BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (BIDA) MEETING
January 14, 2026

A monthly meeting of the BIDA was scheduled for Wednesday, January 14, 2026, 9:00 a.m., Room 208, City Hall, 229 Main Street, Nashua, NH.

<u>Members present:</u>

Jason Haviland - Chair
Lydia Foley, Vice Chair
Ald. Shoshanna Kelly
Ald. Amber Morgan
Dick Cane
Mark Prolman
John Stabile
Deb Novotny
Derek Gagnon

<u>Staff members present</u>:

Liz Hannum, Econ. Dev. Director
Sam Durfee, Planning Manager
Amy Girard, Purchasing Manager
Dawn Enwright

Peter Schaeffer - citizen

MILLYARD SCORING RUBRIC REVIEW:

Ms. Girard said that proposals are due on January 30, 2026, and we don't have submissions back. She said as a group, BIDA needs to decide what the priorities are, whether they are equal weighted, or to have some weights to weigh more than others.

Ms. Hannum said that BIDA should determine what is public and what is non-public, and what conversations can happen and what are we required to have in public versus non-public sessions.

Ms. Girard said that anything dealing with money, when talking with the developer, is a non-public session, that is the City's opportunity to use leverage and negotiate pricing, and do not want their competition to know what their offer is. She said that just about everything else can be public. She said all of the interviews will be publicly posted, and if a decision is made to discuss pricing, you'd vote to go into the non-public. She recommends that after proposals come in, she'd send them to Ms. Hannum, and she'll distribute them to the rest of the group to review, they can be quite long and lengthy, but it's important that you dig into them and really prioritize what BIDA's goals are, each proposal can come in looking vastly different, so that is why having a scorecard will help to determine which direction to go in.

Ms. Hannum said that engaging in personalities is the term for reputation, that would go into non-public.

Mr. Cane said that if we were to try to get a dog park out of a developer, or the developer may have offered that as part of his pricing, asked if that can be discussed privately, because you may not want the other developer to know.

Ms. Girard said yes, as there is a value tied to that, but the price itself isn't being discussed or negotiated, it would be a public session.

Mr. Durfee said that the City has identified things the City wants out of the development, and amenities like a dog park is a publicly stated thing. He said a developer could offer additional things. He said that once you get your preferred respondent, you get into project negotiations, the finer things where dollar values are discussed and tied to amenities, that may be more of a non-public session.

Ms. Hannum said that the amenities are of monetary value, but they're in-kind monetary value, and would still hold them as a non-public. She said that when interviews are done, if there are multiple proposers, both Ms. Girard and Ms. Leonard from Corporation Counsel will be in the room, so they will stop us if it gets to a point where it needs to go non-public, or, if we're in non-public, and it needs to be a public session.

Ms. Girard said that the City has strict processes that must be followed. She said sometimes it is hard for the City to move fast.

Ms. Girard said that there are a lot of approvals that must be obtained along the way, it's a slow moving process, and it takes time, it's not the pace that the corporate world acts under.

Mr. Prolman said that when BIDA has a proposal on the table, we as private people don't want a slow process, the private sector wants to move fast.

Ms. Hannum said that the proposals arrive on January 30, 2026, she gets them, and will put together packets for everyone to review.

Ms. Girard said that at that time, we should have an internal discussion, if we're lucky enough, but if we only get two or three, suggests that we interview the two or three, but if we get five, we should narrow it down. She said if we get one, we'll interview them, and then a decision can be made, perhaps there is more interest out there, or we say it's not the right project, we'll evaluate.

Mr. Haviland said that we'll just see if anyone responds, if no one responds, then we have a good piece of data, and we'll do something else with the property.

Ms. Girard said that when the proposals come in, no one on the Committee should reach out directly to the proposers if you have questions, everything should be flowed through the Purchasing Department, and she said she'd be coordinating directly with the proposers when it's time to schedule interviews, that way, everything is on an even playing field and there is no opportunity for any favoritism to happen. She said that she is the primary contact. She said that she'll email Ms. Hannum and distribute it to the group. She said that they'll either do an evaluation, or schedule the dates for the interviews, and then we get to the rubric.

Mr. Haviland asked if want to use the February meeting as the point to do the actual interviews, so we don't waste any time.

Ms. Girard said that February 11th could be too early for interviews.

Mr. Cane asked if BIDA should have a session before, whether it's one or three or five, to consolidate our questions and our views and comments before we have people in here.

Mr. Haviland said no developers on February 11th, we'll do our own strategy on the 11th, even if we go a little slower.

Ms. Hannum said that we can schedule something in-between, it may mean that not everyone is available.

Mr. Haviland suggested seeing what shows up on January 30th, talk about it on the 11th, and then decide how important it is to take the next step.

Ms. Hannum asked if anyone needs a hard copy of the proposals. She said she'd have five hard copies, the rest would be digital, because usually they are over one hundred pages.

Ms. Girard said that they can get them printed before, and Ms. Hannum will let the committee know when they're ready, the first week of February.

Ms. Girard said that for the criteria, she referred to the Millyard RFP Scoring Rubric of priorities of what we want to be covered in the proposal, and the committee needs to decide if it will be weighted, or if everything is equal, and what the top priorities are, and, if we want any other additional criteria added to this.

Ms. Novotny said that all of them should be equally weighted, because if they can't meet any one of these, it will be a problem with the project.

Mr. Cane said that residential is listed as one of the top goals, and doesn't think it should be limited to saying that it has to be a residential use. He said that this is in the Millyard, it's an industrial area, a mixed use area.

Mr. Prolman said that right now, there are approximately 800 apartments approved by the City that are not being built (Mr. Durfee said it's actually 3,000). He said that they do not make economic sense, so, if we do get a residential deal, it's probably going to be a tax-credit deal, or a mixed use, we have to be very open minded.

Ms. Hannum said that if we end up with all of them as no housing, it would have to be bulletproof in the justification when it goes to the Board.

Mr. Cane said that there should be other purposes for the BIDA group, and has a problem saying if it doesn't have a housing component, it won't get approved.

Mr. Haviland said that BIDA should just see what we get.

Ms. Hannum said that the RSA that gives BIDA the authority, it says that if there is housing, there needs to be one unit of affordability at a minimum. She said that as long as anyone doesn't score a zero, they can move forward, but if they meet some form of the Master Plan, mixed use development, residential, parking, stormwater development, all of these things are goals, so whether they fit better or worse is how the committee decides who to choose, as long as they fit something within our goals, they get more than a zero.

Ms. Girard said that the Pine Street Extension properties proposal date is January 16th, so we will not have proposals back.

Mr. Haviland said that we'll still plan on February for the strategy session.

Mr. Shaeffer asked how the City knows what the mix of housing and business ought to be in the City, and said that developers in the free enterprise system typically know, they won't build something that will not sell.

Mr. Durfee said that there was a housing study, it's about five years old now, but the City probably needs another 5,000 units by 2030.

Ms. Hannum said that the City doesn't have a study relative to the mix, as each City is different, depending on what kind of industry is there, close to a river, or mountain, or ocean, so there is not a good prescription. She said that other factors are the number of employees in the community, commuters, and other factors to tell us what our needs are versus what already is there.

Mr. Haviland said that we're trying to find the highest and best use for this property.

Mr. Durfee said that what the City kept hearing is that there is a housing need, and we have an industrial and business need, the highest and best use is clearly a mixed use development, and if we can craft the rubric to reflect that, and provide it to our prospective respondents. He said if the committee wants to weigh that more strongly, it should be incorporated into the rubric, or, it can be a bonus category, but since the City keeps hearing this, it should be reflected in the rubric.

Ald. Kelly said that was her suggestion, was bonus points for mixed-use development, and starred the connectivity circulation. She said that the public involvement portion is important, and asked if it can be added to the design and development concept.

Ms. Hannum said that once we choose a developer, and they come up with a plan, that they should be talking to the community.

Mr. Haviland asked that in looking at the rubric, is there anything missing, such as bonus points as a criteria.

Mr. Stabile asked if the banks in the area, if there is a way to put a package together so that they can come in and make a loan package to the developers, if they can get a better rate out of a bank.

Ms. Hannum said that is not something typically that the City would do.

Mr. Haviland asked about financial capability, if they're just a bit short, does BIDA as a board want to have a role in helping them get over that hurdle.

Mr. Prolman said that standard development becomes a larger scale, and that lot becomes a structured parking facility, perhaps with a bond.

Ms. Hannum said that is a potential, but we would have already chose the developer at that point.

Ms. Hannum said that the process after we choose a developer, we start the negotiation process for a master development agreement, which that gets approved by the Board. She said that staff is still working on the NIMCO MDA a year and a half later.

Mr. Durfee said that these conversations continue to evolve, we want a level of confidence in someone who can actually deliver a project, and a level of confidence with the development concept, as it will likely change.

Ms. Hannum said that the City is in the process of trying to expand the Riverfront TIF District into the Millyard, it has to go through the Board of Aldermen, it has to be done by April in order to capture some of the increment from NIMCO, so it has to happen quickly. She said that once the TIF is expanded into that area, there is potential that the City can avoid General Obligation bonding, and use TIF funds to bond, if we want to do further projects, such as contributing to a garage. She said that there are a lot of requests for the General Obligation bonds, and a Riverwalk doesn't usually rise to the level of a falling down garage, so the TIF District is the only way to get these investment economic development projects done.

Mr. Haviland asked between mixed use and public involvement, and are there any objections to having those two as bonuses. He said he likes both of them. He said if it's something great that is not mixed use, that flows perfectly with NIMCO, what would the committee say.

Ms. Hannum said that they wouldn't get any dings for not having mixed use.

Mr. Prolman said that what is in place, let's go with it, get the proposals in and deal with it.

Ms. Hannum said that going through this process is insulating the City from people bringing suit against the City by not being transparent, and not showing favoritism.

Mr. Haviland asked for a vote on the items, and vote on them one at a time, the proposals for ones that we would add as bonus criteria to the list.

Ms. Novotny said that advancement of the City's Development Objectives and other Public

Benefits – development objectives are attached below – that is all part of the third criteria, so we'd do bonus points for each of the third criteria, but the other four are weighted on their own.

Mr. Haviland said that we'll do the public involvement, the mixed use and connectivity. He said to the extent that the proposals have those three, they'll get some bonus point, bonus consideration. He said that we haven't talked about how we'll do the grading.

Ms. Novotny said that the rubric specifically says "development objectives are attached below", these are part of the third box of the rubric, they're not separate, they're included in that.

Mr. Haviland said that there are eight of them, and they'll be scored in the first bullet of the third box, and we'll qualitatively look at those.

Mr. Haviland asked if there are any other, other than giving bonus points for mixed use developments, public involvement and connectivity, and asked if the committee wants to add those three as bonus criteria to the rubric, or are there any others that someone would like to see as bonus criteria.

Mr. Haviland said that as the committee evaluates the scoring criteria, will we be asked to give a number, or it fits extremely, fits a little, doesn't fit, or 1-5, what will be asked for.

Mr. Haviland said that if it's a broad enough scale, we as evaluators can incorporate those bonus points into the number.

Ms. Hannum said that what was done with NIMCO, if we have multiple things, we rank them, so instead of scoring, it would be this proposal is number one, this one is number two, and the lowest score moved on, it could be done this way instead of ranking.

Mr. Haviland said that if we do 1-5, all the voting members of the Board submit their responses, and they all get scored, the highest score.

Ms. Hannum said that we don't have to choose the highest score, however, it's hard when we don't.

Ms. Girard said it's fine to do preliminary scores, but don't finalize them until after interviews, as some things can come out in the interviews that maybe weren't portrayed clearly in the proposal.

Mr. Haviland said that if we are going to have a consensus score, let's just leave it like it is.

MOTION by Mr. Cane to accept the proposal as is, and not add additional points, as it makes one of the five issues too important, we can do that by the way we rank within the individual five items to take care of that issue.

Ms. Hannum said that they've had a white board that is erasable, and put everyone's score up there and combine them.

Mr. Cane said that what we have here is sufficient to make an analysis and to do the ranking, and the motion is to accept the criteria as is.

Mr. Haviland said that the motion is to accept the criteria as is and asked if there should be language added to the motion that we will do a collaborative scoring.

Mr. Haviland said that the motion is to accept the proposal as is, and to have 1-5 scoring and the criteria as proposed.

SECONDED by Mr. Gagnon.

MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Haviland said as a follow up, the committee has agreed to do a consensus based scoring.

GOALS for CY2026:

Mr. Cane said that one goal should be that BIDA gets involved with the Board of Aldermen, and at least have them ask for our opinion on proposals for such things as what will be done with the Junior High School site, and the existing facilities up there.

Ald. Kelly said that her recommendation would be to ask for a special meeting, say the things that BIDA has been doing, if we can have some goals that we're setting, and solicit questions from the Aldermen.

Mr. Haviland said that once this project moves forward, it would be a great time to step back and recast, a while back there was conversations about engaging with the community in a way that the Dover BIDA does, they have meetings and outreach and different levels of engagement.

Ms. Novotny said that she believes that most of the committee members feel that we need more of a commitment from the City that they actually want this group.

Mr. Prolman said that BIDA needs to go to the top and show them that there is a lot of expertise here, and doesn't think they understand the knowledge at this table. He said that in twenty years, all we've done is Bridge Street.

Ms. Hannum said that as a City, we have very little leverage point on any private development, so the public development is the only way we can get what we want from the community.

Ms. Hannum said that could be a goal, let's find better properties for more industrial development.

Mr. Prolman said that Poor Pierre's restaurant is not a good example, or some of these smaller properties. He said we should be looking at 100,000 square foot mills.

Ms. Hannum said that the City has been giving BIDA city-owned properties, so that would be a change in how this committee works, is maybe working with more private developers.

Mr. Stabile said that he just did a multi-family development in Manchester, for 240 units, and was in and out in about 8 months, with approvals.

Ms. Novotny said that the City of Manchester made a concerted effort to make it more developer friendly to add homeless and take ownership of those facilities, so they have really cleaned up Manchester and made it an easier town to work with.

Ms. Novotny said that Manchester is committed to being more transparent, five years ago that wouldn't have happened, it's their new administration.

Mr. Durfee said that Nashua is already there, we get approvals done very quickly, the things that hold them up are difficulties on the site, contamination, impossible land owners, things out of City control. He said if someone has a site, and has control, and a project, and our Planning Board process is six weeks, but it's on the developer to get the financing and to get the project done. He said that Nashua's process is very quick, but there are challenges out of our control that hold them up. He said that our process is quite fast, and solid.

Ald. Kelly said that the Alderman have a new board, it would be great to meet with some of them over coffee.

ADJOURNED at 10:11 am.

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