

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

July 7, 2026 at 7:00 PM

Mayor Ruais called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Kaw-uh, Goonan, Dexter, Fajardo, Bonilla, Kantor, Trisciani,
O'Neil, Terrio, Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Vincent

Absent: Alderman Thomas

Mayor Ruais: This evening, we have the musical stylings of Glenn Ouellette, who will come up and share a song with us.

Glenn Ouellette: We just celebrated the 4th of July. We are about to celebrate 250 years. I believe we've already started celebrating our birthday, the city's 180th birthday. I hope that somehow, before it's over, that people know where to go because I still don't have a list of what's happening and a lot of people don't. It is a city of one. Tonight, I'm going to sing The Star-Spangled Banner, a version by Whitney Houston, but I do my own version. I always do my own version. It's called a cover song. Enjoy.

Mr. Ouellette sang the Star-Spangled Banner.

G. Ouellette: Happy birthday, America, and happy birthday, City of Manchester.

Mayor Ruais: With the board's indulgence, I have a few recognitions that I'd like to make this evening. First, I'd like to welcome Madison Ward. She will be interning for us this summer. She's a student at Trinity. Thank you so much for being here. The proud father, John Ward, is here, who is an attorney in the city. So, thank you so much for making the recommendation. We're looking forward to having her with us this summer. And did I see Shana? Please come forward. City of Manchester, a resolution: Whereas Shana Hawrylchak, Executive Director of the See Science Center, and unfortunately we don't have Adele here this evening. But you both have played an instrumental role in coordinating Manchester's Park to Park community cleanup initiative and partnership with

the Manchester Connects and the City of Manchester. And whereas the Park to Park cleanup events bring together residents, volunteers and community partners to improve local parks and streets through coordinated citywide cleanups across multiple wards. And whereas the inaugural event, held on May 21st, 2025, engaged approximately 200 volunteers who removed an estimated 350 bags of trash across six wards, and the 2026 event expanded to 277 volunteers who collected 266 bags of trash, 20 containers of sharps and 23.75 bags of cigarette butts for recycling through Breathe New Hampshire's Bag the Butts program. And whereas these efforts have strengthened community pride, improved public spaces, and demonstrated the power of effective public private partnerships in advancing a cleaner, healthier Manchester. Now, therefore, I, Mayor Jay Ruais of the City of Manchester, New Hampshire, do hereby recognize Shana Hawrylchak and Adele Morier for their leadership, dedication and outstanding contributions to the success and continued growth of the Park to Park Community Cleanup Initiative. These next two are really tough. Lee Ann, please come forward. City of Manchester, a resolution: Whereas Lee Ann Provencher, a lifelong Manchester resident, has dedicated nearly 40 years of exceptional service to the City of Manchester, building a distinguished career in the Assessor's and Finance offices while becoming the first female residential assessor in the city's history. And whereas throughout her career, Lee Ann has demonstrated outstanding professionalism, earned numerous certifications and statewide honors, and has been recognized for her leadership, mentorship, and commitment to advancing the profession. And whereas, Lee Ann's knowledge, experience, and steadfast commitment to excellence have earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues, leaving a lasting legacy within the Assessor's office and throughout city government. And whereas, Lee Ann has also generously served her community through volunteerism and civic involvement while earning the admiration and respect of colleagues for her knowledge, integrity and unwavering dedication to public service. And whereas, her lasting contributions have made a meaningful impact on the City of Manchester, and her commitment to excellence will be remembered long after her retirement. Now, therefore, I, Jay Ruais, Mayor of the City of Manchester, do hereby recognize and honor Lee Ann Provencher for her exceptional service, dedication and countless contributions to the City of Manchester and extend my sincere gratitude and best wishes for a fulfilling and well-deserved retirement. Thank you so much. Denise, I know this is not your favorite place in the spotlight, but it's well deserved. City of

Manchester, a resolution: Whereas Denise van Zanten had joined the Manchester City Library in 1998 as head of technical services, where her leadership, professionalism and commitment to staff and service quickly earned the respect of colleagues throughout the library community. And whereas, after serving as acting library director, Denise was appointed library director in 2005 and has led the library with vision, integrity and unwavering dedication to serving the people of Manchester. And whereas, throughout her tenure, Denise has been a dedicated steward of the historic Carpenter Memorial Building, overseeing major renovations, preservation efforts, and facility improvements to ensure the library continues to serve future generations. And whereas, Denise successfully guided the library through changing technologies, public health challenges, and evolving community needs by building strong partnerships and advocating for library staff and patrons at the local and state levels. And whereas, after more than 27 years of distinguished service to the City of Manchester, Denise leaves behind a stronger library, a lasting legacy of public service, and an example of leadership that will continue to inspire those who follow. Now, therefore, I, Mayor Jay Ruais, on behalf of the City of Manchester, do recognize and honor Denise for her outstanding service to the Manchester City Library and the residents of Manchester, and extend my sincere gratitude and best wishes for a happy, healthy, and well-deserved retirement. Thank you so much, Denise.

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. The Mayor 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. 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.

Leonardo Rodriguez, 1000 Elm Street: I am here to address my permanent ban from the Manchester City Library. This isn't about a charging station. It's about a dangerous mindset in our public institutions. When I challenged the deputy director on the hostility I faced, I told him that in a socialist or communist country, staff act as if they are above the people. But in America, we have the First Amendment. His response was a confession: no, but we can do this in the library. That phrase, we can do. This is the voice of

institutional corruption. It says that regardless of RSA 354A, or the Constitution, the library is a private place where retaliation is a policy. While the library has become a de facto crisis center where drug use is often tolerated in the bathrooms, a citizen who wants to use the space for work and dignity is cast out for daring to follow the complaint. If this board allows a we can do what we want attitude to persist, you are not running a city. You are running a regime. I support your 11 to 3 vote to override the tax cap to fund our first responders. We saw the horror of two DPW workers shot in broad daylight last month. We know the danger is real, but as we spend millions more, we must ask where the money is going. We see Operation Lights Out and other task forces making arrests, but the poison continues to flood our streets. We don't just need more patrol cars. We need higher level intelligence. I am calling for an expansion of undercover sting operations that ignore the low-level addicts and go after the big fish, the suppliers and the wealthy traffickers who profit from Manchester's pain. Don't just clean the street corners. Cut the supply lines that lead into this city. Follow the money. Nonprofit and shelter accountability. Finally, we need to talk about the follow the money aspect of our homelessness crisis. You have launched the Stars Initiative for Taxpayer Accountability. It is time to use it. We need a forensic audit of every nonprofit and shelter receiving city and federal funds. Are these organizations actually helping people find jobs and housing, or are they just managing poverty to keep the funding coming in? We see the trash in our alleys and the desperation in our parks. Yet the nonprofit industrial complex continues to grow. We need real jobs, real training, and an independent auditor to ensure that not one cent of taxpayer money is being wasted while all our streets remain dirty and people remain stuck. I am asking the city solicitor to review my retaliatory ban, and for this board to demand true transparency for every dollar spent in the name of the poor people.

Rick Blais, 733 Chestnut Street: First of all, I want to thank you for your service again. Public service is challenging, and I appreciate the time and commitment each one of you put into our community. So, thank you very much for that. I also want to talk to everybody involved in the 4th of July, 3rd of July, celebration. My birthday. The fireworks were outstanding. As we celebrate America's 250th, like we did earlier with a song, I just want to go over some things that I think would help in the future. I hope next year's event becomes more patriotic. Very few, if any, patriotic songs were played before the fireworks. I understand the Pledge of Allegiance took place earlier that day. Mayor, thank you for

getting back to me on Facebook at 10:00 at night. I appreciate it. Imagine the impact if just before the fireworks, like it usually does, the lights go out and the people start singing the Star-Spangled Banner after doing the Pledge of Allegiance and having some first responders up there, some veterans, making this 250th anniversary special. But every 4th of July should be recognized as being the patriotic people we are in Manchester. You know, earlier today I got here early and get to talk to a lot of people about Manchester and what it was like in the past, and I hate to see that dissipate. I hate the idea of spending money. Everybody knows that. But as I was sitting watching fireworks beside the trash can in Arms Park, we were there for a couple hours, I'm thinking, wow, the most beautiful spot in the city, and it's a parking lot. And basically, it's a great location and for our city; let's explore state and federal partnerships to transform it into something other than a parking lot. Look at building a U-shaped parking garage above it or something. There are some alternatives there. I know we're looking at spending a small fortune just across the street to get to the Fisher Cats, but this might be money better spent that the city and the citizens could utilize that beautiful space. As we begin planning for next year's budget, now it's time to be the leaders. We're talking about the school budget. You know, they got, again, more money; more money every year, and to a point where we're getting low performance out of this and nothing's changing. I feel like we don't start talking about it until a month or two before the budget is up. I think this is the time to take a leadership role, sit the school board down, and explain to them that money doesn't grow on a tree. June, we were talking about that earlier. We need to look at ways of cutting. If we can, please do that. Looking at reducing the cost of administration, I think would be huge and change the outcome of our students. They deserve better education, stronger reading skills. We all know about fourth grade. If they're not reading at that grade level, they're going to struggle and most likely drop out of school. And we don't want our kids to fail. That's a big thing. Finally, I encourage the board to think about beyond the next election cycle. I talked about it last year about going to a 2-year to 4-year term. Whether it's education, infrastructure, homelessness, finances, these challenges require long-term planning. I ask that you really think hard, maybe get that on the ballot for next year. We can fix all these problems. They are fixable. And good luck with the bond rating that I think you're talking about later tonight. It's terrible to get downgraded, but if you borrow too much money lenders don't like that.

Henry Emele, 9 Clarendon Way: I'm a proud resident of ward seven. I'm a husband, a father of two boys, and a business owner, and someone who believes deeply in the future of Manchester. I want to thank each of you for your service to the city. Tonight, I would like to speak about one of the greatest challenges facing Manchester, and that is housing affordability. For many people, the American dream begins with having a safe place to call home. Today, that dream is becoming more difficult to achieve. Young families are struggling to buy their first home. Seniors on fixed income are worried about rising housing costs. Teachers, nurses, police officers, firefighters and many of the people who serve our community are finding it increasingly difficult to afford living in the very city they worked so hard to support. This is not just a housing issue, it's an economic issue. It's a workforce issue. It's a community issue. The same rising costs that priced out young families and seniors are fueling the housing instability we see on our streets today. If we want real progress on homelessness, we have to build the affordable and workforce housing that gives people a stable place to land. I want to support the work this board has already started. As Manchester continue to grow, I believe we must grow wisely. We should encourage responsible development that expands housing opportunity while protecting the character of our neighborhood. We should make it easy to redevelop vacant and unused property, reduce unnecessary delays in permitting processes, and support a wider variety of housing options, from starter homes and townhouses to workforce housing and apartments that working families can actually afford. Growth should never come at the expense of our neighborhood, but neither should fear of change prevent us from addressing problems that affect thousands of our neighbors. I also believe this conversation must include voices of people who live in our communities every day. Residents deserve to be heard before major decisions are made, because the stronger solution comes when local government and the community works together. Manchester has always been a city built by hard working people, people who believe that if you work hard, raise your family, and contribute to the community, you should have the opportunity to build a good life here. That is a vision worth protecting. I hope we can continue working together to make Manchester a city where our children can afford to stay, where our seniors can afford to remain, where our workforce can afford to live, and where future generations will have the same opportunity that drew so many of us here. Thank you for your time, for your service, and for your commitment to the City of Manchester.

Richard Irving, Ward 2: Recently, a former neighbor from my boarding house told me that rents are going to go up over there, and we're not sure if we can afford it. Low-income tenants who are retired senior citizens and disabled people live in apartments and boarding houses and struggle to buy rent, food, medicine, clothes, insurance and other necessities to survive in an uncertain economy. Raising the rent prices in these homes is clearly unfair and un-American, and the tenants who can't afford high rent prices would probably end up living like the homeless population for the rest of their lives. And finally, to those who own apartments and boarding houses, I'm asking you not to raise rent prices from \$600 to \$900 in the boarding houses and from \$1,200 to \$2,000 in apartments.

Kathleen Carswell, Ward 4: Good evening. I have two things to address. First is housing. Like everybody in front of me has said, I'm getting too old to move and move and move. I can't afford it. I can't afford to be on these wait lists that are two, three, four years and longer, and my rent keeps going up. I'll be homeless, so you might have to build more stories on that homeless shelter for the elderly. Because I'm 66.5 and I can't afford almost where I am now, and it's scary. I've been in the city 64 years, and I'm ashamed to even say that to some of my friends. So please, can we look into getting something, at least for the seniors that are on a fixed income? I understand the boarding houses and all that, but at least for the seniors, can we at least have some control and help them help us? It's all I'm asking. The second thing is, being a survivor of sex abuse when I was young, I am tired of seeing on Facebook from these people who keep an eye on where they come from. All of a sudden, we have a homeless population of predators, sex offenders living homeless and their address is Manchester. There's got to be a way to keep an eye on them. I, at this age, believe me, they wouldn't want to mess with me, because it wouldn't be pleasant. But I'm afraid for the children. I was a child once. I know what it's like. And I've been down that road and it's scary. I'll live with it for the rest of my life. Those people get on a program. They get out of prison early. Good for you, you're on a program. It's not, if they will offend again, it's when they will offend again. So please, there's got to be some way we can keep or have a program to keep them in check. If they are homeless, have them check in bi-weekly, if we have to. Monthly is not going to be good enough because they roam, and that's not good for our city. It's bad enough where we have a problem with the homeless. I have to patrol my neighborhood at 66 years old to kick

prostitutes out, drug people who are shooting up in my parking lot in broad daylight at my old church. The other night, I had to call the police department to have them kicked off the church stairs for shooting up. It's disgusting. I mean, who wants to go into a park? Who wants to walk downtown? You don't feel safe anymore in the city, and it shouldn't have to be that way. I don't feel that way because I'm angry, and I shouldn't have to be angry at my age. I should be able to invite people to come in, go out for a nice walk. Enjoy the city. I can't do that with an honest heart.

Lisa Gravel, Ward 7: I'm here to talk tonight about your vote to override the tax cap. I wrote down my remarks because if I went off the cuff, I'd probably spend my entire three minutes swearing like a truck driver and getting escorted out of the building. I can honestly say that I am no less angry today than the night it happened. Many of you cut campaign commercials on Manchester Public Television, talking about the importance of the tax cap and the need to protect taxpayers. Those commercials weren't made by accident. You made them to earn the trust and votes of the people of Manchester. You asked voters to believe that you respected the tax cap. Well, spoiler alert, clearly you lied. When the moment came to defend the tax cap, almost all of you voted to override it, and you absolutely disgust me. I honestly do not know how any of you can show your face around town after taking that vote. If we lived in the Game of Thrones era, you would be forced to walk down the street naked with angry taxpayers spitting on you, shouting: shame. Every dollar you spend represents hours of someone's life spent working to earn that money. But the truth is, I don't think you care. You don't care how hard people work to earn that money. You don't care about the burden you're placing on taxpayers. A perfect example is the portable classrooms at Southside. Every day I drive by them it is like a hot poker in my eye. We paid for these classrooms and now we're paying for an addition to the school. Why are we building an addition after already spending God knows how much on those portable classrooms? You're just pissing our money away: a skate park many taxpayers never asked for; beautiful sidewalks downtown, ripped up and replaced. And don't get me started on the Beech Street school or school bus boondoggles. The city has become nothing but a money pit. Many members of this board bloviate about the unaffordable housing crisis. Maybe they should look in the mirror. How do you think voting to raise property taxes is going to affect this? Landlords will not absorb this increase. They will pass it on to their tenants. It is not rocket science. You take these votes as though

there will be no real-life consequences. It should not be lost on any voter that this vote happened in a non-election year. Many of these aldermen think voters will forget by the next election; I hope they don't, I know I won't. Remember who campaigned on respecting the tax cap. Most importantly, remember who overrode it when the vote actually mattered. Before I finish, I want to acknowledge the three members of this board who voted against overriding the tax cap. Thank you for having the courage to hold your position when it was hard and when it really mattered. And to those of you that betrayed the taxpayers, especially the ones that went to Strange Brew to celebrate after screwing us yet again, you can go to hell.

Rich Girard, Ward 2: As the former chairman of the school board's negotiations committee, I have to admit I am astonished by the lack of transparency surrounding the police contract. The fact that the one-page cost out that you folks put together and delivered the night before the night you took the vote, wasn't even on the agenda for the public to see, is a measure of how untransparent this process has been. Mayor, I sent you an email personally asking you what year two numbers on this contract were. You didn't bother to respond. Seems to me that when you present a contract, all of the years' projections should be put forward. The police chief said the night this contract was brought forward that the cost to the taxpayers was \$2 million. Apparently, he didn't read the sheet, because it's \$3.4 million. Now, what is that \$3.4 million? Is it overtime? How much of it is overtime? Are overtime projections in this? Because this contract adds an awful lot of vacation time to police officers. And every one of those added weeks of vacation is going to be a week someone gets paid overtime. The one concession that was mentioned in this contract was how we're not going to use sick time to calculate overtime anymore. Like the Mayor didn't respond, the police chief didn't respond when I asked him how many overtime days or hours were paid because officers were calling out sick, but having more than 40 hours a week. I would think that would be known here. And how much of the pay raise is because of steps or because we're going to the new pay system versus the increases in critical incident pay, which will add anywhere from \$3,400 to \$7,800 per year to every officer? I've been around long enough to know that critical incident pay used to be something we gave the SWAT team when it got called out. It wasn't something we gave to every single officer every week because being a police officer is dangerous, and it is. But how much of the \$3.4 million are these \$150 a week now that some people are

going to get paid in addition to their step, in addition to their cost of living, in addition to being put on the new scale? How much? I've presented contracts, folks, and I know the detail that's available to you. And when I was chairman of the negotiations committee, all of that detail was made known to the public. The fact that you folks haven't done it is shameful. And by the way, the added accruals that you're giving people that they can leave with as soon as ten years, that's not going to encourage anybody to stay. That's going to encourage people to leave. Have you thought through the increases in extra detail? Have you thought what that's going to do to school activities, sports, dances? You know, once upon a time I had to take trees down on my property. I was told I had to have a police detail. It raised the cost of having to take those trees down by 25%. That's just me as a citizen. There's more that I could say. But you folks haven't put any information out there. And what you've put out, you've left off your agendas, hiding it from the public, and that's wrong. And finally, I'll just say this: I am very disappointed that the city did nothing for America 250. The fireworks, they were great for the 14 minutes and 17 seconds that they lasted; that's embarrassing. But if nothing else, Manchester is home to General John Stark, one of the heroes of the American Revolution. And, you know, this city didn't even mention his name at America 250. How awful.

Glenn Ouellette, Ward 3: Each time that we consider that we are a city of one, a little less fighting, especially after the elections are over on certain issues. Every single ward should be treated alike. For example, it is our 180th birthday as of July 11th. That changed from June 1st. It took us 180 years to realize that they had the wrong date because of the organization by the time it was signed. They started on June 1st, but they signed it on June 11th, and nobody in 180 years took that to notice. That's incredible. We talk about facts. In my new place, I'm right out the window facing Elm Street, but I'm on Chestnut and I have never seen so many people walk Chestnut Street at 2 and 3 a.m. in the morning, and I've never seen so many alleys downtown where the drug dance is taken. I don't understand. We must be a very lucky city because if there's a bad batch out there, we could have a lot of dead people every single night in our alleys. We should find a way to patrol that more. And when a building gets emptied, as it's going to get renovated to another use or a new buyer, we should not be allowing 20, 30, 40 people to run that property. It just makes the area look bad. All of a sudden, we have all kinds of trash outside, including beds, and when they move on, that stuff stays there. No wonder we

collected so much trash. It stays there. Who picks it up? Our city. That's a cost we need to regulate that. You don't allow tents in the city, but you allow bedroom sets on the grass. It makes no sense. I will leave it at that. I will just say that I want to see as many people in the city as we can to celebrate 180 years. And if there's any way, is that agenda on the website of the city? Is the agenda for the celebration of the 180 years, are the events at least put on the website of the city?

Mayor Ruais: One of the things that we had sent to the board about the 250th was that it was in conjunction. But if there are additional things that the board would like to put on, or if there are additional things that the public would like to see, more than happy to do that.

Glenn Ouellette, Ward 3: It would be nice for the public to all know of the celebration. So, if they want to join, they can attend. We are a city of one. Thank you very much and thank you for allowing me to sing.

Mayor Ruais asked if there was anyone else present wishing to speak.

There were none.

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

PRESENTATION

2. Presentation from the New Hampshire Department of Transportation regarding all-way stop control in the City of Manchester.

Corey Spetelunas, NH DOT Highway Safety Project Manager: I am from the Department of Transportation. I am the Safety Section Project Manager in our Safety Office. I am joined by Bill Lambert, who is the Administrator for our Safety and Active Transportation Section, as well as our Assistant Commissioner, Susan Klasen. We are here to speak about an intersection in Manchester, New Hampshire 28 and Sheffield Road. We have an all-way stop project that we'd like to include at this intersection, and we wanted to

present it to the city to either get concurrence or not. And we'll kick start it with this. Quick disclaimer before I get into it, I'll try to keep most of this brief. I know there's a pretty packed agenda. I just wanted to note that regardless of what comes from this meeting, if anything happens that warrants action from the department, it will potentially override anything that's discussed at this meeting. So, when we're talking all way stop control, we like to narrow it down to what sort of intersections are we looking at in general. They don't have to be four-way intersections as shown here. But typically, we're looking for intersections that have a crash history, limited sight distance, physical constraints, whether it's curvature from the road, horizontal or vertical, nearby buildings, etc., high speeds on the main road or limited gaps. And that might be either because of the speed or because of the volume of traffic or other elements. A little background for this. You can see at the top of the screen, that star is where we reside right now at City Hall. Our location is towards the southern part of the city. New Hampshire 28, also known as South Willow Street, and Sheffield Road, neighboring the airport. This location is also the subject of a Manchester 43960 HSIP, or Highway Safety Improvement Program. The project is the result of a 2019 road safety audit. Crash history is one of the elements we like to consider when we're looking at potential locations for all way stop. At this location we had 56 documented crashes, 49 of those are over a ten-year period. It goes to 2024 because that's the last complete year of crash data we have available. 49 of those were multi-vehicle, one serious injury, seven minor, five possibles. The whole purpose of our program is to reduce fatal and serious injuries. So, noting that there was a sizable number of injuries with the one serious brought this to our radar. It's also noted that there are six years that had five plus crashes, with 2017 peaking at a total of 12. So generally, when we look at intersections that have concerns that I've spoken about already, we would historically try to mitigate these through a myriad of countermeasures listed on the screen here. Increasing the stop sign, adding a stop sign, making new stop signs, adding signs under the stop that says cross traffic does not stop, adding the overhead beacon, which flashes red on the stop-controlled leg and yellow on the nonstop controlled leg, or beacons to the stop sign in some cases. Those typically are not super effective. They may be initially effective to a limited audience, but over time, that effectiveness degrades due to familiarity with the intersection or it doesn't address the problem entirely. A lot of the downfalls with those improvements that we just showed is that it doesn't do anything to control the speed on the nonstop controlled leg. It doesn't increase the gaps that

vehicles have to pull out onto the side street if they're making a turn. If the resolution was to trim the vegetation, it grows back. I know everyone's short staffed. It's hard to keep sight lines clear. The biggest thing is that the driver behavior for all directions of travel really remains unchanged. If you're already set to stop, adding a flashing light doesn't tell you to stop harder. You're still expected to stop. If you're not expected to stop, a yellow light might tell you there is an intersection, but it doesn't tell you to slow down. It doesn't change anything as far as what's happening at the intersection itself. So why is the department kind of latched on to this all way stop? This is still pretty new for us. We've been doing this for about 2 or 3 years now. We discovered some national recognition for two other states, Delaware and North Carolina, during a 2023 National Roadway Safety Award program. Bill next to me noted that when two of the top ten nationwide awards are for the exact same thing, they must be doing something right. So, we looked into it more. Delaware did ultimately 25, and they've converted more since, intersections to all way stop control. The notable elements to this are the boxes in red. Their total amount of crashes dropped nearly 60% at these intersections after implementation of stop signs at all legs, and the injuries dropped by 82%. They had about 50 injuries before; they had nine after. The fatalities were eliminated. Recognizing that's a small sample size, but still worth noting. North Carolina found very similar information. They had actually a 70% reduction in total crashes, still close to 80% reduction in fatal and injury crashes, with a 75% reduction in frontal crashes, which is typically a pretty severe injury inducing crash. The biggest benefits from our perspective are that these are very low cost to implement. We're looking at \$20,000 or so, labor included. This is like consulting to a contractor type deal. It's even cheaper in house. It is signs and pavement markings and labor and the benefit cost ratio, which is what is really an important metric from our safety program, is 83 to 1. Which is essentially saying there are 83 parts benefit to this in terms of delay reduction and safety, as opposed to the cost. The biggest takeaway is that we can implement all way stop control at the majority of these intersections without violating the driver expectancy or creating safety concerns of their own. The pros: promotes safer speeds on the major route as they're now expected to stop at the intersection; it requires all drivers to stop, reducing the odds of two drivers entering the intersection at the same time if they happen to do so; everyone's looking to see what everyone else is doing, or it's a very low speed movement and it gets resolved before there's this impact; it does provide the minor road a dedicated turn to enter the major road, whether they're turning

or going through; a little less applicable for this particular location, but it does provide a safer environment for pedestrians just because of the slower speeds and just the general increase of awareness; it largely negates the lack of sight distance, if everybody is stopped, you only really need to see the immediate area at the intersection; it could be implemented very quickly, it's obviously signs and pavement markings, by the time the crews get out there to do it, it takes a couple hours or a day at tops. Traffic control is very minimal and everyone goes about their day. The cons: it does require a short-term re-education to familiarize drivers that the traffic control has changed. If this were implemented on 28, it obviously needs to be notified that drivers on 28 are expected to stop. We do that through message boards that go out two weeks ahead of time and they say, hey, this is changing. It hasn't happened yet, but just be aware of it. Then we'll do the change, flip the message boards for another month and say, the stop signs are there, now you need to stop at the new signs. You'll see on the very end slide, we have bright orange conspicuity panels. We lovingly call them Mickey Mouse ears because you can't miss them. It also does introduce new delay on the previous uncontrolled traffic. So, 28 obviously doesn't stop today. It would have to stop in the future. That's usually the biggest point of contention. North Carolina's all stop guidance, they just created a high level hierarchy of safety improvements. Note that all way stops, circled in red, is on par with roundabouts. Roundabouts have been proven to be a highly effective tool in our toolbox, it just comes with a price. All way stops are basically the equivalent for a lower volume traffic for a much lower price tag. Volume thresholds, a lot of the guidance that we look at, we want to make sure does the all way stop serve its purpose? We obviously know it's going to make us safer, but does it make the intersection too congested or is it going to cause other problems, are people going to reroute to other streets? So, we've plotted New Hampshire 28 and Sheffield Road. You can see it just in the bottom part of that top portion. North Carolina has essentially calculated that you can go up to 15,000 vehicles a day on both roads, and an all-way stop is still a feasible solution. A roundabout would be preferred, but for this particular area, we don't stay at that sort of volume all day. I'll get into some of the operations in a minute, but we feel comfortable with this and to liken it to an intersection that we converted, I think at the end of 2024 in Chester, New Hampshire 102 and New Hampshire 121 in the center of Chester, that was converted to an all way stop that also has a future ten year plan project coming that got a lot of fanfare, which I'll show you in a minute. That has been working remarkably well, even to the effect

that a lot of the community is saying: we don't need our project anymore, this all way stop is functioning fantastically. I know a lot of people haven't necessarily driven an all way stop, it is probably a little less applicable in Manchester. I know there's a lot of all way stops in Manchester in the downtowns, but I do like to just remind people of the rules of the road. It kind of takes the edge off a little bit. The first vehicle to get there has the right of way. If more than one vehicle arrives at the same time and you're adjacent to each other, the vehicle on the right gets to go first. If you get there at the same time and you're opposite, if you have to cross their path, you have to wait. It's very similar to a signal. If both directions turn green at the same time, that doesn't mean you can both go at the same time if you're going different directions. Local experience with all way stop control, these pre-2023 sites were actually before we discovered the research that Delaware and North Carolina have presented. Those were locations that we had tried all those countermeasures that just did not work. We tried the bigger signs, we tried the flashing lights, we tried the site distance improvements, and we still had problems. Those were last resorts, and they've worked out wonderfully, which I'll show you momentarily. Locations that we have done more consciously as a proven safety countermeasure, are Chester, Hampstead, Chichester, Salisbury, and Concord. The Concord one is near exit 17. That one's working remarkably well. This one is in Auburn, New Hampshire 121 and Hooksett Road. 121 goes from the left side of the page south and vice versa. So, it takes a 90 degree turn. We had four and a half years of crash data for this one. We had six crashes. One of those was an injury. Since we've converted, we have ten years of data and there's only been eight crashes. So, you can see the rate of crashes has been cut in half. Nobody's been injured. In Eaton, 153 is also another 90-degree corner. For the main road, we had four and a half years of crash data, it was similar crash data. Six years, six crashes, one injury. The five years of data since, there's been no crashes, no injuries documented. Gilmanton is more conventional. This is 107 and 140 going straight across each other. Almost six years of data before, they had 26 crashes at nearly five a year. Nine injuries reported there. In the four years after, they've had six crashes with no injuries. So that crash rate has been cut in a third. I alluded to Chester. This is some of the loving testimony that we got from concerned citizens. But they were excited to get this, this was sent to us before the all way stops were installed. It was really just the public announcement that we were going to do it. They're strongly opinionated, I'll give them credit for that. So, since we've put it in, we had about ten years of data. Ten years is

usually a cut off just to try to track trends and technology and stuff like that. They had 102 crashes over that ten-year period, so they're looking at just over ten a year. They had 24 injuries. So, a quarter of their crashes resulted in injuries. Since we've converted it, we have about a year and a quarter of data. They have had six crashes with two injuries. One of those was a motorcycle. I like to put a little bit of an asterisk on this because I think there were some of those people like the testimonial that maybe didn't abide by the stop sign just out of spite or not agreeing with it. So that is performing very well. There is a corner general store, there's a church, there's a post office. You can now walk across the street comfortably if you desired to, as I would not have tried that before this was implemented. And we did reach out to the town administrator afterwards. They did have a pretty significant grade coming up on one of their routes, the uncontrolled leg, that they were concerned, if traffic was stopped and we put up a stop sign, drivers were not going to get back up in the winter and we're going to have trucks stopped all the time; that hasn't come to fruition. So, coming back to Sheffield Road and 28, we have access to probe data. I looked through at this location. This is for the 85th percentile. This is for if we were to do a speed study to evaluate what the posted speed limit should be on this. On 28 specifically, we would look at the 85th percentile, which means that 85% of the traffic is going at this speed or lower. So, 15% is exceeding this. So, the bright green line that goes from Sheffield down essentially is 45 to 50 miles an hour. There's a little section north of Sheffield where they do drop into the 40 to 45 range. This intersection up here with Harvey Road is signalized, so that does get some slower speeds just because they do stop occasionally. But you can see the speeds are not terrible, but they are still higher than we would like to see. I also have an origin destination ability, so I can see where, for the most part, vehicles are coming from and where they are going through this intersection. I know these numbers are hard to see. These are about 45% on the north side. These are high 30% on the lower side, these I think are 17% and 12% on the eastern side, this is a 10%, this is a 1%. I know that Sheffield was converted to one way west only two years ago. I don't know if everyone got the memo because we still are detecting 1% of vehicles going the wrong way. But for the most part, it is through traffic on 28. It is worth noting, Sheffield Road westbound, we're looking at this eastern leg coming towards the intersection, half of them go through and almost the other half go right. Which makes perfect sense because if you're going to take a left you would have stayed on 28A which is just off the screen. 28 southbound, about 20% of that traffic is taking a left. There is no room here to

bypass safely. If you're looking to go through and someone in front of you is turning left, you're waiting for them. And 28 northbound, unsurprisingly, has very minor turning movements because if you're going to Sheffield, which is off the screen to the bottom, you've taken Abby, which is just south of this, or you've taken 28A as opposed to taking a right. So those volumes and turning movements make a lot of sense to me, but it is just interesting, all of the movements coming out of Sheffield are either throughs or rights for the vast majority. Everyone wants to know how much longer am I going to be waiting if I put an all way stop here? So, we've run this through our program, it's called SYNCHRO. 2026 existing, this is today with the stop sign on Sheffield, 28 uncontrolled as it is today, throughs and rights in both conditions have no delay, which they wouldn't. There's nothing to stop them. They have the right of way. If you're taking a left in either direction, it takes 8 to 9 seconds depending on traffic. I do want to note this is during the AM peak. So, this is like 8 to 9, somewhere in that ballpark. This is the worst hour of the day. It will not get worse than this. This is as bad as it will get. Sheffield Road takes just over a minute to pull out during the AM peak, whether you're going straight through, left, you have to wait for the queue in front of you. If we were to implement an all way stop tomorrow, 28 would average out to about 17 seconds during the worst hour. I would argue most of the time it would be significantly less than that. Most of the time we will go up to the stop sign, might be a car or two ahead of you, and then you'll go in, it's your turn. You'll notice Sheffield Road drops to 15 seconds. We've now given them their turn. This delay, this queue that is growing on Sheffield, is now going every third car, because there was only three of those four legs actually approaching the intersection. Comparatively, if this intersection were a signal, which is one of the proposed alternatives as part of our larger Manchester Highway Safety Improvement Program project, we are looking at about seven seconds to get through, about 23 seconds to take a left if you're heading southbound, an average of 14 seconds if you're heading northbound. And this northbound does not have a left turn lane right now because the left turn volumes are so low. So that's why there is a left turn duration for the southbound traffic to address the traffic going on to Sheffield in that direction and not for northbound. Sheffield is pretty much unchanged. It's still going to take 15 seconds. And again, these are during the same time period. Projecting this out, we always look at 20 years out for our project lifespan. It doesn't grow too much. These existing numbers do grow a little bit. Just for comparison, eight and nine stay the same for 28. You can see Sheffield Road grows by another 100 seconds if nothing is done at

this intersection. You have 23 across the board for the all way stop on 28. 19 seconds, that's compared to roughly 17 and 15 comparatively. So, you've gained about six seconds of delay there during your worst-case hour during the morning. Same thing during the signal time. These don't grow substantially from the 2026 version. Those are nearly identical. Your northbound and Sheffield grow about four seconds, three seconds each. But, the point is that looking at the signal versus the all way stop, you can see that this is for the worst time of the day. And you're saving six seconds. Most of the time if you're coming to one of these legs and it's not during the peak time, you're probably stopping at a red light and you're waiting and there's nobody there. And then you get to go and you've waited the same amount of time as if it was a stop sign or even longer. Those are the orange conspicuity panels that I noted on the stop. Those stay for about a year.

Alderman Terrio: My wife used to work on Sheffield when it was two way and I agree it was really hard to cross South Willow/28. It was dangerous. The data that you looked at, did you differentiate when it was a two way versus a one way going west? I'm going to assume that the accident rate went way down after we forced people to go west on the western side of Sheffield.

C. Spetelunas: As part of our larger project, we had our before traffic, our initial traffic collection, which had conventional four way, two way Sheffield. And then we redid it after about a year to make sure people were acclimated. So that's what's reflected in these numbers. I would have to look back at the table, but I was actually surprised by how many crashes were still occurring for that exact reason. But I could provide the numbers that we have.

Alderman Terrio: I'm going to assume that the people who are crashing, because it's one way west now, that it's the people who are coming from Sheffield on the two-way part of Sheffield and are crossing over. It was hard to cross over, back in the day. Let me just throw this out there, not that I'm a civil engineer, but my wife is. If you made it so on Sheffield, the part on the eastern side that's two way, if you made it so that they could only go right. So, people can pull into the road. But to me, the dangerous part is either going straight or taking a left out of there. I don't know how impactful it would be on that traffic, but if they could only go right, if you could put paving so that people can pull into

the road and they can pull out doing the right. To me, I'm going to assume that a lot of those accidents are crossing straight over or going to the left. I don't know the traffic patterns in that area.

C. Spetelunas: I'd have to look at the data specifically to see. We don't get a lot of the information with the crash reports just because it's redacted. It's personal information. So, we have to go through a whole process to get that. I don't have that information on hand. You're probably right. Looking from Sheffield Road really looking to your left, the sight distance is very poor, so even pulling right is still dangerous. It's still a better maneuver than going straight or left. The alternative that you mentioned, just making it right only is certainly something we could look at as part of our larger project. My concern is that if we do that, we either need to channelize them so that they cannot make those other movements, which is usually like a pork chop island or a median on 28, and do that so that you can still turn left southbound. It just adds complications to maintenance, which is usually the hang up for that sort of regard. But it's something we could certainly look at as part of the larger project. There are a fair amount of people going around left turners on 28.

Alderman Terrio: If we go with your recommendation of a four way stop sign, would you recommend making Sheffield a two way again on the west side?

C. Spetelunas: Not at this time. It could be something that looked at as part of the larger project, but I would not change traffic patterns for this.

Alderman Sapienza: This is great. This has been talked about for years. I don't know why it's taken so long, but anyway, better late than never, I suppose. Do you need city approval on this?

C. Spetelunas: It is a state road. The technical answer is no, but we like to do this as a courtesy. And there have been communities where we're proposing these on almost entirely state roads, that if the towns feel strongly that they don't think this is going to work or they want to try something else, we won't. Right now, it could be something we consider again in the future, but we wouldn't do it as part of this.

Alderman Sapienza: I say let's do it. And if you could look at Cilley and Jewett, that'd be a good idea, too.

C. Spetelunas: It's been on the radar.

Alderman O'Neil: How was this intersection picked by DOT? Because there's probably dozens of others in the city that could have been chosen. How did this one get chosen?

C. Spetelunas: We had a consultant do a screening of four-way intersections that met certain conditions, this one did meet those criteria. In addition to having the project that I mentioned, the safety project from our 2019 road safety audit, we've been adopting for a project like that that may end up putting in signals, we like to try to see if this will function correctly, backed by the data and the analysis, as an all way stop first. Knowing that the project's coming, if it doesn't behave like we're expecting it to, we do have that change coming in a couple of years that will fix the all way stop at that point.

Alderman O'Neil: Based on the data, would this meet the warrant for signals?

C. Spetelunas: It does currently meet a warrant for signals. It didn't initially. I don't know if it was the Sheffield Road reconfiguration or what, but the latest analysis does meet warrants for signals.

Alderman O'Neil: Is that based on accidents?

C. Spetelunas: It's one of the elements, but I think it met the volume warrants as well.

Alderman O'Neil: My concern is it's a main road for commerce, more so than some of the other projects you showed. I don't live in Chester, but have traveled there. What's going to be the impact on commerce by bringing tractor trailers to a stop and then they have to go again because heading southbound they won't hit another light until almost by 93? Northbound they are going to start hitting controlled intersections pretty quick, but that's a concern of mine. And then regarding speed, we see this in the city, in my opinion, when

we do four ways, and we've done them as an effort to control speed, all they do is speed between the four way stop signs. They're going to make up their time no matter what. And there's nothing, in my opinion, better than enforcement. Is speed the number one criteria here?

C. Spetelunas: Speed is less of a criteria. They may have that behavior; they've stopped at the stop sign and now they're racing either to the signal north or south.

Alderman O'Neil: We have one neighborhood with speed bumps and they speed between the speed bumps.

C. Spetelunas: The manual for uniform traffic control devices strictly says all way stops should not be installed as a form of speed control. So, this is strictly a safety improvement because of the known issues at the intersection. If they are increasing their speed on the corridor on either side of it, that's still a concern, but there's not the crash data and safety concerns that because they've accelerated a couple of miles an hour faster, that now they're going to rear end the guy in front of them and end up in a fiery ball or something. So there's tradeoffs; there's risks to both. But this is more to address the issues we've seen at the intersection, most notably, of the automotive repair gentleman right there. He's had numerous cars go down the hill at this particular intersection and trash some of his merchandise because they're either bypassing cars that are waiting to turn north or vehicles are turning right. And they get hit by someone on 28 and they end up down that embankment. It's not a speed specific improvement, but it's a safety intersection improvement.

Alderman O'Neil: I'm trying to think of where truckers will have a tendency to divert. They do it on 93 all the time and they'll use 3A if they can get around paying the toll. In my head I'm trying to picture where they could divert to: Mammoth Road? I don't know, but it's not going to get them to where their main commerce is. However you do your study does commercial traffic outweigh it or is there no impact on other vehicles?

C. Spetelunas: It could. Our analysis software does have percentages of large trucks, semi-trucks essentially. So, that is calibrated to include the appropriate number of vehicles going through the intersection.

Alderman O'Neil: That was used in this?

C. Spetelunas: Correct.

Alderman Trisciani: You brought up the auto shop with the hill. Is there any plan to actually put a guardrail up there to maybe save some of that? There's the accident, but the accident and then the roll has got to be causing more injury and danger to people. And it seems like, for starters, the state should be putting some level of guardrail in there.

C. Spetelunas: So that's complicated because the guardrail itself is a hazard.

Alderman Trisciani: A guardrail versus rolling over.

C. Spetelunas: If you hit a guardrail, and because of the curvature, it's two connecting roads, if you made a 90-degree bend in the guardrail and you hit that, there's no guarantee you're stopping anyway. And even if you do, you're probably catapulting over the guardrail and you're actually going to make it worse, or you have someone pushing you sideways into the guardrail and then you have that additional impact as well. I understand it sort of sounds a little counterintuitive, but hitting guardrail is not something that I would encourage anyway. I'm not encouraging them to crash down a hill either. Which is why we're trying to prevent the crashes from happening in the first place.

Alderman Trisciani: I think that one thing we are running into at that area, and Alderman Sapienza is well aware, and he did state that this has been happening forever, this has been going on for years. The one way is great; it alleviated it a little bit. If it warrants a light, why are we not just moving to the stage of putting a traffic light up? Because my concern is the amount of residential traffic. We're building more and more units up there that are going to bring more and more people to it. I do get that there's going to be the occasional truck. There's going to be some commerce, but it really feels like at the end of

the day, traffic lights are really the safest option for this. And I'm a little bit nervous to why spend money on an all way stop to then say, that didn't work, we killed a few more people, so now let's do traffic lights.

C. Spetelunas: The all way stop is such a drop in the bucket in terms of price. The signals on their own are \$500,000. This is a capital improvement program, and we have the project, fortunately, in the ten year plan already to potentially do that, and it may well be signals in a few years. It just takes the appropriate vetting and channels and coordination and everything. We're going to have right of way impacts with that, so we're going to have to come to a public hearing. And all of those things just unfortunately take a lot of time to do. We can't just snap our fingers and say, we're going to put signals in tomorrow. We could do that with signs because they're all within the right of way. They are a couple feet off the pavement, and it still provides that safety benefit. Signals feel safe because they're comfortable to people. They're not inherently safe. And that's probably truer in Manchester with the number of people that run the yellow and the beginning of the red, because it happens all the time in Concord, where I live. I do not go until I see both directions stopped; doesn't matter how long I've had the green light.

Alderman Trisciani: I can appreciate that, but with all due respect, we have been talking about this for a number of years. So, to now say we're just going to do these all way stop signs because it's going to take too long to do a stoplight, that's infuriating, particularly where the state has made a movement to zero accidents and zero fatalities. It's been probably at least five years that we've been talking about this. And it's frustrating that your plan to come back to us is that we have to take yet another interim step. And given the number of calls we get from residents, and the accidents, the injuries, the police time that it takes every time we have an accident, the blocking off of the road. I'm frankly a little bit disappointed that we're now going to take an interim step for two years and it might work better.

Susan Klasen, NH DOT Assistant Commissioner: I can really appreciate that frustration. One of the challenges that we're running into right now is that project isn't until at least 2028. So we can either do nothing and get through that in the right of way impacts and

the design, or we can do this, that may have the same or better safety improvements now for those crashes.

Alderman Trisciani: Thank you for the honest answer because that's what I was trying to figure out.

S. Klasen: That's what our internal struggle is. We can do this with zero right away impacts. We can do this as soon as possible.

Alderman Trisciani: So, this can be done right away. While we're doing this, we can continue the studies and continue the approach to get lights there in 2028.

S. Klasen: The goal would be to study this. I want to be really transparent about that as well. Signals is that ultimate goal that we're hearing, and when we put this all way stop in, we are going to be looking at that and following up on if the crashes have decreased. We do expect some complaints when this first goes in. Let's be clear. We're going to get complaints. And then hopefully that's going to level out. That's the goal. The goal will be zero crashes at that intersection, but we're going to monitor it. And then we still have that project in the program. And then this will help us better define what that scope looks like.

Alderman Trisciani: So, this is going to give us the details in the study with a plan of 2028 to have a lighted intersection there.

S. Klasen: It will have a project. I cannot promise you a signal, but that's the plan at the moment.

Alderman Trisciani: In the meantime, I would be curious to see the study on the guardrails because we put guardrails everywhere else for safety, and now you're telling me they're not as safe as rolling down a hill. I've got serious concerns about that. I would like to get a copy of the studies on that.

S. Klasen: Understood.

Alderman Fajardo: How long have you been studying to reach this decision?

C. Spetelunas: For the all way stops, that has been a this year decision.

Alderman Fajardo: Not the decision, but the time to reach the decision for the all way stop signs.

C. Spetelunas: This year. Our consultant finished their review of statewide intersections earlier this year, and we've been conducting outreach and other analysis, like I just presented, this year. This project is actually advertised already. So, if Manchester said we really don't want this, we would change it. It was just the timing to get here didn't work with where our project went.

Alderman Fajardo: For about a year, you've been going around, or for a period of time, going around giving similar presentations as this to other places. It's a cost concern with the light?

C. Spetelunas: Our program is safety focused. Our objective is to eliminate fatalities and serious injuries from crashes.

Alderman Fajardo: I just heard her mention that the actual rub is that you can do this, implement this quickly and for a very small amount of money relative to the actual proposed or preferred solution.

S. Klasen: The other project, where it is in the plan, isn't scheduled to be designed and implemented for a few more years. And so, recognizing that this is a challenging intersection now, we realized we could probably do this now, and instead of waiting. That other project, we haven't even done right of way.

Alderman Fajardo: And will you submit this project for the same award as the ones that were recognized in the other states? I assume that part of the sell here was a lot of emphasis on the fact that this won an award in other states, other intersections in other states. And I just I hope we win, too.

C. Spetelunas: No; the award is certainly secondary. The major takeaway was how much this reduced crashes and fatalities and serious injuries. This is strictly a safety project. It's not to be to look at the DOT and how great we are. We put some stop signs in the ground. This is to prevent people in Manchester and other communities from unnecessarily being injured, or worse, when we could do something rather than wait two or three plus years for a signal, which may be the ultimate goal. It's just 2 or 3 years out, so we'd like to do something in the meantime, and it could be an interim condition. It could be the long-term condition. But it's something that we're still looking at as part of that project. And this is one of the sites we're looking at.

William Lambert, State Highway Safety Administrator: For 23 years, I was a state traffic engineer. I was the guy that always told towns and cities, no, we're not going to put an all way stop in. That's the last resort. Over time, we came up with that list of locations where we implemented all way stops after everything else failed. And around the same time, I saw the notice from North Carolina and Delaware that they were getting recognized. Looking back, those places that I put all way stops in, kicking and screaming because nothing else worked, I haven't heard about them again. Something worked. And what was that? So, we looked deeper into it. So, in the last couple of years as, as Corey's alluded to, I've kind of been on that step nine of a twelve step program, making amends, going back to these towns that for years I said, we're not going to do an all way stop.

Alderman Fajardo: Do you think that MUTCD will get updated to reflect that?

W. Lambert: It's interesting that the project that Corey talked about with our consultant, part of that project was to develop a problem statement for national research to inform the folks of the MUTCD. So, I think the MUTCD, federal highway in general, is already looking at adding all way stop control as one of their proven safety countermeasures. And I think Delaware and North Carolina got recognized, and that is fine, but somebody had to raise their hand and say, if it's working for you guys, why won't it work for us? And kind of spreading that news.

Alderman Fajardo: Clearly, it's not the right solution for this intersection, but I know there's a lot of other intersections in the city that many people will be thrilled to see that update to the guidance.

Alderman Kaw-uh: I think we all share a goal of wanting to reduce roadway injuries and fatalities and that sort of thing. It sounds like this is a harm reduction approach rather than a full fix. Is that a fair description?

C. Spetelunas: The intended result right now is an interim improvement, knowing that we have this project waiting; yes.

Alderman Kaw-uh: In general, I would share the assessment that a roundabout in general is preferred. Is that something that we can request as a board to be done? Would that have to wait until 2028?

S. Klasen: There's not enough funding in the project for that.

C. Spetelunas: I'm wondering if that's why we weren't looking at a roundabout.

S. Klasen: We can take that back and look at that. I do know the dollar amount that's programmed for that larger project is not enough to fund a roundabout, but that doesn't mean that that's something that the team hasn't already looked at or could look at. So, we'll get back to you on that. I'm not sure if they have.

Alderman Kaw-uh: Especially as part of analyzing the alternatives and that sort of thing, I think it would be important to consider all the different options.

S. Klasen: Maybe they have. I just can't speak to that.

Alderman Kaw-uh: The traffic analyses that you performed; did it include the anticipated hundreds of units that Alderman Trisciani had referenced earlier? There's a lot of residential development happening within about a half mile radius, and that will impact

the traffic patterns. I don't know if that has been factored in yet, given that it's both recently completed with Cos, and also some of it isn't even built yet, it's just been approved.

C. Spetelunas: I have some of those on my radar. I know there's a couple towards the other end of Sheffield Road that are in the works. These numbers would not have reflected that.

Alderman Kaw-uh: Another thing that Alderman Trisciani took away from my list of questions is the guardrail. I drive that area fairly frequently to go drop my dog off, and it's kind of scary being right next to that severe drop off. I'd love to see an official report on whether or not that makes technical sense. I also was just wondering about the timeline in terms of getting here. So, it's been a serious concern for the city for a long time. As you know, the city kind of took it into its own hands a few years ago when it made that one part of Sheffield Road one way. Obviously, we would have loved to see stuff happen more quickly. Could you speak to the pace of action from the state's side of things? What has taken so long for us to get to this point?

C. Spetelunas: I wish I had a better answer for you. We've had a consultant working on this project for a number of years now, and I don't want to throw them under the bus, but it's very difficult with getting transfer of information between and trying to push this project along. I've noted to myself that I really need to pull in that consultant and really push this project because I know the city is concerned. It's been on my plate for a while. I'd like to move it forward. I'd love to bring the alternatives that we have to the aldermen and really get that next step going. I just have to have that discussion.

S. Klasen: What I can tell you is I do not have the history on this project. I'm relatively new in my current role, not at the department, but in the current role. So why don't we dig into that and understand it, because one of the things I've been looking at, and a lot of our ten-year plan projects, is what is our process? And are there certain things that can or should be done differently? So, we'll get back to you on that timeline and to Corey, saying that I'll be following up on that. It sounds like we have a couple action items. I guess we'll just have to get back on how we communicate that back to you all.

Alderman Kaw-uh: And if you happen to have more funding, as a Department of Transportation, could that possibly accelerate a timeline on the 28 project, could it move up at all, or is it pretty much locked in?

S. Klasen: I'm not sure if that would make it go faster, but it may be able to change some of the scope. Can I just make one point of clarification? So that project that Corey referenced has gone out to bid and I think I even saw the bids come in. Right now, this intersection is in the contract to be installed with a little asterisk that says it could be withdrawn. But from what I'm hearing right now, we have some follow-ups to do. And then our intent would be to continue and install the all way stop and do the after monitoring of that. And then we could provide that data back when we do some after studies as well along with this additional information. I just want to make that clear.

CONSENT AGENDA

Accept BMA Minutes

3. Minutes from the June 2 BMA meeting, June 9 Special BMA meeting, and June 30 Special BMA meeting.

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

4. 50/50 Sidewalk Petitions:

Residential

- 7 Mirror Street
- 27 Eaton Street
- 47 Porter Street
- 99 Thomas Street
- 443 Walnut Street
- 740 Howe Street

Commercial

- 79 Varney Street

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

6. Resolutions:

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, reducing funds in the amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$350,000) for the FY2023 CIP 611623 InvestNH Municipal Per-Unit Grant."

"Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Nineteen Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty-Two Dollars and Twenty-Five Cents (\$119,832.25) for the FY2023 CIP 711323 Amoskeag EB & Canal Ramp Design and Construction"

"Amending the FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Five Dollars (\$13,500) for the FY2026 CIP C300040726 Seabrook Station."

"Amending the FY2019 and FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thirty-Two Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Four Dollars and Sixteen Cents (\$232,924.16) for the FY2026 CIP C500071126 Pearl Street Parking Garage"

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the FY2027 CIP C500070127 FY27 Parks Paving."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the FY2027 CIP C500070227 FY27 Roadway Program."

"Amending the FY2025 Community Improvement Program, increasing funds in the amount of Seventy Thousand Dollars (\$70,000) for the FY2025 CIP 211325 Overdose Prevention Funding."

"Amending the FY2022, FY2024 and FY2025 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Sixty-Three Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Two Dollars and Fifty-Seven Cents (\$263,922.57) for the FY2022 CIP 712622 ARPA - Revenue Replacement - Roads & Sidewalks."

Bond Resolutions:

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000) for the 2027 CIP C100070127 Purchase of 6 Buses (Fleet Replacement)."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for the 2027 CIP C100070227 Purchase of 5 Buses (Fleet Replacement)."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000) for the 2027 CIP C100080127 Information Technology Infrastructure & Chromebooks."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Seven Hundred Sixty Thousand Dollars (\$760,000) for the 2027 CIP C130080127 Technology Bond."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Four Million Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$4,525,000) for the 2027 CIP C130080227 Munis ERP Financial System."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the 2027 CIP C210070127 FY27 Deferred Maintenance - Municipal."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Twenty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Ten Dollars (\$322,310) for the 2027 CIP C210070227 JFK Coliseum Chiller Plant."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Million Five Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$3,550,000) for the 2027 CIP C210070327 Deferred Maintenance Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$3,500,000) for the 2027 CIP C230070327 Motorized Equipment Replacement."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,400,000) for the 2027 CIP C300040127 Public Safety Communication System Upgrade."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C300040227 Gear Equipment Replacement."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C500070127 FY27 Parks Paving."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000) for the 2027 CIP C500070227 FY27 Roadway Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Twenty Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$20,800,000) for the 2027 CIP C500070327 Raise - City Funds (DPW - Highway)."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050127 Parks Deferred Maintenance."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050327 Park Playground Replacement and Retrofitting."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050727 School Playground Replacement."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050827 School Parking Lot Rehabilitation."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050927 School Deferred Maintenance - P&R."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT AND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION

7. Recommending that all city departments be encouraged to utilize Absolute Data Destruction per the recommendations of the Independent City Auditor.
(Unanimous vote)
8. Recommending that all city departments be encouraged, where applicable, to utilize WB Mason preferred pricing for common purchases such as paper, pens, and other office supplies, per the recommendations of the Independent City Auditor.
(Unanimous vote)
9. Advising that it has accepted the Independent City Auditor's Payroll Process Efficiency Review and Procurement Process Efficiency Review of the Manchester School District.

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

10. Recommending that Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by amending §32.029 Funding and Resource Management pertaining to the Art Commission by increasing spending authorization without board approval to \$1,000 per project.”

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

(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

11. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the reduction of funds in the amount of \$350,000 for CIP 611623 InvestNH Municipal Per-Unit Grant, and an extension for the project to December 31, 2026, be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

12. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorizations providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$119,832.25 for CIP 711323 Amoskeag EB & Canal Ramp Design and Construction be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

13. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$13,500 for CIP C300040726 Seabrook Station be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

14. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorizations providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$232,924.16 for CIP C500071126 Pearl Street Parking Garage be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

15. Recommending that the request from the Solid Waste and Environmental Programs Manager for permission to accept up to \$20,445 in grant funding from the NH Department of Environmental Services and Waste Management Division to conduct two household Hazardous Waste Collection Events be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

16. Recommending that the request from the Assistant City Clerk for permission to apply for up to \$10,000 in grant funding from the New Hampshire State Library Conservation Plate Grant Program be approved.

(Unanimous vote)

17. Recommending that the request from the Police Grant Coordinator for permission to apply for grant funding from the BJA FY25 De-escalation and Crisis Response Training Program be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
18. Recommending that the request from the Planning and Community Development Director for extensions for various CIP projects be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
19. Recommending that the request from the Highway Chief Engineer for extensions for various CIP projects be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
20. Recommending that the request from the Welfare Director for an extension to CIP 810525 Welfare General Assistance Rentals to June 30, 2027, be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
21. Recommending that the request from the Parks Project Manager for a revision to the project description for CIP 511123 Stevens Park - Cal Ripken Baseball be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
22. Recommending that the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) expenditure report through March 31, 2026, submitted by the Planning and Community Development Director, be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

23. Recommending that the request from the Deputy Public Works Director for the following changes to the department's complement:
 - Addition of one (1) full-time Payroll Coordinator (Class Code 1260, Grade 111);
 - Elimination of one (1) Customer Service Representative III (Class Code 1040, Grade 108) once the Customer Service Representative III promotion is grantedbe approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

24. Recommending that the following traffic regulations be approved:
Handicap Parking- Tow Zone
On Stark St, north side, from a point 196 feet west of Hampshire Lane to a point 24 feet west
Alderman Dexter
Rescind Handicap Parking – Tow Zone
On Stark St, north side, from Hampshire Lane to a point 18 feet west
(ORD6767)
Alderman Dexter
(Unanimous vote)
25. Recommending that the request from the Parking Manager for authorization to enter into an agreement with MacKay Meters for on-street parking meters be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
26. Recommending that Ordinance Amendment:
- “Amending Section 70.78 Basic Penalty of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester to include updated parking and other citations.”
- ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.
(Unanimous vote)

JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS COMMITTEE

27. Advising that the Manchester School District Priority I status and financial report for May 2026 submitted by LeftField has been accepted.
(Unanimous vote with the exception of Alderman Thomas, who was absent)

**ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN O’NEIL, DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN TERRIO,
IT WAS VOTED THAT THE CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.**

Information to be Received and Filed

5. Communication from Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer, regarding the Standard & Poor's rating report for the Manchester Sewer Revenue Bond.

Alderman Sapienza requested that agenda item 5 be removed from the consent agenda.

Alderman Sapienza: I'm just asking for a brief explanation of the board's downgrade.

Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer: Standard and Poor's, we have a bond issuance that will be closing on July 14th. So, they came back in to rewrite the bonds. It's not surprising that costs have gotten away from everyone. And it's really the magnitude of the project and how much it costs. It's an unfunded mandate. We are court ordered to do it. Now, this downgrade does not affect the city's general obligation bonds. Those remain at double A. This is strictly on the sewer bonds.

Alderman Sapienza: Is it alarming to you?

S. Wickens: I mean, it wasn't surprising. And to be honest with you, if the rating agency Standard and Poor's had known what the cost of this project was going to be from the very beginning, they would have rated it a plus. Then the downgrade is strictly because the costs have gotten away from us.

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

REGULAR BUSINESS

28. Communication from Kaleigh Shaughnessy advising the Board of her resignation from the Heritage Commission.

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

29. Nominations:
Board of Health
Mary Naczas Seigle to succeed herself as nurse representative, term to expire July 1, 2028
Patricia Anglin to succeed herself as labor representative, term to expire July 1, 2029
Ashwini Saxena to succeed himself as a regular member, term to expire July 1, 2028
Conservation Commission
Lauren Zielinski to succeed herself as a regular member, term to expire August 1, 2029
Thomas Palangas to succeed himself as a regular member, term to expire August 1, 2029
Patrick Chabot filling a vacancy as a regular member, term to expire

August 1, 2029

Heritage Commission

Heidi Hamer to succeed herself as a regular member, term to expire

July 1, 2029

Steve Hebsch to succeed Stan Garrity as a regular member, term to expire

July 1, 2029

Lisa Walsh to succeed Kaleigh Shaughnessy as a regular member, term to expire July 1, 2028

Planning Board

Stephen Meno to succeed himself as a regular member, term to expire

May 1, 2029

Peter Winslow to succeed himself as a regular member, term to expire

May 1, 2029

Safety Review Board

Zachary Silva to serve as the citizen member

Alderman Goonan to serve as the Aldermanic Representative

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

Alderman Kantor: I am opposing Alderman Goonan now during the vetting process for being under the Safety Review Board, because he has been accused of allegedly creating a hostile and unsafe work environment when he was the fire chief. And that created a complaint to the Human Rights Commission in Concord, which the city had to settle in excess of \$200,000 with an employee that felt allegedly unsafe around Dan Goonan. Also, I am opposing Peter Winslow's nomination due to his activism with promoting certain projects. There is a clear conflict of interest with him being on the board.

30. Confirmation:

Central Business Service District Board

Jacqueline Botchman to succeed herself as an at large member, term to expire

May 1, 2029

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

31. Confirmation of Jamie Corwin as the Director of Human Resources.

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

Mayor Ruais: Congratulations, Jamie. Very much looking forward to working with you, and for your first day later on this month.

32. Confirmation of Charles Kurfehs as the Chair of the Board of Assessors.

Mayor Ruais: Another phenomenal privilege and opportunity to make a nomination. Thank you to Alderman Goonan and to the Board of Aldermen for doing the research and work on this confirmation of Charles Kurfehs as the Chair of the Board of Assessors.

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

33. Tentative Agreements:

- Manchester Police Patrolman's Association
- Manchester Association of Police Supervisors

*On motion of **Alderman Burkush**, duly seconded by **Alderman Barry**, it was voted to ratify the agreements, with **Alderman Sapienza** being duly recorded in opposition.*

Mayor Ruais: Congratulations. I want to take a moment to thank Alderman Burkush, Alderman Dexter, and Alderman Goonan, who were nominated by this board, for their efforts on the negotiating team and certainly on behalf of the city. Thanks to the solicitor's office. Thank you, Chief Marr and AC Loui. Thank you, Rob, and thank you, Neil as well. Please extend our thanks to them. But thank you all for your work in this process over the last several months in working in the budget, and thank you to the aldermen as well.

34. Communication from the Mayor's Office regarding the continued operations of the Aged and Infirm Shelter and accompanying Engagement Center at 200 Elm Street.

Alderman Kaw-uh: I definitely appreciate the inclusion of the information. I was curious if we have any data on this year's PIT count. I think last year's was a little delayed. I was wondering if we could get kind of a big picture view of the homelessness situation in Manchester because the engagement center and that shelter down there on Elm Street seems to be doing what it was intended to be doing. I'm concerned that overall, as a city, we may be heading in the wrong direction. Still, given the sheer number of folks on the streets that we've been seeing lately, I know summer is a time when people are more

visible, but it would be, I think, really important for this board to have a fuller picture of what's going on, to see if there's anything else we can do to help address the situation.

Mayor Ruais: We have a wonderful relationship with Matt McCall, who's the chair of the Continuum of Care. The COC, as you know, is the one that does that PIT count. I'm more than happy to have him come in and have a conversation, more broadly, about the work of the COC, and the work of the several boards that comprise the COC. And certainly, if there are any specific questions that you're referring to as well pertaining to Families in Transition or 1269 Cafe, a fuller picture, more than happy to get that information and share it.

Alderman Kaw-uh: I can follow up via email with some more specifics.

Mayor Ruais: Please do.

Alderman Kantor: Are we still not checking IDs?

Mayor Ruais: There has been no change to the standard operating procedure from the last time that Jake was here.

Alderman Kantor: So, we're still not checking IDs; so they could be illegal immigrants.

Mayor Ruais: As we've talked about in the past, there are certain things that we can check. There are certain things that we can't check when there are federal strings attached, when they're coming through the CDBG dollars; there are certain things that we can do and certain things that we can't do. As we've talked about in previous meetings, I've had multiple conversations with Solicitor Rice on this. If there is any kind of restriction that you are looking for, if there are any kind of additions that you would like to make on the rules that are there, I'm more than happy to work with the solicitor to find a way to implement what you're looking for. I think one of the items in here that we wanted to make sure to include after consulting with Chief Marr, there was an arrest down there. So, if there was a concern that the police are not routinely patrolling or are not on top of that location for any kind of nefarious criminal behavior, I think it's been demonstrated that the community

policing team does a really great job of making sure that they're getting down there, talking to those local businesses if they have concerns. But to your point, if there are things that you would like to see implemented there that aren't, more than happy to work with the solicitor within the confines of the law to implement them.

Alderman Kantor: Sounds great. I do know with the first speaker that came up and said he would love a full audit of how the money is distributed and checks and balances, because back with Chief Cashin and Adrienne Beloin, they welcomed sex offenders. She was very proud that they had beds for sex offenders.

Mayor Ruais: If there's a programmatic audit that we would like to do, happy to look into that as well. But as the conversation I've had multiple times with Director Belanger, anybody that receives CDBG funding from the city has to file strenuous, very specific reports on the activities that are going on within their organizations. So that information is all readily available because to receive those federal funds, there are a lot of strings attached to it. I'm happy to provide any follow up information with Director Belanger if you have specific questions about the goings on with the organizations that are receiving funds.

Alderman Trisciani: I have more of a statement, where I think that we're kind of forgetting the most important thing here, and thanking Jake and his team for running the shelter on a shoestring budget, helping get people off the street. And studies have shown that the lower barrier shelters are the shelters that get the most people in, and are able to help them get out of their situation and move forward. So, with that being said, I think what we're doing with the shelter now is fine. I don't think there's anything we should be doing to change it, other than more partners that we can get to help with the engagement portion of it.

Mayor Ruais: We've had more conversations with a number of nonprofits, as you'll recall, that we're going to have the mental health center on that first floor this fall. To your point, I'm remiss in not thanking Jake and Melanie for the work that they do down there. Every time we call them and have a request for them, they always say it's going to be tight if we do this, but we're more than happy to do it. They are more than accommodating. They

answer all of the requests that we have. So certainly, if I haven't said that recently, I would say it again for the public that we appreciate their partnership.

Alderman Kantor: Are we asking if they were originally living in Manchester?

Mayor Ruais: As part of the data in the data input system that we have, those are the questions that are asked: where are you from, what's your background? We ask questions pertaining to that background.

Alderman Kantor: I'd love those numbers because like I said before, build it and they will come. And as the first gentleman that was here, and the speaker concerned about being taxed out of their home when there's an override in the tax cap, and before you know it, more senior citizens will not be in their homes. I'm concerned about it continuing and more people coming to Manchester and feeding off of the taxpayers. I believe in helping everyone, but there is tough love, not letting them go out and smoke everything.

35. 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 Fire Chief for permission to apply for GO-NORTH funding to initiate a Mobile Integrated Health Care model be approved.

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

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Environmental Protection Division for approval of the following Amending Resolutions and Budget Authorizations be approved and referred to the Committee on Finance:

- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$9,700,000 for CIP 710225 WWTP Emergency Power Upgrade;

- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorizations providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$198,660.86 for CIP 710824 Secondary Clarifier Design and Construction;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$300,000 for CIP C270070227 DCMOM FY27 Study & Design;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$500,000 for CIP C270070327 MS4 FY27 Permit Compliance;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$1,000,000 for CIP C270070427 WWTP Effluent Study;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$5,300,000 for CIP C270070127 MS4.DCMOM Construction;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$6,500,000 for CIP C270070527 CMOM C-6 Construction;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$30,000,000 for CIP C270070627 WWTP Pump Station Upgrade Construction;
- Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$2,000,000 for CIP C270070727 Queen City Ave Separation C-8 Design.

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

The Committee on Community Improvement respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$81,000 for CIP C300040427 Weston Tower Site Radio System Upgrade/Repairs be approved and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

- 36.** *On motion of **Alderman Barry**, duly seconded by **Alderman O'Neil**, it was voted to recess the meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.*

37. Mayor Ruais called the meeting back to order.

38. Report(s) from the Committee on Finance, if available.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the following Resolutions ought to pass and be Enrolled:

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, reducing funds in the amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$350,000) for the FY2023 CIP 611623 InvestNH Municipal Per-Unit Grant."

"Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Nineteen Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty-Two Dollars and Twenty-Five Cents (\$119,832.25) for the FY2023 CIP 711323 Amoskeag EB & Canal Ramp Design and Construction"

"Amending the FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY2026 CIP C300040626 Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS)."

"Amending the FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Five Dollars (\$13,500) for the FY2026 CIP C300040726 Seabrook Station."

"Amending the FY2019 and FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thirty-Two Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Four Dollars and Sixteen Cents (\$232,924.16) for the FY2026 CIP C500071126 Pearl Street Parking Garage"

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the FY2027 CIP C500070127 FY27 Parks Paving."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the FY2027 CIP C500070227 FY27 Roadway Program."

"Amending the FY2025 Community Improvement Program, increasing funds in the amount of Seventy Thousand Dollars (\$70,000) for the FY2025 CIP 211325 Overdose Prevention Funding."

"Amending the FY2022, FY2024 and FY2025 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Sixty-Three Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Two Dollars and Fifty-Seven Cents (\$263,922.57) for the FY2022 CIP 712622 ARPA - Revenue Replacement - Roads & Sidewalks."

“Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eighty-One Thousand Dollars (\$81,000) for the FY2027 CIP C300040427 Weston Tower Site Radio System Upgrade/Repairs.”

“Amending the FY2025 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Nine Million Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$9,700,000) for the FY2025 CIP 710225 WWTP Emergency Power Upgrade.”

“Amending the FY2018 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Dollars Eighty-Six Cents (\$198,660.86) for the FY2024 CIP 710824 Secondary Clarifier Design and Construction.”

“Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the FY2027 CIP C270070227 DCMOM FY27 Study & Design.”

“Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for the FY2027 CIP C270070327 MS4 FY27 Permit Compliance.”

“Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for the FY2027 CIP C270070427 WWTP Effluent Study.”

*On motion of **Alderman Burkush**, duly seconded by **Alderman O’Neil**, it was voted to waive the reading of the report.*

Matthew Normand, City Clerk: For the record, the reports from Finance include the Resolutions that were reported in this evening.

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

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the following Bond Resolutions ought to pass and layover:

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$700,000) for the 2027 CIP C100070127 Purchase of 6 Buses (Fleet Replacement)."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for the 2027 CIP C100070227 Purchase of 5 Buses (Fleet Replacement)."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000) for the 2027 CIP C100080127 Information Technology Infrastructure & Chromebooks."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Seven Hundred Sixty Thousand Dollars (\$760,000) for the 2027 CIP C130080127 Technology Bond."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Four Million Five Hundred Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$4,525,000) for the 2027 CIP C130080227 Munis ERP Financial System."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the 2027 CIP C210070127 FY27 Deferred Maintenance - Municipal."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Twenty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Ten Dollars (\$322,310) for the 2027 CIP C210070227 JFK Coliseum Chiller Plant."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Million Five Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$3,550,000) for the 2027 CIP C210070327 Deferred Maintenance Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$3,500,000) for the 2027 CIP C230070327 Motorized Equipment Replacement."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Four Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,400,000) for the 2027 CIP C300040127 Public Safety Communication System Upgrade."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C300040227 Gear Equipment Replacement."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C500070127 FY27 Parks Paving."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Million Dollars (\$5,000,000) for the 2027 CIP C500070227 FY27 Roadway Program."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Twenty Million Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$20,800,000) for the 2027 CIP C500070327 Raise - City Funds (DPW - Highway)."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050127 Parks Deferred Maintenance."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050327 Park Playground Replacement and Retrofitting."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050727 School Playground Replacement."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050827 School Parking Lot Rehabilitation."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the 2027 CIP C650050927 School Deferred Maintenance - P&R."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Five Million Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$5,300,000) for 2027 CIP #C270070127 MS4/DCMOM Construction to pay for the construction phase for MS4 and drainage improvements to the City's storm water system by the Environmental Protection Division, and for the payment of all other incidental costs related thereto. Projects include but are not limited to: construction phase of MS4 and infrastructure improvements to the City's drainage and storm water system."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Six Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$6,500,000) for 2027 CIP #C270070527 CMOM C-6 Construction to pay for the construction phase for the ongoing improvements to the City's sewer system by the Environmental Protection Division, and for the payment of all other incidental costs related thereto. Projects include but are not limited to: construction of the ongoing improvements to the City's sewer system."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Thirty Million Dollars (\$30,000,000) for 2027 CIP #C270070627 WWTP Pump Station Upgrade Construction to pay for the construction phase for the WWTP Pump Station Upgrade project by the Environmental Protection Division, and for the payment of all other incidental costs related thereto. Projects include but are not limited to: construction phase for the WWTP Pump Station Upgrade project."

"Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) for 2027 CIP #C270070727 Queen City Ave Separation C-8 Design to pay for the construction phase for the design phase for the Queen City Ave CSO separation project by the Environmental Protection Division, and for the payment of all other incidental costs related thereto. Projects include but are not limited to: design phase for the Queen City Ave CSO Separation project."

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

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

39. Report(s) of remaining committees, if available.

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from Aldermen O'Neil and Kaw-uh to name the tennis courts at Livingston Park after longtime Manchester coach Mark Telge be approved.

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

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Water Works Director to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding for the purpose of executing a Declaration of Conservation Easement Deed on approximately 70 acres along Lake Shore and Candia Roads be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Kaw-uh**, it was voted to accept the committee's report and adopt its recommendation.*

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Tax Collector for authorization to dispose of the tax-deeded property at 311 Spruce Street through public auction, utilizing the minimum required bid set by the Board of Assessors, be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Kaw-uh**, it was voted to accept the committee's report and adopt its recommendation.*

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the agreement with Stark Brewing regarding its use of a portion of Arms Lot for outdoor dining be amended to prohibit the space from being sub-leased to another business or entity, and further that the space cannot be utilized by Stark Brewing during a permitted special event occurring in Arms Lot.

Alderman Kantor: I wasn't here last night, but I did watch the meeting. I apologize for not being there. I do have concerns on this, as a small business owner, and having to have the employees bringing out the tables and everything. I guess my concern is if there are events that are planned, what you're saying is if he has plans to use that with his customers on a regular basis since he got approval, but if someone gets a permit through the city, they can override it. So then Stark can't use it outside. Is that what that's saying?

Alderman Trisciani: That was the agreement that was reached last night on the committee.

Alderman Kantor: I'm concerned about special events and I'll talk about a specific event. I have three free concerts that we do down at Stark Brewery. I am concerned about if people have planned parties and so forth that if someone comes in and wants to do another event. I am concerned about what's happening over at Stark Brewery. So basically, he's rented the space. I understand there was an issue. How do you manage? What's really fair if you don't know who's renting the space?

Alderman Trisciani: The clerk can back us up, but if there's other events down there, there's nothing stopping you from pulling a permit to use that space through the city.

Alderman Kaw-uh: What I wanted to chime in on was there's nothing in these amendments that would prohibit the event organizer who might have a permit, for example, the recent Bacon and Beer festival that happened in that parking lot, when they submit for the permit, they receive that permit for the entirety of the lot. This created a conflict, an unexpected conflict, where there was overlapping approvals taking place. So, this amendment helps address those overlapping approvals where the main event, if the

entirety of the parking lot is approved through the city for a permit, then the specific restaurant usage of the space, which is kind of an ad hoc thing throughout the summer, that would not be allowed to happen at the same time. However, there's nothing prohibiting the restaurant from coordinating with the event organizer. For example, the concerts, if they wanted food to be served or if they wanted to offer that space to the restaurant. I don't believe there would be anything in here that prevents that coordination from happening. It just kind of clarifies who has first priority during that main event for the that portion of the parking lot.

Alderman Kantor: So, with the other restaurants and so forth that have their sidewalks, are they allowed to continue when you do special events?

Alderman Trisciani: This was something, as you might recall, the concept of leasing out parking spots for use by restaurants, was done during Covid with Covid funding. The goal of this was to assist the restaurants that were having restrictions on the amount of people they could seat inside of their restaurant to bring them outside so that they could get more business. At the price of \$1,260, the restaurants could get three parking spots. We are leasing out at the same amount the use of 22 parking spots and the city lawn for this use. So given the way it has worked out and the conflicts that have arisen, the safest way to be most fair with everybody is they're not allowed to sublease their space out. And if something is permitted in the park, that property is part of the park property and the city has the right to lease it out. And at that point in time, the restaurant business would be ceased for that evening. We do not have restaurants on Elm Street, and I would say that if a restaurant on Elm Street decided to sublease their seats out or do something else with their sidewalk dining, we would have an issue with that as well.

Alderman Kantor: But it's city property.

Alderman Trisciani: Which is exactly why we're doing it this way. The lot that Mr. Telge is using is city property.

Alderman Kantor: I guess my thing is, if we're just going to have a band down there, I'm going to have to pull a permit to have an event? The organization I work with is going to have a free concert for everyone. So, then there's more red tape involved. I get it.

Alderman Trisciani: Just again, back to Covid restrictions. It sounds like you may also have a conflict in voting on this issue since you do have business down there. But if you want to guarantee that spot and you want to host an event, I would recommend you go through the permitting process through the city.

Alderman Kantor: Do you have a personal vendetta against him?

Alderman Trisciani: I do not.

Alderman Dexter: What's going to prevent Stark Brewing from planning an event and then a last minute permitted event be permitted by the city? And then does that cause an issue? So how do we lock in the calendar that something can't come in last minute for him, whereas he may have already put out an event that he was planning on, and then last minute something comes in and we're overriding it? Is there a mechanism to prevent that?

M. Normand: Well, as you might imagine, nothing happens overnight in the city. There's an exhaustive process to get a special event, such as the New Hampshire Bacon and Beer Fest that occurred. That takes typically weeks to get through the approval process. That probably took 5 or 6 weeks in that case. Mr. Telge, I tried to call him today, but he wasn't available to explain this, but he can certainly maintain contact as he has over the past. There are three scheduled events for the rest of the season, three permitted events in Arms Park for the rest of the season, two of which are his events, Brew Fest and a wrestling event. So, the third event is a farmer's market that goes on every Wednesday from 4 to 7 p.m. Mr. Telge does not have permission to use that space that he's using currently until 6 p.m. So, he loses an hour on a Wednesday with this vote by the committee last night. Now, we average 6 to 7 events in that park. Those seven have been licensed or permitted already this season. Does that mean one can't come in towards the

end of the summer? It doesn't, but that's something we can maintain communication with Mr. Telge.

Alderman Dexter: I just want to make sure that we're not doing something and fast tracking an event on a weekend or something that he has an event planned.

M. Normand: Well, just like these events in the park, if he had an event that was going to be impacting the area, he would need to go through a special permit. He knows that process. He's done it. As I said, two of those are his. So, he would have to be going through that process. They're not going to conflict. They shouldn't conflict in any way.

Alderman Barry: I've had the opportunity to speak with Matt as well as Alderman Trisciani and Peter Telge. I think this discussion is great, but I think we're all set. Peter is good with what is happening. He understands why the meeting was held and what was discussed. And Like Matt says, right now, there's three permitted events. Two of them are his, and the other one is the farmer's market. And he's coordinated with the farmers market to interact with each other for usage. So, I think we're good to go.

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Kaw-uh**, it was voted to accept the committee's report and adopt its recommendation, with **Alderman Kantor** being duly recorded in opposition.*

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Planning and Community Development Director to deem the Pearl Street and Hartnett Lots surplus city property be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Trisciani**, duly seconded by **Alderman Kaw-uh**, it was voted to accept the committee's report and adopt its recommendation, with **Alderman O'Neil** being duly recorded in abstention, and **Alderman Kantor** being duly recorded in opposition.*

The Committee on Lands and Buildings respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from 32 Jane Street LLC to enter into an agreement to allow for the continued encroachment of an existing concrete retaining wall into a portion of the South Street right-of-way be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Kaw-uh**, duly seconded by **Alderman Trisciani**, it was voted to accept the committee's report and adopt its recommendation.*

The Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Finance Manager to execute the Submerchant Agreement with NIC Services, LLC for utility billing payments be approved.

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

The Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Finance Manager to execute the renewal of the City's purchasing card contract with Bank of America be approved.

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

The Committee on Human Resources/Insurance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the City Solicitor requesting the following changes to the department's complement:

- Add one (1) Attorney I position, grade 123;
- Add one (1) Legal Assistant I position, grade 107

be approved.

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

The Committee on Human Resources/Insurance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that the request from the Finance Officer for the addition of one (1) Purchasing Manager position (grade 124) to the department's complement be approved.

*On motion of **Alderman Goonan**, duly seconded by **Alderman Burkush**, it was voted to accept the committee's report and adopt its recommendation, and that the related Ordinance Amendment ought to pass and be Ordained.*

40. Resolutions:

"Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, reducing funds in the amount of Three Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$350,000) for the FY2023 CIP 611623 InvestNH Municipal Per-Unit Grant."

"Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Nineteen Thousand Eight Hundred Thirty-Two Dollars and Twenty-Five Cents (\$119,832.25) for the FY2023 CIP 711323 Amoskeag EB & Canal Ramp Design and Construction"

"Amending the FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000) for the FY2026 CIP C300040626 Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS)."

"Amending the FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirteen Thousand Five Dollars (\$13,500) for the FY2026 CIP C300040726 Seabrook Station."

"Amending the FY2019 and FY2026 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thirty-Two Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Four Dollars and Sixteen Cents (\$232,924.16) for the FY2026 CIP C500071126 Pearl Street Parking Garage"

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000) for the FY2027 CIP C500070127 FY27 Parks Paving."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$600,000) for the FY2027 CIP C500070227 FY27 Roadway Program."

"Amending the FY2025 Community Improvement Program, increasing funds in the amount of Seventy Thousand Dollars (\$70,000) for the FY2025 CIP 211325 Overdose Prevention Funding."

"Amending the FY2022, FY2024 and FY2025 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Sixty-Three Thousand Nine Hundred Twenty-Two Dollars and Fifty-Seven Cents (\$263,922.57) for the FY2022 CIP 712622 ARPA - Revenue Replacement - Roads & Sidewalks."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Eighty-One Thousand Dollars (\$81,000) for the FY2027 CIP C300040427 Weston Tower Site Radio System Upgrade/Repairs."

"Amending the FY2025 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Nine Million Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$9,700,000) for the FY2025 CIP 710225 WWTP Emergency Power Upgrade."

"Amending the FY2018 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Dollars Eighty-Six Cents (\$198,660.86) for the FY2024 CIP 710824 Secondary Clarifier Design and Construction."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Three Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$300,000) for the FY2027 CIP C270070227 DCMOM FY27 Study & Design."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$500,000) for the FY2027 CIP C270070327 MS4 FY27 Permit Compliance."

"Amending the FY2027 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) for the FY2027 CIP C270070427 WWTP Effluent Study."

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

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

Mayor Ruais: If there is no objection, I'd like us to address the tabled item before entering into new business.

TABLED ITEM

- 41.** Communication from Owen Friend-Gray, Deputy Public Works Director, requesting the establishment of a tax increment financing (TIF) district for the purpose of financing the construction of infrastructure related to the Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) grant.
(Note: Tabled May 5, 2026.)

*On motion of **Alderman Terrio**, duly seconded by **Alderman Barry**, it was voted to remove the item from the table.*

Owen Friend-Gray, Deputy Public Works Director: Thank you for your time and consideration this evening. I understand it's towards the end of the meeting. It's a bit late. I'll try to be as quick as I can. Basically, in reviewing the TIF that we have discussed multiple times here at the board for the RAISE project, unfortunately, due to some changes within projected projects, changes within interest rates, changes within US debt service ratios as recommended by our financial consultants, the TIF total amount that is supportable within and around the RAISE project has been reduced. And unfortunately, that number is now \$11.6 million instead of the original \$20.8 million. That reduction, unfortunately, means that we do not have the funds to go out to bid with this project, which we need to have in hand before we get approval from USDOT to put this project out, which we are hoping to get that approval this fall or into this winter. That shortfall runs us almost \$12 million shy of what we would need to do the entirety of the project. So unfortunately, unless there is a will of the board within the next few months to bond that amount of money or find it from another revenue source, we would need to look at a modification to the RAISE project. What we are requesting this evening is a vote for approval for the TIF district at the reduced amount, and also a consensus of the board if they are willing to support the alternative scenario, as discussed in the attachment that is in front of you currently and also was, I believe, emailed out yesterday. Unfortunately, what has really broken this project in terms of cost is the largest bridge, the span for vehicular traffic over the CSX railroad. Total funding available for construction right now sits at about, with full funding from the TIF, and the federal government sits at about \$36 million, which is roughly the same cost as the bridge in and of itself. So that one of four elements is the entirety of the funds available to us. If we only did that bridge, we would actually have to reduce the federal grant roughly by half, about \$12.5 million, because the

other \$12.5 million is allocated to the other three elements. So even if we only looked at the large-scale bridge, that wouldn't even be an option because then we'd still be roughly \$12.5 million shy financially. If the large bridge is dropped, the Gas Street connection, then the other three elements can be completed with the \$12.5 million from the federal government roughly, and the money from the TIF. So, at this point, we're looking to see if that is something that the board finds amenable.

Alderman Barry: What if we just cancelled this whole project, what would that cost the city?

O. Friend-Gray: So, there is about \$5.5 million so far that's been paid out in design monies and funds that have come back. We can cover most of that in the cash we have already within the TIF, but then we would also need to find another roughly half million dollars. So, we would need to come up with another half million dollars and we would need to, essentially, sink the \$6 million, give or take, that's gone into design.

Alderman Barry: We would lose that money.

O. Friend-Gray: Yes, and all of the grant money.

Alderman Barry: So how much would we lose again?

O. Friend-Gray: About \$6 million; just under.

Alderman Barry: I'm not saying that this is a small amount, but another \$6 million will save us \$48 million. Because we need \$12 million, right?

O. Friend-Gray: Roughly another \$12 million would save us the \$25 million in federal grants.

Alderman Barry: Right now, we didn't really get anything.

O. Friend-Gray: Lines on paper, but nothing concrete built.

Alderman Barry: I'm not happy with this. Someone goofed somewhere, I guess. I kind of look at it as, do we unfortunately bite the bullet, and spend an extra \$6 million, we're going to have to because I know it's close to \$12 million to get \$48 million worth of a project.

Mayor Ruais: One point of clarification, in our conversations those bonded dollars that we would have to come up with, that \$12 million, that would have to be bonded this year?

O. Friend-Gray: That is correct. In the next couple of months.

Mayor Ruais: Which we can't afford. I mean, to me, this is a fiscally prudent change to the alteration of the plan.

Alderman O'Neil: One of my questions is already answered because she's shaking her head no. So, that answers that one. This whole thing started, and I understand, it's not the first time some consultants have let us down on costs. This whole thing started with the bridge over the railroad tracks, to get a second access point at Gas Street, etc. The other elements kind of came off of that, correct? They weren't, as I recall, part of the original thought with the many times that Public Works applied for a RAISE. It was always the bridge. Correct?

O. Friend-Gray: The bridge has always been the major component, a major driver of this. But what came out of the three years of charette work that we did starting in 2018 and running up to the award in 2021, all had these other elements, these were things that the public was interested in and really wanted, and were all improvements centralized around this one area. So, while the bridge was probably the key original element, I would say that all these other elements were involved in some form or fashion by the time this was awarded in 2021.

Alderman O'Neil: You said the award was in 2021. Were those other elements included in the grant application then? And in your opinion, you can't speak for Federal Highway, were those factors in awarding the overall grant?

O. Friend-Gray: I would say yes, because we lost the award two years prior.

Alderman O'Neil: Without those elements?

O. Friend-Gray: Some of those elements were in, some weren't. We changed it around. We modified it. We worked with Federal Highway to get it more up to what they were looking for.

Alderman O'Neil: I got the nod from Sharon that we're not doing it or we can't do it. There is no way, and Alderman Barry was kind of going down this path, there's no way from a timeline we can financially make this work. To me, the bridge is the most important element of the whole thing, but there's no way we can afford it.

O. Friend-Gray: No, there's no way that the dollars work without coming up with that \$12 million.

Alderman O'Neil: It will probably be years before we could afford it.

S. Wickens: I mean, that's a pretty big hit to the debt service. And we have a lot of projects going on right now.

Alderman O'Neil: I'm sorry this happened. As I said, we've had consultants before who can give us good numbers. And the case here, we didn't get good numbers. And I know you put a lot of time into this, and I appreciate it.

Alderman Trisciani: I'm going to start first with a thank you for going through all of this. I was involved in, I would say, 98% of these meetings since this project started in putting this grant together. I would disagree with Alderman O'Neil, that the bridge was not the most important part to the people of Manchester. They were more excited about the roundabout and making it a safe section on that Queen City Ave piece. They were very concerned about the rail trail extension for safety and another corridor for transportation for the city. For those without vehicles and the pedestrian safety aspect overall, I think given what we're doing, and I don't think we can turn around and blame the consultants,

I think costs have risen. We know petroleum has gone up. We know the costs of everything has risen. So, we're kind of just caught in a very difficult spot. I would propose that we go ahead and we approve the TIF district, and we also give you whatever support is required. I've spoken to you that I've also spoken to our federal delegation and are working to get more approval to get this before the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. And hopefully we can lobby them to reduce the project, accept the new scope of our project, and make a difference in that portion of Manchester, and take one step forward. Hopefully down the road, more money will be available. We will be able to add our bridge on at that point, but I think given the environment we're in today, the situation we're in today, I appreciate that the study was done. I love that we have a study, and I don't have an issue doing this as piecemeal to give back to the city of Manchester, what everybody that participated in these meetings had asked for. I think to walk away completely and have to pay money back is a travesty and is something that should not be done. OST might make us do that, but we are going to fight like hell and we are going to work with OST to get them to understand this is what is best for our community. This is what our community asked for, and I appreciate the time and effort that you have put in to try to say, let's not scrap this, but let's take this action and let's still make something wonderful happen in the community.

Alderman Sapienza: I just want to dial back a bit. We just briefly discussed the downgrade from Standard and Poor's on the sewer project. So that raises a red flag of concern for me. That has certain implications. The city's going to have to pay higher interest rates going forward in the future, if I understand correctly.

Mayor Ruais: It's just pertaining to the sewer bond, as Director Wickens said. It was the unfunded mandate that we signed a consent decree on.

Alderman Sapienza: I understand. A downgrade from a third-party objective group like Standard and Poor's, it's going to make it harder for the city to borrow money. It's a red flag of concern.

Alderman Kaw-uh: That only applies to the sewer.

Alderman Sapienza: Only applies to sewer. Understood. I don't disagree with that at all. But this is coming on the heels of that. I mean, how does this story end? I mean it is runaway spending. It is. I think we need to be more cautious going forward.

Mayor Ruais: So, we had the conversations with Director Belanger before about the 79-E and the TIF that pays for this through the taxes that are raised in that section. Alderman Terrio asked several questions on this about having multiple TIFs in the city and whether or not we could sustain that. And the conversation that we had was multiple cities have multiple TIFs and that we are not unique in that way.

Alderman Sapienza: Right, but lo and behold, we have this problem dumped in our lap that we have to give serious consideration to. I'm just trying to raise a red flag of concern here. A downgrade from Standard and Poor's is not a minor thing. I know it only applies to sewer. This comes on top of that. Are we voting on this tonight or are we going to have a little more time to digest this?

Mayor Ruais: Do you want to speak to the history of the votes and the times that this has been brought up?

O. Friend-Gray: The two different presentations that I've given, and then the votes that have been taken, put us in this position. However, the changing numbers caused this to be delayed. Also, with all of the budget conversation that was happening late into the season we didn't want this to get conflated with the rest of it. However, we do have a timeline that we need to have this project under contract by September 2027, with a contractor, for us to receive the funds. To do that, we need to have it out to bid this winter to get appropriate pricing and to have time to negotiate the contract with the contractor, which means we need to have it in front of USDOT this fall.

Alderman Sapienza: It doesn't sound like we have to vote on this tonight.

Alderman Trisciani: Well, we do, because we need that time in front of the OST to get approval for this fall.

Alderman Sapienza: In the fall; this is early July.

Alderman Trisciani: The OST needs to approve it before we can actually go out to bid.

Alderman Sapienza: I'm a no vote on this if we're voting tonight; it doesn't have to be voted on tonight. I don't see why we have to vote on this tonight.

Mayor Ruais: If it has to be approved in September, we need the time to go to OST, that is the conversation that we had. Just to clarify, I think the request tonight, what we had talked about, was that the support for the TIF is contingent upon approval from OST. So, approving this tonight just allows them to have the leverage to go to OST to rework the project. We're not positive that there's an opportunity to even allow for us to rework this project at this late stage. Did I say anything inaccurate there?

O. Friend-Gray: No, that's completely correct.

Alderman Fajardo: I just wanted to clarify, although I feel like I have more questions after that conversation, but the bridge over the railroad, I'm thinking about all the renderings that we've looked at along the way. That was the one that sort of swept around behind. And now we've also seen images of a footbridge over Granite Street. Is that the pedestrian safety?

O. Friend-Gray: That's pedestrian safety. Yes.

Alderman Fajardo: That's where I was getting confused. So that will stay?

O. Friend-Gray: In some form or fashion. Again, this is all part of the negotiations with OST as to what we can afford and what they'll approve as part of it. But yes, pedestrian improvements, safety improvements within that intersection is one of the three remaining elements. Absolutely.

Alderman Barry: I think when we had met last week, my understanding was that we could do the bonding over a 5-to-6-year period. Now, I guess apparently, we can't. With that in mind, I'd have a difficult time with it.

O. Friend-Gray: To let everybody know, I met with a liaison for the OST, which is the Office of Secretary of Transportation, with the DOT last week. And they were able to give us a lot of clarifying questions. One of them is we don't get any federal funds unless we see this through to full completion. And another one was we do need to have all of the funds in hand before it goes out to bid. We can't sequence it like sometimes the state will allow us to on LPA type projects. So that is a recent update.

Mayor Ruais: One clarifying question for Director Wickens, as Owen talked about, now that the budget has passed, if we were to have to repay that \$100,000, where do we think we would grab that from?

S. Wickens: Is this something we bonded originally?

O. Friend-Gray: Some of it is bond that we would be able to use to go back. Some of it is cash, but there is an additional roughly half million shortfall that we would still need to come up with. Some of the money that we have right now in hand to do this project, essentially to get us through the design work, was bonded. Some of it was cash, but we still, with all of the repayments that we would need to make, we would still be short roughly half a million. So, we would still need to come up with \$500,000 from somewhere.

Mayor Ruais: This started five years ago. My concern right now would be, the question before the board is, where do we come up with that \$500,000 or \$6 million, where would those dollars come from? If we're comfortable with the TIF number at \$11.6 million, which is significantly reduced from the previous time because we've chopped off a leg of the project, I think that's the decision before the board to make.

Alderman Burkush: My reading of the board tonight, and I might be wrong, is I don't think we're comfortable voting on this at all. I would suggest that we put it back on the table.

There are too many questions, I believe. And that would be my suggestion. I'm not sure that we should vote on it tonight.

Alderman Terrio: I thought we were under a time crunch because we need this done with OST by the fall? If we put it back on the table, we wouldn't work on it until August. Would that give you enough time to deal with OST in September?

O. Friend-Gray: I don't think so.

Alderman Terrio: We need to stay tonight until we have a decision.

O. Friend-Gray: If this gets tabled tonight, in my mind, I'll do everything I possibly can to try to negotiate in advance with OST, but putting this back on the table probably would kill the entirety of the project.

Alderman Terrio: Alright. So, that leads me to my second question. I'm trying to get my head around these numbers. So, we don't have the money for the full project, the bridge. We're going to scale it back.

O. Friend-Gray: Correct.

Alderman Terrio: And Alderman Barry already asked this, but I'm not sure if I understood the answer. If we scale it back like you're recommending, how much federal money are we losing without the bridge part?

O. Friend-Gray: About \$12.5 million. Unfortunately, my laptop has died, so I don't have the number in front of me.

Alderman Terrio: Is that all of the federal funding?

O. Friend-Gray: No, it's about half.

Alderman Terrio: If we scale back, we still have half the federal funding.

O. Friend-Gray: Correct.

Alderman Terrio: So about \$12 million.

O. Friend-Gray: \$12.3 million, I believe is what's needed.

Alderman Terrio: But as the mayor is saying, we still have to come up with another \$500,000 that hasn't been budgeted.

O. Friend-Gray: Only if we completely abandon the project and have to fully repay the federal government.

Mayor Ruais: I'm sorry I didn't make that clear. If we abandon the project altogether. If we just said we're not doing this anymore, we have to repay it.

Alderman Terrio: So, if we go ahead tonight, or at least the permission to go ahead with the scaled back project, we will still get the \$12 million approximately in federal funding, and we won't owe the government any money.

O. Friend-Gray: Correct. If OST agrees to these modifications.

Alderman Terrio: If they agree. So, would you say the safest route forward is to scale it back from a money perspective?

O. Friend-Gray: Yes. The TIF, if that is voted on tonight and the project doesn't go forward, the TIF bond never gets pulled. The TIF doesn't happen, the way the TIF resolution is written. It has to be for this project, for these elements. So, if for some reason the negotiations with OST does not work out, there's no risk to the city by voting on this and approving it tonight from a financial perspective.

Alderman Fajardo: This may seem like sour grapes a little bit, but just so that I'm understanding correctly, the federal government gave us a grant with the expectation that

we were going to spend a set amount on a bunch of things. All those things became a lot more expensive from the time that they gave it to us to today. And so, because we can't afford all the things, they are going to take it away. I feel like we can point directly to the federal government for a lot of the increase in costs over the last few years. Especially, it seems, because we were just talking about the fact that this was going up in price when you first brought forward the TIF proposal, and now it's gone up even more. What's your strategy for negotiating with the federal government in asking them essentially to sort of keep up their side of the deal? We're willing to spend the amount that we budgeted and could afford. So why wouldn't they be willing to meet us on their side with the amount that they had awarded us? I guess I don't understand. They're just going to pull it because we're changing the detail of what's going to be executed?

O. Friend-Gray: Essentially, what the federal government awarded us was \$25 million for four components. The bridge was roughly half of that. I don't remember the exact split on the other items, but what we're asking for is going to the federal government and saying, look, we just can't afford this.

Alderman Fajardo: Because everything's so much more expensive than it used to be.

O. Friend-Gray: Because everything is more expensive. This grant was issued based on 2019 dollars. As we all know, a few things have happened in the world since 2019, and pricing is not what it used to be. This is not uncommon. The liaison I was talking with at OST said partial completions or sections of projects is things he's seen other municipalities and states come forward with, and it's been received fairly well by OST. It is something that they've been seeing and reviewing. So, this is not a unique situation. This is not something special to us. I would say the negotiation tactic would basically be, to say to OST that they don't look any better than we do if this project doesn't happen. We were the first or second project on their website for a year when this got awarded as the largest award to a city, to a single entity, we hit the maximum award. And if prices have gotten so out of hand and they are not willing to work with us, I would say they look foolish, just like we would.

Alderman Fajardo: At minimum, if we have to abandon the project, we shouldn't have to pay the \$6.5 million, if I've kept track of the math correctly, back to them.

O. Friend-Gray: That is part of the agreement, unfortunately. We signed that in 2022.

Alderman Fajardo: Well, if it comes to that, is there any opportunity to negotiate on that agreement?

O. Friend-Gray: At this point in time, that's what we are trying to amend, that original agreement saying we will build these four projects, and you will give us \$25 million for it.

Alderman Fajardo: You brought up the consulting numbers being off. We're looking at a large discrepancy between where we were when we first started this, and where we are today. So, to what extent is it being off on the part of the consultant or just economic factors?

O. Friend-Gray: Some might have been underestimations by the consultant, certainly. But we were working these projects off of 2019 numbers.

Alderman Fajardo: Nothing was done in bad faith.

O. Friend-Gray: I don't think anything was done maliciously or in bad faith. In hindsight, there should have been more conservative numbers used and maybe a little more on the contingencies. I don't think anybody predicted Covid or anything like the world we're living in currently in terms of construction costs. I would say that's not necessarily on the consultant.

Alderman Fajardo: So, to Alderman Sapienza's point, having learned that lesson over the last few years, is there anything that we should be hedging as we look ahead at trying to make this work? Are we being more conservative now?

O. Friend-Gray: I can tell you that \$11.6 million that we're asking for in this TIF bond is much more conservative than the \$20.8 million was. And that's part of the discussions. I'll

thank Sharon and her team; she's been on more calls with me this last two months about this than she probably ever wanted to be, and the consultants that worked really hard with us on that. But again, a lot of those things like the debt ratio, the coverage ratio, things like that, we have chosen more conservative numbers with concerns about pricing escalations and costs going forward.

Alderman Fajardo: I'll just say very begrudgingly, I support your recommendation. I would vote to approve the adjusted TIF amount and vote to approve the adjusted project scope. I really hope that if this board does go forward with that vote, that the federal government will look kindly upon us and act in good faith.

O. Friend-Gray: I hope so as well.

Mayor Ruais: Sharon, can you speak to the TIF as it pertains to our credit rating and whether you have concerns?

S. Wickens: Actually, when we were going out for the sewer revenue bonds, not only did we have S&P that downgraded us, but we decided we wanted to go out and get a second rating as well, just to see if we were on par. So we spoke with Moody's. And one of the things in that conversation I had with Moody's, as I was talking to them about upcoming general fund debt, the school piece of the general fund debt, the school phase one project, the Pearl Street TIF, the Water Works garage, I was starting to think that's a lot of debt. They recognized that it's a lot of debt. They also recognize that we have strong management, and that the board does watch these things. And Moody's indicated in that call that they were well aware of what we had coming up, and we would still maintain the city's rating, which with them is Aa3; still a good rating. That conversation alone, and Moody's is the tough one of the two, I mean, Standard and Poor's is, but Moody's has pretty strict metrics, and they did indicate that they felt that we would hold our rating. And I did mention the RAISE TIF. And at that time, I thought it could be about \$20 million after reviewing some of the projects that were in the scope. To your point, some of them really didn't come to fruition. A few of them had 79-Es that weren't relayed to our consultant. So, they're looking at these dollars coming in immediately. Well, they're not for a few

years. I will give a lot of credit to Owen. He's been on the phone and wanting to really understand this and using our financial advisor throughout this entire process.

Alderman Bonilla: I feel like we all have the answers to the questions we need. We'll eliminate the bridge over the railroad, take away the \$12.7 million. We can afford the partial project with the caveat that OST says yes. And then we'll lean on our federal delegation to ask for additional dollars. So, let's just vote on this TIF.

Alderman Bonilla moved to approve the TIF district in the southern millyard for a total value of \$11.6 million and to direct DPW to negotiate with the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to modify the existing agreement to allow as much to move forward as possible within the confines of the available funding, contingent upon the successful completion of negotiations to align with DPW's modified proposal. Alderman Trisciani duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil: I want to make sure I understand. I thought what Owen was looking for tonight was permission to go to the Secretary's Office to negotiate.

O. Friend-Gray: TIF approval and permission or support.

Alderman O'Neil: And we were going to approve the elements two, three and four? And that's what you're going to the OST with?

O. Friend-Gray: Yes.

Mayor Ruais: I think your paragraph here spells out the specific vote: If the board determines that the alternative scenario is to be pursued, what you discussed, the removal of the bridge to remove that \$36 million from the project, so we're cutting the project by \$36 million, if the board were to approve this alternative scenario, then the request of the board is a vote to approve the TIF in the southern millyard for a total value of \$11.6 million to be raised from the TIF, not an increase in taxes, to be raised from the TIF, and to direct the Manchester DPW to negotiate with the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to modify the existing agreement to allow them to move forward as

possible within the confines of the available funding. This vote is contingent upon the successful completion of negotiations with OST to align with the above proposal; the TIF will not be executed unless all finances can be brought into alignment with this scenario. So, this just allows you to go and negotiate.

O. Friend-Gray: Pretty much.

Alderman O'Neil: But, is there a final vote tonight?

O. Friend-Gray: On the TIF, yes.

Alderman O'Neil: So, we're going to vote to approve a TIF that doesn't even impact the businesses that are paying?

Alderman Trisciani: We may not even need that TIF. We're saying we're going to approve the TIF because the deputy director needs to have that in place in order to negotiate with OST. Should OST say, screw you, we're not going to do this, give us our \$6 million back, we never initiate the TIF. So, we're agreeing tonight to give Owen some level and some layer of negotiating power to try to at least save a portion of this project without us losing any money at the city level.

Alderman O'Neil: But again, I understand everything you said, but we're being asked to approve a TIF where the projects that would come out of it aren't even directly related to where the buildings are that are paying the TIF.

Alderman Trisciani: Yes, they are. They're right in the district.

Alderman O'Neil: You can't say Union and Queen City is good for the people in the southern millyard. You can't say that for the pedestrian bridge over Granite Street. This whole thing was about building the bridge over the railroad tracks and getting a second way in and out of the mill yard. That's what this whole thing was about. I'm not comfortable with this.

Alderman Sapienza: Bridge over troubled water.

Alderman Kantor: I was just wondering if Sharon could clarify our bonding with the schools. Where are we at with bonding, if you can clarify that? There's a lot going on.

S. Wickens: There is a lot going on. The sewer bond will be closing on July 14th, and that's \$237 million. I am going out with a general obligation bond for about \$101 million. And that's comprised of the resolutions that we've approved in the past two budgets, the school district, not the phase one project, just the school district's little projects. So, for this year, they bonded \$12 million for parks and things like that. In this issuance, we'll have the Pearl Street TIF, that's the building of the apartments and the condos and the garage over there. We're going to be building that garage in the TIF district. That's about \$23 million. And then we have the Water Works administrative facilities building. Now that's going to be a G.O. issuance, but we backed that out of city bonding because it's backed by the water rates that Water Works charges for water. And that's about \$35 million. It's a big number. We will be going out for the school phase one in November because the BAN comes due. If you remember, we issued a short-term BAN to bridge the time that we needed the bigger amount of money, and that would need to close before November 14th. That's when I thought I was going to issue the RAISE TIF, but that looks like it's going to be pushed off a little bit.

Alderman Kaw-uh: Owen, to me, it sounds like the only decision before the board tonight, really at a high level, is whether we move forward with a reduced version of the RAISE project or try to move forward with that, depending on what OST says, with all the other elements except the bridge, or we scrap the whole thing. Is that a fair assessment of a binary choice at this point?

O. Friend-Gray: Yes.

Alderman Kaw-uh: Personally, I would much rather see a pedestrian bridge, a significantly improved Queen City and South Willow intersection, and also a rail trail, rather than seeing nothing at all. I would have loved to see the bridge happen. Unfortunately, I understand that it just blew up in cost. I plan to support this. I thank you for the diligent

work that you did to try to figure out what could work. I would like to call the question and request a roll call.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. Aldermen Kaw-uh, Goonan, Dexter, Fajardo, Bonilla, Trisciani, Terrio, Barry, and Vincent voted yea. Aldermen Kantor, O'Neil, Sapienza, and Burkush voted nay. The motion carried.

O. Friend-Gray: One point of clarification, on the consent agenda there was a CIP project for the TIF that was approved for \$20.8 million. Does that need to be adjusted tonight or can that be done in the future? I just want to make sure that the vote tonight for the TIF approval at \$11.6 million that just took place does not cause issues with that.

M. Normand: As I understand it, if the OST doesn't approve your reduced scope, then this TIF doesn't happen.

O. Friend-Gray: Correct.

M. Normand: So, they're going to have to come back once you get that revised scope approved.

O. Friend-Gray: An adjusted CIP?

M. Normand: It will be revised then.

O. Friend-Gray: Thank you. Apologies, I just wanted to make sure that wasn't missed.

Mayor Ruais: Thank you for the clarification.

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman Sapienza: I had tried to get this item put on the agenda. I was not successful. Do we have an update with the State Police investigation into the Office of Youth Services?

Peter Chiesa, Deputy City Solicitor: No, we don't. We're in contact with them every once in a while. I know Solicitor Rice speaks to them every once in a while, but we don't have a definitive date as to if and when they're going to complete their investigation.

Alderman Sapienza: Well, we're kind of in the abyss here. This has been going on for a long time; this is beyond reasonable, this is ridiculous. What do we do? Just keep waiting and waiting another 5 or 6 years?

Mayor Ruais: Just like the other matters that have come before the board pertaining to state investigations, we have no control over that. The solicitor contacts them on a regular basis and asks these questions. We have no control over a state investigation.

Alderman Sapienza: Well, if the solicitor contacts them on a regular basis, what are they being told?

Mayor Ruais: Exactly what you just heard from them.

P. Chiesa: They're still investigating.

Alderman Sapienza: This is ridiculous. What are they doing over there at the State Police? I've been in and around law enforcement for about 30 years now, we're getting steamrolled here. They're BSing us. Maybe we should go somewhere else, the county attorney. This has been going on and on and on. What are they investigating, the crime of the century?

Mayor Ruais: The State AG's office, it took over a year for the officer involved shooting from last year to be concluded.

Alderman Sapienza: We're not talking about a shooting here.

Mayor Ruais: Well, that's what I'm saying, I can't speak for them, but my working assumption is that they prioritize the cases that come before them.

Alderman Kantor: I just want to say congratulations to all the homesteaders. You're allowed to be entrepreneurs in Manchester. I was just wondering, how are we going to move forward with that, with aligning with all the other great towns that are already allowed to can their pickles and bake their breads and share because they care?

Mayor Ruais: I know conversations have been happening with the health department and the solicitor's office to understand the impact of the state law, and I'm sure information will be forthcoming, as I think that law was just signed effective last week. More information will be forthcoming; we're subject to the state.

Alderman Kantor: Excellent. Thank you so much. One more thing, a big shout out to DPW, Caleb and his team, for working with the state to fix the problem up on Hanover Street, the light that has been so unsafe getting on to 93, the collaboration of him and the state. We have a resolution and it will be safer up in ward six getting on to the highway and cruising down Hanover Street.

Alderman Bonilla: One, I wanted to say a big shout out to team USA for playing an incredible game. Look, I know y'all tried, y'all made this country proud, regardless of the outcome. Two, as of yesterday, I wanted to provide an update, Mike Whitten, the Director of MTA, had provided us with updated numbers on bus ridership and the new bus pilot route that we launched, route 42. They've transported around 226 passengers during the first two weeks of service. So, a big shout out to MTA. I'm also excited to announce that in that budget that we just passed, it included allocated funding for the engineering, design, construction specifications and permit work required to put the pool and bathhouse project out to bid. So, ward five, center city Manchester, we are actively working on bringing back a pool. Thank you, alcalde, for working with us on making that happen; we're one step closer. I just really wanted to provide that update. Exciting news.

Alderman Kaw-uh: A speaker during public comment had asked about the Arms Park parking lot and possibly being able to use it in a way that at least the commenter thought would make a better use of the space. I wanted to note that the Economic Development Office has been working, as the mayor knows, and as many of you probably know, with the Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission to perform some brownfield analyses or some studies of the soils that are underneath the parking lot, because that was a big question mark for the potential future redevelopment of that lot. The second phase was just recently completed. I, as one member of the board, would certainly love to hear more about the results, the findings, and the possible steps forward from Director Nazaka, if that could fit onto a future agenda as a presentation.

Mayor Ruais: I'm happy to talk to the director. If I'm not mistaken, we took a vote on that my first year, if I remember, about approving the brownfield study. I remember that coming up at some point. I'm happy to talk to Director Nazaka about an update.

Alderman Bonilla: One other thing, more exciting news is that it's our first Levitt AMP Manchester Music Series. It'll be this Thursday. We'll be cutting the ribbon. At 5 p.m. the park opens, at Veterans Park. It's the first of the concert series. And then 6:15 is the ribbon cutting, 6:30 to 7:15 is Donaher, that's the artist. 7:45 to 9:00 is Dyer Davis. It's awesome, bringing in concerts to Manchester, I'm really pumped. Can't wait.

Alderman Fajardo: I just want to acknowledge the handout that Director Nazaka from the Economic Development Office left for each of us about the impact from Banana Ball, the league coming to the city. It obviously is a really big impact and I appreciate this great presentation, and congrats to all who made that happen.

Alderman Kantor: Thank you for bringing up the World Cup. Our great friend, Chris Clark from Central High was the lead DJ, he was featured in the Union Leader. What an extraordinary guy, leading the way and uniting everyone, bringing joy at Gillette Stadium. They were voted number one fans down at Gillette Stadium throughout the World Cup. So, congratulations to everyone coming together and playing ball.

Mayor Ruais: Congratulations, Chris.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Sapienza**, 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

*Meeting Start Time: 7:00PM
Meeting End Time: 9:41PM
Minutes Prepared By: Michael Intranuovo*