

## **CITY OF PORTSMOUTH**

Municipal Complex
1 Junkins Avenue
Portsmouth, New Hampshire
(603) 431-2000

March 26, 2021

Mr. Michael Kane Mr. Ralph Cox Redgate Kane mkane@netkane.com

Re: McIntyre

Dear Ralph and Michael:

This is in brief response to yours of March 15, 2021. In that letter you raised concerns with the City's plans regarding McIntyre, based in large part on media reports.

Point one is that I recommend that you not rely upon media reports to determine anything about the operations of the McIntyre Subcommittee or the City Council. Rather, I would suggest that you contact myself at any time when you have questions.

Your first stated City concern is that, "the City schedule is utterly unrealistic." My response is that the media reports did not provide a proper context for that schedule. The City schedule to which you refer was a response by the Subcommittee to a request from GSA for a non-binding timeline which would produce the result desired by GSA of conveyance of the McIntyre building to the City as soon as possible after the May 30, 2021 departure of the last tenant, the FBI. It was our best estimate at the time of what might be accomplished if things proceed smoothly between now and then, especially our negotiations with Redgate/Kane. Subsequently to the receipt of that schedule, further conversation has occurred with GSA which suggests that more time will be available to the City and Redgate/Kane to submit a modified plan to the National Park Service as long as work is proceeding expeditiously toward that end.

Your second stated concern is, "that the Subcommittee intends to take the position that it unilaterally has the right to insist on design changes – or even an entirely new design – reflected in sketches resulting from the public process ... ." The Subcommittee does not take that position. Rather, it is the Subcommittee's plan to negotiate the next step in the process with Redgate/Kane once the citizens' voices have been heard as to the design most favored by the public. We expect that you will believe, as we do, that the concerns of the public are paramount in determining the goal of our public/private partnership in the McIntyre building. There has been no change in the belief of the Subcommittee that the preferred end product for submission to the National Park Service will be the result of negotiations between the City and Redgate/Kane.

Mr. Michael Kane Mr. Ralph Cox March 26, 2021 Page -2-

The last point which you make in the March 15<sup>th</sup> communication is, "that the Subcommittee is paying little to no attention to the economics of this perspective development." Our response to this point is that we understand that no project can be built which is not supported by economics. However, the proper order of decision-making in this case is to first determine what the citizens wish to see built at McIntyre and then negotiate the economics necessary to bring about that result. Since part one of that process is not yet completed, we have not begun part two.

All of the foregoing is entirely consistent of the oft repeated statement from Redgate/Kane that it desires the City to tell it what to build and that any public process to make that decision should be run by the City and not Redgate/Kane. The Subcommittee is earnestly attempting to comply with both of those positions taken by Redgate/Kane.

In summary, the Subcommittee has not strayed from the course upon which we had agreed to follow with you as our development partner. Time pressures exerted by the Federal Government will be a challenge in following that course. Nonetheless, with the expected cooperation which we know you will provide, and with some extension of time from GSA if necessary, we expect that the City and Redgate/Kane as development partners will complete a project of which the entire City will be proud.

Sincerely

Peter A. Whelan City Councilor

Chair of the McIntyre Subcommittee

cc: McIntyre Subcommittee
Karen S. Conard, City Manager
Robert P. Sullivan, City Attorney