

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (BIDA) MEETING

September 9, 2025

A monthly meeting of the BIDA was scheduled for Wednesday, September 9, 2025, 9:00 a.m., Room 208, City Hall, 229 Main Street, Nashua, NH.

Members present:

Jason Haviland - Chair
Liz Foley – Vice Chair
Dick Cane
Carl Andrade
John Ziemba
Derek Gagnon

Staff members present:

Liz Hannum, Econ. Dev. Director
Matt Sullivan, CDD Director
Sam Durfee, Planning Manager
Connor Muise, Deputy Pl. Mgr.

RFP UPDATE:

Mr. Sullivan said that staff has gone into a little more depth of what the development priorities are for these two sites, and that is what we'd like to focus on today. He said that at the last meeting, there were conversations about how clearly we articulate that, Industrial is a priority, other uses are a priority, or do we let the market control that. He said that staff has laid out a scheme of priority, but not excluded anything, and hope that is ok and then we can talk about development objectives and whether they make sense.

Mr. Haviland said that sounds good, and asked if this pre-proposal conference is something we need to attend.

Mr. Sullivan said that perhaps Mr. Haviland or Ms. Foley should attend that, as this is a BIDA-based RFP, it's not staff or the City. He said that the developers show up, and review the nuts and bolts of the RFP, and then get into an overview of the site, including all the work that has been done to date, the development objectives. He said that they tend to be pretty guarded at a pre-proposal like this, they won't tip too much, but they may ask what the City's expectations are for parking re-creation, and we have to respond to that, and it may end up being an addendum to the RFP, with a response in writing, so everyone has access to it. It is a good opportunity for them to get clarity on what we're looking for.

Mr. Haviland said that if nobody shows up, that is a bad sign.

Mr. Sullivan said it could be. He said that there was a recent RFP for impact fees, and there was one participant, but others submitted.

Ms. Hannum said that she makes her RFP's mandatory when it's not development work, so she knows who will be submitting.

Mr. Muise said that it is for the two Pine Street properties, and tried to format it in a way that it's a single project, but with the knowledge that NIMCO and Bagshaw will be redeveloped. He said

that he tried to format it a way that that has some narratives and using a summary and a background of property details, it would be wise so that we are pitching properties to BIDA's liking, and also the proposal opportunity and development objectives are the basis for why we are pursuing redevelopment. He said that we can talk about the timeline of the application itself.

Mr. Muise said that the development objectives begin on page 11.

Mr. Haviland said that the NIMCO and Bagshaw things are important, and asked what we call them.

Mr. Sullivan they are on page 8 and 9, and we intend to include a map that shows, based on the charette work, development going on in the adjacent area, and prepared a map that has sites highlighted, where things were happening.

Mr. Muise said that on the nearby developed project list, he organized it chronologically, so the first one is the furthest away, and chose NIMCO as the last one.

Ms. Hannum said perhaps separate them into recently completed and currently underway, for the categories.

Ms. Foley asked if the PlanNH information will be made available, and the environmental information.

Mr. Sullivan said that a huge part of this, in the supplemental documentation, there are several things listed, including the Master Plan, the completed Downtown Redevelopment Plan, the planning study for NIMCO, current RECODE documents, and the Millyard charette reports. He said that the Phase I assessments will be included here, they are massive documents.

Mr. Sullivan said that he's hearing that a map is critical, maybe a re-ordering of the actual development sites. He asked if BIDA wants development objectives.

Ms. Foley said yes.

Mr. Cane said that it was a good job of responding to suggestions of not limiting this just to residential, probably the more logical use of it, but not necessarily, and thought it was a good job overall, it was well done.

Mr. Sullivan said that going back to pages 11 and 12, there are a lot of guiding planning documents here. He said that we know that residential is a priority, but it's not a must if there's some other preferred use. He said that Mr. Muise did a great job with the parking, with describing the parking challenge, full replacement is not necessary, but you need to propose some level of replacement in alignment with adjacent land use. He said that mixed use has come up many times, so this is where manufacturing, office space, accessory commercial uses but it's not exclusive, it says any of these things, propose something, and if it works, we'll consider it. He said that the City would like to

see mixed use development.

Mr. Sullivan said that aesthetics and massing are on page 12, which is the development form, and generally the idea is make it consistent with what's already out there. He said you would know if something didn't fit in. He said that a catch-all here is stormwater environment stewardship and sustainability, the City would love to have people propose a green building, whether it's solar or EV chargers. He said connectivity, circulation and access is huge, this is the "thumb" piece of this Millyard area, but it does connect via the pedestrian bridge and solving access is a huge part of this around the Bonnette building.

Mr. Sullivan said staff thought it was necessary to have the successful proposer engage with the public in some way, talk to adjacent landowners, holding a public input session, the RFP asks them to do some level of public engagement, speak to the Millyard property owners, and they can define that, but just do it.

Mr. Haviland asked if the expectation that they accommodate limited parking that is happening there now, and the future parking that is likely to happen as all of this enters the space we re-energize. He said that if they look at the study and see pictures of the parking lot every day or every six months, there's not that many people there, it seems like a low bar to clear. He asked how we would figure out if it's sufficient or not.

Ms. Hannum said that we'd have to judge based upon what the proposer says, it will support both existing and future uses, they would propose parking, and if it's not enough, we can ask for more.

Mr. Cane said that there is a need right now for some parking, there will be future needs, and then you talk to a developer, and you only have a couple acres of land to deal with, and it says that we want you to meet your needs and everyone else's needs, it's unrealistic to expect a developer to come in and maybe even replace what is there now, not alone future parking, it just doesn't work. The logical area to do parking, it would be surface parking due to the cost, there is not enough land here for a parking garage. He said to build a parking garage just to build a parking garage is unrealistic. He said that it's a well-written proposal, let developers come in and tell us what they think, but doesn't believe they'd get as many parking spaces as you have existing, you'll get whatever you can fit on that Police Station property, and let somebody play with the developable land because it's got the right size and shape.

Ms. Hannum said that in the parking study, it says that current use only uses about 15% of that parking lot, so they have to replace 15% of 174 spaces, that is what we're asking, plus, their own usage.

Mr. Sullivan said that on page 13, is a background of the property, including environmental, utility info, the histories of the environmental. He said that page 14 are comments on site control and easements, and some background about how a selected proposer would work through the entitlement process with the City, recognizing that entitlement process could theoretically change before July 2026.

Mr. Haviland asked if we want to say more about the title, and title search, the little strip of road is the issue.

Mr. Sullivan said it's not in question, the title opinion says that, and he would let the title opinion stand by itself.

Mr. Cane said that he doesn't think you should make any comments beyond "make it available."

Ms. Foley asked if there is some issue with the water.

Mr. Sullivan said yes.

Ms. Foley said perhaps they can do their due diligence and find that out.

Mr. Sullivan said that on utilities, we can add a sentence that says that some utilities provided to the site are part of the Millyard Associates. He suggested it say that utility access, or water, is provided through shared infrastructure, owned and operated by the Millyard Associates. He said that for the whole legal question to whether these properties would even have to participate in the Association, we don't want to go there.

Mr. Haviland asked about the boundary study.

Mr. Sullivan said it is acknowledged. They don't have to do the boundary.

Ms. Foley said that for the Executive Summary, it can indicate that we did a lot of the work so that we'd have better responses, and a little bit of history may be helpful.

Mr. Sullivan said that there should be something in the BIDA introduction section in the background that says BIDA has performed a level of due diligence related to this property in the interest of soliciting bids, in the interest of informing potential proposers.

Ms. Foley said it could indicate that in June 2023 this land was assigned to BIDA through the resolution, and this is what we've done over the last year or two.

Mr. Haviland said that for the entitlement process, he asked if it is clear enough, that it states how it is currently zoned, that the property is in the GI base zoning district, and the Mixed Use Overlay district. He asked if it is clear.

Mr. Cane said yes, these are the sections of the Land Use Code, it's fine. He said if a proposed use is not permitted, they would go for a variance, they wouldn't rezone.

Mr. Sullivan said that under Site Control, should there be a statement saying if you have control of adjacent properties, should it be included.

Mr. Cane said he didn't think you should state that, it sounds like you're giving preference, you may want, as a part of your discussion, but if I'm an adjacent owner, if I'm interested, I'd be coming forward. He said if he's not interested, he wouldn't be coming forward.

Ms. Hannum said if some developer goes to Bonnette and says that they'd like site control over your property and would like to propose something using your property, and have an agreement in the proposal, so it's not necessarily giving preference for the adjacent property owner, it's giving preference to people that have worked with the adjacent properties.

Mr. Sullivan said that the proposals that include more larger-scale development over adjacent properties would be preferred, not that owners of adjacent properties would receive preference, but then development concepts that are larger, but also demonstrate site control.

Mr. Cane said if we have a couple really good ones, we can evaluate based upon a whole series of positions, which may or may not be in here, the developers experience, or working in New Hampshire may be issues that become part of the consideration with developer "A" or "B".

Ms. Hannum said that she went through the whole thing with Corporation Counsel for the library RFP, and we had some proposers for NIMCO that were proposing things on sites that they had no control over, so you have to demonstrate that you have some control over what you're proposing, it's more of that than preferential treatment, so don't propose things that you have no control over.

Mr. Haviland suggested it say that proposals integrating with the Master Plan should show or demonstrate some level of site control.

Mr. Sullivan said collection negotiation, he said it's pretty broad, but how would we go about selecting a proposer. He said that obviously, we would do an evaluation proposal here, there may be a need for a non-public, there's reputation-based discussion or something else that's protected, we may not be able to do that non-public, we may need to have an interview, it hasn't been played out yet, and doesn't think we need to just yet.

Mr. Cane said that if we get to a number of proposals, and want to narrow it down, there's nothing to stop you from taking the top two or three that you're seriously considering, and let the others know that you've done that, so they don't continue to waste their time and effort.

Mr. Sullivan said that there's a non-refundable deposit for a preferred developer of \$10,000 that would go to the BIDA account.

Mr. Sullivan said for spill requirements, there should be no surprises here, the development team cover page, Table of Contents, qualifications, proposal concept, a direct response document to all the development objectives, insurance.

MOTION by Mr. Cane to accept the proposal with the changes we talked about.

Ms. Hannum asked about the evaluation criteria on page 23.

Mr. Cane said that you should not get yourself tied in with such language. He said keep it simple.

Mr. Sullivan said that the major issue with NIMCO is that we are really unclear about the boundary of the site, we had different geographies in different documents, here, we are literally saying the survey plan with these two properties, is the spatial area of record, keep it within there, nothing else.

SECONDED by Mr. Haviland.

MOTION CARREID UNANIMOUSLY.

LAND USE CODE UPDATE:

Mr. Durfee said that it has been before the Planning and Economic Development Committee, and another meeting is scheduled for next Tuesday, it will be about the Zoning Map, also talking about a green score, which is how we will be doing our landscaping requirements.

Mr. Durfee said that the presentations before PEDC have been really good, they appreciate the opportunity to dive into specific topics, the last one was for inclusionary zoning, and New Hampshire is an odd space where we cannot mandate it, but even if we do mandate it, they have to be very market sensitive, otherwise, projects don't happen. He said that staff will have to put the work forward to make sure we are getting delivery of units either as part of developments, or as offsite with a partner, or payments-in-lieu, but none of those requirements are too onerous where it stops the project from happening. He said that there are some developers that are not set up from a management standpoint to handle those, or they build and sell, so there are some dynamics at work.

Ms. Foley asked if BIDA can get a list of meetings that are coming up.

Mr. Durfee said that two were scheduled yesterday, so there is one next Tuesday and one on the 30th, and all of the recordings will be linked on the project website.

Mr. Haviland said that one of the reasons for doing the Land Use rewrite was that if we had a satisfaction survey for developers, would they consider Nashua to be developer friendly.

Mr. Durfee said absolutely, but if it's too developer friendly, you ignore community values, and there were some important applications that came before the Planning Board, the most obvious was the asphalt plant, that really highlighted major flaws in the City's zoning regulations, some were "map" issues, where you had a GI zone with a Mixed Use overlay. He said that the current zoning is a patchwork of regulatory band aids that move us along, but not really addressing the underlying issues, so why we still want to be developer friendly, we need more regulations in the

right places. He said that they've got some good feedback, and is confident we'll end up with a better Code in the long run.

Ms. Hannum said that the NIMCO developer said it's so much easier to work here than it had been in Manchester.

Mr. Haviland said that is what we're trying to do. He asked if there is anything else BIDA can do to help.

Mr. Durfee said to continue to show up, ask questions, get feedback.

DEVELOPER TOUR:

Ms. Hannum said that November 12th is the official date. She said that they have a schedule, speakers, list of locations, and are working on the invite, and the booklet, and the booklet is pretty basic, just information of the sites, but in the old booklet there was information about the incentive programs that we have, and don't really have those anymore, so it's not really a great resource for people, and is wondering what other information could be included. She said that the last tour was 2015.

Mr. Andrade asked if we can put together a list of everything that was on the tour the last time, and what's happened since, like a before and after description.

Mr. Haviland said that we should go by Bridge Street, BIDA should get some credit, they're about to launch Phase III on Riverfront Landing, and because of the Mixed Use Overlay, the building further down Bridge Street went up, BIDA should take credit for all that tax revenue, it was zero when we started. All of those apartments were driven by BIDA.

Ms. Hannum said that she's got three drive-by's in the list, Riverfront Landing, the Elm Street Middle School, and NIMCO and Bagshaw on the way to show the Pine Street Extension lot. She said that she's got the Riverwalk too.

Ms. Hannum asked if we should do an amendment to the schedule on the RFP.

Mr. Sullivan said yes.

Mr. Haviland asked if we have the staff to offer if you're going to develop any of these properties, you get a specialized City development person to help you through the process, someone to help with focused access.

Ms. Hannum said that for the tour, a lunch period was added afterwards, and after that, a networking time, and City staff and BIDA members would stay back and do one-on-one sessions as an optional addition to the schedule would be to hang out and talk to all of us during the day.

Mr. Haviland said at least we can say for our lot, we can say that they'll have support, guidance and help from them.

Mr. Cane said it sounds like you'd be giving preferential treatment, and they'd still have to follow the City's rules and regulations.

Mr. Haviland said that whomever BIDA chooses, if you are selected for the BIDA lot, BIDA would help.

Ms. Hannum said that the incentive is the one-on-one for right now, they'd be available.

Mr. Cane said that for the developers that are just getting familiar with the City, seeing the proposal for the first time, won't ask too many questions at that point, the more important thing is to say that if you have further questions either today or in the future, please feel free and contact us. Ms. Hannum asked if anything else should be in the booklet, let her know.

Ms. Foley said that if she could provide a list of properties, so that there isn't one that is expected, such as Daniel Webster College.

Mr. Cane said that is the premier property for a developer, it is huge.

Ms. Hannum said that the property manager was not going to come up for this, but doesn't mind if we drive through, there would be a person on site, but we won't have time for an actual stop. She said that she'd like to get the schedule printed by the end of next month, and will likely do it in-house.

Mr. Haviland said that we've only worked with public land, and asked what BIDA would do if a private developer came to us, and said that they'd like to work with BIDA.

Mr. Cane said it's more appropriate for City staff for a contact.

Mr. Sullivan said it's only because of the way we're structured, if we were structured like the Boston Redevelopment Authority, that's different. He said that there's no problem with a developer coming to BIDA to talk about their site, as long as it is in a public session, and if they ask to help get through the development process, there is support. He said that BIDA is a public body, a developer will not want to come to a public body and ask for assistance, it is likely they'd come to staff instead.

ADJOURNED at 10:09 am.

Submitted by: Mr. Falk, Deputy Planning Manager
CF - Taped Hearing