or a no.

Chief Driscoll answered what I promised you when I came here on that particular night was that prior to any reduction in police protection in any ward that I would explain that to the Aldermen before it happened.

Alderman Cashin stated it is my understanding that before any reductions are done in any ward in the City that you will come back to this Board. Is that right?

Chief Driscoll replied if in fact that is what this Board wants me to do I would certainly do that. This allocation is not the allocation that we asked for. This allocation is not the allocation that we believe is necessary but it is the allocation that we were given and we will do the absolute best as we always do.

Alderman Cashin stated we added money to your budget over the Mayor's number. We have added two police cruisers giving you four.

Chief Driscoll replied that is correct but we asked for eight cruisers.

Alderman Cashin stated so you are better off under this budget then you were under the Mayor's.

Alderman Hirschmann stated you are right, Alderman Cashin. He is a little bit better off. He does have a couple of extra cruisers but he doesn't have the amount of money that he requested.

Mayor Baines asked who did get what they requested.

Alderman Hirschmann answered the School District.

Mayor Baines replied no they did not. The School District requested almost \$120 million. I cut almost \$5 million from their request.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think that there is something that is important to clear up. The presentation that the Police Department made to this Board they spelled out West Side but when they talked about other parts of the City they talked about sectors. Chief, am I correct to say that at times during this past year all sections of the City might have had on a given shift reduced service?

Chief Driscoll replied that is absolutely correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated we seem to keep talking about the West Side but all sections of the City at times had reduced service.

Alderman Levasseur stated the Chief has to make decisions on shifts on a daily basis and now you want him to come to the Board and say by the way I couldn't put a policeman on the West Side last night. That would be ridiculous. I am looking at these numbers and who can give me some information. Wayne, why don't you show us the amount of increases that these departments have gotten over the last two years in percentage number and then show us the number that you gave to the School District. If Alderman Vaillancourt is correct, he said that they have gotten a 10%, 10% and 7.5%. I don't believe that the Highway Department has gotten a 27% increase.

Mayor Baines replied I don't believe those percentages are accurate.

Alderman Levasseur well maybe before you became Mayor. I am not saying only your year. Before we came on Board. All I am saying is...you say that you are cutting the request of the City side and I want to know how much the percentage is that they have received over the last couple of years. I bet you it doesn't come close to what the schools have gotten. Not to say that they didn't need to be increased, but at the same time let's show both sides of the argument. Can anybody get me that number?

Mayor Baines replied yes we are going to get those percentages for you. I believe last year the Police overall budget increased approximately 7.5%. The percentage this year is around 7%. Am I correct?

Alderman Levasseur asked how much of that percent was forced due to Yarger Decker.

Mayor Baines answered that is basically it.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is the point I am trying to make. I want to know what the schools are getting. If it has to be that much of a percent because it is

forced because you have to pay salaries and benefits there is nothing we can do here. We know that but I want to see the differences in those numbers. I believe when I asked the Highway Department if you took away the forced increase of benefits and salaries because of Yarger Decker, he believed he was only increasing the budget by ½% or maybe 1%. He is not getting any increase for his gas and all the stuff we had with snowstorms and such. By the way I want to make one more statement. One more statement for the rest of this Board to listen to. Alderman Wihby, Alderman Cashin and the Mayor have worked and put together this budget okay. Now this was given to the rest of the Aldermen here tonight and if you think that we are just going to pass this thing because you two got together in a room and decided that is what the numbers were going to be without any kind of arguments or fights or decisions from other Aldermen where we are going to put money, you have got it wrong. I do not wear sheep's clothing and I am not following anybody to the door. If I want to fight for certain...it seems to me that you are trying to rush this through tonight. Don't try to pass this thing through in one night when there are a lot of questions that have to be answered. We are not privy to all of the little meetings that you guys had. I am not being disrespectful. I am being passionate about this.

Alderman Hirschmann asked the discrepancy between your number, Mayor and the Police request I think was about \$300,000. Can you remind us what that was, Paul?

Mr. Beaudoin answered several things have changed since the first time we presented our budget to the Mayor. The new health insurance figures were not in yet so we used the current figures going forward for next year. We also did not have money in there for the civic center costs for parking enforcement for police and traffic details in the area.

Mayor Baines stated it was about \$135,000 if I recall.

Alderman Hirschmann stated so their healthcare costs were forgotten, your Honor.

Mayor Baines stated there was an error that I reported that Human Resources did in their calculation. It was \$100,000. That has been restored tonight.

Alderman Hirschmann stated but there was a \$300,000 difference.

Mayor Baines replied overall. The money that you are talking about has been restored. We added the money for the Police associated with the civic center, which was about \$135,000. We restored tonight based upon our agreement that we came to the \$100,000 that we reported to the Board the night of my resolution.

We put that money back. Now they still have not received the total allocation. You are absolutely correct but no other department has either.

Alderman Wihby stated Alderman Levasseur is fine to say that he is against this and that but this was a proposal that was put together for the Aldermen to look at. It sits on the table for five days. Some number had to be presented today. I don't understand how anybody can rant and rave like he just has knowing that he hasn't put in one cent or one iota of anything into this budget.

Alderman Levasseur replied what kind of a statement is that. I have been to every single meeting that took place here. He put this together during the weekend without any of us knowing about a meeting. I would have sat in on another one of those meetings. What kind of a statement is that?

Mayor Baines called for a five-minute recess.

Mayor Baines called the meeting back to order and reminded the Board that no one is to interrupt another member while that member is speaking and all comments should be directed to the Chair. I also want to remind people of the process that everyone has an opportunity to offer motions, amendments or proposals but we do need to get some numbers on the table tonight. I also want to remind people that we have a responsibility to conduct ourselves in a manner that reflects civility and I will not tolerate any inappropriate language or any outbursts of that nature again. Any Alderman engaging in that behavior will have to leave the meeting. Hopefully that will not happen again. If it does, any Alderman involved will have to leave the meeting.

Alderman Levasseur stated I apologize for interrupting Alderman Wihby and I apologize for my passionate outburst. I will try to save that for the back room.

Mayor Baines stated and also I do not appreciate the inappropriate language. We are on television and there are young people at home and I think we can set a better example in conducting the business of this City.

Alderman Wihby stated I don't know if everybody fully understands that some number had to be passed today. It was either going to be the number that you have in front of you from last month or a new number. These were my ideas that I brought forward as anyone else can bring ideas forward and if someone else wants to pass something out today they can. The bottom line is it sits on the table for five days and we come back and we vote things up or down and make amendments or do whatever else we want to do and finally pass a budget. This starts the clock ticking and we had to have had some sort of number in front of us.

Mayor Baines replied that is correct and I want to remind people that there were no secret meetings. Obviously I have been talking to Alderman Wihby and Alderman Cashin so we could come to some agreement to get this budget moving forward and we are supporting these numbers.

Alderman Shea stated I want to ask when Parks & Recreation came in there was a little bit of a difference between what was going into the Enterprise and what was coming out of the general fund. Has that been changed or is it still going to be the same.

Alderman Wihby replied it is still the same.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I think the process is quite clear and I think that is why we are here tonight and I just think that there is an attempt by my colleague from Ward 3 to slow this down a little bit and I would certainly like to do that as well because I think there are lots of questions that should be asked and we all want answers to. Regarding the Police Department, now that the West Side has adequate enforcement I would like to take assurance that I can speed home tonight going to the south side. That was just a joke. In all seriousness I do want to say that I was down on Elm Street Saturday night and I did encounter a DWI checkpoint. I didn't have even one ounce of alcohol in me so I was quite safe but I would like to say that is the kind of thing that I personally as a Libertarian and as somebody who doesn't believe in police encroachment into our freedoms, object to. I have expressed my objections to spending priorities but I don't mean to micromanage the Police Department. You do know that we spent several thousand dollars investigating Susan Lafond last year. We spent several thousand dollars on the raid on Billy's Sports Bar and I just have a difference of philosophy with how we spend our money and where we focus our attention. I don't think it is right to be spending thousands and thousands of dollars stopping people randomly when we have unsolved murders and unsolved thefts and things like that. I would like to see our police more proactive in getting out and stopping criminals rather than trying to create criminals. I just feel that I should say that. I also will say that every time I have called the Police Department with a question from one of my constituents in Ward 8 I have gotten adequate police response so I think they are doing the job. Whether or not I think they should be focusing on certain areas is a problem but I do think that the Police Department is doing a fair job. I would like to see them concentrate, as I say, on areas of real crime rather than on these other things. We can only spend the same dollar once as I have often said. I don't have a problem giving them this amount of dollars and I assume they will be spending it adequately throughout the City. If I might while I have the floor, I spoke with the Fire Chief during the break and earlier today I received a call and this is something a little tangential but apparently the scam is back on with these people claiming to be collecting \$100 for firefighters.

Somebody called me this afternoon and asked if I could give them \$100 for a decal and the Chief has told me that this has absolutely nothing to do with anybody locally. It is an operation out of Florida. I would like to urge anybody that gets this kind of call to not come up with the \$100 or whatever they are asking for for this decal. Can I go to the Library now? They haven't got my four week library loan and in fact I just took this new book out tonight but regardless of that I never do anything because of my personal likes or dislikes for any administrator or anything like that so I would like to focus on the Library budget notwithstanding the fact that they have failed to go to the four week loan. I understand we are taking out money from the Library budget because it was duplicated but didn't we give them assurance that they were going to be able to use that money to buy books or something when they were here? Am I wrong? Didn't Wayne tell them that? I am not taking a position one way or the other but I recall something being said to Mr. Brisbin that he was now going to be able to use the money to put back in his book amount.

Alderman Wihby replied that is what Wayne said and I told him not to say that.

Mayor Baines asked Wayne said that.

Alderman Vaillancourt answered I believe he did. Again, I am not taking a position one way or the other but I want everybody to know that this money will not be able to be used now for the books according to this budget as presented. Is that correct?

Mayor Baines replied that is correct.

Alderman Hirschmann stated I did speak with the Police at the break and the community policing initiatives could be increased if we gave them another \$60,000, which I will advocate for. I don't take it as a personal affront that I am changing things tonight but \$60,000 to reinstitute an important program like community policing...it is one of my constituents favorite things having bikes in the wards and bikes downtown so I wouldn't take that as a personal assault to your budget, Alderman Wihby, but \$60,000 for the citizens of Manchester is important to me.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to amend the number for the Police Department to \$17,654,989, which is a \$60,000 increase.

Mayor Baines stated we haven't put a resolution on the floor yet.

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied there is a resolution on the floor but Alderman Wihby's proposal, actually there has been no amendment made or no proposed

amendment on the floor so this would be the first proposed amendment. It would be in order if you would like to take it.

Mayor Baines asked what if we put the number on the floor as amended to \$102,383,154 and second it and then we can take amendments. Would that be the proper thing to do?

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered you could do that if you wish.

Alderman Levasseur asked where does that number come from.

Deputy Clerk Johnson answered the proposal that was made by Alderman Wihby would put the operating budget resolution, which is the resolution on the floor, at \$102,383,154 and the breakdown of that would be as broken down on the handout.

Alderman Thibault moved to amend the resolution to \$102,383,154. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated it is my understanding that Alderman Hirschmann would like to make a further amendment.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to increase the Police budget by \$60,000 for community policing. Alderman Thibault duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Wihby asked are we saying that if we don't put in the \$60,000 we are not going to have community policing.

Chief Driscoll answered that is not what we have said at all. Our community policing agency will continue to work very hard for the City.

Alderman Wihby asked so if you had an additional \$60,000 and you are going to get to divide it into your budget are you going to use it for community policing or do you need it to go somewhere else? Is your top priority to spend \$60,000 in community policing?

Chief Driscoll answered our budget was fully funded in the salary line items. It was reduced \$54,000 in expenses if I am correct and the capital was funded at zero this year. In conversations that I had I believe that I could certainly provide the expected level of police service throughout the community if that \$60,000 was added.

Alderman Wihby asked so you are saying that if we add \$60,000 you are going to improve community policing.

Chief Driscoll answered last year and I got into...

Alderman Wihby interjected how do you improve community policing, with staff, with people.

Chief Driscoll replied yes absolutely.

Alderman Wihby responded well you just said your salary line item was fully funded so how are you going to take the \$60,000 and throw it into a salary line item. Is that what you are going to do or are you going to put it somewhere else?

Chief Driscoll stated we look at the bottom line. Last year and I got into some hot water for saying this but last year we cut service throughout the community as a result of our budget appropriation. This year we were hoping to have both expenses and salary at an adequate level, which would allow us to restore those services and go forward.

Alderman Wihby stated Chief you are not answering my question. You have \$60,000 more and we put it in the salary account because that is going to help community policing. Are you going to spend that \$60,000 on community policing or do you want the \$60,000 in equipment?

Chief Driscoll replied it is not equipment, Sir.

Alderman Wihby asked on anything other than salaries.

Chief Driscoll answered it would certainly be used both for expenses and salary in order to meet our responsibilities.

Alderman Wihby asked so you need additional money for salaries to do community policing right. What I am getting at is I am not going to vote for \$60,000 to give you to have you do your line items and not add another penny into salaries and just say well I needed it someplace else.

Chief Driscoll answered the bottom line is our expenses are 3% of our budget. They are at 3.5% ...I think they are 3.5% lower than they were two years ago. In order for us to meet our expenses we have to take from salary in order to make our bottom line, which we have committed to doing and it reduces our ability to field police officers on the street. It is really not apples and oranges. It is us working the whole budget in order to provide the greatest amount of service and still pay our expenses.

Mr. Beaudoin stated if I might add, the \$100,000 that is being added in was an error that was not put into our original request. Had it been in there, we would actually be \$100,000 higher right now. So you are giving us back \$100,000 and taking away \$85,000. I think that the Chief was saying when he was talking about adding \$60,000 was adding \$60,000 to the Mayor's budget of \$17.634 million. If you added that it is actually up to the level of \$17.694 million so it is roughly \$100,000 more than what you are...

Mayor Baines stated that is not what he was doing. You were adding it to the amended number right?

Alderman Hirschmann stated the number on the floor was Alderman Wihby's number and I added \$60,000 to his number, which is \$17,654,989. You would still be \$40,000 short.

Alderman Wihby stated I guess we could sit here and take Fire next and Highway next and everyone else next to get the number back up to 7%. I would rather come back Wednesday if we have to with all of the different departments coming forward letting us know whether they can live within this budget or not or what it means to their budget rather than pick and choose which ones we want to fund extra today. Wednesday is open. We can come in Wednesday.

Alderman Hirschmann replied I disagree with that because community policing has to continue. Last year there were less community policing officers on the street due to our budget vote in this room. I committed to my constituents and myself that I would make sure that the community policing would be reinstated. After speaking with the Chief, some of that \$60,000 is going to be used for salaries. Some of it might be for bicycles, I don't know, but they are going to reinstate in the downtown, the West Side, the south end, wherever it has to be. That is an important part of the policing for me and I really think we have to do that.

Alderman Wihby stated I don't disagree with that, Alderman Hirschmann. The only thing I disagree with is if we don't know where they are going to put it...I would rather see their whole budget in front of me and where they are putting the \$60,000 to see if they are using it for community policing or not before I vote for it.

Alderman Hirschmann stated it is a small matter. You have taken away a lot of their money anyway.

Alderman Cashin stated the reason these numbers layover is exactly to discuss what we are discussing now. This should be given to the departments to give them

an opportunity to digest it and if they really feel that they need more then they can come back or let us know in writing and before we finalize the budget these things can be discussed. You can't do it here this evening because you can't get all of the departments here this evening. Just let it lay over and let them digest it and let them come back with whatever recommendations they may have.

Alderman Thibault stated I have no problem with what Alderman Cashin is saying other than I think that what we are trying to do here tonight and what Alderman Hirschmann is trying to do and I support that wholly and what I am trying to do is what was cut as far as community policing last year I would like it to be reinstated. How we do it, I don't care. Just get it reinstated period. I think that is what Alderman Hirschmann is saying but I agree with Alderman Cashin. Maybe they should put the numbers together as to exactly where it will be spent and then bring it back to us in the next four or five days.

Mayor Baines asked Alderman Hirschmann to withdraw his motion so that we can discuss this next week.

Alderman Hirschmann withdrew his motion. Alderman Thibault withdrew his second.

Mayor Baines stated we now have the other number back on the floor, \$102,383,154 for an ought to pass and layover.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated no. The motion on the floor is to amend the resolution to \$102,383,154. We would need a vote on that motion.

Alderman Wihby stated what I think we ought to do for all of our benefits is now that we passed out this budget some of the department heads are here today and we can make sure they get it by tomorrow but by Wednesday at least we should have their responses for what the cuts would be and they can let us know if they have any problems with the number they were given and we can come back on Monday.

Mayor Baines stated we will send something out to the department heads first thing tomorrow morning with these numbers asking them to put in writing their reaction to it over the next 24 hours and we will get it sent out to all members of the Board. We will also ask them to be here on Monday, June 11.

Alderman Levasseur stated you made a comment about five minutes ago that you had accepted these numbers. You accepted the numbers at a 2.97% tax increase. I that what you were saying?

Mayor Baines replied we worked with Alderman Wihby today and Alderman Cashin. Alderman Wihby brought these numbers in. We sat down and we agreed to put these numbers before the Board tonight to lay over for five days.

Alderman Levasseur asked as far as removing the health reserve of \$205,000, you are removing that out of the bottom line of each department but you are not actually making that cut are you. That is actually not a decrease at all. That \$205,000 is just being placed someplace else right?

Alderman Wihby stated if you notice the line item on the left, the minus \$460,000 for health reserves, what they had done was they had calculated that we needed \$665,000 total. \$460,000 was put into the Human Resource Department and \$205,000 was in all of those different numbers in those departments. It was just added into the departments individually. The \$460,000 was added into Human Resources total. We have taken that out and the \$205,000 on the right hand side of that sheet was put in their for reserves in each individual line item and right now we don't need the \$205,000 or the \$460,000 so that is not really a cut to the department. That was just for the reserves and they are not going to have to put that in. Where the cuts are is that ½%.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I have several questions. I think this should be a deliberative operation. I certainly would, instead of adding money, like to see us try to subtract money from these budgets and if they stop some of those roadblocks they can use that money to get their community policing back. I would like to compliment the Alderman from Ward 1 for adding \$1 million to the revenue side for the tax collector. I guess that is the registration for automobiles. I suggested that we do the same last year and I think we are headed in the right direction this year. My question concerns the Traffic Department. In the projected revenues from the Traffic Department are we included those that I have deemed outrageously high projections from the Mayor's aide regarding the civic center parking. Are those projected into this budget? The revenues for the civic center parking, which I think were \$800,000 or something.

Mayor Baines replied yes.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated I just think that is tremendously irresponsible to project something that high. It ought to be knocked down by at least 1/3, probably 2/3. Certainly at least 1/3 to ½. I don't think we will ever realize that and to project that is just irresponsible. I think we should consider that.

Mayor Baines stated some of this ½% cut can be made up by the departments with the savings that they are going to incur with the reduction in electricity costs. It is not all going to come out of their department's operating expenses.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it my understanding that we are going to allow them to do...benefits are included so that if there is a savings in a position there is also savings in a benefit. That was not the case in this year's budget. Am I correct, Alderman Wihby?

Alderman Wihby replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated so as long as we give the departments the tools to do the job, hopefully they will be okay.

Mayor Baines replied yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I have a couple of things in reference to Alderman Wihby. In asking the question of the Police Chief as well as all of the departments that are going to come back here, I think it is very important that when they do come back instead of giving a laundry list that they give a priority list as to...for an example we talked about community policing. In the Police Department last year they had to eliminate positions at the Mall, curtail career development, remove a second officer in the prison transfer wagon and the things that they need this year in their budget were to reinstate community policing assignments and reinforce motor vehicle, increase community outreach programs and enhance training for police personnel. I would like to see, before I vote on it, which is more important to the Chief. If we are going to give them \$60,000 or if it is a directive from this Board that we give them the \$60,000 and it is going to go for community policing if we want to micromanage to that point.

Mayor Baines stated I think the Chief wants to clarify something.

Chief Driscoll stated I appreciate this moment. Twice during this meeting and because these meetings are televised I feel an obligation to respond. Twice it has been brought up that we did a roadblock last Saturday night. That is absolutely true. Eight Manchester police officers and eight State troopers worked. There was not a nickel of salary money spent. It was from our federal highway safety grant. We stopped 240 cars. We arrested and took off the road four drunk drivers, folks that potentially could have hurt your loved ones or mine. I stand behind that. It is an extraordinary program. The inconvenience to the citizens of Manchester is minute. We give them a survey. I would be glad to show the survey as well as the results of the survey to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. I think that it is an exceptional program and makes for a safer city and I stand behind it, Sir. I thank you for the opportunity to bring that to your attention.

Mayor Baines stated I support you on that 100% but I also would state very clearly that as Chief when you are making decisions around the City you are never making a decision that you feel would jeopardize the safety of the citizens of our community. I feel very confident in saying that.

Chief Driscoll replied that is absolutely true. I would tell you also that we filed a multi-page affidavit and had a court order allowing us to conduct that roadblock.

Mayor Baines stated I am talking just very generally in terms of the decisions that you are making around the City that are made with the safety of the City in mind. You are not going to jeopardize the safety of the citizens of our City.

Alderman Shea stated just going down a different road if I may, I think one of the important areas of our City that we often neglect is the paving of our roads. I know that when budgets are made up we do give a certain amount of money to civic contributions and other types of worthy causes but I think that if we could and I don't say nickel and dime but if we could probably quarter and half a dollar a few of these things and get some more money for the Highway Department to pave a few more streets I really think that it would help in our infrastructure here. I know that just looking at civic contributions we have gone from \$112,000 to \$148,000. Maybe we could do a little bit of tightening there and give a little bit more to Frank out of that and probably contingency I know we have gone \$20,000 less than what you suggested. Maybe we could go another \$10,000 or \$12,000 and we could get four or five different streets. We should try to look at these things and see if we can get some help. I know that Frank indicated that if he could get a few more dollars he could possibly do a little more paving. I think that is very important. I think people want that, your Honor.

Alderman Clancy stated recently it has been brought to my attention that we have been renovating some of the playgrounds throughout the City and I heard from Parks & Recreation that they are going to be \$100,000 short in renovating the Beech Street School playground. We are going to have a meeting this coming Wednesday and that school playground is long overdue to have some renovations made. Of course the kids have to leave Beech Street School to cross the street to go to Sheridan Park to play. Ron Johnson and Ron Ludwig notified me that they are \$100,000 shy so I am hoping that we can do something about it because that school has been lacking a playground for quite awhile.

Mayor Baines stated and you have been a strong advocate for that for awhile and I appreciate you standing up for that.

Alderman Pariseau stated I agree with Alderman Shea that we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that there are monies in the CIP account to take care of street

resurfacing and sidewalk construction. I think if we could give Frank a few more bucks we could get a few more streets paved. South Elm Street for one and Calef Road and Rosedale Avenue and Rosemont.

Alderman Levasseur asked again we laid over the CIP budget and I don't think we had enough discussion on where the monies were going to go in the CIP budget and I have a question for Mr. MacKenzie. There is \$100,000 that is being put away for the PAL building and I remember specifically Alderman Hirschmann asking the policemen who were backing the PAL building will you ever be coming back to us for anymore money if we give you the \$75,000 to purchase that property and he said no we will not be coming back for that. So now we have \$100,000 in CIP that I think would be more appropriately spent at Beech Street playground. Can we use that money for the Beech Street playground instead of the PAL building? I think there should be some transfer in some of the CIP money, especially now that I have been finding out where some of it has been put.

Mr. MacKenzie answered you could transfer the money. Both projects are worthy, however, and I would like to be given an opportunity first of to see if we can find \$100,000 in CDBG funds. The park is funded through the HUD money and I would like to go back. If it was cash I couldn't find it but we could go back and look at CDBG funds to see if there are monies available.

Alderman Levasseur asked so in other words there is still some money out there.

Mr. MacKenzie answered I will look.

Alderman Gatsas stated from the Assessor's Office I know that we had sent you on a mission to see if we could get some adequate numbers at least to the level of Nashua. I don't know if you have anything prepared and what impact that would have on this budget.

Mr. Tellier stated what was presented to all of you was a small spreadsheet that includes all of the information for Concord, Salem and Nashua as requested. Then in the fourth column was Manchester's present criteria and information and in the final column was the Manchester proposal according to the request in comparison to Nashua. As you go down you can just go column by column and item by item to see that they were matching item for item with Nashua. When you get to the bottom, under the row that says total assessment or assessed value reduction, that is where you will get to the meat of the presentation. If you look in that row, you see \$71,966,100 for Nashua. That is with 873 people getting their exemptions. If you go to the far right column, at \$111,220,000 that would be with the 1,131 people who are getting it. However, and this is important to note, if the asset limit is increased by \$35,000 to \$75,000 we have every reason to believe that we will

exceed that \$111,220,000 by quite a bit. All we could get for information for this Board is what is out there. In other words, we got everything that we could regarding numbers and exemption amounts but as soon as you open up a particular qualification criteria such as the assets or the income limit without additional demographic information that is not available to us, it is very difficult to make any sort of verifiable predictions. So what we are looking at in our first presentation...had we just increased under the criteria that was presented originally...

Alderman Gatsas interjected why don't we cut to the chase so that you can make this easy for all of us because you giving your dissertation is going to lead us down blind alleys. Let me just ask the question and you give me the answer. If we go with Manchester Proposal 1 and assuming that and assuming that it goes from 1,131 to 2,262 and it doubles, the 1,131 is what dollars to the City, revenues because obviously we have to look at that on the tax rate side?

Mr. Tellier stated the \$111 million is just going one for one. That is 1,131 people that qualify.

Alderman Gatsas stated let me try the question again. If we use that assumption and it was \$111,220,000 what would that effect with the tax rate today mean to the City of Manchester in lost revenue?

Mr. Tellier replied using the \$5.2 billion it is a little bit higher than...it would be about comparative.

Alderman Gatsas asked give me a dollar amount. You want to use it on the old number to see how it affects the tax rate.

Mr. Tellier answered \$2,724,890. That is using \$24.50 for a tax rate. Isn't that what you asked?

Alderman Gatsas replied no that is the \$5.2 billion. I am saying to you...

Mr. Tellier interjected my understanding of what you just asked...the \$111 million in assessed valuation what did that equate to for a dollar amount. Is that what you asked?

Alderman Gatsas replied what you are saying to me is that if 1,131 people with the criteria that you proposed came in to you or that we proposed or I proposed or Mary Sysyn proposed, what would that be for a revenue loss to the City.

Mr. Tellier responded I will repeat what I just said, \$2,724,890. That is based on the \$5.2 billion.

Alderman Gatsas asked what about the \$3.8 billion. That is what you should be basing it on. Don't base it on an assumption that you don't have.

Mr. Porter stated maybe I can help you. If you take the \$111,220,000 and we have been using an estimated tax rate of approximately \$24.50. Up until now we didn't have any other concrete numbers. If we multiply that times \$24.50 you come up with a dollar amount of \$2,724,890 based on this exemption.

Alderman Gatsas stated let's try and use the \$30.68 rate because that is the rate we have currently.

Mr. Porter replied I will help you if you allow me. I will give you the difference. If you take the approximately \$60,335,550 times the tax rate of \$30.68 you come up with \$1,840,800. If you take the difference of \$2,724,890 minus the \$1,840,800 you come up with a difference of \$884,000. Does that help you?

Alderman Gatsas responded that is the answer I am looking for.

Mr. Porter asked so you will not ask me any more questions.

Alderman Gatsas replied I am going to ask you another one. The question I am going to ask you now is that is based on 1,131 people and obviously looking at Nashua's criteria they have 873. Why would the difference be almost 50% when the population is not that much different?

Mr. Porter stated don't forget the criteria that Nashua was using was probably from last year when they reviewed. We haven't yet taken applications for the new elderly exemptions. However, I would also like to bring up one thing that wasn't brought up and that we should address. That is the blind exemption. That is an assessed value exemption as well. It does not impact as much but there is a slight impact. The blind as it is right now and I don't mean to digress Alderman but if you will allow me the blind get a \$67,000 exemption and there are 72 people on that exemption at the present time, which is a total of \$4.8 million. If we go to a new figure, which we calculated would give roughly the same dollars and I am only saying that because I think past Boards during revaluation at times we have changed or at least wanted to maintain the status quo. For the blind in order to get an equivalent exemption to what they are getting now we would have to go to \$85,000 and there are approximately 72 blind people, which would be \$6,120,000. That is a difference of assessed value of \$1,296,000 so we are probably talking about an additional \$31,752, which is not insignificant but I don't think it would

necessarily skew the results. I think we are looking at a substantial difference based on the numbers that you had requested.

Mayor Baines asked just for clarification unless I am looking at the wrong numbers, that number is proportional to the population difference isn't it. About 24% or something like that difference and that is about the difference in population approximately.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated but they are already at 75,000. That is what Alderman Gatsas was saying.

Alderman Gatsas stated so if we need to give the seniors of this City an opportunity to participate in something that they have worked an awful lot of years towards, then to incorporate that proposal of \$75,000 as an asset limit then we need to find at least another \$1 million to \$1.2 million somewhere in this budget.

Mr. Porter stated it would result in, I won't say revenue loss but a revenue investment in the elderly if you will.

Alderman Levasseur asked, Mr. Tellier, could you find out what the other cities have for tax exempt properties. I know we are around \$263,000,000 in tax exempt properties. I wonder what Nashua and Portsmouth's numbers would be. We have a lot of tax exempt properties here because I think we have a lot of services that the elderly live in this City for. We have two big hospitals, we have a lot of nursing homes and other things.

Mayor Baines replied they can get that for us.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated now those figures you just gave us were staying at 1,131. We have to assume that is going to go up some percentage and that is the magic number that we don't know. Do you have any guess whatsoever? 30% maybe?

Mr. Tellier replied there is no way to tell. There is a guarantee that it will go up substantially if you change the asset limit from \$35,000 to \$75,000. That has to be recognized.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated there is no way to tell a definite amount but we can have some kind of guess. You say substantially. Would you say that the 30% range would be a fair guess?

Mr. Tellier replied anything that I give at this point is just a guess.

Alderman Vaillancourt responded that is what I am asking for.

Mr. Tellier stated it would really be unprofessional of me to say that.

Alderman Gatsas stated that is why I used \$1.2 million. I used the 30% figure.

Mayor Baines stated just to clarify on the asset limits, that does not include the value of the home is that correct.

Mr. Tellier replied that is correct. It excludes the value of the home.

Alderman Gatsas asked on the chargeback line for schools, I think we all heard pretty interesting testimony last night and I guess my question is if last year's chargeback number and I am just going to use a hypothetical and say it was \$6.5 million last year and if they have been billed \$5.2 million and they are in disagreement of \$1.3 million or let's use \$1 million for a number, how does that reflect with what we are giving them for this year if we don't get paid for last year.

Mr. Clougherty stated if we don't get paid for last year, that is the point that we have been making regarding fund balance and why we have been so reluctant to make more fund balance available because if they don't pay us you are not going to have those revenues to help you increase that number. If we were certain or we knew better what they were going to pay for us, we might have some more flexibility in that line.

Alderman Gatsas replied I guess that hasn't answered my question. Why are we going to fund...let's try it a different way why are we going to fund \$114 million and change if we don't get paid what we billed them for this year?

Mayor Baines stated Kevin if you can just give us how the numbers work out.

Mr. Clougherty replied the number is the same. Whether they decide to pay it or not, the number that you have included in your budget and calculated is the amount that you expect they are going to have for chargebacks and that hasn't change year to year that much. Whether they decide to pay it or not doesn't change the fact that you have those charges that are legitimate expenses that they should be paying.

Mayor Baines stated to answer Alderman Gatsas' question, in a better scenario there would actually be contracts. How many times have we said this throughout this process that there should be some kind of a written contract as part of the process where the School District agrees in a contract format to the level of

services related to the chargeback so that we do not get into this situation. We don't have that process right now.

Alderman Gatsas replied I understand we don't have that process but if we are just taking an assumption that we are going to be paid why don't we just give them \$108 million and don't give them the chargebacks and let them send the bills to us or we will send them the bills and give them a credit.

Mayor Baines responded there are some of us and I don't want to speak for Alderman Cashin, who feel that the other system was better because it was an established number that was agreed upon that was not subject to the dialogue and the verifications and everything else that are part of the process now. That is the essence of what you have now. In retrospect, even though with due respect to Kevin Clougherty I do understand the rationale of why that has been adopted but that has created this uncertainty because we moved away from that situation that existed up until about two or three years ago. That is the best I can do to answer your question.

Alderman Gatsas stated I will pose the question again. Why don't we give them...well what is the chargebacks? Let's say \$7 million and if we are giving them \$114 million why don't we give them \$107 million and hold the \$7 million until we understand if we are getting paid or not?

Mayor Baines replied I don't think we can do that legally.

Alderman Gatsas stated then there should be some caveat like a footnote like we do at the state level where we give them a budget and the footnote says that if we are not going to get paid on what we charged them the year before we should deduct that from what we are giving them this year.

Mayor Baines replied we had some discussions about a similar type thing this afternoon and Solicitor Clark will be glad to restate what he said to us this afternoon.

Solicitor Clark stated part of the tenor of the Alderman's question is related to the dispute we currently have going in court as to how the chargebacks are answered and what we do if we don't get paid. That will all either get worked out through the two Boards or through the court one way or the other. Secondly, by our Charter we have to give the School Department a bottom line. We can't give them a certain number and say we are going to hold the rest of it in advance because once we say it is part of their money, it is their money.

Mayor Baines stated I don't want to confuse the matter but in the other system...

Alderman Gatsas interjected let's not talk about other systems. We are here today. It is Monday. Let's deal with what we have in front of us and let's not look behind us because I am sick of looking behind.

Mayor Baines replied well we do that a lot in government.

Alderman Gatsas stated I understand that but it doesn't get you any further forward. Either we need to come to some agreement that we give to the School Board that says here it is, this is what we are giving you for a number, this is what we expect or we don't have a deal. Now I don't know how much clearer that could be. We heard the Superintendent the other day in there...I think I gave him more than an opportunity to walk through a door and if he didn't want to take it then we are going to be in the same position here next year. I know that everybody here voted on a health insurance plan and I think that everybody should understand the health insurance plan that we voted on, the two RFP's that I looked at were irresponsible for anybody to take. When you have two plans out there, two RFP's that are two different numbers on how many lives they are insuring, different amounts of claims and nobody is asking those questions, it is irresponsible of this Board to pass those insurance plans. Irresponsible. Now I apologize for being late but somebody should have looked at it. I provided the questions and those were the answers I got. We are looking at a plan that came back with two different bids. Now how does somebody bid on 1,880 lives and somebody bid on 1,850 lives. How does somebody bid with \$2 million more in claims than the other side? That doesn't make sense.

Alderman Lopez stated I think we need a response to that because Alderman Gatsas has put a lot of work into this and a lot of staff time has gone into answering those questions, which we all received today. The professional staff that is here, including the City Assessors who looked over the bid process with HR and David I would like to have them comment. When you say it was irresponsible...

Alderman Gatsas interjected it is.

Alderman Lopez stated I appreciate your comment but I think from the professional staff I would like to hear their comment in reference to your charge.

Mr. Tawney stated we had William Mercer work with us to draft the RFP and then to evaluate the RFP. They went through and when they had this variance in the listing of the claim they did an assignment because we are dealing with the same benefit and the same providers throughout, both systems are identical, then the claims should be identical. They picked what they thought was the most probable

from using Anthem and then the real difference between the two plans is the administrative fees and the reinsurance costs for the aggregate and the stop-loss.

Alderman Gatsas stated I am looking here...do you have the questions and answers in front of you. Maybe we need to and I know that in the past I have suggested that we should be suing on E&O insurance one or two years ago our auditor but we forego that and now we are getting an advisor who looks at something and tells us that they are comparable and I am saying how is it comparable when I am looking and saying the Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan is \$2.6 million in claims and the NH Municipal Association is \$2.4 million. How can that possibly be and how is it only \$68,000 when I am looking at a much larger number?

Mr. Tawney replied the numbers should have been the same. They were dealing with the same group.

Alderman Gatsas asked and that is not irresponsible. I will rest my case on that and let the rest of this Board decide what they want to do when we sit and pay people to come back with judgement decisions and they don't even look at information to give us qualified decision. Two totally different proposals that aren't even close and it took me a whole weekend out of my time to look through it and what did you pay Mercer? How much did we pay Mercer?

Mr. Tawney replied as I mentioned earlier I can give you that information. I don't have it with me.

Alderman Gatsas stated well I didn't get paid anything and I came up with it over a weekend.

Alderman Lopez stated just to make sure that I understand, presently the elderly exemption is assets of \$35,000 and the proposed is \$75,000. Is that \$75,000 recommendation based on Nashua only?

Mr. Tellier answered yes it is.

Alderman Lopez asked and you have no other number.

Mr. Tellier answered the request was to use Nashua's number and to come up with the impact to the budget to the best of our ability.

Alderman Lopez stated I thought that Alderman Gatsas asked for you to come up with your recommendation.

Mr. Tellier replied no. I reviewed the tape and there were some other things bantered about but the earliest part, which was reiterated by several members was to use Nashua's numbers and to come back with what that impact would be.

Alderman Lopez stated I have one final question then. If we use the \$75,000, which you are recommending on your proposal as Nashua, I think Alderman Vaillancourt asked if you knew how many more people you were going to incorporate and you said no.

Mr. Tellier replied that is correct.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated just to follow-up on that I do recall saying the night we did that that I don't think we should go to the most generous City and I think that going to the most generous leads us down the path where it is going to cost us a great deal but back to the insurance question I should say something now. I didn't vote no on that question when it came up tonight but I didn't vote yes either. There was no roll call so I didn't have the chance to vote no and having gotten a little bit sick and tired of pounding my head against the wall and being the only person to speak up and say no, had there been a roll call I would have said no. I agree with Alderman Gatsas completely on that. I suppose we could move to reconsider but I do believe it was an irresponsible thing to do. Perhaps it was irresponsible of me not to shout no and be the only one saying no as well. Back to the overall budget, I understand, your Honor, that you concur with the proposal as put forth by Alderman Wihby. Is that correct?

Mayor Baines stated we have agreed to put these numbers on the table to layover.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked just to make doubly sure, your Honor, you concur that MCTV should not, as Jon Gross said, be moved into its window on Main Street. You concur that MCTV should not get its new facility.

Mayor Baines replied we are giving all of the departments an opportunity to react to the numbers that are being presented this evening. I think Alderman Wihby has made that clear and I have made that clear. The purpose was to get some numbers on the table tonight because we had to do it. When we get their reactions, we will be able to respond to them.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated right and I think we know what MCTV will say. The reason I brought this up is when they came forward with their proposal, your budget was the original one which called for them not to go there and you said something to the effect because they hadn't worked it out yet that you didn't want them to go there so I am just wondering tonight if you are on record as saying that even though they have now worked it out you do not support them going there.

Mayor Baines replied you can speak for yourself and I will speak for myself on that issue.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated that is why I am asking you the question.

Mayor Baines replied I haven't seen a proposal from them in terms of a specific location, specific rental cost or anything of that nature. Nothing has been presented to me as we speak.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked so you support them staying where they are and not going to a new facility.

Mayor Baines answered we are supporting the numbers. As I said to you we are going to get reactions from every single department and once we get them we can act as a body on them and then you can vote. It is a legislative matter at this point in time.

Alderman Vaillancourt stated it is a very small matter but I believe that there should be a reduction of \$6,000...I believe Dr. Sullivan acknowledged to one of my questions that they had budgeted \$12,000 for travel when in fact they only needed \$6,000 so I believe that should have been reduced as one of the footnotes here.

Alderman Shea stated what I want to know is when are we coming back. Have we set a time for that?

Deputy Clerk Johnson replied it is Monday, June 11 at 5:30 PM.

Mayor Baines stated I also have responsibility to chair the School Board and that should be a very interesting meeting on Monday night and I would like to meet at 5:30 PM. I am not going to ask you to rush through it but if I could have at least an hour and a half over here that is all I am asking.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated I just want to point out because people seem to be thinking in terms of Monday evening that you do have another meeting right after this as well so I ask that nobody leave.

Alderman Wihby stated I have a couple of items to follow-up on what is included in the numbers. In the PBS item we had talked about it the other day when schools were here but the proposal was to take the money that was going to be for the additional landscaping, the pilot program, and put it toward two painters, a building technician and a plumber for half a year. That is the way that is. Also in

Human Resources when we got the bids, the bid was higher by \$20,000 or whatever it was to go out and have it by contract. This proposal would mean that they would have the authority to bring it in house with the additional staff and use that same amount of money but do it the way that Howard had talked about.

Alderman Vaillancourt asked are you talking about the Pinkerton security guards.

Alderman Wihby answered yes.

Mayor Baines stated the Clerk will clarify what we are voting on at this time.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated there is a motion on the floor to amend the resolution to the amount of \$102,383,154.

Mayor Baines called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted that the resolution ought to pass and layover as amended.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee