

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
May 14, 2019

A meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, May 14, 2019 at 6:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Vice Chair Tim Shea, Carole Hamilton, Deborah Greel, Ed Moriarty, Mickey Northcutt, Chris Burke and John Boris. Also present Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development. Arriving later in the meeting was Chair Bart Hoskins.

Public Comment

Polly Wilburt stated that bonding would extend the life of the surcharge for the life of the bond. She stated that, the longer the bond, the longer the surcharge is locked in place. She cautioned the CPC to thoroughly understand the ramifications, as it will impact the CPC process going forward. She recommended that the City provide a document that shows the annual bonding amount through life of the bond, and that the CPC be provided a document showing what the bonding capacity going forward, in order to understand how the CPC's bonding capacity has been impacted by the initial bond. She suggested that the CPC have conversations with other communities that have bonded, as they likely have some understanding of the life after the bond has been floated. She suggested that the CPC discuss if a bond is for one category, will that category be constrained going forward, in terms of uses of CPA money and impact on future projects and the impact on each of the 3 categories. She noted that even if the CPC recommends the bond, it will require a 2/3 vote of the City Council, and therefore the CPC should be confident in its recommendation. She stated that she was concerned that the CPC was missing representation by the Salem Historical Commission and therefore missing the perspective of that committee.

Jessica Herbert stated that, as the former Salem Historical Commission representative, she had been through the funding round process until this moment and felt that a new Historical Commission member should be seated and up to speed before making final recommendations, as that perspective is important.

Scott Connelly, Athletic Director of Salem High School, stated that this project means the world to the youth of Salem and its student athletes for multiple sports. He stated that Bertram Field is one of the nicest on the North Shore, and with this project, it will be one of the nicest venues in the State. He stated that it is home to a lot of youth and athletes from kindergarten thru college and means a lot to Salem residents and students.

Jevon Beaver, football and lacrosse student athlete, stated that he has memories of playing football for 9 years and lacrosse for 4 years at Bertram Field. He stated that he wants to see it improved for younger kids so that they can make their own positive memories.

Noah Galeota, football and lacrosse student athlete, stated that Bertram Field holds happy, sentimental memories for him and he would like to see it grow for the younger kids to see what Salem is all about.

Walter Herbert, Cypress Street, stated that he found out about the project yesterday at the preservation breakfast and that it brought a smile to his face.

Mr. Hoskins joined the meeting at this time.

Mr. Herbert stated that back in the days when he was a corporate banker, they did quite a few sport facilities. He asked if the Fogerty consultant cost estimate of \$3.422 million of 2016 is the number being used for the purposes of this project.

Ms. Ide stated that the original study was done in 2014, and it has been updated with newer cost estimates, as well as soil testing, etc. The updated cost is estimated at \$5-6 million. The report is on the City website under studies and reports.

Mr. Herbert stated that he was curious about financing and income generation.

Ms. Ide stated that the revenue from concessions goes to the Boosters. She stated that it has the potential for the other revenue, which could offset operations and maintenance costs.

Mr. Herbert asked if any work has been done on advertising, naming rights, sponsorship, etc.

Ms. Ide stated replied in the affirmative and stated that they are just starting that process, including a website and place for donations. She stated that the cash flow includes an estimated \$350,000 in donations.

Mr. Herbert stated that it sounds like cost of the project is not totally firmed up.

J. Michael Sullivan, Beacon Architects, stated that they just got an updated design development cost estimate today, which will be submitted to the board and the City Council, which looks like a \$6million project cost.

Mr. Herbert stated that when he was at the bank, a project would not go to the credit committee with this much unknown. He stated that the impact goes directly to him, on his tax bill. He stated it is a wonderful project and the City needs it, but that he would like to know what it really costs and what it would generate.

John Robinson, elementary school teacher and football and tennis coach at Salem High School, stated that he has seen the change in the field house and the change in the attitude of the children. When he started 15 years ago, Bertram Field was a great place and while they are proud to call it home, the kids ask when the ceiling will be fixed, when there will be doors that lock and when there will be toilets that flush. He stated that with a renewed facility, there would be an opportunity for revenue, which is not available now due to the bathrooms. It impacts ages 6-18. He stated that the opportunity should be taken now to give students and community what they deserve and something for which to be proud.

Devon Tolbert, football and track and field student athlete, stated that he thought he spoke for a lot of youth. He stated that he has been going to Bertram Field since he was seven years old in the first grade. He stated that he remembers when there were stands on both sides. He stated that he spent a lot of time there for practice, events or just to work on his craft, because football is his

way to college and his dream. He stated that Bertram Field is his home away from home and that there needs to be a safer environment.

Branden Harvey, football and lacrosse student athlete, stated that he is the Captain of Salem High School lacrosse team and has played football at Bertram for 12 years and lacrosse for 4 years. He stated that his family has been at Salem High School for 20 years playing football and it is like a second home. He stated that his father used to paint the locker room and installed speakers. He noted that the locker room has seen years and years of players. He stated that the locker room has peeling paint and leaks when it rains; there are puddles in the locker room, personal items that get wet and destroyed and it needs upgrading.

Nick Galiota, youth football and lacrosse coach, stated that he is the Salem Youth Football Vice President, and the Director of flag football. He stated that they have been unable to have certain conference championships in Salem, which is lost revenue. He stated that these events can't be held at Bertram Field due to the concessions stands and bathrooms. He stated that he loves Bertram, but is embarrassed.

Cam Harvey, former football and track and field student athlete, stated that his family has participated for years in countless sports for countless hours. He stated that the new surface changed the environment as the place to go, but that visitors from other cities now see it as an eyesore. He stated that an update would improve the attitude and help sports teams. He stated that it is an old building on a beautiful field and a change has to happen.

Joshua Harvey, former football and track and field student athlete, stated that he is a licensed electrician and a coach. He stated that the drop ceiling tiles and old electrical work is a safety hazard and that an update would be greatly appreciated by the children and their parents who want a safe place for them.

Lisa Peterson, City Councilor of Ward 3, stated that Bertram Field is in her ward. She stated that she has had the opportunity to serve as stakeholder on the group that developed this project. She stated that she is very impressed by Ms. Ide and the way this project has gone over the last year and a half. She stated that it is a very comprehensive project with every angle thought out. She stated that she would like to echo what the players have said. She noted that photos don't capture the smell and that it is horrific and embarrassing. She stated that it is shocking that we still have students use this facility and they deserve better. She noted that she has been meeting with neighbors, who are generally supportive and that there are no major issues that they had concerning impacts to the neighborhood. She stated that she hoped the project can move forward.

Mr. Burke stated that he was very impressed that so many students showed up and thanked those in attendance.

Ms. Ide responded to some previously raised questions. She stated that she has worked closely with the Finance Director and the City's Treasurer on how this fits into the bonding plan and that she works comprehensively on the capital plan. She stated that with the contribution of CPA funds, they feel the project can move forward. She stated that the FY20 CIP budget has not been finalized. She noted that bonding goes up and down, such as when the Community Life Center was bonded, there was a \$5 million jump or in 2012 for Saltonstall and Collins schools, there were \$45million in bonds. She noted, other than those large projects and water/sewer, the

majority of CIP funds go to Engineering for roads, sidewalks, seawalls, some park work and vehicles. The second biggest is Park and Recreation and then the Planning Department for parks and waterfront. She noted that schools come in big waves. Bertram Field budget is proposed as CIP, CPA, a small amount from water/sewer enterprise funds and a small amount from donations. Other projects in the pipeline are Gallows Hill, which will go out to bid soon, as well as Forest River which is in design for which they are seeking funding for a variety of grants. She noted that Palmer Cove Park is in early design and that the Salem Common fence is underway. She stated that a big part of her job is to look at all these park and historical projects plus buildings, schools, roads and sewer, to understand the capital needs, to help coalesce them and to map them out in the plan, working closely with Finance and the Treasurer to determine the bonding capacity and how to manage that so as not to increase taxes. She stated that the goal is to get away from emergency funding and to look at needs and plan over time. She stated that the Bertram Field building is near failure and that the project won't go away, other than closing it and not having use of the field. She stated that facility will have the same functions but with changes in accessibility, more bathrooms, concession area, addition of security cameras, storage for equipment and maintenance, family restrooms with changing tables and locker rooms being set up for internet. She added that it will have all the same functions, but be a modern facility with more bathrooms due to code.

Mr. Sullivan stated that it will be a fully accessible facility. He stated that right now the grade exceeds the permissible pitch. The new design allows for parking, ramps and stairs, as well as an accessible press box. He stated that building code is set by number of seats in the grandstand which translates by code to 50 women and 40 men's bathrooms. He noted that the State has given a variance for 50% and that the current design is 29/18. The current facility is 6 men's and 8 women's. There will be family/gender neutral bathroom with a separate entrance.

Ms. Ide stated that inside facilities will also have accessible bathrooms which could be used for gender neutral and that the locker rooms will be gender neutral, which the current are not.

Mr. Connelly stated that Bertram Field is used by boys' and girls' soccer, football, track and field, boys' and girls' lacrosse, all the youth groups including flag football, youth football, boys and girls' lacrosse and gym, and for baseball/softball practice.

Mr. Shea asked about public use after hours, such as people walking.

A respondent replied in the affirmative and stated that he also sees youth playing there.

Mr. Shea asked for an estimate of how many in the middle school use it for phys-ed classes.

A respondent stated that it was 700, while another stated it would be every kid in the school.

Mr. Shea asked if it is used by the Boys and Girls Club.

A respondent replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Ide provided analysis of the facilities in Salem done in 2015, noting that anything in red is over-utilized, and anything in green is under-utilized. She noted that Bertram is the only adult

size, rectangular, multi-use field in the entire City. She noted that McGrath is not sized for adults.

Mr. Connelly stated that Bertram Field is the only field in the City with goal posts.

Ms. Ide provided a new packet on bonding, which included a lower analysis at \$1.8 million.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she appreciated everyone coming out and there is no doubt that this facility is greatly needed by the City. She stated that the issue is how to finance it and whether or not this committee feels that it morally can commit the funds it administers to a long term project, for a 20 or 30-year period, and if each committee member feels comfortable doing that. She stated that she agreed it is needed and that the design is good. She stated that the CPC needs to decide if it can commit limited CPA funds to a long term project of this nature. She asked the City's capacity to bond the total amount of project on its own without any funds from CPA.

Ms. Ide replied in the negative, but stated that the City will have to find a way, noting that it would take funds from other park projects. The City is looking to bond for the full amount, but with a portion out of CPA.

Ms. Hamilton asked, if the CPC gave a one-year award this year, and was not willing to cover a bond with a continuing 20 to 30-year commitment, if the city has the capacity to move forward with project. She asked if the CPC is the only link that means this project does or doesn't go forward.

Ms. Ide stated that it is a complicated equation and a balancing act. She stated that if the project is bonded without CPA, it will push out other Park and Recreation projects. She stated that this project cannot be phased and every year it is put off will add 3-8% to the cost. The commitment is needed up front.

Mr. Northcutt asked how much is the total CIP request from the administration to the City Council.

Ms. Ide stated that the summary hasn't been finalized.

Mr. Northcutt stated that he agreed that the project is needed. He stated that the CPC is being asked to commit one quarter of its CPA funds for 30 years. He stated that he felt it is not possible to vote on a 30-year commitment without seeing City's CIP budget for the last few years. He asked how this request fits in the context of all the rest of the City bonding. He asked how much of the CIP budget has been spent on Parks and Recreation and what other Park and Recreation projects are in this year's CIP budget. He stated that he felt to have a better understanding is not an unreasonable request. He noted that the only other time that the CPC considered bonding was for acquisition for a new park for a smaller amount, for which funds were approved by the CPC, but wound up not being used. He stated that to acquire new land through bonding is different than to address massive renovation needs. He stated that there is no question that Bertram Field needs to be done, but that he felt the need for this committee to have every i dotted and t crossed. He stated that he is still not sure he would feel comfortable voting to bond and send that recommendation to City Council. He stated that, if bonded, it commits the funds for 2-3 decades. He stated that he also felt it silly to vote when there is an open seat on the board, although he did

not think it would necessarily change the outcome. He stated that he understood the time pressures, but noted that a vote is not about if the CPC supports the field, but whether the CPC thinks it is responsible to bond for this much money, which he did not think was responsible with the information provided.

Mr. Shea stated that he is totally in favor of trying to help this project and felt the impact has been explained by the public comment. He stated that he would not support the project at the higher dollars. He stated that he thinks that in the future of CPA, there will be additional bonding requests down the road, and that, just because this project happens to be first, it should not be turned down because of what could happen later. He stated that additional bondings will be something for future CPCs to figure out. He stated that the facility has a huge impact on the city and it serves a huge number of athletes, cheerleaders, band members and other groups. He noted that the building has got to be on the verge of being shut down. He noted that if the City has to bring in portable toilets, it would be using money until the project is completed. He stated that the City is going to be paying one way or the other. He stated that he felt the CPC, in its capacity, should assist to keep that from happening.

Mr. Burke stated that as the representative of the Park and Recreation Commission, they are happy to see this project done. He stated that a large part of CPA funds has gone to parks and he anticipates more in future. He stated that he felt it important that a piece of what would be going toward the recreation category should go toward this project because of the impact. He stated that Bertram Field is so much more important than any one of those smaller projects. He noted that more than half of the bond would be CIP. He stated that he felt it an appropriate part of the CPCs responsibility and an important part of its mandate. He did not feel another project would come along as important as this and have an as long lasting effect. He stated that it will last the life of the bond. Mr. Burke stated that he would be in favor of bonding up to the amount they are requesting.

Mr. Northcutt left the meeting at this time.

Ms. Greel asked why the project is not why not grant eligible.

Ms. Ide stated that PARC grants don't fund artificial turf fields, and most other grants are about land/water/conservation and resiliency. She stated that she has looked at football grants and donations, but there are really no target grants. She noted that the school building authority no longer provides grants for athletic facilities.

Ms. Greel asked about the community benefit agreement from Footprint.

Mr. Hoskins stated that it is 10 years at \$75,000 per year starting this year. Therefore, if you choose to look at it that way, the impact would be somewhat offset for that time.

Ms. Ide stated that all the bonding and CIP budgets are available on-line, and that data is in the process of being analyzed, but it is not a simple task.

Mr. Shea stated that the CPC should focus on its task. He stated that he was not so sure this project needs to be compared to other CIP projects. He stated that he felt the focus should be on this request.

Mr. Boris stated that he absolutely supported the project. He stated that he was concerned about the bond time commitment. He suggested that the legislature be asked to set a law setting a maximum of the amount of funds that can be bonded each year. He also questioned what has been done in other communities.

Ms. Guy stated that Stuart Saginor of the Community Preservation Organization states that there have been 10,945 total CPA projects, of which 235 have been bonded. Ms. Guy stated that Mr. Saginor stated that he felt, since the average bond is huge and general projects are much smaller, that dollar volume would be a better measure. The total for all CPA projects is \$1.8 billion of which \$342 million is for bonded projects.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the number of bonded projects is 2% and questioned if this is an appropriate use. He agreed with the worthiness of the project and that the project effects so many people. He stated that he was not sure he was comfortable with bonding anything and wondered if it is really the purpose of CPC. He stated that just because it is something that we can do, he was not sure it was something that we should be done. He stated that maybe this type of contribution is too big and something that should be deferred to the City Council to make the determination as to the extent they wish to bond. He stated that he was not comfortable utilizing this much money over that many years, that it should be addressed by the City and that felt the CPC should address smaller issues. He stated that he might argue in principal that CPA is not intended for a project that is this big and would have this much impact on city bonding capacity and that the City Council should decide.

Mr. Hoskins stated that whatever the CPC does recommend, the City Council will have the final determination. He stated that some communities accepted CPA with the intent to bond on day 1 for the full amount for a specific project, i.e. a new library. He added that based on the number of projects the City has already funded with CPA, the proportion of Salem's bonded projects would also be tiny.

Ms. Greel stated that she did not want to feel like the CPC is the body that stops the most important project, but noted that the CPC is wondering if it wants to commit all this money for this length of time from this little fund. She noted that the bathrooms are horrifying and embarrassing. She wondered why this little bit of money will make or break the project.

Ms. Ide stated that when developing capital plans, the City must leverage various sources and that the CPC should look at themselves as the good guys helping this project to move forward. She stated that if the City has to bond it all, it will take money from other park projects. She noted that every project that comes to CPA, has a match from CIP, and that the alternative would be to take all the CIP funds for this and not contribute to any of the other projects. She noted that the City Council likes to see diversity in projects and leveraging of funding. She stated that this project is ready to go and if not assisted by the CPC, the bond will eventually come from somewhere else, likely other park projects, which will then need more CPA. She stated that every year we wait; the cost goes up. She stated that there is a risk of the bathrooms having to be closed or a child being hurt. She stated understands it is a commitment, but that the CPC should think of this as leveraging. It is a worthy project that would benefit so many. The funds would be spent by 9/2020. There are lots of needs and the City is trying to get through the backlog. She

stated that the existing facility has gotten more than its life and is one of the projects that will probably last the longest.

Mr. Burke stated that one of three main purposes of CPA funding is recreation. He stated that such an important project for recreation is the factor we should take into account on whether we want to commit this funding. He stated that another project won't come along that is as important for recreation and sports, which is why we have to make a larger commitment on this than on the smaller park projects, and is an appropriate use place to spend our funds. He stated that CPA is not a small fund and that it is an important fund for recreation in the city. He stated that if CPA were to end, it would still continue paying the bond. He stated that he felt the risk was small, but if it happened, it would be about 1/6th of what we are taxing now and that he did not feel it that big of an amount when considering recreation is 1/3rd of our purpose.

Ms. Greel noted that the CPC will be coming into \$75,000 annually for 10 years from Footprint.

Ms. Hamilton stated that those funds are not specifically earmarked for recreation.

Mr. Shea stated that the CPC has done numerous small projects. He felt this is an opportunity to have a major impact on a major population of our city. He stated he did not see anything wrong with having a big impact, rather than just another small project.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt there was a sense of being pushed a little bit into a corner. He stated that it was painfully obvious that the emergency situation of plumbing and heating and recreational uses is a failure of maintenance and repair, which is not the business of this committee to correct by making a major contribution over 30 years.

Mr. Shea noted that of those 235 CPA bonded projects, it works out to \$1.4million per bond, noting that enough communities thought that \$1.4 million was appropriate.

Ms. Ide stated that facility has lasted 80 years. She stated it is beyond maintenance; when it is painted, the paint peels off. She stated that the sewer systems are completely broken underneath and the roof is falling in. She stated that the City has gotten as much as it can and it is not to code. She stated that it just cannot be fixed anymore.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he was not convinced of a need to put off the vote to the next meeting, nothing this is the third time the project has been before the committee.

Mr. Shea stated that he would like to offer a compromise, because he doesn't feel full funding is reasonable.

MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to recommend bonding with a CPA commitment toward the project of up to \$100,000 per year for a term of up to 20 years. Mr. Burke seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea stated that the \$75,000 coming in from Footprint essentially offsets the bond and may be a way to encourage another 10 more years of Footprint funding, which would be good PR.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he would be uncomfortable segregating \$75,000 because it might generate another \$75,000. He stated that he understood the need to move the question, but was

sympathetic to the argument that the Historic Commission is not represented tonight and would not feel comfortable until the seat is filled.

Mr. Hoskins asked if there is a reason why voting this meeting urgently needed.

Ms. Ide stated that the City is developing its CIP and budget submission and that it is critical to incorporate the CPC's recommendation into the budget being submitted to City Council. She stated that, if the City Council does not know how much is to be committed, she did not feel they could vote on the project.

Mr. Moriarty stated that this proceeding was continued to make sure all parties were present.

Mr. Hoskins stated that at the next meeting there could be someone else who is not present.

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

Next Meeting(s): Tuesday, June 11, 2019

There being no further business, Mr. Boris 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