

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

May 6, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Mayor Ruais called the meeting to order.

Mayor Ruais called on Alderman Barry to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

A moment of silence was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Morgan, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, Kantor, O'Neil, Levasseur, Terrio, E. Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Vincent, Thomas

Mayor Ruais stated I have three recognitions that I would like to lead off with this evening; three Resolutions. Could I please have the Urban Ponds Restoration Program members please come forward? We have Jen Drociak, Director Clougherty, Rob Robinson of EPD, Ben Lundsted of EPD and Mark Gomez of Parks & Recreation.

The City of Manchester. A Resolution.

WHEREAS the Manchester Urban Ponds Restoration Program was born from the idea of returning the city's ponds to their historical uses such as boating, fishing and swimming and celebrates its 25th Anniversary in 2025, and

WHEREAS the program has fostered a strong partnership with over 1,000 volunteers coordinating 120 clean-ups and water quality monitoring efforts at multiple ponds including Black Brook, Crystal Lake, Dorrs Pond, Nutts Pond, Pine Island Pond and Stevens Pond contributing to the ongoing health of these water bodies, and

WHEREAS 1,452 volunteers have collectively spent over 4,460 hours removing 3,033 bags of trash and numerous illegally dumped items including 469 tires, 118 shopping carts and other debris, and

WHEREAS the program continues to thrive with the support of a dedicated volunteer coordinator and through key initiatives such as educational kiosks, annual newsletters and social media engagement insuring the programs impact remains strong, and

WHEREAS the program has received an EPA Environmental Merit Award and a Volunteer NH Spirit of NH Award,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Jay P. Ruais, Mayor of Manchester and Board of Aldermen do hereby recognize and commend the Manchester Urban Ponds Restoration Program for its outstanding contributions to environmental stewardship, its continued success and engagement in the community, and its volunteers invaluable service to the City of Manchester.

Mayor Ruais stated for our second recognition this evening, we will also be recognizing the Queen City Bicycle Collective under celebration of their 10th year of keeping Manchester moving. Please come forward. Each year, QC Bike proudly serves approximately 1,450 residents in the Manchester area by providing access to bicycles, repair services, hands-on learning opportunities and community-focused events. Every participant helps advance QC Bike's vision of a sustained, empowered and connected community. QC Bike's open shop invites individuals to repair their bicycles using the organization's tools and guidance at minimal cost. The organization also refurbishes and sells donated bicycles at affordable prices promoting sustainability through repurposing and recycling. Through its voucher programs, QC Bike distributes free or deeply discounted bike packages, including a bicycle, helmet, lights and lock to eligible recipients in collaboration with local partner organizations. The largest and long running of these initiatives is the Earn a Bike Be Active Program which fosters leadership skills and encourages active lifestyles among 4th grade students at Beech Street and Gossler Park Elementary Schools. As part of its community outreach, QC Bike works to build a vibrant cycling culture in Manchester. These efforts include hosting group rides and providing bicycle valet services at local events. QC Bike also hosts the annual Tour of Manchester, a city-wide ride that celebrates the Queen City and brings the community together through cycling. Each year, the organization repurposes or recycles hundreds of donated bicycles giving them new life through refurbishment, salvaging parts or redistribution. Congrats on 10 years and thank you for all you do in our community. We appreciate it.

Mayor Ruais stated we have a very, very special guest this evening. Will Cynthia and Zariana please come up? Cynthia is the mother to Zariana and Cynthia had sent an email to Alderman Barry requesting the establishment of Epidermolytic Ichthyosis Awareness Day here in the City of Manchester. She wrote that "this is an initiative that is especially important to me as my seven-year-old daughter, Zariana, was born with epidermolytic ichthyosis." Her condition brings some daily challenges including some

skin scaling and blistering and that has led to some difficulties but when Zariana came into my office with Alderman Barry, both he and I were blown away by her courage and your courage, Cynthia, and your commitment to raising awareness and by your deep love for each other and wanting to progress further in your life and make everyone aware of this disease. I have a resolution and a proclamation.

City of Manchester. Resolution.

WHEREAS Epidermolytic Ichthyosis is a genetic skin condition that affects approximately one in every 300,000 births making it extremely rare and often misunderstood, and

WHEREAS this is a lifelong condition that can cause skin to be fragile, prone to blistering and painful, and

WHEREAS Manchester resident Zariana who is a bright kind-hearted seven-year-old girl was born with EI and has endured care her entire life but through it all has maintained a positive attitude and outlook on life, and

WHEREAS increasing the visibility of EI can help connect families with rare disease networks, medical resources and advocacy support,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Jay P. Ruais, Mayor of Manchester and the Board of Aldermen hereby recognize May 6, 2025 as Epidermolytic Ichthyosis Awareness Day in the City of Manchester with the goal of promoting equity in medical and community support for this rare disease giving the City of Manchester the opportunity to be a model of compassion, leadership and change.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Ruais 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 must sign up with their name, address and topic prior to 7 PM. Once called, they will have up to three minutes to speak and any comments must be directed to the chair and concluded when their time is up. If the Clerk calls their name and they are not present to speak, they will not be given a second opportunity. Any resident wishing to speak will come forward to the nearest microphone, clearly state their name and address when recognized and give their comments.

MacKenzie Verdiner, 539 Silver Street, stated:

Tonight I am speaking for the students from Young Organizers United. They wanted to be here tonight but are studying for exams so I am here speaking on their behalf. They are worried and scared and confused regarding the budget. As we know, we all remember what happened on 4/15. We are getting rid of teachers through attrition and not through lay-offs. Okay great but what happens when the teacher who runs my favorite club or my favorite sport leaves? Well that club won't run anymore. Okay great What about the bathrooms? What is going to be done by that? Well the level of cleaning will be reduced so the three bathrooms that are closed at West High School may or may not get cleaned. Okay great. Our students' biggest concerns revolve around the cleanliness of the facilities and the engagement; the more than two things that are on the chopping block. Those are the main things that the students wanted to express to you. Now, this is what I have to say. If the district were to become a city department like what I saw proposed at the last meeting, what are you going to do to make sure that the students are being heard? If it was up to you, how would you make sure that the students' choices are being considered when you are making these decisions? So far, the only aldermen who have taken the time to meet with the students are Pat Long and Ross Terrio. They have taken the time to explain the nuances of the budget process. Contrary to popular belief, there is no one here who indoctrinated our children. I am the one who runs the program – MacKenzie Verdiner. I am the coordinator for YOU. That is my paid position. I only know so much. I graduated high school last year and only know what I have been taught and no one has taught me anything so what are you going to do to teach me and the rest of the students as to what is going on in our city. We are begging to know and we want to be as involved and engaged as possible. The other thing I have to say, which I said in my original testimony, is it may not be increasing the tax cap but if the school district were to become a department of the city then how we can use other city resources to make sure that the needs of our students are met. That is something to think about. Thank you for your time.

Deb Roux, 97 Springwood Street, stated:

I wasn't here at the last meeting about the budget so I just wanted to voice my overall concern. I did send you all an email to look at as well. I am asking you to instead of

just going ahead and raising taxes and putting more money into the school budget like the woman was saying before, I think it would behoove us all to go in and look deeper as to where our money is going, how it is being spent, what is being taught to our kids and how they are being taught because what I found online is that our students are still in the bottom of the 50th percentile for reading and math. It is 28% reading and 16% math. The budget from what I saw from 2024 to 2025 was \$227 million. That is an awful lot of money. I can't even fathom that amount. I am just asking you guys to really look into it and see what can be done to kind of save costs or use the money in better ways and find out why our kids aren't learning what they are supposed to be learning. My favorite book that I keep sharing with you guys, the Monument to the Forefathers Guidebook, I just wanted to quickly read what they did back in the day. "The Education of Children. There were no formal schools in the early years of Plymouth colony and children were educated primarily at home or with members of another family. The family unit acted as a school as each child's education began at the mother's knee and often ended in the cornfield or barn by the father's side. Following the wisdom of Scripture, the Pilgrims believed the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge (Proverbs 1:7). They accepted their God given roles as parents to instill moral virtues in their children and impart practical skills that would enable them to be self-sufficient as they grew older. In the early 17th century, one of the most widely read books on parenting was called "A Godly Form of Household Government". This popular guide captured the goal of Pilgrim parents to instruct their children in the principles of religion, good manners and civil behavior, to instill in them reverence for their elders and superiors to bring them up in some lawful and gainful calling, to teach them to read and write for both worldly and spiritual ends. For the Pilgrims, the greatest aim of literacy was to enable their children to read so they could understand and interpret Scripture for themselves. Gathered around the family bible, parents would help a child sound out letters and syllables phonetically – reciting passages of Scriptures out loud until the connection between the oral and written words eventually were understood. Even young children were included in family devotions and grew up hearing rich stories and moral lessons of Scripture. Together, as a family, the Bible was read and recited, quoted and consulted, committed to memory and constantly searched for meaning each day in the home. The process of instilling literacy, morals and manners into children were incorporated into the daily routines of life. Armed with love and discipline, Colonial mothers often

achieved more than our modern-day elementary schools with their federally-funded programs and educational specialists. These Colonial mothers used simple time-tested methods in instruction mixed with plain, old-fashioned hard work.” I thought that may be something we want to consider as we make our decisions as well. Thank you.

Kathleen Carswell, 385 Amherst Street, stated:

I am back again. I took the winter off hoping that it would be my last time to have to come down here but apparently not. Unfortunately, I have quite a few issues. Mayor, I asked back in July of last year if I could come and meet with you for at least half an hour. I still haven't gotten a phone call, text message or anything. It took me three and a half years to get Mayor Craig to sit down and that was because I had three shootings in my neighborhood. To me, that was unacceptable. I am begging. I have some ideas for the city that maybe you could at least listen to and hear. The other issue I have is I speak for quite a few elderly people in my neighborhood because I have lived there now for 35-40 years. I grew up three streets over so basically 63 years I have lived in Manchester out of my 65. The question that is brought to me a lot concerns the safety in our neighborhood. I call Parking and I get excellent help. I also get excellent help from the Highway Department. Very poor help from the Police Department unless it is something exciting and they will show up. Otherwise, we get no help. I am not asking for them to come with lights and sirens for a parking ticket. We do have parking issues. The Parking Department told us that if we have issues after their hours to please call the Police Department on the non-emergency line and let them know that there is an issue. It is never addressed. They drive right by. I can't tell you how many police officers I have seen go by. I don't know if they don't want to write tickets or what the issue is but that should be addressed also. I would like to be able to give some of my neighbors some good news. Also, we have an increase of homeless up in my neighborhood which we never used to. I usually have the ladies of the evening I will call them because I am getting old. I had that issue. It took me 25 years to move them two blocks. They stayed away and now we have the problems with the drugs and the homeless. I get spit on and sworn at and pushed. I get things thrown at me. I have been told to go blank myself and I have asked them politely to leave. What more can I do? We need some help and we need to get some things addressed. It is very important in my neighborhood. Also, briefly if we can get Hunt's Pool redone and back

up and brand-new...Mayor Craig promised that when she was in office to me personally. She said she was going to have Hunt's Pool redone for the inner city. We do not have that done yet. We have a splash pad. That is not acceptable and shouldn't be acceptable for a city our size. Thank you.

Mark Hayward, 302 Prospect Street, stated:

I want to start by thanking you for being aldermen and mayor. There are a lot of responsibilities you take on. I am here to talk about Rule 3 in your rules for these meetings. That is one responsibility you don't have to take on, which is speech police. Now you might say that is part of my job and I signed up for it. If you think that, Rule 3 is the wrong way to go about it. Terms like profanity, vulgarity, and civil language are vague and ambiguous and open to interpretation. What is profane? The F word? I think we can all say that is. Probably GD but then there is a lot of gray. Let me give you some examples. A person who talks here on a regular basis comes up here and his first name could qualify as a profanity. A few months ago, another guy who speaks here, Glenn, was up here and I remember because I was here and he used the word pooh. He was describing what was coming out of his sewer pipes into his sink. Now what if he had used...Glenn is a stand-up guy but what if he used the CR word or the SH word. You would shut him down right? You would be saying hey gutter language is more important than gutter borne diseases. Let me give you another possibly hypothetical. Someone comes in and he just praises DPW and says they are a damn good bunch of guys who work hard and the city streets are in great shape and he can't say enough about them. Then two weeks later someone else comes in and says the exact opposite – they are lazy, they are incompetent, they are corrupt and he uses slurs and profanities and you shut him down. Well that is a problem because both are political speech and both are commenting on a city function but you are allowing complimentary speech and censoring critical speech. If you pass the committee's recommendations for Rule 3, I think any profanity or vulgarities will be rare. Most Manchester people are respectful like the people who have come up tonight. They honor this place. They model your good behavior and I would encourage you in your introduction to encourage civil language and civil speech. What if the worst happens and someone starts rambling and swearing and saying terrible stuff? Well the mayor can still ask him to stop. I wouldn't be against you turning off the TV feed. If the person

continues on and on then he can be removed and actions can be taken. We at the New England First Amendment Coalition encourage you to adopt the changes recommended by the Committee on Administration/Information Systems. Thank you.

Stan Garrity, Parkview Street, stated:

I would like to talk about the idea of putting bike lanes on Pine Street. I think it is a great idea. I use Pine Street just about every day. I use the bike lanes all the time and all of my biking friends use the bike lanes. I ride in the bike lanes. We feel safer with the bike lanes there. The streets look much neater with them and much more organized. Everybody should know where they are supposed to be. Scooters are using them. I hope we can fix that on Pine Street. I think it will slow down traffic too. As far as the buffer zone, that came about, believe it or not I actually remember when that came about. The bike lanes didn't have the buffer zone when they first came out. The buffer zone came out because of a bike accident at UNH. The bike lanes were only a few days old and a professor was riding a bike and someone opened their door and he got killed. That is why you have a 2' or 3' buffer lane. It is important to put that in. It is safer all around and I hope you all consider a bike lane on Pine Street. Thank you.

Julie Turner, 285 Ray Street, stated:

Tonight I would like to remind everyone that Manchester school district is the most diverse district in the state and has historically been one of the lowest funded on a per pupil basis. That is still the case today despite increased appropriations from the state. Additionally, our city schools are home to 60 different languages and some of the most unique student needs in the state. Specifically, we have a special education population that makes up 23% of our student body and a multi-lingual learner population that makes up 20%. Remember, our city is obligated to provide a free and adequate public education for all students, including those with extraordinary challenges and expenses. It is difficult to do that with the mayor's proposed budget for the district with a \$9.5 million decrease for our city schools and what was unanimously voted upon at the Board of School Committee for FY26. I implore you all tonight to reconsider the proposed allocation for the district. Please allow the 4.27% increase in tax revenue, allowable by the tax cap, instead of the mayor's suggested 0.85% and appropriate a complete and fair budget to the district. Please consider funding the budget in the full

amount of \$246 million. A few weeks ago, I worked on numbers independently and passed along some of those thoughts as starting points for discussion among some of you. I appreciate the time that some of you took to consider those numbers and ask the important questions. With those figures, I suggested that in your discussions you consider allowing the district to retain around \$5 million above what the mayor's budget suggested allowing the Manchester school district to include in its budget the following: \$90,090 to continue the growth of our athletic programs, \$1,633,000 to retain 25.5 teaching positions of the 38 that will collapse under attrition, and \$481,834 to keep four district level positions. The Manchester school district is actually already under staffed for a district our size as most departments are a department of one at the district level. Also, \$342,000 in transportation that would allow keeping a 1.4 mile walking radius and not charging for high school students to pay and ride the bus. Then a \$3 million retention in our rainy day fund/trust funds to maintain suggested amounts recommended by our auditor. I want you to remember the 60 people that came here to speak two weeks ago in favor of a better, stronger budget for the school district and I want you to imagine if you can a student returning here in five, six or seven years to thank you for their successes in our city schools because of a budget you fully funded, not in spite of a budget. Thank you.

Greg Sullivan, 240 Bedford Street, stated:

I currently serve as President of the New England First Amendment Coalition. Mark Hayward has already spoken. Mark is a member of our NH committee. Our organization is comprised of journalists, attorneys, academics, activists and people who just love the first amendment. It is the opinion of the New England First Amendment Coalition that your current Rule 3 is not constitutional. I will say that here in NH the constitution protects free speech in an even stronger fashion than does the first amendment. Our free speech is sacrosanct. The Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Texas v. Johnson and I wrote this in a letter to you all on April 15 said that if there is a bedrock principle underlying the first amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable. Simply put, the first amendment protects the speech that we hate and I can give you examples from across the country and from the Supreme Court where there is vulgarity that has been protected. We certainly as a coalition don't

condone it. We hope that it is never a problem for this Board or the Mayor but to me it is a matter of constitutional law. The government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society or the government finds that idea or that speech offensive or disagreeable. I would suggest that NEFAC's recommended language, which starts off saying speakers are encouraged to be civil in their language and presentation, is a constitutional rule that still gives this Board as Mr. Hayward said the ability to remove a person whose conduct is disorderly for example but not because of a word that the use. The woman who spoke earlier said that people have told her to blank herself or blank off. That is respectful and that is what we hope the citizens of Manchester will continue to be but as currently standing, Rule 3 will not pass constitutional muster. Thank you all.

Daniel Pi, 26 Thistle Drive, stated:

I am a law professor at the University of New Hampshire. I teach constitutional law and I am speaking in favor of the amendment to Rule 3. So my expert opinion is that the rule as it currently is written is unconstitutional. It is true that this is what is called a limited public forum which gives you some latitude to control the speech that is expressed here but it still requires a legitimate government purpose and a blanket ban on profanity and vulgarity and incivility most likely exceeds that. It is difficult being a constitutional law professor these days because everybody is asking me to predict what we do and that is always an exercise. I am fairly confident that if this rule were tested it would be found unconstitutional by the federal courts. Quite apart from whether or not something is unconstitutional, I think the first amendment is more than just a rule of how to make laws and what laws states are permitted to make. It expresses something more fundamental. It is something about the spirit of the country and the idea that we value freedom and in particular, the freedom of expression. Even if it were that the rule could survive constitutional scrutiny, you should still amend the law because it is in the spirit of an open, liberal democracy where speech is welcomed that we should invite the kinds of speech that we find offensive or that we find problematic. It is interesting to me that when I teach the first amendment in classrooms, a lot of times my students will say well I believe in free speech and I very much believe in free speech but within limits. It always strikes me as being somewhat ironic that they don't see the dissidence in saying there is a limit to it. This is an easy vote for you I think. I recognize that you are faced

with a lot of very difficult problems and budgets where you can't make the numbers square but this doesn't cost anything. It is very easy to vote in favor of the constitution and in favor of freedom and against arbitrary, prudish reservations about what people say. It seems to me that you can still retain control to maintain order and decorum here and the proceedings might be a little more entertaining if you allow a little bit of vulgarity. Thank you very much. I urge you to vote in favor of the amendment.

Chris Potter, 470 Silver Street, stated:

I understand you guys have on the agenda tonight the contracts on the city side. It is going to be a significant increase in spending and I get it. You guys have inflation the same as we do on the school district side. Labor, insurance and utilities are all up due to inflation. The budget we sent you of \$246 million doesn't include everything we need. It is very important that we get a second social worker at all of the middle schools for example but we can't do it. We don't have unlimited money. We are asking the people to pay into our schools. We are doing everything we can under the tax cap to give our students the best education we can. We have reduced class sizes. We got a major federal grant for behavioral health that addresses bullying. We have updated our curriculum and supported it with professional development. We have brought the transit in-house. You see the results. Test scores are up. Sports participation is up. Graduation is up. We have to let Dr. Chmiel do her job with the resources the team needs to educate our kids well. We have a great superintendent and great teachers. We have to give them the resources to actually educate the students. The mayor's budget would have made kids walk, cancelled middle school sports and I understand that enough of you are willing to support a little more for schools and that is good but I want to say even if you were to give us half of our allocation and not the other half, it means we can leave transit and athletics alone. We still have to make up the gap somewhere by either reducing the cleaning level in the schools or making teachers buy their own supplies or using one-time funds and going under 10% of our budget in rainy day funds. Or we have teacher and district reductions. Every \$1 million that you either give us or don't give us is equal to the salary for 17 teachers. Every little bit makes a difference. Like MacKenzie said, I want the teacher of her extracurriculars to be back next year because if that teacher isn't, there is no replacement unless you fund the schools. Thank you.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

Accept BMA Minutes

2. Minutes from the following meetings:
 - March 27 Special BMA
 - April 1 Special BMA & BMA
 - April 8 Special BMA
 - April 15 Special BMA, BMA & Finance

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

3. 50/50 Sidewalk Petitions
Residential:
24 Paquette Street
96 A Street
560 Ray Street
601 Hall Street
1111 Somerville Street
1178 Union Street

Information to be Received and Filed

4. Communication from Comcast advising of its updated mailing address, and providing notice of changes to channels.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT AND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION

5. Advising that the update on the Revolving Loan Fund has been accepted.
(*Unanimous vote*)
6. Advising that the following Finance Department reports:
 - Accounts receivable over 90 days
 - Aging report
 - Outstanding receivableshave been accepted.
(*Unanimous vote*)

7. Recommending that the request from the Finance Department for authorization to write off the identified third quarter receivables be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
8. Advising that the Monthly Financial Report (unaudited) for the first nine months of fiscal year 2025 has been accepted.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

10. Recommending that the proposed charter amendment to change the Municipal Primary Election to the fourth Tuesday in June in each odd-numbered year, with corresponding changes to the filing period and posting notice sections of the charter be approved and that the City Clerk be authorized to schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendment.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Thomas who was absent)

*HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF **ALDERMAN O'NEIL**,
DULY SECONDED BY **ALDERMAN TERRIO**, THE CONSENT AGENDA WAS
APPROVED.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

9. Recommending that the request from Fuss & O'Neil on behalf of Brady Sullivan for an air rights lease to install building canopies on its proposed project at 1555 Elm Street be approved upon the condition that the agreement includes revocable language.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Thomas who was absent)

Alderman Long stated I know that the Solicitor reached out to their attorney to revise the agreement. They haven't responded yet so I would *move to table* this.

Mayor Ruais asked do we have an idea of when they will come back.

Emily Rice, Solicitor, answered I know that we have been in communication with them but I am not sure what their timeline is. I think everybody is trying to get this done but I don't know.

Alderman Fajardo duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

11. Recommending that the suggested revisions from the New England First Amendment Coalition regarding the Board of Mayor and Aldermen's Rule 3 (Public Participation) be approved.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman E. Sapienza who was opposed and Alderman Thomas who was absent)

Alderman E. Sapienza moved to receive and file. **Alderman Terrio** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Terrio stated we just heard from a few members of the public who support the change. One, I would say that we don't stop anybody from saying anything. I have heard mentally ill people talk about numbers and predicting the future. We have heard people talk about...people can come here and talk about anything they want. We don't stop any type of speech. Also, we allow banners. We just don't allow them to block anyone's view. Now, I did send out the case FCC v. Pacifica Foundation, a U.S. Supreme Court case that I believe is still good law from 1978. Although not exactly on point, what it said is that George Carlin's seven dirty words skit where one of them was the F word, one was the C word and one of them was the MF word, that the FCC could restrict the broadcast of these words. I would point out two things. One, our meetings are broadcast to the City of Manchester and beyond. You can also watch on the computer and I routinely watch meetings on the computer. It is going into people's houses just like in the FCC case. Secondly, we routinely have young children here. Tonight, we had a seven-year-old girl. We shouldn't be dropping F words. If you can't express your ideas, and we routinely do this all the time as members of the public without swearing. If you can't express yourself without swearing, then you have a problem with you. I think our current rule is fine and again, we routinely have school children here from different sports teams or different schools and we shouldn't be allowing vulgarities. There is some law and I know I sent it to Atty. Rice and Atty. Chiesa but I believe we do have the power to restrict because we are broadcasting and we have children here and ask people to not use vulgarities. I think our current rule that when we first came on the Board in January 2024 we worked on, is serving us fine and we don't need to change it.

Alderman Long stated so the members of the public that spoke were experts in the field and I am going to take their recommendation. Personally, whether someone uses vulgarity when children are here is going to happen no matter what the rule is. They are just going to use it and we are going to do whatever we are going to do. I would rather suggest to people that they not do that. Instead of saying shall I would rather just suggest it to them.

Alderman Terrio responded I respect your opinion but asking people has no teeth whatsoever. I won't belabor the point.

Alderman Kantor stated I just wanted to question our state reps about this. How do they do it in Concord because when I have gone up to testify, everything has been...it might be passionate but it is always respectful and I didn't feel in fear when I was there talking about hot topics. In January, February and March of last year it was awful. They were singing the song of the Palestinians. It was just too much. I am curious on how we are compared to Concord and what the verbiage is. Do you know what I am saying? I didn't see anyone act that way.

Alderman Long stated I have been there for nine terms and I have never heard any vulgar language. There is no rule that says you can't though. I have just never heard it.

Mayor Ruais stated as we all remember, we had a number of meetings last year where there was significant disruption repeatedly over the course of multiple meetings. At the request of some of the members here, including Alderman Kantor who is passionate about this as well, I asked the Solicitor and the Clerk to do a review of all the rules around the state. That included Concord as well which is where we got the changes to the banner. I think the changes we made last year were prudent. I think they were appropriate. I don't think we need to change them. I think they pass constitutional muster. Those are the conversations I had with the Solicitor and the Clerk. I would support the motion to receive and file.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated whether it is constitutional or not, it is a bad look for us to limit people's speech. If someone wants to come here and use profanity, they are going to look like a knucklehead. That is the penalty they are going to pay. I have been here for 10 years and you are the third mayor I have served under. Every single mayor from either party has had people come up and say all kinds of nasty things to them. That is part of the job. They come and say nasty things and then they go away. All of the sudden we have to have this big reaction because some people came here and expressed themselves? I just think it is outrageous. I thought it was outrageous when we changed the rule and I think that limiting speech is crazy. This is America the last I knew.

Alderman Kantor stated I believe in freedom of speech but everyone deserves to feel safe. It is just insanity. My Jewish friends did not feel safe coming here last year. They couldn't come and voice their concerns. This is real and this is not okay and I am sticking with leaving it the way it is. I just wanted to say thank you.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. Alderman Long requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, O'Neil, Levasseur, Burkush, Barry and Goonan voted nay. Aldermen Kantor, Terrio, E. Sapienza, Vincent, Thomas and Morgan voted yea. The motion failed.

Alderman Long moved to accept the report and adopt its recommendation. **Alderman T. Sapienza** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. Alderman E. Sapienza requested a roll call vote. Aldermen E. Sapienza, Vincent, Thomas, Morgan, Kantor and Terrio voted nay. Aldermen Burkush, Barry, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, O'Neil and Levasseur voted yea. The motion carried.

REGULAR BUSINESS

12. Nominations:
Heritage Commission
Kaleigh Shaughnessy moving from an alternate to a full member, term to expire July 1, 2028
Darryl Johnston to succeed Kaleigh Shaughnessy as an alternate member, term to expire July 1, 2027

Housing Commission

Joe Wichert to succeed himself, term to expire January 1, 2026

Kate Marquis to succeed herself, term to expire January 1, 2027

Jessica Margeson to succeed herself, term to expire January 1, 2027

Brian Cole as a regular member, term to expire January 1, 2028

Richard Clegg as a regular member, term to expire January 1, 2028

Joede Brown to succeed herself as an alternate member, term to expire January 1, 2026

Planning Board

John Wichert to succeed Christopher Wellington, term to expire May 1, 2028

Peter Winslow as an alternate member, term to expire May 1, 2026

(Note: Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, these nominations will layover until the next meeting of the Board.)

13. Communication from Alderman Goonan nominating Patrick Arnold for a second term to the Manchester Transit Authority, term to expire May 1, 2030.
(Note: Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, this nomination will layover to the next meeting of the Board.)

14. Confirmations:

Board of Registrars

Elizabeth Wester to succeed herself as a regular member, term to expire May 1, 2028

Manchester Public Television Services Board

Andrew Fromuth to succeed TJ Craig as a regular member, term to expire July 1, 2026

Planning Board

Peter J. Lennon moving from an alternate to a regular member replacing Erin George Kelly, term to expire May 1, 2028

Alderman Vincent moved to confirm the nominations. Alderman Terrio duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Fajardo stated I just want to go on record to say that I am very disappointed to see your decision to move another Vice Chair off of the Planning Board. That is two Vice Chairs in about 18 months. I recognize that that is your prerogative and it is any mayor's prerogative to put forward whomever they would like for nominations. I guess in this case I am just disappointed that we weren't able to have the discussion about it that you said you were open to.

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

- 15.** Communication from Phil Croasdale, Water Works Director, requesting approval of a contract including indemnity clauses with Lavallee Brensinger, PLLC for architectural and engineering services to design the new Water Works Administration and Distribution Facilities.

Alderman Barry moved to approve the contract. **Alderman Burkush** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur asked will this come back in front of the full Board so we know the price. If you are going to do the architectural and engineering services, then you must know what the cost is going to be.

Phil Croasdale, Water Works Director, responded this is for the design and then we will be back when we get to about 60% of the design and know what the cost will be. We will come back to the Board to get bonding approved and so on.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much is the cost for the design.

Mr. Croasdale answered a little over \$1 million.

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

- 16.** Tentative Agreements between the City and:
- AFSCME - Central Fleet
 - AFSCME - Facilities
 - AFSCME - Health
 - AFSCME - Highway, Parks & Recreation, EPD
 - IAFF 856 - Fire
 - MAFS 3820 - Fire Supervisors
 - PPSA - Police
 - Teamsters - Airport
 - Teamsters - Library
 - Teamsters - Welfare

Alderman Long moved to suspend Rule 29, Labor Contract Ratification, and ratify the tentative agreements this evening. **Alderman O'Neil** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked what exactly are we doing at this point. Are we just suspending the rules and not ratifying any of these contracts yet?

Mayor Ruais answered we would suspend the rules in order to ratify.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so that is the next step.

Mayor Ruais stated we can handle it in one vote or if you prefer we can break it up. This would be to suspend the rules and ratify.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I would rather we do them one at a time. I have some questions. It is too much at once.

Mayor Ruais stated I don't have a problem breaking it up.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated okay. I have at least one question and I am guessing someone else may have some questions.

Mayor Ruais stated I am more than happy to break it up. Does anyone have any questions?

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I have a question about 11.11 on the Firefighter's TA. Can we have Chief Cashin come up please? I will read it really quick so everyone knows what we are talking about. It says "members deployed by the Manchester Fire Department locally, regionally or nationally shall be paid at time and one half their hourly rate for hours worked while on deployment. Deployed members shall be selected by the Fire Chief or designee." It sounds a bit vague to me. Can you go ahead and clarify that?

Ryan Cashin, Fire Chief, replied this article has to do with deployments for either FEMA or EMAC. Those deployments could be locally obviously if there was a disaster or nationally like when we were previously deployed to North Carolina. These

deployments are reimbursed to the city. There is no cost to the city for these deployments. This article cleans up an MOU that we previously had with the local.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated just let me play devil's advocate for a second here. If it pertains to FEMA then FEMA should probably be in there. What I am trying to prevent is somebody maybe a year down the road from now taking a look at this and saying we deployed to Vermont. We had some down time and all of the sudden we were deployed to Vermont and we want time and a half.

Chief Cashin responded nobody can deploy without my permission.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated let me ask the Solicitor. Is that language sufficient or does it leave the city open?

Emily Rice, Solicitor, answered you should probably ask Atty. Upton.

Matt Upton stated we actually chose the word deployment for a specific purpose because it has legal significance. It is different than like a mutual aid call where we are just called for assistance.

Alderman E. Sapienza replied or for that matter being deployed to Hooksett or to Elm Street.

Atty. Upton stated those are mutual aid calls, not deployments. Deployments have a specific...I don't know how to describe it but there is a request made from FEMA and they actually use the term deployment versus mutual aid.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated okay so again I will ask the Solicitor if she has any input on that as far as leaving the city open.

Solicitor Rice answered no. It makes sense based on what the Fire Chief has asked for and what the negotiator has negotiated.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated it seems vague to me but if others feel that it is specific enough and doesn't leave the city vulnerable, I am okay for now. I don't know if anyone else has any questions.

Alderman Barry asked Chief if someone gets deployed, I am kind of cautious now with everything going on nationally with FEMA. Do you pay them in advance or are they paid after you get paid by...for example North Carolina?

Chief Cashin answered we pay firefighters when they are deployed and then we are reimbursed either through the federal government or the state. It depends on the deployment. A FEMA deployment is a little bit different than an EMAC deployment. The EMAC deployment was the last deployment we did for North Carolina. That is a contract from the state of North Carolina with the state of NH and that contract says we will get reimbursed. I understand your concerns. I have had multiple conversations with the Director of Homeland Security and most recently with the new Director of Region I from FEMA. The concerns that you have I spoke to these people about and they tried to allay those concerns. Nothing that I have seen or heard or that they have seen or heard or that they have had conversations about from the federal government is going to affect any responses from emergency personnel. The concerns that the federal government has and is stating publically has to do with recovery efforts, which are after we would deploy in a response. There has been no talk at all from any source that I have seen that they are going to limit funds for life safety measures when we respond to save lives.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is not specifically about the Fire Department. My question is about longevity for all of the bargaining units. When the presentation was first made, the consultant didn't recommend any longevity. That threw a curve at me. I am glad it has been reinstated. Where is the 20-year retention in here? It was reinstated for 15 years.

Atty. Upton replied it is within the salary section. It is in the second section because it doesn't go into effect until the second year of the contracts.

Alderman O'Neil stated okay that is one of my things. Director Drabik and I had a discussion about that. It was a new thing that I heard about.

Atty. Upton asked the 20 year.

Alderman O'Neil answered no. That it wasn't going to be put into action until Year 2. I am going to vote for the contracts but I am concerned. Will anybody get hurt? Matt, you say no but there are people who could get hurt by this. If they planned on retiring in Year 1 of these contracts, they could get hurt because they wouldn't get the step that may be coming to them.

Atty. Upton stated we had extensive discussions about people who were on the cusp of receiving longevity increases under Yarger Decker. This was the compromise that was reached. The number of people I think that would be overall affects was very small compared to the number of people who actually benefitted immensely by the new scale. It is impossible to enact a scale of this magnitude and not have one or two people who do not do as well under the new scale as they would under the old scale. All it really does is delay it by one year. They are still going to end up getting it and many of them are going to get it beforehand because they are going to get it in the second year when they might have had to wait two or three more years to get it.

Alderman O'Neil stated that was new. I don't know where that discussion came from to negotiate that. I don't think it came from here. I had a good talk with Lisa today about it. I am venting a little bit about it. I was hopeful that not one person would get hurt by this. There will be 10-20 that may be hurt by this, either affiliated or non-affiliated.

Atty. Upton responded and they will get it in the second year.

Alderman O'Neil replied right but people many times have specific plans on when they want to retire.

Atty. Upton stated I can also just offer that when the ratification votes occurred, the number of union employees that voted against these contracts was a very small number.

Alderman O'Neil stated I get that but that is not what your instructions were from here to negotiate. Nobody said make sure they get the longevity in the second year. I am venting. I am voting for the contracts. Some people are going to be hurt by it and I just want to go on record with that – both bargaining units and non-affiliated. That was something that I hoped we could have prevented but we didn't.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated it is my understanding that all of the unions ratified these.

Atty. Upton answered that is correct.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked did you just indicate that the unions told you what the vote was.

Atty. Upton replied some of them did.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked and some don't.

Atty. Upton responded with some I am not sure we got into that detailed of a conversation but others...I think the Fire Department had over 200 favorable votes and just a dozen unfavorable votes for instance. Other unions were unanimous. Some had one or two votes against. I think this was a very balanced and fiscally responsible contract for everybody. I think it was a huge undertaking that came together really well.

Alderman O'Neil stated longevity was my issue from day one when the consultant made a presentation because he didn't recommend any. I applaud all sides on this and look forward to voting for it.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I have a comment that is not firefighter specific. I just want to say that we have a time crunch here and that is why we are suspending the

rules. One of the reasons we have a time crunch is because we keep everything so confidential past the time where it really should be. Going forward, once you reach a tentative agreement then it shouldn't be confidential anymore. There is no reason for it. Once it is not confidential, that day or the next day put it out there for everyone to know, including the general public.

Mayor Ruais stated we talked about this and I appreciate that concern. The last one that was ratified was firefighters and on that Monday morning we made them all available. I appreciate your concern.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I don't often agree with the alderman from Ward 8 but on this one I have to agree with him. Once you have a tentative agreement...I recognize during the negotiation process you need some confidentiality but once you have a tentative agreement that is when the public should be clued in so they can chime in. I represent Ward 5. The people in Ward 5 should be able to see these. They didn't get to see them until Friday.

Mayor Ruais responded no 10 days ago. I made everything public 10 days ago. It was on the website and I put out a press release and there was a story written about it with a link to the website to view all 10.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated well 10 days is great but why wasn't it 11 or 9 days.

Mayor Ruais replied because we didn't ratify the last contract until last Monday.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated the point being once a contract has a tentative agreement, that is when it should be public.

Alderman Kantor stated contracts are really important but my big concern is the promotion process because employees matter and the morale of the city matters. I would like to know what your promotion process is. Chief Cashin, how does that work for you within your department? The process from firefighter to Chief?

Mayor Ruais asked is this something that needs to be discussed in non-public.

Solicitor Rice stated as long as the Chief is just going to discuss the system in general, which is what I understand the alderman's question to be, that is fine.

Mayor Ruais stated I just wanted to check.

Chief Cashin stated the promotion process is contractual in the contract. Members will take a test. Every other year we do a test for promotions for lieutenant and captain. They are placed on a list according to how they take that test and score and then promotions are made off the list based on the contract.

Alderman Kantor asked how does the list work. Do you pick from the top to the bottom?

Chief Cashin answered the chief has the discretion to pick from the top five.

Alderman Kantor asked and how do you have people jump. Do you pick from the bottom sometimes?

Chief Cashin replied contractually, I have to pick from the top five.

Alderman Kantor asked you have to pick from the top five.

Chief Cashin answered yes.

Alderman Levasseur asked anyone of the top five.

Chief Cashin responded correct.

Alderman Kantor asked is it just you deciding or a panel of people.

Chief Cashin replied the chief makes the decision on promotions.

Alderman Kantor asked so just one person picks who climbs the ladder.

Chief Cashin answered yes the final decision is made by the chief.

Alderman Burkush stated I am going to abstain from voting on the IAFF 856 contract.

Mayor Ruais *called for a vote on the motion to suspend the rules and ratify the contracts presented. The motion carried with Alderman Burkush abstaining from voting on the IAFF 856 contract.*

Alderman O'Neil asked how are we going to handle the non-affiliated employees. Lisa and I had a brief discussion. Is it with the ordinance changes?

Mayor Ruais replied the ordinances were in Bills on Second Reading earlier this evening.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am not sure that the non-affiliated employees know that that is what is going on. Maybe the Director can just walk through it?

Lisa Drabik, HR Director, stated the changes for the non-affiliated employees will be enshrined in the ordinances which are working their way through the system. Those changes were also encapsulated in the Mayor's budget which he presented. Assuming passage of the budget at some point along with those ordinance changes, it will all move together.

Alderman O'Neil asked open enrollment on health insurance is going on currently correct and that includes the non-affiliated employees.

Ms. Drabik answered yes. We are moving all the trains along the track at the same time.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so in other words in reference to the ordinances, there aren't going to be any snags or any surprises. You said everything is going to move together. Procedurally there is no problem here?

Ms. Drabik responded that is what I am hoping yes.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so there is nothing for this Board to worry about. None of the ordinances are going to stop anything that we have done?

Ms. Drabik replied that would be up to all of you if you raise any objections. We have already previewed them and they have gone before B2R and they are being recommended to the Board tonight to move to the next step and then it is my understanding from the Clerk's Office that the timing would be they could be ordained at the June 3 meeting to be effective July 1. So everything moves together.

Mayor Ruais stated it is going to be reported out from B2R tonight to be sent to the Committee on Accounts for their May 20 meeting and then will report out to the full Board on June 3 and be ordained.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I saw the changes in the packet. That is all of the changes?

Ms. Drabik answered yes.

17. Report(s) of the Committee on Community Improvement, if available.

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the owner of the property located at 232 Conant Street to pay a prorated amount determined by the Planning Department of the HOME Loan recapture provision owed to the city be approved.

Alderman Long moved to accept the report and adopt its recommendation. Alderman Morgan duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Barry asked could we have Jeff Belanger come up. I am concerned about the way this happened. I will let Jeff explain exactly how this came about. My understanding is the person that dealt with this was supposed to live in that property for 15 years. It has been nine years. Can you explain that? I want to check if this is going to set precedent for others coming forward in the future.

Jeff Belanger, Planning & Community Development Director, responded I don't think it sets a precedent. I think each case is different. As the committee heard earlier today, this is pretty unusual. Home ownership in general under this program is unusual. Usually, it is a rental program so the range of potential properties that this could apply to is very narrow. This came up in the way that we write a mortgage for any home ownership property where we would have a list of requirements that are done pursuant to HOME regulations. There is a paragraph in the mortgage that says the buyer hereby acknowledges that they are going to following the following requirements. One of those requirements is that you own the property for 15 years and if you do then you don't have to do this recapture but if you sell before the 15 years expires, you pay the recapture fee which was \$55,000.

Alderman Barry stated this was a \$205,000 house that from my understanding is now being sold for over \$600,000 and he has only been there for 9 years when he was supposed to be there for 15 and we are going to give him a break.

Mr. Belanger replied that is what the committee voted to do.

Alderman Barry stated I'm against it.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked do you know how many other loans like this are in the city.

Mr. Belanger answered I don't off the top of my head. I know it is a small amount but I don't know the total number.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated we may not be setting a precedent and every situation is different but certainly we are going to be inviting every single person that has a loan like

this in here to ask for it. That is number one. Number two is if you owned a house in Manchester in the last nine years, you made a whopping profit. We are giving a guy who made a whopping profit a big break. The third thing is if we were to collect that \$55,000, wouldn't we be able to turn around and use that money again to help somebody else?

Mr. Belanger responded yes. That would be HOME program income so it would go back to the pot of HOME funds that we get that we can then use to pay for any project that qualifies under HOME which is pretty much always affordable housing.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked so is it safe to say that that is money that could be going into our affordable housing but instead we are going to give it to a guy who made a huge profit on a home in the last nine years.

Mr. Belanger replied yes I think that is fair to say.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated that is so important. I have to make sure I understand this. We have a guy who owned a house in Manchester for the last nine years and made a whopper of a profit. We gave him the loan because he said he was going to live there for 15 years. He didn't live there for 15 years and he wants a break. If he paid the loan like he promised in the first place after making a whopper of a profit, we could use that money to help somebody else.

Mr. Belanger stated we are getting the principal payment back of \$200,000...

Alderman T. Sapienza interjected we are not getting the \$55,000. Please don't. The fact is that the number is \$55,000.

Mr. Belanger stated the vote of the committee was to prorate the \$55,000. It is not that the entire \$55,000 goes away. We are getting I believe \$19,500.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked the agreement is \$55,000 right.

Mr. Belanger answered yes the mortgage stated \$55,000 and the HOME regulations permit a municipality to prorate it should they choose to do that.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated right and that is what we are discussing now. I would recommend that we take that \$55,000 and use it to help the next person. If we keep giving everybody a break, sooner or later we run out of money.

Alderman Long stated nine years ago we gave a low income person an opportunity and he did well with that opportunity and now we are going to look down upon that. I am happy for this person. It was a low income person and he happened to hit it right with housing going up. It was a low income person who is now able to get their own house. The program worked. I am okay with the prorating. Again, if we have nine or ten of these and they all come to us to do the same thing, I am going to take them one at a time. They all have the right to do that. I am in favor of this.

Alderman O'Neil stated I share the same concern as some of my colleagues that he really should be paying back the \$55,000. He is selling it for \$680,000. He should be paying back the \$55,000 and not \$19,000. I am going to vote against this.

Alderman Morgan stated I think there is a misunderstanding of this price point. The market value of homes right now is at that level where \$600,000 is the price of selling and buying. He is not making money. He is going to another home and basically has to buy another home at that price. If we sell our homes right now, we are all going to make pretty good money but we have to buy another home for the same price. That is where we are at. He is not making a lot of money. He is just taking what he was able to get at that low income rate when he had nothing and he is building generational wealth for his family. It is a great story even though it looks like he is making a lot of money. He has done some great work. He put \$80,000 to \$100,000 into the building and has been a great steward for the neighborhood. It is a great story overall. While I agree with some of the comments that it looks like he is making a lot of money, he is really not. It is a really good story that NeighborWorks put together.

Mayor Ruais asked he is paying back the principal.

Mr. Belanger answered correct.

Alderman Terrio stated the letter says the house was bought 12 years ago. Some people are saying 9 but the handout says 12.

Mr. Belanger responded I would need to look at it again but I thought it was nine.

Alderman Barry stated it just doesn't make any sense to me. The guy broke the contract. Fifteen years is fifteen years. He decided to move out after nine years. It is great that he is getting \$680,000 for a \$200,000 home even with the upgrades that he brought to the house. Good for him because that brought the value up but he still made an agreement with the City of Manchester for 15 years and he is only doing 9 and it is his choice. It is not our choice that he is leaving the city to purchase another home. Great for him. I am not going to hold that against him but I think he is responsible for that \$55,000.

Mr. Belanger stated I would like to respond to Alderman Terrio's question. The date of the mortgage is August 2015. So nearly 10 years.

Alderman Terrio stated the handout we got at CIP says it was bought...I think maybe what happened is NeighborWorks bought the house 12 years ago, worked on it and sold it a few years later.

Mr. Belanger replied that could be.

Alderman Levasseur asked is capital gains included in that number and that is why he needs that number. If it has increased as much as he says it has, there is going to be a capital gains tax on that. Is that part of the method of why he came up with that number?

Mr. Belanger answered no the \$55,000 is a formula done by the HOME regulations and that was calculated at the time of sale. That number is in the mortgage.

Alderman Levasseur stated if he makes a really big increase, he is still going to have to pay capital gains. You get a \$250,000 deductible if you live there for five years but the increase from that number forward you have to pay.

Mr. Belanger responded but we wouldn't recapture that.

Alderman Levasseur stated no you wouldn't but he has to pay it himself. I am just wondering if that is what was in his mind when he came back with his request. That is a pretty large number to have to pay. You make out but you still have to pay taxes on capital gains. Was this a multi-family?

Mr. Belanger stated from what I understand he is buying a single-family home in Goffstown.

Alderman Levasseur stated okay then it would be a capital gain.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. Alderman Long requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Long, Fajardo, Kantor, Levasseur, Terrio, Morgan and Goonan voted yea. Aldermen T. Sapienza, O'Neil, E. Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Vincent, and Thomas voted nay. Mayor Ruais broke the tie and voted yea. The motion carried.

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$23,493.62 for CIP C300040225 FY24 Hazard Mitigation Grant be approved and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

18. Report(s) of the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance, if available.

There were none.

19. Report(s) of the Committee on Public Safety, Health & Traffic, if available.

There were none.

20. Report(s) of the Committee on Bills on Second Reading, if available.

The Committee on Bills on Second Reading respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Chapter 33: Human Resources of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by making necessary changes related to implementation of the modernized employee compensation plan effective July 1, 2025 and removing or changing applicable obsolete and outdated sections.”

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment and Revenue Administration.

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

21. Budget Resolutions:

“Appropriating to the Parking Fund the sum of \$4,976,749 from parking revenues for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

"Appropriating the sum of \$28,168,194 from Sewer User Rental Charges to the Environmental Protection Division for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$42,884,197 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Appropriating to the Manchester Transit Authority the sum of \$1,999,838 for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$236,499,925 for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Appropriating all Incremental Meals and Rooms Tax Revenue Received by the City in the Fiscal Year 2026 and held in the Civic Center Fund, for the payment of the City’s Obligations in Said Fiscal Year under the Financing Agreement.”

“Appropriating to the Manchester School Food and Nutrition Services Program the sum of \$6,300,000 from School Food and Nutrition Services Revenues for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Raising Monies and Making Appropriations of \$195,751,642 for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Appropriating to the Central Business Service District the sum of \$400,000 from Central Business Service District Funds for the Fiscal Year 2026.”

“Resolution ‘Approving the Community Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2026, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore, and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program’.”

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

***Alderman Long** moved to table all Budget Resolutions except for the appropriation for the Manchester School District. **Alderman Terrio** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman E. Sapienza asked what are we doing.

Mayor Ruais stated we are tabling all of the Budget Resolutions except for the school district.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked and we are going to discuss the school district one.

Mayor Ruais answered yes.

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

***Alderman Long** moved to amend the “Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$236,499,925” to a new total of \$238,499,925 and that it be Enrolled. **Alderman Barry** duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Levasseur asked the number that is here, \$236,499,925, is that your number Mayor that was in your budget.

Mayor Ruais answered this would be \$2 million in addition to my number so a \$4 million total increase over last year.

Alderman Levasseur asked what was the number in your budget.

Mayor Ruais responded \$236,499,925.

Alderman Levasseur stated I thought you said you were going up \$4 million Alderman Long.

Alderman Long replied it is a total of \$4 million. The \$2 million that the mayor gave them and this would add another \$2 million for a total of \$4 million.

Alderman Levasseur stated the number you just said was \$236 million.

Alderman Long responded no my number was \$238 million.

Alderman Levasseur asked so it would be a \$4 million increase.

Mayor Ruais answered \$2 million on top of what I gave them in my budget.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated when you say it is \$2 million on top of yours, are you referring to the original budget that you submitted at the end of March.

Mayor Ruais replied my budget increased last year's bottom line by \$2 million. This amendment that he is proposing increases it by an additional \$2 million.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated my question is, if we don't pass anything the default budget is the original budget that you submitted correct.

Mayor Ruais answered yes. My initial number was \$234,499,925. The number that is here is \$236,499,925 and that is based off my \$2 million increase. What Alderman Long is suggesting is we go \$2 million on top of that.

Alderman Levasseur asked how does that affect the tax rate. Your tax rate was 1.97%.

Mayor Ruais responded it was 1.91%.

Alderman Levasseur asked what is this going to bring it to.

Mayor Ruais replied if it is an additional \$2 million, it would be another .8% so roughly 2.6% or 2.7%.

Alderman Levasseur asked are there any set offs coming from anywhere else that you know of.

Mayor Ruais stated ultimately it would be surplus. We have another month before we work on the budget for June 3 so any surplus that would come in could go towards reducing the rate.

Alderman Levasseur stated I know people are probably going to vote for this. It sounds like a lot of people are more in tune with what is going on here than I am. I just know that I drove down South Willow and I drive through the City of Manchester all the time and I have not seen roads in as deplorable a condition as I have today. Tim Clougherty will attest to the situation. Even in the last couple of weeks I have been getting emails and calls about the roads way more than normal. I know that DPW asked for a \$12 million increase and I believe the mayor's budget allows for about \$7 million. If I was going to pick a place to increase the tax rate by providing another \$2 million, it would definitely be for roads. I am not going to support an increase to the schools. As a matter of fact, I would rather we level fund them and keep the \$4 million on the city side and do close to the \$12 million worth of work that DPW said it could get done. Our roads cater to about 120,000 people that live in this city. That is not including visitors or commerce or all of our delivery trucks, etc. They are horrible and I think the fact that the school district received \$35 million extra not even two years ago and put it all in their budget while the city falls into disrepair the way it has and is now...equity applied, it would make sense to just level fund the school district and put that money into roads in the city.

Alderman Kantor stated I would like to pause because I am going to bring a budget forward next week and I don't think we should be doing the budget piece meal at different times like we did last year.

Alderman Levasseur stated to her point, Your Honor, if this gets voted on tonight anybody that is bringing a budget forward in the next couple of weeks will not be able to vote for or make any cuts or changes adding or subtracting from the school district side. That is the biggest part of the city budget by almost \$40 million. By voting for this tonight, you are locking in whomever is going to bring a budget forward. My understanding is there are at least one or possibly two budgets coming forward.

Mayor Ruais stated one of the purposes behind voting on this earlier was because of the conversations that we have had about the need to hire during the spring time months for the school district. The purpose behind bringing it forward earlier as opposed to later was to allow for the hiring process to proceed.

Alderman Levasseur stated I was told that they needed...they requested almost \$11.5 million and then went down to \$9.5 million or whatever and they told us they were going to lay off all kinds of people at that number. Then in a matter of a little puff of smoke, the original number was \$3.25 million that you proposed and it jumped another \$250,000 in the last two weeks and now they are ready to hire again. This is the frustration with the school district. You just can't believe anything they say. I have been doing this forever. They like to pink slip people and no one will ever lose their job. Their credibility with the city and taxpayers is really, really low. They told us they were going to lay everybody off and make kids walk an extra 6/10 of a mile and pay to ride a bus but then all of the sudden miraculously \$3.5 million changed the whole map and now they are able to put everything back in. It is just too much. It is too soon right now to vote on this when the deadline is 6/3. By the way, I would like to ask what their surplus number is. They won't give us a number unless somebody asks. I have asked them 10 years in a row what is your surplus number going to be and they say we don't know because we won't know until the end of the year. Their school year ends on 6/10 and they still won't give us a surplus number. They always get that surplus number added in. What is their surplus going to be this year?

Mayor Ruais answered my understanding is zero from the documentation that I have gotten from the State of NH. It typically comes in in the fall when they are trying to gauge enrollment. That is why it came up last year and the year prior.

Alderman Levasseur replied I am talking about surplus from their total budget last year. They spent every single dollar in their total appropriation?

Mayor Ruais responded I thought you meant additional revenue from the state.

Alderman Levasseur stated I am glad you brought that up but no. Their budget at whatever it was, I think \$227 million. Did they spend that whole \$227 million? I have seen years when they come in and are stuffing money into their trust funds from surplus funds. We never get that surplus number. Jim, you are probably privy to it but you probably don't even know the real number.

Mayor Ruais stated there will be other opportunities to have this conversation.

Alderman Levasseur stated there won't be other opportunities because you want us to vote on this tonight.

Alderman Fajardo stated I am interested in the monologue about the city streets from Alderman Levasseur who noted that what you budgeted is a fairly unprecedented amount as described by you and yet we are still at 1.19%. Our tax cap is 4.27%. If our city is truly in disrepair, which I would agree there are aspects of our city that could use significant investment but we have the opportunity to go up to 4.27%. Maybe that is a conversation we should be having. According to our Charter, we have room to spend if that is what we want to do. We don't have to choose between schools or streets right now. That is a distraction.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked is the \$236 million number not your budget number Mayor.

Mayor Ruais answered the \$236 million is my budget number. What Alderman Long is suggesting is that we increase that by \$2 million for a total appropriation of \$4 million over last year's number.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I am hearing about a time crunch and I just want to say in reference to a time crunch, on April 1 you put forth a budget. There are the figures. If they want to move forward and plan ahead, there are your figures. They could change but it is not as if there is nothing to go with. We have the proposed budget from the mayor that he put forth on April 1.

Alderman O'Neil stated just in a casual conversation you and I have had and recently in talking to Alderman Long, it is my understanding that the school district is looking for their number sooner rather than later correct.

Mayor Ruais replied yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it your recommendation that we vote on a school budget tonight.

Mayor Ruais answered yes.

Alderman Long stated with respect to surplus, they are using trust fund money all the time so if there is going to be a surplus, it is trust fund money. The reason I am bringing this forward tonight is because the first week in May is when they are able to pick from the best pool of employees that they are going to hire. They have attrition with 38 or something I believe.

Mayor Ruais stated in the initial number I put forward with the extra \$2 million, there were going to be 38 positions reduced through attrition.

Alderman Long stated so passing this now gives them that option because if we wait until June the pool is not as good. That is why I am bringing this proposal forward and I am very comfortable with it.

Alderman Fajardo asked if we go up to \$238 million that brings the tax rate to 2.7%.

Alderman Long asked can I speak on the tax rate. We still have bonding and CIP and the city's budget. We are not ready with April numbers. The Finance Department is preparing the revenues for April and May. Whatever the rate is going to be, it is going to be reduced. Whatever this rate is is going to be reduced because of the surplus we will have from April and May.

Alderman Fajardo asked so at most it will push us up to 2.7%.

Alderman Long responded if we do nothing on the city side, it will push it up to...

Mayor Ruais interjected around 2.6%. Now remember by way of recollection, when I vetoed my budget last year and we had that two-week interim period between then and when we actually passed it, there was \$500,000 in revenue that came in during that two weeks. I would venture to guess that over the next 30 days, prior to the June 3 meeting when theoretically this will all be concluded, there will be additional surplus that comes in that we can utilize to pay down the rate.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked when you vetoed your budget last year, it was still the default budget regardless of the fact that you vetoed it right.

Mayor Ruais answered right. We didn't want to do the default budget because the initial number I produced was before we had all of the surplus. Nobody wanted to go up to that number, myself included, and that is when we used it to decrease the rate.

Alderman Levasseur stated by law, the school district has to tell us what their surplus number is or give us a decent estimate before we vote on these budgets. I am very surprised that we are sitting here supposedly in the last hour, which it really isn't, and we don't know what their surplus numbers are going to be. Whether or not it is from trust money...I don't know if they used any trust money in their budget or added more to it but we know they got \$7 million in October. What did they do with the \$7 million? Did

they put it in a trust? Also, just because they put it in a trust doesn't mean they own it. As a matter of fact, that money is surplus money and is supposed to be coming back to the city. I have never in my life ever heard any law or ordinance or rule that allows the school district to just continuously build up a bank account. They have \$24 million in their trusts and the city has \$12 million in its rainy day fund. They are allowed to just keep piling money into these accounts and then saying well they are trust funds and we are raiding our trust funds. They are not trust funds. It is taxpayer money that is just sitting in these accounts. They are just padding their budgets. It is probably being used to cover mistakes or management issues or whatever. There are all kinds of things that come up in a year. That is why they should be made a department of the city.

Mayor Ruais stated over the last two years, they will have reduced their reserve accounts by \$9 million. It is significant.

Alderman Fajardo stated I think that this is a very sad day when we are going to give an additional \$2 million above what the mayor proposed. We talk about investing in essential services and we talk about investing in the city. I can't think of a thing that is more forward facing and producing a higher return on investment than investment in actual humans. I am really on the fence right now about whether or not I want to say yes to that.

Mayor Ruais stated I appreciate where you are coming from. The conversations that I have had with aldermen here and with Alderman Long, I believe the \$4 million to be a little bit too high. I would support \$3.5 million. If that \$3.5 million were to pass this evening by way of just perspective, the reduction in the request of the school district over the last two years would be about \$12 million but over the last two years they would have received an additional \$11 million between the city and state. That is roughly balanced. That is what I have been talking about – finding the balance. To the earlier point about paving the roads, this is what I have said at every town hall and this is what I am going to say tonight and what I said in my budget address, I think we need a balanced approach. We need to find a way to respect the taxpayers, the school district and certainly the city side because we do have the \$7 million for the contracts. So everything that we do in here needs to be in balance. The \$11 million increase to

the schools over the last two years but a reduction in their request. There were no cuts and certainly no teachers are getting laid off and there are no changes to anything at the elementary school level or to transportation or to expanding athletics.

Alderman Fajardo asked what is locking you into a tax rate increase of 1.91%?

Mayor Ruais answered well we won't be at 1.91% with a \$3.5 million increase.

Alderman Fajardo asked okay so at 2.68% are you trying to split the difference on what the Charter says can be done. When you say balance, I am trying to understand.

Mayor Ruais stated the balance is between the taxpayer, what the school district needs and what the city needs. We just had the conversation about the...

Alderman Fajardo interjected the school district is taxpayers. Streets are taxpayers. All of this is. It is not like we are spending taxpayer dollars on...I don't even know what. Obviously it is a fundamentally different world view on what it means to invest in our city and I don't agree with yours.

Alderman Kantor stated the lack of transparency from the school district is outrageous. I heard that there is an investigation. The fact that they are jeopardizing federal funding is insane. For me, we should know how they are spending their money and we should be able to bring another budget forward and this doesn't help anyone when there is lack of accountability across the board.

Alderman Long stated any alderman can talk with the superintendent. She has a cell phone and she will speak to any alderman. There is information I have that isn't said at these public participation meetings that is helping the students and increasing their graduation rates and test scores. There are programs they have that are doing that. So calling the schools incompetent, I don't believe that. I have a conversation with them and make it my goal to speak to my BOSC member to get the information I need to help me make these decisions.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote to amend the Budget Resolution for the school district to \$238,499,925. **Alderman E. Sapienza** requested a roll call. Aldermen E. Sapienza, Vincent, Thomas, Morgan, Kantor, Levasseur and Terrio voted nay. Aldermen Burkush, Barry, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, and O'Neil voted yea. Mayor Ruais voted nay and broke the tie. The motion failed.

Alderman Long moved to amend the "Resolution appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$236,499,925" to a new total of \$237,999,925 and that it be Enrolled. **Alderman Barry** duly seconded the motion.

Mayor Ruais stated this is a \$3.5 million increase.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I think we should do everything at once. I don't like the idea of doing it piece meal like Alderman Kantor said. Also, they have a budget to work with, the one you put forward originally six or eight weeks ago.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. **Alderman O'Neil** requested a roll call vote. Aldermen O'Neil, Terrio, Burkush, Barry, Vincent, Thomas, Morgan, Goonan, Long, and T. Sapienza voted yea. Aldermen Levasseur, E. Sapienza, Fajardo and Kantor voted nay. The motion carried.

Alderman Levasseur asked what will the tax rate be.

Mayor Ruais answered \$1.5 million on top of my budget will be roughly .6% so it would be around 2.5%. \$260,000 is .1% so \$1.5 million is roughly .59%.

Sharon Wickens, Finance Director, replied it will be 2.66% if nothing changes on the city side.

Mayor Ruais stated no it would be lower.

Ms. Wickens stated you are right.

Alderman Levasseur stated I would like to make a point. Anyone who is bringing in a budget, you can't take money from the school district now because it passed. What was the vote on that?

Clerk Intranuovo answered 10-4.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Morgan stated on May 25 at 3 PM we are going to do a Clean-Up Livingston Park Day. DPW is involved and we need volunteers.

Mayor Ruais asked can you send that to the Board please.

Alderman Morgan answered I will. It is going to be from the entrance of Livingston Park all the way up to DW Highway. It is going to be a major clean-up and we are excited about that.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to give a shout out to the police officers and firefighters in our city. They spent some time over at the Boy's and Girl's Club. On Friday, the Fire Department had a very engaging dodgeball game with them and then later that day police officers went over and played basketball with them. What makes this city great is to see our firefighters and police officers over there interacting with the young people of our city. I was very proud. I have spoken to both Chiefs about it. They should be very proud of their men and women.

Alderman Terrio stated I continue to get rat complaints and in light of the fact that we are building sewer system and tunnels, I believe all of that construction is going to drive the rats out of the sewers and into people's yards. I have spoken to DPW and the Health Department and what I have been told is we should have people remove food sources and have people police their garbage and put garbage in garbage cans but other municipalities like New York City go further. I don't like the thought of poison but we should have some kind of rat mitigation control. I would like us to explore more aggressive methods of eliminating rats. With all of this construction going on, I think it is

going to cause a lot of rat complaints in the city and I would like to be more aggressive about dealing with it. Thank you.

Alderman Levasseur stated two weeks ago Alderman Kantor made a motion to get to the ballot the issue of whether the school district should become a department of the city. My understanding is it failed on one vote because there was some confusion. I would *move that the issue be sent to the Committee on Administration for review* and then hopefully by September we can take a full vote on the school district becoming a department of the city. We will let the voters in the City of Manchester decide.

Alderman Terrio *duly seconded the motion.*

Alderman Long stated I would like to know if we are able to reconsider that motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated I am making a different motion. She didn't say refer it to committee and I am.

Alderman Long replied this is reconsidering what we already voted on.

Alderman Levasseur responded no I am not reconsidering. It is a different separate motion to have it go to committee. Alderman Kantor didn't want it to go to committee.

Alderman Long stated she made a motion to make the school district a department. That was turned down by this Board.

Alderman Levasseur replied she asked for the full Board to vote on it that night. My motion is to send it to committee and go through the process.

Alderman Long stated I would like the Solicitor or Clerk to weigh in. Is this essentially a reconsideration vote?

Emily Rice, Solicitor, answered it doesn't sound like one to me.

Alderman Long stated Alderman Kantor made a motion for the school district to be a department and this Board voted no. Now you want to send the same question to the Administration Committee and then to the full Board again.

Alderman Levasseur responded it is going to go through a process that was recommended.

Alderman Long stated but this Board already voted it down.

Alderman Levasseur stated there has been a ruling so let's vote on it. It is not reconsideration.

Alderman Long stated it sounds like a reconsideration to me.

Alderman Terrio stated I guess there is a question about our rules but I could have sworn in this last term that we voted on the same thing more than once. Didn't we vote twice to remove Alderman Levasseur as Chairman?

Alderman Long answered no that was once.

Alderman Terrio replied I thought it was twice.

Alderman Long responded no it was once. We tried twice but it was a reconsideration and the answer was no.

Alderman Kantor stated I asked that the language be drafted.

Mayor Ruais asked do you recall the specific motion.

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, stated it depends on what this Board wants. If it is authority for the mayor to have line item control, that is different language. That would be the 2001 amendment by former Alderman Wihby that came forward and passed. If you want to merge services performed by both sides as a cost saving measure, those

are more charter sections. I think the Solicitor and I would need to know what the intent of the Board is to preemptively write something for the committee in two weeks.

Mayor Ruais stated I had conversations with the Clerk and several departments on the City side that this would touch – HR, IT, Finance and Solicitor and asked them how a merger would impact them and what would need to change on the city side. What the Clerk brought up was that when this was brought up in 2001 and it was just specific to the budget, there were four Charter changes that needed to be made where the school district is specifically referenced. The easiest thing on the budget side would be to give the mayor, whoever that is, budget authority. Merging the entire school district with the city beyond just the budget would require potentially 14 changes to the Charter. My suggestion would be if this is going to go to the Committee on Administration that they consider those items and come back with a recommendation to the full Board about the best way to proceed. The additional piece I have is in conversations with the relative departments I referenced it was suggested that we attach an effective date to it. In conversations with Finance, Solicitor, HR and IT, this would be a pretty significant merger to take a \$247 million independent district and move it into the city. What I would suggest is that if this is the action that the Board is going to take and that we are going to present to the voters this fall, we should provide some clarity on when that would take place to give our departments the runway to do this responsibly. This would be a pretty significant lift and I just think if we are going to do this we should do it thoughtfully and substantively and go through the committee process as I stated previously.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked didn't just 10 minutes ago Alderman Long put forth a motion to increase the school budget and that motion failed and then he said let's try this again only we are going to tweak it a little. The idea of trying it again with a little difference I don't see how that can be in the wrong. It is not apples to oranges, it is apples to apples.

Alderman Morgan stated so I understand what we are voting on, we are just voting to send this to committee so they can vet it out and make us understand better what this would look like.

Mayor Ruais asked do you need the clarification tonight on whether we want just a change to the budget section or whether it is a full merger or is that something we can direct the Committee on Administration to come back to the full Board with.

City Clerk Normand answered I was responding to Alderman Kantor's comment about having it written for committee. I think it would be better if the committee discusses how they want to proceed. We could then write something to come back to this Board in a committee report.

Mayor Ruais stated what I can do is if this is going to be sent to committee, I can put together what I just said, the outline of things they would have to consider and get it to the committee. They can then come back to the full Board with a recommendation on what that looks like.

Alderman Long asked will it be this Board that would eventually vote on the this.

Alderman Levasseur responded we have to have this figured out by September so it will go on the November ballot.

City Clerk Normand stated you have until June 3 actually to take a vote so we can send it up to the state. We have to hold a public hearing and then it goes up to the state. So June 3 is the deadline for this Board to take that step and move this along.

Alderman Long asked so Administration has one meeting to do all of this.

City Clerk Normand answered correct.

Alderman Long stated and then it will come back to the full Board and we already voted no.

Alderman Levasseur stated anyway, let's get something done here. You just spent \$236 million.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. *Alderman O'Neil requested a roll call vote. Aldermen O'Neil, Burkush, Barry, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, and T. Sapienza voted nay. Aldermen Levasseur, Terrio, E. Sapienza, Vincent, Thomas, Morgan and Kantor voted yea. Mayor Ruais voted yea to break the tie. The motion carried.*

Alderman Long stated there was some mention about the homeless. Is there some update we can get? I know that I am getting calls on them congregating in some areas in Ward 3. Is there an update we can get?

Mayor Ruais stated we can come up with something. When I get into the office tomorrow I will talk to members of the NET Team and Irina and we can produce something for the Board. Are there specific things you want to know?

Alderman Long replied I know I am calling in these areas and I want to be sure they are being addressed.

Alderman T. Sapienza moved to enter into non-public session pursuant to RSA 91-A:3, II(d) for consideration of property acquisition, sale or lease of real or personal property which, if discussed in public, would likely benefit a party or parties whose interests are adverse to those of the general community. **Alderman Long** duly seconded the motion. *The motion carried on a unanimous roll call vote.*

Mayor Ruais called the meeting back to order.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to seal the minutes.*

Alderman Long moved to approve the Hallsville contract, authorize the Mayor to execute any documents necessary and that the city receive proof that York Real Estate has applied to NH Housing Finance Authority for low income tax credits by July 2025. **Alderman Barry** duly seconded the motion. *Mayor Ruais called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

TABLED ITEMS

- 23.** Report from the Committee on Community Improvement recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorizations providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$400,000 for CIP 61065 80 Merrimack Street (Residence at Chestnut Phase II) be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
(Note: Tabled on September 4, 2024.)

This item remained on the table.

- 24.** Report from the Committee on Lands & Buildings recommending that the request from Alderman Morgan to name the soccer field at Sheridan-Emmett Park after Thamba Mbungu be approved.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Long who abstained)
(Note: Tabled on November 19, 2024.)

This item remained on the table.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Vincent**, duly seconded by **Alderman O'Neil**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand".

Clerk of Committee