

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 24, 2018

A special meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 at 6:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Chair Kevin Cornacchio, Vice Chair Bart Hoskins, Tim Shea, John Boris, Carole Hamilton, Ed Moriarty, Chris Burke and Mickey Northcutt. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Public Comment

Alyssa Connery, 5 Hodges Court stated that she was present on behalf of Historic Salem, Inc. to pledge support for the Salem Common fence application, which continues to be a preservation priority.

Development of FY18 Funding Recommendations

Mr. Burke stated that he met with Park Superintendent regarding the Park Department priorities. He stated that completion of the skate park is a high priority, but that the bowl can wait until a Phase II. He stated that because they want to do the golf cart paths all in one project, it is the next priority after the skate park; the balance after CPA funds will be from other city sources. He added that the Gallows Hill Park, goes hand in hand with Palmer Cove study, due to the issue where the primary fields will be.

Mr. Shea assumed that for the paths, the City will take what it can get from CPA, noting that the Committee has never awarded \$250,000 for any project.

Ms. Guy agreed that those were Ms. O'Brien's priorities, but noted that when also considering the City's historic preservation priorities, the cart paths being funded with CPA is lower. The City will also look at CIP funding and bonding to complete the project, so it is high priority project and something the city will pursue, regardless of the amount of CPA funding.

Due to limited funds, the CPC individually ranked each of the remaining 9 high priority projects to determine the order of review for developing funding recommendations.

The Committee reviewed the following remaining applications that were previously ranked High, Medium or Low:

HIGH		
City	Salem Common Bandstand	Historic
City	Salem Common Fence Restoration	Historic
House of the Seven Gables	Roof replacement increase request	Historic
The Bridge at 211	211 Bridge St. window restoration	Historic
City	Gallows Hill Renovation - Designer services	OS/Recreation
City	Ryan Brennan Memorial Skatepark (completion)	OS/Recreation

City	Ryan Brennan Memorial Skatepark (bowl)	OS/Recreation
City	Golf Cart Paths	OS/Recreation
City	Memorial Park Irrigation	OS/Recreation
MEDIUM		
City	Conservation/Restoration of Historic Artwork (Council Chambers)	Historic
Hamilton Hall	Façade Preservation	Historic
LOW		
Hamilton Hall, Inc.	Fence Restoration	Historic
Hamilton Hall, Inc.	Storm windows	Historic
Historic New England	Upgrades to Fire Detection System at Phillips House	Historic
Salem Community Arts Center	St. Mary Italian Church Grotto	Historic

Ms. Guy provided noted that at its last meeting, the CPC recommended \$131,150 for the Lighthouse 34 project, leaving a total of \$605,897.97 available for funding.

- Ryan Brennan Skate Park (completion)

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to recommend an award of \$42,750 with FY19 Open Space/Recreational Reserve funds. Mr. Boris seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

- Salem Common Fence Restoration

Present in the audience was Erin Schaeffer from the Department of Planning & Community Development, who is the project manager.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that the City has completed 3 phases of fence restoration and described completed and the sections proposed for this phase. She is looking to leverage \$135,000 in CIP funding obtained last year with CPA funding from this year. Proposed is Washington Square East missing sections, which could be covered by the CIP funds. The majority of the empty section by the Hawthorne Hotel would also be slated for this phase with CPA funds.

Mr. Hoskins inquired about the issue of a snow plow knocking down one of the new sections of fence that the CPA had assisted. He was concerned that the City was unable to hold plow company accountable.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that it has been recommended to the Park and Recreation Department that temporary concrete barriers be put up in the Winter and is hoping it will be implemented. She noted that across from almost every driveway is where there are missing fence sections, because private plowers plow from the driveways toward the fence. She believed the temporary barriers would fit between the fence and the granite curb as they do during Halloween.

Mr. Cornacchio asked what percentage of the fence is left to be done.

Ms. Schaeffer replied that it is approximately 75%.

Mr. Hoskins stated that there are very few sections entirely intact. The majority is damaged in some way. He stated that he felt that there needs to be game plan for when a new section is damaged by a private company or city plow that there is some accountability. He felt that no one should be able to plow around the Common unless they have a bond or there are cameras on them.

Ms. Guy noted that it is difficult due to their being city plow crews, private contractors hired by the city and plowers hired by residents, which would require policing the Common.

Mr. Hoskins stated that maybe jersey barriers is an option for everywhere there is a driveway, but noted this would incur a cost. He stated that taking 2 steps forward and 1 step back is just so wasteful. He noted it was an infinite project and asked if there could be a plastic composite for sections that are less pedestrian.

Ms. Guy stated that CPA funds could not be used for that.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that the Salem Common is on the National Register of Historic Places and has a permanent preservation restriction; therefore, the City is not allowed to use materials that don't meet Secretary of Interiors Standards. She noted that the actual historic material of the fence is cast iron, which is a brittle material and at the end of its life span. She stated that the City is building in maintenance whenever she leverages CIP funding with each phase. She stated that the material going forward will not be just cast iron going forward, but a mix of metals that we hope will hold up longer.

Mr. Hoskins asked if there is an economy of scale to having the foundry cast a lot of the missing tops or similar pieces to have a stockpile on hand.

Ms. Schaeffer stated the City does not have the ability to physically assemble the parts together and do the painting. Often times we have top or bottom rails or a combinations of things which require a combination of restoring the physical pieces saved and new pieces. There is a lot of physical restoration required. The City does not have the staff to sandblast, etc. We also cannot take the fence down, because there is a preservation restriction on it.

Mr. Shea if the \$150,000 is not fully funded, what the effect would be.

Ms. Guy stated that it is dependent on the combination of funding, including MPPF and CIP. She stated that the City tries to combine the most pots of money to go out to bid to get the economy of scale. \$100,000 is still beneficial, but \$150,000 might get even more sections completed when combined with the other pots of funds.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that the \$150,000 would cover the missing sections at the Hawthorne Hotel. We prefer not to build 3 fence sections and then have several missing on either side. The goal is to be able to tie in on a run. The section by the Hawthorne Hotel is the largest run of missing sections. We don't have any physical pieces from the section, so we will need to create all the posts and the fence sections, which will be a large dollar amount. If awarded

less, she would look at further expanding the scope of work along the corners to get the most visual bang for the buck as well.

Ms. Hamilton noted that this is the Committee's number two high priority and if something deserves full funding, the first priorities are those that do.

Ms. Guy added that it was also considered a high priority by those that spoke at the public hearing.

Mr. Burke asked if the Salem Common Neighborhood Association or others are contributing.

Ms. Schaeffer replied in the negative.

MOTION: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to recommend an award of \$100,000.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the CPC hasn't previously funded more than \$100,000, which is adequate and sufficient. An argument can always be made that \$150,000 is the only amount that can make this succeed, which is not the case.

VOTE: Mr. Boris seconded the motion. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Boris, Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Burke and Mr. Northcutt voted in favor. Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Shea and Ms. Hamilton voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

Mr. Shea stated that he was opposed because he favored an award of \$150,000.

MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to recommend add an additional \$50,000. Mr. Northcutt seconded the motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the motion was out of order and did not feel you can undercut what has already passed.

Mr. Northcutt disagreed. He stated that if someone wants to challenge, it we can go to the City Solicitor.

Mr. Shea suggested a move for reconsideration.

VOTE: Mr. Burke made a motion to reconsider to enable more discussion. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion. Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Boris, Mr. Burke and Mr. Northcutt voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Cornacchio voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

Mr. Shea stated that he felt Ms. Schaeffer adequately explained what the City is trying to do with this phase, which is to fill that run that has a significant gap where there is little or no fence, which he felt justifies the extra money.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the fence was not funded last year, and that the CPC should expect to see annually if the City wants to complete the remaining 75%, it needs to be on any annual basis. She stated that she was okay with giving a little extra this time.

Mr. Burke stated that he voted for the \$100,000 because he would like to see more community involvement. He suggested 2/3 of what has been requested and is open to more when there is more community involvement and a better plan for protecting the fence in winter. He stated that the DPW foreman should assign someone specific to plow that area. He stated that this would be an incentive for better maintenance, better protection and more community involvement.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he understands trying to shave off some funds in order to spread money around. Mr. Cornacchio stated that this was his view.

He stated that this project is the poster child for getting CPA passed. He stated that the signal should be sent that we support the project and that before the next funding request, he suggested a section by section inventory of the needs and an annual inspection occur. He noted that if we know that it is across from driveways that the fence sections are being damaged, a management plan is needed.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that in 2012, CBI Consulting was hired to do a master plan, so there is plan in place for section by section restoration, which is what the City has been acting on annually. There is a management plan that has been shared with the DPW and Park and Recreation. In addition, as project manager, she leverages funding and builds in maintenance.

Mr. Hoskins stated that in any given year where funding is requested, and given that the plan is now a few years old, someone should walk the perimeter to keep track and to see if we are making progress against the plan.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that she personally does a review of sections formally on an annual basis and informally whenever she is on site. It is also part of the bid specification's scope of work as the first task of the vendor. She stated that she would be happy to show the CPC the presentation that has been made to neighborhood associations, etc., which shows the work that has been completed over time.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he knows the City is under pressure to see many things done and the DPW and Parks and Recreation are swamped. The CPC does not have a great sense of what kind of progress has been made and if the CPA investments made two years ago have survived.

MOTION: Mr. Hoskins made a motion to recommend funding \$125,000, with a strong suggestion of getting a report on changes over time. There was no second.

Mr. Boris agreed that he would like a report submitted with each application.

Ms. Schaeffer the map in the current application package shows where Phases 1, 2 and 3 were completed, and photos of the sections proposed for this year. She noted that \$25,000 is the difference between 2 fence sections.

Mr. Boris stated that he supported \$100,000 and that if, after the other project reviews are completed, there is \$25,000-50,000 left over, he would support giving more.

Mr. Cornacchio agreed that he would like to spread the funds around. He also agreed that no one is held accountable for the sections damaged every year.

Mr. Moriarty also agreed there was a lack of accountability. He stated that \$100,000 shows support of fence.

Mr. Hoskins stated that we heard that it is an economy of scale, where you can get more work done for your dollar.

Mr. Shea stated that we are reconsidering Mr. Moriarty's motion, so the CPC cannot act on any other motions until re-voting.

Ms. Schaeffer stated that, with regard to economy of scale, the staff time is extensive for each phase of work. Planning is done a year in advance of construction. She stated that the City can be flexible on the actual scope of work. If the CPC is unable to fully fund \$150,000 for the missing teeth at the Hawthorne Hotel, she can allocate the funds awarded to continue the work along the corner which will leverage CIP funds. She stated that she appreciated any funding recommendation.

VOTE: Mr. Moriarty's motion for a recommendation of \$100,000 was voted on. Voting in favor were Mr. Burke, Mr. Boris, Mr. Cornacchio and Mr. Moriarty. Voting in opposition were Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Northcutt. The motion did not carry.

VOTE: Mr. Hoskins made a motion to recommend an award of \$125,000 (\$66,900 from FY19 Historic Reserve, \$37,247.97 from the Fund Balance and \$20,852.03) from the FY19 Budgeted Reserve). Mr. Shea seconded the motion. Voting in favor were Mr. Burke, Mr. Boris, Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Northcutt. Voting in opposition were Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Cornacchio. The motion so carried.

- Salem Common Bandstand

MOTION: Ms. Hamilton made a motion to recommend an award of \$100,000 from the FY19 Budgeted Reserve. Mr. Shea seconded the motion.

Ms. Hamilton noted that it leverages CIP funding.

Mr. Hoskins stated that this is going to be another long-term project.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt the project is highly seasonal and that the resource is not utilized on a substantial basis.

VOTE: The motion was voted on. Voting in favor were Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Burke, Mr. Boris, Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Northcutt. Voting in opposition was Mr. Moriarty. The motion so carried.

- Gallows Hill Park Renovation Designer Services

MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to recommend an award of \$65,000 with \$24,150 from the FY19 Open Space/Recreation Reserve and \$40,850 from FY19 Budgeted Reserve . Mr. Boris seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea stated that there is a critical need for correcting the baseball issue in the City and a need for a quality baseball field.

Mr. Burke was in agreement. He stated that it is such big park with so much unused.

VOTE: The motion was voted on. All were in favor and the motion so carried.

- House of the Seven Gables Roof Replacement Increase

Mr. Boris made a motion to recommend an award of \$26,500 from the FY19 Budgeted Reserve. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he has championed the House of the Seven Gables before the City Council multiple times, but felt that Gables has gone to the well once too often, where it now seeks further money for the roof. He stated that he is not in favor of additional funding. He added that, in his opinion, the Gables has substantial resources available to it in terms of alternative funding, its endowment and charges to the public. He acknowledged the Gables' willingness to provide free entrance for residents and making use of its facilities as a meeting house for public discussion. He stated that he believes that the Gables had legal recourse against multiple parties for the roof failure in terms of negligence, its design, manufacture of component parts and the architect selecting the materials. He stated that he felt that they have come back once too often when they look for is a relatively small amount versus the amount that has been fund in the past versus the number of other meritorious projects both public and non-profit before us. The Gables is an important component of our City's socio and economic fabric, but he felt is coming back once too often for monies that at this point in time are small versus the problem that has been addressed and the questionable exercise of authority by their board not to seek any legal recourse against the parties who put them in this terrible condition, where they have to build the roof twice due to the nails. He stated he was not in favor of any funding.

Mr. Hoskins stated that when the Gables came before the CPC the first time, they had a lot of project proposals. They invited the CPC to a tour and gave a full run down of each property and its condition and needs for renovations, and what they had available for funding from their endowment and other sources of funding. He stated that it was not a pretty picture when they opened up their books to the CPC. He noted that the CPC funded only one of the proposals, the smallest, which after bidding, the cost had increased. He stated that the CPC has seen costs go up after a project has gone out to bid with several funded projects. He noted that the Gables is an essential non-profit to the City of Salem and they provide a significant public service by keeping the site available to public. My understanding that nail situation struck many in the preservation community. When considering the CPC's \$26,500, he is not

sure how much legal action could have been undertaken for \$26,500, but they probably decided it was not worth it. He stated that he was in favor of funding.

Ms. Hamilton concurred with Mr. Hoskins. She stated that there are a number of other communities that experienced problems with the nails and none have received satisfaction and have had to do their roofs twice. She would be in favor of funding.

Mr. Moriarty stated that there were representations made by Gables at the City Council meeting, that they would not be coming back for further funding and this is inconsistent with that, although maybe it reflects an unanticipated cost.

VOTE: The motion was voted on. Voting in favor were Mr. Burke, Mr. Boris, Mr. Shea, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Northcutt . Voting in opposition were Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Cornacchio. The motion so carried.

Mr. Shea stated that there is approximately \$246,000 remaining and the next two projects are the Golf Cart Paths at \$250,000 and 211 Bridge Windows at \$121,277.50. He felt that the CPC should concentrate on these two.

Mr. Burke asked that what money that would have been considered for the bowl at Ryan Brennan Memorial Park be put into Memorial Park. He stated that it is used extensively and would like to move it up in priority.

Mr. Moriarty agreed with Mr. Burke that both youth and adults use it extensively.

Mr. Burke suggested looking at all three.

Mr. Shea suggested giving the cart paths \$150,000 because of the size and scope. Going up any morning and it is used from early morning all through the day. He stated that he would rather give some to Memorial Park because it is a city park, but that he also likes what he has read about the non-profit and that it is one non-profit that is doing a lot and he could support giving them money, as well.

Mr. Cornacchio was in agreement.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she believed that there is also going to be some bond money used for the cart paths.

Ms. Guy believed that the City looks at what comes out of CPA and then looks at what comes out of CIP and then determines if they need to bond.

Ms. Hamilton asked if it was reasonable to think that if the City is able to bond some, it can bond for all of it.

Mr. Shea suggested discussing how to divvy up the \$246,000 between the 3 projects.

Mr. Shea suggested giving the full amount to Memorial Park, \$50,000 for 211 Bridge and the balance to the Golf Cart Paths.

Ms. Hamilton stated that for Memorial Park, it is not clear where the \$54,000 estimate comes from.

Mr. Shea stated that it has little or no explanation.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that there is no scope.

Mr. Hoskins agreed that he does not know enough about it.

Mr. Burke suggested funding Memorial Park this year, because the Golf Cart paths can be bonded.

Mr. Shea stated that we will look foolish to recommend funding with little to no information. He stated that he would be more inclined to fund the cart paths.

Mr. Hoskins stated that CIP funds would be used for the reseeding and regrading at Memorial and need these funds for the sprinkler system.

Mr. Burke stated that the sprinkler system needs to be in before the reseeding and regrading. He felt the City will bond for the gold cart paths eventually and that the sprinkler system will protect the investment.

Mr. Shea was concerned that the CPC does not know for what is the \$54,000.

Ms. Guy suggesting continuing to the May meeting.

Mr. Burke stated that he would like to get guidance from the Superintendent.

Mr. Moriarty suggested that the same courtesy be provided to 211 Bridge to give them an opportunity to address how they would allocate less than full funding.

Mr. Hoskins stated that they maybe be able to do the highest priority windows and do the project in phases.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to continue the applications for the Golf Cart Paths, Memorial Park Irrigation and The Bridge at 211 windows until the next meeting on May 8, 2018. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

VOTE: Mr. Boris made a motion to accept the following five applications for future consideration and carry over to the next round. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

- Ryan Brennan Memorial Skate Park (bowl)
- Conservation/Restoration of Historic Artwork (Council Chambers)
- Hamilton Hall Façade Preservation
- Hamilton Hall Fence Restoration
- Hamilton Hall Storm Windows
- Historic New England - Upgrades to Fire Detection System at Phillips House

- St. Mary Italian Church Grotto

Mr. Cornacchio stated that the grotto would be located on private land.

Ms. Guy questioned how a restriction would be able to be executed.

Mr. Shea stated that it would be low impact.

VOTE: Mr. Hoskins made a motion that the project is not recommended for funding and is not carried over. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Next Meeting Date

Ms. Guy stated that the next regular meeting date is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, May 8, 2018.

VOTE: There being no further business, Mr. Boris made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy
Administrator