

TASK FORCE

MARCH 23, 2022

A meeting of the Committee on Infrastructure was held Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 7:32 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber and via Zoom teleconference.

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

Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr., and Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr., Co-Chairs, presided.

The roll call was taken with 14 members of the Committee on Infrastructure present:

Members of Task Force:

- Alderman-at-Large Michael B. O'Brien, Sr.
- Alderman Richard A. Dowd, Vice Chair
- Alderman Alex Comeau
- Alderman Tyler Gouveia
- Alderman Ernest A. Jette
- Alderman-at-Large Melbourne Moran, Jr.
- Alderman John Cathey
- Alderman-at-Large Ben Clemons
- Alderman Derek Thibeault
- Marylou Blaisdell
- Paul Shea, Commissioner
- Cathy Cardin-Smith
- Michael Buckley
- Ruth Boland

Also in Attendance: Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMENT – (only for items on the agenda)

Alderman Cathey

Point of order. Mr. Chair.

Chairman O'Brien

Yes.

Alderman Cathey

There was some requests by members of the public to move public comment after we discussed what we're discussing so they have an idea...

Chairman O'Brien

We'll have it before and after as per the...

Alderman Cathey

Oh both? Oh I didn't know we had to do both.

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah the previous public comment in the beginning is our traditions. Yeah, there'll be a second one.

Alderman Cathey

Oh, okay.

Chairman O'Brien

Our previous traditions are only items to be discussed on the agenda.

Alderman Cathey

My apologies. So I thought because it wasn't an official meeting, we didn't have to have public comment and then that way we could move it...

Chairman O'Brien

Usually not. I think that has been done in the past but I think you have stated and I think it was you before that had stated it that you wanted public comment.

Alderman Cathey

Only special meetings.

Chairman O'Brien

Do you want to rescind that? If you don't, you may call for a motion to eliminate public comment.

Alderman Cathey

I'm only questioning the actual procedure and process if we're relying on either the Charter or parliamentary procedure. It's not an official meeting and we can or cannot have public comment based on what we decide. We then therefore can move the one public comment period that we're having either to the beginning or the end but as the Chair, obviously, if you want to have two public comments, I would acquiesce to that. It doesn't matter to me either way.

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah just be clearly that is my duty as Chair and as Co-Chair to just facilitate the meeting. You as members have the right to call. If you wanted to make said motion, you could make said motion.

Alderman Cathey

I believe that it would be more prudent to only have one public comment after we've discussed what we're discussing. I don't know if I should make a motion on that?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN THAT PUBLIC COMMENT IS MOVED FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION ON THE DOWNTOWN BARRIERS AND TO EXTEND OUTSIDE DINING

Chairman O'Brien

We were a little too quick for you Alderman Jette. Go ahead Sir.

Alderman Jette

Cathey was supposed to wake me up but she...

Chairman O'Brien

No, you're fine. You spent too much watching the TV today.

Alderman Jette

So I you know in this public comments stuff is, you know, the public has really been asking for it and I know a lot of people are tired of hearing it but it is on the agenda. So rather than arguing about it, why don't we just move to start the public comment, and, get it over with, and let's...

Chairman O'Brien

I was going to include too, but.

Alderman Jette

Yeah, so...

Chairman O'Brien

But there is a pending motion, Alderman Jette.

Alderman Jette

So this is a discussion on the pending motion, right? So I, I'm against the pending motion because I think we ought to have - let the public say what they want to say, and then we can have the discussion, and then they can talk about what we discussed afterwards.

Chairman O'Brien

I did have Alderman Clemons with his hand up and then I'll recognize you Alderman Moran.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to support the motion because I think a lot of people that spoke, spoke at the last meeting - five minutes ago. So I mean, I'm all for giving the public the chance to speak but I think we need to be a little bit using common sense here. I don't mind moving it to the end that way people can see what we do, and then comment on it, and they will get the opportunity to do that. So I'm going to support the motion.

Alderman Thibeault

So, um, this is kind of what I was talking about last week. So last week I complained because the agenda said one thing and I was told no, you got to have public comment even though I was told something different.

Tonight, we have public comment first and now we want to change it again and have two. Why can't we get the agendas right. I'm okay with public comment but why can't we get these things right? I even asked President Wilshire before I'm like, so we're only have one public comment here because I'm only seeing one. And she's like, I guess that's what the thing says. So I don't know why we change it every time and I get there's a motion now. I would support it. If we're only going to have one, I support moving the second but we just have to get this stuff right. We waste too much time on this stuff.

Chairman O'Brien

Just see to answer your question. If it came out with none whatsoever - this board by the power of the board could decide whether to have it or not.

Alderman Thibeault

I didn't say no.

Alderman Cathey

Just to piggyback on Alderman Thibeault's comments. Last week was a clarification about what constitutes an official meeting and whether or not you have to have public comment based on the City Charter and not whether or not it's on the agenda. Whether or not it's on the agenda is irrelevant compared to the City Charter and the City Charter for official meeting calls for a public comment in the beginning and a public comment at the end. That was the only thing that we're voting on. Since the Task Force is not an official meeting, it's not in the Charter. We have a little more bandwidth on what we do with public comment.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN TO MOVE THE VOTE

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Comeau

Parliamentary inquiry real quick.

Chairman O'Brien

Parliamentary inquiry.

Alderman Comeau

Since I imagine we're about to take a voice vote as opposed to a roll call can I just clarify who in...

Chairman O'Brien

Nobody called for a roll call. It's a voice vote but you could call a roll call.

Alderman Comeau

All right. No, I'm not calling roll call. I just want the Chairs' opinion on who in the horseshoe should be voting and who should not?

Chairman O'Brien

Everybody. They're members of the Task Force.

Alderman Comeau

So the nine of us and the five?

Chairman O'Brien

That's correct.

Alderman Comeau

Okay. Just wanted to make sure that was...

Chairman O'Brien

They are seated. They have been voted in. Okay. Motion to move the motion, just to make sure I have it correctly. The pending motion is to move to public comment to the second half of the meeting. Okay. Voice vote.

Alderman Dowd

That's a non-debatable motion. I had something to say but I'm not gonna do it now because it's a non-debatable motion. You can have to call the motion.

Chairman O'Brien

The Chair is in question. All those in favor. Okay I count eight in favor and five oppose.

MOTION CARRIED

Alderman Dowd

I don't believe there's anything in the City Charter that talks to public comment. I've always been told by Corporation Counsel...

Alderman Clemons

Mr. Chairman, point of order. We just moved the vote. Now we have to vote.

Alderman Dowd

Oh I'm sorry. You're right. Yes, now we're voting.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN THAT PUBLIC COMMENT IS MOVED FOLLOWING THE DISCUSSION ON THE DOWNTOWN BARRIERS AND TO EXTEND OUTSIDE DINING

Alderman Comeau

You have ten in favor.

Chairman O'Brien

And the naves? Please have your vote recorded.

MOTION CARRIED

Alderman Dowd

Just to reiterate. I do not believe there's anything in the City Charter that talks to public comment. I've always been told by Corporation Counsel that there's no State law that requires public comment. I'm not saying we shouldn't have public comment because we want to hear from the public, but it's not required by any law. That's the decision I've been given by legal many times whether I asked for it or not. So that is that is the opinion of legal counsel in the City of Nashua.

Also if we have a working session and the rules are different, the only difference is if we have a working session and we don't have public comment and we just discuss things among ourselves, we cannot take a vote to pass anything. You can only do that when you have a formal meeting. So the work group would then refer to the meeting. That's the way we've done things forever. When we do the budget meetings with the Division Directors, that's a working session. There are no votes taken and take a vote at the (inaudible).

Alderman Jette

Yeah, I just I hate to bring this up but Alderman Dowd it's not in the Charter. It's in the ordinance. In fact, it's an ordinance that was last amended by an ordinance that you proposed. It calls for the order of the meeting in the ordinance. Now that can be waived by a vote of the Board of Aldermen.

Alderman Dowd

Yes.

Alderman Jette

But the ordinance does provide for public comment at the beginning for items on the agenda and public comment at the end for items that is...

Chairman O'Brien

Excuse me. I'm gonna have to gavel because we seem to be going everywhere down the road except for where we're supposed to be going.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

And as your Chairman, I would like to facilitate this meeting. This all can be discussed and I do highly recommend. We have legal offices upstairs and I'm sure there'll be able to assist anybody with any of their questions but right now we have a task. The task before us, again, I'm willing to stay til midnight but the thing is we do have some other people with us that have busy schedules. So I think they would appreciate if we do what we do best is to get down to business here. So I hope you will join me in that type of thought. Thank you. Now with that I'm looking for a motion to remove from the table.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN COMEAU TO REMOVE FROM THE TABLE O-22-008
MOTION CARRIED**

DISCUSSION

- Seasonal Road Closures and Elimination of Certain On-Street Parking for Extended Outdoor Dining and Other Non-Vehicular Use

Chairman O'Brien

So we can discuss it. Mr. Cummings you might as well join us here too. You think you're going to get off easy?

Okay. To again to facilitate this and to get it, we've all heard a lot of stories and to Director Cummings too. This is the opportunity to bring up the difference between fact and myth. Okay. I know there's some things that we really wanted to get clear with this and then to make a decision so we can get going. So with that, what is the pleasure of the board? Do you want Mr. Cummings to start with the whole complete presentation again, or do you want him to put it up, and to go into the particular changes? What is the flavor of the board? Discussion?

Commissioner Paul Shea

I've seen the renderings and have a good idea of what they all mean, but I'd appreciate if Director Cummings could go into it for us tonight.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

If I could, Mr. Chair. So for the record, Tim Cummings, Director of Economic Development. I just shared my screen here. Hopefully everyone can see it where I will quickly go over the substance of the ordinance that's laid out in this document here. I'm also going to take the opportunity while I go through this current plan and tell you about some suggested amendments or improvements I've heard since this was originally proposed so you can have it for your, for your consideration. This has all come about from additional feedback that has come forward over the last few weeks, which may help inform your discussion.

Chairman O'Brien

Director Cummings fine but is there a way that you can go to a full screen? Is it at all possible? I think it would help some of our members who refuse to wear eyeglasses or something. The point was brought up and it would help immensely.

Unidentified Alderman

You can also use the control plus minus.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Yes, that's what I'm doing. So I just magnified it so you could see it a little bit better...

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

...and we can have the conversation. I can try something else if you'd like if you want to bear with me for one second.

Chairman O'Brien

I'll bear with you. Whatever works best.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

This may be of interest and easier for everyone. So I'm sharing my screen now and what you're now seeing is not the PDF that is the document that is in the ordinance. What you're seeing is an internal GIS layer. That is what we use to actually create the PDF document. I say that because I can zoom in, in greater detail if you'd like which may be of interest.

Chairman O'Brien

Yes and also Director Cummings if I remember my dealings with GIS, that does have a measuring and that you can measure and everything with it.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

It does.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Okay, so it's a little bit harder for me to maneuver.

Chairman O'Brien

You're doing a fine job. I think everybody can see it.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Okay. So just starting out here, we're going to be here at the top here of Clinton Street. No changes as previous to last year. This is pretty much how it was all settled and no recommended changes here.

Continuing on down the path here, this is where you're going to see the biggest change where last year you had Peddlers Daughter with some form of barriers. That is not being recommended this year and there would be no extended outdoor dining for Peddlers Daughter. With the extended of Peddlers Daughter last year, there was a need for some sort of traffic calming in and around what we referred to as "the Telegraph building". That prohibited some parking along here as well as some traffic calming measures that went into the travel lanes. Because there's no Peddlers Daughter type of extended outdoor dining, there's no need for that type of traffic calming to occur. So all that's been removed which adds in the parking back in and allows for the free flowing of traffic.

I'll note participating remotely this evening we have Dan Hudson, the City Engineer and also Matt Sullivan, the Community Development Director, if specific technical questions arise but essentially the input from the Engineering Department was making this one change will have an improvement. It will reverberate back through the downtown because we've increased capacity. So this is something that the Engineering Department felt very, very strongly and seeing move forward that would help address the traffic congestion that was previously raised as a concern.

On the opposite side of the street, no real changes here. You will have traffic calming start now just as strongly as the Engineering Department like the idea of no barriers in front of Peddlers Daughter. They are very good strong in their opinion that the narrowing of Main Street happened before Water Street because once it gets past Water Street onto Main Street, it would be unsafe and not something that they would recommend. So that is why you see the particular narrowing occur just before Water Street what is typically referred to as the Darrell's piano building.

I know previously when we met we had a question raised as to whether they needed to be "New Jersey barriers". I have asked that question to our city Engineer. The response I got back was it doesn't necessarily need to be New Jersey barriers, except for when it's like just the start of the traffic calming. I think there and in other areas I think there was

public safety concerns that if it was something other than a New Jersey barrier, that may raise concerns but if there was something else that wanted to be done that would enhance the aesthetic, I believe that folks would be open to that conversation.

So continuing on down here. This is the block where you'll see the most changes - last year on the most westerly side. This all had outdoor dining and the extended outdoor barriers. The extended outdoor dining dialog for the barriers to be put in place. This year we're recommending all this parking to be opened up with depending on the color. Orange being zone one 90 minute parking, green being dropped zone 15 minute type parking added in which, again, increases capacity immensely for parking that would benefit the entire neighborhood not just the frontage. So I know there's people on the opposite side of the street that do have barriers. They would be able to take advantage of this parking.

I know the there was this question about extended outdoor dining for San Francisco Kitchen. That is included and something that we would recommend but essentially that would be the only outdoor dining that would occur on the westerly side of the block. On the easterly side of the block, really no changes though I want to note we have right here added in 15 minute green drop zone parking spot. I know that there's been internal conversations and we would like to try to increase that depending on whether we have the availability or not. We've tried to get a second spot in there. Probably look to do it right ahead so if you will, the recommendation I would make would just to be to tighten it up a little bit like right here, which would allow for - you'll have the one and you'd have a second spot. So that's one item of difference that I wanted to note that something that we would work towards changing if that was the pleasure of the group.

Continuing on down. I want to talk a little bit about Factory Street. So Factory Street which hopefully you can see here now is all the orange would be additional parking. Currently right now you are not allowed to park on Factory Street where you see the orange. I'm not saying that that doesn't occur but it's technically not allowed. It is a travel lane. This would increase capacity immensely with additional on street parking to service again the entire neighborhood. It's something that I know we've recommended in the past doing. The green 15 minute would be closer to San Francisco Kitchen and the salon at the corner of Factory and Main. But the big item I want to call everyone's attention to is we have the Rambling House right here. We had previously added in extended outdoor dining where my cursor is going over one or two parking spaces.

I had conversations with the Gleason family, specifically Dennis Gleason a year or two ago. It was something we were ready to go forward with and include in the program. At that time, Mr. Gleason had said to me we're not ready yet. Let's hold. We have outdoor dining in the rear. If we were to open in the middle of a season, we could we could accommodate it with some deck - with the deck that we have in the rear. Most recently thanks to Alderman Jette, the issue was raised and brought to my attention. Particularly I spoke to Mr. Gleason on Monday. There's an ADA issue actually and we want to make sure we're able to provide equal access to outdoor dining to everyone. So he is interested in having some sort of outdoor dining here. So I would recommend that we look to amend this plan to include one or two spaces right here. That would be a loss of potentially some on street parking but I'll show you where we'll make it up later on in this plan. I think that that would be a worthwhile endeavor that this group, again, consider entertaining.

Again so continuing back over here onto Main Street. No real changes on Temple Street. This is what was laid out last year. This is what we're recommending again. Main Street to High Street - no changes. This is what was done last year. This is essentially what we're recommending again. Similarly on the opposite side now on the eastern side here - no real changes. This is what we had last year. This is what we're recommending again. We are making some changes on a little bit of the southern side of the block. So now I'm at the High to the Pearl Street. No real changes on the westerly side. What was there last year is what we're recommending again. We have made changes on the eastern side though. If you see all this orange, originally last year these parking spaces were not there and we're suggesting that these parking spaces get added in. If you can see where my cursor is, there was a traffic calming measure put in here which precluded really any type of parking in one or two spots here. So we're just suggesting that this get tightened up a little bit which would add some parking back in but still allow for some extended outdoor dining for the area as well as and again, I want to remind everyone of this because the question I know has been raised a couple of times - we have to be very strategic on where we introduce the barriers and where we don't introduce the barriers because you cannot have the cars funneling into a congested area, expanding back out, and then narrowing them back in. A car will be potentially caught in an area where the lane would end and it could be unsafe. So I know that there's been this discussion about two lanes of traffic or four in total traveling two in each direction. Where we can try to accommodate that we have, but what you're seeing is really the best that we can do with the current layout of Main Street. If we were to eliminate all the lines on Main Street and relook at it differently, we would be able to accommodate two way flow but we can't do it and under the current state of our line configuration. So I say that to you because you'll see that in some places, and this is a good example, where we have tried to allow safely two lanes of flow and because of this, we are able to encourage people to move over safely, and that goes down to one lane, and then we try to open it back up again where it's safe. So that is something I want to just call everyone's attention to.

Moving on to Pearl Street. Last year, we had extended outdoor dining out here in City Room on West Pearl Street. I've spoken to the owner. There's no interest, or desire, or need. So we could remove all this and that would open up some parking here and again, I would recommend that. I think that that would be a good additional parking for the downtown and for everyone to benefit from particularly when we heard from Willards Barbershop where they were looking to have some additional parking. I think that this would be, again, a recommendation I think the group should consider.

On the east side of Pearl Street here, last year we had extended outdoor dining going all the way to the corner. We've changed that this year. So now it's hard to tell here but believe it or not, there is a lane of parking that you can have and then there will be another lane of travel capacity. The thought is that this would be a left hand turn lane and you could turn left here. That would open up the flow of traffic on East Pearl Street so you could get more throughput and, again, the thought being is we would improve the condition from last year by having that additional capacity and additional storage for the for the lefts. I know that there was some concern about, again, traffic congestion on the Pearls.

Something else that should be noted that I think we should be cognizant of is the new technology the city is interested in and have executed on under the leadership of Dan Hudson, our city Engineer. We actually for the first time ever have traffic cameras now here at this intersection monitoring Main Street in East and West Pearl Street, which we did not have last year that we do have this year and I believe as of Tuesday, we put a bid out for actually more traffic cameras to be installed on the Main Street intersections, which will again only help improve the flow of traffic.

Then lastly here on Main Street, no real changes here on the left hand side or on what I should say is the westerly side. What you see is here's what was last year. Similarly on the eastern side, there was similar a layout. The only difference really is down here you had more traffic calming and interference with parking spaces, which has been tightened up so allowing some more parking right in through here. Essentially, those are the major changes from last year to this year. I've pointed out the three or so changes that I think if you made you'd be improving the plan and I'll leave my comments there. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you, Director Cummings. Now it's not that I'm don't want to have questions. I want to get the flavor of the board as facilitated here. I would like Director Cummings if it's agreed to members of the board to go up to the top. The first slide that we saw and let's work it down in an organized manner. Because I don't want to be spinning the wheels – no pun intended - going north to south, east to west and everything. I would like to take it block by block questions and when we agree or disagree but if we agree, we can TA and not have to revisit it. But at any time, it could be brought up again. So if we're all in favor of that everybody? We could do with a straw vote? Yes.

Ruth Boland

I don't know if I'm supposed to raise my hand or not. This is very confusing to me but I was just wondering - I mean I've heard a lot of talk about like a slightly different concept that people have been talking about whereas the extended parking would only go into the parking spots and then we would have two lanes in each direction. I think it might be helpful to discuss that concept as it would address the entire Main Street and everything that's involved rather than, you know, the block by block details.

Chairman O'Brien

Director Cummings do you want to answer the two lanes?

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

It will work. That's why I tried saying politely now a couple of times. I don't know how else to say it but under the current configuration, you're not going to be able to accomplish both goals.

Ruth Boland

I guess I don't understand why that is. Can you give an example of that? Am I not allowed to talk now?

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah to help facilitate this, Mr. Hudson are you available?

Dan Hudson, City Engineer

Yes I am Mr. Chair.

Chairman O'Brien

Mr. Hudson by your engineering expertise have you looked at the two versus four lanes issue?

Dan Hudson, City Engineer

Yes, Mr. Chair. I mean I think what's being described is using only the parking areas for extending the outdoor dining, which would leave the four lanes of the existing travel lanes remaining. That has been talked about possibly with they call them "parklets" but basically a level platform that extends the sidewalk. Barriers won't work to create those areas because barriers are about two feet wide and those parking lanes are only about eight feet wide. So by the time we put a barrier in the parking lane, there's hardly any space left for tables, and chairs, and that sort of thing. So it's kind of an either or and what's been discussed about the parklets I mean if you were going to try to do parklets all along Main Street, that's very cost prohibitive. So it's hard to, you know, do a little bit of something here and a little bit of something there because we need continuity throughout the corridor. So hopefully that helps address the question. I'd be happy to try again if I haven't.

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah, it does. Thank you.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I have a question through you to Mr. Hudson if possible.

Chairman O'Brien

Absolutely, Mr. Hudson.

Alderman Clemons

So my question is in a Main Street that has the in a pared down Main Street that has four lanes in each direction with the parklets let's say, in an emergency situation now if there was an empty parking space or something like that if an emergency vehicle was trying to get through, somebody could pull over into a parking space, or move ahead, around, I guess, right, to clear the way for an emergency vehicle. I would imagine just from my vision, you know, just picturing this that that would be harder to do in comparison to the current plan because there are large spaces between the travel lane and the parking spots because we're going to keep parallel spaces where in those spots if an emergency vehicle was trying to get through, theoretically those would always be clear unless somebody was either moving out or in from the parking spot. So that could be the space where you would get out of the way for a police car, or an ambulance, or a fire truck, or that would be the spot where if there was a fire, a fire truck would try to park if it was near where they need to be. Of course, they're going to do what they got to do but. Am I correct in that or could you further explain sort of that scenario with the map that was shown to us?

Chairman O'Brien

Well, I think we could go over more but I think more direct. These plans have been reviewed by both the police and by the fire and there seems to be, unfortunately, misinformation people interpret. Maybe it's because we didn't really get that information out. But you gotta understand there's been a lot of into meetings with this you know what I mean to discuss this. I think my Co-Chair Alderman Moran did you have communications with the Fire Chief on this particular subject?

Co-Chairman Moran

Yes. So I met with Chief Buxton.

Chairman O'Brien

Could you give us a brief report on what he had to say?

Co-Chairman Moran

So in my role as the liaison to Nashua Fire Rescue, I met with Chief Buxton and obviously this came up. He – and I don't want to misrepresent his words - but he was here at the last public hearing. I think his concern was this plan. He can't respond to what the delay response time would be because it hasn't been implemented yet. He was on their position prior was that the previous plan, reduced response time. He had concerns about the safety impact rating on the parklets versus the barriers. If someone comes down Main Street speeding, the barriers are gonna absorb the brunt of that force and the parklet wouldn't. He was very clear, you know, it's not his role to say whether this should happen or not. He wanted to express that. He had concerns about the previous plan response time. This is different. He would obviously track it, and report back, and that the impact concerns the barriers versus parklets. Those are the three main things we discussed during that meeting.

Chairman O'Brien

In the past too in conversation with Chief Buxton, when the Fire Department does times – this I can speak from my own experience - you know they go and turn out but it fluctuates what time of day. I think everybody with common knowledge could appreciate that, that an engine company getting out the door and of course, it's getting woken up out of a dead sleep and responding. They actually do time that. A firefighter is supposed to be fully ready to go within one minute from receipt of the alarm and that's from a dead sleep. But you know, a lot of variables. There's traffic, and hurricanes, and snow falls, and different stuff. So to blame on one particular event over another and then again, there's time. Traffic at midnight is a lot different than traffic at four in the afternoon. So you know if you balance out the wheel on that.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Mr. Chair. In relation to the emergency vehicles that we're talking about, I remember not too long ago at a Board of Aldermen meeting there was funding that was - it may not have been, it might have been Finance - that was talked about to bring the lights back into sync with the emergency where they would set them off and they talked about it going further with the ambulance and so on. Do we know where that status is and would that be in place?

Chairman O'Brien

Well currently right now, AMR is a private entity. Being a private entity, they do not have access to light cycle, okay. Because if they had access to the light cycle and if something were to occur, then I think we accept some liability with that. So it's only the fire apparatus. The Police Department doesn't even have access to that light cycle. I think you got to keep that in mind. For the industry, it's called an "opticom system". Again, other people basically say when those are activated, it sends an infrared – well it used to be infrared - but and the men are out, and all lights within that lane of traffic turn green automatically.

Alderman Klee

May I follow up? Thank you. I saw Director Cummings' hand up too. I think they're trying to put in a new system that will possibly include AMR, will include police, will include all because the current system is failing and that was kind of my question through you to but it's already in place so perhaps Director Cummings could answer that.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

So nothing has been finalized or approved and this body would be one of the bodies that may have to approve it being the full Board of Aldermen. But we have two different pathways to have that particular project funded. We have it potentially through our own ARPA funding, which I believe the Mayor had alluded to at the most recent meeting where this was discussed where he would be looking to bring this forward. It would be for fire as being in the first position, police being in the second position. To be determined but I think it would be DPW for snow removal reasons and then fourth would be actually transit and the buses, which actually would help efficiency on bus routes which would help gain us more federal monies from our federal formula reimbursement.

But also, we're looking to try to take a little bit more of a regional approach because we have hospitals in the area and we're looking at the hospitals catchment area. Actually with the conversation with Alderman Clemons a week or so ago, we thought about maybe tapping into the Hillsborough County ARPA funding and seeing if maybe we could use a County approach to the nine surrounding communities that all get serviced by our hospitals to try to get on the same page, which would actually be more beneficial. So that's a long answer to your question to tell you. We are working very hard on it and I think you're gonna see something in the coming weeks on it.

Alderman Klee

May I have one quick follow up if you don't mind? I'm sorry. I know there was something that came through and it may have been Finance. I don't know why my mind is foggy as to which one it was but something did come up. It was presented and I think fire may have been the one that presented because the current system has failed. It is no longer working properly. So they're coming in with the new system and this system would have the growth of what I think Director Cummings was talking about.

Chairman O'Brien

It used to be anybody to go to Radio Shack with one of those party lights. They could have tripped if we didn't put that out there.

Alderman Cathey

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have a thought but I did see that Mrs. Cardin does have her hand up and since we always get to talk, I'll have to yield if she had a question.

Chairman O'Brien

No, I'll jump over there next.

Alderman Cathey

That's fine. I just don't want to gobble up all the time since they're gracing us with their presence.

Mr. Cummings with all due respect, I do find it difficult as a member of the board to be told that this proposal is my only option or my only proposal. Parklets aren't an option, four lanes aren't an option. When the barrier proposal is a proposal that we discussed about how we want to move our city forward, it is difficult to be told this is the only option or not necessarily this, you know, exactly where the barriers are but really what we're discussing is what storefronts do they go in front of and that's basically about it. That doesn't sit well with me. I feel like we could come up with other options. There are multiple people sitting in this room that want four lanes. The public wants four lanes. So if we started with that premise, could we then not come up with a way to make this happen with four lanes? I'm not really worried about the money because we have our own ARPA funds so we could get the decking on the parklets if we really needed to if this is something that the board felt strongly about. So I didn't know if this is really all that we have to work with or can we move in a different direction where we're talking about four lanes of travel?

Chairman O'Brien

You can choose not to.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

No you can all decide what you'd like to do. If you want to do something different, you can do something different. This was the recommended approach based on the technical expertise of in house experts that you have as what they recommended as the best approach. In your collective wisdom you decide to go in a different direction, you absolutely can do that. I will just tell you the tradeoffs, the pros and cons to any decision that you make.

Alderman Cathey

Quick follow up. Bearing that in mind, recommendation to the Chair for facilitating the meeting, would it not be then more efficient to decide if we're going four lanes before we go block by block because that will affect block by block how we do things? So up front, we need to know how many lanes of traffic we're dealing with before we start placing barriers and whatnot. Just a suggestion but those are my thoughts.

Chairman O'Brien

I'm with that. Yup we could declare a vote, but before we call for it, you've been patiently Cathy.

Cathy Cardin-Smith

Yeah I agree with John. I think that the plan is in force sort of, you know, and I think again Tim's done a great job of tweaking it. But can't we start with the four lanes and then build the plan on that? Okay. Now, we're just saying that the barriers that we have that, you know, people might want to paint and have them more plain, you know, that's great. I'm all for that but when I look out at the front of my building, the bike lane is being eliminated. So if you put that barrier right on the line that half of it is in the bike lane and half of it is in a parking space. Basically, Michael might be able to help me better with this. I mean you should be able to get tables for four in that space keeping your four lanes of traffic, keeping the existing barriers for now, and you know, how much area we're going to have? Was it Dan? The town Engineer? Yeah how much space do we need to have between the barrier and that first lane of traffic? I mean, you know, a parking space is wide enough for a car obviously. Put it right half and half so it's half in the bike lane, half in the parking spot, and you should - to me, it would seem that you could get some tables in there.

So the other thing I wanted to bring up, and Marylou and I have talked many times on this, I love the idea that the parking lights, not the parking lights but the street lights are getting synchronized and so forth. But we also need to slow the traffic down. So when you go into a condo complex, or any kind of apartment kind of gated community, they always have some kind of speed type thing is. Wouldn't it be prudent for us to buy some kind of temporary speed bumps that aren't huge, you know, just a small one and put those at strategic places. Maybe, you know, sort of at City Hall and then down by the bridge, or something to slow that traffic down for when they are coming into the eating area. Especially with our little islands that have, you know, the street lights, and the walking lights. So those are a couple of things that I thought might tell.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you, Miss Smith. The Chair would like to know that was part of the discussion. I'm going to call on as soon as we have some more discussion on Dan Hudson. That was part of the discussion by going to two lanes would naturally slow down the traffic.

Cathy Cardin-Smith

I don't agree. We should go to two lanes.

Chairman O'Brien

I'm only going by what the engineers?

Cathy Cardin-Smith

Yeah. I would like to talk to the engineers and see.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Can I speak to something Mr. Chair?

Chairman O'Brien

Yes.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

There was something referenced that I just want to make sure it's clear because I think there's a misnomer. I just heard that we have a bike lane on Main Street. That's factually inaccurate. What you have is what I think some people think is a bike lane because you have this travel lane, and then you have the parking stall, and it's only about three feet, which is not a technical bike lane. What it actually is because of the way Main Street was laid out, this gets to my original point of how the permanent striping would need to be relooked at because it's actually space just for the doors. So you can open your door safely as you're getting out of a parking spot. It is not technically a bike lane. So I say that to you because you're absolutely right. There's two or three feet there that should be used in a better way. But technically right now, we can only work with what we have. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of things on this whole safety and you know two lanes, four lanes. I mean I would be opposed to starting with four lanes. I would prefer to start with two and work the other way.

Director Cummings said this is the third time now we've seen an amended proposal from the original or maybe the second amendment to the original proposal. You know and the first time that we had these out there the last two years, the biggest complaint was parking. He went in – him and Mr. Hudson and Director Sullivan went in and they gave tons of parking back. The report was that we were only utilizing about 50% of our parking spots. So the people who were upset about parking now have gone away. I don't hear the parking is a problem. You know, we heard that the barriers are ugly and we've decided to, you know, that we would probably in this proposal paint them or do something so that it'd be amenable to more people. And then that kind of has gone away.

Now it's a big thing with safety. I look at this and I go, you know, I did ask the Chair in an e-mail to ask fire and police to come tonight and AMR so if we had questions about this, we could ask them. I thought it was important in case one of us had a question about safety. I know they don't really want to speak to it because it's not out there but, you know, I would ask them what we've done, or what Tim's done, and his team has done have opened up things that weren't there the last two years. The same people that are saying no to barriers - just plain no and calling safety an issue because people may die. No one died in the last few years when we have full barriers but these same people are the people that were wanting to go maskless and tell us to go maskless and yelled at us about that and people did die. So I don't believe that public safety is the whole argument for people. Police and fire - they'll find a way to get through. Look at Daniel Webster Highway during Christmas. We don't cancel Christmas, right? They find a way to get through.

Some of these – Amherst Street. There's not always lanes. There's no break down lanes. Amherst Street is tough. I don't like going down Amherst Street any more than Main Street when it's busy. It's traffic. I think traffic is what people don't want. They don't want to sit in traffic anymore. They don't want to be in traffic six minutes instead of three. I think that's the issue now. We all want instant gratification. I think this proposal does a great job. I think fire and police they will find a way to get through and to help people. So I think, you know, and to go back to Amherst Street, right, if we truly care about safety in the city, we'll put a fire station in the north end of Amherst Street because Merrimack doesn't help us anymore. So if there's a fire at the north end of Amherst Street and during rush hour, you know how long it takes a fire truck to get up there? A while. Nobody says hey, let's spend a bunch of money. Let's use ARPA funds to throw up a fire station down there even though we had land there. So I don't buy the safety issue. I think we can get there. They can get there if need be and I think some of the things that we've opened up here in this plan are good.

That doesn't mean we can't amend some more to Aldermen Cathey's point. I don't think it's - Tim's not coming here and saying this is our proposal. We will not touch anything else on this. Take it or leave it. He's not saying that. We can certainly if Alderman Cathey wants to take time to redo this whole plan and bring it back to the board we could. The problem is we're going to find time is an issue here to get this out. I think to a certain extent, most of us want something whether it's four lanes, two lanes, we want something out there for extended dining and I think we need to get down to figuring what that looks like. Thank you.

Alderman Dowd

Yeah I've got a few points, not that I'm recommending any of them. I'm just throwing them out there. And Dan Sullivan is on. There was alternative barriers on Pearl Street last year that aren't as wide. The orange barriers that we use in construction aren't as wide. I don't know if we want the yellow/orange color but there are other alternatives for barriers at least along where the dining is. I would still suggest concrete barriers on either end of a restaurant.

The other thing is city traffic lanes are how wide and I believe if this fire vehicle or police vehicle coming, there's enough room for cars even if there's four of them to move aside to get something through the middle of them. Now the one issue we do have in some places is those islands in the middle of the street, which at some point we probably ought to remove. The crosswalks are fine but those islands screw the whole thing up and even parades.

So a couple other things. There are six fire stations in the City of Nashua. If there's a fire, the only place we have an issue is if the fire is downtown. If there's a fire downtown, I can show you the trucks, the cars are on Main Street and I want to get the heck out of there fast and the fire trucks will be right behind him. The opticom system is something that

the Fire Department has been after for a couple of years the last couple of Fire Chiefs and that new system, because if there's an emergency by the time they leave the station, they can turn every one of those lights green in one direction, red in the other direction, and clear Main Street. Just a thought.

The other thing is I think that perhaps during certain hours, we ought to bar large trucks from Main Street, especially 18 wheelers. There's no reason for them to go downtown. If they're doing deliveries, we should limit the delivery times. Even with four lanes of traffic, you get UPS and FedEx trucks parked right in the travel lane and screw traffic up. We could fix that.

Another thing we could do is we could limit the speed limit on Main Street to 20 miles an hour, but we'd probably have to have police officers down there during the evening dining hours to make sure that it's enforced.

Let's see if I missed anything. Another question we might have is when are they repaving Main Street? Because that'd be a good time to repaint all the lines.

And so and the other question I guess I have for the city Engineer is do we have a capability at DPW since they control all traffic lights, turn them all green manually?

Dan Hudson, City Engineer

Oh boy, there's a lot there. Well let me just let me just try to respond to a few things. So I echo what Mr. Cummings said about the bike lanes. We don't have bike lanes right now. Last couple years during the dining, we widened - we set the barriers a five foot offset from the travel lanes. We actually created a five foot bike lane where none existed last year. We had the reflectorized things which didn't go great because they were blowing over and that sort of thing. So I think what we're thinking is we wouldn't use those again but we would preserve that width - that five feet off the edge of the single travel lane. It does provide an area for somebody to pull over, to help let the emergency vehicles by. As was noted, there is the center lane for the majority of the corridor and that's another way that emergency vehicles can get around. But certainly I'm not the expert on emergency vehicle navigating a response. So they'd be better to address that.

The islands they mess up parades but they're vital for the crossings that are unsignalized. When we have four lanes of traffic in both directions, we really need that refuge because asking somebody to try to cross five lanes of traffic all at once with two lanes going in each direction and a center lane would be too much I think. We'd have to eliminate some crossings if we're going to do that.

The pre-emption - the new technologies GPS based is noted. Yeah, they're gonna go on a certain route. Green light can happen quicker because they have a plan through so that would be an improvement. I'm not fully up to speed on that technology but it does sound promising. There's not an easy way for us to manually turn one light green remotely. We do have the capability to remotely connect in, you know, and cycle through phases if we need to but that'd be more like an emergency response sort of a thing. We might implement a plan say that if something happened on the turnpike that we could prioritize mainline green to try to process traffic where people are diverting but that'd be like an emergency management plan.

As Mr. Cummings said, we are seeking or we have a bid out for additional cameras on Main Street. Those cameras provide the capability of doing traffic counts 24/7, 365. So that will give us a lot more data and with that data, we can better prioritize or better manage the green splits between Main Street progression and the side streets. So we would hope – every place we put those cameras at, we've seen better traffic operations. They just work a lot better than the loops. So we would expect some improvement there but also with those systems, we're gonna learn a lot more over time and be able to better set the system up to do a better job of managing traffic. So let me know what I missed.

Alderman Jette

The width of the lanes.

Alderman Dowd

The width of the lanes.

Dan Hudson, City Engineer

The width of the lane. Sure. So the width of the lanes, they're about 11 feet wide. And then as was described by Mr.

Cummings, there's a two to three foot shoulder and then there's the eight foot parking stalls. So it is correct. If we put the barrier rate on that shoulder line then that would provide probably about eight feet for dining, but I wouldn't recommend doing that. When you have traffic traveling, you don't want it right up tight against the hard construction like that. It should be an offset of about, you know, two feet or so minimum. So I think if you were gonna place the barriers, you probably want to keep that two to three foot shoulder and place the barrier on the parking line as I had said previously, so.

Alderman Dowd

And how wide are the barriers?

Dan Hudson, City Engineer

Sorry, what was that?

Alderman Clemons

How wide is the center lane?

Dan Hudson, City Engineer

Not on your screen but I have a screen up here similar to what Mr. Cummings has – I just picked a spot on Main Street. It was 9 feet wide.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay I have Alderman Comeau who's been patiently waiting.

Marylou Blaisdell

I have a comment.

Chairman O'Brien

This is your moment.

Marylou Blaisdell

Okay. The statement has been made that it's either this or nothing. I think that Director Cummings, the police, DPW, the Engineering Department have worked on a plan that they feel will work for the betterment of all of us taking into consideration retail restaurants, parking, all the numerous comments from all of us downtown about what we want and what we don't want. I think they're the experts and I think we should listen to them. I'm not an expert in traffic, or fire, or planning, or anything. I think that the experts have gathered. They have really tried to put together something that will work for all of us. I think it comes down to we can beat this forever. Do we accept the experts plan for barriers or do we not accept it?

We don't have time to keep going over it, and over it, and over it. We have to make a decision and move forward on it. I think that Nashua has one of the widest main streets in New Hampshire. Tim can tell me whether I'm right or wrong. Tim and I have walked Main Street looking at where our problems are. That center lane is a problem. Those outlets are a problem. We have extremely wide Main Streets. I'm downtown. Ruth is downtown, Cathy - we're downtown every day. Traffic flies up and down Main Street. By the grace of God, no one's been killed yet but it's going to happen in those crosswalks or somewhere. Traffic has to slow down on Main Street. I personally feel the barrier program slowed that down. As someone said a minute ago, people are impatient. If we got these slides synchronized, I think that would make a huge difference and traffic flowing at a reasonable pace. So I really encourage this group to if there's pieces of the plan you think absolutely will not work, what are those pieces and what is your suggestion to make it work? If not, I think we should accept what the experts have said for us.

I also would like to state this isn't a plan just for restaurants. This is a plan for retail. I feed off of Michael Timothy's business. I think everybody that sits near - has retail near a restaurant feeds off that restaurant. If you look at the parking study that was done of over 1,000 people, what do they come downtown for? To dine. If we don't have restaurants that are healthy and surviving downtown, we die. All of us die. I don't care what anybody says, we die. We feed off of that. I think that this plan works for all of us. I don't mean to ramble, but I think that I like Cathy's idea of a temporary speed bump if that could be put in place but something to slow it has to be done soon.

I also just want to make it a comment on some people from the public talked about they don't like our tax dollars going for this. Downtown supports itself through parking meters and parking revenue. If you look at item 166 and the revenue stream for this city, you'll see that that is all the parking revenue that comes from downtown and it's in excess of \$728,000 usually on an annual basis. The services that we as downtown businesses render from that, we pay our own trash. We're pretty self-sufficient. So our customers have put into almost a million dollars into the city budget each year from parking. We understand that this plan takes away some of that but if you look at the last two years, it's still been a hefty sum of money that has been in line item 166. So it isn't a burden I do not feel on the taxpayers of this city because downtown does support itself. I think that we are the heart of Nashua. Every other town in this State is doing this - every other town. If we don't do it, our customers are going to go there. We have to make a decision whether we lose them or we continue to be a vital downtown is my opinion. I'm not saying that for the restaurants. I'm saying it for all of us. I think we all need to move forward.

Chairman O'Brien

Ms. Blaisdell did you mention that you want to put that in a motion to follow the engineering study to go to two lanes?

Marylou Blaisdell

No, I don't. That's just my opinion. I'm open to whatever...

Chairman O'Brien

As would facilitate, I would like to entertain that motion and then we can have the discussion on the motion.

Co-Chairman Moran

I was on the same line of thinking as you Mister Co-Chair. I think...

Chairman O'Brien

Yeah I think to keep this – we could be here...

Co-Chairman Moran

I would just add two things. I think we need to understand that if we are doing four lanes, it has to be the parklets right Director Cummings? And if we do the two lanes, it's an end up being the barriers and the added cost of the parklets versus the inexpensiveness of the barriers but then also keeping in mind some delays in response time. I think we have to be clear on the two options.

Chairman O'Brien

Right? What I mean the two lanes will be the two lanes and then the barriers. The four lanes will be no barriers at all. That the barriers remain if they exist and that this isn't a bust, then it would be in the parking spaces.

Co-Chairman Moran

The parklets, right. Director Cummings how much of those parklets again?

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

If I may, Mr. Chair.

Chairman O'Brien

Yes.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

On average, you're looking at a per parklet cost of about a \$20,000 give or take. It could be a little more. It could be a little less. After the last meeting, I actually went back and did the math. If we were to do the entire area, you're going to be looking at approximately \$2 million in cost.

Chairman O'Brien

Do you want to make the motion Co-Chair?

Co-Chairman Moran

I get a lot of hands up. So...

Chairman O'Brien

A motion is always in order.

Co-Chairman Moran

So how we're going to make this motion?

Chairman O'Brien

Because I'm sure they will chime in to facilitate on discussion on the motion.

Co-Chairman Moran

I think we should start at the top of the four lanes and if that motion fails, then we go to the two lanes? I think it's worth starting - I think someone mentioned let's start at the top work our way down.

Chairman O'Brien

So you want to go with keeping the current four lanes.

Co-Chairman Moran

So in keeping in mind someone can make an opposite motion of this other one. So I motion to keep the four lanes of traffic with the use of the parklets in the downtown expanded dining project.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN TO KEEP THE FOUR LANES OF TRAFFIC USING THE \$20,000 PER PARKLETS INSTEAD OF THE BARRIERS ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Clemons

I won't be supporting that and I'm going to explain why. What I just heard, and I wrote this down, I wrote the figures down as he was saying this. So the City Engineer told us that there's 11 feet in each travel lane in either direction and that there's nine feet in the middle of those two travel lanes. Granted, there are spaces. Some of its intersection, some of it has those crosswalks that we all hate, and so there's obstructions but the majority of Main Street is nine feet clear and 11 feet of a travel lane.

In addition to that, in addition to that, there's five feet on either side that's going to be kept clear that wasn't kept clear in the last plan because it had the bike lanes. So that's a lot of feet. So what I hear from folks is that their concern is the ability for an emergency vehicle to make it down Main Street if there's traffic. With nine feet in the middle of most of Main Street and five feet on either side of each lane plus the fact that despite the opticom not working properly, they do work

and when a truck comes down, the light will turn green and people will clear. All of that into consideration, all of that into consideration, for me the emergency part of that is alleviating for myself. That was my main concern back in the meeting in December because I, too, was concerned about the response times. I think that the plan by - there is four lanes up in the top between Canal and Water Street. There will be four lanes. So I think most of the traffic goes north. So by having the lanes up there, which we didn't have in the previous two years, that's going to clear out the traffic. And so to me, yeah, there's going to be traffic and I think that that's something that downtown is a destination. Right? I in my career on the Board of Aldermen have worked very hard to make it a destination. Very hard. It didn't used to be. It used to be a ghost town. But now it's a place where people want to be.

And I think that the barrier program has revolutionized the downtown. I think that it's been good for both the restaurants and the retail business, as Marylou has stated and so for those reasons, for all of those reasons, I'm not going to support the motion of having two northbound and two southbound lanes in either direction. I don't think it's necessary. I think it's a cost prohibitive that money that we could spend better in other places. You want to talk about a burden to the taxpayer, spending \$2 million for parklets. I don't think is the right thing to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you.

Michael Buckley

Thank you, Chairman. I just want to add a little perspective and some insight from what I've learned here tonight regarding my comments earlier about the four lanes. As Tim and Engineer Hudson had pointed out, we don't actually have a bike lane. I thought we did. I guess that two to three foot was for opening of doors. It was my thought that if we move the barriers to the very edge of that, that would allow us to have the full inside curb or the full inside parking space for the dining which you would need because when you have a table, plus chairs, and an ability to walk around, you need that full eight feet. So once you start straddling that line and coming in closer and leaving five or six feet, it really renders it useless. We may as well not have it. I like a lot of what Alderman Clemons had to say. I think it's pretty valid as well as Marylou.

I think if we look at it that way where you have seems to be extra space now by getting rid of that bike lane and going to the other lanes, you can still have the full parking space and it would make it obviously, a nice destination for the restaurants. Let's face it if you don't have enough space here to do it right, nobody's going to want to utilize it. So it's either you do it right or you don't do it at all type of a situation.

Then we also didn't, you know, talk about some of the other things that I addressed before as well where there still needed to be some room to gain more parking spaces. I know this is something that maybe is something that has to be taken up next year but maybe it could be taken up this year seeing it as it's gonna be a little time still. But I think if it doesn't get taken up this year, it does need to be taken up next year which is prorating fees for the restaurants in order to make it more fair for the taxpayers and which I also want to point out that I think people forget that the businesses downtown are also taxpayers. I have a fairly large tax bill downtown. I do own property downtown and we also make rather large investments in the downside. So it's not like we don't have skin in the game. I just think it's important for the people out in zoom land to understand that I hear them and I'm here speaking for you guys as well because I tried to consider everyone. But don't think that because we're business owners downtown, that we don't have any stake in the game financially as far as tax burden or investments because we certainly do and it's very, very substantial.

I think that we could probably allow some type of a motion to - I don't know if that's something that I would do. I don't think I would feel comfortable doing it but if we wanted to study the two lanes thing, I think that probably at this point is really could be the only solution because now that I realized that there wasn't the space there I thought for the dining if we did it my way. I think it was clear that Engineer Hudson made it clear that you couldn't bring the traffic right to the barriers. There has to be a buffer and I wasn't really thinking of that earlier when I was kind of making the case for four lanes. It would be nice to have but there are reasons why maybe it isn't the best idea and I think slowing the traffic down is also not a bad idea for safety reasons as well. So that's just a little bit insight, especially on the amount of space that a restaurant needs which is really the full space. So once we come in a little bit further than that, it no longer works.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. So my fellow Aldermen no, I'm gonna go right down the line because you're all queued up. So okay.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To Alderman Clemons point, \$60,000 for barriers \$2 million - I don't see how that even makes sense to do that. It just - it's much cheaper to do the barriers to get the same thing. The parklets were beautiful. When I saw them, I thought they were free and I said go with the parklets but that's just way too much money.

The other thing too, is again with Alderman Clemons, I want it to be a destination. You know, this isn't Nashua 1970. Woolworths is not coming back. I'm a fourth generation Nashua. My grandmother used to say Nashua. So I know, right? The old stores aren't coming back. It's not a shopping center as much anymore but what I think and to Ms. Blaisdell's point which I think is a great one, she benefits from the dining experience in the summer. I would push for those businesses down there, especially businesses that offer a product that you can go in and buy to find a way to utilize that time. If it's open later on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, or something when it's the busiest because when they go downtown and they see your stuff, they want to buy it, right? I know not all businesses can do that. Unfortunately, like Wingate, you know, people aren't going to walk by and say I'm gonna go buy some compound medicine. So I get his point but I think it should be utilized in a way where you're gaining the most out of it.

My last point is to the public, right, and I wanted to mention this in the last meeting and I withdrew. But we've heard the public. They don't have to sit here to us not have heard them. We got hundreds and hundreds of e-mails. Most of us - I know I did I read every single one of them. Even when I knew who it was from and I knew what their opinion was going to be, I read the whole thing and we had a public hearing where tons of people spoke on both sides. So we've heard the public. I'm sure some of the things they've said have influenced us. So we haven't withdrew from the taxpayer. We're all taxpayers here. I think it's important to know that we do - I do take and I think all of us who take what the public says. Thank you for that input by the way. So thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you.

Alderman Cathey

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Excuse me. I did appreciate Alderman Clemons' comments and I appreciate his enthusiasm. I, however, would enthusiastically support a motion for four lanes for a few reasons. One - I have no problem spending ARP funds. It's our money. Let's spend it. We approved \$21 million for a riverfront and bonds, which was gonna hit the city at some point and taxpayers are gonna pay for it. We have a \$20 million PAC. Taxpayers are eventually gonna have to pay for that and now we're talking about \$2 million to get the thing that you want. It accomplishes two goals - taxpayers aren't paying for it and you get parklets which aren't ugly and that was half of the complaints. Now honestly if they are ugly or not ugly not really my concern but constituents have said, it looks ugly. That's two birds with one stone.

Also with the four lanes, the delivery trucks if they stopped - I think it would be hard to come up with some sort of resolution to stop delivery trucks for certain hours because they're on a schedule. They're on certain routes. They go to certain restaurants at certain times and so that may actually end up hurting businesses because they're not getting deliveries when they may need them. So if they do stop and they do in that one lane of traffic, that traffic is going to backup. We all know that. So because I don't think there's a clear path to keep the trucks off of Main Street, the four lane would seem like the better option because we can pay for it through ARP funds. We can get the parklets. It accomplishes a lot of goals.

Now obviously people want more space. I get that and honestly, long term I'm not against the pedestrian Main Street. I think that would be awesome. You want to be the Netherlands, let's do it. It's got to take time and right now we're trying to bite off too big of a chunk. So if you just take the parking space, that's phase one. A little bit of space. Maybe in a year or two, we take a little bit more space. Once the traffic gets used to it and we can mitigate and we can get that outflow going in different directions, now we're talking. Now we've got our heads going with a headwind and we're going in the right direction. But right now, let's just start small. We'll take the parking spaces and then we'll move on from there. So four lanes, I think is a great start. We can always amend next year if we think, you know, it's not good. We have three years to do this. That's why I would support that motion.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

If I may, Mr. Chair?

Chairman O'Brien

Yes you may, Director Cummings.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Thanks. I just need to clarify a couple of comments that were just made so just so it's factually accurate. The riverfront bond is not going to be paid by Nashua taxpayers. That's paid for a TIFF. So just want to make sure that that's clear.

And just an element that I want to make sure folks are aware of. I just want everyone to be aware of the fact that I can't guarantee that we will get the parklets in time for this year. It's probably something we could have for next year but we have a very close window. So whatever you decide, just keep that in the back of your mind. I will do the best that I can to get them in as quickly as possible but I'm subject to whatever the vendor tells us. So I just need you all to just be aware of that potential timing issue. Thank you.

Alderman Gouveia

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So just a few things that I've noticed through just looking at the analysis of the bill itself is the price to what's going to be to the taxpayers - \$115,000. There's lost meter revenue. There's reduction in parking enforcement revenue, the moving of the barriers, and the painting. You add those parklets in, it's a much bigger project and to go off of what my colleague next to me said about ARP funds with all due respect, they are taxpayer funds. It's just coming from a different tax. It might not be from our municipal tax, but it's coming through our federal taxes. It is taxpayer funds to us. I think to protect the taxpayer here and agree with what Alderman Clemons had to say, I think the only way this motion works is if the restaurants and the businesses that want to use these parklets are the ones who pay for the parklets. So with that being said, I'm going to move to amend the motion adding in that the parklets are paid for by the businesses who want to use them.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN GOUVEIA TO KEEP THE FOUR LANES OF TRAFFIC USING THE \$20,000 PER PARKLETS INSTEAD OF THE BARRIERS AND THAT THE PARKLETS ARE PAID FOR BY THE BUSINESSES WHO WANT TO USE THEM

Chairman O'Brien

Okay, there's an amendment on the motion. Any discussion on the amendment?

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Cathey

Is that non-debatable?

Unidentified Alderman

No.

Alderman Cathey

Okay. Sorry. I wasn't sure.

Co-Chairman Moran

I do appreciate my colleague's amended motion. I would just say that these are restaurants who are coming out of quite a dent that they had over two years. In coming down with this potentially being placed in May, there's a short turnaround for, you know, the cash for an independent business owner. I just want that to be mindful among the board. Yes we're talking about ARPA funds is coming from a federal pot of money but its money we got to spend. We got to spend it somehow. But I would just be mindful that these restaurants had have quite - went through the quite the wringer and we have to be mindful of that.

Alderman Klee

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commenting on the amendment of the parklets, I agree with what my colleague here said. Restaurants are coming out of this and to throw this to them at the last minute is just completely unfair. I remember when COVID hit and Mr. Buckley can probably speak to this, just the restaurants trying to get tables with umbrellas. They were running around trying to figure out where they were gonna get this money. Luckily a lot of the businesses stepped up and gave them umbrellas and we had to change city ordinances that allowed them to have it with advertising on it. So there was a lot of things that changed. I think to hit these restaurants, some of them are smaller restaurants. Some of them are larger as Mr. Buckley says and some of these restaurants are just kind of squeaking by finally seeing the light of day.

I did want to comment about the four lane but should I wait till after you talk about the amendment? I wanted to discuss something on the four lanes but I'll wait until you discuss the amendments. I'll let you do the amendment first and then I'll talk then. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. Further, Alderman Dowd.

Alderman Dowd

Yeah, a couple of things. One - no matter who we have paid for them, we still can't get them in any faster. So I wouldn't support the amendment right now. I think we should look at a short term plan and a long term plan. We're trying to do something for this summer starting in May and believe me, that's going to come a lot closer than you think especially when you get into budget season. So I don't think that, you know, these small restaurants can't afford that kind of a hit. It's not like we give them this extra dining space and they're making a few \$100,000. No. So you put most of them out of the picture on downtown dining will open up lanes for you but it would hurt a lot of people. So I can't support the amendment and I hope at some point that we can have a long-term plan and a short-term plan to address, you know, and I think we ought to focus on the short-term plan which is what do we do for May this year? Then I'll have other comments when we come back into the circles. It's on next on the four lanes.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Can I ask Mr. Buckley a question, please?

Chairman O'Brien

Yes you may.

Alderman Thibeault

Mr. Buckley being one of the busiest restaurants two of them on the street if you had to pay \$20,000 a parklet is that something you would entertain?

Michael Buckley

I can tell you this that I think people are forgetting that it's not just this whole what we're talking about is not just for the restaurants contrary to what some people may think. It's for the vitality of the downtown. If you think that we're making all kinds of money off of a few tables on Main Street, it's a nice add but it's not - I wouldn't say I wouldn't want to spend that kind of money personally but I could probably afford it. I think that if I'm the only one and maybe one other restaurant on Main Street can do it, then what are we doing? It won't work. Personally whether I was paying for them or not, I don't think that's the answer. I personally think those things are not safe. If somebody careened into them, whoever sitting behind him is going to get crushed. I think they look nice. I think for what we have downtown, because now you're talking about speeding the traffic back up again, it's just not the right answer. It's very expensive. I think we're kind of missing the point of it. You would basically say, okay 90% of the restaurants downtown you're not gonna get parklets because most of them aren't going to spend that money and myself included. Do you know how many fish tacos I got to sell to make the bottom line because that's right off the bottom line? It just doesn't make sense.

It's really comes back to what do you want your downtown to be? If you want it to be vital and that's these are the things that make it vital, and I still don't think the parklets are the answer personally. That's not the route I would go. So I probably wouldn't do it just because I don't think they're the right answer from any standpoint. I think the ones we have

can be painted, can be implemented better, like with the plan that we have. I think they could even be tapered back a little bit more. I think with the implementation of some permitting fees, which will maybe be substantial enough to make some impact to alleviate some of the burden for the taxpayers, is appropriate and I'd be 100% willing to do that. I'm talking about fees that are sizable enough that they actually are impactful and maybe will make the people that don't utilize it properly say geez I don't really want to spend that kind of money. But when you start talking about \$20,000 parklets, which are how many seats does that get? What does one of those seat Tim? How big are they?

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

They're roughly one parking space. So you know, about 8 feet by 18 feet.

Michael Buckley

So you're gonna get a couple three tables.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

I was just gonna say (inaudible)

Michael Buckley

So I'm going need three of them.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Correct, you would.

Michael Buckley

So it's \$60 grand for me. No, thank you. I just don't think it's the right answer.

Alderman Thibeault

Thank you. That's a perfect answer. Thank you.

Alderman Cathey

PI?

Chairman O'Brien

Oh, go ahead.

Alderman Cathey

Can you amend an amendment?

Alderman Klee

You have to vote it and then...

Chairman O'Brien

Vote it up or down and then – we could confuse this.

Alderman Cathey

I thought that might be the case, but it wasn't sure.

Chairman O'Brien

I'm already confused. Okay.

Alderman Comeau

Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I don't support the city making the expenditure for the parklets. I don't really support them at all. I think it's the wrong solution. So that being said, I would reluctantly support the amendment because I don't want the city to have to pay for them but I don't think that we should be getting them at all. So hopefully that didn't confuse you any further. Thank you.

President Wilshire

Thank you. I won't support the parklets. I don't think they're fundamentally the cure to the problems that we have. I don't think that - they're attractive. They look nice but if you're, you know, putting them on the front of a magazine, that's fine but to put them into use just doesn't seem to - they don't seem to be safe. So for that reason, I won't support anything to do with parklets except voting them down.

Commissioner Paul Shea

Thank you, Mr. Chair. On the topic of safety in relation to the parklets like and don't get me wrong, like I cut my teeth downtown on parklets. We had this parking day. Somebody thought it was a good idea to allow us to rent parking spaces for the day for \$10 bucks a piece. We put sod out. We built a community garden and parking spaces. This was like in 2012 and, you know, I love the idea of parklets. Montreal I think is a place where it's a pretty popular practice. I would agree that it's cost prohibitive. If you had asked me 10 years ago, 9 years ago how I felt about this, I'd be like yes. Everyone let's get the parklets, let's do it right away, we need more parklets. In any case, I digress.

On the topic of safety in relation to the parklets, I wrote to Chief Buxton to inquire about areas of concern and whether or not they were adequately addressed. He identified four areas of concern. I think that two are germane to this part of the conversation. One being that he wrote if seating is to be placed in the street parking areas, they should be protected by a hard barrier. It is my belief and I can't speak for Chief Buxton on how he would read this but that the parklets do not satisfy what would be defined as a hard barrier.

In in 2015 in Niece, France, there was this Bastille Day incident where a person who was not in the right frame of mind drove into a crowd and hurt and, I believe, killed a lot of people. When that event happened, we had an emergency meeting about the Holiday Stroll. This was my first year in my previous role as Executive Director of Great American Downtown. We had an emergency meeting. I was on the job for four months and we have very serious conversations about hard barriers. They are they're super important to safety. As much as you would like to think that everybody is a good driver and that, you know, people are not at risk, that's simply not true. I would concur as much as I would love to see more deckage out there, that, you know, it's not the right solution from a safety standpoint.

The other piece that Chief Buxton raised is that the Nashua Fire Rescue desire that there'll be a break between barriers of approximately four feet to allow for access in the event of an emergency - not just for fire related emergencies, but also for more frequent medical emergencies that they respond to. The spacing would allow for access for a stretcher. If you have a deck built out in parking spaces, you're not going to have gaps in the deck. The combination of not having the clearance that Nashua Fire Rescue has asked for, along with not satisfying the request that there be hard barriers in place to protect people while they're enjoying themselves, you know, those two things combined I think make the idea of parklets a non-starter from a safety standpoint. Thank you.

Alderman Dowd

Just one additional thing. I don't think this motion or the other motion can allocate funds. It can either be done by finance or Budget. So you can make a recommendation and somebody has to come up with legislation to fund this but you can't make it part of this motion. It's not authorized.

Alderman Clemons

Only to that point, I think everything we're doing here is a recommendation so.

Chairman O'Brien

Alright without further questions, we can move the amendment. Okay. Can the Clerk refresh everybody because there's been a lot of discussion on the amendment?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN GOUVEIA TO KEEP THE FOUR LANES OF TRAFFIC USING THE \$20,000 PER PARKLETS INSTEAD OF THE BARRIERS AND THAT THE PARKLETS ARE PAID FOR BY THE BUSINESSES WHO WANT TO USE THEM

Chairman O'Brien

I will call on this one the roll call vote. So the Clerk can call – I hate to do it to you. You can write on a separate piece of paper. Thank you.

A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Comeau, Alderman Gouveia, Alderman Cathey 3

Nay: Alderman Dowd, Alderman Jette, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Thibeault,
Marylou Blaisdell, Commissioner Paul Shea, Cathy Cardin-Smith, Michael Buckley,
Ruth Boland, Alderman Moran, Alderman O'Brien 11

MOTION FAILED

Chairman O'Brien

Without objection, I will call the pending question.

Alderman Dowd

You haven't got done with all the comments on the original motion.

Chairman O'Brien

Yes. Is there anything further?

Alderman Dowd

We got this far and....

Chairman O'Brien

I'll tell you what we'll do, we'll add a little decorum and that way I think I could take a little bit of a bathroom break if I may. If the coach here can kind of watch things, make sure they're on their best behavior.

Co-Chairman Moran

I think we can do that.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. To be fair and if you so allow, we'll start here.

Co-Chairman Moran

I'll take over.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN TO KEEP THE FOUR LANES OF TRAFFIC USING THE \$20,000 PER PARKLETS INSTEAD OF THE BARRIERS

ON THE QUESTIONAlderman Dowd

Okay. I think the motion, I think, is for four lanes with the parklets. I won't support it for a couple of reasons. One - I think we just said the parklets aren't something we want to do. And two - part of the program already has four lanes. I would like to see if we can't do four lanes and some places that we have three lanes so that we have a middle lane to allow for emergency vehicles. But to just mandate four lanes by itself and the fact that parklets are mentioned, I'm not supporting it.

Co-Chairman Moran

Thank you Alderman Dowd. Anyone else on that side?

Alderman Jette

So the issue, I guess, the motion we're discussing now is whether or not we're going to have four lanes with parklets. I think when you made the motion, I wondered if that's really the motion you were trying to make because right now we Main Street has seven lanes. So there are two parking lanes on either end. There are two lanes going north, two lanes going south, and a lane in the middle. So that's what we're dealing with right now out there.

With the barriers, one of the products of the barriers is that we're going to like we did in previous years, we're going to limit the travel lanes one north, one south, and there still be a middle lane. So there are three lanes and then you've got the two parking lanes for a lot of the areas would be used for the dining. So I think when Ms. Boland and Ms. Cardin-Smith we're talking about four lanes, I think they're talking about the possibility of not having barriers at all. So you can have the four travel lanes. I think they're talking about and what we have now - two parking lanes, two lanes north, two lane south, and a lane in the middle. The parklets were only to provide dining in in the street. I thought when Engineer Hudson was speaking, you know, I first thought he was saying that if you put the barrier in the parking lane, that it's two feet wide. So you need the parking lane. I think he said was eight feet. So it would reduce it down to six feet and at first I thought that was doable but hearing from I think Mr. Buckley is saying that that's not that's not wide enough there.

So I think, you know, as far as the motion that's before us going to four lanes with parklets, I'm not in favor of that. At first I thought we could go to four lanes of travel, and a middle lane, and then dining in what is the parking lanes. But it sounds like that's not going to be doable. I think I've come to the conclusion that the only way that we can make this work is one lane north, one lane south, and a turning lane in the middle. And then as Engineer Hudson said, you know, provide a buffer before the barrier and then the barrier is far enough from the curb so that you can accommodate tables to make it worthwhile for the restaurants. So I think that's probably where I'm going to end up on this.

I do think by eliminating the barriers between Park Street and Water Street and Canal and Franklin, I think and I hope that that's going to do a lot to improve, you know, one of the objections that people have to the barriers and that's the traffic congestion, right? I'm hoping that by eliminating that bottleneck that has existed, you know, where you've got traffic coming north on Main Street, you've got traffic turning from Park Street going north on Main Street, you've got traffic coming from Water Street turning north on Main Street, and all having to go across one lane over the bridge, and then you're getting to Canal Street. I think that that was the pinch point, which I think caused the backup of the traffic for the rest of Main Street, and the intersections, and the gridlock. I'm hoping that by eliminating those barriers, that'll relieve that pinch point and relieve the traffic congestion in those other areas. So I will not support returning to the four lanes. Thank you.

Co-Chairman Moran

So before I turn it over to Alderman O'Brien, so obviously I made the motion...did you want to go? So sorry.

Alderman Jette

She had her hand up.

Co-Chairman Moran

So sorry. Thank you Alderman Jette.

Unidentified Female Speaker

I think a lot of information has been really clarified tonight. The fact that Michael said he needs that eight feet in order to do this, you know, I can appreciate that make it worthwhile. I also appreciate Ben stating, you know, the measurements and Dan stating what we have for space. I'd be willing to compromise as Mr. Jette has just said because I think we have to move on with this and I think a lot of really good information has been brought forth and let's keep let's keep going.

Co-Chairman Moran

Thank you for that. So I came into this meeting wanting the four lanes to work. Only made this motion to start at the top and work our way down, right? I was recently in Santa Monica and the parklets work there. We don't have Santa Monica money. Santa Monica is much different than Nashua, New Hampshire. It looks beautiful the parklets. They have two lanes of traffic flowing but \$2 million at this moment, I don't think it's advisable even though it would come from ARPA funds. I think we can best use that somewhere else in the city to make improvements. What really changed my opinion was hearing Mr. Hudson and Mr. Buckley regarding the practicality of the changes that would need to occur and the math - just basic math. So initially was going to support this and I think at this point I won't.

Alderman Klee

I know I'm not a voting member on this but I do want to point out some things. When Director Cummings' plan was first brought forward to us and I looked at it, I think I may have spoken to Alderman Clemons and I was quite excited by it. The amount of parking that went back. I think last time we lost 75 parking spaces. This time we're losing 44 parking spaces. I think the compromises and I thank Peddlers for being the sacrificial lamb in all of this. I mean, they're the ones truly taking it in the shorts - pardon my language - but they truly are the ones that are taking it for the greater good.

But having said that when I first saw the plan to Aldermen Dowd's comments, my first thought was okay I love this plan but...but I want to see all these changes made. I think Director Cummings has heard me on and on about change West Pearl around, get rid of the little bumps that are in the road, get rid of that as well as maybe attractive the little islands in the middle. The issue I have with four lanes of traffic, even beyond the barriers, is as a person who drives down Main Street almost every single day and probably all of you do the same thing here, I don't know how many times I never drive in that left lane. I only drive in the right lane. The reason for it is because people don't want to go to those mid intersection crosswalks or the crosswalks. The cars there, they walk out and come out in front of it. So I drive truly like a little old lady waiting for someone to come out in front of my car. The reason I don't go in the left lane is because I cannot tell you how many times - and it's happened to me as well - is that you see a car pulled there and you don't know are they pulling into a parking space? Are they waiting for someone to come in front of them? Is there someone in delivery there and you go around them only to almost hit that person that you can't see either. Two lanes of traffic in a main street is very, very dangerous. I'm talking about that 12 months out of the year.

But putting that aside if we do the four lanes as was originally suggested, one of the things you're going to have is twice as much traffic as you had last year. That's twice as much exhaust for those people that are sitting there trying to eat at those restaurants. Twice as much noise at those lights. So really think about it. Are you enhancing or hurting what you're trying to do by putting four lanes of traffic in there? I think two lanes of travel is really what you want to go with. I don't have a vote in this committee but I always have an opinion. Thank you.

President Wilshire

Thank you. We talked a lot about the pinch points and where the traffic is and I think that's been addressed in this amended format, which I appreciate. I know coming out of West Pearl Street was awful. You'd sit at the light cycle three or four times, you know, at five o'clock and the Canal Street intersection as well. I think that's really going to make a big difference. We've added more parking on Main Street. I think this plan can work for now. I mean, certainly the first two years we did it, we didn't know much about this, right? We'd never done it before to this magnitude anyway. But now that we have the experience of you know what we've learned over the last two years, I think we go with this plan and tweak it if something's not working.

I think we've done a lot to address things here, including additional parking on Main Street. I mean there's plenty of parking downtown but people want to park in front of the business they go to. They got used to that. That's how the old Nashua was but that's not how Nashua is anymore. You drive into Boston, you don't park right in front of the restaurant you want to go to. You park a block away in a parking garage and that's what's happening here. It is. You can't just park in front of the pharmacy or the retail shop that you want. Its growing pains and people don't like that. I think that we really should go with the plan as it's been laid out. I think we revisit it when we have to, if we have to, and move on from there. I

think a lot of compromise has been made. So that's where I'm going with us. Thank you.

Ruth Boland

The conversation seems to have moved away from the amendment a little bit. So I want to throw my two cents worth then. I want to remind everybody that we are talking about doing extended parking again and everybody talks about how it's revitalizing downtown, etc., but downtown Nashua on a nice summer night on Friday and Saturday night it is its pretty exciting. But nine to five every day nobody is sitting in those spaces. It's just a wasteland. I mean restaurants don't even open till four. The Mexican restaurant next to me is open for lunch but there's nobody sitting there. There was the first year they couldn't go inside. There was restricted dining, but they didn't have a lunch crowd. So if there's somebody sitting in the street, they could be sitting on the sidewalk. There's never been anybody during the week, during the day that needs to be sitting there this whole summer. If they were sitting in the street, there was room sitting on the sidewalk tables too.

I don't want to lose track of that in the discussion that I'm not even sure we should be doing extended outdoor dining. Yes outdoor dining on the sidewalks as we've always had but this discussion seems to be just an assumption that we are going to do it. I know a lot of works been put into it and it is much better than last year. But the fact remains that during the day, people aren't using the extended outdoor dining. They're not, not when the businesses are open. It's not just the (inaudible) retail. There's all the other businesses that are not on the street that are upstairs and their customers have to come downtown.

We had this parking study that was presented to us and you asked people who are downtown who are on a mission how far will you walk? That's a different question than asking somebody if you know you have to walk three blocks to park will you go downtown or will you go somewhere where you know you're gonna be able to park closer than that. Whole different question.

The other question I had with the parking study was presented was, you know, only 50% of our parking places are utilized. When did they do that? Was it are the residential type parking? Were they looking at it at night when people are parking or are they looking at it at during the day while they're at work? Or the downtown business were they looking at it while people are downtown or were they looking at it at night when everything is closed? There weren't a lot of details. So you can always - whenever you have statistics, you can manipulate things not that anything that was said was untrue but it was all meaningless to me because we weren't able to ask questions of the presentation.

So just want to throw that out there. I'm not convinced that we should have extended dining. I was kind of excited by the idea that oh maybe they could just do the parking spaces but you know, we do have a restaurant expert here who said no that's not enough space. So that's kind of off the table. I also think that, you know, we keep talking about everybody else is doing this while everybody else is charging for it to my understanding. It's what I've been told by Mr. Wingate. Concord and Portsmouth were the places that he gave me numbers for. So I think that before we have a plan, we need to decide are we going to charge, what are we going to charge, and ask the restaurants if they want that space given that, you know, you're going to have to pay \$2,000 for a parking space for five months? They may not want it because you know what they don't have that many people that they need to sit out there. Surf on a Saturday night, you need that space but most of the restaurants maybe the outdoor space is full, but they still have room inside. So we say all restaurants needed it. I don't know that they do need it. Mr. Buckley just said that you don't really make that much money on a few extra tables. So I'm not sure it's for the restaurants. I think it's for this concept of this vibrant downtown, but it's really not vibrant during the day. It's not great.

Less people coming downtown. The businesses can't - people don't want to come because of the parking which I know there are only 45 spaces but they're the good 45 spaces. Maybe they move. Maybe they're not downtown anymore and maybe the landlords have to raise the rent price that the restaurants are paying. I don't know. But I just wanted to bring the big picture back a little bit of what that's been commented a lot by the public and everybody. I'm done.

Co-Chairman Moran

Those are all very valid points and I think the point of this motion is to clear out the four lanes of traffic and we still have more work to do in regards to potentially fees that we can recommend, getting permission from the neighbor to take storefront space is something that we should also discuss, and anytime I'm sure anyone can propose a motion that we don't do outdoor dining. Right now I think that's something I'm not going to propose but I think it could be discussed at some point but those are valid. You know I go downtown. I think Mike and I ran into each other at Peddlers Daughter the other day on St. Patrick's Day. This is, in my opinion, a way to make Saturday and Friday night be Monday night, Tuesday night, Thursday night, more than just the two nights that it's mostly packed. I think that's the direction we want to

go in as a city but does the entire board think that? I don't know.

President Wilshire

Thank you. One of the things that I think we need to be looking at is not just what's happened in the last two years but what's going to happen over the next in the future. We have a performing arts center that's going to be opening and with that comes some more filled up storefronts on the street. Maybe there will be more demand. I mean this has only been in effect for two years and during a pandemic. Maybe once the performing arts center and other things move in and they will have daytime needs for restaurants and shopping. So I think we need to look more long term and not just what's happened over the last two years. I think we can just keep revisiting this until its right. That's my thought.

Chairman O'Brien

We're debating whether to move the motion. I will allow because if we look at Mr. Clock over there.

Alderman Klee

Thank you and I will try to make this really quick. The thing that we do have to keep in mind here is that the first year was a pandemic. The second year fine. People can say you could go in it wasn't a pandemic but it was also one year. One year that had a lot of rain in it, had a lot of sun but more rain than anything else like that. I can tell you, I'm a person who goes during the daytime. I consider myself an old person and I like to be home or going to meetings here in City Hall at seven o'clock to god know when. But the bottom line is you're only looking at one year.

All the pictures that we saw of that one year does not paint a picture. Director Cummings can correct me if I'm wrong but I believe that most people look at three years as a good sample, not one year. So to turn around and say that one year the tables were empty and so on, I think we're being short sighted. So I'll stop there and I know Alderman Clemons...

Alderman Clemons

I move the question.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO MOVE THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

Well, he was it gonna do it. It's not debatable, but I want to please excuse me but I know but as Chair I just want to have our civilian guests. I know they have businesses so I will accept the motion to move this. Thank you.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN TO KEEP THE FOUR LANES OF TRAFFIC USING THE \$20,000 PER PARKLETS INSTEAD OF THE BARRIERS

Chairman O'Brien

And the Clerk will call for a roll call for verification.

Alderman Clemons

Point of order. Is this on the question to move the question or is this on the question?

Chairman O'Brien

Oh, geez. I didn't even do that. Sorry.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman O'Brien

Now we'll get back. Thank you for your correction. Now we have the pending motion. Can the Clerk go over the pending motion?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN MORAN TO KEEP THE FOUR LANES OF TRAFFIC USING THE \$20,000 PER PARKLETS INSTEAD OF THE BARRIERS

A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:

Yea:		0
Nay:	Alderman Dowd, Alderman Comeau, Alderman Gouveia, Alderman Jette, Alderman Cathey, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Thibeault, Marylou Blaisdell, Commissioner Paul Shea, Cathy Cardin-Smith, Michael Buckley, Ruth Boland, Alderman Moran, Alderman O'Brien	14

MOTION FAILED

Alderman Comeau

There's a whole lot of Nos and no yeses.

Alderman Clemons

Thank you. I would - there's no motion in front of us right now, right?

Chairman O'Brien

Not right now no.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO HAVE THIS GROUP VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PLAN THAT WAS PRESENTED IN THE ORIGINAL BILL AND TO WORK, AS YOU SUGGESTED, BLOCK BY BLOCK DOWN THE MAP AND TWEAK IT AS WE GO. BUT TO VOTE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE, THAT THAT'S THE DIRECTION THAT WE ARE MOVING

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Clemons

That is my motion and I'd like to just speak briefly to that. I think what that enables us to do is to move forward in one direction and put any other questions behind us. We can tweak it as we go, make suggestions block by block. I think there were things even that Director Cummings wanted us to add and subtract and we can debate each block and things like that. At least the point of the motion is to move forward in one direction and so that would be my...

Alderman Dowd

I think you motion is the actual motion that we've been discussing. It says to approve the plan. So unless you're amending that motion...

Chairman O'Brien

There's no pending motion that I know of.

Alderman Comeau

We didn't make a motion.

Alderman Dowd

So are you making the motion that's on the agenda?

Alderman Clemons

Yes, it's to recommend final passage.

Chairman O'Brien

It's strategically to go from the north to the south, block by block, and discuss it, and come up with that particular solution per block so that we can...

Alderman Clemons

That is my motion.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO GO FROM NORTH TO THE SOUTH, BLOCK BY BLOCK, AND DISCUSS IT, AND COME UP WITH THE PARTICULAR SOLUTION PER BLOCK

Alderman Comeau

Parliamentary inquire just because Alderman Clemons mentioned the words "final passage". We're not recommending final passage. This is not a committee meeting.

Alderman Clemons

Correct. This is just a plan moving forward on how to discuss the proposal in front of us.

Chairman O'Brien

Block by block. So what Alderman Clemons - just for clarity, we're discussing strategy and how we're going to come to the conclusion.

Alderman Clemons

Yeah so my motion, and I will repeat it, The motion is to review the plan that is in the ordinance, and I don't have it in front of me but in the ordinance, block by block, from north to south, with the idea that there's going to be two lanes of traffic on Main Street but most of Main Street.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO REVIEW THE PLAN THAT IS IN THE ORDINANCE BLOCK BY BLOCK, FROM NORTH TO SOUTH, WITH THE IDEA THAT THERE'S GOING TO BE TWO LANES OF TRAFFIC ON MOST OF MAIN STREET

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Dowd

It's probably not a good amendment. I'd like to amend that to say that due to the civilians we have working with us tonight that we don't take up any new position on anything after 10 o'clock that we adjourn.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO AMEND THAT DUE TO THE CIVILIANS WE HAVE WORKING WITH US TONIGHT THAT WE DON'T TAKE UP ANY NEW POSITION ON ANYTHING AFTER 10 O'CLOCK TONIGHT AND THAT WE ADJOURN

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

Well I was gonna - the Chair was gonna say after his motion, the Chair was gonna have a straw poll to find out what the flavor of the board wants to do. If they don't want to continue hashing with this, I'm okay because I understand they have businesses to open up tomorrow. I think Mr. Buckley needs a good stock that he's got to make tonight or something like that. I was gonna ask that question but we could put that in as a 10 o'clock.

Alderman Dowd

Yeah and usually after 10 o'clock you start making good...

Chairman O' Brien

So you civilians, we're night owls. We'd stay here til 11. I don't know why but we do.

President Wilshire

So anything that we take up in this workgroup gets back to the Joint committee. Just so that's clear.

Alderman Cathey

I would just like to say that I would support Alderman Dowd's amendment and I think we should take a vote on it.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO AMEND THAT DUE TO THE CIVILIANS WE HAVE WORKING WITH US TONIGHT THAT WE DON'T TAKE UP ANY NEW POSTION ON ANYTHING AFTER 10 O'CLOCK TONIGHT AND FOR ALL FUTURE MEETINGS AND THAT WE ADJOURN

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

All right. The amendment is that we shall not go past 10 o'clock on all future meetings?

Alderman Dowd

Good for me.

Chairman O'Brien

If you're doing it for now...

Alderman Dowd

Unless there's a vote of the committee to extend it, then yes.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay. So clarify just what your motion is. I think I might have confused you.

Alderman Dowd

It's to not take up any new actions after 10 o'clock in this meeting and in any meetings going forward. That doesn't mean we stop talking if we're in the middle of something, you know, just leave but we don't take up anything new after 10 o'clock.

And I'll tell you where that comes from. When I was Chairman of the Zoning Board upstairs, that we actually went to 11. But at 11, it was a drop dead and it went to the next night. We can't do it here, but and it was because any decisions that were being made after 11 o'clock at night, even after 10, we're very suspect and not very good. I think and in this instance, in deference to the people that do have businesses that they have to work tomorrow, I don't think and certainly healthcare professionals that we probably don't want to keep them out too late.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Further discussion on the amendment?

Commissioner Paul Shea

Though I greatly appreciate the consideration that Alderman Dowd his afforded us in his motion and proposal, this is the second night that we are here. I would really like to see us complete this conversation tonight. I work an evening shift myself. So I'm a little opposite the clock of what everybody else is doing and had to do a good bit of hustling to be here and join you. I don't know that there is an intent. I could misunderstand the nature of conversation here but I don't know

that there's an intent to have future meetings of this group but it is my view, if that is a possibility, that we can adequately discuss and resolve this issue as a Task Force tonight.

Chairman O'Brien

The Chair can clarify. The intent is - so mark your calendars - that until we have this resolved, keep in mind we have a target date as it sits right now May 1st. So there will be meetings up until whenever we get resolved. I have booked possibly March 30th and 31st. So if you could scribe them in your calendar because I'm really on a rush. We're into April and I think Alderman Dowd will say we're into his budget season eating up space for a room. So it gets difficult.

President Wilshire

I don't support the 10 o'clock cut off because we have such a short timeframe to get this done. So that's my concern. I think if we have to go another half hour to get things wrapped up that we do and probably should vote on that at each meeting and not just all future meetings. That's my input.

Alderman Clemons

I agree with Alderman Wilshire. I agree with Commissioner Shea. I think we just need to make that decision on a case by case basis. So I won't support the motion.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay.

Alderman Dowd

I'll modify the motion to eliminate the part on every meeting, henceforth, but it's already quarter to 10. If anybody thinks that we're going to have a final resolution on this soon, not tonight.

Chairman O'Brien

I agree, but...

Alderman Clemons

With all due respect to the maker of the motion, these kinds of debates are the reason why we're being held by. So again, I would move the question.

**MOTION BY ALDERMEN CLEMONS TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION CARRIED**

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO AMEND THAT DUE TO THE CIVILIANS WE HAVE WORKING WITH US
TONIGHT THAT WE DON'T TAKE UP ANY NEW POSTION ON ANYTHING AFTER 10 O'CLOCK TONIGHT AND FOR
ALL FUTURE MEETINGS AND THAT WE ADJOURN**

ON THE QUESTION

Unidentified Female Speaker

Just cuz I am so confused. We have a motion that we basically pass the plan as stated here.

Alderman Clemons

That's not what we're debating right now.

Unidentified Female Speaker

But that's what your motion is?

Alderman Clemons

Originally, yes.

Unidentified Female Speaker

Your original motion was that we pass the plans as presented.

Alderman Clemons

No way original motion was to work through the plan.

Unidentified Female Speaker

Okay.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay, call the roll call.

Alderman Comeau

Alright. So the motion is that no new action will be taken after 10pm. An affirmative yes vote is that no new action will be taken after 10 p.m.

A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:

Yea: Alderman Dowd, Alderman Comeau, Alderman Gouveia, Alderman Jette, Alderman Cathey, Marylou Blaisdell, Ruth Boland, Alderman Moran	8
Nay: Alderman Clemons, Alderman Thibeault, Commissioner Paul Shea, Cathy Cardin-Smith, Michael Buckley, Alderman O'Brien	6

MOTION CARRIED

Chairman O'Brien

So motion compasses. So we got a 10 o'clock jump. Okay.

Alderman Comeau

If I may Mr. Chair, your motion as I've written it down, I just want to make sure that I've written down your intent because I cleaned up the words a little bit. Motion is from Alderman Clemons to approve the one traveling in each direction as written in the current plan and review the proposal block by block for amendments to the current proposal.

Alderman Clemons

Correct. Thank you for cleaning that up.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO APPROVE THE ONE TRAVELING IN EACH DIRECTION AS WRITTEN IN THE CURRENT PLAN AND REVIEW THE PROPOSAL BLOCK BY BLOCK FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CURRENT PROPOSAL

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Dowd

I mean it's almost ten minutes to ten but we can start discussing it and if we're on a particular, for instance, we're in a particular block, the way I stressed my motion is we can finish that block, but not go on to another block. If you think we're going to go through the entire downtown in the next hour or two, we won't be making good decisions.

Chairman O'Brien

Any further discussion on the motion? Yes Ms. Boland.

Ruth Boland

I'm confused because I think you've just said that we approve it, and then discuss it, and then somebody asked earlier are you saying do we approve it and it was no. So can you read that one more time?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO APPROVE THE ONE TRAVELING IN EACH DIRECTION AS WRITTEN IN THE CURRENT PLAN AND REVIEW THE PROPOSAL BLOCK BY BLOCK FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CURRENT PROPOSAL

Alderman Comeau

So as I understand it, I don't want to put words in Alderman Clemons' mouth. All we're doing is moving forward with the affirmative that we're going to do the one traveling in each direction but then we will be able to review Mr. Cummings' plan for the revisions that he's recommended and anything else block by block that we want to discuss.

Chairman O'Brien

Ms. Boland if I may as the Chair, the intention here is to come up with a strategy for the next meeting that we come down to. I have to agree with this and myself personally because I think it will assist us to continue to move on. Some of the things that you might have been confused on - hopefully this will clean up some of them. This is a positive step but I don't want to taint you but the Chair concurs with this particular motion.

Ruth Boland

So I just want to clarify. So we are voting to approve that there will not be four lanes of traffic and that will be a final decision recommendation then.

Alderman Clemons

Yes.

Ruth Boland

Which therefore assumes that there will be extended outdoor dining.

Alderman Clemons

Yes.

Chairman O'Brien

Yes.

Alderman Comeau

So as the motion is written, a yes vote will affirm that the barriers will extend out into the right most traveling leaving one traveling in each direction.

Chairman O'Brien

I apologize for not being further clearer. I thank you. Okay. Any other further discussion on the motion?

Alderman Thibeault

Very quickly. I just want to apologize for the citizens that we've asked here tonight to not again get through this because we had bouts of time where we had to talk like I am right now about things that aren't part of what we're trying to talk

about. Now we're gonna have two maybe three meetings and I think that's not fair to you guys to have you come out again. I think in some ways it's a stall tactic and it's just we're running out of time to Mrs. Blaisdell's point, we are running out of time. So thank you.

Commissioner Paul Shea

May I motion to move the question?

**MOTION BY COMMISSIONER SHEA TO MOVE THE QUESTION
MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman O'Brien

Okay, one day, two days, three, days? Okay three days. The question has passed and the motion is so moved. Will the Clerk please - does everybody understand that need a reading?

Unidentified Female Speaker

Can you read it one more time?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO APPROVE THE ONE TRAVELING IN EACH DIRECTION AS WRITTEN IN THE CURRENT PLAN AND REVIEW THE PROPOSAL BLOCK BY BLOCK FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CURRENT PROPOSAL

A Viva Voce Roll Call was taken, which resulted as follows:

- | | |
|--|----|
| Yea: Alderman Dowd, Alderman Jette, Alderman Clemons, Alderman Thibeault,
Marylou Blaisdell, Commissioner Paul Shea, Cathy Cardin-Smith,
Michael Buckley, Alderman Moran, Alderman O'Brien | 10 |
| Nay: Alderman Comeau, Alderman Gouveia, Alderman Cathey, Ruth Boland | 4 |

MOTION CARRIED

Alderman Cathey

Okay. All right. I would like to motion that this proposal now that it's been essentially recommended for us to discuss in Mr. Cummings form in his presentation. I'd like to motion that that proposal comes with expenditures, how much we're going to spend, and then that also comes with a full traffic study - the traffic that is affected by Main Street so we can use it for the next upcoming years and we can see what's really happening on Main Street.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CATHEY THAT THIS PROPOSAL COMES WITH EXPENDITURES ON HOW MUCH WE'RE GOING TO SPEND AND A FULL TRAFFIC STUDY

ON THE QUESTION

Chairman O'Brien

The Chair could probably say that some of this has already been pre done. Director Cummings would you like to...

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Yes, happy to address some of those points made. The ordinance before you has a fiscal note, which outlines the expenses that we are anticipating to date. However, I'd be more than happy to provide that to you additionally. I don't have it at my fingertips. Right now, I can tell you - if you don't hold me to it I can roughly tell you off the top of my head. I will caveat it by saying I'll follow up with the communication with this tomorrow. \$20,000 for the painting. It's going to be between \$40,000 and \$60,000 for actual dropping of the barriers. We escrowed that money in previous years. We will try to use the DPW as much as possible for the implementation of this project, though I will note as the timeline gets more condensed we're probably going to need to use an outside vendor.

The loss of revenue, parking enforcement somewhere between \$5,000 and \$8,000, and then parking revenue from meters and what not is I want to say approximately \$40,000.

Chairman O'Brien

Okay and Director Cummings besides a fiscal note, could you supply the traffic?

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Yes, I think it would be prudent of us to collect the data and provide a data report. I wouldn't suggest just for next year but I think throughout the progress of this through the summer. I can tell you that NRPC has over the years counted the traffic. I can make those counts available to you and then I will work with City Engineer Hudson to develop what would be an appropriate traffic study for you or for, again, the end of this year but also for purposes for next year.

Alderman Cathey

Follow up if I may? I'd like to amend my motion to get rid of the expenditure part because that question was answered. Thank you. To have a traffic study and then a revenue study as well because the Mayor has talked about they did a study and we had X amount of dollars but we as Aldermen at least I have not seen hard numbers. I think it behooves us to give ourselves and the public hard numbers because let's say those numbers come back and they are I mean, they're jamming. It's gonna be real hard to argue with, you know, \$2 million, \$4 million, or \$5 million of revenue.

MOTION BY ALDERMAN CATHEY TO AMEND BY REMOVING THE EXPENDITURE PART

ON THE QUESTION

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Can I speak to that Mr. Chair?

Chairman O'Brien

You absolutely may.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

I agree with Alderman Cathey and actually today I reached out to an economic consultant, actually, someone who you all may know - Steve Michaud. He is an economic development consultant who is very well respected. Because I believe we should get an economic impact study done. I am soliciting quotes right now and my goal would be to exactly do what you're saying, which is study it this year so by the end of the season you'll have actually real numbers for positive or negative economic impact.

Alderman Cathey

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Any other requests of Director Cummings for information prior to the next meeting?

Alderman Clemons

I guess it's a question is Alderman Cathey's motion is still on the floor?

Alderman Cathey

Yeah, it's a motion to have it included with the proposal.

Alderman Clemons

Okay so can I speak to that motion please?

Chairman O'Brien

Sure.

Alderman Clemons

So I agree with you but before I voted on that, I'd like to see what the Director comes back with the costs of that. So I don't know if, you know, I think obviously I would support that in the future. I think I would support it regardless of what the cost was but I think just for clarity purposes, maybe it would be better if we let him do that and then wait till the next meeting to vote on such an amendment.

ALDERMAN CATHEY WITHDREW HIS MOTION

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Alderman Cathey withdraws his motion.

And the Chair is now looking at the time. It's 9:57. Without objection, I think we had a first. I am so excited. I was beginning to worry about you guys that we would never do anything. But we basically have done something. I think this is good and so I congratulate you all. We still have some housekeeping items still on the agenda as Mr. Clerk has brought up, so we must follow the proper.

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN CLEMONS TO TABLE O-22-008
MOTION CARRIED**

Chairman O'Brien

There's a motion to table as per our custom to put it back it on the table so when we meet again we will take it off. Okay. So tabling. I'm just explaining a tabling motion is not debatable, but just to explain what we are doing.

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC COMMENT

Beth Scaer

Yeah, Beth Scaer, 111 East Hobart Street. I was very concerned that Alderman Thibeault said that because people who were opposed to the mask mandate also opposed the barriers, then we shouldn't listen to them because there's concerns about safety mean nothing to him, I assume is what he meant by that? It was an awful thing to say.

And something nobody's brought up this entire time is that the Main Street is a major north/south route. I mean if you look at a map of the city, we have the turnpike and we have Main Street. There's only two ways to get through. If the turnpike is closed, everyone goes down Main Street and vice versa because of the bridges or the lack thereof. So you can't just say hey, this is fun. We'll have two lanes. We'll slow down traffic. It will be a nice cozy downtown. You can't just magically make that happen.

And I like that a few of you mentioned that, you know, restaurants should be paying for this sidewalk space because it's a limited resource. If they don't pay for it, they might just take it and not use it. You know the value goes with how much they pay for it.

Dan Hudson was cited as the expert and then he admitted that he is not the expert on emergency services or emergency vehicles. That's kind of a big deal. If he is being cited as the expert and then he admits that he's not the expert on all the issues - the important issues, including emergency vehicles, then that's a big problem.

If you guys pass this, if you put this into place and it ends up being a huge debacle again, then God willing we can get this on a ballot question and get this fixed because I'm very concerned with where this is going. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Anybody else?

Matthew Gouthro

Thank you, Chair. Matthew Gouthro, 104 Fawn Lane in Nashua. I'm going to reiterate that the entire premise of this plan for our historic downtown. It was born out of a need to allow the restaurants to survive during the beginning of COVID when indoor dining was restricted. By the time the season rolled around in 2021, the Governor lifted all the restrictions and outdoor dining was a luxury not a necessity. But all of this is not about downtown dining but a plan that came about from an Imagine Nashua Vision workshop where less than 500 people participated in the vision workshop survey and less than 1/5 of that actively participated in the meetings on Zoom. So we're reshaping our historic downtown based upon the input of less than .5% of our residents who participated in the survey and less than .1%, who actually participated in these virtual meetings. Really? Is this what we're basing this economic development boondoggle on?

Nashua is not Boston's North End. We need to realistically think about what reducing parking will do to our downtown. Making our residents walk blocks to get a haircut, pick up their medication at the pharmacy, or do their banking on Main Street is not going to be overwhelmingly embraced by our residents. Many of these tables set empty throughout the week. You're going to create a permanent barrier choking traffic and restricting parking downtown where these residents aren't even open every day during the season that you want these barriers erected.

While I don't always agree with my Ward 2 Alderman, Alderman Dowd does have a point that we are putting the cart before the horse so to speak and this Task Force needs to put forth a short term plan and a long term plan. We cannot in good conscience in a few meetings come up with a plan that covers the legislation proposed for three years. We need to really understand the economic impact of this legislation and a traffic study is sorely needed. Therefore, we cannot look beyond one year with this legislation.

Finally, the one thing that's being ignored is that an overwhelming amount of residents have spoken out against this. This is an unnecessary waste of our tax dollars and a huge safety hazard in the making. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Anyone else?

Gary Wingate

So Gary Wingate at 15 Sherman Street. One of the things that wasn't brought up today is about the placement of the outdoor dining. You know restaurants have outdoor dining, which means defined as tables and chairs on the sidewalk should be allowed to place them only within the boundaries of respective storefronts. Restaurants having extended dining, which is defined as tables and chairs in a parking spaces, would be allowed only within the boundaries of the respective storefronts. That will allow the neighboring non-resident businesses to have the parking spaces for their customers in front of the respective businesses. That's what Portsmouth does. That's what Nashua should do. You own up to the boundaries.

Pay to play came up. I feel like that should be done. I mean you could within one day go to all the restaurants and figure out the square footage and determine a fee like Ernie Jette had recommended it was \$5 a square foot for Portsmouth and also the parking space in front of them should have a certain amount - \$2,000 - \$3,000. I feel like we should go through the exercise of looking at how much that would be, which would take you one day to do and presented at the next meeting so you can see how much skin in the game. I know Mike Buckley was in favor of having to pay to play and I know others. We should do it also. You know I find it hard to believe that we've ignored the fact that all the letters, all the testimonies, 50 businesses that we interviewed downtown were all concerned about the traffic. Traffic is the number one problem. Like this lady said before, you know, it was going to be difficult to get down to two lanes again. It doesn't make any sense because we have so much commercial traffic. If you stand up on Library Hill - I told Tim Cummings - let's go out there some day for half an hour. I believe there's big cement mixers, there's Waste Management, there's the beverage company. There's so much huge trucks plus the freight of the FedEx is, and the UPS, and all the other cars that come downtown, you know, coming onto Main Street from Amherst Street, Concord Street, Canal Street, Daniel Webster Highway. This was sort of just ignore tonight but that is the biggest problem we have downtown.

Also, I would recommend that each one of you go back to the testimony that Donna Graham provided you on the Infrastructure meeting on the 8th of December and read very closely what the Fire Chief Brian Rhodes had to say...

Alderman Comeau

30 seconds

Gary Wingate

...and also the Police Chief Kevin Rourke had to say. I could read a couple quotes now. I don't have a lot of the time. I feel like what Alderman Dowd said is you want to look at a way to do the thinner barriers or you can put the actual tables and chairs right in front of the respective restaurants. I have so much more to say but I'm limited by the time. I just think there's a lot of work to be done and a lot of the important issues were ignored tonight and they need to be - like the gentleman Matthew had said. Thank you very much for your time tonight.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Anyone else on public comment? Seeing no one else. Alderman Comeau do you have a motion?

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COMEAU TO ADJOURN

President Wilshire

Would you allow Mr. Cummings to say something? He was trying to get your attention.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Sorry. Thank you, President Wilshire. I just had a process question that I wanted to ask to make sure I understood what is happening. So if I understand it correctly, that this body being the Task Force is meeting again on March 30th.

Chairman O'Brien

That's correct and possibly the 31st.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

And possibly the 31st. So my question at hand is whatever recommendation is made by the Task Force that will go back to the Joint Committee on infrastructure and PEDC. Will there be a meeting following the Task Force meeting on whatever night or will there be another night where you'd have to convene to get an official recommendation of the Joint Committee before it goes on to final passage? Do you understand what I'm asking?

President Wilshire

I do.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

So I asked you that so you think about it and so you can try to align it to Marylou Blaisdell's comments relative to the sensitivity to the time. Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

I have had some of this conversation with legal. Still a little up in the air but, however, many of the members I hear but, again, once this Task Force is completed its assignments even though members of the group are here, we may have to convene another meeting.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

So what I would recommend is you notice the Joint Committee on the night of the 30th and on the 31st to follow directly after the Task Force meeting so therefore you would be in proper order to take committee recommendation to move it on to the final Board of Aldermen

President Wilshire

I don't have a problem with that.

Chairman O'Brien

That had to be done. We don't necessarily - the meeting can be adjourned at any time.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Otherwise I just want to point out and this is more - I know this is really granular but this is more for just people who don't understand our process, which is there'd be potentially a delay of a week before turning to the Joint Committee and then a delay of two weeks before it's heard by probably the full Board.

Chairman O'Brien

I concur because we do – (inaudible) is upon us. Yes.

Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director

Thank you.

Chairman O'Brien

Thank you. Alright, I'm going to that if everybody understands? Okay. We'll do that. I'll book two that we could possibly convene at that particular time as a joint board to vote, thus making the recommendation to the full Board of Aldermen. If not, we'll hold it in reserve. Okay? All right. Okay, that being said, now, we have somebody that wants to make a motion.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY ALDERMAN DOWD TO ADJOURN
MOTION CARRIED**

The meeting was declared closed at 10:11 p.m.

Alderman Alex Comeau
Committee Clerk



THE CITY OF NASHUA

Office of Economic Development

"The Gate City"

TO: Michael O'Brien & Melbourne Moran, Joint Chairs
FROM: Tim Cummings, Economic Development Director
Cc:
DATE: March 24, 2022
RE: Fiscal Note for O-22-008

Just following up on my comments from last night relative to anticipated expenses and lost revenue. Below, you will see the fiscal note included in the O-22-008, which reflects what I suggested off the top of my head. As I mentioned last night, we will most likely need an outside vendor to place the New Jersey barriers I do not have a quote, but am working on getting one. Past payments were in the \$30,000 to \$50,000 range.

**COMMITTEE
ASSIGNMENT:**

Committee on Infrastructure

FISCAL NOTE:

The reduction in meter revenue is estimated to be from \$30,000 and \$45,000. The reduction in parking enforcement revenue is estimated to be from \$5,000 to \$8,000. Cost to move the barriers is estimated to be \$60,000 a year. Painting cost is estimated to be \$20,000.