

CITY COUNCIL E-MAILS

July 15th (after 3:30 p.m.) – August 8, 2019 (9:00 a.m.)

AUGUST 12, 2019 CITY COUNCIL MEETING

UPDATED 08/12/2019 THROUGH 4:00 PM

New content begins Page 12

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Carol Bird (cbird5564@gmail.com) on Monday, July 15, 2019 at 14:34:40

address: 49 Pickering St

comments: It seems to me the most fair way to decide whether this Redgate Kane proposal is in the best interest of the public is to have it on the ballot in November. Everyone has wasted so much time and effort trying to get you all to change your minds when really it could be solved very easily. If the majority of the population votes FOR the proposal then it should move forward. If the majority votes AGAINST the proposal, we start over. Why isn't this the best solution now that we are told there is no hurry? I would appreciate some feedback but not the fact the Redgate Kane has already invested too much. That was their decision. Thank you in advance.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Michael Casino (casinom@comcast.net) on Monday, July 15, 2019 at 14:37:02

address: 135 Bow St

comments: Dear Council Members,
I am unable to attend the meeting tonight regarding the McIntyre redevelopment plan. However, I still wanted to encourage you to vote against approving the proposed plan. Since I've written to you before regarding my reasons for opposing the Redgate/Kane development plan I will not go into the same detail here. Suffice it to say that there are numerous concerns regarding too much density, insufficient parking, and the lack of suitably size open urban space in the plan as proposed. I would urge you again to please consider re-engaging the public input process to address these and other concerns. The project as proposed will completely overwhelm the site in the heart of our beautiful downtown. We will regret it for a very long time if we don't reconsider it know.

Thank you.
Mike Casino

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Dave Hudlin (dhudlin@hotmail.com) on Monday, July 15, 2019 at 14:53:00

address: 260 Miller ave

comments: Dear Council,

Please see below my letter to the Assessor. We need answers to the questions. I hope that you will be looking at the data carefully and ensuring that we fully understand the impact to residential taxpayers. We are relying on you to advocate on our behalf.

Mr. Hudlin

The final analysis will be presented to the City Council August 12, 2019; at that time the City will have answers to your questions.

Thank You

Rosann

From: Hudlin, David J. [<mailto:david.hudlin@thermofisher.com>]

Sent: Monday, July 15, 2019 2:26 PM

To: Rosann Maurice - Lentz <rlentz@cityofportsmouth.com>

Cc: John P. Bohenko <jpbohenko@cityofportsmouth.com>

Subject: 2019 Commercial Assessments

Roseann,

I wanted to present some data to you and get your feedback. If you recall, in 2017 I presented to you a list of 139 commercial properties spanning a variety of industries and locations representing \$1.3B in value. My file contained the 2015 valuation and the 2017 valuation, with a calculation showing the % change and the impact on change in annual taxes based on the delta between the 2015 tax rate and the 2017. My data at that time showed an aggregate 6% increase in assessed value (3% annually). Your initial reaction was that my data wasn't a complete list of properties and may not represent the aggregate commercial increase. As we know, my data proved to be accurate as it represents a large sample size.

I've taken that same file and populated it with the 2019 valuations. The results are a 6.2% increase. This indicates no aggregate change vs. the 2017 valuation. Although "In town" properties show a slightly higher increase of 10% vs 7%, the remaining commercial properties outside of downtown, including route 1, Pease, and hotels are showing a lower rate of appreciation than 2017. Because downtown represents a small subset of overall properties, it's not helping the aggregate number.

My interpretation of this indicates that, despite economic factors outlined in the 6.17 presentation, it's not translating in the numbers. When we say that Commercial will help with the residential burden in this reval, what we're really saying is that we hope, after the new tax rate is set, that unlike in 2017, commercial doesn't realize a 3% tax bill reduction. My projection is that Commercial taxes will stay flat YOY and that residential will increase due to the fact that our valuations are increasing by at least 2x commercial.

In 2017 residential values increased 18-20%, or 3x Commercial. If that happens again, then the impact to residents will be the same, if not worse due to an even greater increase in the operating budget.

Questions:

1. Are you seeing what I'm seeing in the overall change in Commercial valuations?
2. What is the overall increase in residential valuations?
3. Based on the new preliminary tax base figures and the budget, what is the preliminary 2019 tax rate?

Thank you
David Hudlin

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Sarah Smith (sarah.uhl@gmail.com) on Monday, July 15, 2019 at 15:33:52

address: 969 Banfield Rd., Portsmouth, NH 03801
comments: Dear Members of the City Council,

I regret being unable to join the meeting this evening due to taking care of my toddler. He is my reason for writing this evening, and my reason for being less engaged on this issue heretofore. As parents of a young child, soon to be two, my husband and I find ourselves spending much less time downtown. The recent op-ed by State Sen. Fuller Clark resonated, especially while having ice cream at Izzy's yesterday evening and trying to contain our toddler on the busy sidewalk, keeping him away from traffic. Looking across the street, I thought about how incredible it would be to have a park there and how sad it would be for large, new buildings to take up more of the sky, adding to the concrete jungle feeling in many parts of our downtown, maybe even blocking the early morning sunshine in the winters that heats up the brick and makes Bow Street one of my favorite, bright strolls on the chilliest days.

Back to yesterday, I hobbled my pregnant self and toddler over to Prescott Park eventually, so he could run around. But it's a considerable walk, and in the process I wondered if we should have skipped downtown that night.

Realizing that much thought has been put into this process already, I hope that young families and the next generation are given serious consideration prior to the Council's upcoming votes. The legacy of a new park endures, and while it may require up-front sacrifices including financial ones, I hope that the bold leaders on the council will seriously consider the possibility - either of using the land adjacent to the McIntyre Building for green space or of negotiating the building's sale to the city for that purpose, too.

Many thanks for considering my comments,
Sarah Smith
969 Banfield Rd., Portsmouth, NH 03801

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Timothy Montminy (timothy.p.montminy@gmail.com) on Monday, July 15, 2019 at 16:19:26

address: 171 Monroe St Ext

comments: I am contacting the city council to lend my support to the proposed McIntyre Project. The process to determine the site partner and the development plan were open and transparent. There were a considerable number of opportunities for public input. In addition, the public-private partnership for the development of the McIntyre Site was a prominent subject during the previous city council election. All but one of the elected council members supported the proposed project, demonstrating the public's assent. As with all development in Portsmouth, a small but vocal group of citizens who have time and disposable income oppose the current McIntyre Plan. Some are upset that their vision for the site will not be achieved and propose a new process. Others propose the city negotiate a purchase of the building and demolish it, which is not feasible. Perhaps most upsetting is that a few members of this group have chosen to obstruct due to longstanding grudges against the city manager and members of the council. Regardless of their many motives, this vocal minority was not elected to the council. They do not represent the collective will of the city and furthermore they have no coherent plan or proposal for the site. The city has done its due diligence, and the voters have already spoken on this issue. Voters like myself elect representatives to the council to

make knowledgeable decisions in the city's best interest. We do not elect our representatives to make decisions based on the uniformed opinions of a vocal minority. Please vote to move forward with the current McIntyre plan and move the city beyond this issue.

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kelly Shaw (consuela58@yahoo.com) on Friday, July 26, 2019 at 08:22:38

address: 892 Banfield Road

comments: Hi all- I went to this very important meeting last night Thursday, July 25. I said to myself I wonder how many city councilors will attend this meeting? I know you all received personal invites. Only 2 city councilors showed up to this meeting. (Rick and Cliff) I do not understand once again that the only time we might see you is during election time — well doubtful except to come our way to squeeze in more housing. This is one more instance that you don't show support for our end of town. These proposed changes will directly effect 22 residents and a lot of businesses of your city! (Water Country, etc.) Part of the proposal that your city office recommended to the DOT without our input recommended to make a bike path on one side and walking on the other side with a median. We do not live in Florida and if you attended the meeting last night you would of seen the folks of our end of town not on board on this proposed change! Again, what about the rest of Portsmouth.

I request this email be read in full during public comments. Sincerely, Kelly Shaw

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Deb Bergeron (Crazyredhead03894@yahoo.com) on Tuesday, July 30, 2019 at 07:40:38

address: 242 State St., Portsmouth

comments: PLEASE APPROVE the Blue Ribbon Panel plan for compromise! No more condos!!!

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kathryn Lynch (kathielynych@hotmail.com) on Tuesday, July 30, 2019 at 19:01:01

address: 3 Boyan Place Portsmouth NH

comments: I am writing to express my support for the current plans for redeveloping the McIntyre site. While no plan is perfect I am opposed to the city purchasing and developing the site as this will be a tremendous burden on taxpayers. I have faith that the city's land use Boards, including the HDC, will require a redevelopment that is complimentary for our city and that will serve the best interests of the city.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Iiro Lehtinen (iiro.lehtinen@gmail.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 08:35:04

address: 740 Woodbury Avenue

comments: Honorable Councilors,

Thank you for your hard work and diligence in putting the McIntyre plan together, and thoroughly vetting it in public meetings. I appreciate the fact that the plan limits the burden to taxpayers.

Please vote to approve the current public/private partnership with Kane, so we can move forward to adding the property to the tax base without additional delays.

Best regards,

Iiro Lehtinen
740 Woodbury Avenue, Portsmouth, NH

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Aubrey Gewehr (agewehr@gmail.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 12:45:37

address: 255 Cass St., Portsmouth, NH. 03801

comments: Hello Councilors,

Unfortunately my work takes me away from Portsmouth this week and I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting about the Revisit McIntyre petition. Since I cannot attend I wanted to put on the record that I do not support this petition nor the goals of Revisit McIntyre. I know many others who feel this way as well including some folks who originally signed the petition and no longer support it once they learned more about the McIntyre process and the full scope of the project that Revisit does not address.

This has been a long hard process and I appreciate the work, tough decisions, and balanced compromises that you all have had to make to forge as much public good out of this project at no expense to the taxpayers as could be done. Please don't let a loud vocal minority of people derail the project at this point.

Thank you for your service,

-Aubrey Gewehr

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jim Splaine (jimsplaineportsmouth@gmail.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 13:43:23

address: 201 Oriental Gardens

comments: Wednesday, July 31, 2019

To: The Portsmouth City Council

Because of a work commitment, I cannot attend your hearing this evening. But I want to share some final thoughts before your vote on the Kane/Redgate McIntyre Project. I offer a half dozen facts, and challenge anyone to say they are not correct.

FACT ONE: City management and the City Council could have worked harder during the past 19 months to keep the U.S. Post Office at the McIntyre location.

FACT TWO: City management and the City Council could have worked harder during the past 19 months to create a more inclusive process that would have brought the innovative ideas of the best of Portsmouth's talent to the table, instead of choosing one developer early in the process to essentially lead and direct the project.

FACT THREE: City management and the City Council could have worked harder during the past 19 months to include more of our citizenry into the process of design and vision.

FACT FOUR: City management and the City Council could have included more developers and architects in the process of charrettes to come up with ideas for the 2.2 acres of McIntyre land, including the current building, that would serve the people of our community to the 22nd Century and beyond.

RevisitMcIntyre and many citizens advocated all of this. What an exciting process that would have been.

FACT FIVE: City management and the City Council could have saved a hell of a lot of consultant money by starting a process from Day One that accessed the vast and expansive talent of the citizens of our community, rather than rely on the profit-motives of one developer to the exclusion of all others.

But city management from that first day wanted to max out on development on that 2.2 acre site, so the deal was in -- that's why I have called this whole process "rigged," i.e. as my online Merriam-Webster dictionary defines it: "to manipulate or control; to fix in advance for a desired result." That's exactly what has happened from the time the Council voted on December 20, 2017 by a margin of 8-1 (I was that "1") to start this process. "The Urban Dictionary," especially relevant to this discussion because the topic is something urban offers further definition of the word that I have chosen to use: "The word 'rigged' is used to describe situations where unfair advantages are given to one side." "Rigged" is a descriptive word. And it describes the McIntyre process from Day One, 19 months ago. A process determined to get this desired result. It was all set up at that first vote on December 20th, 2017 to happen the way that it turned out. The deal was in.

AND FACT SIX: There is still no "deadline." Way too early on, we were told there was -- and that led to some panic decision-making and bowing to city management and staff -- but there is no deadline.

The City Council now should wrestle the future of McIntyre away from city management, staff, and the developer and revisit the process and the project. Otherwise, it seems clear to me that there will be well-founded protracted litigation to comply with federal requirements yet unmet, and expectations of the people of our community not yet realized.

There is time to get it right.

Please, take the time to get this right, instead of yielding to the powers-who-are in Portsmouth City Hall and some businesspeople in the development community who want to sign some documents to close off the discussion.

Because like it or not, that discussion will continue anyway. The powers-who-are may have the authority to take a vote. But not the authority to shut up the rest of us.

Thank You -- Jim Splaine, Citizen Activist, 201 Oriental Gardens, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801 E-Mail: jimsplaineportsmouth@gmail.com

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Steve Szmyt (molyoy2@gmail.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 14:08:41

address: 690 Woodbury Ave

comments: I am in favor of the originally proposed redevelopment plan with limited burden to taxpayers.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ilysse Sirmaian (Sirmaian@comcast.net) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 14:19:20

address: 1133 Woodbury Ave

comments: I appreciate all your hard work on the plan, especially the fact that you are thinking about the taxpayers and not burdening us with any cost or risk.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jason Walls (jason@msgmedia.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 14:56:08

address: 1113 Maplewood Ave

comments: Hi all,

I want to state as a voter, homeowner, and supporter of growth and progress in our city, that I do NOT support the proposals of the Revisit McIntyre petition. I would like to see the existing proposal continue to move forward, understanding the incremental changes that will be made along the way.

Our primary goal for the McIntyre project should be to maximize its usefulness (i.e., year round) in a way that mitigates or eliminates taxpayer expense. I don't care that we could or could not maybe get more revenue from a slightly different plan; even breaking even is great and I'd rather it get done already. Nor do I have any qualms about the city working in public/private partnerships - it's the best way to ensure that we benefit from market forces while still getting to provide input to the project. I see no evidence that anything was done outside of our duly elected representative council, and voted for them to make these decisions. Since the initial decision for a public/private partnership, there has been more than enough public input - we have what we wanted and are satisfied with the process. There will be time to tweak things, but the overall premise is sound.

Please consider this input during tonight's deliberation.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Trevor Bartlett (greatnsecret@gmail.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 15:01:28

address: 316 Coolidge Dr

comments: It was with great interest that I met the opportunities offered by the public input process leading up to the current state of McIntyre Project. I engaged in many of the open sessions, and know the high degree to which the development team regarded and responded to our suggestions. I walked out of those meetings always with a head full of new ideas, educated about innovations from all over the world being brought to bear on a genuinely complicated set of variables. I can understand how difficult it might be for anyone who did not attend those sessions to get their head around the ten-thousand turns it took us to arrive where we did. That said, I know from my own experience how false, misleading, mistaken and flat out deceitful the rhetoric is that the Revisit McIntyre camp has been smearing all over our good city. What their motives could possibly be are unfathomable to me, but that they have successfully snow-jobbed over 600 people into lending names to their efforts to sabotage such an inclusive and effective process should not be held as any directive to dismiss all the good work that we all did, nor the solutions we manage to knead out of a very challenging set of parameters and restrictions. Despite all the smoke the RM people might try to blow at it, it's a solid direction, a good plan, and I stand proud to have played even a small role in its production. I humbly ask that you deny their shifty little petition and proceed with all dispatch to get our McIntyre Project back in motion. Thank you.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jason Boucher (boucher.jason@gmail.com) on Wednesday, July 31, 2019 at 15:39:55

address: 65 Wibird Street

comments: Greetings, City Council:

I am a lifelong resident and in favor of the proposed McIntyre plan with Redgate-Kane. This conversation has gone on too long and it's time for the city to progress and approve this project, get the proper board approvals and build this welcomed addition to our beautiful city. Thank you, Jason Boucher

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Joanne Wolfe (JoanneWWolfe@comcast.net) on Friday, August 2, 2019 at 14:18:21

address: 213 Gates Street, Unit 1

comments: I copied this from a comment on social media where the author said to use it. I can't say it any better and I agree with wholeheartedly.

I sent this to the council a week or two ago. Feel free to use it:

I am contacting the city council to lend my support to the proposed McIntyre Project. The process to determine the site partner and the development plan were open and transparent. There were a considerable number of opportunities for public input. In addition, the public-private partnership for the development of the McIntyre Site was a prominent subject during the previous city council election. All but

one of the elected council members support the proposed project, demonstrating the public's assent. As with all developments in Portsmouth, a small but vocal group of citizens who have time and disposable income oppose the current McIntyre Plan. Some are upset that their vision for the site will not be achieved and propose a new process. Others propose the city negotiate a purchase of the building and demolish it, which is not feasible. Perhaps most upsetting is that a few members of this group have chosen to obstruct due to longstanding grudges against the city manager and members of the council. Regardless of their many motives, this vocal minority was not elected to the council. They do not represent the collective will of the city and furthermore they have no coherent plan or proposal for the site. The city has done its due diligence, and the voters have already spoken on this issue. Voters like myself elect representatives to the council to make knowledgeable decisions in the city's best interest. We do not elect our representatives to make decisions based on the uninformed opinions of a vocal minority. Please vote to move forward with the current McIntyre plan and move the city beyond this issue.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Maxene Feintuch (Mfeintuch1@comcast.net) on Saturday, August 3, 2019 at 07:56:22

address: 180 Lincoln Avenue

comments: Councilors and city manager:

I attended but didn't speak at Wednesday's meeting. For the reasons you heard, I, too, oppose the project as it is.

Three points to consider:

1. When the idea to create high-end condos was conceived, Portsmouth was a different city. In the last year or two alone, an explosion of residential building proposals, starts, and completions has made its mark (traffic, needs for city services, and soon water-sewer needs). We couldn't possibly NEED more places for wealthy people to live. We should know the number of living units that are planned or nearing completion now -- before we take up this precocious land for more. I'll bet the number is staggering.

2. I've lived in Portsmouth long enough to know what citizens have lost to development without foresight, backbone, zoning, a passion for what gives Portsmouth its character.

(A) We gave up a river view from Bow Street so people could eat expensive food at the water's edge.

(B) We gave up a river walk that other cities like San Antonio and Newburyport saw as a source public enjoyment and even a right.

(C) We gave up owning the old Pier II restaurant at the foot of the Memorial Bridge for more large condos.

(D) We gave up the Connie Bean Center for more expensive condos -- where most are dark, not lived in.

(E) We gave up an inviting streetscape on Deer and Maplewood Avenues because we didn't have the zoning to stop the Hampton Inn from installing a mass of frosted glass to hide their swimming pool and gym, making it a far less desirable place to walk.

Before we give up more to benefit a few, I suggest a "re-think."

3. Finally, no one can argue that the planet isn't in trouble. People around the world are making the effort to slow the disastrous effects of warming. They're trying to plant millions of trees (as fast as forests are being destroyed); they're constructing green/ living buildings; they're not "paving over paradise;" they're trying to reduce our carbon footprint.

Portsmouth should be doing a whole lot more (plastics ban -- did you see the photo in the paper of the tax assessor at a table with 2 single-use Poland Spring water bottles in front of her? Mandatory composting. Planting trees and keeping green space. Adding solar panels to municipal buildings.)

We've heard the warnings about the fate of the earth and the fate of coastal Portsmouth! Yet we may take these last 2 acres of land and pretend we didn't know. Shame on us. The planet deserves our acknowledgement, innovation, and sacrifice, not more bricks, parking, density.

Portsmouth should be praised by environmentalists, forward-thinking developers, and innovative city-planners for what action we take. We can do this.

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Keith Wilkinson (kwilk.works@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 4, 2019 at 09:08:00

address: 62 Winter Street

comments: August 4th, 2019

For the twenty years that I've resided in Portsmouth, I can summarize the city's upkeep of Goodwin Park as sporadic, reactive, and generally inadequate. Beyond the regular lawn mowing, some of the other plantings are usually lacking for care until a catchup effort just before Veterans Day. Drastic action is sometimes taken, like wholesale removal of entire planting areas, perhaps a quick and easy escape from the results of little regular preventative care throughout the season. On a positive note things have generally improved over the last twenty years but certainly not in line with property values. This year the central circle around the monument has been entirely forgotten. Nothing has been done. Some weeds are four feet high. I spent an hour there this morning removing tree seedlings and vines from the blueberry bushes.

The blueberry bushes are a special feature at Goodwin Park that should be maintained. The harvest adds a healthy charm to our family's table every July. I am concerned that this year's Veterans Day landscaping effort will involve wholesale removal of the blueberry bushes as the city scurries to show its annual respects.

For twenty years I've watched the city fail to regularly maintain the entirety of Goodwin Park. I am writing the city council advocating for systematic change rather than just a one-time resource allocation. The following are some considerations for a path forward.

Expectations be set as to the minimal maintenance of park infrastructure.

Consider metrics that are regularly monitored and scored. Make metrics transparent, available (online), with opportunity for resident feedback.

Apply adequate resources to meet resident service expectations and raise taxes if needed.

Consider private\sponsored resource use, such as landscaping company, and allowances for advertisement.

Consider seasonal hiring of temporary low wage but high skill labor pools such as UNH or other collegiate botany programs.

Consider seasonal hiring of teenagers and instruct them in basic plant care and weeding.

Thanks to you and city staff for your service to the residents. I apologize if my comments are taken in a negative light by anyone. This letter is truly meant as constructive feedback to build a better way forward.

Keith Wilkinson
62 Winter Street
603-781-9882
kwilk.works@gmail.com

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kristin Scott (Krscott@hubspot.com) on Wednesday, August 7, 2019 at 08:42:43

address: 16 Isaac Foss Rd

comments: I would like to make my support of the McIntyre Project public. On an economic level, New Hampshire (NH) loses many of its residents due to lack of professional growth and opportunities. Approving this project ensures that the current workforce shortage will be reduced, by potentially keep some of these

individuals working and living in the state. The state of NH just approved senate bill 12, which creates an opt-in agreement with employers to provide NH college grads with at least \$1,000 dollars to them personally, or their loan lender, for their first four years of employment. With the goal to incentivize young people to work in NH. Given that the state is taking such dire measures, why would we not contribute in the effort to minimize the workforce shortage that the state is continuing to bear witness to? Please approve this project to ensure that HubSpot, and other business, can continue to contribute to the New Hampshire economy and provide jobs that allow residents to continue to stay, work and play in NH.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jim Splaine (jimsplaineportsmouth@gmail.com) on Wednesday, August 7, 2019 at 13:24:42

address: 201 Oriental Gardens

comments: Wednesday, August 7, 2019

To: Portsmouth City Councilors,

In my morning mail today were a couple of birthday cards -- everyone has one and today is mine -- and a neat, flashy, multi-colored two-sided 9 1/2" by 11" card promoting "The McIntyre Project." It is complete with quotes from two former Mayors and four very pretty imaginary drawings packed-full of lots of goodies.

So much was squished onto the card that it reminded me of the actual plan, which squashes 77 \$3,000/monthly housing units, alleyways, stores and high-density office space with very limited parking into a relatively small spot of land. But like the project itself, the card was cluttered to the edges.

To give credit, the card is a fancy, puffy, fluffy feel-good piece similar to what our visiting candidates have been sending out, and what City Council candidates are likely to mail out for this coming November's election.

The word salad and drawing collage included on the card is a bit amusing to anyone who has seen development projects from initiation to completion. I've been around long enough in my roles in state, county, and local government to see many proposed developments seeking approval, and I know that often, to paraphrase a term from my original computer desktop publishing days, WYSIWYG: What You See Isn't What You Get.

In advertising and the promoting of a development, the trees are always green, the sidewalks always clean, the depictions of the people always show them full of smiles, and a mish-mash of goodies like benches, flowers, shrubbery, and lights are squeezed in to make it look all so wonderful.

Nice try by the developers. Their public relations during the past several months has been expert-level. I assume they think it's worth their investment.

As you consider your votes for your next meeting of Monday, August 12th, I urge you to consider the meaningful words of lifetime resident Deaglan McEachern, titled "There's Time To Create A Better McIntyre Plan." His commentary was published in this past weekend's Seacoast Sunday. I assume that each City Councilor has read it, but if not you can find it at <https://www.seacoastonline.com/news/20190804/theres-time-to-create-better-mcintyre-plan>

I go a bit beyond what Deaglan McEachern has suggested in his commentary. I support a serious all-aboard "revisit" to the entire McIntyre project concept. Since there is NO "deadline" on action for developing the property or determining a vision for the 2.2 acres of McIntire and environs, there IS time to involve more people and ideas and visions into the process, as RevisitMcIntyre has asked. The idea of design charrettes inviting the inventive and creative talent of area architects and visionaries is excellent indeed.

I think the hearing that was held on Wednesday, July 31st offered some valuable new ideas, including those of Bill Binnie, Paul McEachern, and Michael Simchik. The process for exploring best-use of this important piece of our Downtown should be revisited.

This is a piece of our Downtown that will affect, hopefully positively, the lives of those who will in future years call Portsmouth "home" as they move here or grow up here. Let's consider that they deserve the best, well thought-out use of those 2.2 acres in the center of our community. It's there future, not just ours.

I agree with Deaglan McEachern that there "is time" to do this better. There is time to get the McIntyre Project right. Please, do not feel compelled by any developer or by city management to vote on documents or agreements at your August 12th meeting.

I realize that with an election coming up in just a few short weeks, some City Councilors will try to find wiggle room and will call their vote as only a step in the process of acquiring the land, but any vote that sets into motion the process for confirming any part of the proposed Redgate/Kane McIntyre Project will be known for what it is. As a great man said, "One can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some the time, but..."

Thank You - Jim Splaine, Citizen Activist

201 Oriental Gardens, Portsmouth, N.H. 03801, E-Mail: jimsplaineportsmouth@gmail.com

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Fred Engelbach (f.engelbach@comcast.net) on Wednesday, August 7, 2019 at 16:31:50

address: 305 Marcy Street

comments: The architect's objective stated in today's flyer is "to enhance the quality of life, economic vigor, and sense of community". This demonstrates insensitivity to the loss of our Post Office (although it is noted that a Post Office is shown in the picture of the "most extraordinary enhancement to Portsmouth since Market Square"). To us residents, loss of the Post Office is the single, most important reason that planning needs to be revised or needs to start over. Taking all of the "extraordinary enhancements" together, they do not come close to offsetting the loss of the Post Office to the core of Portsmouth's downtown.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

New content begins:

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Erin McDonough (emcdonough542@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 08:23:26

address: 90 Brewery Ln, Apt 302

comments: I'd like to thank yourself and the entire City Council for your leadership on the redevelopment of the McIntyre site in downtown Portsmouth. Our city needs strong leaders who are committed to economic development and moving forward with projects that will deliver for our community. The project enhances downtown Portsmouth's economic development by attracting and retaining high quality employers like Hubspot.

The McIntyre project will generate new economic benefits for our city, bring new amenities downtown, create a year-round indoor community gathering space, and provide space for new retail and lifestyle features that will attract more visitors throughout the year.

I'm also gratified that the project will generate more than a million dollars for the city in annual revenue, including funds that will go directly towards improving existing parks throughout the community.

This is an unprecedented opportunity to transform an entire city block by addressing what residents prioritized most during the public input process.

It is my sincere hope the City Council will vote to move forward with this project on August 12th.

Thank you,
Erin McDonough

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jennifer Thomas (jenstebthom@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 09:20:22

address: 279 Wibird Street

comments: Hi Councilors - My husband, daughter and I recently moved to Portsmouth to be closer to family and take advantage of the vibrant community you all have helped create in the city. We understand that change can be hard, but embracing change in thoughtful ways is one of the reasons why Portsmouth is so wonderful today. My family and I support the Redgate / Kane proposed project on the McIntyre site and we would be excited to see that part of Portsmouth developed from the existing parking lot into a vibrant streetscape.

Thank you to the councilors for all of the time and effort you have put in to making sure this process has been fair and transparent over the last two years.

With appreciation,
Jen Thomas

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ken Linseman (kenlinseman@newlanddevelopment.net) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 11:27:55

address: 1070 Ocean blvd. Hampton NH

comments: Thank you councilors for your hard work over the past couple of years on the potential McIntyre project. I strongly believe that this project is the highest and best use for the property and most beneficial to Portsmouth and its residents. I am proud of my colleagues at Redgate/Kane - and most specifically the town of Portsmouth councilors for their diligence in working towards enhancing the downtown experience and maximizing the positive impact this project can have on the town.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ken Lingle (klingle750@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 11:39:32

address: York Maine

comments: I think this will be a great positive step in continuing to activate Portsmouth in a positive way by bringing more office space into town during the weekdays and more residences in town. They have provided a vision for a great community space that will help drive a positive, vibrant downtown. For someone who works in Portsmouth and hopes to move their shortly I think its a great way to continue Portsmouth growth.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Mark Schleicher (vermontmark@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 11:45:29

address: 35 Watergate Dr, Sarasota, FL 34236

comments: First off, let me thank you all for your hard work over the past couple of years bringing this project forward. As a part owner/investor in several businesses in the city, your efforts to make the downtown even more attractive to residents, businesses, and visitors alike is most appreciated. This project will certainly make for an even more dynamic Market Square and burnish the already estimable reputation of Portsmouth. It is apparent that the developers have listened to the community input and delivered a well thought out project for your consideration. I urge you to vote in favor of its approval.
Thank you.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Henry B Stebbins (hstebbins@slvlaw.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 11:57:49

address: PO Box 2091

comments: After more than a year of public input, I strongly encourage the City Council to vote in support of the Redgate/Kane plan for the McIntyre Building. The City owes it to its residents to move ahead and enthusiastically submit the plan to the federal government. It is good for the City, its taxpayers, and the greater Seacoast area.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Erik Anderson (andy42152@aol.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 12:23:34

address: 38 Georges Terrace

comments: Dear Councilors
At this moment the agenda for the 8/12/19 Council meeting has not been announced. I do believe that you will be reviewing a police contract and have found no place where this contract can be read for comment. Any help in finding it for review would be appreciated.
Here is a question? Does the upcoming contract contain the same provisions that would prohibit the city and the public from obtaining any settlement (aka, Goodwin settlement) negotiated Another Question: What are the COLA provisions in this upcoming contract?

Shouldn't any contract have ample time for public review beyond the night of the Council meeting?

Thank you for your time and any reply

Erik Anderson

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Marguerite Mathews, Co-Director (info@pontine.org) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 12:48:02

address: Pontine Theatre, #1 Plains Ave, Portsmouth 03801

comments: Pontine Theatre Presents "PLAINS SPEAKING:
Portsmouth's 1696 Massacre in Fact & Fiction"

(10 Sep - 8 Oct) Pontine presents "Plains Speaking: Portsmouth's 1696 Massacre in Fact and Fiction," a series of events exploring the history and legacy of the massacre that occurred on the Portsmouth Plains on June 26, 1696. Pontine's home at the 1845 Plains School is located on this site. "Plains Speaking" is made possible by a grant from NH Humanities. Activities are free and open to the public. Due to limited space, however, preregistration is required. Contact Pontine -- info@pontine.org or 603.436.6660.

A New Hampshire State Marker (#75), located at the Portsmouth Plains, reads, "In the pre-dawn hours of June 26, 1696, Indians attacked the settlement here. Fourteen persons were killed and others taken captive. Five houses and nine barns were burned." In fact, there are scant historical records documenting the facts of this event and the veracity of accounts given in local sources, such as Brewster's Rambles About Portsmouth (1859), has been challenged by local historians. Little progress has been made in understanding or to finding a context for this dramatic event,

Schedule of Activities:

Tue 10 Sep, 7-8:30pm, Emerson Baker, historical archeologist and professor of history at Salem State University, will speak to the patterns of English settlement in the Piscataqua that gave rise to conflict with Natives in the region in the 1690s.

Thu 26 Sep, 7-8:30pm, Lisa Brooks, Abenaki scholar, historian and professor of American Studies at Amherst College will provide a Native perspective of historical documents pertaining to the aggressions and outbreaks that took place in New England following King Phillip's War (1675-78).

Sat 28 Sep, 1-3pm Walking Tour. Adjoining the site of Pontine's residence at the Plains School is a five hundred acre tract of publicly owned undeveloped land known as The Great Bog. A 19th century railroad line running through the bog is being transformed into a walking trail that runs from Portsmouth to Breakfast Hill Road in the neighboring town of Greenland. This is the site where, the morning after the massacre, the Wabanaki raiders and their captives were overcome by pursuing settlers. Working with Denise and Paul Pouliot, Abenaki specialists in Native plant use, project leaders will lead a trail walk. Participants will enter an environment that retains features that existed at the time of the massacre and will learn about native species and their traditional uses. We will follow in the footsteps of the Wabanaki raiders on a likely route of their retreat. Along the way, stops will be made to share narratives written by those captured in historic raids.

Tue 8 Oct, 7-8:30pm, Nina Maurer, curator at Old Berwick Historical Society and project humanist for Plains Speaking, will present the findings of new research into the Portsmouth Plains Massacre and its connection to other raids in the Piscataqua region. This presentation will also include a panel discussion with Seacoast historians: Sandra Rux and Stephanie Seacord

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by E. Scott McQuade (smcquade@coolcore.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 13:03:41

address: 210 Commerce Way

comments: Dear City Councilors,

Our business was in downtown Portsmouth but now is located in Commerce Way only 3 minutes from downtown.

I have been to the meeting when the Kane Group presented 3D images and later broke out in small groups discussions. I feel very strongly that their proposal meets all the benefits that the majority of Portsmouth citizens had requested. All Portsmouth citizens will have open and protected space for year round use. Please consider a Yes vote for the Kane McIntyre Project.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by James True (jtrue@overheaddoorcompany.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 13:33:16

address: 210 West Rd. Portsmouth

comments: I would like to encourage the City Council to move forward with this project at the upcoming meeting. The partnership between the City and Redgate/Kane is impressive. This type of economic development is critical in that it attracts high quality employers, brings new amenities downtown that will bring new visitors year round. and the associated benefits to the city

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Wendy Kessler (fagelbagel@aol.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 14:39:44

address: 790 McGee Drive

comments: I haven't written to you before about the McIntyre project. I've been weighing it in my mind, and hadn't come up with a decision about how I felt about it.

I personally think the project is too dense, and I do not agree with the lack of parking. I can also see that there is a public benefit to the some of the design.

What I definitely know is this: this project is dividing the residents of this city. I think you should take a step back and see what the rest of us are seeing and hearing.

Is there a way we could have a non-binding referendum on the project at the next election? Then you would at least know how the majority of the voters feel. I am not naive enough to think that a vote would put the issue to bed (I don't believe the Revisit McIntyre people will quietly go away), but at least we'd all have an idea about where the majority of the voters stand.

I urge you not to plow forward with a vote for Redgate/Kane at this time.

Thank you.

Wendy Kessler

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Albert Howes (alhowesjr@hotmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 14:46:09

address: 21 Moonlight Drive

comments: Hi,

I am not a resident of Portsmouth but I live nearby and have worked in Portsmouth for over 20 years. I have been following the progress of the potential of developing/improving the McIntyre building and grounds and I like this project that the Redgate/ Kane group has proposed. Some of the aspects I like include the open space areas and public market...the fact that the building will not be another hotel but offices where those future office workers may/will procure local stores...and finally, Bow Street will have similar looking buildings behind McIntyre facing RiverHouse, Pocos, etc.

Please vote in favor of the Redgate/Kane project.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

AlbertHowes

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kathy dodwell (Kmdodwell@yahoo.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 14:49:36

address: 123 Bow st

comments: We are strongly in favor of the McIntyre Project Kathy & Peter dodwell

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by John & Bridget Stebbins (john.stebbins@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 15:31:28

address: 390 Richards Ave

comments: Councilors,

First, thank you for all of your efforts thus far on the McIntyre Lot Development. It has been a very long, bumpy & mostly thankless process and, as citizens of this beautiful city, we greatly appreciate the time and energy you have spent to provide us with a great project that will benefit all residents.

We are both strongly in favor of moving forward with the Redgate/Kane proposal. This proposal has been thoroughly vetted by third-party experts and has received mostly positive supports from all but a vocal minority of constituents. It would truly be a shame to start the process over at this point.

There is always going to be a "grass is greener on the other side of the fence" mindset with projects like these, but you should not let that hold you back from moving forward with this very strong project.

You should take solace in the fact that the current proposal is infinitely better use of the land than its current state. Please don't fold to the minority and let the parcel sit as a blight on downtown for another ten years.

Best,

John & Bridget Stebbins

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by David Marcel Arseneau (RealEagleScout@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 15:36:19

address: 245 Middle St, Apt 609

comments:

Dear City Council Members.

None of you should take any vote on any Climate Change issue until considering this information.

Thank you for your concern and consideration.

As an individual who authored his college's first paper on acid rain, please consider this commentator's scientific opinion.

.<https://youtu.be/fA5sGtj7QKQ>

David M. Arseneau
245 Middle St. #609
Portsmouth NH
603-316-0563 03801

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Joshua Bolduc (Jbolduc89@gmail.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 15:57:37

address: 5 winding brook dr. Stratham NH 03885

comments: The McIntyre project will generate new economic benefits for our city, bring new amenities downtown, create a year-round indoor community gathering space, and provide space for new retail and lifestyle features that will attract more visitors throughout the year. I'm also gratified that the project will generate more than a million dollars for the city in annual revenue, including funds that will go directly towards improving existing parks throughout the community.

It is my sincere hope the City Council will vote to move forward with this project on August 12th.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Merrill Aharonian (active_voice@yahoo.com) on Thursday, August 8, 2019 at 18:45:14

address: 5 Junkins Ave., Apt. 203, Apt. 203

comments: As residents of Portsmouth, my husband and I feel strongly that Bill Binnie's proposal for the redevelopment of MacIntyre is more inline with the values of the city and the interests of a far broader spectrum of its citizens' interests, offering better public use (including more parking, access to the Post Office, offering retail space first to residents and existing businesses, community meeting space and year-round access to greenspace). Allowing time to thoughtfully consider the Binnie proposal, rather than voting in the existing proposal on Monday, reaches beyond the limited vision of high-end luxury condos in a city whose workforce, young people and long-time residents are being forced out by the lack of affordable housing and the encroachment of hotels and condos well beyond the economic reach of many citizens who contribute to the vitality, diversity and economic viability of the city. Sincerely, Merrill and Russell Aharonian.

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kathleen Watson (salisburywatson@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 05:31:40

address: 200 New Castle Ave

comments: Councilors, Thank you to all of you for your dedication. I am a fairly close observer and I admire your commitment to the city and our residents.

Please vote to proceed with the McIntyre project as partnered with Kane/Redgate. It is a good plan and the revenue will go a long way toward enhancements in our other parks.

Thank you again for your service.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ron Rockelein (rrockelein@colwenhotels.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 06:21:36

address: 100 Deer St

comments: I am in support of the Kane's McIntyre proposal. It certainly is an improvement of the architectural landscape and it is welcoming/inviting to pedestrians. I believe the entire area requires less motor vehicle traffic and much more walking traffic. Restricted parking supports this.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Elizabeth Storm (elizabeth.knies.storm@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 06:49:40

address: 24 Osprey Dr

comments: I was thrilled to read that Bill Binnie has presented new vision for the future of the McIntyre Building. The Council needs to take a step back and consider what will really benefit the city. We do NOT need 77 "high-end" apartments with parking only for them. Binnie's plan to work with the McIntyre Bldg. itself and only develop the Bow Street side of the property makes such good sense. We need the parking he envisions, and we want our post office to stay! Please give this plan the careful hearing it deserves.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Gerald Duffy (gduffy44@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 07:38:08

address: 428 Pleasant Street

comments: Dear Mr. Mayor and Councillors:

On Aug 8, 2019, at 10:40 PM, Gerald Duffy <gduffy44@gmail.com> wrote:

If the Council decides on Monday not to advance the current McIntyre Project design and submit an application to the National Park Service — that decision will represent a betrayal to the many of us who have stood by, supported, defended, and been loyal to the Council we helped elect, and which offered us a legitimate process to bring this project to fruition. That process was an implied good-faith contract between

government and citizens to work together. I recognize that “betrayal” is a strong term, and I hesitate to use it, but it fits. I also realize that the Council faces a tough decision in weighing its options.

The combined effect of social media, a completely unprofessional and biased reporting job by our local newspaper, questionable tactics by critics, and the co-opting of several local luminaries has, to my mind, created the illusion of wide-spread opposition. Were the project to go back to the drawing board now, I can guarantee that almost all those 600+ petition signatories would disappear back into the woodwork and we would end up with the same crowd who will want to argue about parking, parks, and post offices. Moreover, such a decision would be very unlikely to bring the community together; if anything I predict it would deepen the resentments and ill-will that already exists and extend them for a long time to come.

The opponents — many of whom have disrespected and belittled the work of the Council and individual councillors — have now dangled an attractive shiny bauble under your noses, an “alternative” proposal that has zero process behind. The proposal, designed to tempt you to stall the progress, may or may not hold up under scrutiny. We can be reasonably certain the current plan is watertight. In effect, the alternative proposal represents nothing more than the plan that Michael Simchik and Bill Downey were waving around in late 2017, with the addition of some glass structures. A huge step backwards in a long and arduous process. The opponents — in spite of all the indications during the City’s formal input process that this would not be what thoughtful citizens want — would get their park, parking, and (God only knows how) their Post Office.

The camel’s nose is under the tent flap and it’ll take political courage to keep the rest of the camel out. I hope the Council stays the course it has been committed to for almost two years, and helps the City acquire this property as soon as possible. We know that the final design of the existing plan is still a work in progress. It’s good now; but it can be even better.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Nicole Davis (ndolan@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 09:15:16

address: 139 Fairview Ave

comments: Dear Councilors,

I am writing in support of the ordinance limiting the distribution of single use disposable items on city property. This will allow Portsmouth to set an example as an eco-municipality, and hopefully show both residents and visitors just how easy it is to eliminate all this unnecessary waste. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Best,
Nicole

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Matthew Wirth (mwirthnh@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 09:36:12

address: 439 Hanover St

comments: Thank you for your diligent work in the current redevelopment process.

Is it perfect? Nothing is, but we trust that realistic adjustments can be made.

The "Revisit" group is merely grumbling because they didn't get their way. Our downtown is very small compared to Boston or New York, let's make the most of buildable land. Pedestrian green space downtown will be plentiful with the completion of the North Mill Pond Trail and Greenway.

Thank you for your continued service in helping to make our charming city both beautiful and practical.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by David Ludd (dludd@aol.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 09:45:03

address: 125 Spinnaker Way

comments: As a Portsmouth resident (18 years) and former downtown business owner, I have a strong connection to this amazing city and tremendous pride in being a witness to its evolution. It has become a national model and standard for transformative growth and community development. The city is vibrant both socially and economically. It is exactly this kind of proposed development (Kane McIntyre Project) and out of the box thinking that has led Portsmouth to be listed as one of the top 10 places to live in the USA. Our local, state and federal officials worked collaboratively for years to secure the rights to develop the McIntyre building which everyone agrees has been a less than efficient use of space and an eyesore to many. The Kane McIntyre project represents a well thought out endeavor/plan that will positively impact the economy by providing jobs, an influx of business development and an aesthetically pleasing use of space that future generations can enjoy. It's time to stop the politicking and move to get this amazing projected started so we can all, residents and vistors alike, begin to enjoy the space and bask in the pride we have for our community. I support the Kane McIntyre project!

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Nick Isaak (nick.isaak@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 09:55:05

address: 35 Oyster River Rd.

comments: I would like to express my support for the adaptive reuse proposal that the Kane development group has proposed for the McIntyre property. It will bring a vibrancy and economic sustainability to an underutilized block of the city and greatly enhance all the surrounding streets.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Curt Rose (crose@sitestructureslandscape.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 11:03:30

address: 113 Government St Kittery

comments: We strongly support this project

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Katie Ehle (kehle@c3metrics.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 11:32:18

address: 2 International Drive, Portsmouth, NH 03801

comments: I would like to offer my support for the Redgate / Kane initiative to take on the downtown McIntyre project. They have proven themselves to do high quality work in preserving the historical value and beauty of our city.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Victoria Leonard (rose_alucard@yahoo.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 11:37:23

address: 17 George St

comments: To whom is may concern;

I fully support the Redgate-Kane McIntyre project., it has been five years in the making and it will provide a major economic boost to the city of Portsmouth. It will entice growing businesses to either remain or move into the Portsmouth area. The Redgate-Kane project has listen to feedback from the community and has meet all of the requirements to move forward with the project and I believe that they should be allowed to do so.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Bob Marshall (bobem11@hotmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 12:30:07

address: 11 Emerson Road, Durham, NH

comments: Having been a resident in Portsmouth, and worked in Portsmouth for close to 30 years it is exciting to see plans are moving forward with this building. The partnership between the City and Redgate/Kane provides a unique opportunity for collaboration between the community/City leaders and leaders in local real estate development to most comprehensively address the priorities of the community. Thank you to the City Council and Redgate/Kane for all your work on this project and I hope the Council will vote to move forward with this project on August 12th.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jeff Greenfield (jeff@c3metrics.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 12:44:07

address: 2 International Drive Portsmouth NH

comments: This is a massive project many years in the making and I'm confident in the ability of the Redgate/Kane team to execute. I'm very concerned about others teams showing up at the last minute and trying to jump in line without understanding all of the project requirements. I urge you to stay with the partner you have selected and who is committed to seeing this thru.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jake (Jakeem2195@gmail.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 13:52:17

address: 50 Sheffield Drive

comments: I support the Redgate/Kane team and do not support other folks jumping in and trying to say they 'handle it' at the last second.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Peter Somssich (somssich@myfairpoint.net) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 14:49:47

address: 34 Swett Ave.

comments: Subject: McIntyre Project / Aug. 12,2019 Meeting
(from Peter Somssich , 34 Swett Ave., Portsmouth NH (603) 436-5221)

Dear City Councilor,

I write to you today to encourage you to give yourself enough time to thoroughly evaluate the proposal made by Mr. Binnie as an alternative to the current plan being considered by the council for the McIntyre project. Mr. Binnie's plan seems to incorporate elements to address many of the concerns voiced by people opposing the current plan. A recent Herald editorial reminded everyone that originally, most residents supported and expected to see a significant park area as part of the redevelopment proposal. Perhaps, when the developers insisted that this was not possible for the project, unless a hotel was part of the proposal, it may have been discarded.

Mr. Binnie's proposal appears to be financially more beneficial to our city, with a higher ground lease and a higher deposit, as well as self-financing. It expects to keep the space available to the post office, while developing the McIntyre building which the city could acquire at minimal expense, create a park and protect the great views of our waterfront. It seems only prudent of the council, to carefully evaluate Mr. Binnie's proposal in detail, as well as giving the developers of the current proposal a chance to compete with what is now being offered.

Finally, as Mr. Binnie mentioned, this process has torn our city apart and we need to find pathways to bring us back together again. Also, my visits recently to various Night Out events in Ward 3, confirmed to me that many residents are paying attention to this controversy and that their votes in November will be affected by the outcome of this process.

Best Regards, Peter Somssich , tel. 603-436-5221

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Joel Breen (Joel@c3metrics.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 15:44:46

address: 2 international drive suite 130 Portsmouth NH 03801

comments: Simply state — I support the Redgate/Kane team and do not support other folks jumping in and trying to say they can "handle it' at the last second.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Dahvin Greenfield (Dahv@dahvdaniels.com) on Friday, August 9, 2019 at 18:40:12

address: 10 Pamela Dr Portsmouth NH

comments: This is a massive project many years in the making and I'm confident in the ability of the Redgate/Kane team to execute. I'm very concerned about others teams showing up at the last minute and trying to jump in line without understanding all of the project requirements. I urge you to stay with the partner you have selected and who is committed to seeing this thru.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Rick Wetmore (Rick.wetmore@wetsusa.com) on Saturday, August 10, 2019 at 08:17:17

address: 155 echo avenue- unit 17

comments: I've lived in Portsmouth since 1996. After years of delay it's time to make a move to finally upgrade the McIntyre building. After keeping up on all the articles the Kane/Redgate plan makes the most since. Let's stop the delays and move forward.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Kathryn Lynch (Kathielynch@hotmail.com) on Saturday, August 10, 2019 at 11:09:13

address: 3 Boyan Place

comments: I'm writing, once more, in support of the McIntyre project as proposed. I'm confident that the city land use board process will result in development complimentary to the site and its surroundings. I would like to see the memorial 9/11 tree carefully protected and the post office return with more 15 - 30 minute parking availability at the PO site. While I appreciate the "11th hour" offer of Mr. Binnie unless his project is as developed as the current plans and provides for zero taxpayer expense it seems too late. I'm opposed to taxpayers footing the bill for purchasing, rehabilitating, or redeveloping the property - our taxes are high enough as it is.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Mara Witzling (household@casswitz.com) on Saturday, August 10, 2019 at 11:17:47

address: 33 Hunking Street, Portsmouth

comments: 10 August 2019

33 Hunking Street
Portsmouth, NH 03801

Dear City Councilors:

We are writing to urge that you postpone approving the Redgate/ Kane plan for the McIntyre site. We are among the 601 voters who signed the petition to Revisit McIntyre, which we signed as individuals expressing our consciences in good faith and not as a part of any political block. For the last year and a half we have followed the conversation hoping that as the project evolved more resources would be put towards the public good rather than private development, but that has not been the case. We firmly believe that it would be a grave mistake to precede with the project as it is defined, regardless of how much time has been spent on developing the current plan.

Our major objection to the plan as it stands is that, ultimately, it benefits private development much more than the citizens of Portsmouth. We think that is a mistake – one that no amount of design tweaking can rectify. The Redgate/Kane plan is a business proposition that puts private business and living structures at the center while allowing for only incidental and peripheral public spaces, as some large buildings in Manhattan have created public plazas or interior atriums in order to receive tax credits. What the Binnie proposal gets right, on the other hand, is that it puts the public usage first. It emphasizes the rehabilitation and upgrade of the Federal Building and the retention of the Federal tenant whose presence at an intown location is a huge priority for so many residents of Portsmouth, ourselves included. And it creates a space whose purpose is for the public good, a resource be enjoyed and inhabited by all, not incidental spaces squeezed in amongst dwellings that have a price tag that is unaffordable to many people.

Please do not misunderstand us, however. We do not necessarily believe that is a question of choosing the Binnie plan instead of the Redgate/Kane plan. Rather, we believe that their differences highlight an important distinction: building for the public rather than private good. We believe that a truly long-sighted approach on the part of our public officials would consider the enhanced quality of life of the city's indwellers over densely developed revenue streams. Prescott Park, itself, is a good example of an area kept green and undeveloped although it does not necessarily add to the city tax base. The High-Line in New York was an abandoned eyesore until it was turned into a flourishing park, whose popularity in turn had the effect of rehabilitating and developing an entire neighborhood. Wagon Hill Farm in Durham is an instance where the residents actually chose to assume the financial burden of purchasing the property in order to keep a precious resource out of development.

We in Portsmouth are being gifted the McIntyre site. Our elected officials at the very least owe it to the citizens they represent to review all possible options to use the site to the greatest benefit of the public good. At the very least, the Binnie proposal deserves scrutiny and consideration.

Sincerely,
Mara Witzling
Peter Cass

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Fernando Amato (Fern_5@hotmail.com) on Saturday, August 10, 2019 at 12:13:11

address: PO box 584, Seabrook, NH 03874

comments: To the City Council,

This letter is to express how impressed I am with how you handle some of the most recent meetings regarding the McIntyre project. I also would like to note that I'm in full support of your plan, process, and all aspects of this project.

While in attendance for some of the meetings it really was concerning to see how some of the Portsmouth residents would act, I'm embarrassed for them honestly. Some comments that were made aimed directly at individuals on the council, trying to manipulate your judgment by making personal attacks with such negative and unappreciative comments. Kudos to you all for not letting these comments deter your decisions.

What I really loved was how you all kept composure, directly addressed the mob, and backed yourselves up with comments like "I don't need to be known for another flat parking development because over the years I've done a/b/c projects." Just a perfect response to put these animals in their place.

Now to address the actual project, I think you've fallen into a messy situation with this asbestos filled eyesore in the center of a beautiful community. However, a great opportunity has arisen from it, with a solid vision from Redgate/Kane. To come to the table with a unique idea, with common areas to be enjoyed by the community and visitors, this is really exciting. I spend in excess of 10+ hours a week at Pierce Island from April til October. To a few small groups of us who spend our time there, the idea of another location, in the center of town, either hardscape or green space sounds really wonderful. Side note – with all the time I spend in the parks, I've never seen any of those people who were at the meetings asking for a bigger park, and in my opinion most of them should probably work on going for a few walks because its evident they spend a lot of time sitting down. Another thought, the maple tree that was brought up, go ahead and move it – plant a bonsai tree instead... Planting a maple downtown and thinking it's going to stay forever is like planting a sequoia in your window planter.

My next concern is the proposal from Binnie – ridiculous! The guy starts his presentation by saying he doesn't want to do the project, then throws a fluff filled, off the cuff presentation. What a joke, let him fix someone else's building. It's disrespectful to the council and everyone involved to completely disregard the process over the last 2 years and make this kind of empty promises, that whole circus act was embarrassing. I would rather see the project go to someone who is passionate about the project vs disgruntled, because the passion is sure to yield a better ending result.

The final point is the financial benefits, I love the idea of the increased revenue to the city and no additional cost, no brainer!! I wish my town would have that opportunity. But the next part is key and was never addressed at the meetings. How much value does 76 luxury residential units bring the city? Yes there are tax benefits, but if they all have \$500k to buy a spot in this building I'm going to expect they have a few bucks left in those deep pockets to buy a few cheeseburgers from Gilly's, maybe a cocktail down on the decks, or maybe they will be the people who are donating to Harbor for Hope and really helping the community thrive – I'm sure these kinds of people are a lot more fun to spend time with than that old lawyer who just likes to talk shit for 30 minutes at the beginning of the meetings.

I hope the rest of your process is less painful than that 4.5 hour meeting, and I will be thrilled if this week the project is voted on to move forward with the current plans.

Thanks for the entertainment and learning experience, and thanks for building such a great town for my friends and I to enjoy!

Sincerely,

Fernando Amato

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Timothy Allison (tim_allison@hotmail.com) on Saturday, August 10, 2019 at 21:51:14

address: 19 ATKINSON STREET #3

comments: To: City Councilors

Please vote in support of moving the McIntyre Building Project forward at Monday's meeting. This is an important civic project that is worthy of everyone's support.

Thank you.

-Tim Allison

19 Atkinson Street

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by J. Dennis Robinson (dennis@seacoastnh.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 03:24:01

address: 101 Crescent Way, Portsmouth, NH

comments: I would like to go on record in opposition to both the deeply flawed McIntyre Project plan and the process by which the plan was created, presented, promoted, and steamrolled over hundreds of informed, intelligent, and caring local residents. Portsmouth is what it is today because, time and again, grassroots groups have stepped up to preserve historic buildings, kick-start museums, revive theaters, create festivals, build parks, save a steeple, launch a gundalow, fund a memorial, invent nonprofit agencies, land a submarine, lure tall ships, and more. For our elected officials to conclude that the current commercial plan is the best this city can come up with is to ignore Portsmouth's greatest resource -- the incredible people who live here.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Brad Lown (lown@nhtrialattorneys.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 07:12:49

address: 439 Middle Street

comments: I read with interest the Binnie article in the Sunday Herald. On its face, the proposal seems to have merit and is worthy of consideration. However, it appears to be roughly the same proposal Mike Simchik put forward a couple of years ago and then withdrew, and the article doesn't explain why a substantially similar proposal was withdrawn, or why it was not resubmitted sooner, while so many citizens were giving their input and spending so much time and energy evaluating alternative plans. Something else about the Binnie article struck me - there are two not-so-subtle references to "litigation" that might threaten to slow down the project. Binnie represents that he can somehow eliminate that prospect and at least implies that he controls the entire Revisit group. The threat of litigation may be real, but to reverse course at this late stage in response to the threat of what can only be frivolous litigation is not good politics, and not a good precedent.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Zelita Morgan (Zelita.morgan@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 07:43:43

address: 39 Richards Avenue

comments: Good morning Councilors,
Are we mandated by the NH Legislature to make a motion to propose this to go on the ballot? I don't recall any discussion around this with the community. If we are not mandated to make any motion or take action on this, when was this topic previously discussed and voted by the Council to bring the NH Lottery Executive Director for a presentation to the Council?

Thanks!
Zelita

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by josh denton (joshuaddenton@hotmail.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 07:46:06

address: 110 Brewery Lane, 312

comments: <https://casetext.com/case/marbucco-corp-v-city-of-manchester>

Marbucco Corp. v. City of Manchester
Supreme Court of New Hampshire BelknapSep 30, 1993
137 N.H. 629 (N.H. 1993)
137 N.H. 629632 A.2d 522

BATCHELDER, J.

The plaintiff, Marbucco Corporation, d/b/a Granite State Glass (Granite State), was the low bidder on a municipal contract. It sued the defendant, the City of Manchester (the city), for money damages for failure to award it the contract. Granite State argues that the Superior Court (Fauver, J.) erred in ruling that "although violation of competitive bidding procedures may create a right to an equitable remedy or mandamus, it does not give rise to a claim for damages based upon the failure or refusal to accept such bid." We reverse and remand.

On August 30, 1990, the city issued a notice to bidders for the replacement of windows at the city's public library. The notice, as amended, provided that bids would be opened September 25, 1990, at 3:00 p.m. and that bids received after the stated date and time would not be accepted.

The instructions accompanying the notice stated the city's intent to award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder who complied with the requirements of the bidding documents. The city retained the right to reject any or all bids and to waive any informality or irregularity in any bid received. Substitutions were prohibited unless a written request was sent to the project's architect at least ten days prior to the deadline for receipt of bids.

The bid process called for a base bid and eight alternate bids, specified either as additions or deductions from the base bid. Granite State's bid, adjusted for the alternates selected by the city, totalled \$142,370. Pro Con, Inc. (Pro Con), another prequalified bidder, did not specify whether its alternate #7 was an addition or a deduction and included an additional deduction, alternate #9, without explanation. Pro Con's adjusted conforming bid, assuming alternate #7 was to be deducted, was \$158,947.

The day after the bids were opened, Pro Con sent a facsimile transmittal to the project's architect, clarifying that alternate #7 was a deduction and explaining that alternate #9 was "voluntary on our part and reflects a savings if you supply an exterior muttin [sic] on [window types] I and H." The contract specifications called for true divided muntins on these windows.

Although the project's architect's "immediate response was not to accept the Pro Con bid because of the irregularity," he nevertheless recalculated Pro Con's bid, deducting alternate #9, and presented this information to the city. The result was \$650 lower than Granite State's bid. The city decided to "waive the irregularity" in Pro Con's bid and awarded it the contract.

Granite State filed a petition for temporary and permanent injunction, declaratory relief, and common law damages, arguing that the city improperly rejected its bid. By order dated November 14, 1990, the Superior Court (Murphy, J.) denied Granite State's request for a temporary restraining order. Thereafter, the city filed a motion to dismiss the remaining damages action. The Superior Court (Fauver, J.) granted the motion to dismiss, ruling that a disappointed low bidder could not, as a matter of law, maintain an action against a municipality for failure to award a contract. This appeal followed.

"On an appeal from an order granting a motion to dismiss, the only issue raised is whether the allegations are reasonably susceptible of a construction that would permit recovery." *Collectramatic, Inc. v. Kentucky Fried Chicken Corp.*, 127 N.H. 318, 320, 499 A.2d 999, 1000 (1985) (quotation omitted). We construe the facts and all reasonable inferences therefrom in a light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Id.*

We consider a question of first impression for this court: whether a disappointed low bidder on a municipal contract may recover money damages from the municipality for failure to award it the contract. The city contends that no contractual relationship exists between a disappointed low bidder and the municipality upon which a suit may be grounded.

[3, 4] Competitive bidding for a municipal contract serves "to invite competition, guard against favoritism, improvidence, extravagance, fraud and corruption, and . . . secure the best work or supplies at the lowest price practicable." *Gerard Construction Co. v. City of Manchester*, 120 N.H. 391, 396, 415 A.2d 1137, 1140 (1980) (quotation omitted). Where competitive bidding provisions are in force, "strict compliance with the municipal scheme is required; otherwise the contract award is void." *Id.* at 395, 415 A.2d at 1140.

As part of the municipality's obligation to protect the public interest and to avoid weakening public confidence in government, it is required to treat all bidders fairly and equally. See *Irwin Marine, Inc. v. Blizzard, Inc.*, 126 N.H. 271, 275, 490 A.2d 786, 790 (1985). "Consequently it is essential that the bidders, so far as possible, be put on terms of perfect equality, so that they may bid on substantially the same proposition, and on the same terms." 10 E. MCQUILLIN, MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS Â§ 29.52, at 436 (3d ed. rev. 1990).

[6, 7] The city argues that because it had no contractual relationship with Granite State, no contract remedy is available. We agree that an invitation to bid on a public contract is not an offer. Rather, the bid itself is an offer that creates no right until it is accepted. 1 S. WILLISTON, CONTRACTS Â§ 31, at 82 (3d ed. 1957). However, Granite State's reasonable reliance on the city's promise, if it awarded the contract at all, to award it to the lowest responsible bidder submitting all essential information prior to the bidding deadline, could entitle Granite State to damages under the theory of promissory estoppel. See *Owen of Georgia, Inc. v. Shelby Cty.*, 648 F.2d 1084, 1094-96 (6th Cir. 1981); RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF CONTRACTS Â§ 90, at 242 (1979). Hence, the city's argument that Granite State cannot prevail in contract fails.

When the facts and all reasonable inferences therefrom are construed in a light most favorable to the plaintiff, *Collectramatic, Inc.*, 127 N.H. at 320, 499 A.2d at 1000, it appears that the error in this case arose in the inclusion of alternate #9, an option proposed by Pro Con itself and not available to any of the other bidders. Alternate #9 went beyond the bounds of a mere informality or irregularity. Consequently, the city's award of the contract to Pro Con, based on an alternate not offered to the other bidders, was improper.

We must now determine whether money damages are an appropriate remedy. Although we acknowledge that the majority of courts have held that damages may not be recovered for rejection of the lowest bid, see generally Annotation, Public Contracts: Low Bidder's Monetary Relief Against State or Local Agency for Nonaward of Contract, 65 A.L.R. 4TH 93 (1988), we find the authority that allows the award of damages to be better reasoned.

The policy reason for denying money damages to the unsuccessful low bidder is that taxpayers should not have to pay twice, once for the contract and again in damages. See *id.* Â§ 2[a], at 99. We find this rationale unpersuasive. An award of money damages would be in the public interest because it would deter such misconduct by public entities in the future. Municipalities are generally subject to the same financial consequences for their misconduct as private corporations. Cf. *Gardner v. City of Concord*, 137 N.H. 253, 256, 624 A.2d 1337, 1339 (1993) (discussing the abrogation of municipal immunity in tort). No reason exists to insulate the city from the award of damages in this case.

[10, 11] Having held that money damages are appropriate for wrongful failure to award a contract to the lowest responsible bidder, we must determine the appropriate measure of those damages. In the ordinary case, the damages that an unsuccessful low bidder may recover should be limited to those it sustained directly by reason of its justifiable reliance upon the municipality's promise to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder submitting all essential information prior to the bidding deadline, if it awarded it at all. Hence, damages ordinarily should be limited to the expenses incurred by the low bidder in its fruitless participation in the competitive bidding process, i.e., its bid preparation costs. See *Paul Sardella Construction Co. v. Braintree Housing Authority*, 371 Mass. 235, 243, 356 N.E.2d 249, 254 (1976). To permit the recovery of greater damages in such cases could drain the public fisc in response to mere carelessness on the part of low level government!

t officials. If a disappointed low bidder complies with all requirements of the bid instructions but is deprived of the contract through some conduct of the awarding authority tantamount to bad faith, however, then the recovery of lost profits should be the measure of damages. See *Peabody Const. v. City of Boston*, 546 N.E.2d 898, 902 (Mass.App.Ct. 1989). The greater deterrence resulting from an entitlement to lost profits is justified when bad faith is proven because a municipality's bad faith undermines the purpose of competitive bidding. No contractor would bid at all if it knows that "the deck [is] stacked against" it, *Owen of Georgia, Inc.*, 648 F.2d at 1095, and public confidence in government is eroded when municipal officials act in bad faith.

Construing all facts and reasonable inferences therefrom in the light most favorable to Granite State, we hold that the trial court erred in ruling that Granite State was not entitled to maintain its action against the city for money damages. Accordingly, we reverse and remand.

Reversed and remanded.

All concurred.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Karin Barndollar (karin.bdollars@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 13:29:31

address: 120 Ridges Ct, Portsmouth

comments: I am writing to urge you to postpone the vote on the Redgate/Kane proposal for the McIntyre project, currently scheduled for August 12. Bill Binnie's plan offers a true alternative to the Redgate/Kane version which has caused so much division in the City. Not only does it come much closer to what participants of the public input sessions envisioned for the site, thereby offering the public benefit that is lacking from the Redgate/Kane proposal, it also appears to be a more financially prudent option. I hope the

Council will take this opportunity to work towards a solution that can be embraced by most Portsmouth residents. The current proposal is clearly opposed by many, as evidenced by the vocal opposition at recent public input sessions.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Gerald Duffy (gduffy44@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 14:25:34

address: 428 Pleasant Street

comments: Dear Mr. Mayor and Councilors:

I wanted to add one further thought to my last email, which urged the City to proceed with the McIntyre Project as planned.

I hope it doesn't, but IF the Council decides to seriously consider the Binnie Plan — a last-minute attempt to circumnavigate the whole formal process the City has put in place with a slightly reworked Simchik solution — there is only one way to get the best possible deal for the City (after all, how do we know the Binnie Plan will be the best option?) is to:

- Throw out the Redgate/Kane plan
- Throw out the Binnie Plan
- Go back to square one and initiate a lengthy, highly structured visioning plan, engaging the public in charettes — Then ask again for developers to apply — Then go through the lengthy process of vetting their proposals — Make sure the public is involved all the way — Council, City, and residents finally decide on the best plan — Implement it.

Personally I think this would be a terrible idea. Mainly, it would greatly increase the risk of losing the property altogether, which would truly be tragic. But it would call the opponents' bluff and invite all those petitioners to volunteer their time and energy over months. Residents would have no choice but to feel they had been listened to.

Entertaining the Binnie plan at this late juncture would be a complete travesty of the City's process to date. A complete restart would be the only right thing to do, if the opponents of the current plan really want the best possible solution — architecturally and financially.

Warm regards,
Gerald Duffy

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Tom Watson (twatson@dwmlaw.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 18:22:12

address: 200 New Castle Avenue, Portsmouth

comments: Mayor and City Councilors,

I am writing to urge that you move forward with the Redgate/Kane redevelopment proposal for the McIntyre parcel on Monday, August 12, 2019.

Let me begin by applauding the time and effort that this and prior City Councils have devoted to examining and developing the options for this property. I have been impressed at the number of community meetings and opportunities for public input. I believe this process has made the Redgate/Kane proposal a stronger one with a better outcome for the citizens of Portsmouth. That outcome includes:

- redevelopment of the property through a public/private partnership without City taxpayers footing the bill;
- significant short term and downstream revenue to the City which will help fund the restoration and maintenance of our existing public parks;
- the addition of office and retail space to the core of Portsmouth's downtown with its accompanying jobs;
- the addition of 70+ residences in a city starved for more housing;
- the addition of both indoor and outdoor public spaces creating year-around opportunities for the citizens of Portsmouth to gather without paying a cost of admission.
- the return of Bow Street to a two-sided street at its busiest stretch with the replacement of a brick wall encasing a subsurface parking lot.

In short, the Redgate/Kane proposal is urban infill at its best.

Those who oppose the redevelopment of the McIntyre parcel as too intensive forget that Portsmouth was once a much more densely developed community. Portsmouth spent several decades tearing down buildings in its urban core to accommodate parking in a misguided belief that it could best compete with suburbia in that fashion. We now know better. Much of the best development in Portsmouth in the last 20 years has been downtown infill. It has added to the City's vitality, prosperity, sustainability and appearance and made the City a better place in which to live and work. The Redgate/Kane proposal will significantly add to that outcome.

Rest assured, no proposal for the McIntyre parcel will please everyone. There will always be another person with another idea, a "better" plan, or a different vision. We can spend years vetting and debating these ideas. In the interim, the McIntyre Building will sit empty and begin deteriorating.

The process of regaining the McIntyre parcel began over 15 years ago. As our elected representatives, you established a process for weighing the options, soliciting public input, evaluating the proposals and negotiating a good agreement. You have done your job well. Now is the time to bring this process to its natural conclusion.

The Redgate/Kane proposal is a win-win for the citizens of Portsmouth. I urge you to move forward with this proposal on Monday night.

Thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts on the very important project.

Tom Watson

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Johanna Soris (Johannasoris@gmail.com) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 18:26:00

address: 14 Sheffield Rd Portsmouth NH

comments: I was born in Portsmouth in 1949. I grew up on 14 Sheffield Rd, graduated from PHS and UNH. During the late 1940's my father and grandfather owned the Blue Goose Restaurant on the corner of Congress and Chestnut Sts.

The McIntyre figured prominently in my family because my mother went to work for the IRS there. The Blue Goose burned down in 1955 and we moved to our new house the following year. My father started working at Pease. We were a happy family. My mother lived in 14 Sheffield Rd until her death in 2017. Now I'm living there again.- I moved back in March 2018. While growing up our family loved to take advantage of the changes in downtown Portsmouth. My parents and my friend's loved the Blue Strawberry, the Theater by the Sea, the Ferry Landing, Prescott Park, Market Square Day, the Bow Street Fair. You name an event or new venue and no matter what the generation we were all going to check it out. A few years ago my mother slowed down and couldn't navigate downtown Portsmouth on her own to do errands, go to the Post Office, go shopping, meet friends. But she would find a way not to be a so-called shut-in. She started driving to the Stratham Post Office for one thing. Her ladies who lunch group seldom met at a downtown restaurant because of difficulty parking. My sister spent Saturdays with her so she could be dropped off close to Popovers or the Music Hall. She would have been sad to have missed out on Bill Binnie's concept of the redeveloped McIntyre block. We could have parked nearby. Eaten at a new venue, taken in the sights from Bow to Daniel, and she could have reminisced about her days fighting tax protesters back in the IRS days. Bill Binnie's concept is multi-generational, Michael Kane's doesn't even acknowledge the existence of long time residents who want to participate in Portsmouth downtown but who rely on safe parking close to their destination.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Gayle blumenberg (Gayleblu@comcast.net) on Sunday, August 11, 2019 at 20:00:41

address: 18 Congress st 404

comments: I am strongly in favor if the Binnie plan for the McIntyre building. It fits in so much better with the surrounding neighborhood and will still be financially good for the city.. It is a plan for the people who live here in town.. Please give it a chance. The Kane project has been basically shoved down our throats with slick presentations. Please give Binnie a chance!

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Michael Stasiuk (m.stasiuk@comcast.net) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 07:50:37

address: 31 Dearborn Street

comments: I strongly support the reworked proposal to include open green space in the McIntyre project. As a 35 year resident of the north end of Portsmouth I experience daily disgruntlement and sadness over the greed that altered my end of town with no consideration for views or a sense of scale and a green neighborhood. Just room for trees on the hotel side of Maplewood Avenue would have made such a difference.

It's mystifying to see the work being done to streets like Woodbury Avenue making it more pedestrian friendly along side a major street like Maplewood being aesthetically violated.

The McIntyre block is a chance to get right what was done very poorly along Maplewood. Do the right thing.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Roger Wood (Rogerwoodnews@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 07:55:32

address: 1066 South St

comments: I could be wrong, but when senator John Gregg. First announced to the media, and I was there as a reporter at City Hall, he envisioned a new federal building at Pease as part of the plan to transfer McIntyre to the city. That federal building has never been built. My question would be where would the workers at Social Security the IRS and other agencies go. If this issue has already been resolved, you can ignore this.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ken Goldman (kgoldman@comcast.net) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:14:16

address: 271 Islington Street

comments: Over the last several months I have been reading a lot about resistance to the current McIntyre Plan, Revisit McIntyre and the 601 residents who signed the Revisit McIntyre petition. What i have never heard or read anything about is the number of people who, like me, have contacted the City Council to express their support for the current plan. Are these numbers available. If so, I think it would be an important metric to share with the community to help put the pro and con arguments in context. Thank you.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jeanne Amato (jeanneamato@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:23:43

address: 365 F.W. Hartford Drive

comments: I am writing to encourage all of you to seriously consider alternative options for the McIntyre site before you vote yes for Redgare/Kane proposal. Your decision in this matter will impact this city forever. I feel strongly that we do not need more big buildings and more high end condos. My walk to work takes me down Bow Street to Penhallow. This morning I was thinking how awful it will be to come around that bend and see massive big buildings. It saddens me. I find it hard to believe that all but one of you actually believes that this plan is a good idea! You were elected by the residents of Portsmouth. It is your responsibility to listen to them. I would like to see this issue on the ballot in the Fall and let the residents decide. Thank you.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Karen Bouffard (Kbouf@aol.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:35:11

address: 87 Richards Ave

comments: Dear Mayor Blalock and Members of the City Council:

I agree with the opinions and editorials in support of the Binnie option for the McIntyre property. To move forward with the Kane proposal with an option on the table such as we have would be irresponsible and change the face of our historic downtown for generations. Please don't allow that to happen by signing onto the Kane proposal tonight.

Respectfully,
Karen L. Bouffard

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jason S Walls (jason@msqmedia.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:37:17

address: 1113 Maplewood Ave

comments: Dear city councilors,

I want to express my support for moving forward with the next step in the existing Redgate/Kane public-private partnership for the McIntyre property, understanding that there will be opportunities for adjustments along the way.

I am particularly concerned about the tactics of certain opponents of the plan to move forward. But there has been a severe amount of disinformation, scare tactics, and moving of goal posts that I think is transparent for everyone to see at this point. I don't want to dwell on the negative here, but I feel that to further entertain these tactics, even by giving an inch and "hearing it out", will damage our ability to use our representative form of city government. I don't want to see populism take hold in Portsmouth, especially when the populism is a vocal minority. I don't want to name them, as a group or otherwise, because I feel that the perpetrators of those tactics are mixed in with a few people who just had legitimate concerns and questions about the existing plan. There has been plenty of clarification and easing of those concerns and questions by not just yourselves.

I think that this is a sort of moment of truth, literally and figuratively, when it comes to how we as a city (and city government) will act in situations like this in the future. Trust the people that voted for you that we believe you'll do the right thing and will vote for you in the future knowing that you will.

Thank you.

-Jason Walls

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Mike Ripley (mripley@crossagency.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:44:16

address: 255 Portsmouth Avenue

comments: I have lived and worked on the Seacoast and in Portsmouth for the last 6 years. I've seen how in that short time things have changed and love the feel of downtown. The McIntyre project is another example of the commitment for the city to enhance the economic development by bringing in and attracting employers like Hubspot.

It is my hope that the City Council will vote to move forward with this project on August 12th.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Dixie Tarbell (dixiemcleantarbell@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:45:48

address: 25 Driftwood Lane Portsmouth, NH

comments: I trust that the City Councilors for whom I voted in the last election have been diligently studying Revisit/Binnie's plan in comparison to the diligently wrought RK McIntyre plan- and that their ethics and expertise will best determine the next course of action. I'm not attached strongly to either plan, so will be fine with whatever the result is of their much more informed opinions than mine. I voted for them because I trusted them to most competently represent the common good in Portsmouth. (The possibility of litigation on either side should not be a deciding factor in their decisions.) Thank you all for your extensive time and dedication!

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Graeme Boyd (graemeboyd86@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 08:56:25

address: 81 Decatur Road Portsmouth NH

comments: I want to express my support for moving forward with the next step in the existing Redgate/Kane public-private partnership for the McIntyre property, understanding that there will be opportunities for adjustments along the way.

I am particularly concerned about the tactics of certain opponents of the plan to move forward. There has been a severe amount of disinformation, scare tactics, and moving of goal posts that I think is transparent for everyone to see at this point. I don't want to dwell on the negative here, but I feel that to further entertain these tactics, even by giving an inch and "hearing it out", will damage our ability to use our representative form of city government. I don't want to see populism take hold in Portsmouth, especially when the populism is a vocal minority. I don't want to name them, as a group or otherwise, because I feel that the perpetrators of those tactics are mixed in with a few people who just had legitimate concerns and questions about the existing plan. There has been plenty of clarification and easing of those concerns and questions by not just yourselves.

I think that this is a sort of moment of truth, literally and figuratively, when it comes to how we as a city (and city government) will act in situations like this in the future. Trust the people that voted for you that we believe you'll do the right thing and will vote for you in the future knowing that you will.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Barbara DeStefano (barbarajdestefano@comast.net) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:01:48

address: 90 Brewery Ln

comments: Please vote to proceed with the current Redgate/Kane plan for the McIntyre project. The process has been long & open to the public already. I am sure it will be tweaked all along the way. No matter what you do, not everyone will be happy (this is Portsmouth after all). Thank you!!

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jennifer Padgett (jpadgett71@hotmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:12:53

address: 303 Decatur road

comments: Dear city council ,
I think you all are moving into the right direction to allow Redgate/Kane project to move forward I think other developers that just walked in last min with a new proposal is insane and unfair to Redgate /Kane ! They should have gone through the process like the others ! This project is what the city needs and is so great in all aspects ! The Kane's have done so much for the city including state of the art medical buildings that we use and are 100% occupied and more to come ! I can't wait to enjoy this new project ! Thank you and I know you will do the right thing by voting for it ! Thank you

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Byron Matto (bmatto@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:24:51

address: 17 Fields Rd

comments: Move forward, do not allow Revisit and sideline developer to break a sagacious process to this point.

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Adam Ryan (Kaplan) (mobiltune@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:29:32

address: 100 Islington St., Apt. 2

comments: Dear Councilors,

I support delaying submission of the Historic Monument Program Application. I have followed this process closely, always supported until the details of the RK proposal came to be. I really think that the Redgate-Kane plan needs significant changes before moving forward to the land-use boards. I would like to see MORE public benefit, more affordable rents and more suitable rental units for our cities needs. The financial report strongly supports a reduction in developer profits and shows very little risk to the developer.

On Bill Binnie's proposal, I am glad to see it is at least causing some to more critically evaluate the RK plan. I personally feel that the RK proposal just needs some modifications to appease the public. We are close and I hope that we can spend more time working through this decision.

Please take as much time as you need to reach the best decision. I support a delay of the applicaiton submission.

-Adam Ryan Kaplan

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by John Kilroy (john.f.kilroy@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:31:02

address: 25 Buckminster Way

comments: I DO NOT SUPPORT moving forward with the Redgate/Kane plan for development of the McIntyre site.

The process for public input was flawed and unduly influenced by the developer. The existing plan imposes an artificial deadline and is skewed heavily toward the developer's, rather than the public's interests.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Gretchen Rath Porter (gretchen.rath@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:40:40

address: 112 Penhallow St, Portsmouth, NH

comments: City Councilors,

The proposed Kane/Redgate McIntyre development with its attempt to mimic the oversize scale of the McIntyre Building will destroy the pedestrian scale of the 3 story historic architecture on all the surrounding streets. The mass of the proposed Kane/Redgate McIntyre development will cause unprecedented congestion in the heart of historic Portsmouth which is already packed with pedestrians and backed up with traffic on the one way streets in this confined area. The iconic views of the St John's Church and the Bow St cityscape will be lost forever with the proposed 5 story buildings that will only allow brief glimpses of these historic treasures through very narrow canyon-like walkways.

The Portsmouth Downtown Historic District was entered in to the National Register of Historic Places in June of 2017 for a reason. The scale of the 3 story warehouse buildings, the St John's Church and Bow St cityscape, and views of the waterfront are jewels in the heart of the historic district that define the "sense of place" that attracts residents and visitors to the area.

The proposed Kane/Redgate development includes a massive, over-scaled building of 79 luxury apartments with only 79 parking spaces exclusive for the apartments and no public parking! In fact, 50 public parking spaces are being removed with the the Kane/Redgate proposal!

How will 1,000 people a day, who will be needed to shop in the proposed 40 commercial retail/restaurant spaces, be able to drive on these one way streets or find a place to park with all the traffic that this overdevelopment is destined to bring to the area? Are they all walking over from Hanover St Garage which is already full some days? You do not need a traffic study to understand what a congestion disaster this will bring to what already has standstill traffic due to so many pedestrians walking around the Ceres St/Bow St/Penhallow St/Market St area. Having a business on Penhallow St for 40 years, I have observed the increasing number of pedestrians and cars causing traffic headaches even without the added stress of the Memorial bridge going up several times a day!

Why do we need this much more retail space when the national trend of brick and mortar retail is on the decline, as witnessed in NYC and Newbury St, Boston.

Additionally, there is so much new commercial space coming on the market in Portsmouth with the new construction at the Foundry garage, the building on the corner of Hanover St and Maplewood Ave, the building on the corner of Deer St and Maplewood Ave, and the new proposed construction on the corner of Daniel St and Penhallow St as well as the corner of Maplewood and Raynes Ave to name a few. Is Portsmouth really in an economic bubble as Mr Eaton described, that we can be sure that so much new commercial space will not flood the market at a time when there is an economic slowdown forecasted on the horizon? What's the rush to commit to develop more commercial space now when there is a boom underway in Portsmouth! There is no deadline on the McIntyre project and these buildings proposed in the Kane/Redgate project can not be undone and taken down!

“What will it profit a man if he gives the whole world, yet forfeits his soul?”
What will it profit Portsmouth if the City Council agrees to the Kane/Redgate development, yet forfeits the soul of the city in doing so?

Please give consideration the Binnie proposal which is a positive alternative to over development and answers so many of the requests heard over the past 2 years: open space, parking and post office, none of which are found in the Kane/Redgate proposal. PLEASE consider the grave decision you are about to make and give serious thought to the future of this area for many years past your lifetime!
Thank you

IncludeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Terry Bickhardt (tbickhardt@colwenhotels.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 09:52:22

address: 230 Commerce Way, Suite 200

comments: I support the McIntyre project and believe it will be a boost to the city. Kane is an excellent company that only does first class projects in the city of Portsmouth

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Zelita Morgan (zelita.morgan@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 10:17:47

address: 39 Richards Avenue

comments: Good morning, Councilors!
Thanks to those councilors who have had the chance to reply to my original submission.

It will be wise for this body to first seek to listen from the community and then decide on next steps, not the other way around. The proposed motion on the agenda - wherever it came from -, signals a haste in pushing this through.

Thanks for your time and consideration,
Zelita Morgan

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Scott McKee (turbulence19@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 10:25:25

address: 151 Lafayette Rd #3 Portsmouth

comments: I am contacting you in support of continuing the Redgate/Kane project, which has been fairly and publicly vetted over the course of many years. While no development is ever going to please everyone (myself included), I firmly believe that it would set a dangerous precedent to allow competing developers a second bite of the apple this late in the game, simply because a vocal minority of residents think that they have a better vision for the project. --Thank you for your service to our community.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jonathan Sandberg (jfsandberg@yahoo.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 10:33:45

address: 160 Bartlett Street

comments: Dear City Councilors,
I am writing to urge you to reject the "Binnie" plan and pursue the Redgate-Kane plan for the redevelopment of the McIntyre site. I participated in many input sessions and was pleased to see many of my ideas included in the Redgate-Kane plan. It would be unfair at this late date to negate all the hard work by involved citizens over the past few years.

The RK plan provides a lot of much needed amenities for the city including year-round public gathering space, retail space for small businesses, office space, and most importantly, housing. I am pleased that there is limited parking on the site since more parking would draw more cars an already dense neighborhood and it makes it more likely that the residents and employees of those buildings will walk and bike more.

Furthermore I am quite suspicious of the sincerity of Bill Binnie's proposal. While I am by no means an expert I seriously doubt that his plan could possibly be profitable. He would have to spend many millions to build all those underground parking spaces and rehabilitate the McIntyre and it would take him an awfully long time to recuperate that money in rent. Therefore, I don't trust his motivation and I think you should be weary of dealing with him.

Thank you.

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Barbara van Buskirk (art@bvanb.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 10:42:34

address: P.O. Box 938, Portsmouth, NH 03802

comments: I am unable to attend this evening's City Council meeting and vote on the McIntyre Project yet want my voice to be heard via this email. "If you remember only one thing from this entire semester," said my Boston University professor during my first Mass Communications class, "remember this: No matter how much time you've spent on a project, no matter how much money you've spent on a project, if, at some point, you realize you've made a mistake and are on the wrong track, stop and start again. No matter how much money or time has already been spent, stop and start again. Otherwise you will regret moving forward for the rest of your life." I urge the City Council to vote to consider alternative plans to the Redgate/Kane McIntyre Building Redevelopment plan. If you do not do this, each of you and every Portsmouth citizen and visitor will regret your decision for the rest of our lives and the lives of future generations. Thank you.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Emma-Rive A. Nelson (Portsmouthcafe@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 10:53:58

address: 87 Richards Avenue

comments: Dear Mayor Blalock and Members of the City Council

I agree with the opinions and editorials in support of the Binnie option for the McIntyre property. To move forward with the Kane proposal with an option on the table such as we have would be irresponsible and change the face of our historic downtown for generations. Please don't allow that to happen by signing onto the Kane proposal tonight. As a business owner and life-long resident of Portsmouth, I hope the future of the city is as important to you as it is to me. The Binnie plan warrants serious consideration—to disregard it would be a baffling and shortsighted choice. Regardless of how much time has been invested in the Kane option, it is never too late to abandon something that is flawed and ultimately bad for the city's future.

Respectfully,
Emma-Rive A. Nelson
87 Richards Avenue
Portsmouth, NH

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Ned Thompson (Ept1955@aol.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 11:11:32

address: 55 Salter Street

comments: I truly hope that everyone will take a deep breath and truly examine the phenomenal opportunity presented by Bill Binnie. This is truly a vision which captures most of what a vocal majority of Portsmouth residents want.

includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Melanie Burger (melanieburger@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 11:09:44

address: 25 Nelson Street, Dover

comments: Good morning!

Although I am no longer a resident of Portsmouth, I am still a property owner here (259 Raleigh Way) and feel very connected to the city that I called home for 20 years. I'm writing to express my support for the proposed Redgate/Kane development of the McIntyre property. While I have not actively participated in the project up to this point, I found the entire process to be exceedingly transparent and fair. The council communicated adequately to residents prior to each public input session, making it easy for anyone who wanted to be involved and have their voices heard to have that chance. I am excited for the plan that my fellow citizens and the developer have come up with and would like to see it come to fruition.

I am deeply frustrated by the gaslighting and misinformation that I have seen coming from the Revisit McIntyre group and I urge you to dismiss any further obstructionist actions that this group takes to delay this project further. They had an opportunity to be involved in the project just like everyone else at the onset.

Just because they chose not to participate and now don't like the outcome of the hard work that many others put into this does not give them the right to derail the entire project.

I urge you to proceed with the McIntyre project as proposed by Redgate/Kane.

Thank you,
Melanie Burger

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Catie Medeiros (catiemed@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 11:41:22

address: 43 Allen Farm Lane, Greenland, NH

comments: Dear City Council Members,

I've sat at many of the council meetings regarding the McIntyre project. It's been a long and thoughtful process. Thank you for your help in facilitating great discussions with the public and getting everyone engaged. I know some people are chiming in late to this project and the show must go on. They will appreciate the hard work you've all done once the project is finished. This is going to be a great site with multiple benefits for Portsmouth. The proposal is vibrant and innovative with space to accommodate all ages and bring in new attractions like the indoor market.

The financial benefits of the project are also great with the site bringing in a million dollars of annual revenue to the city. The site will also be enriching other parks and green space with the additional revenue.

We are blessed to live in this beautiful area and I'm grateful that there is so much passion in developing downtown to make it better for all people - residents, businesses and visitors. Thank you again to all the members of the council and the Mayor for taking this project so seriously and giving it the time and detail it needs to be a success. See you all tonight and looking forward to seeing this move to the next step in the process!

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Paige Trace (jtraceantiques@mac.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 12:27:47

address: 27 Hancock Street

comments: Dear Mayor Blalock and City of Portsmouth City Councilors,

Like others, I'm asking you to consider "taking a deep breath" and to postpone this evening's vote. You have a choice now and it would be horrible to not take everything into consideration just because Carlisle came late to the party. The party is still in full swing so please don't walk away from their proposal. I would hope that you would take some small amount of time to consider the Carlisle Capital proposal. There is no deadline other than your own eagerness to sign up SoBow LLC/Redgate Kane. Why? Carlisle has doubled the moneys to go to the City and is apparently willing to finance the project themselves. Will Michael Kane do the same? The City would end up with less financial risk and far greater public benefit with Carlisle's proposal. What is it that prevents all of you save likely one from moving to postpone this evening's vote to take Redgate Kane as the City's partner? Wouldn't it be in the entire City's best interest to look at both proposals to determine which one would best serve the residents for the next seventy five years? I know you all to be bright caring City Councilors who strive to do what's best for all who elected you. Please consider your actions and your

vote because you have the ability to do so much good. And you also have the ability to take away so much potential benefit with your vote by voting tonight for Redgate Kane d.b.a. SoBow LLC. I know you've all worked on this for what seems like forever but to me it seems that you would want the proposal that provides greater financial security and greater public benefit. Please do your due diligence and take the time to do a comparison. Taking your time would truly be so much better for all of us. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Paige Trace

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Matt Lane (Matthew.Lane@icloud.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 12:35:07

address: 102 Pine St.

comments: Good afternoon,

To everyone on our city council, thank you all for your continued efforts regarding the McIntyre project. Regardless of which side you're arguing for, both parties seem to be motivated by their love for the city & desire to produce the best possible outcome for Portsmouth's residents.

We have elected you to make these decisions on our behalf. While public input is important, ultimately this decision lies in the hands of our elected officials. This decision shouldn't come to a public vote, as proposed by some. That process would simply serve to draw out the divisiveness that this project has created. Our city council is educated on the nuances of both proposals and is less apt to vote on emotion than the public. You have my trust to make the best decision tonight on behalf of our city.

One last note. If at all possible, the revisit opposition should be utilized to leverage a slightly better offer from RedGate/ Kane, if that's determined by the council as the best path forward. A proposal with thinner margins for the developers, or more favorable variability for the city in terms future earnings would perhaps help rationalize & justify the division that has been caused by this process. An improved RedGate/ Kane deal may be perceived as a win for both sides of the argument.

Thanks again for your continued efforts & good luck tonight. Cheers, Matt
includeInRecords: on

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Tom Holbrook (tomholbrook1970@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 12:42:16

address: 86 Morning St

comments: Hi- The world is on fire. We should be worried about making our city carbon neutral, and when it comes to housing, we should recognize that the kind of housing we want in this city, the kind that provides a diverse, sustainable workforce, is never going to be the result of market forces.

I firmly believe the city should take the McIntyre property and build city owned apartments at a below market rate.

I know that nobody else wants this, and I accept that. There was a process that solicited ideas and projects, and the Redgate Kane proposal came out of that process. You should, BY NO MEANS, restart this process to accommodate people who waited until the eleventh hour to get involved. Sadly, the city is going to get sued either way. But you risk setting a very, very dangerous precedent if you backpedal on this.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Aubrey Gewehr (agewehr@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 12:44:10

address: 255 Cass St

comments: Hello City Councilors,
I am writing to give my support to the Redgate/Kane partnership to develop the McIntyre Building project. Please move forward with this and continue the several years of progress that has been made towards this project.

While the last-minute proposal from Mr. Binnie has some interesting features, he has ignored the multiple year RFP process that the city has in place to process and vet such proposals. Mr Binnie is a professional developer and I am sure he knows exactly how municipal RFPs must proceed to be fair to all interested parties. To consider his proposal now would not be fair to the other 3 developers who followed the city rules and processes to participate in this process. It would also not be fair to the many Portsmouth citizens who have been participating in this review and public input process for several years. Please support the RFP process and continue the course with the vetted Redgate/Kane proposal.

That said, as you continue to fine-tune the project and work out details, count me as one of the people who would like to see a more modern design for the new buildings that better compliment the mid-century modern architecture of the anchor McIntyre Building, rather than more faux-historical 18th century-ish looking buildings as currently proposed. Portsmouth has enough of that and needs to expand our architectural portfolio. Many European cities far older than our 400 years do this regularly with grace and panache that only adds to the historical flavor of their cities.

Thank you all for your service to our city,

Aubrey Gewehr

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Lori Tiernan (loritiernan@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 13:19:07

address: 230 Thornton Street

comments: I am writing to ask the city council to delay the vote on the McIntyre project until we have adequately adjusted the contract and analyzed the financial possibilities available. I have supported the Redgate Kane project under the belief that this was the best possible deal available for the city. It now appears, there is a possibility to negotiate better terms and create more benefit for residents. Given there is no timeline for this project, I plead the council to assure we create the best long-term plan possible for the city and its future.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by TIMOTHY MONTMINY
(timothy.p.montminy@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 13:37:25

address: 171 MONROE STREET EXT, Portsmouth, NH 03801

comments: Members of the City Council,

I am contacting you today with regards to your upcoming decision on the McIntyre Property project. First, let me unequivocally state that you have my respect for the way that you continue to handle this process. You have diligently pursued a development you feel is to our community's benefit, continue to take public feedback on the project, and have responded respectfully to that feedback regardless of its tone. This is no small feat. You have made many in your city proud.

With that being said I want to voice my concerns with recent developments regarding the project at the McIntyre Property. I attended the Public Forum on the Revisit McIntyre Petition and must admit I found it very frustrating. I found the surprise proposal of William Binnie was not fair to the council, nor fair to the city's residents. Mr. Binnie's reluctance to take on this project allowed him to circumvent an 18 month development process and rally support for an unvetted proposal based on a few key promises. I am choosing to ignore the ethical arguments against his actions, because ethical or not, Mr. Binnie's proposal is now on the table and it is clear that it cannot be ignored.

I ask the council to weigh their actions carefully going forward. I understand that you have knowledge beyond that of my own regarding the proposals for the McIntyre project. I am limited to what is published in the local paper. Still, I wish to comment on two items I consider of important, given my knowledge.

1) In his op-ed for the Seacoast Media Group, Bill Binnie: Our plan for McIntyre project (8/9), Mr Binnie states the following:

"The project will need a lot of permits and "permissions." It looks like 13 permits and other approvals from state, federal and city agencies. Carlisle will provide a letter of support and a "no-litigation" agreement with Revisit McIntyre -- as a condition for going forward -- and a result of this there is a high likelihood of commencing construction years ahead of the Kane project."

This very troubling to me. While Mr. Binnie's intent may be to notify the city of his agreement with Revisit McIntyre, the statement can be read as a threat of litigation by Revisit McIntyre if Mr. Binnie's plan is chosen. The threat of litigation should not be included as a variable in the decisions regarding the McIntyre Property. If it is, the city could be viewed as bowing to extortion, and have significant consequences for the city going forward. At the very least it would reduce the city's negotiating power in future agreements across the spectrum. It may very well set precedent that prevents future development of Portsmouth properties that address our community's needs. Portsmouth will not be a boom town for developers forever. When the profit margin for development narrows, the city could face challenges if developers feel the city makes decisions taking into account threats of lawsuits. Whatever your ultimate decision may be on the McIntyre Property!

, I hope that you make it absolutely clear that the fear of litigation was NOT a factor in your decision.

2) Mr. Binnie's proposal for the site includes two items that I find perplexing. The first is turning the McIntyre Building into office space. It is unclear to me what benefit this holds for the city. There may be a market for high end office space in Portsmouth, but its need is dwarfed by the need for housing. Consider the following: The vacancy rate for a balanced rental market is considered 4-5%. The current vacancy rate for rental housing in Rockingham County is 1% (https://www.nhhfa.org/assets/pdf/data-planning/RentSurvey_2018.pdf). On the contrary, office and industrial vacancy rates in seacoast region are currently at 5% (<https://nerej.com/industrial-and-office-market-trends-for-new-hampshire-s-seacoast-region-by-kent-white-christian-stallkamp-and-caitlin-burke>). I understand the objection to the cost of the housing in the Redgate Kane plan, but at the very least this housing adds to our rental housing stock and may,

in the future, contribute to alleviating a problem facing our community. Office Space carries no such benefit for the city. Furthermore, given that there is less demand for high end office space, it is unclear to me how utilizing the McIntyre Building for office space allows Mr. Binnie to make good financial promises to the city. I have no doubt any housing put up in the city will be filled. I can't say the same for high end office space.

I am also perplexed at Mr. Binnie's offer of increased public parking. While I understand that lack of parking is a common complaint amongst some in Portsmouth, I must say I don't think the data bears that out. We have a new parking garage that the city and the city newspaper describe as under-utilized. Anecdotally, I rarely have trouble finding street parking in Portsmouth. I may have to walk a block or two to my destination, but I think that is a reasonable expectation in a downtown area. Putting that aside, does the city benefit from the Binnie parking plan at the McIntyre Site? If utilized, this parking will increase traffic in the downtown area, an area filled with one way streets and pedestrians. I am not sure that the convenience of being able to park closer to a favorite eatery will be balanced by the increase in traffic and hazard to pedestrians. It is also unclear to me who will control said parking lot. If Mr. Binnie controls and administers the lot, the city is essentially creating a competitor for its parking resources. Perhaps if the city did not have an under-utilized parking garage, I could understand the addition of parking. But at this point, why would the city create a competitor for a resource it controls that generates revenues it relies upon?

In closing, I hope you will carefully consider your path going forward for the McIntyre Property. I believe the council has already developed an effective plan with the Redgate Kane group and I hope that you will pursue it. Still, if the council decides to further consider Mr. Binnie's proposal, I will hold no grudge. I only ask that it hold Mr. Binnie to the same standards that it has held other developers who have pitched proposals for the project. I would also hope that city allow Redgate Kane to make a counter bid and accept proposals from other Developers in the same manner it has Mr. Binnie's proposal.

Thank you for your time,

Dr. Timothy Montminy, Ph.D.
171 Monroe St. Ext
Portsmouth, NH 03801

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by N. W. Barrett Gallery (nwb@nwbarrett.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 13:38:06

address: 53 Market Street

comments: The N. W. Barrett Gallery has been in operation since 1985. Many of our customers come back again and again, some for decades, and they talk to us about what they love about Portsmouth. Among the things they love are the older buildings, the sense of open space even downtown, and the walkability of the city. In the past few years, however, we have been hearing comments of dismay at the new construction in town, which is changing the city's character--and not for the best. The proposed Kane/Redman project is more of the same--not good for the citizens of Portsmouth nor for the people who come here, year after year, to enjoy the city's unique character. We believe the entire downtown business district would be adversely affected by this new project. And especially since our business backs onto Penhallow Street, we fear we will see fewer customers coming into our store. We are at risk of having to close our business.

Thank you,
Nancy Barrett

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Alison Stebbins (alisonstebbins@hotmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 13:53:34

address: 210 Commerce Way Portsmouth, NH 03854

comments: I am writing to express my strong support for the Redgate/Kane development plan for the McIntyre Building in Portsmouth. We lived at 135 Bow Street until recently and know first hand that Portsmouth needs to continue to upgrade and provide more public space for people to gather and enjoy the vibrancy of our Community.

Growing our workforce with the talent needed by our thriving Seacoast businesses is key. The workforce will definitely enjoy having the attractive and engaging life style amenities in the McIntyre space brought by the Redgate/Kane development. What a super draw the enhanced McIntyre area will be for the workforce, visitors and residents!

I see no reason that we should wait when a well-thought out plan has been approved with substantial Community input. Let's make this happen and move forward with the Redgate/Kane plan so we can all enjoy the many features of the transformed building & outdoor areas.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Allen R Nelson Jr (lshoals95@aol.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 14:02:20

address: Richards Ave

comments: I agree with the Portsmouth Herald editorial on 08 AUG 19. The Carlisle plan should be considered and there should be no commitment made to the Kane Company at this point. It is not dramatic to say that this project will impact our city for generations. It is not unreasonable to anyone, even at this late date, to consider another option. It will not take long to compare the two plans. The Binnie plan is a real deal, not a "sketch". It is my hope that you will be good stewards of our city. If you are confident that the Kane plan is the best, we will know in short order. Considering the Carlisle proposal is the ethical and proper thing to do.

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jim Smalley (jsmalleycfa@gmail.com) on Monday, August 12, 2019 at 14:46:15

address: 352 Kearsarge Way, Portsmouth 03801

comments: Dear Councilors,
I am not a member of Revisit McIntyre, but I respectfully ask that you consider the Binnie option:

Sunk Cost Fallacy: That there has been much time and effort put into the process is true, but to reject an alternative because of this is to fall for the sunk cost fallacy. While understandable, it is sub optimal decision making.

There GSA has delayed vacating the building for an additional 9 months from Jan 2020 until Oct/ Nov 2020. Time that can be used to vet the Bennie proposal. Additionally, there is no critical need to vote tonight in favor of any proposal. This vote can be delayed until needed.

The financial benefit may be as good or better than the R/K proposal, while being less disruptive to the surroundings.

Before even considering his proposal, Mr Binnie can be ask to agree to pay financial incentives for late submission such as: non reimbursable deposit, partial cost reimbursement for R/K, payment to city for lost revenue vs R/K should there be incremental delay ect...

The NE Patriots would often show up late in the game, 11th hour, last 2 minutes.... They weren't obstructionists. There is time. But only if you allow it.

This is an irreversible decision, on the most valuable piece of available property in the city. Use the 9 months delay from GSA to vet the Binnie proposal and require Binnie to meet set deadlines to ensure no further delay.

There is no legal constraint preventing you from vetting the proposal, and no requirement that you vote to approve the R/K plan tonight.

While I didn't sign, 600 residents did sign a petition, which is erroneously dismissed as a small minority. A sample of 600 should not be confused with a statistical population. Given Portsmouth's size, a sample of 600 could represent the opinion of well over a majority of residents. A sample of less than 400 is enough to represent the majority.

It will be far more palatable and less divisive for the residents , if even after vetting the proposal, you decide to go with R/K.

Respectfully,

Jim Smalley

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit
