

PAC Steering Committee

City Hall Room 208

July 24, 2019

Draft – Unapproved Minutes

Meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

Present: Lori Wilshire, Judy Carlson, Maryann Melizzi-Golja (participating remotely), Tim Cummings, Marylou Blaisdell, Tracy Hall, Brandon Laws

Absent Member: Lindsay Rinaldi, Rich Lannon, Trish Klee, Mark Thayer, Mayor Jim Donchess

Maryann Melizzi-Golja

For the record since it's a public meeting, I think we have to just acknowledge that in case we need to go into nonpublic, I am participating but there are no other members of the public with me.

Tracy Hall

Thanks for clarifying that. I'd also like to ask those others who are in attendance to indicate so we have that for the record as well.

Gloria McCarthy, Brendon Gear, Mark McCevitz, Judd – DJ Architects, Gaston Peets - DJ Architects, Ned Toller – Icon Architecture, Colby Wahl – Harvey Construction

Updates and Clarifications:

New Market Tax Credit update

Tim Cummings explained that the New Market Tax Credit is ongoing and are continuously speaking to groups that have an allocation. The FY18 allocations came out in late spring/early summer. The one group they were hoping to get an award did not. We were in their application but are now focusing on other groups that have allocation which are throughout the country. There is a lot of allocation uncommitted right now as they're all working diligently to fund their projects. We are not in anyone's pipeline so we're waiting on projects to fall out of some of the group's pipelines as they're not "project ready". We have been having active and potentially fruitful conversations with a group out of Louisiana. No commitment has been made but are willing to look at us if any of their current projects were to fall by the wayside.

The next calendar would be 2019 for the awards. Applications will be coming out this fall and allocations made available to CDEs in the spring. We are only in one CDE's application – Mascoma. We're trending to be in at least 2, 3 or 4. If we were to receive an award from one of the groups that have an allocation, we wouldn't be looking at having the funds to proceed with this project until late spring/early summer of 2020 for a start.

Mr. Cummings read a letter from Mascoma outlining the latest information discussed in a recent phone call. Mascoma has not received an award in the last two years and not sure if they'll receive an award this spring. If they do receive an award, it sounds like they would want to make this project a reality and participate in some way.

It was brought up that we need to start thinking about alternative funding solutions. Tim indicated that if we follow along with Ned's schedule, it works out because there's a delay on their end and on our end. We need to be at a certain point to be project ready. Tracy suggested at the next meeting that there be an agenda item specifically for the alternative funding.

The two questions Tracy had on the process is the CDE group didn't happen. We didn't get told no where we thought we were going to get told yes. Mr. Cummings explained it's a multi-step process. The group that has the ability to give us a New

Market Tax Credit really likes us. They don't have the ability to give a New Market Tax Credit. If they do get it, he believes we would get it.

Tracy asked if Louisiana was someone that has funding or they're in the same boat as Mascoma. Tim indicated we need one of their groups that they've committed for their project to fall apart for us to backfill into place.

Maryann Melizzi-Golja asked if the money received from the State qualify as the minority portion or is there something else. Tim said it hasn't been discussed it's technical in the weeds. Because the groups only have a finite amount of allocation, they like to spread it around. Maryann recapped saying if Mascoma were to grant us New Market Tax dollars, it would be their responsibility to find another CDE or is something we would have to get out there and shop around for. Tim said it's both. Ninety percent of the time Mascoma has developed working relationships with other CDEs that they work collaboratively with. Because we're the City of Nashua and this will be an attractive project and the risk is minimal, there will be other CDEs that we may want to talk to.

Tracy acknowledge that Rick Dowd and Lisa Bissonnette joined as members of the public.

Review of Designs

Nick Collier stated the last time the overall schedule was presented to the committee was in January 2019. It's now been updated. In regards to the design phase, Harvey and Carl's did some exploratory demolition work with a detailed cost estimate which resulted in a hiatus for about a month. The committee decided to move forward with version two. We're moving forward with the design phase with the goal of completing the documents by the end of the year. We'll be submitting 50 percent design developments and will run for 3 to 4 weeks. We've identified that there would be meetings in June with Eversource which has happened.

Carl discussed the utility updates. Eversource has decided that we do need fiberglass poles and they're in the process to walk it once again and are waiting to hear back for the latest. The estimations received earlier and the cost to move the utility lines to the north side of West Pearl is going to be much cheaper. A meeting was held with the gas company. They will allow the meter to stay in the building. We're good with Pennichuck. If we can reuse the fire service at the current location, it's a matter of confirming that we need a 4 inch domestic line. The only other one out there is Comcast. They thought if we were to move the lines north of West Pearl rather than the south side, there was enough slack in the fiber lines to move them across the street without too much trouble. We're still waiting for a price from Comcast behind the building to transfer the connection box.

The second design phase should be finished by the end of August. Once we get through the cost estimates with Harvey and we reconcile them, we will not go into the construction document phase until we have an on budget project. An early demolition and abatement release package is not necessary but there may be benefits to the project to doing a more extensive demolition package in the apartment building than previously anticipated. It's largely risk mitigation and helps advance the design. If we expose it now, then we know what we're dealing with. If we find out later, now it's a contingency item that has to be dealt with.

The construction document phase got pushed out further than the January scheduled. We have not altered the length of that and would resist altering that. If we put this out right after the holidays when everybody is looking to gear up for the following year, it's the most opportune time to bid a project. Tim made it clear that this assumed that we have a project we can finance. Tracy asked for a combination document that noted the contingencies for moving beyond the preparation of the plans to actually going out to bid is contingent on funding whatever the contingencies may be.

Maryann Melizzi-Golja indicated the Board of Aldermen need to approve whatever comes out of this committee. Where does that fit in here? Can the package be sent out prior to Board of Aldermen approval of this or do we have to reflect Board of Aldermen approval in this? The legislation says the Steering Committee is putting this together and making a recommendation to the Board of Aldermen that they need to approve. Where does that come in in this? Tim answered the time the Board of Aldermen would have an opportunity to weigh on this would be at contracts coming forward. The bond authorization has been approved and it's technically to the administration charged to execute based on the bond authorization. Maryann understood that the Steering Committee would be putting all of this together but they have to make

a recommendation the Board of Aldermen has to approve before we can let the bond and we approve the bond. I think we need to clarify that. Tracy asked Tim if he could get us a specific outline of what approvals by anyone are and what we would need for the approvals to go forward.

List of new design changes: basement – nothing will be done. The existing mechanical will be used but no program elements will be in the basement. A slide presentation was shown relative to the design.

Tracy asked that the record reflect to show that Shoshanna has joined the meeting alone via telephone.

Shoshanna asked while they were losing programming in the basement would it be a possibility to put it in later if it was necessary. It was explained that one programmatic component that has not been accommodated is a stand-alone gallery in the upper levels but not in the basement. When looking at the two options, we're using the apartment building existing space more efficiently. Instead of having a large quantity of toilet rooms in the basement under where the shoe store currently is they were accommodated in the apartment building.

A further review of the design changes were presented and gone over.

A question was asked any issues with sound where the stage edge abuts Surf on that side. There will be a new wall constructed at the back of stage and will be designed to be acoustically isolated from Surf. There is no concern.

Maryann Melizzi-Golja asked about the audience chamber itself. Are the dimensions the same as in the original plan or have they changed? They are basically the same. There's more floor area than what we had when the telescopic seats are retracted. In essence, it's the overall same dimensions. Maryann asked about the spacing between the seats – the back-to-back spacing. As it was designed previously, it's 3 feet 4 inches from back of seat to back of seat and it is in part because we're doing the curve to linear telescopic seating. It gives you a couple more inches to scoot through in front of people.

A couple of small things to point out, next to the freight elevator is an existing stair which we are retaining. It goes all the way from the basement to the roof. We are indicating a lift from the audio chamber floor to the stage. New Hampshire law doesn't require it so it will be carried as an alternate.

Some asked if there was going to be a coat check. There is not a coat check. Early in the programming discussions it was talked about bringing in racks.

In working with our code consultant, we're treating this as a single building which means we do not have to have a lot of fire separations between the apartment building and the new construction on theater. They are expensive elements and would go away as part of the strategy. The other is something to look forward to since we're talking about seats, Jon and his team and Joe Mobilia are working on getting the auditorium seats delivered here in early fall. There will be a couple of different telescopic seating, a couple of the fixed seating, and some samples of the loose seating for the committee to sit down and try out.

From past conversations, a terrace is a fairly high priority for the committee. If they knew where it is projected to have savings in other areas, it would be great to know those sooner rather than later so that a determination could be made going forward. September would be the best time for that when working through the next round of cost estimates. Tracy indicated it means we could add it at a later date if we were unable to come up with the funding to do it this time around.

Carl asked about the exterior wall between the balcony if it could possibly be looked at as a series of sliding doors. If you're looking for a specific donor, it's a way of increasing that balcony area. Tracy said they have to make a determination that we wanted the sliding doors or we didn't want the sliding doors as part of the initial project and not as something that we could add at a later date.

From a material point of view, we're continuing to look at a rough, white brick on the upper portion. The color materials which will be gray, yellow, and blue are all a metal composite panel that has a permanent color on it. There will also be a polycarbonate panel that is translucent in quality and would be back lit at night.

Ned indicated the next we see you will be to report on the state of the estimate, the design and whether we have issues that we need to have you work with us on again, and to test out some seats.

Tracy asked if we really wanted to push to move from being alternates to being actually part of the design. Perhaps we need a meeting. She wasn't sure if they needed the cost estimates or what the best way would be to proceed. There has been some consensus that there are things assuming that they are not completely cost prohibitive that we would like to make the decision before going too much further to incorporate sooner rather than later. From a budget management point of view, if we do that sooner we're looking at an increase to budget in order to accomplish that or we have to find something else to take out and that has to happen very soon. On the other hand, it not unusual to carry additive alternates. Following this meeting, a summary will be sent to Tim of the ones that were identified tonight.

Maryann Melizzi-Golja had a concern on the steepness of the balconies and worrying on how that is going to impact the customer's comfort level in participating in events. Her other concern is about the lack of fly space and how it may impact the future for some of the community groups as well as other programming that might go to Keefe in the present but if something happens to Keefe where would they go or how would that impact the quality of their show.

Tracy asked for some comparisons to other theaters in the area or what the norm is for risers by industry standards. How far off, or are we on the industry standard, are we better than the industry standard if we do this, are worsen by how much? They will get all kinds of different references for the committee to understand.

Richard Dowd had a concern over being able to fly. His question is can that area above the stage be so designed that if in the future we wanted to add the space to have flyers, how would that impact Surf's roof. The difficulty is the rigging system. The stage area has concrete on it for acoustic purposes because of the mechanicals on top of it. It would be costly. They would need to know that now so we could design the footings and the steel around the stage house to accommodate that. It would add costs right now.

Tracy said she was comfortable with the design direction going on right now.

Judy thought this design was much better and commented that they did an incredible job listening and incorporating everything we need. It is too bad that there's not the potential in the future to use the basement space.

Lori Wilshire support the design. She too was concerned about the shift but she liked it and thought they did everything asked of them.

Brandon Laws noted you quietly provided me with everything that was asked for originally.

Maryann Melizzi-Golja thought it looked great and was happy to see it flushed out. Her concern is the seats. We need to figure out how to have access to the basement space for informal programming or classes. She was happy with how the old building is being utilized.

Gloria asked about sight lines. Will you be losing visuals from higher up? No. They wouldn't have come forward with this recommendation if Fischer Dax weren't behind it and they did the sight line studies.

On behalf of Spectacle, we are very pleased with the way this has played out and fully stand behind it.

Tim Cummings asked to meet next Wednesday to continue talking about the New Market Tax Credit and the budget conversation to make sure we're comfortable and clear on the path we're going.

**MOTION BY JUDY CARLSON, SECONDED BY BRANDON LAWS, TO ADJOURN
MOTION CARRIED**

Adjourned at 7:02 p.m.