

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION COMMITTEE  
MINUTES  
November 13, 2018

A regular meeting of the Community Preservation Committee (CPC) was held on Tuesday, November 13, 2018 at 6:00 pm at 98 Washington Street, Salem, MA. Present were Chair Bart Hoskins, Vice Chair Tim Shea, Ed Moriarty, Chris Burke, Mickey Northcutt and John Boris. Also present was Jane Guy of the City of Salem Department of Planning & Community Development.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Review of written comments received

Ms. Guy stated that since the last meeting, she received written comments from the Bicycling Advisory Committee and Conservation Commission, along with an email from the Planning Board expressing their appreciation to the CPC for their dedication.

Review Draft Community Preservation Plan for release for public comment

Ms. Guy reviewed the Draft Community Preservation Plan. Changes from the prior year plan include updates to dates, dollar amounts, pictures and project status. There were four new plans/studies added on pages 29-31 & 38, which she encouraged the board to review prior to the review of applications in the Spring. She stated that in response to the Bicycling Advisory Committee comments, she added excerpts from the new Bike Master Plan (page 29). In response to comments from the Conservation Commission, edits to the criteria were made on pages 6, 19 and 20. Ms. Guy stated that if the draft is acceptable, she will release it for public comment.

Mr. Shea stated that he was concerned about giving the impression that the recommendations summarized in the plan are all eligible for CPA funding. For instance, he questioned where CPA funding might be eligible for recommendations found in the Salem Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment & Action Plan. He noted that if the House of Seven Gables were in the middle of a flood plain, it potentially could be eligible, but was concerned about giving a false impression that CPA can fund something based on the report referenced in our plan.

Ms. Guy stated that the strategies in the Salem Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment & Action Plan could be applicable buildings that are historic or for new housing projects, such as those the CPC has funded in the Point Neighborhood, which is almost completely in a flood zone. She stated that if there is wording that should be changed to make it clearer, it can be changed before the plan is finalized.

**Mr. Northcutt made a motion to accept the draft plan as proposed and to release it for a public comment period. Mr. Boris seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.**

Review and Vote on Request for Additional Funding – The Bridge at 211 Window Restoration

The CPC was provided with a copy of a letter from Dale Yale, Co-Chair of the Board of Directors of the Bridge at 211, requesting an additional \$45,429.53 in order to restore the remaining seven large windows on the main level of the Annex and the six smaller windows on the lower level in order to complete the project in accordance with the previously-submitted budget. Ms. Yale was present.

Mr. Moriarty stated that since inception, the CPC has had applications that have been approved after discussion, after amendment, are consolidation, after economization, etc. He stated that he got impression that the CPC is always open to reapplications from those that have received funds, as well as new applications on an equal basis. He stated that his sense was that what the CPC would be looking for in a reapplication is changed circumstances or unforeseen circumstances, new information, new evidence or something that would be different than the original application. He felt that this reapplication is just saying that they want to do more windows, because it is more efficient and they want to do it now. He felt it diminishes the time and attention to detail that the CPC took with the application and the amount of money awarded. He added that he was not in favor of starting process all over again, absent of new developments.

Mr. Shea stated that he was somewhat in agreement. He stated that his thought is that the organization would assist in funding a portion, not that CPA would fund 100%. He believed the application is the same as submitted, which the CPC funded at 50%, rather than fully funding. He felt as before that all organizations, not just this one, should be doing some of their own fundraising to help with these projects.

Mr. Burke asked if there is money now available that wasn't available during the budget process last time.

Ms. Guy replied in the affirmative, noting that at the close of each fiscal year unspent admin, interest, fees and surcharges that exceeded the budget estimates are added into the Fund Balance, certified by the DOR and made available in the Fall. There is currently approximately \$129,000 available

Mr. Burke stated that he gave The Bridge at 211 credit for being smart enough to come back and apply for funds that are now available time and would like to reserve judgement until hearing from the representative of the agency, adding that Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Shea also make good points.

Mr. Northcutt stated that it looks like when they first applied, it was for \$121,000 for 26 windows. It seems what they can now afford is only 6. He agreed with Mr. Moriarty and Mr. Shea to a degree that there should be some sort of match requirement, but from an amount perspective, he did not have a problem, whether now or later, giving them potentially more money, depending on how it fits with all the projects that come in. He stated that potentially all the projects that were not fully funded could all come back and is worried if several came back in one year wanting more money and a good portion of the annual budget might be spent backfilling previous projects. He agreed from a process perspective, that it might be better to have them reapply. He added that it is not necessarily unreasonable to ask for more money.

Mr. Shea asked about the timing - when the next infusion of money comes in and when project applications will be coming in.

Ms. Guy stated that the deadline for Step 1 eligibility applications is January 3<sup>rd</sup>. Step 2 funding applications will be due March 22<sup>nd</sup>. In March, the State will announce the match percentage and the City Assessor will estimate the expected surcharge revenues. These will be used to develop the FY20 budget, which will be added to whatever is left of the \$129,000, which will be used to apply to the applications to be reviewed in April/May.

Mr. Shea stated that the \$129,000 is really part of the current budget.

Ms. Guy replied in the affirmative, stating that it is left over money because we always get more surcharge revenue that is estimated and admin that is not spent during the prior fiscal year. This is consistent every year, where this is a small amount in November to which the CPC has access and then a larger amount in March or April.

Mr. Boris asked if we lose if, if we don't use it.

Ms. Guy replied in the negative.

Br. Hoskins stated that the CPC has funded projects that came up short in past. He stated that he is seeing here that the original was for \$121, 277 for 26 windows and then they went down to \$88,077, for which they were awarded \$42,647, which would complete 12 of the large windows. They are now asking for \$45,429 to complete the remaining 13 windows. So, they are still asking for less than what they originally requested. We already know they are eligible, so it is a question whether we do it now, or have them come in with a full application.

Mr. Shea asked about their fundraising capabilities.

Ms. Yale stated that she is the co-Chair of the Board of Directors for The Bridge at 211, that they are grateful for the funds awarded and that she hears the CPC's concerns. She stated that they started with \$121,277 and that it was pared down by cutting out painting and other things that they could fund on their own and revised it to \$88,077. She stated that it is still the same 20 large and 6 small windows. They are looking to have one seamless operation without disrupting tenants and to have consistency of carpentry.

Mr. Burke asked what projects are they doing with their own funds.

Ms. Yale stated that they are hoping to do some fundraising and have plans to apply for additional preservation grants. They would like to restore the tower, which was taken down in the 80s. She stated that they have recently spoken with a consultant to look at Preservation Works grant. They want to become an arts performing center. They want to do the construction now in one operation and the contractor states that it is more efficient to do in one operation rather than twice.

Mr. Shea asked if it falls to board members to raise funds and if they have events to raise funds.

Ms. Yale stated that they are a new non-profit, in existence for three years. She stated that they have concerts, plays and things in partnership with other organizations that use the building, such as the Salem Arts Association. They have not done a capital campaign, but would like to contemplate that. They are a seven-member board with a small endowment that helps keep the roof fixed.

Mr. Shea asked what they have raised annually.

Ms. Yale stated that they are operating in red. Their fundraising efforts, including donations, help keep them solvent.

Mr. Shea asked Ms. Yale to list the community service efforts by the organizations in the building.

Ms. Yale stated that they are home to the Salem Food Pantry, the Neverland Theater which does 3-4 shows a year, the Salem Arts Association which has their gallery space and shop and several anonymous groups that meet in the building.

Mr. Shea asked if they are free.

Ms. Yale replied that it is pass the hat mostly with the income helping to heat the building. The Salem Food Panty and Neverland Theater pay a modest rent.

Mr. Burke stated that it is an architecturally important building of Bulfinch design and was glad that they are keeping it up. He noted that this type of building is tough to fundraise for and that the Cabot Theatre in Beverly has been kept alive for years by a professor at Salem State, who had a volunteer group to get it over the hump. This is the same with the Larcom Theater in Beverly. He felt it important in the first years for the Bridge at 211 to get support.

Mr. Shea stated that he would not be able to get over the organization not contributing something, but he would be in favor at this time of increasing some, but not in total. He stated that he would be in favor of adding \$25,000 and leaving \$20,000 to do on their own. He felt any organization should be out there raising money for things like this and that he could not support the amount in full.

Mr. Hoskins stated that if they are not realistically able to raise more funds, we may find they come back and, at that time, there may be an increase in cost which could make it be a wash. He stated that it's nice when things actually get finished.

Mr. Moriarty stated that he unconditionally supported the group morally, but could not support providing additional funds, when there is no new information. He felt they are receiving an unfair advantage being first out of box and felt they should compete with everyone else, when we look at all organizational needs. He would not support any additional at this time, but would encourage them reapply and make their best argument with all other organizations, both public and private.

Mr. Shea stated that this \$129,000 available is part of last year's remaining fiscal budget, so the timing of the request isn't so bad. He stated that just because the others that weren't fully funded are not here, we should not penalize the Bridge at 211 for that reason. He noted that it easily could be applied to any of the other groups that come before us. He was also impressed with what they do for the community, but noted that he can't get over hump of having organization raising funds.

Mr. Burke stated that he supported Mr. Shea's suggestion. He added that he also appreciated Mr. Moriarty's assertion that this is a slippery slope, and that next year we could have several

organizations fighting over the funds, but noted that he liked this organization and felt it important to help them in their early years.

Mr. Boris stated that he would also support the proposed motion, noting that he would like to see some fundraising efforts, which are essential

Ms. Yale stated that they will be pursuing every possible avenue.

**Mr. Shea made a motion to recommend funding of an additional \$25,000. Mr. Burke seconded the motion. The motion was voted on. Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Boris, Mr. Shea, Mr. Burke and Mr. Northcutt voted in favor. Mr. Moriarty voted in opposition. The motion so carried.**

#### Other Business

##### *Review and Vote on Determinations of Eligibility Applications received*

There were no applications to review.

##### *Approval of minutes – 10/9/18*

VOTE: Mr. Boris made a motion to approve the minutes of 10/9/18. Mr. Northcutt seconded the motion, all were in favor and the motion so carried.

##### *Funding Status*

Ms. Guy stated that the funding status has not changed since the last meeting and that \$129,164.20 is currently available until the FY20 funding surcharge revenues and estimated State match funds are determined in March or April, 2019.

#### Next Meeting Date

Ms. Guy stated that the next meeting date is scheduled for Tuesday, December 11, 2018, which will be to review any comments received and to finalize the plan.

**There being no further business, Mr. Shea made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Boris seconded the motion; all were in favor, and the motion so carried.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jane A. Guy  
Administrator