

FINAL

**LEBANON CITY COUNCIL  
MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, March 4, 2026 7:00 p.m.  
Council Chambers**

**Remote Via Microsoft Teams: [LebanonNH.gov/Live](https://LebanonNH.gov/Live)**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mayor Douglas Whittlesey, Assistant Mayor Devin Wilkie, Erling Heistad, Nicole Ford Burley, Timothy McNamara, Laurel Stavis, Christian Simon, and Karen Zook

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** George Sykes

**STAFF PRESENT:** City Manager Andrew Hosmer, Deputy City Manager David Brooks, Planning Administrative Assistant Crystal Taplin, Finance Director Alesia Williams

- 
1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Mayor Whittlesey called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
    - City Manager Andrew Hosmer announced the meeting criteria for attendees.
  2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Mayor Whittlesey led the Council in the Pledge.
  3. **PUBLIC FORUM:** Mayor Whittlesey made the Public Forum announcement.
  4. **OPEN COUNCIL DISCUSSION: NONE**
  5. **OPEN TO PUBLIC: NONE**
  6. **RECOGNITIONS: NONE**
  7. **ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES:** February 18, 2026 (Regular Meeting)

*Councilor Heistad MOVED to approve the February 18, 2026 minutes as written and presented in the March 4, 2026 City Council agenda packet.  
Seconded by Councilor Stavis.*

*\*The Vote on the Motion was approved (8-0)*

8. **APPOINTMENTS: NONE**

9. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS: NONE**

10. **OLD BUSINESS: NONE**

11. **NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Discussion and Set Public Hearing for March 18, 2026: Extension of Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive (RSA 79-E) Approval for 10 Spencer Studios, LLC for Rehabilitation of 10 Spencer Street, Lebanon, NH

Included in the agenda packet: (All supportive documents and information can be found on pages 20-62, in the Council agenda packet. Minutes do not include screenshots, graphs, Maps or images.)

1. February 2, 2026 email from Jennifer Caine providing project update and requesting extension of 79-E Tax Relief
2. Declaration of Covenants, recorded February 12, 2025
3. City Council Agenda materials from January 8, 2025
4. Excerpt of City Council minutes from January 22, 2025

Deputy City Manager Brooks summarized the background for the Extension of Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive (RSA 79-E) Approval for 10 Spencer Studios, LLC for Rehabilitation of 10 Spencer Street, Lebanon, NH. He noted this project still meets the requirements and complies with the program provisions. Essentially, the Council was being asked to reapprove it for the period of time being requested.

### **BACKGROUND**

On January 22, 2025, the Lebanon City Council approved an application from 10 Spencer Studios, LLC for nine (9) years of limited property tax relief pursuant to the City’s Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive (NH RSA 79-E) Program. The tax relief was requested and granted in connection with a project to convert the existing structure at 10 Spencer Street (Tax Map 92, Lot 33) from an industrial use (a former rug cleaning business) to an art studio use.

Under the terms approved by the City Council, the project is required to be completed on or before March 31, 2026, “unless otherwise extended by the City Council in writing.” On February 2, 2026, Jennifer Caine, Manager of 10 Spencer Studios, LLC, submitted a request for an extension of time associated with the approved property tax relief. In the request, Ms. Caine noted that while the renovations are well underway, and many are already finished, there is a chance that not all of the required improvements and issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy will be completed by the March 31st deadline.

In considering the request to extend the tax relief associated with the project, the Council is, in essence, verifying that the proposed project and property continue to comply with the provisions of the 79-E program and would be re-approving the applicant’s participation in the program. Under the terms of the 79-E program, the City Council must hold a public hearing on the request to determine whether the proposed project still qualifies for the tax relief incentive.

The property at 10 Spencer Street remains a Qualifying Structure located within the designated Downtown Lebanon 79-E district, and the project continues to exceed the required threshold to be considered a Substantial Rehabilitation. In addition, staff presumes that the previously documented Public Benefits approved by the City Council still apply to the project, including:

1. Enhancement of the economic vitality of Downtown Lebanon;
2. Enhancement or improvement of a culturally or historically important structure;
3. Promotion of the preservation and reuse of existing building stock; and
4. Promotion of the development of municipal centers, providing for efficiency, safety, and a greater sense of community consistent with RSA 9-B.

Since the tax relief was originally granted, there have been no changes to the location or extent of the designated 79-E Districts, nor to the City Council’s Policy CC-105, Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive Program Guidelines, under which the 10 Spencer Studios application was originally reviewed. In addition, whereas the property is also situated within the Downtown Tax Increment Finance District, Section 5.3 of the Policy normally requires review of the request by the Downtown TIF District Advisory

Board. However, since this is a request for re-approval of the same project for the same time period of tax relief, staff does not believe it is necessary for the Downtown TIF Advisory Board to review the project again pursuant to the policy.

Ms. Jennifer Caine came forth to give an update on what she has accomplished to date and spoke about her reasons why she is making the same request that was made last year. She apologized that she was not able to meet the Certificate of Occupancy (CO) by March 31, 2026 and noted that in reality it was not realistic because they should have accounted for more time. They are really very close to meeting the expectations, but construction has its own timeline which caused delays. She noted it may be between April/May before construction has been completed, but it could be as late as June/July and further explained the reasons why.

**Council/Staff Comments:**

In response to Mayor Whittlesey’s question regarding the length of time needed for this extension, Ms. Caine explained it should be within the next two months, but, for safety reasons, it more likely would be in July. She also noted there have not been changes to the overall permitting process.

Deputy City Manager Brooks noted the program kicks in on April 1<sup>st</sup> of the tax year after the project has been completed. So, whether their CO is approved on April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2026 or next March 31<sup>st</sup> 2027 it will kick in on April 1, 2027. In terms of setting a date, it could be anytime between now and March 31, 2027.

**ACTION:**

*Assistant Mayor Wilkie **MOVED**, that the Lebanon City Council hereby schedules a public hearing for Wednesday, March 18, 2026, beginning at 7:00pm in Council Chambers, City Hall, and Remote Via the City’s Virtual Platform, for the purpose of receiving public input and taking action on a request by 10 Spencer Studios, LLC, for an extension of the previously approved tax relief under the provisions of the Community Revitalization Tax Relief Incentive (NH RSA 79-E) Program as adopted by the City Council on February 17, 2016.*

*Seconded by Councilor N. Ford Burley.*

*\*The Vote on the Motion was approved (8-0).*

- B.** Discussion and Set Public Hearing for March 18, 2026: Consideration of Adoption of Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) Enabling Legislation (NH RSA 53-F), and Establishment of C-PACER District

Included in the agenda packet: [\(All supportive documents and information can be found on pages 63-110, in the Council agenda packet. Minutes do not include screenshots, graphs, Maps or images.\)](#)

1. Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) Program Guidebook, prepared by the NH Business Finance Authority, dated June 2025
2. Process to Adopt the Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) District, RSA 53-F, prepared by the NH Business Finance Authority
3. C-PACER Frequently Asked Questions, dated December 11, 2025, prepared by Clean Energy NH
4. Draft Language of Municipal Ordinance, prepared by LEAC
5. NH RSA 53-F, Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy Districts

Deputy City Manager Brooks reviewed the background behind the Adoption of Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) Enabling Legislation (NH RSA 53-F), and Establishment of C-

PACER District, which is being spearheaded by LEAC (Lebanon Energy Advisory Commission).

Mr. Henry Bromberg (LEAC Chair), Ms. Sherry Boschert (LEAC Member), and a representative from Clean Energy NH reviewed and described the C-PACER program, how it works, and how it could benefit individual property owners as well as the City.

Ms. Boschert reviewed the background for the C-PACER (Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency) Program. She reviewed the slides she sent to Deputy City Manager Brooks, noting these slides would answer every question that the Council could possibly have stating that C-PACER is a new tool in our toolbox to help businesses and developers be able to afford improvements to their property, reduce energy use, lower greenhouse gas emission and make our communities more resilient at **no cost and no risk to the City**. In a nutshell, by passing an Ordinance to create a C-PACER District, the City would enable private lenders to offer favorable long-term loans up to 30 years that are tied to the property to be used for specific energy improvements. The program is managed by the NH Business Finance Authority. This program can be used for new construction and existing (commercial) properties and stays with the property when the owners change. She explained what these loans could be used for and explained what the benefit of this program was for New Hampshire. There are three roles:

- 1) The C-PACER Lender, who lends the money, collects the payments and handles problems with a non-payment.
- 2) The New Hampshire Finance Authority screens the lenders for quality, reviews applications for quality to make sure they comply with the rules in what the money can be used for, and provides all documents, forms, etc., and
- 3) The City needs to pass an Ordinance creating a C-PACER District. (Sample is in agenda packet). The City records the documents with the City Clerk at the closing and then releases the documents once the lender has been paid.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Lebanon Energy Advisory Committee (LEAC) has been working for several months with staff from Clean Energy NH to review and evaluate the potential benefits of establishing a Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) District. Prior to establishing any specific C-PACER District, the City must first adopt the enabling legislation set forth in NH RSA 53-F, Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy Districts, and find that the energy conservation and efficiency and clean energy improvements enabled by the program will serve the public purposes set forth in RSA 53-F.

As authorized by the legislature, a C-PACER program allows commercial property owners within the district to fund qualifying projects and improvements to real property through private lenders or capital providers and to have that private financing secured by a special assessment lien on the property itself. The types of qualified projects and improvements include but are not limited to solar PV and solar thermal systems, air sealing, insulation, HVAC systems that meet or exceed Energy Star standards, efficient lighting systems, fire and wind resistance improvements, and others.

## **Council/Staff Comments:**

The Council discussed developers being able to get below market lending interest rates because it is considered to be safer than market rate lending; questions around liability that the owners of a property would be taking on; the NH State requirements for the C-PACER program; the liability the City would be taking on in case of a default loan and how the taxes would get repaid once the property is sold to a new owner; how the C-PACER lender would initiate a foreclosure; questions around liability; where the C-

PACER District could be established (the proposal would cover the entire boundary of the City); who could take advantage of this program; and, potential developer clients who have expressed an interest in the program.

**Mr. Jon Livadas (owner of the Lebanon Woolen Mill):** He spoke about his reasons why he would support this program and why there would be a lot of interest in the C-PACER Program. This is an unbelievable tool that would result in their ability to move forward with the Woolen Mill Project by finding a cheaper debt loan and further explained his reasoning.

Councilor Simon questioned why the City would need to be involved in this process if the goal is to help developers get a cheaper loan for energy efficient equipment, etc. The short answers to Councilor Simon's question were: 1) State Law requires municipalities to opt in to enable C-PACER financing within each community. 2) Only municipalities are legally permitted to file those special assessments on properties within their communities while C-PACER enabling legislation allows the municipality to delegate this file and be reimbursed for any costs associated with the paperwork. By opting in, the municipality is legally agreeing to file this paperwork when requested.

Mr. Clifton Below (LEAC member): He spoke about how a Special Assessment lien: a powerful element by Statute and is subordinate to any tax lean. It's that Special Assessment lien that allows it to travel with the property and further explained his reasons how this would be done. He also noted that the payments do not need to go through the City. It is set up so the commercial lenders and the NH Business Finance Authority will figure out how to make this actually work moving forward. Once this is set up, they will be the ones who are handling invoicing and collections directly and will only come back to the City if they have to enforce their lien. He urged the Council to go ahead with the Public Hearing, and more questions could be answered at that time.

Mayor Whittlesey emphasized that the C-PACER program is set up to isolate the risk for municipalities. He felt this was a well thought out, developed program from a legislative perspective.

Ms. Boschert noted that while the C-PACER program is new to New Hampshire, it has been in other areas within the US for years. She also spoke about how the following two items need to be warranted for the Public Hearing:

1. The creation of a C-PACER District, and
2. Confirming that the C-PACER program is in the public good.

**ACTION:**

***Assistant Mayor Wilkie MOVED, that the Lebanon City Council hereby schedules a public hearing for Wednesday, March 18, 2026, beginning at 7:00pm in Council Chambers, City Hall, and Remote Via the City's Virtual Platform, for the purpose of receiving public input and taking action to adopt the enabling provisions of NH RSA 53-F, Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy Districts; and to establish a Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) District to encompass the entire area within the boundaries of Lebanon.***

***Seconded by N. Ford Burley.***

Deputy City Manager Brooks noted that, based on the comment that Ms. Boschert just made about the second vote confirming that the program will serve the public benefit, he questioned if there was a way to

build that language into the motion (above) and offered potential language that could be inserted into the Motion.

City Manager Hosmer reiterated that two votes need to be included: 1) Approve a Motion establishing a C-PACER District, and 2) A vote to confirm that the program is a public benefit. This could be done at the Public Hearing meeting.

**AMENDED MOTION as highlighted in red below:**

***Assistant Mayor Wilkie MOVED, that the Lebanon City Council hereby schedules a public hearing for Wednesday, March 18, 2026, beginning at 7:00pm in Council Chambers, City Hall, and Remote Via the City’s Virtual Platform, for the purpose of receiving public input and taking action to adopt the enabling provisions of NH RSA 53-F, Energy Efficiency and Clean Energy Districts; and to vote that the program will serve the public benefit and establish a Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) District to encompass the entire area within the boundaries of Lebanon. Seconded by N. Ford Burley.***

Deputy City Manager Brooks read a portion of the language in the Draft Ordinance created by the NHBA (Page 83 agenda packet) as listed below:

**Vote on the required statutory findings, RSA 53-F:3:**

a. Whether the energy conservation and efficiency and clean energy improvements will serve the public purposes as set forth in RSA chapter 53-F and not primarily be for the benefit of private persons or uses even though such private benefits and uses may incidentally result.

b. This 2nd vote must occur after the adoption vote, but can occur at the same meeting so long as it was noticed and held as a public hearing – if it was not, then the Council must notice and hold a public hearing before voting on the required statutory findings.

Mayor Whittlesey noted those two votes (as noted in the Amended Motion above) will be taken at the Public Hearing.

***Seconded by N. Ford Burley***

***\*The Vote on the AMENDED Motion was approved (8-0).***

### C. Presentation and Discussion of Potential Signal Park TIF District

Included in the agenda packet: (All supportive documents and information can be found on pages 111-167, in the Council agenda packet. Minutes do not include screenshots, graphs, Maps or images.)

1. Signal Park Infrastructure, Conceptual Estimate, November 1, 2023
2. TIF Recreation Phase, Conceptual Estimate, November 1, 2023
3. Potential Signal Park TIF District Properties
4. Draft Lebanon Signal Park TIF District Development Program
5. Draft Development Agreement
6. Minutes of May 7, 2025 City Council Meeting - Excerpt
7. Signal Park Conceptual Plans, presented to Planning Board on February 9, 2026
8. Draft Minutes of February 9, 2026 Planning Board Meeting - Excerpt
9. Signal Park Draft TIF District Revenue and Debt Service Capacity Estimates

Deputy City Manager Brooks summarized the background of the potential Signal Park TIF District and noted that in order for the City Administration to proceed further in discussions and negotiations with Mr. Campion, the Council needs to provide further guidance about several aspects of the proposal, including the extent of the proposed TIF District; the percentage of increment to be captured. The proposal is that 60% would be captured by the TIF District and 40% would continue to flow to the (City's) General Fund as passable value to be taxed just the way everything else is. The Council can vary that percentage; they can change those aspects or add to them with requirements relative to payments towards the School District, etc. In addition, the question of which facilities and improvements would be eligible for reimbursement through the TIF District is another big question that Mr. Campion is going to have to answer. His proposal is that the City would accept all, or most of, the infrastructure associated with the project.

### **BACKGROUND**

Choice Storage, LLC/Jay Campion is the owner of several properties located along Etna Road and Labombard Road in Lebanon. Mr. Campion has been communicating with the Planning & Development and Recreation, Arts & Parks Departments for several years on a development project titled "Signal Park", which would include residential, office, and commercial uses. Campion's properties were included in areas proposed to be rezoned prior to the City Council's recent decision to postpone further consideration of certain zoning amendments in the Route 120 corridor. As a result, Campion is planning to move forward with development options based on the current zoning of his properties.

As part of the overall Signal Park development, Campion is proposing to convey a parcel of land to the City for the creation of public recreational facilities, potentially including playing fields, sports courts, playgrounds, and the associated access, parking, and infrastructure improvements. The Recreation, Arts & Parks Department has documented a longstanding need for additional recreational facilities, especially playing fields, due to high participation rates in adult and youth sports programs.

On May 7, 2025, Mr. Campion attended a City Council meeting to discuss the potential establishment of a Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District, which would cover the Signal Park development as well as several surrounding parcels. As proposed, if a TIF District were established, Mr. Campion would secure the private funding necessary to construct the public recreational facilities and other improvements in exchange for being reimbursed for those costs from the TIF District once the increment begins to be generated by the taxable portions of the overall Signal Park development. Through such an arrangement, the City could potentially obtain needed public recreational facilities without having to incur the upfront costs for the improvements.

Based on the May 7th presentation and discussion, the Council directed the City Manager to continue negotiating with Mr. Campion on the potential Signal Park TIF District and associated public-private partnership agreements, and to bring additional details back to the Council for further review and discussion.

Since last spring, Mr. Campion has refined the draft language of a Development Program and other components of a TIF District and has prepared a draft Development Agreement, which summarizes the development project and the reimbursement arrangements proposed by the City. The City Manager's Office has reviewed and commented on the draft documents, but it is noted that the City's legal counsel has not yet reviewed the documents.

Mr. Jay Campion came forth and reviewed and discussed the status of his development concept and his proposal for a Signal Park TIF District. He noted the core of this TIF District is a privately funded TIF District and not a City TIF District. It will afford the City with the recreation facilities that they have been trying to create over the past 10 years. He spoke about his proposal to donate, by Deed, +/- 39 acres of land to the City to create soccer fields and other athletic facilities on City-owned property. That infrastructure would be funded by the TIF District and would include a residential development.

The Phase I proposal is in front of the Planning Board and includes 216 residential condominium units on the property that would be part of the TIF District. Sixty percent (60%) of the tax revenue (from these units) would go to fund that infrastructure including the construction of the ball fields, soccer fields, etc. There would not be any limit in terms of what the City could do with the land. In terms of funding outside of the TIF District for anything that is not in that recreation area, it would not necessarily be limited to the income that the TIF District would generate, but having the TIF District income would assure the land he donates actually goes to the soccer fields and athletic facilities because the funds would already exist in the City's General Funds.

Mr. Campion and the developer spent a lot of time looking at the geography that he wanted to include in this TIF District, noting it basically parallels a proposal he has that permits the residential land that he is proposing to create, by a Conditional Use Permit, a planned Business Park that will combine the residential density in Phase I and those lots in the planned Business Park as part of the TIF District. He further described the property as described on his proposed Master Plan Map (included in Council agenda packet). While he was uncertain how the financing would break down over time, he did provide his detailed Conceptual Financial Estimates and spoke about what his plan was for the proposed TIF District and Business Park and how future Zoning could grandfather the TIF District. (Please note that complete details and explanation can be found on pages 129-163 in the Council agenda packet.)

Mr. Campion noted this is the first step in a process that can bring a lot of housing options, noting the combined properties in the planned Business Park would be around 142 acres, which could be developed to address the changing needs for housing in Lebanon. He also spoke about the details of the infrastructure; the recreational facilities; the cost per lineal foot for roadways, sewer lines, etc., noting the full build out of infrastructure for Phase I and the recreation facilities come out to approximately \$13M; and, the revenue needed from property values to pay taxes. From his viewpoint, he needs to move forward to establish the TIF District in order to Deed the land to the City and get the ball rolling. He is going before the Planning Board again with the use permit for the planned Business Park and the subdivision required with the housing components. This will happen on May 9, 2026.

Mr. Campion emphasized this is a public/private partnership. He has privately guaranteed borrowing in order to accomplish this (partnership), so the City has no risk involved. The incentive is pretty strong on the developer to get some things built because we are going to be creating infrastructure that we will need for revenue to pay for this development. He is at the point now where he feels he needs to take the next step to get a commitment from the City to do this or not.

**Council/Staff Comments:**

Councilor McNamara asked if:

- 1) To clarify, if 60% goes toward paying the infrastructure/recreational facilities and the remaining 40% would go directly to the City? Mr. Campion said yes.
- 2) If the plan Mr. Campion has today is based on the existing zoning of Ind-light and RL-3? Mr. Campion said yes.
- 3) If Mr. Campion is asking for the TIF District to only include Phase I or the entire property? Mr. Campion stated it was for the entire property. In response to Councilor McNamara, Mr. Campion

also noted that the infrastructure dollars that are being discussed actually cover Phase I & Phase II of infrastructure and does not cover the income that would come from additional building and acknowledged that the infrastructure from Phase II could change. The developer gave a detailed review of the Draft Site Master Plan that Mr. Campion envisioned.

Councilor McNamara noted that this would be the first real infrastructure expansion project that the Council has even thought about in a long time. In former Councils, it was decided to try to limit development within our existing infrastructure areas of the operational costs associated with this.

Councilor Stavis noted that after having a very extensive conversation about creating a new neighborhood in the area of Route 120, the Council heard very clearly that residents (of that area) did not want to see that happen. We heard concerns about potential impacts on existing neighborhoods already in place. At the request of Councilor Stavis, Mr. Campion explained and gave his detailed reasons why his development was not like the other developments.

Councilor McNamara questioned with the boundaries of the Planned Business Park as proposed, how much of the residential density gets tied up in Phase I and what is left after Phase I. Mr. Campion said he thought there would be 216 units to start with and then 617 units under the Planned Business Park regulations. Councilor McNamara noted he would need more information before the Council moves forward with this discussion. What concerns him are:

1. TIF Funds are not allowed to be utilized for maintenance and operations, so we have additional roads that would need to be plowed and maintained because they would become city streets. This is a cost associated with that which is not reflected in the TIF District;
2. Costs associated with water/sewer.
3. If recreational facilities are doubled, the City would need more staff.

Mayor Whittlesey noted that what he does not see (in this proposal) are what roads we are in fact taking on, noting that current road replacement costs are +/- \$2M. He would like to see a delineation of the infrastructure that the City would be taking on vs. what the City would not be taking on. Also, the Council does not have an approved final plan from the Planning Board.

Councilor Stavis questioned whether or not the roads for the planned condos would be public or private roads. If they are public roads, the City would be responsible for plowing and sanding. Mr. Campion stated the roads would be public and the driveways would be private.

The Council continued discussions on: The Planning Board timeline(s) for project completions through their regulations; whether or not, once Mr. Campion submits his TIF District Master Plan, they would be grandfathered under Zoning; what the City would like to see from Mr. Campion's proposed TIF District (specifically what a phased map of what roads might be looked at for the City to take over); having a third party verification of the (Condo) unit costs (i.e., roads, materials, etc.); having DPW weigh in on the 617 unit build out and how that correlates with capacity in the waste water/water systems (i.e., in treatment, etc.); having Recreation, Arts, and Parks weigh in on the estimates of costs of labor; how the Council needs to see anything that Mr. Campion feels could cost the City (i.e., Safety Services, Fire, Water Department increased uses, highway vehicle usage, the effects on City Hall when residents come in to register vehicles and pay taxes, the impacts to the School District and whether or not they would have to build a new school); what the capacity is for water/water, etc.; if this project would impact the City's budget; how the Council needs to have the Final Planning Board submission and approval before they can

continue discussions for the TIF District; how the City needs to have a contractual guarantee in writing of what gets done by the City vs. what gets done by the Signal Hill Park TIF District; and, having the City Manager sit on the Board that governs this TIF District.

Councilor McNamara noted that the way he sees this is really putting the cart before the horse. The horse is the Planning Board approval; the TIF District follows as the cart. The Planning Board in evaluating a project this large and complex is going to want the engineering studies, the traffic studies, the fiscal impact studies, which are part of their review of a large project. He feels the TIF District needs to follow that approval otherwise we are essentially doing two reviews and further explained his reasoning.

Mayor Whittlesey stated the Council does not have an approved plan to look at relative to the (Signal Park) TIF District. He felt it was worth telling Mr. Champion about the things the Council is looking for to approve the TIF District, so if the City is to further the negotiations with Mr. Champion, this is, what we, as the Council, need to see.

Mr. Champion stated he is in Phase I of permitting with the Planning Board and his Master Plan will be submitted as a working document. The Planning Board is intentionally not being asked to approve the Master Plan. The Master Plan (for the Signal Park TIF District) is something that needs to change over time and will not happen all at once. Look at the number of projects in the City that have been smashed because they were not able to get their projects completed in time (i.e., Iron Horse, etc.).

Councilor McNamara noted that if they are only going to the Planning Board for Phase I and not asking for full permitting, the Planning Board will not be approving anything beyond Phase I, which could mean that anything beyond Phase I, could be at risk of potentially not being grandfathered if Mr. Champion goes back to them for a Site Plan Approval, and explained his reasons. Mr. Champion acknowledged that this is correct but if he permits the Business District with the Light Industrial Zone as it is right now, the Planning Board would not be able to that, which would grandfather him for the boundaries of the planned Business Park.

Councilor McNamara was trying to avoid the duplicity of effort here and asked Mr. Champion about what further negotiations would consist of because, to him, it is almost exactly what the Planning Board would be looking for.

In response to City Manager Hosmer's question regarding how far along Mr. Champion is in the Planning Board process, Mr. Champion stated they would be meeting with the Planning Board on March 9, 2026, noting this was a resubmission. Deputy City Manager Brooks noted he pulled out what the Conceptual discussions were on February 9, 2026 and added this to the agenda packet. He was uncertain about how much it was going to be different. Mr. Champion said there were some pieces they lacked so they withdrew their application submission when the Zoning changes took place, but those changes will be put forward at the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Champion reiterated stated he really did not want to commit to a full build out plan of the (Site) Master Plan, noting it would be incredibly expensive and incredibly short-sighted because it could change in time.

Mayor Whittlesey noted that the Council was being asked to approve the (Signal Park) TIF District's full plan. We are not being asked to create a TIF District just for Phase I. If it were just the Phase I TIF

District (to support the infrastructure associated with Phase I) he would feel more comfortable with that. However, his biggest concern is creating a TIF District for the entirety of the (Signal Park) TIF District Master Plan which could be something that continually changes. He suggested looking at Phase I first, then the Council can look at Phase II and beyond in the future.

In response to City Manager Hosmer’s concern regarding the timeline for this (it could be a 25-year build out), Mr. Campion said it would be more concerning if it were part of a bond guaranteed by the City and further described his reasoning.

In response to Councilor Stavis’ request about what Mr. Campion is asking the Council to do, Mr. Campion stated he is looking for a commitment from the City Council to establish the TIF District to fund the infrastructure and the recreation facilities stuff. If he can’t get that, that’s okay but he will not give the City the land and he will not build the recreation stuff.

City Manager Hosmer requested that Mr. Campion reduce this into writing so we can memorialize exactly what the request is just to make sure that we are not asking the same question a couple of months from now, particularly with the new Council members coming in.

Mayor Whittlesey noted this is a decision that the Council cannot make tonight because we need:

- 1) A concrete plan,
- 2) Associated studies,
- 3) Updated costs, Phasing information, and what the City would be asked to take on, not only for Phase I but in general,
- 4) A DPW (Department of Public Works) review (i.e., water/sewer capacity, road costs, etc.)
- 5) The Recreation, Arts, and Parks review: Potential costs to City (i.e., new employees, maintenance, etc.)
- 6) Police/Fire/EMS review: Impacts to the City and public safety
- 7) City Clerk review,
- 8) Fiscal overall impacts to the City,
- 9) Impact on the School District: Student capacity, etc.

Step 1: Get the Planning Board Review/approval

Step 2: Tackle the TIF District information

This information will decide whether or not we (the Council) will continue this discussion and move more towards the negotiation phase around the legal documents. Mayor Whittlesey wanted it to be clear that the Council is not committing to anything, we are finding a pathway towards beginning those discussions.

Mr. Campion stated he has the above on his list and will need to decide whether or not he will do this or not, noting he can do Phase I without the TIF. This may be the best approach

**ACTION: NONE TAKEN**

**D. Discuss 2027-2028 NHMA Legislative Policy Process**

Included in the agenda packet: (All supportive documents and information can be found on pages 168-188, in the Council agenda packet. Minutes do not include screenshots, graphs, Maps or images.)

1. 2025-2026 NHMA Legislative Policy Positions
2. 2027-2028 NHMA Legislative Policy Process, Questions & Answers
3. 2027-2028 NHMA Legislative Policy Process, Proposed Policy form

Deputy City Manager Brooks gave an overview on the background behind the New Hampshire Municipal Association (NHMA) process, noting that this item will be on the agenda for the next 2-3 Council meetings. He suggested that the Council review the contents of the 2027-2028 Policies and bring their suggested add-ons or deletions using the form included in the agenda packet.

### **BACKGROUND**

The New Hampshire Municipal Association (NHMA) is currently planning for its Legislative Policy Conference in the Fall. The policy process begins with a solicitation of policy proposals from local officials to create an initial issues list. The deadline for submission of a policy proposal is April 17, 2026.

NHMA’s legislative policy committees - Finance and Revenue; General Administration and Governance; and Infrastructure, Development and Land Use – will review all policy proposals in order to make recommendations which will go to the NHMA Legislative Policy Conference in September.

**Council/Staff Comments: NONE**

**ACTION: NONE TAKEN AT THIS MEETING.**

#### **E. Vote on City Manager Compensation Based on 6-Month Review**

Included in the agenda packet: (All supportive documents and information can be found on page 189, Council agenda packet) Minutes do not include screenshots, graphs, Maps or images.)

Mayor Whittlesey reviewed the background.

### **BACKGROUND**

City Manager Andrew Hosmer was appointed as the City Manager effective August 31, 2025. The City Manager’s Employment Agreement provides for 6-month and 12-month performance evaluations during the first year of employment, with annual evaluations thereafter.

**Council/Staff Comments: NONE**

### **ACTION:**

***Councilor Stavis MOVED, that in accordance with City Charter §3.09, Salaries, the City Council hereby increases the compensation of the City Manager by 2.5% in accordance with the Manager’s Employment Agreement, with an effective date of February 28, 2026. Seconded by Councilor Simon.***

***\*The Vote on the Motion was approved (8-0)***

**12. City Manager Report:**

City Manager Hosmer updated the Council on the following:

- NH Congresswoman Goodlander’s visit to Lebanon on March 9, 2026.
- Fire Station: Now occupied by our Firefighters one month earlier than anticipated and on budget.
- Rock Ridge issue/questions regarding refunds and adjustments: Email sent to Council members. Of note: There were 5,600 revaluations and 50 abatement requests.
- Congressionally directed funding requests (earmarks): The following two (2) items have been submitted: 1) The Mascoma River waterfront and environmental remediation, and 2) Reconstruction of the West Lebanon Village Streetscape.
- Election Day: March 10, 2026, 7:00AM – 7:00 PM.
- City Council Canvass of Vote: Thursday March 12, 2026, 8:00AM, Council Chambers.
- Last Council Meeting for the current Council will take place on Wednesday, March 18, 2026, 7:00PM, Council Chambers.
- New Council members will be seated on March 27, 2026, 7PM

**13. NON-PUBLIC SESSION: NONE**

**14. ADJOURNMENT:**

*Assistant Mayor Wilkie **MOVED** for adjournment.*

*Seconded by Councilor Stavis.*

*\*The Vote on the **MOTION** was unanimously approved (8-0)*

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Dona E. Gibson  
Recording Secretary