FALL RIVER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

BOARD MEMBERS

Kara O'Connell, Chairperson
Loriann Taylor Branco
Michelle Dionne
Joseph Oliveira
Robert Smith

John Coughlin, Esq. Cathy Ann Viveiros Michael Dion

Fall River Redevelopment Authority meeting held pursuant to the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law, M.G.L.C. 30A, 18-25, on Wednesday, January 9, 2019, transcribed by Jeanne M. Bramanti, Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

BRAMANTI & LYONS COURT REPORTING, INC.
REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL REPORTERS
92 STATE STREET, 8TH FLOOR, BOSTON, MA. 02109
TEL: 617.723.7321 / FAX: 617.723.7322
www.bramanti-lyons.com

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Pursuant to the open meeting law any person may make an audio or video recording of this public meeting or may transmit the meeting through any medium. Attendees are, therefore, advised that such recordings or transmissions are being made whether perceived or unperceived by those present and are deemed acknowledged and permissible.

I'm allergic to microphones, sorry.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes for December 12, 2018. Did everybody have a moment to review those?

MR. COUGHLIN: I have copies here. I know I emailed them to everybody. I don't know if you guys want the copy.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: I'll take a copy of it actually because it was really a lot to read.

MR. COUGHLIN: Yeah.

MR. SMITH: Joe.

MR. OLIVEIRA: I'm good. I read it electronically.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Did anybody have any questions about the minutes?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Motion to approve. 1 MR. OLIVEIRA: I make a motion to approve the 2 meeting minutes as written. 3 MS. BRANCO: I'll second. 4 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: All in favor. 5 THE BOARD: Aye. 6 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: The next item, 7 downtown and waterfront urban renewal plans update. 8 MS. CATHY VIVEIROS: Madam Chairperson, we do 9 have Bill Roth. He is the Fall River planner, and he 10 has been working on passage of the urban renewal plans, 11 so he did attend the last city council subdivision 12 meeting, and he is prepared to give you an update. 13 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you, Cathy. 14 MR. BILL ROTH: Thank you. The committee made 15 the -- the consultant was not able to be there, they 16 had another public hearing, so I did the best job as I 17 could to answer the questions. 18 There were a lot of -- several outstanding 19 questions from several of the counselors. I've 20 requested that they submit those in writing to me so I 21 can give them to the consultant. I know that 22 Miss O'Connell and Cathy I sent you kind of a brief 23 synopsis of when I went over when I sent the message to 24

the consultant. I met with -- I saw the councilors last night and reiterated to please get me those questions that they had.

A lot of it revolved around some of the properties, the takings, should we move try to move the DPA line. I don't really want to -- you know, that's a whole process in itself to deal with the DPA. I thing that's outside of the scope of the urban renewal, and I told them is that.

So the preface of it is that we're going to look at having another committee meeting, and that has not been scheduled yet. I talked to Vice Chair Lebeau about that. She did wish me to when we did schedule the meeting to send out yet another notice to the affected property owners on the takings list, so I will look at doing that.

I told her in doing that that will -- that affects timing because we want to give them at least ten days, two weeks' notice. So right now I am waiting for the questions that the councilors had because they had pretty in depth questions.

I will get those to the consultant and then look at scheduling working with the councilors scheduled meeting, and hopefully -- it sounded like we

could do it within the next month or so knowing that there is about a two-week lag time that I wanted to give for sending notice out to the property owners, so that's kind of where we are.

And then one of the things, I have received numerous emails, some property owners wishing to be taken off the takings list that -- and I think some of their -- and I think this was a decision that the board needs to look at weighing in on.

Some of the properties when this process was started several years ago were vacant, underutilized, or abandoned. Some of the folks that had asked to be removed have renovated or they're at full occupancy or they've done significant upgrades, and probably it makes sense that they not be on the list.

So I am going to work with the consultant and kind of prepare, have them take the takings, the two maps of the identified properties, and then identify the ones that are specifically removed, and then maybe we can evaluate what has changed and transpired in the couple of year period since when we first started this process.

And are there any questions?

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: No. I just wanted a

Я

د م

couple of comments on where you went with that because I did get a letter, as I am sure that you did, from Luciano DeVito a couple of times.

MR. BILL ROTH: Yes. That was property at the end of Columbia Street that we looked at, that the administration wanted to look at adding, and I did get that.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: So I do think, you know, the sooner we can have the meeting with the consultant just to start narrowing down a little bit more the process so that we can move forward with the city council and the state and keep the ball moving.

A month seems like a long time. I know we've been waiting a long time for this process. If there is any way that could see if we could speed that meeting with the consultants.

MR. BILL ROTH: Oh, we could probably meet with the consultant -- we could meet with the consultant sooner rather than later. I'm talking about the committee meeting with the consultant, lining that up. I need about a two week -- a little more than -- if we're going to give the property owners a two-week notice then I need a little bit of time to send out the, I don't know, however many hundred mailings that

goes out, and then figuring out scheduling that meeting.

I am hoping that we could have the committee meeting within the next month, but if you want to meet with the consultant sooner rather than later, I mean, they are consultants, so we can meet at any time.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: I think it would benefit everybody if we could meet. I mean, I'm sure — Loriann and Bob are relatively new to the board, so they might not have gotten a gist of both plans and the extent of both the plans, it's been open for review, but there is certainly — I see, you know, you also got the letter here from the historic society, so they posed some questions.

MR. BILL ROTH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: And I think if they
can be invited as well to the meeting with the
consultant so that we can have just -- let's freshen
everybody up, get everybody on the same page and answer
some of their questions as well.

MR. BILL ROTH: Okay. So that's more of a consultant meeting with the RDA, correct --

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. BILL ROTH: -- that you would like?

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Yes, that's what I would like.

MR. BILL ROTH: Okay. Would you like it during the day or at night?

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: I think if we have a couple of options out there for all the board members to be available, obviously we all work so nighttime, and of the historic society, nighttime would probably be best to see if we can get some of the answers as posed in the letter that I received from them on wednesday, January 2.

They have some comments and questions that they would just like some answers to, so maybe we could try to get another meeting whether -- you know, obviously a special board meeting with RDA because we would be over a quorum, however would be the best way to go about that just so that we can kind of get everybody on the same page and see if we can continue to keep the ball moving forward to get these plans put in motion.

MR. BILL ROTH: Now, you as well, do you have copies of the latest plan?

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: I do.

MS. BRANCO: I don't have it.

1.2

1.3

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Do all of us have 1 copies of the latest plan? 2 MR. BILL ROTH: May is not the latest. 3 MS. TAYLOR BRANCO: No. 4 MR. BILL ROTH: Okay. Well, I will make sure. 5 I can have those sent down to the print shop tomorrow 6 and get those printed. 7 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: That would be great, 8 and then reach out to the consultant or if you want me 9 to do it, Michael, you know, whoever you would like to 10 reach out and try to set up a meeting and reach out to 11 the historical society so that we can all be on the 12 same page. That would be wonderful. 1.3 MR. COUGHLIN: You can just have a special 14 meeting with one item agenda and just post it. 15 have a quorum, you have a quorum. If up don't, you 16 don't. 17 okay. That would be CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: 18 wonderful. I think we really need to keep the ball 19 moving forward. 20 MR. BILL ROTH: Okay. I'll call the 21 consultant tomorrow and look at trying to propose some 22 dates over the next week, maybe next week sometime. 23 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you. 24

1	MR. BILL ROTH: Okay.
2	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Does anybody else have
3	any questions for him on those two plans?
4	MR. OLIVEIRA: The only question is can you
5	send those files electronically?
6	MR. BILL ROTH: I can't. They are actually
7	large files. If you go on the if you go on the
8	city's website they're all posted on the web site and
9	you can download them. They're larger than our system
10	will stand.
11	MR. OLIVEIRA: So the most current version of
12	the plans are on the city website?
13	MR. BILL ROTH: Are on the city website, yes,
14	they are.
15	MR. OLIVEIRA: Okay.
16	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you very much
17	for coming.
18	MR. BILL ROTH: No problem.
19	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Have a nice evening.
20	MR. BILL ROTH: I will be here later.
21	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: The next item on the
22	agenda is the City Pier update regarding docks and
23	moorings.
24	MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Good evening.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you for coming.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Thank you. My name is

Scott Skuncik with Foth CLE Engineering. We were the successful bidder to your RFP to redevelop the city pier area, and we just wanted to talk about our scope and where we think we're headed with the project.

our understanding is that we want to bring this cite through preliminary design through what we think is permanent about this local, state, and federal level and through a design that you could move forward with as a municipality or present to a developer as a starting point and say this is a design that is permitable, here are your permits, they're good for three to ten years. Here is available water depth, here is the vessels that you can bring in here, and here is what you have for available parking.

And we don't intend that the final design is something that someone is going to take and carbon copy and build, but I think it's really going to enhance the site to have a place hold design that they know is feasible, constructible, and has been preapproved rather than a developer coming in and having to debate what's permitable on all three levels, local, state, and federal, and what are the limitations based on the

site contaminants that we know exist and the limitations based on that and what you could expect for vessels or what you could expect for fees and things like that.

So we've done this type of study for cities like Gloucester, New Bedford, and we are working on one now for Boston right now and overall permitability, future construction costs, and what we think is an income stream all into one report, and then you'll have different alternatives to choose from for different facets of it whether it's how many vessels, how far you would like to go out, whether you want a building, whether you want facilities, and the cost related to all of that so you can pick a path for whether you want to develop it yourself or go to a third party.

And that's our understanding of the scope. We are a waterfront firm, that's all we do, we have 30 waterfront engineers in Marion, Massachusetts, and we have another six in Newport, Rhode Island, so you're right between the two offices. That whole staff is available, all the vessels are local. There is no out of state groups really involved with our personnel.

Are there questions on our scope or where we're headed or questions on our proposal?

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Do any board members have any questions at this time with their scope? We did all read their presentation.

MR. SMITH: I do. I have a question.

The scope, you mentioned the plans you're going to get it fully planned. Does that include fully permitted, ready to go?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: That would be -- so we expect to come to this board with two alternative designs, and we expect to bring one of those designs through all the permits. So that's conservation here in Fall River, that's DEP for Chapter 91, and that's Army Corp of Engineers at the federal level.

whether you want to get a longer term on some of these permits which we recommend, you know, try to spend a little extra effort and get a ten-year permit instead of a three-year permit so that these things are just open for a longer period of time.

That's especially important at the federal level. The regulations can change. If you have a permit already that won't affect you, so we will advise you on a path forward on that.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Another question I have is

14 (

the board was told that our former consultant signed an agreement with the EPA that they could never be any type of building on the City Pier, period, and there was no shot of that happening. Do you agree with that, or do you think that there are alternatives?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: So we think that there are alternatives to that. We have read that document, and if you go to Dartmouth right now we have a building that's half on the water half on land. We designed that structure, it has similar site constraints, and a pile supported structure.

And part of the pier over the water could provide all the bathrooms, locker rooms, any sort of office space you need, and we could also at the same point negotiate and try to renegotiate some of that language. There is an alternative if that language is in stone, there is a path forward to get you there with everything you need over the water that isn't affected by that document.

MR. SMITH: And would that process be included in the scope of your contract, this contract going back to the EPA.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Yes. Well, the EPA is a state corps, Army Corps permit, so they will weigh in

at that time, that document will come back, again, and they will weigh in at that point. So if you get an Army Corps document for development of the site and the EPA agrees to it then that becomes the law of the land. That supersedes it.

MR. SMITH: So we would expect you as per the scope of the agreement to take that all the way through to the finality, if you will, to get a determination one way or the other if we could put a building on that?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: The way we understand our scope in terms of the RFPs you could take our final deliverable and build something. You could build it yourself, someone else could build it, but we don't intend to leave you with anything to do after that other than finding a contractor.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: And so when you say you're going to examine every available option for us, so you would also let us know on the main property if we could build a structure on there, any type of building --

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Yes, correct.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: -- whether it be supported on pilings like Scituate has or anything else

1.3

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Correct. Yeah, we
would -CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: It would encompass
everything.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: We would explore foundation types and we would upon selection of alternative give you that cost estimate for that work. What's not included is to bring this to a hundred percent design because you would want to decide who is going to do the project whether it's the municipality or private.

MR. SMITH: When the Chapter 91 people, they issue the permit for the marina, are there requirements that you have facilities and services for the marina? In other words, we say we're going to build a marina, but we can't have a building and we can't do any of the facilities. Would they permit that?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: They would -- they would want some sort of facilities. We can talk about -- and, of course, they're going to want everything to be universal, have universal access, but if you develop it as a public facility they're going to want bathrooms and locker rooms probably as a minimum.

And you would want that, too, for a parcel

that's desirable.

MR. SMITH: So would it make sense to go forward with the possibility of the building on the property before doing the other thing, or do you do them parallel to each other?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: So you will have an alternative that has a building over the water. You have no -- your hands aren't tied at all. And you may not have an alternative with a building on land depending on how the EPA document handles it.

MR. SMITH: So you seem pretty confident that one way or the other we'll be able to put a building to service this marina.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: There is no document that currently exist that prevents you from building a building over the water, and there is numerous municipalities and redevelopment authorities that we've built buildings over the water for. And because you have no excavation in that situation, no material to dispose of, then we don't see why you couldn't do that.

MS. DIONNE: In terms of the three-year and ten-year permitting, what are the requirements? What differentiates from the three year to the ten year?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Sure. So three years

versus ten years is primarily at the federal level.

Your local conservation can give you up to a three-year notice of intent and issue an order of conditions, and they can extend that numerous years, and that will be up to them.

The Army Corps can issue a three-year permit which is a PCN which is a lower level review, or they can issue a ten-year individual permit and the only difference is it takes longer for review, and I don't feel like given the nature of this project it's worth pushing for a faster review and sacrifice seven years of her permitability.

so we would recommend to you that you go for the individual permit and attempt to get ten years.

They can deny it and say we approve the project for three, but we would attempt to get ten years so that you have the longest window possible.

MR. SMITH: I have another question. A pretty substantial amount of that contract pertained to mooring fields, and I'm not sure what the dollar amount, what the breakdown was towards the mooring fields. I think it was ten, \$12,000, something like that.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: So we didn't do a

breakdown -- when we looked at this proposal the 1 optional tasks that were listed was the Army Corps 2 permit and the CZM permit, and to us those are permits 3 that are required for the building and marina anyway, 4 so we never separate out the mooring piece to us. 5 MR. SMITH: okav. 6 MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: We know we need a 7 hydrographic, and, basically, an underwater survey 8 anyway, so you knew how much water you had under your 9 floats, so we never included it's day of hydro whether 10 we do the moorings and the floats or just the floats. 11 So we never include any extra time for that. 12 MR. SMITH: So it's not a big deal to figure 13 out --14 MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: The mooring, to go forward 15 with the mooring? 16 MR. SMITH: Yeah, the mooring aspect of it 17 seemed to be --18 MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: It's not, no. Not to us. 19 MR. SMITH: It didn't seem worthwhile to me at 20 I don't think we need it. There is no permitting 21 needed for the mooring, so I don't know why we're 22 paying for something. 23 MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: I would recommend that if

you were doing a survey why not survey it because you're getting eight hours in the water, let's get a little extra data and you can use it for whatever. you want to use it for moorings in the future or if you want to use it to justify dredging in the future so that you can prove that it's filled in because right now you don't have that data. MR. SMITH: Okay. That's all the questions

that I have.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Any other questions from the board members?

Have you already -- when are you going to start?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: We intend to start as soon as possible because we would prefer not to be on the water as it gets colder and colder and we have the chance of floating ice, so we would like to get the hydro survey done as soon as possible.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: And what's your normal timeframe of reporting back to the board with each step of the way on what you find?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: So the first thing that we would do is do the underwater survey and submit the plan to the board, and we would have that plan done

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

probably three weeks after we do the survey. So we've been holding off until this meeting. Following this unless there is an objection we would like to green light the survey for you and get the crew out there.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: So we could almost expect, like, a monthly update from someone from your

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Sure. From myself.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: That would be wonderful. Thank you.

Any other questions from the board?

MS. BRANCO: I have one more question. How does the fact that the infrastructure and storm drainage hasn't been installed yet effect what you're going to do and what the potential is for us?

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: So where storm water is going to come in is at the conservation level. Chapter 91 -- the DPO and the Army Corps aren't really concerned unless you're adding new storm water outlay. We would have to get the storm water at least on paper to get an approval of conditions if we're doing the parking area and we're doing the storm water that we've already agreed to in the past project.

So that would have to be rolled in. I think

firm?

-

we could get approval from conservation on our piece, and then you could handle your storm water later before you built it with the requirement that the order would have a condition that says the storm water application has to be approved before you can build this marina, and so we could separate the two so one is not holding up the other.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: So a quick question on the drainage and storm water there. So say that we did find that we could put a building on the main portion of the building albeit on stilts or anything, would that affect the design and placement of the drainage and storm water? Say that we put it in right now and then we found out, hey, we can put a building and then we have to take out what we installed.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Yeah. I would suggest at least letting us collaborate with whoever the storm water -- whoever is coordinating the storm water placement because there is definitely places where you wouldn't want a water building.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Right.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: And we could draw some boxes on the plan now and move places out that are safer for storm water. We may want to leave some boxes

open for availability for that.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: So we're not necessarily in a horrible position without having that in the ground right now. We could almost be to an advantage right now --

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: It's an advantage right now.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: -- because we don't have to take it out and move it if we can in fact put a building on the property.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Right.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: I do have another question. How long before you would actually submit plans for a Chapter 91 until the scope of your project is done and you submit the plans to the DEP.

MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: So long as we could get an alternative agreed upon probably by, say, May we would have all the preliminary design done. By May we will be ready to file Chapter 91. Chapter 91 is a six to 18 point process, so we'll file that permit first, see if they make any changes, and then file the other two because those windows have — the Army Corps is probably four months, and conservation is 60 days so

long as we don't have any issues. 1 so we'll file as we go along, the Chapter 91 2 has to be signed by the governor, so that process can 3 take a little longer, and then we'll do your permits in the order in which they take the most time. 5 MR. SMITH: And your contract goes right to 6 the completion of the project? 7 MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: It does. Our contract 8 ends with your permits being submitted. 9 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Any other questions 10 from the board? 11 Thank you very much. 12 Great. MR. SCOTT SKUNCIK: Thank you for the 13 14 opportunity. CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: The next item is a 15 financial update. 16 Michael, will you be giving that to us? 17 MR. MICHAEL DION: Sure. Your first financial 18 update is marked 3A-1, 3A-2 and 3A-3. It is your 19 income statement for your general operating, and I did 20 a little tweaking on the report. As you can see it's a 21 little different format than what it was from last 22 month's reporting. 23

24

The first column is your first 11 months

through the year, your second column is just that month that we've just closed out, and you have your year to date in your third column. Right now the balance on that account is \$2,291,738.54.

So if you have any questions concerning the layout or you want any changes just, please, let me know. I thought this would work out the best to give you the full picture of the account throughout the whole year, and you will get the bank statement attached to that financial report on a monthly basis, also.

I don't know why your bank accounts and your statements end on the 15 of the month. It's a little bit more difficult that they don't fall at the end of the month, but we can figure it out.

The other report is your operating parking garage account which is 3B-1, 3B-2, and 3B-3, the same format. The balance in that account is \$166,403.49. I will have to meet with you, Kara, at some point because there is that transfer that needs to be done, so I don't have access to do transfers, so I'll need you to do that for me to get the accounts in balance.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Just let me know whenever is convenient for you, and I will meet you at

1 the bank.

MR. MICHAEL DION: Okay. C is the warrant schedule. What you have in front of you is all of the invoices, listing of invoices. The warrant total is 100,769.92. If you all remember we agreed last month to follow the type of warrant procedure that is used in the city.

Most of the -- a big part of the total of the warrant was Yard Works on the old Second Street project. All of that invoice has been approved, signed by the architect, also signed by the contractor, and I believe you signed it, Kara.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. MIKE DION: There is one -- just so you know, I just want to make it apparent to you guys, there is one vendor name which is myself. Your SAM registration needed to be renewed, and the only way you can do that is through computer system, and you need to use a credit card, so I used my personal credit card because I didn't have another one.

So if you could look at this, and it requires your signature on it, and once you sign it, Kara, I will cut the checks and get them to you and Lori for your signature.

Did it work out okay the last time? I had somebody from my office go to your work. I don't want to disturb you guys at work.

MS. BRANCO: No, that's fine.

MR. MIKE DION: As long as you're fine with that.

The other piece of paper that you have which is D is your accounts payable register which is the actual bills. This is called 3D in your packet. It's as the actual bills that you have that are not up yet to be paid. That total is 24,728.04.

There are some, as you can see, National Grid bill, four bills for the town of Freetown for property taxes, a couple of bills from Jobs For Fall River.

There is a retirement board bill, and a group insurance, small group insurance bill that will be taken care of. So that's the accounts payable register.

Q. And then on E -- I'm not going too fast for you hopefully, on E you got the old Second Street project. We've basically put that project on hold right now because of the plantings, and those will be done I guess in the spring coming up in March or April.

4 5

24 ~

The only changes that have happened to this report from last month's report was the payment of the Yard Works bill for 77,798.70. The three change orders, if you remember, you'll see them there, have all been approved, have all been signed off, and I am waiting for Invoice No. 2 from Yard Works, and they're going to include those change orders on that invoice, and we'll cut the check for that.

so, you know, hopefully you're happy with the layouts of the reports, and like I said, if anybody has any questions, if anybody wants to change anything it's very simple. I am right now currently working on a trial balance for 2017. The trial balance is needed so that we can get a quote from Clifton, Larson, Nelson to do your audit.

I am working on that. I, basically, started it this week. We just got the records from your last consultant. Those records are in the Room 420 on the fourth floor, so if you want, anybody wants to stop by there, look at the records.

So I'm hopefully to have the trial balance done by the end of the week, over the weekend for next week to give to the city administrator to start that process.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you. Does any 1 board member have any questions about these? I think the layout is easily explainable, Mike. I think we can 3 actually see the bills that are coming in, what's going 4 out, our balances. It's well presented. Thank you. 5 Any questions for Michael? 6 MS. DIONNE: Only -- well, in terms of the 7 Yard Works, the fencing that was an issue, is that 8 going to be addressed now, in the spring? 9 MR. MIKE DION: The only issue of the fencing 10 that was brought to my attention was the sturdiness of 11 the fencing. I've actually gone out myself and 12 personally looked at it, and the architect has been out 1.3 there. It's sturdy. So we wouldn't have paid the bill 14 if there was a problem with it, so it's -- I don't know 15 esthetically if you like it, but it's sturdy, I can 16 tell you that. 17 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: So do we need a motion 18 to --19 MR. COUGHLIN: I would just do a motion to 20 approve the warrant. 21 MR. SMITH: I make a motion to approve the 22 warrant. 23 MS. BRANCO: I'll second. 24

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: All in favor. 1 2 MR. SMITH: Aye. 3 MS. DIONNE: Aye. MR. OLIVEIRA: Aye. 5 MS. BRANCO: Aye. MR. JOHN COUGHLIN: And then you sign it. 6 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: The next item on the 7 agenda was the update regarding parking garages and business for better parking. I did hear that the city 9 10 is going to -- they voted last night, and they are 11 going to take over the parking garages and have that fall underneath the city. 12 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: So I guess the next 13 step would be, Attorney Coughlin, will just so Attorney 14 Macy is aware --15 MR. COUGHLIN: Do you want me just to send the 16 draft to him? 17 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Yeah, send the draft, 18 and we'll have -- we also need to provide 90 days 19 notice to the Businessmen For Better Parking a/k/a 20 21 group to notify them there was a 90 day notice provision in there, and that would need to come from 22 the Redevelopment Authority. 23 Additionally there is I guess a question about 24

existing leases and so we need --1 Right. So there was the post MR. COUGHLIN: 2 office lease which is expiring, and then there is the 3 traveling building. 4 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Yeah, the 99 Main 5 Street. 6 MR. COUGHLIN: And there is one more. There is the BBP, Post Office, and Travelers, I think. 8 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: So I presume that the 9 RDA would have to provide notice regarding the 10 assignment. 11 MR. COUGHLIN: Yeah. We would do a deed and 12 then the assignment of those leases. . 13 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: And at that point, at 14 some point I guess they would have to be notified of 15 the change in ownership as well. 16 MR. COUGHLIN: Yeah. I can do that. 17 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: But Attorney Macy is 18 available if you want to coordinate the efforts with 19 But the city council did approve acceptance of 20 him. the garages and the flat surface area. 21 Additionally, there is an account that was 2.2 established for maintenance and capital repairs. The 23 agreement with BBP does specifically say that that is 24

the property of the Redevelopment Authority, and the 1 city is expecting that that account will transfer with 2 the garages. They are planning on utilizing it for 3 maintenance and capital repairs to the building, so if those steps are all approved then we're ready to 5 proceed. б MR. COUGHLIN: So do you want the board to 7 take a vote to authorize Kara to send notice to BBP? 8 That's the only thing that we haven't done. 9 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: I would suggest that 10 if you think that that will be appropriate. 11 MR. COUGHLIN: We took a vote to authorize her 12 to sign the deeds, but we didn't do anything about --13 we just said subject to all existing agreements. 14 MS. DIONNE: Can I just ask a question and 15 make a statement before we do that. 16 So, basically, at this point do you have all 17 the contracts that are involved with people who still 18 have existing contracts? 19 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: We have the one with 20 99 Main Street LLC I think is the name. 21 MR. COUGHLIN: Yeah, Post Office, 99, and BBP. 22 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: And BBP. We have --23 MR. COUGHLIN: So the city has been given 24

copies of all of those. 1 MS. DIONNE: And Travelers? 2 MR. COUGHLIN: Travelers and 99 is the same 3 thing, yeah. 4 MS. DIONNE: All right. Who negotiated that 5 contract, do we know? 6 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: It was negotiated, it 7 8 started back in 2015, so it would have been your former consultant, and I'm assuming it was signed by your 9 former chairman of the board which was William Kenny, 10 so they at least would have been involved with that 11 negotiation. I'm not sure if it came to a full vote 12 13 before the RDA board. MS. DIONNE: And that was for the 30-year 14 15 contract. MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Yes. 16 MR. COUGHLIN: So just my memory of the 17 18 history of that it was if you go back to the early '80s when the Traveler's building was first built, there was 19 actually a special act that gave a 30-year lease to the 20 occupant of that building. When that lease expired the 21 Redevelopment Authority went out to bid, again, and 22 that's the current one. So there has been a lease in 23 place for that building from day one since that parking 24

3

2

4

5

7

8 Э

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

garage was built.

MS. DIONNE: So the only comment that I would like to make, I would just like to go on record, and this is just -- I'm not speaking for the board, I'm speaking for myself, in terms of this transfer of property I do want it to be clear that it had nothing to do with inadequacies as far as the board is concerned.

The board did not go to the city to ask them to take these properties, the city came to the board and asked the board if we would return the properties to the city, correct?

MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Yes. That was after the board had been notified I guess by BBP that they were no longer interested in providing the management services, so there was clearly going to be a void in that area.

That's all. I just wanted to go MS. DIONNE: on record making that statement that it wasn't a case of us wanting to just dump a property.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you.

Anybody else have any comments regarding the parking garages?

> MR. SMITH: I do. I have one question. IS

this transfer, does it include Old Second Street, too? 1 MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: That's an interesting 2 question. We're going to have to look at the deeds. 3 don't know if Attorney Coughlin has that with him. 4 That question has come up. 5 MR. COUGHLIN: So the way the vote read, we 6 did this vote back in October, I think, if I remember. 7 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Yeah, a few months 8 9 ago. MR. COUGHLIN: It was a vote to transfer Third 10 Street and Pearl Street parking garages and lots and 11 associated property, so that's the way we voted, so I 12 assume that that's what the city is expecting. 13 MR. SMITH: And I think if we're all voting we 14 should vote them all and hopefully the city will take 15 old Second Street. It's of no value to the 16 Redevelopment Authority, it's of more value to the 17 owner, whoever the owner of the garage is because the 18 access to the garage, a large portion of it comes from 19 old Second Street. 20 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: I think we did do it 21 as a complete whole. 22 MR. COUGHLIN: That's the way we voted. 23 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Yeah, that's how we 24

1	voted.
2	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Is that on the same
3	deed?
4	MR. COUGHLIN: No.
5	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: So it's a separate
6	parcel.
7	MR. COUGHLIN: It's on the same plan, but
8	separate parcel.
9	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Separate parcel. So
10	you don't have to transfer, but, again, if that's the
11	board's intent.
12	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: But we voted to
13	transfer.
14	MR. COUGHLIN: I think our intent was so we
15	didn't end up with these little orphan pieces of land.
16	MR. SMITH: Yeah. To me it makes no
17	difference. I'm just wondering about this contract for
18	old Second Street, and if we're going to dump the
19	property on the city we don't have to finish doing the
20	contract, they can do it, to be honest with you.
21	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Well, I would
22	respectfully suggest that the contract is an obligation
23	of the Redevelopment Authority.
24	MR. SMITH: Okay.

MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: However, as far as the administrator services of that Mr. Roth our planner is here this evening, and he was just going to give you a quick update, but he is going to be assuming active oversight of that project to completion.

MR. SMITH: I don't think that it makes any difference. I'm just thinking for ongoing maintenance and it only makes sense for the owner of the garages to also own the access plan which is also old Second Street.

MR. COUGHLIN: And, also, whoever clears the snow from the garage or the walkways also has to do old Second Street because you have to have access.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Because there is access right there. Yes. So by no means do I think the board is going to not continue with the plantings and finish off the project. I don't think that's our intent at all to leave that hanging and anybody hanging as much as, Bob, you might like that, I don't think that's the intent nor the purpose of the board.

MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Next, Old Second Street update.

MR. COUGHLIN: So I think we need a vote --1 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Another vote? 2 MR. COUGHLIN: To terminate the BBP contract. 3 They're asking us to terminate that as part of the transfer and give the 90 day notice. 5 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: All right. I make a 6 7 motion to --MR. OLIVEIRA: I make a motion to authorize 8 the chair to terminate the contract with the BBP. 9 MR. COUGHLIN: Send a 90 day notice. 10 MR. SMITH: I'll second that. 11 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: All in favor. 12 THE BOARD: Aye. 13 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: The next item, old 14 Second Street update, and the city planner can add to 15 what Michael has already updated us on, that would be 16 wonderful. 17 MR. BILL ROTH: Okay. At least I don't have 18 to do the financials. Thank you, Mike. 19 I've reviewed the contracts. I've spoke with 20 the architect, the landscape architect briefly this 21 afternoon. He was getting ready to go into a meeting. 22 I requested that he send me the bid specs and plans 23 electronically because there is no copies of those. 24

There is copies of the contracts.

And then he wanted to really kind of -- I think he had a brief discussion with Mike about the way that they were going to leave it for the winter, so I'm going to have more of a discussion on how the site is going to be buttoned up for the winter and what our expectation is for that, maintaining safety, and then we're going to discuss the remaining items. We're talking about some landscaping, it looked like -- I walked there today, it looked like there was some concrete work of some sort.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Irrigation.

MR. BILL ROTH: Yeah, the irrigation. I saw a chain of emails, and I'm not quite sure if the electrical had been connected or not. That was roughly a month ago when they were looking at doing that, connecting the electrical from the electrical panel at parking garage is rather ironic due to previous the conversation.

so that's kind of where we are with it, and we'll look at just going to get up to speed with the architect with Mike on where we -- the remaining items. And my main concern is getting it buttoned up more for safety for the winter, and it's pretty close right now.

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

It's still got some chain-link fencing up.

MR. MICHAEL DION: Yeah. Just so the board knows, too, I believe I got an email from Webster Bank, and they were a little concerned about how it looked, how it was going to be left for the winter, so I told them we would do our best to button it up to make it look halfway decent. There might be some wood there, I think there is some fencing that might be able to come down.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: And get those signs back up.

MR. MICHAEL DION: They want their signs back So I'll work with Bill on that. up.

MR. BILL ROTH: And one of the things everyone keeps on asking me, the wooden slats they are white cedar, they are not just pine. Everyone says that on the project it looks like it's white pine, it looks like it's pine, and it's just going to rot. No, it's white cedar, so it can withstand the weather.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you very Great. much.

MR. BILL ROTH: Okay. The next item on the agenda is proposed executive session. We have two items for that, one to discuss strategy with respect to

potential litigation regarding the City Pier project; 1 and the second item is to review and approve executive 2 session minutes for December 12, 2018. 3 Do we have those findings? MR. COUGHLIN: Yeah. So we'll need a roll 5 call vote on both of those. I guess the question is is 6 there any old or new business because we're probably 7 just going to adjourn from executive session. MS. DIONNE: I think at this point it's 9 probably close to two months ago that we unanimously 10 voted to take the sign down on the pier, and it's still 11 stands today. 12 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: The cove sign? Yeah. 13 so, Mike or Cathy, is there any way someone could help 14 us with that? I mean, I can do it with a chain saw it 15 would be real easy, but that's probably not how Peter 16 wants his sign taken down. 17 MR. SMITH: He might own that sign. 18 MR. MICHAEL DION: I'll call Peter and tell 19 him that the sign needs to be removed. 20 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Okay. 21 Great. Anything else, Michelle? 22 MS. DIONNE: No. 23 CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Joe, do you have 24

anything to add?

MR. OLIVEIRA: No.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Cathy?

MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Yeah, thank you,
Madam Chairperson. Under old business just to alert
the committee we did in fact issue a request for
qualifications for the real estate services for -- your
current contract is expiring. That's going to appear
in goods and services on January 14. It will be two
weeks, and then once we get proposals then we'll be
back to you. So we should be able to get someone on
board on or about the first part of February.

And the second RFQ engineering services, the City Pier is also going to be posted in goods and services on that same date, January 14, and those proposals will be due -- I think those are due a month after.

CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Thank you very much.

Anything else under old or new business. So
we need two motions.

MR. COUGHLIN: Yeah, we need a motion to go into executive session for those two purposes. Under A we need a finding by the chair that an open meeting will have a detrimental effect on the litigation

1	position of the public body. So we need a roll call
2	vote to go into executive session for those two
3	purposes, and that we will not return to open session.
4	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Cathy, do you want to
5	do a roll call vote?
6	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Sure.
7	Kara O'Connell.
8	CHAIRPERSON O'CONNELL: Yes.
9	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Lori I'm sorry,
10	your last name Branco, Lori Branco.
11	MS. BRANCO: Yes.
12	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Michelle Dionne.
13	MS. DIONNE: Yes.
14	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: Joseph Oliveira.
15	MR. OLIVEIRA: Yes.
16	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: And Robert Smith.
17	MR. SMITH: Yes.
18	MS. CATHY ANN VIVEIROS: It's unanimous.
19	(Meeting adjourned.)
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	