

Community Preservation Committee

April 28, 2021

Via Zoom Webinar

Minutes

Call to Order

Chair Mike Dissette called a meeting of the Community Preservation Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.

Chair Mike Dissette began with a reminder to the applicants attending and presenting to know applications have been reviewed so there is no need to go over applications in entirety, just provide new information or highlighted information they would like to present. After each presentation the call will be opened for questions from the Committee and then opened to the Public. Also, added a reminder that 10 minutes per application will be allowed, with some flexibility due to the agenda being lower than usual.

Roll Call

Committee members in attendance were Chair Mike Dissette, Vice Chair Jane Healey, Paul Healy, Don Little, Chuck Griffin, Mark Rosen, and Tom O'Brien.

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

Glenn Richards arrived 8p.m.

Don Walters was not present

1. FY 2022 Application Presentations for Community Preservation Funds

a) Market Landing Park Expansion- Construction Funding Newburyport Office of Planning & Department \$250,000

Presented by Director of Planning & Development Office Andrew Port. He reviewed the park and waterfront area at Market Landing Park. He is looking for funding for the construction of that site which includes arching out the park, adequate parking spaces, and Public access to the water front. There were 14 proposals from developers with the final selection being Sasaki Associates. This developer has been used before and has excellent experience with waterfront and downtown projects. They are currently under contract and meeting with them to look at the base survey plan as well as to provide an understanding of design constraints. Constraints include the wings and parking spaces, along with remaining parking area, and how to complete the project without impacting businesses. They are currently on track to complete schematic design; details should be worked out within the next 5-6 months. Plan is to keep the budget below \$5 million and should have a better idea in the fall of that figure. The construction costs will also need to cover additional costs such as

drainage. He believes they have sufficient funds to complete the design but not enough for the construction. They want to have funding available and ready when the construction phase begins. The cost will be more than what they are requesting and they are seeking other resources to support the project as well. It was originally with NRA group which was dissolved and there is money left from that group they will use. It has been decades since planning originally started with NRA and would like to get the project moving.

Comments/Questions from Committee:

- Paul Healy asked if they had an estimated time or date when they'll be ready to start the construction and how much money is needed for funding before they can begin?
 - Andy advised realistically will begin Spring of 2023. Expect to have the schematic design plan in the fall, then can have the consultants working to get ready to put the bid out and then construction can begin.
 - Andy explained the project may need to be phased out to prevent impacting both sides of the waterfront at the same time, and that could impact length of construction. Usually, will have all funding lined up in advance with exception of State funding for reimbursement.
- Tom O'Brien asked how much was available from NRA? Also, how much do you estimate you will get from the downtown parking revenues?
 - Andy advised he believes it was approximately \$600,000. Of that amount he knows \$134,000 has been committed to the schematic design phase right now. There were enough funds for design, but not the construction.
 - Andy advised can't say how much money from downtown parking right now, that is up to the City Council. Confirmed there is already statutory requirement to allocate funds towards this project. He has initiated a request from the Trust Fund Commission for an old fund set aside some time ago that could provide \$750,000 to \$1 million towards the project for Public or park improvements along Merrimack River and waterfront. He can't say how much the City will allow but he will pursue State and Park Grant programs for funds as well as from the CPC.
- Jane Healey referred to past difficulty with planning and developing of this area and questioned what makes this attempt or effort different, along with any assurance the project will actually happen? Also, requested to clarify the existing funding is \$600,000 from NRA with schematic design cost of \$134,000; do you confident this amount will get you to the end of the final design phase? She requested confirmation that the RFP addresses sea level rise, storm surge, and adaptive landscape to make sure the finished product will be there long term?
 - Andy referred to the slide showing "An Act to Dissolve the Newburyport Redevelopment Authority and Transfer its Lands to the City of Newburyport"; Section 7. Mayor and City Council finally coming to resolution for the City to reconstruct and design this area gives the confidence this project will be worth the efforts. Also, consider this is the Flagship Park of the City with broad consensus over having this completed so feel confident it will happen. As far as funding, he is confident, framework plan is sufficient for the completion of design with the remainder to put towards construction.
 - Andy confirmed design phase approved for \$134,000.

- Andy confirmed that has been a consideration and advised sea level, storm surge, and adaptive landscape were included in Scope of Services for RFB which became a base for Scope of Work for the contractor.
- Mike Dissette questioned the \$5 million budget cap and if it's in order of magnitude that people are thinking about for total cost? Also, questioned when the hard numbers for construction will be in from the bidders? Advised will help to add any committed construction funding to those State or Federal applications.
 - Andy confirmed that's the number they believe is reasonable for this project. They have discussed it with City Council and the agreement at that time was to cap it and hold Sasaki Associates to that amount. Also, will need to keep in mind may have to stretch the dollars and don't want the project too expensive. They can't ignore parking areas which need to be landscaped and blended in to make aesthetic.
 - Andy explained they won't be ready for construction bids until summer to fall of next year, based on his experience. It's all dependent on Funding. He plans to request multi-year funding from CPC, in place of one large sum request, to prevent taking funding away from other worthy projects. He will pursue outside City/State funds.
- Chuck Griffin commented in regards to overall cost of the project and may be looking at well over \$5 million. Also, added he believes it would be worth it. He mentioned prices are rapidly increasing with construction and it may take 2 years to design before talking about putting out to bidders.
 - Andy commented they will do their best to keep costs down. Quality and keeping to budget is the goal.
- Mike Dissette opened to Public for questions. No questions.

b) YWCA at Hillside
YWCA Greater Newburyport
\$50,000

Presented by John Feehan. He explained this request is in addition to \$150,000 that was already awarded in the past to this project.

The Project meets Newburyport Master Plan requirements and is designed to be net positive, produce more energy than it uses. Project also addresses transportation issues with location next to rail station, easy ability to walk to downtown, and promote bicycle use with a bike storage shed. The Project includes:

- 10 Unit lodging/ accommodates 1 person
- 6 Units for those with income below \$28,200 with subsidies to help pay the rent
- 4 Units for those with income below \$47,000
- 1 Unit Wheelchair Accessible
- 1 Unit Sensory Accessible
- 2 Units Homeless

Turnkey project where the YWCA is purchasing a completed building from Hillside Center for Sustainable Living (HCFS). Some of the delays with the project have been beyond control of the YWCA. Passive houses are set up to be an open door design which causes some

technical issues related to having very small rooms with doors closed (related to lodging house), also delays with construction, reorganizing pushed them out on the list, and the pandemic. Costs have also increased up to \$330,000 due to technical nature of the project and inflation. They currently have \$1.5 million of confirmed funding from private donations/Foundations/CPA/DHCD/Bank loans and still need about \$330,000. Reaching out for additional funding: Franklin Square House is very interested, submitted an application to People's United Bank, Federal Home Loan Bank, and Federal Earmark. Progress is being made with LD Russo hired as General Contractor by HCSL. Contractor has past experience with affordable housing and passive house design. Construction has started with documents submitted to DHCD and working with them to get a closing date assigned.

Comments/Questions from Committee:

- Chuck Griffin asked what happens if unable to raise the money where construction has already started?
 - John Feehan explained they have an agreement with HCFS to give a 0% interest loan for up to 2 years to cover the amount. Would still have to raise the money at some point, but will allow more time to accomplish that.
- Mike Dissette questioned the gap they have now and if it's related to changes encountered in this project with this building and not from increases in the other parts of this build out?
 - John Feehan confirmed the cost increase is just for this project. Biggest reason for the increase is having LD Russo to serve as General Contractor in place of Hillside building at their own pace. This will help to speed the project along.
- Mike Dissette opened to Public for questions.

Comments/Questions from the Public:

- Karen Wiener, resident and member of Affordable Housing Trust. Support the project and application. Tremendous need for Affordable Housing in Newburyport.
- Christin Walth, resident. Supports project and commented project necessary for the City in adapting to climate change and issues, social justice and equality issues, and important Y gets the funding.
- Meo Young, resident. Supports the project and is excited about the building of this affordable housing; feels it is much needed in times where things have gotten so expensive.
- Cintra Warden, resident. Supports the funding; feels very important what YWCA is doing.
- Madeline Nash, resident and member of Newburyport Affordable Housing Trust. Very supportive of the Y's application. The Y has done a great job assembling a variety of funding sources. This is a great opportunity for the City to address housing needs.
- Jeanette Isabella, resident. Supports the funding and agrees with other comments about the need for affordable housing in Newburyport.
- Michael Laine, resident. Supports application. Y has done amazing work in Salisbury and this a continuation of effort, design and execution.

**c) Emergency Rental Assistance Program/ General Rental Assistance Program
Newburyport Affordable Housing Trust
\$200,000**

Presented by Madeline Nash, Karen Wiener, Sierra Partlan

Karen Wiener started presentation, Newburyport Affordable Housing Trust. Requesting \$200,000 with approximately \$110,000 for reimbursement for an Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP). Since June 2020, the Pettengill House has been running this program for them. The other \$90,000 would be used towards starting another program related to ERAP. The program came about when COVID hit and they were given guidance from the State on how local communities could start own funds to help those impacted to keep their homes. They used their funds to provide to mainly lower income residents to help pay rent, mortgages, and to support landlords. Looking for funds from CPC to replace about \$100,000 used for residents in need and \$10,000 for the Pettengill House for administering the program.

Sierra Partlan, Pettengill House Director of Development and Programs. Reviewed program was able to assist 27 Newburyport households in need during COVID using \$78,811 in Rental Assistance funds (included 30 adults, 20 children, 8 seniors). There are 7 applications pending which is expected to use remainder of funds. Program takes applications, screens them and administers the funds. Even with a moratorium on evictions, rent is still accruing, people losing their jobs, and parents staying home due to child care & remote learning, so it's essential to make it more manageable to keep people in their homes and help with hardships during this time.

Madeline Nash reiterated requesting funds for reimbursement due to this exceptional situation. They have been looking at other needs in serving Newburyport households for current residents and those looking to become residents. They are looking at Newburyport Crossing, which has 19 units with rent at 80% of area median, which is costly. The idea is to design a program to help lower income tenants move into these apartments. They are working on the parameters and hoping Pettengill House will help. This program may include limiting upfront costs to last month rent and security and for deed restricted affordable units.

Comments/Questions from Committee

- Jane Healey posed 2 questions related to each program. With the Emergency Rental Assistance Program, it appears it covers 3 months' worth of rent, will that be enough/helpful after a year of rent accruing? Are there any other programs in the State that will address these issues? Also, with the general Rental Assistance Program, once someone moves out, would the program get the security deposit back?
 - Madeline Nash advised there is a State program for rental assistance but it takes time to access it and not everyone is eligible, even those eligible for the Newburyport assistance. There is some overlap, so for those that the 3 months is not enough, they can look there.
 - Sierra Partlan added as they took applications and screening, they did provide other funding sources to assist them. Ongoing assistance is available as well.

These funds were available on emergency basis and could be accessed more quickly.

- Madeline Nash explained envision the funds as recirculating to assist others, in that hoping to reclaim the security deposit, but never really know.
- Paul Healy questioned if the funds were awarded would they go directly to the programs mentioned or would they go to Affordable Housing Trust and they then allocate the funds?
 - Karen Wiener confirmed funds requested for specific programs mentioned with reimbursement for the ERAP and to start another program to assist those in need.
- Mike added it's a wonderful partnership with Trust and Pettengill House to have this need met as one side is experience with the funding and the other side experienced in administering the funds.

- Mike Dissette opened the meeting to the Public for questions. No questions.

d) Custom House Maritime Museum Door Restoration Project
Newburyport Maritime Society
\$43,831.87

Presented by Greg Colling, Doug Muir, and Joan Whitlow

Doug Muir advised funding requested includes 2 components to restore the doors on the front and rear of the building. First to restore the red front door on building which hasn't happened due to lack of funds and second is for installation of a new rear (North) door. The rear existing doors are in terrible shape and not historically accurate.

He introduced Greg Colling who developed the plans and is Chair of the Building Committee and a preservation architect. His work includes Amesbury Carriage Museum.

Greg Colling provided a brief introduction and update on current funding. In 2018 given \$100,000 for the slate roof replacement project which completed in 2020. Reimbursed by the CPC in February of this year. In 2019 received \$75,000 CPC funding for a Feasibility study of Climate Control System work. Recently, received Thermal Envelope Analysis report from the engineers working with them. His company is updating a report of the baseline conditions of the building with a draft under review and should be completed this week. Also, had an Amended & Restated Preservation Restriction recorded Jan 2021 that allowed them to receive matching funds for the slate roof project. Currently received approval Newburyport Historic Commission for the South door restoration and North door of the building. Estimates prepared by C2MG Builders and KSD out of NH.

South door estimate of \$23,000 with scope of work including removing the doors, temporary doors in place, and shipment of the doors to NH to be restored. Last restored in 2003 with abuse over the years as well as parameter is unsealed, and hardware not functioning properly. Propose to replace hardware with new period hardware appropriate to history of building and allow safe exit from the building, also prevent heat loss with new parameter seals. They are doing work to preserve the portico as roof is leaking and the wood ceiling is damaged. Also, replace the light fixture and interior fixtures such as deadlock and hinge pins.

North side doors are aluminum due to budget cuts from 1973 redo. The side lights have been covered with plywood and painted and the size of the doors do not meet requirements for safety/fire guidelines. Propose to replace with a door more appropriate with tongue and groove, to replace the hardware to prevent heat loss, add weather resistant seals, and paint. Project will also include removal of the bulkhead to protect the basement from storm surge and flooding. Estimated cost for North side work is \$33,000. To Summarize the project: Exterior door project for South and North sides of the building to increase safety for visitors, more secure openings for security, to minimize heat loss, and reduce carbon footprint. Also to provide resiliency to climate changes, prevent flooding into the building, and improve overall look.

Comments/Questions from Committee:

- Tom O'Brien questioned if there is not enough funding which door would be replaced?
 - Greg Colling advised the North door due to the flooding as the door threshold is 2 feet below flood elevation level. This will help to reduce the hazard and preserve the building.
- Jane Healey asked to confirm if roof is still leaking? Also North door, is that incorporated in the Preservation Restrictions or any requirements needed before replacing it? Confident the new door will meet requirements of the Preservation Restriction?
 - Greg Colling confirmed the roof is no longer leaking due to the slate roof project. Roof was replaced along with flashings. He confirmed the North door was approved by Historic District Commission. The doors installed in 1973 as a way to complete the project as the original contractor defaulted and brought in another so there were not enough funds to go with original design. Yes, confident will meet requirements.
- Glenn Richards also confirmed Historical Committee did review and give approval due to improvements needed ascetically and to preserve the building.
- Mike Dissette questioned if the water tightness of roof included the portico in the front? Should it be addressed prior to installation of new/restored door?
 - Greg Colling advised that the roof is not part of the project and he will be addressing with current assessment. Roof was installed in 1973 and is leaking and damaging the interior wood finish. Not sure of full condition, going to open the ceiling soon. Think doors can be restored prior and still protected when opening the ceiling. Also looking to do more work on the windows on Water St. side as some are leaking, have solar film removed which has lost adhesion, and have them weather sealed. There is a list of projects that have been broken into smaller phases.

- Mike Dissette opened the meeting to the Public for questions.

Comments/Questions from the Public

- Tom Kolterjahn resident and Co-President of the Newburyport Preservation Trust. Added he is in favor of this project and there has been significant progress made to improve this historic building. Any support would be appreciated.

- Joanne Whitlow of the Custom House. On record to put in a plug to support the Custom House doors. Advocate for the replacement of door for both openings of the building. Confirmed current condition of the doors inability to seal off elements/weather. She agrees back doors are critical if funds prevented both doors from being replaced.

e) Cushing House Landscape Restoration Phase III
Historical Society of Old Newbury
\$45,717

Presented by Susan Edwards. Started by thanking CPC for their past support. This is the third and final landscape and restoration rehabilitation phase.

Carriage Drive part of the plan includes providing drainage, relaying all of the granite, and salvaging the current cobblestone to be re-laid once a new base is in. This will allow for less fluctuation over the years.

Plan for Fruit St. to the Carriage Barn path includes removing the granite, the grading and drainage, and resetting the granite apron. Also, will restore existing pattern of the cobblestone at the barn entrance. To allow for more drainage and cobblestone to the barn, the bulk head which is no longer functional and the rotted ramp will be removed. Donor and Museum funds were used this winter to replace the fence and granite wall that were damaged from drainage issues.

Plans for the Orchard and Nursery Treatment includes cobblestone and granite wall, some reconditioning of lawn areas, perimeter fencing restoration/replacement, and adding lattice work enclosure to hide the new Split system for HVAC. Primary focus on path as it is the only access way and make it ADA compliant.

Comments/Questions from Committee:

- Don Little complemented them on wording used in the application on page 4, related to “Matching Funds”.
- Glenn Richards commented this project is under preservation restrictions, and has been reviewed and approved by the Historical Commission.
 - Susan Edwards added the work done on Carriage drive with granite wall and new fence. Submitted request to Fruit St historic commission and that was approved by them.

Questions/Comments from the Public:

- Tom Kolterjahn resident and Co-President of the Newburyport Preservation Trust. Commented that this is a delightful project and the Trust fully supports it.

f) Garrison Birthplace Signage in Garrison Gardens
Newburyport Preservation Trust
~~\$3,694~~ \$1,800.00

Presented by Tom Kolterjahn, Andrea Eigerman, and Stephanie Niketic

Tom Kolterjahn Co-President of the Newburyport Preservation Trust started with correction/change to the application to reduce the requested CPC funding to \$1,800. Newburyport Bank has awarded the Trust with a matching grant of \$1,872.50. Proposed amount for project to research, create, and install 2 interpretive signs in the Garrison Gardens section at the Atwood Park. This is directly across the street from 18 Century House. Signs will be common to what is on the Rail Trail. They would like to put in 2 smaller signs, 18x24 inches, which would allow for a good amount of information on them. He provided information on updates/restorations made to the Garrison house and identified the importance of Garrison to the City. With an increase in interest of Garrison, these signs will help in educating visitors and residents about his accomplishments and identify the importance of his birth place. The signs would be placed in the corner of Garrison Gardens, within the park, facing the Garrison House. Dr Larsen has agreed to write the text for a sign. Research is needed to get more information for the second sign.

Comments/Questions from Committee:

- Don Little questioned if a new manufacturer is being used to avoid peeling like the panels installed at Brown Square?
 - Tom Kolterjahn confirmed they are aware of that issue and want to avoid that.
- Tom O'Brien commented he grew up across the street from the Garrison House and been in the house many times from 1946-1964. When he returned to the City and saw the sign gone, he thought the City should do something. Fully supports this project.
- Mike Dissette opened the meeting to the Public for questions. No questions.

**g) Shipbuilding Memorial, Phase 1- WITHDRAWN
Lighthouse Preservation Society
\$300,000**

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

Chair Mike Dissette reviewed there was a package circulated to the Committee which included some quarterly reports and updated budgets. Also, will get further details for May meeting for available funds.

Andy Port added to submit any questions on applications prior to the meeting to Katelyn Sullivan and she will get back to applicants.

Mike Dissette added that Katelyn will circulate a worksheet prior to the May meeting for personal rankings of each project and amounts would like to recommend or not.

3. Approval of the minutes 3/24/21

Chair Mike Dissette motioned to approve meeting minutes.

Chuck Griffin moved to approve and Tom O'Brien second.

Mike Dissette opened to comments or corrections? None voiced.

Roll call vote on minutes and to adjourn.

All in agreement except Mark Rosen (left meeting prior to roll call).

4. Next meeting date: 5/26/21, 7p.m. online

Chair Mike Dissette to review all applications and make recommendations

5. Meeting adjournment

Chair Mike Dissette called to adjourn the meeting.

All in agreement except Mark Rosen (left meeting prior to roll call)

Adjourned 8:58pm