

East Boston PierPAC

April 17, 2018

Attendance:

Mary Berninger
Peter Cardinale
Mary Hanlon
Adrian Madaro
Lucille Monuteaux
Bob Strelitz

Connie Carbone
Jerry Deneumoustier
Bernardine Joslin
Karen Maddalena
Rose Petraglia
Melissa Tyler

Fran Carbone
David Halbert
Sal LaMattina
Louise Mantanino
Frances Piantedosi

Excused:

Karen Buttiglieri

Absent:

Marie Deneumoustier

Associate Members Present:

Michael Bruno
Lucille Drago
Libby Scimeni

Mary Cole
Lucille Reed

Alex DeFronzo
Mary Romano

Attendance was taken.

Peter Cardinale - Before we start, if somebody poses a question could they please stand up

Mary Berninger - Good news, we have a microphone and it is portable.

Mary Berninger - Minutes from March, corrections, additions. I know they are long and involved, but I think that is good because it is good record of what we are doing. This is a great resource to be able to go back and look at it.

Lucille Reed - Page 11 when you answered Lucille Drago, you said there were, 'some individuals and I know you guys are not around'. I think that should be amended to 'you and Mary Romano were not around' because I was here.

Mary Berninger - In reference to the nominations it is personal preference, too. Who was nominated by whom.

Lucille Reed - I know that, but I was here and I think it should be amended that they were the only ones who were not here.

Mary Berninger - Okay, we can do that.

Lucille Reed - And the other one was when Lucille asked 'if everybody had been here for a year' you answered 'yes, well over that'. Well not everyone was here for over a year and I think that should be removed. Not all. (The sentence was located in the minutes.)

Mary Berninger - Because some of them have been. The ones who were nominated were. If you want to let us know who you think it was?

Lucille Drago - Louise.

Mary Berninger - To Louise. You haven't been here for over a year?

Louise Montanino - No.

Mary Berninger - I will go back to the attendance. The year requirement, which isn't a true requirement as Richie explained, was that the longer people attend meetings, it gives people an opportunity, the ones doing the nominating, to see if there is a true, invested interest in doing it. There is no hard and fast rule

about it, but if somebody shows consistent attendance and interest. When did you start coming, because there is no hard and fast rule?

Louie Montanino - I want to say October, November, around there. I couldn't tell you exactly.

Lucille Reed - I think it should be removed because that is not a true statement.

Mary Berninger - Actually it is true statement in that sense because I said it. I was going under what we had discussed in past years; for individuals to show that they had a real good commitment to what this group does. So if you want to change it go ahead, but I go by what I said. That is the way we try to see how people would participate in a meaningful way.

Karen Maddalena - So if 1 person hasn't been coming a year, so I think it should be amended.

Mary Berninger - If Karen wants it amended it will be amended. The issue is that I guess I talked about the year thing and I said people had been here more than a year.

Richard Lynds - Where is the statement in the minutes?

Mary Berninger - It says that we talked about all 4 being nominated and attendance is taken for that reason, they have to be here a certain length of time. 2 or 3 years ago we talked about showing good faith, not that you have to be here so many meetings, but to show the people who would be doing the nominating that you were someone who showed an interest

Richard Lynds - So the purpose of that, it can be for debate later. If something in the minutes is attributed to somebody in the membership and they believed they said that, that is not an appropriate thing to strike from the minutes. That is something that should remain in the minutes because it memorializes what transpired in the meeting. So, in the interest of transparency, it probably is not appropriate to strike it in the minutes because the person it is attributed to believes that is what they said at the meeting. If there were was some mis-characterization of what was said and the person who said it and felt that it needed to be corrected, then that is an appropriate amendment to the minutes. But to strike that from the minutes is probably not an appropriate measure

Mary Berninger - Any more discussion on that matter? Any more additions, corrections, or deletions?

Bernardine Joslin - Motion to accept.

Bob Strelitz - Second.

Voted and passed.

Mary Berninger - Now that our counsel is here, we are going to begin with Anthony, Ned and the representatives from Kleinfelder. They will present for about a half hour and then we will go into our session with the rest of our agenda.

Anthony Guerriero - First of all let me be the first to welcome you to the Cathy Leonard McLean Community Room. Thanked the members of the PAC that attended Saturday's re-dedication of the room. Cathy was important to me both professionally and my personal life as to all of you. You worked with her in Phase I of Piers Park. Mary Berninger and Karen Buttiglieri were part of the speaking team that day. They did a fantastic job talking about the relationship they had with Cathy and Massport. On April 28 East Boston Little League opens at Festa Field and the Sailing Center opens for the season at 12:00pm, also on the 28th. At Festa Field, looking at replacing the lights in the outfield, replace lights with new LED lights. It will make it easier for the kids to see. A lot of work going on for opening day. Girls softball doesn't start until July. During our tour last year with Mary and Bob Strelitz and going over Piers Park; we are doing regular maintenance of painting the fences, railing, looking at lights, trees, trimming branches, looking at damage done through the storms with ballparks and open spaces. The granite medallion on the pier in Phase I has been cracked for some time. A lot of wear and tear, the weather, etc. It is a big cost to replace it and we are still taking a look at it to see If it can be repaired with granite, metal, etc. Will try to address it sometime next year. Before Ned Dawes, the Project Manager speaks, we had a very good meeting on Friday in preparation of today's meeting. We talked about the roles of Kleinfelder and Pressley Assoc. over the course of this design process. I think that

what they are going to say today is that the next couple of months are going to be the classroom. You are going to have homework assignments. Taking a look at what works at all the parks. Just don't focus on Piers Park, look at Bremen St. Park too. Get a better idea over the season because it starts next month. People start to utilize and exploit that park. Start making notes so that in the fall, when we come back, we can take a look at what works in the park. I spoke with Sam Slieman, Director of Capital Programs, Ned's boss. He suggested what we did not see, re-visit a park, or others South of Boston or Northshore, etc. We should try to plan that and then we could have Kleinfelder and Marion on that bus tour to give us some explanations about design or answer some questions.

Ned Dawes - Handed out copies of Piers Park - Phase 2 "Road Map" for the Project.

We talked internally with Massport as to how we want to attack this project, the steps we can see to bring us to the conclusion. We thought about breaking the project up into steps. Some of the steps we have started, and some we will be working on over the summer.

Step 1. Introduction and Discussion

The consultant selected is Kleinfelder and, also, Marion Pressley who is also here tonight.

Step 2. Kleinfelder Team's Discussion of Past Park Designs

Here and other places, lessons learned, do not want to repeat something that does not work, went to other parks and captured information about design.

Step 3. Review Existing Data

What information, what existing data can we use, not start from square 1. Topographic survey may not be able to be used, we may need new one. Environmental permit rules have changed in some cases, potential possible hazardous materials. Past information may not be valid, resiliency may be a factor, flooding, etc. What we can do to protect sections of East Boston.

Step 4. Collect Information About Surrounding Area

Have started doing some of these things. Visiting parks, asking Kleinfelder to look into the demographics in East Boston, the developments that have taken place, who is using the park, what the residents want, what features are in other East Boston Parks. Phase II is a more active park. Do you want to replicate same features that are in other parks, what are the activities in other parks in East Boston. Ideas of multiple use of the active space, if there is enough space to fit what we want. The idea is to get information on the surrounding areas.

Step 5. Park Programming & Community Input

Start to try to short list the activities, bring it down to a more realistic view and from that do a conceptual layout, fit, interlock, etc. Construction phasing, cost estimates, stick with budget, environmental permits. Up to this point collecting information, doing conceptual ideas, up to this point is relatively easy.

Step 6. Park Design and Community Review

Slowly solidifying what we want in the park, preliminary designs, community review, community input, construction phasing. May tie into other types of environmental permitting, checking process.

Step 7. Finalize Park Design & PierPAC Approval

Once we have a good handle on the preliminary design, we will move into final design. Check cost estimates, make sure we are staying on budget, have community review, then come back before you to make sure the design gets approved by the PierPAC and Massport.

Step 8. Bid & Construction Phases

Because of the nature of the project, the bid phase would probably be a little longer, file 7 bids because of construction, once we have the bidder/contractor selected, have to

have pre-construction administration, various things they have to give us; schedules, shop drawings, etc. Then ready to go, start construction, etc.

That is how we saw the project go step by step. Tonight we are at step number 1 with the Kleinfelder team and through to opening the park. Andre will talk about the team, some of the experiences with other parks, possible homework assignments or things to think about as we move forward.

Andre Marticchini - Project Manager for Kleinfelder.

- Thrilled finally kicking this off. Kleinfelder has been looking at this project for a couple of years. We are really excited we are here today. I have Nasser Brahim and Marion Pressley with us. Kleinfelder is the primary consultant with Massport. We are the team that has the contract with Massport. We are doing mostly civil engineering, architecture, a lot of the permitting work, helping with the community input. We will be the main consultants.
- Pressley Assoc. has a lot of history on this project as does Kleinfelder. Kleinfelder was involved with Pressley Assoc. doing the original Phase design. We were known then as SEA Consultants. We were bought in 2009, have 60 offices all over the country and a couple around the world. Pressley Assoc. will be in charge of landscape architecture which is what you actually see. She will have a lot of input in what the park will look like.
- Foth Infrastructure and Environmental Engineering will be our waterfront infrastructure. They just bought CLE Engineering who will be our waterfront infrastructure. When we build new waterfront bulkheads, which is the lining of the water's edge, and maybe docks, they will be heavily involved with that as well as the permitting. CLE has been involved with inspecting some of the bulkheads that are out there today in Phase I. They have a good handle on what is out there today and what is working or not working.
- RDK Engineering is our mechanical, electrical, plumbing engineering for the buildings for the lights, etc., and they were also involved with Phase I.
- VJ Associates are cost estimating and scheduling specialists. As Ned mentioned, cost is a huge thing when we design. Money does not grow on trees and we have to design to a budget, and as we start trading off different ideas, cost always has to be thought of.
- Code Red Consultants is going to be doing some code consulting. One of the things, when you look historically from 2 years ago, codes have changed. So much has changed over the years. It has become so specialized.

We have a lot of experiences with Phase I and with Phase II. It was an award winning park. The Sailing Center has grown by leaps and bounds. As you look at the park we want to understand, through your perspective, what is working within that park; are people using it, etc. The demographics have changed.

Marion Pressley - Massport did some refurbishing some years ago. The play area, redid the pool area, the adult exercise area, worked with drainage problem over the years. Almost every other year we have been asked by Massport, with the supervisor, to do a walk around in the spring to do a punch list. Have stayed in tune with it.

Andre Marticchini - Charlie Saccara, one of our lead engineers, will be involved with this project. On Phase II, we went through the design almost to bidding and construction and then it was put on hold. We had a design and layout. Things change, and maybe this was a park that had a lot of passive, a lot of walking, When Ned talked about sports; is that something that would fit and would you want it?

Marion Pressley - Just to remind you we ended up adding additional play ground equipment. There seemed a need for swings for larger children. We also ended up with a volley ball area which everyone seemed heped up on and we also have a park basketball. Of course the biggest piece of this was the enormous fountain, with waves, etc. That was one of the major features. And the bicycle track was around the outside. That was the essence of being active. There was also a desire for additional parking,

and picnicking. And, also, continuing the idea of the arboretum and native plants that are ocean sensitive. The Sailing Center was a big piece of this. It had not only a place for teaching, but there was also a community room. It did double duty because the building was larger. That was the interest at that time.

Andre Marticchini - Our team has been involved with many other parks which, hopefully, we will be drawing some ideas from. We recently did the lawn at the Mass. Convention Center in South Boston.

Marion Pressley - At Neponset there is the Pope John Paul the II Park. It went under construction when Piers Park was finished. It has a soccer field, play area, picnic area, etc. It was at the old dump site/ drive-in theater. It also has the 9ft. tidal movement that you have. The acreage is enormous. I have been working on Point State Park for 14 years, 4 phases of construction. It is a national historic landmark because it was the site of the French and Indian war. It had to be totally refurbished. It had very poor handicapped accessibility. In 1950 when it was designed no one cared about handicap accessibility. We worked a lot to make that work. It also had 2 rivers that go into one, so it has flooding issues about 6 times a year. We knew we would have 6 to 12ft. of water at any given time. Resiliency was very important there. It was flooding into the main part of the park.

Andre Marticchini - Speaking about resiliency, Nassar will talk about a finished project in East Boston and why it is so important.

Nassar Brahim - We looked at the risk from sea level rise, storm surge and the impacts of flooding it would cause in the neighborhood. It was a City of Boston project, not led by Massport, but Massport was involved in the stake holder engagement process. We went to all the different neighborhood associations in East Boston, talked to people about the flooding information we were gathering. There are a number of low points along the waterfront that are serving as channels when the sea level rises and comes up. You may have seen in the news or social media during the March and January storms locations such as Lewis St, and over by Shaw's. In that process we were looking along the waterfront and trying to define what these waterfront areas will look like in the future. How we can re-design these areas to act as a barrier from coastal flooding coming into the community and also provide every day benefits. We want to make use of that space and enjoy it. Many of the solutions we looked at over the longer term, incorporated using waterfront space as park space for recreational purposes, and social activities. Piers Park II was one of the sites we thought had a lot of potential. Not just to be a safe park itself, but to make sure the facilities are not damaged by flooding. It could actually be part of a long term solution to flooding for the neighborhood; by building out that waterfront. Excited to be exploring what those issues and solutions are with this group and other groups in the community. Looking to hopefully make East Boston safer.

Andre Marticchini - Speaking of that, one of the goals is to make the park resilient. We want to make it a flood barrier, but not make it look like that. We do not want you to think that it is flood barrier. You could put a wall up and it would serve the same function. As Nassar is saying we want you to experience the park and not know that it is a flood control structure. I would be the Project Manager. Community participation would be dealing with your committee as well as any community stake holders. Marion and Nassar will be leading that effort. Both of them have a lot of experience dealing with all kinds of community engagement. We take our design and break it into 3 categories. The designers, which are the landscape people, the architects, and they are the people that will make the park look good. The engineering are the people who make the park functional, in the sense that it cannot fall apart, and looking at utilities, lighting, etc. We have a lot of support services, climate resiliency, the environmental, hazardous materials, permitting, etc. 3D visualization is important. We look at drawings and plans, but with people, who are not used to looking at plans, it is hard to visualize. Communication in any project like this is important. We have had problems in the past when we have had people come to us as designers, come to us directly to do things. This creates problems. With this project, our goal is

to have any communications first come through Massport. Whether through Anthony or Ned or other Massport departments. Ned mentioned homework and we are not going to talk about all these things today, but, one of the things we want you to think about because you people are the users and you know the park, the community, better than anyone. We need your input on what is working or not working. Go out to the park and observe, look at the park, be critical, ask questions, write them down so when we come back to you we will get bombarded with ideas. The other thing is having a group like this that knows the history of the park and many of you have been on this committee for a long time. We would like you to come up with community participation. We would like your help to gather data. Have high school kids, they sometimes need to earn credits, etc. How can we use local people to do data counts, count people in the parks? Again, what amenities, what infrastructure, activities do you want in the park. I am sure you all have different ideas. We start with the big group of ideas and we slowly say what does not work, not compatible, etc, and then whittle it down. It is a fantastic process, but do not expect to have a solution in a day. Again, ideas for engaging the community. If you want to have a good successful park, the community should be participating. You are the main conduit for the community so how can we get to the community. In the East Boston work that Nassar was working on, we had various meetings that were well attended. What is the mechanism for this? Interview people at the park, social media, send questionnaires, etc? Think about your experience here in East Boston and what has worked well in the past. We would love to get those suggestions. One of our goals is to look for ideas to have the community participate.

Mary Berninger - Questioning if you are aware of Phase III that is coming down the highway very quickly and if you are aware that it is supposedly being done in a concurrent/parallel manner. The reason I ask is because, in my mind, I am trying to envision how it would work; whether it is the engineering, resiliency, design, movement of materials, etc. Being sensitive to each others need. If you do go to any other neighborhood groups, I would ask that you let us know so we can put it out to our membership to attend so we can also hear what the people in East Boston are saying

Anthony Guerriero - You and I talked about that briefly. When it gets to that point we will coordinate with the PAC.

Ned Dawes - They are aware of Phase III, as to the process, and later this month, April 20, proposals are due. We would then have to see what comes out of that and will have to coordinate with them.

Anthony Guerriero - It could be a different project manager, there are so many unknowns right now.

Mary Berninger - I would just hope that all the moving pieces are coordinated between the 2 parcels.

Anthony Guerriero - We have a lot of work to do with that. We have been talking for a couple of months now, next month Ned has secured Sherri Ruan.

Ned Dawes - One of the parks we really liked was the Thomas Menino Park. It had a lot of good features, similarities. Sherri is the designer and I reached out to her. Told her we were designing this park, it has a lot of similarities and a lot of the people that visited it. We liked the aspect as far as accessibility, play structured, etc. Sherri is coming in next month and talk about some of the lessons they learned as well as how they went out and got community input.

Anthony Guerriero - You might want to take a ride out there on your own and be prepared to ask questions. It has a resilient surface just like our park, it is just larger. Over the course of this year Ned took some great photos for the power point he did last year. He could bring it back to this meeting and start to talk about design elements.

Karen Maddalena - We are talking future and I sound like a broken record. We really have the Naval Field Buffer edge which is the perfect example of our neighborhood and that has appropriate plantings. At some point maybe people might want to see it.

Anthony Guerriero - Maybe we can all meet there, take a look at it and then take a walk to Piers Park. Maybe on a Friday, in the summer, when the kids are out of school. Have a lunch there, and just an

observation, watch people using the park, etc. Would be a productive meeting. Work closely with the Jeffries Point Neighborhood Assoc. (JPNA) and AIRINC on the design process. I think as we move forward you will be driving that process right along with us. And then we will have to reach out to the JPNA and have a presentation. My expectation is the kids working with Mary and the rest of the team here and the PAC would be at that meeting. There are so many community groups. Gove St. might ask for a presentation, other groups, but we will schedule it and work with the executive team here. We have a lot of work ahead of us.

Mary Berninger - Before we get to the operations, security and maintenance, (OSM) a couple of more housekeeping things. You all received your mailings and agenda either in an email or snail mail. We are starting to enter into this process, it is going to be busy and as we talked last month, we may have multiple meetings in a month. Relying on snail mail for some people, proves to be a little difficult in terms of getting something out in an immediate fashion. If you have an email address that you have not shared with this group please give it to Maria because that is going to be the best, the preferred way, for this group to communicate. She can send out the list (the membership list) the way she does now and I have asked her to add everybody's email addresses. If you do not have a printer that is okay. You can at least communicate because it is faster, more reliable and it creates a record for you and the person receiving the information. Who does not have access to a computer and who does not have an email? It is simple to get an email address.

(Discussion on the members with or without an email address and who might be able to get one.)

Mary Berninger - If relying on snail mail only, you may not receive it and answer in a timely manner. If you all would consider that, it would make our work simpler.

(Secretary explained even with an email address the snail mail could continue. I would copy the agenda/minutes and send it out for the members without access to printers/computers.)

Richard Lynds - Most of the items that we send do not have to be printed. We will always make sure we have it at the meetings for you. Tonight a lot of you may have gotten an email about our annual review. As we start getting into the next phase of the discussions we will be having are operations, security and maintenance (OSM), and Phase II. We want to do our annual checkup with compliance issues. Compliance with the Open Meeting Law and all of the things we want to do, so that we continue the PAC in the most transparent and open way. For our new members; we are not necessarily a governmental body, but because we are created by the legislature, we strive to achieve transparency through compliance with the Open Meeting Law, which essentially says that, when we have a meeting, we publish notice of that meeting at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Anything that we are going to discuss at the meeting has to be included in the Agenda. We typically do not discuss things that are not on our Agenda for the purpose of not doing something by surprise. Tonight we could not say we could take a vote on X, Y or Z if it was not on our agenda. In order to do that, in the spirit of compliance with the Open Meeting Law, everybody who is a member, not associate members, will sign this document stating that they read the open meeting law, that they understand it and understand the requirements of it. Do not want people to get nervous that somehow you cannot talk with each other outside the meeting. That is not an issue for the purpose of what we do. Our intent is to ensure that when people do want to participate in our meetings, that we are making sure that everything we talk about is done in a public transparent manner. One of the things we did email out was basically a summary review of the meeting law. It is not something I expect everyone to memorize or know. It is something you have to have and if you want to read it you can, but the certification for homework purposes, and are due at the next meeting, should be signed by all of the members of the PAC. All of these documents are on our website, ebpierpac.org. It has a list of all documents and was something we had done a few years ago. The enabling legislature as well as the by-laws. Most important is our Conflict of Interest Policy. As we start getting into matters that are going to require votes, discussions, and deliberations on things that are

significant and important to this community. We want to make sure we are doing it in compliance with our by-laws and we are doing it in a way that we are not subjected to criticism for not following the rules. If there is ever a question about the by-laws you can ask me for the interpretation. You do not have to agree with me. You can disagree with me and then it goes to the Chair and the Chair can put it to a vote for interpretation. As counsel I will do my best to represent to you my interpretation of the by-laws and I strongly encourage membership to rely on counsel to interpret by-laws and not to disregard counsel because there are times when things we do under the by-laws are going to be required for our non-profit status as well as our compliance with things like the Open Meeting Law and the IRS regulations. When you rely on council and you act, you are shielded from any issues or problems that may go along with that. I am the one that has to be responsible for any determinations that we make under our by-laws. If there are any questions on the by-laws feel free to ask me directly, privately or during the meeting. We did have an entry on the OSM tonight and I want to preface that first and I think the opportunity for people to comply with the open meeting law, get our sheets signed and then get into a fruitful discussion as part of our next meeting with the OSM. I did send a copy as well to Maria and she has to get out the actual agreement

Maria - The email you sent to me today with the 4 intents attached; I copied them all and everyone has a copy.

Mary Berninger - Questioning if Peter can hear tonight. If we have side conversations we cannot be heard.

Peter Cardinale - Maybe if you all stand up.

Mary Berninger - Before we get to the homework that I hope we all did for the for OSM, I wanted to bring up something that has been mentioned here briefly, mentioned at the caboose and the big meeting at Y and that has to do with Phase V. We are talking about resiliency, talking about continuity for Phase I, II, III, IV, but we are not yet at the point where the Greenway is connected to everything and it is segmented from Massport to the City. There is always what do we do with it and from the City's point of view, where do we get the money for it? It would be an example of maybe the design and would not be contiguous to the one that is going to the beach. Massport has heard this suggestion a few times and they have said that would be down the road. I had a conversation this week with Adrian Madaro and I asked him if he thought this would be an appropriate time to suggest to Massport, going through the elected officials, that this group, and it would have to be voted on, would like to entertain the idea that Massport assumes ownership of that last segment of the Greenway. It needs a motion here, would have to be passed, and then a letter that we could write. We have written a lot of letters lately and they seem to be getting noticed. Send the letter to Adrian, Lydia, Sen. Boncore and Adrian said that with this idea from the PAC, he would be willing to present the idea to the Mayor.

Adrian Madaro - One thing I would add is that we all know about the drainage/flooding issues down there and the city has committed to fixing that problem. That is the one thing we need to check in on because if the city hasn't made that investment yet, my guess is that Massport is going to want them to make that investment before they (Massport) take it on. That is the one piece we need clarity on. But other than that, I think it makes sense and it is a timely piece to take up now that we are having the discussion on Phase II, III, IV and you are going to have this one missing gap that is the city of Boston's land. They do not want it, we do not want the city to have it. We want everything to be maintained, operated by Massport and not to have this one missing link, will be problematic down the road.

Karen Maddalena - They have a drainage problem and in consideration of that, there has to be some way that the Friends of East Boston Greenway have some part of this. We have been working on that for 20 years. If Massport takes it over there has to be some way the Friends of East Boston Greenway work with the PierPAC.

Mary Berninger - Questioning if you have a design that your group came up with for that section. I know it is a mess, but have you thought of something that you wanted there?

Karen Maddalena - They did have a meeting with members of the Parks Dept. The drainage problem has been resolved and there is also the fact that there is money from the Barr Foundation, \$100,000 Grant to make the Greenway more accessible, signage, etc.

Mary Berninger - Maybe, if going on what Adrian and you said, maybe the city, whatever funds they were thinking of allocating and then the funds that you got, would do whatever needed to be mapped out, to whatever could be done with that money and then the Port maybe could put in their own. But, I was also thinking long term of another OSM. The city is not really good.

Karen Maddalena - I am not against what you are proposing, but there has to be some way for partnership. For instance, the Friends of East Boston Greenway were responsible for having the extension to the Constitution Beach. We had a significant part in that planning. Worked with the city of Boston and the MBTA. Our plan is to continue into Winthrop.

Adrian Madaro - None of this precludes us working with this. I don't see this at all like grabbing land from the Greenway Council. I think the Greenway Council is still going to be the steward of the entire Greenway. The one piece that is missing is that we have heard of for years now, is issues that have persisted, relative to safety, security, lighting, etc. This is a conversation that we, Mary, myself, Karen, others, have had meetings at length with the city to get them to move on this. The reality is the city does not have the resources that they are willing to allocate to this piece. Whereas if we get it transferred to Massport I think we will get some call boxes and lighting very quickly.

Karen Maddalena - Also, Roseland has to step up to the plate and pay for some of that too.

Adrian Madaro - That's another reason why getting it over to Massport gives it an extra carrot to get it over there. It is sitting on Massport land.

Richard Lynds - The conversation is not about territorial jurisdiction.

Karen Maddalena - No, I know we can come up with a partnership.

Richard Lynds - We have a missing tooth here in the entire park system; the Greenway, and not because it is not valuable to the community. It's a missing tooth because it lacks operation, security, maintenance and control. When I say control meaning it doesn't have the teeth this organization has because we do not have any jurisdiction over it. We can't dictate to the Port Authority what their maintenance and security obligations are.

Karen Maddalena - I think it is a very good thing.

Richard Lynds - I think what we are trying to say is if that gets folded into this entire picture. And what we don't want is to put things artificially in the way of the success of that. I understand what you are saying; get Roseland on the hook. Great idea. But, if Roseland is not going to step up to the plate, we can't put that in as a condition of this being successful, because that is just an out for the Port Authority. No disrespect to the Authority, but that just gives them a reason to say that is what the community wants, so we are not going to do it unless Roseland steps up. We want to make it simple for the Port Authority to step in and take it over if that is possible. Very similar with the Bremen St Park and has happened with other areas in the community because they do a great job with parks. It becomes a big plus.

Mary Berninger - I think history showed that the conveyance of the ownership isn't clean yet with Bremen St. Park. It took a while to do that conveyance to the extension to the beach. If you remember the MBTA, NSTAR, etc. A lot of agencies have to come together, and many others also.

Karen Maddalena - And that was through the advocacy of the Friends of the Greenway.

Mary Berninger - What I am trying to say is, no one is trying to say they are not a valued partner, but I am trying to say if we could do the conveyance sooner rather than later, so it is one system. I think that

is the whole idea. Any comments, should we make a motion? Get all of this done, while everything is being talked about.

Fran Carbone - Make a motion because it needs help, so this is the right route to take.

Mary Hanlon - Second.

Mary Berninger - Any discussion on the motion?

Richard Lynds - Just to be clear. The motion is to express the support of the PAC with respect to the ownership (of the Greenway) being conveyed from the city to the Port Authority for purposes of maintenance, operations, security and improvement.

Mary Hanlon - Questioning why the city failed. It is just about the money from the city?

Richard Lynds - The city's park system is so expansive they need an endowment just to take care of what they have. A lot of the parks in the city are not maintained to the level as Piers Park. They are not even close to what we get at the Piers Park.

Mary Berninger - Asking for a vote on the motion on the floor.

Voted and passed.

Richard Lynds - At our last meeting we spoke about how we are going to approach our conversations. We are not going to get the OSM done in one evening. It is more of a conversation that takes into account the proposed amendments that the Port Authority would like to enter into this agreement, but also any issues we feel are important that haven't been addressed in the last 8 to 10 years. In looking at the agreement the best place to start is the numbered sections we have to go through. Not saying we get through them tonight or in the next few meetings. A good place to start is the goals. In your recommendations we understand what the goals were. The goals were established when this was put forth to the neighborhood. Good place to start to thinking about things to be changed or added. The top goal for this is to insure the park is maintained in a condition consistent with that of a first class public park. We just talked about this. The difference between the city's maintenance of parks and what Massport does. In thinking about the things that are important to this agreement, we need to think about those types of issues that might crop up historically in the future, to ensure we keep this goal as one of the top priorities. If there are things that people feel have to be addressed or added to the agreement. We have had a lot of discussions about this. Things that could be better. What can Massport do better to ensure this goal could continue?

Mary Berninger - Anthony mentioned tonight the medallion. It has been broken for some time and all they keep saying is, they are trying to investigate the best material, trying to go back to the original design, etc. It has been over a year that it has been discussed. I think that when this group or anybody in the community either contacts Massport or one of us and we tell Massport, I think there should be a reasonable length of time for them to get an answer to us. I think a year or 2 seasons is unacceptable.

Richard Lynds - I have heard this a number of times at different meetings about timely response by the Port Authority on operations and maintenance issues. If the Port Authority is going to meet its objectives and ensure that we have those as goals in the community, then having a timely response to them is something that needs to be better defined in the agreement. It has to be reasonable, not 24 or 48 hours, but I think there has to be some sort of time limit on when they can do things. When they don't do it there should be some other alternative action that we can pursue. For example; if the brick pathway is in very bad shape, we make the request, put it in writing to the Port Authority that it needs to be addressed, etc., and they don't respond or don't do it. What is our alternative, how can we enforce our rights under the agreement? I think part of that has to do with what these options are that presently exist. Arbitration or mediation which is always the last resort. I think we shouldn't have to go and call our elected officials and say they are not listening to the agreement. We should have something built onto the agreement that gives us the ability to address that. One of the things we probably want to think about is what those alternatives are. If the Port Authority does not respond to a request within a reasonable period of time, we will fill in those blanks as we get closer, but I think a timely response that is not met

should have some type of action by either this group or others to be able to say to the Port Authority you cannot ignore us on this stuff. It will be a drip, drip over time that we do not ever want to lose that momentum when it comes to the input that this group gives. I think what happens is the Port Authority will realize, not necessarily this administration, but they could eventually say that they do not have to get to it. We want to be able to have the teeth built in, whether we use it or not, we want to have something that makes it difficult for the Port Authority to ignore important issues.

David Halbert - Questioning how often we get information from the Massport Board itself.

Richard Lynds - We have communicated to the Massport Board in writing and I have been before the Massport Board and also others have been, in community capacities.

David Halbert - Wondering in terms of adding something with teeth. Massport Board has designees in the Secretary's Office, the Governor's office, etc. If we had something as part of the OSM, some sort of standing, regular addition to their order of business. Once a year, twice a year, whatever. Something where all of the folks at Massport knows that at some point this group will have an audience in front of the Board that is scheduled. If problems have not been addressed then we will bring them to the Board. If the Board is ultimately the oversight and authority for the entire agency I would imagine that nobody wants to look bad in front of their boss. At the very least they would have the answers before we get there so they can be addressed as opposed to having us just walk in and say that we have been asking about this for a year and we are not getting any answers.

Bob Strelitz - Isn't there a community member on the Board? So that shouldn't be our means of communications on something like that.

Richard Lynds - John Nucci is the community member. I think if there is a provision or acknowledgement by the Port Authority that does not presently exist in the agreement, that sets forth some trigger. Let's say we did not get satisfaction, that this may be an item that is given to the Board, you're right. I am sure they probably wouldn't be too happy with us telling them they are not doing their job. It gives us the opportunity to bring our grievances to someone higher up. This is something we could include in the list of items, if there is no objection to that.

Mary Berninger - I like that. I have spoken to the Board twice. Once was the Sailing Center when they were being taken off their books. The other time was about the Lincoln/Concord/Hanscom issue. I don't think that Board hears from the community enough. I think they sometimes operate in a vacuum.

David Halbert - I think for John, things that he is personally dealing and we are all aware of, if as the community representative, he is not just the PierPAC representative, he is representing so many voices. That is a lot to ask of him, to take our specific issues and make sure they are addressed. We can do that on our own, as an organization.

Richard Lynds - With respect to that goal I have cut, 'more timely response in a period for addressing concerns that effect this particular goal' and included 'Massport presentation process semi-annually' where we could just give a good report. Just a matter of presenting that from the PAC perspective to Massport and then we have that opportunity to include it on the agenda. We just know, whatever month, that we made a presentation at the Massport Board. Any other items that we think are necessary, based upon the history about what we think going forward, and that should be including the goal of maintaining a first class public park.

Mary Berninger - We do not do enough walk throughs with them. Maybe more walk throughs with the staff of the parks. Now we are creating more acreage so going forward, especially if this is going to be a 10 year and all of these things come on line, there will be so much more to check.

Richard Lynds - So that would be before opening and after closing.

Michael Bruno - Does the PAC have any input or items that need improvements or maintenance of the park? Does Massport handle that totally separate from this group?

Mary Berninger - We give advice of what needs to be fixed.

Richard Lynds - They have an overall maintenance budget for all of their parks and we have a check list of items that are supposed to be done on an annual basis. I don't want to say it doesn't matter. I don't think cost has ever been an issue. I don't think they have ever said that they do not have the money to do a specific thing, especially when it comes to maintenance. The sky is the limit, I guess, but that is not to say it always will be. I think we want to make sure we keep that level of funding.

Bob Strelitz - The exception would be that medallion. It has been sitting there for awhile.

Mary Berninger - This is off topic but maybe it meshes a little. When they were here earlier and they were making their Power Point presentation, I think I heard 3 times that they talked about the budget. I don't ever remember Massport giving us an exact figure yet.

Richard Lynds - On the actual cost of Phase II?

Mary Hanlon - He kept saying that we have to keep it within budget. I think that needs to be shared with this group. How do we know what Kleinfelder is looking at? We are suggesting things, but we need to know that final figure. He kind of intimidated it, but, we don't know it.

Richard Lynds - I added to that and what we will do is include it in this summary sheet as we continue the discussions. Budget costs that are allocated to the cost of maintenance should be defined. If there is a decision of the Port Authority to cut those costs we should have some input into that. That would ensure at least a level funding of maintenance for the park systems. I am sure as it grows that should grow as well.

Mary Berninger - You talked about the condition of the bricks though and did anybody else pick up on it at the Y meeting when Liz made a comment, questioning if we want to keep the bricks. I was thinking that we want to keep the bricks but maintain them.

Louise Montanino - I used to work in the North End and they had all brick. The city was forever repairing them. I was watching one day and they actually took off the bricks, cemented, let it dry and then put the bricks over the cement so they did not have them warping anymore.

Mary Berninger - That's like my patio. It is a poured cement padding and the pavers are on top with sand.

Richard Lynds - I think the goal of bricks in a lot of those areas is that they are pervious so water will be able to go through and drain instead of pooling. They are the older historic sidewalks and they probably do not have the slope and pitch that concrete sidewalks have. I have seen that for small areas, but I do not think that would actually work in a park.

Mary Berninger - I was just wondering though if that is why they are delaying it. It seems to me she brought that up pointedly. Was that to get us to think that we would have asphalt everywhere?

Karen Maddalena - Another thing is because of the tree roots. You can't fix the bricks because of the tree roots.

Richard Lynds - Asking if there were any other comments or things we want to add to ensure the park is maintained in a condition consistent with a first class public park. People have ideas and we are not closing it out tonight, but we just want to start a conversation.

Melissa Tyler - Not sure if it is appropriate right now but what about 'way signs' because people do not know which direction to go, especially coming off the T. Better signage. Where the park is, the waterfront, etc. People come off of the T and wonder where to go.

Richard Lynds - We saw that in New York.

Sal LaMattina - We (Adrian and I) were just talking about the Greenway. Adrian and I worked on the last agreement and sometimes I think we did make a mistake that we did not add that piece in there. I have to be honest. I think that we need to just fold down and focus on our parks. That is what we are supposed to be doing. The Greenway is something that we want to get done someday, but I do not think we should make that a priority right now. I think we should just concentrate on our parks, help these guys out as much as we can, but let's do that at another time.

Mary Berninger - Maybe we just have the letter go out just so that it is on someone's radar screen and they do the timeline together.

Adrian Madaro - The only other piece that needs to be mentioned is the deployable flood wall that the city is invested in and the Greenway that is supposed to be at that location. Would this give the city room to pause and say, well then, Massport can pay for the deployable flood wall. They have already started to budget that into things. Sal and I were talking and maybe we should wait until that investment is real and the city signs and delivers on that wall. It is just a thought, but it is worth a discussion.

Karen Maddalena - With the money from the BARR Foundation, one of the things we will be working on is better signage. Also the Harborwalk. There is a group called the Harborwalk that is working throughout the city with signage. It is going to be all one design and that is being worked on.

Richard Lynds - That would have to come in the form of a motion.

Mary Berninger - Sal, do you want to do it as a motion because we already have a vote on one motion?

Sal LaMattina - I make a motion that we hold off on the letter until the city finalizes what they are supposed to be doing.

Mary Berninger - Questioning if he knows when they might do that wall?

Sal LaMattina - It is supposed to be soon. I can get the dates.

Adrian Madaro - I thought it was in this budget cycle. They just released the budget and I think it is in the FY19 budget for the city to make that investment in East Boston but, we need to confirm that.

Sal LaMattina - I know we announced it last October or November so it could be in this budget.

Mary Berninger - Then if we want to have a second or discussion and you bring that next month it think that is fine. At some point we would like to get that in front of them.

Adrian Madaro - Without a doubt, but given the workload we have in front of us, this is going to be timely for a while, so let's make sure we cross the t's and dot the i's before we make an overture that gives the city a room to wiggle out of a commitment. Make sure East Boston gets the investment we deserve.

Mary Hanlon - Second. (Sal's motion.)

Voted and passed.

Richard Lynds - The next goal listed in the agreement is protecting public safety and minimizing vandalism, security and other risks to persons and property. I want to point out that there is a goal in here that is inconsistent with the second goal. The second goal says protect public safety, minimize vandalism, security and other risks to persons and property. The next goal right after that says minimizing long term maintenance, repair and security costs. I do not think you want to minimize security costs if you want to be promoting public safety. I think one of those has to give here and I don't think the cost of security should be the one. One of the things I would suggest is that we ask them to amend their goal that sort of clarifies that, even though minimizing the security cost, I would say make making security costs more efficient. Doesn't necessarily means it reduces the amount of security that should be there. There shouldn't be substitutes for things like live officers in the parks. Those are all things we feel very strongly about. Security cameras are important, but they are a supplement to live police officers in the park. We want to make sure we are clear on that goal. We understand we are not going to waste money on security, but we are not going to devalue the amount of security these parks are going to require, especially as we get into Phase II, and perhaps a connector between Bremen St. and the Piers Park if the Greenway is successful. Those are security issues that are going to cost money and

we want to make sure that is going to fit with all the other goals that make this a first class park. So I am going to propose as counsel, we restate some of these goals when it comes to security and public safety, and that includes making that part, of the highest priority for the parks success, and to ensure that if cost is going to be an issue, the cost should not come at the sake of public safety. That is something we want to rewrite. I am guessing we are going to have a little bit of a debate with the Port Authority on this. They do not like to be bound to these sort of commitments where we have to say there is a certain level of security that we insist on. We want to define what that is. They shouldn't have the ability to just decide if there is enough security. I am going to propose some language as to how those goals can be restated. On that topic are there public safety issues or things different? Looking back historically as to what we have seen and then perspective what the next 10 years might produce. Are there things that are important that we want to address that we don't feel the Port Authority is doing or could do a much better job at?

Mary Berninger - We talked last month and Karen has mentioned it a few times over the years. We have talked to Mr. Lawless about it. Regardless of which location, Bremen St. Piers Park, Phase II, those guard shacks should never be vacant. There should always be a presence and I know we are only advisors, but if we could suggest they have non-police officers also, per shift, there in those buildings so that the public at least has a person to approach. You could go in and ask them to reach an officer by phone or radio because there is something going on in the park. They become the force multiplier instead of the public. I keep thinking about the massive amount of acreage we have to cover now and what are the numbers they need to seriously consider for bodies to do the job they should be doing. I think we also need to keep in mind that we heard from the Trustees. They would not give a firm commitment either about what type of security personnel they envision on their parcel. If it is not Port Officers and not something comparable to that, that is a gap in security. You have Phase I, Phase II, and then you have III that doesn't have the same level of security. There is no continuity to it. Then you have Phase IV which is going to be an open area, but if we were to do the Greenway there is a break there and I do not know what language you can put in to that.

Richard Lynds - I think there needs to be an increase in security for the additional acreage they are taking on. To suggest that the same level of staffing can handle the additional space is the equivalent of saying you are cutting staff because you are tasking them with a much greater responsibility without additional resources. The Port Authority's answer will be that of course they will increase staffing and security. Our position has to be that we want numbers. Numbers speak to what we can actually put our finger on to say how much security will there be. If there is twice as much space but not twice as much staff. I don't know if the number is twice as much, but it shouldn't be the same. It shouldn't be whatever the number is today or tomorrow when we have Phase II, or II, IV, etc. We want to put in something that talks about a commitment to make an increase in security. The same security they have today and they may have to hire more officers. That is something that shouldn't be negotiable when it comes to the goals because we are starting with the goals that this park was built upon. This goal is one of the most important and we have to be firm about what the security commitments will be going forward. We are thinking 10 years from now and they get locked in here so they do not have to renegotiate with us if we don't make this request now.

Louise Montanino - I know they keep saying they are doing Phase II with Phase III, but what about for this? Are we going to discuss Phase II and III? Will the security and maintenance also include Phase III?
Mary Berninger - We were going to do placeholder language.

Richard Lynds - So the OSM is presently for Phase I, Bremen St. Park, the connector, Navy Fuel Pier. Anything that is covered in the park system presently. That is what the OSM will cover. 8 or 9 years ago we did not have the connector, didn't have the levels we have today for parkland. Things have already changed. The levels can't stay the same and we will put things in that will say that in the event that Phase III comes on line during this agreement, that we want to insure that these will be re-visited. Or

any other park they may take under their control. We want to build that in, so they will not just say they will do what they want. We want to ensure it is the same level.

Maru Berninger - Along those lines about all of those parcels that they have now; the Neptune Road, the Navy Fuel Pier, Bayswater, the new Saratoga St. buffer. I have called them a couple of times and they are responsive. But if it is all in here, all of these parcels, then you can address it.

Richard Lynds - It ties back to what we talked about earlier. The teeth for enforcement isn't just the threat of arbitration, they have an unlimited supply of lawyers and we have a limited resource we can use to address arbitration. At least we know we have the opportunity to speak, if that is something they will agree to, that we have an opportunity to say that we are not happy with the security being provided and we do not have to wait 10 years to address that. We can do that in the 6 month review.

David Halbert - So much of this is driven by the numbers and what they are actually providing. Wondering if we can ask them for specific numbers?

Richard Lynds - We have.

David Halbert - My question is how are we breaking it down? You said we have to think about the past in order to successfully think about the future. What has the spending been, the percentage increase been over a 3 year run, a 5 year run? So we can have some things to compare to versus us having to hold on and amortize all of this information. They have the facilities, in house, to do that. In my opinion the other thing we should be asking is what is the spending? Thinking about this from the real estate stand point. So when you are buying a house, condo, etc. what is the cost per sq. ft.? We should be asking what is the spending per sq. ft., per yard, per acre, for security and use that at least for some sort of baseline. So if Phase III does come on we can say if they are spending \$2000 per square acre for security, and just throwing that number out there, then at the very least we should be seeing that same level of expenditure for that expansion. It gives us a place to negotiate or to at least have a conversation.

Mary Berninger - The difference with Phase III though, for the language and I do not know how you do it, they will be the landlord but they won't be managing that park. On Phase III, the Trustees are.

Karen Maddalena - I think in partnership with Massport.

Mary Berninger - They haven't completely said that. They said they would be operating the park, so that is what I am trying to figure out. How you do it with language to make sure that the same thing we are doing with everything we are creating, we have on that parcel too?

Richard Lynds - We won't know that until the 20th. So when we see the information, the bidder, how that will work. It will all probably include details and language on management and operations. I would think we probably would want to have a say on that.

Karen Maddalena - I would suggest you make a classification on that and let Massport know. As far as security, the new sections of the park that are built are under State Police not Massport Authority.

Mary Berninger - Say that again?

Karen Maddalena - The new sections that have been built up to Orient Heights Beach are under the State Police not Massport Authority.

Fran Carbone - They are because when you pick up a phone in the walkway going to the Heights Beach, State Police pickup.

Karen Maddalena - The connectors are currently being policed by the State.

Richard Lynds - Do you see the State Police patrolling that?

Fran Carbone - No never, but they do answer the phones.

Karen Maddalena - State Police

Mary Hanlon - They answer the phones because they are right there.

Richard Lynds - This is part of the issue. That connector slipped somewhere in between the last negotiations and the current one. Call boxes are not a substitute for officers. State Police ring at the barracks on the airport and they have to send a cruiser to deal with it. People learn, they watch areas and if they going to commit a crime, they understand the response time and when it is patrolled. If a patrol is not happening it just creates potential problems in the future.

Louise Montanino - Last year I was walking near the beach on the Greenway and I noticed there was a police force there. A police car was driving down but I can't remember which force it was.

Mary Berninger - Massport's vehicles, from a distance, are white and blue and they look like Boston's. Fran Carbone - If we have a problem on Bayswater St., I call F Troup. All the State police respond to Bayswater St. That is their domain, all the way down to the field.

Richard Lynds - I think it is great you have State Police, but they are not patrolling it, there are no responsibilities to patrol. I think we get the big picture on adequacy of security and ensuring we have a certain level. Are there other specific security issues or thing that are happening we have plan for? I think there are things we feel we want to have addressed. This is the time we want to do it.

Alex DeFronzo - I think there might be if we make a point to it put in. When advocating for some level of sustained security that is identified or quantified, is the pressure to have I, II, and III be opened all of the time? It is likely to grow once the Harborwalk is opened up. People are going to be able to walk from Boston, Atlantic Wharf, edging, Clippership, Roseland, etc. It is all going to be opened 24/7 and they will arrive at Phase II or III and want to be able look at the city at night. It will be hard for the park to be locked up and closed when everything else is accessible. Feels it will require additional security for people in the park at night.

Richard Lynds - That will come under Part C goal, which is 'use and operations'. It dovetails and I can see how that is going to be an issue. That the parks are going to be open, more people, more hours of operation, and more necessary security. I think that is something we can tie back into security concerns.

Mary Berninger - That might be something for when we do the talking and the questioning as we go around the community, especially with Jeffries Point. It might happen, but it will be interesting to talk to people because this is a change that may happen. The agreements come up and the rules and regulations. We could have a discussion about it to find out the level of interest. That would be something that this group would have to live by because it came out of the workings of this group. I'm not saying this is the case, it may be just a generational thing, but it requires a lot more personnel. I don't know how the people along Bremen St. will feel about it if it is open 24 hours a day. But, it would have to be voted. It will be something that might come up for discussion. I hear what Alex is saying, that there are other places that are open, but there are more places that are closed from dusk to dawn.

Michael Bruno - Even if you decide not to have the park open for those hours, depending on the design of Phase III, there could be a whole new element with water access that will need to be monitored even if the park is closed.

Mary Berninger - I heard the gentleman that night and I was talking to Richie about it. The man from the Trustees intimated that they had this vision of bringing people to the water's edge on a sloping thing. I do not know how that would fly with Massport. They said we should have another beach area. Just letting you know that is something they are presenting to the PAC and the Port and then it will come back to here. Then what do you; lifeguards, etc., We have a beach in our community, a sizable beach with water access.

Michael Bruno - I was thinking more from the marine transportation standpoint. The current Piers Park dock is isolated, secluded. At night when the sailing center is closed you cannot get from the dock into the park. But depending on the design of Phase II, if there is more boat access because it jets out into the harbor, there could be more of an invitation for people to approach that area.

Mary Berninger - I was surprised. I expected a bulk head also. That kind of system and not what he talked about that night. We haven't seen it yet. It is just a conceptualization that he was talking about. I think we should be concerned about that.

Karen Maddalena - There is a boat ramp for kayaks at LoPresti Park.

Richard Lynds - So for Part C goals, it really just deals with operations, use and things we want to see changed from Phase I or done better. We should also be thinking about Phase II. I think this could be a separate conversation. I think we can really drill down the Phase II issues and it sort of dovetails into one talk with listening and trying to understand what is important. I think we can use that as an opportunity to talk about things, about Phase I or Bremen St., that we want to change.

Mary Berninger - Prior to the meeting I was talking with Ned and Anthony and Anthony had told Ned what I had said at the Y meeting, bringing up Phase I and the resiliency piece. Anthony said that they envision the pier, right now, where the pavilion is, that is a water break. And then he said we have the amphitheatre. I call it the bowl and I call it our own retention pond. He said going forward it will be a money issue. I get the sense they wanted to push that down the road too, but why, if you are trying to create a system, why wouldn't you put the same amount of attention towards your existing phase? I don't know, but can they rely on that bowl?

Karen Maddalena - They are probably working on their runways and resiliency plans so it should continue all the way.

Michael Bruno - It seems like that would be a good goal to add to the agreement. It might be a good goal to address.

Mary Berninger - If it is not in there and the next storm does come and that section gets whacked and maybe they didn't get whacked the last 3 or 4 times, but to say 'well we have the bowl and that pier'. I don't know.

Karen Maddalena - It did. Even the Boston Shipyard and the Marina, water came up and over. Even at Piers Park and Roseland, water came over.

Mary Berninger - I would just, and this is my own opinion, I would be concerned if they take the stance that they would prefer to look at that later. Their focus right now is II and III, but I thought we were focused on the whole harbor situation with the water. I thought that is what everyone is telling us to do; think about the impact of these storms.

Richard Lynds - On the Part 3 goals I think would be a further conversation, discussion. We had a lengthy presentation tonight. What I think we probably would want to do for our next meeting is have our conversation focus on the operation and use of the park. Issues about openings, closures, timing /type of events, etc. Things we want to see different in the park or things we do not want to see in the park. In the meantime, I will try to incorporate some of these recommendations into a red line draft. Start making the changes we have already talked about. Then look at the context of the entire agreement to figure out what else might have to be discussed or changed. Hopefully we can get to the point to have a working document.

Mary Berninger - I don't mean to beat the dead horse either, but when we are going to hold their feet to the fire and fix the Bremen St. Park title? I just do not understand how this is dragging on and on.

Bob Strelitz - The actual ownership?

Mary Berninger - They do not truthfully own it. They told us that.

Richard Lynds - It is more than complicated. It has a lot to do with the billboard structure. So, if you take a billboard structure that has been permitted and you no longer renew it's permits, that is considered a taking. A land taking has consequences for the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has to compensate 'fair market value' for any taking that they undertake. There is a special law, both Federal and State for advertising devices. In this particular case so much money must be set aside before the State can authorize the taking of that structure and that money is never funded into those accounts. Until

such time as the State funds it, the State can't take it. If the State can't take it, the Port Authority won't take title to it.

Mary Berninger - Don't forget I talked to Anthony. He is coming to the next meeting with the woman from Menino Park. I don't think it will take long because we already saw it. Anything else?

Richard Lynds - For next month think about and be prepared to talk about those items that are important. We talked a lot about it in the last 2 meetings, but this is our time to have input into what we want to see different about this agreement of how Massport deals with these parks. If there are things you feel strongly about this is the time to talk about it. We need to address it now and bring it up at the meetings. I am going to try to put in some other information I have taken from our notes from our past meetings. Things like; when they come to a meeting and they present to us statistics about incidents in the park. Don't just stand here and tell us about things that happened in the park over the last 6 months. They have to show it, we have to real data, it should be compiled on a regular basis. We should be able to go back and review it. There should be a receptacle of some kind for that. A Drop Box of some type of data storage that we can always go back to and review it because that is our job as an advisory committee. We have to be able to be informed and be able to give meaningful input as to how they are operating and securing this park. These are the types of things I will be adding into the agreement, but that is based upon observations from past meetings as to how we can do things better. We are being transparent and the Port Authority needs to be transparent as well.

Mary Berninger - So we have that to do for next month and for those of you who still have to update Maria with the emails. Call her or give her the information tonight. Please, seriously consider doing the email so you will get Richie's communications. It is just the best way to handle it.

Jerry Deneumoustier - Motion to adjourn.
Bob Strelitz - Second.