

Newburyport Redevelopment Authority
11/21/06

1. Attendance

Present: Janet Marcus, Nat Norton, Rick Taintor, Erford Fowler, and Tim Brennan
(6:15pm)

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the 10/25/06 meeting were approved unanimously with corrections. Mr. Taintor motioned to approve the minutes and Mr. Fowler seconded.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Fowler suggested limiting the public comment period to a total of 20 minutes, as the City Council does.

Bill Harris said he was very pleased to see the NRA opening its meetings up for public comment. He said that intense parking on the waterfront may not be the highest and best use for the property but noted that the NRA recognizes the need to plan for replacement parking. He also suggested delegating the signage review authority to the Planning Department or some other organization as it may deflect from the NRA's more important issues. Ms. Marcus said that Mr. Taintor has been working on changing the signage procedures for about a year. She also said that the City should also do something about enforcement and suggested that maybe City employees would have to reallocate responsibilities to get this done. She felt that allowing violations to remain for months sets a bad precedent. (Mr. Brennan arrived.)

George Roaf asked if the NRA would be required to answer questions posed by the public. Mr. Taintor said no, as these meetings were public meetings not public hearings. Mr. Roaf presented the NRA with his one year parking survey of the waterfront.

4. Correspondence

Letters were received from Joseph Brown, Fred Hufnagel, and Ben Lynch, which may be viewed in the Planning Office. Two additional emails from Ben Lynch were received by Jan Marcus rephrasing his letter. Ms. Marcus also wrote a letter to Fred Hufnagel thanking him for his input. A letter from Mayor Moak was received offering the services of the Planning Department during the park planning. Ms. Marcus said she was very pleased to receive the letter and would write a follow up letter. She said it was always the intention of the NRA to work with the City in this venture. Mr. Fowler motioned to receive and file all correspondence, Mr. Brennan seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

5. Treasurer's Report

Mr. Norton reported that the total cash on hand is \$69,077.37, the loan balance is \$48,143.52, the interest rate remains the same, and three payments were made to

National Grid. He noted that \$5,937.63 of the parking revenue was from October's parking receipts.

Mr. Norton reported a deposit error that Standard Parking made (\$44,270 over the amount they owed.) It has been corrected and the reports reflect that.

Mr. Brennan suggested paying down the line of credit since the NRA would always be able to draw on it later when it was necessary. The Board discussed how much funding would be necessary in the next couple months and decided to pay the balance down to zero so that they would not incur further interest charges. Some members were concerned with unforeseen expenses and paying for the maintenance of the lots but decided they could draw money in the future, if necessary. Mr. Brennan made the motion to pay the loan balance down to zero upon assuring that the account would not be closed out. Mr. Taintor seconded and the motion was approved 5-0.

Mr. Fowler motioned to accept the Treasurer's Report and Mr. Taintor seconded. It was approved unanimously.

6. Discussion on Standard Parking meeting

Ms. Marcus reported that some members of the NRA met with Fred Snow of Standard Parking. Mr. Snow reported that Friday nights did not yield as much income as expected and requested to charge for parking all day on Fridays in the future, if they were selected. They also suggested delineating the parking spaces better with tennis tape, or similar materials. Ms. Marcus said that they also requested to allow automatic transfers to the NRA's bank account once a month. She also said that Standard Parking has the capacity to do studies on who parks in the lots for how long, if the NRA wanted to pursue this. Mr. Fowler suggested making changes to the fee for senior citizens. Mr. Brennan also questioned whether it would be a good idea to reduce the fee during slow hours. Mr. Taintor suggested asking for an alternate rate schedule as part of the RFP and the including the possibility of renewable options. The discussion of the RFP for summer parking would be added to December's agenda.

7. Waterfront Use Applications

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society applied to use the west lot on April 28, 2007. They provided their non-profit paperwork and their insurance binder. Mr. Norton motioned to approve the use request and Mr. Brennan seconded. It was approved 5-0.

8. Sign and façade applications

Angie's Food, 7 Pleasant Street, applied for façade changes to replace a window and part of the granite wall. They provided a sample of the replacement tile which appeared to be a banker's or a charcoal gray. Signage was not being modified. Mr. Taintor motioned to approve the façade changes and Mr. Fowler seconded. It was approved 5-0.

Absolute Hair Salon, 44 Pleasant Street, applied for an awning similar to the one next door at Amy Williams. The lettering would be 5" – 6" high and the lip of the awning

would be 8" high. It would be gray with black lettering. Mr. Fowler motioned to approve the awning and Mr. Brennan seconded and it was approved 5-0.

9. Report of Mayor's Task Force on parking

Ms. Marcus reported that she and Mr. Taintor attended the Mayor's Waterfront task force meeting. Mayor Moak sent a letter to the NRA stating that he would compile all the information from the participating groups and forward them in early December. She noted that none of the groups had specific directives or proposed a specific number of parking spaces. Ms. Marcus said that she spoke with Esther Sayer, who sent out questionnaires from the Chamber of Commerce to business members. Ms. Sayer said that only 20% of the businesses responded. Ms. Marcus was surprised at the lack of participation from the retail business community.

Mr. Taintor noted that most groups involved were not very far away from each other in regards to their goals for the waterfront.

10. Report on Meeting with Waterfront Trust and Parks Commission regarding park use

Mr. Fowler met with the Waterfront Trust and the Parks Commission to discuss park rules. He said that they are working on the assumption that the 19 rules of the Waterfront Trust would be put into the existing park rules. He said that the meeting went well and they would meet again December 7th. Mr. Taintor said that the Waterfront Trust keeps emphasizing that they are not a public park but want the rules on the books so that the police can enforce them.

11. Old Business – RFPs for Park Planner

The group discussed whether non-collusion and EOE paperwork should be included in the RFP or be dealt with at the time of contract signing. Mr. Fowler said that he would prefer to see it included in the RFP. Mr. Taintor said that he would add the forms as attachments to the RFP. Ms. Marcus suggested adding the Planning Office's address and the submission deadline to the cover of the RFP. The pre-proposal meeting was agreed to be on 1/9/07 and the deadline for submission would be 1/26/07 at 10am. The RFP would be available on 12/12/06.

Mr. Taintor said that he would advertise the RFP in Goods and Services. He would also check to see if the Central Register should be used.

Mr. Norton suggested changing the language on page 1 from "two parcels" to "three parcels" and describing them as two parking lots, East and West for more clarification. He also wanted to note that the East lot is two parcels separated by Ferry Wharf Way.

Mr. Brennan felt that the board should be more descriptive of what will be required of the Planner. He wanted the RFP to result in figuring out the most parking the NRA could get under Chapter 91 constraints. He suggested requesting proposals for an underground lot. Mr. Taintor said that they could make the maximum parking exercise an earlier deliverable required of the planner. Mr. Brennan also wanted to include in the

RFP the possibility of combining the Waterfront Park into the mix and considering the whole area as one property. Ms. Marcus said that would require a survey of the entire area and they would need to rewrite the RFP to do this. She noted that the Waterfront Trust does not have any income and the property would only be able to be financed if they turned the park back over to the NRA. Mr. Norton was opposed to including property that the NRA was not in control of. Mr. Brennan thought they should consider both options because it could provide valuable information. He said that the parcel was always intended to be one parcel and the only reason it was subdivided was because of the staged development. He suggested approaching DEP with this idea, given the history of the properties. He said that he would assume that the total number of spaces would be reduced from the existing and noted that he wasn't considering touching the existing park, it would just be added to the denominator. Ms. Marcus was concerned that the NRA had not discussed this topic with the Waterfront Trust. Mr. Fowler was also concerned that the Waterfront Trust would not be willing to participate and wanted to ask them prior to mentioning them in an RFP. He said if they did not agree to take part, he would not be voting in favor of including them in the RFP. Mr. Taintor suggested maybe requesting one plan maximizing the parking and another plan based on an arbitrary number. He felt it was politically unwise to do an RFP without the Waterfront Trust being approached first. He felt that this would emphasize differences between the groups. Ms. Marcus said that she would set up a meeting with the Waterfront Trust for the week of December 13th.

The meeting adjourned at 8:36 PM.

Sincerely,

Dianne Eppa
Note Taker