

Community Preservation Committee

April 27, 2022

Via Zoom Webinar
Meeting Minutes

Call to Order

Katelyn Sullivan of the Planning Office announced the meeting would be recorded and broadcasted.

Chair Mike Dissette called a meeting of the Community Preservation Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. Meeting to deliberate on the applications presented in February.

Roll Call

In attendance were Chair Mike Dissette, Vice Chair Jane Healey, Don Little, Chuck Griffin, Don Walters, Mark Rosen, Paul Healy, and Joe Morgan.

Andrew Port and Katelyn Sullivan from the Planning Office were also present.

Not in Attendance: Tom O'Brien

1. Welcome by the Chair

Mike Dissette welcomed all to the meeting. He reviewed letters submitted, which included one from the mayor with recommendations on ways the applicants can be financed. He noted receiving and filing for this meeting, all documents, and items have been circulated to the Committee and a part of the meeting packets.

2. Museum of Old Newbury Project Bidding Update Letter

Mike Dissette advised the letter is part of the additional supplemental information received. In the process; had ordered and paid for an inspection following which should receive 2nd bid from outfit. Mentioned outfit is very experienced with historic structure experience.

Paul Healy questioned the cost, for purposes of the meeting tonight, will they go with the original figures?

Mike Dissette confirmed only had original request for \$69,650 and would need to work with that number.

3. FY23 CPA Project updates (if needed)

Mike Dissette clarified updates were included in the packet and while during discussions anyone may reference those, which may be useful for informing their decisions.

He mentioned there are a few major differences making this cycle different from recent years. First being large projects with Bonding requests, as it's been about a decade since they've had those. Another being receipt of detailed thoughts, preferences, and priorities from the Office of the Mayor,

which they don't usually see; mainly see individual letters per project without context of prioritization. He explained as this is helpful to inform what other branches thoughts are on priorities, CPC are independent and have their own ideas of what is important and what is in need to bring that to the table to reach a consensus which may not align with Mayor's Office. Also, there is the concept of a significant Bonding request & with how it works in differently and how much money will go out and if there will be enough to cover everything requested. They will need to consider groups' comfort level and how much percentage on an annual basis where it could mean taking funds off the table for 15 years.

He advised it would be Important to get their weigh-in to get to a collective "yes" and they should feel free to express discomfort or comfort on possibility of 35-45% of revenue to be dedicated to certain projects which may result in exclusion of a future opportunity or a project may not be fully satisfied if that amount is put aside now. The other side is that there are large projects in need with the capacity to get done in the near turn; if funded by a bond now & would be a great benefit. The larger projects allow for greater number of people to enjoy opposed to several smaller projects done in pieces, not effecting as many people in the Public.

He referenced the Staff Report to show what the round numbers' net result could be for funding significant portions of 2 projects with bonds; also, what it will mean in years to come over the next 15 years. He mentioned a piece of information they don't have yet is the current bonding at \$186,000 (3 projects outstanding) which does not run the full 15 years and may retire in less than 7 years. Should that happen CPC would have more uncommitted, unspent funds available at the backend of the 15-year term.

He called for a discussion on the comfort level in spending up to \$500,000 per cycle up to 15 years with the 2 largest projects requesting bonding; Market Landing and Bartlet Mall.

Paul Healey mentioned prior years with large bonding requests which brought up big concerns but were passed and they survived. He referenced figures in the spreadsheets that talk about future years & how much will have to spend and believes they could be more conservative; they should be prepared it may be smaller than predicted. He believed if the 2 projects are needed, do them; everybody is good with lower funds available in coming years.

Mark Rosen questioned if they do as the mayor recommends and cover both bonds, none of the money allocating this year would be used for the 1st bond payment? The money should still cover rest of requests? He also went on to clarify that they should still have approximately \$740,000 to disperse even after the large projects, leaving them in good shape. He reiterated they typically don't see requests that high, but they are important projects for the city.

Mike Dissette confirmed with all recommendations taken in, including \$525,000 for Lower Atkinson and reduce Joppa to 0 and give \$216,000 that leaves \$714,000 which covers everything out. Eye balling appears have all covered. He added he believes if do it that way will have about \$92,000 left.

Don Walters commented his view was closer to Paul's and felt increasing would be ok, but concerned with going from \$186,000 as they may not have State match every year and future funds

may greatly diminish. He added, if the drive is for the City, then have residents vote on it instead of putting \$500,000 extra debt without Residents voting, which takes away optionality. Ok to increase, not ok with a decrease.

Don Little commented he is uncomfortable with it; 15 years being more important piece to him. A lot of money per year over so many years.

Joe Morgan pushed to the other direction to give balance. He mentioned he is in disagreement with reasons to lower the Market Landing request and would like to push back and fund at the original \$4.8m level. He doesn't see any benefit in delaying a project that is paramount to complete and justified. It would save residents by not phasing it and extending it. If they are confident these projects are important, like Mall and Market Landing, projects in works for long time and important to City, this is time to fund them completely.

Mike Dissette questioned the adjustment downward from \$4.8mil to \$3m; where it came and based on what? Was it based on carving out a phase of the project?

Andy Port recognized adjustment due to timing of CPC applications and were still assessing at that time feasibility to do it all at once. Recognize could be difficult to commit to that amount over 15-year period and leave some support for the Bartlet Mall project. Also, other projects that may come in future to allow funds and cause burden to CPC and what that \$1.8mil could mean to projects. Balancing act of having them done on time and phasing things.

Jane Healy commented she isn't necessarily comfortable dedicating that amount of money over the next 15 years. Given the absence of Proposition 2.5% override they will see these projects over the next several years. I can see overall cost rising over time so that is going into her deliberation.

Mike Dissette referred to Paul Healey's comment when they encountered similar situations like historical restoral with City Hall and the Rail Trail. All of that was immediate need and it was a hard decision to make to do. The bond was under \$2.5mil which was significant at the time. They had to tighten belt for couple years but don't believe they lost any significant projects due to that. Didn't know what would come of it but have that to show that they could handle it and get through.

Paul Healey added the big difference was with some of the years following it forced them to look closer at projects and say no to some. Everyone knew CPC didn't have all the money so understood couldn't fund every project.

Mike- explained some came back later on for funding. Some projects lowered their asking amount and they were able to find remaining funding elsewhere.

Mark Rosen questioned if they were able to increase a request or does that come from requestor? Example the \$3mil to \$4.8mil.

Mike advised if they feel justified going to spend it at some point and have seen the figures, as long as there is a basis for it, could be increased.

Mark Rosen questioned if Andy wanted to increase Market Landing project back to the \$4.8mil request?

Andy Port clarified he would not want to impact the Bartlet Mall project but wouldn't object if wanted to increase the Market Landing request. Reasons being inefficiencies as mentioned prior and temporary disservice to down town. Up to the CPC to recommend and Council to decide.

Mark confirmed the number should be \$4.8mil on the chart? He believes it would be better process to ask for the actual amount want and then the Committee decides whether to lower it. He questioned the Bond payment with the project back to the original request and clarified the payment wouldn't come from this year.

Andy Port commented as project manager of the request would be preferable to have it done at once. He also confirmed that the Bond payment would be delayed until next year. The amount would be a bit less than doubling the amount. He deferred to Ethan Manning for those numbers.

Jane Healey referred to the packet section regarding CPA future proposed borrowing sheet. She entered the \$4.8mil figure and found it would add approximately \$163,000 per year to the debt service with Market Landing and Bartlet Mall projects both approved. Which is a lot of money.

Paul Healy questioned reason request dropped to \$3mil was due to indication Mayor/ City Councilor would use own Bond for rest of project. He felt that would be good. Uncomfortable not knowing what parts of the project may be cut.

Joe Morgan reminded them that they are not just looking at the money, but about the values and priorities of the projects. Can't predict future of projects and fund with what they have while they have the resources. Lending rates will be going up and should secure funding for these instead of delaying. He explained he did the back of envelope calculations for \$500k for safety improvements of the playground and if put in bond is about \$8.5m or also have the option of making an out and out grant of the remainder of the money. Also, very positive and gives flexibility with how fund to Lower Atkinson Common. Believe that is a fair compromise to make the other 2 park projects happen.

Jane Healey also was thinking about bonding for Atkinson vs funding the \$550,000 out of this year's allocation. Do they pay the \$50,000 per year and hold the \$500,000 to roll over for future or allow it to go and not have that going forward.

Mike Dissette added cash vs bonding, there is cost involved in bond, not just soft cost. Also, the interest and carrying charge to look at.

Mike Dissette summarized that if they go with the big picture with \$5.5mil Bond, currently fund everything else asked for including \$216,000, and the Bartlet for design, then would still have \$92,000 to put in the bank. Where they seem to be in agreement that the two bonded projects are significant and important and will be doing something with them, he suggested to start with the topic on consensus of the two projects and then go back to the balance of cash to distribute this cycle.

4. Deliberations FY2023 Applications for Community Preservation Funds: Total requests

\$7,530,203

Mike Dissette began discussions starting with the larger projects being Marketplace Landing and Bartlet Mall.

a) Priority Housing Needs & Update to Housing Production Plan: \$230,000

Mike Dissette reviewed request and called for motion.

Don Walters motioned to approve with Paul Healy as second.

No discussion requested.

Roll Call taken with all voting yes and motion passed.

b) Old South Clock Face: \$4,650

Mike Dissette reviewed requested amount and called for motion.

Mark Rosen to approve for full amount with Joe Morgan second.

No discussion requested.

Roll call taken with all voting yes and motion passed.

c) Cushing House Architectural Preservation: \$69,750

Mike Dissette reviewed requested amount and called for motion.

Don Walters moved to recommend approval with second from Mark Rosen.

Discussion requested from Paul Healy who asked what happens if a new bid comes in higher?

Mike Dissette explained they would be doing fund raising to cover.

Jane Healey added she is concerned current estimate may not be a practical request, not enough money.

Paul Healy suggested they we put a condition on this for when they get other bids in, either CPC or City Council review it, then allowed to withdraw and come back.

Don Little referred to applicant in attendance to speak to concerns.

Susan Edwards explained the applicant signed American Steeple and Tara will be doing the assessment and if bid comes in lower, which is unlikely, all extra funds revert to CPC. If the bid is higher the Museum committed to using funds and doing fundraising for this phase of project so won't exceed requested amount.

No further discussion requested

Roll Call taken with all voting yes and motion passed.

d) **Bartlet Mall Frog Pond Improvements: \$2,790,000**

Mike Dissette broke down funding options. Then called for motion.

Mark Rosen moved to approve \$2.574 m, 15-year bond and \$216,000 allocation for this year's round. Paul Healy 2nd the motion.

Mike Dissette opened call for discussion.

Joe Morgan questioned the numbers; if \$216,000 pulled from original number \$279m for engineering studies and documents, A note to understand the scope of the work under option 1 does not include granite curbs & associated foundation. Make sure option 2 if use \$2.79m that will cover foundation and curb as long as have \$216k for engineering study.

Mike Dissette clarified that they requested flexibility for engineers.

Joe Morgan suggested they should go with the larger number \$2.79m to accommodate option #2. The \$400,000 plus \$200,000 covers \$600,000 for foundation and curb.

Mark Rosen questioned figures as they didn't go along with letter from Mayor. Why would recommend back out the \$216 if effects the project. Either Mayor not informed properly. Total request is \$2.79m for us to approve including the \$216,000 to be available. Can't go beyond the \$2.79m as it is not the request.

Jane Healey referenced letter from Kim Turner which appears to show the difference can be made through other funding, including Morrill foundation.

Kim Turner advised comfortable keeping request at same amount; with the flexibility to work with the engineering team on which option makes most sense. They are confident they can raise additional funding and tighten up some of the numbers. Clarified ok with \$216,000 backed out and awarded in current funds, however CPC feels appropriate.

Mike Dissette motioned recommend \$216,000 current funds for design & bid documents and to recommend a 15-year bond of \$2.574m for the Bartlet Mall?

Roll Call taken with all voting yes with exception of Don Walters.

e) **Open Space Reserve Fund: \$100,000**

Mike Dissette reviewed requested amount and called for motion.

Paul moved for full amount with Jane Healey as second.

Roll Call taken with all voting yes with exception of Mark Rosen. Motion passed.

f) **Heritage Tree Preservation: \$10,000**

Mike Dissette reviewed request and called for motion.

Mark Rosen moved to approve for full amount and Paul Healy second.
Roll Call was taken with all voting yes and motion passed.

g) Joppa Park Improvement Project: \$115,000 (reduced)

Mike Dissette reviewed request was reduced based on contingency amount over funding received elsewhere, then called for motion.

Mark Rosen moved to approve \$15,000 and Joe Morgan with second.

No discussion requested.

Roll call taken with all voting yes with exception of Jane Healey. Motion passed.

h) Lower Atkinson Common Improvement Project: \$1,157,803 (reduced)

Mike Dissette reviewed request of \$525,000; applicant amended request for playground only. Called for motion. Clarified funds would cover relocation and building of the playground only.

Mark Rosen moved to approve \$525,000 with Don Walters as second.

Mike Dissette called for discussion.

Jane Healey advised she supported the \$525,000 but there is still the safety issue with parking lot/sidewalks. She referred to the Mayor's letter stating intent to find funding to address that. She questioned what they thought about tying CPC support to the City doing the safety issues to address sooner than later

Don Walters advised he would like to keep them separate. He explained he appreciated that the playground approval brings in more children so if used more, that will call action from the City to get the funds secured; more motivation to get safety issues addressed.

Mike Dissette asked if Jane wanted to amend the motion.

Jane Healey moved to amend the motion to recommend the \$525,000 without condition to recommend added the condition where the City secures funding of the safety concerns. Paul Healy second.

Discussion opened-

Mark Rosen commented it may be self-defeating to put the amendment; if don't allow the \$525,000 they can't do anything. He didn't think it would be appropriate to put conditions on this request

Paul Healy reviewed the initial request was for the playground and everything else and now compromised with Parks and Mayor's Office that if we approved the playgrounds, they would find the money/resources to do the rest of the work. He added he understood they don't want to tie peoples' hands but it would be nice to get it done and not just playground.

Mark Rosen reiterated that if Mayor doesn't have funds, then they can't move forward with playground.

Jane Healey added amendment purpose to send message to City Council on importance of that funding.

Mark Rosen suggested to go to City Council meeting to speak in support instead of making condition where lack of funding would prevent moving the playground.

Mike Dissette called for motion to amend.

Roll call vote to amend \$525,000 with condition of City funding to address safety issues.

Results: Chuck Griffin, Paul Healy, & Jane Healey voting yes and Don Little, Joe Morgan, Mark Rosen, Don Walters, and Chair Mike Dissette voting no. Motion to amend failed.

Roll call taken on the original motion without conditions with all voting yes and motion passed.

i) **Market Landing Park Expansion (Central Waterfront): \$3,000,000**

Mike Dissette asked opened discussion on where members would like the project to end tonight. Mark Rosen questioned if they do \$3 million Bond what is ramification from the timing to project getting done and passing the way it is. He referred to Andy Port, Project Manager.

Jane Healey interjected that it may not be fair to ask Andy questions where all applicants don't have the same opportunity.

Mark Rosen contested where the context required passing everyone else's request, so not unfair to other applicants. Also, the \$3 million is there, so no impact on others. He also questioned the bathrooms and seasonal access.

Andy Port added he would be reiterating information already in the project so it wouldn't be unfair. Referred to slide of Phased Construction of project to break down areas of priority being the park space and deferring work to the parking lot and visitors center for later. Clarified the visitors center is part of the \$3 million; building is not part of this. Current bathroom facility is where new pedestrian way is going so will have port-a-potties until facilities are done. New facility design for year round bathrooms, as current are seasonal. Bathrooms will be seasonal and not part of the CPC funding and they will seek funds elsewhere. Visitor's center \$1.6m is also not included in this. He also added that the parking areas will include some landscaping to define and create the park space. Keep that in mind as it may impact the appearance of that open space.

Paul Healy confirmed that the paving and parking lots are the loss with the reduced request to \$3m versus the \$4m

Andy Port clarified

Mike Dissette agreed \$3m sounds like a reasonable way to proceed. Priority is expanding the park. Parking lot something that is beyond the park and could come from other sources or funds. Comfort level thinking \$3m is very significant to get park in place and keep up momentum. Existing parking areas will be used for construction vehicles while work being done and allow time for other funding for the lots. Any other questions?

Mike Dissette motioned to approve Bonding for \$3mil; put aside and move on.

Don Walters to recommend \$3m in form of long term 15-year debt service for Market Landing; with Mark Rosen with second.

Roll Call vote taken with all in agreement to approve, with the exception of Joe Morgan who voted against.

j) Newburyport Black History Initiative: \$53,000

Mike reviewed request and moved for motion.

Mark Rosen motioned with Paul Healy second

Roll call taken with all voting yes and motion passed.

Mike Dissette concluded this segment to advise approximately \$92,000 funds remaining.

He moved to recommend that payment of dead obligations and \$12,000 toward administrative expenses with Mark Rosen as second.

No discussion requested.

Roll Call taken with all voting yes.

5. Recommended Grant Agreement Project Completion Dates

Mike Dissette requested to build into the standard conditions an expected completion date of any project to be 24 months. The 24 months commences with the signing of the grant agreement with the mayor's office and the applicant. The condition to be uniform unless otherwise stated in recommendation.

Mike moved to change the policy to that effect with Paul as second.

No discussion requested.

Roll Call taken with all voting yes.

6. Requests for Grant Extensions and Process for Extensions

Mike Dissette reviewed there are 8 extension requests for outstanding projects, with some already extended prior. He suggested they consider taking this as a group and extend each one in the group for 12 months.

Mike Dissette with motion to extend group 12 month with second from Paul Healy.

?

Mike Dissette added as a footnote and procedure that Katelyn points out current grant agreements are with administration and the applicant so in order to adjust any of these under grant agreement it would be the mayor signing on to extend with our recommendation.

No discussion requested.

Roll call taken with all voting yes and motion passed.

Don Little asked about the 2 requests to extend- Joppa and Swan Fountain asking remaining funds carried forward to current application. Need to be separate vote?

Mike Dissette moved to approve those 2 requests with Don Walters as second.

No discussion requested.

Roll Call with all voting yest. Motion passed.

Andy Port suggested they also consider voting at this time on whether \$250,000 appropriated last year extended into current funds.

Mike Dissette called for motion to extend the \$250,000 to use with current funds, that was recommended last year. Jane Healey second.

No discussion requested.

Roll call taken with all voting yes & motion passed.

- a) **Old Hill Burying Ground Restoration (FY10)**
- b) **Highland Cemetery Gravestone Restoration (FY11)**
- c) **Historic Structure Survey Update Project (FY17)**
- d) **Joppa Park Renovation Project Phase II (FY17)**
- e) **Community Building Rehabilitation (FY18)**
- f) **Restoration of the Swan Fountain at Bartlet Mall (FY19)**
- g) **Kelleher Gardens Siding Project (FY20)**
- h) **Gateway Trees 2 (FY20)**

7. Other Updates from the Chair or Planning Director (if needed)

Mike Dissette advised no other updates.

Joe Morgan reviewed information found on Coalition website on historic properties - record show CPC remember CPA grant awards should clearly stipulate use of these standards for treatment of Historic properties for requirement of receiving grant. Everything sent out clearly in advance then less chance going wrong. Not sure if grant notification out to applicants.

Katelyn Sullivan confirmed that language is in the grant.

8. Approval of the 4/7/2022 Minutes

Mike Dissette made motion to approve 4/7/22 meeting minutes as corrected.

Second from Mark Rosen.

Roll Call taken with all in agreement.

9. Meeting Adjournment

Mike Dissette adjourned the meeting at 8:47p. Motion to adjourn All in agreement