

**Budget & Finance Committee**  
Thursday, October 3, 2013 – 6:00 p.m.  
1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Committee Room – City Hall  
**Minutes**

**Present:** Chair, Councilor Paul McGeary; Vice Chair, Councilor Joseph Ciolino; Councilor Melissa Cox  
**Absent:** None.

**Also Present:** Aleesha Nunley; J.J. Bell; Harbormaster Jim Caulkett; Fire Chief Eric Smith; Mark Cole; Tony Gross; Sandra Dahl-Ronan; Cate Banks

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.**

***Regularly Scheduled Business:***

**1. CC2013-035 (Cox/McGeary) Regulations concerning off-season parking fees at city beaches for review And recommendation (Cont'd from 09/19/13)**

**Councilor McGeary** said that he and **Councilor Cox** met with Mark Cole, Assistant DPW Director, and determined that the current policy is that if a resident has a valid beach sticker or, if beach stickers aren't yet on sale, has a Gloucester car registration, that resident will be allowed to park in beach parking lots off season at no charge. The Councilors' had raised a concern arising out of the Essex County Velo Cyclo-Cross event where local residents might have been charged a parking fee.

Another part of the regulations was found to be a duplication of City ordinance. The Councilors and Mr. Cole agreed that section should be deleted from the regulations which had described what streets was sticker parking only for beach parking.

Responding to **Councilor Ciolino's** inquiry, **Mr. Cole** summarized the City beach sticker policy as follows:

- Beach stickers are valid and accepted from January 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup>.
- If the City opens the beach parking lots early in the season, as long as person has a Gloucester car registration, they won't be charged for parking.
- If a City-sponsored event is taking place, say at Stage Fort Park off season, and if so instructed by the Administration or the Council that anyone with a beach sticker is allowed to park, they will not be charged a parking fee.
- The City can charge fees up to September 30<sup>th</sup>; after that the DPW is not authorized to charge a parking fee. In order to charge after that date, the authorization to charge a parking fee would have to come from the Administration and City Council with instructions as to who would be charged and for what amount.

**Councilor McGeary** further clarified that nothing has changed in terms of beach sticker parking regulations as there is a policy in place regarding off-season parking at City beaches, and in particular for Stage Fort Park. He said this examination of the policy stemmed from the especially hot Patriot's Day weekend several years ago and parking issues at beaches that resulted. He asked for a report from the Administration for its preparation for plans as to how the City will deal with beach-like weather occurring pre-beach season or post-beach season as he did not know of any formal plans to deal with such occurrences.

**Jim Duggan**, CAO said there is no policy in place. Councilor McGeary said the Administration would have until late March to create that policy. **Mr. Duggan** clarified parking policy by saying if an event is not a City sponsored event the City would have the flexibility on whether to charge for parking for the event, even if Gloucester residents attend. He said that was on a case-by-case basis.

**Councilor McGeary** said that was not what he, Councilor Cox and Mr. Cole spoke about at their meeting; rather if it was a beach parking lot, and a resident has a valid beach parking sticker or registration if new stickers hadn't gone on sale yet, that the beach sticker or registration will be honored and not charge those residents. Anyone sponsoring an event has to know that in terms of what they will be charging for parking. **Mr. Duggan** acknowledged the policy as stated by **Councilor McGeary**.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to approve the amendment to the City's Beach & Stage Fort Park Regulations by DELETING Section II (D) 7 in its entirety and renumbering the subsequent paragraphs of Section II (D).**

**2. Memorandum from CFO re: Loan Order for Private Way Repairs and Betterments related to High Popples Road, Jacque Lane, Mayflower Lane and Stewart Avenue in the amount of \$350,000**

**Mr. Duggan** said that these private way road paving projects have been an ongoing discussion for about three years in which there was some confusion on the ordinance process. He said with the support of the Council that process is now streamlined and clearly defined. The City would like to move forward with these road paving projects as agreed, and he said that the Mayor is in favor of this loan authorization.

**Councilor McGeary** noted that although the City borrows the entire \$350,000, the abutters pay for half of the costs of the road paving project through betterments. **Mr. Duggan** said the betterment to each abutter is spread over 10 years, and the cost to the abutter will be different for each project. **Councilor McGeary** noted that his experience is that the DPW Director is very conservative with his paving estimates and often paving bids come in under his estimates. **Mr. Duggan** confirmed that the DPW Director and Assistant DPW Director do a great job.

**Julianna Hood**, 9 Jacque Lane, questioned the loan order noting that it included Stewart Avenue which was not a part of her neighborhood's original petition for the repair of the private ways of High Popples Road, Mayflower Lane and Jacque Lane and asked how the betterment would work if Stewart Avenue was included. **Councilor McGeary** said his understanding is that these are two separate projects and that the betterments would be assessed as such. High Popples Road, Mayflower Lane and Jacque Lane are one project and Stewart Avenue is a separate project. **Mr. Duggan** further explained it is one project for the purposes of putting the paving out to bid, but because it is two separate petitions he assured these are two separate projects in terms of the betterments, but that it is likely all four roadways would be paved at the same time as it would be an opportunity to save money.

**Councilor Ciolino** said on the advice of General Counsel he would recuse himself from the loan order vote under MGL c. 268 as he would benefit by the paving of High Popples Road.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor McGeary, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Ciolino) recused, to recommend that the City Council adopt the following loan order:**

**ORDERED: That Three Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$350,000) is appropriated to pay costs of making temporary repairs, including paving, to the following private ways:**

**High Popples Road  
Jacque Lane  
Mayflower Lane  
Stewart Avenue**

**To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to MGL Chapter 44, Section 7(5), or pursuant to any other enabling authority. Although any borrowing by the City to meet this appropriation shall constitute a general obligation of the City and a pledge of its full faith and credit, one-half of the amount required to repay any borrowing pursuant to this Order shall be raised by taxation, and the balance of the amount needed to repay any borrowing pursuant to this Order shall be raised through the assessment of betterments upon the abutters of each of such private ways, in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 80, and any other applicable authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the City are authorized to take any and all actions necessary to assess the betterments described above, the term of which shall not exceed ten years. Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes; AND FURTHER TO ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.**

**3. Memorandum from Fire Chief re: new Commonwealth of Massachusetts permit and inspection requirements under 527 CMR 33 Hazardous Materials Process or Processing (new fee implementation)**

**Fire Chief Eric Smith** explained to the Committee that his department is required under 527 CMR 33 Hazardous Materials Process or Processing to issue permits and conduct inspections for various levels of operation that are split into four categories:

Category 5: Vessel with a process covered by OSHA, PSM (Process Safety Management) or EPA RMP (Risk Management Plan) Programs

Category 4: Vessel > 300 gallons not covered by OSHA, PSM or EPA RMP  
Category 2 & 3: Vessel > 60 gallons but less than 300 gallons or an H occupancy due to vessel.

He noted that some of these inspections may be complicated which could extend beyond the department's inspector's expertise, which in that case there is a possible requirement of a third party review in addition to the fees proposed as an additional cost. **Chief Smith** said that as this is a new requirement there are no comparable fees listed with any other communities on line yet; and in reaching out to fellow Fire Chiefs in the area he was informed they are requesting to put in basic maximum fees of what is allowable which is a \$50 permit and \$50 inspection. He also pointed out the term vessel means the container in which the hazardous material is contained in, not a ship's container. He pointed out that this new ruling by the State is based on firefighter safety and for documentation of an entity in the community who is doing this type of processes. This is also about proper reporting as well, **Chief Smith** added.

**Councilor McGeary** asked if there are separate vessels owned by one entity, the inspection fees is for the overall inspection, not per vessel/container which the Fire Chief confirmed was the case. Chief Smith added that most of these facilities are covered by OSHA and the EPA which have very stringent regulations in place.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Cox, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council approve the institution of new fees pursuant to 527 CMR 33 Hazardous Materials Process or Processing and MGL 148, §10 and to Amend GCO Chapter 8, Article I. In General by ADDING a new Section 8-5 entitled, "Hazardous Materials Process or Processing" for permit and inspection requirements of \$50 per permit and a \$50 inspection fee as follows:**

**Sec. 8-5. Hazardous Materials Process or Processing:**

**Category 5: Vessel with a process covered by OSHA, PSM\* or EPA RMP\* Programs**  
**Category 4: Vessel > 300 gallons not covered by OSHA, PSM or EPA RMP**  
**Category 2 & 3: Vessel > 60 gallons but less than 300 gallons or an H occupancy due to vessel.**

**AND FURTHER TO ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.**

**4. Memorandum from DPW Director re: request permission to pay invoices from previous fiscal years with current fiscal year funds**

**Mark Cole**, Assistant DPW Director, explained to the Committee the reasons for the HD Supplies outstanding invoices as follows:

HD Supplies Facilities was for one of the water projects in Annisquam. Materials were ordered from HD Supplies; the pipe material ordered were incorrect and sent back three times. When the DPW was set to pay the invoices, HD Supplies told the department to hold off payment. He said that his bookkeeper informed him that once the invoices are put in the city's financial system with her authorization to pay, it leaves the bookkeeper's purview in the system and so the bookkeeper loses the ability to be able to see the invoices awaiting payment. When the bookkeeper went to do carry-overs at the end of FY13, she couldn't see the outstanding invoices as a carryover as it was showing up in her system as these invoices were paid; and so these invoices were missed the carry over into FY14.

**Aleesha Nunley**, Assistant City Auditor, confirmed these invoices have to be paid with DPW FY14 funds; and that this was an understandable error due to the heavy volume of invoices that are processed by the DPW. **Councilor Cox** said that the DPW doesn't make this sort of mistake regularly and understood how something like this could occur.

**Councilor Ciolino** noted the credit memos showing restocking charges on one item of about \$2,300 and another for \$341, which he said seemed rather high. **Mr. Cole** said some of these items are a special order items and may be why the restocking charges are high. The department did check on these invoices and what items were ordered, he said. **Councilor McGeary** expressed his agreement noting it comes out to a 15 percent charge of the total cost of the item, which also to him seemed high. **Councilor Ciolino** said if it was a specialty item, generally a supplier won't take that item back at all. **Councilor Ciolino** also asked that Mr. Cole notify the Committee if HD Supplies bills the DPW for interest, after having paid restocking charges in these invoices, as some invoices go back to April. **Councilor McGeary** also asked Mr. Cole to discuss the restocking fees with HD Supplies.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council under MGL Chapter 44, §64 authorize payment of outstanding invoices incurred by the Department of Public Works for goods/services received in FY13 from HD Supplies Facilities Maintenance Limited for a net total of \$21,054.62 to be paid with funds from the current FY14 Water Enterprise Fund budget, Account #610000.10.450.54320.0000.00.0000.00.054, Water Enterprise, Pipes, Tubes, Fittings:**

<u>Invoice #</u>	<u>Date of Invoice</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
6319243	4/08/13	\$15,368.29
8112097	5/08/13	\$ 648.00
B092030	6/14/13	-\$ 550.00
B053542	6/05/13	\$ 341.00
9679035	6/05/13	\$ 7,182.20
B088831	6/13/13	<u>-\$ 1,934.07</u>
<b>NET TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$21,054.62</b>

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council authorize payment of invoices as listed below from HD Supplies Facilities Maintenance Limited for a net total of \$21,054.62 for goods/services received in FY13 to be paid from the current FY14 Water Enterprise Fund budget, Account #610000.10.450.54320.0000.00.0000.00.054, Water Enterprise, Pipes, Tubes, Fittings without a purchase order in place:**

<u>Invoice #</u>	<u>Date of Invoice</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
6319243	4/08/13	\$15,368.29
8112097	5/08/13	\$ 648.00
B092030	6/14/13	-\$ 550.00
B053542	6/05/13	\$ 341.00
9679035	6/05/13	\$ 7,182.20
B088831	6/13/13	<u>-\$ 1,934.07</u>
<b>NET TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$21,054.62</b>

Mr. Cole said that the next invoice was related to some City road work done on May 23<sup>rd</sup>; and the DPW didn't get the invoice from the Beverly Police Department until after July 1<sup>st</sup>. Ms. Nunley said the bookkeeper does her best estimate with the blanket open purchase order for road details as there are so many road details needed by the DPW. She added that the bookkeeper can't know in advance what city or town is sending a policeman to cover a City road detail.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Cox, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council under MGL Chapter 44, §64 authorize payment of an outstanding invoice #65562 from the Beverly, Mass. Police Department dated 5/23/13 incurred by the Department of Public Works for services received in FY13 for a total of \$180 to be paid with funds from the current FY14 Water Enterprise Fund budget Account #610000.10.450.52000.0000.00.0000.00.052, Water Enterprise, Contractual Services.**

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Cox, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council authorize payment of Invoice #65562 from the Beverly, Mass. Police Department dated 5/23/13 incurred by the Department of Public Works for services received in FY13 for a total of \$180 to be paid with funds from the current FY14 Water Enterprise Fund budget, Account #610000.10.450.52000.0000.00.0000.00.052, Water Enterprise, Contractual Services without a purchase order in place.**

The request to pay National Grid invoices totaling \$437.00 was continued to October 17<sup>th</sup> pending a review requested by the Committee of rates charged by the vendor.

**Mr. Cole** explained the following National Grid (NG) and Sprague Operating Resources invoices as follows:

According to National Grid (NG) there was a gas meter for the DPW highway barn that hadn't worked correctly for two years. About five months ago NG noticed the DPW that it would come out to change the faulty meter. Once the meter was replaced, the DPW was informed by NG that estimated readings had been done for two years for billing purposes, resulting in a bill for \$4,620.53 from NG and a bill for \$8,721.07 from the Sprague Operating Resources, the gas supplier in that two year timeframe. Mr. Cole has made many inquiries to NG and has never been able to get to a supervisor. He was told that the estimates for usage were based on weather and temperature conditions.

**Mr. Cole** said he has expressed his concern to NG that it went two years without billing the department properly, although he added that in a comparison of what has been paid to NG prior to the meter becoming faulty, these bills don't appear to be too far out of line. **Councilor Ciolino** and **Mr. Cole** discussed the comparisons of previous years for usage. **Mr. Cole** said letters inquiring about these invoices have been sent to NG as well. The DPW is getting notices that the gas will be shut off, he pointed out if these invoices remain unpaid. Mr. Cole said this gas heats the upstairs on Poplar Street which contains the DPW offices.

**Councilor McGeary** said that as the NG invoices appear consistent with the gas usage in the past for this same building, he is inclined to put this matter forward to the Council. **Councilor Cox** confirmed she, too, had come to the same conclusion as Councilor McGeary.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council under MGL Chapter 44, §64 authorize payment of outstanding invoices incurred by the Department of Public Works for services received in prior fiscal years from National Grid for a total of \$4,620.53 to be paid with funds from the current FY14 Department of Public Works budget Account #101000.10.472.52150.0000.00.000.00.052, FACILITIES, NATURAL GAS HEATING.**

<u>Billing Period</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
11/4/11 to 4/3/12	\$ 595.91
4/3/12 to 11/3/12	\$ 281.42
11/3/12 to 4/3/13	\$3,579.13
4/3/13 to 5/8/13	\$ 164.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,620.53</b>

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council authorize the payment of invoices as listed below from National Grid for a total of \$4,620.53 for services received under National Grid Account #44218-23800 in prior fiscal years to be paid from the current FY14 Department of Public Works budget Account #101000.10.472.52150.0000.00.000.00.052, FACILITIES, NATURAL GAS HEATING without a purchase order in place:**

<u>Billing Period</u>	<u>Amount Due</u>
11/4/11 to 4/3/12	\$ 595.91
4/3/12 to 11/3/12	\$ 281.42
11/3/12 to 4/3/13	\$3,579.13
4/3/13 to 5/8/13	\$ 164.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4,620.53</b>

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council under MGL Chapter 44, §64 authorize payment of outstanding invoices incurred by the Department of Public Works for services received in prior fiscal years from Sprague Operating Resources, Inc. for a total of \$8,721.07 to be paid with funds from the current FY14 Department of Public Works budget Account #101000.10.472.52150.0000.00.000.00.052, FACILITIES, NATURAL GAS HEATING.**

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Ciolino, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council authorize payment of invoice # 70157420 from Sprague Operating Resources, Inc. for a total of \$8,721.07 for services received under Sprague Account #89718000 in prior fiscal years to be paid from the current FY14 Department of Public Works budget Account #101000.10.472.52150.0000.00.000.00.052, FACILITIES, NATURAL GAS HEATING without a purchase order in place.**

**5. Memorandum from Harbormaster re; Agreement with Massport for the funding, purchasing and installation of conservation moorings for the purpose of eel grass mitigation**

**Harbormaster Jim Caulkett** explained to the Committee regarding the Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport) agreement as follows:

Several years ago it was mandated by the federal government that Massport put an extension onto Logan Airport, and Massport built it over eelgrass beds. As a result, Massport was then mandated by the federal government to institute a remediation program. Through this program, Massport has reached out to several coastal communities to install ecologically-friendly moorings, which consist of a helical type screw anchor and an elastic rode (as opposed to a common chain rode). The elastic rode stretches as the boat rises, settles and moves with the tide and wind. The elastic rode goes out and then retracts to its original shape and stays above the bottom and doesn't fall and scrape the bottom as would normal chain rode, thereby preserving the integrity of the eelgrass beds. This funding would replace moorings that exist in the eelgrass beds. The permit holder gets a new mooring system guaranteed for 10-15 years. When permit holders have to replace the mooring, they would have to replace it with the same type of mooring.

The contract between Massport and the City was reviewed by General Counsel, and **Mr. Caulkett** asked for the Committee's approval of it. He noted that the Waterways Board will hold a public meeting with the affected permit holders with the contractors to explain this program and have samples of the moorings on view. It is the permit holder's choice to accept the moorings or not, he said. **Mr. Caulkett** responding to **Councilor Cox** further inquiry said the replacement moorings are not new technology but has been available for about twenty years. He also explained that the Waterways Board several years ago submitted to the Conservation Commission and received approval for a Mooring Management Plan. Any of these moorings that were placed prior to the eelgrass growing, when the gear is changed, the permit holder must install this type of mooring. **Councilor Cox** asked how many moorings should be converted. **Mr. Caulkett** said there are about 60 which is the number presented to Massport based on the City's mooring permits. He noted the areas where moorings are located in eelgrass beds are: Raymond's Beach at Eastern Point; Niles Beach, Cambridge Beach, Diamond Beach and all of Hodgkins Cove. Any moorings in those areas are sited in eelgrass beds, he said.

**Tony Gross**, Waterways Board member, said although the contract allows for \$2,600 per mooring, that is probably a low estimate. There is a caveat in the contract allowing for the City to revisit that number. Massport is under the obligation, he said, to do a certain number of moorings. He confirmed this program is only for existing moorings, not any new moorings. However, he added there is language in the contract that allows for an amendment to add more moorings to the overall number, he said.

**Councilor McGear**y noted a \$7,000 fee (5 percent) for administration. He said the contract indicates the Waterways Board would manage this program locally for Massport and asked if this would be enough money to do that. **Mr. Caulkett** confirmed that dollar amount was adequate. **Mr. Gross** commented the Board is acting as the middleman for permit holders to avail themselves of this program. Permit holders, **Mr. Caulkett** said, would arrange for their own contractors to install the new moorings.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Cox, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend that the City Council approve the City entering an agreement with the Massachusetts Port Authority (Massport) regarding Funding for the Purchase and Installation of Conservation Moorings for the purpose of eelgrass mitigation ("Agreement"). The term of this Agreement shall be from the date of execution of October 9, 2013, through the completion of the Massport Conservation Mooring Installation Program or September 30, 2014, whichever is earlier.**

**6. Capital Improvement Plan FY2013-2017**

**This matter is continued to November 7, 2013.**

**7. Memo from City Auditor regarding accounts having expenditures that exceed their authorization And Auditor's Report**

**Aleesha Nunley**, Assistant City Auditor reviewed the City Auditor's reports (on file) briefly with the Committee.

**Community Preservation Committee Recommendations re: Review of Applicant Projects for Community Preservation Funding, Round 4, FY13:**

- Committee for the Arts (Works Progress Administration Mural Restoration Project-Phase II) \$35,000

Speaking for Committee for the Arts Works Progress Administration (WPA) Mural Restoration Project-Phase II was **Dale Brown**. She conveyed the following information:

The CPA funding of \$35,000 will serve the purpose of preserving an historic asset by continuing the restoration and repairing of the Mulhaupt panels in the hallway of City Hall, mural in the City Attorney's office, the mural in Kyrouz Auditorium, and the mural in the Mayor's office reception area. Following recommendations from the 2010 Condition Assessment Report funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Committee for the Arts (CFA) has already overseen the completed restoration of six Charles Allen Winter WPA murals in City Hall. The second phase will include the remaining four WPA murals (as listed) recommended for restoration in the Condition Assessment report, the total cost of which is approximately \$55,000.

**Councilor McGeary** and **Ms. Brown** briefly discussed the murals in poor condition currently housed under the Kyrouz Auditorium stage.

- Rocky Neck Art Colony (Cultural Center Rehabilitation, 6 Wonson Street) \$50,000

Speaking for the Rocky Neck Art Colony, Inc. for the rehabilitation and restoration of the former Christian Science Church located at 6 Wonson Street on Rocky Neck was **Karen Ristuben**, President, Rocky Neck Art Colony. She conveyed the following information:

The CPA funding of \$50,000 will serve the purpose of rehabilitating and restoring of an historic asset by providing exterior restoration which includes: window repair, gutter and downspout replacement and painting as well as providing handicap accessibility through the installation of a ramp and construction of American with Disabilities Act (ADA) bathrooms at the Rocky Neck Cultural Center.

**Ms. Ristuben** said that the Rocky Neck Art Colony (RNAC) has acquired this historic building and took title of it on April 30, 2013. The RNAC would like to continue operating it as the Cultural Center of Rocky Neck, she said; and it is hoped that the building's mortgage will be paid off by the spring of 2014. The RNAC is seeking funding for two rehabilitation projects required in order to offer the Cultural Center as a public welcome center, art gallery, educational space and community gathering place, she noted. Ms. Ristuben noted the funding is sought for offsetting the costs of

- 1) a handicapped-accessible ramped entrance on the eastern side of the building; two accessible bathrooms, and an interior wheelchair lift (which may be done in the following year); and
- 2) exterior restoration which includes window repair, gutter and downspout replacement and painting; a kitchen as well for a total cost which is estimated at \$249,375.

**Councilor Cox** expressed her appreciation for the Rocky Neck Cultural Center and what the RNAC is doing for the community with so many events that can now be held on Rocky Neck. **Councilor McGeary** added approbation as well.

**The Committee will conduct a site visit on Friday, October 11<sup>th</sup> at 3 p.m.**

- Waterways Board (Hodgkins Cove Town Landing Restoration Project) \$8,000

Speaking for the Waterways Board was **Jim Caulkett**, Harbormaster, **Cate Banks** and **Tony Gross** of the Waterways Board for the Hodgkins Cove Public Landing rehabilitation and restoration. He conveyed the following information:

The CPA funding of \$8,000 will serve the purpose of rehabilitating and restoring recreational land by clearing overgrown areas and provide seating/viewing and parking areas at the Hodgkins Cove Town Landing. The project consists of clearing overgrown and invasive species; spreading loam and reseeding the cleared areas; planting with native plants; installation of benches for viewing; creating a small parking area and installation of fencing and signage for a total cost of approximately \$16,873. This also requires Conservation Commission approval and pre-site visits have been conducted on this project and the Lobster Cove Town Landing project to be taken up next, he indicated.

**The Committee will conduct individual site visits.**

- Waterways Board (Lobster Cove Town Landing Restoration Project) \$5,000

Speaking for the Waterways Board was **Jim Caulkett**, Harbormaster, **Cate Banks** and **Tony Gross** of the Waterways Board for the Lobster Cove Public Landing rehabilitation and restoration. He conveyed the following information:

The CPA funding of \$5,000 will serve the purpose of rehabilitating and restoring recreational land by clearing overgrown areas and provide seating/viewing area located at the Lobster Cove Town Landing. The project consists of clearing an area of invasive vines; installing granite steps and granite benches and planting with native plants; for a total cost of approximately \$5,020. A survey recently conducted for the head of Lobster Cove will be recorded at the South Essex Registry of Deed, **Ms. Banks** said. As a result of the survey, she and **Mr. Gross** noted, a substantial amount of property has been reclaimed by the City in this area.

**The Committee will conduct individual site visits.**

- Essex County Greenbelt Association (Norcross Property Acquisition) \$100,000

Speaking for the Essex County Greenbelt Association was **David Santomenna**, Director of Land Conservation, for the Norcross Property Acquisition. He conveyed the following information:

The CPA funding of \$100,000 will allow the Essex County Greenbelt Association (ECGA) to pursue the purchase of the Norcross property for the purpose of its preservation, located at Concord Street and Route 128 by protecting the property for development as well as to enhance, expand and improve access and parking for the adjacent 300 acre Thompson Street Reservation, also purchased with some CPA funds as well.

Showing the Committee a USGS Map of the 10.3 acre area, **Mr. Santomenna** said the ECGA proposes to acquire and preserve the Norcross property at a cost of \$200,000, with the total project cost being approximately \$225,000. The ECGA will own the property and convey a permanent Conservation Restriction to the City of Gloucester. The property which is located on Concord Street in West Gloucester directly abuts the ECGA's 300-acre Thompson Street Reservation and serves as the de facto access point via an existing trail. Some features of this property are: a 19<sup>th</sup> century carriage road, granite retaining walls, second growth hardwood forest, granite outcroppings and a large wetland area which composes the majority of the property. An unnamed brook forms the northern boundary of the property flows into the Little River, to the Annisquam River, which ultimately flows into Ipswich Bay and Gloucester Harbor. This property will be a gateway, he said, to the Thompson Street Reservation. This property was once a part of the Clarence Birdseye estate, **Mr. Santomenna** said, and is now owned by the Norcross Family Trust; the agreement to purchase the property is with that entity.

**Mr. Santomenna** said there will need to be a survey of the property to determine the inventory of trails in order to connect the two properties and upgrade them. He also said ECGA has about \$160,000 in hand for the Norcross property purchase, adding that the ECGA is confident of reaching their funding goal to purchase of the property which would be the bookend to the Thompson Street Reservation. He said the ECGA is confident the property will see a lot of use.

**The Committee will conduct a site visit on Friday, October 11<sup>th</sup> at 1:30 p.m. to meet at the parking area of the Norcross property.**

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Ciolino, seconded by Councilor Cox, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to vote to ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING for the CPA FY13, Round 4 Funding.**

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Dana C. Jorgensson  
Clerk of Committees**

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.**