

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

October 17, 2023 at 7:00 PM

Mayor Craig called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Cavanaugh, Stewart, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, Kantor, Trisciani, Levasseur, Heath, E. Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Gamache, George-Kelly

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Craig advised that the purpose of the public comment session is to give residents of Manchester the opportunity to address the Board. All people wishing to speak will have up to three minutes to do so and any comments must be directed to the chair.

Any resident wishing to speak will come forward to the nearest microphone, clearly state their name and address when recognized and give their comments.

Kathleen Carswell, 385 Amherst Street, stated:

I am back again. This filter issue that we have going on. I don't see where Alderman Kantor did anything wrong. We needed to get some numbers. We have not had any accountability for numbers of people in that shelter who have gone out of that shelter. It is like the Ritz-Carlton for them. They are there for another year. Beds taken. Names taken on the paper. Nope, no room for the next person. What are we going to do? Are we going to have the shelter open 24/7, 365 days a year? This is ridiculous. I have talked to quite a few homeless people myself when I am out on the street doing errands or whatever and I ask them do you know where 39 Beech Street is where the new shelter is? I get what and no. I tell them there are all kinds of services for them down there. They ask how do I get down there because it is too far? It is too far. Anybody with a disability is not going to walk from the center of Manchester down to the south end. That is a long walk. It is ridiculous. We are paying for all of these services...our tax dollars. I pay rent so my rent goes to my landlord's taxes and every time his taxes go up, my rent goes up. For what? For wining and dining people who are double-dipping. It is ridiculous. The city has to get a hold of this issue. We need accountability from the homeless director. We need to get numbers. Numbers count. Not just oh it is

working or it is doing that or it takes a little bit of time. It is two months late in starting and that is a sore spot for a lot of people in the city. Enough is enough. It is ridiculous. Why can't we give some of these developers that want to build high-rises or developments for low income, fixed income people who make only \$1,400 or \$1,500 a month with their social security and maybe a benefit if they get that to live on? We are not doing any tax breaks for them. We are already putting off the two projects, I saw that in the paper, for a year to two years. That is between Pearl Street and over by the old police department. I mean what the hell is going on in this city? We just pass it off to the next person. It is getting tiring coming down here and speaking all the time. I have older neighbors that are scared to death they are going to sleep in a tent and the tents they are going to be sleeping in are going to be in your yard. Thank you.

Robert Tanguay, Bowell Road, stated:

I have two children that are very young that I have not seen in almost a year now at this point in time. I called the Manchester Police on 7/25/22 twice while at my full-time job because the mother took my children and hid their location out-of-state without telling me until the day and I still do not know where she took them. That is a crime. It is called 633:4 Interference with Custody. There is no justification for it per statute and it is also a form of domestic violence. In light of this, I brought it to the police's attention and then pretty much every agency policy and this was prior to a parenting petition being filed in the Manchester Family Court where there are, as some of the members may know, extreme issues with the family courts in the state of NH. There are a lot of families that aren't getting what they deserve and their rights. Article 14 of the NH Constitution "legal remedies are to be free, just and prompt" is the law of the land. Article 15 is the right of the accused which entitles anybody accused or despoiled of any of their liberties the right to due process. That due process is the foundation of our constitution in this city government. According to the mayor's 2/07 charter, Section G, as I have been trying to reach the mayor and Emily Rice about this problem, they have the duty to...law enforcement authority, the mayor shall enforce or direct other officials to enforce ordinances of the city, this charter and all general laws and special acts applicable to the city. So, when I brought this to the police's attention, and am still dealing with this and there are hundreds of calls of which there is a 91-A request, mayor, I am still being treated poorly and instead of helping me and responding to my

complaint, they hired a lawyer and they are using our city's money to hire a lawyer instead of doing their duty which is to investigate crimes and not botch investigations. They are prejudiced. The city and state are prejudiced against men and do not investigate crimes of domestic violence against men mostly. There is a record of that. There is a record of the police referring to men that claim domestic violence or have domestic violence civilly brought against them without any charges or police calls, the male half. So, I just ask you guys...I am going to be sending you all information and eventually you will be seeing a lawsuit and that will be because the mayor has not done her duty and neither has Emily Rice to administer the police properly to respond to me. Thank you very much.

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, stated that concludes our list of speakers. I will note for the record that a communication from Atty. Peter Doyle has been distributed to the Board.

Mayor Craig asked is there anyone else wishing to speak.

Dennis Higgins, Homeless, stated:

The last time I talked I was over outside near River's Edge. Since then, it took me a little while but I got into the Beech Street shelter. I tried to hold my breath and take a step back and let things evolve but we are going on seven months now that this has been open and there is still really no policy that they have inside. I know that Adrienne is working hard to do a lot of stuff on the outside but there is nothing happening on the inside. There is no oversight. What I see is just a bunch of people making up rules as they go and whatever the whim is. There are people losing their spots if a staff member is having a bad day and they give someone a 24. That person is out on the street. There is no appeal process and no one to go to. I don't think any of the staff has been trained at all. I really don't think any of them have been trained. I don't know what the guy is doing that runs the show. He is on Tik Tok a lot explaining that the city has a lot of problems; well, he is one of the problems. There is a lot going down there. They waited until September 30 and started what I want to say is Draconian compared to what the rules were prior. The staff doesn't talk to each other. I was working because I had to feed myself so I was working and I had to work all night for a week. The guy I

was working for asked me to do that so I went in every day and told the staff what I was doing but they didn't tell the third shift that so I was told that I lost my bed so now I am outside. I had a lot of bikes down there. Maybe there were too many but that is what I do for a living. I haven't had a problem with the city on that for a while now. The head guy told the people that stay there that all of the bikes are going to go for junk and they are going to have a free for all with them was probably not the way to do it. I don't know if that is the way anyone here would do it. I lost six bikes that way. What I am saying is that someone has to go down there and really check out what is going on. They won't let any of the aldermen in there. Why? I don't know. I know that it is not a freak show and you are not supposed to go down there and just gawk at all of the zoo animals or whatever but someone should go down and check out what is going on. I know Adrienne is really busy and she is doing a great job. I really believe that but Beech Street has become a trap house. Someone has to go there and check some stuff out. I will come back next time and have more to say.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Stewart**, it was voted to take all comments under advisement and further to receive and file any written documentation presented.*

CONSENT AGENDA

Approve Under Supervision of the Department of Highways, subject to funding

2. 50/50 Sidewalk Petitions

Commercial:

- 467 Amherst Street

Residential:

- 134 Brunelle Avenue
- 228 Ash Street
- 774 Silver Street

Information to be Received and Filed

- 3.** Communication from Comcast regarding a name change for their video on demand service.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

4. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Sixty Seven Thousand Dollars (\$167,000) for the FY2023 CIP 210523 Healthcare for the Homeless.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) for the FY2023 CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixty Five Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Two Dollars and ninety-four Cents (\$65,662.94) for the FY2023 CIP 211723 Opioid Litigation Settlement Trust.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars (\$12,566) for the FY2024 CIP 212024 Bridge Access Program CMC HHC FY23.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Forty Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty Three Dollars (\$340,953) for the FY2024 CIP 411024 Substance Abuse Reduction Initiative.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Thirty Eight Thousand Dollars (\$338,000) for the FY2024 CIP 411124 City’s EOC Renovations.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) for the FY2024 CIP 411224 FY 2021 Hazmat Collaborative Allocation.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the FY 2023 CIP 611023 2022 Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Grant Program.”

“Amending the FY2012 and FY2022 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Forty Three Thousand One Hundred Fifteen Dollars (\$243,115.00) for the FY2012 CIP 510712 South Manchester Rail Trail.”

"Authorizing the utilization of excess revenues from the Manchester School District Fiscal Year 2024 budget revenue estimates for a supplemental appropriation of \$35,223,387 to the Manchester School District pursuant to Section 6.05 (a) of the City Charter in Fiscal Year 2024."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

5. Recommending that the summary of abatement requests submitted by the Chief Engineer be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
6. Recommending that the following CIP projects be revised to change the administering department from the Fire Department to the Department of Housing Stability:
 - CIP 212023 - Gatehouse TST Initiative
 - CIP 410322 ARPA – Director of Homeless Initiatives
 - CIP 610024 ARPA – Winter Emergency Shelter
 - CIP 611423 ARPA – Homelessness Response & Emergency Shelter Operations
 - CIP 810324 ARPA – Coordinator*(Unanimous vote)*
7. Recommending that the request from the Security Manager to apply for a Homeland Security Grant in the amount of \$750,000 to upgrade the City's access control systems and security cameras be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
8. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$100,000 for CIP 611023 2022 Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Grant Program be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
9. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$243,115 for CIP 510712 South Manchester Rail Trail be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
10. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$2,000 for CIP 411224 Hazmat Collaborative Allocation be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- 11.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$338,000 for CIP 411124 City's EOC Renovations be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 12.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$340,953 for CIP 411024 Substance Abuse Reduction Initiative be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 13.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$12,566 for CIP 212024 Bridge Access Program CMC HHC FY23 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 14.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$65,662.94 for CIP 211723 Opioid Settlement Trust be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 15.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$10,000 for CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 16.** Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$167,000 for CIP 210523 Healthcare for the Homeless be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 17.** Recommending that the request from the owner of 32 Douglas Street for the subordination of a City lien placed upon the property totaling \$20,000 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
- 18.** Advising that the request from the owner of 23-25 Arlington Street for the subordination of a City lien placed upon the property totaling \$76,790 has been received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

- 19.** Recommending that the request from the Airport Director for the following changes to his complement:
- Addition of four (4) Airport Supervisor – Terminal and Landside Operations positions, grade 19, and adoption of new class specification;
 - Addition of one (1) Airport Supervisor – Parking and Ground Transportation positions, grade 19, and adoption of new class specification; and
 - Addition of one (1) Public Information Officer position, grade 20

be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)

- 20.** Recommending that the request from the Deputy Public Works Director requesting the addition of one (1) Scale Operator position, grade 14, to his complement be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

- 22.** Recommending that the following traffic regulations be approved:

NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Beacon Street, east side, from a point 85 feet south of Laurel Street to a point 50 feet further south

On Lincoln Street, east side, from Amherst Street to a point 65 feet north

Alderman Fajardo

METERS 2-HOURS

On Merrimack Street, north side, from Chestnut Street to a point 50 feet west

Alderman Long

CROSSWALK

On Brown Avenue, west of Elm Street

Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Merrimack Street, north side, from Chestnut Street to a point 50 feet west
(ORD 3387)

On Oakland Avenue, south side, from Woodbine Avenue to a point 65 feet east
(ORD9126)

Alderman Heath

(*Unanimous vote*)

HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF **ALDERMAN FAJARDO**,
DULY SECONDED BY **ALDERMAN BURKUSH**, THE CONSENT AGENDA WAS
APPROVED.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

- 21.** Recommending that Sheffield Road be changed to a one-way, westbound, from South Willow Street to Harvey Road until further notice and that a public hearing be held at a future date to be scheduled by the City Clerk.
(Unanimous vote)

Alderman Levasseur stated in lieu of the fact that we had a bunch of emails come in over the last couple of days concerning this particular road, unfortunately I don't feel comfortable...probably this would have been a good addition to a road trip so that we could get an idea of what this was going to entail and the businesses that are involved asking questions about it. I know the alderman says that he wants this and that this went to committee but I wasn't privy to that particular discussion so I either need more information or maybe somebody could explain. I don't know if this has been approved by Highway. I really don't know how many committees this went to and how the decision for this was made. Obviously, it would have had to come through someone at Highway right?

Tim Clougherty, Public Works Director, stated a couple of weeks ago this was presented to the committee and we had provided pros and cons for both alternatives which were one-way partial on Sheffield Road as well as one-way throughout the course of Sheffield Road between Perimeter Road and South Willow Street. The committee ultimately decided to vote in the affirmative for making the street one-way.

Alderman Levasseur asked was this a recommendation from Ms. Clarke or whoever is in charge of that decision-making? Is it okay by your department? Generally, we get a department head saying yes this is good.

Mr. Clougherty responded the information was laid out for the Public Safety, Health & Traffic Committee two meetings ago and they asked us to come back with a recommendation and I presented our recommendation which would be to allow the state to conduct their engineering study in order to make an informed decision, do all of the studying that is required like traffic flows and traffic analysis and accident history in

both directions as well as potential reconfiguration of the intersection, regrading, removal of trees and all those types of things.

Alderman Levasseur asked did the state already do an investigation.

Mr. Clougherty answered no. The state is currently in the process of engaging an engineering firm to conduct an engineering study. It would be some time before the city took action on that but that was our recommendation.

Alderman Levasseur moved to table until the state weighs in. There was no second.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I can speak to this. So, a little bit of background. The intersection that we are talking about is the intersection of South Willow Street and Sheffield. Pretty much everybody agrees it is a very dangerous intersection; very dangerous. We have all heard the testimony from Mike Alton, the owner of Pro Image Auto, which is located right there. He gave some compelling testimony. Making this a one-way is in the state plan. I say state because South Willow Street is state-owned. It is state Route 28. I have been in contact with the state every step of the way. I just spoke to them a few days ago. They are in agreement with this. It has been batted back and forth a few times. We could do a road trip if you want. That is fine and the public will have the chance to weigh in because there is going to be a public hearing if this does go forward, which I hope it does. There was an accident there a couple of days ago; I think maybe two accidents. Those people at Pro Image live in daily fear of this. I don't know if you are really familiar with that area but there is an embankment and they are lower. They try to protect themselves with the snowplows. Everybody agrees it is an awful, awful situation and I really hope that we don't continue to bat this thing back and forth with the state. I hope that we move forward. Certainly, anybody can weigh in on this. I went up and down the street myself on foot and I spoke to everybody that I could come in contact with that day and everybody that I spoke with that day, including the residents and employees of businesses...not owners of businesses but the employees, was in favor of making this a one-way. There you have it.

Alderman T. Sapienza moved to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur asked you made the recommendation that the state should do certain things so does that mean you are not recommending that we go forward with this.

Mr. Clougherty answered the Board has, within its purview, the opportunity to do whatever it wants with that street. We have presented information and pros and cons regarding making the entire street a one-way or part of it one-way and it is up to the Board to weigh that information and make a decision.

Alderman Levasseur asked can the state overrule us after at some point or has the state been on board with this.

Mr. Clougherty responded I don't believe the state can overrule because I believe it to be a city street but I defer to the City Solicitor on that.

Peter Chiesa, Deputy Solicitor, stated that is correct. Sheffield Road is a city street, not a state roadway or right-of-way.

Alderman George-Kelly stated one of the things we did talk about in committee is that when the state was done with their investigation if they had other recommendations, we were willing to reconsider them at that time but we didn't want to delay what we thought was a public safety concern in order to wait for the state to finish the work that has been kind of bouncing back and forth between the city and state.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated the state is on board with this. It is part of the state plan. I have the photos and diagrams and plans. It is part of the state plan. It is coming and I hate to say in the near future because it is the state and they move slowly. I encourage anybody who is interested in this to go to Pro Image Auto and talk to those folks because they live with this daily and it is not a good situation.

Mayor Craig stated we are going to talk about the state plan later on in the agenda. It is good that it is on there but it could take 30 years.

Alderman Levasseur asked how many businesses and how many residences are on this road that will be affected.

Mr. Clougherty replied it is a relatively short section of roadway, probably $\frac{1}{2}$ mile long. I don't know how many businesses are there. I am speculating maybe a dozen.

Alderman Levasseur stated I generally defer to the aldermen in their own wards and that has been the practice of this Board for five decades at least. I am just a little bit nervous about not having some sort of a public hearing on this. I don't know if the residents or businesses were allowed to come and speak at the committee meeting.

Mayor Craig stated it has been on agendas and it went to committee and it is on the agenda tonight.

City Clerk Normand stated the committee's recommendation is also to have a public hearing on this.

Alderman Levasseur asked so if passes tonight is it going to turn into a one-way.

City Clerk Normand answered the committee recommended that a public hearing be held before it is turned into a one-way.

Mayor Craig stated so it will come back for another vote.

Mayor Craig called for a vote on the motion to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.

Mr. Clougherty asked so for my clarification there is going to be a public hearing prior to so we are not doing this right away.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated that is not what it says on my agenda.

City Clerk Normand stated the item states “until further notice and that a public hearing be held at a future date to be scheduled by the City Clerk.” That is on Item 21 on the agenda.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated it says that Sheffield Road will be changed to a one-way westbound from South Willow Street to Harvey Road until further notice and that a public hearing will be held at a future date.

City Clerk Normand stated the chairman of the committee is here and he can certainly speak to that. Alderman Barry do you recollect that discussion?

Alderman Barry stated my understanding was that we would at least get it going and then also have a public hearing. We need to see how it is working.

Mayor Craig stated that is different than what was just communicated.

Alderman Barry responded I understand that.

Mayor Craig stated what we just voted on was to have a public hearing and come back after the public hearing and vote on it again.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated no it wasn't. My motion was to approve the recommendation and the recommendation clearly says it goes to a one-way now and you can have a public hearing as well but now it becomes a one-way.

Alderman Barry stated Alderman T. Sapienza is 100% right. That was the recommendation of Alderman E. Sapienza.

Mayor Craig stated I said something different so I think we need to vote again. If your motion is what is literally written on the committee report, we will vote again.

Alderman Levasseur asked will you accept an amendment to the motion.

Alderman T. Sapienza answered no.

Mayor Craig stated so the motion on the floor is to change Sheffield Road to a one-way westbound from South Willow Street to Harvey Road until further notice and that a public hearing be held at a future date to be scheduled by the City Clerk.

Mayor Craig called for a vote. *The motion carried with Aldermen Levasseur duly recorded in opposition.*

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so we are voting again on that.

Mayor Craig replied no it is all set.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so it is not concrete yet.

Alderman T. Sapienza responded yes it is.

Alderman Barry stated it will start and then we will have the public hearing.

REGULAR BUSINESS

23. Communication from Alex Horton advising the Board of her resignation as a member of the Central Business Service District Advisory Board.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Cavanaugh**, it was voted to accept the resignation with regret.*

24. Confirmations:
Arts Commission
Anne Lederhos as an alternate member, term to expire December 1, 2024
Police Commission
Eva Castillo Turgeon as a regular member to succeed herself, term to expire September 15, 2026
John Cronin as a regular member to succeed himself, term to expire September 15, 2026

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Cavanaugh**, it was voted to confirm the nominations as presented.*

- 25.** Communication from Owen Friend-Gray, Deputy Public Works Director, requesting approval to submit the Department of Public Works' comments regarding the New Hampshire Department of Transportation's Draft Ten Year Transportation Improvement Plan to the Executive Council and NHDOT.

Mayor Craig called Tim Clougherty forward. Can you give a brief overview of what you have included for all of us? I think it is important.

Mr. Clougherty stated the state has published what they refer to as their 10-year plan, which includes various construction projects across the state. The City of Manchester is included in those construction projects. They are extremely large construction projects. Sheffield Road, as Alderman E. Sapienza mentioned, is part of that. Also included are Exits 6 and 7 on 293 as well as the Amoskeag Bridge. As part of the process, the DOT publishes what they refer to as a draft and that draft 10-year plan goes through a series of hearings and public comment is solicited. That is where that 10-year plan is currently. There are several changes that were included within the most recent 10-year plan and the letter that we presented to the Board within the agenda highlights some of those concerns. Projects of major concern include the improvements at Exits 6 & 7 on 293. Construction has been pushed out five years on that and six years from the original proposal with construction starting now in 2032-2034 where it was previously 2028. Engineering stayed the same at 2025-2026, which would lead me to question what we are doing for that six-year period between engineering and construction starting. As everybody knows, there are major safety concerns associated with Exits 6 and 7, as well as congestion and overall traffic flow throughout that general area. I personally see it being extremely disappointing that we are not going to see any construction start in that area for nine years.

Mayor Craig asked when did Exits 6 and 7 show up on the state's 10-year plan for the first time. Do you know?

Mr. Clougherty answered the funding for those exists was started in the 10-year plan in 2013 so 10 years ago. It was a 2013-2025 plan. I believe that is what they labeled it. We have done some research relative to the 10-year plan specific to the history of Exits 6 and 7. Other projects have been added since that time, since 2013, and they are now fully funded and have more accelerated construction schedules than Exits 6 and 7. Funding has been removed from those exits from the previous 10-year plan to the current while other projects in this general area along 293 have had their funding increased.

Mayor Craig asked so it was funding and they took the funding away.

Mr. Clougherty replied yes. It was fully funded in the past three iterations. That doesn't necessarily mean that the project is going to happen obviously but this is the first time that we have seen the projects not fully funded. They actually took funding away while other projects had their funding increased. So not only is the project substantially delayed until that 2032-2034 timeframe, but it is also underfunded according to current estimates by \$160 million. There is no reasonable expectation that that project is going to get completed any time in the near future.

Alderman George-Kelly stated as you can imagine, constituents in my ward are really concerned about this and I wonder if you could, just for the public's knowledge...I know that there are no public comment hearings happening in Manchester regarding this draft 10-year plan from the state but do you know if there is an ability for constituents to write in their statements and how they would go about doing that.

Mr. Clougherty responded there certainly is and I can communicate that through the Clerk's Office to the entire Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The due date for those comments is November 3.

Mayor Craig stated I do think it is crazy that here are no public comment meetings in the largest city in the state especially since there is a huge project that has been on the list since 2013 and funded that is now being pushed out and totally unfunded. I don't think

there is an opportunity in Nashua either so two of the largest cities are not getting an opportunity to speak in person which is absurd to me.

Mr. Clougherty replied I agree. Mayor I would also like to bring attention to the Board and include as part of the action because it came to my attention after we wrote the letter a couple of weeks ago that CMAQ funding, Congestion, Mitigation Air Quality funding is also being held up. The City of Manchester applied for \$2.4 million in CMAQ funding for traffic flow improvements on a 1.7-mile segment of Mammoth Road between Bridge Street, Cilley and Huse Road. Applications were due on January 6 of this year and anticipated to be recommended for inclusion in the draft 10-year plan in spring/summer of 2023. The total funding available in the CMAQ round is enough to fund all DOT recommended projects, however, they are not currently in the 10-year plan. These projects are critical in reducing congestion and improving air quality. It is our recommendation that the BMA support advocating for these 2023 CMAQ projects to be included in the 10-year plan, as well as the commentary that is provided in the letter.

Mayor Craig asked where were they held up.

Mr. Clougherty answered I believe in the Executive Council but I am not exactly sure how that process works.

Alderman Heath stated I believe there is a public hearing next week in Goffstown. Would it be possible that a letter be prepared for that public hearing?

Mayor Craig responded that is what this is for.

Alderman Levasseur stated this is not a 10-year plan, this is a 25-year plan. When I was on this Board in 1999, we switched out all of that property with UNH for Hackett Hill. Ray Wieczorek's biggest plan, if he had won again, was to get that exit in there. I did participate in public comments about this. I thought we were ready to start that rotary at least six times. We are bringing \$70 million into the school system right now. We have \$35 million on the agenda tonight and we are going to have another \$35 million next year so there is \$70 million there but they are now saying that we are not funded for the

\$130 million for one of the biggest economic development plans that would affect the City of Manchester with those two exists. So, who is changing the plans?

Mayor Craig stated what I think is important, to your point, is the funding for these projects is changing and they are adding new projects and funding those while taking funds away from Exits 6 and 7. The funding that is going to the school district is totally separate and based on a new formula. It has nothing to do with this funding. They are choosing to fund projects other than these significant projects that are a safety concern for the City of Manchester.

Alderman Levasseur stated there is something going on here and I don't know if it is because the rotary they want to change has them in a tizzy because of the amount of businesses it affects. I don't know what it is but there has to be a reason for them to have taken this off the table. The plans were already done and the engineers already did the work. They already notified a lot of the abutters about the properties that they were going to take. I was thinking this was going to start next year or soon and come to find out now we are not even on the 10-year plan. I don't know who needs to be brought in front of us. Maybe the Executive Councilor should come and explain to this Board what is going on because this is ridiculous. We have a huge piece of land and Londonderry keeps getting all of the big buildings and we are getting stuck with nothing because that property is sitting there and that is not cool.

Mayor Craig stated with Jodie we have taken people up there and talked about the opportunity once the exit is there but...

Alderman Levasseur interjected we stopped the builder who wanted to put a whole bunch of townhouses over there on the recommendation that that was going to be used for light commercial and light industrial, etc. We are holding up other projects and not starting probably some very important and valuable projects. I would request that somebody put a call into our Executive Councilor and get him in front of this Board please.

Mayor Craig stated the City Clerk can do that. Is there a motion to approve the letter along with the information about the CMAQ grant?

*On motion of **Alderman Heath**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to approve the comments to be sent to the Executive Council and NHDOT.*

Alderman Levasseur stated maybe the Commissioner of the NHDOT could also come to our next meeting.

Mayor Craig responded sure.

- 26.** Communication from Jeff Belanger, Planning & Community Development Director, recommending approval of grant awards from the \$3,851,246 of ARPA and HOME funds approved in the FY24 budget for Affordable and Supportive Housing Initiatives to the following organizations:
- Lincoln Avenue Capital - \$2,550,000
 - Light of Life Ministries - \$767,517
 - Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority - \$300,000
 - Neighborworks - \$236,729

***Alderman Trisciani** moved to approve the grant awards and refer the related Resolutions and Budget Authorizations to the Finance Committee. **Alderman T. Sapienza** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to have Mr. Belanger come up to explain one of these projects. I had a very lengthy conversation with Mr. Belanger because I wanted the Cliff note version on that 600-page document that they sent us. What I was interested in finding out and would like to have some information on for people who are looking at this project, especially the Lincoln Avenue Capital project which is the old police station, the lot across the street and possibly the lot west of that, is the amount of money going into that property isn't only \$2,550,000 that we have available through city funds but there is also a major investment by the state correct?

Jeff Belanger, Planning & Community Development Director, answered correct. The NH Housing Finance Authority among others. They are getting federal low-income housing tax credits. There are a lot of different sources for that project.

Alderman Levasseur asked and how much money is that going to be.

Mr. Belanger the NH Housing Finance Authority has committed \$57 million to that project. I believe there is another \$20+ million from low-income tax credits in addition to our contribution. All in, the city is in for a little more than \$7 million over the course of multiple years.

Alderman Levasseur asked have the plans been done and are there permits and approvals. Has it gone to Planning yet?

Mr. Belanger answered yes it has gotten full approval from the Planning and Zoning Boards.

Alderman Levasseur asked so they are expecting to start in the spring.

Mr. Belanger replied they are expecting to close in November and I believe begin demolition in the same month.

Mayor Craig stated this is really exciting. This project will fund the development of 188 units of HUD designated affordable housing for families from 30% to 80% AMI and then the other programs that we are approving tonight include a continuation of a program with the MHRA to incentivize landlords to rent to tenants with Section 8 housing, Choice Vouchers, and a partnership with Light of Life Ministries to reopen the women's shelter at 15 Brook Street for an additional two to three years.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I think it is worth noting that the city is doing what we can for affordable housing. Obviously, we can't get money into every project but we have department employees working very hard on it. I know that I have supported many

projects and I am happy to support these. We can't be part of every project. I wish we could.

Alderman Levasseur asked Mayor can you explain what affordable in this sense means. We hear about affordable being like a one-bedroom at \$1,500. How does this fit into the affordable housing complex? Is it on the same level as the Gallen Building or the Burns Building or is it a little bit higher of a threshold to get into those types of buildings?

Mr. Belanger responded it depends on the project. If we are talking about the Lincoln Avenue Capital Project, which is the old police station, because it is funded by low-income housing tax credits, it is capped at 60% of area median income. From memory, I think for a single person that is around \$42,000 a year. It would be affordable to someone making that amount of money.

Alderman Levasseur asked so what does 60% mean.

Mr. Belanger answered Housing & Urban Development does studies across the country to determine...

Alderman Levasseur interjected so what would the rent be for a one-bedroom.

Mr. Belanger replied the NH Finance Housing Authority publishes income and rent limits. The rent limit for Manchester at 60% of AMI for a studio apartment is a little over \$1,100. For a two-bedroom, it is a little over \$1,400 and for a three-bedroom it is a little over \$1,600.

Mayor Craig stated as Alderman T. Sapienza said, the Board is taking action and making a difference providing affordable housing and shelter for residents in the City of Manchester.

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

27. Application for Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive, RSA 79- E, for property located at 25-27 Lowell Street.

Alderman Levasseur moved to approve. **Alderman Barry** duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Craig stated they have committed to four Section 8 units and that would be included in the vote.

Alderman Fajardo asked and that would be in exchange for six years.

Mayor Craig answered yes.

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

28. Application for Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive, RSA 79- E, for property located at 215 Canal Street.

*On motion of **Alderman Stewart**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to approve.*

29. Budget projections to be submitted by Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer, if available.

Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer, stated you should have before you the fiscal year 2024 general fund expenditure and revenue forecast as of October 17, 2023 based on department head estimates. The current projected general fund operating surplus is relatively flat at \$109,000. The operating surplus is comprised of an expenditure deficit of \$291,000 and a revenue surplus of \$400,000. The expenditure deficit relates to auto registration. A large trucking company that normally registers its fleet with Manchester has been sold. This new owner has moved his fleet out of Manchester resulting in a monetary loss of approximately \$700,000 this fiscal year to the Tax Collector's auto registration line. The revenue surplus relates to interest income. Favorable interest rates, as well as higher than expected cash balances have provided a boost to interest earnings. Health insurance claims for the first quarter are much higher than expected. The summer months tend to be when we see the lowest claims presented and this year that was not the case. This expenditure line will be closely monitored as we head into

November. The forecasted surplus does include \$300,000 from the contingency account. There were 18 retirements through October 13, 2023 compared with 6 retirements at this same time a year ago. Severance paid through 10/13 amounts to \$709,924 compared to \$384,924 a year ago. The severance reserve account is anticipated to have a balance of \$927,215 after all related entries have been posted. I have also attached for your review the overtime reports as of October 13 and a summary by department of the severance paid.

Alderman Levasseur asked have you done a survey on potential retirements through June 30.

Ms. Wickens answered we have.

Alderman Levasseur asked are we going to have to bust out the number or will it be within it.

Ms. Wickens replied we should remain within it. I think the retirement number might be almost \$1.4 million but I expect there will be others that will come through the woodwork. The interesting thing is if you notice I said there were 18 retirements in the first quarter and only 6 last year. I called Retirement just to ask what some of the conversations have been and people delayed their retirement in April-June and kicked it over to July to get the COLA. I fully expect that to happen again this year.

Alderman Levasseur asked on the issue of the \$700,000 that we are losing from the trucking company, what was the name of the trucking company.

Ms. Wickens answered it was Kris-Way Trucking and it was bought by Penske Trucking.

Alderman Levasseur asked so they bought them but Penske is not staying. They are gone?

Ms. Wickens replied right. They moved the fleet out of Manchester. I don't know if a portion of them remains here but the registration will not.

Alderman Levasseur asked on the issue of revenue, are we okay with those.

Ms. Wickens responded other than auto registration, we appear to be doing relatively well. I was very conservative on the interest income. It is probably going to be even higher than the \$400,000. As we go along, that could get up to close to \$1 million. I think there has been a little bit of delay in spending on projects so the cash balances have been higher. That is great for us because we have great interest rates and I will take it.

Alderman Levasseur asked any recommendations as far as belt tightening strategies or do you want to wait.

Ms. Wickens answered through September I would say that we were about \$300,000 over plan. That is concerning because normally we are below plan that first quarter. Going into October, the claims are on fire. We have some very sick members. I would like to get the rest of the data through October but by November if we are \$600,000 or \$700,000 above plan, we may want to start talking about tightening some of the spending because I can't imagine it is going to get any better through the winter months. I did mention at the Committee on Accounts that we have a reserve account of \$2.3 million but at this rate, we could exceed that.

Alderman Levasseur asked what other reserves do we have. I thought there was \$2 million put into a reserve for potential changes to our compensation plan.

Ms. Wickens replied we had put \$2 million in. When we met with the Board, it was April 18 and we had what we projected to be the claims throughout the rest of the year. We blew that away in May and June so that was unexpected. We also renewed our stop-loss premium and that was \$400,000 higher. We looked at the claims through September between what we paid last year; it was \$860,000 higher. We threw some

money over there, \$2 million more in health insurance and we raised premiums but not enough to cover all of that.

Alderman Levasseur stated I am going to get booed for this question but we have \$35 million going to the school district that we are voting on tonight. Do you recommend that we keep \$250,000 or \$500,000 or any of that money on this side for any potential shortfalls? Once we give that money away, we can't get it back but we can always give it back to them if we don't need it or use it.

Ms. Wickens responded in my personal opinion, I feel like that money was earmarked for the school district. It would be difficult for me to say that we should take that for the city. That would be a Board decision. We don't have many tools in the toolbox. You have said this many times. The only thing we can do, the bulk of our expenditures are salaries so what do we have a salary freeze again? That is very tough to do but to hold the money from schools is also a tough decision.

Alderman Levasseur replied I am not saying hold it and keep it. I am just saying insurance and give it back to them if we don't need it. You are right that we have not seen these types of numbers or these types of claims for insurance. We have not seen the massive drastic fall in auto registrations so early in a fiscal year either. I don't know what is expected but if El Nino stays around with all the wet weather we have had, we could really be dumped on with a lot of snow. I am curious as to what Tim Clougherty has to say about his budget as far as covering for snowfall this year and if they are nervous about it or not. I just see money there...we gave them 5% on the budget. The school district got the full amount of the tax cap whereas the city side did not. They had a \$3 million surplus and now they are getting...we were told they were getting \$12 million at the time of the budget. That is what we were expecting them to get from the state and it came back at \$35 million. I just look at prudence and I look at caution and I look at an insurance policy for the city side because we do not have the luxury of going out and raising any more revenue. I am putting it out there. I doubt I will get any support and I don't expect to but I am a very cautious person when it comes to this stuff especially this early.

Alderman Long stated we have expendable trusts and the rainy-day fund. So, we do have the money if we have enough votes to appropriate it in an emergency. I believe we would in an emergency situation. If healthcare blows us up over \$2 million, we have the funds available. It would just be a matter of getting the 10 votes we need to take it from the trust. Sharon, do we know what the FY23 surplus was?

Ms. Wickens responded we don't have that yet. In fact, we don't have state numbers as of yet and we called on that again today. We do know some of the numbers that have come in. Shockingly county tax is \$2 million higher. We really got socked with some serious expenditures. I think Rooms & Meals is going to get us out of this but we won't have that next year if we get a huge county tax bill like that again. We also ended the year \$1 million higher on health insurance.

Alderman Long asked did I just hear that the county tax is an additional \$2 million.

Ms. Wickens answered yes. It went from \$12,181,000 to \$14+million. It was a 14% increase.

Mayor Craig asked what are we getting for that.

Ms. Wickens replied I don't know what the county does for that money.

Alderman Long stated the county commissioners gave us an increase of 21%. It was a fight at the county level to get it down to 11% but you are telling me it is 14%. I thought it was 11%.

Ms. Wickens stated keep in mind that it is not based on population but based on valuation. The prior year, we fully expected to have county tax go up but Manchester's valuation has been much lower than Nashua because theirs went up greatly and we actually had money that came in lower, like \$400,000 lower. The new county tax bill is \$14,145,214.

Alderman Long asked are we above Nashua now.

Ms. Wickens answered I didn't see where Nashua is. We would either be comparable or probably more.

Alderman Levasseur asked how did that 14% increase affect the tax rate. What will the tax rate be for November?

Ms. Wickens replied I don't have that information yet because I still don't have all the state numbers. If you recall, Rooms & Meals increased from what we had projected in FY22. We had a receivable in there and we wiped out the receivable and then we had \$3.1 million and this Board allocated that to reserves; great. I didn't do anything with the receivable that I booked this year of \$4.5 million because I could see the fire coming. It was a little worse than what I thought but that money should cover this. That tax rate should be very close to what you approved; very, very close.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't think when we put the budget together...the county tax rate was not even close to an increase of this size.

Ms. Wickens stated we didn't know that. I had anticipated about \$800,000.

Alderman Levasseur asked and what is the actual number at a 14% increase.

Ms. Wickens answered almost \$2 million more.

Alderman Levasseur asked doesn't \$1 million increase the tax rate by 1%.

Ms. Wickens replied yes but like I said we have Rooms & Meals revenue that I let fall to cover that.

Alderman Levasseur stated I have one other question on the issue of the rainy-day fund as a venue to go get more money. You can only take that money when there is a revenue shortfall and not an expenditure shortfall correct?

Ms. Wickens responded that is correct, however, the Board can do anything with 10 votes. My recommendation, if we were really against the wall and depleting our reserve that we have for healthcare, would be using the one-time fund. That has a balance of \$4.5 million right now.

Alderman Levasseur asked is the rainy-day fund an interest-bearing account.

Ms. Wickens responded it is not. It is fund balance. It is money that just sits there in fund balance.

Alderman Levasseur asked so that is not money we have in the bank.

Ms. Wickens answered no. It is part of the money we have in the bank and the interest that is earned comes into the general fund as general income. It is segregated and restricted.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked can you explain to us why the county tax even matters to us. The county tax is just that; it's for the county. We are not the county.

Ms. Wickens answered we have to collect it. If it goes up and we didn't budget that in to the tax bill...you are right. The tax bill increases by county tax but it is difficult when you are talking to the average resident. They see a tax bill and they don't care that X amount was for the city and this went up and it is county tax. Their tax bill went up and that is what they see.

Alderman Levasseur stated, however, that number still goes towards our tax cap right.

Ms. Wickens responded yes overall tax.

Alderman Levasseur asked so even though it is a tax we are collecting for the county, it goes towards...it is like the school tax. We have three different taxes on our tax bill – school, county and city. Add them all together and the bottom-line number comes up. I don't remember what number we budgeted for as far as an increase from the county.

Ms. Wickens answered historically, we have always left that flat. We have no idea what is happening with valuations and how they fluctuate. I kind of went back and looked at it to see the fluctuations and this was awful. Normally, it is kind of in the realm of what we can deal with. It is a few hundred thousand and you can kind of work that in and deal with it but \$2 million is a hit. This was huge.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so it does affect the tax cap number or it does not.

Ms. Wickens replied it is part of the general fund that we get the money and the city spends whatever. We don't increase that particular one. It may go down and if it goes down then that helps the tax rate. If it goes up, then it hurts the tax rate but the decrease and increase is normally not a huge amount.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I understand that and at base we are just collecting. It is not our tax.

Ms. Wickens responded that is correct.

Mayor Craig stated we are collecting the money and paying the county.

Alderman Levasseur stated but we are still paying a county tax. The taxpayer who owns a home is still paying a county tax.

Mayor Craig stated I would like to go back to Item 28. The recommendation was either a 79-E for four or five years.

*On motion of **Alderman Stewart**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to approve the 79-E application for 215 Canal Street for five years.*

*On motion of **Alderman Heath**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to recess the meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.*

Mayor Craig called the meeting back to order.

32. Report(s) of the Committee on Finance.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Resolutions:

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Sixty Seven Thousand Dollars (\$167,000) for the FY2023 CIP 210523 Healthcare for the Homeless.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) for the FY2023 CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixty Five Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Two Dollars and ninety-four Cents (\$65,662.94) for the FY2023 CIP 211723 Opioid Litigation Settlement Trust.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars (\$12,566) for the FY2024 CIP 212024 Bridge Access Program CMC HHC FY23.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Forty Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty Three Dollars (\$340,953) for the FY2024 CIP 411024 Substance Abuse Reduction Initiative.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Thirty Eight Thousand Dollars (\$338,000) for the FY2024 CIP 411124 City’s EOC Renovations.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) for the FY2024 CIP 411224 FY 2021 Hazmat Collaborative Allocation.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the FY 2023 CIP 611023 2022 Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Grant Program.”

“Amending the FY2012 and FY2022 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Forty Three Thousand One Hundred Fifteen Dollars (\$243,115.00) for the FY2012 CIP 510712 South Manchester Rail Trail.”

"Authorizing the utilization of excess revenues from the Manchester School District Fiscal Year 2024 budget revenue estimates for a supplemental appropriation of \$35,223,387 to the Manchester School District pursuant to Section 6.05 (a) of the City Charter in Fiscal Year 2024."

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Seven Hundred Twenty-Nine Dollars (\$236,729) for CIP 611324 The Orange Street Apartments.”

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Three Million Six Hundred Fourteen Thousand Five Hundred Seventeen Dollars (\$3,614,517) for CIP 610823 Lincoln Avenue Capital-Residences at 351 Chestnut Street (Merrimack St. Parcel), CIP 611124 Brook Street Shelter Operations, and CIP 611224 MHRA Landlord Incentive Program.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Stewart**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.*

Alderman Levasseur stated before we go any further, that included the \$35 million for the school district correct.

Mayor Craig responded it did.

Alderman Levasseur stated it has already been approved so people don't have to sit around and wait. I do want to say for that particular issue that a lot of people deserve credit for that like Alderman Heath and Alderman Long for the work they do up at the state house and everybody involved in bringing that money to the city.

Mayor Craig replied there is one more vote.

Alderman Levasseur responded right but the vote we just took did include it. I just want to let people know that there are a lot of people who should be thanked for all the work they did.

Mayor Craig stated I think Alderman Heath wanted to speak.

Alderman Heath stated I just want to mention the work that Representative Wilhelm did with the senate in negotiations. The general court did admirable work though we are still not funding education to the extent we should be and there is a lawsuit in place. We did bring a substantial sum to Manchester, of which I am very proud.

Alderman Long stated just to clarify, this is from the general court, not the Department of Education. It was the general court that did this.

Alderman Levasseur stated and the Governor didn't veto it so even though you don't like him, give him some credit.

33. Report(s) of the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration.

The Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Manchester Arts Commission for the release of \$6,000 from the art fund for a mural project to be painted on the WayPoint Center at the corner of Hanover and Beech Streets be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Heath**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendation with Alderman George-Kelly recusing herself.*

The Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Manchester Arts Commission for the release of \$759.68 from the art fund to reimburse the cost of purchasing exhibition and display materials be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Fajardo**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.*

34. Report(s) of the Committee on Administration/Information Systems, if available.

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the following Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Chapter 38: Procurement Code of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by additional requirements during the prequalification of bidders associated with the procurement of city construction contracts.”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Bills Second Reading for technical review.

*On motion of **Alderman Burkush**, duly seconded by **Alderman T. Sapienza**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.*

The Committee on Administration/Information Systems respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from Fuss & O’Neil for approval of an air rights lease for building sun shades to be placed on their multi-family developments located at 351 Chestnut and 80 Merrimack Street be approved and that the Mayor be authorized to execute the lease upon review by the City Solicitor.

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.*

35. Report(s) of the Committee on Lands & Buildings, if available.

The Committee on Lands & Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from Fuss & O’Neil for a revocable license for landscaping planters to be placed at their multi-family developments located on Chestnut and Merrimack Streets be approved and that the Mayor be authorized to execute the license upon review of the City Solicitor and Public Works Director.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman George-Kelly**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.*

36. Resolutions:

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Sixty Seven Thousand Dollars (\$167,000) for the FY2023 CIP 210523 Healthcare for the Homeless."

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) for the FY2023 CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness."

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Sixty Five Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Two Dollars and ninety-four Cents (\$65,662.94) for the FY2023 CIP 211723 Opioid Litigation Settlement Trust."

"Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twelve Thousand Five Hundred Sixty-Six Dollars (\$12,566) for the FY2024 CIP 212024 Bridge Access Program CMC HHC FY23."

"Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Forty Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty Three Dollars (\$340,953) for the FY2024 CIP 411024 Substance Abuse Reduction Initiative."

"Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Thirty Eight Thousand Dollars (\$338,000) for the FY2024 CIP 411124 City's EOC Renovations."

"Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Thousand Dollars (\$2,000) for the FY2024 CIP 411224 FY 2021 Hazmat Collaborative Allocation."

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$100,000) for the FY 2023 CIP 611023 2022 Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Grant Program."

"Amending the FY2012 and FY2022 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Forty Three Thousand One Hundred Fifteen Dollars (\$243,115.00) for the FY2012 CIP 510712 South Manchester Rail Trail."

"Authorizing the utilization of excess revenues from the Manchester School District Fiscal Year 2024 budget revenue estimates for a supplemental appropriation of \$35,223,387 to the Manchester School District pursuant to Section 6.05 (a) of the City Charter in Fiscal Year 2024."

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thirty-Six Thousand Seven Hundred Twenty-Nine Dollars (\$236,729) for CIP 611324 The Orange Street Apartments.”

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Three Million Six Hundred Fourteen Thousand Five Hundred Seventeen Dollars (\$3,614,517) for CIP 610823 Lincoln Avenue Capital-Residences at 351 Chestnut Street (Merrimack St. Parcel), CIP 611124 Brook Street Shelter Operations, and CIP 611224 MHRA Landlord Incentive Program.”

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to waive the reading by titles only.*

*On motion of **Alderman Stewart**, duly seconded by **Alderman Cavanaugh**, it was voted that the Resolutions ought to pass and be Enrolled.*

37. Ordinances:

"Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 & 33.026 (Airport Supervisor - Parking and Ground Transportation) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

"Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 & 33.026 (Airport Supervisor - Terminal and Landside Operations) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester."

*On motion of **Alderman Cavanaugh**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to waive the readings by titles only.*

*On motion of **Alderman Burkush**, duly seconded by **Alderman Heath**, it was voted to Ordain.*

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman E. Sapienza asked can we get some clarification on the situation at 39 Beech Street. I am a little unclear on how we are supposed to track what is going on there and whether the folks that go there are becoming independent and finding gainful employment, avoiding incarceration and things of that nature. What is the deal there exactly? Is Director Beloin here?

Adrienne Beloin, Director of Housing Stability, stated just so I understand, you are concerned that we are having folks in the emergency shelter and they are not moving forward.

Alderman E. Sapienza replied my concern is how do we track if they are moving forward or backward or whatever. What is the deal there?

Ms. Beloin responded we have been in an implementation phase since we started this in February. We had the first three months of a temporary shelter and then we approved to have it extended for a couple of more months and then we went to semi-permanency with a whole year approval. Every way that we have been tracking the data has evolved with that temporary to semi-permanent system. Initially, we had to kind of track folks on paper where we were appreciating who was coming into the shelter and trying to keep tracks of their lengths of stay and connecting them to services and trying to measure some outcomes. I provided the data that I had available to me along the way and everything I have been doing has been working up to developing a more sophisticated data collection system so that I can then present more sophisticated data in the ways that we have been talking about over these last several months.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated that is great. So, the city broadly speaking has their name and other information?

Ms. Beloin replied the city collects that data; yes.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked but that data is confidential or what.

Ms. Beloin answered yes. I would defer to Solicitor Rice because I believe she has given us guidance on that practice.

Peter Chiesa, Deputy Solicitor, stated I believe Solicitor Rice issued a written opinion to that effect.

Alderman E. Sapienza replied right that is terrific. Can we just get a quick review of that?

Deputy Solicitor Chiesa stated I don't have that in front of me.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I know it is the email but if we could get a quick explanation, that would be terrific.

Deputy Solicitor Chiesa stated essentially the information is both private under the Constitution due to a recent amendment and it is also private under 91-A. If some person was to request a person's name, address or anything that is being recorded, it would be deemed privileged under the Right-to-Know Law, 91-A.

Alderman E. Sapienza replied that is why I am a little unclear here because on the one hand I am hearing that the information is private but on the other hand I am hearing that the city collects this data for the purpose of tracking these people. I think that right there is where the confusion comes in. So, what is the deal exactly? Who is privy to this information and who is not?

Ms. Beloin responded I think I understand what you are getting at. So, there is a difference in providing anonymous information or detailed information with names connected to personal information. We collect the personal information that is a standard and a best practice for any emergency shelter or homeless serving program. There is a whole system that we are tapping into that goes across the country that is the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). We collect lots of demographic information and lots of sensitive information about people's disability status and other things that we can't share outside of our agencies and we are bonded to that. We take oaths and we get licenses associated with that where we have to comply the same way that a clinician or doctor would have to comply with patient information they receive. Numbers are still important right? You need to know from me how many people are you serving and who is getting jobs and who is getting connected to housing and how are you showing us you are doing that and that is information that can be provided because we are tracking it. For example, since we have opened the Engagement Center, it has

been three weeks and we have had 98 people come through the doors to get services; 98 individual people unduplicated. What I am going to be able to do is from those 98 folks we will be able to track the services they have made individual connections with and some of the outcomes. Some of them will have increased income. Some of them will get connected to housing. Some of them will move into transitional housing. Some of them will have health improvements or insurance improvements. Any of those things that we are tracking, we will be able to track that confidentially in our data system and when I run reports, I will be able to provide pie charts and different kinds of graphs to say this percentage of people connected to jobs but you won't know the person's name, social security number, DOB or the connection to that service because that would be illegal.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated thank you. Is there a screening process when somebody goes to the shelter? Is there an intake or screening process?

Ms. Beloin answered yes. The process is people who come into the shelter have to agree to the terms of the shelter. So, they have to come in and abide by the rules. For example, they can't come in when it is not time for them to come in for their shelter bed. They have to agree to the rules and expectations. We have that all in writing for them so right upfront if you are a new person coming into the system, whether it is the Engagement Center or the shelter, you sit with staff and review an entire page of rules. They talk about the expectations that you have to follow and you have to agree to them, sign off on them and hand it back to the staff. In addition to that, we also have some other requirements like our data collection. So, everything I just mentioned to you. If someone said I want to come to the program but I don't want to give you my name or tell you any of the services I have connections to while I am here on-site and I won't let you track that, we are not having those folks come into the shelter. It has never happened. Everyone has agreed to the data agreement but we are making sure they sign something that gives us the permission to collect that data on them and for us to be able to analyze it and provide annotated data to you.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked but there is no criminal background screening.

Ms. Beloin replied no. Knowing people's criminal status is a really important part of the case management aspect of helping them overcome barriers to housing.

Understanding people's criminal history is a big part of what happens on-site with the case management that we bring in from outside providers but it is not anything that would preclude them from being able to access the shelter and the reason for that is our shelter is low barrier and that is not unusual. All of the state-funded shelters are required to be low barrier in the same way so the criminal record is not a barrier to shelter.

Alderman George-Kelly asked when you continue to provide us data, can you also provide us data with the number of individuals...I know you said you collect information about disability and we know that there are times when there are people who come into a shelter setting who going out and getting a full-time job and being able to support themselves through earned income is not necessarily going to be a realistic goal for them based on whatever disability or struggles they may be dealing with are. Could you help inform us through your reporting how many of those people we are seeing at the shelter and also what a successful outcome for that category of people be?

Ms. Beloin responded that is a really good point and I can absolutely do that. It is a best practice standard and the way that we talked about people connecting to jobs is actually we reshaped that to talk about income maximization because income maximization can mean a lot of different things. Sometimes it means maximizing the benefits that you are eligible for so that you actually have more resources under your belt and sometimes it means the more traditional thing of increasing your income by way of employment or changing your employment or having a job turn into a career. That would be an income maximization. That is the way we talk about it in the field and I sent something to Alderman Long last week that was a look inside the way that we are uniquely using the HMIS system. You can customize it and what I am implementing now, and I couldn't have done it any earlier than now because of the implementation steps it takes to this point...we just now got Wi-Fi in the part of the building we just fit up so some of these things are logistical but the sophistication of what we are collecting at this time really captures not just demographics but really specific information about people's income, their disability status, their ability to increase their income, what benefits they have, what

benefits they are eligible for, their veteran status and domestic violence status, all things that play into us analyzing whether or not someone needs a maximization and a resource or a connection to a service and then we are plugging them in with those service providers on-site. This is a much different operation than what we were even trying to do in the emergency shelter setting. The emergency shelter's purpose was to take people from the street in the cold in the winter and give them a warm place to sleep overnight and we were doing that. That was very successful and now we are doing something completely different which is about the next level of connecting them to services and actually measuring the outcomes. I agree with a lot of the comments that you have been hearing for months from me that we have been successful and we have been helping people and we have been connecting them to things but you haven't had trustworthy data other than what I am telling you in a PowerPoint. So that needs to change and the way it is changing is we are entering, and I can even give a presentation on that if that is helpful to the Board, the way the staff are entering the information and how it goes through the process to get into a report to you so you can feel more confident about what it is that is actually happening and where the outcome is. The other thing that is important to note is that if people are not moving away from emergency shelter, whether it is my shelter or any other shelter, you have to appreciate that it is because there is a lack of housing as well. I think that is a learning area that we all stand to learn more about at the event that we are hosting on November 1 and 2. I am hoping you can come to that so you can better understand it.

Alderman Levasseur stated we just had a huge discussion on privacy rights but after everything you said you know about these people it doesn't sound like they have any privacy rights at all. I mean you basically just gave us a list of everything in the world you could possibly know about people.

Ms. Beloin replied they agree to provide those details to us in confidence the same way they would with any other provider.

Alderman Levasseur asked could send this Board a copy of the rules and expectations document.

Ms. Beloin answered absolutely. I would be happy to share it with you and I did share it with the Board members that came to the open house. We made a point to introduce those expectations and share it with everyone at the open house.

Alderman Levasseur stated you gave a really good presentation on what you are allowed to disclose and the rules and oaths that you take but you used the word patient. Are homeless people patients?

Ms. Beloin asked I used the word patient to describe our guests in the shelter.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes.

Ms. Beloin stated that might have been a slip. They are not patients. We consider them guests. They are consumers of our shelter and guests. We refer to them as guests but they are patients to some of the service providers and come and provide care there like Healthcare for the Homeless and the Mental Health Center of Greater Manchester. They are their patients and that is the bulk of the provider activity that is happening on-site at the shelter.

Alderman Levasseur asked in the context that the question was presented to you as to why this Board or this body of government would not be allowed to view simple records like sign-up sheets and who the people are that are actually using this on a daily basis, and I say this because you used the word patient which I understand you are backing way to a different venue and not you personally or the government or the City of Manchester. We are not considering them patients and you don't consider them patients, right?

Ms. Beloin responded are you asking me that again.

Alderman Levasseur replied yes. I just want to confirm that.

Ms. Beloin stated I don't consider them patients of mine but they are patients of some of the providers there.

Alderman Levasseur stated but they are not patients of the...in order for me say a sentence I need to say the sentence to get to the next sentence. I am sorry if that is confusing for everybody but now you are taking me off my throw and I think that is intentional to just try to take me out of what I am trying to get across. Anyway, the reason why I bring that up is because they are not patients per say because you said that you yourself needs to take an oath and I would assume that is part of HIPAA and why you have to be really careful about the information you disseminate to anyone outside the patient/doctor or patient/nurse privilege is. My point is that you are an employee of the city and you get this information and you come under the Board's...we are your boss, we are the men and women you have to report to so why can we not see the same information that you see as an employee of the city? Is there another tier that I don't understand?

Ms. Beloin responded yes. It is protected information when it is somebody's name in combination with something like their social security number or somebody's name in combination with their DOB. So sometimes there are things like people's names that gets shared and that is different than having a combination with other things. This is a standard across any sort of social service. People sign consents to work with us at the shelter and we disclose this to them in a very particular way to say that you are sharing this with the City of Manchester through this program and this is how and why we are using the information and they consent to that. So, we have to have that posted and they have to agree to it and consent to it and then we can collect the data but I will defer to the Solicitor's Office about the layer that is in between what my staff and I can know and what the Board can know.

Alderman Levasseur stated I will have a discussion with him. In the meantime, a sign-up sheet doesn't include social security numbers, does it?

Ms. Beloin replied it includes their date of birth and that has been the issue.

Alderman Levasseur asked that can't be redacted.

Ms. Beloin answered I will defer to the Solicitor's Office about what information the Board can receive.

Alderman Levasseur stated well you are able as an employee of the city and a department head of the city to get information that you get to look at that some members of this Board would like to look at. We got a 600-page confidential memorandum concerning this big huge project of the city. Why couldn't you just send that to us on this Board and say it is confidential?

Deputy Solicitor Chiesa stated just because the department head has confidential information or private information doesn't mean she can disclose it to anybody including this Board.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is exactly the answer that I wanted from our government, which is what I expected from our government which is why people don't trust our government because the elected body itself that is elected to make sure that the government is doing its job and doing it properly and honestly with actual integrity and accountability and transparency to use the words from Alderman Kantor, this Board is elected to be able to look at these things. So basically, we are here doing nothing and can't look at simple documents like sign-up sheets to see if Mr. A is still there seven or nine months later. Now you could actually provide us a sheet without using a name. You could say this is Resident A and Resident A has been there since this date. You could actually provide us with some data like that.

Ms. Beloin responded yes. Length of stay data is something that can be used in a way that doesn't disclose the person exactly who that information is attached to.

Alderman Levasseur stated I am fine with that. I would also say that as far as I am concerned as an attorney, the decision by the City Solicitor's Office when I looked at the opinion, I thought it was very broad and not narrow because now if I am an employee of the City of Manchester, I don't think I would like it if everybody in the whole state knew what my salary was. I wouldn't like them to know...when I go to my voter's checklist and it says my name and address and if you go to Vision Technology it shows where I

live...I look at all of the information out there that is not private but under the ruling of your office and I am not saying you and I don't care who wrote it but it is a very, very broad structure. We are here in this government. This elected body needs to be able to make decisions and I am not trying to be facetious or rude. We have to wonder about whether or not we should be extending the lease when it expires on June 30. This body is going to have to vote whether to spend \$1.4 million or whatever amount of money, and it is probably going to be more, to keep that place open. I say that because when I look at people who are on the spectrum of losing their apartments, we are providing some people over there nine months of free rent. Not only free rent but they have a shower and other benefits. They have some things that a lot of people who work seven days a week waitressing or maybe have two or three part-time jobs to pay their rent don't have. We have people like the one that came in here tonight that has been living there since February. I think this Board should know that stuff. We get the pushback from everybody – Solicitor's Office and you Mayor and everybody telling us no we can't have that information and what that does is make us wonder why and make us wonder why we can't because we have to make decisions on the spending and whether or not this is a vital service that we should be providing.

Mayor Craig stated I think it would be really great, Adrienne, for you to provide a presentation to this Board on HMIS so they can see the data you are collecting because I am confident that the data you are collecting and will be providing to this Board will meet their needs. You are just not going to have a name attached to it.

Alderman Levasseur responded I never said I wanted names. I just think that is why it is good to have this discussion. I want to ask one more question. This low barrier decision, you just said that the state's shelters are low barrier...

Ms. Beloin interjected all of the state's shelters are low barrier and are required to be.

Alderman Levasseur stated but this is not a state shelter. It is a city shelter paid for by taxpayers. Why do we...FIT doesn't have a low barrier shelter?

Ms. Beloin answered they do and what I would say to that and it is probably not the answer you want to hear but it is important for you to hear these things from me and understand...

Alderman Levasseur interjected they have much stricter rules than we do.

Ms. Beloin stated I am still explaining something.

Alderman Levasseur replied wait. You don't get to talk over me. They have strict rules over there. They don't get to stay out until 10 PM and smoke weed outside and then go back in the building. They have stricter rules so they are not as low barrier as Beech Street. That is about as low as a curb. That is how low it is. Again, my point was going to be do we have to follow the state low barrier rule or can we put in our own rules that say we are not a low barrier shelter anymore and we can go to a medium barrier shelter? That is where I was going with that.

Ms. Beloin answered the shelter that I am operating at Beech Street is lower barrier than 199 Manchester Street. There is a low barrier standard and I have reduced the threshold even lower so we can get people off the street in a way that those shelters cannot and it is working.

Alderman Levasseur asked working how.

Ms. Beloin replied we allow couples to stay together. We have storage on-site where you can store an entire tent set-up. We let people come in until 9 PM and 10 PM. We accommodate people who work overnight and need to hold onto shelter beds for odd hours. We provide a lot of lower barrier sheltering in order to get those folks to come inside.

Alderman Levasseur stated so the answer to my question is yes you could make it a higher barrier but you have chosen to make it a lower barrier and you made that decision as the Homeless Coordinator because that was your position and now you are a department head.

Mayor Craig stated she was always a department head.

Alderman Levasseur stated yes and she has a different department now.

Ms. Beloin stated you know exactly what my title is.

Alderman Levasseur responded no I don't. Sometimes I do but sometimes I forget.

Mayor Craig stated we will move on and come back to you.

Alderman Long asked regarding confidentiality, this is the first time I am hearing that it would be confidential to the aldermen. I don't agree with that whatsoever. If we received the information, it would be confidential but confidential to us...how do we measure accountability? You see I am spoiled by February 2023 when GateHouse presented to us and we were looking for details on people and where they were going and talk about HIPAA violations, those are the details we are looking for. To all of the sudden not have purview to get this information...I question the confidentiality to aldermen. That is what I heard from you Peter, that it is even confidential for aldermen and I question that. How do we check and balance that?

Mayor Craig stated you guys have other department heads that have confidential patient information that is not shared with this Board.

Deputy Solicitor Chiesa stated you don't need a name, address, social security number and data of birth.

Alderman Long stated this is the case of a name of someone going to the shelter, not a department head that has an employee that is sick. These are names of people in a shelter.

Mayor Craig stated we don't provide names of patients or other...

Alderman Levasseur interjected they are not patients.

Mayor Craig stated I am talking about other departments that provide services.

Alderman Long stated you are talking apples and oranges.

Mayor Craig stated so Health and Welfare.

Alderman Long asked can I finish and then you guys are more than welcome and I will listen and not interrupt you. They are not patients. We already established that so now I am getting examples of when we protect patients' names. I am saying it is apples and oranges. All I am saying is I question the fact that some of this is confidential to the aldermen. I question that. Now the 98 people who went through the Engagement Center, how many are part of the 40 residents that have a bed there? Could we include the 40 in the 98?

Ms. Beloin answered yes and once this data collection is done, it will be much more specific but the average of people that have been going there since the day we opened and it has been 20 days open by this point is 38 people a day and about 8 of those folks on average per day are not staying with us at the shelter and the shelter rotates. So, all in all, it has been 98 individuals but we only have 40 shelter beds.

Alderman Long asked so all of those who have assigned beds, are they also going to the Engagement Center.

Ms. Beloin replied many of them but not all of them. Some of them wake up early in the morning and are gone for the day. Some are working. Some are not utilizing the services at the Engagement Center but several of them are.

Alderman Fajardo stated I just wanted to draw a comparison...for example we hear a lot about the insurance and getting hit with insurance premiums. Sharon Wickens has said that we have some really sick people but we as a Board don't typically want to know their names or their illnesses...

Mayor Craig interjected we don't know.

Alderman Fajardo stated exactly. We don't know and we wouldn't even ask. I am not quite sure...it feels like a double standard almost and I am not sure if that has to do with the nature of the services that we are providing to that particular population. We don't apply that same entitlement to other things. I think about all of the information that HR sits on. In my profession in the last eight years working with technology companies, I do regular training on personally identifiable information. It is a defined thing. There is all kinds of data and information that can be shared out accurately that is meaningful and answers the questions that I think we as a Board need to keep an eye on. Again, referencing insurance premiums relative to the budget. It just feels like we are taking a different standard and applying it to this particular application.

Alderman Trisciani stated it is apples to apples when we look at the Welfare Department and the Health Department and the Housing Stability Department when we are dealing with the shelter. Welfare gives us a report of what the results are and what is being paid out. We are not entitled to names and we should never have that information. Yes, Charleen technically works for us but it is not our purview to know that information. Adrienne is in the same boat and we have the Health Department doing the same thing. This is names, addresses, personal information and it is not our purview. Our purview is the data and to understand what resources, how they are being used and how they are helping people.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated thank you for working on this. I hope you come back next month.

Ms. Beloin responded thank you. I appreciate it.

Alderman Barry stated Adrienne I know a few months ago I am the one that asked for names and when I was asking for names, my thought process was I want to know who has been there since February. I know that Alderman Levasseur brought that up. I

don't want their health records and I don't want any medical records or DOB or social security number. They receive mail there, right?

Ms. Beloin answered yes.

Alderman Barry stated so once they start receiving mail there, their confidentiality is out the window right because now it is public information.

Ms. Beloin asked once they receive mail there what.

Alderman Barry replied now it becomes public information because someone is getting their mail at their address so the post office knows who is staying there and anyone running for political office will probably know sooner or later.

Mayor Craig stated I don't understand why we have this focus on a name when she said she can get you the information that you want.

Alderman Barry replied let me finish. There is a reason I brought that up to begin with and the reason I want names is because I want to know if someone has been there...I want to know if John Smith has been there since February 1 or whenever we opened and he is still there. I want to know what is going on with him and what we are doing for him. How come he is still there? My opinion is a shelter is temporary and not permanent and if we allow it to be permanent then we lose.

Ms. Beloin responded I am of the same opinion and overseeing programs like this, my responsibility is the quality control to insure those very things. I am supposed to be looking at the documentation in order to determine whether the staff are doing the right interventions they are supposed to be doing and are they following through and making the service connections and why aren't they and do they need more training. Those are the things that I need to care about so I am right with you. Unfortunately, it is not something that could be delivered to you earlier than what it took to get these implementation stages in place. If you give me a couple of months, you are going to be

really impressed with what I have to show you. I think you should just stay tuned honestly.

Mayor Craig stated let's have the Deputy Solicitor answer your questions.

Alderman Barry stated I have one more comment. When I had first asked, I was jumped on by a few people in here that it was a HIPAA violation. I wasn't asking for any medical information and I wasn't asking for any health information. I was asking for names and names only. I know that Solicitor Rice gave her opinion and she actually excluded HIPAA. She said HIPAA wasn't involved.

Deputy Solicitor Chiesa stated the mere fact that somebody gets their mail at the shelter does not waive their rights to privacy or confidentiality. You can get what you want without names and without dates of birth and without marital status or anything else. As I understand it, it could be a number system and instead of John Smith it is Mr. X or X.

Alderman Barry stated I am not saying they waived their confidentiality but I am saying now their confidentiality will be less now than it was prior to them moving in and receiving mail there.

Deputy Solicitor Chiesa responded perhaps so but that still doesn't enable the city to disclose that information to the public or any third party.

Alderman Fajardo stated I have an announcement to Ward 4 residents. We are having a community meeting at the Library this Thursday, 10/19 at 6 PM. It will be in the auditorium on the first floor.

Mayor Craig stated I have some nominations. Brian McCoy to replace William Houghton, term limited, as a regular member of the Board of Recount, term to expire November 30, 2025 and Don Goduti as a regular member, term to expire November 30, 2025. The Station 9 grand opening is tomorrow, October 18 from 6 PM – 8 PM at 575 Calef Road. Municipal elections are Tuesday, November 7 from 6 AM until 7 PM.

There is no BMA meeting on that night. Downtown trick-or-treat is Friday, 10/27 from 3 PM until 6 PM and city-wide trick-or-treat is Tuesday, October 31 from 6 PM until 8 PM.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I had a chance to visit the new water treatment facility that was just built by Manchester Water Works. Many decades of work went into that. It is an engineering feat and people in Manchester don't know about it because it was so successful. It was so successful it was implemented and nobody knew it. That is a testament to the talent and hard work of Manchester Water Works. It is real gem for the state. You hear people knocking Manchester every single day but every community around Manchester depends on Manchester water. Towns around Manchester without Manchester water would be unlivable. They just built this giant well and giant treatment plant and nobody even noticed. Everybody can turn their water on and off every single day without noticing. I never put a water treatment plant on but I have been part of big projects and you hope nobody notices. If the lights go out, everybody notices. That is the business I was in. People have more water than they know what to do with and they didn't even know it was happening.

Mayor Craig stated clean, safe water.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated the cleanest water in the country at your fingertips.

Mayor Craig stated thank you to Phil Croasdale and Water Works.

Alderman Long stated on that same subject, this issue of our exits being postponed and other things, the state requires Water Works to supply to other municipalities. Now the state does pay for that but that is Manchester paying again because that state money is our money. Manchester, as Alderman T. Sapienza said, is above and beyond supplying our state with clean good water. To not even have a meeting in the City of Manchester on these projects that have already had hearings and where they have already come before us and asked our opinions and to just all of the sudden pull it out from under us is absurd.

Alderman Levasseur stated Mayor there are no resumes for the two nominations. They have to meet certain requirements for that particular board and I just want to make sure he does.

City Clerk Normand responded the resume was submitted and the second one is being reappointed.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Cavanaugh**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

City Clerk