

**City of Salem Massachusetts  
Public Meeting Minutes**

<b>Board or Committee:</b>	<b>Redevelopment Authority, Regular Meeting</b>
<b>Date and Time:</b>	<b>Wednesday, September 30, 2019 at 6:00 PM</b>
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	<b>98 Washington Street, First Floor Conference Room</b>
<b>SRA Members Present:</b>	<b>Chair Grace Napolitano, Gary Barrett, David Guarino, Dean Rubin, Russ Vickers</b>
<b>SRA Members Absent:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Others Present:</b>	<b>Tom Daniel – Director of Planning and Community Development Kathryn Newhall-Smith – Senior Planner</b>
<b>Recorder:</b>	<b>Colleen Brewster</b>

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

### **Projects Under Review**

---

#### **Executive Directors Report:**

Daniel stated that;

1. The City Council approved the Special Permit for the reuse of religious properties.
2. The dedication of the Charlotte Forten Park at 289 Derby was 2 weeks ago. The arrangement for the 20-foot-wide strip of land along the building will be discussed soon.
3. The City Council adopted an order proposed by Councillor Milo to have a meeting into looking at affordable housing on the Church Street parking lot property. The SRA wasn't consulted or included in this order, but the Council has welcomed the inclusion of the SRA moving forward. Mr. Guarino added that he spoke to Councillor Milo and she was happy the SRA was included and wanted their participation on the discussion of new affordable housing. The Clerk will schedule that meeting possibly in November. This property could be a possible location for affordable housing which is an important issue.

Councillor Madore stated that she attended the City Council meeting and mentioned that the SRA went through the visioning process with ULI and Utile. There should be a bigger conversation and not specific to just these two sites. The Museum Place Mall and garage should be included in this discussion to make it a better package. More affordable housing is needed, but the Councillor's approach was wrong and there should have been more internal conversation. The SRA is halfway through the ULI report's recommendation, it's a lot to add on to the SRA at this time, and not including the SRA from the beginning wasn't appropriate because the SRA should be driving this discussion. The neighbors are anxious about losing parking and more construction when there are three projects going on downtown already. This topic has been discussed for a while and asking for public input at this point also wasn't appropriate. The SRA should be the conversation driver since the Council doesn't own the parcels and didn't pass the policy necessary to support these types of developments. Their job as Council is to pass the tools and the SRA's job is to make sure development is done correctly. She voted against it but was out-voted. Mr. Daniel noted that a parking configuration, 10-year parking replacement plan, and financing also need to be considered. Mr. Vickers agreed with the inappropriate timing since the SRA is only on the first part of the ULI recommendations they received 2-years prior.

Adding affordable housing is out of context and a city-wide parking study should be conducted, as recommended in the ULI study. Chair Napolitano noted that it's not a proposal and isn't viable at this time so the Council shouldn't be asking for the public's input.

Mr. Guarino stated that the Council's decision makes it look as if the SRA hadn't considered it, and if Councillors attended SRA meetings they would know. Mr. Rubin stated that the SRA should take a more assertive role and drive the discussion not just be a part of it. Mr. Guarino added that the Councillor he spoke to only welcomed the SRA's input but the order also passed. It would be worse to have the meeting and not have the SRA involved at all. Mr. Vickers noted that the SRA should question why they are even having the meeting. This property has been looked at for the past 10 years, and the SRA was instructed not to look at it individually. Mr. Guarino suggested a meeting prior to discuss it. Councillor Madore suggested the SRA not meet with the 5-member sub-committee because their vote could be problematic. Chair Napolitano suggested a letter be sent to the Council. Mr. Vickers requested the letter inform the Council of their study and the recommended approach for this site.

Councillor Madore stated that she will put a public statement out about why she voted it down and noted that the Council doesn't own the property, the SRA does. Mr. Guarino noted that they don't want it to look as if the SRA doesn't support affordable housing and the Council looks like as if they are the ones being proactive, so the letter should explain the SRA's reasoning. Mr. Daniel agreed with the Council's timing being off, their vote being inconsistent with the process the SRA has in place and is already working on. The City didn't get the grant from MassDevelopment to look at this property but they are looking for other sources of funding. It's important to go on record and reach out to them and explain that the SRA is in process. Mr. Guarino suggested an SRA member be regular contact with the Council. Mr. Daniel noted that he can reach out to the Council too.

Guarino: Motion to allow the Planning Staff to draft a letter to the Salem City Council, and to reviewed by the SRA Board, as soon as practical.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes 5-0.

4. **Superior Court:** Mr. Daniel stated that he and Ms. Newhall-Smith continue to have regular meetings with DCAMM every 2 weeks. Ms. Newhall-Smith is working on the Preservation Restriction with a Consultant and a photographer is being sought. Input from HSI and SHC will be welcomed. They received a letter from Registrar O'Brien about the project after the Salem News article was published. He and Chair Napolitano met with the Registrar one week ago where he indicated support for the work being done and is open to discussing what the Registry of Deeds does and their functional needs, which since much business is conducted online, are reduced so there is have less foot traffic.
5. **District Court:** Mr. Daniel stated that the groundbreaking was held on September 20<sup>th</sup> where several DCAMM employees and state officials were present.
6. **30 Federal Street:** Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the existing building shares a party wall with 28 Federal Street. The applicant wanted an addition with retail on the first floor. The applicant began the process, but the proposed residential units in the new space doesn't satisfy the required 8 on-site parking spaces. The DRB started reviewing the project but the current plan won't work as proposed since off-site parking can't be utilized for the residential parking requirements. The applicant withdrew and has refiled with two-levels of commercial space and 2 residential units on a 3<sup>rd</sup> level, with 3 parking spaces on site and underneath the structure, hidden from view. Numerous abutters are concerned with the original proposal. The project team met with the abutters multiple times and since there is a new proposal on the table, we are not sure who may be in favor of the revised project. Chair Napolitano asked for their concerns. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied the walkway, parking, and possibly other items. The commercial use doesn't

require parking and now that the residential units have been modified, the project team wants to start the project review over with the SRA. Mr. Guarino asked how the neighbors will be notified. Mr. Daniel replied that abutter notices are not sent out by the SRA, but that topic will be discussed later in the meeting. Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that she's received numerous comment letters but she doesn't know all the abutters; however, Councillor Christine Madore could be included since she is an abutter. Mr. Guarino suggested Ms. Newhall-Smith get back to everyone who has contacted her and let them know when there will be a public meeting. Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that she will also reach out to the attorney hired by the abutters.

Councillor Madore stated that she hasn't met with the neighbors yet and will review the revised plan. She will contact the neighbors or abutters about the SRA meeting on October 9<sup>th</sup>. She added that there is only a small group doesn't want it built at all.

## **Urban Renewal Area Projects Under Review**

---

### **1. 300 Derby Street (Casa Tequila): Review of Patio modifications**

Attorney Chad Colarusso was present to discuss the project and presented on behalf of the Owner, Gilberto Reyes.

Atty. Colarusso requested approval for the patio plan, which needed to be adjusted per the DRB's recommendations. Ms. Newhall-Smith noted that they were approved for outdoor seating several months ago and a condition was to look at the integrity of the granite wall between the restaurant and the Central Street Cemetery since the mound of dirt against it may be helping to keep that wall stable. The client constructed a retaining wall around the mound of dirt without DRB approval. Photos of the new retaining wall indicate that it is not consistent with the look of the granite wall. The DRB requested vegetation to cover up the new wall. Atty. Colarusso stated that the DRB approved English Ivy on the retaining wall, two beds cut out of the tiered wall approximately 3-feet wide, and three Sea green Juniper shrubs on either of the beds, to camouflage the retaining wall.

Mr. Rubin asked if the applicant returned to the SRA on their own or was it found out that it wasn't done as planned. Atty. Colarusso replied that his client made the change on his own without permission. Mr. Rubin noted that the umbrella had signage and aren't plain. While he's okay with the changes, this is the second unauthorized change but applicants are told to follow procedure. Atty. Colarusso replied that his client has no plans for additional work, and he's notified his client that he needs to follow procedure. Mr. Guarino agreed with Mr. Rubin and asked if the client were asked to remove the wall. Atty. Colarusso replied yes, there was discussion and the DRB didn't want to add the financial burden onto his client despite his non-compliance.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Rubin: Motion to approve the DRB's recommendation for the revised design as presented and any changes must be reviewed prior to implementation.  
Seconded by: Guarino. Passes: 5-0

Mr. Guarino asked if the Ivy doesn't do what's proposed will the applicant return. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that any changes with the plantings will be handled administratively. Atty. Colarusso noted that there were some constraints given the size of bed, daylight, and salt contamination from the road, hearty and durable plantings were proposed.

**2. 87 Washington Street (Opus):** Review of Café Permit Application for Rear Patio Seating and Proposed Partial Demolition of Rear Façade

Norberto Leon, Architect from Peterman Architects and Jeff Cala (Opus) were present to discuss the project.

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that Opus finished their review with the DRB but there was a concern with the rear fencing that was tall and more of a wall than a fence, with no way to see in. The SRA felt it only functioned to extend their restaurant, not enliven the outdoor space. The proposed wall is the same height but with wider openings between the horizontal boards of the fence. The DRB shared the SRA's concerns but approved of the plans, the NanaWall, and replacing the front façade windows with a folding partition. The DRB raised concern with how the wall would work, if it was seasonal or full time, because they didn't want it up year-round. She asked if they will drill into the ground to keep it in place. Mr. Leon replied that they will create a mountable system, with 2x4 studs in a base plate that will be anchored to the ground to hold the plate in place. It will be removed at the end of the season along with the base plates. The door will be solid section of wall and the remaining walls will have larger gaps in between the horizontal members.

Mr. Guarino asked what the season would be and why it wouldn't be up year-round. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that it would become a permeant extension of their restaurant. Mr. Cala added that some of this is also on public land and at the last meeting they agreed to do this seasonally because he doesn't want the snow removal bobcat to hit the wall. The structure has been designed by an engineer for easy removal. Mr. Daniel noted that outdoor seating activates streets and the City and SRA is on board with it, but it's meant to be seasonal only. This instance is different in scale, there is no more transparency, and there will be 4-feet of clearance on the other side of the wall. It feels different because you can't see over an 8-foot high wall. It's not a formal design standard but the outdoor seating needs to be designed so that it is ancillary to the primary use. Chair Napolitano asked if an easement was required since there are holes in the ground of a public sidewalk. Mr. Daniel replied that he needs to investigate that, and the Building Department should also be consulted.

Mr. Rubin asked if the walls feel too private can it be redesigned. Mr. Leon replied that the height can't be modified. They will have lights and a sail above to provide shade and they want the height to clear people's heads. Mr. Guarino compared this structure to the East Regiment Beer Co. structure and activating an outdoor space. If activated it might be nice to open the area up. Mr. Rubin noted the posts are high and it does still feel enclosed. They could remove a couple of the upper slats after they see how it work in the upcoming season. He added that no interior banners shall be installed on interior to block visibility between the fence slats.

Chair Napolitano questioned drilling holes on City property. Mr. Daniel replied that it's a question to ask the City Solicitor, since this is a new and different situation. The Building Department is different than legal. Mr. Cala stated that the holes could be capped when it's not in place. Mr. Daniel replied that with holes in the concrete and brick, and because it's not immediately moveable, could lead to other potential issues. This could become a condition of an approval.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Ms. Newhall-Smith stated that the front windows are fine; however, the plans show front seating can't be handled as portrayed. An approval should be just for the windows. Mr. Leon replied that

they want to match up to the red line on the sidewalk. Ms. Newhall-Smith replied that that is not enough room for pedestrians and it's also not part of the application. They do not have permission to install the front seating as proposed. Mr. Daniel added that front seating creates a pinch-point and they don't have the clearance for it with the tree and tree-pit. There needs to be space between the A-frame sign and the seating. Mr. Rubin added that 4-feet of clearance is required.

Guarino: Motion to approve revised plans as reviewed by the DRB conditional upon review by the City Solicitor and the approval of new NanaWalls at the front and rear facades, but not the front seating configuration which must follow the city ordinance for clearance.

Seconded by: Vickers. Passes: 5-0

**3. 112 Washington Street (Lappin Park):** Pilot program to install synthetic turf on a portion of the park

Ray Jodoin, Director of Operations for the City of Salem, was present to discuss the project.

Mr. Jodoin stated that the City wants to fix the grass issue at the park. They tried to re-seed last April, it came in healthy, but it doesn't take long to die with so many people smoking on it, standing on it, and walking across it to get to the Little Free Library. Mr. Jodoin has not yet met with the stake holders. There are turf samples that are permeable to allow things to pass through it for rain, snow, sweeping. Mr. Rubin asked how pet waste is dealt with. Mr. Jodoin replied solid waste can be picked up and all fluids will filter through the turf with the sunlight killing the bacteria.

Mr. Daniel asked if it retains heat. Mr. Jodoin replied that there is nothing to heat up and the turf rests on sand to help stabilize it. Chair Napolitano requested the installation time. Mr. Jodoin replied two weeks. The pilot would only be for the section of grass by the Samantha statue, to see how it look installed and if it will work.

Mr. Daniel stated that this is a City project despite it being owned by the SRA.

Mr. Vickers noted that this is a good approach and it's hard to tell it's not grass until you walk up to it. Mr. Guarino asked what was needed to make actual grass grow. Mr. Jodoin replied that he can get it to grown but how the area is used effects whether grass can hold up. Too many people stand on it, walk over it, put out cigarettes on it for it to grow. Mr. Guarino requested the life expectancy of turf. Mr. Jodoin replied with proper maintenance 15-years, it needs to be swept yearly depending upon the use and sand added. Ms. Newhall-Smith asked how long the pilot will last to determine whether it's been successful and how will he measure its success. Mr. Jodoin replied that he needs to have a conversation with the stakeholders and select a product and price point. He wants to install it next season, April-May of 2020, in time for October 2020.

Mr. Rubin asked what happens if someone drops a cigarette on it, will it burn? Mr. Jodoin replied that the turf is plastic and it won't burn. Mr. Daniel stated that the DRB input would be useful since they are architects and landscape architects. Mr. Jodoin added that the turf's permeable aspects will allow roots to grow up through it. Mr. Rubin stated that it's good to try it as a pilot program first. Mr. Guarino agreed, and added that it's unfortunate that the grass can't grow when this area of the downtown is widely seen unlike the other neighboring parks. He's curious to see what the surrounding business think of turf.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Will Dowd, Salem Gazette, asked who the stakeholders were. Mr. Jodoin replied that the stakeholder list needs to be determined.

Councillor Madore. Asked for the contents of William Legault letter. Mr. Jodoin replied that Mr. Legault felt that “turf isn’t appropriate for this site because it doesn’t maintain the vision of the park.” This is a pilot so it can be undone and the area reseeded every year if it doesn’t work. Mr. Guarino noted that parts of Boston Common don’t grow because of people sitting or sleeping and the public garden is completely blocked off. Mr. Jodoin added that this park is front and center in the City and something needs to be done. The benchmark isn’t being hit and they want people to use the space and the City will benefit from it.

Councillor Madore. The City has made multiple attempts to get grass to grow, but it’s seems like a money pit when it could be made flat programable space, similar to 289 Derby Street. Enabling the area for aesthetics; turf doesn’t add to the space. Mr. Rubin agreed but added that they should make the attempt and a plan B could be considered if the pilot program is not successful. Mr. Jodoin noted that ADA accessibility, different ways to use the spaces, do the raised beds get removed, and maintaining the trees all need to be looked into. Councillor Madore added that it’s the only green park downtown and there is an opportunity to do more with the space.

Will Dowd, Salem Gazette. Asked where the funds for the pilot were coming from. Mr. Jodoin replied that he will be reviewing that with the DPW Director, so he the source of the funds is unknown at this time.

*Chair Napolitano closes public comment.*

Rubin: Motion to move forward with testing the artificial surface as a pilot program to be reviewed in the next season and to be revised by the DRB.  
Seconded by: Vickers. Passes: 5-0

## **New/Other Business**

---

### **1. FY20 Community Preservation Plan – Request for Comment / Input**

Mr. Daniel stated that every year comments are sought for the CPA plan for any modifications. Two years ago, the SRA offered to comment with broad language on City/SRA owned parcels. Mr. Rubin suggested a spreadsheet be created to show the progress along with an estimated completion date, to gauge their completion time and keep track of how long it took to complete.

### **2. 112 Washington Street, Lappin Park: 3 Kitchens Catering ‘Czechtoberfest’ – Request to Withdraw**

Mr. Daniel stated that they’ve chosen to withdraw this year.

### **3. Grimshaw House:** Mr. Rubin asked about the restoration of the structure. Mr. Daniel replied that Walter Beebe-Center is no longer working for the owners but there has been no progress. The City has discussed it but made no decisions.

### **4. SRA Goals for FY 2020**

Mr. Daniel stated that Councillor Madore’s last request before leaving the SRA was to create a list of SRA goals. It originally had a total of four goals and ran with the calendar year. The SRA switched from calendar to fiscal year. The previous year’s goals were: 1) District Court, 2) RFP for the Superior Court which was changed to a two-step process, 3) Inviting Historical Commission members to, and having a preservation community meeting in May specific to their downtown resource survey update with Preservation Planner Patti Kelleher. Ms. Kelleher is also part of the Historic Preservation team for the Superior Court project. 4) Ensuring the stakeholders feel involved

in the process, through outreach and communication with HSI, whom he meets with three times a year. For the current fiscal year, there are two goals: 1) disposition and reuse of the court complex and crescent lots, and 2) adopting an abutter notification protocol. Mr. Daniel states that there are several different models to consider. He is in favor of determining the most efficient and least expensive manner, which may be a postcard and including an abutters list fee with the application.

Ms. Newhall-Smith suggested another goal of updating the sign manual which hasn't been revised in years; Mr. Daniel stated that this goal was too much to add given the courthouse project. Chair Napolitano replied that she is in favor of abutter notices so information gets to everyone involved in advance and to receive their comments. Mr. Daniel added that they are considering switching to online applications so everyone can see the contents of each application packet, although there has been some pushback. Chair Napolitano noted that it would be good to have everyone informed since the SRA receives the packets in advance.

5. **City Council Concerns:** Mr. Rubin stated that the SRA previously requested one joint meeting per year with the Council and this should happen again to build a strong relationship with councilors. Mr. Daniel stated that Mayor Driscoll suggested a member attend a Council Meeting to give them monthly updates on the Court Project. Mr. Guarino agreed and added that someone should attend even if they don't speak. Mr. Daniel noted that Mayor Driscoll is also considering an orientation for new councilors in January.
6. **Courthouse and Crescent Lot Project:** Review of established community goals for the redevelopment and reuse of the courthouse and crescent lot

Mr. Daniel stated that he met with HSI recently and he told them the RFP wasn't open for public discussion; however, the SRA spent a lot of time discussing the values and vision that HSI can review. This process has been going on since the 1990's and we always knew these two buildings would be preserved. There was some legislative effort was to convey these two buildings to the SRA and between 2008 and 2014 there was a lot of effort but nothing was being passed.

**Presentation:**

20 years ago, the courts functions had a significant economic impact;

1. Employees, business and jobs related to them directly, and the businesses that benefit from the courts being in session like restaurants having customers.
2. There are also the economic benefits of having new developments on vacant sites, bringing; new jobs, new housing, new tax base, and a further enhancing of downtown vitality.
3. Identity and character. Salem has always been the judicial center and historic preservation is a core value of the community, and the built form is integral to that character. That's manifested through the Memorandum of Agreement between DCAMM and Mass Historic for the Ruane Judicial Center. It has a preservation restriction in place before DCAMM disposes of the building.

**Timeline of the Legislation:**

- 2011: Urban Renewal Plan - Guiding Policy document
- 2017: Imagine Salem – Community Values and a Broad Vision for the City
- 2017: ULI Panel – Helped with the buildings on the Northern end of the City
- 2018: Joint Meeting
- 2018: Northern end workshop with Utile
- 2019: Transfer from the City with the associated goals

#### Urban Renewal Plan:

1. Eliminating and preventing blight
2. Preserving and enhancing historic architecture
3. Achieving coordinated developments with compatible uses, high quality architecture and urban design
4. Accomplish redevelopment of vacant or underutilized land or buildings

#### Imagine Salem:

1. Guiding Principles: Community, Housing, Employment, and Transportation
2. Key Values: Diversity, Inclusiveness, Historic, Vibrancy/Livable, Green
3. Future Vision Statement: “In 2026, we are sustainable and livable City, where we celebrate our diverse histories, and where people of all backgrounds and means participate and thrive.”

#### 2017 ULI Observation by the Strategy Assistance Panel:

1. Cities commitment to preserving the buildings that have historic and symbolic value and having public access to them
2. Court Buildings are an entry point and need special prioritized focus
3. They recommended emphasizing uses for the Superior Court that make the interior accessible to the public

#### 2018 North Downtown Vision workshop – 4 Goals:

1. Economic vitality & Compatibility: Looking at the Northern downtown, jobs, tax revenue, and redevelopments should be compatible with their surroundings, in terms of; uses, scale, design, and character
2. Housing: Transit accessible housing for diversity in terms of incomes and ages
3. Connectivity: This redevelopment project should increase walkability through downtown. As a Gateway project they are looking to leverage the Court buildings and crescent lot, to create a thriving Gateway at this end of town, with the right mix of public oriented amenities for people stepping off the train and activating Bridge Street.

#### Related ideas developed at that workshop:

1. Traffic patterns: The slip lane off of Bridge Street onto Washington Street, and making it more pedestrian friendly rather than vehicle focused
2. Existing green space: There could be more activation with a possible rear entry to the County Commissioners Building or expanding the green space
3. Suggested uses and other ideas:
  - a. Everyday Needs: Grocery store, daycare, restaurants
  - b. Community Enhancements: museums, market hall, innovation space
  - c. Ideas not critiqued or validated:
    - i. Related Uses and Symbiotic development: Hotel at crescent lot, restaurants and conference spaces in the Court Buildings
    - ii. Housing made sense at the crescent lot but some raised concern with housing at the court houses
    - iii. Office space given the buildings role as a judicial space
    - iv. Parker Brothers History Museum to activate the space

#### Conveyance from City on the Crescent Lot meant to advance the Court Houses:

1. Economic Development: tax revenue and jobs



2. Catalyst for Activity: Activating this end of downtown
3. Physical environment: Improve conditions both on and around the lot that is compatible in scale, use, design, and historic character. The new construction design should relate to the historic structures across the street.
4. Enhance the surrounding property values:

Synthesized Goals:

1. Economic Vitality: Create new jobs, housing, and tax base
2. SRA plan, including tenants, needs to be financially sustainable so the building remain, for the next 100-years and the uses enhance the downtown vitality and allow public access to the courthouses, particularly the law library.
3. Historic Preservation: Preservation of exteriors through preservation restrictions or other covenants, and preservation of character defining interior spaces to the greatest extent practical.
4. Public realm: Development on the crescent lot and court houses so they are compatible with the neighborhood around them in terms of; scale, use, design, and historic character. The project creates well designed functional and beautiful open spaces. The project improved the Washington / Bridge Street intersections for pedestrians without harming vehicular functionality. Some changes are similar and other would be more aggressive and expensive.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

No one in the assembly wished to speak.

*Chair Napolitano opens public comment.*

Mr. Daniel stated that he received a letter from HSI in regard to the historic preservation of historic resources. They reviewed the four responses and the RFQ and they feel the RFP should emphasize public access to important spaces such as the law library. The rehab of the court buildings should meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards. As for new construction in a historic setting, it will be prominent for two reasons, 1) at the pedestrian realm at street level, so facilities of public accommodation will be a requirement of the crescent lot at ground level, and 2) a sense of the skyline – the structure should complement rather than block it.

## **Executive Session**

---

1. To review the submittals to the Request for Qualifications for the redevelopment of real property located at 32-34 Federal Street and 252 Bridge Street, Salem, MA because an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the public body.

Guarino: Motion to request an Executive Session.

Barrett, Guarino, Chair Napolitano, Rubin, Vickers. Passes: 5-0.

The SRA entered executive session at 8:05PM.

Roll call to adjourn the Executive Session at 9:10PM. Rubin second.

Barrett, Guarino, Chair Napolitano, Rubin, Vickers. Passes: 5-0.

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

## **Minutes**

---

Guarino: Motion to approve the July 23, 2019 regular and executive session meeting minutes.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes: 5-0

Guarino: Motion to approve the July 25, 2019 regular and executive session meeting minutes.  
Seconded by: Barrett. Passes: 5-0

Mr. Rubin stated that the Recorder did a masterful job on the minutes and captured all of the complexities and thoroughness of the development team interviews.

## **Adjournment**

Guarino: Motion to adjourn the meeting.  
Seconded by: Rubin. Passes 5-0.

Meeting is adjourned at 9:10PM.

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