



CITY OF CONCORD
New Hampshire's Main Street™
Community Development Department

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EDAC)
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
January 20, 2026 @ 5:00PM
City Council Chambers
37 Green Street Concord (2nd Floor)
Concord, NH 03301

Attendees:

Committee Members:

Mike Vlachich, Chair, Mayor Byron Champlin, Bobby Segal, Michelline Dufort, Jim Bouley, City Councilor Judith Kurtz, Patrick Tompkins, Alex Stoyale, Chuck Gilboy, City Councilor Ali Sekou (Arrived 5:11), Ari Pollack

Absent Members:

Emily Ricard, Sal Prizio, Jean Hakuzimana, Steve Duprey

Staff Present:

Matt Walsh, Deputy City Manager – Development
Tim Thompson, AICP- Assistant Director of Community Development
Stephanie McKim, Administrative Coordinator

Meeting called to order: 5:04 pm.

1. **Welcome by Chair Vlachich:** Chair Vlachich welcomed those in attendance and reviewed the agenda.
2. **Adoption of Minutes:** A motion was made by Dr. Tompkins and duly seconded by Councilor Kurtz to adopt the minutes of October 21, 2025. The motion passed by unanimously voice vote.
3. **Comments by Mayor Champlin:**

Mayor Champlin reported it will be a challenging, busy year ahead for this committee in its advisory capacity and predicts more referrals from City Council. This committee is poised to play a major part in meeting those challenges.

4. City Council Referral

- a) Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) – Mayor Champlin introduced Rob Werner, Chair of Concord Energy and Environment Advisory Committee (CEEAC). CEEAC fielded this proposal for C-PACER and forwarded it to City Council. Councilor Kurtz reported City Council received the proposal with recommendation for referral to Fiscal Policy Advisory Committee along with Community Development Department and she made a request to refer to this committee as well.

Mr. Werner reported Business Finance Authority (BFA) Executive Director James Key-Wallace gave a presentation CEEAC discussing the opportunities for Concord through the C-PACER program. Mr. Werner reported one of the key differences in the C-PACER program from past iterations is that the NH Business Finance Authority (BFA) is the administrator of the program and they are responsible for the financial risk. He further reported this is one of the first pieces of legislation Governor Ayotte signed into law because she saw the value in this program for communities to spark additional energy efficient housing development.

1
2 Councilor Kurtz inquired if the City chooses to adopt C-PACER, does it become a requirement for
3 all development. Mr. Werner reported this is an incentive rather than a requirement. Councilor
4 Kurtz inquired about the anticipated demand on City staff to manage this program. Mr. Walsh
5 reported there are requirements on the Municipality in the statute such as preparing and
6 recording a special assessment lien on the property by the City that runs with the land. This lien
7 is as powerful as a tax lien per state law and therefore no other lien can supersede it. The City
8 would be responsible for invoicing and collecting all payments for the lien but has the ability to
9 delegate that authority to a BFA approved third party. Additionally, Mr. Walsh reported the City
10 does has the ability to recover expense from BFA, but only to the extent BFA can recover those
11 cost from the property owner (per NHBEA's standard form of agreement with municipalities).
12 Also, it appears there are additional administrative requirements above and beyond normal and
13 customary requirements should the City take possession of a CPACER property due to unpaid
14 property taxes.
15

16 Mr. Walsh reported C-PACER is a long-term financing mechanism for energy efficiency, clean
17 energy, water conservation and climate resiliency projects in commercial, industrial, agricultural
18 or multi-family properties with 5 or more dwelling units. The loan amount per statute is capped
19 at 35% of the appraised value of the real estate or actual cost of the improvements and BFA has
20 the ability to look back up to three years on completed projects. He further reported BFA secures
21 funding through capital provider institutions for loans up to 30 years.
22

23 Mr. Walsh reported that he had received an email from Mr. Duprey that he read into the record:
24

25 *"I do want to weigh in support of the committee endorsing the C-PACE program. This was a*
26 *program I discovered through one of my lenders that works out of state and wondered why we*
27 *didn't have it in New Hampshire. I worked with James Key-Wallace and we drafted a bill and*
28 *then I had it sponsored by Senate President and it was the second piece of legislation that Kelly*
29 *Ayotte signed this year. What it effectively does is lower the down payment a developer needs in*
30 *order to get a loan by taking all the energy components and putting them into a second-long*
31 *term fixed rate mortgage. With construction cost so high now and with lending cost still high,*
32 *by taking a portion of the first loan and reducing it to a second loan makes banks tend to give a*
33 *better loan on the first mortgage as they have less risk. It doesn't supersede any municipal loan*
34 *but it basically gives the same kind of priority so that if the first lender forecloses, the C-PACE*
35 *loan remains in place. Because this is a fixed rate loan it has this level of scrutiny the lenders in*
36 *this area tend to make 30 to 35-year loans, which helps on the overall debt service to the*
37 *project. It is a terrific tool and I hope the City adopts it soon. As an example, when we did Arts*
38 *Alley all the banks would only give us 50% loan to the total cost because it was an unproven*
39 *concept. If Concord adopts this, I can obtain a C-PACE loan for almost 2 million dollars, which*
40 *because it is secondary to the first loan it does not affect their long-term exposure or leverage*
41 *but allows us to get some of those invested dollars back"*
42

43 Chair Vlacich reported State Senator Tara Reardon was a prime sponsor of this bill along with
44 Senator Innis and it was passed bi-partisan which is unique in the environment.
45

46 Mr. Pollack inquired about rate difference for borrowed funds between prevailing rates and C-
47 PACER. Mr. Walsh nor Mr. Werner had that information. Mr. Gilboy reported it was his
48 understanding that there is flexibility on the rate for the C-PACE loan.
49

50 Mr. Segal inquired if the C-PACE loan is solely for new construction. Mr. Werner reported this is
51 also available to redevelopment of existing property.
52

53 Mr. Thompson reported C-PACER is an option for developers to use to in a state that has limited
54 supply of economic development program or incentive options available.
55

56 Councilor Sekou inquired about the administrative burden on City staff if this is a successful
57 program. Mr. Walsh reported that, per the Statute, the City is the debt collector and is
58 responsible to invoice and collect payment for the lender unless it contracts to a third-party
59 vendor.

1
2 Dr. Tomkins inquired if staff has any indication how this program could scale up in Concord. Mr.
3 Walsh reported that there is currently no other Municipality in the state that has adopted the
4 program to reference to nor does he have any projections at this time. Mr. Gilboy reported he
5 feels this is a complex program, and on any development project there will be other pieces that
6 will need to be financed and that will require a sophisticated lender to understand the program.
7

8 Mayor Champlin inquired if this committee considers this an advantageous economic
9 development tool for Concord.
10

11 A motion was made by Mr. Bouley to recommend City Council adopt the C-PACER program for
12 the entire city and duly seconded by Councilor Sekou. The motion passed by unanimously voice
13 vote.
14

15 5. Updates

- 16 a) **City Master Plan** – Mr. Walsh summarized the City’s Master Plan timeline and anticipated
17 process. He reported the request for proposal (RFP) for consultant services was issued in early
18 December and the responses are due back January 29th. There is a comprehensive scope of work
19 in the RFP and if all goes well with the selection process, there should be a consultant on board
20 by March and he anticipates completion is January 2028.
21

22 Mr. Pollack inquired about targeted zoning ordinance amendments City Staff had been working
23 on prior to the RFP Master Plan development and how that process will continue. Mr. Walsh
24 responded that staff intends to continue with interim zoning amendments. Specifically,
25 amendments will be targeted at provisions that will not be dependent upon forthcoming policy
26 guidance from the Master Plan. Staff are continuing to work on parking, signage, and rooming
27 house regulations amendments and may have more as new legislation passes at the state level.
28

29 A brief discussion ensued around City Master plan chapters, community and committee
30 participation and input.
31

32 Mr. Bouley inquired if the RFP is available online for review and who is on the consultant
33 selection committee. Mr. Walsh reported the RFP is located on the purchasing page of the City
34 website and City staff are typically on the selection committee.
35

- 36 b) **Ad-Hoc Impact Fee Committee** – Mr. Walsh provided a brief overview about Impact Fees prior
37 to discussion of the Ad-hoc Committee’s review. Mr. Walsh reported the City has an Impact Fee
38 Ordinance Impact Fees, and explained that fees are assessed to new development for the impact
39 they create on municipal infrastructure in accordance with RSA 674:21 which is the innovative
40 land use controls statute. He reported the City has been charging impact fees since 1986, and
41 that the current Impact Fee Ordinance was adopted in 2001. The Ordinance has been
42 periodically amended.
43

44 Mr. Walsh explained that the Ordinance requires a periodic review of the fee schedule. Said
45 review was completed by the Planning Board last summer and was submitted to City Council for
46 its consideration. Specifically, the Planning Board’s report noted that fees have not been
47 adjusted since 2013. As such, the Planning Board recommended that the City Council adjust the
48 residential impact fees by 33.7% and the transportation fees by 26% for inflation. The Board
49 also made suggestions on how fee adjustments could be phased in over time. The report also
50 discussed hiring a consultant to review the entire impact fee ordinance and potential classes of
51 impacts fees the City currently has.
52

53 Mr. Walsh further explained that the City presently only assesses impact fees to new residential
54 development. In 2017, the City Council amended the ordinance to provide for a waiver of impact
55 fees for commercial / industrial projects. Prior to 2017, new commercial/industrial projects
56 were only subject to transportation impact fees.
57

1 The Mayor appointed an Ad-Hoc Impact Fee Committee to review the recommendations the
 2 Planning Board provided to Council. The Committee is doing an in-depth review of impact fees,
 3 including reviewing state law, the current ordinance, as well as comparative analyses of other
 4 communities in New Hampshire with impact fees. The Committee is also working to understand
 5 how impact fees are used by the City and fiscal impacts on the City's budget thereof. The
 6 Committee is also reviewing actual projects to understand their role in the total development
 7 cost, or sale price, of particular types of development. Mr. Walsh reported once this review
 8 period is complete, the committee will report back to Council with its analyses and
 9 recommendations

10 Mr. Bouley reported it was his understanding the impact fees collected has to be spent on capital
 11 improvement project within a certain time frame. Mr. Walsh reported by statute, impact fees
 12 revenue must be allocated within 6 years and used for capital improvement projects or to pay
 13 down debt service on an existing capital project which created capacity to serve new growth.
 14

15
 16 Mayor Champlin reported once the Ad-Hoc Impact Fee Committee completes its review and
 17 prepares its report for City Council, EDAC will have an opportunity to review it from an economic
 18 development impact standpoint and also weigh in and report to Council.
 19

20 A brief discussion ensued around the history of impact fees, purpose of waiving fees, impact on
 21 future development, and project by project basis impact fee collection.
 22

23 6. Discussion of Future Meeting Topics/Committee Goals for 2026

24
 25 Chair Vlacich reported he has reviewed the prior year's City Council priorities around economic
 26 development. He requested feedback on future topic and goals of this committee.
 27

28 Ms. Dufort reported she would like a better understanding of the members of the economic development
 29 community and how they could better support the City's work in recruiting businesses, interact and
 30 supporting growth, and how can EDAC support good procedures and policies.
 31

32 Mr. Segal reported he would like to encourage EDAC and the City staff to be customer focus to partner or
 33 support developers and new businesses.
 34

35 Mr. Stoye reported he would like to better understand business development mentorship and how local
 36 business owners can support future business growth.
 37

38 Councilor Sekou reported he would like to better understand what EDAC could implement to assist and
 39 support future business owners that are considering Concord through mentorship.
 40

41 Mr. Gilbo reported he would like to review projects that have stalled for one reason or another and see if
 42 EDAC could make recommendation to support projects moving forward.
 43

44 Mr. Pollack reported there is increase pressure on residential tax payers and he would like to place more
 45 emphasis on non-residential tax base expansion through incentives.
 46

47 Mr. Bouley reported he would like to prioritize interim zoning amendments, participate in the Master
 48 Plan process and to be a voice for the community in economic development.
 49

50 7. Other Business

51 None
 52

53 8. Next meeting

54 The next meeting is scheduled for February 17, 2026 at 5:00 PM. The March 17, 2026 meeting is
 55 canceled.
 56

1 A motion to adjourn was made by Councilor Kurtz and duly seconded by Mr. Segal. The motion passed by
2 unanimously voice vote.
3

4 9. **Adjourn:** Meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.
5

6 Respectfully Submitted,
7

8 Stephanie McKim

9 Administrative Coordinator - Development

DRAFT