

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

June 3, 2025 at 7:00 PM

Mayor Ruais called the meeting to order.

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

A moment of silence was observed with Mayor Ruais asking everyone to keep in their prayers Priscilla Clougherty-Papp who passed away on 5/30 who was the mother of Director Clougherty. Alderman O'Neil stated could we also remember Marie Raiche and Tom Ebol, sister and brother of Alderman Long who passed away recently.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

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.

Jason Bonilla, 463 Central Street, stated:

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak in front of you all tonight. I would like to take some time to talk about Job Corps as all of you are aware from the recent article in Ink Link. I know that to me this is a pressing issue that I feel like all of us should be looking at. My question to you all is how can you, as the BMA, leverage your platforms, thank all of those who already have and give insight to those who want to shut down the doors on our young people? What solutions can we all come up with tonight to keep the doors open? While I appreciate people trying to figure out where to

house our students now, we can't give up the fight to keep the doors open. I know many of you here have come from similar places as the students we are speaking about. Look at all of you now. You made it out. I know that we can agree that you will never forget about those who didn't make it out. Those who didn't get a chance to pursue their passion. Those we lost to the areas where we wished we could have them back. I know again that all of us can agree that zip codes don't predetermine the futures of our children. For me, we can't turn our backs on them. We have to try to do something here. Time is against us. I just came back...to be honest with you all I visited their campus this morning and I got some testimonies to share with you all – six of them. I am not going to say names. Student #1 said “I came here for discipline and to get my life together so that I can serve my country in the military. What I have found in Job Corps is community; friends that push me to be my best self.” Student #2 said “I have had to get an apartment at 17 years old after the news in order to get my high school diploma. I faced going homeless or not succeeding in the electrical apprenticeship program. I came from a rough home and found success at Job Corps. It will be sad to see my friends get dropped off at homeless shelters in the near future. Student #3 said “I came here because of the levels of racism and bullying I faced in Northern NH. I was able to be with a community that sees me. The staff here actually care about me and I know they don't do this just for the money. A lot of people in this state have a lot to say about how we are bad kids and that is not true.” Student #4 said “I came here to get away from my abusive parents. During the holidays, Job Corps is my home.” Student #5 said “I had hoped to start college this year but due to the current situation I have had to start looking for my own place. Many of my peers came to Job Corps facing homelessness. Again, aging out from foster care and escaping domestic violence.” Cutting this program doesn't just interrupt our education, it pushes thousands of vulnerable young people closer to the very system Job Corps was created to prevent; the school to prison pipeline. The Department of Labor and federal government aren't simply making fiscal adjustments; they are deciding whose lives are worth saving. To me, this is an urgent matter that should be discussed at tonight's meeting. Thank you for listening.

Richard Girard, 283 Orange Street, stated:

On tonight's agenda you have letters regarding the restoration of the school district as a department. While neither is inaccurate, neither is on point. Explaining that there is not much difference between the school language in the current and previous charters is accurate but it doesn't address the court ruling that created the district after the school department sued to separate from the city. Similarly, saying that making it a department won't change much regarding the budget because of the similarity in the charter language or the requirements of state law doesn't address what did change because of the lawsuit. When I was the mayor's budget director and an alderman, the school district was a department. If I had questions about how many people the district had hired, how many vacancies it had or most other personnel questions, I could call the city's HR Department and get that information. Because of this, as an alderman I was able to expose the truth behind what was driving the school budget deficits at the time and, surprise, it differed greatly from what the superintendent was telling both boards. This ability came in handy when I was the budget director, too. The same kinds of calls were made to Finance. The then new superintendent didn't like that the mayor and aldermen had access to school data that he couldn't control and I believe it is one of the reasons why the separation lawsuit was filed. Reintegrating the personnel and finance systems, which you could do with this change, is key to insuring that you have full, unfettered access to this data on demand and in a format that is consistent with what you are used to from the departments. It enables a level of transparency that now does not exist, is not otherwise possible, and that is sorely needed. This change would also get rid of the ridiculous system of chargebacks. Currently, you appropriate money to the schools for police and the repair and maintenance of buildings, grounds, playgrounds and athletic facilities among several other items. The school district pays that money back to the city. It is a stupid shell game that ties up a lot of staff time to create, send, process and pay invoices. Back in the day, departmental expenditures on behalf of the schools were simply recorded on the appropriate state forms. This change would also make the City Solicitor the final arbiter of how the charter applies to the schools. How much money has the district spent on lawyers over the years to challenge Solicitor rulings it didn't like such as on the tax cap and whether it applied to them or how it worked? It is one of the reasons why they still give you the budget in the format that they do. Since well before my time as budget director, the schools had their

own HR and Finance Departments and outside legal counsel. Making the district a department won't change this. Nobody will lose a job and nobody will have to be hired to do a job. The changes made to state law in 2003 were made so that the charter amendment that passed overwhelmingly in 2001 could be enacted. There is nothing that prevents you from ordering that very same question onto the ballot. Things haven't changed that much, if at all. Without it, you truly cannot hold the district accountable for its spending. Please order the 2001 ballot question to this fall's ballot. Thank you.

Christian LaCoss, 78 Cartier Street, stated:

Do you guys know what this logo is? Can you guys see it? It is the NH Job Corps logo. Six years ago, in 2019, I graduated from the program. There are 256 kids that don't know what the hell they are doing right now. There are 17 year olds as Jason said that are signing leases on apartments. Did any of you sign leases on apartments when you were 17? Did any of you know what you were doing at 17? A lot of these kids don't. Job Corps has given them a purpose. Honestly, I know there is nothing you guys can do on a city level but I know you guys have connections up in Concord and I know you guys have connections on the state level. I am asking you guys to please help these kids out before we have almost 60-70 homeless kids on the streets getting dropped off at homeless shelters on June 30. I am asking you guys to leverage your friends. I know you guys have connections up there.

Dennis Kirkhart, 249 Smyth Road, stated:

I have lived in Manchester for 17 years. My home is directly adjacent to the vacant lot at 587-12. I am here to respectfully ask the Board to reconsider their decision to sell this lot or at the very least to fully understand the effect that selling it would have on me, my family and my neighbors. I am a disabled veteran of both Iraq and Afghanistan with 100% permanent and total rating from the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Due to service connected injuries, including PTSD, for me peace, privacy and predictability in my home environment aren't just preferences. They are medical and personal necessities. For more than seven years, my household and the previous owners have maintained a portion of 587-12 and over 20 years ago the owners that had it put a fence on a portion of the land. We have maintained it since. This land has served as a natural buffer between me and my neighbors and the nearby properties and has helped

create a quiet sanctuary that has been in my backyard for almost five years. It is not just a vacant lot to us. It is an essential extension of the security and stability to my day-to-day well-being. When concern about a potential sale arose last October due to your program of selling surplus lots, I spoke to Alderman Goonan and expressed interest in acquiring the lot. At the time, it was determined that the best course of action was to do nothing due to the lot not being on anybody's radar and the property having legal issues and not on the tax rolls. Apparently, they have changed it since then. With that said, I was surprised and extremely disheartened when a neighbor informed me just this past weekend that the lot had been added to the most recent surplus property list. I don't know what has changed in recent months but I respectfully ask the Board to take my circumstances into account. I remain interested in purchasing the lot and as the adjoining property owner, I would have appreciated more notice to prepare a formal offer. If at all possible to halt the current process, I would sincerely and forever be grateful. If not, I kindly ask that my situation be considered alongside any offer that may be presented through the sale. Not all public benefit is monetary. Sometimes, it is about stability, continuity, and preserving character to the neighborhood. It would be a shame to disrupt what has quietly worked so well for decades on Smyth Road. I thank you again for your time, your service to the city and for giving me the opportunity to read this. I also ask that you swing by the neighborhood. It is a great piece of land the way. To develop it would be a total shame to lose that much overgrowth and sound barrier and overall privacy for a lot of people. Thank you.

Malinda McCusker, 44 Karin Street, stated:

I am a lifelong resident of Manchester, a graduate of West High School and I raised two children in this city. I am here to speak about 39 Beech Street. This has been going on for two years; since 2023. As of April 1, you guys allocated \$500,000. Rent is \$30,000/month which leaves us with \$70,000. What is the \$70,000/month being spent on? Are we feeding them? What results have we seen? Are these people getting jobs? Are we moving them into affordable housing? Since Adrienne Beloin parted ways with this city, to my knowledge we have not seen any updates as to what is going on with this facility. We have allocated millions of dollars. Even though they are federal funds, they are still funds. I ask you between the lease and the funds that are being allocated, how does that join? These funds are going to end in September so I am

assuming you are going to come back looking for more funds. When does the lease end? At what point do you come to the city residents looking for more money? I have looked at the city website and I couldn't find a plan so I am not sure what is going on there right now. It just seems like it is a great big mess and it is being run all throughout the city. You can take a walk around. It is not getting any better. You could take that \$100,000 and help hundreds of families; families that are working and are struggling to pay rent right now because of the rising costs. People are sleeping in their cars at various businesses because they don't want to go to 39 Beech Street. It is a low barrier shelter. People are drunk and high. If you were homeless or housing insecure, would you want to go there? We have multiple organizations in this city who are doing great things with far less than \$100,000/month. We have 1269 Café. We have Light of Life Ministries. We have a shelter on Manchester Street. When does it end? Two years ago the YWCA came here looking for money to continue their shelter to help women with the results that they were getting. You voted not to give them money and they shut that shelter down. It is now being run by Light of Life Ministries which is employing people and putting them into housing. Maybe it is about time that you start working with some of those community partners to figure out a plan for 39 Beech Street. It is about time we shut it down. You have people here talking about Job Corps being shut down and 17 year olds looking for rent. They are not going to be able to sign leases at \$1,800/month studio apartments if they are without a job. Thank you.

Glenn RJ Ouellette, 112 Auburn Street, stated:

Once again I want to thank Alderman Barry for turning on the lights on an entire block that had been shut down. In this city, we are growing new property. I guess lights aren't so important. Too many times the lights are turned off because they burned. There must be a mechanism in this city to turn them back on by just replacing the LED's. It needs to be done faster and better to keep our city safe, especially in the downtown areas on the west and east side and the very dense areas. The Job Corps. I knew about it a month ago because I know a couple of employees that work there. They could not believe it would ever happen. Last week I actually saw their letters that as of June 30 they are no longer employed. So 500+ students who are 16-19 years old are going to be shut out. These are people who needed help because they couldn't graduate from high school due to whatever problems they had. Some of them have

addiction, some of them have behavioral problems and some of them have learning problems. They are succeeding in that program. We were the last state in the union to get that program. This city fought for that. Some of you, in fact, fought for it. You need to notify the state and the feds to see what can be done. We do not shut down programs that help people and make them responsible citizens instead of going to jail. It is not right and it needs to be defended. I am hoping that this Board tonight authorizes a letter be sent to the Governor and our legislature to do something about it as well as our congressmen and senators. The last thing I want to say is that we are a growing city. We are growing more property. How many of those 17-20 year olds are going to be able to afford rent? They don't have a job now. They are in school. Who would rate them an apartment at \$1,800 or more? Few if not any. We need to succeed in our programs and that is one that succeeds. Please do something about it. Thank you and have a good night. By the way, I am thinking of running for alderman in Ward 3. I love my downtown and I want to see more improvements. Thank you.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

Accept BMA Minutes

2. Minutes from the May 6 BMA meeting.

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

3. 50/50 Sidewalk Petitions
Residential:
66 Carpenter Street
90 Kelley Street
127 Birchwood Avenue
171 Carnegie Street
271 Youville Street
356 Oakland Avenue
547 Blodget Street
1325 Belmont Street

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT AND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION

4. Advising that the update on the Revolving Loan Fund has been accepted.
(Unanimous vote)
5. Advising that the Finance Department reports:
 - Accounts receivable over 90 days
 - Aging report
 - Outstanding receivableshave been accepted.
(Unanimous vote)
6. Advising that the Monthly Financial Report (unaudited) for the first ten months of fiscal year 2025 has been accepted.
(Unanimous vote)
7. Recommending 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 Enrolled.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND BUILDINGS

8. Recommending that the request to rename Milford North Back Street to Nuri Street be received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

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

REGULAR BUSINESS

9. Communication from Anne Lederhos advising the Board of her resignation as a regular member of the Arts Commission.

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

10. Communication from Bill Gabler advising the Board of his resignation as an alternate member of the Conservation Commission.

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

11. Communication from Lisa Drabik, Human Resources Director, advising the Board of her resignation effective July 5, 2025.

Mayor Ruais stated we will have the opportunity to thank her at her last full meeting on July 1 but I would like to say a quick thank you for your service to the City of Manchester and we will accept this with deep regret.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman O'Neil**, it was voted to accept with regret.*

12. Nominations:
Conservation Commission
Thomas Palangas to succeed Bill Gabler as an alternate member, term to expire August 1, 2026
Manchester Development Corporation Board
Andrew Boyle to succeed Stephen Grzywacz as a regular member, term to expire March 11, 2027
(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 Mayor Ruais nominating Thomas J. Malafronte as Airport Director.
(Note: Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, this nomination will layover until the next meeting of the Board.)

Mayor Ruais stated congratulations Tom. When I nominated him as interim director, I walked through his resume a little bit but this is a guy who has literally done every single job there is to do at the airport. I had the pleasure of going there as well to do a mini employee town hall and with the level of love, respect and admiration they have for him there and his deep knowledge of the airport, we are going to be well served with him as director.

14. Confirmation:
Central Business Service District Board
Brad Pernaw to succeed Judi Window as a regular member, term to expire May 1, 2028

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

15. Communication from JoAnn Ferruolo, Assistant City Clerk, submitting the warrant for unlicensed dogs to be committed to the Chief of Police.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Fajardo**, it was voted to approve.*

16. Communication from Thomas Hilton, Election Administrator, requesting the Board establish the polling hours for the upcoming Municipal Primary and Municipal General Elections to begin at 6AM and conclude at 7PM.

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

17. Communication from Ken Loui, Assistant Chief of Police, requesting \$30,000 from the city's contingency funds to defray the department's costs associated with locating suitable gym space for its officers.

Mayor Ruais stated I understand that the Police Department wishes to receive and file this item.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Barry**, it was voted to receive and file.*

18. Communication from Jodie Nazaka, Economic Development Director, regarding an application for a Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive, RSA 79-E, for the property at 944 Elm Street.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Terrio**, it was voted to refer this to a public hearing to be scheduled by the City Clerk.*

19. Communication from Atty. A. Eli Leino of Bernstein Shur, on behalf of his client Grand Central Suites LLC, requesting approval of a subordination of the City's lien on insurance proceeds in connection with the redevelopment project at 21 & 31 Central Street.

Alderman O'Neil asked what does that mean.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated we should move this to a committee so we can find out what it is about.

Mayor Ruais responded the attorney is here if we want to ask some questions.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to hear from our attorney.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated I would like to hear from Jodie.

Emily Rice, Solicitor, asked is the question what a subordination agreement is.

Mayor Ruais asked what exactly would this do. I believe that is the question from Alderman O'Neil.

Solicitor Rice stated Peter was handling this but I believe that what it means is that there are insurance proceeds being received by the client and we are being asked to subordinate our lien to those proceeds. I don't have the amount in front of me.

Alderman Fajardo stated I was surprised to see that the property is changing hands at this stage and I don't know if Director Nazaka could speak to that. I think there was a 79-E involved in this.

Mayor Ruais stated at this time I think there are a significant amount of questions so I would accept a motion to send it to committee for further discussion.

Alderman O'Neil moved to send this to the Committee on Administration. Alderman T. Sapienza duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

20. Communication from Emily Rice, Solicitor, and Matthew Normand, City Clerk, regarding the city charter as it relates to the school district.

Alderman Fajardo moved to receive and file. **Alderman Long** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Terrio asked this is strictly on the communication so we can still have a motion after this to send it to the state to then go to the ballot correct.

Mayor Ruais replied the motion before us right now is that the communication we received from the Solicitor will be received and filed.

Alderman Barry stated we asked our City Clerk and Solicitor for their advice and we got it. I think we should take it into consideration and not move forward with making the school district a department.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I also think it is important that we take into consideration the input from the Solicitor and City Clerk but being a representative is about making your own decision after you receive all of the information. That is kind of what it is all about. Thanks for the input and we will go ahead and make our decision. Thank you.

Mayor Ruais stated to Alderman Barry's point, with regard to the letter from the Solicitor, I think one of the things that was discussed in that and in the conversations I have had with her, we have the right to turn the district into a department subject to the 200 RSA's plus that are on the books. So we only have the rights that are given to us by the state. I guess the question would be, as we talked about in committee a couple of weeks ago, if we were to make it a department we are subject to the RSA's that govern this so there would have to be pretty explicit clarity on what exactly we are looking for that is not going to bump up against the 200 RSA's. If the question is about budget authority, I think that was answered in the memo. We do have significant budget authority as a Board of Mayor and Aldermen. I think the question before us first is just the communication and if we want to entertain an additional motion after that we can have the conversation.

Alderman Levasseur stated if we receive and file this then a motion for it to become a department would have to come up under new business. I would like to say that for all of the talking that goes on about what was sent to us, the bottom of the page that was sent to us, the very bottom where it says Article 6 states “the Board of Mayor and Aldermen may provide by ordinance any additional procedures for administering the budget including the budget of the school department.” Although there are a lot of statutes out there, we can do certain things and make requests through our own ordinance process here. This is an issue that has been lingering over this city for many, many years and many people want to vote for it one way or the other. I do believe we should at least put it on the ballot. I think that voting to make the school district a department of the city would also be a vote of no confidence in the school district. I think that is something that we should vote on for the city.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I need some clarity because it sounded as if you were saying we already have the budget authority. Line item budget authority? If we have had it for all of these years, why have we never used it?

Mayor Ruais answered in the letter that the Solicitor offered she clearly articulated the ability we have in the Charter. I don't know if the Solicitor wants to spend some time talking through that.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked line item.

Solicitor Rice replied the Mayor has line item veto authority which was added in the most recent iteration of the Charter. Given the authority provided to school districts and superintendents under state law, the school district pertains, both in the Charter and in state law, the right to move funding among line items. That is explicit in the current Charter. School districts and school boards have authority over their budgets to a certain extent under state law just to administer the services that are provided by the district. So yes, in our Charter it says that the school district budget is a single line item.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated right the school district budget itself represents a single line item.

Mayor Ruais stated I don't have authority over individual line items in the school budget.

Alderman E. Sapienza responded well that is the sort of thing that we are looking for here.

Mayor Ruais stated this conversation came up at the BOSC meeting. Theoretically, any mayor can stand up here and say I am going to veto the school district budget unless you remove these line items. So there is a back door way to have a line item veto but the question would be if we are looking for specific authority to say the mayor can go line by line through it, is that something that would be allowed under current state RSA or would we need to do more research on that?

Solicitor Rice answered I think frankly...as a practical reality I think there would probably be a public dispute between this Board and the school board and potentially the state of NH about the extent of this Board's authority to do that by Charter amendment. The enabling legislation that was passed in 2003 is a necessary step for this Board to turn the school district into a department but it is not an entirely sufficient step.

Mayor Ruais asked because of the existing state RSA's that are there.

Solicitor Rice replied yes and the budget authority and the superintendent authority granted under those state statutes. It is important to recognize that unlike some of these other jurisdictions that combined the school district as a department with the city government, the enabling legislation here leaves open a very, very important and significant question which was addressed in at least three court decisions between the City of Manchester and the school district. That is that our school district is a separate and independent municipal corporation and the enabling legislation is silent on that point unlike the enabling legislation in some of the other jurisdictions. So it begs a very serious question.

Alderman Barry asked if we vote for this to go to the ballot would we have to or should we include all of the RSA's that are going to be backed into.

Mayor Ruais responded this is where we need clarity. I don't think we can just send something to the city that says the district as it currently stands is going to now be a department because we are going to bump up against those existing RSA's. To me, that is just endless litigation and what did you mean by that and does it mean you were going to merge all of the departments and does it mean that all of the union contracts are now null and void and what exactly do you mean by moving it from a district to a department.

Alderman Barry stated also would it be fair to the public not knowing all of those RSA's that might be affected. They are not going to understand it. I think it is something we need to get clarification on.

Mayor Ruais stated I think what the City Clerk had talked about too is that we are up against a timeframe right now. This is our last meeting before the July 1 meeting where we would have to do a public hearing. So effectively we would have to determine tonight what the language is that is going to go before a public hearing and determine which of those 200+ RSA's we would potentially be negating.

Alderman Levasseur stated irony loves irony. The funniest thing I hear tonight is that it won't make any change and there will be no extra powers by us and they will not lose any power at the school district if we call them a department but when it was changed and the vote came from the public to make them a department what did they do. They went to court. So if it didn't cause any kind of changes and they weren't losing any power and the mayor didn't have any authority and the aldermen didn't have any authority, why did they spend hundreds of thousands of dollars going to court to keep the word district and not the word department? That tells you all you need to know. They didn't go to court because they were losing power. They went to court to make sure they kept their power and kept their autonomy and kept the information and as we like to say around here transparency and accountability in one building instead of allowing this Board and this mayor the ability to be able to see whatever we want to see.

I asked them how much the surplus is this year. I have been asking them every budget year and they don't give us the number and they won't tell us the number. They say we don't know and won't know until June 30. They won't even give you an estimate. If this is not a big deal and there are not going to be any changes, then let's put it to the voters to change the name of the Manchester school district to the Manchester school department just for fun.

Mayor Ruais asked so semantics.

Alderman Levasseur replied well do we have veto authority or not.

Mayor Ruais responded I think what the Solicitor articulated was that we have a great deal of budget authority. I think what I am concerned about is there are RSA's that we would bump up against. If we were to say we are going to make it a department, what exactly does that mean? I am looking for that clarity so that we don't get sued.

Alderman Levasseur asked so what you are saying is that this Board will have more authority...

Mayor Ruais interjected we do have current authority based on the Solicitor's letter.

Alderman Levasseur stated if we have all of this authority and we are changing the name from district to department and they are fighting us for it, if we go back and I am not saying we are going to do that but the voters, if the voters vote to change it to a department they are going to go back to court and fight us on what? There is nothing in here that says we are changing any statute. We know that the state statutes generally overrule us unless they are in comparison or if they are more restrictive, we can make more restrictive law than what the state gives us. I just don't see what the big deal is. We are asking just to put this to the ballot for people to vote on. I thought you were for this.

Mayor Ruais responded what are we asking them to vote on. Just changing the name? There are parts of the Charter that say department and district.

Alderman Levasseur replied we are going to put the same thing to the ballot that was put on and passed in 2001.

Mayor Ruais asked if that is what you are talking about, then that is a different matter. I would ask the Clerk to talk about what...my understanding was that those were more cosmetic changes than anything else just clarifying language. It doesn't effectively do a great deal or at least that is my understanding of those Charter amendments. I think that is what I sent to the committee before when you guys were going to discuss it. I guess I am looking for clarity.

Alderman Levasseur stated I agree with the fact that if we change them to a department we don't have to play the chargeback game anymore. I bet that is hundreds and hundreds of hours that are spent dealing with that on our city side who have to write out a bill for all of the plowing, etc. and now they won't have to do that administrative task. Just that administrative task alone is worth the savings in the vote to make them a department. I mean if we don't have any authority over their budget and you can't veto line items just that one transaction alone would save this city and the school district a ton of time, money, headaches...like you said, it is just moving stuff around and it is all an accounting gimmick but it has consequences to our budget and their budget. I think that alone is a good reason. I am sure there are other reasons we could talk about but to me that is a very good reason to make them a department of the city; just to stop playing the money changing games all the time.

Mayor Ruais stated I am looking for clarity on what the language would be that we would send...what I am saying is if it is just high level we are going to change it from the current setting as a district to a department, I think we need specificity and clarity on what we are talking about because there are those 200 RSA's.

Alderman Levasseur replied the changes that would be made are whatever changes are allowed under the law. We may not know every single possibility because there are 200 statutes out there that I have never heard of before but there may be differences that are probably not known with specific detail. Why did they fight it in the first place?

If nothing can be changed, why was there a charter amendment and a vote and years after the charter was passed why was there an attempt to put them back to a department? That passed and then they went to court. Somebody is not telling us something and they are not telling us something and there is more to the fact of being a district or department as far as consequences. What they are I don't know but I know that David Wihby was the budget guru back then and this was his amendment and proposal.

Mayor Ruais stated my understanding was that those changes...

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, asked do you want me to read those four sections that he proposed. I read one in the committee meeting but I can read the four sections that were referenced in 2001. The first amendment was "The City of Manchester, a municipal corporation, shall continue to constitute a single school district administered by the Board of School Committee"...

Mayor Ruais interjected so that first part of it says it still constitutes a district.

City Clerk Normand answered correct as a department of the City of Manchester. That is literally the change that took place there. "Wherever this Charter refers to school district, school district shall also mean school department. Except as otherwise provided in this Charter, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and School Committee shall continue to exercise such power in relation thereto as the respective bodies exercise at the time of the adoption of this Charter. The second amendment says "The Mayor shall establish the form and organization of procedures for preparation and adoption of the annual budget including the school department budget, the capital improvement budget and other budget instruments and plans for future fiscal periods as the mayor deems appropriate and which shall conform to all city ordinances concerning budgets and fiscal matters. Such procedures shall require that all budgets include all proposed expenditures according to the general object of expenditure and the proposed use of all anticipated revenue." The next amendment goes to Alderman E. Sapienza's comment. The third amendment proposed was "The school committee shall prepare and submit its budget proposal. The budget shall be subject to the approval of the Board of Mayor and

Aldermen. The budget shall be submitted in accordance with the budget form, organization of procedures and schedule established by the mayor under Section 6.03(A). The Board of Mayor and Aldermen shall accept such budget as submitted or reject it and return it to the school committee along with an explanation for the rejection and the maximum dollar amount which the Board of Mayor and Aldermen will approve. The school committee shall then submit a revised budget which will not exceed the maximum dollar amount established by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. The school committee shall administer, expend and account for the funds approved by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and shall have the exclusive authority to transfer funds among line items in the school budget.” The fourth amendment was “The Board of Mayor and Aldermen may provide by ordinance any additional procedures for administering of the budget, including the budget of the school department.”

Mayor Ruais stated it is effectively what we do now. Is that your understanding?

City Clerk Normand replied I think Alderman E. Sapienza brought up the point about line item control. This amendment #3 that I read still maintains a bottom line amount which is transferred to the school district for them to administer.

Mayor Ruais asked so it was more cosmetic changes than anything else. It was a clarification of language.

Alderman Levasseur asked then nobody will fight against it on the school district side.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated obviously this is about some people that want to micromanage the school budget line item by line item. I think it would be a lot more productive if the people that wanted to manage the school budget line item by line item run to be on the school board. They will have an opportunity to run for school board this fall. That is where you go to run the school board. Trying to run it from this Board is not the place to be.

Alderman Long stated so chargeback savings...I don't see where the savings are going to be. I don't believe DPW is jacking up their prices for chargebacks from the schools.

The city is going to have to pick up that cost for the plowing of the schools. I don't see where the savings are and as Alderman Barry mentioned...I spoke with several people about the question of changing the school district to a department and they all had different scenarios on what that means. What do they know? They know DPW as a department and Police and Fire. This wouldn't run the same as one of those departments. You mentioned being comfortable with letting the people vote and being confident. I have confidence in them. I speak to them and I speak to the superintendent and administration. I visit the schools and I speak to BOSC members. I don't always get what I want but that is politics.

Mayor Ruais called on a vote on the motion to receive and file the communication. The motion carried.

21. Tentative Agreement between the City and Manchester Water Works United Steelworkers, Local 8938.

Alderman O'Neil moved to suspend Rule 29 and ratify the tentative agreement.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked Lisa is this consistent with everything else we have done.

Lisa Drabik, HR Director, answered correct.

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

22. 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 Engineering Project Manager to apply for grant funding from the US Department of Transportation's Safe Streets and Roads for All program be approved.

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

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

There were none.

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

The Committee on Public Safety, Health & Traffic respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the following parking ordinance changes to provide for a lane reduction and addition of a bike lane on Pine Street from Bridge Street to Webster Street be approved:

NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Pine Street, east side, from W Salmon St East Back to a point 50 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Sagamore Street to a point 170 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Penacook Street to a point 170 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Blodget Street to a point 170 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Harrison Street to a point 170 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Prospect Street to a point 170 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Myrtle Street to a point 170 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Orange Street to a point 90 feet south

On Pine Street, east side, from Bridge Street to a point 220 feet north

Alderman Long

2 HOUR PARKING

On Pine Street, east side, from a point 220 feet north of Bridge Street to Pearl Street

On Pine Street, east side, from Brook Street to a point 45 feet north

Alderman Long

RESCIND 2 HOUR PARKING 8AM-6PM

On Pine Street, east side, from Harrison Street to a point 175 feet north (ORD 6517)

Alderman Long

RESCIND 2 HOUR PARKING

On Pine Street, east side, from Bridge Street to Pearl Street (ORD 7297)

On Pine Street, east side, from Brook Street to a point 65 feet north (ORD 8352)

Alderman Long

RESCIND NO PARKING ANYTIME

On Pine Street, east side, from Brook St to a point 50 feet south (ORD 7296)

Alderman Long

Alderman Morgan moved to accept the report and adopt its recommendation.

Alderman Long duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Terrio stated I am going to vote for this but what I have been told in the past and I still believe this is that the bike lanes aren't really for bikes. They are to slow down traffic and calm traffic. Personally, it is expensive. I still think we should turn these two lane one-way streets that are highways...people speed on Maple and Beech and Pine and I know it would be expensive but I would like to see them turned back into two-lane

roads which would slow down traffic. I don't think bike lanes are the best alternative. It will calm down traffic but I drive through the city every day and there are not a lot of bikes using these. That is fine. This will slow down traffic. I will vote for it but I would still like in the future to see streets like Maple and Beech and other one-way two-lane streets be turned back into two-way streets to slow down traffic. Thank you.

Alderman Levasseur stated I second Alderman Terrio's idea for those one-ways. I do have to say that when you get to the end of Webster Street they should back that up 100' or 200' so that people will be able to get into the right lane. If you stay in the left lane you can't go straight but I see people go straight all the time. It is just too long and they should back that off so that more cars can move over to the right-hand side. I am not for bike lanes. When I had one by my restaurant at Theos, I can't tell you how awful it was because it would be in the middle of the road and then it would keep going with a light that goes to the right. I am surprised nobody has been killed down there. I think if we went back to two lanes, one going north or south or whatever, that would really improve things more for people in this city. I am voting no on bike lanes. I have always been against them. I think they are a total waste of money for our Highway Department and I also think that when I look at how many people ride bikes not in the bike lanes around the city there never seems to be an issue. Calming the traffic...I don't think this does that at all. People speed on Maple Street and people speed along those streets all the time. So I am a no on bike lanes.

Alderman Morgan stated to address Aldermen Terrio and Levasseur, this Safe Streets grant that we just approved will address your concerns. They will be able to see the big picture and do what you are talking about.

Alderman Levasseur stated my understanding is, and please correct me if I am wrong on this Alderman Morgan, but the vote that we are taking allows for Pine Street to be one lane with a bike lane but it stops anymore bike lanes for the rest of the city.

Alderman Morgan responded my understanding in talking to DPW is they don't have any plans to put any further bike lanes in the city. That may change based on this grant that we are going after but at the moment there are no plans for any more bike lanes.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. *The motion carried with Aldermen Kantor, E. Sapienza and Levasseur duly recorded in opposition.*

25. Report(s) of the Committee on Lands and Buildings, if available.

The Committee on Lands & Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the NH DOT Bureau of Traffic for permission to install up to four permanent traffic monitoring stations in the following locations:

- Brown Avenue in front of Lot #675-48
- Queen City Avenue by Lot #459-27A and the end of Caron Street
- Candia Road in front of Lot #478-8A, across from 840 Candia Road
- Bridge Street at the edge of Lot #906-3A (Derryfield Park) across from 443 Bridge Street

be approved contingent upon entering into a revocable license agreement to be approved by the Solicitor's Office.

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

The Committee on Lands & Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that six lots within the Hackett Hill property (Tax Map 0766, Lots 15, 15B, 15C, 15D, 15E and a portion of 15M) be deemed surplus, and that the request from William Socha to purchase said lots be referred to city staff for final negotiations and to authorize the Mayor to execute all final necessary documents.

Alderman Vincent moved to accept the report and adopt its recommendations.

Alderman Levasseur duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated we were talking about the public good and I would like to add into the record that the Socha family hires a lot of local businesses to this community and do a lot of business in the city also. They are a very good business that has a business in Manchester and they are a very good business that does really good business with Manchester. They also do business with a lot of businesses that are here in Manchester too.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to thank Will and Sheila and their families and their company for believing in Manchester. We believe in you so thank you for believing in Manchester.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Terrio being duly recorded in opposition.

26. Ordinance:

"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."

On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to waive the reading by title only.

This ordinance having had its third and final reading by title only, on motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to Ordain.

NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Ruais stated I got a request asking if we would reconsider the subordination that we referred to the Committee on Administration. Director Nazaka and Solicitor Rice are comfortable to answer any questions anyone has. It is the Board's will.

Alderman O'Neil stated we should keep it in committee.

Mayor Ruais stated it was the communication from Atty. Eli Leino of Bernstein Shur on behalf of his client, Grand Central Suites LLC requesting approval of a subordination of the city's lien on insurance proceeds in connection with the redevelopment project. The conversation we had was that we didn't have enough information. Director Nazaka informed me that she and Solicitor Rice are comfortable to answer any questions.

Alderman Levasseur moved to reconsider the vote to refer the item to the Committee on Administration. **Alderman Barry** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated if this was so important it should have been figured out sooner and not have just been a one-page item on our agenda.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated it should have gone to committee in the first place.

Jodie Nazaka, Economic Development Director, stated I am not sure if I am following why it needs to go to committee. We had a similar request come before the Board last year for 215 Canal Street. It went to the full Board and at that time it was Atty. Suzanne Brunelle who answered questions from the Board.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated nine times out of ten these things go to committee as they should. I don't know why it didn't go to committee to begin with.

Mayor Ruais stated she is saying there is an historical precedent for it to come directly to the Board.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated well it shouldn't have and two wrongs don't make a right. This should have gone to committee no question. Slam dunk should have gone to committee.

Ms. Nazaka asked which committee.

Mayor Ruais stated we just reconsidered the vote to refer this to committee so if anyone has any questions, please direct them to Ms. Nazaka.

Alderman Fajardo stated I guess it caught my attention that the property is changing hands at this stage. I am curious if you could speak to that. That doesn't feel typical to me and I guess I was a little surprised to hear it. Also, just the fact that there is the 79-E involved. How does that transfer happen going from one holder to the next?

Ms. Nazaka stated the buyer's attorney is here also. We have seen this happen before. Like I mentioned last year we saw one very similar. What happens when we have a 79-E is the state requires in the city's best interest a declaration of conveyance that is put on the property. Basically, the city is protecting its interest and making sure that if we are allowing a tax incentive the city wants to make sure the project is being done as it was described. There is a lien on the property that the city has. There are now several liens and I will let the attorney speak more eloquently to that and the property is being transferred. There are several liens that our essential conveyance is before and in order for the transfer to happen we need to basically shift that. Our covenant would still remain active.

Alderman Fajardo asked so the subordination would be for...is our fee the tax credit. I am unclear what we won't be getting paid for.

Eli Leino, Attorney, Bernstein Shur, stated I represent Grand Central Suites. Your question at the beginning about the transfer here is that we are bringing on new equity investors as well as refinancing the project to fund completion of this so members of the same group that own it currently in the Grand Central Suites LLC will remain but yes this is a way to finance completion of this building and as part of this loan, the title report run on this shows that there are various liens including the lien to the city through the recorded covenant. The grantor grants the city a lien upon the proceeds of any casualty insurance policy to insure the restoration, rebuilding and/or demolition of the premises occurs in a timely manner. The lien granted herein shall expire upon the fifth anniversary of the issuance of the above-referenced unconditional certificate of occupancy. So your lien takes place in the event that there is a casualty at the building pursuant to RSA 79-E Section 8 and it only comes into play as leverage for the city in the event of a casualty which, again, has not occurred and if the owners are not rebuilding this in a timely manner. The level of risk there is not like you loaned in first position and now I am asking you to subordinate to this. It is in the event something that we hope doesn't happen happens and then my clients don't rebuild quickly enough then the city has this leverage through the lien on the covenant by statute.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked if I can just recap here, your clients came in here and asked for a 79-E tax break. That tax break was contingent upon this lien. This lien came with the package.

Atty. Leino replied it did.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated and now you are offering to give back the tax break.

Atty. Leino responded no.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked you said no.

Atty. Leino stated it is certainly not our intention to give back this tax break which under 79-E is the Community Revitalization tax break.

Alderman T. Sapienza responded I know what it is. So the thing is you came in here asking for a tax break, there were some conditions to it and you accepted the tax break with the conditions and now you don't like the conditions. Does that sum it up pretty good?

Atty. Leino replied I don't necessarily agree with that posture on this because the goal of this statute is community revitalization and we have the opportunity to do good in downtown Manchester blocks away from here and no lender, which is what you were told last year by Suzanne Brunelle of Devine Millimet, is going to lend into second place. This is not that the city lent money for us to buy and build this project. This is that you have this contingent relief for something that...again, I pray that there is not a casualty that requires insurance proceeds and my client can timely rebuild but this is based on 1/3 of a million dollars, which is not small money and we certainly appreciate the relief here but to be able to finish this project and build this great building, eight stores of housing in downtown Manchester with first floor commercial, this is a necessity.

Ms. Nazaka stated I want to be clear that the restriction is not going away. They are just asking to change the position so they can pay off a couple of liens that are on the deed right now.

Atty. Leino stated not even a couple of liens. We are paying off liens at closing of this refinance. The only thing that won't be cleared here as part of this transaction is the city's covenant which we are asking to move from priority position one to second to the lender's funds.

Mayor Ruais stated you mentioned Jodie that this item is similar to one that we took up last year and passed.

Ms. Nazaka responded correct at 215 Canal Street, the York's Harpoon project.

Alderman O'Neil asked are some of the liens currently by sub-contractors who haven't been paid.

Atty. Leino answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated and the old ownership group is part of the new ownership group.

Atty. Leino replied there is overlap.

Alderman O'Neil stated so we are almost saying it is okay you didn't pay your subs and I have heard it is a significant amount of money to some quality subs locally. Are all of these subs getting paid if this gets refinanced?

Atty. Leino answered absolutely because otherwise to the same point if any of those liens remain on and then we record a mortgage, it would be behind all of the existing liens. Certainly we are not going to ask a sub-contractor to subordinate to this. We are paying them off as part of the funds of closing which is why we brought on new equity and this loan. It is an opportunity to bring the ledger current with all of these subs and finish this good project for the city.

Alderman O'Neil stated with all due respect, we didn't have these problems at Canal Street where major subs were not getting paid. There is something wrong with this project. Subs are not getting paid. I just think we are playing into the hands of subs still not getting paid. It is the same players with other investors now. I can't support this and it is not the same as Canal Street.

Alderman Morgan stated to follow-up with Alderman O'Neil, are any of these IRS liens.

Atty. Leino answered no.

Alderman Fajardo stated I am hearing you say they will get paid. Is there some written guarantee so this Board can rest assured that there won't be any fancy moves to make it so that any money coming out of the refinance ends up back in the investors pockets versus those who...

Atty. Leino interjected the first tranche of refinancing this is that all of these lien holders need to be paid off otherwise the new lender puts their money out and doesn't have assurance that they are in first position. We are building the settlement statement right now to close this. One of the pieces of closing this is receiving this Board's approval for this subordination.

Alderman Fajardo asked to clarify, that isn't money that we are not getting it is just money set aside if they were to run into a scenario where it would need to be paid out. It is not like we are otherwise putting more money out. It is just that we are stepping aside so the contractors can get paid. Where will we fall in the new arrangement?

Atty. Leino responded second. It would be to the lender. You would subordinate to them. There is a sheet in your packet showing the proposed subordination agreement. It is a one-page document based on the form that was used in the transaction last summer.

Alderman Fajardo stated I am willing to support this because I feel like this project is essential and close but I will say this. I want to be fully assured that the people who have been putting the work in at the site get what they have earned.

Mayor Ruais asked and can you confirm that they are going to be paid.

Atty. Leino answered yes the subs will be paid. Again, we are here discussing loan priority and that is something where the lender cannot be behind these subs. The only way to do that is either subordinations which they are not going to give because they are owed money so, therefore, you pay them all off as part of the proceeds of the loan.

Alderman Kantor stated I can't support this. Not to pay people is just unacceptable.

Mayor Ruais asked Atty. Leino you are going to be paying individuals correct.

Atty. Leino stated we are behind admittedly but through taking on new investors and this loan, this is our ability...this project fails without this money. With this money all of these subs get paid and brought back up and we end up back on the critical path and finish this project and build what is becoming a very good looking building in downtown Manchester.

Mayor Ruais asked so folks will get paid.

Atty. Leino answered yes sir.

Alderman Long asked Jodie how many years did we give them the 79-E for.

Ms. Nazaka answered three. It is three from the time of CO so it doesn't kick in until they get their final CO.

Alderman Long asked so how can we be assured that this refinancing won't happen again.

Atty. Leino replied that is a very fair question. The understanding here is that this a lender who vetted this and this is a project that can work. The due diligence has been done here. Something would have to go catastrophically wrong for this not to happen.

Alderman Long stated having been involved in construction for 30+ years, I have heard contractors forever to pay somebody what they are owed. That doesn't always happen and that is my concern. That is why I am not in favor of this.

Atty. Leino stated with the new construction financing, and I am not sure how familiar you all are with it but this first tranche of money will go out and pay off all of these liens and the contractors will be brought up for the work they have done previously and the lender asked for lien waivers so that there is nobody else out there. It is a full list of contractors and they say we sign a lien waiver because they get paid. Those are in escrow pending the closing and then further disbursements, because having a lender on this, they go on an inspect. So if you say we built \$100,000 worth of light switches or whatever in the building, before the disbursement comes, this independent inspector comes to review and says yes there are this many light switches that are in place and work and are approved and we have the sign-off from the city so the disbursement goes out and that is paid by the lender. Then the next set of funds goes to continue paying these contractors.

Alderman Levasseur asked is this under foreclosure right now.

Atty. Leino answered no.

Alderman Levasseur stated so the original owner that started the build is still going to be the owner.

Atty. Leino responded he will be part of a group bringing on new equity investors.

Alderman Levasseur asked is construction still ongoing daily.

Atty. Leino replied I am not sure.

Alderman Levasseur asked so the city isn't going to be left with a big empty building right. Are the taxes being paid currently?

Atty. Leino answered yes and your covenant there is that if this is left in the position it is in now that is a situation where your lien comes into play.

Alderman Levasseur asked so you are not sure if there is construction going on. Do you know how much of it is done? Are we at 50%?

Atty. Leino responded I don't know the answer to that. I am sorry.

Alderman Levasseur asked so his company is not in bankruptcy.

Atty. Leino answered no.

Alderman Levasseur asked do you represent him or his company.

Atty. Leino replied I represent the entities. I certainly talk to the principal daily on this project.

Alderman Levasseur asked so this new group coming on don't have to be approved by the old group. Are they a brand new group of people? Can they still benefit from the 79-E for another year and a half or so?

Atty. Leino answered once the CO is issued is when the tax benefits come.

Alderman Levasseur asked how long before this will be wrapped up if we vote on this tonight.

Atty. Leino responded we are in the final push to close this thing. I have spent my last week and a half negotiating the final payments with the various subcontractors who say you owe this and here is what you need to clear the lien, getting the lien releases, which

are the documents that gets recorded, putting them into escrow and doing escrow agreements.

Alderman Levasseur stated but they won't get paid until we vote. Our next meeting is not until July so tonight if we vote they will get paid faster?

Atty. Leino answered yes.

Solicitor Rice stated as I understand it, there is financing in place and the city is in second position behind that mortgagee correct.

Atty. Leino replied if you subordinate. Right now you are in first.

Solicitor Rice stated so simply you are changing lenders or changing financing and we are basically moving to second position.

Atty. Leino responded right because like Suzanne Brunelle said last summer, no lender is going to disperse these funds in second position. I think that holds true and I would repeat what she said last summer.

Solicitor Rice asked as part of the closing, if you close with this new lender and this new financing, the workers are going to be paid first essentially correct.

Atty. Leino answered yes. The subs need to be brought current otherwise they are not going to release their liens. Their mechanics liens will not get released without getting paid.

Solicitor Rice asked what happens if we don't subordinate and you don't get the financing.

Mayor Ruais stated no one gets paid. If we don't support this, no one gets paid.

Atty. Leino stated my client doesn't have the money in this new investment group to continue.

Alderman Terrio stated Jodie you mentioned that after the project is done the 79-E is good for three years. When did the work start on this project?

Ms. Nazaka responded probably 2022 is when the building came down.

Alderman Terrio stated so it has been three years.

Atty. Leino asked are you sure it has been that long.

Ms. Nazaka replied the time of demo was 2022 I believe because the proposal to get the 79-E was when I took my position as Economic Director and that was in 2022. It was before the Board had changed the rules and five years was the maximum so the Board voted not to give the full five and go with three because after the third year they were going to start seeing some return on revenues.

Alderman Terrio asked what was the original projection as far as length of work. Three years seems like a long time.

Ms. Nazaka answered I don't remember off the top of my head.

Atty. Leino stated the covenant was recorded in August 2023 and work would have started sometime after that.

Ms. Nazaka stated they were late in recording their covenant though.

Alderman Terrio asked so it has been almost two years and we are still not done. Here is my concern. I am going to vote for this because it seems like it is dead in the water if we don't but I guess we need to vet people better because if somebody says they are going to do something and build something and then they run out of money...it sounds like this person or entity went into it and they didn't have enough money to actually do

the project. People aren't being paid but they will be paid if they get a loan and they have to bring more investors in to finish this. It is not your fault but their plan obviously was substandard if they didn't have enough capital and the ability to complete this project in two years. I am going to vote for this but it is concerning that they weren't able to finish without this major disruption.

Ms. Nazaka stated during the 79-E process we do ask for a pro forma. We ask for all of their financial information and what their estimates are. This building in particular, and I am not making any excuses for this builder but this building is a steel frame which is significantly more expensive than a wood frame building. I don't know if that had anything to do with the extra costs or the overages but I know that is very unique. We don't often see a lot of steel frame buildings in downtown Manchester.

Alderman Barry stated as far as the subcontractors go, is the agreement to pay them in full.

Atty. Leino replied yes. We have agreed to a good through date because you have to pick a number. They are still working and doing requisitions but they will sign a lien waiver and release good through a certain date which I believe is through the end of March and then the rest of the work will be on the draw system that I discussed earlier.

Alderman Barry asked so what they are owed they will be paid in full.

Atty. Leino answered yes.

Alderman Barry asked Jodie does the original developer have any other projects in Manchester.

Ms. Nazaka replied not that I am aware of.

Atty. Leino stated there is nothing active at the moment.

Alderman O'Neil stated the attorney says they are going to get paid but if we vote for this tonight we have no assurance that those contractors are going to get paid other than his word.

Alderman Terrio asked can we make the 79-E contingent upon all of their contractors being paid. Can we say you are going to get the 79-E only if you pay all of your bills? Can we do that?

Ms. Nazaka stated I would defer to Solicitor Rice. It is my understanding from when we met with Deputy Solicitor Chiesa that there are liens on the current mortgage and in order to move forward they would be required to pay those contractors because there are legal liens on their mortgage.

Solicitor Rice stated that is correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked Jodie could you repeat that.

Ms. Nazaka stated there are liens on the current mortgage so in order for them to actually complete the closings they legally have to pay the contractors.

Mayor Ruais stated our assurance is the law.

Ms. Naka replied right court ordered.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there something we can get confidentially that shows that those contractors have been paid. We are not talking \$5,000 here. I hear on the streets it is a significant amount of money. Some of them are Manchester-based contractors employing Manchester people that have not been paid. It is a big number. I really don't understand how this 79-E is going to change them getting paid. Does anybody know the number that is owed all of the subcontractors?

Ms. Nazaka stated I think the 79-E might be protecting some of these contractors in this situation.

Alderman O'Neil asked does anybody know what the number is and how much they are owed.

Atty. Leino stated one of the things you asked was is there a way to do this confidentially. To do you one better on this, these liens are each recorded and public record in the registry so they can all be looked up and added up.

Alderman O'Neil asked if that is the case why can't you say it now then.

Atty. Leino replied each of the releases will also be public so once they have been paid and we are hoping to get this done as soon as next week...

Alderman O'Neil interjected if what you said is accurate, can you state how much the liens are then if it is public record.

Atty. Leino responded I don't have the number in front of me.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated you worked on it for a week and a half day and night and you don't have the number.

Atty. Leino replied I am not closing counsel on this project.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated no but you just negotiated it. You just told us that.

Mayor Ruais stated everything will be public record next week.

Atty. Leino stated yes.

Mayor Ruais stated if the liens have not been removed then you haven't paid them.

Atty. Leino stated correct.

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

Alderman Barry stated I know a few people came up and talked about Job Corps. I know that Alderman Long and myself went to a fair yesterday at Job Corps. It was pretty impressive. We had two of our departments there – OYS and Welfare to work with the students. I know Mayor you have been working on this but I think it is important for the citizens to hear what we are doing.

Mayor Ruais stated I was on the phone all weekend on this. Just to recap, Friday morning we learned of this potential closure. Initially the talk was that the closure would occur on June 6, this coming Friday. Forty-three students have no fixed address so they would be rendered homeless as a result of that. There are 243 students over there right now. In the conversations we have had with the Governor's Office and with the federal Department of Labor as well as our other federal counterparts and our community partners, the thrust is on protecting those kids and insuring that there is a transition into housing once the closure occurs on June 30. What we have talked about in the department head meeting that I called yesterday was a two track plan. If students are allowed to stay on the property, we would address that as such with one plan and if we have to move the students off of that property what would those logistics look like. We are working on that two track plan now to insure that no kid after June 30 does not have stable housing.

Alderman O'Neil stated that is great on the housing component but what about meals.

Mayor Ruais interjected going deeper into it, it is the entirety of it. It is the housing portion of it and the supervision as well because you don't want kids being on a campus all by themselves. So it would be the supervision portion and feeding portion as well. I talked to a non-profit about setting that up as a pass through for a fundraising entity so that the city itself wouldn't have to pay all of this but we could work with our local

philanthropists, grant making organizations, corporations and private funders as well to help defray the cost that the city could potentially incur if we didn't have additional funding. It would be a holistic approach to make sure they are taken care of.

Alderman O'Neil stated it is sad on the housing component and these young people getting fed. Also the last I knew, there were some very unique training programs that these young people graduated from and were finding jobs. It is just a total shame that this is happening.

Alderman Burkush stated in public comment session we had some discussion about unhoused people and it seems that especially in the center city and in ward 9 we have seen a significant increase in unhoused people. Can we get a briefing from our Homeless Coordinator in July so we know what is going on?

Mayor Ruais responded certainly. I don't remember all of the questions that came forward but we have been releasing the monthly statistics of individuals who were getting help and going into rehab or detox or getting employment and identification cards as well, although I don't think we have in the past few months. As I said at one of the previous meetings, my primary concern regarding the individuals that are down there are those 15 that are the most vulnerable. I am trying to find a way we can bifurcate that and say we don't need the shelter. I want to insure that whatever steps we take next we can take care of the 15 individuals that are there that are either in wheelchairs or on oxygen...7 of the 15 are amputees. These aren't individuals that I think anybody on the Board wants to see living on the street.

Alderman Burkush stated that is not the issue.

Mayor Ruais stated the point is I am looking for opportunities to close the shelter but at the same time caring for those individuals as well.

Alderman Burkush stated what the resident was talking about was correct. 39 Beech Street was never a hangout but now it is completely surrounded by unhoused people

with tents and all kinds of stuff. It is not only anecdotal. You can see on the police blogs daily the amount of work that is being done and it seems to be increasing.

Alderman Terrio moved to make the school district a department of the city replicating the language from 2001. That would entail sending this language up to the state again for approval and then bringing it back to put on the ballot in November.

City Clerk Normand stated the first step would be for it to go to a public hearing should this Board authorize that.

Alderman Kantor duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Long asked what is the motion.

City Clerk Normand stated the motion is to send the four amendments that I read aloud that were on the 2001 ballot forward and initiate the process. It would go to a public hearing and then to the state for review.

Mayor Ruais asked can you walk through what that process would look like. It would go to a public hearing and what would occur after that?

City Clerk Normand answered this would be posted publically for seven days in a legal notice prior to the public hearing. We will hold a public hearing. The Board will then decide at that time if they want to direct me to continue with the process which would be to send it to the three state agencies for review – the Secretary of State, Department of Revenue Administration and the Attorney General. They have 15 days to acknowledge receipt and 45 days to review. So that is 60 days. Then we would come back to a meeting in September and assuming it is fine with the state the Board would then vote to send it to the ballot for the November election. One thing the Board needs to be clear on is what the proposed effective date of this would be. I would assume you would want it during the next fiscal year.

Alderman Terrio stated I would assume that would make the most sense.

Mayor Ruais asked can you give us your interpretation of what those four amendments do. My understanding is that it is more cosmetic in nature and it still references the school district as both a district and a department.

City Clerk Normand stated I think beauty is in the eye of the beholder in this case. It does allow the Board to consider the district a department. What rights or additional authority this Board would have I think are going to be determined through a) the review from the state, and b) I think they are going to be adjudicated on a case-by-case basis. I am not an attorney so probably the Solicitor should be weighing in on this but the Board will take some action and it would be up to the district to decide if they believe that is what this Charter amendment, if it passes, provides this Board the authority to do.

Alderman Barry stated we will be fighting each other in court.

Solicitor Rice stated my predecessor gave an opinion I believe in 2002 or 2003 that the full effect of such an action would be essentially impossible to predict and that as facts and circumstances arise they will be decided. Given the fact that this is coming from one of the two municipal corporations obviously we can't presuppose what the other municipal corporation involved is going to think about any of these things on a case by case basis. I think we are just going to have to see as things roll out.

Alderman Levasseur stated maybe they will just fight it before we even get it to the ballot. Maybe they will file an injunction.

Mayor Ruais asked how would that process work. Could they file an injunction?

Solicitor Rice stated in one of the earlier cases I think there was a declaratory judgement.

City Clerk Normand stated that was done after the public vote.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated it sounds like we are setting up perpetual litigation. We are going to spend a whole bunch of money.

Alderman Morgan stated what I don't understand is why we continually go down this path. We can't bully the school district to do something. We are trying to work with them. Why can't we just all come together and find a practical solution? If it takes a little time then so be it but to just throw it at them and say we are doing it this way and we are fighting...we all know where this is going. We are not all stupid here. We are all smart people here. Why don't we sit down behind-the-scenes and try to put it together and find a way? If it takes a year or two or three to get to that point...I understand the point of doing it. I see both sides but I don't want to get into a fight. It makes no sense. I don't think the citizens want us to fight. I think they want us to get things done and I think that is why we need to work together. I just don't agree with bullying them and putting this out there for that reason.

Alderman Kantor stated this is for full transparency and accountability. The school district has steam rolled their Phase I through and now they want to steam roll the second one. It is very important that we bring this to the voters. They need to stop bullying and confusing us. It was a department before so let's go back to a department so we can be transparent and accountable to the citizens of Manchester. They deserve better. Never mind that the school district is actually the bully. They don't want to be transparent and they are bullying us with the wheel of power and privilege. I can remind you that I am not on the privilege section of this wheel. I am actually in the middle somewhere. I am 100% seconding Alderman Terrio's motion. We need bold leadership from now on.

Alderman Terrio stated we are not deciding. We are just allowing the voters of Manchester to decide. They approved it last time and they will have a chance again to vote and I think they are going to approve it again but that is just my opinion.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. Alderman Terrio requested a roll call vote. Aldermen Terrio, E. Sapienza, Thomas, Kantor and Levasseur voted yea. Aldermen Burkush,

*Barry, Vincent, Morgan, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, and O'Neil voted nay.
The motion failed.*

Alderman Kantor stated I would like to have a discussion about the veteran out there who came to public comment. I would like to understand the issue with the property a little more. Is that possible?

Mayor Ruais replied absolutely but I think we need Brenda. She put together the surplus properties and I don't want to speak out of turn about these specific properties. I would be more than happy to set up a time for her to meet with you and I would be happy to join that meeting. I will have the Tax Collector look into that specific issue so she can provide a report or summary to the Board.

Alderman O'Neil stated to follow-up on what Alderman Kantor said, there is no action based on tonight correct.

Mayor Ruais asked regarding what.

Alderman O'Neil replied on the property the gentleman spoke of.

Mayor Ruais stated no there has been no action on that.

Alderman O'Neil stated so Brenda can come to our next meeting on July 1.

Mayor Ruais responded yes but I don't want to wait a month. If you guys have questions on that, I would be happy to have her prepare something to send to everyone and she can come before the Board in July if you would like.

Alderman O'Neil asked so there is nothing happening in the next month.

Mayor Ruais stated do you mean selling the property in the next month. I will call Brenda in the morning to get an answer.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would like to learn more about that.

Alderman Goonan stated I was under the impression that that piece of property and another piece of property were already being marketed through a broker. Is that correct?

Mayor Ruais responded I would have to get some clarity on the specific project. If that is one of the ones that we just deemed...we have had two of these sales now where we deemed property surplus so I want to know if it was part of the first set of parcels or the second. I can get an answer from Brenda and get back to the Board.

Alderman Fajardo stated I want to circle back to the Job Corps thing for just a second. Just to clarify, it is the Department of Labor that cut off the funding for this program?

Mayor Ruais answered yes.

Alderman Fajardo asked so should we be engaging with our federal delegation.

Mayor Ruais replied there are two pieces to this. It is a program that was authorized by Congress so the administration can't end a program authorized by Congress. In this instance what they have said is individuals who are on the properties that are contract based they are terminating the contracts. My understanding is, as has happened in other instances where funding has been shut off or cancelled, injunctions have been put in place while they have the conversation in court whether or not the legal authority exists to do that. My working assumption is that this will play out through the legal matter but in terms of who you would talk to about restoring funding, that would be obviously the federal delegation and not us here or the state.

Alderman Fajardo asked is this a DOGE cut. It feels like we are going to end up spending a lot more money down the line when we are caring for 233 young adults that had an opportunity that then got cut off. I want to make sure that anybody listening who wants to maybe get engaged that they are clear on what path they could take.

Mayor Ruais stated I think the appropriate course of action would be to call the federal delegation regarding advocacy to return or restore funding.

Alderman Kantor stated I was just curious about the investigation with the school board on the wheel of power. How long will that take? Any news on that?

Mayor Ruais answered I don't have any update. At the school board meeting last week they said the investigation was ongoing and that is the last update I have on that.

Alderman Kantor stated I gave everyone a wheel of power and privilege the last time we met and that was distributed to all the teachers and they were expected to do this and the 8th grade class over at McLaughlin. Did you guys read through this and do it and circle it the way I have? Has anyone? If you have white privilege you should probably give up half of what you have so that you make people feel better.

Mayor Ruais stated before we get into the budget, my understanding is that Item 28 is ready to come off the table.

City Clerk Normand responded that is correct. The Board was waiting for the revocable license that Alderman T. Sapienza had asked for. That is attached and ready to be approved.

TABLED ITEMS

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Burkush**, it was voted to remove Item 28 from the table.*

- 28.** Report from the Committee on Administration/Information Systems 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)

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

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Levasseur**, it was voted to remove Item 27 from the table.*

27. 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 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'."

Alderman Long stated the latest report from the Finance Director projects a total FY25 fund balance of \$2,069,000 as reported by the department heads. By ordinance, this amount will be allocated 1/3 each to the rainy day fund, the severance reserve account and the FY26 tax rate.

***Alderman Long** moved to suspend ordinance 35.032 and allocate \$689,666, which is 1/3, to the severance reserve account and utilize the remaining \$1,379,334 which is 2/3*

to reduce the FY26 tax rate. Any excess FY25 fund balance by year end will follow the ordinance as intended.

Mayor Ruais stated so this motion is to just lower the tax rate by using 2/3 instead of 1/3.

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

Alderman Long stated as we worked through the budget process and reviewed the city department budget proposals, we recognized several priority adjustments to those FY26 appropriations. These adjustments include...you will find them in the document that was sent out Friday.

City Clerk Normand stated a copy has also been handed out to the Board tonight.

Alderman Long stated so those are the changes to the mayor's budget. I don't know if anyone has any questions. They include compensation adjustment for the City Clerk which was overlooked, an increase in the cable franchise fees, two youth counselors...this is the list of items we added that the mayor didn't have in his budget.

Mayor Ruais stated these are just the changes from my budget to this budget.

Alderman Long moved to amend the resolution "Raising Monies and Making Appropriations of \$195,751,642 for the Fiscal Year 2026" to a new total of \$196,511,261 and that it be Enrolled. ***Alderman Burkush*** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Terrio duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Barry stated the next motion is related to the FY26 CIP allocations. During our discussions with CIP staff we were notified that there has been a 3%-4% cut to federally funded CDBG, ESG and HOME programming. There are a number of corresponding reductions that were necessary to the related CIP projects. Rather than

read through every single one, I would ask you to review the CIP project tables in front of you.

Alderman Barry moved to amend the resolution “Approving the Community Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2026, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore, and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program” to reflect the adjustments made in the tables presented. **Alderman Burkush** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Kantor duly recorded in opposition.

Alderman Burkush stated one critical project that was not incorporated within CIP was the Opticom Emergency Vehicle Preemption System. We were notified by Chief Cashin that the current life safety feature that controls our traffic signalization at major intersections within our neighborhoods is aged out and in critical need of replacement. In order to hold the bonding at a reasonable level for FY26, we recommend instead utilizing \$1.6 million of the special reserve account for this vital capital purchase. The current balance of this account is \$3.8 million and with this purchase we will maintain a balance of \$2.2 million for future capital purchases.

Alderman Burkush moved to utilize \$1.6 million from the Special Revenue Reserve Account for the replacement of the city’s Opticom system. **Alderman T. Sapienza** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Burkush stated this concludes our amendments to the mayor’s proposed budget. The Clerk will walk us through the final motions required to pass the balance of the FY26 resolutions.

Alderman Long stated Alderman Morgan wants to make a motion and if that motion passes then we have to reconsider the general fund budget that was just approved.

Alderman Morgan stated in the proposed mayor’s budget, you had \$400,000 in additional expenses for the health insurance line. I would *move to take that out and put*

*it to the bottom line to reduce the tax rate. **Alderman Levasseur** duly seconded the motion.*

Mayor Ruais asked can we have the Finance Director weigh in on that change.

Sharon Wickens, Finance Director, stated Alderman Morgan and I spoke about this. We were talking about where we were this year. We expect to end the year with a little bit of a surplus. It won't be as much as the \$1 million I was hoping for. May is not turning out to be as good but we should still have a positive balance. If you are asking me what my preference would be, it would be to leave the \$400,000 in there because that is what our consultants are saying. They believe we are going to face an increase. At the end of the day, it is the will of the Board and if you want to roll the dice and not fund what the consultants are saying, that is your prerogative. The health care consultant thought that we could expect increase of 2.8% and that was about \$400,000 which the mayor funded in his budget. What Alderman Morgan is proposing because we are doing okay this year but again the health care consultants took that into consideration, he is willing to roll the dice to see if we would be okay next year and he wants to drop it. Again, that is something we could absolutely do. It would be my preference not to but it is not the end of the world.

Alderman Barry stated we are not the only municipality that is going through this. Other municipalities are going through the same thing with their health insurance and they are all predicting an increase. It is my understanding that you think there will be an increase. Is that correct?

Ms. Wickens responded there has been every year so I would be hard pressed to think that there wouldn't be. USI did find \$750,000 worth of savings that will be going into next year which is why the increase is only 2.8%. I think if you look at other communities it is much higher. We will only need to fund the 2.8% or \$400,000.

Alderman Barry stated I think Nashua is over 9%.

Mayor Ruais stated their health care increased and if I am not mistaken the school district side was 10%.

Alderman Barry asked are we really going to gamble. We are fortunate that we have that \$750,000 to offset it. What would happen if it is way out of whack and really goes up? Where are we going to get the money?

Ms. Wickens stated we do have a health reserve account that has \$3.6 million in it. It is not fully funded based on our actuarial estimates but it is a chunk of money. It would be about a \$.03 reduction on the tax rate. It was about \$133,000 equals a penny so if you multiply that by three we would be pretty close to \$.04.

Alderman Barry asked so it would be 2.45% down to 2.42%.

Ms. Wickens answered it would be 2.30% if we were to take the \$400,000 out. What I was talking about was the actual dollars on the tax rate would be about \$.03.

Alderman Barry asked but we are gambling.

Ms. Wickens replied right.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Morgan I just want to make sure I am on the right line item.

Mayor Ruais stated my budget was \$16.6 million and at the beginning of the year I was looking at the previous budget. So it was the previous budget plus the \$400,000 got to that amount. He is asking to reduce that line by the \$400,000.

Alderman Levasseur asked Sharon are you expecting any more revenue coming in in June or will we be level or lower.

Ms. Wickens responded I am hoping it comes in flat. I am a little concerned about some of the school district's pulling of the permits because two of the big permits they pulled

were less than what they said they were going to be. Now I adjusted down my projection in May but there was still more we didn't know. I bet it will be close to flat or a little bit higher but flat I would say.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much was estimated for permits from them and how much lower is it.

Ms. Wickens answered it was almost \$200,000 lower. I think I had \$867,000 as a projection and I brought it down to \$700,000.

Mayor Ruais stated the concern exists that effectively we would be rolling the dice. I share the concern and I think there is a valid argument to make that the number came in \$500,000 lower than what we put in last year. The number we put in was \$2 million and the increase was less than that.

Alderman Burkush stated I know we worked with you on the budget and you didn't suggest the \$400,000 decrease when we met with you last week.

Mayor Ruais replied I did not suggest it. At the time, it wasn't a topic of conversation. The motion is to reduce the health care line by \$400,000.

Alderman Morgan stated I just want to reiterate to everyone that we have a \$3.6 million reserve for the health insurance line so taking \$400,000 out is not going to really be a grand move but it will be for the taxpayers and that is important.

Ms. Wickens stated yes we have a reserve that would cover that. Is that ideal? We could be going out with \$250 billion worth of bonds in the fall. I am very protective of the reserve accounts. It is only \$400,000 and I shouldn't say only but it is not like it would be the end of the world. Alderman Morgan and I talked at length about it. It truly is the will of the Board. I don't have a crystal ball and I don't know what it is going to be but this is the first year we are going to have a little bit of a surplus. We have been behind the eight-ball for years.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated we already voted for the bottom line number. After this one here is another alderman going to come up with another item? I might want to take a couple off, too.

Mayor Ruais stated we would have to take two motions. One to reconsider the vote we took on the general fund amendment and then another vote to consider Alderman Morgan's motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked does it require a unanimous vote to reconsider.

City Clerk Normand answered it doesn't. If we take this vote on the \$400,000 and the majority of the Board agrees to reduce that, we will then take a motion to reconsider and adjust the total so there will be three motions. The first motion would be to reduce the health insurance line for FY26 by \$400,000.

Mayor Ruais stated Alderman Morgan has a motion and I believe it was seconded by Alderman Levasseur.

Alderman Levasseur stated I am in support of Alderman Morgan's motion but I would rather reduce it from \$400,000 to \$200,000.

Mayor Ruais asked would Alderman Morgan accept a friendly amendment to change the number from \$400,000 to \$200,000.

Alderman Morgan responded I would like to stick to the \$400,000. I think taxpayers are more important.

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

Alderman Kantor stated I have a question about 39 Beech Street. I thought that was going to be closed down but it is in the budget.

Mayor Ruais responded right now the funding runs through the end of August. The date right now for it to shutter would be September 1.

Alderman Kantor stated but it said the warming station.

Mayor Ruais stated there are dollars in there for any warming station that we may want to use. There are affordable housing trust funds dollars in it to plan ahead for a winter warming station. That doesn't have to be at 39 Beech Street.

Alderman Kantor asked so it is not at 39 Beech Street and is going to be somewhere else.

Mayor Ruais answered it could be anywhere.

Alderman Kantor stated it is just that the line item says that so I was wondering.

Mayor Ruais responded winter warming is just that I am trying to plan ahead for the winter months and get ahead of that process to make sure we are on the ball and ready.

City Clerk Normand stated I will read through the remaining motions and the motion would be to approve and enroll those resolutions. They are:

"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 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.”

“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 O’Neil**, it was voted to waive the reading by titles only and Enroll.*

Alderman O’Neil stated I would like to thank Aldermen Barry, Burkush and Long for their efforts. I had a chance to call them on different things and give them my thoughts. Some things they agreed with and some things they didn’t agree with. I would like to thank all of the departments because I reached out to them for input. Thank you, Your Honor, for your efforts. My understanding is that you were willing to have discussions. This could never get done, and I don’t know how many years this is, but Sharon is the best at this. She is the best at getting this budget done. She can go back and when there are changes she can figure out how to put it all together. Thank you Sharon.

Mayor Ruais stated I would reiterate that. I said it during my budget address but thank you to Sharon and Mish, all of the department heads, Pat, Jim and Bill and everybody’s work on this. I truly appreciate it.

Alderman O’Neil stated and this whole thing wouldn’t get pulled together without Matt and the City Clerk’s Office who put the resolutions together and get everything lined up.

- 29.** 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 610625 80 Merrimack Street (Residence at Chestnut Phase II) be approved.

(Unanimous vote)
(Note: Tabled on September 4, 2024.)

This item remained on the table.

- 30.** 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 E. Sapienza**, duly seconded by **Alderman Levasseur**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

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

City Clerk