

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
April 11, 2017

A meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, April 11, 2017 at 6:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Chair Kevin Cornacchio, Bart Hoskins, Carole Hamilton, Joanne McCrea, Mickey Northcutt and Tim Shea. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Entering later in the meeting was Ed Moriarty.

Public Comment

Annabelle Johnson, 13 River Street, read a letter into the record in support of the Saltonstall School playground on behalf of 5th and 6th grade students.

Susan Moulton, 98 Washington Square, stated that she was present with Jen Santo on behalf of the Salem Common Neighborhood Association in support of the Salem Common fence application.

Mr. Moriarty joined the meeting at this time.

Alyssa Conary, 5 Hodges Court, stated that she was present in support of the House of the Seven Gables application and to answer any questions.

Lise Hansen stated that she is the co-applicant for the Saltonstall School playground project to answer any questions. She stated that the reason Annabelle Johnson's letter was selected is because it was from the fifth and sixth grade class, who have never had a playground to play on during school.

Approval of Minutes

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to approve the minutes of January 10, 2017. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Vote to Recommend FY18 Budget

Ms. Guy stated that the State has not released the CPA match percentage for FY18; therefore, an actual draft budget is not available. She stated that the City Assessor has estimated Fy18 surcharge revenues at \$550,000. She suggested that the CPC vote to allow her to submit the draft budget to the City Council based on the \$550,000 estimate, plus the percentage of the State match when released, with 5% budgeted to Administrative Expenses, 10% to Housing Projects Reserve, 10% to the Historic Projects Reserve and 10% to the Open Space & Recreation Projects Reserve and the balance to the FY18 Budgeted Reserve, as has been done in the previous three years. This will eliminate the need to come back to the CPC for a formal vote when the State match is released so that Finance can quickly submit the budget to the City Council.

VOTE: Mr. Hoskins made a motion to submit the budget to the City Council as proposed and adjusted when the State match percentage is received. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Northcutt and Mr. Shea voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

Budget Update

Ms. Guy stated that there is currently \$116,907.97 in available funds and provided an updated spreadsheet of available fund. Once the State match is announced and the FY18 budget is submitted to Council, those funds will be also be available for award. Because that total number is not available this evening, she stated that the CPC will only be able to rank order the applications, but not make actual award recommendations. She recommended setting a special meeting during the week of April 24th which will be tentative pending announcement of the State match.

Review of FY18 Funding Applications Received

Ms. Guy stated the carried over Salem Athenaeum proposal is no longer for consideration as they have already begun the project with other funding.

- Saltonstall School Playground

Mr. Shea stated that the narrative states that PTO and playground committees are not currently fundraising.

Ms. Hanson stated that they have raised approximately \$7243. She stated that the playground was demolished in 2011 and there was an effort in 2013 to fundraise to build a new playground., but they realized last year would not be able to reach the goal with bake sales and movie nights. She noted that there was some fundraising burnout for a couple years, because they were not seeing enough progress. She stated that if CPA funds were awarded, there would be new energy to fundraise and seek other grant funds.

Mr. Shea asked the availability of playground to neighborhood.

Ms. Hanson stated that there are no locked gates and it would be accessible to the community after school hours. She stated that they will hit up local banks for additional funds and seek local grants.

Mr. Cornacchio asked from where the estimate came.

Ms. Hanson stated that the expense summary shows the largest expense to be for O'Brien and Sons. She stated that they will have volunteers for a community build and that her husband is a construction supervisor.

MOTION: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea agreed with the priority recommendation. He stated that he may not support full funding, but significant enough to give an incentive, as has been done with CPA in the past.

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

- Lafayette Park Renovation

Mr. Shea stated that he would rate the project medium, based on the impact in terms of the number of people it will serve due to the small size of the park. He agreed it was in a key location and is an entryway to the downtown. He stated that he was in favor at some point of funding it, but that he had other applications that he feels are higher priority in this round.

Mr. Moriarty was in agreement and noted that there was a concession by the applicant on application that there is no critical deadline.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a medium priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Moriarty, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Northcutt and Mr. Shea voted in favor. Ms. Hamilton voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she did not feel it was far enough along.

- Dickson Memorial Chapel Building Utilization & Preservation Plan

Mr. Moriarty stated that one measure of the use of limited funds is to get greatest good for the greatest number of citizens. Although the architectural is stellar and the historic value is substantial and significant, he finds this to be an outlier in terms of greatest good for the greatest number. He stated that it is a remote area of the city and not easily accessible except to certain groups such as dog walkers, joggers or persons interested in nature. He stated that substantial CPA funding has already been provided, and felt it was a mistake to give it a high or medium priority due to its remoteness and that there is no evidence suggesting that there is a multiple use function for this historic, architectural gem. He added that he hasn't seen an effort to make it more connected to the community in terms of having uses Monday through Friday or on weekends or on a repetitive basis in terms of using it for various interest groups, such as youth or seniors or for music or otherwise. He stated that he is reluctant to continue to provide substantial funds simply to preserve what is beyond dispute an historic gem. He felt there is an ability to provide accessibility and continuous use day after day for all citizens of the city.

Mr. Shea stated that there is no financial statement on what the balance is on what the Friends of Greenlawn have raised and that he would be interested to know.

Mr. Northcutt stated that the CPC should not dismiss the application because it was funded before. He stated if it was a high priority before, it is not a low priority now. He stated that he would like a little more clarity on what we get for a \$40,000 plan, which seems like a big number. Perhaps there is something in the scope that is more complex, but it is not really articulated.

Mr. Hoskins stated that his understanding is that the money spent to date was to stabilize the building and keep it from further damage to do water leakage. Now what is envisioned is to find a use for it, perhaps similar to the little building on Winter Island to produce a little income stream, such as small funeral services, to pay for upkeep. He stated that he is supportive of the concept of having someone evaluate and propose a business plan for how it can be sustained without waiting for it to fall apart again and putting more CPA funding into it later. He supported the concept, but agreed that in terms of city wide impact it is out there on the edge and proposed medium priority ranking. He agreed more clarity is needed.

Ms. McCrea stated that she was in agreement with Mr. Hoskins. She also asked if we know how much Friends of Greenlawn have raised.

Mr. Shea agreed that they should submit what was raised, what was spent and the balance remaining.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a medium priority and to request clarity on financing. Mr. Northcutt seconded the motion. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Northcutt and Mr. Shea voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. Ms. McCrea abstained. The motion so carried.

- Bicycle Rack Acquisition - Open Space & Recreation Locations

Mr. Shea stated that he was concerned about buying equipment to place throughout the city.

Mr. Moriarty stated that for recreational land, the purchase of equipment use is permitted. He stated that the Bicycle Advisory Committee felt short-changed by CPC in the past and that their mission is to make Salem a more bike friendly community was not supported by CPC. He noted that the BAC is married to the concept to make Salem bike friendly and that racks are needed to make that happen.

Mr. Shea stated that he feels bike racks and playground equipment are different.

Mr. Northcutt stated that he feels bike racks are like playground equipment because it is something a child or adult will use for fun at all public sites or facilities.

Ms. McCrea stated that it promotes the use of bikes rather than autos.

Ms. Hamilton stated that it is the real mode of transportation for kids.

Mr. Moriarty stated that bikes and bike racks connect people to open spaces.

Ms. Guy noted that bike racks funded with CPA should only be installed on recreation land, not cemeteries or school properties.

Mr. Hoskins stated that the application shows some are at schools, but the majority at parks. He stated that he felt it a high priority to have bike racks at parks. He noted that, otherwise, people will lock up bikes to fences and that we don't want people locking bikes to the Salem Common Fence. He suggested it be a high priority, but that maybe not providing full funding.

Ms. McCrea stated that the City took down perfectly good bike racks at the Library and now there is just one in front.

VOTE: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Northcutt, and Mr. Moriarty voted in favor. Mr. Shea voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

- Nathaniel Hawthorne Statue Restoration

MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project high priority. Mr. Northcutt seconded the motion.

Ms. McCrea suggested that the City hire the same people who did Choate statue because it came in under budget.

Mr. Hoskins stated that statues are tough, because if you wait till they deteriorate then you need to restore them. However, he noted that it has a small impact because not a lot of people actually noticed what has already been done. He stated that it is a lot of money, but agreed it was high priority.

Ms. McCrea noted that it is only \$45,000 as compared to the Choate statue.

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

- Salem Common Fence Restoration

MOTION: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion.

Mr. Northcutt noted that it has been funded with CPA funds for two years.

Mr. Shea stated that it was skipped last year.

Mr. Northcutt stated that it the is cornerstone park for the downtown. He asked where are we now percentage-wise in completion of the fencing.

Jen Santo, 25 Washington Square North, stated that she chairs the Common's Issues Committee for the neighborhood. She noted that the current work is on the end of Phase 3. Each section costs \$14,000 to replace and over 40 sections have been done. A few sections were lost this past winter again due to snow plows. Because, no one was there to witness with a camera, the plowing company could not be charged. It is the same company that damaged the fence at the Roger Conant statue. The Salem Common fence is a continual project and will continue many years because it is so fragile. She stated that we need to do a good job of taking care of what we have. She noted that the fence is protecting the busiest playground in the city.

Susan Moulton stated that they would like to meet with the City to find a better way to protect the fence in winter.

Mr. Cornacchio suggested that the suspected contractor not be assigned to plow that area.

Jenna Ide, Director of Capital Projects and Operations for City of Salem stated that the City is having discussions around insurance. She noted that it will take five to ten years to get all fence sections completed if continually funded and a larger discussion is needed on how to maintain it. This is definitely an important, historic component of the neighborhood.

Ms. Guy stated that about 20% of the sections have been completed (approximately 44 of 220).

Mr. Shea stated that the Committee has shown support in past but that the big question is how much can be given in order to spread the available funds around.

Ms. McCrea stated that maintenance is critical. Plowing issues need to be resolved before next winter, including deciding who should do it and what skills they should have and this should be part of our recommendation. It is a critical problem.

Mr. Shea asked if it is always the same spots that get damaged.

Ms. Moulton replied that in her experience it is focused in certain areas.

Mr. Hoskins stated that the CPC may be overstepping its bounds, but asked if the CPC can make funding conditional that the City include a plan for protecting the investment. He noted that it is a horrible use of taxpayer money to replace a section of fence and have a company blow it out and have to come back to fund it again at \$14,000 per section. He stated that even concrete filled bollards that are painted might help. He stated that it is really infuriating.

Ms. Hamilton disagreed with that the notion that you can't go after the plow company because there is no photograph. It is known where these plows are assigned.

Mr. Hoskins stated that a camera could be installed on a poll.

Mr. Northcutt thought they had them on the Common.

Mr. Moriarty stated that in his day job he has something to do with risk management and loss control and that it is an inaccurate statement that the plow company must be caught in act of destroying property. He stated that it is not the standard at all. It is not a difficult case to prove. You know what the condition of the fence was, you have routes that are designated and know not only who the plow company was, but also the plow operator. It is almost bad faith to suggest they are not liable unless somebody saw them do it. He suggested a more aggressive protection of the fence and to also hold the plow company liable.

Ms. McCrea stated that at the Preservation Partners meeting, she was delighted that several people supported funding the Salem Common fence.

Mr. Hoskins stated that one of the public comment period comments was that the CPC should finish what we started and see it through.

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

- Charter Street Cemetery Restoration

Mr. Shea stated that his business abuts Charter St. Burial Ground, abstained from the discussion and left the room.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that he felt the cemetery is a valuable city gem.

Mr. Northcutt stated that it is the oldest in the city and is one of number one tourist sites, felt it is a huge priority and noted that it is very unique, setting aside the amount of funds requested.

Mr. Moriarty agreed it is a very high priority and terms of the tourist perspective there is no distinction between the Witch Trials Memorial and the cemetery. He added that the CPC has already invested a substantial sum of money for the Proctor's Ledge project for which the three sites are interconnected. He felt it has to be rated high and agreed there is sticker shock but felt it is inexplicably married to the concept and is in a more centrally located area.

VOTE: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Ms. Hamilton asked how the matching grant funds work and if they must be in place to apply.

Erin Schaeffer from the Department of Planning and Community Development replied in the negative and stated that if the City is financially ready to go with the required one to one match for the Massachusetts Cultural Council Facility funds, it puts us in better ranking and position to get the project fully funded.

Mr. Hoskins asked if the City pursued grants for the Salem Common Fence.

Ms. Schaeffer replied that the City has pursued MPPF grants and have been successful in two rounds, which is unprecedented to get two rounds back to back from the State. We need to have 75% of the total project cost in cash in hand at the time of application. She stated that the fund is starting to dwindle and the funds are spread out all over the State. Last year, we got a MPPF grant for the Dickson Memorial Chapel for \$50,000 to leverage the CPA funds.

Mr. Shea rejoined the meeting.

- Conservation/Restoration of Historic Artwork (Council Chambers)

Mr. Northcutt stated that he felt it would be helpful to have some idea what is in the pipeline. He stated that he felt it was of importance, but relative importance is the question. He questioned how many portraits are in City Hall.

Ms. Guy believed the focus has been on Council Chambers and believed there was at least eight.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he has a philosophical issue to suggest. He stated that because paintings are old and were of value to the community at one time, does not mean they are of continuing value today. He stated that he had no objection to the Lafayette portrait restoration, but that he was not interested in funds going to restore the Lowe portrait restoration. Evidence shows that the Lowe family fortune in part was built on being a drug merchant; Salem families became rich due to opium and opium wars. There is indication that Mr. Lowe's father was a drug merchant and Mr. Moriarty stated he was vehemently opposed to any funds for any family that had anything to do with the opium trade. He noted maybe Mr. Lowe was guilty by association, but his wealth was tied to it, but he was not interested in restoring his painting or anyone in his family.

Mr. Northcutt stated that it would be restoring City resources and that he had no strong opinion if it was ranked high or medium, but did not feel it should be ranked low, because if it is owned by the city and needs to be invested in at some point.

Mr. Shea asked question the value of the paintings.

MOTION: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank the project a medium priority. Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea stated that he was leaning toward high, because it is a piece of artwork, which he felt was critical to continue to restore.

Mr. Cornacchio agreed and noted it is viewed by a lot of people.

Mr. Hoskins agreed that it should be medium given all the other things before the Committee for funding and not on the merits of the particular paints, but the all-around community impact.

VOTE: The motion was voted upon. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Northcutt and Mr. Shea voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

- St. Mary Italian Church Grotto

Mr. Shea stated that he felt the project is a low priority based on its impact and it not being city-owned. He stated that he thinks those from the parish that remain are very attached, but did know of anyone else besides those remaining parishioners.

Mr. Northcutt was in agreement.

Mr. Moriarty agreed it is a low priority. He stated that he did not understand how one can separate the structure from the church. He stated that it is inherently a religious symbol that does not merit CPA funds. He added that it would be a poor use of municipal funds and that he feels it crosses line of separation of church and state.

Mr. Northcutt was in agreement, adding that they are also trying to rebuild it in an entirely different place.

VOTE: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a low priority. Ms. Hamilton seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried. Ms. McCrea abstained from voting, stating that she sees it more as an ethnic symbol than a religious symbol and that the applicant received approval for the site to rebuild it.

- Turner-Ingersoll Mansion Roof Replacement

Mr. Shea stated that he has been opposed to awarding to private non-profits, but stated that he would make exception for this building, because it is actually the House of the Seven Gables and is entwined in the fabric of our community.

Ms. McCrea was in agreement.

Mr. Northcutt was in agreement, and added that if the Gables were to cease to exist, the City would not make it condos. He stated that Salem is lucky they are investing money.

Ms. Canary noted that they have applied for a match through Massachusetts Preservation Projects Funds, but if it is not received they will use Gables funds.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he did not disagree that it is unique to the intrinsic value of the city. He stated that thing that bothers him is that the roof was constructed in 2005 and that he is uncomfortable to use CPA funds for maintenance so soon, rather than for the preservation of a historic resource. He stated that it is an awful quick time for a new roof.

Ms. Canary stated that the roof that was installed in 2005 was done with defective nails. She stated that sixty buildings in Essex County have the same problem. Shingles are falling off and it is an unforeseen problem, requiring roof replacement.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he did not understand why lawsuits were not undertaken and he is not persuaded that the 501c3 has pursued all avenues.

Ms. Canary stated that they did explore legal options and noted that the consultant did not have the correct insurance.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Mr. Northcutt seconded the motion; Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Northcutt and Mr. Shea voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

- Winter Island Function Hall Deck

Mr. Shea stated that Patricia O'Brien, the Director of Parks and Recreation, told him that this is the top priority project, noting that a lot of it has to do with ADA issues. He stated that he went by and saw that the foundation is pretty much rotted out and that the concrete is chipped off where it meets the ground.

Ms. Ide stated that while it is a deck, there is a need to take care of the slider, because the floor inside the function hall is lower. There may also be some upgrades internally to the bathrooms. A ramp up to deck would need to be done with deck.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a priority. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

- Ryan Brennan Memorial Skate Park Renovation

Mr. Shea stated that he liked that they are only asking for one third of the funds needed.

Ms. McCrea stated that she understands that it addresses a need for that age group of teenagers in city. She stated that she believes the Chief of Police supports the project.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that he would like to continue with funding the skate park.

Ms. Ide stated that the Brennan family are committed to donate in kind services. She noted that older parks were designed for certain users and that nowadays parks serve all types of users, including wheelchairs.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

- Palmer Cove Assessment & Concept Plan

Mr. Northcutt stated that he felt good about this project because there is a lot of dead space and walkways and that the parking area in bad shape.

Mr. Shea stated that, whatever the plan, he hopes the consultant is aware that baseball teams are now using Bertram field and can also use Salem State University baseball field for free.

Ms. Ide stated that the idea is to determine what is the best location for a regulation size baseball field. If that moves, it fundamentally changes the park.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the most intense use is basketball. He stated that there is a large amount of land under or never utilized but the basketball court is over utilized and there may be a need for twice the number of basketball courts. He added that it is the most densely populated ward in the city and felt the study was appropriate to find out the best recreational uses.

VOTE: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a high priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

- Hamilton Hall Storm windows

Mr. Cornacchio stated that this is a 501c3.

Mr. Shea stated that for that reason he would consider it low priority.

Mr. Moriarty agreed it was eligible but noted it is not open to the entire community.

Mr. Northcutt stated that, whether we want to fund it or not, they have articulated that they are open a fair amount. He noted that it is one of only other privately owned historic buildings that is so important to Salem that the City would not let it fall into disrepair. Speaking of the building only, he stated that it is so unique and is an important resource to city. He stated that funding should be based on the project not the organization.

Mr. Moriarty stated that being open only 9am to noon on weekdays is minimum and that they offer only one free event per year. He stated that it is not the type of commitment to community worth investing CPA funds.

Mr. Shea was in agreement. He added that the tours are self-guided. He agreed it was also low because there are plenty of other public projects. The project is for storm windows to protect historical windows that CPA funded, but what they are asking for is not in itself historical.

Ms. McCrea stated that it is a major historic attraction because it was built by Samuel McIntire. She noted that she is often stopped by visitors about it. She agreed it was not in same realm of the House of the Seven Gables but that it is a major large building built by McIntire.

Mr. Shea noted that Ms. McCrea is being stopped by visitors, because it is not open and not public.

Mr. Hoskins stated that there are two applications for the site. He stated that he felt the same about both. He supported medium priority due to the importance of building and having stabilized the building. He stated that we are lucky there is a non-profit looking after it. He stated that it could be phased as was done with Old Town Hall and that the same approach might make sense here.

Mr. Cornacchio agreed that we want to keep historic places going.

Ms. Hamilton stated that she felt the same, and that this request is to protect an asset that we funded. She noted that if we don't put up storms, they will be back for new windows.

Mr. Moriarty stated that there is no requirement that historic windows need to be encased by storm windows; if properly maintained, they can have long life.

Ms. McCrea stated that it almost seems like a discussion on need for maintenance versus restoration. She wondered what guarantee they have for the windows.

Mr. Shea stated that one could argue that one does not want storms to cover up historic windows.

VOTE: Mr. Shea made a motion to rank this project low priority. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion. Mr. Moriarty, Mr. Shea, Mr. Cornacchio and Ms. McCrea voted in favor. Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Northcutt voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

- Hamilton Hall Fence Restoration

Mr. Shea noted that the Committee turned down the stucco wall at North Shore ARC.

Mr. Northcutt stated that it was not turned down because it was privately owner.

Ms. Guy stated that it was due to the finding that it lacked public benefit.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that he felt the fence was medium priority, noting it is in a high traffic area.

MOTION: Mr. Northcutt made a motion to rank this project a medium priority. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion.

Mr. Shea and Mr. Moriarty stated that they had the same objections for this project as for the windows.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he was in support as medium, and noted that one can see the visible deterioration when walking by.

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

- Salem Public Library investigation into cracking around 3rd floor

Mr. Shea stated that he felt the project is critical.

MOTION: Mr. Shea made a motion to rant this project a high priority. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt it certainly is something that could be considered high priority, but that because there are so many needs, he felt it a medium priority. He stated that the Library has done great things being proactive, but the indication is that, although important, it is not suggested to be an irreparable loss. He stated that it is a beautiful but expensive white elephant. He stated that he felt medium is more consistent with this particular defect in the property. He stated that otherwise it is a beautiful structure that performs a critical service.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the project is the opportunity to investigate whether it is a critical issue or not.

Mr. Cornacchio was in agreement.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he was simply quoting the application that it is not at risk for irreparable loss.

Ms. Hamilton stated that the applicant is asking for a structural engineer to make the determination of how bad it is.

Mr. Hoskins stated that the answer the Library gave previously was that it was single biggest unanswered question. He stated that he is looking forward to the answer to that question.

Mr. Northcutt stated that the Library is heavily used.

Mr. Hoskins stated that Salem is probably approaching a point in time for there being a move afoot to rescind CPA in Salem. If that happens, no one will say we shouldn't have saved the Library.

VOTE: The motion was voted upon. Mr. Cornacchio, Mr. Hoskins, Ms. Hamilton, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Northcutt and Mr. Shea voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. The motion so carried.

- Fort Lee Restoration

Mr. Shea stated that given what have in front of us with other projects and the scope of work, he felt it was not a high priority.

Mr. Cornacchio agreed it was a low priority.

VOTE: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to rank this project a low priority. Mr. Shea seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

- Broad Street Cemetery

Mr. Shea stated that he feels the cemetery is primarily used for dog walking and is in a low impact area. He noted that some of stones need attention, but felt it was not a high priority. He suggested medium priority

Mr. Moriarty suggested it be low priority, noting that there are so many other priorities. He noted that a low ranking will make it easier to make a funding determination.

Ms. McCrea was in agreement.

VOTE: Mr. Moriarty made a motion to rank this project a low priority. Mr. Shea seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Development of Funding Recommendations

The CPC determined that the funding recommendations will be continued to a special meeting to be scheduled on April 24, 2017 at 6:00pm.

Other Business

Letter from the Town of Scituate Community Preservation Committee

Ms. Guy read a letter dated 2/10/17 into the record regarding Scituate CPC's desire to pursue an amendment to the CPA which would allow the purchase of non-motorized water vehicles to be used exclusively for town-sponsored recreation programs and activities. Ms. Guy stated that she

informed the Scituate CPC Chair that she would bring this to the Salem CPC attention at this meeting, and that Mayor Driscoll supported the proposed amendment.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that he supported it because it would be considered part of playground equipment to coastal city.

Mr. Hoskins stated that it is similar to a bike rack and that he could envision it for 289 Derby Street as an amenity for a park. He stated that it should not be a distinction because it is not nailed to ground.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he sees a distinctive difference because a vessel has no connection to the land and he did not see the benefit to an amendment. He stated that with fewer and fewer dollars from the State, it does not make sense to increase to an area of funding vessels. He stated that he was not in favor of an amendment.

Mr. Shea stated that he did not feel the City could purchase golf clubs CPA. He questioned how far this would go and stated that he has a hard time understanding and grasping the idea.

Mr. Northcutt stated that he had no problem with docks or bike racks, but did not feel CPA should buy boats and bikes. He stated that CPA should be for fixtures.

Mr. Shea noted that we have a hard time funding what is in front of us and questioned if we really want to expand.

Mr. Moriarty stated that it is possible to fund golf clubs, but it depends where you want to draw the line.

Mr. Cornacchio suggested that Ms. Guy reply indicating that there are reservations and concerns.

Review of Determination of Eligibility Applications Received

No applications were received.

Project Updates

Ms. Guy distributed the list of CPA funded projects and their status.

Next Meeting Date

Ms. Guy stated that the next meetings are:

- Monday, April 24, 2017
- Tuesday, May 9, 2017 (regular meeting date).

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

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy
Administrator