

PERSONNEL/ADMINISTRATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AUGUST 4, 2025

A meeting of the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee was held Monday, August 4, 2025 at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber and duly noticed in two places, including the City's website in accordance with the requirements of RSA 91-A:2 II.

The roll call was taken with 4 members of the Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee present: Chairwoman Shoshanna Kelly presided.

Members of the Committee present: Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly, Chairwoman
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons, Vice Chair
Alderman Thomas Lopez
Alderman Tim Sennott

Members not in Attendance: Alderman Ernest A. Jette

Also in Attendance: Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman Chris Thibodeau
Mayor Jim Donchess
Tim Cummings, Administrative Services Director
Nancy Trask, Human Resources Manager
Steve Buxton, Fire Chief

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT

Paula Johnson

Good evening, my name is Paula Johnson, I live at 15 Westborn Drive. I'm here to speak about O-25-060...

Chairwoman Kelly

I'm having a little hard time hearing you.

Paula Johnson

... I'm a little tired tonight.

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay, well I just want to make sure I can hear you fully.

Paula Johnson

The reason I'm here is I understand you don't want political banners. You don't want political flags in here. We never had it, everybody respected that but when Mr. Teeboom, former Alderman came in here and he had a chart, he brought in a poster talking about the spending cap. I guess it was something like this except in a bigger board, except mine is upside down. And this talks about the charter related laws and he was talking about this so everybody can understand. But I guess it was too high or whatever to

block views. So you could have people with a poster like this. You could move the mic over to here...

Chairwoman Kelly

...You have to stand for the mic so it gets recorded for the...

Paula Johnson

...I get it, but you could move over to there which wouldn't obstruct any views. So I just happened to be on watching my favorite rumble programs and this is Congress. Congress have people coming in and testifying which we basically are when we're giving public comments and they allow charts, diagrams. Why can't we the citizens of Nashua? You're taking away our First Amendment rights. Again, I understand political nobody ever wore buttons in because it's supposed to be non-partisan for our local elections, which we know it's not most of the time. But to have this I'm sorry, it's not right to take our First Amendment right, our Freedom of Speech. You are representatives of the people and I keep going through this all the time.

We elect you to represent us, not to take away our rights in this city or at this microphone. You have taken away time from us and only give us three minutes to speak because that's all we're worth is three minutes of speech. But to say to us that we can't bring in a chart like this and if it's going to obstruct views this microphone can be moved over there and we could stand over there and show our charts and our diagrams and it's fair. Don't take our rights away. And the other ordinance which I can't find here with all my papers is regarding the salaries that Alderman-at-Large O'Brien is bringing in. Maybe you'll table that tonight because he's not here to speak about it. But again, don't take our First Amendment rights away. Thank you very much.

Laurie Ortolano, 41 Berkeley Street

Laurie Ortolano, 41 Berkeley Street. First of all, are you going to address the New England First Amendment Coalition letter that came to the committee regarding the ordinance language? Is that, it wasn't in the packet, did everyone get it?

Alderwoman Kelly

I believe everyone on the Personnel did receive it.

Laurie Ortolano

Okay, but it's not part of your agenda talk. Well, initially...

Alderwoman Kelly

That one only goes to where it was sent. It doesn't attach here.

Laurie Ortolano

Okay, so I think it's something that you should all be looking at because when I immediately read that ordinance I saw the opportunity for viewpoint discrimination and quite frankly I don't know why Dorie Clarke doesn't reach out to any AFC before she sends the language in or Steve Bolton to avoid the discrimination issues associated with that. I brought in banners in 2021, 2022 held them up here. Poster boards with my assessment stuff on it. Nobody complained and told me I couldn't do it. So I think the banner thing is a little bit absurd.

I also think I saw Lori Wilshire tell a group that came in with 8-1/2 x 11 signs held them here and said no masks because they didn't want the mask ordinance. She told them all to put the signs down; no signs

allowed. I knew that was unconstitutional and I want to know what is this Board going to do when somebody sits in the audience with this sign, "the Board sucks". What are you going to do? Is that constitutional? Are you going to kick them out? You going to say it's okay? What's your sign policy going to do about that it's not causing a danger. What if somebody gets a little deeper into it and pulls up a sign that says "Derek is an ass"?

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay, that's enough.

Laurie Ortolano

Okay, what are we gonna do about that?

Chairwoman Kelly

We do have an ordinance against using those kinds of language.

Laurie Ortolano

Okay, so I think you're wrong about that. What if okay, because this is constitutional. If they're not speaking it and they're sitting there holding it what are you going to do? Are you going to kick them out on that? You just kind of indicated you would? What if it's this sign? I won't read it for you because it upsets you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Miss Ortolano we have an ordinance that says that we are not allowed to use crude or vulgar language and what you're holding up is vulgar. If you'd like to keep within the decorum you can continue to speak if you do not please sit down.

Laurie Ortolano

I don't think this stops anyone from being in this chamber with this sign. You know why? Because it is constitutional and when you produced your public comment policy you would not take the language of New England First Amendment Coalition.

Chairwoman Kelly

Your time is done.

Laurie Ortolano

No, it isn't.

Chairwoman Kelly

You are not following the ordinance that we have and I have asked you...

Laurie Ortolano

Derek T. is an asshat. Now that's a level farther. What are you going to do with this sign? Is it constitutional or not? You're saying it's not.

Chairwoman Kelly

I'm saying that we have rules of decorum that have been approved by this Board...

Laurie Ortolano

Am I violating those rules?

Chairwoman Kelly

...and vulgar language is not allowed. You are done. Thank you.

Laurie Ortolano

I think you should really...I still had time and you took that away.

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Tim Cummings, Director of Administrative Services
Nancy Trask, Human Resources Manager
Lizzie Gouveia, Sr. Human Resources Specialist

Re: Request for Legislation for implementation of Unaffiliated Salary and Compensation Schedule for FY27

There being no objection, Chairwoman Kelly accepted the communication and placed it on file.

Without objection, Chairwoman Kelly suspended the rules to allow for two communications that were received after the agenda was prepared.

From: Bobbie Bagley, Director of Public Health and Community Services

Re: Board of Health's recommendation relative to O-25-051 Prohibiting the Sale of Kratom

From: Nancy Trask, Human Resources Manager
Lizzie Gouveia, Sr. Human Resources Specialist

Re: Proposed Ordinance O-25-058 Recommendation

There being no objection, Chairwoman Kelly accepted the communications and placed them on file.

Alderman Sennott

I have a concern Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

And this, I'm only speaking to myself personally. This second communication I did get into my email right before the meeting tonight and see that it was received around 4:41 p.m. that's about 10 minutes after I leave work. I haven't had a chance to review this yet so I guess, in regards to that I do have concerns accepting this communication having not had the opportunity to review it prior to this meeting.

Chairwoman Kelly

What does the rest of the board feel? Alderman Lopez, you're not...oh, you are on my committee. Go ahead. I'm sorry it's Monday. We're gonna get there.

Alderman Lopez

So I think if we're accepting the communication we probably should. It was received by the Board just because we want to make sure other people can read it and it goes on the agenda. But I do think it's true that if a communication comes this late on an issue we may or maybe we withhold or reserve the right not to act on that legislation because now we need to review this a little more thoroughly. I do not like the last minute ambushes.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

As far as not moving forward on different legislation. I mean, I assume that what is within the documents has been verified because it is coming from the administration. However it's a recommendation and we can decide to accept it, not accept it, move forward anyway, do whatever we want. We really don't have to listen to what is in here.

Alderman Sennott

I'll withhold any objection so we can at least accept the communication.

Chairwoman Kelly

I will somewhat frustratedly accept the communication because I feel the same way as many of my Colleagues. This is an issue that's been in front of us for many months and the last time we talked about this was two months ago, so for it to come in at 20 minutes to the end of the day feels intentional. So moving on, we have interviews.

INTERVIEWSCable Television Advisory Board**(not in attendance)**

Oscar Villacis (new appointment)
76 Beauview Avenue
Nashua, NH 03064

Term to Expire: June 10, 2028

Keefe Auditorium Commission

Joe Olefirowicz (new appointment)
35 Newbury Street
Nashua, NH 03060

Chairwoman Kelly

Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Donchess

Thank you, Madam President. So I am here to introduce Joseph Olefirowicz. Now this is really Alderman Wilshire's appointment, but I'm here so I said I would be glad to introduce Joe for the Auditorium Commission. His background in I mean you should read the resume because it's really extensive and very interesting. But he here in Nashua is the Music Director up at the First Church, but has been involved in many, many different musical organizations both here in the United States and in Europe. Has extensive music background. I think understands and has seen many, many auditoriums. So he's a perfect nominee for the Auditorium Commission and I'm sure that's why Alderman Wilshire decided to appoint him. He's a resident of Ward Seven, Crown Hill and has lived there for quite a few years. And so I will turn things over to Mr. Olefirowicz and let him say anything further he'd like about himself and of his interest in the Auditorium Commission.

Joe Olefirowicz

Good evening folks. Thank you for having me this evening as members of the Committee for Personnel. I have a 30 year background in international arts production both in classical and commercial theater. The beginning of my career was actually doing all of the German companies and Broadway musicals abroad. And in the 90s back then that was not a thing and so there were purpose built theaters being built, conversions of spaces of old train depots into theaters and this kind of thing. And so in my 20s as a puppy I went through at least four or five of these new builds most of them all 1,000 to 1,800 seat spaces on it.

And my final one with Disney was with the initial stage production of the Hunchback of Notre Dame in Berlin, Germany where Renzo Piano designed the new massive theater on (inaudible). And I was actually commissioned in that production to design its orchestra pit. So there's a lot of the things, I also have a background in theatrical lighting design, those kind of things. So not only on a production level in the arts that I'm primarily on the podium conducting productions or orchestras, but also on a technical level and just kind of on building and plans and that kind of thing. And so it's seems like a natural fit.

As a former acting principal keyboard of Symphony, New Hampshire, formerly Nashua Symphony I've played in the Keefe quite often. Very fond of the space, that kind of thing. Here I've been 18 years as a Nashua resident at the church and also as the Artistic Director of the First Music Concert Series which is also under the church's umbrella. So I think the and also living in Crown Hill it's really just a hop of a couple of streets over to the Elm Street property looking at that. And so I'm very invested in seeing if we can preserve it, seeing if it's viable to do so. Have already attended the first meeting of the gathering that was a few weeks ago, even though I could not yet vote officially. But there's a good overview and it's a very good team that's been put together. So I hope you'll be interested in having me as part of that.

Mayor Donchess

And so with that, you can how well-qualified the nominee is and please proceed with any questions or comments you have.

Chairwoman Kelly

Open up to questions from the Board. Alderman Clemons and then Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you very much. So thank you very much for coming forward and wanting to accept this position. Obviously, the Keefe is a very important community asset. My question to you, the only question I have to you is what is your take on the current state of the Keefe Auditorium and what do you think is

necessary to where it needs to be?

Chairwoman Kelly

Just a small one!

Joe Olefirowicz

It's a bit, I'll admit that's a bit of a loaded question.

Alderman Clemons

It is.

Joe Olefirowicz

Mayor Donchess as well knows that I wrote a very strong op ed before the pandemic regarding the design of the PAC downtown kind of playdoughing for the Keefe to become that particular building. So I think there is a challenge now that did not exist then in that because the school has been decommissioned that you have a major infrastructure issue with the building in terms of getting its utilities and all of its updates done. And it's the kind of thing where the tolerance for that kind of budgeting just to get the building functioning as a theater as is, I do not believe will be a wise investment for the city. You really need to think about the long term what is going to be the 40-50 year use of the space and that's going to take a lot of additional design and additional things that are kind of there that are going to be possibly uncomfortable conversations and looking at budgets and looking at planning.

So I think that there's, the bones are amazing. Okay, the bones are great, but the bones alone the building itself just its footprint cannot be the thing that is the only thing that happens to the space in order to make it viable for the city and I think the city really needs to you know, that's going to be the challenges. And I understand that the Keefe Commission is a recommending Board, they're not a deciding Board. They make recommendations to the Board of Aldermen. So already in that first meeting there have been certain things that are said that I won't put into this meeting right now because it's not probably the best place for it. It's either going to be in minutes or your representative that was with us. We talked about you know viability and looking at this; does it even make sense to move forward? So I think it's an uphill battle because I think the public, the public's perception of putting more money into the arts is a very strong, opinionated kind of you know, black and white subject and we hope to be able to produce something, I would say that could be viable. I think it's going to be work. This is not next year, this is not 2 years. This is 5-7 years from now in my opinion.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah, if I can continue. I appreciate that answer and you know, I think one of the goals right of the Commission is to engage with the community and really see like you know, is there an option to fundraise, is there an option to come up with a capital campaign, things like that for that. I think one of the things that we first need to do here is a decision by this Board and that is to engage the two developers with the two proposals that went forward. We're having a meeting on that on Thursday. It'll be interesting to see the format of that meeting and to see what comes out of that. I'm optimistic that there is the ability for this Board to put its suggestions forward and hopefully have some of those architects go back to the drawing board because to your point about the utilities being separated out. If the building could be redesigned to include some of the utilities to be shared between the two the newly renovated area and the Keefe then I think we're talking a significant amount of savings that could be born onto the project where you could then, if you could have a successful capital campaign you could then have that money go towards other things which is making that a more viable space. So I think there's some stuff that still needs to be done here on our end, but I appreciate the glass half full approach I guess, that you have and I think part of that comes from your background. And so again, I

thank you for coming forward.

Alderwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez, I had you next.

Alderman Lopez

So kind of along the same veins and maybe asking you to just focus a little bit of the comments because I think you did kind of touch on it. A lot of the concerns I think are whether this is a good use of taxpayer money, whether the city will see a return on investment. I am personally pretty firm in my belief that arts brings economic activities. It brings economic vitality. It engages residents in personally investing in their communities because they feel part of something greater than if we just you know, have roads that are just for traveling instead of having restaurants and businesses on either side and I think art enhances the sense of community that makes the community thrive. But in your professional experience have you seen in the areas that you've been working to develop projects similar to this or even it sounds like much larger there's a solid return on investment and it's something that the community benefits from?

Joe Olefirowicz

I've worked in an industry abroad. The commercial theaters were exclusively private, subsidized also by cities because they had interest in this. One of the phenomena for me working in the arts for as long as I have a little bit is Nashua's laser focus on economic development as being the reason why arts have to be in a city and that's something completely foreign to my world. The world that I work in when I'm in the public orchestra sector in Germany for instance, 90% of the cost of production is state money only. The tickets only pay for 10% of anything and that's a vastly different model. Because for instance, I was thinking about this today whether this question would come up. This would be equating the reason for Greeley Park existing in order for it to be an economic driver. Greeley Park exists because people need public space.

The Arts exist, in my opinion, because people need that facet of their life to have an enhancement and an enrichment. And so the investment in that arts are not always an economic return. And I think there has to be a balance found in that and this is going to be a, this is a big ticket item for the city to preserve this building and to expand it into modern production use. I actually think that there needs to be very ardent conversations and looks at these things. I think it's fascinating about the utility share. That's something that's interesting but as you said Alderman about you know, taking the costs and then putting them into the infrastructure needs that are lobby, backstage space, rehearsal rooms, dressing rooms, all these other things that are there. So I think there is a jewel. I go back to the days of the Collins Center in Andover that was a single donor to Andover High School that back in the day did Broadway bus and truck tours. Okay, we're not there yet in any Auditorium in Nashua. We could be there with that space in smaller touring companies in the future if the right things were done.

Then you're talking about your economic driving. But just to have another performance space that houses our current organizations is not enough to spend that much taxpayer money. And I think one of the challenges Nashua will have because I have it as a smaller producer in town. New Hampshire is constantly 49th or 50th in the country with philanthropic giving and that's a big challenge in terms of raising any money for any of these things. So I think this is a longer term project. I think people's identity with the history of the New Deal building that Elm Street is with the Keefe being the largest theatrical auditorium, traditional one, in the state and we're not talking about this new center and those kinds of things.

So I know I'm rambling a little bit about this, but I think in my world things are not produced necessarily because they bring in the money and the economic drive. There is that reciprocity that happens as a part of that, but that is second or third in line. You know, that's and so I think the arts if we want that profile for the city to have yet another jewel that is preserved and expanded into much greater use than

what we already know, move forward with the Keefe. But that is going to take education and that is going to take willpower and a lot of rolling up the sleeves and moving forward and being tenacious about it because I think the cost is going to be a factor you know, in this type of thing.

And so whether that brings in, in that region, I've heard about the plans that they're thinking about. There's some beautiful things for that property that they have in mind. But one of the things that also in my opinion also needs to be looked at is what happens to either developer if the Keefe doesn't move forward. Because it's saying that the city wants to preserve it, but if that priority is not set there and I'll reserve comment specifically on that because there were things said in our first meeting that I don't think are good for this meeting to necessarily go in the nomination process.

But I think the economic factor; it fascinated me when I served on the Arts Commission for a little bit that the arts and culture plan everything is from the economic, the economic, the economic. And I kept going what about it just needing to exist as a pass to. And that's part of the thing, I think the Keefe needs to exist for Nashua because if we lose it, we lose it. There's not going to be another 1,400 seat house built in the city at any time that I can foresee unless the magic donor goes hey, build a new theater, build a new opera house that has a pit and you can do symphonic and ballet and do all this other stuff. But I think the Keefe has such amazing potential also for the historic space that it is. And as mentioned, I think the school having to be repurposed put a challenge into this because I think it would be a different conversation if it was still an active building because the renovation of the space would be much less if the utilities were being kept from their original source. So that's, I don't know if that answers the question or is way too broad, but those are my extrovert stream of consciousness thoughts.

Alderwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez, follow up?

Alderman Lopez

Yeah, just to respond. I appreciate the passion because I share it and I do understand the existential value of having the Arts in Nashua in particularly the role that the Keefe as a historical amenity for that has performed as I see it though, I think the economic need is going to have to be part of the conversation because we're not going to get anything out of the state. This is not a friendly state to arts right now and we are also heavily self-regulating in terms of how we're bonding or trying to. Things keep coming up, it's a big city and we're trying to watch our bonding levels and our large scale investments and all that kind of stuff. So if it's going to move forward I think we need to be able to characterize it in a way that it will get at least the political support to continue moving forward.

Because in my personal opinion I have seen effort to just try to steamroll right over it and I think that's what some of us are trying to stop from happening and say wait a minute we put an ordinance in, and we put a rider in saying we have to consider the Keefe and we need to apparently fight just to have that honor. So that's why I think the economic consideration is going to be something to consider. I agree with you, I lament that we have to look at it from that perspective. In a lot of ways, New Hampshire is a stingy state and a lot of other ways I think Nashua particularly might buck the trend when it comes to philanthropic giving. I know we're one of the most active when it comes to anti-poverty and housing stability. We have one of the densest populations of charities and people supporting those charities. Art, I agree as an artist myself, it has been an uphill climb getting that recognized so I think we need somebody on the board who's willing to put their flag on that hill and make sure that we don't lose sense of that. So I appreciate your comments. I just hope that we're able to navigate forward.

Joe Olefirowicz

Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't necessarily have a question for you. I just really want to thank both Mayor Donchess and President Wilshire for the candidates they have brought forward thus far including yourself because we've had the opportunity at this committee to see a new commission grow. The Auditorium Commission has always been there, but we're sort of starting from zero here again and what we've seen is a variety of backgrounds and a variety of knowledge and you as well are bringing that to the table here with as we talked about before the meeting you're incredibly fun to read resume. You're, I don't know how you've accomplished so much in such a relatively short period of time, but it's it was very fun to read as somebody who very much enjoys the stage and musical arts. And I appreciate your passion.

I appreciate statements that you bring to the table here, where you feel as though we need to preserve the Keefe and you said something that really stuck out to me. Whereas you know, if it goes away, it's gone. I had said something to the effect when we first considered the ordinance directing our developers to save it is you know, if we don't pass this tonight we'll get another opportunity to kill the Keefe, but we may not get another opportunity to save it. But I also appreciate that you're bringing that with a pragmatic recognition that this is not going to be easy. It's going to cost money and it's going to take a willingness to invest and you would also mention the word education which I think is going to be one of the real uphill battles is getting all the stakeholders and the stakeholders includes the entirety of the City of Nashua on board with this and recognizing what's at stake, what we have to lose and what we have to gain. So I'm going to leave my comments there. Thank you very much for your willingness to serve on this commission. I know you just resigned another Commission recently, so I'm really glad to see you right back in the fire again.

Chairwoman Kelly

Any additional questions or remarks? Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Madam President. I want to echo all my colleagues words especially the last speaker; I agree. Joe, I've been on opposite sides of the conversation with you many a time, but I respect everything you have to say in your honest, forthright I think you're just like all the others that have been picked for. I think you're going to be an excellent person on that. I think that you shoot from the hip and you don't mince words. There's no doubt about that and that's a good thing because sometimes we have to hear what we don't want to hear. And I do appreciate and I appreciate all the conversations you've had extraordinarily this background is incredible. I had no idea until I read this. I knew that you were well-versed in many things, but not to this extent. So thank you for stepping up and to the those that will be voting. I think you're voting in positive for this particular person is an excellent step forward. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Any additional? We'll be taking up your nomination in just a bit. Thank you.

Mayor Donchess

Alright Madam Chair, we now have the Mine Falls Advisory Committee and we have Walter Davis and Kimberly Gryglik.

Chairwoman Kelly

I have them read it into the record while they come up.

Mayor Donchess

Pardon?

Chairwoman Kelly

I wanted to read it into the record, but then.

Mayor Donchess

Oh, sorry.

Mine Falls Park Advisory Committee

Walter Davis (new appointment)
Q1 Snow Circle
Nashua, NH 03062

Term to Expire: July 22, 2028

Kimberly Gryglik (new appointment)
7 Denver Drive
Nashua, NH 03063

Term to Expire: July 22, 2028

Chairwoman Kelly

Mr. Mayor, please proceed.

Mayor Donchess

Thank you, Madam Chair. So you've heard the nominees, Mr. Davis and Ms. Gryglik. We always are needing people on the Mine Falls Advisory Committee. They of course, help to advise Public Works and everybody regarding the direction that the city should take regarding this very significant Park. But also they help to organize and participate in the cleanup days and all of the other activities that the advisory committee organizes in the park. Both Mr. Davis and Ms. Gryglik have participated in those in the past. Both are very interested obviously, in the park. Mr. Davis is retired from I think Raytheon right?

Walter Davis

Yeah, actually.

Mayor Donchess

So he's got a little time, so we appreciate his interest. And Ms. Gryglik works for the State of New Hampshire and just has a very keen interest in the outdoors and in this park in particular. So I have introduced them both together which I hope is okay, but I will turn to Mr. Davis and Ms. Gryglik to first Mr. Davis to say a little bit about yourself and why you would like to be on the Mine Falls Advisory Committee.

Walter Davis

Hello, everyone. I've been in Nashua about 23 years. I live down at Ward Eight on the Villa

Condominiums and I used the park quite a bit, a lot. Also, I prefer the nickname. My nickname Ben is what most people refer to me by, which is fine. I mean either one is fine. My history with the park is I started coming here when I in the late 90s actually. There was a girl I was dating down here and she was a runner and she and I went out on the trails. I think we also did some biking if I remember, in fact I think we biked the Red Trail, which I would not I think that should be not allowed and but I don't think there's any rules posted about that. But, okay, so we did that. And then you know shortly thereafter, I moved to Nashua and I live with my girlfriend Denise and okay to get my history with the park is...Oh, I love skiing, biking and trail running. I have a few notes here.

Biking and trail running and I come here a lot. I came sporadically over the years because it I had other places that I prefer for running. And but this has its advantages. Mine Falls is close which is real nice because I don't have to commit a whole lot of time to it. I can get there fast and also if I fall when I'm exercising, when I'm running and it's not out of the realm of possibility that I would fall or hurt myself somehow because that does happen that somebody would be around within too short a time, in a short amount of time to you know, just laugh at me or whatever or get help. And so that's why I've been coming mostly to the park. But I realized that it's like a I see it as an oasis for the city and it's right down the street from the tree streets which probably is a nice location for inner city people looking to get out of you know, the area out of the city per se. And it's just a nice place. I like a lot of things about it. There's like four water features, different water features they are connected, but that makes it very appealing. I see people kayaking and doing stuff on the water, but just having the water there is pleasant. And there is plenty of forest.

As far as what was my motivation to get involved with the committee is that I wanted to give back and I've done trail days quite a bit over the years. It's not like I've been going doing these more and more frequently lately, obviously. But yeah I've been doing more frequently because I have more time, but I wanted to give back do the trail. I've done trail work and I've seen some of the problems up close. And my interest in so I was interested in finding out what the committee was all about, what they did and how the whole thing was organized as far as the trail days and what were the problems of the park and to that end, I started asking a lot of questions.

Well, let me go back a little bit my first visit. My first trail days was with this guy Joshua Siegel and he wrote that book, this book here. And I talked to him quite a bit that day when I went and he gave me this book and I insisted on paying him for it. But it has a it's a wealth of information. He gave me some information. It seemed to me like he was kind of on his way out. I don't know if it was his idea or somebody else's idea, but it sounded like he was he was done on the committee.

Mayor Donchess

So Joshua Siegel used to be a Nashua resident down in Lancashire Heights. He moved to a more remote community after somewhere to the west like Mont Vernon or something like that. Anyway, he was a great guy yeah, definitely.

Walter Davis

So he was good to talk to. He filled me in around a lot of stuff. I think we pulled a lot of wood out of the stream and on that visit and looking back I'm not sure exactly why that was so important do but, but I'll find out more as I go along, hopefully.

So anyway, so I wanted to go. I sat in a few meetings. I think it was three meetings I sat on total just to see what it was all about and they discussed some of the problems that the park had. And the first thing I did after hearing about these things was I headed out to those places that they mentioned, those parts of the park which was on the east side near the mill you know, closest to the Millyard. And I don't go to that part of the park very often at all because I don't really like the straight, flat, hard surface of the those trails to run on. I do trail running mostly. So I went down there and I started at the Seventh Street Bridge which I guess has to have new decking put on. And I understand the new decking can't exceed

the weight of the decking that there now. So I went down, I took some pictures and some rough measurements and just got a feel for what that's all about. And also at the same location was some silt that has come in from the culvert and it's impeding the flow of the water I think, down there and I guess that's a problem.

And also they were talking about the flow through the canal is a problem. So I wanted to assess that for myself so I went down and to me it looked like there was no water running at all. It was stagnant. But I went down farther past the Gate City Fence and to where it empties out into the culvert, catch basin and there is flow through there. So these are all things I wanted to check off for myself plus of course, Dave's pet peeve which was Dave Silva which was the encampments. I know he really had a problem with that and I know that's probably a big problem for the town, but I wanted to have a look see for myself. And in this book, Joshua talks about the cove trail and how nice it is. And I guess, you know, it looks like it's you wouldn't go down there. You wouldn't dare go down there, I wouldn't because it's you know, just encampments down there. So I can't even see what that trail is all about and when I go out that way I want to complete the loop, and I don't want to be going over parking lots because it's not fun for me at all. So I thought and it's a real loss to have that part of the trail missing

Also, I mean you probably know all about these problems, but on the embankment that holds the canal in I guess there's some tall trees there and the fear is that if the trees get blown over that they'll pull part of the canal with them, and then little water might start as a little flow of water and through scouring it probably you know, it'll get larger and larger, and I'm afraid that you'll lose that whole canal, because it'll drain out. Okay, the mill pond will also drain some, but the canal might be more or less empty and I thought that was a real problem that needs to be addressed. And obviously, you can cut down the trees, but maybe the trees are holding the soil in place.

There's just a whole lot of think about. And you know, I put on my engineering hat and try to look at it as far as trying to solve those problems. So I'm just saying you know, I'm very interested in all these things they were bringing up. And yeah, I saw it for myself. And erosion also is a big problem in the park. You know, that happens all over and I've done some erosion control in the past, some of that work.

Chairwoman Kelly

Thank you for the overview.

Walter Davis

What's that?

Chairwoman Kelly

Thank you for the overview. We're going to have...

Walter Davis

Oh, sure. I'm sorry.

Chairwoman Kelly

No, it's okay. We're gonna ask questions too, so you'll have lots more to be able to share with us.

Kimberly Gryglik

Good evening, I'm Kimberly Gryglik and I've been in Nashua for about eight years this month. I love Nashua and my neighborhood actually is part of Mine Falls well, kind of you can walk and you hit the trail and I do it all the time. And simply, I really just wanted to be part of something bigger than myself and

I'm at a desk at work so I really like to get out. Mine Falls has been great for me. I know candidly, I was struggling with a little depression a few years ago and getting out there and walking is like a world of difference. And so I was thinking when I was sitting there, thinking about how do I give back to my community, to the city? I was like well, what brings me joy? What makes me happy? What can I do that I really feel good about and invested in and I thought Mine Falls. So I looked online and there was the board, the advisory committee and I was like I'm going to see what happens. I'm going to apply for it and see what happens and see how I can give back and help.

I have a little boy who just turned six on Saturday and he loves he's a trash picker. He's obsessed with trash. So we often go with; he really is. So we do my whole neighborhood on Nashua North and it made me think like wow, in a little way I can give back and maybe I'm going to be going back to Simmons University to get another Masters for my clinical social work. Maybe I can use some of those skills to help in some ways with the homeless encampment. No way can I solve the problem, right? None of us can it's been existing for what, 30-40 and it's a you know, tale as old as time. But what can I do to help solve the problem? What can I do to give my perspective in my hands and my sweat? And what can I do to help rather than be the complainer can I give back in a way that's productive. So it's as simple as that. I don't have a long story. I don't know all the history of Mine Falls. I know some of it. You don't need to hear all of it, but I know that I love it and I hope that I can be a source to help others continue to love it for a long time.

Chairwoman Kelly

Great. Since we have both candidates up here as the alderman ask questions if you could just let us know who you're addressing it to, one, the other or both. That would be great. So questions from the committee. Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

So Mr. Davis you kind of concerned me a little bit. You won me over a little bit with the tree streets comment, but then you were kind of like I might fall, I might be stuck there in the middle and give my last. Are you really, are you healthy enough to do this? You're not really.

Walter Davis

I'm just saying that. I'm sorry. I just I have fallen in the past because I'm very active and I don't think it's a problem. I'm physically fit, I'm in good shape, I'm healthy and I've done this work. I enjoy this work. I love working with my hands and yeah I mean, maybe I like part of the red trail that I like is the boulders. And I actually do you know, walking on the boulders and stuff because it gets me, I think it gets me to train for hiking where you will go over a lot of rocks and stuff like that. So, yeah, I take a few chances here and there. But that's part of the it's actually really fun. I mean a fun part of the runs through there.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez, do you have any I'll follow up?

Alderman Lopez

That was my question really. I mean I've taken definitely my fair share of dives when I'm tripping over stuff, running through races and all that, but don't think I'd be doing my job as a human if I didn't acknowledge and I was like as long as you're sure you're okay then that's fine. But yeah, a little worried. And then I appreciate Ms. Grylik your comments too as well. I know particularly the homeless encampments are not preferred by anybody including them and it is a very difficult problem to solve because it's not always the same people, it's new people coming in. And the city is working very hard to address those needs. So I think you're right that all we can do is focus on the people we can help when we can help them and do our best.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I don't have any questions per se. I think you both have are bringing different strengths to the committee and so I appreciate that. I appreciate everything you've had to say and I will support your nomination. So thank you.

Walter Davis/Kimberly Gryglik

Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

All set. Okay, we'll be taking up your nomination. Oh, Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd

Yeah, I'm not on the committee, but I appreciated what you had to say. I think you're two good candidates for it. It is a great asset to the city and the two most important things in there is safety and keeping it clean. I have an interest in it because my grandkids are on track and both of them run in Mines Falls with other kids and we want to keep it safe.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alright. Thank you so much. Is Amanda here?

Alderman Sennott

Mr. Mayor, is our next two nominees still here?

Mayor Donchess

Pardon?

Alderman Sennott

Next Conservation...

Mayor Donchess

Yes, they are, yes.

Conservation Commission

Amanda Griffith (new appointment)
111 Bluestone Drive
Nashua, NH 03060

Term to Expire: July 22, 2028

Chairwoman Kelly

Alright, take it away Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Donchess

So Madam Chair this is Amanda Griffith who I have nominated to be on the Conservation Commission. Ms. Griffith has a long time career with various YMCA's in various parts of the country. Now as Operations Director at the Granite Y, which is the Concord Y, but in these different positions she's had a lot of outdoor experience with camping and program management. So clearly she has a very good background for the Conservation Commission given her interest in the outdoors and in the environment. As you heard, Ms. Griffith lives on Bluestone which I think is Ward Eight and has attended some meetings of the Conservation Commission so was very well aware of the responsibilities and therefore will be a very strong member of the commission. And with that I will give you Ms. Griffith to add anything she would like.

Amanda Griffith

Thank you all for having me tonight. I do want to clarify. I am the Operations Director at the Goffstown YMCA. I am not in Concord, that is too far of a drive.

Mayor Donchess

Sorry, I thought it was Concord.

Amanda Griffith

And over the course of my tenure at the Y I've been a Camp Director for the last 10 years and a big piece of what we teach all of our campers is leave no trace. And the natural world is something that's very important to me. My partner and I spent a lot of time outdoors. I actually just recently accomplished my first 4,000 footers in New Hampshire so that's exciting. And in working for the YMCA I'm very familiar with what servant leadership looks like and sounds like and so I'll be honest I am very green and new to this world of service, but it's something that I am very excited to learn more about and jumped at the opportunity.

Mayor Donchess

What's the 4,000 footer you did climb?

Amanda Griffith

I've been corrected on how to pronounce things in New England a couple of times; I'm from Philadelphia. Osceola.

Chairman Kelly

And it's Kancamagus.

Amanda Griffith

Thank you. Yeah, I've gotten that one wrong sometimes.

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay, I will open up to questions from the committee. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

So I've done all 48 New Hampshire 4,000 footers plus the other 12. At the time there was 12, now there's 14 other ones in New England, but it's definitely a challenge and but it's well worth it. In regards to the Nashua Conservation Commission, have you attended any meetings and what are your thoughts on maybe some challenges or opportunities that might exist?

Amanda Griffith

Absolutely. So, full disclosure. I have not attended them yet. I was first presented this opportunity I went to the Sustainability Fair that was at the Nashua Library. I met some really wonderful folks and they were speaking to me about what some of the projects were that they were working on. And so candidly, I am not quite sure what the commission is working on quite yet, but what I can speak to as broad themes is I think education is a big thing that kind of every place struggles with. If people aren't out in their natural environments, they're not going to understand what conservation looks like or sounds like or feels like. And so I'm always happy to be a mouthpiece for that and help educate. That's something I'm really passionate about and enjoy doing, so.

Alderman Clemons

Okay, thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

I don't know what 4,000 footers I've done, but since we're all boasting I have done 16 marathons, so....! But I think your experience speaks for itself. I am in awe of this resume and I know you credit the Y with the values of service that it's taught you but I mean, it looks like you have made a whole career out of it. So I think you'd be a great fit for the Conservation Committee. I think the focus on education and family is definitely one that we will benefit from as a city and focusing on the opportunity to serve I think is what all of us need to focus on. So I definitely will be supporting your nomination.

Chairwoman Kelly

Anyone else? I'm going to comment. Thank you for stepping forward. I actually was the liaison to the Conservation Commission in my first term and it is very interesting. It is a very interesting commission. I when I first started on the Board I just was so in awe of how many smart, intelligent people and all the things that make the city work. But just so you have a preview it is definitely about education and making sure we have those spaces. There's a lot of like impervious material and looking at planning and making sure that we're not in the wetlands. So there's a lot of that and there's a couple of like scientist scientists on the Board. So it can get very, very heady, but it's really cool work. So thank you for stepping forward. And we will take up your nomination, unless anyone else has any questions.

Mayor Donchess

Thank you very much. And now we have Mr. Dearborn.

Greater Nashua Revolving Loan Fund Committee

David Dearborn (new appointment)
1718 Belmont Street
Manchester, NH 03104

Term to Expire: July 22, 2028

Mayor Donchess

So Madam Chair, we have a Revolving Loan Fund that is administered through our Economic Development Office this constitutes about a million dollars. It's been in place for quite some time and in order to help manage those funds and decide which potential loans should be made we have a loan committee essentially, which consists principally of people in the finance industry. And so Mr. Dearborn has stepped forward and he works for St. Mary's Bank and has had previous banking experiences. You can see from his resume as well as financial experience. So he's well qualified to be able to judge you know, the credit worthiness of the applicants.

The loan fund is really intended to help smaller businesses that are having trouble getting bank financing. So it kind of helps bridge the gap between four smaller businesses that are trying to get going and try to qualify them for bank financing later on. One loan that I'm sure you're familiar with would be Liquid Therapy. They borrowed the money to pay for their equipment in the brewery that's in the Central Fire Station. Have since paid that back, but that is an example of the kind of loans that the revolving loan fund is intended to make. And so Mr. Dearborn has expressed an interest and certainly has the expertise. So again, I know he will be an excellent member of the committee and I will let Mr. Dearborn tell you anything further he would like about himself and of his experience and interest in being on the loan committee.

Chairwoman Kelly

Great, Mr. Dearborn.

David Dearborn

Thanks so much, I appreciate that. And good evening everyone. Thanks so much in advance for your time and for your consideration. I appreciate the opportunity. What it shows on my resume is that I'm a resident of Manchester however, I have deep ties within the Nashua Community. My whole mother's side of my family actually is from Nashua. I know that my pepe was a community leader back in his time, namely for the Knights of Columbus. I believe he got a key to the city and named three streets here so pretty cool. Really upstanding gentleman here I think some kind of accolade.

So, namely I was born and raised here in New Hampshire. I went to UNH met my wife. We have resided in Manchester and spanning a 13 year banking career I've done a little bit of everything namely with consumer lending, business lending. I've done mortgages, fixed annuities, fixed indexed annuities, life insurance, health insurance, all kinds of things. So namely within the last six years I've been tasked in my roles for sourcing and trying to complete business capital solutions for business owners namely for larger banks. So this last September there was an opportunity that arose. There was a committee member named Kyle Schneck, another very upstanding Nashua citizen here as well namely our Chief Lending Officer at St. Mary's.

So given now his current role he decided to afford somebody else an opportunity to step forward and join the committee and here I am. So I was asked to probe my interest here and humbled for the opportunity. So going forward in my current role at St. Mary's as a Business Development Officer I'm talking to business owners all the time, each and every day. Not only for the Greater Nashua Community specifically but that spans across, you know Hudson, Milford, Merrimack, all the supporting, all of the local municipalities around here as well which I feel would be a great fit for the committee given

the I believe 12 towns that it provides support for. So three main things I think I can provide value here in this commitments. Number one is business acumen and reviewing financial statements. Having a Master's Degree in Finance you know, pretty tenured banking career at this point.

Number two, sourcing applicants. I'm talking to business owners all day, every day. Namely for you know, providing to just trying to provide some consultation and strategy and trying to help support them and grow their businesses.

And number three, just dedication. You know, I'm committed to really giving back to the Greater Nashua Community. I love helping people, love helping individuals and businesses. So would really be humbled for the opportunity to be able to leverage my skill sets and in my passion for helping people within this committee. So thanks so much for your consideration.

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay, I'll open up to question from the Committee. Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, Madam Chair and thank you for putting your name forward. Obviously, your experience is textbook catered for this sort of work. A question I have for you and you kind of alluded to it a little bit when you talked about your experience and what you can bring to the table is you're talking to business owners, maybe prospective entrepreneurs, things like that in your day-to-day life. One of the gripes that I've had in this chamber over the past year or so is generally with larger businesses. Why are larger businesses going to communities outside of Nashua?

The one I always pick on is the new New Balance development that went in Londonderry. Gosh darn it, I drive by it every day and I really wish that was bringing those jobs to Nashua. But in regard to the smaller businesses that maybe this sort of loan fund would be attracting I think about the new up-starts, the type of businesses that people kind of maybe speak aloud or talk about online that they'd like to see in the city. We just had a new retro collectibles shop open on Main Street. A lot of people may not know that there's a baseball bat manufacturer downtown. So these are kind of new, innovative ideas which are really exciting to have into the city. In your experience are business owners or entrepreneurs who may be coming up with this new, great idea for the next business to open in Nashua? Are they aware of this? Are they aware that this is an opportunity available for them? And if not, I don't even have to ask the question of how would you fix that but...

David Dearborn

That's a terrific question. I've had the opportunity to join a few meetings already like as an observer to kind of get a feel for the committee itself and the short answer is no, not in my assessment. In speaking to local business owners I think that they're conditioned to accept pretty traditional means of qualifying for business capital. That's namely having a regimented you know, credit score of X amount with what the lender decides in being in business for a period of two years, right? So I feel that this Revolving Loan Fund Committee is a phenomenal opportunity to go outside the lines and try to support business owners in a different way that could make sense and deviates from those pretty regimented, sometimes bureaucratic means of providing capital to business owners.

So I think that's really probably my greatest value that I can bring to the committee is educating them and raising awareness that it's there. I think the committee honestly in my you know, few months that I've had some exposure to it is the number one problem is they have the money and we don't know who to give it to. So that's kind of a great problem to have. It's you know, coming from you know, my experience in speaking to local business owners it's a matter of saying hey this didn't work, but let's get you to the point where it does and educating them that this is a resource that they could leverage in order to get the capital that they need to support their business.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, and thank you for that answer. I mean it's you really hit the nail on the head and I'm enthusiastic about what you will bring to the table. And again, the problem that you had like you said, a great problem to have. You know, we have this money who should we give it to? Who can we give it to? Because you don't, it's hard to think of a new business or an upstart in terms of what they could be 5, 10, 15 years down the line but you know, I pointed to in particular that baseball bat manufacturer. I mean, who knows? Who knows if they're the next big premier in manufacturing baseball bats. I work for a company that started close to 100 years ago making a candy coating machine and today they have the market cornered in food preparation. So you know, we want to attract those big, big businesses but maybe if they start small here this is where one day their headquarters are. So I'm really excited about your enthusiasm that you bring to this. I'll be very happy to support your nomination.

David Dearborn

Appreciate that. Thanks.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

I'm intending this as a compliment to my colleagues comments. But even if they don't end up opening a string of Liquid Therapies across the country I think that was a really good investment because that area really needed something to bring it up. It was a building that was not really fully engaged. And the vision that they had there and what they've done with it is a great investment. So I definitely would like to see that kind of support for local investments. I know Economic Development Office is working on trying to work on boosting locally owned businesses in the area.

I did have a question for the Mayor to the Chair, if I may. I'm just wondering if I understood the comment about Mine Falls Advisory an individual stepped down because he moved out of Nashua. This committee doesn't have a requirement for it to be local, but that one does?

Mayor Donchess

I don't know what. There is no requirement here that the person be local. I mean and Mr. Dearborn has experience with Nashua and therefore could help us and has knowledge so I don't see that his Manchester residence is a problem. As far as the Mine Falls, I don't know if there's a, I mean I haven't looked at the ordinance. I don't know if there's a requirement that they live in Nashua or not, but it is you know, just in its nature a little more locally oriented whereas here, we're looking for kind of technical expertise. There we're looking for just kind of a community participant.

Alderman Lopez

That makes sense. I just wasn't sure I was understanding that correctly.

Chairwoman Kelly

I actually, I don't why.

Mayor Donchess

I'm not sure whether there is a... my guess is there isn't, is not a requirement. I think there's a Merrimack resident on there.

Alderman Lopez

Maybe they moved too far away.

Mayor Donchess

Yeah.

Chairwoman Kelly

I was raising my own hand to myself, that was great the committee. Alderwoman Kelly yes, so I was going to say the same thing that we've definitely appointed others who have not been in Nashua and most of them unless they're very specific, sometimes it'll say like a Nashua resident like for example, on the Revolving Loan Fund we have that specific but this I'm looking at the Mine Falls and it doesn't say that and...

Mayor Donchess

Are you looking at Mine Falls now?

Chairwoman Kelly

I am, yep.

Mayor Donchess

Does it say anything about requirement of residency?

Chairwoman Kelly

It does not. It does not. But I am not City Council. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Yes, thank you. I just want to thank you for stepping up and I appreciate putting your name forward. I've had jeez how long now? At least 15 years in the credit union world as well. I work at MIT Federal Credit Union. So yeah, so obviously you know, just reading your background you obviously have the expertise that this committee is looking for and I certainly am going to support your nomination.

David Dearborn

Thanks so much.

Chairwoman Kelly

Anything else? Alright, thank you so much for stepping forward. We'll be taking up your nomination in moments.

David Dearborn

Thanks for your time.

Mayor Donchess

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chairwoman Kelly

Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

APPLICATION TO LICENSE HAWKER'S, PEDDLER'S, ITINERANT VENDOR'S LICENSE – None

APPOINTMENTS BY THE MAYOR

MOTION BY ALDERMAN SENNOTT TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING NEW APPOINTMENT TO THE KEEFE AUDITORIUM COMMISSION: JOSEPH OLEFIROWICZ WITH A TERM TO EXPIRE TO BE DETERMINED;

TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING NEW APPOINTMENTS TO THE MINE FALLS PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE: WALTER DAVIS AND KIMBERLY GRYGLIK, BOTH WITH TERMS TO EXPIRE JULY 22, 2028;

TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING RE-APPOINTMENT OF PHILIP SCOTTSAS WITH A TERM TO EXPIRE DECEMBER 1, 2027 TO THE DOWNTOWN IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE;

TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING NEW APPOINTMENT TO THE GREATER NASHUA REVOLVING LOAN FUND COMMITTEE: DAVID DEARBORN WITH A TERM TO EXPIRE JULY 22, 2028; AND

TO RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING NEW APPOINTMENT TO THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION: AMANDA GRIFFITH WITH A TERM TO EXPIRE JULY 22, 2028
MOTION CARRIED

UNFINISHED BUSINESS**R-25-121, Amended**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman-at-Large Gloria Timmons
Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr.
Alderman Tim Sennott
Alderman Thomas Lopez
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman Derek Thibeault
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CITY CHARTER RELATIVE TO ESTABLISHING A LIMITATION ON ANNUAL BUDGETS

- R-25-121 WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2025 MEETING AS CFO GRIFFIN WAS UNAVAILABLE TO ATTEND

Alderman Clemons

So I know that the so I'm going to move to take it off the table. Yes, that's my motion is take it off the table.

Chairwoman Kelly

It's not technically on the table. So sure, let's address this.

Alderman Clemons

Oh, it's just in front of us?

Chairwoman Kelly

Yeah, in front of us on the note, it says it will be discussed the September 2 meeting. That's not on the table but it was information that was provided to us.

Alderman Clemons

Oh, okay. Then I misunderstood that. So I actually am going to make a motion to indefinitely postpone and I'd like to speak to that.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO INDEFINITELY POSTPONEON THE QUESTIONChairwoman Kelly

Please. It's indefinitely postpone. You have the floor.

Alderman Clemons

So I know that this was anticipated to be discussed at the September meeting. However, I truly don't believe that it is - that it's clearly not going to go on the ballot this fall and I don't think it's appropriate that this makeup of the Board of Aldermen discusses it and tries to kind of like go through the motions of what could be, or couldn't be, or whatever, what have you with it because we have an election that's coming up and I feel that it's most appropriate if it was to be reintroduced in some manner next year and have the new Board discuss it.

I know that this was batted around back and forth that well, you know, that we could discuss it and then make some changes to it, and then kind of get it ready for the next Board if you will, but we don't know what's going to happen in the city elections and that next Board could have a completely different view point than what this Board does. So for all of those reasons, I think that we should indefinitely postpone this and let the next Board of Aldermen in whatever contingency it may be made up of in January. If they feel necessary that this is something they want to do, one of the members of that Board can bring it up and can discuss it.

Chairwoman Kelly

All right.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going to very disappointedly agree with my colleague At Large with the motion to indefinitely postpone. I voted to send it back here to discuss and workshop with the anticipation that we would be doing that tonight but unfortunately, we're not and, you know, we can't change people's schedules and that's fine. I mean the simple reality of this is we were told that the special meeting when this was still a possibility that it had to be back to the city after going through all the motions, public hearings, and vetting by the State by September 6th. If we take it up at September 2nd, it's simply not going to happen. So at this point, I agree with Alderman Clemons that this is better left to whatever composition of the Board become seated in January of 2026. Hopefully, more in depth work can be done at that time. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Any additional conversation?

Alderman Lopez

I am going to die on the hill and I know it but I will vote against this because I think we need to do the work. I will also admit, though, that I don't know exactly how the flaws are, insurmountable flaws, and I don't see the city Attorney here to explain that. So I don't think we're prepared to do that and because we're not prepared to do it tonight, I don't think this September 2nd will actually achieve anything either.

So I commented on the fact. Like I don't have a crystal ball but have a shiny head and I can see that we were going to say this these exact things. So I'm not shocked by it and if this isn't the strategy to addressing how we budget, then I need to do more work and figure out exactly what it is. I was talking to Treasurer Enwright earlier in the year to try to figure out what a tax cap would look like. When this came forward, I mistook it and thought that was a product of it but it was entirely a different group working along similar lines. If they're not certain that this is going to move forward, then I'm not going to debate that more than necessary but I do think that when we put things before committees, when we're elected to look at issues, we should do the due diligence, and we should put the effort in.

I think a lot of time was spent talking about whether we should do this and there needs to be a point where we actually look at how our budget is done and how we legislate it because it's not entirely unfair for people to come at every public comment and say, you know, property owners are bearing the brunt of a lot of decisions we're making here but we're also not doing much to change that situation. There's plenty of needs for the city that, unfortunately, are not going to wait for us to have, you know, the tax revenue or the property values to support them.

I think we do need to be looking at other resources, and other opportunities, and I think as long as we have a spending cap, it's not going to be in a point in doing that either. So, I mean I'll vote against it but I also have no hope that this would pass the Board either if we did make progress on it tonight.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Madam Chair. As not a member of this Committee, I appreciate you allowing me to discuss this matter. To my colleague, the Alderman-at-Large Clemons, this is a moment of profile and courage. I thank you for making the proposal for indefinite postponement. My 16 years in the State House when we had a Bill that didn't really do everything that we wanted with it, we used to say it's not ready for prime time. It's my particular feeling that this is not. In my 35 years of service with the City of Nashua, in came, you know, in my career, mid in my career, the spending cap and I watched the city suffer. Now I know after living through the spending cap, the young child mother tells him, don't touch the stove. It's hot. You'll get burnt. But what does he do? He touches it and then gets burned and hopefully he learns never to touch the stove again. Hopefully the burns are minor. But, however, why in a way are we

touching the stove again here is the way I look at it.

The spending cap; you want to stagnate a city, that's what it does. Now you take the main person, Alderman Teeboom, could have very easily got together the signatures and then have his idea for the spending cap come in to be voted by the voters of the city but he didn't. He went up to the State House and as I said in this chamber before, got a state Senator of his same party to come in and put it through the Senate then it came to the floor and I don't know why the citizens of Bartlett or Lancaster or Berlin have a say in the sovereignty of Nashua politics. Yet it went by their party affiliation and it passed. I'm proud to say all 28 delegates from the City of Nashua and I think Alderman Klee you were there when that came up. We were in an auditorium because of COVID; kind of unique but however, we couldn't stop it and here it is again. I don't know I question Alderman Teeboom's real ethics on this spending cap. I've lived it. He laughed when I says oh, you run out of toilet paper? Well it happens when you run out of your budget towards the end of the year. You can't buy equipment. You're watching the overtime you got this.

A lot of things come into play for the self-imposed cap. I cannot help, I understand the hurt and the pain and everything else with our citizens, but I can't help it that their houses and their real estate investments has brought them up to this level. That isn't us or our fault here in this chamber that a house that they bought for probably \$50,000 at one time is now worth \$400,000, yet you have to set the tax rate. Maybe there's a better way to look at this. Maybe we don't have to charge on the tax rate the full value of the property. We could look at something else and so I compliment my colleague, Alderman Clemons for withdrawing this so other proposals can come up. I really don't like the super majority. I don't know why we vote everything else mostly with the regular majority, but you see the unfairness of a super majority. The unfairness of the super majority is sometimes this board will change and if you get an extremely conservative Board you might have nine people don't want to override the cap, but it only takes the one and the minority of the five to stop it. That's not government. So it strictly puts other people in favor. So a lot of revisions need to be looked like.

I think this was a fair job. I signed on as a sponsor and I still might you know what I mean. When something comes out through the committee in the future you know, but I think it needs to be a lot more discussion and I'm not afraid. As something as important to the taxpayers of the city on what they have to reach into their wallets and pay that we do it right and take our time and look at it. So again, compliments to you Alderman Clemons. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd

I also want to thank Alderman Clemons for that, I think it's a good idea. I'm not opposed to having some kind of legislation that protects the taxpayers of Nashua in some degree from budgets however, I don't think we're close to having the current document settled. My concern is that I don't want us to pass legislation that's going to handcuff the future Board of Aldermen from keeping Nashua. With what's going on at the federal and the state level we have no idea what's coming down and hitting us. And whether or not we want to be able to take that decision to fund it locally and that could become problematic.

I also agree the spending cap was caused us numerous concerns and short spending. I remember a former Mayor and Board that didn't spend any money and all of our city services got to a point where it was ridiculous until a new Mayor came on and had to go through hoops to fix it. So if we're going to do legislation I think it's going to take time. I would want to make sure that the wording is such that it does what we want it to do, but it also gives us protections so that the city doesn't lose its standing as one of the best and safest places in the United States to live.

Chairwoman Kelly

Additional comments? Alderman Klee then Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Klee

I'll defer to Alderman Sennott, he's on the committee so I can wait.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott and Alderman Klee.

Alderman Sennott

I just had a quick note of administrative clarity. If I understand the process correctly we would recommend indefinite postponement. Is it correct?

Alderman Clemons

Correct.

Alderman Sennott

So this can go to the full Bboard for a final.

Alderman Clemons

Yes.

Alderman Sennott

Alright, thank you. I just want to make sure I'm right. That's all I've got.

Chairwoman Kelly

Yes. It is a recommendation for indefinite postponement. Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Madam President. To my colleague who I served in the State with yes, we did have to face a State vote versus a local vote as to what happens here in the city as far as our budget is concerned. But trying to move past that the one thing that they did put through with that legislation was they forced a super majority and we can't override that. And speaking of the word override, I think rather than trying to do this tax cap where we were trying to put in all of those items such as overrides and so on we're trying to build it. You know, perhaps the next board can look at the spending cap that was put through and maybe make the tweaks.

If I remember correctly before I became on the board I know Alderman Clemons was probably there. There were amendments that were put in that helped exempt certain things because that's all that the spending cap allows is exemptions, there's no override in it. So perhaps that is something that needs to be looked at in the future is to go back to where we were before the judge said that it was unconstitutional and we dismissed it.

And I just want to remind the public if I'm not mistaken, that even when we didn't have the spending cap we never went over the spending cap if I remember correctly. We still tried to maintain within that area, but I could be wrong on that. But I think that for the future board where some of us may not be there, I would hope that people will look at the spending cap maybe not try to put a tax cap in, but look at the spending cap how we can make it better with maybe an override. Super majority has to be there, so we would have to live with that, but maybe something on the ballot that would suggest putting in a couple of overrides for the year rather than the one time exemption.

And then you know, if we make it to the end of the year or something I think that would be there. So I do applaud my colleague for the indefinite postponement. I think we've kicked this can long enough and just to say that we're going to have a meeting and get everybody here on September 2 would be a waste because I don't think the board has an appetite to build on the tax cap. So thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

So I definitely appreciate the contributions over the years my colleagues, Alderman Dowd and Clemons and I think they have a really good handle on the budget. So I don't mean any disrespect when I vote against indefinite postponement because I know you have a lot of knowledge, a lot of acumen. You've been in countless meetings and you know even after 10 years as an alderman myself, I can't even remember every meeting I've been in and you guys are able to pull out exactly what happened and you have that context. So I think if your instinct or your sense is that it's not ready for prime time yet then you're probably a voice I would listen to. I would say just because it has been discussed here in terms of super majority being undesirable.

Super majority is really important if you're in the minority and on a voting board and while we don't have partisan politics here on the Board of Aldermen ostensibly, you can have more conservative and you can have more progressive, I would say on boards. And sometimes, if you have a group of people that are outnumbered, they can be a real obstruction to the Mayor trying to operate the city just because they don't need a super majority to stop things.

It was pointed out by my colleague in the past that as aldermen we are supposed to be making decisions and a spending cap is just putting on an auto pilot. So we do have to leave some kind of provision in there that will allow for if it's a spending cap overrides. I mean, right now I think we're using exemptions which are not overrides, but still kind of let us exercise our judgment. And I think any form coming forward of budgetary revision should include that ability, because we do need to be able to exercise our actual responsibilities. We need to show up at meetings, we need to pay attention in the meetings and we need to be able to recall what's going on in them and then connect the dots and represent our people. And then we need to be able to communicate that to people and actually do the work to do that.

So I definitely see that the will of the board isn't to move this forward at this time and I respect where some of that will comes from. I just want to signal to my constituency that I do think it's important that we make some kind of progress and commit to that.

Chairwoman Kelly

All set? So I'll speak. I'm going to only comment procedurally on this. I think it was put back in our committee. I obviously said I would welcome the conversation that the work happens in the committee. However, not having the people here this evening to speak on it creates a timing issue. And while I am always a person who is not really for something like an indefinite postponement because we want to talk

it out. In this matter we won't get on the ballot this year. And I think that you know, putting forward an indefinite postponement at this point knowing that we won't even have the time to get it on the ballot. This isn't something that should be rushed, it should be something that should be really thought through. We've, I mean no one in this whole chamber right now has been here as long as this conversation has been going on and I don't want to cram it in at the last hour to try to get something that will very, very likely be imperfect in front of voters. So I'm going to support the motion on the table. With that said, all those in favor of recommendation for indefinite postponement.

MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS - None

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

O-25-058

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr.
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman Tyler Gouveia
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman Tim Sennott
Alderman Derek Thibeault
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

AMENDING THE UNAFFILIATED EMPLOYEES PERSONNEL POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO THE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S CHIEF OFFICERS' COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN SENNOTT TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE

ON THE QUESTION

Chairwoman Kelly

Discussion? Alderman O'Brien.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Madam Chair for allowing me to speak again and even though I'm not a member of your committee I appreciate to be here to speak to you about this. For the group at large many of you know I was a firefighter and for 15 years of my career...

Alderman Clemons

I'm sorry just a point of a point of order. Real quick. I want to ask a question through you to the current speaker. Did you receive the memo that came out today at 4:40pm?

Alderman O'Brien

No, I did not. Can you give me one second to refresh it?

Chairwoman Kelly

Sure.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah, I can.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman O'Brien, while you read that.

Alderman O'Brien

Yeah, no I think I'm good to go because what the thing is here with the merit system we have a problem. And to me, what happens is it's a thing that we discuss within the department and we use the term compression. Now this board looks at the people who are Affiliated, Local 789 of the International Association of Firefighters. They negotiate with the duly elected by the public Board of Fire Commissioners and they come up with this salary and everything if warranted increases and they make a recommendation to us on the Board of Aldermen and we approve it. What this ordinance was intended to do was to make it really etched in stone. If you stay with the merit system it gets forgotten. Now what happened to me one time with one of our Mayors said the affiliated employees on the Fire Department got a raise, but the merit employees did not. And this is what happens when you have ultra conservative Boards of Aldermen and ultra conservative Mayor, nothing gets done and you get stagnant.

And so the chief handed me my performance review and it was good. And he says okay sign it, and I says "am I getting a raise"? And he says "no". I says "well, I'm not signing it, because my interpretation of merit, if you're doing a meritless job, then you should be compensated. This does not take the any authority of lack of performance or anything else like that from the deputy chiefs, the assistant chiefs and the chiefs is enough like the job of the chief of the department to make sure that the Fire Department is running like a top and he does.

This is very serious business. If he doesn't, somebody's got to get killed. The job is like that. So the thing is just so that you know, when you have that compression from a captain to deputy chief. What does a deputy chief do? Yeah, he stands out in front of the building and says you go in here, you do this and you go that. That's a lot of responsibility, but when I was a deputy chief I had the concerns of our constituents, the taxpayers, the people who live in this city and their life safety and their protection. And then my number two priority was to get my guys home. I didn't want any crying widows or fatherless children and I was happy to say that did not happen to me. And I thank my God because I got very lucky and we were at times in some pretty nasty situations. But I just happened to work out.

I look at tragedies in the past like Worcester and everything else. And I remember the Deputy Chief of the Worcester Fire Department had to stand at that door of the building and hold his hands up and say nobody else going in. And the guys wanted to God bless them, but he had to draw that line. And so it's a lot of responsibility to be a deputy chief. So the thing is, I'm going to well other discussions on this, but I just want you people to understand we drafted this because there is somewhat of a problem. And when you're in the merit system you get two different organizations, Local 79 could come up and compress on the deputy chiefs with the Captain's salary.

So why would a Captain want to become a deputy chief for all the aggravation or the responsibilities. So and then look at our department, I could name off the top of my head chief officers that have left and became chief officers of other departments. If we're going to groom them, let's keep them here. Let them develop into the home system that has groomed them and made them rise to the top. So I hope you in some form, can compensate this. But to me, the

merit system never really worked the way it was intended. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd

Yeah, as I had mentioned a couple times previously there are issues with our compensation system for unaffiliated right now. In this instance it was caused you know, we approve the union contracts for the firemen and when we did we caused compression at the upper levels of the deputy chiefs and the assistant chief. And the last two years we've approved funding in the budget to fix this problem and they never got it because we never passed this legislation.

This past budget for 2026 we also increased the compensation in the budget for the Edgewood Cemetery groundskeepers because they were all going to leave because they could go over to DPW and get a heck of a lot more pay because they're unionized. If we don't fix the compensation system for unaffiliated we're going to end up with more unions and far increase over what we would compensate as an affiliate. I was just looking at the schedule and yes, there are other people that could be impacted. I've heard that we may be trying to go to the new compensation levels of the study this year.

That's another discussion we don't have tonight, but in this instance we in the budget approve the funding to pass this legislation to alleviate the compression problem we have in the Fire Department. We had that same thing years ago in the School District with I think it was headmasters and not being compensated. They were getting compensated less than head teachers. And I mean, who's going to take a job with a lot more responsibility and get less pay and more hours? So I think in the end they all became assistant principals which solved that. So on the fire chiefs it's a little hard to smoke them. This is no higher level.

And I know it's a budget issue and it's increase in pay, but when we passed the budget with this funding in it to do this especially since it's the second year we've done it, it's not fair to those chiefs to not do this. Same thing with the Edgewood Cemetery guys. We approve the budget and it's in the budget, we just have to award it via this legislation. We can address all the other parts of the compensation study when it comes up. And you know how we address it then is another issue. Right now this is what's before us and I think it's only fair that we take this into account and solve the discrepancy issue.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Madam President. To be honest with you the one negative thing I keep hearing as to why we should not do this is because if we do this and there's going to be other department heads that are going to say, me too, me too, me too. And while that is a possibility or even a probability, I don't think we should put our decision based on that. If when that does come to the table it merits the additional compensation for those particular ones. We should look at it that way, but we should not hold back one group because of that.

When I look at even the letter that came from Ms. Trask and I look at the current grade that the Chief has added at a Grade 23 and that we would be pushing him up to a Grade 25. And I look at all those people, they gave us a list of the people who are in 24 and 25 as well as within 23. I do

believe that if we're going to look at that I think our fire chief definitely deserves to be up in the in the higher grade with those that he or she at this point, I think he would fall within. I don't get to vote in this, but I will get to vote when it comes to the full Board. I intend on honoring and I intend on supporting this and I do hope that you will too and that we can't look at it as let's not give it to them because someone else is going to want it. That cannot be our argument. So thank you for hearing me.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

So I'm pretty certain someone else wants it because there was a retracted Ink Link article where an anonymous letter was written and a lot of it I feel like was very unfair comparisons. It was suggested that block parties were going to take funding from personnel when I mean the block party that I organized is not funded by the city. It's organized by every penny we can get donated by people in the community. There was you know, claims made about why we rescheduled the meeting which I mean, it's summer so some people have to travel and have to go away. I don't think there's any kind of intentional duplicity in forestalling recognizing the firefighters and the letter was characterized as all merit employees. Some pretty dire stories were suggested to be happening with regards to merit employees and I don't think they were reflecting firefighters at least, I would be appalled if they were and just be a better reason to move this forward.

So I do think we're going to have other departments come forward and say well, we would like more too but, I also think as part of being Alderman and doing Governance and Budgeting is we're going to have departments that actually present you know, different levels of need than maybe the Mayor or his administration when they're doing their job would prefer. And we have to take those conversations on the same way. We had to look at what was going on with the School District and we had to say okay, well we wanted to keep the 3% but at the same time there are circumstances happening outside which are very germane to the situation and we might not be able to stick to our initial plan.

And likewise, when it comes to public safety and firefighting my colleague probably knows more about it than me, but there's more and more exotic firefighting you know, risks. There's more and more complex materials that are you know, presenting a danger to firefighters health. And we're becoming a bigger and more dense city. And I mean leaving aside actual fires, firefighters are always first on the scene with respect to the police and AMR. It's literally always Nashua Fire who gets there first anytime I've been involved in 911 call and I get a lot as a social worker and in a very dense ward.

So I think that mandates leadership and we need to compensate and encourage the best regional leadership we can or we're going to lose people who are very good, know what they're doing, but have to make decisions for their families. So I agree with the previous speaker that we're likely to see other departments coming forward, but I think we have to take those as they come and I think this is definitely not the one to start drawing a line on.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question through you to Alderman O'Brien and it's in regards

to the memo that we received this afternoon. I'm looking at this and I'm looking at the memo as it's drafted and it has you know, it has statistics based on you know, what's on paper if you will. Like in other words what the salary ranges are in theory for the fire chief, the assistant chief, the deputy chief, all of that. And it's showing the differences in pay that you know, from the fire chief to the assistant chief it's 9.37, from the assistant to the deputy it's 8.84, and all of this stuff is based on a 42 hour work week and this is all the stuff that's on paper, right? This is so when you look if you were to just take this, you would say I don't know what problem we're solving right? So can you explain for the public why this memo here isn't the reality that we're seeing? Because from what I've heard from you and from others on the Fire Department is that in some cases the deputy chief is actually making more money than the fire chief or very close to it.

Alderman O'Brien

That could happen okay. Not to say that that couldn't that the deputy chief could and that's why that from assistant chief this what's in this ordinance O-25-058 would kind of make that very hard to do because if you look, there's an in between step there of assistant chief and then 15 percent above the assistant chief would be the chief of the department. But currently now in the matrix system that does exist it is possible that it could happen. How does it happen? A case in point a deputy chief gets ill, it happens unfortunately. I you know, if I should admit it publicly, but I had a hip replacement done when I was a deputy chief. The other deputies back filled my position. It's 24/7 protection so they had to. So that year yeah, they went up a bump and probably some bean counter somewhere out in the public aah, look what a deputy chief is making. But it was glorified by the fact that I was out sick. And so it's very rare circumstances that that can happen. What I propose in this legislation and Madam Chair I think I answered Alderman Clemons question, did I not?

Alderman Clemons

You did.

Alderman O'Brien

May I continue?

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman O'Brien, unless you have a (inaudible).

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Madam Chair. If you look back into the Fire Department history and you bring the other part of your question up, what would the taxpayers come to understand? The thing, the memo that I was presented was an attempted fix on a system that is kind of broken and will break again because when you have that matrix you exceed in time out of the matrix okay. What's in this ordinance will solidify it forever. Now in ancient times at one time even in the city they took whatever the top firefighter was making and said a fire chief should make this amount and came up with it.

When I started taking lieutenants exams the pay grade was 15% over top private, 10% from lieutenant to captain and then when you get to deputy chief you fell off the radar because you were no longer protected by Local 789, you now had to get into the merit system. And God, man that was something else. They gave you a little bit of book, the merit system employee handbook and I read it and it says oh, you have holidays off like Thanksgiving. So I highlighted it and I showed it to the chief and said I'm up on Thanksgiving this year. Do I have to work? Because in

the merit employee book it said that I didn't. It was a antiquated system. Well, not a good system. I think if we look back to the way fire departments originally operated, that you had that agreed percentile. Now, can somebody out there say what about all runaway spending when the local or any other union because if this expands when they come forward that's something for us to consider in approval. It's something for the commissioners of the different divisions to look at and to consider. Because if you give a consider to the top person in the low position that percentile can affect all the way up to the director. In theory, the director is like the chief of the fire department and the chief of the police department. So it makes us do a little bit more diligence, but it eliminates the problem of a matrix-orientated system. This is very easy to run. I think it's one could say in the numbers it's very simplified. You're not into different charts and everything else like that.

In the past, as a deputy chief they were making more money because they were getting paid for being dive certified, HazMat technicians, EMTs and everything and I was all of that. I ran the dive team, but I never got compensated. So then we came up with stipends to try to boost into our system and was headed. It didn't go to my pension or anything else like that. This fixes that makes everybody what they're paid and what they're worth and received a fair compensation for it, you know. So yeah, it's a little step back to some old school thinking. Sometimes the old school is good, you know and why did the city come up with the matrix? Let's look, you saw the problems. It kind of you know, invented the compression. Maybe that wasn't their intention, but it sure has happened under it, you know?

So I would recommend that you really strongly consider O-25-058 as a good fix. And then the (inaudible) come forward. You know what that identifies, maybe we get a problem and we need to address it. Keep in mind we're managers of this city. We're the employer and if we want good people to work in this organization and give the best to our taxpayers you got to have compensation for them, decent compensation. You all work your private industry jobs. You're all I know, ask for a raise, you know. And that's the other thing, the deputy chiefs who did they go to say give me a raise, nobody. You ask the chief but it depends if it was a chief strong enough to go and try to get the raise.

Meanwhile, that compression factor came up from the captains, you know. So this solidifies that it gets rid of it all together and hopefully maybe we can look at the individual groups if they do come forward, and balance what we feel is proper compensation. They are working hard for us. I know it's no fun sitting in that plow truck at three o'clock in the morning you know, doing it for six hours earlier you know, but they do and God bless them and thank them for it. We can look at that in the future. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

So I'm going to speak here for a moment. I've always been in support of this. It's been in front of the Board multiple times. It's been pushed off multiple times. I am feeling frustrated in that the purview of this Board and has very loudly said we want this to be pushed forward and there's been a lot of obstacles put in the way for this. First there wasn't this piece of legislation to allocate it. There were other things that came up and I just want to compliment everyone who continued to hear out and do the steps that needed to happen for this compensation adjustment. I know there's been a lot of waiting for studies and those sorts of things and so I'm going to support this wholeheartedly.

I do want to address some I guess I'm all about procedure tonight, but here we go. I want to request I think that the city obviously, it is your job as heads of these departments and working in HR, it is your job to advise us and I do appreciate when you do so. We need it before 19 minutes before the end of the day before the meeting we're having. It's just not fair to us to expect us to absorb a two page memo when this legislation was written on June 4 and put it in front of us 10

minutes before the end of the day. I'm trying to say that I actually want to hear your recommendations, but we need to be given that way sooner. And we've given that guidance in the past as well. That you know last minute after the agenda was prepared type memos not only keep us from being able to do our job, but the public doesn't even know what this thing we got says we're having this discussion, and they don't even know what this two page thing says, because we didn't get it. So I'm frustrated with the way this has gone down and I am going to support this wholeheartedly. I think that the fire department has spoken very eloquently multiple times on this and been patient on this and I hope that my colleagues will support it as well. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah, and I don't want to call out the two folks who this memo was from because I don't necessarily think that there was anything done here that was underhanded or whatever, but what I will say is there has been times from other sources within the city where I do think things have been given to us at the last minute in an effort to stall, delay, cause confusion, throw questions at us and so while I don't think this necessarily follows that. I do think that we've seen that and I think that's the danger of having things come in last minute like that right before the end of the day especially when it comes to you know, yeah we could table this or whatever, right? But then this committee doesn't meet for another month and then that wouldn't and then if we did something with it and it did move forward, or even if it didn't move forward right. Then it waits another two weeks to get to the next Board of Aldermen meeting.

And so by throwing something at us 15 minutes before the end of the day you've now delayed legislation that could have gone forward by a month and a half and that's just not fair to the employees that in this particular case, the employees of this particular thing talks about but or just the situations where that kind of thing has happened before in the past. So my comments are more general where you know, I not going to call anybody out by name, but I can tell you that in my opinion that type of behavior has happened from the administration and it's it undermines the legitimacy of this Board. And so if my comments earlier were a little terse, I apologize to the two folks on this memo. I do appreciate the information. I do want to continue to get the information. I just want to get it more timely. So thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Klee then Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Klee

Again, I'll defer to the member of the Board.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott then Alderman Lopez then you.

Alderman Sennott

I'll start by expressing my appreciation for Alderman Klee. That's twice that she's done that tonight so very kind of her. I just wanted to piggyback off the previous speaker's comments a little bit and also with reference to Alderman Lopez's comments at the start of this discussion. There was an anonymous piece that was published in various news outlets recently that not to dilute a wealth of information down to terse summary, but essentially accused the city of playing games with people's salaries. I can speak as somebody who operates primarily in the private sector that I certainly wouldn't appreciate management that played games with my salary. Just like everybody

else in the city I depend on that to put food on the table and keep a roof over my family's head. And that's the situation that we could be in if alderman, like Alderman Clemons had alluded to, we table this, chew on it for a month. It's another month that we're not passing this. That's another month that we're making the firefighters wait for ultimately, a decision on what we're going to do with these salaries.

A month may not seem like much in a vacuum, but that's another month on top of what a year plus that this has been bounced around and budgeted for and then not enacted. We've had a lot of time to chew on this one and I'm going to support what's in front of us tonight because I don't want to be part of playing games with these salaries anymore. It has been discussed, there are other divisions, other groups, other individuals that want to match this. I'm perfectly willing to have that discussion. I'm perfectly willing to dive in, roll up the sleeves, and do this. But this is at the point of being terse again. It's a magic word tonight terse. This has been done to death. There's no reason to delay this any further. I am going to support what's in front of us tonight.

Alderman Lopez

This gives me hope because earlier tonight I was making a very similar argument and I feel like it was sort of just not being recognized. So as long as we all agree we shouldn't be stalling things down until there's no time to do them properly, then I am fully in support of this. But since the staff are here should we invite them to comment on any of this? Since we did want to hear them?

Chairwoman Kelly

Sure. Do you guys want to?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services Director

Sure. Tim Cummings, Director of Administrative Services. We are here only if questions arose this evening so we have no comments. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Do you want to give us a quick overview of the memo that nobody's seen?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services Director

Yes, sure. Happy to. So essentially, to boil it down, the memo talks about just a quick technical issue, which the legislation before you proposes a gradation of, I think 20ish percent. Recommended best practice is somewhere between five and 15% and so it was just an observation that the consultant made. Was something to entertain or consider, but at 20% that's totally acceptable as well. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

I see Commissioner Burgess coming up.

Kevin Burgess, Board of Fire Commission

Thank you. Kevin Burgess, Board of Fire Commission. I did have some remarks I wanted to share, but I think Alderman O'Brien really covered most of it. I think we're all aware of, you know what, what's been the discussion for the last few months and even years perhaps. So I just want to thank everyone for their support. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay, back to the chamber. I think you spoke. It's Alderman Klee now unless you have a follow up, Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

No, I'm good.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Klee go ahead.

Alderman Klee

Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate all the comments that have been made here and while I appreciate also, I want to lend my voice to the fact that this document does give some really good information that isn't worth ignoring you know. It does have some information and I think Director Cummings kind of mentioned it. I want to echo and support the words that have been said here is that we need to get these things earlier. This isn't brand new and it's not a surprise that it was coming forward. So I know there are vacations though I want to echo that and sometimes staff is on vacation they get back and they get that holy oops moment. You know, this is coming forward and I need to get this document out, so I want to appreciate that at the same time, but I would hate for this to have to be changed at the BOA because I don't think that it needs to.

I understand where all the comments are being made including the comment about base pay only versus doing it through their benefits and so on. That was something that is put in this particular document and while I worked for the federal government when they did pay differentiation because we worked in a higher cost area, that did not come towards our retirement it was our base pay, but it didn't hit our retirement. So they did that. I don't want to see that happen to our firefighters. And I say firefighters and we're not talking about all of them. We're talking about a specific group of firefighters and fire department that are often referred to as non-affiliated. They're not covered by the union and they have to fight for their own. So I'm glad to hear I think from what I've heard it sounds like you are all in favor of this and I just want to reiterate, thank you. I think it's time to move it forward to the Board of Aldermen. Thank you.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services Director

Madam Chair, if I may just one comment. I wasn't going to engage on this, but I guess I feel as though maybe I should put it on the record as well. If you look at the memo and you look at what we received from the consultant it only came in on July 31st, Thursday night. The HR team did a yeoman's job of turning it around to get something for you. Yes, it was beyond the closing date of your packet being filed, but we wanted you to have some information on hand just for the file. Instead of suggesting we delay this longer because the information just came in to us, we turned it around as quickly as we could just so you guys had a recommendation or had some technical guidance. We could have waited and provided after the fact, but we just did the best we could to turn around based off of when we got the information. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

And I'll just respond. I don't think anyone is you know, in saying that there was malice here. It's happened before and it is hard for us as Alderman to try to like look at and do the committee work in front of us when we don't have all the information. So I appreciate your team and how quickly

they turned it around. Just requesting that we try to get ahead of that or at least flag a Chair if you're like hey, this report came in on Friday I don't know if we're going to have it in time. I think it's really important that we have open lines of communication so that you know we're not getting something and not being able to really absorb it and account for it and how we think through the piece of legislation. Is there any additional conversation? Alright, with that the recommendation in front of us is to recommend final passage.

MOTION CARRIED

O-25-060

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderswoman-at-Large Gloria Timmons
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

PROHIBITING BANNERS, FLAGS, AND SIGNS AT MEETING

ON THE QUESTION

Chairwoman Kelly

I'm gonna let you speak to it, and then point of personal privilege, I'd like to respond. So you can go ahead first.

Alderman Dowd

Okay, since I introduced this legislation a couple things. In all the years I've been on the Board we always had an agreement, gentleman's agreement if yes, nothing was formally written down that I could find from anywhere that we never allowed signs. It became more prevalent after these meetings were televised and in the last amount of time people are ignoring when we tell them they're not supposed to have signs. And it's I want to emphasize that it's not per se, what's being said on the signs. I've heard people saying oh, it should only prohibit political signs. Well, some of the things I've seen on some of the signs we've had lately, my God I think they're pretty political. It may not have a person's name on it running for office, but they're political.

So there's three reasons I put this in primarily. Very large signs are a danger in exiting the hall in case of emergency. You know, if you got a 4' x 8' sign you're trying to go out the door and you're blocking people, that's a danger. That's one thing. When you hold a sign up you're blocking people's sight lines and not necessarily from the TV, but from seeing what other aldermen are saying or doing or so. And we don't need to have a debate as to where they can and can't hold the signs and whether they are or are not blocking and whether there are a full audience or not a full audience. Because if we have a rule, we have a rule. This ordinance is going to make it a rule we can enforce.

The wording in this ordinance is in line exactly with what Manchester Board of Alderman rules and it's less restrictive by far than what they have. We're just blocking, we're just enforcing the signs. They have that exact same wording because that's where I got the legislation from as is in this legislation. And they made a formal rule because Nashua had this unwritten rule so they finalized it and I think we need to embrace it in this ordinance to be fair to everyone that comes to our meetings. So with that said, I would appreciate it if we approve this and moved it forward.

Chairwoman Kelly

So I'm going to just make a comment before we go into this discussion. There was some unpleasantness at the beginning of the public comment. And I just want to reiterate that we absolutely do have an

ordinance that allows us to cut off speech that is rude or vulgar and so does the Board of Manchester. And the idea that our Board does not have the ability to make rules around what we can allow and not allow is just, it's just not right. I mean I pulled up the US Congress. There's whole sections. You know how many times decorum comes up in there? Nine times. So we are allowed to and we've been given the counsel from our Legal Counsel that this is our meeting and we need to make sure that it is expedient and that we can get to the work we need to get done. So just wanted to put that out there before we go into the full discussion of this piece of legislation.

Alderman Lopez

I think this is a reasonable step. I think has been demonstrated in this public comment that people will absolutely abuse a platform if they don't have their own, if they don't have enough audience, enough people listening to them and they'll come in with their own messages and their own purposes. And a lot of that's protected in free speech, but if it is a danger to other people or it is literally large enough to block egress you know, or other people's views then it's not fair to the audience that they can't see what they came to see. It's not fair that some of the aldermen and other members of the community might actually have their kids watching and now they get to see signs that some people think are funny or clever but are just crude and reflect the crudity of that individual. I think we're not being unfair here. I think we're being reasonable and I think it is our responsibility in managing a platform for public discourse that we do so responsibly and it's not easy to chair or preside. So I think as alderman we should support rules of decorum when we have a population that's just deciding it's not going to recognize the polite ones; they're going to need it spelled out for them and apparently a big sign.

Chairwoman Kelly

All set, Alderman Lopez. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Madam Chair. So for every action, there is a reaction. And you know, I was just really sad I guess is the word you can use this evening by behavior of what some might consider to be a community leader with the inappropriate signs that were displayed at the podium tonight. It's a shame that some people think that in order to get their point across they have to stoop to those types of levels. You know, sarcasm has a place in society, I certainly appreciate it, I'm probably one of the largest users of it, but I try to limit that when I'm in a public space like here or a place where there is you know, rules of decorum, right? And there are levels to that depending on where you are out in the world and we should understand just as somebody who approaches a podium to speak you should understand what those rules are and what those generalities are. And to push the envelope, create situations like we have tonight where now we're saying you know, we don't want people to have banners and signs and things like that, right?

And I don't know, I understand where this is, I understand why we would want to do this and I understand the purpose behind it, but I also understand that it does limit freedom of speech to a degree. And so you know, I don't know what to do on that, I don't know where I'm going to fall on this to be perfectly honest with you. You know, I just think it's a shame that we have come to a point where you know, I was mistaken the evening in question here really that brought this up which was when former Alderman Teeboom had that big, giant board and he was trying to present something. I was mistaken that evening when I said you know, I think I made a point of order that the signs weren't allowed. I was mistaken that evening, right? And the point of the matter is though that his sign was appropriate when you compare that to what was displayed tonight by the speaker tonight. His when you compare the two, his was appropriate.

The problem that I have with some of the stuff and where this becomes a slippery slope is, you know, is the display that we had tonight and so that's where I struggle with this because I feel that the actions of

the Chair tonight were the appropriate response to the sign that was in question and to say, No, you're done you violated the rules. But if somebody you know, if on the other hand if somebody like former Alderman Teeboom came in and had a chart that he wished to display and talk to maybe that is okay, maybe that is appropriate.

You know, maybe we ban where we need to ban the signs is out there from person being able to sit and hold a sign, but if you're up speaking and you want to use it as a display maybe that is appropriate, and maybe that's something where this legislation could go because I can completely understand that you know we have TV cameras that pan to the audience and what you don't want is somebody to be able to use public access or government public access television as a platform for some kind of advertisement, right? Because that's not the purpose of it. So I think we need to kind of think about this a little bit. I certainly am struggling with it because although I disagree with the signs that the member of the public had tonight, I agree with her on this does limit freedom of speech, so I don't know there has to be a middle ground somewhere.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you, Madam Chair. Yeah, that's one of the shortcomings of the First Amendment; somebody is always going to push the envelope. That being said I don't think it's proper to punish one for the actions of or punish many for the actions of a few. To speak a little anecdotally one of the proudest public speaking moments that I've had in my life and I don't have many as you can tell by the innumerable ums and uhs that I utter up.

Alderman Lopez

Here's one.

Alderman Sennott

Now he's going to make me all self-conscious about it was during a hotly contested issue in my neighborhood a couple of years back. Somebody on the opposite side of the discussion had brought forward photos that didn't properly illustrate the issue. I went out and I did my own work and presented more clear photos that demonstrated the issue. And the funny side of that is that ultimately I wound up coming down with COVID the night of the meeting and I wound up presenting them on Zoom which was actually much better for what I wanted to convey. But prior to that my plan was to tack these things onto a piece of poster board and walk into the room and that chamber has different rules because it was upstairs.

But nevertheless, if somebody felt that passionately about somebody or something that was before us here, I wouldn't want to stop them from bringing forward those photos tacked to that poster board because somebody else in the community is going to take it that extra step and I struggle with that. I've sat in this chamber I know I'm new, I know there's people who have done this for an entire lifetime's worth longer than I have, but nevertheless I've followed the happenings of this chamber for a long time. I've sat in this chamber basically for four years in spite of only finishing a two year term. And I've seen a handful of situations, a real small handful. One contained a flag draped over the back of one of the benches when I was the only other person in the gallery. Another was more recent, when we had folks coming to speak on matters taking place in the Middle East. And again, this was a matter of small signs like this that they were asked to remove and for the most part did. And then there's the most recent instances with again what I wouldn't even call signs or banners, these visual aids for somebody's argument.

And I'm just not comfortable passing this for really a handful of small situations. I would be much more in tune with something that specified ordinances that we already have on the books relative to I don't know what the wording is off the top of my head, crude, vulgar, what have you. I'd certainly be amenable to specifications indicating that signage promoting a current candidate for public office or a ballot measure to be voted on by the electorate. Because I feel very firmly that in spite of everything that we do here being politics this should be a political neutral zone where we're working through the issues of the city. So I'd be perfectly comfortable with that, but I'm not comfortable with a broad ordinance restricting it this far just because some folks are going to push the envelope. We've said time and time again on multiple issues whether it's spending on legal representation or whether it's limiting public comment. Just because we put these restrictions in place doesn't mean somebody's not going to push that envelope. It's still going to happen, and the folks who want to bring in materials for the benefit of working through the city's business with us they shouldn't be punished for that. That's all I got.

Chairwoman Kelly

So I'm going to respond to some of the things that were just said. I also wasn't sure how I was going to vote on this. I feel very strongly about allowing people to speak and have their minutes and tell their stories because that's what we're here for. But the public comments definitely demonstrated that there's going to be lines that are going to be pushed and if you noticed I didn't cut off or ask the first speaker to remove the sign because the sign was not crude or vulgar and she was telling her story. Where I chaired and said no was because of the language which was on there was attacking a member of this Board which we repeatedly have said we do not allow and used swear words. So I struggle with it in its current form. I think there's been some interesting points made out like maybe it's not in the gallery, but if you have a visual aid that can be appropriate. I think that someone pointed out that chairing and presiding is not an easy job. I think where the Chair is able to have some middle ground sometimes if it's not in someone's face, if it's not insanely big so someone behind them can't see and it's appropriate I think that that can be allowed.

But I think when rules are pushed, when people can't see, when the general board work is interrupted by things that happen in the public comment that is where we have to. I mean, it's our job to get the work done and that's where I keep coming back to it. It's not that I have any desire to quash the public. I actually am very passionate about making sure that anyone who wants to speak to us can. So if your sign says "this Board sucks" okay that you're allowed to say that, that's fine but I think that we do have to get through a lot. It's what time is it? It's 9:30 and we're still not done with the agenda in front of us so I think there's got to be a balance there. Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

Can I ask the sponsor of the bill does this ordinance read "the use of banners, flags, signs, or other items which may create a safety concern, obstructive use of other members of the public or restrict public access within the aldermanic chambers is prohibited". That's what you're proposing? Is that correct?

Alderman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Lopez

Okay, is there language in there that actually says you can't say things that are crude, vulgar, or that we don't like or is it referring to things that might literally, physically block exits?

Alderman Dowd

It doesn't prohibit the language. I didn't put that in there. It is in the Manchester's rule and they're much more restrictive in the fact that if you want to speak on a subject that's not on the agenda like at our second public comment period you have to pose that question in advance, and you can correct me if I'm wrong because you've also seen it, to the City Clerk. It has to be put on the agenda and you can only speak on it once a month. It's much more restrictive than so I didn't get into that. They also prohibit foul language or I think they were trying to allow foul language, but I don't know where they ended up with that, so I wasn't getting into that either. But it's a safety concern and as far as having banners and showing things we have numerous ways that people can do that to get us the information. They can email us ahead, they can have handouts, you know. They can send us the pictures you know. We don't need to have a sign so big that if there's trying to get out the door and you block people. And you know trust me, over the years we've had more than just those incidents you mentioned. We had people in here trying us to pass rules on abortion and other things and holding up signs and it's not appropriate.

And the one thing you don't want to do is have a rule where the Chair has to make the determination as to whether it's appropriate or not. Because now you get into oh, well hey they allowed this, but didn't allow that and now you get legal involved. The rules should be hard and fast; no signs. And it started years ago with political signs, people coming in and running for office and they're holding up their signs you know. And we said no and as years went on with other signs, we as a Board of Alderman previous Board said no, no signs. Because whatever you're holding up in the audience or holding up at the podium is going out on TV.

Alderman Lopez

But to clarify this doesn't go that far. It just says large signs that might be blocking the view or create a safety concern.

Alderman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Lopez

That was the point that I want to make because a public speaker earlier said this is like going to Congress; we're testifying. It's not like that, you're not on the agenda. Nobody's looking at your stuff ahead of time. You're making public comment because you have the right to express free speech. If Alderman Teeboom really wanted to make a detailed presentation he could have just asked President Wilshire if he could address the Board and make a presentation. Some other members of the public might not necessarily get that particular audience if they have a habit of being crude, vulgar or just you know, abrasive but that's within the Chair or the President's purview. But just because we have a public comment that's meant for the whole public to be able to comment doesn't mean a small group of people can monopolize it because there's no check and they could literally roll in a billboard and block everybody from being able to see what's going on or whatever if they felt like they wanted to do that.

So I mean, I think I fully agree with most of the sentiments that have been said about not wanting to restrict free speech. I think if the people who were supporting the atrocities in Gaza had brought a giant billboard of some of the photos they shared with us that would have been immediately called out because they were pretty graphic. But I don't think that's what's being suggested here at all. I think it's just when somebody is egregiously trying to bring a huge prop in that could have been a handout for everybody. Because as much as everybody says, oh I like bringing in big flags or something. I can't see it and there was no copy brought to me, so I just had to guess what you guys were all talking about. So I think that if people are going to bring in handouts they can do that. And I think if people are going to communicate to the Board ahead of time and we should accept it, place it on file and make sure that it's seen, but I don't think that the three minutes that we're allowing for public comment with a reminder that

not all Boards do allow any public comment. We should let people speak, but they should be reasonably managed and when they're doing that.

Alderman Dowd

Just a follow up to the answer.

Chairwoman Kelly

Yep.

Alderman Dowd

In that legislation and what I mentioned earlier nothing mentions anything about content. It's a safety issue like if you have a cardboard thing in the audience and you'd have to have it in the audience before you came up to the podium you're not going to run out in the hallway and get it. You know, you could poke somebody in the eye. You could hold up in somebody's face and they can't see anything. That's the legislation not what it's on, not what's said on and they have other ways of doing it. They could even give us a stick with a presentation and they could have it put up on the TVs if you wanted to allow that. I don't know if we do, but I think this is not, we are not by passing this there's nothing in this that restricts the Freedom of Speech in the First Amendment.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons. Alderman Klee, I see your hand.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. So the issue I have is again now we're dictating the size of the sign that can come in. Because the speaker tonight had an 8-1/2 x 11 sheet of paper that said something extremely inappropriate, but was able to hold it here which obstructs nobody. And under the ordinance that's being proposed that would be allowed. Now, what it said isn't allowed because of a different ordinance. However, you know the point of the matter is we ought to be more consistent in what we're trying to accomplish. And to me I think this would make more sense if we were to say that we don't allow signs to be displayed in the audience out here and define that somehow, right? Or just say that the only place that you can have a display is when you're doing your three minutes of public comment, and it has to be germane to what you're talking about, you know. So in other words, if it's the first public comment period, it has to be germane to something that's on the agenda. If it's the second public comment period it has to be something germane to what you're talking about. And of course that could be anything and that's fine, but you can't be talking about you know, baseball and have something that's showing Gillette Stadium, you know.

So I just, I would be open to this if it were designed in a way that basically didn't allow somebody to speak without speaking in other words, right. Because if you're conveying your message out there to the TV cameras and that's the purpose that you're doing it, we don't want that type of behavior because that's when you get into the whole political agendas and all of that. And basically to me, that is in the disparate of the public comment period, number one and two, that kind of stuff really shouldn't be out there on government access channels, and it has little to do with the chamber and more to do with television. So that's kind of just my point of view and I'd be open to amending the legislation, getting legal's opinion on that to see whether that was viable or not. But I'm not ready to support it in its current, the way it's currently written.

Chairwoman Kelly

I was going to say the same thing that if we as a committee would like to make changes to this I would very much like to have legal here to better guide us on that because they definitely have you know, when we did the other pieces where we amended public comment. We had them there to guide us and I think that's really important piece that happens if we do make amendments. Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

He's a Board member.

Chairwoman Kelly

You've been waiting; go ahead.

Alderman Klee

Thank you very much. Everything that's been said here is absolutely correct in all veins that they had to say. The speaker earlier today proved that we have a need to be able to have some control within the room. And I can tell you that as a Chair up in the State House, in the committee rooms no signs were allowed whether you be the speaker or whether you be in the audience. To the point where we asked them to put them outside of the room. That's how deliberate it was. You could not bring them there. If someone wanted to make a point as in the past has done while that sign that was brought up that had all these pointers and so on they were asked to bring it and we made sure every member got a copy of that particular thing.

So that is kind of the way I would recommend and to the point that my colleague from Ward Seven had made, you know with his pictures and so on. If that were the case you would have given them out at the committee meeting and you could talk to them in that in that respect. But upstairs I will agree, upstairs is completely different. They have to have visuals because you're talking about physical properties. That's a little bit different, but if someone were to stand up there and put a sign as vulgar and as disgusting and as rude as what we saw earlier they would ask to have that sign removed and they would probably ask to leave the room. I can tell you up in the State House I would have called someone to have that person removed and I believe my other colleagues would have done the same thing.

What I thought this fell short of was that it just talked about safety concerns and talked about size and the point is you can say a lot as we saw in a very small sign. And if someone were to stand there and hold the sign and as they talked kept changing that sign to much of what we saw or even to say you know, vote for Alderman Thibodeau. They're doing an advertisement while they're talking about something else. And if you'll indulge me a little bit I'd like to read something from Manchester's Rule Three and I found it very interesting. I got this today, and I did share it with the Madam Chairwoman earlier today.

It says public comment sessions shall be conducted at each monthly regular meeting. This allows residents of Manchester the opportunity to address the Board of items of concern affecting the community. When I asked what that meant was, I was told is they don't have a second public comment. Once a month the public can come and the public can speak. It goes on to say it's at the discretion of the Mayor. They don't have a President as we do, their Mayor presides over their Board. Members of the public may be given up to a total of three minutes to speak. A member of the public must register name and topic with the City Clerk prior to the session beginning. A registered member of the public cannot relinquish allotted time to another speaker. The Mayor reserves the right to select speakers of different issues to be permitted to speak in order to provide a form of various topics to be presented. So in other words, the Chair or the President can say I'd like someone to come up here and speak to this because

they're a topic expert. *Speakers are encouraged to be civil in their language and presentation. True threats and the use of fighting words are prohibited in addition to any and all speech of actions which violate any applicable law during public comment. Speakers shall only address the Chair.* Our audience, I mean our speakers will address individual members and not just the Chair and we allow it because we push that freedom of speech a little bit more *the audience shall likewise not engage in any conduct that would prevent the public participation sessions from occurring or would otherwise violate any applicable law.*

Next, they're going to talk about the banners and so on. And they did use the language that was sent to us. If I remember I think his name was Mr. Kelly. He asked if we would amend ours to equal the particular language. So it does say *the use of banners, flags, signs, or other items which may create a security concern obstruct the view of other members of the public or restrict public access within the Aldermanic Chambers is also strictly prohibited, In those instances when a security concern is posed by a flag, sign, banner or other items, the Chair must publicly explain why that item is causing the concern before ordering its removal.* So that is what they call their rule three. I read it in its entirety I didn't skip anything. I did editorialize a little bit as I read on, but for many members of the public they come here and say that we don't allow free speech when others would do that. I can tell you I believe it was Portsmouth that when I had contacted when we talked about different languages. We are the only, the only municipality that I contacted and I contact a lot that allow as much public comment, both prior to the meeting based on that as well as post meeting.

Now, Manchester only allows it in the Board of Aldermen. They do not allow it on the committee level so there is no I'm not saying that there's no public comment prior that one I could be mistaken, but they don't allow public comment post and so on. Our public is given a lot of time to talk at the committee members to reiterate at that and while we do limit them to three minutes they are allowed, I don't believe we are stepping on anybody's freedom of speech. There is certain decorum that should be allowed, and the person who held those signs is considered to be a leader within the community as well as I would consider her to be an intelligent person. And having said that, I think what was put here is a reason why we had to put through the use of vulgar language, etc., crude was not acceptable within this because we want to maintain that certain decorum and so while I do agree with some of the comments that maybe amending this chamber and so on I don't think it's bad to prohibit signage. Maybe to say that the speaker if they have a visual aid, it would be preferred that they make copies and give that to the members.

But if that can't be done perhaps permission with the Chair could be acceptable and maybe they're doing it for the public so that the public can see what they're speaking at because they don't have access to what we have. So regardless of why the reason for it is, I don't think just saying it's a safety concern. It truly does come down to what is being put up there. Are we going to allow the speaker to stand there and advertise for an election? Are we going to allow them to advertise for Liquid Therapy you know. Do we want this to become you know, we're not Major League Baseball we're starting to put stickers on people's shoulders for free advertisement. So I do think it does come to a point where we have to maintain some civility. We have to maintain some decorum. And I find that sometimes the public will push the envelope. It is their right to but it's also our right to push back. So I apologize if I offended anybody, but thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd

Unless you want to go first?

Alderman Sennott

Oh, sure.

Chairwoman Kelly

You didn't have your hand up.

Alderman Sennott

I know, it's 9:40 you know.

Alderman Dowd

You have to poke the Chair.

Chairwoman Kelly

Yeah, I might smack you.

Alderman Sennott

Just with regard to pushing the envelope and I'm only bringing this up because Alderman Klee made a good point of you know, do we want folks coming in advertising for a certain candidate or do we you know, you would use the example of Liquid Therapy. This is where I think we're back on the slippery slope. Many times we have speakers come in, come up to the lectern here and they may not be holding a sign or wearing a button or anything, but perhaps they're wearing a Liquid Therapy t-shirt. We have a regular guest here at the meetings who is a very impassioned activist for a particular issue. This individual has signs, has banners, has flags and in absence of all of those in the chamber has worn a t-shirt that extols their opinion on that matter.

Now we're regulating message because if we are going down that road, then that's where we're at. You know if the message on the signage that we saw tonight was inappropriate I could have that on a t-shirt tomorrow no question, it could. And then I could come in here with a zip up jacket and just remove my jacket when I come up to the lectern. So I think there's a whole lot more to consider here. I think the time that we've spent on this is already indicative that the phrase was used earlier tonight, ready for prime time. I don't think this is quite yet. I know some other folks want to speak, so I'm not going to make any motion just yet.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd

So I just want to say that I did run this through legal and I'm not opposed to anybody coming up with amendments. You know, I think the safety concerns are you know, well-documented in Manchester and should be adhered to here, you know. There's no reason to have some no limitation on what can and can't be in this chamber. Legal's concern was the more you give the Chair the ability to say something is or isn't appropriate the more you open it up for legal challenge. They suggested that we have a law that's hard and fast. If there are no signs, there are no signs for anything and if you say okay, a reasonably sized sign now you're letting the Chair make the determination as to whether something's reasonable size and now you get into a legal challenge. Now you're saying oh, they can have it, we

can't, you know. You don't want to get into that. So I'm not opposed to you know, if you want to push it off and or make amendments to it go ahead, but I think we need something to control the decorum in this chamber. If we don't, we're going to lose it.

Chairwoman Kelly

So I'm going to respond and then I'll have the alderman just because you spoke to something that I brought up before and I actually agree with you remarks wise of having a clear fast rule makes it easier for presiding. I'm just more person who lives in the gray, but that makes sense. I do agree with some of these conversations around there are some additional things we could change to this. I am also not going to make a motion because I know there's other people speaking who want to speak, but I do have some potential amendments that I'd like to see. Alderman Lopez and Alderman Klee, I think right that's what I have left.

Alderman Lopez

I just want to reiterate what I said earlier that the amendment as written and confirmed by the maker of it and signed off by legal does one thing and it's my impression that people are trying to hollow it out and add everything else into it that they want to do. Nobody has made an amendment that we can actually talk about. We've been talking about things that are not in this amendment most of this discussion. If somebody wants to make an amendment they don't even have to do it and hold this part of it up. If this has been signed off by legal and if this is just saying if a sign so big that it blocks a doorway or something, then don't do that. If people want to make an amendment, they can just make an amendment after it's sent to the full Board or even after if it passed the full Board. But I think what's being done here, what was being presented here in the amendment is pretty straightforward and adding all of the other bells and whistles that people might want to do, but also might also be saying they don't want to do because they believe in free speech more than everybody else. I think that can wait for a different time and that's not what it's trying to do.

Chairwoman Kelly

So then my question to you, Alderman Lopez is we did receive a communication around changing it based on recommendations from an organization. What do you think about...

Alderman Lopez

Not our legal counsel? Our legal counsel signed off on this and left it where it was and it was and it already has a precedent in Manchester as the maker of it pointed out.

Chairwoman Kelly

Actually, Manchester amended theirs to what they recommended us to do. I think it's adding a line. Let me see if I can find it around.

Alderman Sennott

I have it right here if you'd like.

Chairwoman Kelly

It says, in those instances when a security concerns is posed by a flag, sign, banner or other item the Chair must publicly explain why that item is causing the concern before ordering its removal. Did I get that correct?

Alderman Sennott

You did.

Alderman Lopez

So, are you proposing that amendment? Are you opening a discussion now at this point?

Chairwoman Kelly

I'm just saying your point was that we should just pass this and keep going. And I just if we if that is on the table because nobody's tabled it yet. There was a piece that was specifically recommended we consider and I think we should if that is the pleasure of this Board.

Alderman Lopez

Chair to the maker if he has any problem with amending that?

Alderman Dowd

I think that legal doesn't want the chair to be making determinations at all because the minute you do that it's the chair's opinion and not the law and you're asking the Chair to interpret the law. As opposed to having black and white words on a piece of paper that there's no ifs ands or buts. Now, if you make that it may go to legal and they're going to come back and tell you the same thing. But if you want to you can go ahead.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

The problem is that there's nothing in this ordinance that says what a big sign consists of. So is it this? Is it this? Is it something even bigger? I don't know and if absent the language making the Chair be the one to tell the person that the signs too big, who enforces the rule? A rule that's ambiguous because like I said the speaker tonight had a sign that was this big didn't obstruct anybody because it didn't go beyond the dimensions of their body. So it's not obstructing anything.

Alderman Lopez

If I can ask.

Alderman Clemons

No.

Alderman Lopez

So how is that against the ordinance?

Alderman Clemons

It's not, but my point is...

Alderman Lopez

Then why are you using that as an example?

Chairwoman Kelly

Hey, both of you do not talk over each other please. We've had a long meeting

Alderman Clemons

The point of it is someone could say that something like that is an obstruction and they would probably be wrong. Someone could say that a 4 x 8 sign in here is not an obstruction and I would think that they would be wrong as well. The point is the ordinance is not ready for prime time and it needs to be looked at a little bit more closely because in my opinion this ordinance is ripe for somebody to come in here and test it and bring it all the way to the State Supreme Court. And that's the point that I'm trying to make.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez, I thought you had your hand up. Did you want to...

Alderman Lopez

I mean I would just answer that if that were the case, then they would do it with Manchester anyway.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Thibodeau.

Alderman Thibodeau

So I'm getting mixed messages because I'm being told by the author of the motion that they feel it's black and white. I feel this is entirely open to interpretation by the Chairperson. It does not say no signage shall be allowed. It says signage that which may well who determines that it "may". So I'm in agreement with Alderman Clemons that I don't think this is as black and white as it's being presented that it is. I believe this is totally written as it is up to interpretation. It's not black and white. I'm not going to support it one way or the other. My point is though is if this is to prohibit signage, then it should say no signage shall be allowed in the aldermanic chamber. I wouldn't vote for it, but I'm saying if that's what the intent is I don't read this as that. And I don't know if it's that is the intent.

Alderman Dowd

It is the intent.

Alderman Thibodeau

But I see this as windows of opportunity and interpretation. So that's all I wanted to say is that's how I'm reading this and maybe I'm wrong, but that's how I'm reading this.

Chairwoman Kelly

Motion on the floor is to recommend final passage. Is that what that is?

Alderman Sennott

That's till where we're at.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to address a couple things that were said. Again, I'm going to go back to the State House. When you are on the floor of the house and you want to be a speaker and you want to go up into the well and you want to speak. If you had a t-shirt on or a button on that spoke to anything political, controversial or something. You would ask to be put some to cover it, or to take that button off before you would be allowed to speak in the well. Now that is holding a State Rep. deep to the fire. That's not necessarily the general public, but the reason for it is because they believe in decorum and they believe in the proper way. And my colleagues, I had colleagues that would wear very controversial shirts, but if they wanted to go speak they would borrow somebody's jacket and put the jacket on to go up there and speak. So to address the t-shirt I do 100% agree with you at our next Board of Aldermen meeting that speaker who spoke will probably have a T-shirt that has something very similar to what we saw and that will be the truth.

But the bottom line is we do have that decorum and to speak to that yes, we do have an ordinance that speaks to vulgarity and so on. And the reason why if I remember, much of the conversation that we had around that was because we have children that are watching this and is that what we wanted them to see? We asked that no one would speak those kind of languages while putting it in writing is the same thing as speaking it to me. So that particular thing was vulgar. The person said oh, I don't find it vulgar. Well, that person didn't find other words vulgar. I found them vulgar as well as I would not want my 13 or 12 year old child to see something like that of adults that are supposed to be having a civil conversation.

But again, that is a conversation for another time, but that is the point that I'm trying to make about these t-shirts. If that person did come in with a t-shirt I would hope that they would be asked to cover it or to leave. I don't know if that will be happening.

I agree 100% with what my colleagues here have said. This is not black and white. I was less than disappointed when I when I saw this that I didn't feel that it stated what I had hoped it had stated. I did sponsor this or I did raise my hand and say that I would do that because I thought it was the start of a conversation. I think the conversation does need to go further as to what is acceptable and what is not acceptable. I'm not on this committee I'm just lending my opinion. I will get to vote when it comes to that. I think having the chair make the decision while I agree they should, what we are leading ourselves up to is if Chairwoman Kelly says I find that sign too large or I find that, because you have a large audience here that sign has to go and then I'm chairing committee and someone brings up a sign maybe equally as large, but there's nobody in the audience and I allow it to happen and so on. Are we leading ourselves into a legal battle that we will end up in court and to Supreme Court or to whatever.

So I think we have to, I believe we take it out of the hands of the chairperson. I think that we get very specific, we get as much as this and will there be unintended consequences where someone is going to push the envelope as I stated before? Absolutely there will be. I use the Liquid Therapy only because we had said the word and it popped into my head, but I was talking about you know, holding up signs, wearing a t-shirt of Liquid Therapy or The Surf. I have both and I do wear them proudly out. I don't think that would be considered what I meant by advertising of holding up a sign so that you could do that. Someone may argue different with me and I would have to listen and probably aqueous to what they had to say. But I think that we do have some common sense. If someone's saying vote for so and so and something they have their three minutes where they can stand up and say, I want to let the entire public

know I am voting for Alderman Thibodeau even though I'm in Ward Four you know, I'm going to write them in. They have the right to say that, they have the right to do what they want to do for those three minutes as long as within a keeping a civil tongue in their in their mouth. So thank you and I apologize for going on.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO TABLE
MOTION CARRIED**

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

R-25-158

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

RELATIVE TO A NON-BINDING BALLOT REFERENDUM CONCERNING THE KEEFE AUDITORIUM
- tabled at 5/5/25 mtg

O-25-051

Endorsers: Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr.
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman Chris Thibodeau
Alderman Tim Sennott
Alderman Derek Thibeault

PROHIBITING THE SALE OF KRATOM

- tabled at 3/3/25 mtg

ON THE QUESTION

Chairwoman Kelly

And just before we go on I just wanted to say that we are going to have most likely a special personnel meeting where the Kratom will come up so that people can absorb the new information that was... my brain is like not working anymore. We accepted it under suspension this evening this evening.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN SENNOTT TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE O-25-056
MOTION CARRIED**

O-25-056

Endorsers: Alderman Chris Thibodeau
Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr.
Alderman Thomas Lopez
Alderman John Sullivan

RULES FOR REMARKS BY ALDERMEN AT MEETINGS

- Tabled at 6/2/25 meeting

ON THE QUESTION

Chairwoman Kelly

And I am going to recognize the main sponsor of this, Alderman Thibodeau. Thank you for waiting a very long time to speak on your piece of legislation.

Alderman Thibodeau

Thank you, Madam Chair. My intention for this was to levy the same parameters we apply to the citizens when they come up for their free time to speak on the alderman themselves. Obviously during conversations of legislative items that are currently being on the agenda that there should be no time limit on that, that's where the work gets done. But at the end when we have our time to if we choose to discuss whatever we feel free to and that's currently on our minds. Just like the citizens, I believe that the aldermen should have the same parameters applied to their time that the citizens do.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alright, question/comments/thoughts from the Committee? Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

I mentioned this in a committee meeting previously so I would support it because if we make rules regarding public comment. I think particularly in the aldermanic remarks, like we're not discussing necessarily legislation we're not debating or you know, enacting our duties. We're making comment which is often duplicative and on the subject that we just covered or general announcements, and those are things that we should be able to compose ourselves and do in three minutes.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Madam Chairwoman, while I do understand the you know fair play type of legislation that this is supposed to be. My concern is that as we sit here in a meeting there are multiple things that are happening. Multiple Speakers have spoken maybe in public comment, things have happened within it plus there may be something that we're going to mention in regards to something that's happened out in the public that we want to acknowledge and so on. To limit us to three minutes means that you pick one subject that may have happened or you pick one subject of something you want to say. Oftentimes we give condolences and so on. I don't think you necessarily can do it within three minutes. And I know I'm a for lack of a better term, I'll call myself a chatterbox where I tend to go on too much and much like my colleagues that do a lot of ums and ahs as they grope for words.

We do the work here and we listen to the public and we want to comment to the public. If I had three members of the public who spoke I might want to address them. I would have to limit myself to maybe one. I think you really handcuff while I do agree with you know, we make rules and we should have to abide by those same rules. My fear is that we really will be handcuffing ourselves. We really will be losing the opportunity we have to be able to speak to the public to speak to something that's happened and so on. And just like right now, I'm probably going on much too long and I apologize for that, but I think those are things that we have to that would be the unintended consequences if you limit our comments to three minutes and I think that's something you need to think about, but thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

So I have just a clarifying question because I'm not sure, and I'm sure the speaker already or the

sponsor already said it, but I just want to clarify. So when it says remarks by Alderman aloud in Subsections A and B is that talking about at the end of the meeting where it says aldermanic comments and then general comments. Are those what it is or?

Alderman Thibodeau

Yes. If I may?

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Thibodeau.

Alderman Thibodeau

That is the section when the President says additional comments by Alderman. So it's just that final, final aldermanic comment portion.

Alderman Clemons

Okay. Now would this is my other question. Would this be in committees? Because basically in the committees there are this, I think the committees follow sort of the same format where like at the end of this committee for example, you have general discussion and then you have remarks by the alderman. So my question is on this ordinance, does A and B refer to remarks; general discussion and remarks by alderman or is it just remarks by Alderman? That's the question that that I have and then in that is that for just the Board of Alderman or is this for the entire like all committees, basically?

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Thibodeau.

Alderman Thibodeau

I'm trying to pull up the ordinance, but my computer's giving me a hard time, sorry.

Alderman Sennott

I have it right here if you'd like

Alderman Thibodeau

What's that?

Alderman Sennott

I have it right here.

Alderman Thibodeau

You have it pulled up.

Alderman Sennott

So the section that your legislation specifically addresses is Section 5-14 which Section A spells out the order of business for regular meetings of the Board of Aldermen shall be as follows. Then Section B refers to meetings of committees of the Board of Aldermen shall include the following. So if the question

is A and B or as allowed in A and B, then this would refer to both the full Board meeting as well as the committee meetings.

Alderman Clemons

Okay.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

And so to go further. So this would only be, so under general discussion we would be able to have unlimited time, if you will. But under remarks by alderman it would only be three minutes.

Alderman Thibodeau

Correct.

Alderman Clemons

I think hearing that, that balances the concerns that Alderman Klee brought up and which were my concerns as well which was what if three or four different members of the public bring up three or four different things, let's say at the previous Board of Aldermen meeting and now we're at the second Board of Aldermen meeting and we want to address those three or four people well that with three minutes to address three different topics that could be difficult to do. If you're saying though that under general discussion that we could bring those things up and you know, discuss them. But then when it goes to remarks by alderman we just have three minutes, I think that that's a reasonable balance and I think that's something that I could get behind. You know again, I think we all should do a better job at trying to be a little bit less winded than we are and I'm guilty of it myself. I've probably spent way too much time talking tonight, but I think that addresses the concerns, I think and I'd be interested to hear what Alderman Klee has to say.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, our current document that we have here as far as the agenda is concerned has public comment, then general discussion, and then remarks by Alderman. That's not the way it normally goes. It goes general discussion, public comment and then remarks by alderman. That is usually the form that it takes. General discussion always happens before public comment so if the public, if multiple of my constituents have come up, this is an error. This particular agenda is an error. So that would stop me from being able to address public comments that have come up, and this is where I really have an issue with it.

So you know to be honest with you, I was going to put legislation through to get rid of general discussion because it's the same. We all interpret it as the same and some people speak before public comment, some people speak after, and some people speak during both. I think it's redundant. I don't think we necessarily need both, but I would say keep remarks by alderman where it is, post the public comments so that we can address some of those things. But I do not believe you should be limiting what the aldermen say because we could be responding to them. And while yes, we may go off on tangents and perhaps the President or the Chair could say to us okay, take a breath and leave the stage, but I do

think I find general and remarks by alderman to be redundant, but there's public comment that's in between it. This particular agenda is wrong. If you go back and look at other agendas, you will see that it's general discussion, public comment and remarks by alderman. So thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

Thank you. To that point, we actually don't have general discussion at the full Board.

Alderman Klee

Pardon.

Alderman Sennott

We don't have a general discussion period at this full Board.

Alderman Klee

Yes, we do.

Alderman Sennott

It hasn't been called out since I've been here.

Alderman Klee

It's there. It is on the agenda.

Alderman Clemons

Wasn't that in the ordinances that you just read.

Chairwoman Kelly

I'm looking at it right now.

Alderman Sennott

I'm just saying in the two years that I've been sitting here, it hasn't been called out as part of the agenda.

Alderman Clemons

I'm sorry I'm out of turn.

Alderman Sennott

But regardless, I try to come here prepared with my remarks at the end of the evening. I, not to be too morose but I you know, get through the obituaries and identify who I want to remark on the passing of or you know, nice things that have happened in the community or at the Community Center or what have you. And I try to have that in front of me in my notes so that I can hit those points and cede my time to either Alderman Clemons or Alderman Jette. Sometimes somebody will put a bug in my ear or they'll

call me out and I don't like to respond when I'm called out, but I feel compelled to. But regardless, I think we can all come in with that preparedness without needing to restrict it. I wouldn't want to step on somebody else's toes just like I didn't want to step on the public's toes. We you know, I understand that this legislation largely comes about as a matter of fair play. Well, we didn't extend the public's time earlier this year or last year, whatever it was.

And for the record I did vote to extend that time, but regardless it does bring about some concerns when we had that discussion that I felt were a little disingenuous. One that I thought in particular was that you know, if we let everybody sign up to speak for six minutes at a time beginning to end we could be here all night. Now yeah, it's rare that a meeting comes by where all 15 of us want to say something and we go on till the ends of the earth. It could happen you know, the world's turning into a scarier place. I'm sure we've all got a lot more on our minds that we'd like to speak on, but that could have us here all night. I don't have any real strong feelings about this legislation one way or the other. I don't think it's necessary. I could live with it if it's there, but I just thought for the sake of playing devil's advocate that that was worth mentioning because in the interest of fair play we did have a piece of legislation ahead of us to afford the public more time and there were those of us in this room that supported it and it still got shot down.

And so it's understandable that maybe the public would want a little bit of give from us in that regard. I had a whole rant that I opted not to go on tonight about the fact that it does seem sometimes that whether the perception is true or not, sometimes there's a perception from the public that there's an air of combativeness from this chamber toward the public and certain pieces of legislation or pieces of legislation not passing, don't do anything to cool that. Like when we say people are speaking for too long at the lectern. We didn't do anything to cool those temperatures by saying no, you've had your time. I don't think this in particular would do anything to cool those temperatures. It would put us on the same page but in general I just, I don't know. There's a lot of arguments for and against this. I don't have a strong opinion one way or the other. I'll live with it if it passes, but I don't think it's necessary. That's where I'm at with this right now.

Chairwoman Kelly

So I'm going to give my thoughts here if I can collect them. I think when you originally mentioned this, I said put it up, I'm interested to see it. And I was one of those people who said that I think that the public in three minutes is plenty time to make an argument. And I think I could live with that and I also think at the end when it's just the remarks part, trying to come prepared makes a lot of sense. I do hear the other side of if something is said and I want to be able to respond. I may not be as prepared to do so because it just happened in public comment. So my thoughts here, I kind of feel like the previous speaker like can live with it.

I think there's some merit here and I understand the will to want to be more fair. I also don't love meetings that go on and on and on and on especially towards the end so but that's why I like it that you're not limiting when we're doing the business, when we're talking about pieces of legislation, anything that would impede us from doing the work of the Board. Just a thought, is there any opportunity to make it more of a guideline like, instead of it saying limited say you know, each speaker is recommended to keep it to three minutes and gives us a little bit more opportunity if there's something really big in front of us or someone wants to talk about it. At least it sets a it sets a guideline and that's in everyone's head, just a thought. You can take the thought while Alderman Klee speaks if you want. Alderman Klee.

Alderman Klee

Yeah, I want to speak to what Alderman Sennott said. I am looking at through E-Code and I'm looking at order of business which is 5-14. And in doing so, I will be very honest with you I do not see general discussion. And while we do have it on our agenda, we do have it on our agenda and she does ask for it. You may not have heard, but it has because many of us have spoken prior to public comment and

then we speak after public comment, so it has been asked for. But as I'm looking through here I see under that 51-4 A, order of business for regular meetings. I see the Aldermanic President calls assembly, prayer, designee leads the pledge, roll call, remarks by the Mayor, response to the Mayor's remarks, recognition of City's employees, reading of minutes, communications, a period of the acceptance of orally presented communications, communications requiring final approval, petitions presented and disposal thereof. Eleven is such nomination, appointments and elections. Twelve is reports of committees without objection. Thirteen is confirmation of the Mayor's appointments. Fourteen is business unfinished. Fifteen is new business may be introduced. Sixteen communication to include a period of the acceptance of orally presented communications or comments from the public or others. I believe that is the first public comment. Next, I'm sorry that's the last public comment. Then it's remarked by Alderman and adjournment. There's no point here where it actually speaks to general discussion which is why I really felt it was redundant and I was going to put through legislation to rid us of it. I don't think we necessarily need and many of us often get confused is this where I need to speak or do I speak at the end? When is this particular subject appropriate?

So in general, I think removing general discussion would be the right thing to do from the agenda. And I will not try to repeat myself too much, but I'm going to stand by what I said as to limiting the remarks by the alderman. I think is very dangerous because we cannot do our job. We cannot speak to the public that has spoken. We cannot speak to a constituent that maybe has come up. We might not even be able to answer a question. Oftentimes, we do answer questions that someone came up. We don't answer them as they're speaking. We don't interfere with their three minutes. Sometimes we do, but we shouldn't and sometimes we address it afterwards that will be part of remarks by the alderman. To limit my answer to someone to three minutes no matter how prepared I am. On the fly, I write down notes as people are speaking. I may not be able to gather my thoughts enough to be able to maintain it within three minutes. I am a scattered speaker and for that I make no apologies it's who I am. But I think we're doing ourselves a disservice if we try to limit ourselves to three minutes and I will stop there. Thank you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Hearing what the actual order is and knowing that there's no technically, there's no general comment I then I defer to what Alderman Klee has said in that it does us a disservice and there hinders us from being able to truly do the job we were elected to do and that's to inform you know, well partially in part, to inform the public of you know things that have happened in the community or responding to constituents, thing of that nature. I to be perfectly honest, was willing to support a compromise of I believe, four and a half minutes or four minutes to extend the public comment. I wasn't, I was on vacation and not at the meeting when that actually was indefinitely postponed. But had it been, I would have supported a compromise to add minutes to that public comment period.

But again, we are representing there's 15 of us here and we're representing 90,000 people, right? Or I am representing 90,000 people. Some of us represent our individual wards and that's about 10,000 people, right? So, but we all work on behalf of the entire city regardless of that. And the point of the matter is that you know, we have to have the time to be able to speak to the citizens. And while a citizen yes, is limited to three minutes there, they're not limited in the sense that they can email us. They can try to call us. They can write to us, you know, they can get their point across just as we can; we can do that too.

But I think the point of these meetings is not necessarily for the public to tune in to hear what a citizen is saying, but it is definitely the point to tune in to hear what their aldermen are saying and I think that we lose sight of that if we were to restrict the amount of time that any individual Alderman has at the end to give those public comments. So while I appreciate the spirit of the of the ordinance, I can't support it because I do think that the points that Alderman Klee brought up were very valid. And I do think that it

would inhibit us from doing our work so I won't be supporting this tonight.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

So a member of the public is using their public comment. They can exceed the three minutes if the Board just gives them permission to and typically that's either voted on explicitly or is just done without objection we'll add an additional three minutes if somebody suggests doing it. So we do have a mechanism for unique circumstances like a record needs to be corrected and several of us have taken multiple bites of the apple because I know I'll get through two thirds of what I meant to say and then end and then later be like oh right, I forgot something and have to put my hand up again. And that I think is a function of the President, of deciding okay well I mean you shot for three minutes, you shot for your one time in this case because it's not, there's no limit on us right now. It's just customarily President Wilshire gives us one shot and then if we screw up she'll give us a second one. And if we do too much, people will start like heckling.

So I think there is a mechanism especially if something serious is happening, if there's a direct attack or assault on something or major misinformation. I think that mechanism exists. We could put it in here if we wanted to and I don't necessarily see a problem though, not speaking from the maker of the motion initially with just saying this is recommended. As it is right now I think two thirds of us probably do stick to the three minute rule. Ever since we had that conversation with public comment I've been timing my comments just so that I could try to feel what it was like to get through that just because it didn't occur to me to do it when we first added three minutes.

But when we started talking about adding more or less I was kind of thinking like, well, why can't I say. I mean, I like promoting the Tree Streets Block Party, for example. But if a member of the community dies and I prioritize and I switch things and dispose of half of the comments that I was going to make in rebuttal to somebody who is using their three minutes of fame to heckle themselves or whatever. Some comments from the public it is better not to respond to. It just doesn't feel like that in the moment when they're making their comments and then we're up next. Because it is positioned kind of to be the last word. So I don't think we do a disservice just by setting standards. I do think that if there's something serious that needs to be said we should be able to say it, but I think we can any rule we make can be you know, regarding how our meetings are conducted can be overridden by the will of the body. So I don't think there's a contradiction there personally. I do see what is being said, though.

Chairwoman Kelly

Oh, I have some hands up. Alderman Thibodeau and then Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Thibodeau

Well, what I was going to say I would like to hear what Alderman Clemons has to say first if that's all right with you.

Chairwoman Kelly

Sure. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

I just thought of this and I want to thank Alderman Lopez for actually bringing it up because I do think that the rest of this ordinance has merit in the sense that like you know, so one) speaker may not speak

until recognized; that's obvious, right? One person speaks at a time; that's obvious. Each speaker is limited to speaking once in the remarks by Alderman; I think that's fair. The profane and obscene remarks; I think that's fair. I think the fact that the presiding officer has the authority to terminate the remarks of any speaker when such remarks do not adhere to this chapter, I think is also fair. So I could support this if we took out the three minutes because I think the rest of this is germane.

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay. Alderman Thibodeau.

Alderman Thibodeau

I don't know if this is appropriate or not. I was going to make a recommendation if possible to table it so I can work on it.

Chairwoman Kelly

Okay.

Alderman Thibodeau

If that's acceptable, is that acceptable?

Alderman Clemons

Yes.

Chairwoman Kelly

Yes, you can ask someone to table. Would anyone like to do so? Alderman Clemons.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO TABLE
MOTION CARRIED**

Alderman Lopez

Madam Chair, Can I get a point of clarification just because we went past it and I didn't fully understand. We went past the Kratom because is this the communication that we're talking about or the one from Alderman Moran?

Chairwoman Kelly

Nope. There was a request from Alderman Moran to take it off the table. I was asked this afternoon and I felt it was not fair to not allow the public to at least see that it was going to be coming off the table and be able to weigh in. So we had a discussion and he sent an email maybe 15 minutes ago saying or maybe an hour it's been too long, saying that he was fine with that.

Alderman Lopez

Before the meeting.

Chairwoman Kelly

No, during the meeting.

Alderman Lopez

Just out of curiosity as a point of procedure. How do we announce that? Do we just tell people? Or can we take it off the table for next meeting?

Chairwoman Kelly

I just told them. 8:54 he said he was just fine with keeping it on the table till the special that we're going to put together. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

No, if you're not finished, Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

No, I was just asking how we set that up as would we just take it off for next meeting? Would we just...because as it is right now if it's on the table for the agenda people won't know that it's actually coming off.

Alderman Clemons

Right.

Chairwoman Kelly

I mean we say that we will be taking it off the table at the next meeting. Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah, I mean as a matter of practicality if somebody was to come from the public and they had wanted to speak to anything that was tabled at the first public comment period we would have to let them talk about it because technically it's on the agenda, right? Doesn't mean that this board has to take it up. And also the generally speaking when something is on the table not always, but usually if we know like okay, you know it's something especially if it's a controversial topic which that is. Then you know, you try to say. You give it your best effort forward and say hey you know what? Like, we got some information the Board of Public Health recommends a change to this. Just came in today. Let's take this off the table at the next meeting. Unless there's some something pressing that we have to some sort of timeline. But I mean, in general practice that's what we've done in this board. We could take it off the table and move it to the next meeting. I think we've given plenty of notice that at the next meeting it's going to be taken off the table though.

Alderman Lopez

So as a point of clarification I was speaking to how it would appear on the next agenda. If we don't take it off the table this week.

Alderman Clemons

It'll still be tabled.

Alderman Lopez

So that was my concern.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Sennott.

Alderman Sennott

Just as a I guess a point of argument, we periodically from time to time have notations in the agenda. For example, tonight's agenda under unfinished business for R-25-121 indicates that this will be discussed at the 9/22/25 meeting. I don't see any reason why the agenda for whether it's our next meeting or a special couldn't indicate that it is anticipated that R-20 or O-25 whatever will be removed from the table.

Chairwoman Kelly

All set Alderman Lopez?

Alderman Lopez

I mean I don't see any reason either. I just don't know what the difference is between literally just taking it off for the next meeting so that there isn't like a special notation. But I mean, as long as the legislative assistant does whatever and everyone feels like there's transparency then I'm fine with that.

Chairwoman Kelly

It's also generally the, we generally ask whoever is the main sponsor how they would like to do it. So as the Chair, I talked to them before and ask are we taking it off the table so that we can be prepared. So I mean, Alderman Thibodeau knew that. That's why his was tabled last time he came back tonight to talk to it. So that is you know that you chair.

Alderman Lopez

Right and as a point of clarification I wasn't disputing that we were taking it off the table in the next meeting. I have zero problem with that. I'm just trying to make sure that because we're taking it off the next meeting so that people know and have time to prepare to come comment on it. I was just thinking the best way to make sure that they knew would be to take it off the table. There's a workaround apparently.

Chairwoman Kelly

So remember that whole general discussion piece that we were talking about, that's on a thing. I was going to announce during general discussion that we are looking at doing a special personnel with this and another piece of legislation before the September meeting, but we didn't get there yet. Alderman Klee, did you?

Alderman Klee

If Alderman Lopez is finished.

Alderman Lopez

Yep, I'm done.

Alderman Klee

Okay. The comment that I was going to make is if you do things often we do it up in Planning is that we table something to a very specific date. And we've done this at different committee meetings and different board meetings and we did it up in the State House. When you would table something you would say table to ___ and you gave the date. If necessary, when you got to that point and it wasn't ready to be discussed you took it off the table and changed the date to kind of be pushing it forward. That might be a nice practice for the Board of Aldermen to be doing in the future. But oftentimes something gets tabled because there's a lot more work that has to get done and you don't know how long that work is going to take.

So for instance, maybe in this case where Alderman Moran is the primary sponsor, but he may have wanted more time to it. And I look at the primary sponsors taking some responsibility of saying Madam Chair, could this come off the table and so on and to her. So while I do like the idea to some extent that we say at a time to be named in the future giving that specific time. It could be a slippery slope because people could be coming here to speak to it and then you don't because you're not ready for it. So leaving it open, the public has a right to call and find out if it will be actually on the agenda. They could send the Personnel Committee or whatever committee a note saying will this be taken off agenda? Or they could come to speak to it.

As was pointed by Alderman Clemons if it's on the agenda table, they're not. You have the right to still speak to it and actually for your benefit, if you speak to it, doesn't get taken up. You get one more bite at that apple the next time it comes to the meeting, every time it's being carried forward. So you get three minutes, three minutes, three minutes, three minutes. So I would not say put a specific date in. I think that could be a dangerous. Certain ones we did such as this one here, because we knew that there would be no the previous one because we that you mentioned we would not have time to speak to it today. So it had to be put forward to the following one. But just again, my comments.

Chairwoman Kelly

Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

I just point out on behalf of the incredibly passionate people who would speak to Kratom. We did table it a while ago so they might have stopped looking because they didn't think we were going to go anywhere with it. And I agree entirely with like giving them a little bit of lead time just because they may not have realized that we were going to discuss it. So I mean, they've known they could come up and talk while it was tabled they probably would have been up a couple times in between. They were just waiting for the Board of Health.

Chairwoman Kelly

All set?

Alderman Lopez

Yep.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Alderman Lopez

Alderman Klee, when you were reading that... three minutes... when you were reading the order of the Aldermanic meetings did it say oral report from members which was referred to as members as public comment?

Alderman Klee

You mean the oral report...

Alderman Lopez

It was comments that were prepared orally or something to that effect.

Alderman Klee

It's so #16 which is prior to remarks by the alderman. The exact wording is communications to include a period of the acceptance of orally presented communications or comments from the public or others on items not on the agenda or regarding actions taken by the board during the current meeting.

Alderman Lopez

Really wish I'd seen that before the whole debate before because it looks like that already does sort of discourage signs.

Alderman Klee

Yeah, so it says communications to include a period of the acceptance of orally and it's item # 16 by the way, under 5-14A. It says communication to include a period of the acceptance of orally presented communications or comments from the public or other on items not on the agenda or regarding actions taken by the board during that. So that basically is a second public comment.

Alderman Lopez

But without rehashing everything that seems like a pretty decent starting point for a compromise because we don't want to restrict people who want to express themselves freely, but we also want to manage some order in public comment. And if they're supposed to be presenting oral arguments we're not telling them what they can't bring as a sign. We're just saying this is the time to be speaking, not showing and then we're not doing anything about what they're waving around the rest of the time. Because I mean, I think 90% of us aren't trying to limit speech unless it's literally vulgar, crude or threatening.

Chairwoman Kelly

Any other general discussion? Does anyone want to make additional remarks? Please limit them to three minutes.

Alderman Lopez

I was told to bring during general discussion you'd say when that next meeting will be.

Chairwoman Kelly

I already said it. We don't have a date yet because it was just discussed today. So we have to go to

Donna and see when the chamber is available. And there'll be information coming out on a special personnel meeting either in august.

Alderman Lopez

Please do not do it the wee I'm gone.

Chairwoman Kelly

I'm going to do it the week you're done,

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO ADJOURN
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 10:35 p.m.

Alderman Tim Sennott
Committee Clerk

City of Nashua

Division of Public Health & Community Services
18 Mulberry Street, Nashua, NH 03060



To: Personnel/Administrative Affairs Committee

From: Bobbie Bagley, Director of Public Health and Community Services

Re: Board of Health's recommendation relative to O-25-051 Prohibiting the Sale of Kratom

Date: August 4, 2025

The Board of Health would support the recommendation of a ban on the sale of Kratom to individuals under the age of 21.



City of Nashua
Human Resources Department
Administrative Services Division
229 Main Street - Nashua, NH 03060

(603) 589-3230
Fax (603) 589-3209

TO: Shoshanna Kelly, Chairwoman of Personnel & Administration Committee

FROM: Nancy Trask, Human Resources Manager
Lizzie Gouveia, Sr. Human Resources Specialist

Date: August 4, 2025

RE: Proposed Ordinance 0-25-058 Recommendation

Proposed Ordinance 0-25-058 is to amend the Unaffiliated Employees Personnel Policies with respect to the Fire Department's Chief Officers' compensation and benefits. As noted in the fiscal note, this proposal is for seven (7) employees for a total cost of \$262,175 plus additional vacation time.

In the current Unaffiliated Salary Classification Plan (Exhibit A) there are two grades between each of the Fire Chief Officers'. The Fire Chief is grade 23, the Assistant Fire Chief is grade 21 and the Deputy Fire Chief is grade 19. The current salaries and ranges of the grades are as follows:

Current Salary:

Fire Chief - \$173,802

Assistant Fire Chief - \$158,905

Deputy Fire Chief - \$145,994

*based on 2184 hours

Salary Ranges:

Grade 23: \$132,038 - \$173,802

Grade 21: \$120,721 - \$158,905

Grade 19: \$110,912 - \$145,994

*based on 2184 hours

Currently, between the Fire Chief and Assistant Fire Chief there is a 9.37% differential. Between the Assistant Fire Chief and the Deputy Fire Chief there is an 8.84% differential. It is also important to note that the Deputy Fire Chiefs are paid based on a 42-hour average work week and are also eligible for overtime pay at time and a half for hours worked over 42.

In our current classification, all of the Fire Department's Chief Officers' are at the top of the range of their grade.

In 2024, the City conducted a Classification and Compensation Study for all Unaffiliated positions working with MGT Consulting. The study included a market review and update of our current compensation and salary classification plan. In the proposed compensation study salary classification plan (Exhibit B) there is one grade between each of the Fire Chief Officers'. The Fire Chief is grade 25, the Assistant Fire Chief is grade 24 and the Deputy Fire Chief is grade 23. There is a 5% differential between grades. The proposed ranges of the grades are as follows:

Grade 25: \$146,094 - \$199,940

Grade 24: \$135,902 - \$185,991

Grade 23: \$132,740 - \$181,664

*based on 2184 hours

This proposed ordinance would compensate the Deputy Fire Chiefs 20% greater than Fire Captains assigned to the top pay grid in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Assistant Fire Chief 20% greater than the Deputy Fire Chiefs and the Fire Chief 15% greater than the Assistant Fire Chief. Please note, the Fire Captains' base wage includes holidays and specialty team pay which is not the case for base wage for Deputy Chiefs, Assistant Chief or Chief.

Our consultant, MGT, reviewed the proposed Ordinance and provided these observations/recommendations (See Exhibit C for complete details):

- Among the comparable communities analyzed during the Salary Study, supervisor-to-subordinate differentials within Fire Department roles range from 9% to 17%.
- To maintain equity and prevent overlap between subordinate and supervisory positions, it is critical to define salary ranges and implement policies that guarantee supervisors are compensated appropriately above those they oversee.
- Maintaining a differential between 5% and 15% is a best practice for ensuring fairness, preventing compression, and supporting organizational effectiveness. **This percentage should apply to base pay only** and would provide a streamlined, transparent approach to compensation decisions.

The change in vacation accruals is a 33% increase over the current top unaffiliated accrual tier and the years of service requirement has been removed. This may increase the overtime cost for Deputy Fire Chiefs.

We concur with our consultant and recommend maintaining a differential between 5% and 15%. One of the pillars of our recent Compensation study was to ensure and maintain internal equity. It should be noted that with the Fire Department proposing these changes to their compensation and vacation, other groups (such as Police and DPW) may look to amend their compensation as well. Consideration should also be given to the sustainability of this compensation over the coming years.

Enclosed: Exhibit A – Current Unaffiliated Salary Classifications
Exhibit B – Proposed Compensation Study Salary Classifications
Exhibit C – Recommendation on Ordinance 0-25-058 from MGT

Exhibit A

UNAFFILIATED SALARY & WAGE CLASSIFICATIONS

<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Grade</u>
DIRECTOR PUBLIC WORKS	23	ASSESSING MANAGER	15
FIRE CHIEF	23	DEPUTY HEALTH OFFICER	15
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIRECTOR	22	DISEASE INTERVENTION & BEHAVIORAL HEALTH NURSE	15
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	22	EPIDEMIOLOGIST	15
CORPORATION COUNSEL	22	GIS SPECIALIST	15
ASSISTANT FIRE CHIEF	21	HRIS ANALYST	15
CITY ENGINEER	21	MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION MANAGER	15
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PUBLIC WORKS	20	PARKING MANAGER	15
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PUBLIC WORKS FINANCE & ADMINISTRATION	20	PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE	15
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER	20	SENIOR STAFF ENGINEER (no PE)	15
COMPTROLLER	20	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SPECIALIST	14
DEPUTY CORPORATION COUNSEL	20	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH STRATEGIST	14
DIRECTOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	20	BUILDING MANAGER	14
DIRECTOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SVCS	20	BUSINESS & PROPERTY MANAGER	14
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR	20	DEPUTY CITY CLERK	14
TREASURER / TAX COLLECTOR	20	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COORDINATOR	14
CYBERSECURITY ENGINEER	19	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST II	14
DEPUTY FIRE CHIEF	19	GRANT WRITER	14
DIRECTOR LIBRARY	19	PAYROLL SUPERVISOR	14
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR	19	PUBLIC HEALTH EQUITY OFFICER	14
MANAGER PLANNING DEPT	19	PUBLIC HEALTH NETWORK SERVICE STRATEGIST (CK TITLE)	14
RISK MANAGER	19	PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS COORD	14
SUPERINTENDENT OF FLEETS	19	WELFARE SPECIALIST SUPERVISOR	14
SUPERINTENDENT OF PARKS	19	BILINGUAL MEDICAL ASSISTANT	13
SUPERINTENDENT OF SOLID WASTE	19	COMMUNICATIONS & EVENTS SPECIALIST	13
SUPERINTENDENT OF STREETS	19	COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST	13
SUPERINTENDENT OF WASTEWATER	19	ECONOMIC MOBILITY PROGRAM SPECIALIST	13
ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL	18	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SPECIALIST I	13
BUSINESS MANAGER - NFR	18	ENV HLTH QUALITY IMPROVEMENT & COMPLIANCE SPECIALIST	13
BUSINESS MANAGER - NPD	18	HEALTH PROMOTION & COMMUNICATION SPECIALIST	13
CHIEF OF STAFF	18	PAYROLL ANALYST	13
CHIEF PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE	18	PEG PROGRAM MANAGER	13
CITY CLERK	18	PROPERTY AND CASUALTY ADJUSTER	13
DEPUTY CITY ENGINEER	18	PUBLIC HEALTH STRATEGIST	13
DIVISION OPERATIONS MANAGER (DPW)	18	SENIOR HUMAN RESOURCES SPECIALIST	13
ENTERPRISE DBA/SYSTEM ANALYST	18	STAFF ENGINEER	13
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEER	18	SUPERINTENDENT CEMETERY	13
HEALTH OFFICER	18	BENEFITS SPECIALIST	12
HOUSING SERVICE OFFICER	18	CONSTITUENT SERVICES COORDINATOR	12
IT MANAGER PROJECT/DEVELOPMENT SVCS	18	CREATIVE COORDINATOR	12
SENIOR FINANCE MANAGER	18	ECHANNEL ACCESS ADMINISTRATOR	12
SUSTAINABILITY MANAGER	18	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	12
TRANSIT ADMINISTRATOR	18	INTAKE/WELFARE SPECIALIST	12
WELFARE OFFICER	18	PAYROLL SPECIALIST	12
ACCOUNTING MANAGER	17	RECORDS ADMINISTRATOR	12
ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER NPD	17	SENIOR RISK COORDINATOR	12
DEPUTY TREASURER/TAX COLLECTOR	17	SOLID WASTE TECHNICIAN	12
ENERGY MANAGER	17	TRANSIT MOBILITY MANAGER	12
ENTERPRISE SYSTEM ADMINISTRATOR	17	WELLNESS BENEFITS SPECIALIST	12
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS MANAGER	17	ARLINGTON ST COMMUNITY CENTER DIRECTOR	11
PURCHASING MANAGER	17	BILINGUAL OUTREACH WORKER	11
SENIOR STAFF ENGINEER (PE)	17	COMM SVCS PROGRAM ADMIN ASSISTANT	11
SENIOR TRAFFIC ENGINEER	17	EMPLOYEE BENEFITS COORDINATOR	11
SENIOR WASTEWATER ENGINEER	17	EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT / OFFICE MANAGER	11
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR LIBRARY	16	RISK COORDINATOR	11
BUILDING DEPARTMENT MANAGER	16	LEGAL ASSISTANT	11
COMMUNICATIONS AND RECREATION ADMINISTRATOR	16	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III	10
DEPUTY CHIEF PUBLIC HEALTH NURSE	16	ASCC CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMING COORDINATOR (PT)	10
DEPUTY RISK MANAGER	16	BILINGUAL/BICULTURAL COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKER	10
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS MANAGER	16	BILINGUAL COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKER	10
HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGER	16	PHNS PROGRAM ASSISTANT	10
IT MANAGER, TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	16	ASCC CHILDREN'S PROGRAMMING ASSISTANT (PT)	9
MANAGER CODE ENFORCEMENT	16	SUBFOREMAN CEMETERY	9
MANAGER URBAN PROGRAMS	16	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I	8
PAYROLL MANAGER	16	TRANSCRIPTIONIST & LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT	8
ACCOUNTS PAYABLE MANAGER	15	GROUNDKEEPER CEMETERY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE PROJECT SPECIALIST	15	PARKING ENFORCEMENT SPECIALIST P/T	5
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR	15		

6/20/2025

Exhibit B

Position	Proposed Pay Ranges	
	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 25</u>	\$ 146,094	\$ 199,940
Administrative Services Director		
Chief Financial Officer/Director of Financial Services		
Corporate Counsel		
Director of Community Development		
Director of Public Health And Community Services		
Director of Public Works		
Fire Chief		
	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 24</u>	\$ 135,902	\$ 185,991
Assistant Director of Public Works		
Assistant Fire Chief		
Chief Information Officer		
City Engineer		
Deputy Corporation Counsel		
Economic Development Director		
Emergency Management Director		
Library Director		
	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 23</u>	\$ 126,420	\$ 173,014
Assistant Director of Public Works-Finance & Admin.		
Deputy Fire Chief		
Division Operations Manager		
Treasurer / Tax Collector		
	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 22</u>	\$ 117,600	\$ 160,944
Chief Public Health Nurse		
Comptroller		
Deputy City Engineer		
Health Officer		
Risk Manager		
	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 21</u>	\$ 114,242	\$ 156,348
Assistant Corp Counsel		
Chief Assessor		
City Clerk		
Human Resources Manager		
Manager Planning Department		
Superintendent of Fleet		
Superintendent of Parks & Recreation		
Superintendent of Solid Waste		
Superintendent of Streets		
Superintendent of Wastewater		
Transit Administrator		

	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 20	\$ 106,271	\$ 145,440
Assistant Library Director		
Building Department Manager		
Communications and Recreation Administrator		
Cybersecurity Engineer		
Deputy Chief Public Health Nurse		
Employee Benefits Manager		
IT Manager Project/Development Services		
IT Manager, Technical Operations		
Payroll Manager		
Sustainability Manager		
Welfare Officer		
	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 19	\$ 98,857	\$ 135,293
Assessing Manager		
Business Manager - NFR		
Business Manager - NPD		
Chief of Staff		
Code Enforcement Manager/Investigator		
Deputy City Clerk		
Deputy Health Officer		
Environmental Engineer		
Senior Finance Manager		
Urban Programs Manager		
	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 18	\$ 91,960	\$ 125,854
Assistant Business Manager		
Business and Property Manager		
Deputy Treasurer and Deputy Tax Collector		
Energy Manager		
Parking Manager		
Purchasing Manager		
Senior Traffic Engineer		
Senior Staff Engineer (PE)		
Senior Staff Engineer II		
Senior Wastewater Engineer		
	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 17	\$ 85,544	\$ 117,073
Accounting Manager		
Deputy Risk Manager		
Housing Services Officer		
Senior Staff Engineer (No PE)		

	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 16	\$ 79,576	\$ 108,905
Accounts Payable Manager		
Arlington Street Community Center Director		
Building Manager		
Disease Intervention And Behavioral Health Nurse		
Emergency Management Coordinator		
Enterprise System Administrator		
GIS Specialist		
Motor Vehicle Registration Manager		
Payroll Supervisor		
Peg Program Manager		
Public Health Nurse		
Senior Human Resources Specialist		
Superintendent Cemetery - Edgewood		
Superintendent Cemetery - Woodlawn		
Welfare Specialist Supervisor		
	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 15	\$ 74,024	\$ 101,307
Behavioral Health Strategist		
Economic Mobility Program Specialist		
Legislative Affairs Manager		
Public Health Preparedness Coordinator		
	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 14	\$ 70,499	\$ 96,483
Echannel Access Administrator		
Enterprise Database/System Analyst		
Environmental Health Specialist II		
Epidemiologist		
Health Promotion & Communication Specialist		
Public Health Equity Officer		
Staff Engineer		
Transit Mobility Manager		
Wellness Benefits Specialist		
	Minimum	Maximum
Grade 13	\$ 67,142	\$ 91,889
Administrative Project Specialist		
Administrative Services Office Administrator		
Communications and Event Specialist		
Communications Specialist		
Creative Coordinator		
Environmental Health Specialist I		
Environmental Health Improv. & Compliance Specialist		
Grant Writer		
HRIS Analyst		
Legal Assistant		
Payroll Analyst		
Property And Casualty Adjuster		
Senior Risk Coordinator		
Subforeman Cemetery - Edgewood		
Subforeman Cemetery - Woodlawn		

	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 12</u>	\$ 63,945	\$ 87,513
Administrative Assistant III		
Benefits Specialist		
Bilingual Outreach Worker		
Bilingual/Bicultural Community Health Worker		
Bilingual Community Health Worker		
Bilingual Medical Assistant		
Executive Assistant to DPW Director		
Executive Assistant/Office Manager Library		
Intake/Welfare Specialist		
Payroll Specialist		
Records Administrator		
Solid Waste Technician		
Welfare Specialist		
	Minimum	Maximum
<u>Grade 11</u>	\$ 55,125	\$ 75,442
Administrative Assistant I - HR		
Children's Programming Coordinator		
Community Services Program Admin Assistant		
Constituent Services Coordinator		
Employee Benefits Coordinator		
Groundskeeper Cemetery - Edgewood		
Groundskeeper Cemetery - Woodlawn		
Parking Enforcement Specialist		
Risk Coordinator		
Transcriptionist & Legislative Assistant		

July 31, 2025
Tim Cummings
Director of Administrative Services
229 Main Street
Nashua, NH 03060

Subject: Recommendations on Ordinance O-25-058

Dear Mr. Cummings,

MGT has reviewed Ordinance O-25-058 in conjunction with the findings and recommendations from our recent Classification and Compensation Study for the City. Based on this review and our broader knowledge of industry practices, we offer the following insights and recommendations.

As part of the Classification and Compensation Study, MGT evaluated both internal equity and external market equity. To address and prevent pay compression, we established specific gradation guidelines within each pay band. Our recommendation included a minimum progression of 5% to 7.5% between each grade.

In public sector compensation practices, it is standard to maintain at least a 5% differential between supervisory and subordinate positions. Many municipalities have formal policies requiring supervisors to be paid no less than a certain percentage (i.e., 5%) above their direct reports. Among the comparable communities analyzed during the Study, we observed supervisor-to-subordinate differentials within Fire Department roles ranging from 9% to 17%.

The City's compensation philosophy, as established during the Study, positions Nashua at the 70th percentile of the market—placing it at the top tier of its peer group. This above-market strategy supports strong employee recruitment and retention. However, it also requires consistent attention to internal equity across all departments to ensure alignment between classification levels and pay practices.

To maintain equity and prevent overlap between subordinate and supervisory positions, it is critical to define salary ranges and implement policies that guarantee supervisors are compensated appropriately above those they oversee. Structured salary ranges inherently support this, as supervisors will have higher range ceilings than their subordinates.

We recommend the City consider adopting a consistent pay differential—potentially between 10% and 15%—for supervisory roles within the Fire Department. This percentage should apply to base pay only and would provide a streamlined, transparent approach to compensation decisions. The proposed pay ranges should still exist alongside this differential.

While each community's needs and practices differ, maintaining a differential between 5% and 15%, aligned with market data and applied consistently, is a best practice for ensuring fairness, preventing compression, and supporting organizational effectiveness.

Sincerely,

Rachel

Rachel Skaggs
Director of Human Capital



Disclaimer: The information and recommendations provided are for general informational purposes only and do not constitute legal advice. Our recommendations are based on our professional judgment and knowledge of current industry practices as they relate to classification and compensation in public sector organizations.