

**City of Salem Massachusetts  
Public Meeting Minutes**

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Board or Committee:</b>  | <b>Redevelopment Authority, Special Meeting</b>  |
| <b>Date and Time:</b>       | <b>Wednesday, October 26, 2020 at 6:00 PM</b>  |
| <b>Meeting Location:</b>    | <b>Zoom Virtual Meeting</b>  |
| <b>SRA Members Present:</b> | <b>Chair Grace Napolitano, David Guarino, Cynthia Nina-Soto,<br/>Dean Rubin, Russ Vickers</b>  |
| <b>SRA Members Absent:</b>  | <b>None</b>  |
| <b>Others Present:</b>      | <b>Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community<br/>Development<br/>Kathryn Newhall-Smith – Principal Planner<br/>Mathieu Zahler – Consultant</b> |
| <b>Recorder:</b>            | <b>Colleen Brewster</b>  |

Chair Napolitano calls the meeting to order. Roll call was taken.

**Special Meeting**

---

Chair Napolitano provides an update for the public. She states that additional questions were sent to the teams. Staff is working on a draft MOA that the MBTA has with the SRA regarding the ‘remnant parcel’ next to the crescent lot. The MBTA has 30-days to review and approve the SRA’s recommendation. Next SRA meeting is Tuesday November 10<sup>th</sup>.

JHR - Questions & Answers:

Q 1: Are you able to achieve a minimum of 20% of the units affordable at a range of incomes, i.e. 30%-100% of AMI, with at least 10% of the units being affordable at 60% AMI or below? If not, please explain what the maximum affordability is. State what the affordability mix would be.

Response:

Yes, JHR Development will commit to 20% of our 129 housing units being affordable, and, yes, JHR Development will make 10% of the units available for those renters who are at 60% Area Median Income (AMI), or below. As you may know, our utilization of the Commonwealth’s HDIP program will allow a maximum of 20% of our housing units to be affordable, thus, the 20% affordability will allow the HDIP to continue to be utilized.

Q 2-A: Please describe and/or visually depict your vision for the tunnel in terms of how it connects to and interacts with the MBTA garage and train platform and your proposed building on the Crescent Lot.

Response: Please see the submitted plan, sketches and narrative from Lead Architect, Michael Wang of Form + Place, which outlines our thoughts on accessing our proposed tunnel from the existing train platform.

Q 2- B: Do you foresee a change in ownership/control of the tunnel upon completion? Under that plan for ownership/control, who would be responsible for managing and maintaining the tunnel when it is complete? Please be specific regarding your role and the level of commitment you can offer now for managing and maintaining the tunnel element of your proposal.

Response:

JHR Development has retained City Point Partners, one of the Commonwealth's foremost transit-focused consulting groups, to work with JHR and the MBTA on the tunnel concept.

In response to your question, City Point Partners offers:

Transitioning the tunnel from its current state - as an attractive nuisance - into a functional design element of the train station, will rely on the outcome of a multi-party negotiation between the MBTA, MDOT, the City of Salem and JHR development (and perhaps others).

We have already established that the MBTA owns the tunnel and that they will have final say over the disposition of their asset. At the same time, we feel there are mutually beneficial and compelling reasons why they would embrace the concept of deploying this underutilized asset to improve accessibility to the station and surrounding area. As part of its \$8 Billion, 5-year capital investment plan, one of the MBTA's priorities is to improve the accessibility of the entire system.

Though the fee ownership of the tunnel is likely to remain with the MBTA, we note that it is far too early in the formation of this idea to come to a final conclusion on that issue.

As for maintenance of the tunnel, we offer that the tunnel will be – practically speaking – 2,000 +- sq. ft. of space. When this small amount of space is compared to the 225,000 sq. ft. MBTA parking garage, it accounts for less than 1% of the total MBTA garage space, which is currently both clean and secure. It is easy to see the existing maintenance and security program for the garage being the vehicle to address the 1% of additional space that the tunnel adds to the garage.

Thus, City Point Partners considers maintenance and security to be a manageable detail that will be worked through during our discussions with the MBTA.

Q3: What is your plan to activate the space designated for SSU until the University is ready to come downtown?

Response:

We are sorry if at any point we implied that we would be willing to wait up to seven years for Salem State University to decide on tenancy. If we presented that as our time period, we assure you that it was a miscommunication.

JHR plans to undertake the Superior Court exterior restoration, mechanical systems upgrades and tenant build-outs (for Essex County Bar Association, JHR Development and Essex County Sheriff's Office Civil Process Division and the Registry of Deeds) from the very outset of development of the project. Thus, when our early tenants are entering the building the exterior restoration will be complete, the lights will be on and all of the ADA and safety measures will be completed in both courthouses.

NOTE: A very important distinction between our proposal and our final competitor's is that we will NOT be selling the courthouses as a condominium and we will not be requiring each of our tenants to do their own build-out. JHR will do all build-outs to ensure close conformance with our State and Federal Historic Tax Credit requirements. Actual in-person and constant communication with our tenants has indicated that they either do not prefer to do their own build-out, or, they in fact, cannot do their own build-out. Our willingness to invest in these discussions now, provides us with this valuable insight into our tenant's needs.

All along we have considered the two-year permitting process, as well as a small portion of the tenant build-out period, to be enough time to accomplish our Salem State University tenancy. We are supremely confident that in that 24 to 30 month time period we will accomplish the goals that President John Keenan spoke of (Criminal Justice programming, partnering with other North Shore institutions of higher education, and University and community functions at the spectacular Law Library) when he joined our presentation. However, in the unlikely scenario that SSU tenancy cannot be accomplished, we will begin leasing the remainder of the space, from our office on the third floor of the building.

To help the SRA visualize this we have provided a new set of plans indicating the tenants and their currently proposed locations. You will note that 32 Federal is 100% tenanted by the South Essex Registry of Deeds. (Over the past several weeks we have met with or spoken many times to Registry officials, including Register O'Brien, to advance their design, which began in Superior Court and is now nicely situated into the entirety of 32 Federal Street). As you see, 32 and 34 Federal Street have a number of existing tenants (Registry of Deeds, Essex County Sheriff's Civil Process, Essex County Bar Association Department and JHR Development's offices), even before counting the space that we are working on with SSU.

Throughout all of this we maintain our commitment ensuring that the Law Library will be publicly accessible in perpetuity. Space in any current or future design will be along the lines of the eloquent vision offered by President John Keenan at our recent presentation to the SRA Board, to ensure that this commitment will be kept.

#### Board Questions:

Mr. Guarino asks about the seven-year waiting for SSU. He stated that there was a verbal answer during the interview period was that they would wait as long as seven years. Mr. Daniel stated that the development team confirmed that the project can proceed without SSU tenancy and that the seven-year estimate is just that. The development team anticipates SSU tenancy would happen sooner.

Team Response: Hilary Rockett – Mr. Daniel's response is accurate, and they don't expect this to go on anywhere near that long; it should be within the next few years. Mr. Guarino asked if he would look for similar uses or other types of tenants? Mr. Rockett confirms that he will look for office use.

#### Winn - Questions & Answers:

1. Public Realm: The SRA wants to ensure public spaces are active. How are you programming the open spaces/plazas you are creating on the two properties?

Response: Our team wholeheartedly shares the SRA's desire to see the public spaces active. Vibrant public spaces would benefit our proposed tenants as well as the community at large – **Salem and Winn's interests are aligned.** We are confident in our ability to deliver this because our development program is sufficiently diverse; even more so if the Registry of Deeds occupies a portion of the Superior Court building as contemplated in the SRA's Question 2.

In the scenario with the Registry, the public spaces at both the Federal Street and Crescent Lot would benefit from foot traffic generated by a variety of components:

- **Residential:** an inclusive, mixed-income community of 123 new households
- **Government:** The public utilizing the Registry, as well as the Registry's staff

- **Institutional:** The variety of programming offered by the Museum of Justice
- **Food & Drink:** The East Regiment Beer Company's second Salem location, a tap room in the Law Library, and Alma Fusion's new location in the Crescent Lot's commercial space

**These diverse uses are complementary – yet not inter-dependent or overly reliant on any one sector.**

Programming of the open spaces / plazas will ultimately be formulated after consultation with the City's various departments and local cultural and civic institutions; Winn would not presume to put forth a program without local input. That said, we would submit the following for consideration (similar to the requested response in 1.b, but encompassing both the Federal Street public spaces and the Crescent Lot's, which are also governed by Chapter 91):

- Each of our prospective tenants who have provided LOIs – the Museum of Justice, East Regiment Beer Company, and Alma Fusion Restaurant – have expressed a desire to cross-collaborate. A great example would be an MOJ-hosted outdoor speaker series or historic re-enactment on the new plaza at the Courthouse site; Alma Fusion and East Regiment could offer food and beverage.
- The Crescent Lot's ground floor commercial space will have an outdoor presence - which is assumed to be patio seating for the restaurant. Alma Fusion Restaurant, which participated in our September 15<sup>th</sup> interview with the SRA and has provided an LOI for this space, has stated a strong desire to employ outdoor seating.
- East Regiment Beer Company, in addition to their LOI for a tap room in the Law Library, has expressed an interest in providing a “pop-up” beer garden on the plaza at the Courthouse site.
- Public art from Salem artists will be featured prominently on both courtyards. In addition to permanent fixture(s) on the courtyards, there is a great opportunity for rotating displays of works from local artists
- Pop-up food trucks and/or farmers' markets
- Open-to-the-public yoga/fitness classes and street performances
- On-site bike sharing infrastructure (currently contemplated for the Crescent Lot site as its adjacency to the MBTA station and garage lends itself to multi-modal options)
- Public kayak storage onsite (as represented in our RFP submission's Crescent Lot floor plans)

Q1-B. Please provide a resident services plan as well as your plans to program the Chapter 91-required spaces?

**Response:**

**Resident Services Plan**

Enclosed please find our team's Resident Services Plan for the new, inclusive, mixed-income community put forth in our RFP submission.

- **As one of the nation's largest providers of resident services in mixed-income housing (inclusive of affordable, middle income and market-rate apartment homes)** for nearly five decades, WinnCompanies believes in its obligation to the quality of life in the communities and neighborhoods we serve. In 2017, WinnCompanies launched Connected Communities, a collective impact approach to true community development. Focusing on People, Place and Partnership, Connected Communities supports our community teams, residents and partnerships across the

nation to develop collaborative strategies that drive positive outcomes for the 350,000 residents who call our communities home.

- **Winn partners with more than 500 national organizations and 1,000 local and regional service providers nationwide** to connect our communities to programs, services and resources that achieve measurable results – **our commitment to equity extends beyond just access to the highest quality housing.**

**Examples of our Salem partnerships include:**

- HOUSING

- City of Salem
- Lynn Housing and Neighborhood Development (LHAND)
- North Shore Community Action Programs

- EMPLOYMENT

- MassHire North Shore Career Center
- Lynn Housing and Neighborhood Development (LHAND)
- North Shore Community Action Programs
- Compass Working Capital
- Roots Culinary Program

- EDUCATION

- Salem Public Schools
- Boys & Girls Club
- YMCA of the North Shore

- COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- City of Salem
- North Shore Community Action Programs
- Salem Public Schools
- League of Women Voters Salem
- Salem Police Department

- HEALTH

- Salem Pantry/Sharing Table
- Mack Park Farm
- North Shore Moving Market
- Cooking Matters
- North Shore Elder Services
- Community Life Center
- City of Salem Board of Health

- ECONOMIC MOBILITY

- Compass Working Capital
- Lynn Housing and Neighborhood Development (LHAND)

- In 2020, WinnCompanies' was the first for-profit affordable housing development and management organization in the U.S. to earn the Certified Organization for Resident Engagement & Services (CORES) designation from Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future and Fannie Mae for **Winn's "robust commitment, capacity and competency in providing outcomes-focused resident services in affordable rental housing."**

## Chapter 91-Required Spaces

As the SRA's question rightly alludes to, the Chapter 91 License Application requires applicants to speak to how they intend to activate the public spaces. Ultimately, this response will be formulated after consultation with the City's various departments and local cultural and civic institutions; Winn would not presume to put forth a program in the application without local input. That said, we would submit the following for consideration (similar to the requested response in 1.a., but specific to the Crescent Lot's Chapter 91-governed public spaces):

- The Crescent Lot's ground floor commercial space will have an outdoor presence - which is assumed to be patio seating for the restaurant. Alma Fusion Restaurant, which participated in our September 15<sup>th</sup> interview with the SRA and has provided an LOI for this space, has stated a strong desire to employ outdoor seating.
- Public art from Salem artists will be featured prominently on the Crescent Lot courtyard (as it will be on the new public space at the Federal Street buildings). In addition to permanent fixture(s) on the courtyard, there is a great opportunity for rotating displays of works from local artists
- Pop-up food trucks and/or farmers' markets
- The Crescent Lot's courtyard could be a fantastic venue for open-to-the-public yoga/fitness classes and street performances
- On-site bike sharing infrastructure
- Public kayak storage onsite (as represented in our RFP submission's Crescent Lot floor plans)

Q1-C: The SRA is intrigued by the tunnel concept presented by JHR Development. State whether you have considered adding this public realm feature to your project plans. Please include why or why not.

Response: Allow us to begin by stating unequivocally that **nothing we have proposed in our RFP submission relative to public realm improvements would preclude pursuit of the tunnel concept now or in the future.** This is not a zero-sum proposition.

**If the SRA and the City would like us to commit to exploring the feasibility of the tunnel concept, funding the necessary preliminary engineering of the tunnel and funding its entitlement – we commit to that.** As the SRA and JHR have made clear, the ultimate cost of construction and operation of the tunnel would be borne by the public. Winn is committed to assisting the City in securing the public sector financing resources that will be needed should the tunnel move forward.

Winn certainly has the right team assembled to investigate this concept further if so desired by the City. VHB is currently working on Lebanon, New Hampshire's downtown tunnel as a part of that City's larger downtown renewal project. Construction is underway and anticipated to be completed in December 2020. VHB is working closely with the City to rehabilitate its downtown tunnel (what had been a deteriorating former railway tunnel), which was badly damaged by a fire 50 years ago. The VHB team's structural engineers carefully assessed several alternatives that included various potential tunnel treatments based on cost, functionality, safety, future maintenance, and compatibility with the Downtown Visioning concepts. The approach VHB formulated with their municipal partners will provide connectivity for the Mascoma River Greenway (a multi-use trail) and allow areas for vehicular/pedestrian use above the tunnel. To help the City achieve its vision, VHB's Tunnel Engineering report included recommendations on potential interim repairs, capital allocation strategies, and project delivery methods that provide opportunities for the greatest benefit at the best value. An

extensive public outreach process, including interviews, public forums, surveys, and close coordination with local business and property owners, underpinned the entire project.

Our team did consider incorporating the underground tunnel/walkway under Bridge Street. In consultation with VHB's Transportation Planners, we elected not to include it in our RFP submission for the following reasons:

- **Projected Future Sea Level Rise:** With the site's vulnerability to Sea Level Rise, proposing a pedestrian tunnel in that general area without proper solutions accompanying the tunnel use will cause additional issues. Protecting the tunnel from flooding will add more to the overall cost - even if found to be feasible.

- **Public Realm & Pedestrian Foot Traffic Considerations:** Sending pedestrians and bicyclists below-grade would defeat the purpose of creating the attractive public realm on the north side of Bridge Street at the roadway level. Public spaces that are exciting and dynamic have a critical mass of foot traffic. If that foot traffic is halved – between the at-grade and below-grade public spaces – neither space provides the experience the SRA desires. The two spaces would, in essence, be competing against one another.

- **Existing Structural Conditions are Unknown:** Our team has not come across a condition assessment report or any detailed information about the tunnel to understand its structural needs and cost implications for its restoration. We felt that, without this information, we could not confidently and responsibly represent the scope of work and cost required to restore it in our RFP submission. At a minimum, restoring the tunnel, along with an elevator/stair system in the park area near the courthouse will cost several millions of dollars.

- **Public Safety:** Salem's public safety leaders (police, fire, EMS) must be consulted as a tunnel crossing would impact their respective services. At the time of our RFP submission, we did not feel it would be appropriate for us to approach the various department heads to discuss a myriad of questions:

- In the event of a health emergency, how will EMS personnel access the tunnel?
- Similarly, in the event of a fire or flood, does the Salem FD have sufficient access to the tunnel?
- A tunnel in this location would presumably require a regular police presence; does the Salem PD have the necessary manpower to provide a foot patrol in this location? Or would it be the purview of the MBTA's Transit Police? Presumably either approach affect's both agencies budgets as well.

Maintaining the cleanliness of the tunnel and ensuring it is a public benefit, not a public nuisance (i.e. drug use, vagrancy, etc), will be a tall order. Not insurmountable, but this particular area of concern warrants consideration from a lot of stakeholders.

- **Past Experience with Grade-Separated Solutions:** On other projects, VHB has developed "what-if" scenarios that almost always indicate that at-grade crossings are preferred by pedestrians than grade separated solutions in such urban settings. VHB has found instances where a tunnel makes more sense is when there is no need to use vertical transport of any sort (i.e. switchback stairs/ramps or elevators/escalators). For example, the crossing of a roadway on an embankment by with a culvert style treatment for bikes/pedestrians is a good application of a tunnel solution. In our case, the differential elevation only exists on the north side of Bridge Street.

- **Functionality:** Even if a tunnel were determined to be feasible, the at-grade crossing at the signal would not be eliminated as not all pedestrian crossings across Bridge Street are associated with the MBTA station. So, a pedestrian who arrives at the intersection via Washington Street will be faced with

the choice of using an elevator/stair/bike rail system to go down to the tunnel from the courthouse corner and exit onto the garage entry level on the station side vs. crossing directly at a protected signalized crosswalk in a fraction of the time. Instead of a tunnel solution, our design features a ramp on the north side of Bridge Street, from the sidewalk down to the lower level, for bicyclists and pedestrians who may want to access to the lower level. This is a relatively more cost-effective solution when compared to a tunnel restoration / beautification project.

2. Registry of Deeds: At the interview and subsequent communications and meetings, you indicated that you would welcome the Registry of Deeds as a tenant.

a. How would the Registry of Deeds and Museum of Justice be co-located in the Superior Court building? Would the law library be utilized by the Registry, the Museum of Justice, another tenant, or some combination thereof? Please show floor plans indicating where the Registry would be located along with the other proposed uses for the Superior Court building. Please also include a numerical breakdown of square footage for each use in the courthouse portion of the project.

Please see the enclosed floor plans indicating precisely how the Registry of Deeds, the Museum of Justice and the East Regiment Beer Company Tap Room would be co-located in the Superior Court building. A numerical breakdown of square footage for each use is included on the floor plans as well. In short:

- The MOJ's footprint in the Superior Court building is unchanged from our RFP submission.
- The bar/café taproom in the Law Library (plus the adjacent 730 SF space) is also unchanged from our RFP submission. As we presented during our September 15, 2020 interview, we have received an LOI from East Regiment Beer Company to open a second Salem location – a tap room in the Law Library.
- Space is made for the Registry of Deeds on the first floor of the Superior Court via the removal of the six units provided in our RFP submission for that space. Removing these residential units provides the Registry of Deeds with approximately 3,300 SF of ground floor space fronting directly onto Federal Street. Additionally, we have identified 2,560 SF of space at the basement level for “back-of-house” needs the Registry may have (i.e. file storage, server rooms, IT equipment, etc); we have accounted for the need for these basement-level spaces to be secured and climate-controlled.

b. Would the ownership structure be adjusted if the Registry, a non-residential tenant, is added to the project? How will Winn maintain the majority ownership in the condominium association?

No, **the ownership structure will not be adjusted if the Registry is added to the Project** as outlined above in 2.a. **Winn will main the majority ownership interest in the Condominium Association.**

- The Condominium Association will encompass both the Federal Street and Crescent Lot locations; they will be financed and function as one property.
- Winn would be the majority/controlling member because it will own the building grounds, exterior areas, interior common areas and the residential component – the overwhelming majority of the project square footage.
- Park Towers will own the commercial component only, which is a much smaller portion of the property – even with the substitution of the Registry of Deeds for six of the residential units in the Federal Street portion of the project.

### Board Questions

Mr. Rubin asks about incorporating the Registry of Deeds and if Winn had a conversation with the Registry about tenancy. Mr. Curtin states that he did not reach out to the Registry with the revised plans showing the it as a tenant in the Superior Court.

Public Comment:

Ms. Newhall-Smith states that she has received written comments since the Oct 14<sup>th</sup> meeting:

- Register O'Brian, 10/19/20
- Mickey Northcutt, 10/25/20
- Annie Harris, 10/16/20
- Mayor Sarno of Springfield, MA, 10/16/20.

Stephen Kapantis, 23A Wisteria Street. SRA failed to include the need to require affordability. Winn is proposing a significant amount of affordability. He discusses the costs of development on a flood plain and mentions the 7PM Salem Sound Coastal Watch meeting.

Patricia Zaido, 10 Andrews Street, Salem, MA. In support of JHR proposal, has experience in 3 diverse professional careers at SSU Enterprise Center, then 11 years at Salem Partnership when the J. Michael Ruane Judicial Center and MBTA garage project. Salem is a World Health Organization certified community for all ages, the first in Northshore and 3<sup>rd</sup> in the state. She thanked both teams for including affordable housing for older adults. SSU – has had 14 presidents since 1864 and she worked for 6 including the current president. Each one has worked diligently to get SSU downtown and this is long overdue. This is their first opportunity to make this happen. John Keenan and his team can make this happen. SSU is far from the downtown and the Salem community should work together as a community. As an Arts Administrator, many say they support the Arts but attendance at live theater is down, as is attendance at the symphony. A museum requires ever- changing exhibits and events which, has a high cost. This museum has limited appeal to a small audience. The proposed use will give it legal and sustainable public long term anchor tenants. She is concerned that Winn will turn it over to a third party or sell it. Winn public space design is not as creative as JHR's. She loves the tunnel concept. Winn's ideas will need full time people to make that happen. Their crescent lot isn't in keeping with the spirit of Salem's historic character. She doesn't want Salem to go back to the past but the Downtown Renewal Plan calls for historic preservation and compatibility. This building towers over the ramp and demands attention. JHR's design blends in. Lastly, people say the building design would be corrected in the design review process but it's the SRA's responsibility to review design as the Downtown Renewal Plan states.

Emily Udy, HSI. Wrote several letters. If JHR's proposal is moved forward they would want to ensure creative design ideas. She questioned the ownership plan proposed by Winn, which hasn't been fully addressed. Winn will have a majority interest; will they continue to hold that interest in the condo and construction? Their previous letters have been posted on the blog of HSI. Newhall-Smith will send the comment letters received so far.

John Carr, 7 River Street. Lived in Salem for 43 years. First, he urged the SRA to read the letter from John O'Brien at Registry, who is advocating for JHR, but wants to confirm that. He and other neighbors are all concerned with parking for 130 units that could require a higher demand on neighboring streets. Former HSI member from the start of the HSI and endorses all the comments from Patricia Zaido.

Rebecca Curran-Cutting, 14 Clifton Avenue. Excited about the JHR proposal with its proposed uses, which is a nice nod to the former uses with JHR office in the building that the other proposed didn't commit too. The tunnel activation improves the City approach. Crescent lot design was well done, and

tenants are real. Finds it peculiar that the SRA is asking if Winn can do what JHR is proposing, i.e. build-out the tenant space and have the Registry as a tenant. She also asks for the letter from the Registry of Deeds to be read during the meeting read for the record.

Mary Whitney, 356 Essex Street. She is interested in the letter from the Registry being read for the record as well as the other written comments that were previously received. Chair Napolitano confirms that public comment letters can be sent to whomever wants them and the Board can consider posting them. Mr. Rubin states that Register O'Brien's letter is as a member of the public and will be treated like any others. Mr. Vickers questions that as a potential tenant, are his letters of a higher importance? The Board agreed to read the letter from Register O'Brien at the end of the public comment portion. Ms. Whitney also agreed with Ms. Zaido's comments.

Justin Whittier, 10 River Street. Salem has been irresponsible with regard to development on flood plains, agreed with Mr. Kapantis. The City needs to focus on resilience and we don't do that by building on flood plans. He supports the JHR proposal, which is superior aesthetically, the building is suitable for the downtown historic architecture.

Stacia Kraft, 140 Federal Street. Agreed that plans are exciting and included organizations they love, tenants, public realm. The preservation is most important to her. Confused about the end result of the crescent lot in terms of coastal resilience and why this lot was added. Doesn't support a residential use on this lot.

Newhall-Smith – Read a letter submitted by Register O'Brien dated 10/16/20.

#### Development Team Responses

Larry Curtis, Winn: He stated that the proposed building was designed so that all residences are not in the flood plain, only parking is. They have developed multiple projects in floodplains. He confirms he met with Register O'Brien and he was told that he had no interest in moving to the Federal Street buildings. They have activated the public spaces as they have done in their other developments. They have responded to the needs of the community regarding affordability. Their project differentiator – don't want to only building housing for wealthy people, if Salem wants a true mixed-income project, that is the reason to select them.

Hilary Rockett, JHR: Central focus has been the courthouses, he stands by the work they've done the past 18-24 months.

#### Additional Public Comment:

Annie Harris, 28 Chestnut Street. Sent two pages of comments to the SRA. She is excited by the JHR proposal. She has worked on the courthouses when at Salem Partnership, and the goal was to make them open and accessible.

Barbara Clearly, 104 Federal Street. Requested that the answers to the questions submitted by the teams be posted and asked if the non-price proposal can be shared. Mr. Daniel confirmed that these things can be shared.

Public comment closed.

Rubin: Motion to move into executive session.

Vickers: second. Guarino, Nina-Soto, Vickers, Rubin, Napolitano. 5-0 in favor.

Chair Napolitano states that Open Session will not reconvene at the conclusion of the Executive Session.

Executive Session began at 7:25 PM.

Rubin: Motion to end executive session.

Seconded by: Vickers.

Guarino, Nina-Soto, Vickers, Rubin, Napolitano. 5-0 in favor.

Guarino: Motion to adjourn meeting.

Seconded by: Rubin.

Guarino, Nina-Soto, Vickers, Rubin, Napolitano. 5-0 in favor.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:00 PM

Know your rights under the Open Meeting Law M.G.L. c. 30A §18-25 and City  
Ordinance Sections 2-028 through 2-2033.