

JOINT MEETING WITH  
BUDGET REVIEW COMMITTEE  
AND  
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2020

A joint meeting of the Budget Review Committee and Planning and Economic Development Committee was held Monday, September 28, 2020, at 8:50 p.m. via teleconference.

Chairman Dowd

As Chairman of the Budget Review Committee, I find that due to the State of Emergency declared by the Governor as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and in accordance with the Governor's Emergency Order #12 pursuant to Executive Order 2020-04, this public body is authorized to meet electronically.

Please note that there is no physical location to observe and listen contemporaneously to this meeting, which was authorized pursuant to the Governor's Emergency Order. However, in accordance with the Emergency Order, I am confirming that we are:

Providing public access to the meeting by telephone, with additional access possibilities by video or other electronic means:

To access Zoom, please refer to the agenda or the City's website for the meeting link.

*To join by phone dial: 1-929-205-6099 Meeting ID: 876 8012 6610 and Passcode: 195026*

*The public may also view the meeting via Channel 16.*

We previously gave notice to the public of the necessary information for accessing the meeting, through public postings. Instructions have also been provided on the City of Nashua's website at [www.nashuanh.gov](http://www.nashuanh.gov) and publicly noticed at City Hall and Nashua Public Library.

If anybody has a problem accessing the meeting via phone or Channel 16, please call 603-821-2049 and they will help you connect.

In the event the public is unable to access the meeting via the methods mentioned above, the meeting will be adjourned and rescheduled. Please note that **all votes** that are taken during this meeting shall be done by **roll call vote**.

Let's start the meeting by taking a roll call attendance. **When each member states their presence, please also state whether there is anyone in the room with you during this meeting, which is required under the Right-To-Know Law.**

Alderman O'Brien called the roll and asked them to state the reason he or she could not attend, confirmed that they could hear the proceedings, and stated who was present with him or her.

The roll call was taken with 10 members of the Budget Review Committee and Planning and Economic Development Committee present:

Alderman Richard A. Dowd, Chairman  
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons, Vice Chair  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman Ernest Jette  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza, PEDC Chairman  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Brandon Michael Laws, PEDC Vice-Chair

Also in Attendance: Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman June M. Caron  
Alderman Elizabeth Lu  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Skip Cleaver  
David Fredette, Treasurer/Tax Collector  
Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

---

ROLL CALL

Alderman Kelly

Here, I am alone and I can hear everyone.

Alderman Wilshire

I am here, I am alone and I can hear everyone, I am social distancing.

Alderman Jette

I am here, I can hear everyone and I am staying safer at home with my wife.

Alderman Schmidt

I am present and I am alone.

Alderman O'Brien

The Clear, Alderman-at Large Michael O'Brien is present, I can hear and I am alone.

Alderman Clemons

I am here, I can hear everyone, I am at home alone. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

I am present, I can hear everyone and I am alone in the room and practicing social distancing.

Alderman O'Brien

Alright Mr. Chairman, for the Planning & Economic Development Committee.

Alderman Laws

I am here, I can hear you and I am alone.

Alderman Lopez

I am here, I can hear you and I am alone.

Alderman Tencza, PEDC Chairman

I am present I am alone and I can hear everyone.

Alderman O'Brien

Mr. Chairman, all are present with 10 members present.

Chairman Dowd

Thank you. We also have Director Tim Cummings; David Fredette, Treasurer of the City of Nashua; we have the Mayor, Jim Donchess; and don't think I see John Griffin anywhere. Is there anyone else I am missing?

Alderman O'Brien

Yes, Mr. Chairman I would like to include Alderman Klee.

Chairman Dowd

Oh yeah ok.

Alderman Caron

Alderman Caron.

Alderman O'Brien

And Alderman Caron, excuse me.

Alderman Caron

Thank you.

Alderwoman Lu

And Alderman Lu, can you see me.

Alderman O'Brien

Ok so let me get that; Alderman Caron, Alderman Harriott-Gathright, and do I have everybody. The additions are Aldermen Klee, Caron and Harriott-Gathright.

Chairman Dowd

And Lu.

Alderman O'Brien

And Lu, thank you.

Alderman Cleaver

Alderman Cleaver.

Alderman O'Brien

Alderman Lu and Alderman Cleaver. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Alright, so the first item is public comment. Is there anybody that didn't speak during the public hearing that would like to address the Board? Seeing and hearing no one, Communications?

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

COMMUNICATIONS

From: David Fredette, Treasurer/Tax Collector  
Re: Bond Sale Plan and Debt Service Analysis for General Fund

***There being no objection, Chairman Dowd accepted the communications and placed them on file.***

UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS – RESOLUTIONS

**R-20-071**

Endorser: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons  
Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Skip Cleaver  
Alderman Tom Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND CITY TREASURER TO ISSUE BONDS NOT TO EXCEED THE AMOUNT OF EIGHT MILLION DOLLARS (\$8,000,000) FOR TWO CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS, CONSISTING OF A PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE GROUND LEVEL PARKING GARAGE (\$2,500,000) AND ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE PROPOSED PERFORMING ARTS CENTER (\$5,500,000)**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE BY ROLL CALL**

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman Dowd

So is there discussion on R-20-071; is there anyone that would like to discuss this motion? Alderman Wilshire?

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you, Alderman Dowd. After the public hearing I really gave a lot of thought to how we've gotten this far and I really need to thank Director Cummings for his hard work on this; keeping things on track, trusting in the process for getting the New Market Tax Credits, believing in this. You know, you had the Capital Campaign, they worked really hard I think and you can't take this for granted. I mean people have been working really hard to make this a reality. It's been a long-time coming, I'm going to support this and I wanted to give a shout out to everybody who's been involved and has done the hard work to keep this on track. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Anyone else? Alderman Lopez?

Alderman Lopez

I know at times, I was initially very supportive of the Performing Arts Center as a concept and enthusiastic about the opportunity for an economic anchor downtown particularly after Alec's shoe stores moved away. There were definitely points in this process where I really doubted it and it didn't seem feasible. But after the presentation at the public hearing, the acknowledgement that we are getting some New Market Tax Credits, we do have (inaudible) and the addition of the whole development project for School Street, I mean pending this Board's decision and approval. I feel like we are in a much better place now which much more holistically reflects the needs of that area for general development. Because downtown we need amenities to help attract younger people and (audio cuts in and out) to downtown to spend money.

We need it as a community gathering place but we also really need housing and we need to be attentive to the people that are living there. And while the School Street Lot isn't exclusively low income housing or public housing the way that I would have personally preferred, we do have those projects that are underway that are sort of being better, I don't know the word there, that are complementing this project and this particular plan does allow for the parking that the housing (inaudible) in the area need to continue. I'm thinking specifically of Mary's Place, of Dalianis House, of the Harbor Care Clinic, the local stakeholders that were initially very, very (inaudible) raising a lot of those concerns, the City worked with them to help to compromise what their needs are against those needs of a developer who is willing to actually develop and invest and this developer particularly has a lot of faith in the Performing Arts Center, which again, I didn't for most of the phases of the project, but I do now.

So much of my praise is (inaudible) and not necessarily exclusively complementary, I think it is very well deserved that the fund-raising Committee and Director Cummings have done a very good job of persevering and pushing through. I also want to give credit to the Aldermen who participated on the Steering Committee and have really advocated for this internally and added that little bit of guidance and to the Mayor whose really, really shepherded this project as a (inaudible) project. So I feel much more positively about this. I am generally in favor of it so I am looking forward to the changes that are to come.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Chairman Dowd. I want to basically I am going to do a me too of much of what Alderman Lopez had said. This has been a longtime going and a lot of people have worked really hard; the Capital Campaign people have worked hard; the Steering Committee has worked hard and I know I am kind of patting myself on the back because I'm part of that Committee. But the truth is that every step of the way there have been very unique individuals as part of this Committee, whether they had an expertise in the arts, expertise in building or whatever, there's been a lot of different people that have been part of this project.

I think everyone has done an incredible job. I am glad to see it's going forward, I am glad to see that we are finally hearing what the Capital Campaign has raised. They have worked so hard in doing all of that. I also want to say about the parking garage, I know that there was a comment that was made that we are building it for the apartment building. It is not, it is still going to be City used and so on. I have a constituent that owns a business in that area and I have spoken to him quite a bit. The need for that parking was imperative for his business as well as for all the other businesses that Alderman Lopez had mentioned. It was important for us to work with all of the abutters. We do this for a private home that's having a driveway put in or having an addition put on. I think its right to discuss with the abutters; I think its right to make them happy. It doesn't mean that we ignore the rest of the City. But the abutters are important and I am really glad to see that the City was able to work it out with them.

And kind of in summation, I think this is a really great project. I hope we push it forward to the Board of Aldermen. I like the fact that it's kind of bundled together. I see how they go hand in glove; I see how the developer wanted that to happen in such a way. So please go forward and thank you very much.

Alderman Schmidt

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I came here tonight prepared to say no to this. Only about 49% of the people in Ward 1 voted for this and I said that I would hard towards this if we could get the \$4 million dollars. I didn't think we would; it looks like we might. So much work had been put into this. I can't see throwing it out at this point, it would be a sin to do this to downtown. Yes, the two projects work well together, the TIF ties it together, the TIF will improve that entire area. We will be able to all kinds of things, things that Ward 1 was looking for like improving the method of getting to Main Street. All of the things that we can do with that, are going to make a huge different. And making sure that there is parking available, that was a big winner for me and I really appreciate that. So between the parking and the \$4 million dollars and the TIF, tonight I will say yes to this. Thank you.

Alderman Jette

Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a very difficult vote for me. You know taking first the Performing Arts Center, three years ago this Performing Arts Center failed to get the 10 votes necessary from the Board of Aldermen to go forward. It was put on the ballot for the voters to vote on. And when I ran for Alderman the first time, I told people that I would vote the way the Ward voted. Ward 5 voted against this, not by a lot but they voted against it. Five out of the 9 Wards voted against it. Overall, it passed by 155 votes, 50.7% to 49.2%. So that indicated to me that this was far from an overwhelming majority of people who were in favor of this.

Now, three years later, the cost has gone from \$15.5 million to \$25 million dollars. And I don't know if this were put before the voters again whether the people who voted for it then would still vote for it or the people who voted against it would still vote against it. Who knows? It would be speculation to try to guess what they would do.

Unidentified person speaking

I'm sorry am I - do I still have the floor? At the time there was the condition that the \$4 million dollars be raised privately. You know, I take my hat off to Director Cummings and Deb Novotny and the fundraising committee. It looks like they have done it, it looks like they are coming up with the \$4 million and I congratulate them for that.

However that \$4 million was supposed to be put into an endowment not used for construction, but held in an endowment and the income from that \$4 million dollars, which was estimated to be about \$160,000.00 a year was going to be used to operate the Performing Arts Center. Then Spectacle Management came forward and said that they could operate it without getting paid anything and as Alderman Teeboom pointed out if the seating capacity was 750. So you know that's great that they have come forward, but in their Memorandum of Understanding, they said that the City should continue to provide for that \$4 million dollar endowment and that the income, \$160,000.00 should be used to help market this Performing Arts Center. And Spectacle said that they would match the money but they were looking for the City to spend that \$160,000.00 a year for marketing. Now I don't know if Mr. Lally is on the meeting tonight and whether that condition is still a condition. The Memorandum of Understanding was just a Memorandum of Understanding, it is not a contract. I don't know if that's going to be in the contract or not. But that's a concern if it is. If it is then that \$4 million dollars can't be used towards construction, it's got to be reserved in an endowment.

The other thing is that I have looked at other Performing Arts Center in the State. You know, people point, you know Mr. Grip one of my constituents spoke in favor of this proposal and he talked about his experience with the Capitol Center for the Arts. He and I spoke earlier today about this and I pointed out and he didn't disagree with me, the Capitol Center for the Arts was undertaken for a lot less money. It cost them less than \$5 million dollars. Now granted they already had a theater to begin with; we are starting from scratch so I understand that. But their project cost a lot less and their project was funded by a non-profit corporation of local businesses and local citizens, local, political, academic, school leaders all got together, formed a non-profit

corporation and raised the money. The City of Concord paid very little, contributed very little to the Capitol Center for the Arts.

The Music Hall in Portsmouth, a very similar model. A non-profit corporation formed by local leaders, business people, government people, academic people, people involved in the art community, formed a non-profit corporation and raised the money necessary to renovate the Music Hall Theater in Portsmouth, with not a whole lot of money coming from the City of Portsmouth. The same is true of the Colonial in Keene. So I look at these other projects and as much as I am in favor of a Performing Arts Center, I struggle with the idea of is it fair for those of us who think the Performing Arts Center would be a great thing? Is it fair for us to ask the rest of the citizens in Nashua, you know, not everybody is in favor of this and a lot of them will never set foot in this place, you know, is it fair to ask them to use their tax money to pay for a very, very expensive project in comparison to other projects in the State.

On the parking garage, we were originally presented and the developer presented us with a project of building this apartment building. And he told us he could not provide parking on-site for the residents of this building. He said and Director Cummings has also said it's just economically unfeasible, the numbers just don't work. So he and the City came up with a plan to use the High Street Parking Garage to provide the parking necessary. Now I was one of the people who questioned about losing the School Street Parking Lot. But the Mayor and Director Cummings advocated very strongly that parking would not be a problem. That the High Street Parking Garage was pretty empty at night, my office is right across the street, and I use that garage. I can confirm the fact that it's pretty full during the day at least before COVID, but at night it was empty. And I became convinced that the local businesses there, the River Casino for example, their patrons could use the parking garage. There's a smaller parking lot next to School Street that's owned by the Katis Company that owns the building that the River leases space from. They have a parking lot. I don't know why a deal couldn't be made for the River to rent space there. And the Mayor and Director Cummings assured me that there was plenty of alternative parking in that area, parking was really not a problem.

But then when we came to the meeting to discuss it, all of a sudden, they had a solution for the parking problem. We went from there's no parking problem to all of a sudden there is a problem but we found a solution to it and that's to build this garage underneath the apartment building at a cost to the citizens of \$2.5 million dollars. Now we are selling this land to the developer for \$900,000.00. We have agreed to spend \$100,000.00 in the infrastructure improvements, so that's a net of \$800,000.00 and now we are going to spend \$2.5 million to build a parking garage, parking facility underneath the apartment building for \$2.5. That looks to me like a \$1.7 million dollar deficit. You know the idea of well we will talk about the TIF when that comes up, but I just you know combining this whole, you know for another \$8 million dollar bond, considering the Performing Arts Center a total bonding of \$20.5 million.

I know Treasurer Fredette has provided us with a schedule of future bond issues and the money that's going to be required to pay for those bonds. And I see that with the addition of these bonds and the Performing Arts Center, the total cost of paying for those bonds increases slightly from what we are paying now and people could say it's like refinancing your mortgage. You are used to paying a certain amount in debt service and as your mortgage principal goes down you can borrow more money and use it for various projects and still be paying about the same in interest costs. However, there are a lot of other projects that when I look at the Capital improvements Program, I see a lot of other projects on that list. You know I can think of we didn't fully come up with a solution for the Public Works Department. They originally wanted to move the Street Department and the Parks & Recreation Department to that new facility that we are building at the landfill. And they left the Street Department where it is and they left Parks Department where it is because we couldn't afford, we were told, we couldn't afford the extra bonding that it would cost.

You know if we didn't do this, maybe we could. The Street Department I see still has a heating problem; they still need a new roof. They need a facility to wash their trucks and equipment and we are going to be investing more money into that facility which we are probably going to abandon a few years down the road when we move that to the landfill area. The Parks Department, those facilities are really bad. And there are a lot of other projects that are sitting, waiting for funding that we could probably look at instead of building this

Performing Arts Center. So with that, I'll stop. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Alderman Lopez and everyone please be considerate of the time it's getting very late so go ahead.

Alderman Lopez

I mean for my personal recommendation other than there's no filibuster here, so you don't have share it. But particularly I object to some of the mischaracterizations of how a TIF (inaudible) and I know we will talk about it later. But there's still money proposed to bond that exists right now. TIF money is from development, tax (inaudible) projects. So projects that don't exist right now, spending money that would be a product of the development and enables that development to proceed. So development stops, (audio cuts in and out).

Chairman Dowd

You're breaking up Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez

You don't get the project without the parking garage because the (audio cuts out) so by using the TIF money and the anticipated revenue from the development (audio cuts out). Equally with the Performing Arts Center we are not spending more money, we are spending money that doesn't exist right now. If we actually do something with Alec's Shoe Store instead of (audio cuts out). With regards to the way TIF money is (audio cuts out) we are not asking taxpayers to do any more than what they automatically (audio cuts out) giving them two amenities downtown including an Arts Center. So I think that's important to remember and I would also like to remind the Board that while it is a Performing Arts Center, it really is an economic anchor. The purpose behind it is to draw people downtown, succeed and thrive and then pass that diversity and that energy and that success around to the residents who use the downtown area. So things you are investing in downtown you really are investing for the entire City's use.

Chairman Dowd

All set? Is there anyone else that would like to comment? Alderman Lu?

Alderwoman Lu

Thank you, can you hear me?

Chairman Dowd

Yes.

Alderwoman Lu

Just for the record, I didn't hear anything that Alderman Lopez said and I wish I had, but I wanted to just cover a couple of things. So the \$2.5 million dollar bond, first of all I wanted to suggest that we separate these two issues. I was going to ask if Corporation Counsel was here tonight, that he that they provide how that's done. But the other thing I want to mention is the \$2.5 million dollar bond for the parking garage, you know, we never heard, I had never heard that the Melbourne Group felt their investment was contingent on a Performing Arts Center. I may have missed something, but I never heard that. I understand that a big concern was the Casino and they have people coming and going with possibly cash. And they wanted surface parking. But it seems to me they could hire or we could hire a security guard for less than the bond maintenance cost for \$2.5 million dollars.



The other thing I wanted to bring up is the description of the construction of the parking garage was to do it on City property that did the raise the question, it could be that it was just described – the question is are we holding on to that property or is it going to be sold to the Melbourne Group. And at what point does that happen? Maybe it was described as a parking garage on the City of Nashua property because it is going to be done before the construction starts, I'm not sure.

Chairman Dowd

Is that a question you'd like answered?

Alderman Lu

Yeah thanks for stopping me, yes.

Chairman Dowd

Director Cummings?

Director Cummings

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Very quickly and simply we will be retaining the fee interest in the land and what we would be doing is entering into a long-term lease agreement for the air rights. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Much like they do in Boston and New York and other major cities. Any other questions Alderman Lu?

Alderman Lu

If I could get some information on what that means, that would be helpful. I didn't see that anywhere.

Chairman Dowd

What that means is we own the ground level and we sell the rights to the stories about ground level. It's done in major buildings in Boston, New York, Chicago, its done all the time.

Alderman Lu

Mm-hmm. So I just wanted to comment on the last meeting when I was having a conversation about the TIF District. I am just concerned that the TIF District actually has ...

Chairman Dowd

Yeah if I could just stop you there. The TIF is another ...

Alderman Lu

Oh we are not talking about that now?

Chairman Dowd

We are not talking about that now.

Alderman Lu

Good enough.

Chairman Dowd

We are just talking about the bond.

Alderman Lu

I think I'm through. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Anyone else? Alderman Tencza then Alderman Cleaver.

Alderman Tencza

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think like a couple of the earlier speakers, I still have concerns and I am still not clear on the economics of this plan, you know, whether they work out in our favor with the bonding. I want to be very clear I am committed to the Arts Center. I think it's a great project and I would even go as far as saying, look the project has changed, the cost of the project is different now and if we were looking for additional money for that through a bond or TIF, I wouldn't have a tough problem supporting it. But we were presented something much different I think at PEDC and even in front of the Planning Board as far as the sale of the School Street Property and what that looked like. I went back - I mean there was no parking garage. I've been supportive of that development as well, I think it is an underutilized portion of downtown, which we have talked about a couple different businesses or housing there. I thought that the original plan that Melbourne Lansing Group before was a good plan for that area. But again with losing the \$900,000.00 anticipated cost, moving that tax revenue going forward which was a large part of my support for the development of that. You know I say "losing it" you know, losing it to the General Tax Base. I am concerned about this. I think that if we did the math, and I know, I understand it is tough to do the math, but if we were just to bond the additional \$5.5 million dollars for the Performing Arts Center, I think, in the long run, the City would come out ahead and we would basically benefit from that development, the entire city, the General Fund, would benefit from that development.

And then the last point I'll make, I'm disappointed and troubled about, is that the Infrastructure Committee has been telling people for months now that we are doing this downtown parking study. We are also engaging in the Master Plan process starting now. I am disappointed that we are pushing this forward and not separating it so it couldn't be part of that downtown parking study. Because I think at least at that point we would have professionals who would be able to give us an opinion and say, yes this is a worthwhile project or no – the parking downtown in this area is sufficient. I understand that the businesses down there are concerned as are residents all over the City when there's new development. No one knows exactly how it is going to affect their interest. But it seems to me like we are putting up this \$2.5 million dollars without really knowing whether it's necessary. So I am still open to listening to everybody, but at this point, I am having a tough time in Committee, supporting this as it's presented. Thank you.

Alderman Cleaver

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to reiterate that I am strongly in favor of the Performing Arts Center, strongly in favor and I back the bonding for that immediately. However, I say again, the fact that they are tied together creates problems. So I have a motion, I would like to move to separate the question and make this two different issues.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEAVER TO SEPARATE THE TWO ITEMS**

Chairman Dowd

I don't think Corporation Counsel, I mean these two items are, because of the TIF, are tied pretty close together. I mean you can make that motion but actually you are not part of the Committee either.

Alderman Harriott-Gathright

You have to wait until it comes to the full board.

Alderman Cleaver

Well as a follow up then I have some objections I would like to list, a few objections to the School Street Program.

Chairman Dowd

Go ahead.

Alderman Cleaver

First of all, developing only one bedroom and studio suites by definition this is for young couples and youngsters only who have animals and so on and so forth. There's no provision for families or others so it's a form, in my view, a form of gentrification of the downtown created for a select group and not including others. The other thing is that if you do the math on the space available within that building, within the parameters of what's been described, it's like trying to put a bushel of potatoes into a one peck bag, it doesn't work because there are just too many units for the space available. So I have concerns about that and the design doesn't seem to have amenities involved either like laundry and fitness room and offices and so on and so forth. So that's a design issue. Also as a building in the downtown, it's not attractive in any way, shape, or form. It doesn't fit into the architecture. The downtown will be a deterrent rather than an addition. And I don't see it as being a draw in any way, shape, or form. The developer has opportunities to do things like solar panels for green energy, no mention of that or green energy of any kind.

For example, there could be a rooftop (inaudible) with an observation deck and so on and so forth, available to the public during the day by express elevator. Things like that, creative use of the space so that it becomes an attraction rather than a detriment to the downtown. And other green space is not available so a rooftop green space would be an ideal situation. Financially, as has been pointed out, \$900,000.00 minus \$2.5 million to \$3 million because there's also parking amenities that are going to have to be developed along street level, as the mayor has pointed out, that's going to cost money also. So it's a losing proposition from a financial standpoint, whereas the builder is going to have rental money coming in in perpetuity, the City doesn't get anything except promised future tax revenue which may or may not be enough.

Most importantly there should be a minimum in my view of 20% affordable housing and that seems to be a non-starter with anybody including the City officials and including the developer for obvious financial reasons I am sure. But to have City Property not used properly in terms of providing housing to those who need it is a big mistake in my view. So parking is still an issue and, in fact, we are still going to be losing parking spaces from businesses in addition to business construction is going to be enormous for that area both in construction and after. So those are my objections to School Street. As I say, I'd like to separate the two issues completely and address them individually for those reasons. Thank you very much.

Chairman Dowd

Alderman Clemons and then Alderman O'Brien.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity. So you know it's interesting the crossroads that we are this evening. Three years ago the City voted to move forward with this project and several things have changed since that time. Alderman McCarthy, who was the leader on this, passed away mid-project; that kind of derailed a little bit the Capital Campaign. That got back on track. They needed a little bit more time. Back in February we gave them that extra time, whether or not we were going to get to that, you know, they needed the time to do that.

And then, of course, we were hit with COVID-19 and because of that the New Market Tax Credits were put into question, whether or not those were going to come around because the Government was spending money on other things related to that, plus that put a hinder on some of the fundraising. And, of course, we went through some design changes as was previously mentioned. So there was a lot difficulties, a lot of obstacles that have come along the way over these last few years.

Alderwoman Lu

Point of order if I can?

Chairman Dowd

Excuse me?

Alderwoman Lu

Chairman Dowd.

Chairman Dowd

Is it a point of order based on what Alderman Clemons is saying?

Alderwoman Lu

Yes, I believe so. Isn't Alderman Clemons talking about the Performing Arts Center part of the bond?

Alderman Clemons

Yes?

Chairman Dowd

There's two parts of the bond, there's money for the parking garage and money for the Performing Arts Center. The thing we are not talking about is the TIF.

Alderwoman Lu

OK, I stand corrected, thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Continue Alderman Clemons.

Alderman Clemons

So it took a long time to get to where we are at, but we are finally here. The \$4 million dollars has been raised and we are faced with the Legislation that is before us. And yes, the Legislation that is before us does contain bond money for the School Street Project as well to raise the lot or to raise the structure there so they can put the lot underneath the building. So therefore, I can understand from a point of view that you may find it difficult to understand why these two projects were tied together. The thing about it is that I believe that the like many of us who have spoken that the extra \$5 million dollars for the Performing Arts Center is absolutely necessary and we need to have that.

But I also fundamentally believe that the lifting of the building and putting the parking lot underneath that building is also essential because the neighbors and the business owners that are around that area came out and spoke very forcefully that they wanted to keep that parking lot. And it was incumbent upon the City to come up with a compromise and make sure that that development still went forward. And the compromise was that we had to figure out a way to lift that building and put the spaces underneath. So the reason that these two pieces are together is because we can do one bond for the two separate projects.

Now I understand Alderman Cleaver's hesitation towards the actual aspect of what is being built there and some of the design elements and that thing. I'm not an architect and I'm certainly not a person that ever would be accused of having good design taste. However I do have to say that I have full confidence that the developer knows what they are doing and that they can add substance to our downtown and add apartments that are going to be economically viable and affordable. It's not just young people who will be attracted to those apartments, I can tell you that for a fact that many older folks, single individuals will also be attracted to that and want to have a smaller place to retire to and live in, in a nice downtown like Nashua. It is not going to be restricted housing, it is going to be market housing so it will be open to anybody that wants to live downtown, in a one-bedroom or a studio.

I think that we really need to think about everything that is before us here. We also need to think about how it is tied into the Legislation that we will be talking about. So I think from my perspective, we have a developer who is going to build something, build these apartments downtown. We are taking into account the fact that the abutters and the businesses around it needed the parking underneath to stay so that they could be successful. And lastly, we all know that we needed to increase the amount of money that it takes to build the Performing Arts Center. What I am happy to say is that the bond will be completely paid for and we will get into that when we start discussing the Legislation of the TIF District. So I think for all of those reasons, I am going to be supporting this and I would not support untying them. The reason being is that when we get to the TIF District Legislation, it will become obvious why it is important to keep them together. Thank you.

Alderman O'Brien

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wasn't going to comment but I am going to try to be brief to keep within the confines of this meeting. But I would be amiss if I didn't speak. First, I would like to recognize Mr. Keating and I was happy to hear the testimony of Fauston. I do understand the needs of affordable housing in the City. However when you come down to affordable housing, it's like real estate, and when it comes down to real estate we all hear the term, location, location, location. Is this the area that would be best benefited by having affordable housing in that vicinity? One, we could have the current developer and his plans go for something more of an uptick. Affordable housing, I support Mr. Keating and his advocacy of it and don't think we as Aldermen may not have a second bite at the apple. As we go down the road in the future, if all goes well and we do build an additional middle school, what is going to be done with Elm Street? Can that discussion come up for affordable housing at that particular time. It may and it perhaps it should.

But when we build something such as the Performing Arts Center, we don't build it for the year 2020 or the year 2021. We build it for the future. And for that future we will get, I think, a lot of potential tax revenue, enhance our downtown and that's why the location is so key. So spending money at this particular time for this project we are spending it on not the Performing Arts Center but for the future of the downtown and for

Nashua. Now being Chairman of the Infrastructure Committee, I am glad my co-chair mentioned parking. But let's look at what is happening with the parking. Yes, we have had COVID and because of COVID we shut down basically Main Street and brought it down to only two lanes of travel and anybody hasn't mentioned how many parking spaces has been eliminated to enhance the public dining that our residents seem to enjoy. Yet as an Alderman and as Chairman of the Infrastructure and perhaps maybe you people have, but I have always heard the inklings of parking, parking, parking. Yet when we came up with the outdoor dining proposals, I haven't heard really any rumblings or anything close to the rail on the parking issue. Should we go for that parking study in the future? Absolutely, I mean we have more other neighborhoods that we need to take a look at than just the downtown. So I do hope that does come to fruition.

But I think with this project of going with parking underneath the Melbourne Lansing Development, I think that's going to increase the parking downtown so it is best to stay with that. And whenever the City of Nashua builds any type of infrastructure such as a Fire Station and perhaps maybe as somebody brought up the Public Works Garage, those are housing City facilities. What economic development does City Hall actually give into the downtown other than being a place to work? And it is the same thing with the Public Works building it is a place where they can have good quality offices which doesn't exist right now and safe work environment. But it doesn't really add to the economic development into a community, it is part of the day to day infrastructure. It's like owning a home, if you don't improve on your own personal infrastructure of painting your house or doing the gutters, your house is going to fall apart. And in some places in the City we do have buildings that are past their prime. So it is something that we should look to do.

And as far as the parking lot on the School Street, this is like a good compromise. I was working with Mr. Rafferty on this and with others and everything. I think it's a darn good compromise. And let's remember, what was the original School Street area? That was residential, so what we are doing right now is turning what was hard top turning that back into a residential community and the bonus is increasing the parking. So I would like to end it there and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to speak. Thank you.

#### Chairman Dowd

Alderman Lopez do you have something new to add?

#### Alderman Lopez

So yeah one of the things that came into as a communication to us and was referenced in the public comment regarding the housing was a petition that was circulated among Bronstein residents. I just wanted to point out based on some of the comments by some of the Aldermen, I mean that was a little of a misguided (audio cuts out) the way they were doing that. But all of the plans that we have seen on School Street, do not include family sized housing. They include mostly one-bedrooms and studios. So I wouldn't have gone a large number of (audio cuts out) in public housing and suggested that they could move into that apartment at least not (audio cuts out). So that's unfortunate and I think it is a little bit of a distraction here. When it was said previously that this building shape because it didn't have family apartments in it and would have only one-bedrooms and studios, therefore would be gentrifying the community, I disagree with that entirely because the building next, Mary's (audio cuts out) is units (audio cuts out) apartment. The next nearest small-scale development Dalianis House which is all bedrooms and mostly studio apartments, it actually does fit the character of the neighborhood. I can't really speak to the on-site amenities like laundry rooms or fitness rooms, but I do know there's a laundromat a block away that basically everyone in the other adjacent apartments all would be like used. And I think we have to be realistic about how many of these amenities we can expect a developer to put on a lot while keeping that a viable project? I mean and greens space on the roof of a 7 story building would be great but I don't think finding a developer who will do that and so right now (audio cuts out) parking lot, the project before us gives us a parking lot plus a building on top of it. If you disagree with the building on top of (audio cuts out) probably would still be a parking lot in order to get abutting neighbors to agree. So I don't think those two should be separated from the Performing Arts Center.

I also question whether we could easily do that or not because we just had the public hearing for the two as a

cojoined bond, so if we change it I would guarantee that not only would we have to have a separate set of hearings but that would probably delay both projects at a time where neither project would really benefit from such (inaudible).

Chairman Dowd

Thank you, Alderman Lopez. Anyone else, Alderman Wilshire?

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you, I just want to say that I learned recently at a meeting of the Nashua Housing & Redevelopment Authority that they have a plan in place for folks who might be displaced temporarily to the new development going on there. But they will have a place to come back to that will be new and nice. So the Housing Authority hires relocation specialists that they do this all the time. And no one is going to be without housing. They will either put them in another housing unit or give them a Section 8 Voucher that they can use and help them find housing. Not just say, here you go, here's a voucher, you know, because we all know that there's less than a half percent vacancy rate. So there is no housing and there's no place, but the Housing Authority has assured their residents over there that no one is going to get stuck. And it might be a little bit inconvenient but they are working with people far ahead of time to make sure that the inconvenience is as little as possible. And they are working with them so I don't think those people should be concerned, that they are going to be out because they won't. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

OK I am just going to make one quick comment and then wrap this up. I can tell you that having attended most of the meetings on the Performing Arts Center, they have an outstanding architect and an outstanding building contractor and I think the project is well planned will go ahead smoothly. The other thing is there's two things I want to do while I am still a resident of Nashua. One is attending the grand opening of the Performing Arts Center and the other is riding the first train service that we have that returns to New Hampshire.

Having said that, the Motion on the floor is for R-20... excuse me?

Alderman Caron

Alderman Dowd may I speak?

Chairman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Caron

OK. This is Alderman Caron. Can you hear me?

Chairman Dowd

Go ahead.

Alderman Caron

OK I won't keep you because I am not on this Committee, but I have to agree with several of the Aldermen, I have some real concerns about this tied together. And the other thing that no one has brought up for the last 7 months we have been in lockdown. People have not been able to go out so obviously parking is not an issue. But the other thing is what is going to happen down the road? What is going to happen when we are working

on our budgets for next year? These are things that we really have to think about before we approve an \$8 million dollar bond. When you get to the TIF part of this, I would certainly like Treasurer Fredette to give us an overview of how many TIF's we have in this community right now. And also to remind people that in Ward 7 almost two years ago we were supposed to have some buildings going up or being redefined for working class people who need housing. So I think we need to think about this as a whole. I can't support something that I don't know what is going to happen down the line. Thank you for letting me speak.

Chairman Dowd

Ok I let Alderman Caron speak because she hasn't spoke before, but I'd like to move this on to a vote. If I could have Alderman O'Brien call the roll. The motion is for approving final passage of R-20-071 by roll call.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE OF R-20-071 BY ROLL CALL**

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Wilshire Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Lopez, Alderman Laws	8
Nay: Alderman Jette, Alderman Tencza	2

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Dowd

Ok, the next item is R-20-076 and I'd like a motion to table; it needs to be tabled because it requires a Public Hearing so we cannot hear that this evening.

**R-20-076**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderwoman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman Skip Cleaver  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**AUTHORIZING AN ENERGY PERFORMANCE CONTRACT AND LEASE FINANCING ARRANGEMENT**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO TABLE R-20-076 UNTIL A PUBLIC HEARING IS SCHEDULED BY ROLL CALL**

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Lopez, Alderman Laws, Alderman Tencza	10
Nay:	0

**MOTION TABLED**



NEW BUSINESS – ORDINANCES**O-20-030**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
 Alderman Patricia Klee  
 Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien  
 Alderman Jan Schmidt  
 Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
 Alderman Tom Lopez  
 Alderman-at-Large Shoshanna Kelly  
 Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons  
 Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**ADOPTING A TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF) DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT UNDER RSA 162-K AND NRO 295-11, THE “SCHOOL STREET TIF” AND A TAX INCREMENT FINANCING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND FINANCING PLAN FOR THE NEW TIF**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE BY ROLL CALL**ON THE QUESTIONChairman Dowd

Ok Director Cummings would you like to talk to this first or do you want to just open it up?

Director Cummings

Just very, very briefly Mr. Chairman I want to just provide a quick overview relative to the TIF plan that is before the Committee. I will keep my comments short. So essentially a Tax Increment Financing is a tool that every state and municipality authorizes here in the United States as a municipal financing tool, particularly to spur redevelopment and development in areas that are struggling. That is essentially one of the reasons why we decided to pursue this mechanism, this tool. There are essentially no taxes collected on the School Street Parking lot right now because it is publicly owned. When the time comes and there's full valuation on the property it will collect somewhere in the order of magnitude of just over \$400,000.00. We can take those revenues and we can dedicate for certain purposes, when you create a TIF and you can spend those dollars within a TIF district as the plan outlines it is a very concise area. We could use it for School Street, West Pearl Street for the Performing Arts Center for various street scaping type needs.

But ultimately the thought process is for it to be project-specific for it to support the parking structure that we have discussed tonight that would allow for a little more than 50 parking spaces to be publicly available. And then in addition, closing the gap on the Performing Arts Center project. So the bond I believe was for 25 years, TIF's can go up to 40 years, we are recommending that this just be in place while the bond is currently out. There would be a lot of benefits to the City if this project were to move forward. The bond would eventually be paid off. All the new tax dollars would come in. The bond goes down over time, so there's additional tax revenue that would be received as the years go on. We need housing. We have talked about that previously as well as just investment in a low-income area which this area is. So investment begets investment starting to get that type of investment going will help spur other projects. That's something that the Mayor alluded to earlier. And so for all those reasons why you have the TIF legislation before you this evening. It was a product of a compromise.

When we first started out on the conversation about developing on the School Street Parking Lot, there was no anticipated parking associated with that program. However, through a lot of discourse and dialogue particularly with the neighbors, we understood the concern and the need. So we asked the developer if there was a way to redesign the project. He indicated that there would be but the costs associated with providing public parking is not something that the project could support. So knowing that constraint, it just seemed

logical to use a TIF type mechanism as a way of moving the project forward. So that's a quick overview. I wanted to just quickly provide you all and I'll leave my comments there. Thank you.

#### Chairman Dowd

Alright, anybody that would like to speak to this legislation? Alderman Clemons?

#### Alderman Clemons

Thank you. So you know obviously this is – this Legislation is tied to the Legislation that we approved or that the Committee recommended to approve previously, well its one bond but the two projects. And here's why I wholeheartedly support the TIF and why I voted yes, or partly why I voted yes on the two bonds. The question was asked earlier and I asked a question, will this raise anybody's taxes who is paying property taxes now. And the answer to that question is no and here is why. All of the estimated revenue that is going to come from the TIF District is coming from the new building that is within it, that is going to be constructed on the School Street Property.

So all of the tax revenue that is going to be raised is going to be raised by that project. So there's nothing there now and the owner, so no one is paying any taxes. So once that development is built, it will be assessed and the money that comes from that building will pay for the two bonds; the one for the parking structure and the other actually for the Performing Arts Center. So it is interesting to me because if you had asked me a year ago whether or not I would support number one the School Street Project or number two doing additional money for the Performing Arts Center I might have told you "no" on both. But the fact of the matter is it isn't everyday that we got an opportunity to build new housing in the City that's going to be relatively, yes it is market rate but relatively affordable, in a great location downtown and on top of all of that, have it pay for itself and have it pay for the Performing Arts Center so that no taxes are being raised for citizens so that we can do this project that we have been promising them.

So here's where we are at tonight. We are at the point where we've raised the \$4 million dollars for the Performing Arts Center, we have just recommended adding to the bond earlier and now we have a mechanism to pay for it without costing the City of Nashua anything else. That's a beautiful place to be, a beautiful place to be. Is it perfect? Is it everything that we wanted it to be? No, it's not. I wanted to see a hotel built in that location. I wanted to see that happen, you know, Some of the Aldermen wanted to see more amenities, different things like that. No project is ever going to be 100% what we all wanted it to be. But the beautiful thing about this project particularly in the School Street one is that is absolutely the product of listening. This community and this TIF proposal is the product of listening, listening to taxpayers. So let me explain that.

So first off, as was mentioned earlier about half the City voted "yes" and half the City voted "no" on the Performing Arts Center, fair enough. I would say that the City is probably still 50/50 split on that. The second thing is we need housing in the City. This project proposes to build it, more housing. We need a way to increase the amount of money to make the Performing Arts Center viable. This project does it. This TIF District does it. We listened to the neighbors who wanted to make sure that we maintain that School Street Parking Lot, this project does it. This project is the best way forward for the Performing Arts Center and getting it done. We have one chance folks to make this happen, one chance. And the beautiful thing about it is and this is what's great, is by doing this TIF District, we can go proudly back to the taxpayers and say, not only did we come up with a solution for the Performing Arts Center, not only did we raise the \$4 million dollars, but it's not going to cost you any money. It's not going to cost you any tax money. I think that's pretty remarkable, I really, really think that's remarkable and my hat goes off to Director Cummings for coming up with that idea, because I am telling you right now, that will ease 50% of the population in this City who worry about their taxes going up because of the project. It won't happen. We have it figured out. So for all of those reasons, we have spent three years coming to this moment and now it's time to pull the trigger and do this. The day has come and here we are and now it's time to get it done. And I am very excited, very happy to support this and I hope my colleagues will also do that. Thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Yeah, just one thing I want to point out, this has nothing to do with the two elements of money. This TIF could just support the Performing Arts Center if it ended up that way, although we just passed to cover both. But I would not want to be against the TIF because of the parking garage. The TIF could end up just being used for the Performing Arts Center and it's a viable way to do that and get things going. If we are going to meet a closing date, so I'll take additional comments, but please, everybody be cognizant of the time. Alderman Lopez then Alderman Jette.

Alderman Lopez

So I am in favor of this TIF, it's very common that lower income neighborhoods don't get representation when it comes to funding and infrastructure needs. And the TIF District base guarantees that. It means the money (audio cuts out) revenue that we create these development projects is going to go back to those neighborhoods and that development. I am in favor of the TIF project, I like having both projects in this as was pointed out earlier, (inaudible) we don't know what our revenue is going to be next year so we have to be a little bit cautious and the bonding mechanism is the best way to see the development project move forward that will fit this economically in many, many ways without having to commit to biting off a huge amount of money to pay for it right out of the gate. So I would rather us plan ahead and use the TIF the way it designed (audio cuts out) taxpayer contributions low and keep projects paying for themselves doing that. And I would like to continue developing economic opportunities for people that are in low income neighbors and to keep that money within those neighborhoods. Thanks.

Chairman Dowd

Thanks. Alderman Jette?

Alderman Jette

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So I recognize that Director Cummings has come up with a very clever plan. 20 years from now as we look back, we may see him as a visionary along with the Mayor and Alderman Clemons and you and the rest of the people who are supporting this and I may be looked upon less favorably. But I have some questions. In the summary provided by the Legal Department, I don't know if Attorney Leonard is still with us or not. But in the summary, the Legal Department says that the Aldermen will provide reasonable opportunity to the County Commissioners and School Board to meet with the Governing Body, that's the Board of Aldermen, and to be made aware of what the ramifications of this TIF District might be. I am wondering, has that been done? Are the County Commissioners aware of this, have they been invited to a meeting, I don't think they are here tonight. Is there anyone that can answer that question?

Chairman Dowd

Attorney Leonard is still with us.

Attorney Leonard

Yeah, it's a little past my bedtime, I'm a farmer, I get up early. Yes, my understanding is that notice has been sent out as required by law to both the County Commissioners and School Department.

Chairman Dowd

Alright, thank you.

Alderman Jette

Thank you and so on another point so the TIF District as I understand it and I think this is accurate. The TIF District takes whatever taxes are being generated by these properties with the TIF District now and whatever amount of taxes that that might be continues to flow into the General Fund. But going forward, whatever increase in the tax revenue from those properties would go into the TIF and would be used for the benefit of the properties in the TIF District. So as I understand it, the tax revenue, you know that increase in tax, I mean we've been told that the Performing Arts Center is going to increase the property values of downtown which would include the properties in this TIF District. So I am assuming that that means that their values, their assessed value will increase, which will generate more income and that increased income will go into this TIF.

The bulk of the money, of course, will come from the development of the School Street Property, this new apartment building which has been estimated to be about \$400,000.00 a year. And as Alderman Clemons has pointed out, all of this money will be used to pay the debt service on the bonds. And so from his point of view, these bonds are not costing the taxpayers anything. However, I would like to point out that another way of looking at this is that if the apartment building was built as originally proposed by the developer, without the parking garage, we wouldn't be issuing a bond of \$2.5 million. And if we didn't issue another bond of \$5.5 million to close the gap as they say on the Performing Arts Center, that \$400,000.00 in additional tax revenue would go into the General Fund and would help pay for schools, fire department, police department, Board of Public Works, the different services that the City is providing.

Now I am assuming that some of the residents of this new apartment building could very well be children who are going to need schooling. And with this TIF we are taking all of the tax money that the apartment building will generate and using it to pay for these bonds, none of it will be used to pay for educating these kids if there are any or the other expenses. And when you say it's not going to cost the taxpayers anything for these bonds, you are taking away \$400,000.00 from the General Fund which the taxpayers are going to have to make up for. So I understand the way that Alderman Clemons is looking at this and I am not saying he's wrong about the way he's looking at it. But there is a different way to look at it, which is that we are taking \$400,000.00. We are asking the taxpayers to pay an additional \$400,000.00 to maintain city services that this new apartment building, the money that this new apartment building, the tax revenue that this new apartment would generate is not going to be available for. So thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Alderman Tencza?

Alderman Tencza

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple I guess questions if people are still available to answer them on the TIF. So again on the Legislation on the Fiscal Note it says that over a 5-year period it is expected the income within the District could range from \$1.4 to \$1.5 million dollars. Is that the additional value that will be captured under the TIF or is that the total amount of tax revenue for the properties within the TIF?

Chairman Dowd

Who wants to take that one? Director Cummings?

Director Cummings

Yes thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe it is specific to just the School Street Project. And the reason being is because we don't every year increase values. We do it on average every 5 years. So we don't know of any new development or growth happening and so therefore it is just going to be predicated on the current project.

Alderman Tencza

Ok so again I think it's just the language is confusing me a little bit in the fiscal note but that would mean not that the TIF would collect an additional \$1.5 million in taxes but just that the value of land would increase, the value would increase \$1.5 million.

Director Cummings

Well essentially the TIF Districts, the TIF would generate approximately \$1.5 and that's due to the engine that spins that off being the School Street Project if that makes more sense.

Alderman Tencza

It does, I guess where I am a little confused is there are other properties that are included in the TIF so you're not saying that those properties are necessarily going to contribute all that much to the TIF; it's the School Street Property.

Director Cummings

Go as far as saying that they are not on the horizon to be contributing really anything unless they take on a new development type project and I am not aware of anything happening.

Alderman Tencza

Thank you for that clarification.

Chairman Dowd

All set? Alderman Klee?

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Chairman Dowd. I just want to make sure I am clear and I know I am not a voting member but I want to do clarification. The apartments that we are looking at are going to be, to the best of my knowledge, they are going to be like one-bedroom apartments and studio apartments, so they probably would not have children in them. But putting that aside, the life of the TIF is only supposed to be as long as the bonding correct? And that the monies generated beyond the payment of the bond would go into the General Fund. So it's not like the Riverfront TIF where monies are going to keep collecting so that there can be an on-going taking care of that area as the Riverfront is going. This one is slightly different. Am I correct on that? I don't know who should answer that.

Chairman Dowd

Director Cummings?

Director Cummings

Yes so this is the same point that has come up two or three times now so I will double check what I am about to say but yes what you just said is correct. The idea or thought process – unless this Board wants to do something differently, but the idea is for it just to cover the debt of the bond and then any excess revenue would be transferred to the General Fund.

Alderman Klee

Ok thank you. That answers my questions.

Chairman Dowd

I just want to point out that if we have, if we pass the bond \$5.5 million for the Performing Arts Center, we are either going to pay the debt service out of regular taxes or it is going to be covered under the monies from the TIF. Either way you are going to be paying for the debt service. So it's not like we just do away with the debt service. Do you have something new Alderman Lu?

Alderwoman Lu

Yes, I do. May I speak?

Chairman Dowd

Go ahead.

Alderwoman Lu

I wanted to point out that we have to consider that there are parcels in this TIF District that are currently exempted from taxes. And those exemptions, those properties will end up if .... OK, so as we decide when Elm Street becomes available, as we decide to move our some of the non-profits or a non-profit or something like that to Elm Street and the property becomes sellable or rather valued or taxable, then the (inaudible) between the taxable amount or the assessed amount and what they were paying in taxes will all go to the TIF District. My concern with that is that the TIF District plan says, well let me just say the Legislation 162 K that deals with the TIF District says that it will pay off, it may, it will pay off principal and interest on bonds and it may pay additional to the principal but it doesn't have to. So my concern is that for 20 or 30 years, I don't know what the terms of our bonds are, but for that period of time, we essentially have a District that gets special treatment, let's just say. And I don't think under the present Mayor that would happen but we are talking about 20 years down the road.

When I first started as Alderwoman, I asked, well I had a conversation with some of the City Staff and I said my District feels like they are paying more in taxes than what can be put back in the Ward. And the response I got was that's a crazy or that's not a very reasonable objection and that you know, it's a really a citywide thing. But my feeling is that a Tax Increment Financing District does do that. It segregates the increase in taxes and I mean it has very good possibilities, but I think there are negative possibilities also to consider. And those are that we have a lot of vacant lots, not in this particular agreement.

Chairman Dowd

You might be getting off ... do we have a specific question that you want to ask?

Alderwoman Lu

No, I don't. I have an opinion on trying to ...

Chairman Dowd

Because you were saying that if somebody is a non-profit and they move out of the TIF and the building sells and a for profit goes in there, yes, they are going to pay taxes. And those taxes would go at least part of them anyway, would go to the TIF, because the non-profit that was eligible for not paying taxes moved. The property

....

Alderwoman Lu

It wasn't a question, I was trying to speak an opinion but if you feel informed then that's fine, I'll stop.

Chairman Dowd

It was just a little confusion. Anyone else?

Alderwoman Lu

Well you could have waited until I stopped and just asked the question.

Chairman Dowd

Is there anyone else? If not, would the Clerk please call the roll?

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Wilshire Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Lopez, Alderman Laws	8
---	---

Nay: Alderman Jette, Alderman Tencza	2
--------------------------------------	---

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman Dowd

Ok I've talked to the people involved with the next three items that were tabled in Committee and they will stay on the table. They are not ready to be discussed. So general discussion?

TABLED IN COMMITTEE

**R-20-016**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderwoman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.

**AMENDING THE PURPOSE OF A FISCAL YEAR 2020 UNLIKE ESCROW FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

**R-20-017**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman Thomas Lopez  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman-at-Large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Patricia Klee  
Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderwoman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Skip Cleaver  
Alderman Jan Schmidt  
Alderman-at-Large Lori Wilshire

**RELATIVE TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION OF \$50,000 TO FUND A FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE FUTURE REUSE OF THE ELM STREET MIDDLE SCHOOL BUILDING**

- Requires a Public Hearing which has not yet been scheduled

**R-20-028**

Endorsers: Mayor Jim Donchess  
Alderman-at-large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Alderman-at-large David C. Tencza  
Alderman Richard A. Dowd  
Alderman Linda Harriott-Gathright  
Alderman Patricia Klee

**AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF NASHUA TO ENTER INTO A MASTER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH LANSINGMELBOURNE GROUP, LLC.**

(re-tabled at 8-12 mtg)

GENERAL DISCUSSION - None

PUBLIC COMMENT –

Alderman Clemons

I think Mr. Keating wanted to speak, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Dowd

Mr. Keating did you have something? You're on mute.

Bob Keating Yeah, I am not sure if this appropriate at this point because it is about the parking and to clarify a point from the Bronstein perspective we weren't speaking about the difficulties or the payment of the parking. There is parking needed for that area in terms of School Street. It was specifically targeted to say the City is now paying for that money and that specifically we were asking for the consideration for apartments to be created within that would allow people to move from Bronstein there. So I just wanted to clarify that. So we certainly believe that there's needing of parking but have questions that the City would be paying for the parking rather than the development itself. Thank you.

REMARKS BY THE ALDERMEN

Alderman Wilshire

Thank you. Again I'd like to thank everyone. I would name names, but if I forget someone, I would feel really bad. But everyone who had a role in getting this project to this point, yes even you Treasurer Fredette. So just want to thank everyone for their understanding what the neighbors needed, understanding the scope pretty much of what needed to be done. I think it's a good project, I think bundling them makes the most sense. It shows the City's investment in their downtown too. So that's all I have. But thank you everyone who worked on this.

Chairman Dowd

Anyone else? Alderman Lu.

Alderwoman Lu

I hope that as an Alderwoman, I could get five minutes of time to talk. So thank you.

Chairman Dowd

Ok there's no reason for a non-public.



POSSIBLE NON-PUBLIC SESSION - None

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN O'BRIEN TO ADJOURN BY ROLL CALL**

A viva voce roll call was taken which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Schmidt, Alderman Jette, Alderman Wilshire  
Alderman O'Brien, Alderwoman Kelly, Alderman Dowd, Alderman Lopez,  
Alderman Laws, Alderman Tencza 10

Nay: 0

**MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 10:38 p.m.

Alderman Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.  
Committee Clerk