

JOINT MEETING – PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE and COMMITTEE ON
INFRASTRUCTURE

FEBRUARY 7, 2023

A joint meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee and Committee on Infrastructure was held Tuesday, February 7, 2023, at 7:10 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber.

The roll call was taken with 8 members of the Planning and Economic Development Committee and Committee on Infrastructure present:

Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr., Chair
Alderman June M. Caron
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
Alderman Derek Thibeault
Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman Alex Comeau
Alderman Tyler Gouveia
Alderman Ernest A. Jette

Members not in Attendance: Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr.,

Also in Attendance: Alderwoman-at-Large Gloria Timmons (arrive at 7:34)
Alderman Thomas Lopez (left at 7:47)
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire
Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director
Matt Sullivan, Community Development Director

ROLL CALL - None

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

Tonight we're going to have a discussion on the Elm Street Middle School discussion with the architects. I would now like to recognize Mr. Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director. Can you bring us up to speed Sir on this?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

I would like to join you but before we do that, I wanted to just ask the question as to whether it may make sense to go a little bit out of order this evening?

Chairman O'Brien

I was actually thinking that. Mr. Prolman?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Correct. I think you may want to take up the business item this evening because I think our conversation may be a little lengthy today.

Chairman O'Brien

A wise decision. What we are talking about, Attorney Prolman is with us for a separate matter. So that he doesn't have to sit through the presentations and everything without exception, I'll take items out of the agenda dealing with the street

discontinuance.

Mr. Prolman would you like to come up and bring us up to speed?

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. Good evening. My name is Andy Prolman, Attorney with Prunier & Prolman here in Nashua here on behalf of The Flatley Company. Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you Mr. Cummings for accommodating the schedule tonight. I was hoping to hear about Elm Street it's my Alma Mater.

Chairman O'Brien

Well you are welcome to stay.

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

I was in the first class of Elm Street Junior High School in 7th grade and so I hope it stays in some fashion.

Mr. Chairman I am seeking this Committee's positive recommendation to the Board of Aldermen to discontinue a portion of Dozer Road. I believe you have some plans that were presented. They were shown last time when I was here January 11th. I am taking this discontinuance request through the process. I was before the Planning Board last week and if you see in your packet, you should have a positive recommendation from the Planning Board to discontinue this portion of Dozer Road.

This portion of Dozer Road that we're talking about it where a Flatley subdivision was approved last August and in your packet, there's a subdivision plan and the discontinuance plan. You can see that the discontinuance of Dozer Road where Dozer Road right-of-way exists encumbers and interferes with the proposed lots and some of the roadways in the cul-de-sacs as part of the subdivision plan. One of the conditions of approval from the Planning Board of the subdivision was that we go through this process to discontinue this portion of Dozer Road. So that's what we're here to do tonight and if we are successful, we go to the, I believe, the Aldermen full Board next week. And you should know that Dozer Road, I did a brief presentation last time I was here. Dozer Road was acquired by the State of NH having to do with the development of the highway that began in 1964 and bits and pieces NH DOT picked up all what is Dozer Road today up until 1993. Dozer Road was conveyed to the City in its' entirety in March of 2010. There has been a previous portion of Dozer Road discontinued that small section behind the Sheraton as Innovative Way makes its way up the hill. So this Board has previously discontinued, excuse me, this Committee and then the Board of Aldermen has previously discontinued a portion of Dozer Road. I think that's really all I had Mr. Chairman was just a very brief summary and we are seeking to move this process forward.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Before we open up for questions, we would need to go through some matters of decorum here. The motion in the previous meeting was tabled so therefore, I'll be looking for a Motion to Remove from the Table the aforementioned. Alderman Clemons?

Alderman Clemons

So moved.

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE THE PETITION FOR STREET DISCONTINUANCE OF DOZER ROAD Lots A-990, 132-85, A-994, A-768, A-68, 132-1, A-67, and A-58
MOTION CARRIED**

Petition for Street Discontinuance – Dozer Road Lots (A-990, 132-85, A-994, A-768, A-68, 132-1, A-67, and A-58)

Chairman O'Brien

Okay, the second Motion I don't think now is open for further discussion so Alderman Dowd? Mr. Prolman can you stay in case members have a question directed towards you?

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

Certainly.

Alderman Dowd

I'm sure that the Planning Board asked you this question and you answered it appropriately but are there any easements on Dozer Road that need to be encumbered by property owners?

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

There is one easement that we The Flatley Company is going to grant to the City. On your plan you can see it. If you look at the subdivision plan at the very bottom of the subdivision plan, you'll see the end of a cul-de-sac. Then to the right of that, there's a tiny little triangle piece right along the DOT right-of-way that's a City owned parcel. If we discontinue Dozer Road, the City loses public access to that tiny little triangle piece that's 2,000 square feet. So the Flatley Company has agree to grant an easement from the end of that cul-de-sac right across over to the triangular piece. It's a condition of the Planning Board's approval and that's fine. In addition, we are going to begin the discussion with staff about possibly purchasing that small little triangle piece. In the first instance, we'll be granting easement as part of this process.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Thibeault?

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is in my Ward and my constituents their concern about this is that it's making the way. We've already done – obviously already put in the subdivision there which they were obviously mostly against. I think the main concern they have is that this makes way for at some point to connect everything that's at Innovative Way through our neighborhood. Well not my neighborhood but through Ward 8's neighborhood. That obviously would have some concerns. People would be going through the neighbors, you know, to the Sheraton right there. All the stuff on Innovative Way is there. Are we sure that is not going to happen or is that something that someday will come before us or come before the Planning Board to do - outside of like emergency access with the gates and stuff like that?

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

Well Sir I can't guarantee you for all of eternity that there won't be a connection at some point. I'm not aware of any plans with The Flatley Company to make any connection from this subdivision southward.

Alderman Thibeault

Okay. I don't think I was asking for eternity but a few years would be nice but at least until those people are long gone.

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

Okay. I'm not aware of any plans to that effect.

Alderman Thibeault

All right. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Further questions by members of the Board? Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

So I watched the Planning Board meeting and of course Alderwoman Klee was there, so she can speak more to this. The staff memorandum talks about that the Planning Board approved this on the condition that you either grant an easement or purchase that little triangle. So I think I've heard you say several times that your client is agreeable to that but I think we

need to add that condition to our granting of the petition.

Chairman O'Brien

At this time, Director Cummings are you better qualified to answer that question on that triangular piece? Is that purchased by the City?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

I'm sorry. I missed the question. Can Alderman Jette repeat it?

Alderman Jette

Yeah. I said that at the Planning Board meeting and in the staff memorandum telling us about the Planning Board's recommendation that Dozer Road be discontinued, it says that the Planning Board's recommendation comes with a condition that the Petitioner either grant the City an access easement or purchase lot #114-233 from the City for fair market value. I know that Attorney Prolman at the meeting said that he and his client were agreeable to that but I think tonight our granting of the Petition or recommendation that we grant the Petition should include that condition.

Chairman O'Brien

Director Cummings?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

If I may again, Tim Cummings Director of Economic Development. Actually this specific issue is one that I had identified very early on because as you may know, aware of all the City owned parcels in the City. We own this in fee. So I was very concerned that we would lose our ability to have access to this potential asset. So very early on as I understand it, The Flatley Company had agreed to give us an access easement. Also they said if there's an appetite, they would buy it from us as well. We haven't gotten that far in the conversation but I think it would probably behoove everyone to memorialize this and make sure the priority to clear is that we get the access. If we can work out the purchase and sale later on, that's great but I wouldn't want that to be contingent.

Chairman O'Brien

All set Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

I'm all set for now but if you would recognize me or someone to make a Motion of that amendment.

Chairman O'Brien

Will do. Alderman Klee?

Alderman Klee

I want to echo what has just been said. It does need to be memorialized. It was part of the contingency as far as the Planning Board. I was there. We discussed it. I know Attorney Prolman was very agreeable as was The Flatley Company. So I do think we should put it in writing. I was going to bring that up myself but not being a member of the Committee, I'm glad you did. I do think it's very important that that be part of it. I don't know if it means you have to do an amendment to this or how you have to handle it?

Chairman O'Brien

We'll accept the intention amendment. First so everybody will understand the parliamentary rules, what we'll do is we'll vote on this. Once the Ordinance has been voted on, it is open for future amendments at that particular time.

Alderman Comeau

No. We have to amend it first. We need a motion to grant the Petition and then we can make a motion.

Alderman Clemons

Correct.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Alderman Lopez and Alderman Dowd?

Alderman Lopez

Just a clarifying question because the map's a little difficult for me to scale things on. Maybe this is a question for Director Cummings. How big is the Ernest Jette Memorial Triangle and (inaudible)?

Chairman O'Brien

You'll be disappointed by its size.

Alderman Klee

It is .06 acres.

Alderman Lopez

Yeah, okay. So there wasn't a scale (inaudible). All right. So half an acre?

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

No. 2,000 square feet.

Alderman Lopez

Okay. Well thanks for clarifying.

Chairman O'Brien

It's nothing. I think we might if we use the small one put a park bench on it. I don't know.

Alderman Lopez

Is there going to be enough increased revenue supplied?

Chairman O'Brien

With the trash can, I think we'd be over limit. Alderman Dowd?

Alderman Dowd

I'm just concerned. Are we saying we're going to hold up the discontinuance for the sale of that property or...?

Alderman Klee

No.

Chairman O'Brien

No.

Alderman Dowd

Or we just going to say that it's going to be...

Alderman Comeau

Contingent upon.

Alderman Dowd

So I have no problem with the easement being granted to get to the property. The only thing I was concerned about when you do a property purchase it takes forever. So I'm fine if the contingency doesn't say that the discontinuance is predicated on the sale.

Chairman O'Brien

I think you'll be satisfied. I think Alderman Clemons will probably shed some light on it.

Alderman Clemons

Yes, thank you Mr. Chair.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO AMEND TO ADD TO THE PETITION THE FOLLOWING: "THE PETITION SHALL ALSO INCLUDE THAT THE PETITIONER EITHER GRANT THE CITY AN ACCESS EASEMENT OR PURCHASE LOT 114-233 FROM THE CITY FOR FAIR MARKET VALUE"

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Clemons

So essentially either they can give us an easement to that or they can purchase it from us.

Chairman O'Brien

And I'll ask everybody to indulge the Chair. Director Cummings and Attorney Prolman, can you step forward. You heard the Clemons' Motion can you just briefly say whether you support?

Attorney Andy Prolman, Prunier & Prolman

I support and vote in favor.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Mr. Chair I recommend that you include that language in the Ordinance.

Chairman O'Brien

I like it when government moves so smoothly. All right. Okay. We're going to vote on the amendment first.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO RECOMMEND GRANTING THE PETITION FOR STREET DISCONTINUANCE AS AMENDED

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Thibeault?

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I guess at the end of the day I will support this because it doesn't look like trying to prevent this is going to prevent the developments from being built. I'm just hoping if we do sell that little 2,000 square foot lot, we don't

put a vape shop on it or anything. We do something good with it. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Any other discussion on the Motion? Seeing none.

MOTION CARRIED

DISCUSSION

- Elm Street Middle School discussion with Architects

Chairman O'Brien to recognize Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate being here this evening with you. I am going to ask your indulgence that we have a little more of an informal meeting this evening in terms of parliamentary process. We have the architects up with us this evening and they're going to lead you through a discussion and an exercise that's going to be a little bit more interactive. Why are we doing this?

Back last December when I came before the Joint PEDC and Infrastructure Committee to have a conversation about the Elm Street Middle School, I walked away from that conversation and I said to myself I really believe it would behoove us to have a little bit more engagement on what the goals and values would be that this group has for the nine acres and how you want the site to be laid out. So one of the ways to kind of achieve that is to go through what is referred to as "a blocking exercise" here. What you're going to quickly realize is there's give and take. Not everyone is going to be able to achieve everything they want on this site and that's okay. Hopefully what it does do is it brings about level of consensus that if we all agree towards these types of goals and we understand we will achieve this type of development is, I think, a good conversation to be had. So I've asked the architectural team to come before you this evening and have that conversation with you.

I'm hoping that will be relatively interactive. You'll also stand up, go to the table, maybe move some blocks around but feel free to stay seated if you'd like. The only thing I would want folks to be cognizant of this is the microphone here so you may want to remove the mic if you're going to speak or say something so you can be picked up by the viewers at home. Otherwise I'm going to be sitting in Alderman O'Brien's seat just watching and listening to the conversation this evening. I hope everyone here finds it to be beneficial and fruitful. It was similar to an exercise that took place this afternoon. For those who may or may not know, the architects were here a little bit early wanting to be a good steward of the City's money. I suggested that they do some sort of community engagement this afternoon with whomever would be available from the public. They had about 20ish or so people show up and they had a round table type conversation. It was structured to be an open house so people could come and go as they would like but they would be able to have direct contact with the design professionals. More so than just me and you seeing some images up on a screen, pdf's of site layouts, and so this is actually a real live model of a site layout that hopefully you can move around and bend to whatever goals that you'd like to see happen and occur on the site. So I'll leave my comments there. I'm going to hand it off to Guido Mr. Chairman and have him comment further on what they're trying to do this evening and of course I'll be here if any questions are asked.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Hold on for a second. I think it's a good to get the ideas out. Less informal procedure. The only thing I ask is yield the microphone plenty of time to speak for people who have questions just to be courteous. I saw the first hand was Alderman Dowd?

Alderman Dowd

Yeah, I was one of those 20 some odd people that were at that meeting. So just to set the stage for what we're trying (or what they're trying to do) is they're trying to give two or three alternatives to a proposal to get builders to present ideas back to us on what they will do with this property. This exercise is to (I won't steal your thunder) but this exercise is to see what this Board identifies as sort of what you'd like to see. That's no guarantee that the developer is going to come back with exactly what we come up with these layouts. The one thing to be caution of is there's a lot of discussion about different parts of this property. The final design will still have to go through all the City Boards. You'll still be subject to

Zoning, and Planning, and a traffic study. So with that in mind.

Chairman O'Brien

Well before we start, the Chair does recognize and welcomes Alderman Timmons she came on board at 7:33. Alderman Klee you had your hand up?

Alderman Klee

Actually I was going to say basically the same thing that Alderman Dowd had said. I, too, was there and that's exactly right. So this is just setting priorities of what will go into the RFP. They have built it the way anybody designed it or how we think it should happen just like any other RFP. So I just wanted to echo Alderman Dowd's words. So thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Welcome to the Board of Aldermen. This is your show.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

Thank you and thank you to the Board. Mr. Chair my name is Guido Hartray. I'm a partner at Marvel Architects.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

My name is Caroline Frantz. I'm an architect and associate at Marvel.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

We've been working on a planning study with Tim and other folks in the City over the past year and have had multiple community engagement sessions. I would say that broadly the priorities that came out of those sessions in terms of potential uses for the site were creating housing and both interest in creating market rate housing when creating affordable housing. Market rate housing is probably - so all of these, we've been looking at them in terms of what is the kind of desire expressed within the communities for these uses and also what is the economic impact. So housing is probably the use that has the greatest kind of economic positive, the greatest sort of market pressure to drive it and make it happen. There's also been an interest in preserving the ability to use the Keefe Auditorium on the site. There has been an interest in preserving the structure of the middle school, the historic portion of the structure of the middle school. I'm kind of listing these in descending order of what we heard in various community meetings and pop up sessions that we've had.

So based on that, we developed three options for the site and maybe we can go to those quickly. Basically, going from an option that totally redeveloped the site, and cleared the site, and just treated it as a site where you could do housing. Another option which cleared the site except for the Keefe Auditorium. These will become clearer once we get the visuals to move. So three options. One was all new development. That's actually Option 3 there. Then option 2 was maintaining the Keefe and clearing the rest of the site for the kind of highest and best use which from a market perspective would be housing. Then Option 1 was maintaining both the Keefe and the historic portion of the middle school. After having done those options, we subsequently developed - one other thing emerged as a possibility which was an interest from Rivier University to create a skating facility - an ice rink facility on the site. So this, maybe just backtrack a second. So this is maintaining the historic structure of the middle school which you're seeing in red, maintaining the Keefe Auditorium and adding a lobby to it because it needs a lobby and certain support facilities when you disconnect it from the middle school. The middle school would be converted to housing and this would maintain the green space on Elm Street. If you're maintaining the historic building, you want to maintain the kind of green space in front of it that kind of gives it its presence within the City.

So then this option creates a little bit more housing because it replaces the middle school structure except for the Keefe. So it keeps the Keefe and creates that kind of addition to it which would have lobby and support spaces and develops the rest of the site as housing as a reduced open space really just in relation to the Keefe Auditorium. Then this Option which treats the site basically as a blank slate and kind of maximizes the housing. Although, this does also leave an open space as well which was expressed as a community kind of desire. So that was a first round of studies and then with the interest from Rivier University, and the skating facility, and a developer who was potentially interested in creating that, we did a second round of three which basically go through the same pattern. So the first of those is keeping the historic middle school structure, keeping the Keefe, and kind of sistering the skating facility up to it. When you disconnect the Keefe, right now the Keefe depends on services that come through the middle school. One of the significant costs in activating it as

part of a renewed vision of the site where the middle school would be converted to housing is it needs new infrastructure. So the skating facility, there's an opportunity to share infrastructure, potential opportunity to share a lobby with the Keefe, and potentially an opportunity to kind of use them together for certain events. So this option keeps all those elements, keeps the open space on Elm Street. Next option keeps just the Keefe Auditorium, allows for a little bit more housing, a little bit less open space again focusing the open space in front of the Keefe, and then the final option is treating the site as a blank slate - sort of housing and the skating rink.

So as was mentioned, the purpose of our study is really to create a report which the City can then use to guide developers who are responding to an RFP and to evaluate submissions to that RFP. So we would be very grateful to have your comments and thoughts tonight on those three schemes. We have models here which allow us to kind of represent all of them or maybe on some other possibility that we haven't even considered yet that we can use to kind of study, and develop, and use to kind of inform the document that developers will use as their starting point.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

Thank you. I like the idea of keeping the historic middle school but when we had architects Harriman look at that building for the purposes of continuing to use it as a school, they came back and pointed out all kinds of problems with that building. So I don't know if you've had enough time to look at the Harriman report or look at the building. Keeping the historic building at what cost would that be? Is it really that bad a building that converting it to apartments would be a really expensive proposition or was it just too expensive to convert to a school but it would be okay to convert to apartments?

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

So we did look at that report and we looked at the building. There is nothing on the surface of looking at the building that says it's going to be prohibitively expensive to convert to apartments. It is going to be a little less efficient than if you were building apartments from scratch. It is a model that exists in this area with the kind of mill building conversions to residential. In fact, it has a layout that even if you look at those massings like a double loaded corridor for residential and the double loaded corridor of the school, the dimensions are actually pretty similar. Now I think our recommendation would be that whatever priorities come out of this are still sort of recommendations. One developer might look at it and say like this is crazy. I've had a bad experience trying to do this before. I don't want to deal with it. Maybe they're the perfect developer in terms of what they're going to do for the Keefe or maybe they're great because their proposal includes - they're able to include more affordable housing. So I would say that the answer to that is we don't see anything that should preclude it. If it's seen as a benefit, I think it can be included in the RFP response. I wouldn't suggest certainly based on what we've heard from communities, I wouldn't suggest that you exclude any developer that says that they can't keep it but I think it could be included as a positive.

Alderman Jette

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

In the order I have Alderman Clemons had his hand up, Alderman Klee, and then Alderman Wilshire. So Alderman Clemons?

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I'm just going to state for the record that the only thing I will support is something that keeps the Keefe Auditorium. If the plan comes back and it doesn't include the Keefe, I'm not going to support it. That's my bottom line. I don't really care which one of these plans we do but it has to include the Keefe Auditorium.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Klee?

Alderman Klee

Thank you Mr. Chairman. At today's conversation, one of the things we learned was all the new buildings would have parking underneath it. So that's one of the things to keep in mind. If we did keep the older school, we're going to lose the parking ability. So when you look at the little blocks there, you see those little gray areas underneath it, that's surface parking. So if we were to look at some of them, we might see that there is a 34 units and that 57 spaces. So the way they planned it out with newer buildings allows it - and please correct me if I'm wrong - but you said 1.25 spaces per unit or in some cases, maybe up to 1.67 spaces per unit if all went well depending on which model we chose. Am I correct on that? We would lose that if we kept the older school, is that correct?

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Yes. So just looking at this block for everyone to get on the same page, this is representing two levels of residential development and then one level of parking. It's assuming that the parking the reason it's smaller in height is because it's assuming half of that level is below grade. We know we'd have to dig in the ground for foundations anyways and to address the frost level which is a very serious thing here. So we are trying to balance the amount of parking a five foot height parking at grade is a much difference experience than two levels of parking. So we tried to keep the pedestrian experience in mind. So anytime you see the orange blocks which represent multi-family residential and which have the gray parking on the bottom of the model, that's what you're seeing there. The ice skating rinks in one scheme were showing office, those are served by the surface parking that you're seeing in the model.

To address what you were saying about the ratio. 1.25 is a number that came out of our stakeholder interviews and discussions that we were targeting as a minimum but most of these schemes with the parking under the multi-family residential are much higher than that. Several of them are getting closer to 1.67. Then for the ice skating rink in our discussions with Edge Sports Group, we understand that to serve two rinks, they need a minimum of 160 spaces and so that's accounted for in the schemes you're seeing.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

There's also parking here at the perimeter of the site. So it is true that this historic school building would not have parking below it. Between the parking that would be located below the other multi-family buildings and the other parking on the site, you could still satisfy the same ratio.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Klee follow-up?

Alderman Klee

Yes. You are a Nashua resident and went to Elm Street School. If you could just let the Board know.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Yes, of course. Gladly. I grew up here, spent my whole childhood here. I went to Elm Street when it was still a Junior High. So I have a strong connection to this site. My brothers went to school here too. My mom was a teacher in the District. So yes, this is near and dear to me. Thank you.

Alderman Klee

You're welcome.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Wilshire?

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you. When you mentioned getting rid of the building, keeping Keefe, what would be the difference in the number of units if we kept the Keefe? You know what I'm saying, what I'm asking.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Yes.

Alderman Wilshire

If we're talking about 100 units keeping the school and maybe 300 units without it, do you have a number?

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Sure. So this first scheme - so for this numbers, we're using a factor of approximately 1,000 square feet per unit. That's gross square feet so that is not necessarily the exact unit size. That includes circulation space, that kind of thing. That's just a parameter that we use to compare the amount of units we would get across the schemes. We've spoken with several different developers. They all have their own metrics for their unit mixes and the exact size that they are most successful building. So I think the precise unit sizes would be specific to a respondent to the RFP but using the 1,000 square feet or gross square feet factor is a parameter we typically use to determine unit count. So in this scheme, this represents approximately 140 units total. I'll go to the next one. That's about 100 units total. One caveat to this one is that in the gray block that you're seeing, we're showing that as office. That's just to show a variation in this scheme that could be multi-family. We are just representing that could take on a different program. This last one represents 182 units. So the last one does give you the highest unit count.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Can I interject for a quick second Mr. Chairman? So one of the goals that I'm hoping that will come out of tonight's meeting is as you are looking at these different layouts, there's pros and cons to each direction that you go. As President Wilshire just kind of pointed out, one of them is the unit count. So that's a good thing if that's a priority for you to keep in the back of your mind.

Another one is, and I'm not saying this is a priority for you all but something I wanted you to be aware of in terms of a difference in the site layouts is introducing the street grid. And so there are some options here that allow for the introduction of a street grid, there are some that aren't. So as you're going through this conversation this evening, talk about the pros and cons of each site, preserving the historic building, not preserving the historic building, preserving the green space, not preserving the green space, getting a certain parking requirement, not getting certain parking requirements, unit count, not unit count. It's that type of conversation that we're hoping to hear from you all tonight. So thank you Alderman Wilshire.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay we have Alderman Comeau, then Alderman Dowd, and then Alderman Thibeault.

Alderman Comeau

Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. I had a couple of quick questions. On a previous slide before the introduction of the ice rink in the I guess north corner there, in all three layouts it looked like it was a three story garage. Once you've introduced the ice rink, it looks like there is no more three story garage. It's just surface parking and I'm wondering why the elimination of the garage? It would seem to me that with the introduction of the ice rink, you'd want more parking and not less.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Yeah, that's a great question. This actually was discussed in our meeting earlier today. So we pivoted from the structured parking to the surface level parking or the partially below grade parking, podium parking in the latest schemes that you're seeing because in part cost. The cost of structured parking is much greater than surface parking and partially below grade parking. So it's not that we've reduced the parking that's being provided. You can also see that this scheme has a lot more multi-family development in it and it's much taller. So these volumes ranged between three to five stories in this iteration that you're seeing. In this one here, they're two stories. That's really to show development that corresponds to the amount of parking we can provide.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

So the difference is being driven – so the difference in the residential typology is actually independent of the ice rink or not the ice rink. The change in the residential typology is really being driven by a little bit more feedback that we got in terms of what the market could support here. I think that the structured parking could always be there as an option I think in the

way that kind of the report in the RFP is written. A developer could have that option if they feel like building more units can support the cost of the parking but we felt like a kind of more conservative option that we knew the market could support here was just basically the parking at grade with two floors of residential above. So there is the - I guess the amount of parking that would be available to a secondary use like the ice rink or the Keefe. There's more of that available in these later schemes even though they don't have the structured parking.

Chairman O'Brien

Follow-up?

Alderman Comeau

Yes, thank you. So earlier that you mentioned Edge Sports Group recommended roughly 160 spaces for the two sheets of ice.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

That's correct.

Alderman Comeau

Are we confident that if we're just relying on surface parking that if everyone is home at the same time that there's a hockey game and at the same time there is a play at the Keefe that you can fit all of these cars on this site?

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

Not the sellout crowd at the Keefe. So the Keefe is just under 1,500 seats. The reality is that a venue of that scale in similar venues in other towns operate with parking that is offsite. If you wanted to provide the parking for a kind of sellout crowd at the Keefe that would basically what you would be doing with the site. It would support the ice rink and the residential all at the same time. The City is completing a parking study of availability of parking and I think that will further inform it but I think there is parking available typically in evening hours when you'd be more likely to have that major event at the Keefe, not immediately at this site. Clearly it's something that needs to be addressed. It was discussed extensively today. I would say the first two yes. The later needs to be accommodated off site.

Chairman O'Brien

Director Cummings wants to add something, but in the que will be Alderman Dowd, Alderman Thibeault, and Alderman Klee.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think this is a great point that we need to have a conversation about to really get some direction. So I want to add some additional details to what the architects have just said. Yes we could provide structured parking on the site. I don't think it may be necessary to accommodate the "hockey rinks" as the schemes have showed we can design it in a way to be the parking can be provided on site without the structured parking. But there may be a need in that the City of Nashua sometime in the future will need additional public parking. If you wanted to designate this site as maybe a site for a public/private partnership for structured parking, that is absolutely something that we should talk about and start to think about in our long-range planning for another parking asset. I can tell you that we're not necessarily seeing the private sector demand over in this area of the City as we are in other areas in the downtown - mainly near the river and over on the eastern side of the downtown between Main Street and Hudson. Definitely, we need to think about possibly some structured parking 10 years from now. I would suggest that you're in the 10-20 year horizon not in the 1 to 10 year horizon.

Ultimately what everyone needs to kind of understand is the economics to structured parking. If you want to have structured parking and you're thinking of using the future tax dollars to pay for that, you're not going to also be able to pay for the Keefe Auditorium. So this is a good example of the trade-offs. So if you want to provide structured parking, there's not going to be enough to do any type of renovation or preservation of the Keefe. If you want to preserve the Keefe, then you need to understand that you're probably going to need to dedicate the future dollars generated from this site and I can't even represent right now that would be enough to cover the cost of rehabilitating the Keefe but you'd need to prioritize that and therefore you wouldn't be able to do structured parking. So as I said at the beginning of this

conversation, it's a balancing act and you prioritize and what your goals are. This parking and how you want to accommodate parking is a great example of that. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Comeau has a follow-up so I'll allow him his follow-up.

Alderman Comeau

Thank you. Actually that was a great segway from Director Cummings to the last thing that I wanted to mention was regarding the Keefe. It was previously mentioned by Alderman Clemons that he was going to support anything that would save the Keefe. I don't personally have a problem saving it or not saving it. The question to me is going to be cost and I want to know what the City's financial responsibility is going to be before I decide whether I'll support or not support any plan. But hearing that it's either parking or the Keefe, this neighborhood already has a parking problem. There's already not enough parking on these streets and now we're talking about adding hundreds of residential units plus ice hockey. There's not going to be enough room to put these cards without a parking solution. So I'd need to know that that's all going to be resolved before I could support any plan, whether it included the Keefe or not. Those are the types of things that I need to see resolved before I can support any plan.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

One way of framing the issue that we kind of have come upon is that the kind of regular day-to-day, week-to-week use of the site. The parking for that should be accommodated on site. But that parking for, again, the kind of major event at the Keefe which is a much larger number that is something that the redevelopment needs to take into account and plan for but that could be provided off site. I think that is a very viable approach if that's an approach that people are comfortable with. I think that's - we want to understand what people are comfortable with but that would be one way of framing it. I definitely understand the idea of cars that are going to be coming to this site on a daily basis for residential for the hockey, for rehearsals at the Keefe, for kind of those more regular activities. The Friday night concert of the NH Symphony that may be more of a challenge if that needs to be accommodated onsite but we do believe that there are ample opportunities to accommodate it within the area offsite.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

I just want to add a quick visual to kind of I think help to illustrate some of this. So this surface parking that we're showing here in this scheme, this is approximately 250 - 260 spaces. So you can imagine if you were trying to provide 500 - 600 surface parking spaces on the site that it would take up a large majority of the site which in any of our community meetings that we've had there's been no feedback that everyone wants to see the whole site as surface parking and it would be empty most of the time. There was positive feedback in the work session that we just had about potentially considering offsite parking for major events at the Keefe such as using a shuttle from Shaw's for instance. There's a Big Lot at Shaw's. Most people don't do their grocery shopping at night but the Keefe often has events at night, so that's an example of kind of some synergy that might be possible with some local assets that are already in the area.

Then there's other little things that I think help to alleviate the parking. Like in this scheme, we - and I do think it is helpful if we're all kind of around the model. I don't know if everyone would feel comfortable coming over here but I do think these kinds of exercises are more interactive and helpful for all if we're all standing and talking around the model. But for instance, there's the angled parking along Elm Street currently. So in this scheme for instance, we are showing it revised as perpendicular parking which gets you some additional spaces. For schemes where we have a street going through the site, there is opportunity for on-street parking on both sides of that street so that adds some additional parking. There's currently just under 70 spaces around the perimeter of the site now and those would either remain in all these schemes or be increased like what we're showing here. So I think those are all considerations but to Guido's point, we are addressing - and in the schemes that we're showing, we are addressing the parking needs and in most cases well exceeding them for the day-to-day uses.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

This is the scheme that would keep the middle school and you see the housing around that. Basically the trade-off is that if I take that out, then I can put essentially that amount of housing back in place of that. It's actually not that big a difference in units. I think that's probably more a place where it might be the difference in economics to a developer as you were point out. If someone looks at it and says this is going to be very complicated for me to do or the other thing is, it's existing structures are much easier to convert into larger units versus if you're trying to do smaller kind of affordable

housing that's for those units, you really need to hit a specific size to make the economics work. Market rate housing, you can give people larger units, and they pay for that, and it makes them a little more flexible in terms of existing conditions.

Chairman O'Brien

Further questions? Alderman Dowd?

Alderman Dowd

I actually got a few. One thing that just came up. If the Keefe has something that they're filling all 1,500 seats and Rivier's got both ice rinks going, to me that's a great thing for the City of Nashua. We can accommodate where they can park. We can shuffle them from Shaw's. We can shuffle them from the Elm Street Parking Garage which is a mile away. I mean that would be great.

One of the constraints with Keefe's utilization over the years is it belongs to the school. The school has first use. It was pointed out at the meeting this afternoon by the Actor Singers that they limit the use of Keefe. Even when the Actor Singers or the Symphony are using it. They can only use it from 5:00 at night til 9 or 10. They can't use it during the day. They can't leave anything there. It's just a real pain. So you'll find much increased use after the school is out of there. That's one thing.

As far as the school building is concerned, I am intimately aware to more degree than I want to know of the engineering part of Elm Street because as Chair of the Special School Building Committee, we analyzed that thing to death about continue using it as a middle school. One thing, you cannot move any walls. There are no walls that can be moved because if you do that, you'll have a structural integrity issue with the building. You can add sheet rock walls because some of the rooms on the third floor are larger or you can make larger apartments. As far as the inside of the building, you can't be moving walls around. Everything is encapsulated so you're not having an issue with anything as long as you keep the rooms the same size. The reason we didn't use it as a middle school is because that was built to the old requirements for a high school. Much, much smaller rooms. We need bigger rooms and we can't move walls. There's a lot more to it and it's all in that report that Harriman did. It's about six inches thick and if you're having trouble sleeping at night.

The other thing is you can add a lot of those blocks but the one thing that's going to constrain what you can put there is the traffic study. How much traffic can those streets handle? Six thousand new residents in that area? That's tough. That will never fly through Planning. It's going to be constrained by Zoning and Planning anyway.

The other thing is these are ideas that we're giving to them to go out with a proposal. The contractors are going to come back with what they think they can afford to build and make a profit. It may not be exact of any of these three. Can you put up the ice rink with the keeping the Keefe? Okay. The one advantage of this is the ice rinks don't cost us a penny, including the ability to keep Keefe because common lobby, new infrastructure for the heating and cooling, lobby, rest rooms, and all that would be taken care of, and all at somebody else's expense by the way. Since they need 160 parking spaces, we can get them to pay for 160 of the asphalt parking spaces. So all of that would not cost the City a penny plus it's going to get Rivier downtown. It's going to increase the revenues to the City and it's also going to keep the Keefe Auditorium. So in this instance, they're showing keeping the original.

So the other piece is that I mentioned this afternoon, that upper corner which has the glass company when they built the original school, they did not take that corner lot because there were active railroad tracks there. The School Department has been trying to buy it for a long time for additional parking but you don't have to worry about the railroad anymore. I'm sure the developer is going to want to take that and add units or parking. So I think that this that they're showing right now in general is what I would support because if you're going to keep the Keefe and you're going to have somebody pay for the major cost of keeping Keefe, that's a win. That's a big win. This is the largest auditorium in the State of NH. It has the ability to do Broadway Shows. If we have someone that controls the talent that's going in there, it could be utilized a heck of a lot more than now. Its things that can't be done at the Performing Art Center because they do not have the ability, what's known in shows is the flies. You can't lift things out of the way. You can at Elm Street because if you want to go there and look, it was just replaced not too long ago. It's an extensive, extensive number of rows of things that you can lift in and out of the frame. Like I said if there are any questions that come up relative to the Elm Street existing school - first of all, I went there at the high school. I was there for the addition and now as Joint Special School Building Committee, I know every inch of that building.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Thibeault?

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a couple questions and a statement. My first question is directed through you to Director Cummings. Alderman Comeau just asked you a couple of questions here. One of them I believe he asked is what Alderman Dowd was saying was true. Can you please repeat that and tell us if it's true or not what he was saying?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Yeah, thank you for the question if I may Mr. Chairman? So I didn't catch everything that Alderman Dowd had said but essentially, the thought process is, the logic is I believe that we could put an RFP out and ask for the private sector development to pay for not just the private ice rinks but also shared lobby space. Also I would suggest some also shared infrastructure, underground infrastructure, as well as the bathrooms. Could we start to have further conversations and actually we were just talking about this at dinner about trying to figure out a business model where, and this is outside of the box thinking and I don't have all the details, but it goes along the line of what Alderman Dowd was talking about is maybe the City actually acts more like the mall where we own the common area and the two department stores which would be the ice rink and Keefe act as the anchors and they attach to. We would charge them a CAM for Common Area Maintenance and then we could talk about maybe shared concessions at that point.

The ultimate thought process is could we reduce the cost of renovating the Keefe by getting innovative? Some of the ideas that I've heard Alderman Clemons talk about and maybe drop that number down that we've been talking about – that \$25 millionish figure down by getting innovative. I can't represent to you - I want to be very clear. I can't represent to you that we could get a private developer to pay for the mechanical upgrade of the Keefe Auditorium. I think that's a stretch. I wouldn't want to make that representation but do I think we could find some shared common expenses and try to shift those over and ask the private sector development to take some of those costs on which would reduce the cost to renovating the Keefe, yes absolutely I do. I'm just not exactly sure what that number is yet.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you. And my follow up to my first question?

Chairman O'Brien

Follow-up?

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you because that does lead to part of my question where I'm going to go with this. I would assume and maybe I shouldn't assume but I'm looking at Director Cummings and I'm seeing that – I have a sense that the easiest thing for the City would be just to bulldoze the whole place. If we did that, my suggestion would be 10-story buildings, full of low-rent, affordable housing, parking garage. Just fill it up because that's really what the City needs. We don't need ice rinks or the Keefe. We need that. That's the easiest thing. The problem is the hard thing sometimes is the better thing to do and I do believe that keeping the Keefe is part of that. My question was on each of these pages, the con was major investments for Keefe and last time we met there was that whole well we're going to try to work with a partner, maybe Edge to get them. If we have a lobby and we have a connection to the HVACs and the bathrooms, then any upgrades to the inside of the Keefe Auditorium doesn't need to be done when we move this over when this gets built. But now you're saying that we don't know if that is going to be the case. It was my concern that I saw that on every page. It was popping up major investment, major investment, major investment. We kind of talked that was going to help us keep the Keefe and not have that \$30 million price tag that you guys were throwing around earlier in this whole process and reduce it down to quite a low cost for us.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Again, I just want to make sure I'm clear. I do think there could be some cost savings on the Keefe renovation. I'm just not exactly sure how much that is. We need green rooms. We need lobby space. We need bathrooms. I think those could be all designed in a way where we could shift that cost. Basically the blue that you're seeing, a good portion of that cost onto the operator/developer of the ice rinks. That's going to be a negotiation but that is what we'd strive to do. Do I think it takes it a little too far to suggest that they would take on the mechanical HVAC infrastructure for the purple building and also all the blue? Again, I think that may be stretching it. I think that probably would be a cost that the City of Nashua would have to bear. Again if we can start to go in this direction, we're talking about moving that \$25 - 30 million price tag maybe down to \$15 to \$20 million range. If we're really lucky, the \$10 to \$15 million range. I'm not going to make any

representations tonight as to where we're going with that but that's what I'm trying to do so I can try to move this project forward. I'm trying to figure out really how much density you will all find acceptable because that will go into the mathematical equation that I'll eventually get to, to be able to come back to you and say this is reasonably what I think a bond could support and this is where I think we need to go to try to achieve your community goals.

Alderman Thibeault

Last follow-up? I just want to make a comment saying I'm with Alderman Clemons as well. I probably won't support anything that doesn't somehow include the Keefe.

Alderman Dowd

Just to interject, I was never reporting that Rivier was going to pick up the HVAC portion of this but in that blue space that's added on with lobby space, common bathrooms, there can be a room to handle the HVAC system.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Absolutely - the mechanicals.

Alderman Dowd

Whoever owns the Keefe Auditorium, being the City right now and by the way we will have at some point have to transfer from the School Department to the City, we've been doing a lot of that lately. We could put the HVAC in the room they provide for us.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

And so to Alderman Dowd's point, right now the mechanicals are intertwined with the current infrastructure.

Alderman Dowd

Way at the other end.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

So when we separate, we are going to need to have space. Yes to Alderman Dowd's point, some of that blue could be a mechanical room that we don't have currently space for.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Alderman Klee and then in the que we have Alderman Jette.

Alderman Klee

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to talk about some of the things relative to the Keefe. One of the things that I pointed out at this afternoon's meeting was that I go to the Capital Center in Concord. I go to both the Rex and the Palace in Manchester. The Rex within half a block is the Victory Parking Garage. It's just one block behind the Palace. So that's wonderful. I really enjoy that. I go to the Capital Center, I have to walk all the way to the Red River Theater Parking Garage behind it. That's the municipal parking garage. That's, I think, probably close to 3 or 4 blocks before I can get there. There's rarely any parking around there except for handicap parking and there's no shuttle. Just to let you know, there is no shuttle. You kind of huff it yourself or do neighborhood parking.

One of the things that I'm glad that Alderman Dowd brought up was the traffic study that would need to get done. That would be extremely important but remember if you have something like the Keefe and the rink there, there are going to be times when there's going to be a lot of traffic unlike when there's residents that are living there if you were to put all of this as residential, you're going to have continuous traffic. Only traffic study, I know nothing about traffic, but only a traffic study can tell us that. So as far as the parking's concerned, I think that something could be arranged with the Shaw's parking lot whether a shuttle, or people have to walk that space, or something of that nature.

I know it's just kind of off-the-cuff remark that we don't need the Keefe, we don't need the ice rinks. Well one of the things that I also can say is that every time I go to the Palace or the Concord Center for the Arts is I go out to eat and I do that.

I've had friends who've gone to Rivier College for because their child is there, they go out to eat in the south end of Nashua. I have another friend from Concord whose son-in-law played at Holman Stadium and was always sending me messages what are the best places to eat? So I would give them a list of restaurants to go to. So when they come to do these shows, yes they'll be concession stands, but a lot of them might go out to eat beforehand and so on rather than having the local hot dog. So we are increasing the economy in that area. I kept writing down little notes here about this.

So the point that I really want to make is more people in that short period of time is going to mean more for the businesses. We need housing and that is a given but if we put a lot of density into that area, you're going to create traffic for those neighborhoods as well. One of the things I do want to point out that one of the neighbors who lived in the area had spoken about was during winter those 25 spaces that exist on there, a lot of the neighbors go and put their car there during snow emergencies and so on when they can't be on the street or at night. They were fearful that they would lose that. I don't know how to answer that question whether or not they are going to lose that but there is that 260 spaces that are going to be there. So when the show is over at the Keefe or the hockey is over, those spaces will exist. I don't believe all those housings will use that 260. So I do think it will still be space that the neighborhood can use but I can't say that for certain. I just wanted to point out that there was fear and anxiety that they would lose those 25 spaces. So I think we need to keep that in consideration.

I also talked to some of them and they spoke much about like what Charlotte Ave. School and everything. When there's performances going on, people park in front of their driveways and so on. So the City and the Aldermen will probably have to take efforts for no parking except for residents and maybe through the parking study will show us that we can do residential parking permits on their side of the road versus and so on. I think we can be creative and I don't think we should throw the baby out with the bath water. I think we should look at what all the potential issues are. Personally, I'd like to keep the Keefe. I think the ice rinks are a good idea and while it may not cover the total cost of the Keefe, I think it adds to it. It's going to change the bathrooms so that you don't have to be a 10 year old to be able to use the bathrooms at the Keefe without being on your knees because they are low. It does upgrade that. It gives a better lobby for it.

As I spoke at the other meeting, I did speak with three different people who promote shows and so on and no I'm not going to give their names. I did speak with them and one of the things that did get brought up was the green room and I kind of mentioned that. One of the things was that connecting building is a two-story building so there's potential for green room or something. Again, being creative where we can put these things. So I don't think we should throw everything out just because right now there isn't the green room space and so on. I think once this is built, if it were built this way, again I say a big giant if, if it were built this way, those things can be accommodated. So I think we do need to think outside the box and I appreciate everybody talking. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

Thank you. I don't think we ought to get hung up with parking for Keefe. I think as Guido pointed out, that's only going to be needed not every night. It's just going to be needed some nights. Right now, people go to the Keefe, they fill it up, and they park somewhere now. So they will find a way, find a place to park to go to the show if there's a show to go to. I think the more important thing is we seem to be talking as though the ice rink is a done deal. Last I heard, Director Cummings you were preparing a resolution for us to – that would lead to an RFP to see whether someone is willing to build the ice rink, and under what they would offer us, and what the deal would be. Don't we have to find out if that piece is going to be filled before we deal with the rest of this?

Chairman O'Brien

Director Cummings?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Yes, thank you. Just one caveat to what you were saying. I was not going to do a resolution in advance but yes, an RFP needs to be issued. We need to see if we get a response to that RFP. I don't know whether we will get a response or not but that would be the start of the conversation.

Alderman Jette

Right. If I can continue?

Chairman O'Brien

Follow-up.

Alderman Jette

So I think we have to answer that question before we decide how we're going to develop the rest of the property. Are we going to have an ice rink or aren't we? It seems to me that has to be answered first.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

I think it would be possible to structure something that has different options and that leaves the City open to evaluate different RFPs. I think, for example, with the preservation of the historic structure that might be something that one developer looks at and says this is going to cost me a lot of money. Another developer says this is going to be great. There are people who are gonna come and rent these units because they're going to be kind of attracted by the charm of the historic structure. So I think you can design the RFP so that it is open to both options and potentially it says that there are - you get points for one option versus another. You could design an RFP that looks for different, creative ways to provide support spaces for the Keefe and leaves ice rink as one way of doing it but is also open to maybe someone comes with another kind of possibility that can also provide that support to the Keefe and that is just another thing that basically gets favorable points in evaluating that response to the RFP. So I think you could do the RFP separately but you could also probably do one that kind of treats the thing simultaneously.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

If I may Mr. Chair. I also just want to add some additional detail. It is going to be very beneficial to have an understanding as to how approximately we envision the site to be used, and how much density we are willing to accept, and what it is that we want to happen on the site in broad strokes. It's necessary because it's going to go to what the future tax projections are going to be. That will help answer some of the questions as to whether you want to entertain ultimately preserving the Keefe, or not preserving the Keefe, or how you want to move forward. So understanding the economics of this is really part of the conversation here. So when we go out and talk to the development in the community, we can tell them what the community goals are and we can see whether we can actually create that public/private partnership.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Gouveia, that brings Alderman Comeau, and Alderman Clemons in the queue.

Alderman Gouveia

Thank you Mr. Chairman. You know I'm just generally thinking about the project. I'm indifferent on the Keefe. Would I like to see it stay sure but at the end of the day, I think it comes down to the dollars and cents side of it and what makes more sense for the City. I do enjoy the outside the box thinking and the kind of conjoined lobby area. I think that could help bring that price tag down substantially on some areas of the project. I also agree with Alderman Jette. When it comes to the parking, I think people will find parking. It's no different than when I go to a concert up at the SNU Arena in Manchester, I park at a bank. The bank never intended that would parking for people to get over there but it is. It's off hours, it's an empty lot, and it's free. I think people will adapt. Will it be a learning curve different than how they're doing it now, sure. I think people will eventually adapt especially with big parking lots right across Main Street.

I think it's kind of hard to make a decision on what we're looking at here without seeing the parking study. I think the numbers will help us and it will definitely kind of sway me in one direction or another when we finally get some hard numbers and find things on this. You know I'd like to see a focus on more low income housing. I know I say that quite a bit when we're talking about development projects like this but I think it's really what the City needs and I know people my age need it as well and it would be helpful. I think what we're doing here is great looking at these and coming up with ideas. The big thing is what will a developer actually do. That's kind of - for me its well what can we get done and what will a developer actually do. So that's kind of where I'm standing on it. I think we're at least thinking creatively and we're making progress but I still think there's quite a long way to go and a lot of decisions and conversation left before I'm either sold or not sold on the project for sure.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Alderman Comeau?

Alderman Comeau

Yes thank you Mr. Chair. Just a quick comment and a question. I suspect there was probably made somewhat in jest but just so that it's clear, the neighborhood and myself included, we don't want to see 10 story buildings on this site. I think three stories is around the maximum.

Question for Director Cummings. To echo what Alderman Jette was talking about, I thought I remembered from the last time we met that there was mention of the resolution to the point where I'm pretty sure that you asked for sponsors. So I don't know if that's something that's still happening but I guess my question is what do you need from us tonight that's different from the last time we spoke about this because I feel like we are getting the same presentation except now it's in 3D.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

So I want to clarify. I believe that last conversation was all centered around the NIMCO building. I don't think it was on the Elm Street. It was on NIMCO. Sponsors was NIMCO.

Alderman Comeau

They're all blurring together.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Yeah, right. I know and that's why. We have two competing sites that are kind of going along a similar type process. We're much further along on the NIMCO one. But that was to put the NIMCO property out and we had a conversation about before the NIMCO property going out it, there was actually a resolution to accept the plan that I showed you that was produced. That was still in draft form and so that is actually a resolution that I would like to get before you because I would not be putting that out until after that resolution is accepted. I would like to get that RFP out onto the streets sometime this spring. I have actually started talking to developers. The biggest question there is how many units you want, what type of affordability you're looking for, what the parking is actually going to look like - your parking ratio is going to look like. Those are the biggest drivers in that conversation.

Alderman Comeau

Follow up?

Chairman O'Brien

Follow up.

Alderman Comeau

Thank you. So why would we not need a similar resolution tonight? When we talked about the NIMCO building, there's no final plan. There was still three or four options. It feels like we are in the same place with this. Again, I'm just curious what you're looking for, for action from us tonight?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

If I may?

Chairman O'Brien

Absolutely.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

So I'm not at a point yet where I think we are at a place where I can say that yeah I think we have a plan. I think we have a design. I think we have consensus to actually say let's proceed. It's a strategy to be clear. Statutorily, I am not required to

get a resolution in advance before issuing an RFP. I just use it as a good consensus building tool because I don't want to represent to the private sector that I have consensus with the Board of Aldermen on something, have a developer go through the effort to then just find out that it's not going to pass. Ultimately, the contract needs to pass the Board of Aldermen. I do think I will use that tool when the time comes for this so we can make sure I can represent with confidence that we have a rough understanding of the parameters or the framework that we're looking for but I do not think we're there yet. I'm hoping we can whittle this down to maybe one or two scenarios and then I can start to actually apply the mathematical analysis that needs to go into it. So actually I can come back to you and we can have a more intelligent economic conversation around this about, you know, preserving the Keefe is going to cost this. We can generate why off of the future dollars on just this site and if that's the value that you want to have, then you know that the City of Nashua is going to need to subsidize this project by this. We haven't even had that conversation yet.

Alderman Comeau

It wasn't too long ago this was 30 options so I'm confident you can get it down to two.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. I have Alderman Clemons next with Alderman Dowd in the queue.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. My question is in regards to the - I think that there is a good opportunity there with the hockey rink as was stated before to maintain the Keefe and kind of move some of those costs down or shift some of those costs. My question is, is the way that you described that relationship the last time was that we'd essentially be leasing the land but that the entity that owned the hockey arena would have to pay us property taxes anyway. My question is what is the going rate of a hockey rink for property taxes versus if we didn't do that and we built housing where the hockey rink is?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Let me confirm this for you. This came up at our December meeting and I have a number. I can't recall it off the top of my head but I'm going to suggest it's somewhere around \$300,000 to \$400,000 but I will circle back and get that for you.

Alderman Clemons

Can you clarify when you say 3 - I guess my question is, is what is there a difference if we build housing versus?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Yes.

Alderman Clemons

And was is that? Is it \$300,000 we're getting more for the hockey arena, or less, or?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Okay, great question. I can come back to you and just double check what I'm about to say. I'm going to say roughly each sheet of ice is going to be about \$8 million in valuation give or take. For this conversation, let's say \$10 million. So you're going to be looking at approximately \$400,000 in tax revenue roughly. A little less than that in all honesty but that would be for the ice rinks.

Now if you were to instead of that put in housing, how high do you want to go? How dense do you want to make it? I would say to you on average, we could probably program - how many units is that all in?

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

This plan we had townhouses and it was 14, 24, and...

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

I don't think that scheme would work per se because you've eliminated the Keefe, right? You want to preserve the Keefe but...

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Give or take 80 units.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

So 80 units.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

But that's at two stories.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

At two stories. I can tell you that would not meet private sector demands. You have to get to 150 units for just that section if we were to create its own map and parcel.

Alderman Clemons

Mr. Chairman if I could?

Chairman O'Brien

Yes, follow up.

Alderman Clemons

So you could raise that another story and still keep the parking underneath it or no because you'd have to have enough parking? Is that the issue?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Yeah, you're going to need to have to be able to park the project. So I don't know if you could raise it up and that would be essentially podiums for parking. I don't know.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

Yeah so we were concentrating the parking to one story for two levels of multi-family and that level of parking being partially below grade because once you start stacking levels of parking below the multi-family, it drastically changes the experience for a pedestrian walking by so we were trying to keep it to a reasonable height.

Alderman Clemons

Okay.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

But to answer your question Alderman Clemons, so just using the 80 units as a figure, you'd be generating approximately \$700,000 in taxes. So it would be a little bit more than double. That was the point I wanted to make to be very clear. If you weren't to go to the direction of the rinks and you wanted to put housing in instead without question, you'd generate more tax dollars. It depends on how many units you want to put in there but the highest and best use from a tax perspective, from a valuation perspective, is going to be multi-family.

Alderman Clemons

So Mr. Chairman can I continue?

Chairman O'Brien

Yes.

Alderman Clemons

So my question then is if the object is to, as it is for me, to save the Keefe Auditorium and that's the only objective, then putting as much housing on the property wouldn't you say that you could balance out the amount of money that it would cost to do the renovations with the tax revenue versus or would that not be the case because you would still want the private sector to be in there to take some of those costs down?

Chairman O'Brien

Follow up.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

These are all great questions and I started to do this type of analysis so I'm going to caveat what I'm saying that I need to confirm and check what I'm about to say. I'm pretty sure when the last time I did this exercise, I was still coming up short by a lot of getting the number of units onsite to be able to justify the Keefe renovation. So pegging the Keefe renovation at \$25 to \$30 million, I tried to make the math work by not even worrying about how high we went, and assumed we went as high as we could, and I would have to deal with those neighborhood issues which will come up, I could still only try to probably bond about \$10 million - maybe 12. Then I was like well maybe we can try to bring in some contributing capital, donations, we'd fund raise. Could we get it to 15 maybe with other income besides the City of Nashua, but then that's only 50% of the project. I'm still now trying to figure out how we're going to get to the other 50 percent - to get to that \$25 - \$30ish millionish figure. So I haven't been able to figure out how to make the unit count work. So that's when this idea of well maybe we could spread the cost came into play. So now okay yes, it's a little bit of a tradeoff. We're not going to be generating as much money on the taxes because we're going to have ice rinks instead of housing. At least I then might be able to shift some of the expenses off to another entity, maybe drive that down, Haven't done that analysis yet but I believe we've heard tonight we can do that substantially. Then based on the willingness of this body, how much density you're willing to accept on the site. Maybe just then we might be able to come up with a way that gets closer so then I'm coming to you and saying you're only going to need to float a \$3 to \$5 million subsidiary to preserve the Keefe because we're able to do this. That is the ultimate goal that I was trying to get to but I'm not there yet and I don't think there's consensus yet that everyone even agrees that they want to preserve the Keefe.

Alderman Clemons

Well I think that's the white elephant that's in the room. I don't think that until this Board votes one way or the other that you're ever going to get that consensus unless you ask us. So I mean I don't know - we need a direction to go in. I've given you my opinion. Other Aldermen have given you their opinion that the Keefe is an important thing. I think it's important. I think everyone here has expressed - I don't want to speak for everybody but everyone here has expressed that it would be nice to be able to do to keep the Keefe. So even if to at least go down the road of finding out if it's possible. In my opinion, that's the direction that you should be going because from everything that I've heard tonight, that has at least been expressed by any speaker that I've heard that if we can do it then great. So my opinion is that that should be the direction you move towards with this goal of keeping the Keefe and trying to keep the costs down and come back to use with a plan of what it's going to take to do that, and how much it's going to be, and whether or not once we do that if you have to float a bond if what the property taxes were going to take from that piece of land can pay for a bond then I think we have our answer.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Dowd?

Alderman Dowd

First of all, I think if you replaced the ice rink with housing you're never going to meet the traffic study. I'm not a traffic engineer but I've been involved in a hell of a lot of them and I don't know how you're going to get that many cars on those streets and get approved by the Planning Board. Ain't gonna happen. The other thing is that I hear \$30 million to renovate the Keefe. The Keefe is totally usable right now. The only thing we're lacking if we tear down the school is the heating and cooling. Yes we want to approve the restrooms and the lobby but

we've lived without it for 89 years. So the ice rinks give us a substantial dent in any cost associated with keeping Keefe assuming a developer will go along with what we're trying to do. Another thing to point out is, again, for the last 89 years do you know how much tax revenue that lot gave us? None, zero. So we don't have to make up the entire City revenue, double it with the amount of taxes for this lot. We've got to be smart about how we develop this area - improve the housing situation but don't overload the streets and the neighborhoods with cars from this oversized development.

So the original thing I wanted to talk about before all those questions came up was from our meeting this afternoon. Marvel needs something to go forth with a proposal to see if somebody wants to take on this development. The longer we that off, the more costs go up by the way just generalizing. I thought the idea from this afternoon's meeting was that we wanted to give the developer like two or three options, which we have here in these blocks, to use as guidance when they're giving us a proposal. Again the proposal comes back, you could have nothing in that. Why should we spend months trying to play with the blocks to figure out what's the ultimate solution when they're going to come back and say no we're doing something else or we won't give you the money. So what I want to know is what and when we need to give to Marvel to go out with their proposal?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

So if I may Mr. Chairman? We have some more community engagement that we need to do. I think we have a couple more - I'm going to use the word "town hall type meetings" but we're going to need to engage the community to flush some of these details out. I'd like to get a sense from the Board that I have an understanding of the amount of units you want to see onsite approximately. How much affordability you want to see? Because I can tell you right now, the more affordability you infuse into the project, we won't collect as much tax revenue off of that and that's okay but I just need to kind of, again, get an understanding. I'm under a directive from the last time this conversation occurred to set aside a certain portion of this land for "affordable" which is 40 to 60 units approximately if memory serves. I'd have to double check by notes. Again, happy to do that. I understand that that's what we need to do. But again, that factors into the amount of future tax dollars that we're going to get. So I'm still trying to get a good assessment as to where we are at and I would like to move this forward but I think this is one of the few times that I want to make sure I'm being very deliberative.

Alderman Dowd

Follow up?

Chairman O'Brien

Follow up.

Alderman Dowd

The one thing I want to avoid is analysis paralysis. You can analyze this 9 ways to Sunday over the next 12 months and you're not going to have much more clearer answer because everybody you talk to has different slant on the opinion. See what's concrete and go with it. I can tell you, June 24 that building belongs to the City and becomes an empty lot. School Department is not going to be paying for maintaining that school so who is going to pick up that cost burden until somebody decides what the hell we're doing with it? Then it's going to take months, maybe years, to develop this site. Just the tearing down of all the existing structures is going to take a long time and then to develop the buildings, a long time. You're probably talking when they start developing that lot 6 to 8 years before you see the first building. So if we don't get going, it's just going to drive the cost up and we're not going to be any different than we are today just about.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Klee?

Alderman Klee

Thank you Mr. Chairman. A couple of things I want to bring out and I'm glad that Alderman Dowd referenced analysis paralysis because I think we're getting really close to that. When we finally do put out an RFP and different ideas are kind of thrown at us, there will be hearings. There will be everything else like that. Looking back at the presentation that was given on the ice rink back in December 6th I think it was, one of the comments that you put in one of your slides was that you had hoped to get an RFP out in the winter of 2023, and then you said the timeline would be that, and then spring/summer of 2023 design, in the fall of 2023, and winter, of 2024, and construction occurring in 2024. The longer that we put anything off could possibly - Rivier may say the heck with this I'm going somewhere else and then we're kind of

sunk in it. The longer we take to deliberate this and go on, the more time that passes, the larger the cost there's going to be, and I'm not saying that the rink should necessarily go there but I'd like to put into the hands of a developer that comes back with plans. If I'm not mistaken, that was one of the things that keeps being said over and over again. What we think here and what we want here may not be what a developer comes to say.

Mr. Chairman if I may make another comment here. One of the things that came out of the meeting was, and I believe Guido kind of put this out, if you knew that the Keefe was dependent on the rink would you want the rink and would you want the Keefe? People that said they wanted one or the other put their hand up and said yes they would be interested. So everything is how we pose a question. I don't want to put a loaded question out there to someone but I think the more I like the community engagement but I think we're kind of chasing our tail around if we don't make a decision and put out an RFP and find out what a real developer feels can happen on this property. I think that we've moved the little blocks around long enough. I think it's time to kind of move forward.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Thibeault?

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Two questions. I'll ask them both together. When are we getting the parking study? Second question is actually through you to maybe Director Sullivan. So Alderman Dowd had mentioned the traffic and doing a traffic study and Planning and Zoning not being able to support the traffic there. I wanted to see what since Director Sullivan is here what his thoughts are on that question? I support the rink right now anyway but I want all the information out there. If they're going to put apartments there that will cause more traffic, I'd like to hear his thoughts on that.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

Before we get too far Mr. Chairman, I do want to address some of these comments that were raised.

Chairman O'Brien

Go ahead Director Cummings.

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

If I can and I apologize for interjecting but before Director Sullivan talks about some land use principles and the regulatory process, just want to clarify some comments that were just made. So developers have their own business model and their business plan. So I believe there might be some confusion. Although we haven't necessarily talked about it this way, we're essentially going to be talking about two RFPs. One RFP is just for the ice rinks. I wanted to be able to represent to whoever wants to develop the ice rinks with a ground lease that there's going to be an expectation that you're going to need to share in the cost, take on some of the cost of preserving the Keefe Auditorium because that is community value and put that out to market place. I want to do that as soon as possible for all the reasons that were raised and hopefully get a response back this spring sometime. That would then give us some more information to allow us to decide if we want to proceed with the second RFP if you will which is really the remainder of the site.

I've been strategically trying to have a piecemeal conversation about this about four quadrants. We have one quadrant figured out, it sounds as though we're getting to consensus on a second quadrant where we want to have the Keefe. I'm hearing that loud and clear and people can correct me if I'm wrong and then it's a question of well it's going to take to be able to do that. So the balance of the site, the other 50% or the two other quadrants, we're going to look at putting housing on there and how much housing units we can actually put on there. I'm going to suggest to you under this conversation, there will be no preservation of the historic structure of the building because we'll look for new construction because that's how we're going to get the most units. Then it would be that type of plan, that type of design, that we would actually issue with the RFP and we would try to move the conversation forward to see if we can generate enough revenue to ultimately come back before you and say with a TIF you can issue a bond of "X" amount and then using other monies from the City, you're going to be solving for a subsidy of "Y" which may be for this conversation, don't hold me to it, \$5 million and you may all say that's totally fine. Or you're going to say I'll come to you and say it's going to be more like a \$10 million subsidy and you may say that is absolutely unacceptable. So that is part of the reason why I'm trying to have this conversation. Thank you. Sorry Mr. Chairman.

Chairman O'Brien

I think you have something to say Director Sullivan?

Matt Sullivan, Community Development Director

Not by choice admittedly thanks to Alderman Thibeault but no happy to address the question and I'm going to dodge a bit as well. So it's difficult to say at this point in time what exactly the regulatory implications of the required offsite mitigation would be for the traffic this site would generate. When it comes to the Planning Board's review of any traffic impact whether for this or a project of another type, it's not often a question of whether the project can be approved but more of a question of what is the offsite mitigation that's required to actually deal with the impacts of a project's traffic, contribution to the existing street network, or the surrounding intersections. So I think it will – it is an iteration of the project that we're discussing this evening potentially challenging for the Planning Board to or for the development to mitigate, yes. Can it be mitigated? I would suggest that it can to the extent that these uses can balance each other out and the traffic impacts can balance each other out based on the character of the uses. I don't want to argue with Alderman Dowd. He has a tremendous amount of experience with the Planning Board and has had to face many of these questions before but I think if these uses can be successfully balanced onsite that this could be an approvable proposal in front of the Planning Board from a traffic perspective but there will be some massaging necessary to do that.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Clemons?

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. So through you to Director Cummings. It sounds to me do you have a clear direction from us this evening?

Tim Cummings, Administrative Services and Economic Development Director

I do. I got much more of a direction than I ever thought I would so I appreciate it.

Alderman Clemons

Can I ask a follow up?

Chairman O'Brien

Keep in mind Alderman Clemons. There's no need for a vote. We're not picking – we're waiting for more facts to come in.

Alderman Clemons

Well I only have a logistical question if I could ask that? If you're talking about two separate RFPs and one of them is the hockey arena and the auditorium and the second one is the housing but the second one if tearing down essentially Elm Street School, my question is because the Keefe is attached to that school right now how do those two marry if they're two separate projects? So in other words if you have somebody coming in to build a hockey arena that's going to be attached to the Keefe Auditorium however if you have somebody else that's coming in to develop the rest of the site and they have to tear that down, how do you marry those two construction projects?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

They'd be two separate projects. They'd be two separate construction projects. I assume we will get it subdivided – we would subdivide it and we'd be creating new lots.

Alderman Clemons

So the fact that – I guess just from a physical standpoint – the fact that that building is attached to the other building or is a part of the building would have no bearing on a construction project of the hockey arena?

Unidentified Speaker

That's a good question.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

I think you could do it. You could if the - let's just say the hockey arena project went first, you could make it part of their responsibility to kind of seal off the Keefe. I don't know if you would potentially put the demolition of the school on their back or just that you would demo up to the Keefe but then they would be responsible for sealing off and kind of stabilizing the Keefe and then basically that would become a new lot line, and the residential building would come, and they would build up to that lot line.

Caroline Frantz, Marvel Architects

I did just want to point out in this scheme and this was something that came up in our group earlier is we are locating that new multi-family massing on the side of the Keefe where the existing school ties in currently because we recognize that is going to be - it's not a new façade. It is going to have markings of the demolition. So that's an acknowledge of that.

I guess one other thing we're kind of talking about options that maintain the Keefe. In our stakeholder conversations with local developers, there are some that see use of repurposing the school building and some that's not just part of their business model. So I'm just bringing that up because we do have two schemes that maintain the Keefe - the one that has the school too and the one that doesn't so maybe there's a way to structure that framework of the response to allow it be tailored to the specific developer.

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

If I could add one more thing to that and this is something we'll have to go back and study, right now as we have modeled these just because of how we're dealing with the parking and limiting the height of the new build residential, you're actually getting more residential units when you keep the school. That's because the school is not - we're providing parking for that at the perimeter of the site. So it's a little bit of an open question at least as we've framed it right now. Keeping the school gets you more units. Now again, that has to work for an individual developer's approach. I agree there is a challenge moving walls. That's why turning the school into market rate units that might have more generous sizes is going to be much easier than turning it into very kind of efficient, affordable units. So it also kind of inflects the mix.

Alderman Clemons

One follow up.

Chairman O'Brien

Follow up.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you for answering those questions. I appreciate that. I also want to say that I appreciate the fact that hopefully I am hoping that we're coming out of this with two RFPs coming soon.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Dowd and then Alderman Wilshire in the queue.

Alderman Dowd

Two things with vast amount of construction experience I have. Separating the two buildings - the building from the auditorium is not an issue. You're going to have to keep part of the school building on the side of the auditorium because that's where the stairways are for egress. You may even have to add an elevator, I'm not sure. It depends on what you're doing but the stairways to evacuate up the balcony is part of the school building. So you would just cut it off. From a construction standpoint, it's not that hard. You're going to have to do some kind of thing to block off. If you keep the school building, you're going to have to block it off so you can't have access to the auditorium. All of that is doable. How much it costs is a different story though. It's not that difficult. The other buildings that were added in 1963 are all

independent and can be torn down fairly easily. They're just brick construction. So I mean, again, I think that we need to move forward. I agree with Alderman Clemons, let's see how much teeth they have in doing the ice rink. If they don't want to do the ice rink, it changes all of what we're going to do with the other part of it. You could do the ice rink and the connection to the Keefe and keep that separate from the rest of it very easily. It's not that difficult.

Chairman O'Brien

Alderman Wilshire?

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you. So I appreciate all this back and forth tonight. It was very interesting. My priority on this site would be housing. I think that's what we need the most in this City. However, I would like to see the Keefe and I would like to see hockey. So those are the order of my priorities. Housing, Keefe, and hockey.

Alderman Klee

Just a quick comment? Just doing the math and the three things that are put there. If you looked at one that kept the school and the Keefe, we're looking at 141 units. This is based on the 1,000 feet that you talked about and 489 parking spaces based on their numbers. Without the school but with the Keefe, we're looking at 100 units and 437 spaces. Those two by the way do have the rink in it. The last one would be without the rink, without the Keefe, without the school. 182 units, 574 spaces. You're only looking at an additional 40 units and I say "only", but that's the key there. So if we kept the school and the Keefe, we're looking at 141 units with 489 parking spaces. Again, I just say let's put the RFP out, see if anybody wants to bite on the rink, and if we don't get anybody, then we can go in the direction of the 182 units without the Keefe, without the school, and so on. But I think that conversation has to be had first, so we need that RFP for the rink and potential for the Keefe and I think we need to move forward with that as soon as possible.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Any further comments or discussion?

Alderman Jette

I don't know if the architect wants to say something?

Guido Hartray, Marvel Architects

So the only thing I'm thinking. I actually think we have gotten a lot of feedback. So I think we do have priorities that we can kind of distill down and give to Tim that he can take forward and put into that RFP.

I would like to leave the possibility open for a developer to take a holistic approach to the site. It may be a challenge but I also think that's potentially where the biggest benefit is. I would think that a developer could look at this and say I want to do the residential and the fact that I'm partnering with another developer who's going to do the ice rink but we're kind of co-developing this. It's added value. So I think what we were just talking about was the potential of doing an RFP that includes the ice rink, and the Keefe, and potentially also the housing. So it's challenging, you know. It takes a pretty creative developer but I do think that if we can leave that option open, it has the biggest potential upside.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Everybody's good?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I got a question.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay, we might as well let you.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well since we've brought this conversation this far, I'm going to ask the group. I'm just going to pick this number and I'm not saying this would be the number but would there be support for a bond authorization, not a TIF, but a general bond obligation to renovate the Keefe for \$10 million? So if we were able to go forward and do all this, is there going to be 10 votes for a \$10 million of not future tax dollars because that is on top of this. So you'd have to be willing to dedicate all of future tax dollars that are generated. That would be the TIF. That would be probably a certain dollar amount that would cover, again, I'm going to make this up but \$15 million and then - or I'd say \$10 million and then there would be a potential another \$10 million subsidy necessary to move forward with what I'm hearing people talk about. I guess I'm asking you all are you comfortable with that type of scenario?

Chairman O'Brien

Show of hands would be appropriate.

Alderman Jette

Could I say something?

Chairman O'Brien

Oh, go ahead.

Alderman Jette

Thank you. So think of what you're asking us. You're telling us I'm making up numbers. I have no idea whether these numbers make any sense or not but let's take a number out of the air - \$10 million would you support a project? There are too many unanswered questions for me anyway to answer that question. Why don't you do what you said - do the RFP or maybe as the architect suggest do one RFP for the whole thing and see what comes back. Then we have some information that we can then base a decision on. To ask us whether we would be willing to support a bond for \$10 million when you don't even know if that makes any sense or not, it's...

Chairman O'Brien

I think if I may Alderman Jette. I think what the gist of what Director Cummings is you just don't show up to the bank and say I want a bond for \$10 million. There's processes that it has to go through and I think it will be judged with the RFP as well. But this is a straw vote. It's not committal. It's just basically if there's a willingness if people want to...

Alderman Jette

I know. We're the bank so he's showing up to the bank and saying will you lend me \$10 million? For what? We need more - no disrespect. I know you've got a lot on your plate. You've got a very difficult job. I understand that and I appreciate all the work you're doing but I can't answer that question.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

But I can if I may Mr. Chairman? So the reason why I asked this question, and its fair, if don't want to give me that direction, don't. I've been dealing with your market long enough and I know the real estate developers. If I tell them that there's nothing when I have my conversations with them, I don't think you're going to get a response to an RFP and that's fine. We can test the market and see whether we get a response or not. I'm well aware of the June 2024 deadline. So I was trying to expedite this a little bit. I was trying to short circuit it with my question but if that is not the pleasure of this body and you'd prefer to just have me issue the RFP and we can go through the process, I am absolutely happy to do that as well.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Quick question Alderman Klee?

Alderman Klee

I hope so. You know there's no one that respects you more than I do. We all do here. My question is I think a \$10 million means we go through and renovate. We upgrade the seats. We do whatever else has to be done to it. My question, and

I think I've asked you this question before, I like the baby steps idea even though I know in the end it will probably cost us a little more. If we put the rink in that would put in A/C, that would give us a lobby, and possible bathrooms, and possible green rooms, and so on, can we at least take a breath and start from there and maybe later on go and do some of the upgrades? When you ask me am I willing to spend \$10 million or commit to potentially spending \$10 million, my knee jerk reaction is no. I want to save the Keefe but if we did the rink and we did these little things, would that be enough to save the Keefe to make it programmable? That's my question.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

Thank you. Great question. I want to clarify one thing you said. Provide air-conditioning. So no, air-conditioning would not be provided under the scenario you just talked about. That's the reason why I need to kind of know if there's an appetite to issue any type of bond because that type of cost is not going to be covered so you wouldn't make it programmable. We're going to need to have that addressed. Again, your point is well taken though and so, again, if folks want to wait and just see what the market says, we can absolutely take that approach as well. I'm totally fine with that. I just want to make you aware of the risk I guess.

Alderman Klee

May I follow up?

Chairman O'Brien

Follow up.

Alderman Klee

Thank you. So again for me to make it programmable, it has to have the air-conditioning. If you were to say what the cost would be to put air-conditioning, a unit on top of the building, etc., can it be tied into whatever heating system would be kind of coming into it, that I would rather have that conversation than looking at a \$10 million or plus future types of things. That's kind of where I was going at. So even if this doesn't provide air conditioning, that's more of the conversation I want. What is what we can do to get it to be programmable and then look at future upgrades, and changes, etc?

Chairman O'Brien

Director Cummings?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I hear what's being said. I think actually probably what makes sense is the next point is we take a pause this evening. As much as you may not like to hear me say this, but I come back to you with actually some of the math done so we can have that type of conversation. I think we got the direction we need in terms of the amount of density, the amount of units. I think the team here can put a site out for consideration. I can absolutely do the economics on it to kind of bring it back to you and say here's roughly what the game would look like. We can have that conversation another night. We could proceed with issuing the RFP after that if that's what folks want to do.

Chairman O'Brien

So you want to withdraw your...?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

Yeah, no, absolutely. We don't need to have that conversation now. We can do that on another night if it's...

Chairman O'Brien

Go ahead. You might as well.

Alderman Comeau

Thank you Mr. Chair. Director Cummings I wanted to ask if you could clarify something to make sure that I heard you

correctly. Are you thinking that if we create something like a TIF for this and we generate \$10 million in revenue, you're still going to need possibly a \$10 million bond to do this work even after the savings we get from partnering with the rink?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

So again, you're not going to generate \$10 million in new revenue off this. You may generate \$2 million. No. You're not even going to generate \$2 million. You're going to generate maybe a million at the most. You're going to generate about a million dollars. So you're only going to be able to bond about \$10 million approximately. Then the question is - let's say my numbers are wrong and let's just say it's a \$20 million project, you're going to need to provide a \$10 million subsidy. Maybe we can shift some of that cost onto the ice rink folks. Maybe we could shift 10% of that, so that's \$2 million. Maybe we're only bonding \$8 million instead of \$10 million but that's the type of conversation. I guess at the end of the day, that's the question of to preserve the Keefe are we ready and willing to do that and mind you, I'm here talking about the Keefe. You really need to compare that against all the other projects in the queue to decide whether you want to actually spend the money here as opposed to somewhere else.

Alderman Comeau

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Have you considered leaving the door open from the ice skating rink to the Keefe and putting some fans in the doorway?
Alderman Wilshire?

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you. I know your question was kind of hypothetical and had no qualms about doing a show of hands. So if you're still interested in a show of hands, I'm ready to support it.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I appreciate that. Thank you. I mean I think it is good information to kind of put out there so we at least have a framework. Everyone wants to preserve the Keefe. Alderman Comeau you've said this many times. Everyone wants to preserve the Keefe but preserve the Keefe at what dollar amount, right? So we've been kind of having this conversation for over a year now and I have been very slowly trying to have this conversation but I think we are now at a point where there needs to be some direction given as to what the comfort level is.

Alderman Dowd

So you've come up with a couple numbers including \$30 million. I'd like to see a list of breakdowns where you think the expenses are in the infrastructure. Not right now.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

It may be up on the website. I think it is up on the website. I would have to double check.

Alderman Dowd

It says this much for seats, this much for air-conditioning, this much for this. You don't have to bring it up.

Chairman O'Brien

All right. Alderman Clemons?

Alderman Clemons

I was going to ask for the same thing but at the next meeting.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

It's on the website.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah, I know but if we're going to have the discussion of what we think the breakdown will be as you said if you could bring that to the next meeting and then we can discuss the details of what we're going to get for "\$10 million" or whatever it is. Then I think maybe we can even make some – we can make some other decisions amongst ourselves whether or not we want to include everything that's on that list, and can we whittle that down, and go from there. That, I think, is a worthwhile conversation to have.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Director Cummings, I think you've got your marching orders. So I think you know/got the flavor of what the Board wants. A little bit more harder numbers when you come back and we'll be able to make an intelligent decision at that point.

So I'll conclude without objection, further discussion on the Elm Street Middle School jointly with Director Cummings and the architects. I would like to thank the architects for coming up. I hope you had a wonderful dinner in our great City. I hope Director Cummings wasn't too cheap and took you out to a good place. Thank you so much for the information. I think you definitely assisted the Board tonight. So thank you for coming. Anybody else further comments? Seeing none, we'll move on.

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development
Re: Communication on potential new development project(s) for BIDA

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COMEAU TO FORM A SUBCOMMITTEE TO DISCUSS THE POTENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT OF PARCEL MAP 77-3, 77-8, AND POTENTIAL DRAFT LEGISLATION IF CONSENSUS IS REACHED

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

And I assume that the President will appoint this sub-committee? Is that what you're looking for Director Cummings or will it come from the Committee of Infrastructure?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

So if I may Mr. Chair. Yes, thanks guys. I'm just quickly go through this. So I believe what I was asking for with this communication to be referred to the sub-committee of PEDC and just to get confirmation that there is an appetite to see future development on specifically 77-8 but also 77-3 as those are two parcels in the Millyard that BIDA has expressed an interest in moving forward for development. So I would guess before a resolution is drafted, I wanted to have this first initial conversation just to make sure that we are on good ground.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Alderman Comeau has graciously stated that he will withdraw his Motion and will constitute from Director Cummings said with the direction for PEDC. Alderman Comeau?

Alderman Comeau

Thank you Mr. Chair. I will withdraw my Motion and I will make a Motion to refer the communication to the PEDC.

ALDERMAN COMEAU WITHDREW HIS MOTION

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COMEAU TO REFER THE COMMUNICATION TO PEDC

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

Do you want a little more out of that? Is that satisfactory?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I guess I would just ask for an affirmative recommendation that we look to explore Resolution 77-8 or something to that effect.

Alderman Comeau

I'm just reading the script.

Chairman O'Brien

We're a little off script but we're trying to get what the recommendation of the Director is. Alderman Clemons do you want to take a stab at it?

Alderman Clemons

Sure so by referring it to PEDC, the Chairman will then have to make a meeting I guess around that. So that will, I think, that's what you're looking to do.

Chairman O'Brien

I would assume.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

We can absolutely have a PEDC meeting where this conversation takes place. I know the hour is long this evening. It's not time-sensitive. We can do that at a following PEDC meeting. Ultimately, I'm just wanting to make sure that everyone is aware that there is an appetite by BIDA to redevelop 77-8. I wanted to be available to answer any questions that came about. This is a site that is going to be turned back to the City in the near future. It is currently used as the training facility for the police. It's in the Millyard and so I just thought that before a resolution comes about, and some of you might not have the institutional memory, but there was a resolution that created the BIDA having jurisdiction to some degree over what's referred to "Downtown Renaissance", the Renaissance Project. So BIDA is looking to emulate something similar to that where they know that there is a comfort level with the Board of Aldermen that they can proceed with developing 77-8. That was essentially the orientation or the genesis behind this communication.

Chairman O'Brien

As you know Director Cummings, the Chairman of PEDC is on some personal time off so how timely is this? Would March be within your scope to handle this?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I think we could absolutely have the conversation in March. I mean just point out that this communication was sent to you in December.

Alderman Wilshire

There's a Vice Chair.

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah, that's me. We could do it.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

BIDA does want to be able to move this along.

Chairman O'Brien

I'm just trying to find when our next meeting is and I think we missed the date.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I'll pull that up.

Chairman O'Brien

That's what I'm trying to figure out.

Alderman Dowd

You could set up a special meeting.

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah that's what I find out if we need to call a special.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

I'm look it up right now. So the next meeting is scheduled for February 21st.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay, so we'll move it to February 21st.

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

That would be great.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. We'll put in on the docket. That will expedite it more. Sorry Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

No I was just going to say, I think while it's an important conversation, I think we need more information as to what they want to do and I would like to have a separate meeting on that before.

Chairman O'Brien

I think they'll be able to get the ducks in a row by the 21st, correct?

Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development

Yes, correct. To answer his question multi-family is what they would like to do specifically looked at as affordable. They haven't done much study or investigation of the land because they're not really sure that there's an appetite for it to be developed. I think if we have a conversation on the 21st we can go into more details, give people an opportunity to kind of think about it between now and then. All I'm looking for is to be able to be charged to go make some representations back to BIDA. I can accurately convey this information to BIDA and then if it so pleases everyone, start to work towards getting a resolution drafted.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. The Chair will basically at this point will accept the communication as read and refer the matter to the PEDC.

Without objection, Chairman O'Brien accepted the communication and referred it to Planning and Economic Development Committee.

From: Sam Durfee, AICP, Planning Manager
Re: Planning Board Report – Ordinance O-23-040

From: Sam Durfee, AICP, Planning Manager
Re: Planning Board Report Dozer Road Discontinuance Petition

There being no objection, Chairman O'Brien accepted the communications and placed them on file.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

PETITIONS

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS - None

NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES

O-23-040

Endorsers: Alderman Richard A. Dowd
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
Alderman Patricia Klee
Alderwoman-at-Large Gloria Timmons

AMENDING THE LAND USE CODE REGARDING PARKING SPACE REQUIREMENTS FOR MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOLS

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COMEAU TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE

Chairman O'Brien

Motion for final passage. Any discussion on the Motion?

MOTION CARRIED

GENERAL DISCUSSION - None

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN - None

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO ADJOURN
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 9:31 p.m.

Alderman Alex Comeau, Committee Clerk