Minutes for GNRLF Meeting
8/25/25
11:30 am
Room 208, Nashua City Hall

Attending Committee Members: David Dearborn, Dawn Enwright (11:45), Liz Hannum, Stephen Michon, Deb Novotny
Administration: Abimana Ngira, Kathleen Palmer
Guest: Christine Malloy

Call to Order: 11:35 am

Approval of July's Minutes: Contingent on revision noted by Stephen, a **Motion** to Approve was made by Liz, second by David, all in favor; approved. *[Kathleen has now revised and reposted July minutes]*

Membership update: David is now a voting member. Christine will meet with Personnel Committee on Sept. 2.

Updates on CARES Act and EDA RLFs:

a. **Reaching 75% utilization of capital:** We still need to loan out $485k to achieve compliance
b. **Applicants consultations:** We have three potential applicants, none of whom currently meet the qualifications. Abimana to connect them with SBDC to help them.
c. **BDC Community Capital Corporation partnership:** There is a potential client who could receive a total of $1.2M; BDC is willing to lessen their award to enable us to pick up the balance, to get into compliance. There are multiple questions and concerns surrounding this proposal.
    a. Abimana will reach out to Karim Hill of BDC to express committee's interest and to obtain more information and clarification on the partnership details. Should meet with him in-person or virtually.
    b. Deb suggested we request BDC's participation agreement verbiage for City Legal to review, as well as the loan writeup for this specific potential client
    c.
        i. Stephen brought up two issues:
            1. We need clarity on this specific loan; and
            2. Is BDC wanting to run our entire program?
        ii. Christine recommends clarification that we would be participating, not relinquishing to BDC. Also, clarifying that BDC won't originate our loans for us, but they could potentially do our UW.
        iii. Dave wondered about them managing our existing portfolio.
        iv. Deb wondered if this MA firm is aware of the NH rules of the CARES Act
d. (and e.) Unpaid loans and collections and potential agencies or individuals to obtain payments:
    a. Christine suggested Collections for those delinquent loan recipients that are multiple years in arrears. She was concerned about any statute of limitation. Abimana said in fact there is a four-year statute. This means we may have to do some charge-offs.
    b. Stephen made a **Motion** to move forward with a business attorney at a cost not to exceed $20k, and/or a Collections agency (Christine suggests atty Robert Perotti); Dawn seconded; all in favor. Liz and Abimana are seeking a file reviewer/researcher; Deb suggests Kanakas. Liz will also check with City Legal on their availability.

[CONT. NEXT PAGE]

Administrative Plan Review and Update:

a. The first goal topic of the plan revision for this meeting was **loan size**.
    a. Deb suggested upping it to $250k or to omit the amount entirely from our online information.
    b. Christine wondered if using large(r) amounts for less clients was counter to the intentions of how we were supposed to serve the community with these funds.
b. There are many other facets of the plan that need updating.
    a. Liz and Abimana will begin by redlining the background data as much as possible, for review and comments from committee.
    b. Deb suggested, Dawn made a **<u>Motion</u>**, to eliminate the bank declination requirement; Deb seconded, all in favor. This prompted David to wonder if we should have some other proof of an applicant's reason for approaching us, then.
    c. Christine suggested adding "and have filed taxes" to the "one year minimum in business" facet of our requirements.

Other discussion points:

a. Stephen made a **<u>Motion</u>** to terminate monthly payments for PortFol software; Dawn seconded; all in favor.
b. There was discussion around the lack of personal guarantees historically, as CARES did not require it. We should require it now.
c. Christine noted we may have to be prepared to write off high-risk loans at the time of awarding them. If we adhere to City-priority goals, this may lead to riskier paybacks. Maybe consider different terms and/or exceptions.
d. Deb suggested possibly not specifying City priorities, in the hopes of not having to repeatedly update.
e. Liz suggested focusing on the Marketing plan for setting goals, etc. Christine suggests focusing on promoting/marketing on our City website as soon as we have a plan.
f. Liz will check the EDA login for compliance and de-Federalization eligibility (we believe we have three years left of the seven).

<u>Meeting</u> <u>Adjourned</u> at 12:59 pm.