

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

A regular meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, September 8, 2015 at 6:00 pm at 120 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Vice Chair Kevin Cornacchio, Leslie Tuttle, Tim Shea, Joanne McCrea, Bart Hoskins, John Boris and Ed Moriarty. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Arriving later in the meeting was Helen Sides.

Public Comment

Sarah Murphy of Japonica Street stated that she was present to observe and was representing the Bates playground project.

Timeline for FY16 Process

Ms. Guy reviewed the FY16 timeline and noted that requests for comment were emailed to the various boards on August 24th. She will provide project updates to members to take to the board meetings.

The next meeting is the public hearing. Ms. Guy asked if the CPC wanted to have it on the regular date of October 13th or wanted it one week earlier on October 6th. The consensus was to keep it at October 13th.

Review and vote on Determination of Eligibility Applications Received

Salem Public Library Brownstone and Brickwork

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

Ms. McCrea was in agreement.

Mr. Shea made a motion to find the proposed project eligible, to be submitted through a CPA funding application under Historic Resources: Preservation. Mr. Moriarty seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Review and vote on Determination of Eligibility Applications Received

Salem Public Library Brownstone and Brickwork

Nancy Tracy was present and John Goff were present.

Ms. Tracy thanked the CPC for recommended the previous CPA grant. She noted that the Library applied for an MPPF grant for windows, which they did not receive. Last year, they worked on roof and planned to reapply for windows. They had Mr. Goff come in to do a survey of building and issues were found that needed to be addressed immediately. She stated that they

applied to MHC for MPPF funds for brownstone and brickwork. The brownstone belt over the children's court resulted in safety issues, requiring that they close off the courtyard for the summer. They requested \$100,000 in MPPF, which required a \$100,000 match. MHC only awarded \$60,000. They need \$140,000 to complete the project, but at a minimum need \$60,000 for the MPPF match. She stated that the project must be completed during this fiscal year to receive the \$60,000 grant.

John Goff, 194 Lafayette Street, stated that he used a telephoto lens to take close pictures of the details. He stated that the belt courses have probably been there 150 years and were laid incorrectly with the grain vertical, resulting in massive spalling with pieces ready to fall. There are also a lot of cracks in the quoins. There are other weather envelope problems, such as copper flashings, windows and steel window frames. He noted that Architect Bob Farley also found sealant and brick repointing problems. Another red flag is evidence of portions of the north side back wall dropping, which needs to be looked at structurally.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he was concerned, if the cause of the problem on the north side back wall is not yet known, that it will potentially undo some of the work proposed under this \$200,000 project.

Mr. Shea had concerns over the cost estimates, noting that miscellaneous crack repair is at \$300/lf on one page and then \$400/lf on another page.

Mr. Goff noted that prevailing wages are required.

Mr. Moriarty stated that the CPC does not have the type of funding to provide all the funds requested.

Ms. McCrea stated that she was not clear what needs to be done.

Ms. Tuttle stated that these are soft numbers and that it hasn't gone out to bid. She stated that she did not feel the library should lose the \$60,000 grant. She suggested that it be put out to bid to see the hard numbers.

Ms. Guy stated that they could bid the entire project with alternates and then accept those alternates for which they have enough money.

Helen Sides joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Tuttle stated that \$60,000 is a drop in the bucket, and that she did not want to lose the \$60,000 grant.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he did not like being held hostage to another commission. He stated that he felt the CPA cannot fund deferred maintenance. He noted that the threat of severe weather does not make a project worthy or unworthy.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he disagreed that the project could not be funded. He stated that what is described in the proposal is the cause for damage which has created an emergency problem that requires restoration. Deferred maintenance is the reason for the damage and the damage is the

reason for the eligibility. He stated that the word maintenance in the proposal does not mean that CPA would be funding maintenance.

Mr. Moriarty stated that CPA prohibits funding deferred maintenance.

Mr. Hoskins stated that CPA prohibits funding maintenance. He stated that he would question any project that we have funded for historic preservation that was not the result of deferred maintenance.

Mr. Goff noted that MHC has same requisite and that the library cannot apply for work that is covered under normal maintenance. He stated that the fact that the library was awarded funds shows that they do not feel it is maintenance. He stated that he felt the brownstone is the most important need, because it is about to fall. The bricks and brownstone are the most acute safety need.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he would support funding on the condition that it is only for emergency structural concerns and repair and safety issues to prevent further damage, but nothing that is considered normal maintenance.

Ms. Tuttle agreed that CPA funding should not be used to repaint steel window frames.

Mr. Hoskins stated that funds should be utilized for the best use to possible, so things don't get worse. He encourage a second application for a structural assessment of the entire building. He stated that he wants to make sure the library doesn't lose the \$60,000.

Mr. Shea made a motion to recommend funding of \$60,000 (from FY16 Budgeted Reserve) under Historic Resources: Preservation, conditional that it is used for structural repairs and that the library report how the funds were used.

Mr. Boris stated that he felt certain things must be done to make sure the entire project can be completed. He stated that if it is part of the project for fixing the brownstone and bricks, it is not maintenance.

Mr. Moriarty suggested having a rule that applications are welcome, but that they should not be coming back in same calendar year or fiscal year.

Ms. Guy suggested the discussion be future agenda item.

She suggested that the existing CPA project sign remain.

Ms. Tuttle seconded the motion. Mr. Cornacchio, Ms. Tuttle, Mr. Shea, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Boris and Mr. Moriarty voted in favor. Ms. Sides abstained from voting. The motion so carried.

Request for additional funds – Dickson Memorial Chapel at Greenlawn Cemetery

Ms. Guy read a letter from Natalie Lovett regarding a request for additional CPA funds in in the amount of \$50,000. It was noted that the City applied for \$50,000 in MPPF funds for the project

but did not receive an award. The additional funding is needed to complete the water infiltration work and repair the interior stone.

Ms. McCrea was concerned that the Gables got a \$50,000 grant from MHC, which we didn't know about prior to their coming to the CPC.

Ms. Guy stated that it is for a different project. She noted that there are lots of balls in the air when trying to fund projects, applying all over the place and applying as applications come up.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he felt people coming back for more funds is going to be the rule more than the exception because things go out to bid and bids come back and sometimes it is a happy surprise, but more common it isn't. He felt it was something we are going to have to expect and should be a cautionary note, that if we are going to fund something, we need to do a gut check that about how we will feel, when more likely than if, they come back for more money. If they don't get the promised matching funds, as we fund these we might as well talk about what happens if the grant doesn't come in, and how strongly we feel.

Mr. Shea stated that maybe we need to consider putting people off until get they get their grants. He acknowledged he did not know if that would fit with time schedules.

Christine Lutts, Salt Wall Lane, stated that from what she was told, they will apply again next year. The reason we are back here is because we hoped we would get the \$50,000 from MHC but we did not. She stated that she is getting estimates and trying to get ducks in a row and feel it may be more money than estimated. They are trying to make up the extra money to button up the building. They have donors interested in helping and the Cemetery Commission that has access to a trust fund that we can hopefully match some money, as well. She noted that they redid the doors of the conservatory side through a donation and have two others offering to donate for the 3 windows on the same side of the building. They have estimates of \$34,000 for the windows.

Mr. Shea asked if some of the donated money could be put toward the \$50,000 needed or is locked into the windows.

Ms. Lutts stated that the windows are an important part of the restoration project.

Mr. Shea stated he was not sure which work should come first.

Ms. Lutts stated that they don't have \$30,000, but are trying to raise it.

Mr. Shea stated it was a matter of priorities and questioned that the CPC is being asked for an additional \$50,000 while others are being asked for \$30,000 for something else. He stated that he didn't know if the windows are a higher priority.

Ms. Lutts stated that it is part of a whole project.

Ms. Guy stated that the \$30,000 is part of the water infiltration project, but is not part of the \$50,000 needed. The FOG is taking on the window portion of it.

Ms. Sides stated that with a lot of fund raising, donors go for things that are visible and attracting and that it was too bad it was not unrestrictive giving. She stated that windows are critical but can be covered and protected until funding is available; whereas the building leaking can cause a lot more damage. She felt that donations should be less restrictive and go where it is needed the most.

Ms. Lutts stated that when a donor comes to you and offers to pay for something specific, it is hard to refuse. She stated that someone how is an expert in the field would have to tell us what is most important and she did not believe we have that information.

Ms. Tuttle stated that she was confused regarding the total work cost and the proposed project cost.

Ms. Guy stated that there is \$215,583 worth of work, but that, due to minimal funding, the City has pared it down to get the minimum we can do to get a project that will stop the water, plus oversight and contingency, which comes to \$126,403. When you are asking the priority, it is the proposed project cost. \$41,401 is needed based on the number provided by Larry Spang last year.

Mr. Shea stated that they are asking for \$50,000 in case there is an increase.

Mr. Moriarty stated that this illustrates again problems we have in dealing with repeats. He agreed that it is predictable that there will be repeat customers. He is suggesting that the CPC also have something that is also predictable for the applicant and for the committee in terms of an orderly review and assessment of the project. He felt it should be by fiscal year, where the best case is made and then they can come back the next fiscal year for more or less. He stated that it becomes very confusing and even sometimes emotional. He predicted emergency proposals are going to be a theme we will see time and time again. Everything is going to be an emergency because of the number of applicants we have and the number of historic structures we have in our city. He felt for a fair and balanced approach giving everyone ample opportunity to make their best case, everyone should come in, make their case, abide by the decision of the CPC and come back in the next fiscal year. He stated that he is not comfortable with estimates from January, 2015 and rounding it up. He stated that maybe it is enough, but maybe it is not enough. He stated that he is willing to consider a current proposal for the new fiscal year. He stated he is supportive, but cautionary in terms of the process. He stated that the likelihood of re-do applications coming forward should be handled appropriately, but systemically and dispassionately.

Ms. Tuttle stated that she loves Greenlawn Cemetery and this chapel and noted that the CPC already awarded \$85,000, which was our second highest award last round. She noted that it is not the same as the library and questioned how many people go there or even know this exists. She stated that she was torn.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that he was also thinking along those same lines and that he hated to deplete the whole budget.

Ms. Sides noted there had also been discussion last time of intentionally putting money aside. She also appreciated what Mr. Moriarty was stating about returns and that it is the next big topic to figure out. She stated that it is difficult not to feel sympathetic, but noted it should not be our

first judgement. The first time around we asked for an itemized list of expenses and we can't just throw estimates out and hope that it is right. She appreciated the volunteer work that the Friends of Greenlawn has done.

Pat Donahue, Dearborn lane, stated that she is a lifelong resident of Salem. She noted that in Salem, all public buildings have never received the attention they deserve. She stated that maintenance is not deferred, it was never done; it is not deterioration but disintegration. She stated that the Chapel was bequeathed by Walter Scott Dickson with his own money. It fell into disrepair after 50 to 75 years of neglect and the conservatory is now lost. She noted that they have 500 people on Facebook, many who walk the cemetery. They are trying to bring the Chapel back to use for memorial services and to bring in some income. She agrees the library is a hub, but noted that they have worked very hard to get to this point to start stopping the deterioration. She thanked the CPC for what they have awarded, but added that it would be wonderful if the project can be completed. She stated that the overall project can make substantial inroad in stopping the deterioration.

Beth Gerard, 49 Larchmont Road, stated that people do have an interest in coming to Dickson Memorial Chapel and often ask if it can be open more frequently and if they can have services there. It is in a very difficult state, noting that some parts are gorgeous and in other places it is deteriorating due to leaks. She stated that she did not want to deplete the City's CPA funds, but felt this is really important. She stated that she would hate the thought of putting tarps on the roof to protect the interior from another awful winter.

Ms. Donahue stated that the cemetery has just been placed on National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Shea stated that he would entertain approving approximately \$20,000 in addition funds with the idea that the Friends of Greenlawn try to convince their donors to use their funds for this project rather than windows. He suggested that next fiscal year the City could apply for CPA funds for the windows. He stated that it would put the onus on Friends of Greenlawn to raise the additional \$30,000. He felt that chance of getting funds for the windows in the future was pretty good.

Mr. Cornacchio stated that he thought it was a good compromise. He stated that he would hate to deplete the whole budget. He asked if it was possible to apply in the next funding round for the \$40,000 being sought and put off the repair until Spring.

Ms. Lutts stated that she is concerned putting this work against the windows.

Ms. Sides stated that it is not against it. She stated it was about how donors are approached by encouraging them to donate in an unrestricted way for what is needed right now. She stated that as an architect she expected that the windows could be protected and that the work that needs to be done is keeping the water out of the roof and wall. She agreed that it is not as glamorous from the donor's perspective. She agreed no one prefers to do their electrical and plumbing over getting a new bathroom, but you have to do the infrastructure if that is what is needed.

Mr. Shea stated that a request for \$60 from each Facebook follower would net the \$30,000.

Mr. Hoskins stated that he is picking up that a lesser amount might be a favorable way to go forward, asking if the City could go forward and get as much stabilizing work done as it can with a prioritized list and then come back the next round to reapply. He stated that he supported funding less than what is being asked, but enough to get some work happening before the winter. He stated the job is not just restoration, but keeping it from getting worse.

Mr. Shea stated that the CPC obviously supports the project, otherwise it would not have funded \$86,000. He stated that some sort of compromise will be beneficial. He stated that he had a problem fundraising for windows when this appears to be a critical need.

Ms. Donahue stated that they did not fund raise, rather someone came forward and offered.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he agreed it was a hard choice, but stated that he reluctantly cannot, even under emergency circumstances, authorize additional funds under same fiscal year for this particular project. He stated that it is a worthy project, but he would like to reiterate that it was the number two project that was funded in last fiscal year for \$86,000, so there was tremendous support of the structure. He stated that he felt it sets bad precedent in name of an emergency with figures that are 9 months old.

Ms. Lutts stated that the Friends of Greenlawn really appreciate the funding and are thankful. She stated that she has been to prior a CPC meeting for Old Town Hall windows and has seen a pattern of estimates that are not necessarily accurate and the need to have to come back. She stated that it is hard sitting here looking at an estimate, getting more concrete estimates and having things not very close.

Ms. Sides stated that the reality of any construction project is exactly what you are going through. She stated that when the real budget comes in and there is not enough funds, the scope of work is reduced. This is common practice. The scope of work of work needs to be cut back when the money is not there. She felt that there is a way to use the \$86,000 in a productive and protective way for that building. She noted a lot can be done with that money to get through the winter. She stated that she believed coming back in the next round was a good idea.

Ms. Donahue stated that the chapel is in Bryant Tolles' *Architecture in Salem*, so it is considered a unique historic property in Salem.

Mr. Shea made a motion to allot \$20,000 additional funds toward this project.

Mr. Hoskins seconded the motion.

Ms. McCrea stated that she appreciated it, but questioned if the \$20,000 will really help

Ms. Lutts stated that everything helps.

Ms. McCrea stated that she was not concerned about the current CPA balance, noting there will be more money in November and new proposals won't come till Spring.

Mr. Hoskins stated that his concern is about chasing our own tail if we don't somewhat split the difference. He stated that we know that we won't get the entire wish list, but is there an amount that will stabilize the damage so we don't see an even bigger number next year if the damage is worse.

Ms. Sides stated that that scenario could happen anywhere and that there needs to be an overall comprehensive plan from start to finish on how the money is going to be spent over many years to restore the building. It is not going to come all in one shot; it never does. She stated that she was hesitant to throw in an arbitrary \$20,000. She felt \$86,000 was a lot of money.

Mr. Shea stated that his purpose in proposing this is to spur these passionate supporters of this building into a little more action. He stated that if CPA is providing more \$100,000 and they only need another \$30,000, he was serious about collecting \$60, which seems like a small amount to raise the extra \$30,000 to finish the work. He stated that they are almost at the finish line and the CPC is not depleting our budget at the same time.

Ms. Tuttle stated she would vote in favor because the proposed amount brings us close to do what we need to do.

The motion was voted upon. Ms. Tuttle, Mr. Shea, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Boris and voted in favor. Ms. Sides, Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Cornacchio voted in opposition. The motion was carried.

Other Business

North Shore CDC Agreement Terms

Ms. Guy stated that North Shore CDC has requested an amendment in two of the terms of the agreement template for the 15-17 Harbor Street project. Specifically they would like to extend the term to four rather than three years and would like the ability to assign the agreement to a related party.

Mr. Hoskins was concerned about the words “related entity” and felt it should be specified.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he felt they should sign the standard agreement and as changes come up, come back. He noted that their requests for possible issues and he felt the CPC should cross that bridge when they get to.

Ms. Guy noted that the City Solicitor has reviewed and approved the request.

Mr. Boris stated that related is a technicality and that all properties go to corporation of the agency.

Mr. Hoskins made a motion to accept language that is approved by City Solicitor. Mr. Boris seconded the motion. Ms. Sides, Mr. Cornacchio, Ms. Tuttle, Ms. McCrea, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Boris and voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty and voted in opposition. Mr. Shea abstained from voting. The motion was carried.

Mr. Moriarty requested that CPC members receive copies of the 7 gables and Hamilton hall agreements when executed.

Project updates

Ms. Guy distributed an update on all current CPA funded projects.

Sarah Murphy, Japonica Street, stated that for the Bates School the PTO asked for its dream playground. They received a \$45,000 CPA award. They have raised \$10,000 from other sources. They are now looking at how to pare down and make sure they have something that meets the capacity of the school children. They received \$5000 from Salem Five. They are working on soliciting from Eastern Bank. They are meeting with contractors on cost. They are also looking at revitalizing a structure to see if there is a cost savings. They are trying to bring down expenses and raise more funds. They are considering coming back to the CPC. They are looking into having PTO members right grants and into having fundraising events.

Mr. Shea suggested that they approach Kernwood Country Club.

Mr. Hoskins stated that they could consider phasing rather than scaling everything back.

Budget Update

Ms. Guy distributed a spreadsheet of the current CPA available funds.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Moriarty made a motion to approve the minutes of July 14, 2015. Ms. McCrea seconded the motion; all were in favor and the motion so carried.

Next Meeting Date

Ms. Guy stated that the next regular meeting date is scheduled for Tuesday, October 13, 2015, where the CPC will have its annual public hearing.

There being no further business, Mr. Shea 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