

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

May 20, 2025 at 5:30 PM

Chairman Long called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Long, Levasseur, Thomas, E. Sapienza, Fajardo

Messrs.: Alderman Terrio, Mayor Ruais, Alderman Kantor, Alderman O'Neil

1. Discussion regarding making the school district a department of the city.

Alderman Levasseur moved to approve. **Alderman E. Sapienza** duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Long asked move to approve what. Are you making a motion to approve a discussion regarding the school district? What is the motion?

Alderman Levasseur stated I want to discuss it.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I am not sure that discussion is even necessary. Let's just move forward.

Alderman Fajardo stated I was reviewing some of the information provided by the Mayor's Office and I did feel that there are a handful of questions that we ought to consider. For me, the main thing would be what is the realistic timeframe for something of this magnitude?

Chairman Long stated we would have to get the ballot question to the clerk by June 3.

Alderman Fajardo responded to clarify, what would be the timeline to absorb the school district into the city.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated that is a great point so why don't we go ahead and move forward with this. The quicker the better.

Chairman Long stated I would like to have a timeframe myself. Is this going to take six months or a year?

Alderman Fajardo asked do we have details on what we should expect or what the voters should expect. Let's say it does make it to the ballot. Are we looking at consolidation in the year 2026 or 2027? How do we know what expectation to lay out for voters?

Alderman Levasseur stated I know it didn't take them long to go from a department to a district. I would say probably the same time.

Alderman Fajardo asked do you recall what that timing was.

Alderman Levasseur replied it was very short. There is not really...this is not a massive movement of things like IT and HR. Those types of things will stay the same. Nobody is going to move them or take over any of that. This is more about the mayor having a little bit more control over the way the money is spent and line item control over their budget. That is basically the way it was before when it was a department.

Chairman Long stated first of all, it wasn't a full department in 2001 like we are thinking it was. I don't know if we want to go back to that. My understanding is the BMA had to appropriate dollars because they would overspend. I don't know how that issue came up. Just making a motion to have the school district be a department of the city is wide open. There are no details on what that is.

Alderman Terrio asked Matt does this need to go to the full Board tonight to get up to the state.

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, replied it does not. I think what we talked about last meeting was that we would have this meeting and this committee would determine what they wanted to see and would draft amendments for the June 3 meeting. June 3 is the drop dead date for the Board to start that journey up to the state agencies.

Alderman Terrio asked so as long as we vote by June 3 we are within the timeline.

City Clerk Normand answered yes.

Alderman Fajardo asked could you clarify because I am not familiar with what the previous model was. You are saying you would not want to move forward with consolidating IT, HR, unions, etc.? I am wondering if the objective is to assert line item oversight. Is there some other version of this that is commensurate with that specific thing? Do we know if we just want to do that if we can leave all of those departments separate?

Chairman Long responded I can't answer that. All I am hearing right now is having the mayor have line item authority. It is not veto power. If it was veto power, he is a member of the BOSC and has a vote and he is also the chair so I don't know if he could have a vote and have veto power.

Alderman Fajardo stated that is a good question. Would that shift the mayor's role to look more like it is on this Board?

Chairman Long stated the more details we get, we will be able to look at the charter and see what needs to change. I have a funny feeling that although former Reps Infantine and Vaillancourt evidently changed the state law so we can have a school district, I don't know what that change is. I don't know if it is what we are thinking it is which is like DPW or Police.

Mayor Ruais stated one of the reasons why I thought it would be appropriate to come through committee was to answer the questions that you guys are asking right now. In my conversations with the department heads, my understanding from the legislation is

that this allowed us to go from a district to a department subject to the other RSA's that are already there that establish what a school district is allowed to do. That is why I said I think that clarity is important. I understand the Solicitor was looking for just how many RSA's govern what a school district is allowed to do. Basically, we can call it a department but we can't do things that RSA's don't allow us to do. That is why I think from a timeframe standpoint, it is important for us to understand all of the RSA's out there. From what the Solicitor told me, there are several hundred potential RSA's that govern what school districts do. That is why I think it is important to get clarify from the committee on just what we are being asked to vote on so we don't wind up in a lawsuit on the back end because we are not allowed to do what we are requesting.

Alderman Fajardo asked who can provide us with the answers to these questions. Is it the city HR Department or the school district HR Department? It is the Solicitor's Office? All of the above? I assume somebody from the school district.

Mayor Ruais stated after our first meeting when this was discussed, I asked for those departments to come together because I wanted to get a sense from them of how this would impact them from a governing standpoint. That is when some of those issues were raised. I think in speaking with those department heads, you will get a good feel for what this would look like if this were to pass as the end of the year - if this were to go to the AG's Office, come through the BMA and then get passed by the voters at the end of the year; whatever iteration we wanted it to take. I think something else for consideration is it is my understanding and the Solicitor can correct me if I am wrong but if this were to pass on November 4, we have until the end of this upcoming fiscal year for this to be finalized. What that would give us is about seven months to make whatever changes we had to by the end of the next fiscal year, June 30. So we would have seven months to do it.

Alderman Fajardo asked would it have to be by the end of this fiscal year.

Mayor Ruais replied not this fiscal year but the end of FY26 which is June 2026.

Alderman Fajardo stated I don't know if that is enough time because I am not clear. I am not trying to be impossible. I am just trying to ask questions.

Chairman Long asked so this discussion is what you envision within the school district or department. What is your vision because there are statutes we have to comply with? We could have the voters approving something that statutorily we can't do and that would be problematic. Reviewing the statutes would be a good starting point. I don't know if the Solicitor has already begun that process.

Emily Rice, Solicitor, stated we have begun the process of looking at a variety of options but what would be most helpful to those of us who are going to be trying to draft the language to fulfill the committee's and the Board's intent would be to understand in as much detail as possible what it is that you want to achieve. I do know, and I think that the Board Chair has been very consistent about this, that one of the objectives would be to provide the mayor with line item authority over the school district budget. That is one concrete objective. I don't know if that is necessarily synonymous with the school district becoming a department of the city. If there are other specific objectives, it would

be helpful to know what those are because based on the work that we have done so far if this is truly an absorption by the city of the school district as a department, that implicates many sections of the charter. If, on the other hand, it is strictly a budgetary matter, then that just means a handful of amendments. Any guidance of specificity that we could gain would be helpful. We can do it without more specificity but that is kind of where we are.

Chairman Long stated I think the mayor has a vote on line items as a member of the BOSC.

Alderman Fajardo stated I am thinking of last night's special meeting of the school board. In this scenario, this mayor with the current budget had stated that he deferred to the school district on their recommendations. He did say that you were part of discussions and so perhaps creating influence there but I think maybe a future mayor may not completely defer. I am trying to think of a scenario. I am guessing the idea is that a line item might be too high for a future mayor's taste or perspective. In this case, we know the entire school budget is getting cut back. Based on what I heard in last night's meeting, Mayor you seemed very confident that you had been able to exercise the level of influence that you saw fit in this particular scenario. I don't know if there are other scenarios that other people can think of but it might be helpful to hear of a specific scenario.

Mayor Ruais responded what I had said last night was that I had been in contact with the superintendent and spoken with the administration throughout the process dating back to prior to my budget being introduced. I thought that the recommendations made were something that I supported. I supported the reductions of staffing and administrative overhead through attrition, the change in the contract services line, and the change in the facilities line. I made another recommendation last night that was not going to get the support of the board but because I had been brought in throughout the process entirely, I supported those. I don't want to put words in the Alderman Levasseur's mouth but the language that I sent over in the email, the charter amendment that then Alderman Wihby had proposed, I think provided greater clarity on what the mayor and BMA's authority is vis a vis the budget and being able to explicitly say...so how it works for the budget process right now is I send out an email to the department heads and I say this is exactly what I am looking for and they report back with that. I think clarifying that the mayor has that authority with the school district is something that we have talked about internally as a potential avenue that we could take by clarifying the language in the charter that allows for that. At the same time, that doesn't stop an alderman from coming in and saying I disagree with the number the mayor gave to the BMA and I want to come in at a higher number or lower number.

Alderman Fajardo replied this is an open question for me. If that is the role that the mayor will play in future budget cycles, relative to your role as mayor of this Board and chair of that board, are you no longer chair of that board? Do you understand?

Mayor Ruais answered I don't believe anyone has suggested removal of the mayor from the school board. I think the Alderman Levasseur was clear that this isn't an attempt to get rid of the school board. I think he was clear on that.

Alderman Fajardo stated in your capacity as chair of the school board or in a mayor's capacity as chair of the school board, that person is involved from the outset when the school district is building their budget as well. You have said that you have been involved in constant conversations. Again, maybe I am misunderstanding that scenario or there is another scenario where a mayor needs or wants more control than they currently have. You already get to present your own budget. They presented their budget and you came back with your own budget. Do you want to actually...there are no other hypothetical mayors here so I am just asking you these questions but did you need or would you want a greater level of influence or control as the school district recalibrates their budget to match what this Board ultimately funded them at?

Mayor Ruais answered I think that is the purpose of the conversation tonight; to determine exactly what we are looking for when we say a department.

Alderman Fajardo asked for those who put this forward, and Alderman Kantor I know you had some thoughts...did you make the motion or...

Alderman Levasseur interjected I made it.

Alderman Fajardo asked could I get some clarity.

Alderman Levasseur stated very simply all you have to do is go back to the original charter before it was changed and see what the department looked like when it was a department I think in 1999. You can see what the powers were and the different divisions they had within their department at the time. I think they had their own IT and HR. I don't think anything was changed at that point. Whether this mayor wants to have line item authority or whatever, the voters want to decide. If you look at what we have for a school district since they have been on their own and you look at the fact that they have gotten \$46 million over the last two years and the city has gotten \$18 million and you look at when I started here in 1999/2000 their budget was I believe \$100 million and you look at where we have progressed with them being on their own as a district and you look at the results and then you look at the cost and then you look at the amount of money that is spent, something isn't working. It worked a lot better when it was a department or at least that was the perception at the time. I know that Mayor Wieczorek had a sharp pointed pencil and he had authority over that department and he used that authority. This Board just voted on a school budget without knowing what the surplus is. We didn't know how much of a surplus they had. Now I have been sitting on this Board for the last 12 years and every year they come in front of us and we don't know what their surplus is going to be. We vote for their budget and they never tell us. They always tell us we don't know but if you are the mayor with budgetary authority over that department just like the mayor right now is currently in charge of 13 departments on this side or whatever the number is, he knows where the money is being spent and how much they have left over. Everything over there is on its own little island. I don't want to say anything bad but they are like a secret organization that doesn't share information. We don't get the information we want when we want it. It is basically on an island all by itself and it has completely spun out of control over the last 20 years. It is not working as a district. It needs to go back to when it was working with the mayor who is going to need to get a raise if this does happen. He would have line item authority.

Chairman Long stated I totally disagree. We are talking about finances and the bottom line is that the BOSC looks at students. If you watched yesterday's meeting, academic achievement is the sole priority of the BOSC and I think they have that working. If you watched last night's meeting they were looking for cuts on things that are helping with making graduation rates higher and test scores better. That is working great. Mayor Wieczorek didn't sit at the BOSC meetings.

Alderman Levasseur replied he didn't have to.

Chairman Long responded well he did have to if he was thinking of academics. By the way, by the time he got out there was a lot of work that needed to be done to the schools. Maintenance was one of them. It was a large issue because there was no money going in there. We just won't agree with what direction the BOSC is going in.

Alderman Levasseur stated I want to go back to my original point which is if we want to see what the department looked like under the old format it would be very simple to do so.

Chairman Long asked why was that format changed to what it is today.

Alderman Levasseur responded they had a Charter Commission and they put a whole bunch of stuff that was new. I remember being around at that time and the city was not just going in the right direction so people voted for change. Well they got change alright. They got not a good change when it came to the department becoming a district.

Chairman Long asked so the voters didn't like what it looked like as a department.

Alderman Levasseur replied two years later when it went on the ballot, it passed I think 54%/46%. It was once given to the people in this city to vote on shortly after they became a district. The citizens voted to make it a department back then. If they had a couple more shots at this, we wouldn't have to keep trying to get it out there. We want to give the voters the opportunity to be able to decide whether they want to make it a department with more control from the Mayor's Office than it currently has now which is nothing.

Chairman Long responded as a voter, how am I going to vote on something when I don't know what the details are. What are the details you are looking for?

Alderman E. Sapienza asked Alderman Fajardo did you just say a few minutes ago that the entire school budget has been scaled back? I am pretty sure I heard you say that and I don't believe that is factually correct.

Alderman Fajardo replied well compared to what they requested.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated we are all entitled to our opinion here but we are not entitled to our own version of the facts. That facts are what they are and we should be careful with that. I think you were wrong when you said the entire school board budget or the entire school budget had been scaled back.

Alderman Fajardo responded I met from what they requested.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated okay then so from what they requested. Okay. That is different. Thank you.

Alderman Fajardo stated thank you for clarifying that.

Alderman Thomas asked is there a way to allow for the aldermen to have more say in what the school board does with their money because I have come into problems that a lot of people on the Board know about multiple times with the school district. Special ed stuff, sports stuff and OYS stuff. I am hearing these things from community partners and parents. Kids are leaving the district from bullying most of the time right or because special ed services aren't being met. That has been going on since I was on the school board years ago. I think that giving the aldermen or the mayor more judgment on it...they have a facilities plan going through and no one has looked at a special ed specialized school right now. We are still getting sued all the time because special ed isn't being met and parents are still pulling kids. A school board member came up here to speak during public comment to say that her child wasn't getting special ed services. These things are very upsetting and I would like to see a change with that.

Alderman Fajardo stated one thing that comes to mind is you, Alderman Levasseur, said it was working under the previous arrangement up to 1999 and that is it no longer working now. I am wondering what is the metric that you are looking at? What do you mean by it is not working? Is it performance? Is it attendance?

Alderman Levasseur answered I think the evidence shows...if you think it is working then that is your opinion. I don't believe it is.

Alderman Fajardo asked strictly from a financial perspective.

Alderman Levasseur replied no it is not only a spending problem. There is no legitimate oversight by an elected person. The mayor is an elected official who controls all departments in the city except for one.

Alderman Fajardo responded there are 14 school board members.

Alderman Levasseur stated they are policy makers. They are not supposed to be the day-to-day operators. The CEO of the city is the mayor. The CEO doesn't have any power, control or authority over a budget that is \$30 million more than the city side. That is just unheard of that some rogue department can just go off. You want to make the Fire Department its own district? You can let them all to branch off so they are only responsible for themselves. We are talking about a \$237 million budget that has no oversight by the CEO; the person elected to oversee the day-to-day operation of the city. When we come back in June, we are only going to have one meeting a month and the school district only has one meeting a month. There are 30 days or 31 days in a month. The mayor is working those days every month on all of these issues. We have no idea what is going on in all of these little departments. We come once a month. The mayor has nothing and I am not talking about just this mayor. I am talking about mayors from here on out. They have no power and no authority. They can't just walk in

and say open your books because I want to see what is going on. We can't audit them. We can't audit our own department. We have to rely on the school board to do it and they refuse to do it. This isn't the way to run a city. You can't just let the largest tax bill and the largest budget just be on its own without any authority by the CEO of the City of Manchester. It just doesn't make any sense.

Chairman Long stated so we have 14 people that are elected on the BOSC. They have oversight of the details. This meeting is regarding discussion about making the school district a department. Alderman Thomas brought up a suggestion. Can the aldermen have more oversight? I think it could happen a lot easier with respect to statutes than making the school district a department.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I would like to answer Alderman Fajardo's question about what metric. I will give you one example about how they are not succeeding. For years they talked about what high school they were going to close...

Chairman Long interjected we are not talking about that. We are here to discuss policy on making the school district a department.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated at their meeting last night they talked again about it. They might close a high school. I am answering her question.

Chairman Long stated they might do a lot of things. Let's get details on making the school district a department. That is what our goal is. We can look at the BOSC and say whatever we want to say but it has nothing to do with our mission.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think I gave you a suggestion. Let's go back to the charter before this one was put in and look at the differences and if it is something we want to stick with or make amendments to. My guess is we won't want to make any amendments and will just want it to go back to the way it was before the change. I think that would be a simpler thing to do.

Alderman Kantor stated I just wanted to say that I believe in checks and balances and that is why I want to change it to a department.

Chairman Long asked what changes would you like to bring.

Alderman Kantor replied more accountability and transparency. There is a lack of transparency when it comes to the wheel of power that was distributed. To me, we need accountability. More checks and balances is very important and I still want to know where the accountability is for this wheel of power.

Chairman Long asked how are we going to get that by making them a department. How do we meet those goals?

Alderman Kantor responded maybe an oversight committee on efficiency to look into each...I have personally gotten a ton of complaints from teachers and principals that this is unacceptable, the power and privilege. They feel less than.

Chairman Long stated I haven't gotten any calls on that and personally, I investigated that and I don't think it is as blown up as we think it is.

Alderman Kantor replied well according to the wheel of power you are definitely privileged because you are white and you are a heterosexual man. I will have homework for you later. Just kidding. Being a brown girl, I am a little offended right now by this privilege. We need transparency and accountability and checks and balances.

Alderman Fajardo asked does that mean that the mayor would also have oversight over academics with this as well. While we are looking into Alderman Levasseur's recommendation on what the structure was in 1999, I would also be interested in looking at performance of the school district in 1999. For that matter, we could even try to look at the arc of spending relative to performance between 1999 and now. I guess when I hear it is not working, I agree with you that it is very subjective in terms of what any of us could argue meets the definition of working. All that being equal, at the end of the day voters need to understand if we are going to put something in front of them and say hey let's go back to 1999. Because why? Ultimately, I think we can't just make an argument on the sake of spending because again none of us make and spend the same amount of money today that we did in 1999. Secondly, some other metric like performance is the only other relevant thing to look at. Let's make a motion to review the 1999 structure and also the performance metrics tied to it.

Alderman O'Neil stated you opened up on the right track. The Solicitor is researching state law. The state statutes are going to prevail. It doesn't matter what talk goes on here. I was here when it was a department and the majority of the power came from state statutes for school boards. It is not like the BMA is taking over the responsibility of the school board. State law controls that and that is not changing.

Chairman Long asked Matt who would be able to get us the details from when they were a department.

City Clerk Normand stated the current charter that this Board is guided by today is the 1997 charter. That is when it was passed. In terms of what was amended, we can provide that at the Board meeting if that is what the committee wants. It is not clear to me, Alderman Levasseur, if you would like a copy of what was on the ballot in 2001. Is that what your end game is? To get those questions back on the ballot? I have those in front of me and we have 10 minutes and I can read them. It is four sections that were on the ballot in 2001.

Alderman Levasseur responded so basically if you put those back on the ballot you are asking them to...

City Clerk Normand interjected it is what the voters voted on in 2001.

Alderman Levasseur stated correct so you would be asking a negative question. You would be saying do you want to reverse these?

City Clerk Normand replied no what I am saying is we can present those same sections if that is what your objective is.

Alderman Levasseur asked so the ones that were part of the 1996 charter.

City Clerk Normand answered these were part of what we will refer to as the Wihby amendment that went to the ballot in 2001.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much of a change was that.

City Clerk Normand responded they were minor change where they literally are referring to the school district as a department.

Alderman Levasseur stated I think we should know the difference between the 1996 charter and the 1997 charter. If they just came out and said do you approve of making the school department a district of the city, if it just said that then there were no amendments or changes or anything. I don't know how the question was posed in 1997.

City Clerk Normand stated if I can just read the first amendment that was on the ballot, you will understand what I am saying. This was pursuant to Section 4.01 that read "The City of Manchester, a municipal corporation, shall continue to constitute a single school district administered by the Board of School Committee as a department of the city." That was added. This is literally how this section would read "wherever the charter refers to the school district, school district shall also mean school department. Except where otherwise provided in this charter, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and school committee shall continue to exercise such power in relation thereto as the respective bodies exercise at the time of adoption of this charter." That is a minor change and I would even say it might be still ambiguous on what it is doing there. It allows you to call it a department.

Chairman Long asked as far as the mayor's job, are there any details about that.

City Clerk Normand stated the mayor currently has the ability to dictate budget directives to the school district just as he does with all the departments. That didn't change in any amendment. He has that authority today. Could it be clearer? I am sure it could be clearer to avoid confusion but that power exists today. As for the line item detail that Aldermen Levasseur and Thomas are looking for, I think the state statutes might have something to say on that. I think Emily will be able to weigh in on that at the Board meeting on 6/3.

Alderman Levasseur stated this is a question for Solicitor Rice and this isn't something I need an answer on now unless you happen to know. I would like to have an amendment added to whatever we end up passing as a Board that the mayor have veto power on the school board. I don't know if there is a state law that says they can't. If they can't because it is a state law then that is fine but if it doesn't say anything about that, I would like to see them mayor have veto power the same as he has here on our Board and it could be overridden by 10 votes. If that is something we can look at, I would appreciate it.

Chairman Long stated also the question on the mayor being a member of that BOSC so he has a vote and would have veto power and is that okay. I would like to see the details of what it looked like in 1996 and what happened when they changed it and then went to change it back after a couple of years. I would be interested in that information.

Alderman Fajardo stated so in 1996 it was a department and then in 1997 it was voted to be a district and then this David Wihby amendment in 2001 was attempting to bring it back to a department and it didn't pass.

Alderman Levasseur replied correct and it did pass.

Alderman Fajardo asked so how did it get back to a district.

Alderman Levasseur stated what happened was it passed but it was found that the City of Manchester did not have the legal authority to put it on the ballot without special legislation from the state. In 2003, a couple of Manchester aldermen went up and got the legislation changed so that Manchester got an exception to be able to make those changes. It was reversed by the Superior Court in Manchester and then it went up to the Supreme Court where they codified it as law. You can't make these changes unless you have a special exception which we do in Manchester to be able to put this on the ballot and change it back to a department so it can pass legal muster. That is why we are able to at least try this. This has been attempted a couple of different times. One time I thought it did pass and we got to a public hearing and it didn't go forward. We have come very close to letting the voters decide and putting this to rest because it did pass that first time but we never got another try.

Chairman Long stated to wrap up, we are looking for more detail from 1996 and I think it would be good to make sure...from what I am hearing it is a transparency and budgetary issue. Statutorily, what is it that the aldermen could have purview to that currently the BOSC has? Is there anything else?

Mayor Ruais stated if I could add one more thing, I think it was brought up earlier but what are the state statutes that govern what it is. If we do go forward with this and put it on the ballot, I want to make sure that the city is protected as well and we are not going to do something that is going to end up in a lawsuit. I would like to know what those relevant state statutes are to make sure that we are clearly defining what we are asking to do for the voter.

Chairman Long responded exactly. If we can get the state statutes, we can look at them and say here is our goal but this statute is stopping us from meeting that goal so what do we do.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't believe that the state statutes would allow the aldermen to be able to have any power over that school district.

Mayor Ruais replied I think you are right on that.

Alderman Levasseur stated the school district has its own elected board. This is solely for the mayor. The mayor is the only one that might have a little more power and that is what this is about.

Chairman Long asked and that is pertaining to financial stuff.

Alderman Levasseur answered yes.

Chairman Long asked Solicitor Rice do you understand what we are asking for.

Solicitor Rice answered I do but I have one question. Given the specifics that have been articulated here tonight, if we do come up with proposed amendments that accomplish all of those objectives but do not specify that the school district is a department, is that an option that you want to see?

Chairman Long responded that would be a decision of the Board. Present us with what you have and then it would be up to the Board as far as where they want to go and what hoops we may or may not have to jump through. My understanding is that today's discussion was giving the mayor more oversight of budgetary items. With respect to that, how can we do that?

City Clerk Normand stated we will report that directly to the BMA on June 3.

Alderman Levasseur stated can we move my motion.

Chairman Long stated I am not voting on something that I don't know what it means.

City Clerk Normand stated as I understand it, the motion is to direct staff to come to the full Board with the items as Solicitor Rice outlined.

Chairman Long called for a vote. *There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman E. Sapienza**, duly seconded by **Alderman Levasseur**, 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.

Clerk of Committee

TABLED ITEM

2. Conflict of Interest proposal submitted by Alderman Ross Terrio.

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business, on motion of

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.

Clerk of Committee