



CITY COUNCIL MCINTYRE SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 2021 MEETING

The McIntyre Subcommittee held the March 2, 2021 meeting via Zoom.

Chair Peter Whelan opened the meeting at 4:11 with a roll call.

Subcommittee Members Present via Zoom: Chair Peter Whelan and Councilors Deaglan McEachern, John Tabor and Paige Trace.

City representatives present via Zoom: City Manager Karen Conard, City Attorney Robert Sullivan, Principal Planner Nick Cracknell, Moderator Synthia Ravell, Stephanie Seacord and Legal Secretary Marian Steimke

Also Present via Zoom: Mandy Reynolds and Russell Preston, both of Principle Group (PG) and Sen. Martha Fuller Clark.

Chair Whelan planned to discuss the schedule, get agreement moving forward, set timelines and deadlines, and decide on a timeline to give to GSA from the City.

Public comment:

Andrew Bagley of 40 Chauncey Street said the Miro comments are heavy on the left hand side. Consolidating down to three choices is a good idea. He said he hoped the Subcommittee had a good process for filtering that down.

Chair Whelan said they would try to narrow that down that day.

Bill Downey of 67 Bow Street asked how they came up with so many plans and why did some have more drawings than others.

Mr. Preston answered. He discussed new building volume and having a range there. PG looked at a full spectrum of options and tried to accommodate as many wishes as possible. Eight options is where the design process took them. He said some have more drawings than others because some needed more due to the three dimensional schemes. We wanted people to understand the aspects. In the time we had available we got as much out as we had time for. Mr. Preston described what a design brief is – it lays out the problems that the design should solve. It is a tool to guide design.

Chair Whelan closed public comment at 4:19 as no one else was present to speak

Mandy shared her screen on the Final Phase: McIntyre Visioning and Public Input Process which included dates ranging from 2/25 through 5/30/2021 with primary and secondary tasks.

Mr. Preston said comment period closed on February 25th, PG has been processing all those comments and they want to do that before going back to the drawing board. Mr. Preston discussed the tasks associated with each of the steps in the process and discussed moving forward.

Chair Whelan said they were looking to Council to review on 4/14 to review and endorse. He talked about the tasks from then through end of May, estimated submission to NPS by 5/30/21.

City Manager Conard said it is a tight window for the step 12 on the Land Use review boards – that should be more time.

Councilor Trace agreed. HDC will need more time and discussed the amount of time HDC may need and the HDC process. Mr. Cracknell agreed and said Councilor Trace was spot on. There is at least a three week window to get on the agenda. Before that there needs to be a design.

City Manager Conard stated keeping NPS apprised of the progress. Councilor Tabor discussed an interim Agreement with GSA and a potential approach.

Attorney Sullivan said they need Planning Board and HDC approval and does not consider the May 30th timeframe to be realistic. However, on the last go-around, the application got filed, and it was not necessary to have the land use boards first, but later after the application was approved by the NPS. So flip-flop those, he suggested. It would go before the land use boards after we get the application approved by NPS. Chair Whelan agreed with this approach.

Chair Whelan asked how long it would take for the Redgate/Kane negotiation. Attorney Sullivan said if Council could pick a design by April 14th, it would be possible to have a development agreement by May 31st.

Those present discussed details of the application. Councilor Trace said HDC needs to look at scope, massing, height, etc., so a 2-D drawing will not work. But an architect drawing in color if drawn to scale might be acceptable, she said, as they want to see what fits in with the monument.

Councilor McEachern said we'll have to agree on financing so it may have to be more than a sketch. Our partner may need more time for that and to run the numbers.

Attorney Sullivan said the Council specified the lawsuit must be withdrawn before we can proceed with Redgate/Kane.

City Manager Conard said she is happy to advance this to the GSA if this is the wish of the Subcommittee.

Councilor McEachern made a motion that the Subcommittee ask City Manager Conard to forward this schedule to GSA and NPS for their feedback. This was seconded by Councilor Trace.

Those present discussed the presentation on the 18th (6:00 – 7:00), that it does not conflict with the Planning Board, and to ensure the presentation is done by 7:00 so folks can go to the Planning Board.

Ms. Reynolds updated the dates on the Final Phase: McIntyre Visioning & Public Input Process chart.

Councilor Trace said HDC could work before the Planning Board as part of a Work Session.

Attorney Sullivan said he was thinking about what Councilor McEachern said. If anyone takes a position on a design, that person would be disqualifying themselves from being on a quasi-judicial board (e.g., HDC or Planning Board), so each Subcommittee member must be thinking about this. If there is an enemy of the project, and the member does not respect the neutrality, then they are giving that enemy ammunition. Once the Council votes on a design, Chair Whelan would recuse himself from the Planning Board, since he sits on that, and Councilor Trace would recuse from HDC as well.

Those present discussed whether it would be PG or Redgate/Kane that would present to the HDC. Councilor Trace said the architect or designer brings it forward to HDC.

Councilor McEachern made a Motion to adjourn, seconded by Councilor Tabor. The motion passed on a roll call vote 4-0. The meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Date Signed: _____

Peter Whelan, Chair,
McIntyre Subcommittee

Minutes taken by
Marian Steimke, Legal Secretary