

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
April 9, 2019

A meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, April 9, 2019 at 6:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Chair Bart Hoskins, Vice Chair Tim Shea, Carole Hamilton, Ed Moriarty, Chris Burke, Jessica Herbert, Deborah Greel and John Boris. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Public Comment

William Griset stated that he is the member of the Planning Board and was present as an abutter to and support of the Salem Willows project. He stated that Ms. Ide is responsive to neighbors' concerns regarding plantings and trees.

Simeen Brown stated that she supports the Bertram Field project. She stated that the building is horrific and that a new building will give visitors a psychologically different idea of the high school. It is a great way to show that the schools aren't falling apart.

Tim Jenkins, 18 Broad Street, stated that he was representing Historic Salem, Inc. (HSI) for their roof replacement project. He noted that copper gets harder as time passes and feels the new roof will last 50-100 years. They received a good estimate from a local contractor. They will paint the building at same time using other funds. The funding request is 50% of the total cost. They are applying for other foundations as well. The building is on the National Register. The building was saved, along with the Witch House, in the 1840's by a joint effort with HSI and then the Witch House was given back to the City. He added that HSI supported the adopting of CPA in Salem early on.

Jenna Ide, Director of Capital Projects for the City of Salem, she is directly involved with the Bertram Field Phase 2, Forest River and Salem Willows restoration projects and is available to answer questions. She added that she is familiar with the Salem High School tennis courts and Gallows Hill projects.

Mr. Shea stated that the roof price for the HSI project seems kind of low.

Mr. Jenkins stated that he believed the number is correct, and they tried to use the best source available to them. The roof is 1300 s.f.

Ms. Guy stated Patricia Kelleher is also present for questions on the Broad Street Cemetery application.

Vote to Recommend FY20 Budget

Ms. Guy requested a vote to recommend the FY20 budget to the City Council. As in prior years, the draft budget is for 10% in each of the three categories, 5 % in administration and the balance in the budgeted reserve. The FY20 estimate for the State match is 11.57%. This year's budget

revenue also includes Year 1 of 10 of the Footprint Community Benefits Agreement Contribution of \$75,000.

**ESTIMATED ANNUAL FUND REVENUES**

	<b>FY20</b>
Estimated CPA Surcharge	\$650,000.00
Footprint Community Benefits Agreement Contribution (Year 1 of 10)	\$75,000.00
State Match	\$83,882.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$808,882.00</b>

**RECOMMENDED BUDGET**

Administrative Expenses	\$40,444.00
Housing Projects Reserve	\$80,889.00
Historic Projects Reserve	\$80,889.00
Open Space & Recreation Projects Reserve	\$80,889.00
FY20 Budgeted Reserve	\$525,771.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$808,882.00</b>

**VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to submit the budget as proposed to the City Council. Mr. Boris seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Available Funds Update

Ms. Guy provided an updated spreadsheet and stated that with the approved FY20 budget, there is currently \$853,202.20 in available funds. Three projects came in under budget and the funds will be returned to the fund balance, but the funds will not be available until Fall, 2019. There are \$1,400,012.50 in applications to review.

Approval of Minutes

**VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the minutes of February 25, 2019. Mr. Burke seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Review of FY19 Funding Applications Received

*Review for completeness and criteria; rank order each High, Medium or Low*

Ms. Guy read the following Disclosures of Appearance of Conflict of Interest for applications for which the members can still vote:

- Jessica Herbert and Chris Burke regarding memberships with Salem Athenaeum.
- John Boris regarding his being on the board of the North Shore CDC.
- Deborah Greel regarding her husband previously working on the Forest River Park project.

Ms. Guy added that due to Conflicts of Interest, certain CPC members must abstain from discussion and leave the room for the following:

- Mickey Northcutt for North Shore CDC's Lighthouse47 project.

- Jessica Herbert for Historic Salem, Inc.'s project due to being a tenant in the building.

Mr. Moriarty questioned how members of private organizations seeking public funds can vote.

Ms. Guy stated that the disclosures of Appearance of Conflict of Interest are filed so that they may vote. They could not vote if they are an officer, director, trustee, partner or employee.

Mr. Moriarty clarified that the only connection that these members have is a membership in a private organization seeking public funds and whatever the outcome, favorably, unfavorably or in the middle, they have no benefit, apparent or actual.

Ms. Guy was in agreement.

Mr. Moriarty stated that it is fine with him.

Ms. Guy noted that she has copies of some of the studies that were filed with the projects, but they were too large to email to the members.

#### **HOUSING PROJECTS:**

- **Lighthouse 47 – 43 Leavitt and 38 Palmer Streets**

Ms. Greel stated that the project's environmental foot print is very low and the units are all affordable housing. It will be a very exciting addition and environmentally sound.

Ms. Guy noted that this is our only application in the housing category.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the CPC has statutory, community and moral obligation to fund public housing. He noted that the environmental is an additional benefit. He stated that the priority seems to be high.

Ms. Herbert was in agreement, noting that the project came before the Historical Commission comment. It will be a real boost to the neighborhood and will be all affordable.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.**

Mr. Boris stated that because he is a member of the board of the CDC, he preferred to abstain from voting.

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried. Mr. Boris abstained from voting.**

#### **HISTORIC RESOURCE PROJECTS:**

- **Gedney House Structural Repairs**

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt private applicants have every right to apply for CPA funding and in return for obtaining benefits, a restriction must be executed that runs with the land for the benefit of the entire city. He added that he felt it incumbent on the CPC that we should look at what the funding is requested for the structure, which may qualify because it is an historic structure, the accessibility of the structure, the activities that are contained inside the structure, and the accessibility of the structure to the entire community. He stated that he did quick web-based research. He stated that it is clearly a historic structure, but noted that it doesn't have public accessibility and doesn't have a connectivity to the community. He stated that he felt the project was low priority and should not receive this type of public funding. The website says it is by appointment only and he felt the CPC should be careful to apply public dollars to any entity that only authorized public access by appointment only, which he feels is the antithesis of public.

Ms. Greel was in agreement.

Mr. Burke stated that he knows it is not open all the time, but that he has taken public tours and has seen them advertised every Spring, noting that they are limited access, but more than what their website apparently indicates.

Mr. Shea agreed with low priority and stated that he felt it was hard to fund an organization that has \$156 million in assets.

Ms. Greel agreed that there was limited access and noted that there are other historic preservation funding sources.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a low priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried. Ms. Herbert abstained from voting.**

- **Conservation/Restoration of Historic Artwork in City Council Chambers**

Mr. Hoskins stated that this application is a carry-over from last year.

Ms. Guy noted that CPC skipped funding the portraits last year and suggested that the CPC consider funding one every year or every other year.

Ms. Greel noted that she is the former Public Art Planner. She stated that those portraits have sat many years in the chamber when people used to smoke. She noted that every person whose portrait is hanging there had influence or a direct relationship to the city. She suggested considering doing one per year, noting paintings don't last forever and they become unstable. She stated that it is a public art asset.

Ms. Herbert asked how many portraits would the requested funds cover.

Ms. Greel stated that the last time it funded three with frames. She noted that some are larger in size or are in different conditions.

Ms. Herbert asked if some were copies.

Ms. Greel stated that they are all originals. They are oil paintings of another. One is a Frank Benson, which was restored the last time.

Mr. Hoskins suggest that, if funded, the one that is worst condition be done next.

Ms. Greel stated that the CPC could decide on an amount and if any funds are left over, they would become available again.

Mr. Moriarty stated that current historic research suggests that for one city father, some of his wealth came may have been derived from the opioid trade. He agreed it may be a historic painting by all definition and criteria, but questioned if the CPC wants to fund restoration due to the activities of the subject matter of the portrait. He suggested being cognizant of current historical research that may reflect well or poorly.

Ms. Greel stated that she looked into the history and had shifted the application to a different painting.

Ms. Herbert stated that some are clearly copies, and that she did not necessarily consider them good art. She stated that she would rather invest in an original.

Ms. Greel stated that they are original paintings that are copies of portraits. She noted that they are a city asset.

Mr. Burke asked if there is other art that isn't hanging.

Ms. Greel stated that the city is working on a public art inventory.

Mr. Shea stated that he is between high and medium.

**MOTION: Ms. Herbert made a motion to rank this project a medium priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on. Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Moriarty, Ms. Herbert, Ms. Greel and Mr. Boris voted in favor. Mr. Burke voted in opposition. The motion so carried.**

- **Old Town Hall Master Plan**

Ms. Greel stated that for four years she managed the building for the City. She stated that it has become a center of use and the city is not completely sure how to monetize it or give it another look in terms of structural use. She noted that it is an extraordinary building and that the current use is heavy, but not necessarily for what it could be. The City is looking at ways to utilize the entire square with the building. She stated that it is not a lot of money to do some research on how to best utilize this income producing space.

**MOTION: Mr. Boris made a motion to rank this project a priority high. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on. Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. Herbert, Mr. Burke, Ms. Greel and Mr. Boris voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. The motion so carried.**

- **Broad Street Cemetery Preservation Plan & Design Development**

Mr. Shea stated that he felt the priority should be high, considering what has been done with other cemeteries; this is in tough shape.

**MOTION: Ms. Shea made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Ms. Herbert seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

- **Facilitating Redevelopment of the Courthouses**

Mr. Shea stated that when considering the impact on general community, he feels this will greatly impact the community in general by the development of this area. He felt it is a high priority.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he is generally not a fan of planning studies and it is sometimes amazing how expensive a plan is. He stated that in this instance he agreed with Mr. Shea, and that there is a problem in terms of development with can be done with zoning, planning, historic easements and marketplace to maintain it. He felt it was a smart use of money to indicate that the City is working hand in hand with an entity willing to develop the property and felt it should be rated high.

Ms. Greel stated that it could also impact the Tabernacle Church and help form some ideas for them for a plan for that building.

Ms. Herbert stated that it was impressive what DCAM has done, noting it was amazing mothballing. This project would help continue to move the project forward and she agreed with a high rating.

**MOTION: Mr. Burke made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Mr. Boris seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

- **Salem Athenaeum Plan**

Mr. Shea stated that he considers this a low priority, and noted that he had voted against it being even eligible. He was concerned about it being a vague request, noting it was very general regarding the use of funds and included space utilization and fundraising capacity.

Ms. Herbert stated that she is a member, but not a trustee. She stated that she has been working on the committee to determine how to do climate control without destroying the building. The need is not only for people, but for preservation of the artifacts and antique books that are slowing disintegrating. They are asking for half of the cost of the study. Each discipline will involve a report. They are matching with grant funds. The scope is paired down by volunteer work. The Athenaeum has lectures and programs, including children's programs, which are open to the public. She added that one does not have to be a member to go to the programs. She noted that CPA funds are utilized 50% for public projects and 50% for private non-profit projects across the state and should not give it a low rating because it is not public.

Ms. Greel stated that she used to be a member. She felt the times it is open is not particularly accessible for a library. 24 hours a week is not much. She felt that general outreach to the community is not a lot and that while they attempt programming but the amount that can attend is small.

Ms. Herbert stated that one issue is the need for handicapped accessibility, which is part of the motivation for the study.

Mr. Moriarty agreed with rating the application low. He stated that he is always concerned about public access. He felt it is antithetical to funding to provide funding to an organization that has a membership that has a fee and that provides access to members with the fee. He stated that it also has trustees, multiple sources of income, its own budget and an endowment. He noted that it is an extraordinary organization with invaluable material, but felt it was not the type of facility that should be subsidized by the CPA for our stated purposes. He added that one of the core values of the project seems to address the concept of access, but that it talks about universal access, including researchers and staff for improved workspace, while he is talking about public access. He stated that the House of the 7 Gables, which also has an endowment, and the Salem Public Library have access to the premises by the community on a consistent basis, unlike the Athenaeum. He stated that he felt the priority was low, although he saluted the organization.

Ms. Herbert asked what the CPC would be looking for – that they have handicapped access or that they have free admission. She asked what is the mix of things we would want them to present.

Mr. Shea replied that he would want access for Salem residents and expanded public hours. He noted that he once stopped there in the middle of the day and the doors were locked. He stated that before he would support it, he would want to see some benefit to Salem residents.

Mr. Burke stated that the programs he attended at the Athenaeum had a wide range of people, who were not all members. He stated that they had a CD release party for a young Salem musicians group which was a full house.

Mr. Shea asked what is a full house.

Mr. Burke estimated that it was 100-125 people. He stated that they have lawn lectures and a language group. He noted that they have books that are very unique that aren't published anywhere else and they are deteriorating. He felt it was akin to the Essex Institute that then became part of the PEM. He stated that it has a unique collection that is geared toward Salem

and should be preserved. He noted that Harlan Kelsey landscaped the Athenaeum. He added that it is a great Salem institution and should be supported.

Ms. Greel asked how large is their endowment.

Ms. Herbert stated that she did not know. She stated that for the Athenaeum and Old Town Hall, from the standpoint of accessibility and programming, are not a lot of difference in comparison.

Ms. Greel stated that Old Town Hall is open every day during the season with the Salem Museum on the first floor and History Alive on the second. She stated that any community group utilize the space for nominal cleaning fee. The City hosts events in there as well as others.

Ms. Herbert stated that handicapped accessibility gives Old Town Hall more opportunity.

Ms. Greel stated that it may be time for a conversation about expanding the Athenaeum's hours and footprint and looking at what they have in their endowment. She noted that it is a treasure.

Mr. Boris asked the amount of the dues.

Ms. Herbert stated that she believed it is \$40 per adult member, and \$5 less for seniors. She stated that programs, such as lectures, music and education events, are attended by more people who are not members than those who are members. The events are always full. One of the reasons they need to build is that there is over subscription for everything they do.

Mr. Hoskins stated that his position is when a non-profit takes care of a historic building they provide a valuable service and question what would happen if the non-profit walked away. He felt the city might feel be obligated to do something with it or it could fall into disrepair and have a bleak future. He stated that some people in Salem are hung up on not funding non-profits or membership organizations and he cautioned about knocking something down because it is not city-owned. He was concerned if there was a circumstance under which the people who are opposing this would ever support it.

Mr. Shea stated that the CPC has awarded funds to non-profits in the past so it is not an issue. He stated that in this case, the issue is public access. He stated that he felt they were exclusive. They only have 100 trustees and can't go over 100, so that is kind of an exclusive group of people that run this operation. He stated it was more about openness and access to Salem residents and more public time that he is concerned with.

Mr. Moriarty was in agreement with Mr. Shea. He stated that no one has suggested that the CPC has a heightened standard if you are a non-profit or private entity seeking public funds before this committee. He stated that it is appropriate to determine what benefits are provided to the city and what access is available. He stated that the CPC is concerned with the entity, the operations and the values that the organization espouses. He added that the CPC is obligated to not only preserve the structure but also support the organization existing within the structure. He noted that it is an important institution, but, by definition, it is exclusionary in terms of its structures, trustees, fees that are charged, hours that are available, and non-accessibility for handicapped access, and all of these weigh against it in the opinion of some members of this board. He added that Salem has an unbelievable number of eligible projects that happen to be



public and there are few cities or towns to compare apples to apples with Salem. He stated that approvals should be done on a case by case basis and felt that if a private entity seeks funding, it is subject to an inquiry as to whether or not it is open, available and accessible.

Ms. Herbert asked the percentage of city vs non-profit applications that have received CPA funds.

Ms. Guy stated that the current percentage is approximately 80% City and 20% non-profit.

Ms. Hamilton stated that, as a newer member on the committee, she felt that the first year there was a stigma to being a non-public institution and that the bar was higher. She agreed that there is a limited amount of money and stated that to make the bar higher is not fair. She did not feel the CPC was doing as good a job as it could at 80/20.

Mr. Burke stated that he did not think the Athenaeum was exclusionary because they charge a fee, noting that the YMCA charges a fee. He stated that the Athenaeum does serve a smaller group of people who tend to join, but it serves an important purpose as a repository of very important documents for the City of Salem. He stated that regarding the structure, it will depend, noting that it could be 100 trustees or 8 board of directors. He stated that membership is open to anyone and events are open to non-members. In those ways he felt it is not exclusionary, but saying they don't have a broad reach is more of a fair comment.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he felt trustees in organizations are those that are able and more willing to give money to keep the building propped up. He stated that exclusionary sounds a little judgmental.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the stigma is suggesting that we should publically fund an organization that has trustees, that has members, that charges a fee and is open only 24 hours a week.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a low priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: Voting in favor were Ms. Greel, Mr. Shea, Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Boris. Voting in opposition were Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Burke and Ms. Herbert. The motion did not carry.**

**MOTION: Mr. Burke made a motion to rank this project high priority. There was no second.**

**MOTION: Ms. Herbert made a motion to rank this project medium priority and suggested they provide more information. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: Voting in favor were Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Burke and Ms. Herbert. Voting in opposition were Ms. Greel, Mr. Shea, Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Boris. The motion did not carry.**

**MOTION: Mr. Boris made a motion to table the ranking of this project to the next meeting. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

- **Nathaniel Bowditch Roof Replacement**

*Ms. Herbert being a tenant of Historic Salem, Inc. abstained from discussing the application and left the room.*

Mr. Shea stated that he is amazed that for \$33,000 they can get a copper roof, when it is usually ten times the price of regular shingles. He added that he did not know the impact for the general public in terms of access. He stated that he has some concern that they have some income coming in and are renting out part of the building. He stated that he questioned supporting the application, but stated that he could be convinced otherwise if enlightened.

Ms. Greel stated that it is an historic site and that it is housing an organization that is sort of city-wide in terms of the impacts and that it is next to another historic property. She stated that it is housing an important organization that does a lot for bringing awareness to the city.

Mr. Hoskins stated that it is a highly visible building.

Mr. Moriarty agreed it has high visibility. He noted that there is no person more singularly important for maritime history than Nathaniel Bowditch and that in the past the city has utilized it as a municipal building. It has been utilized in terms of public access either by a city agency or by an agency dedicated to preservation and he would rate highly.

Tim Jenkins stated that he insisted that they get an accurate estimate from a professional that does this type of work. He believes Bob Levesque also does all the work for the PEM. Mr. Jenkins stated that it was explained to him that the roof has shallow pitch and tends to retain water. He noted that they can't go with asphalt and need to use accurate period material. He agreed that this non-profit is city wide, and stated that it is the oldest perseveration organization in the city, that they advocate for saving buildings and have done it for the Witch House, that the building is open during all business hours and they have a very small museum with a collection of Bowditch-related materials. They also have a curriculum that was created for the city schools. He noted that Historic Salem, Inc. helped stop urban renewal, they are celebrating their 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary and the building is a National Historic Landmark. He added that their Christmas in Salem tour opens up many historic buildings to the public.

Mr. Shea stated that he was convinced and would vote high.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a priority high priority. Mr. Boris seconded the motion.**

Mr. Burke stated that supports a high rating and he thinks the benefits of HSI are quiet, such as the house plaque program. He noted that their visibility is important, as is the Athenaeum. He added that all these non-profits serve an important function and each of the functions are different.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he supports this project, adding that this is a specific request for the necessary preservation of a structure, while the athenaeum proposal is a study that talks about universal accessibility for members and events that are allegedly open to the public and reputedly attended by apparently scores of people, but that information is ephemeral.

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

*Ms. Herbert rejoined the meeting.*

- **Brookhouse Home Brick Repointing**

Mr. Shea asked if anyone was concerned that this may be maintenance.

Ms. Guy stated that for historic preservation, if it is restoration, it is allowed. Painting would be ordinary maintenance, which would not be allowed. She stated that she would be comfortable with eligibility if it is restoration.

Ms. Herbert stated that it is definitely a capital expense.

Mr. Shea wondered what type of endowment that they have.

Mr. Moriarty wondered how it is used for current residents and the eligibility requirements.

Mr. Shea wondered the criteria for getting in.

Ms. Greel believed it was limited income.

Mr. Herbert stated that it is assisted living.

Mr. Shea wondered who was eligible in terms of Salem residents versus non-Salem.

Ms. Guy stated that the application states that 96% are low-income where social security is there only source of income.

Mr. Hoskins stated that some granting organizations are more apt to give funding if they are matched and that he was curious to know if this is case. He questioned if they got less than the \$125,000 request would the project proceed.

Ms. Herbert noted that the Murray Masonry quote is \$239,000 and, if they getting \$225,000 from the other granting organizations, they could possible pull it together with a smaller award. She stated that it is a very important historic building on the waterfront, should be preserved and is definitely eligible.

Mr. Shea stated that he would like to know about their endowment, the criteria for admission, if a lesser amount would work, and the status of grant applications. He suggested tabling the ranking to the next meeting.

Ms. Herbert also wondered what the minimum they would need to qualify for any matching grant.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to table the ranking of this project to the next meeting. Mr. Boris seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

- **Restoration of the Salem Public Library's Poseidon Fountain**

Mr. Moriarty stated that he loved the library and that they have tremendous hours for accessibility for the public. He stated that they have requested and the CPC has provided them with substantial funds. He noted that there are so many worthy projects and so little funds this year. He stated that he felt this application is more aesthetics than structural and questioned if it is necessary to community purposed. He stated that he regrettably felt it was low priority.

Ms. Greel question if it is considered public art.

Ms. Guy stated that it is two pieces – the statue and the fountain. She stated that maybe the statue has more importance than the fountain, noting that the fountain would need a plan for maintenance.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a medium priority medium. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on. Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Burke, Ms. Herbert Ms. Greel, Mr. Shea and Mr. Boris. Voting in opposition was Mr. Moriarty. The motion so carried.**

#### **OPEN SPACE & RECREATION PROJECTS:**

- **Salem Willows Restoration Phase 1**
- **Gallows Hill Park Renovation**
- **Salem High School Tennis Courts**
- **Forest River Pool: Bathhouse & Assoc. Facilities Design & Permitting**
- **Bertram Field Phase 2**

Mr. Burke stated that for the Salem Willows, Gallows Hill Park, Salem High School Tennis Courts and Forest River Pool, he felt they all are high priority.

Ms. Ide gave an overview of each of the projects. She stated that the Gallows Hill project is moving forward and this is the piece to help the project get over the hump for baseball, the skate park and the trails. For the Willows, this is the first part of it. We are trying to secure the hill so it doesn't get worse and then start the restoration process. The Willows will be a 5-10 year plan of small and medium size projects. The Forest River project, we could probably take less money. The City does not have the full funding, but is looking for funding between bond and CPA to move forward with the next phase of design, if we want it open by 2021. She stated that

the tennis courts are important, but there are potentially other funding sources. For Bertram Field, the existing building is really poor and we don't know how much longer we can justify having kids in there. We don't know where the sewage is going right now. Without CPA, the project won't work for at least a while.

Mr. Shea feels they are all high, but Forest River and Bertram Field appear higher priority. He noted Gallows Hill is well on its way which puts it ahead of the pack.

Ms. Guy noted that the Bertram Field funding would not come from this year's funds. If bonding is approved, it would start with the next round.

Ms. Greel stated that she liked that Ryan Brennan's family is helping to fund the project.

Ms. Ide that all of these have a public education and art component. Forest River and Bertram are both zero net energy. Bertram will be a critical piece of access, so that people can walk through and it will connect to the neighborhoods through walking paths.

Ms. Herbert asked if Mass Development grants play a part in these projects.

Ms. Ide replied in the negative. She stated that for Forest River, they have an earmark and are going for a PARC grant and others. Ms. Ide stated that the City is going for a CZM grant for Salem Willows. She stated that for Forest River they are also looking for an innovative model for revenue from pool passes to help offset the capital.

For the purpose of today, it should be irrelevant how much funding is being requested, but should be just ranking high, medium, low.

Mr. Burke stated that the dusty hill at the Salem Willows is an eyesore and he felt is the highest priority for the Willows.

Mr. Moriarty agreed that the hill is major detriment to people's enjoyment of the Willows. Mr. Moriarty asked Mr. Griset's experience.

Mr. Griset stated that it is a horrible dust bowl and that twice a year he has to have his house power washed. He stated that it is problem that needs to be attended to.

Ms. Ide stated that there is gulley erosion and there is already a loss of top soil.

**MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank all the projects a high priority. Mr. Burke seconded the motion.**

**VOTE: The motion was voted on; all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

#### Discussion on Bonding - Bertram Field Phase 2

Ms. Guy stated that appears the CPC members have not fully reviewed the different bonding scenarios and suggested that, while Ms. Ide is present, that members let her know if there is additional information that would be helpful to have at the next meeting.

Mr. Shea asked if \$100,000 per year would be significant enough, because he did not know how much more he would be willing to approve.

Ms. Ide stated that the treasurer prefers to pay level principal, which results in the first years being more.

Ms. Guy stated that Stuart Saginor recommends that when approving bonds, the CPC specify the amount, the number of years and the terms.

Ms. Ide stated that for 30 years, the City will pay more interest, but it will be a smaller commitment each year.

Mr. Shea stated that the biggest decision is what we want to commit for the long term. He suggested looking at some lower options.

Mr. Hoskins stated that with a bond, the City gets to do the project all at once.

Ms. Ide stated that the current restrooms at Bertram Field are designed for boys and these will be fully gender neutral and an accessible bathroom on the outside.

#### Next Meeting(s)

Mr. Burke stated that he will not will be available for the meeting on April 29<sup>th</sup> and would prefer not to miss the development of funding recommendations.

*Mr. Shea left the meeting at this time.*

The CPC decided to cancel the meeting of April 29<sup>th</sup> and push out the development of funding recommendations to the regular May 14<sup>th</sup> meeting.

*Note: it was later determined that the meeting of April 29<sup>th</sup> would not be canceled and would only be for the ranking of the Salem Athenaeum and Brookhouse Home applications and for further discussion on the Bertram Field project bonding.*

**There being no further business, Mr. Moriarty made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Greel seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy  
Administrator