

 CITY OF DOVER	COCHECHO WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES Meeting Type: Regular Meeting Meeting Location: McConnell Center Room 305, 61 Locust Street, Dover, NH Meeting Date: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 Meeting Time: 5:30 pm
---	---

PRESENT: Dana Lynch (Acting Chair), Dane Drasher, Kim Schuman, Matt Cox, Sean Fitzgerald, Peg Purcell, Jack Mettee (left at 7:15), Samia Touma, Kyle Pimental, Dennis Ciotti (left at 6:20)

EX-OFFICO: Karen Weston (Mayor)

STAFF: Steve Bird – City Planner, Gary Bannon – Recreation Director

OTHERS: Jon Ford, Barry Abramson, George Maglaras, Chad Kageleiry, Kevin McEneaney, others

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Minutes from January 16, 2018 Meeting

Motion: Drasher made motion to approve minutes of 1/16/18, Fitzgerald seconded. Vote: UA

3. Citizens Forum: None

4. Changes to the Agenda: None

5. Correspondence: None

6. Old Business:

A. Report on Bluff Excavation Progress

Bird: I spoke with Tom Severino today to get an update. They plan to complete the removal of overburden by next week. Once that is complete they will set up for the rock processing operation, which will continue the rest of the year. Blasting will end on March 15th and they have made good progress and are ahead of schedule. They will assess how much is left and blasting would begin late this year to finish up.

Lynch: When can they begin blasting again?

Bird: July 15th according to the permit, but they will be busy processing rock for rest of the year.

B. Report on 2/8/18 Pre-permitting Meeting with Permitting Agencies

Bird: We had a meeting up in Concord at the Department of Environmental Services offices. Our consultants from Horsley and Witten, GZA, and Ironwood, presented the current plans to those Fish & Game, Wetlands Bureau, EPA, and the Heritage Bureau. Focus was on wetland permitting but also discussed site grading and shoreland stabilization. Discussed the amount of wetland impacts and what mitigation options would make the most sense. One option would be to place a conservation easement on an existing City owned parcel, which we have done before.

Mettee: What is the amount of impact area and what is the schedule for obtaining the permits?

Bird: We are still trying to calculate with their assistance but it is in excess of threshold limit of 10,000 square feet, where mitigation is required. Would like to file applications in two months.

7. New Business:

A. Report on Horsley Witten Meeting with City Technical Staff on 12/12/17 – Jon Ford

Ford gave a PowerPoint presentation. Comments from technical staff were in three categories – design details, vehicular circulation and parking, and street design. Topic of one way circulation was raised. That is counter to our vision and walkability designs. It would cause more traffic through the residential areas to the rear.

Lynch: This whole design is set up to be 2-way. One way is not compatible with our design.

Mettee: Agreed that this is best to be 2-way.

Ford: Parking is provided along the streets in a variety of ways and in the lot at the end. Parking design works for 360 days of the year. Parking is based on a pedestrian friendly design.

Ciotti: Parking is at a premium in downtown. May need more depending on the type of development proposed.

Ford: Parking will be handled by developers on their sites.

Weston: What about parking on the closed dredge cell?

Bird: Yes that is part of the plan for Maglaras Park.

Pimental: We need to encourage alternate ways for people to get to the site other than in cars, like bikes and scooters.

Ford: The location of River Street has been discussed for years and were part of our early designs. We looked at the alternative of relocating River Street behind the pump station. The pros of the current layout are that it increases the private development area and lower costs for the street and park. Changing the street layout requires a redesign of plans and that will cost a lot. Locating development between the road and river privatizes that land.

Lynch: It may depend on designs proposed by the developers. This decision doesn't impact north side of parcel.

Mettee: In discussions with developers, we can talk about them contributing to the costs of changing the road layout if they propose that.

Pimental: If you were to change the layout of River Street you could soften the look of the pump station with landscaping.

Weston: The pump station is not such an ugly building and it could be improved with shutters. Need to design water and sewer lines in River Street.

Fitzgerald: I like the four way intersection design to improve site distance issue.

Lynch: We should stay with the current design that we have for now and wait to see what developers propose.

Fitzgerald: Could we move forward with seeking permits for both road options?

Ford: No that would be time consuming and costly and the agencies would want one design.

Ciotti: Put it on the developers to suggest change to road design.

Consensus was to leave the road alignment as designed but be open to relocation if it comes up during the RFP process.

Abramson: You need to know the cost differences between the two options. Developers can submit alternative layouts.

Weston: The City Council and TAC prefer the 4-way intersection.

Ford reviewed the street design elements and traffic calming options.

Consensus was to keep the street design as drawn to promote pedestrian friendly design and slower traffic speed.

B. Report from Park Programming Sub-committee Meeting on January 30th

Purcell: We met to review design options for the park building. I thought we might be able to show them tonight.

Bird: We decide that given the other agenda items tonight that we would review the building design options at the March meeting.

C. Discussion on Draft Developer RFP and Timeline

Lynch: Bird has prepared drafts of the RFP and Abramson has provided good input. We still want to complete the RFP as soon as possible, but there are issues that need to be discussed tonight..

Bird: The RFP is about 80% complete, but it is still a draft. I have received input of the draft from a variety of people, including Dana Lynch, Dane Drasher, Anthony Blenkinsop, Chris Parker, Allan Krans, Ann Legere, Jon Ford, and of course Barry Abramson.

One crucial piece of information that needs to be added is more information on the detailed cost estimate of the public improvements included in the TIF plans based on the 75% design plans. Horsley Witten is working on preparing that information. This will tell us how much the City is going to be able to complete based on the \$6 million TIF budget. We also need to talk schedule and timeline for the RFP process.

One item to discuss is whether the interviews of the three developers will be done by the whole committee or a sub-committee.

Lynch: We have a standing sub-committee that could handle the interview process.

Abramson: The issue of \$6 million TIF funding versus public improvements which were estimated one year ago at \$12-15 million. Not sure these numbers are going to change much with the new calculations. We need to replace the language in the RFP regarding the cost of the public improvements with forthright information. City has not agreed to spend more than the budget. I have prepared more detailed wording addressing improvements, budgets and phasing. City should propose public funding in phases.

Lynch: I am hesitant to make any decisions until we have the updated costs. We need to fully disclose the cost estimates in the RFP. We could delay RFP until that information is available and decisions are made on funding.

Ford: We can prepare those estimates based on the 75% plans that are not final yet.

Lynch: What would be the variance from the final numbers?

Ford: I would say maybe around 10%, but there are various factors.

Abramson: We need to know if the \$6 million commitment is contingent on property taxes covering the bond debt in the early years. Is city willing to be speculative if gap financing is required in the early years?

Bird: We are planning to have a workshop with the City Council once the cost estimates are available to discuss issues.

Abramson: A preproposal conference is a good idea.

Bird reviewed the timeline for milestones in the RFP.

Mettee: Why couldn't the RFP be issued shortly after the March 20th CWDAC meeting?

Bird: It was more of a function of decisions being made on the cost estimates, these dates are flexible.

Abramson: CWDAC could meet to discuss the cost estimates and priorities of spending before meeting with the City Council. Can we count on that \$6 million even if phase 1 real estate project doesn't cover the whole thing?

Lynch: I would like to have a meeting of the Developer Selection sub-committee before meeting with the City Council so they could look over the cost estimates on how we approach the improvements.

Weston: You should also reach out to Dan Lynch on what revenue is in the Waterfront TIF account at this point, before you come to City Council.

Lynch: We are also looking at the land sale values with the assistance of the Tax Assessor.

Motion: Mettee made motion that the Developer Selection Sub-committee be charged with reviewing the engineering cost estimates provided and its relationship to the available TIF funding and potential funding priorities, Purcell seconded. Vote: UA

Pimental: If we can release RFP earlier, we can avoid the Memorial Day weekend for due date.

Weston: I would recommend using the entire CWDAC to conduct the developer interviews, not just a sub-committee.

Lynch: I don't object to that approach.

Consensus was to do the interviews as a committee as a whole.

Discussed the logistics of interview process.

8. Committee member comments:

Cox: Are we comfortable that two months is enough time for the developer's responses?

Lynch: Yes that is a reasonable time frame and Abramson agrees with that.

9. Adjournment:

Motion: Cox made motion to adjourn at 7:22; Drasher seconded. Vote: UA