## **Special Permit Hearing**

			1
1		Pages 1-203	
2			
3			
4			
5			
6		SPECIAL PERMIT HEARING	
7		HAVERHILL CITY COUNCIL MEETING	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15	DATE:	May 25, 2021	
16	BEFORE:	Haverhill City Council	
17		Melinda Barrett, President	
18		Colin LePage, Vice President	
19		Councillors Joseph Bevilacqua, John	
20		Michitson, Thomas Sullivan, Timothy	
21		Jordan, Michael McGonagle, Mary Ellen Daly	
22		O'Brien, William Macek	
23			
24	Transcribed by: Roberta Katz		

I

PROCEEDINGS

(Commencing at 00:31:21 in recording.)

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Next item.

CLERK KOUTOULAS: Document 32/B,

Application for a Special Permit, CCSP 21-7,

Zero Railroad Ave., Site Plan Review (Major).

have Attorney Michael Migliori representing PE

8 Partners, LLC, to construct 290 apartment units

9 in approximately 6500 square feet, retail space

on existing vacant parcels owned by the city on

11 Railroad Avenue and Skateland site, also on

12 Railroad Avenue. Applicant requests, had

requested on April 13th to move the hearing to

today, May 25th, several related comments. The

documents are included from various departments

and the public.

1

2

3

4

5

6

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

permit hearing to order. We will have the presentation by the Applicant. After they finish their presentation, we'll open it up to folks, both for and against. And if there needs to be a rebuttal, that will be allowed and if there is a spokesperson for those that may be opposed, they will be allowed to speak and we

will maintain order at all times, please.

MR. MIGLIORI: Sounds fair to me.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. MIGLIORI: Good afternoon, President Barrett and members of the council. For the record, I am Michael Migliori and I represent the Applicant this evening. My offices are located at 18 Essex Street here in Haverhill. I'm thrilled to be back before you this evening and working on the most dynamic and transformational project that I've ever been involved with.

Mike Procopio is here this evening, along with the entire team. We'll be presenting to you in detail this project which has been in the works for almost two years now. I won't take too much of your time because of the importance of everybody who comes after me, but I think it would be beneficial to quickly summarize the site and the project history.

I unfortunately am old enough to remember when the project site, referred to as the Ornsteen site, was an active manufacturer of shoe products in the city that employed many,

many people for many, many years at this site on the river. Sadly, like all of the other shoe manufacturers that were located in the city, its day came and the plant closed down. The parcel changed hands a number of times over the past 40 years, always with the hope that it would be put back into service in some form. Unfortunately over those many years, no one has had any success. The buildings eventually came down and we all know what it looks like now.

The most recent owner failed to pay taxes back in the '80s and the city foreclosed on its tax lien at that time. For almost 40 years the city has owned the parcel and has always hoped someone would come along with the right proposal and create something special on the river. But 40 years later I think that proposal is finally before you this evening.

In 2019 the city, at the direction of the mayor, drafted an RFP for the site. In that RFP the opening paragraph stated as follows, and I'll read it to you: "The City of Haverhill is pleased to present this request for proposals for the disposition by sale and redevelopment of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Ornsteen property located at 31-35 Railroad The City of Haverhill seeks proposals that will successfully convert this vacant land into an active use that will also provide an economic gain for the city. Specifically the City of Haverhill hopes to see the subject property redeveloped into a primarily marketrate residential or mixed residential and retail use that will utilize the adjacent commuter rail services. The subject property could also be potentially combined with the three adjacent privately owned parcels and incorporated into a more comprehensive redevelopment plan for the The city further hopes to see riverfront area. a portion of the property developed by the proponent as an active park for the residents of the development and of the city to enjoy, along with improved access to the Merrimack River along the rear property line.

With the many options that Haverhill has to offer, the city expects that occupants of this new development will be able to enjoy the convenience of the commuter rail station across the street, spend an evening walking to

Haverhill's many downtown restaurants and services or spend an afternoon walking or riding their bike on the new rail trail along the Merrimack."

The RFP that Mike Procopio submitted was deemed to be the best of all the proposals the city received, after a committee appointed by the mayor reviewed the proposals and met with all of the applicants. His proposal, as you know, was the only proposal to successfully incorporate the Skateland site and the former gas station site, those privately owned parcels that were referenced in the RFP.

The project before you this evening hits on everything the RFP hoped for and in my opinion more. Based upon the results of the RFP, the city council held a hearing in February of 2020 where we made a brief present -- excuse me, brief presentation to the council and the council showed its support at that time of the project and declared the parcel surplus allowing the process to move forward, excuse me.

This council in June of 2020 approved the sale of the parcel and authorized the mayor to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

sign a purchase and sales agreement with Mike Procopio. A purchase and sales agreement was signed between the parties a short time later in July of 2020. Since October of 2019, notwithstanding a pandemic, the Procopio team has worked tirelessly to deliver a one of a kind development to the city. I remember personally being concerned about whether the project would move forward because of everything we were facing back in 2020, the pandemic and everything else that was going on around us in the country. And I asked Mike in one conversation, you know, what impact something like this pandemic and the economy and everything else that was happening would have on the project. And I remember, and I remember it to this day, you know, he looked at me and said it would have absolutely no impact whatsoever; I love this project. Those were his words.

So here we are tonight. I think you're going to be impressed with what you see, and at this point I am going to sit down and turn it over. I think the mayor has some words to say and then we'll go through the rest of the

presentation. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR FIORENTINI: Thank you, again. I'm making up for the meetings I missed. Thank you for allowing me to speak.

In my years as mayor, this is one of the very few times that I've ever been before you on a special permit application. It might be only the second time I appeared before you to get the downtown started on the Beacon project and I don't recall others, there may have been, but I know there's been very, very few because special permits are your purview.

But this project is that important. This property once housed the Ornsteen heel factory, not shoe, where 100 to 200 people worked for decades. The Ornsteen family, good residents of Haverhill, I knew Eddy Ornsteen myself, they paid all the taxes for decades and I want to stress that they never missed. But when the family sold the property, the new owner didn't, so the city took the property for back taxes sometime I think in the 1980s. It could have

been before that.

Since then, the city has made a number of efforts to sell the property, all without success. We've made four efforts in my career to sell the property and issued three RFP's. A year or two years ago after the third RFP, we got this proposal from the Procopios, easily, easily the best proposal we've had in the 20 years that Mayor Rurak and myself were trying to sell this.

The project does something not possible in any of the earlier proposals and probably not possible, at least not now if it's turned down, it gives the city a beautiful waterfront park at the entranceway to Bradford. Only the Procopio Companies could do this because they're the only ones that had the adjacent property, Skateland and the abandoned gas station, under agreement. Skateland was on the market anyway, I might add.

The waterfront park will provide a beautiful gateway to Bradford. It will be the first thing people see when they enter Bradford and will give an incredible impression to people entering the city or that area of the city from

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

coming over the bridge. It will include a public playground, and we all know we need more playgrounds, a walkway along the water, a rest area, benches, a new dog park, the only one which will be in that area of the city, and an amphitheater. It will be an incredible addition to our city.

Now, a lot of the credit for this park has to go to the city council and I want to credit you here tonight. A few years ago I visited the Brooklyn Bridge Park in New York City. I came back thrilled and wondered how they did it. My daughter lived in Brooklyn at the time and gave me a book about how they did It was a public private partnership. it. council worked together with the mayor's office to come up with a brand new waterfront zoning package that included the possibility that here in this subzone along the water, we could create a park, and I thank you for doing that. waterfront zoning you approved allowed for increased density if the developer worked with us to develop a park along the waterfront, and this developer had done just that.

So when we came before you a year or so ago, you approved Procopio as the preferred developer of this project, along with the park they proposed. But councillors at that time also expressed concerns and rightfully so. Your primary concern was traffic and you asked us to make it better.

Now, there isn't any doubt the traffic in this area has been a concern for decades. This project has nothing to do with it. It's been a concern for decades, ever since the factory was there. We heard your concerns. We applied for a MassWorks grant and received over \$2 million to improve traffic at that intercession. You'll hear tonight from the traffic engineers that Procopio hired to change the traffic pattern for the better. But we didn't stop there.

We had our own city engineer, John
Pettis, and he's here tonight, he went over the
plan and it meets with his approval. We hired
an outside professional traffic expert. They
paid for it. We chose them and hired them to
review the plan, and you will hear from them
that this plan improves the situation. We all

know that traffic is challenged in that area but this is a unique, once in a lifetime, at least once in several decade opportunity to improve it. It won't improve on its own.

I know that everyone here has seen some negative comments on social media and we all know there is no project anywhere in the country that won't generate social media comments. I like to say that NIMBY has been replaced with some people by BANANA. Their motto seems to be BANANA, build absolutely nothing anywhere near anything, and if we only listen to negative voices, we will never accomplish anything. And if we only listen to negative voices, we'll completely miss the fact that this is a popular project.

I polled it in the newsletter I sent out yesterday. I normally get 100 to 150 responses to my newsletter, my new online polls. I had by far and away the most responses I have ever had, 631 responses, 78 percent in favor and only 8.7 percent against, a 9 to 1 margin.

The Procopio Company used a social media tool called coUrbanize, something we're

considering using for downtown, in order to gauge public input, get public input and public reaction. You will hear that the park was designed by residents who went onto coUrbanize and made suggestions and comments. The public meeting -- the comments on coUrbanize were almost universally favorable. There was a public meeting on this project and I attended it. There were maybe 20, 30 people there, including some neighbors. No one at that public meeting spoke in opposition to this project.

You're going to hear from some of the people who were there tonight. You will hear from the owner of the project. You'll hear from our own planning director Bill Pillsbury and from Tim Love of Utile, who helped us design what I think is a great master plan. You'll hear from traffic engineers about how they're going to improve traffic and you're going to hear from some neighbors. You'll hear from a neighbor who lives on Laurel Avenue who drives for a living and more than anyone, can't afford to be stopped in traffic who welcomes this project. You will hear from members of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Ornsteen family that ran this for decades and will tell you that traffic today is nowhere near as bad as it was back then.

And then we'll hear from you. It will be your chance to speak and to vote, and all I can ask is that you listen and take everything into account, as you always do. Tonight you'll be asked to vote one of the best projects, maybe the best project I have seen in all my years in public life. A yes for this project gives us a waterfront park, a dog park, an extension of the rail trail, a restaurant along the park and river and a beautiful entranceway to Bradford. A yes vote is a vote for MassWorks money and for improved traffic flow. A no vote ends the chance to develop this site for the near future and for the near future at least, maybe forever, dooms the chance of putting in a park. vote means that this MassWorks grant will probably be lost and will make us more difficult to obtain one in the future . A no vote means that the traffic flow stays the same.

I ask only that you listen and I hope that tonight you will agree with me that this is

one of the best projects ever to come before the city. And with that, I would like to introduce the owner of Procopio Companies, Mike Procopio.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Welcome. Name and address for the record.

MR. PROCOPIO: Michael Procopio, excuse me, 9 Vinegar Hill Drive, Saugus, Massachusetts.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Welcome.

MR. PROCOPIO: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mike Migliori is right. I do love this project very much. There's a number of projects that did not survive the COVID pandemic on our plate. This is one of them, so I'm really excited to be able to be here tonight. I appreciate the opportunity, Madam President, City Councillors, to be able to stand and present our project, The Beck, for the Ornsteen site.

Before I get into that, I would like to make a couple of introductions, myself, my firm. As I said, my name is Michael Procopio. I am the CEO of the Procopio Companies. I'm third generation. We're a family development firm based in Lynnfield. We focus on southern New

England, primarily eastern Massachusetts, and these are the types of projects that we do. My grandfather started this firm in 1950, and we're not the big national developer. We are the local guys. We are the folks that come in. We learn the neighborhoods. We learn what's important. We become vested in the community and we try very, very hard to deliver projects that speak to the community, projects that improve lives and projects that better the places that we build.

One of our core values is that any place can be better. We believe that about ourselves and we believe that about our firm. We believe that about the communities we work in and we absolutely believe it about the projects that we bring forward. We believe that any place can be better. If you were to ask about us in the places that we work, ask the municipal leaders, ask the communities, what you'll discover is that we as individuals and we as a team deeply care about our projects and the communities we work in. We deliver on what we say. Our word is our bond and you have direct access to us.

We're the decision makers on our team and we pride ourselves in being small and agile and able to deliver very impactful projects in our communities.

I do want to make a couple of introductions on the wider team. Originally we had contemplated a bit of a bigger presentation but I think I know what's really important here so we're going to focus on the core issues, but I do want to introduce the team. They are all available to answer questions as they come up at the end, whether in response to public commentary or in response to questions from the council.

So Dan Skolski is here from DMS Design.

He's the project architect. Dan is also a

Haverhill local, born and raised. Steve

Martorano is here behind me hiding. He is from

Bohler. He's a principal there. He is the

primary civil engineer on the project. Matt

Mrva is here as well from Bohler. He is the

landscape architect on the project. And Bob

Michaud is with MDM, he's the transit consultant

that we engaged for both the MassWorks grant

application and for the overall improvements to the Railroad Ave. and South Elm intersection.

So aside from presenting this evening on the overall project details, I think there's three, three key elements of community impact that I want to hone in on. It was very clear in our previous engagement with the council that while there was a level of support for redevelopment and for this project, there were key issues that were a focal point and a flash point in the neighborhood and for the council, and I want to come right out of the gate and address them.

We took it seriously. We heard you, and the way we worked this project over the past year, a lot of work has gone into it, over a million dollars has already been invested into this project, getting it to the point where it's at. And the bulk of that was to address the concerns that the council raised. We wanted to take them seriously and we wanted to come back to you with an impactful plan that wasn't going to raise more questions but was going to garner support so that you could put your weight behind

this project.

And there's three things I want to address before we get into presenting the project details. So first, I think we have the elephant in the room, which is the traffic congestion and safety issues at Railroad Ave. southbound and the lower approach to the Comeau Bridge, and obviously tied in with the signalization on the Washington Street end of the bridge and the way those signals are synchronized and really inefficiently flowing the traffic through there today.

I want to be unequivocal and state that we believe we have the best solution to present to you tonight to solve those problems with that traffic flow at those intersections. We did not come here tonight to present mitigation to you. We did not come to present some sort of token little fixes, change the buttons, change the signs, paint some new sidewalks. We came with a major infrastructure plan specifically designed and thought out to solve the specific issues that are there around traffic flow, around timing, around vehicle queuing and around safety

coming through those intersections, both for motorists, for pedestrians and for bicyclists.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Is it perfect? No, nothing is perfect. These were roads that were laid out in the 1700 and 1800's. There's bridges there that were built in the 1800's. There's not a lot that we can do about some of the physical elements that we're faced with there. But we believe within the constraints that we have, this is the best possible solution that could be put forward for this. It's not a band-aid. It's detailed, it's comprehensive. I think as Bob works through that presentation, you'll see that this is an infrastructure improvement project that has received overwhelmingly positive feedback as the mayor mentioned, both from the city's internal review, as well as the third-party reviewers that have taken a look at this and frankly, had input and modified things to some extent, to make sure that this was a proposal that by all the stakeholders' involvement was going to be viewed as comprehensive and long-term to improve the traffic flow at that intersection.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

developer, the Commonwealth providing some of the funding and the city, we have a unique opportunity to leverage the Commonwealth's desire for additional housing at MBTA stations, which has been their stated impetus for throwing money at this project. We have the ability to leverage their desire for transit-oriented development into a meaningful improvement for Bradford, for Haverhill and for folks that are simply transiting that area. Whether it's folks that are commuting, taking their children to school, coming home at the end of the day or simply trying to get from Bradford into the downtown for dinner, we believe we have a meaningful and impactful solution that improves safety and flow.

You're going to hear a lot more about the traffic. That's all I am going to say in intro to that. I'll defer to the expert.

So secondly and tied to the transit, the other big community issue that we heard an awful lot about was the MBTA layover station and the idling of trains. So we had a number of conversations with the MBTA, stretching back

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

over the past 14, 15 months that we've been working on this, and while to a great degree it's outside of our control, I think as folks have learned that have tried to deal with this in the past for many years, the MBTA has committed to move the layover station. identified a parcel. They are scheduled to close on that parcel in three or four months and they have now viewed the movement, the transfer of the layover station as a high priority relative to this development and relative to the neighborhood there in Bradford. So our hope is that as we progress this project, we're able to continue the pressure on the MBTA, execute on the plan that they've already put in motion and see that that issue, whether it's completely dealt with or mitigated in a large part, ceases to become the major issue that it is with the residents in Bradford today.

Finally when it comes to community impact, we're going to be presenting a major public park project. You've heard a lot about that already. There's some boards in the room. You're certainly going to see it as we get into

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the presentation. We're going to present a major public park that's funded entirely with private money and gifted to the city. This is something we feel passionately about. I have, I have -- I don't live in Haverhill but I have three young kids. I have three kids under 5, and I can tell you coming out of COVID, there's not enough, there's not enough focus put on mental health and on the need for families to be able to get outside, for the need for children, young people to be able to get out and do things and engage in the community in a meaningful way.

And what you're going to see is when we look at this park, as the mayor stated, we took public input and designed the park, the first time in my career, we designed this entire park specifically around the feedback from the community. The members of the community, many of them are here tonight, they gave us specific asks in the park. We want a dog park. We want a splash pad. We want a bike path. We want a quiet area. We want an area for teens. want, we want a kayak launch. All of these things we were bombarded with. Through our

public process, we were able to take and build that into basically a custom built, almost three and a half acre park that we're able to build and turn over to the city as part of this process.

This is a first for us, being able to do it that way. We feel really good about it.

We're more excited to present the park maybe that we even are to present the rest of the project. I love space-making. I love making spaces that people want to come to that are a draw for people and that are basically legacy things in the communities where they're built. They become an anchor for the community and we believe that's what we have and are able to present in this park. We believe that will be a showpiece for Haverhill and for Bradford and for this community for decades to come.

So with that intro, I'm going to get into the presentation itself. So we've done some of the intros. I'm going to be handling the general overview. You're going to then hear from Bob from MDM. He's going to present the traffic improvements, and then we're going to go

right into, into any questions that the council may have for the wider team, including Dan and Matt and Steve from Bohler, and be able to answer any questions when you have, and then I know there's some further commentary and whatnot. Sorry. There's a little bit of lag with my, my remote.

So this is the current overview and what we call plan view of the project. So obviously you can see the -- oh, wow, the TV doesn't show the, doesn't show the laser, okay.

Merrimack River, obviously. You can see the project orientation. You can see Railroad Ave. and you can see part of the intersection that we're going to talk about. On the far right of the project, you see the primary park area. It's almost, it's a little -- the entire park area is 3.2 acres. The bulk of it is in that primary area. We'll walk through that in a little bit more detail.

That connects to what we're calling a linear park. One of the major asks that we heard from the community was unfettered access

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to the Merrimack River for the public. We have The public has complete access delivered that. to every piece of frontage on this project. It's ADA accessible and it's designed for folks to be able to use at their leisure. This isn't something that's restricted to residents. not something we're gating off. This is absolutely part of the public park. There's active spaces. There's quiet spaces. spaces for older folks. There's spaces for kids. We really wanted this to be inclusive of what the community wanted.

When it comes to the buildings itself, there's two buildings. We'll talk a little bit about how that shifted from three buildings to two buildings. In some earlier materials you got, there was three buildings. We've condensed it into two buildings for efficiency and frankly to free up more space for the park, which we were able to do.

In between the buildings, we have what we're calling a motor court. That is an area for ride shares, drop-offs, pick-ups, to be able to come in, get off of Railroad Ave., be able to

handle the drop-offs or the pick-ups in a safe manner and then return out to Railroad Ave. without having to park and take up space on the street.

On the opposite end of the E-shaped building, to the far left you see the primary entrance to the parking garage. This site has underground parking. The vast majority of the parking is below grade. You will not see it from the street. There's very little surface parking included in the project. It's primarily below grade and the access is down on the far left. We pushed that access as far down Railroad Ave. as we could to reduce kind of that vehicular clash with folks coming and going to the park, temporary drop-offs and residents who are coming home to park.

So this is what I was speaking about relative to the original rendering. So on the left you see the rendering you folks were originally given. This is three buildings. You still had the park at the end. The park was about half the size of what it is today in the proposal that we're presenting. We've taken

those two buildings. We've condensed them into three buildings. We've done that in a couple of ways. We've simply made the buildings more efficient. We've skinnied up the amenity offerings, we've become more efficient with the floor plans and we've shifted the unit count to an extremely heavy studio, one-bedroom count.

Our demographic is young professionals commuting into Boston and that's the demographic that we're looking to serve. While it's certainly not an age-restricted project, that is what we primarily see as our residents in our project and in doing those shifts, what that did is it freed up enough space to get this into two buildings, much more efficient, opens up much more of a view corridor to the river for the residents, more area for the park. We felt it was a win/win and that's what we're presenting tonight.

Again, this is a before and after of the park. On the left you see the original rendering of the park. You can see it had a couple of areas. It had a shade area. It had a small playground area, some launch space and a

little amphitheater. On the left what you see is the park that we're presenting today. This is the park that was primarily designed by the neighborhood in Bradford. I wish my pointer really works. This is really -- yeah, this is really unfortunate. Yeah, that's right. At least that's a good fit for it because it's off, right?

So just working through the uses on this park, you know, part of our goal was to create a space that's usable, right. We don't want to create a park that has a whole bunch of uses jammed into it but they are so small and they're shoehorned in, that really functionally nobody can use it. So what we really wanted to think about was how can people use this space? We wanted some active space. We wanted some passive space. We wanted space that could be flex space, right? A variety of uses could be brought in to utilize some of these spaces, and I believe that's what we achieved.

So starting down in the lower corner, we have a plaza. This is kind of one of those flex spaces. This is wide open. It could be used

for food trucks. It's something that could be used for a farmer's market. It's something that could be used for pop-up events in the summer. It's something that frankly the city could take or an organization could take and kind of use to program in whatever way that they see fit, a very flexible open public space at the very entrance to the park.

Next to that we have a children's playground, a really robust playground, playground equipment, everything you would imagine would be there, a rubberized surface, very safe. It's fenced, kept in a separate area from kind of the rest of the, the rest of the park, so it's safe in terms of the road. There's public parking for families to be able to come and use that.

Just above that, we have a splash pad with a water feature, something that would allow families or folks to be able to engage with in the summertime, create that interactivity. And then there's a lot of passive uses in the park as well. There's kind of an open lawn recreation space, play Frisbee, very flexible,

set up a rink in the winter. I mean there's a lot of uses when you think of the sheer acreage that we're working with here in the ways that this park would be programmed for the community.

Working towards the river from there, there's some shade areas. There's some areas for passive recreation, picnic. Whatever you could imagine for those spaces, I think the park would support it.

And then there's really an amphitheater which is very naturally sloping down to the river. There's seating that could be used for performance venues. It could be used just for folks to sit on and read a book, read the paper, have a cup of coffee. Again, very, very flexible space but space that we could envision the community using in a very meaningful and impactful way.

When you get all the way to the right, there's a couple of things I want to point out. You've got the entrance to the park for pedestrians. So if you're walking across from the rail trail, you're going to come into the park at this area that Matt just indicated.

It's kind of a plaza area. There's space to gather off of the road. It's safe. This is how you'd access the park from the rail trail. This is how you would access the park from the Comeau Bridge if you were walking from the downtown.

Once you come in from there, there's a dog park. That's the big round grassy thing that you would see there, and that again is split into a couple of areas, one for small dogs, one for large dogs, well set up for residents to come. We heard loud and clear that having a dog park in Bradford was a major, major ask of the neighborhood. This came up again and again and again in the public commentary that we had and really having one that's that large, suitable for all dogs was a direct result of those conversations with folks.

Finally as you get to the river, you've got these paths that, you know, in this view kind of look a little awkward. There's a significant grade change from where the dog park is down to the river. That bank is very steep. What this is a series of ADA compliant accessible rampways to get down to a kayak

launch. There's also stairs for folks that want to use those. But we've really tried to make every aspect of this park accessible and really folks can walk right down to the waterfront, launch kayaks, launch canoes, launch paddle boards, with a seasonal dock that we're permitting down at the river at that end of the park. So -- I think you're good. Thank you.

SPEAKER: I couldn't reach the kayak launch.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Good work, Dana.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. PROCOPIO: So I do just want to run through a few, a few of the project highlights. So this is all in the package that you folks have and has certainly been in the public domain for some time as we've run the public process on this project.

There's 290 apartment homes that are contemplated here. For those that were involved in the original RFP response, you will know that this was originally 320 units. We reduced it to 290 units. We've held that count, despite significant increases. This is really at an

inflection point for the project. There's 290 apartment homes, in a very, very heavy studio and one-bed mix. This is a mix that we believe works well. It attracts a lot of young professionals.

This is transit-oriented development.

Our goal here is that people are going to have less cars. They're going to walk to downtown. They're going to take the train into Boston.

They're going to utilize that Bradford T stop to make their lives more convenient and that's what's going to attract them to this project.

Hence the large mix of studios and ones. As you can see, it's nearly 200. 199 of the units are studios and one-bedroom units. Only 91 are two-bedroom units in the project.

There's 347 parking spaces. We're going to go through a couple of slides to support that number and work through some of the other urban sites that we've done on transit and what those parking ratios are. This is a higher ratio than we typically do in other places, frankly because the project fit the parking. So we included it and it's below grade. So we're less worried

about kind of jamming surface parking all the place up there and having that visual effect and, you know, negative environmental effects from that much paved and surface parking area.

There's 291 garage spaces, 56 surface spaces, the majority of which are restricted as public spaces for the park. That entire parking lot that you can see down on that end of the site is a parking lot for the public for the park. It's not for the residents at all.

And then finally the park we've been talking about, 3.2 acre public space, the 1.4 acre public park. That's the primary park we've been talking about. That ties into nearly 2 acres, 1.8 acres of linear riverfront park. That is the entire length of the site. It has pocket parks along it, quiet areas, shade areas, picnic areas, seating areas, way-finding signage, signage on the history of the site, signage telling the story of Haverhill across the river, bringing people down into the site, inviting them to view the river, inviting them to use that space and really seeking to engage the neighborhood in this project, right? We

want this to fit seamlessly into the neighborhood and we believe this is the method to do that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The project has some significant offsite improvement. You're going to hear a great deal about that tonight relative to the infrastructure improvements. There's \$2.5 million being proposed in offsite infrastructure improvements. The bulk of that is being spent at the Railroad Ave. Comeau Bridge southbound intersection. We're going to walk through what those improvements are, but a significant piece of that has been reserved outside of the MassWorks funds from the development's funds to deal with the signalization updates and the controller updates on the Washington Street end of the Comeau Bridge. We recognize that that is while not the same safety concern, a problem relative to queuing of cars, flow of traffic, synchronization of the traffic signals and a problem with the way traffic queues up, especially during rush hour on the Comeau Bridge and we want to address that comprehensively as part of this project.

There's meaningful city revenue generation. This was a point in the RFP we addressed. We want to reiterate that. This project generates \$19 million in revenue for the city over 20 years. That is significant, especially considering a site that has generated essentially nothing in city revenue over the past several decades. We believe that's meaningful. We believe that can have an impact on schools, public safety, the neighborhood, everywhere else where those funds can be seen as impactful in the community.

And then finally, there's opportunity for Haverhill residents. This is something that we take seriously. There's a number of temporary construction jobs on this project as the project is getting built. We will give preference to Haverhill contractors and Haverhill vendors as we build out this project. And there is permanent jobs at the property. Just on the property management side, there's six or seven permanent staff members that would be required to run a project like this. We give preference to Haverhill residents as well for that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

As an example -- we take it seriously. As an example we brought a project online in Lynn in the fall, the Caldwell, 260 units. has a staff of six. The manager was born and raised in Lynn, currently lives in Lynn today. She was a hire for that project from the community in Lynn. The senior maintenance supervisor has lived in Lynn his whole life. was hired for that project from the community in Lynn. We take this seriously. We run a very robust process and whenever possible, we want to see these jobs, which are good jobs, good paying jobs going to Haverhill residents who are vested in their community and have a motivation built in to have the project succeed, have the property succeed, have the park be showing nicely in the community. This is what we want to see from that team.

So both Mike and the mayor alluded to the public process we ran on coUrbanize. CoUrbanize is an online platform used to get feedback from the community, primarily for real estate development. It's used by major national developers. We used it on a number of projects.

It's a great way to get out in the community. Folks have to register for the site, so we know who they are. We have their contact information and they engage in a public dialogue, whether it's positive or negative, around the project and we're then able to take that feedback and it's able to inform the project decisions we're making. We're able to actively change things about the project to respond to the community. In this case a lot of it was around the park and around the public benefits but it affects everything.

So I wanted to share some stats. We ran this process over an eight-month period. There was hundreds of comments that were received, leading to hundreds of follow-on conversations with individuals from Haverhill and Bradford about this project. Over -- it's interesting the way this stacks up with the mayor's survey. 84 percent of the comments that were received were positive and supportive of the project, and very overtly so. They said that.

About 10 percent of the comments, they were basically neutral. They may have said,

we'd like to see a Cheesecake Factory here.

Like we don't know whether that's positive or
negative. It was just kind of a comment that we
got and about 10 percent of them were like that.

And then about 6 percent of the comments were
negative. They were, they were, you know,
commenting on some aspect of the project that
they didn't like or that they didn't want to see
the project happen.

In any event, that's overwhelmingly supportive, which we take as a good sign. We were able to engage the bulk of those people in a meaningful dialogue. Many of them are here tonight in this room and out in the overflow room as well.

I do want to share some of the highlights from that. 26 percent of the respondents expressed excitement over the park and provided detailed follow-on input on its uses and design. This park was designed by the neighborhood, completely. Every aspect that you see came out of the neighborhood, came out of these engagements.

15 percent were very focused on retail

and on restaurant uses and bringing those uses across the river from downtown -- not taking them from downtown Haverhill but creating in Bradford a designation for retail and restaurant uses. 15 percent of the folks were very focused on that, suggesting types of uses, suggesting areas, suggesting different retail offerings and programming like that.

expressing a high level of desire for the river access, the boardwalks, and provided detailed input for the design, sustainability, connectivity and public access to the riverfront. This was a major point. This is what drove us to not simply have the park on one end of the project but to take the entire riverfront and essentially make it a public park so that the public had access to the entire length of the river.

A number of the comments revolved around how while that site doesn't have anything built on it today, you can't see the river. The views are completely cut off. There is no access for folks to get down to the river and enjoy it and

it's on that wide, nice beautiful stretch of the river that I think folks obviously were expressing a desire to be able to enjoy. This was a comment, a set of comments that directly impacted our design and what we're presenting.

17 percent provided detailed input on community uses, festivals, food trucks, farmers markets, music events. We got a ton of suggestions around how this space could be programmed for the community, tons. Hundreds of different uses. Some of them we would never even think of in a million years but it was changing the way we were approaching some of the flex space and how we were designing this.

11 percent had a high priority and interest in the plan to fix Railroad Ave. and South Elm, as well as the connectivity for pedestrians and bikes. This was their number one issue. They were very focused on -- in fact in a way that we had not originally -- when we approached this, we were focused on the vehicles and the traffic and that was the feedback we had gotten. When we began this process, what we saw was there was concern about the traffic and the

vehicles and fixing that, but there was an equal concern for bicycles and pedestrians and the lack of safety in and around those intersections and the connectivity to the rail trail and the bridge, particularly around pedestrians. We'll see how they address that in the traffic infrastructure improvements.

1 percent of the folks commented on the density in a negative manner. They thought it was too dense for the area. 3 percent of the respondents actually thought the density was too low and they were commenting on the desire to have higher density clustered around the train stations, so not really meaningful statistical numbers there but we thought we would include them so you could see that density does sometimes come up in conversations.

Interestingly, zero percent mentioned concerns related to the impact on schools. I think that's stemming out of the fact that it's heavy studio and one bedrooms. The demographic skew, very young professional s and interestingly, absolutely no one had any commentary on that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 percent of the people mentioned traffic as their number one issue related to that project. And nobody, in all the responses we got, in the hundreds of conversations we had, nobody mentioned parking or lack of parking as an issue related to the development over there, likely tied to the fact that the T lot is across the street and generally not full, but in any event it's an interesting stat that no one brought that up.

So I do want to talk about parking for a little bit over there. I've got three or four projects that we've done in an urban setting, similar-sized projects, similar number of units, just to highlight their parking spaces per This is our Mosaic project in downtown bedroom. As you can see, it's right on the train That's Central Square in Lynn. station there. It's 146 bedrooms. It has 40 spaces and it's .27 spaces per bedroom. This project is .8 or .82, I don't exactly remember what the number is. We'll get it later, but in any event, significantly higher than what we provided at that project, .82.

This is the Caldwell project, also in downtown Lynn. This is 309 bedrooms, 48 spaces provided with that project, right across the street, very similarly situated to the T. And this is .16 parking spaces per bedroom. Again, this project we're presenting .82 spaces per bedroom.

Again in downtown Lynn, 372 bedrooms. This is our Traverse Crossing project. You can see the T right at the top of the screen. 134, spaces .36 spaces per bedroom. So again, significantly -- we're parking this project significantly over the similarly situated projects, primarily because we had the space, not because we think there's necessarily even the demand. It's a lot of parking for a transit project.

290 bedrooms, 347 spaces, .27 spaces per bedroom. I think that's inaccurate on the slide actually. It's .82. So that's an error on the slide. I apologize for that.

Again to demographics, I know this has come up in relation to school impact and concerns around that. In our entire portfolio

of properties that we operate, similarly sized to this, across the whole portfolio only 6.2 percent of our residents are age 21 and below. We don't break out the demographics beyond that because of fair housing rules, but I can tell you that even of that 6.2 percent, a number of them would be aged between 18 and 21 and simply live on their own. It's a very, very heavy young professional demographic and just the way it shakes in these kind of transit projects, very few children that would be school-aged, the way it shakes out, and very little impacts generally seen on the schools as a result of that.

So this is the exterior rendering along the river. You can see the two buildings situated. You can see the T station beyond Railroad Ave. and you can see that swath of land. This is not insignificant. This is not some minor walking trail that we're building along the river. This is a significant linear park along the river, completely adding all that green space and making that usable for the community along the entire length of the

project.

The view from Railroad Ave. Again, you've got the two buildings. You have that motor court in the middle. You can see the river beyond and you're seeing the landscape improvement. These are set back off of Railroad Ave. a little bit, so you get that urban kind of townhouse feel with the buildings that fit with the general esthetic in Haverhill and are efficient for us with multi-family, yet you still have room for green space and kind of that place making along Railroad Ave. and with the park.

This is the motor court. Again, it was important to us to be able to get vehicles off of Railroad Ave. for temporary drop-offs. We didn't want Ubers pulling over on Railroad Ave. and just letting people out on the sidewalk. This was an important piece of that. It's becoming more and more prevalent at our properties. So we want to bring them right in. There's some temporary parking in there. There's some leasing parking in there, but it gets them

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

off the street, allows them to have a safe pick-up and drop-off zone before they exit back out into the traffic.

This is a close up of the park. Again, what we looked at earlier, the same -- excuse me, the same functions, the same program areas, again a very healthy mix of active and passive uses, most of them designed to be very, very flexible for the community.

Again, this is the plan overview of the parks and the river walk. You can see I mentioned them, but what you will see along the river walk, in the center by the E building you see that round circle. That's a patio area. It's a picnic area. There's some shade structures there. There will be some seating there that's public, and then again, you see that at the end with this pocket park all the way at the end of that river walk. you've got this quiet pocket park, frankly designed for folks that want to get away from maybe the activity of the other park, right? There's a playground there, there's a splash pad. We've also designed some very quiet,

passive spaces for folks that just want to go and enjoy the outdoors and enjoy the river.

So that's all I have. I'll be back up for the Q and A and to deal with questions, but I am going to pass it off to Bob for the next bit.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Welcome. Name and address for the record, please.

MR. MICHAUD: Yes, thank you, Madam

President, council members. For the record,

Robert Michaud, a principal with MDM

Transportation Consultants based in Marlborough,

Massachusetts.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, sir.
MR. MICHAUD: Thank you.

I would like to start by saying that a year ago, I received a call from Mike and his group and he posed a question. That question was: Given the location of this property, is there a solution that works for the community? He didn't ask me a question about whether his traffic impact could be mitigated, which is a common question of a development team. He asked me whether this is a solution that would benefit

the community on a long-standing issue that exists at this particular, very unique location.

I began to answer that by saying, let me take a look. And my first experience with this particular section of Haverhill and this particular intersection itself was a near collision in my car as a result of what is a very difficult sight line, when anyone who is unfamiliar with that location attempts to travel under the MBTA overpass.

I then, having traversed this intersection, attempted to do so from the pedestrian's perspective to understand what barriers exist and what impediments exist to creating an environment that actually allows people to safely, efficiently use this area for that purpose, to get from this particular site to any other location of the city, whether it was the bike path or the downtown area. And again, was faced with near calamity, frankly, and having to dodge very fast moving vehicles with limited sight lines and attempting not to trip over sidewalks that were in disrepair.

I also witnessed a bicyclist attempting

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

to use this area of the city with trepidation. So it's not unknown to this community and folks who live here and experience this on a daily basis that this location is very challenging, has been for decades and really stands out as a location that deserves and warrants an improvement, not only to improve safety but to enhance the ability for those who choose to use automobiles to get safely from one side of the bridge to the other.

Importantly, this particular solution that we've developed was not done in a vacuum. It was done through direct consultation with city staff, department heads, fire department, police department, public works, very early on in the process before a MassWorks grant was actually applied for. We wanted to understand the local perspective and concerns from folks who live with this on a day-to-day basis. If an emergency response is required, what are the challenges? Are there drainage issues that affect this location? What are the safety What's the experience of the city? issues? What are your thoughts on how to solve this?

Mike had mentioned the community outreach as well was part of that solution and identifying through a public process, coUrbanize in particular, specific experiences that the community has with this location. While only 2 percent of the respondents identified traffic as a principal concern, it was evident to us that folks who use this on any regular basis do have concerns with safety in particular and the ability to get through this location, whether in a vehicle or bicycle.

In November 2020 the state selected this particular infrastructure package, which I will present in a moment, as one of a select few communities in the Commonwealth to receive a substantial grant for infrastructure improvement through what's known as the MassWorks grant program. That program really is intended to --for projects across the Commonwealth to support economic recovery, especially in the current climate, to generate local development, which this does, and to create jobs and new housing, particularly at transit-oriented locations such as this. This is literally a poster child

location of all of the elements that are required to present a successful multimodal experience for folks who choose to use this development or for the community that are left to have to traverse this particular intersection.

And I'll stress that but for the MassWorks grant, this project wouldn't exist, and so it's critically important that the two projects, if you will, be viewed as integral to one another. This \$2 million grant would not have been forthcoming but for this project.

That said, what I would like to do is present to you a simulation model that would indicate some of the primary elements of the infrastructure plan that we developed. This is a color-rendered representation at a very conceptual level, of course, of what we're intending to do. And it shows the orientation of Railroad Avenue, the Comeau Bridge on the top of the screen, South Elm Street to the right and Laurel Avenue to the bottom corner, left corner, as well as Blossom Street. And what we're intending to do is not only realign roads in a

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

way that's more beneficial and easier for the motorist to use, but also as importantly, the ability to knit certain pieces of infrastructure together to make sure that they're effective, specifically bicycle and pedestrian accommodation features.

As we begin on the Railroad Avenue side, we are entirely realigning that approach to the terminal point of the bridge where it meets South Elm Street. Today if one sees a MVRTA bus attempt to use the underpass to make a turn from Railroad Avenue, they can't. They entirely swing into the opposing lane. They block traffic. They potentially impact pedestrians. I saw one bus almost have to climb the sidewalk below the overpass to make that movement, very difficult. Fire trucks would have the same So we've realigned that. We've pulled issue. Railroad Avenue further from the overpass so that it meets at a 90-degree alignment with South Elm Street.

The Laurel Street approach also comes in at a very sharp or skewed angle. It is a location that is very difficult to make a

maneuver from, after coming to a stop. It's in direct conflict with higher speed movements from the bridge. There is no pedestrian accommodation in that area and it's a very difficult alignment. We've also realigned that so that it is also better aligned with the overpass at more of a 90-degree alignment, improves sight lines and visibility.

As we proceed to Blossom Street, which requires a pedestrian to cross over 70 feet of paved area to get from one side of that intersection to the other, and for vehicles that literally slingshot the right turn movement without necessarily stopping but proceeding at a rather high rate of speed, we've aligned, realigned that to a 90-degree alignment, introduced a central island feature that allows pedestrians to cross with refuge at the midpoint of that intersection and requires that anyone using an automobile come to a stop and make a 90-degree turn, rather than a so-called slingshot movement onto South Elm Street.

east, the trail head to the Bradford Rail Trail

Finally as we proceed further to the

is in that vicinity. We are proposing to provide an enhanced crossing to that location, pedestrian crossing that will be controlled by what are known as Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacon controls, so that anyone attempting to get to the trail head from the neighborhood or from the bicycle lanes that will be built from the project to that location can cross at that location safely and with clear visibility to motorists who are approaching it.

These sets of improvements are not insubstantial, required extensive input from city staff, were subject to peer review as the mayor had indicated funded by the developer but working on behalf of the city, and they've given this a thumbs up as being appropriate at addressing safety-related issues and concerns and presenting what we would call a multimodal opportunity to use this Ornsteen intersection area, whether on a bicycle, as a pedestrian or as a motorist.

This series of improvements was the subject of the \$2 million grant from the state. The state believes that through the issuance of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

this money, that this can be brought to bear in the near term to the benefit of the project but more importantly to the benefit of the community. This isn't all about how we can serve a project. It's about how we can solve a long-standing community issue and need.

Beyond these improvements, Mike Procopio had mentioned that there will be enhancements to the Railroad Avenue corner, which we'll review in a moment, as well as the integration of these improvements to the signal on the north side of the Merrimack River at Washington Street. You'll see two colored nodes here at the two intersections. Those are new signals. Those signals will work in coordination with one another to ensure that vehicle queues are managed very efficiently at this location, without creating what people currently experience as they travel over the Comeau Bridge toward Haverhill Center, which is in today's parlance long queues, potentially longer delays. This series of signal controls will not create extensive queuing. They will allow vehicles to make safe and unimpeded movements through this

interaction in a way that also respects the pedestrian environment and the bicycle environment as well.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

On the north side of the bridge, the commitment goes well beyond the \$2 million There's an additional half million grant. dollar commitment by this developer to improve portions of Railroad Avenue, as well as the signal equipment at that Washington Street location. We estimate that the upgrading of equipment and bringing that signal to current standards and efficiencies is north of \$200,000 of new and improved equipment, all of which will be coordinated and connected to these signals so that they are able to communicate with one another, not only for the benefit of traffic flow but for the benefit of preemption for emergency vehicles, the fire department. fire department can activate these signals when they approve them to make them go green so that they can get to where they need to in an efficient manner and they can do so with the geometry that we've shown here, as far more efficiently than they can today.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The next slide I would like to show is a This is a computerized model of fly-through. what this intersection will look like when it's built and functional. Beginning at Railroad Avenue, this is the site on the left, the Bradford rail station on the right. You will see the multi-use path, the trail system on the north side of Railroad Avenue as it traverses the site frontage. You will see occasionally bicyclists as well as pedestrians all modeled in this fly-through. The orientation to the park, the realignment of Railroad Avenue where it meets with the Comeau Bridge. You will see the phasing of the new signalized locations and how that phasing allows for the unimpeded movement of traffic, without coming into direct conflict with opposing traffic.

It well manages vehicle queues. Again, you will see pedestrians and bicyclists move along here in a very efficient manner, finally terminating on the easterly end of the project at the new pedestrian crossing that leads to the trail head of the rail trail.

The next slide or fly-through, if you

will, focuses a little bit more on the intersection itself and will demonstrate some of the vehicles that were modeled to go through here. You will see again Laurel Street in the lower portion of the model, an occasional train that goes over. The separation of conflicting vehicle movements, we've modeled MVRTA buses here. We've modeled single unit trucks and Amazon-type vehicles that would be traveling through here and this is a very good representation of what we know will occur once this is built and operating.

And that this not only reflects today's traffic condition. This reflects seven years of growth in the City of Haverhill. It represents the full development of the property at The Beck and was all subject to a rigorous peer review process. And so what you're seeing is a representation of what this is going to look like seven years from now, with additional traffic above and beyond what the project is estimated to add. Very efficient operation.

We're very pleased to say that we have submitted the 75 percent design drawings for

these improvements to the city. Those have been reviewed by the engineering department. They will continue to be reviewed through the peer review process that has been applied to date, and I believe John Pettis is able to represent his department's position on what these improvements represent and what benefits they'll bring. But in conclusion, I'm very pleased to be standing before this council representing a project that is really, truly a city project that is being moved forward by private development through a very collaborative effort and through very rigorous input from city staff. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you very much.

I have a question from Councillor Michitson on the fly-through.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes, thank you,
Madam President. Just could you give people
that are listening a little bit of a description
of the simulation model that you used, that its
not a video game?

MR. MICHAUD: Thank you for that, yes.

In the conduct of doing transportation analysis,

the consulting industry relies on very well established computerized models that were developed through vast research conducted through Federal Highway, through the Institute of Transportation Engineers that have been accepted by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation and transportation departments throughout the country.

One of those models is referred to as the Synchro model. The Synchro model is a computerized version of what's referred to as the Highway Capacity Manual that is published by Federal Highway, and that manual and the techniques for analyzing traffic are all memorialized within the context of this computer program called Synchro.

This model that is presented takes all of the inputs to the Synchro modeling and imports them into a more advanced graphical representation of traffic movement that is known as VISSIM. This is a VISSIM model. It was developed by a private company. It's actually an internationally recognized model that is well used and accepted, again by Mass. DOT and

throughout the country and the world actually. It's a very high level model. It is not a computer game. It actually relies on specific traffic inputs that reflect actual traffic counts, actual truck percentages, actual pedestrian volumes, bicycle volumes, roadway geometry, signal timing and phasing inputs, a lot of variables go into it.

This model, in terms of person hours to produce, represents the outcome of about 200 person hours of time, and a lot of input from department, department heads.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: So I did a little research on the model and it does have credibility, no doubt about that. But a couple of questions. What I noticed during I guess you call them fly-bys.

MR. MICHAUD: Yes.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Backed up traffic on the bridge. If you go back and look at those fly-bys, right, they all show back up traffic on the bridge.

MR. MICHAUD: Yes, absolutely, yes. And I can address exactly that question.

	04
1	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Okay.
2	MR. MICHAUD: But is that the extent of
3	the question? We'll focus on that.
4	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: That's the first
5	question.
6	MR. MICHAUD: Okay. So I want to be
7	clear that any time a traffic signal is
8	introduced anywhere in the Commonwealth, that it
9	will require that vehicles stop and that will
10	result in vehicle queuing. That's just a fact.
11	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Okay, but you had
12	said earlier in your presentation that there is
13	no queuing.
14	MR. MICHAUD: No, no
15	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Based on your
16	assessment. Did I read did I hear you wrong
17	or did I misinterpret what you said?
18	MR. MICHAUD: I want to be very clear
19	that what I was representing, and I hope I
20	didn't cause confusion. It was that vehicle
21	queues will be properly managed at this
22	location, all right. And what I mean by that is
23	that if one were to go over the Comeau Bridge
24	during an evening peak hour, it wouldn't be

uncommon to see 10 or 20 vehicles in front of you attempting to get over that bridge. The ability to travel on the Comeau Bridge is very much connected with the ability of a signal to work efficiently.

The modelling that we've done, which again was subject to peer review as well as city departmental review, indicates that queuing does occur, and we anticipate that between six and ten vehicles will be queued at any given time they have to stop for that signal.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: At any one of the signals?

MR. MICHAUD: In particular for the bridge approach, so that's the focal point. If we were to look at Railroad Avenue, we would expect between two and four vehicles to be queued there. If we looked at Laurel Avenue, we would expect about six to eight vehicles to be queued there. The queuing itself does not mean that those vehicles will experience long delays but as is the case in any signal in the Commonwealth, you will be required to stop because the right-of-way is being granted to an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

opposing approach. And the idea behind a signal is that it reduces vehicular conflict and allows right-of-way to occur which today, if you attempt to make certain movements, is very difficult to do, particularly as an example, South Elm Street approach.

If you want to go through South Elm Street to Laurel Avenue, which I did my very first time through this intersection, you really can't see vehicles coming from the bridge side through the underpass which are going in certain cases in excess of 40 miles an hour. very little ability for someone to properly react to high-speed vehicles because of the limited sight line. The concept of signalization is to allow for a dedicated green movement by someone on South Elm Street who wants to go straight to Laurel, without having to worry about whether a 40-mile-an-hour car is approaching them in a very little space. queuing will result here but it will be very manageable and it will be balanced among the various legs of these intersections.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: And that's based

on a maximum load?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. MICHAUD: Yes.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: That you put into the assumptions?

MR. MICHAUD: Precisely. And I mentioned the seven-year growth horizon, so our firm went out and actually obtained existing traffic volume information. We had the benefit of having historical traffic volume information for Haverhill in the downtown area, including the Washington Street signal through prior studies that were conducted pre-pandemic. We had the benefit of having historical information from ridership at the Bradford station and the associated traffic pre-pandemic. We put all that together to ensure that what we're representing not only represents a pre-pandemic traffic condition but that it also includes seven years of area growth, in addition to this particular project.

And that's important to understand because when this type of an investment is being made, whether through a MassWorks grant or private money or a combination of both, you need

	08
1	to get it right and it can't be something that
2	works year one and doesn't work year two. It
3	has to work long term and that's what this does.
4	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Last question, and
5	this one I'm not sure that you have done the
6	analysis but I'm going to ask. So how can you
7	compare those queuing numbers that you gave me
8	here to what exists today? What is the queuing
9	time today?
10	MR. MICHAUD: At Ornsteen intersection?
11	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: At these same
12	intersections that you just gave me the
13	information.
14	MR. MICHAUD: We have done an analysis of
15	today's condition which relies on stop control,
16	stop signs.
17	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
18	MR. MICHAUD: Stop signs, which aren't
19	necessarily completely effective.
20	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Right.
21	MR. MICHAUD: So the vehicle queues, if
22	you were to look at the Comeau Bridge, for
23	instance, traveling over the bridge through
24	these intersections is has limited queuing

but it does occur, and the reason it occurs is because of the confusion that often arises through movements, whether vehicular or pedestrian, through that area. And unfortunately what happens today is that while a queue might not develop, it creates other very distinct safety concerns in travel through the intersection. So you know, I don't mean to be evasive on the question of queuing.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: You're not. I have hands-on experience in what you're explaining.

MR. MICHAUD: Yes, okay. So the idea here is not what kind of queues are we going to create but what kind of right of way and ability to safely travel through the intersection, what are we creating? Particularly from the pedestrian and bicyclists' perspective. You know, those are as important as vehicular flow, so this is much about safety. We're very cognizant of the need to efficiently process traffic for sure. And I can say that on a letter grade rating, which is something that traffic engineers use to qualify how well an

intersection will function, that we always attempt to achieve what's known as a level of service D or better operation, right. It's a bit like a report card and it has to do with the average delay that someone would experience as they travel through a location.

This design will achieve of level of service B operation. This is going to be a very efficient location. It doesn't mean that queuing won't occur. It will. But certainly not to the extent you see on the north side of the bridge and we believe that we can actually improve the ability for that signal to work more efficiently as a function of this project.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: And you've shown that as well?

MR. MICHAUD: We are -- we've submitted a traffic study that evaluates the north
Washington Street interaction that was subject to peer review. In the conduct of that, and we do report levels of service and queuing in that report that was subject to review, it became apparent to us that in the course besides the analysis itself, the reality of that signal is

that it's complicated. And there was a mast arm that had been hit and was down within the past year. We know that the fire preemption equipment was not functioning properly at some period of time and that the signal controller itself can be improved in terms of its ability to better manage traffic. So we're looking at this very practically and we have a solid commitment to make that location better through investment and ongoing technical review by the city.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Well, thank you very much. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Councillor Daly O'Brien, you have a question?

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes, just a follow-up on him. My interest is also on back-up on the Washington Street side because it's a mess right now at certain times of the day. And that certain time of day has been growing because we've got more people living downtown on that side of the river. Is there -- do you see -- what did you see about that? I mean was there any outcome?

MR. MICHAUD: That particular location has a high level of pedestrian activity and that's not an unknown thing. About three or four, five years ago, the city undertook a road safety audit of the downtown Haverhill area in which they attempted to identify ways to better accommodate pedestrian activity. That study really didn't quite reach to this particular intersection but this intersection has the same needs as the downtown area in terms of pedestrian accommodation, making sure that vehicles can get through safely, first and foremost, and certainly to the extent possible, to make it work better.

Today, I absolutely understand that there's longer queues and delays that exist there but I also can say that through the use of technology, improved signal controller, optimization of what's known as vehicle detection --

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Mm-hmm.

MR. MICHAUD: -- and allowing the signal to communicate properly with the south side of the bridge, that it will work better. And this

project, notwithstanding it will add some traffic, it certainly will, is not the project that's going to create more problems for that intersection.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Okay.

MR. MICHAUD: This project is going to create a solution.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: And my only other question is about bike travel. I notice that we have a bike trail coming along Elm Street. How do you get, if you've been -- when you get to the end of Elm Street opposite Laurel Ave., how do you get your bike over to Railroad?

MR. MICHAUD: Okay.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Because it looks like you can only go one way or the other underneath the overpass.

MR. MICHAUD: Right. So there are actually supplemental slides in the back that present the design that we've submitted to the city that make it a little more clear than some of these color-rendered drawings, and Angelo is going to find those. So if you scan to the back of the design plan set, there we go, go a couple

more sheets down, okay. Hopefully the councillors can see this but this is actually the engineering design that is representative of what we want to do. And you can see Laurel Avenue on the bottom.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes.

MR. MICHAUD: Railroad on the top and you've got South Elm to the right. If you're coming from the bike trail, you will have a dedicated bike lane along South Elm Street that goes all the way to the new signal. That lane proceeds to the underpass as a separate lane, separate from traffic, and terminates at the signal at the foot of the bridge. You will also notice that at the foot of the bridge, there's a new pedestrian crossing that allows you to cross from one side of the bridge to the other, to the Railroad Avenue side.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: So the bike would proceed to that cross?

MR. MICHAUD: Yes.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Okay, okay. It just wasn't clear that the bike could do this and then go across. That's what I couldn't see.

MR. MICHAUD: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a lot of biking in Haverhill and I hope it gets to be more. And I think that this is -- because we're trying to really promote the outdoorness of all of this, and what a gift this will be to that section of the city, that I want to make sure that not just the pedestrian needs are met but clearly that the bike needs are met too.

MR. MICHAUD: Absolutely. And one of the things I can say about a MassWorks grant is that it is a very competitive process and you need to have the right elements of a plan for it to even be competitive in that program. There are over 200 applications that were submitted, 35 of which get picked, this one among, if not the top selection in that program, for the very reason that it includes bicycle accommodation features, enhances pedestrian sidewalks and connections, introduces pedestrian crossings, as well as, and I didn't mention this before and this was an outcome of local peer review for the city, also a new crossing of Laurel Avenue to the T station.

	76
1	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Mm-hmm.
2	MR. MICHAUD: You will see in the left
3	corner, that is a new crossing or an enhanced
4	crossing that will also be equipped with Rapid
5	Rectangular Flashing Beacon controls. So we're
6	very much top of mind on bicyclists and
7	pedestrians here.
8	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: And so how will
9	the pedestrian get from your development to the
10	T station?
11	MR. MICHAUD: Walk across the street, it
12	is right across the street. And there is a
13	pedestrian crossing that is in the plan set.
14	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: I guess I'm not
15	seeing it.
16	MR. MICHAUD: Angelo, if you can back a
17	couple of slides
18	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: I think it's
19	is it towards the end of the third building?
20	MR. MICHAUD: Yes. So you will see the
21	primary entrance to the Bradford parking area is
22	on the right half of that drawing, and you will
23	see a new pedestrian crossing exactly at that
24	location which brings you directly to the

1	loading platform.
2	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: So everyone who
3	lives in that building that wants to use the T
4	will go there?
5	MR. MICHAUD: Absolutely, sure.
6	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: That's all my
7	questions for now. Thank you, Madam Chair.
8	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor
9	Daly O'Brien.
10	Council Vice President LePage.
11	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Thank you, Madam
12	President.
13	Just a quick question. When you're
14	talking about the MBTA lot, you said you have
15	data of who has been there and how long they've
16	been there. So you have like a three-year
17	average or the five-year average of the parking
18	rate in that lot?
19	MR. MICHAUD: Yeah. So we actually went
20	back through MBTA records of ridership which
21	actually indicate boardings and alightings from
22	that station over I don't have the exact
23	years, it was pre-pandemic. I believe it was
24	several years of data and we picked the highest

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

year of ridership for that location. MУ recollection, I don't have it right in front of My recollection is that there were me. approximately 60 boardings or alightings during the highest hour of activity for that station. And those trips equate to essentially a vehicle and those vehicles were then added to the Railroad Avenue corridor as a trip in the modelling to make sure that we're properly reflecting the historical parking and trip activity that is associated with that station, above and beyond what we're likely to add for trips from this particular project. VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: So you're saying 60 for a day or 60 --MR. MICHAUD: During an hour, during a particular hour. VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Do you know what the number was for a day of how many folks park in that lot? MR. MICHAUD: I don't. We do have that information in the submitted traffic report that

technical attachments to that report, which I

It's in the

was subject to peer review.

don't have here. But the highest period of activity of course would be boardings in the morning and alightings in the afternoon. The alightings in the afternoon, which would drive the demand for traffic on Railroad Avenue, actually do not occur in a way that's coinciding with commuter traffic. It's actually either just before or just after that commuter peak, which was an interesting trend to us. It's just the way the train is scheduled. But we did take that highest hour of activity and we loaded that into the volumes. We can certainly provide that but it is in the record in the traffic report.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: I would just like to know because they charge parking there, and quite a few folks don't park there.

MR. MICHAUD: Yes.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: They park along Laurel Avenue.

MR. MICHAUD: And we have had that discussion with the police department and other city staff as to what that trend is, and it's not uncommon for someone to park on Laurel Avenue because it's free and they can walk

across the street to the platform. This plan will reenforce that bicycles are more important than free parking along Laurel Avenue, and so you will see in the design that there are bicycle paths, lanes if you will, along Laurel Avenue as well that lead all the way from South Elm Street to the new crossing at the MBTA station. So if you're on a bicycle to get to or from the station, there's a direct way of accommodating that trip.

so we're aware that people don't necessarily use the Bradford station lot because it costs money and there is free parking in the neighborhood. And our design, by design through input from police and others at the city, specifically will reduce the parking, the free parking there, and encourage the use of the MBTA parking itself, as it should be.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: As I look at it now, are you pretty much eliminating all that parking along --

MR. MICHAUD: Yes, we are, from -- we're not eliminating -- I want to be very, very clear about this. We are not eliminating resident

parking. We are not eliminating resident parking. But what we're eliminating is free parking that is regularly used as a by-pass to the Bradford.

WICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: It's kind of a misnomer, the signs that we have because we really don't have resident stickers in parking.

It's just been there to eliminate a problem with -- my understanding of creeping up into the neighborhood when the police would enforce no parking there. So it's been allowed to be there but at least now in my opinion that would be great to eliminate that.

MR. MICHAUD: Mm-hmm.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: All right, thank you. I would like to know, like I say, that's been a very under-utilized in my opinion parking lot.

MR. MICHAUD: I would agree. And even tonight, understanding it's still, we're still in the tail end of the pandemic at least, that it's uncommon to see any more than a dozen cars parked there, but historically it has been higher than that. And the premise of this

project because of the amenities that it's creating and the energy that it's creating in cleaning up that area and making it more viable will, in fact, attract more use of that station.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor Vice President LePage.

Councillor Jordan.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Thank you, Madam President.

Just questions for you looking at the fly-over, it looks like you are doing a lot to try to address the traffic issues which for those of us who live here knew, know definitely do exist and particularly going from Bradford on South Elm to go over the Comeau Bridge, really between 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. That's the time when it's a real issue.

I did it last Friday, just going through a couple times in those windows just to get a sense of when the backup starts, which can be as far back as the liquor store. Theoretically it can be as bad as Mal's where the barber shop is.

It took me at one point like seven minutes just to get from when I first backed up to get over the bridge to the Haverhill side and the second time it was actually 13 minutes. It was that bad.

Your modelling, obviously you're creating queuing. Right now if you're coming from the Haverhill side to go over the Comeau Bridge, there is no backup. You go, you basically fly right over. And you look at your modeling, do you have it that tight to get a sense of how long it will take now, you know, in peak hours to get over that?

MR. MICHAUD: As we continue to finalize the design for this, this is at the 75 percent design stage and we will be subject to site plan review, should we be successful in securing an appropriate vote from this council, that we know that the 13-minute delay that you're experiencing can be vastly improved.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: I would certainly hope so.

MR. MICHAUD: Period. Yeah, it can.
Will it be perfect? Will queuing be eliminated?

No. We're certainly realistic about what's possible at that location, and it's always a balancing act between how much delay River Street might get versus Washington Street versus the bridge. And that's critically important, not only because of the convenience or lack thereof by folks like you who try to get over the bridge but it's critically important from the perspective of emergency response, fire response.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Sure.

MR. MICHAUD: First and foremost in my view. Those types of conditions need to be addressed and will be addressed through this project. And we know, while those delays will exist in some form, they're certainly not going to be 13 minutes long.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: I just, my sense would be, again as a person who is not an engineer, is that when you put in these improvements, it's going to make it a lot better. My question, which I don't know the answer to, is what will the impact be when you add 290 units that are now flowing into there?

So on the first step when you put in all this, you know, changes to the intersection, add the lighting, it should make it a lot better for people like me going from Bradford over to Haverhill. I just wonder if it's temporary until the people come in and then how much do they add to it? Does it end up being a wash in the end? That's what I'm unclear on.

MR. MICHAUD: Yeah, it's an excellent question because folks will oftentimes correlate the number of units to a high level of traffic impact. And one of the reasons that we've taken the time, that Procopio has taken the time to fund and have us complete a detailed traffic study, which was subject to peer review, was to identify and quantify how much more traffic might impact the bridge in particular.

I can say that because this is a transitoriented project, that one of every five trips
that will be made here during peak hours is
likely to be transit related. We know that from
U.S. Census data for folks who live in this
neighborhood today who use public transportation
that don't have as easy access as this project

will have to commuter rail.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We also know that, you know, the number of trips that will be generated which is estimated using industry standards, well established standards, is measured at about one additional vehicle per minute over that bridge at most. The higher percentage of trips will be actually oriented to Laurel Street and Route 125. There will be people who use that bridge, for sure. If they have employment centers within Haverhill, they want to drive to DeMoulas Supermarket, those trips will occur. But the number of trips relative to the volumes that currently exist there are inconsequential. Yes, it will add traffic but it's on the order of about one vehicle per minute.

Now if you were to stand at the Comeau Bridge and just watch traffic and try to feel what that's like, wait a whole minute. It's not a lot of traffic, right, and it's not -- and this is shown in our analysis. It's not going to materially affect how long the delays of the queues are at that signal.

So that was something we very much paid

attention to, but more importantly for the delays that do exist and the traffic that does exist, as well as the growth in traffic, regardless of this project, that signal needs to be improved and it can be, as a function of this project. This project is more than mitigating its impact.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor Jordan.

I do have a question. You compared the October -- you used the October 2007 data and added 34 percent it says. Volumes collected in July 2020 with available data from October 2007 to determine an appropriate -- how come so far back?

MR. MICHAUD: We actually use a combination of factors. We had the benefit of having what are known as peak season, peak hour traffic volume counts for the Haverhill downtown area. In the conduct of our study, because it was in July of 2020 and during a pandemic, we knew that we had to make corrections to represent, fairly represent what the actual

conditions at these locations would be pre-pandemic, without that effect.

So we went back to the road safety audit that was conducted in the downtown area which had October traffic data. We did counts at that exact same location in 2020, in July of 2020. We looked at the growth or difference in trip activity from our count in July 2020 to the October counts that were published and relied on, and it demonstrated that it was between a 26 and a 34 percent difference in trips. Those were the factors, the corrections that we made to the data.

In addition to that correction factor, we have looked at historical data that's published by Mass. DOT for area roadways generally, and we see this throughout the Commonwealth, that the difference in trip activity during peak hours, commuter hours pre-pandemic to during pandemic were on average 25 to 30 percent below a typical condition. So when we viewed the historical information for the downtown area and compared that to the count at the very same location in 2020, we knew that that 26 to 34 percent factor

was entirely consistent with the adjustments that were made in literally dozens of other communities and dozens of other projects that we've worked on in the Commonwealth, and that are consistent with what Mass. DOT has recommended as adjustment to reflect prepandemic conditions.

so the conclusion here is we've not only made that adjustment, but we've taken that one step beyond and looked seven years from now to add traffic growth. So the volumes which were peer reviewed, independently they concur with our approach. They agree with it. It's consistent with the Mass. DOT methodology, it's consistent with what we've actually observed in the field in other communities and that's the basis of the correction.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay. And so you're eliminating parking on South Elm in front of those businesses from probably what is now a barber shop down to a garage that is now a bikeway?

MR. MICHAUD: The liquor store, the garage, that's correct. There's a handful of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

curbside parking spaces there that quite honestly create a lot of friction for folks who are traveling along that corridor, and if they were to remain there would be in direct conflict with the objectives of the MassWorks grant itself which is to provide bicycle accommodation features, improve pedestrian accessibility and to allow for proper vehicular flow. But we've, we've addressed that very specifically through ongoing discussions with department heads, police, public works, and we know that the liquor store, as an example, has adjoining parking, both behind and adjacent to the building. We know that the corner property which was formerly an auto repair shop has, recently at least, attempted to provide surface parking within the confines of its own property.

The design very specifically recognizes that and accommodates the potential for a driveway connection to that surface parking. We are continuing to work with the city on how that particular land use, that particular property can have viable parking off street. We believe that it is possible but there are likely to be

changes that are necessary for that particular property on its own property to accommodate that need. And that landowner is aware through its discussions with city staff of this project and what the objectives are in the reduction or the elimination of parking, so they're aware of this.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Going northbound over the bridge, the queuing up onto the bridge and right now it goes, it snakes around to South Elm and Laurel, how do you alleviate that with no lane for a right-turn lane? I mean, back before they did the bridge over, there were two lanes that you could kind of queue up there and people would peel off to the right as they could, and that's gone. So that's not available. It's going to be solely on signalization?

MR. MICHAUD: Yes. The models that we presented and the geometry that we're proposing are more than adequate to account for that, all right. So I'm going to actually turn to an exhibit that I have here. I want to be clear that we are actually introducing two lanes on South Elm Street. There is a right-turn lane

	92
1	and there is what's shown as a left-turn lane.
2	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yeah, I was talking
3	about the bridge itself.
4	MR. MICHAUD: Oh, okay.
5	PRESIDENT BARRETT: That causes the
6	backups.
7	MR. MICHAUD: Oh, on the north side of
8	the bridge?
9	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yeah, the north side,
10	going north.
11	MR. MICHAUD: Yeah, we're not proposing
12	to change the geometry there, the lane
13	designations.
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I don't think you
15	can.
16	MR. MICHAUD: We can't. But what we can
17	do, what's within the realm of grasp here is to
18	make sure that the signal that is there is
19	working as efficiently as it can. And it's not
20	uncommon to have signals be timed in a way that
21	reflected patterns that might have existed three
22	or four years ago, and those patterns change.
23	It's one of the reasons that this applicant is
24	willing to commit to upgrading the equipment at

that location so that it has proper vehicle detection, current technology and that the technology is able to communicate as well to the signals on the south side of the bridge. And so the technology is really the answer.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay.

MR. MICHAUD: And that can be improved.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay, because I've attended many traffic and safety meetings over the years and this Laurel Ave., South Elm, Railroad intersection has come up a few times over the eight years of meetings. And the answer was always, oh, no, we can't put a light there, that would -- you can't put a light there; there's no way to put a light there. So now there's a way to put a light there? Is it just technology in the last couple years?

MR. MICHAUD: No. Again, I go back to the very first conversation we had with Mike Procopio. He said this project doesn't exist unless there's a solution and a solution that benefits the community, not just the project; it just won't happen. So we were challenged with developing a solution that is viable, and that's

what this represents. So I don't know the history of other prior studies or analysis of this intersection, whether or not the type of design we're showing here was even considered. But we like to pride ourselves on thinking outside the box at the firm MDM.

I'm joined by my business partner Dan Mills who is here tonight. We're supported by a very well qualified compliment of staff. We've been in the industry now for more than 30 years. And so when we looked at this, we knew it would be a challenge but we knew that there was a solution, and that's what this is. So signals do create queues. They do. But they have a purpose in managing those queues and managing those delays, not only for traffic operations but for safety. And this can exist absolutely in concert with that other signal.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: And what happens when some day in the near ten-year future the Basiliere Bridge is worked on and it becomes a two-lane probably so they can work on half of it? What happens to your scenario then?

MR. MICHAUD: I wouldn't hazard a guess

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

right now. You know, we're focused on what we know exists for infrastructure in this area and what the constraints are and the opportunities are for that existing infrastructure. speak to whether or not Basiliere Bridge is going to be improved or not or when. certainly to the extent that happens, they'll obviously have to consider what exists at this location at that time as well. You know, the idea here is to solve what is a very difficult safety-related issue, to balance it against the transportation needs of having motorists get through here and to make sure that we're properly getting -- making opportunity for folks who want to use alternative modes to do so safely.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you. I think that's it for questions on the traffic.

MR. MICHAUD: Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. PROCOPIO: As a follow-up to your question, one of the reasons that the current solution is viable and wasn't necessarily viable in prior studies or examinations of this is that

the realignment of Railroad Ave. to come in at a
90-degree angle and create that new geometry is
using the private land. It would not have been
possible without essentially using the Gulf
station property and part of the Skateland
property in the past. So what's allowed us to
do that is because we basically put it all on
the table and said, what do we need to do? And
the solution from Bob was, you need to bring
Railroad Ave. kind of over your land and make
that connection and increase the geometry. So I
think in previous studies of that, that probably
wasn't on the table and it's unique to kind of
the way we're looking at this now.
PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay.
Mr. Pillsbury, are you part of the
presentation or are you speaking in support or
what's I'm not quite sure.
MR. PILLSBURY: I'm speaking in favor,
Madam President, of the project.
PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay. Are we at that
point
MR. PILLSBURY: I believe we are.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: -- on your

1	presentation?
2	MR. PROCOPIO: The only other thing that
3	we have in terms of our presentation is if
4	there's other questions, not related to traffic.
5	PRESIDENT BARRETT: We'll have questions
6	probably after. Councillor Michitson had asked
7	specifically to ask questions during the
8	hearing. You're all right with that?
9	Would anyone like to speak in favor?
10	Would anyone like to speak in favor?
11	MR. PILLSBURY: Madam President
12	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Would anybody like to
13	speak in favor?
14	MR. PILLSBURY: I welcome the
15	opportunity, Madam President. Thank you so
16	much. Again
17	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Name and address for
18	the record, please.
19	MR. PILLSBURY: Bill Pillsbury, Economic
20	Development and Planning Director. I will be
21	extremely brief, because you have my four-page
22	letter. I basically wanted to focus on the
23	zoning, the waterfront zoning that was created
24	for this particular subzone and how this project

complies with it. You have that in front of you. I would be happy to answer any questions that you have.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But very specifically, I think it's important to note that the city departments have reviewed this and find it to be in compliance with the requirements of the ordinance, and there's a number of different requirements of the ordinance. We've looked at the waiver requests as well. I believe that the waiver requests are appropriate based on the requirements of the zone and some of the emphasis of the zone, the purposes of the zone. And I think it really, the design guidelines are complied with and I think, you know, we all know that the real, the real issue before us is to put a project that makes the most sense for the City of Haverhill into play and I think what we have seen here tonight is that type of a project.

I've been involved with a number of projects over the years, as you know, and we've brought a lot of projects forward. I specifically when we walked out of the last

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

hearing we had with the council, I called Mike Procopio and I said, look, we don't want your regular, standard, off-the-shelf traffic engineer. We want you to get somebody that is going to give us a solution, and those were the terms that we laid out to them. And Attorney Migliori heard that loud and clear.

And I think what you've heard tonight is that Mike Procopio did that. He went and got an engineer that was going to put together a package that was not simply focused on straight up mitigation. Obviously, we get a lot of traffic studies that show mitigation, we're going to put a stop line and we're going to put a stop sign and we're going to leave it at that. I think what we have tonight, and I think it's a testament to the team that Mike has put together and how they've worked with the city, I think that's another important element, that they have worked extensively with John and his office and the rest of the city departments. You have recommendations in favor of this project from the police, from the fire department, and I think that's very important and very telling

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

about the nature of the way this team has worked with us and worked with the city over the last period of time.

And again, one thing I would also mention is that this project going forward is a city project, city/developer program. This is not a state project. I had conversation with one of the councillors earlier today to mention at least, that this is not a state, Mass. DOTauthored project. The design is being handled by MDM and it's being handled through the MassWorks program and evaluated and peer reviewed and implemented by the city. So we're not going to get any Mass. DOT surprises as we did on Route 125 and other projects. So I know that that was a concern in some corners and I want to point that out right away.

But I think in general, we have a solution before us tonight that's consistent with the master plan. And I want to just take a minute and recognize the fact that Tim Love, who did the master plan, was also in the review committee here, is online, is on the line and I would like to briefly hear from Tim, Madam

President. And I'll be here to answer any questions that you might have that relate to the zoning but I think in general at the appropriate time, Madam President, I would recommend your approval of this project at the appropriate time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

Mr. Love.

MR. LOVE: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Name and address for the record.

MR. LOVE: Tim Love, 122 F Street, South Boston.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. LOVE: My name is Tim Love. I'm the founding principal of Utile. We're a planning and urban design firm, and I led with my colleague Will Cohen who is also at the meeting, the master plan process that I think you were all involved with. We also were the consultant to the committee that reviewed the proposals that were submitted in response to this RFP, and so we're very familiar with the alternative proposals that looked at the site and the

reasons why the Procopio proposal came out ahead as the preferred proposal.

I think since a lot of the things I was going to cover have already been covered by the speakers, I wanted to focus on some of the design attributes of the project, speaking as an urban designer and an architect, in addition to the fact that the project fulfills the vision of the master plan. I know a lot has been said about the park but I want to emphasize a few points.

First, the park is located at the junction of an expanded riverfront trail network, the bridge, and as a result of that and some of the parts between the existing bridge, the new park and the expanded trails, a unique and memorable civic designation will be created. It's the combination of the trails, the park and the bridge coming together to creatine in a way a new symbol for the city.

Secondly, the park includes uses and attributes that will attract people from across the city, including killer views across the river framed by an amphitheater, a playground,

	103
1	and seamless access to the riverfront trail
2	network. Lastly, the residents of the
3	development will ensure that the park is busy
4	across all hours of the day and days of the
5	week. This will make the open space feel safe
6	and welcoming to all.
7	I also want to reenforce again the
8	complimentary nature of the MassWorks grant and
9	the development proposal itself, and the fact
10	that a private parcel was used to solve what
11	before was an intractable transportation
12	problem. So for all those reasons, I'm in
13	strong support of the proposal.
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.
15	Mr. Cohen, did you want to say anything?
16	MR. COHEN: No, just that I support it as
17	well and happy to answer any questions if anyone
18	has any.
19	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.
20	Anybody else would like to speak in
21	favor?
22	Mr. Callahan. Name and address for the
23	record.
24	MR. CALLAHAN: Good evening, Dan

Callahan, 57 Lowell Ave. in Bradford. I've been -- I've owned a home up there for the last 42 years. I've seen a lot of traffic go up and down my street. I can remember back in the early '80s, you know, when Western Electric had 8 or 10,000 people employed and I would have to wait to back out of my driveway.

Traffic has always been something that's gone on on Laurel Ave. and it shouldn't stop us from -- I was excited about the project before, and after watching the presentation with these guys, I'm even more excited about it. To see something happen in my neighborhood that I haven't seen happen in 42 years, it's a great project, you know. I think it's worth a real good look at, you know.

And I love traffic by the way. I love traffic. Traffic is a sign of a healthy economy. It means people are going places and doing things, contributing to our neighborhoods, you know. Oh, yeah, I'm the guy that drives for a living, but I want to thank you for your time this evening.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: I can't wait to tell Tom, you're the limo guy.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Anybody else that would like to speak in favor?

MR. PETTIS: John Pettis.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Here, and then to you. And I do have some people online that want to speak, so I am going to let them jump in at some point.

MR. PETTIS: Good evening, President Barrett and members of the council. John Pettis, city engineer.

I have had the opportunity to meet with the design team quite a few times, including today. I did come into this with a lot of reservations, you know, the traffic across the bridge especially in the afternoon, the safety at the intersection on both sides of that railroad bridge and the path, pedestrian safety at that location. But all along the way, everything that I have had, everything that police, fire, the other departments have worked with, have met with them as well, they've addressed everything really, really thoroughly.

1	We also had the BSC Group, which is an
2	engineering firm that we use sometimes for
3	traffic-related matters, do the peer review, and
4	Michael Santos had quite a few comments
5	initially. His review letter of January to this
6	date, to date, every one of his comments has
7	been satisfactorily addressed, and I would like
8	to introduce him now. I think he's online.
9	PRESIDENT BARRETT: He's online.
10	Hello, Mr. Santos.
11	MR. SANTOS: Hi, this is Mike Santos.
12	Can you hear me?
13	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yes, we can. Name
14	and address for the record, please. I can't see
15	you but I can hear you.
16	MR. SANTOS: Okay. I did turn on my
17	oh, one sec. There we go. How's that?
18	PRESIDENT BARRETT: There you are.
19	MR. SANTOS: Okay. My name is Michael
20	Santos. I am a traffic engineering consultant
21	for BSC Group. I'm based out of Worcester.
22	We're based out of Boston so we kind of cover
23	all of Massachusetts and southern New England.
24	I've been working with John Pettis, not

only on this project but on other projects to do system peer reviews of developments like this. This is, obviously this is the biggest one that I've had a chance to look at. I don't have a presentation prepared or anything but I'm just going to briefly go over our peer review, the process. So what we do, you know, we provide an objective review of the traffic analysis presented in the traffic study and any transportation-related issues with the site plans.

so we initially took a look at the traffic study back in January. We had a substantial amount of comments related to, you know, related to the traffic study. So the scope of our review, it includes the review of the study methodology to ensure that it's done in accordance with professional standards. You know, through that we look at the data collection, the existing traffic volumes, which that was actually pretty tricky for this project because they did data collection in July. But we did review all of the adjustments that they made.

Mr. Michaud spoke to that earlier and, you know, we have no issues with how they, how they grew the traffic volumes to reflect hopefully where we will be very soon. We also reviewed the safety and motor vehicle crash analysis and then the project-generated trips and the trip generation associated with the project to make sure that they are accurately projecting how many, how many vehicles are going to and from the site.

And then the biggest part of the review is to take a look at the proposed mitigation and the proposed intersection work, the MassWorks project that is currently at the 75 percent design stage. So we first provided our comment letter, our initial comment letter on January 26th of 2021. MDM provided responses to all of our comments, I'm not going to go through every single one of them, in a letter on March 3rd which addressed all of our comments.

So the outstanding issues that they did address were, you know, like I said, we did have some questions on the traffic volume adjustments, just because it was kind of a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

complicated process to, you know, to take traffic counts from last summer and to adjust them to make sure that they're accurate. The other thing that we looked at was safety and making sure that they have adequate sight lines and they do. There's plenty of sight distance along Railroad Avenue, so we don't see any issues with the site access.

A couple other important things to note, and again, Mr. Michaud spoke to this earlier, is that part of our, part of our review was to ensure that, you know, we understand that there's some traffic issues at the northern end of the Comeau Bridge at Washington Street and River Street. So they had committed to contributing to funding traffic signal improvements there. So that's something that we recommend the city, you know, you codify that and make sure that that's part of the conditions of the project, just so that happens. We think that, you know, there could be some significant improvements just by looking at, looking at the detection there and looking at the traffic signal timing.

You know, we also looked at the proposed traffic signals at South Elm Street and Railroad Avenue and South Elm Street at Laurel Avenue, with the understanding, you know, right now it's unsignalized, so there's really no delays on South Elm Street over the bridge. But with the addition of this project we feel that, you know, the analysis that they presented shows that the signals can handle, you know, they can process the traffic. There will be enough capacity for that. And again, you know, you will see queues on South Elm Street that don't currently exist today but that's typical of any traffic signal.

And more importantly, we wanted to make sure that, you know, none of the movements are going to be over capacity, where you have queues just building up that can't, can't clear through the intersections. So we did look at that and we're comfortable with, with what they presented. And we're also available to the city to review, you know, the ongoing design to make sure that the traffic signal timing is finetuned to what it should be to make sure that the detection there is, is properly designed.

You know, another thing that I don't know if it was pointed out but it's going to be fully actuated. So what that means is that, you know, when there's a slug of traffic that comes out of the commuter rail station when a train drops off passengers, you know, there will be actuation there to allow the appropriate time for that, for those vehicles to clear through the intersection. So that's another thing that we'll, we'll also be looking at through the remainder of the design process.

Another thing that we looked at that's also important is to make sure that the site itself can handle fire trucks, delivery vehicles, moving trucks and other vehicles that will be serving the site. So they did, they did provide diagrams, I'm not sure if you have those. But they did provide diagrams showing that all of those vehicles will be able to maneuver throughout the site efficiently without any issues and, you know, that's a safety issue that we always, that we always make sure to look at.

And one other thing that we did ask them

to do, it wasn't in their original traffic study, is there is a mid block crossing on Laurel Avenue, you know. As you come down the hill you have, vehicles can be traveling at a higher rate of speed. So we did recommend that they install a Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon which Mr. Michaud spoke about before, so they're also committed to that as well.

And just one other thing. I don't think that this came up but they did, they did provide a list of transportation demand management measures that they're going to do, such as, you know, it's not limited to this but transit subsidies and I'm not sure what else. But that's a very important thing, especially for transit-oriented developments like this. You know, this development, it's going to be, in my opinion it's going to be at the commuter rail station. It's going to be attractive to people that do want to commute into Boston, so it's a great location for it.

And just one other thing. They did, you know, when they did the trip generation estimates, they did account for some transit

usage which I think it was about 19 percent, 19 percent of the people in this area use public transportation. In my professional opinion, just because of the location of the project, that will probably actually be a lot higher. So I think that they may have, you know, overestimated the number of trips that this project will generate which, you know, we call a conservative estimate, so everything that is designed will be able to handle that higher level of traffic.

So we don't have any additional comments on this and everything has been addressed. We feel that this project can be constructed safely and all of the proposed offsite roadway and intersection improvements, it's going to be a big change. It's going to be better pedestrian connections and bicycle connections, you know. Adding two signals is definitely going to add some, some delay on South Elm Street but, you know, for the larger transportation network, these signals will be able to process the traffic more safely, most importantly, and efficiently. So we don't have any other

additional comments on this project.

Everything, all of our comments have h

Everything, all of our comments have been addressed and I think the Board should have our most recent letter that I just sent out yesterday, it's dated May 24th, just confirming that all of the issues have been resolved.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

MR. DOHERTY: Steve Doherty. You all know me. I'm from the city here, but I recently moved to Windham, New Hampshire but I think I'm coming back.

I'm with him over there. I like traffic but just not in front of me, okay. But I would like to say that looking at it from a different perspective, I know traffic is huge to everybody here tonight. But I also own real estate downtown Haverhill and we lease it out to G's Restaurant, and I think that having this type of a project across the river, okay, I think a lot of these people will walk to downtown, will help the downtown area and it will really help the -- everybody in business down there. I think it would help tremendously from these amount of people coming to that area.

1 And that won't be giving more traffic to the Comeau Bridge headed downtown. That will be 2 3 foot traffic. And I think that will be important that if we can get this amount of 4 people to come over to this side of the bridge 5 and spend their money downtown, it will be great 6 7 for the economy. It's great for the city. a wonderful project. It's really, it's really a 8 9 stellar job, if you see what they put together. 10 I mean this is, I think this is a good one. So 11 if you could find it in your hearts, we, we got 12 to get this thing going. Okay. And I'm in 13 favor of this project. Thank you. 14 PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you. Cassie, I 15 think we have somebody online. Go ahead, sir. We'll queue up somebody 16 17 Your name and address for the record. online. MR. GAGLIARDI: Thank you, Madam 18 Michael Gagliardi, 103 Cedar Street, 19 President. 20 Haverhill. And for those of you that don't know 21 me, I'm the business manager for the Laborers' International Union, and one of the communities 22 that we represent here is Haverhill. 23 24 And I'm here with my brothers from the

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers who support this project. As you see, our members that live in the City of Haverhill are here supporting this project. This developer is a little bit unique. He wants to ensure that Haverhill residents are on the project. And what we've committed to as building trades is to go into the inner cities and also get some of the kids from some of the underserved communities that may not be college-bound and put them into our apprenticeship programs. And that's how we repay the city for helping to get the jobs.

And I think that this council should be thrilled that we finally have a developer here that wants to ensure Haverhill residents go to work, because that hasn't been the same for all of the projects. We've had to force them to do it reluctantly, as they come and take their money back home, but this developer wants to keep it here. And us as a building trade union, we're totally in support of this project and we think that it would be a shame to not give the opportunity to some of the kids of this

	117
1	community to get into the trades and have a
2	career that travels outside of the city where
3	they can work for their own, for entire career.
4	Thank you, Madam President.
5	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.
6	Is Steve Pascoe still online? Steve?
7	MR. PASCOE: I am here.
8	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Hi, Steve. Name and
9	address for the record.
10	MR. PASCOE: Steve Pascoe, 52 Colby Road,
11	Danville, New Hampshire.
12	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Welcome.
13	MR. PASCOE: Thank you for giving me the
14	opportunity, President Barrett, other council
15	members, anybody who is listening. This is such
16	a huge opportunity for the City of Haverhill to
17	revitalize another distressed area. We've got a
18	totally increased housing demand which everybody
19	is aware of. Really, it blew up more in the
20	last year but it's been going on for at least
21	five years that I know of.
22	And it offers, this project, all of the
23	amenities, the kayaking, the boating, the
24	amphitheater, the dog park, the water, you know,

1 the waterfront area, boardwalk. You can't say 2 no to this. This is an amazing opportunity. 3 know it's late but I'm in total, I'm a big yes 4 on this project. I'm a developer and I'm a landlord in the 5 city, and I think that this is just a tremendous 6 7 opportunity to make things much better, add to the revenue to the city for taxes and will give 8 9 people a great, great park to enjoy. And the 10 sincerity from Mr. Procopio, who I don't know 11 and his firm, and the things that I have heard about their organization just gives me a great 12 13 feeling about the future of Haverhill, and this 14 project is amazing. That's pretty much all I 15 have to say. PRESIDENT BARRETT: 16 Thank you very much. 17 MR. PASCOE: Thank you. 18 PRESIDENT BARRETT: Have a good night. 19 There was one other person. There she 20 goes. 21 A really quick statement. MS. SMIDA: Name and address for 22 PRESIDENT BARRETT: 23 the record. 24 MS. SMIDA: Danielle Kravetz Smida, 17

Lexington, Haverhill. A little over 20 years ago, my husband and I moved to Haverhill to live in the Bixby Building downtown so we could park our cars and walk to the train station for our daily commute to Boston. We love seeing the river from your deck, walking downtown for dinner and being a short drive to Boston or the mountains. We liked it so much we stayed.

And as you know, I liked it so much I got involved in a couple projects downtown and one of these projects being the Bradford Rail Trail. It's always been our vision for our trail to connect to the Bradford train station. As you know, the current intersection at South Elm and Railroad Ave. is quite dangerous for pedestrians. The MassWorks grant to mitigate traffic will address these pedestrian issues. And additionally, it's my understanding that the proposed developer will contribute additional funding to these enhancements. However, it doesn't happen one without the other.

I believe that if the council does not approve this project tonight, it risks signaling development that -- to the development community

that this parcel is not developable due to traffic concerns that are unable to be mitigated to the city's satisfaction. Without this type of development, it's unlikely that we'll be able to leverage funding opportunities to address serious pedestrian issues connecting the rail trail to the train station without significantly foregoing phases to expand the trail east. In other words, it took ten years to have what we have now and it will take much longer to reconnect to Groveland if we need to -- funding to replace what is proposed as part of the project to the west end.

As a long-time member of the Rail Trail Committee, I urge you to consider how this proposal benefits and builds upon an asset that each of you have supported in the past. As a resident, I think it's an opportunity. I am encouraged by what I have seen from the developer's project and approach to the community feedback. And just as my husband and I came to Haverhill to ride the train, I think many of the residents who choose to live at the proposed project will do just that. They'll

come to Haverhill for the river views, for the downtown restaurants, for the rail trail and eventually for an art center just down the street. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

Okay. One more, and then we'll go to the other side.

MS. HERLIHY: Good evening. I'm Kay
Herlihy. I live at 4 Riverdale Terrace, and I'm
one of the fortunate few who live on the banks
of the Merrimack. My backyard is the Merrimack.
I think that was, this proposal will give a lot
of people in our city the opportunity to be
close to the river and enjoy it, as I do.

I am one of three people here from our walking group who walk the rail trail, and when we get to the end, we keep saying, well, soon we're going to be able to walk across and go to a wonderful park. And I hope that the city council will think about the residents of Haverhill and the opportunities this gives us, all of us, not just those in Bradford, those in Haverhill as well. I hope you will vote in favor. Thank you.

1 PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you. MR. FOURNIER: Good evening, Madam 2 3 President and members of the panel. My name is Robert Fournier. I live at 76 Pleasant View 4 Ave. here in Haverhill, and I want to speak in 5 favor of this job, of this project because of 6 7 all the jobs it will create in construction. I'm in construction myself. I'm currently 8 working on a similar project in East Boston, and 9 10 it's good work and puts a lot of people to work. 11 And if they are committed to using local people, 12 Haverhill residents for labor, we'll earn the 13 money here. We'll spend it here in town. 14 will be very good for the economy, not just for the people who will move to Haverhill but for 15 people who already live in Haverhill and will 16 17 work in Haverhill to construct this project. Thank you. 18 PRESIDENT BARRETT: 19 Thank you. 20 How -- all right, one more. We're going 21 to lose, we'll lose the council here and they're 22 getting upset. 23 FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm wondering, did 24 anybody talk about to mitigate the traffic

1	problem of using the MassWorks grant to enlarge
2	and widen the streets on River Street and
3	especially the Merrimack Street, at the end of
4	Merrimack Street between Gerson and the
5	overpass? It seems to me that if you widen that
6	area, you might have to take out two businesses
7	but that would really improve the traffic flow
8	over the bridge from the south to the north.
9	And I haven't heard anybody talk about it. All
10	he said was somebody tried to mention it and the
11	developer said we can't, and I would like to
12	know why can't we use the Mass. grant or
13	something to widen the street on the north side.
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.
15	We have one more person that I can't say
16	no to. Is Ted connected?
17	FEMALE SPEAKER: There's no answer to my
18	question.
19	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I'm going to ask it
20	again, ma'am.
21	Ted, are you on?
22	(Pause.)
23	Mr. Gaiero, give him a couple seconds to
24	unmute.

you're in favor, Mr. Gaiero?

23

24

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Excellent.

And

	125
1	MR. GAIERO: I have a very formal
2	education. I have ideas to enhance the best
3	city east of the Mississippi, from the Gulf of
4	Mexico to the Great Lakes.
5	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Mr.
6	Gaiero.
7	MR. GAIERO: No. What's my name again?
8	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Ted.
9	MR. GAIERO: Sergeant Ted, if you'd like.
10	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay, Sergeant Ted.
11	Thank you so much.
12	MR. GAIERO: Is your brother going to
13	open up Kelly's again?
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: No. I wish but no.
15	MR. GAIERO: One and done, right? They
16	had a wonderful success there.
17	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.
18	MR. GAIERO: Are you still living in the
19	family house on Salem Street?
20	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I am for the moment,
21	yes. Thank you very much.
22	MR. GAIERO: Where are you going to move
23	to? That's a great place.
24	PRESIDENT BARRETT: It's beautiful, yeah.

Thank you very much.

All right. Anyone opposed? Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition?

MR. KATZULIS: Michael Katzulis, 119

South Elm Street. I have a few questions.

One, the parking. According to the codes in Haverhill, we need to have 1.5 spaces per unit, that's 435 spaces, which brings us a deficiency of 88, and that's including whatever businesses are going to be there. I'm just trying to -- so I'm trying to find out what -- are they going to be using the MBTA parking at all? Are they going to be leasing spaces for that?

Also I'm just, one thing I thought about listening, this is a former manufacturing plant, correct? Who was there? Has the EPA been there to see if there's any issues? I know it's been 40 years I guess since the building has been there but I'm just concerned. Are there any safety issues that need to be cleaned up? Also there was a gas station that was previously there.

I'm just concerned about the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

infrastructure as well. Do we have enough infrastructure to -- now we have this big building. Do we have enough fire? I don't think we do, and we only have one little fire station at Bradford. If we have any major issues, are we going to have a way to cover everybody?

And obviously, our police have always been strained. We know that. That's just a lot more, you know. I'm concerned some place like Skateland, it's been there for years. I've been here for 19 years. I have never heard a problem I mean, it's where kids are there, they're staying out of trouble and now we're losing more places. I know they want the park. Traffic obviously is a problem. I live up the street where there's another intersection. got a lot of traffic as well. I'm wondering how much this is going to back up when they start queuing with the new lights they want to put in there. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you very much.

MS. HOBBS EVERETT: Katrina Hobbs

Everett, I live at 41 South Central Street and

1 pretty much work at 293 Washington Street. 2 So I came here actually to speak to 3 oppose, but I'll be honest. The presentation 4 was very impressive and I am very much looking forward to like the park and things of that 5 nature. But I did want to just kind of ask, 6 7 well, I guess say one statement to the council, and that's while this project seems like it will 8 9 be great for a transient population, you know, 10 coming into Haverhill working in Boston, it does 11 not address the housing needs for the population 12 that is currently in Haverhill. But aside from 13 that, I do think it's a great project. 14 you. 15 PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you. Anyone else that would like to speak in 16 17 opposition? Anyone in opposition? And I know I have somebody online too. 18 19 Name and address for the record. 20 MR. FOSSARELLI: My name is Louis 21 Fossarelli. I have a place of business at 297 22 South Main Street in Bradford. 23 PRESIDENT BARRETT: Welcome. 24 MR. FOSSARELLI: Madam President, members

of the council, it's always a pleasure to be here. I thought I would shed a little light on the gentleman's question about safety. I am going to reveal my age. In 1988 I was chairman of the Conservation Commission. Before the city foreclosed on the property, they wanted to make sure they were not foreclosing on a hazardous waste site. So they did a 21E, and we were involved in that on the Commission and it had a clean 21E at that time, which was a surprise to everyone because it had been a factory for a long, long time.

With that, I would like to really address my primary concern which is probably everyone else's is traffic. You know, there's an old cliche: You can rearrange the chairs on the Titanic; the Titanic's problem was that it had the Atlantic Ocean. The intersection of Railroad and South Pleasant Street has the railroad. It has the railroad bridge, is not getting any wider. They softened some of the radiuses, they improved line of sight but they haven't changed the problem.

I go through that intersection probably

five, six, seven times a day. At certain times of the day, Councillor Jordan had it right on the money. I've waited at the stoplight, at the stop sign rather on South Pleasant Street to enter the traffic flow going across the bridge. If you're on River Street, you're at least a half to three-quarters of a mile down the road at certain times of the day. And those aren't the worst spots. The worst spot is if you want to take a left off of Washington Street across the bridge to go to Bradford. If you don't make the first four spots in the staging lane, it's a disaster. It's a nightmare, especially if someone is moving into the viewpoint.

Now, back any of those up and you have a worse problem. And right now, there's nobody in the train station. There's nobody in the 300, 291 units. There's nobody in the restaurants or commercial space. There's no people in the park. We're going to improve pedestrian traffic which pedestrians press the light, it stops everything. Bike paths, we're going to have bike paths, enhance bike use in that area, slows everything down further.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I found it interesting. There's two little things that I didn't know but I was watching the presentation. One of them was you're not going to take away residential parking on Railroad Avenue, but residential parking is in the same place where the bike path is going to be and you're going to eliminate the people who park there and ride the train. I think that's, that's impossible.

The second thing is, which is really even more serious, if you come out of Blossom Street, excuse me, if you come out of -- yes, Blossom Street and you try to take a left to go across the bridge, you have to enter a staging lane. The staging lane you're entering is the staging lane that goes straight up Laurel Avenue. It's not even the staging lane you need to get to in order to go across the bridge. So if you're going to Haverhill, you can't come down Blossom Street. You're going to have to go somewhere And if, if the traffic backs up else. seriously, you're going to be at Bradford Avenue with the same problem.

It's just, it's almost unmanageable.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

it would seem -- I love the project. I'll tell you what I like more than the project. the enthusiasm of the developer. I'm convinced it's, it's as good as it gets. I'm convinced he believes everything he says and I think he's right on all of it, except the traffic. You put that train station back in business without a pandemic. You add 300 condominiums with, and we can speculate forever who has got a half a car, three-quarters of a -- I'll just give you any I'll take his number. You add those number. You have retail activity on the lower You have people going to the park. have people trying to get off the rail trail with bicycles and walking, stopping the traffic in a two or three and a half, two and a half, three and a half out, and you have a nightmare.

Nothing against the project, love the project. Think it's great. I wish it wasn't where it is. It always has been the problem. It will be the problem as long as they're unable to improve the opening that's there, that they have to deal with, the railroad track. I guess that's a very expensive thing and very difficult

but essentially we're going to have a lot of traffic lights. They're going to slow everything down. We're going to do very touchy feely, wonderful things that we all want to do, we inspire to do those things, outdoors, enjoy, walk, ride bicycles, that's going to slow it down further. This is a very heavily traveled commercial area.

And I'm not sure, you know, the more I think about it, which is worse, the other end of the bridge or the trestle part of the bridge? It's really a toss-up. But I can see this project only exacerbating it by its existence, not by what it's doing wrong or that it's designed incorrectly or it's not sensitive to the community's needs.

I just think, and Madam President, your point is well taken and undiscussed. We're all here, because I sat there with you when we did the Comeau Bridge. Five years of nightmare. At least a half a dozen streets changed direction, made into one-ways. Remember, you couldn't go down Merrimack Street from Bradford? That's because the traffic was so bad. We got it five

1	years at least, and I don't care if they put one
2	lane or two lanes and they pass by, people avoid
3	that stuff and they go to the other bridge.
4	It's a nightmare that's going to be made worse
5	by that situation.
6	And who even knows what the schedule is
7	for that situation. Certainly I don't. I know
8	it's been delayed at least once or twice
9	already. I would love to do a temporary bridge
10	from Taylor Goodwin to the old, the old
11	restaurant but that's another story for another
12	day. I had my say. Thank you for listening to
13	me and I know you'll do the right thing.
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, thank you.
15	We have somebody else in opposition
16	online. Paul Abreau, are you still there, Paul?
17	MR. ABREAU: Yeah, I'm here.
18	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Welcome. Name and
19	address for the record.
20	MR. ABREAU: Paul Abreau, 53 Boston
21	Street.
22	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Go right ahead.
23	MR. ABREAU: Okay. I grew up on Laurel
24	Ave. I live on Blossom Street. I had a lot of

houses in Haverhill, so I kind of wear Bradford underwear. We would love to see something there. It's an awesome project. I really like the park. But, so I would like to say that to the development team and I would like to address the balance of my comments to the council.

This is a big, big project, as you think to vote on it. And not, I think Mr. Fossarelli said, there's a lot that's kind of undiscussed. Now, the school and the school's concerns, right, with 91 two-bedrooms, you got to figure we're looking at another classroom or two. So these are concerns that we're going to have to address, if you move forward with this.

I mean so much has been said about the traffic so I really don't want to rehash any of that. But those models, we've all been down there. They look nothing like the traffic and the backup that we have there, at all. I mean I just took a walk down there today and it was just backed up past what used to be Quality Liquors.

And that's another thing. I mean, there's friction between the businesses and the

project is what they said. And that's, you know, some of us, we do business with those people at the barber shop, so I know it's only two businesses, and they're not here. So they must not care, right? But there's a lot of neighborhood concerns with the traffic, which we've already, you guys have already discussed. So with the amount of variances that we have, parking and height and capacity and stuff, I really think that the council needs to think why we have so many regulations and why they are what they are, if we're always going to be granting, you know, preferential treatment to certain groups. So thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.

Is there anybody else that would like to speak in opposition? Anybody in opposition? I don't think there's anybody else online.

Anybody else in the room?

With that I will -- oh, do we want to answer the woman's question about the north side of the bridge, that you can't adjust the north side?

MR. MICHAUD: Thank you, Madam President.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I addressed the issue of that intersection by stating that this developer is committed to the equivalent of \$200,000, maybe even a little bit more, to improving the technology and the operation of that location. What we're not proposing to do is widen roads, eliminate parking or make any kind of those what we would call structural changes to the intersection. don't believe that they're warranted as a basis of the project. They're clearly outside of the realm of a MassWorks grant but they, the developer is not holding back anything either, They're providing substantial you know. financial support to have our firm working under the auspices of the city and the objectives and needs of the city through a review process, peer review, to make it better. And we're going to more than offset the impact of this project.

But the project itself is not going to solve every ill of the city. That's an example. They're going to make it better but they can't solve every issue. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you very much .

I appreciate that.

	138
1	Councillor Daly O'Brien.
2	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: No, I thought
3	we were getting ready to
4	PRESIDENT BARRETT: We're going to.
5	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: That's why I
6	put it on. I'll do it after.
7	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Put it back on, put
8	it back on. All right. With that, I'll close
9	the hearing.
10	Council, what is your wish? Councillor
11	Daly O'Brien.
12	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: I would like to
13	call for a vote in positive for this project.
14	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Second.
15	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I have a motion by
16	Councillor Daly O'Brien and a second by
17	Councillor McGonagle, and we have many
18	questions.
19	Councillor McGonagle.
20	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Thank you, Madam
21	President, and thank you for the presentation,
22	thanks for the interest, thanks for the
23	thoroughness. The traffic explanations were
24	outstanding. It is a tough area. I came into

this with concerns about traffic. Traffic is going to be there.

The one car per minute number that you used I think is manageable for the benefits of how I see this project. When the mayor was talking about all the attributes, good attributes of this project, he forgot to say one of the most important things in my eyes, Mr.

Mayor. There's 290 more housing units going to be added to our city. We always are in here saying there's not enough housing. We need more housing, we need housing of every type in this city. That's a big asset, I believe.

And then we talk about trying to keep our taxes low and the cost of water and wastewater low, and then when we have an opportunity to bring in the type of revenue that this project will bring in and we let this go by the boards, I think that's a mistake. We've had many opportunities. We've had a few opportunities over the years to have developers come in and talk to us about this project, and this is by far the best one that I have seen.

It does have, you know, no disrespect to

the people who spoke in opposition. Those are concerns. But this group is trying to and I believe them, that they're going to try to mitigate those concerns and will use some modern technology to try to alleviate and try to, try to take the back-ups out of those areas.

Every time you stop a car with signalization, it's tough for me to say that, you're going to have that queuing, but that's going to, you know, I listened to Councillor Jordan and Mr. Fossarelli, and they're right, that it's going to take some time. But with signalization, you actually get to go before maybe that 13 minutes I think, if the process is working the way. I don't know how many cars they're going to allow to pass. That will be worked out, I believe, and that will hopefully stop the 13-minute wait or get it down to a number that's feasible.

And again, I want to thank our city department heads who spoke in favor tonight, Mr. Pillsbury, who comes in before us with many good projects, and I think we're pretty good at accepting them and I think this is a great one.

I think you should be commended and our city engineer, John Pettis, who spoke in favor after sitting down and doing the reviews and listening to the experts. These are the experts that are talking to us about how solid this proposal is. And I'm going to support it because that's what we have these department heads here for is to give us advice on what is a good project. You know the revenue numbers. You know the job opportunity, you know the housing benefits and that's why I will support this tonight. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor McGonagle.

Councillor Daly O'Brien.

I was lucky enough to be the council representative that oversaw all the proposals and worked with that committee very closely, and from the very beginning, you could tell that this was the best, even with all the concerns we had at the time, and traffic was definitely number one. You could tell that they thought a lot of Haverhill and they were going to do what

1 they could to remediate anything that came up. 2 So when it came before us to give the 3 mayor the authority to do a purchase and sale, I encouraged my fellow councillors and said that I 4 thought we should do it, and we were able to 5 pass it. So this gave the mayor the ability to 6 7 move forward with the Procopio Group. What I'm most impressed with is, one, 8 9 they are moving that horrible MBTA layover, 10 which we as a council working with our state 11 delegation have tried for at least 10 or 12 12 years, maybe longer. I mean --13 PRESIDENT BARRETT: The state delegation 14 moved the layover, Councillor. 15 COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes, but we, we were not able to successfully do it. It took 16 this and that together. 17 PRESIDENT BARRETT: They had it, they had 18 I think --19 it moved. 20 COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Well, then, it 21 was a secret. So I can't give you any props for that, so. 22 23 I love the preference for resident

24

workers.

I think that that is key and it's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

something that other developers have always shied away from. I think that is really wonderful. And the fact that they're actually offering a solution to the longstanding, intractable traffic problem, I think it's worth They really have tried to make a difference. I don't think it's going to be perfect, and I agree that I think the other side of the river, Washington Street and River Street, that is a problem that we're going to have to address. But that's also a sign of growth and we've had a lot of growth on that side of the river, a lot of residential growth. We've had a lot of restaurants. We have a lot of businesses going on, so in a way, it is that kind of good growth that you want.

And we've got old streets. The way those streets have come together on either side of the river is crazy. It is the 1800's. It's wagons being pulled by horses to get to and from the railroad stations on both sides. It doesn't work this way. All the businesses were downtown then. All the shoe shops were downtown, the tanneries. Everything was downtown. That's why

it was the way it was. It was a convenience for those businesses, and now we have residents. So we will adapt and do what we can, and I know the mayor will always try to do what he can to get the money to help the city mitigate these problems.

So in all, I think the other big plus is that park. Everybody in Haverhill is going to be able to use that park. Everybody in Haverhill is going to be able to have access to the river. They're not taking away from viewpoints of the river and I think that that is absolutely fabulous. It's a place where families and children can enjoy the river and enjoy the outdoors.

I do have a couple of questions that don't have to be answered immediately. You can -- how many of those units are going to have balconies? Because I really believe in outdoor space and I think that's an interesting question. And how many public parking spaces will there be and where? And that's really it. Other than that, if you can answer those questions, I'm already in support of it but I

	145
1	would like those two answers if possible.
2	Thank you, Madam President.
3	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you. I'm sorry
4	for interrupting a few times. I apologize.
5	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: That's all
6	right. It was a secret.
7	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Councillor Jordan.
8	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Thank you, Madam
9	President. First, I do have a question as well
10	that I actually had a resident text me to ask
11	it. It's for Mr. Procopio. I don't know if he
12	wants to wait again until the end to answer it
13	or he's ready to answer it now. It was actually
14	regarding the park and specifically, would there
15	be any barriers to prevent children from getting
16	down to the river? That was the question the
17	resident had.
18	MR. PROCOPIO: What would you prefer?
19	Would you prefer me to answer as they come up?
20	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Now.
21	PRESIDENT BARRETT: You can come up.
22	Come on up. Thank you.
23	MR. PROCOPIO: Perfect. I'm going to
24	punt the balconies. Public parking spaces, I

believe the number is 36 but I'm going to -- 30, okay, 30 on the public parking spaces. 20 percent of the units have balconies.

Barrier access to the river, yes and no. There's not a firm kind of wall, where you would have to undo a gate to get to the river, but most of the children's areas are segregated with fences. The playground is fenced, both for river safety and for road safety. The splash pad, those types of things have their own kind of barriers but in general, there's not really a wall going down to the river, just for flow and access.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Yeah, I think the question really was related to the splash park and where the younger kids are likely to be.

MR. PROCOPIO: Yes, secured and gated, and areas for adults to be seated and have shade and be able to watch and kind of keep an eye on them. But yes, very secure.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Okay, thank you. Is it okay, my comments?

PRESIDENT BARRETT: No, no, no, go ahead.

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: All right, thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So yeah, just to give you my two cents on the whole thing, maybe a little more than two cents. I do have some concerns. One, the impact on the schools. As we know on the council, most of the schools are at capacity, and certainly Hunking, the primary one here in Bradford, is already capacity. I just have to say, I really doubt that 91 two-bedroom units will only yield, what you had in here, less than 15 children. So I do think as we continue, not just this project but, you know, in talking to the superintendent as well, all the projects we keep approval, we have to make sure we have a plan, you know, for the impact it's going to have on the school system.

I very much appreciated the presentation related to the traffic and the plan, the solution. I'm still skeptical. I'll be honest. I think Mr. Fossarelli raised some very good points, that a lot of the queuing, the lights are going to create backups that don't currently exist. I don't think it's going to be nearly as smooth as indicated in the fly-over.

That said, there's a lot that I do love

about the project. I think the waterfront park is fantastic, the kayak launch, the amphitheater, the park, the dog park, removing what's currently an absolute eyesore that's been there for a long time of the former gas station. I do love the river walk and letting people from the public as well as residents there walk all the way down along it. It's a great enhancement and as we saw the pictures from Mr. Herlihy today, at least the councillors removing the dangerousness of the homeless tent park that exists in that area right now is certainly great.

The extension of the Bradford Rail Trail is fantastic, as Ms. Kravetz Smida referenced. I think that's a great enhancement for our city. I do think the redesign, clearly I am very impressed. I had more skepticism about the solution. Again, I'm still using solution there in quotes, but there's a lot clearly positive from it. Namely, the fire trucks and buses will be able to safely make that turn which they can't right now. You know, for people who currently are coming down from South Elm to go

over to Laurel Ave. as the gentleman mentioned,
I mean you're taking your life in your hands,
hoping that a car is not coming out from
underneath the railroad trestle really fast. So
having lights there definitely is going to help
make it a lot safer as he mentioned.

I am, as I stated when you guys first presented, a big fan of market rate housing on the waterfront. The most desirable property we have should be, you know, at market rate. And also from the people I have talked to in the development community, Procopio certainly has a great reputation for the work that you do, so.

I would want to add, I think it was the gentleman from BSC Consulting who mentioned that we should have in the criteria --

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Flashing pedestrian?

COUNCILLOR JORDAN: No, I was going to say the \$200,000, it sounds like they're amenable to it. They were saying they were going to do it but I think if it's in the proposal or in the approval, we should have that specifically stated that they're going to provide that money for the light synchronization

on the Haverhill side.

So bottom line for me, I mean again, no project is going to be perfect. I mentioned my concerns. They're real concerns, but there's so much positive from this project that I plan to support it tonight. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you,
Councillor Macek.

President. I think this project provides a great deal of amenities to the city, not just on their property but even in the vicinity and the linkage, as it used to be called, is something that is more than I expected with all the signalization and road redesign. I think that we couldn't ask anybody else, if we don't approve this, to even come close to what is being offered here tonight in total.

I do have a few questions that I would just like to go through the checklist right now. Maybe Mr. Procopio or somebody else could just -- and because this is stuff we normally see in presentations, we didn't really see this kind of stuff tonight about the actual construction

	151
1	project. So one of them would be in this day
2	and age, we're seeing more need for electric
3	charging stations for cars. Are you planning to
4	maybe have some installation of driving
5	stations?
6	MR. PROCOPIO: Absolutely. Yeah, there
7	will be some ratio. We're not far enough along
8	in the actual design to know.
9	COUNCILLOR MACEK: I'm not saying that.
10	MR. PROCOPIO: But I mean I would imagine
11	with that many garage parking spaces, probably
12	12 or 18 of them.
13	COUNCILLOR MACEK: And you'll have some
14	for the general public and some for your own
15	residents?
16	MR. PROCOPIO: Yes.
17	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Okay. What about bike
18	storage? When we're talking about bikes, is
19	there going to be easy access for the tenants to
20	have someplace to
21	MR. PROCOPIO: Yes, it will be on the, it
22	will be on the river side on the exterior of the
23	parking garage, there will be, there will be
24	storage for a sufficient number of bikes for the

resident population.

COUNCILLOR MACEK: Okay. Unfortunately sometimes during the year, we get something called snow. What about snow removal and storage? Do we have areas planned?

MR. PROCOPIO: There will be areas, areas planned. I'm not sure whether we've specifically gotten to that stage yet but certainly as with any large scale dense, relatively urban project, it's a big factor. We plan for onsite storage safely in a way that the Conservation Commission signs off on and if we can't accomplish that, we have to do snow removal and we have to get it offsite. It's just an operating factor.

COUNCILLOR MACEK: Right. And the same thing for rubbish and recycling. Are you going to be providing access for the tenants?

MR. PROCOPIO: It would all be, it would all be internal. There's not going to be dumpsters, with the exception of any retail dumpsters that are required. Those would be shrouded. The tenant refuse would be internal through trash chutes into compactors. There

will be private pick up. They would come, remove the canisters from the building, put them right in the truck and take them out, and all of that would be happening off the street in the loading area.

COUNCILLOR MACEK: Great. And one final question. Would you, are you planning to do a complete build out or are you going to do it in phases?

MR. PROCOPIO: This is not a non-answer. So it's not really a phased project but just because of the size of the project and the fact that it's two buildings, it would inherently be phased. So what likely would happen is construction would start on one building. It would progress to a point where the next building can start. It wouldn't be a significant lag. Maybe, maybe it's four months, maybe it's five months. It's not a matter of build one building, see how it does and maybe we start the other one, maybe we don't.

COUNCILLOR MACEK: Okay. That's what I was really looking to find out.

MR. PROCOPIO: We start, we're going to

finish the entire project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COUNCILLOR MACEK: Okay, great. What's your plan with -- just kind of relative to this. What's your plan with the park? Are you planning to donate it to the city for upkeep and use at some point? Or how do you plan that? I know there was a mention that there was going to be city involvement.

MR. PROCOPIO: Yeah. So the plan is, it's very, very difficult for us to operate the park privately. So in our initial proposal what we proposed is we'll build the park out. get the park stabilized. We'll turn the park over to the city as a gift. What the mechanism looks like, I won't pretend to understand what that legal mechanism is. But the city ultimately would have to take it over. focus in designing the park is that to the extent possible, it's as low maintenance, as durable and as long lasting as it possibly can It's not in our best interest or the city's be. to have a park that decays because the city can't keep up with it.

And also you're

COUNCILLOR MACEK:

1 planning to build out all of the walking paths and everything? Everything we're seeing --2 3 MR. PROCOPIO: That's correct. COUNCILLOR MACEK: -- is going to be 4 done? 5 MR. PROCOPIO: Yes. 6 7 COUNCILLOR MACEK: Okay. I personally -thank you for your questions, for your answers. 8 9 I personally see this project as 10 something that doesn't come along every year or very often actually as a life-long resident of 11 12 Haverhill. I think it's going to be 13 transformational in that area and maybe for the 14 larger portion of the city than some people I think that this is another project 15 believe. that is, you know, it's comparable to what was 16 17 done downtown with The Heights, with Harbor Place and AJ Lane. Oh, AJ Lane, what's that? 18 AJ Lane was a huge project proposed right 19 They had, 20 off of 495 at Elliot Street and 110. 21 as this project does, had commitments from the -- I think it was probably the federal 22 government to actually put the access ramp that 23 24 currently exists and existed back then right

into the project and right into their grounds.

Unfortunately, I won't go into it any more, but
it was going to bring city water and city sewage
down there for their project. It was going to
be a Sheraton Tara Convention Center. It would
be operating today. It would create jobs, tax
revenue, and it's not there.

And the reason it's not there is because of skepticism, NIMBYISM, and people that were afraid to try something. And the only thing that I can compare this to recently, and it's a little touchy subject but I'm going to say it anyway, we thought we were going to have chaos with our pot shops. There hasn't been one story on the radio or in the newspaper or talk to any police officer, there's been no problems. And I think that this project is going to end up the same way. All of the fears are not going to happen and if anything does happen, I know that a company such as Procopio will fix it and they'll do whatever they have to do to smooth it out.

Let's not make the same mistake that the city made with AJ Lane on this one. We've got a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

couple of good ones starting. I think this is another riverfront project that at some point in time, the city is going to be known for midrises and projects like this all up and down the river in Haverhill on both sides. Maybe it won't even happen in my lifetime but that's what's going -- that's the future of this city. I want to make the future of this city, you know, I want to keep it happening because we need to have the change, and anybody with a smaller or lesser project can't give us the amenities and the, the amount of greatness that this project is really going to have, with the park and the walking areas connected to the rail trail, all of those things are fantastic. I'm going to support this project and I would just like to make sure that we properly put all of the conditions necessary into this approval before we vote on it, Madam President. Thank you. PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor Macek. Councillor Vice President LePage.

All right.

Thank

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE:

you, Madam President.

Mr. Procopio, I just, I have a few questions for you. You might want to stay at the podium.

Thank you for your interest and what you're doing, and a couple of questions, as Councillor Macek said. So park maintenance is one of my concerns and very frankly, I wish you would take care of it. Because we haven't done a real good job to be honest with you as a city with maintenance but that's another issue. That's not your concern.

But one of those things it makes me think of, when they did the rail trail and again, you're taking suggestions I guess and say, will there be some things there that they have call boxes if there's any issues on the rail trail? Will they be able to incorporate those also, as we have on the Bradford Rail Trail that's up there?

MR. PROCOPIO: That's actually not something that we thought of, frankly, but we would be happy to do that. I don't know what the mechanics of that would be. We certainly

would build that in. The emergency boxes?

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Yes, just as a continuation on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. PROCOPIO: I don't see why that would be an issue.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Okay. And also another question Councillor Macek said. So the construction site would not be in phase, but how many folks roughly would you think, construction workers you'd have on the site at one time?

MR. PROCOPIO: So that's like throwing a I don't know. dart, so let's have that caveat. But I can tell you that we just completed a project in Lynn. It was 260 units, a high-rise downtown at the train station. We averaged around 175 workers a day on that job. And I want to be very careful, that's not 175 cars. I mean there's a lot of car pooling. COVID was a big challenge related to that. Folks come to work together. On that particular project, it was very urban, there was no parking. We parked them all in the MBTA garage. We handled their parking passes. We made sure they weren't parked on neighborhood streets and stuff like

that. That's certainly commitments we could make here. We believe on this particular project, there's sufficient room on the site to park the workers because there's room essentially on the site. If there was any overflow, we would ensure that it wasn't overflowing into the neighborhood and it was contained in the MBTA lot and we would strike that deal with the --

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: I just saw some of the numbers you had. I think it said 700 construction jobs, obviously all different trades but not all at one time?

MR. PROCOPIO: All different trades, not all at one time. And frankly, that's a calculation that we enter the size of the project in dollar volumes and there's an industry standard that kind of spits out and says, okay, you've got a project that's a hundred million dollars, it's going to generate this many jobs in construction.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: What was also in the thought is the train. I mean we're talking the train station. We also have the bus stop.

1 Would there be a bus stop along the way? MR. PROCOPIO: We haven't addressed that. 2 3 That's not something we looked at. VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Okay. I'm just 4 thinking of folks, again not everyone is going 5 to take the train in. If someone wants to --6 7 you have some workforce housing and others like that, if some folks are not walking or whatever, 8 9 like that, if there is something to be done that 10 way. 11 MR. PROCOPIO: I think that's right. 12 That's certainly a conversation we'd be willing 13 to have with them. As I said, we've got that 14 kind of drop-off, pick-up/drop-off thing. There's some convenience there. We could try to 15 work through that with them. 16 17 VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: So, and looking at the site plan, I think it was the second 18 19 slide where you had the two buildings, the C 20 shape and the E shape. On the right-hand side, 21 that's all public parking? I think it's the second slide. 22 23 MR. PROCOPIO: That's correct, so that is 24 public parking. One of the things that we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

didn't touch on really is that C-shaped or in this orientation, U-shaped building, the upper leg of the right-hand leg where it appears as one big box, that's what's -- that's the retail We were kind of anticipating having a area. restaurant or a food and bev operation that would front out to the river. It abuts the public parking that's there, and then that parking also serves the park and public uses on the trail. And that would absolutely be restricted from resident use. It's not quest parking. It's not resident parking. It's not leasing parking. That is public parking and only public parking.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: So on the left-hand side, is that resident or is that --

MR. PROCOPIO: So on the left-hand side is resident. The bulk of that is actually some service parking. That's where move-ins would occur. That's where trash pick up would occur. So the rest of that is resident parking. The bulk of the resident parking is all below grade.

VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: So the retail is just in that one, that one section on the

	163
1	right-hand side?
2	MR. PROCOPIO: That's correct.
3	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: And again on
4	this, it shows the parking all along Laurel Ave.
5	You said that is one of the things that's
6	changing? It will be now a bike lane?
7	MR. PROCOPIO: No, I think the parking on
8	the one side of the street remains.
9	[Simultaneous speech.]
10	MR. PROCOPIO: That's Blossom or Laurel?
11	SPEAKER: That's Laurel.
12	MR. PROCOPIO: Right. So the crosswalk
13	to the street on the right-hand side of the
14	street where we're showing parking in the
15	graphic, that remains.
16	SPEAKER: The parking from the crosswalk
17	to the signal will be eliminated. (Inaudible).
18	MR. PROCOPIO: It's shown as parking on
19	this graphic but it is being eliminated. Okay,
20	okay.
21	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yeah, it's on the
22	east side of Laurel, right?
23	MR. PROCOPIO: Correct.
24	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: So like I said,

	164
1	this is where the folks park to go
2	MR. PROCOPIO: To the train.
3	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: to the train
4	station, okay. Okay. With that, the one other
5	thing that I will say at this moment in time is
6	it hasn't been recently but when you first came,
7	I went and looked and I drove around. It's one
8	of the things I like to do and I went to see the
9	projects in Lynn. I haven't seen them all so I
10	don't know if they're completed. I believe the
11	one downtown, the ten-story one
12	MR. PROCOPIO: That's done.
13	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: is done. The
14	one where the hospital, adjacent to the
15	hospital?
16	MR. PROCOPIO: The hospital one, we're
17	not doing. Another developer is doing that. We
18	were involved in the beginning. We're no longer
19	involved in that.
20	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Okay. And then
21	so like I said, I saw three in Lynn.
22	MR. PROCOPIO: Yeah.
23	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: I traveled to
24	Merrimack. Is that completed also?

1 MR. PROCOPIO: Merrimack is completed, 2 correct. 3 VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: All right. So from what I could see what was going on and 4 looked at the pictures, again, what I have heard 5 of the reputation, it all seems to be stellar. 6 You do great work and the investment is from what I have heard good. At this moment I'm just 8 going to -- that's all the comments I have at 9 10 this moment and questions, but again, thank you 11 for the presentation. 12 PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Council 13 Vice President LePage. 14

Councillor Sullivan.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN: Thank you, Madam President, and thank you to the Procopio Companies for this amazing transformational project in a blighted area of Bradford. only one who can say that I grew up in the neighborhood. I grew up in the neighborhood. Ι was born in '61. I hung around those tracks in the '70s. It was our stomping ground back in the day.

I never envisioned a project of this size

or magnitude or scope would come to this area because it was such a blighted, troubled spot. It was used for partying back in the days. Now it's used for worse, homeless camps which is unfortunate. We need to do more for our homeless population. They deserve better than to live on a dirty riverbank.

I have heard all the remarks tonight.

I'm not going to go on and on. I don't like to repeat what everyone else has already said. I can tell you I agree with everything that was positively stated here tonight. This proposal is amazing. No other applicant comes before us with a \$2 million traffic solution. It doesn't happen. And I have opposed projects in the past because they don't come to us with any real traffic solutions. But you guys tried hard, you tried really hard, and a \$2 million MassWorks grant is incredible. It's very competitive.

You just don't get those.

The fact that you're going to use union construction workers and you're going to give Haverhill residents a preference, that's huge.

That's huge for the local citizens who work in

the trades. Not every developer does that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The fact that you're taking a blighted area and turning it into an amazingly beautiful area with a public park, that the city will maintain. The city has gotten much better at maintaining its public parks and I'm one of the reasons why. It's the truth. And I love this I love the amphitheater. public park. I love the various features of it. I love the fact that you're putting a public park where a gas station existed. I used to go to that gas station. I knew the people who worked there. We would hang out there. That gas station has been gone for a long, long time.

Skateland, I know there's a lot of sentimental emotions about Skateland. I used to go to Skateland. I love Skateland. Everyone loves Skateland. But when Skateland's owner decides it's time to move on, then it's up to somebody else to say I want to buy Skateland and I want to continue to run Skateland. But nobody came up, stepped up and wanted to do that. It's time for a change in this area.

I love the transit-oriented model here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It's definitely going to attract people who work in Boston. It's definitely going to attract young people. Yeah, there will be some children in there I'm sure. It's our obligation to handle the school issue and we try to work on that all the time. And we are trying to build new schools and expand our school capacity. It's not like we're not trying to do that and it's not like we're not going to succeed. We're already being successful. We have some of the best schools, I think, in the state.

Anyway having said that, I am certainly going to propose this -- support this. you for your proposal. I thank you for having and making transformational change come to this area of Bradford. Again, never thought I would see it in my lifetime. I'm not worried about losing a few parking spaces on Laurel Avenue for people who don't want to pay to take a train. It's stuff like that that doesn't bother me at all, the little things. I don't like when people say we can't do things here in Haverhill, we can't do that here. That's very, very old school. And I might be getting older but I'm

not old school. So with that I'll be supporting your proposal. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor Sullivan.

Councillor Michitson.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Thank you very much, Madam President. I've got a couple of comments to make and then a couple of questions to ask.

So I think that transit-oriented behavior has changed as a result of the pandemic and I think for the better for Haverhill. And here's what I mean by that. I think that young knowledge workers will go into Boston two days a week, and then they'll enjoy remote working at a really nice place and in Haverhill. So I think that, you know, the future to me is brighter for this kind of approach, you know, the transit-oriented approach.

I think the traffic study has credibility. I think the gentleman was pretty much upfront, your consultant. It's likely, you know, a tad bit optimism but, you know, that's the way, that's the way it goes, so. But a lot

more creditable than what I've seen in all my years here at the city council, and I say that very honestly, very thorough, and he did have very direct answers to all of the questions.

But I am concerned about the traffic, no doubt about that. So in terms of traffic mitigation you had, you had a list of potential mitigation measures that you would be applying. And I don't know if your consultant can answer these questions better, but I do have a couple of questions on the transportation demand management that you were, you earlier referred to but we didn't really get into it in any kind of detail.

So along with the behavior that is going to be changing, I think more people are going to spend time in Haverhill, I like some of these mitigation approaches and I just want to know what kind of a commitment you're willing to make, for example, on the Zipcar, on the car sharing spaces. I mean is that just pie in the sky or do you think it can work in this kind of environment? And if you could explain what Zipcar is. Yes.

	171
1	MR. MICHAUD: Exactly. So the TDM, which
2	is actually outlined in the traffic study that
3	we prepared
4	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
5	MR. MICHAUD: does identify that as
6	one of a number of different programs, that
7	would be under that umbrella. The way that
8	Zipcar works is that, you know, a proponent, an
9	applicant if you will, would commit to reserving
10	spaces for that purpose but ultimately the
11	decision to place vehicles at a site is really
12	ultimately up to them.
13	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
14	MR. MICHAUD: And it's market driven.
15	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Correct. And
16	that's why I'm asking the question.
17	MR. MICHAUD: Yeah.
18	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Is this a
19	realistic market for that? I know Salem, Mass.
20	has been very successful at using Zipcar.
21	MR. PROCOPIO: There are two big things
22	that in our experience with Zipcar they will
23	consider, size of the project, this clearly
24	qualifies. The rest of the potential usage in

the neighborhood, we believe is walkable enough where that would qualify as well. And is there a public surface spot available?

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Could you go to the microphone? Because nobody, nobody on TV could hear you probably.

MR. PROCOPIO: So the way Zipcar looks at it, and again, it's kind of up to them, whether they decide to place it.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Right, which you can rent a car for an hour.

MR. PROCOPIO: Right. You join a membership and you can go just pick up the car. You look on your app. It says, hey, there's a car parked on Railroad Ave. next to the park, you can use it. And you go and your key unlocks it and you can use the car for an hour, two hours, a weekend even.

They look at how big the project is.

This would certainly qualify. They look at how walkable the neighborhood is in terms of are they going to get people that aren't associated with the project. Are just other residents going to use it or residents perhaps walking

across from downtown? We believe that would bode favorably for this project.

And then they look for a public surface parking space. So on this project, we would need to likely restrict one of the spaces in like the park area parking, because it needs to be accessible to everybody. It can't be in the parking garage. It can't be private for the residents, or one of the few street spots that are there. But if we're able to do that, which we think we should be able to do, there's a decent likelihood. We'll certainly run it down with them. It's in our interest to get it there.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yeah, and I think if the city also coordinates with the downtown Parking Commission, right, I think there's a lot of opportunity downtown, right, and that can help the traffic, you know, coming over the bridge. Now I don't know if -- I mean I haven't done the model so I don't know, you know, how significant that could be but it has worked. You know, I have researched it and it has worked in certain scenarios. College campuses, for

	174
1	example, use Zipcar all the time.
2	MR. PROCOPIO: They're very, very
3	successful on urban projects.
4	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: So I think, you
5	know, maybe you pairing with, you know, the
6	downtown Parking Commission and taking, and
7	working with Zipcar and seeing, you know, what
8	you can, you can draw in from them. Whatever
9	their criteria is, I have a feeling that we
10	should be able to meet it.
11	MR. PROCOPIO: I would agree.
12	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: What other
13	measures with regards to the TDM can you
14	actually get traction on?
15	MR. MICHAUD: Sure. So I'll run down the
16	list that we've outlined and through the site
17	plan review process, this isn't necessarily, you
18	know, everything that would are included in the
19	TDM but it's a pretty good outline of it.
20	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
21	MR. MICHAUD: First and foremost, there's
22	a regional transportation management association
23	called Merrimack Valley TMA. The applicant
24	here, Procopio has committed to becoming a

member of that. And what that allows is access of the residents of The Beck to have ride matching opportunities through that program, transit promotional programs that are offered through the TDM, et cetera. So there are a whole host of programs that are then made available to the residents as a member of the TMA.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: So this company would become a member?

MR. MICHAUD: Correct, that's right. And the same process they've done on other projects. They've become a member, opens up opportunities for those, ride matching, ride sharing, car pooling opportunities for residents and other programs.

Secondly, the parking that's being proposed is not -- it's what we call unbundled. It means that if you want a parking space, you've got to pay for it. And what that does is it encourages tenancy by folks who maybe either don't own a car or rather than owning two cars, decide that this project is for them because they only need one car. And that's not an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

insignificant issue. It's one that is oftentimes pointed to as the primary element of a TDM program in an urban environment. And we do a lot of urban projects. Other programs would include of course the multiuse path, if you will, that is being proposed and developed. So there's infrastructure that becomes part of this TDM program that links up with other available amenities, right. We've discussed all of that. There's a transit subsidy program that would essentially be an incentive to new tenants in the first year of occupancy to try out public transportation. Procopio would essentially buy a one-month pass on them, so that the new residents of this could give it a try, see how it is and what it entails. COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: I see. And have

you used this in Lynn, for example?

MR. PROCOPIO: Yes.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Successfully?

MR. PROCOPIO: Very successfully.

MR. MICHAUD: There's other -- and Mike

had mentioned this, way-finding opportunities

within the property itself, not only to define
the history of the river and the site and to
provide, you know, areas to sit down, relax and
contemplate perhaps, but way-finding signs that
would indicate how to get to the bike path,
where bicycle parking is provided, to provide
bike parking for public use within the context
of the retail use, for example. So if there's a
restaurant that goes there, there will be
bicycle parking available to the public. So if
you want to use the bike path to get to that
restaurant, you have that opportunity and you
feel comfortable and safe doing so.

provided at time of lease, that would indicate public transportation schedules, routes, that includes MVRTA routes, where bicycle amenities are provided, you know, et cetera. So a lease-up package that promotes that. And finally a designated transportation coordinator would be named, who could be the point of contact for residents if they have questions about any of that. How do I get a free T pass? Where are the bikes provided, located? How do I

get to the path, et cetera? So there would be a dedicated resource for that.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Well, thank you.

That's well thought out. Did you have another point?

MR. PROCOPIO: There's a couple of other things we like to do. We have a technology integration with the MBTA and likely would be able to do the same thing with MVRTA, that allow both the screens in our common areas and the resident's app to show them when the train is coming, when it's at the previous station, so they can walk across to the platform. It encourages use, so they're not kind of doing it blindly and waiting out on the platform. They can wait in the lobby, they can wait in the building and run across kind of just in time.

And then there's two other things that we, we like to integrate but we always defer to the city and we will only do it in partnership with the city, because different cities have different experiences with them and different tolerances for them. That's bike shares and scooter shares. So if it's something that the

city is embracing and utilizing successfully, we will jump on that bandwagon. We will, we will involve ourselves in that. We will use our property as one of their hubs, one of their stations. We'll put money into that. If it's something that the city is not interested in, some cities have had poor experiences, we back off and we don't do it. But it is something that we, we find the residents like it but we defer to the city on that and we would work with the city for those types of offerings as well.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Okay, thank you very much.

The last point I want to make on the traffic, you know, even though you're going to be creating or increasing queues, it's undeniably, you know, it's 100 percent certain for me that you're improving safety and I don't think that, you know, you can put a value on that. As I said earlier, you know, I've been through that intersection many times and, you know, it's difficult, no doubt about it. And you know, the city engineer is behind it, is behind this approach. I don't think it's going

to solve all the problems with traffic but the bottom line is that the rest of the project is very good and I'm going to support it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you, Councillor Michitson.

COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Councillor Bevilacqua.

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Thank you.

I drive through this area every week, nighttime, daytime, and one of the things that I particularly watched for these last several months when the project was filed was what would happen to the project in terms of improvements? What would happen to the intersection and the roadways if nothing took place? What would happen to the vacant land if this project were not approved and what would happen to Skateland? And I looked at this project literally for years and watched the disinvestment and the blight that occurred, were times when the bushes were higher than I, and saw nothing but problems.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I listened intently. I read all the materials. I listened intently to the presentation. I watched the movies, and one of the things that I think will happen is that you will make the intersection better, and I believe that's true. I'm not -- I'm more concerned about the bike lanes causing more problems. I think that's going to prove to become a problem I definitely would not support scooters because of all the problems that cities and towns have had with scooters running wild in the downtowns and create all kinds of issues in cities and towns.

But I do think the improvements, the signalization, the reinvestment, the new technology is going to make that intersection better and safer, and I think it's going to provide for much better visual access. The sight distances based on the plans that I could see seem definitely improved, and as Councillor Michitson mentioned, our city engineer and the police department and fire department and our planning director have all looked at it with a keen eye and have given their approvals and

obviously, any and all conditions of the city department should definitely be made part of the special permit.

The highest and best use of this site for decades has really been abandonment and disinvestment. And one of the things that I think is going to be important is that we're now going to find a public use for that land that will allow Bradford residents and residents from all over the city to access the river, to access the play areas, to access the amphitheater and the multitude of potential uses, and I think the fact that we're continuing to capitalize upon the access which we have and the beauty that we have in the Merrimack River I think is very, very important.

This is different from a project that I think is stuck on a site that is far too dense, far too large, far too high, far too tall, far too few parking spaces, as we've been presented with a couple months ago and prior to that.

This is a project that I think is better thought out. And the difference as well, we've heard people tell us that projects that are a mile and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

two miles away are going to utilize the train station, and I just can't envision someone like me walking in a snowstorm to the train station in a mile and a half or taking a bike and sloshing through 6 feet of snow.

I do believe this project will generate transit usage, because the train station is literally right there. I like what you mentioned about the app. I could wait inside the building and not have to wait on the cold platform. I think it's going to be an asset. do see the bus stop being right there as well because it's a natural for them and I think it takes you throughout the region, which I think is very, very important. I like utilizing the transit authority and the MVRTA for the ride-sharing in the off peak hours which they utilize in terms of their employees working. That's one thing that I'm very, very familiar with in terms of what they do.

I think this is an opportunity for the city that the city can't pass up, because I'm not sure when the next project of this significance comes by. And I'm not just saying

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the million dollars of purchase price, because I'm always concerned that the city not keep spending all its money, but actually utilize it to help taxpayers reduce their tax burden, help reduce their other costs to living here.

And I think that this is the kind of project that I think will better utilize the site, the access to your natural resources and will be an asset to the neighborhood. You know, far too often housing projects become a burden to neighbors. I think this one gives the neighbors a better chance for amenities because one thing that I think we're seeing and we learned this through the pandemic, that too many people are locked up too long, they don't have an open space park to go to. They don't have large yards, for example. Many of the younger families have more concerns about taking care of the kids and mowing the lawn or shoveling snow, so they can now utilize this public park and access to the river.

But I do have a couple conditions I would impose and I have a request for you. Because while your construction crews, your landscape

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

crews are out there doing all this beautiful landscaping, I would like to ask if you would consider sending them up to the Wood School playground which for so many years, it's just a neighborhood school which for so many years has been waiting for some public landscaping improvements and some public recreational improvements to benefit that neighborhood. I think that's something that I think while your crew is there, it's just up the street and I would ask if you would consider making that part of your project, making some investment that the neighborhood would appreciate because obviously, they're going to feel the brunt of the project more than anyone else. And then I have a couple conditions I would suggest.

MR. PROCOPIO: Certainly.

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: So I'd like your thoughts on that.

MR. PROCOPIO: That's -- we're happy to do that.

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: That's great. I think, I think the Wood School, the former Wood School, you know, it's a small neighborhood

school and the people went to school, they lived around there, and I think they would appreciate seeing those improvements. I appreciate that.

MR. PROCOPIO: We're happy to do that.

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: And I would make

that a condition of the special permit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

One issue that I have which we all share and which again, I appreciate the people that spoke in opposition as well as those that spoke in favor, is the traffic improvements. And I would ask, as a condition of the special permit from my fellow councillors, that all the traffic improvements are in place and functional before we issue occupancy permits. And the reason why I say that is because once -- first of all, we're going to see some impact during the construction, not obviously a huge amount but we're suggesting that this is a great project and it's going to make an improvement to the traffic but if the traffic improvements are not in place and they're not functional, then obviously we're going to get whatever impact there may be without any of the improvements.

So I would ask that be a condition of the

special permit. I think that's for the benefit of the city and a benefit for the neighbors. I don't see that as being a problem to you, because obviously, you're going to make that improvement anyways.

MR. PROCOPIO: We're fine with that.

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: So I would make those, I would make those two conditions from my point -- actually three. I think the council at the end --

PRESIDENT BARRETT: What was the third one?

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: -- already mentioned the one about the city departments being mandatory.

PRESIDENT BARRETT: Oh, yes.

COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: I would make that condition that they make the improvements, and again whatever Vinnie Ouellette, the Recreational Director, thinks is appropriate, would be appropriate for the Wood School playground at your cost, and that before any occupancy permits are issued, all traffic improvements that are proposed and approved will

	188
1	be in place and functional.
2	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Thank you.
3	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: And I would make
4	that as a motion or an addendum, an amendment.
5	PRESIDENT BARRETT: We have a whole bunch
6	of conditions.
7	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: I would add
8	those.
9	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Councillor
10	Bevilacqua, you made a condition that the Wood
11	School playground sees an investment for
12	improvements, depending on what Vinnie
13	Ouellette
14	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: The Recreation
15	Department, yeah. And the developer has agreed
16	to undertake that.
17	PRESIDENT BARRETT: And traffic
18	improvements in place and functional before
19	occupancy permits are issued.
20	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes, and that
21	would be the signalization, the realignments,
22	all that type of thing. And much of that is
23	going to be paid for by the state anyway, so.
24	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Can I have a you

Yes.

COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN:

24

	190
1	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Macek.
2	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Yes.
3	CLERK KOUTOULAS: President Barrett.
4	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yes.
5	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Nine yeas, zero nays.
6	That is a condition that passes.
7	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Thank you.
8	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Councillor Macek, I'm
9	just going to do some housekeeping here.
10	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Sure.
11	PRESIDENT BARRETT: You made a condition
12	that the project meet all conditions of all
13	departments?
14	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Correct.
15	PRESIDENT BARRETT: And that snow removal
16	is appropriate, I think you mentioned.
17	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Right, right.
18	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Councillor Macek,
19	could you make that a motion?
20	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Second.
21	COUNCILLOR MACEK: I would move that snow
22	removal be adequate for the project and that the
23	what was the first one?
24	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Conditions of all the

	191
1	department heads.
2	COUNCILLOR MACEK: I'm looking at my
3	notes, and that, yeah, all the conditions of all
4	department heads be conditions of the permit.
5	COUNCILLOR: Second.
6	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I have a motion by
7	Councillor Macek, and I believe Councillor
8	Jordan already did that. Thank you, though.
9	COUNCILLOR: That's fine.
10	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Madam Clerk, please
11	call the roll.
12	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor LePage.
13	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Yes.
14	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Bevilacqua.
15	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes.
16	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Michitson.
17	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
18	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Sullivan.
19	COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN: Yes.
20	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Jordan.
21	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Yes.
22	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor McGonagle.
23	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Yes.
24	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Daly

	192
1	O'Brien.
2	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes.
3	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Macek.
4	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Yes.
5	CLERK KOUTOULAS: President Barrett.
6	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yes.
7	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Nine yeas, zero nays.
8	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Great. And Council
9	Vice President LePage, you mentioned call boxes
10	on the rail trail as a condition?
11	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Sure, I'll take
12	that.
13	PRESIDENT BARRETT: All right. So we
14	have a motion by Council Vice President LePage.
15	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Second.
16	PRESIDENT BARRETT: A second by
17	Councillor McGonagle.
18	Madam Clerk, please call the roll.
19	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor LePage.
20	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Yes.
21	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Bevilacqua.
22	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes.
23	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Michitson.
24	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.

	193
1	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Sullivan.
2	COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN: Yes.
3	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Jordan.
4	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Yes.
5	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor McGonagle.
6	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Yes.
7	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Daly
8	O'Brien.
9	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes.
10	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Macek.
11	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Yes.
12	CLERK KOUTOULAS: President Barrett.
13	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yes.
14	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Nine yeas, zero nays.
15	PRESIDENT BARRETT: And that passes.
16	And then we had \$250,000 for the lights
17	on the north side of the Comeau Bridge.
18	Councillor Jordan.
19	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: That's my motion.
20	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Second.
21	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I have a motion by
22	Councillor Jordan and a second by Councillor
23	Macek.
24	Madam Clerk, please call the roll.

as a possibility to be installed.

24

	195
1	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes, and I think
2	they made the commitment to join was it TVM.
3	SPEAKER: Merrimack Valley TMA.
4	SPEAKER: Yes, correct.
5	PRESIDENT BARRETT: And can I also throw
6	at you the one that the consultant for the city
7	traffic said, a flashing pedestrian crossing
8	light at the midpoint of Laurel Ave. at the
9	crosswalk?
10	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
11	PRESIDENT BARRETT: I have a motion by
12	Councillor Michitson.
13	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Second.
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: A second by
15	Councillor Macek.
16	Madam Clerk, please call the roll.
17	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor LePage.
18	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Yes.
19	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Bevilacqua.
20	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes.
21	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Michitson.
22	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
23	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Sullivan.
24	COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN: Yes.

1	MR. PILLSBURY: Madam President, I would
2	recommend that you take all of the conditions
3	that you've just approved and kind of bundle
4	them under the idea that these would be passed
5	through to the development review process.
6	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay.
7	MR. PILLSBURY: Okay, so that they're
8	actually, they're conditions to the special
9	permit which will be now moved forward as
10	conditions into the development review process.
11	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay. Can someone
12	make a motion to bundle those all together?
13	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: So moved.
14	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Second.
15	PRESIDENT BARRETT: All right. We had a
16	motion by Council Vice President LePage and a
17	second by Councillor Jordan.
18	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Could I, could I
19	just make one question?
20	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Certainly.
21	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: But the
22	conditions are not waivable by any city
23	department or by any subsequent review?
24	MR. PILLSBURY: No, but they become

	198
1	enforceable because they're going through the
2	development review process.
3	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes, but no city
4	department can waive any of those conditions.
5	MR. PILLSBURY: No, but the reason I'm
6	suggesting this, Madam President.
7	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: I agree, I
8	understand.
9	MR. PILLSBURY: Is that I don't I want
10	them to be able to be included but they have to
11	be included somewhere and I'm recommending that
12	that is the appropriate place is the development
13	review process.
14	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Okay.
15	MR. PILLSBURY: Which is where the
16	project goes next.
17	PRESIDENT BARRETT: All right. So we had
18	a motion by Council Vice President LePage, a
19	second by Councillor Jordan.
20	Madam Clerk, please call the roll. We'll
21	do it really
22	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor LePage.
23	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Yes.
24	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Bevilacqua.

	199
1	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes.
2	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Michitson.
3	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
4	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Sullivan.
5	COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN: Yes.
6	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Jordan.
7	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Yes.
8	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor McGonagle.
9	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Yes.
10	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Daly
11	O'Brien.
12	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes.
13	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Macek.
14	COUNCILLOR MACEK: Yes.
15	CLERK KOUTOULAS: President Barrett.
16	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yes.
17	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Nine yeas, zero nays.
18	PRESIDENT BARRETT: And that passes.
19	And I'll just say my piece here. While I
20	appreciate the professionalism, the enthusiasm,
21	the presentation really was impressive, my first
22	concerns with this project was its size, its
23	impact on the traffic, not only on Laurel Ave.
24	and South Elm and the bridge but the feeder

streets that people will peel off when they get frustrated and go through Blossom instead of waiting in line and go back up to 125. The queuing up doesn't alleviate that. It may exacerbate it.

The impact on schools, I too have, you know, question the 15 number that has been thrown around here. The Hunking School is already at or over capacity. I have issues with, you know, almost -- I was relieved that Mass. DOT isn't doing this, even though I have many friends at Mass. DOT, because almost every project they've touched has sus, sus -- I can't even say it, has been panned after the fact by residents.

So, you know, none of that really has changed, even though it was really a lovely presentation and I love the park and I love the boardwalk. But, you know, the waiver for parking, waiver for height, waiver for units, and then you think, well, what happens when they replace the Basiliere Bridge, the Basiliere Bridge? And what happens to Bradford? It becomes like an island that you cannot get off

	201
1	of and it's also a food desert because we don't
2	have any supermarkets. So for that reason, I
3	will go not support this.
4	Madam Clerk, I believe, if I have it
5	written down here, we had a motion by Councillor
6	Daly O'Brien.
7	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: We can call for
8	a vote?
9	PRESIDENT BARRETT: Yeah, I'm going to
10	call for a vote, and a second by Councillor
11	McGonagle on this item.
12	Madam Clerk, please call the roll.
13	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor LePage.
14	VICE PRESIDENT LePAGE: Yes.
15	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Bevilacqua.
16	COUNCILLOR BEVILACQUA: Yes.
17	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Michitson.
18	COUNCILLOR MICHITSON: Yes.
19	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Sullivan.
20	COUNCILLOR SULLIVAN: Yes.
21	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Jordan.
22	COUNCILLOR JORDAN: Yes.
23	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor McGonagle.
24	COUNCILLOR McGONAGLE: Yes.

## **Special Permit Hearing**

		202
1	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Daly	
2	O'Brien.	
3	COUNCILLOR DALY O'BRIEN: Yes.	
4	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Councillor Macek.	
5	MR. MICHAUD: Yes.	
6	CLERK KOUTOULAS: President Barrett.	
7	PRESIDENT BARRETT: No.	
8	CLERK KOUTOULAS: Eight yeas, one nay.	
9	PRESIDENT BARRETT: And that passes.	
10	Thank you.	
11	(Ending at 3:57:54.)	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

## **Special Permit Hearing**

		203
1	CERTIFICATE	
2		
3		
4	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS	
5		
6		
7		
8	I, Roberta Katz, do hereby certify that	
9	the foregoing transcript represents a complete,	
10	true and accurate transcription of the	
11	electronic recording furnished to me in the	
12	above-entitled matter, to the best of my	
13	knowledge, skill and ability.	
14		
15		
16	Roberta Wal	
17	Roberta Katz	
18	ROBERTA KATZ	
19	June 11, 2021	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		