

East Boston PierPAC

July 17, 2018

Attendance:

Mary Berninger	Karen Buttiglieri	Fran Carbone
Mary Hanlon	Bernardine Joslin	Sal LaMattina
Karen Maddalena	Louise Montanino	Lucille Monuteaux
Frances Piantedosi	Bob Strelitz	

Excused:

Connie Carbone	Peter Cardinale	Adrian Madaro
Jerry Deneumoustier	Melissa Tyler	

Absent:

David Halbert

Associate Members Present:

Michael Bruno	Tom Bruno	Alex DeFronzo
Lucille Drago	Margaret Farmer	Lucille Reed
Rose Petraglia		
Mary Romano		

Attendance was taken. (Margaret Farmer arrived after attendance was taken. During the meeting Melissa Tyler had left me an email asking to be excused.)

Mary Berninger - I'm sure that most of you know that Marie passed away, which is very sad news for this group, because of her many long years to the PAC and the community at large. (Passed out a print out with information regarding the wake and funeral.) It does say if anyone wants to make a memorial donation they reference the Alzheimers Assoc. of Greater Boston. I know we have done similar things for other people in the past. In lieu of flowers, or in addition to flowers, can I have an idea from people about what you want to do?

(After a short discussion it was suggested to send a fruit basket and a donation to the Alzheimers Association.)

Sal LaMattina - Motion to send a fruit basket and a donation to the Alzheimer Foundation.

Rose Petraglia - Second.

Voted and passed.

Mary Berninger - Minutes from the June 19th meeting. Changes, deletions, etc. to the Minutes. For those of you have been doing it on email, every month there will be extra copies here.

Bernardine Joslin - Yes, correction on Page 9, (second paragraph), the word 'pick' change to 'pay'.

Mary Berninger - Anything else? Hearing none could I have a motion to accept?

Karen Buttiglieri - Motion to accept.

Mary Hanlon - Seconded.

Voted and passed.

Mary Berninger - Richie is not quite here yet, so I think we will move things around and we are going to invite Massport to do the Power Point Presentation that Ned has put together, about the next steps to checking out parks.

Anthony Guerriero - What we have been doing is data collection. In our last conversation, we talked about doing another tour in Boston, and trying to get some ideas from Marion Pressley, who is assigned to design Phase II. Working with Kleinfelder, the primary, Marion, Ned and the team have come up with a list of parks in Boston, Somerville and Roslindale. In talking with Mary, we are thinking we will take this next visit tour sometime in September. We are going to take Karen Maddalena's suggestion to start at the Navy Fuel Pier. We will all meet there in the morning and take a look at those elements. Some of you have worked on that. Walk into the shipyard, will have a bus there, etc. Asking you to start thinking about elements you might want for the design. A conversation Ned and I had recently was that our cell phones die because of overuse. At the Hudson River Park we saw a couple of multi use benches with charging stations. So beyond kiddie equipment, lights, fencing, etc., that might be something we want to talk about. In some of the conversations we talked about if we don't go with pavers, and we decide to go with cement because of safety reasons, you do different things with cement; color design, etc. In one of the parks we saw, you can stamp the cement. If you go up Neptune Road, where our buffer is and under 1A, you can see a collection that looks like cobble stone that is actually stamped cement. There are a lot of options. In a cordial conversation I had with Edie DeAngelis, she came up with a good idea. She asked if there was a way to memorize and do something nice for our Gold Star mothers. A parent who lost a child during a war situation. Maybe a black bench with gold stars in it. These are things that Ned and I are talking about and I am hoping that you are doing the same thing. Ned is going to work with Kleinfelder to try to get some feet on the ground in Piers Park and Bremen St. in August and September. August is the end of the year, the parks are packed, so you will have all different needs and use. Once school starts the use of the park changes. Question is what those people want and their needs. Also working with Chris and Karen in the Greenway about the possible uses. YMCA senior walkers, etc. Different clientele. Ned did a terrific job with this Power Point and he did a lot of great research.

Ned Dawes - (Ned did a Power Point presentation on the many different features in parks in surrounding areas of Boston. The presentation was to propose Boston-area parks to be visited in the future. Q & A by the PAC Members throughout the presentation about each parks structure, amenities, materials used, etc. I will be happy to mail out, upon request, a copy of the material provided by Ned.)

- East Boston
 - Navy Fuel Pier Airport Edge Buffer - Marginal Street
 - American Legion Playground - Condor, Glendon and East Eagle Streets
- North End
 - Langone Park & Puopolo Field/North End Park - Commercial Street
- South Boston
 - Sweeney Playground - West 5th Street & Gold Street
- Roslindale
 - Fallon Field & Playground - Walworth & South Streets
 - Healy Playground - Washington & Florence Streets and Firth Road
- Somerville
 - Chuckie Harris Park - Cross Street East

Most of the parks are either Boston or other municipalities, renovated, etc. All different sizes.)

(Q & A in between Ned Dawes' presentation. Showed parks for different age groups, plantings, pools, activities, resilient surfaces,etc).

Anthony Guerriero - In terms of the Navy Fuel Pier: Shortly after 911, when things started turning back to normal in terms of aviation, Massport looked back into doing its commitments. The first commitment was the Maverick St. Gate and then coupled with work along the Maverick Buffer, and then the Navy Fuel Pier. Karen Maddalena was president of the Jeffries Point Neighborhood Assoc. Sal was on the City Council. That had a lot of community meetings, the Social Center near Brophy Park, etc. This was

a little bit different. We are on the water's edge. Some of the neighbors wanted a passive park, quiet area, a location that would be set aside. It has a lot of sea grass, it has a small fence. The interpretive panels for the Immigration Station at Piers Park, there is a duplicate set at the Navy Fuel Pier. Because it is an airport edge buffer, there are no benches. We have granite monolith benches. Get a lot of compliments on this park. It has sea glass in its walk path. Hours of operation replicate the other parks. Bikes are not allowed, but people with bikes are always in there. It is maintained by us and policed by the Port Officers. They do a loop and go down to the Pier. There is a memorial stone to Steve McQue, deceased Project Manager. On the outside of the park there is a flagpole and a memorial to Ralph Corelli, a World War II hero from the Jeffries Point neighborhood. It opened in 2007. It was a 3 year project, it gets a lot of use, and looks pristine all the time.

Karen Buttiglieri - Questioning why it is always pristine. Curious because I look at Orient Heights and it is not pristine at all.

Anthony Guerriero - There are a couple of things. It is a good question.

Mary Berninger - We have been talking about how Bayswater looks. Anthony met me there the other day, and we did a walk through. He did agree with our concerns that everybody had; Fran, Karen, myself. The snow fence is there because there is an erosion problem. In the interim, he had the field of weeds near the flagpole done. They did all of the grass, can now see the contours. They were out there this morning doing the weeding. Anthony said he spoke with people internally and it will be back on the radar screen, in a meaningful way, and they will also try to figure out why the sprinkler systems are not fully working.

Karen Buttiglieri - Just wondering because it is the same type of look, and, trust me, I am not saying I want it all to be pristine. I am just curious why one was so pristine and the other one wasn't.

Anthony Guerriero - This has come up a couple of times and I learned it the hard way, I gave Fran Carbone my personal cell phone number. I will never do that again.

Karen Maddalena - Another thing is, there was a subcommittee from Marginal St., Sandy Thomas. She was very knowledgeable about plantings. Things they planted there will thrive.

Anthony Guerriero - This is at the edge of Jeffries Cove. It is as bad as Bayswater. It is starting to show its age, 17 years old. We were hit hard this winter with 2 storms and I was unaware with that. That is expediting some erosion issues, and we are having that addressed. They have to work with the conservation commission in different ways to stop that. On the plantings; we had a frank conversation with our guys in facilities. It looks shoddy; around the flag pole was a meadow. They need to do a better job. They were out there this weekend, one of the sections of the sprinkler blew out, and they had to fixed that.

Karen Buttiglieri - But, that's all maintenance, and it is ongoing maintenance that hasn't been done.

Anthony Guerriero - Bright View is the new landscaper. Not trying to make excuses, but I told them they had to pay a little more attention. It gets beat up a lot. Not only the water, but when they plow, the snow gets over. I asked them to try to re-evaluate it. It doesn't have to be done today or by the end of the year, but they need to be on top of the maintenance. The last couple of days is a turn in the right direction. In terms of the erosion; I don't like the orange fence there. We may do something different. I do not want to put a jersey barrier there, but we will rectify it.

Mary Berninger - I think the conversation that Anthony and I had, and I was drawing a comparison, if you want to use the word pristine again, the Buffer near the FAA Field. It is in East Boston and Winthrop took the credit for it. My theory on it is that folks in Winthrop petitioned their state rep, the speaker, to get it done, knowing, full well, it is not in their community. We did not have any input in it. They have been working on their sprinkler system prior to fixing the issues over here. It was not a nice thing to see that it was getting so much attention. Perhaps, Mr. DeLeo only drives on Saratoga St. not on Bayswater St.

Sal LaMattina - I thought they did it because it is a gateway to East Boston.

Karen Buttiglieri - No, they had a big thing with a Winthrop ribbon cutting without East Boston people.
Mary Berninger - Mr. Glynn was on the sidewalk there. I needed to talk to him about other matters. I stopped, and asked him why he was there. He explained it was a ribbon cutting. I told him I did not see anybody there from East Boston, and you (Massport) are on our side of the bridge.

Anthony Guerriero - So let's talk about Massport at 60. Me and Sal were not born when it was devised.

Karen Maddalena - On Bayswater, the fumes from the airplanes might have something to do with it.

Karen Buttiglieri - It's really neglect.

Fran Carbone - On Massport's part.

Karen Buttiglieri - But, Anthony always comes through.

Anthony Guerriero - A lot of you worked on Phase II, and you made sure some of the design elements, particularly in the granite, referenced the history of East Boston, nautical history. When Ned and I were going over this, one thing I was thinking about, was Marginal St. So, if you did something with a historical spin, why not make an area look like the granary that was on Marginal St. It is a throw back to history. Again, this is just a blank canvas, where you are just tossing some ideas down. Ned will show you something in Somerville that throws back to the history of auto making in Somerville.

(Personal comments were interspersed throughout the Somerville presentation.)

Anthony Guerriero - So, if you have the Edsel you could maybe interchange it with the clippership, which came into East Boston. Host of possibilities.

Mary Berninger - Some of the designs reminded me a lot about what the commissioner from New York talked about at the Boston Harbor Now. There is very little delineation between the sidewalk and the park. It was nice, no high fences. I like all these parks, but is it too ambitious to see all in one day?

Ned Dawes - Anthony and I had talked about meeting at 10:00 at the Navy Pier.

Mary Berninger - Would like to suggest we push it up to 9:00. Feels it is a lot to see, and with traffic, etc. We talked about stopping in Roslindale for lunch.

Anthony Guerriero - We are talking about sometime in September.

Mary Berninger - The only thing I want to bring up, and not sure Maria captured it in the minutes, but Anthony made an interesting comment, talking about the parks. He said 'following 911 at a point where Massport began to look back at its commitments, after the aviation industry began to recover post 911'. Does that mean you are going to re-visit other commitments that have gone by the wayside?

Fran Carbone - Such as the sailing program.

Mary Berninger - Now that you said it, it is on the record. We do not need much of a discussion on it, but maybe you should keep it in the back of your mind, because we will keep it in back of our minds.

Sal LaMattina - Have we looked at any parks that have exercise equipment for seniors? It is a big area, and that is something that is lacking in this area. I saw that in New York. A place for seniors to exercise.

Ned Dawes - One of the parks we had visited before, the Menino Park beside the Spaulding. Some of the features are geared to people for rehab. All ages. That is another thing we will put on the list to think about.

Sal LaMattina - I was at South Beach, they had stationary bikes in their park for exercise.

Fran Carbone/Mary Berninger - Think it is a great idea.

Ned Dawes - Once again the idea is to meet at the Navy Fuel Pier, visit these parks, and try to plan it so that we could have a lunch and work our way back.

Mary Berninger - We can poll everybody for a later date.

Karen Buttiglieri - Are we looking at a Saturday or Sunday?

Mary Berninger - We have time and we can talk about that next month on the agenda. Figure out a date.

Ned Dawes - I can make it work.

Fran Carbone - Most people work.

Mary Berninger - We can put it on the agenda for next month.

Mary Cole - The little exercise area that exists at Piers Park; there is always somebody there.

Ned Dawes - We replaced that 2 years ago. It does get heavy use.

Q -What kind of time are we looking at for Phase II?

Ned Dawes - No specific time frame. I know the prime consultant Kleinfelder specializes in resiliency. So part of this whole idea with parks would be the idea of a slide could be built on a hill that also becomes a flood barrier. We are trying to think about things we can incorporate in the overall design to provide resiliency because that area for Phase II is one of the areas they talked about. We are trying to prevent the water from getting into that section.

Q - Does that mean it would cover the entire perimeter of the park?

Ned Dawes - Not so much the perimeter. I think we were looking for a barrier to stop it from getting into East Boston. It may not be as abrupt, more gradual, but the elevation changes and it acts as prevention.

Bernardine Joslin - The Puopolo Park in the North End; how do they prevent the sea water from coming in?

Ned Dawes - They don't. It is a situation there and they closed a section because it had been damaged as a result of a storm. The sea wall had partially collapsed.

Alex DeFronzo - I think the Phase I Park is about 4 1/2ft. higher across that entire part of Marginal St. The Phase II parcel is at level, and the grade goes down a little before it gets to the sea wall. That could be raised up. The flooding that happened during the winter, the tide was more than 14ft, and it only flooded a little in the back area of the Phase II parcel.

Ned Dawes - In some cases, as you have pointed out, the sea water levels in Boston have risen, so they are looking for this idea of a built in capacity.

Michael Bruno - Just curious what the time line is for Phase II? Obviously we are in the early design phase. How long before the engineering starts and a target for construction?

Ned Dawes - I know we are looking at next year for the design aspect. I think we had previously talked that 2018 is for going out and doing homework to collect information. 2019 would be part of the design aspect.

Anthony Guerriero - Marion Pressley and a representative from Kleinfelder will be part of this tour.

And then when we start to put shoe leather to the pavement, they will be coming to these meetings with us. You are looking at a long, at least through next year, a lot of discussion, and then going out into the community. PAC meetings here, and then we have to do a JPA (Jeffries Point Assoc.), and the larger community thing.

Alex DeFronzo - I am hoping the PAC provides feedback to the design of the Sailing Center as part of the community process, and, if possible, do a tour of other community sailing centers.

Mary Berninger - We can put that in the minutes, and when we get to that part we can talk about it.

Questioning if they have begun that process internally.

Alex DeFronzo - Yes, CBI on the Charles River is a great example.

Mary Berninger - Next is a presentation from Chris Marchi- Senior Bike

Chris Marchi - We are going to describe things to you. Primarily we are here to talk about an expanded cycling initiative, which can bring the exercise and the health of cycling activities to a wider range of people in our neighborhood. I am working on a part time contract with the Friends Group. We have been funded by the BARR Foundation as part of their waterfront initiative. Our reason for getting involved with the waterfront initiative is because the Greenway coalition and the Friends of the Greenway have been at this game of trying to support/develop open space in East Boston for a long time. Interested in learning about how they can encourage people to become stewards of open spaces in the city, primarily on the waterfront. They recognize that we have done a lot of things in East Boston in conjunction with the PAC, in terms of expanding open space in the neighborhood. We are trying to integrate on the Greenway right now. We are looking at making improvements to the maintenance of the Greenway and access issues and uses. That is where the cycling issues come in. Who is using the Greenway and how they are using it and other ways we can make it more accessible to more people. We have been invited here today to talk about the cycling initiative. There are a number of initiatives, a concept of Greenway Galleries which would allow us to do 2 dimensional art in the parks. Maybe historic exhibits about ship building or other things in conjunction with the Eastie History Museum people. Art history for educational purposes. Managing invasive species and communicating with the Parks Departments about parks needs and with other agencies. (Passed around a series of photos.) The cycling initiative began with a survey of East Boston residents. It was an online thing. We wanted to get response from a variety of ages of East Bostonians. The first was to have bikes available for free. Not everybody can afford a bike or physically move or store it. The second issue we asked people about was adult sized tricycle bikes. There are a lot of people in East Boston who have never ridden a bike because of work or economic disadvantage or because of physical conditions. Finally, Surry bikes. They are available for rent in a lot of tourist destinations and they are equipped for families. All of this equipment is not very expensive, so if we can figure out how to manage the bike paths in such a way that there would not be conflict.

Mary Berninger - Those are big and there will be conflict because the width of the path does not accommodate something like that with pedestrians and people on regular bikes, or even the senior trikes. The path is a finite structure. If you add too many things, what I heard today and last night, about the water things, and places to get food, whatever. The Greenway is one place that you can go and it is freely flowing; not obstructed by anything.

Chris Marchi - That is one of our major concerns. We are not proposing any particular service, we are suggesting that we need to look at a variety of options and assess whether or not they could be feasible. Conflict on the Greenway is an issue that we want to look at now. There are cyclists, some of whom move too fast, and there are pedestrians that also walk on the bike path, but there are also signage issues. I know where the city Greenway turns into the Bremen St. Park there is a little confusion because the Bremen St. Park is marked with a cycle on the right and a pedestrian on the left. If it were a one way road it might make sense. There are pedestrians and cyclists going in both directions. It has been brought to our attention that that is something we should deal with. Conflict is definitely on the horizon, and it is a valid concern. We did ask people if they would be interested in this service. Bike storage is a real issue. We want to encourage cycling on the Greenway, especially for commuters. One of the things that we learned is that the storage of bikes is a problem. People want a secure place to put a bike. If you have invested in a cycle that you would be using to commute, they can cost thousands of dollars. People are hesitant to leave a bike out in the open. Cyclists are more interested in having a covered, secure storage. There are bike stations that we asked people about; whether or not they would cycle more if they had a secure place to keep their bikes. Not necessarily a proposal to build one, but understanding what kind of demand there is. Right now there is no bike amenity available on the Greenway in terms of free cycles, especially nothing that is addressing the needs of senior citizens. We wanted to target that,

test that, as part of our Grant this year. Whether or not these bikes would be popular, if people like them, are comfortable on them, could we administer a program, etc. I have experience with the kayaking program which was started when I was with NOAH. Mary was very helpful and supportive with that. We want to look to the future, some sort of senior cycling program which we could offer that would work in conjunction with jobs for young people in the neighborhood. We bought a couple of Schwinn Meridian 26 inch adult tricycles on this Grant. We signed up as a member of a local advocacy group with the Legion of American Cyclists, which allowed us to purchase these, especially the insurance policy for cycling clubs. We are covered by insurance to run free events, which is what we did last Saturday as a throw in with the Marine Festival at Constitution Beach. We were able to put up a tent, have people sign waivers, etc. We served about 15 people just to get a sense of how it would work. We gave them basic training, taught them how to get their balance, instructions with the helmets, etc. We had 2 bikes out there. (Gave multiple examples of the people they came in contact with, gave instruction to, including seniors that enjoyed the rides for health reasons. Young people that had never ridden a bike, etc.)

Feels this is a broad and diverse market. (The pictures that were passed out were explained; the times and places that people road the bikes on that Saturday.) That was a great presentation by Massport. We hope to be able to do this in a couple of different locations. One might be the Bremen St. Park. There is a big exchange of people there, the senior activity at the YMCA, and a group of people that walk the Greenway. It would be a great location for us to operate, but we would have to work out the details with Massport about how we could do that. We could do some work at DCR where there are a lot of senior citizens and there is going to be a senior center there.

Karen Buttiglieri - Questioning where there is going to be a senior center.

Chris Marchi - Up the Heights at the beach. They have a fantastic exit out the back, which could work well with the Greenway people.

Fran Carbone - We have to save room for our Bocci court and our barbeque.

Karen Buttiglieri - Did you ever think about the East Boston Health Center, Bike Safety, why can't you partner with them? They give out free helmets. Maybe you could capture some of those helmets.

Michael Nicastro is there, etc.

Chris Marchi - East Boston Health Center could be a great partner. If we go a few years down the road, if this works, we didn't notice any conflict on the paths, but it is one of the most important things for us to look at. I can create a report about it and really study it.

Mary Berninger - When we had the initial meeting with Massport, Karen, Anthony, Jason and public safety folks and landscaping supervisors, I think they were specific that short of a change of activities that are allowed in the Bremen St. Park, there wouldn't be any on the paths in the park itself. Within the park. That would have to be another discussion.

Chris Marchi - I think we are talking about the bike paths in the park.

Mary Berninger - If you introduce it into the park, that park or Piers Park, it would have to go back into discussion that this group would have to direct.

Chris Marchi - Absolutely. That is why we are here to bring to you the ideas of expanding uses, and it is also about by expanding uses we can get more benefits out of these parks. There are people who may not be able to ride a bike, and if you only have walking as the one form of exercise you can have, cycling can be another form.

Sal LaMattina - So you are looking at the beginning of the Greenway and at the end?

Chris Marchi- If you could go ride to the beach and there are cycles there, you could take a bike and go on a long ride. To have a fleet of bikes in a couple of locations, but most importantly to have these bikes be free to people, East Boston seniors or residents, etc. You could decide where to ride. Could also have a rental feature. The program might be able to generate revue.

Mary Berninger - Generate revenue for what?

Chris Marchi - For the purpose for paying for the use, to manage it, or if we needed to have a managing partner. The Friends of Greenway is not necessarily in this to have ongoing capacity for the future. We are fortunate to have Grant funding right now. We can develop these ideas, but you want to make sure you create something that is sustainable.

Mary Berninger - What percentage of that BARR Grant went towards, not purchasing the bikes, but, you know (other things).

Chris Marchi - I think the total percentage that goes to staff is probably, between Kannan and I, maybe 28/30% percent.

Mary Berninger - I will be honest with you. Last night was the first time that I heard any reference that the BARR Grant was used for community engagement. I was under the impression, listening to different presentations about it, that the Foundation was providing the bikes. I did not realize it was almost like a make work thing. I did not realize it would be providing stipends to people because I thought that anybody, like ourselves, who do these things, it was all on a volunteer basis. Which is so great for East Boston. I didn't realize that was what the Grant was for.

Karen Maddalena - You can rely on volunteers just so much. But there comes a point that you need a paid staff. Especially when the Boston Natural Areas network, the organization, that we had to work we along with the Greenway. And, you have heard me say, that when the Trustees took over, they dropped us like a hot potato. So you do need some kind of a staff to carry on, and you can't just rely on volunteers.

Karen Buttiglieri - I agree.

Mary Berninger - Just to let you know, that is was not until last night, when you made that comment that it raised my antenna. We have a few more items on the agenda.

Kannan Thiruvengadam - In general I would say now, that the Friends of the East Boston Greenway has a web, there is a Twitter page, an Instagram, etc. Those of you who are connected electronically, this is now in the 21st century. They are available there. If you walk the Greenway, take pictures, you can send it into different social media. Ideas, etc., anything you want to share. After we put all of the information together, we will share with you.

Mary Berninger - Is Big Blue going to put any bikes at either end? Other than the trikes?

Chris Marchi - We are not attached to them. They have a contract with the city. With their type of payment, you have to have a credit card.

Mary Berninger - It might be something for some people, another option.

Chris Marchi - Another idea, I couldn't stop thinking about during the Massport presentation. I saw a vision of a Clippership play structure with rigging and masts that you could climb and then go down a slide.

Sal LaMattina - Questioning if the kayak program still going on at the Heights.

Chris Marchi - It is, but I think it is Thursdays and Sundays, 11 to 5, until August 22nd.

Mary Berninger - Following with the Agenda, questioning if Richie had the open meeting law forms to sign. If not we will do that next month.

Sal LaMattina - We all have to sign?

Richard Lynds - Yes.

Karen Buttiglieri - What is it about?

Mary Berninger - There was an email that went out a few months ago reviewing the rules about the Open Meeting Law. Everyone was asked to review them, and then you sign a paper that you understand what the concept of it was. I am going to move to the Nominations for the Board Member, before we do the OSM and the Community Benefits Agreement. We have an opening on the Board.

Richard Lynds - There needs to be a motion to open nominations.
Bernardine Joslin - Make a motion to open the nominations.
Bob Strelitz - Second.

Lucille Montanino - Nominates Lucille Reed.
Rose Petraglia - Second.
Lucille Reed - Accepts nomination.

Mary Hanlon - Nominates Lucille Drago.
Sal LaMattina - Second.
Lucille Drago - Accepts nomination.

Bernardine Joslin - Nominates Mary Romano.
Frances Piantedosi - Second.
Mary Romano - Accepts nomination.

Mary Berninger - Nominates Margaret Farmer.
Sal LaMattina - Second.
Margaret Farmer - Accepts nomination.

Mary Berninger - Any more nominations?
Karen Buttiglieri - Questioning how many openings.
Mary Berninger - Just 1. Hearing no more nominations. Motion to close nominations.

Lucille Montanino - Motion to close the nominations.
Karen Buttiglieri - Second.

Mary Berninger - Next month we will have the election for that open spot. And, as it has been done in the past, we will give each person a minute to talk about their interest in becoming a Board member. I want to get moving because we have to go into Executive session at the end of this meeting. Questioning if everyone has had a chance, the voting members, to review the Operation, Security and Maintenance, (OSM) and the Community Benefits Agreement that was sent to you. Did everybody have a chance to read it? We have to vote on it, not tonight, but the agreement that came from Massport. We felt it was appropriate to review. There are copies here and it will be on the website at some point for full transparency.

Richard Lynds - This may be new to some people, but this second amendment to the second Community Agreement to the East Boston Project Advisory Committee and Massport Authority, is part of an ongoing agreement that has existed with the community since 1998, in connection with the Logan Authorization Project which dealt with land side improvements. Massport, back in the late 90's and through the early 2000's, entered into an agreement with the community that identified what we commonly referred to as mitigation, the Mitigation Agreement. It had a number of components that required Massport to meet certain goals and objectives. It is not just about money. It is about other things they would do. One of the most significant things included in that agreement is the additional funding for continued sound proofing. If anybody is unfamiliar with that soundproofing program; it is a Federal program where the FAA funds a substantial portion of it, but Massport also has to add matching funds in order to complete soundproofing for homes that are included in 65LDN Contours. That is the description of where properties fall within the qualified range to have the soundproofing done to their properties. Massport has to make a contribution to that. Part of this community agreement ensures that Massport will continue doing that. That is only one of a substantial part of this agreement. Second. Back in 1998 the Port Authority established the East Boston Foundation. The East Boston Foundation has provided, over the past 20 years, millions of dollars to worthy non-profit community organizations.

It helped get a lot of these community organizations off the ground through very good stewardship by a Board of Trustees. Over the many years that I served as the Executive Director, that money was invested as a legacy of endowment. Massport in 2015 made a commitment to renew that, and the amount that they agreed to was 2.5 million dollars, in addition to the original 9.6 million dollars they granted in 1998. This agreement would actually increase that even further. A total of 5 million dollars, additional, would still go to the East Boston Foundation. That is in addition to the commitment under Massport soundproofing, and it is something they are committing to under this agreement as well. A 3rd component of this, and probably the most significant component, involves the funding for Phase II. I think it is important, for context purposes, that people understand that Massport was never obligated, under the original legislation, to fund Phase II Park. We are sort of like the fire department, we are always ready; we got the call, and the park segment is going to happen. One of the significant things about this agreement is the commitment that Massport will spend up to 15 million to fund the construction of the Phase II Park. This is a huge step for the community. It is something that a lot of gratitude and thanks should go to those members that served in the LIAG, the elected officials and others. This is something that I know, as long as I have been involved with the PAC, and involved in issues like this in East Boston. It is something I worked on long before I was an attorney; when I was an intern in State Administration. I remember this whole issue; the controversy over not having the legislation or not having the ability to require Massport to pay for this portion of the park. When Bob Strelitz was President we drafted legislation to force the Port Authority to get to the next level. To remove the restriction that they had no obligation to fund this, to get it out of their own general funds to pay for this. We did have a lot of support for that legislation, but, unfortunately, the politics were not right, and we weren't able to make it happen. This is a huge step that the Port Authority is actually paying for it, and it is something that this second amendment to the second community agreement spells out. The 3rd component, and again another huge victory for the neighborhood, is the commitment for funding for a senior center. There is a 10 year commitment in here, for \$187,000 per year that would go to the senior center. The location has been identified, and it is a partnership that is being worked out with the city of Boston, as well as the Port Authority. I think it is important that people understand the overview of this. This agreement, unlike the OSM agreement, which is within our purview to deal with the Port Authority under legislation, this agreement is more of a product of a conversation with the LIAG, our elected officials, the Mayor and others. However, as the PAC, being the legislatively recognized organization, we would be the signatory. This is presented to us in a way that it is not, I wouldn't say it is not up for negotiation, but it is a little different on how we approached the OSM. I think there are things in here that we may want some clarification on before we sign it. There are some important things that we might want to get a little more detail on. I think people, if they read this, will ask a couple of questions. The first is; why do they make these payments and that they are tied to certain things? It is a great question and it gets asked a lot, even from years back when I served as the director of the Foundation. The Port Authority is restricted. The funds that they use are federal funds, governed by federal regulators, and must be used for airport related uses. They cannot just spend money in a community. They have learned how to do that. One of the things that the Port Authority is allowed to do is make what is called 'payment in lieu of taxes'. It is referred to as the Pilot, ironically for an airport. That 'payment in lieu' of taxes is the money they pay to the city of Boston instead of actually paying real estate taxes. All of the land that they have cannot be taxed as a governmental agency, but they do make a payment in lieu of taxes. That has been authorized through the Federal Aviation Administration, as any Federal Government oversight organization, that would actually watch the dollars and recognize legitimate expenditures. What Massport does is identify certain components of projects that it does over time. Things like the park amendments, Terminal E, Phase I Certificate of Adequacy, the park facility, etc. All of those are projects that Massport will likely endeavor to complete. and they can identify an additional payment of those taxes. Through the cooperation of the city of Boston, something that was negotiated a long time ago, the city of Boston, unlike any other neighborhood in the city, this is a unique arrangement that East Boston has. The city of Boston actually dedicates a portion of their neighborhood taxes to East Boston. That is what makes up the mitigation and the funding that goes to the East Boston Foundation, and other programs as well. That is part of this process and how it all works. What is

contained in here is, and I want to say is, what you see is what you get because the negotiation of this was not the job of the PAC, but the job of others. The PAC is simply expected to sign this. Procedurally, legally, I can't tell you that you have to sign it. What I can say is that, if you don't, the community does not get the benefits. In doing this, and executing it, you are accepting, essentially, what the LIAG and our elected officials have, I would say for a lack of a better term, negotiated with the Port Authority. You would be the signatory to this because we are the only legislatively created organization that actually has a relationship with the Port Authority.

Karen Buttiglieri - Is there any language in there about the sailing program?

Mary Berninger - There was a ranking during the LIAG for participants to decide how they would envision the best use for the money for the community. The sailing center was mentioned, but it did not receive as many dots, if you will, in there.

Margaret Farmer - I will say that was done before it was revealed that the sailing center had then ongoing financial issues. So, at the time the conversation happened, we were under the impression that the sailing center was doing fine. I think there was less of a sense of urgency as compared to a senior center. We were like, there is no senior center, there is a need.

Karen Buttiglieri - I still feel like there is a need for a senior center, but I think there needs to be funding somewhere.

Richard Lynds - So, the water has gone under the bridge already, is the LIAG process. We cannot go back and start changing what gets funded. It is not our purview. It is outside the scope of what we are actually authorized to do as an organization. We were not charged with that responsibility even if they proposed it in this document. We can work with this document and have questions, something for clarification, etc. But, to go and change the substance of this, is not our responsibility.

Karen Buttiglieri - I still think it is a tragedy.

Richard Lynds - Just want to clarify that on the OSM we did include as a recommended change of the OSM, because there is language that actually requires as part of the goals of this organization, is to look at fund programming in Piers Park. So, we have added language that says to the extent that if we are asked to support programming in the park, they should provide us additional funds for things like Piers Park Sailing. We did cover that in the OSM agreement which is more appropriate for our ask. It would not be appropriate in this, because, this is not something that we negotiated.

Mary Berninger - I was on the LIAG and I have to thank Sal, Adrian, etc. Massport invited us there for many meetings. But, when I received this the other day, and speaking as an LIAG member, there were things that struck me as being different from the intentions of the group. The first being that the original innovation of the park, that you who were on the PAC many years ago, and had came up with that design. We talked about it in the LIAG meeting. The original price tag could have been in excess of \$17 million dollars. This is how many years later, and it says \$15 million. That concerns me because it does not allow for inflation or a baseline of what we were going to do before. That, for me, was concerning. In those meetings, when we talked about the senior center because that was a goal of mine, I specifically used the line "in perpetuity". I used that term over and over again during those meetings because I remember what happened with the sailing center. I remember what happened here, when an agreement would expire, and we were operating without an agreement in force. I am concerned about what happens at the end of this 10 year period. The political structure could conceivably be different. The administration of Massport could conceivably be different. How much willingness is there going to be then to make sure everything is there to keep the senior center operating? Are we going to have to go back to fundraising, are we going to have to go to the city and say Massport doesn't agree to extend this? I am not saying they are not going to, but it is concerning that we have to go back every 10 years and do this process all over again. These are a couple of things, as an LIAG member, I was concerned about and wanted to bring to the attention of this group. I spoke to Lydia and Adrian about it because to

me, if you recall in these meetings, we asked the Port and we asked Kleinfelder what the budget they were working with. They would never tell us, and we would say that it was hard for us to operate in a vacuum. We now do know it, and I am not sure that it is going to do Phase II.

Michael Bruno - The \$17 million that you referenced, does that include the design or is that only construction?

Mary Berninger - No. That was the construction price. The design is already done.

Richard Lynds - They were responsible to pay for the design. That's about \$2 million that is dedicated to the design. There is another component that I talked to Mary about as well. Many years ago when they were preparing to build the Roseland site, Roseland requested to use the Phase II as a lay down for staging. We asserted consent of the PAC because that would be putting the site to a different use other than park use and that is inconsistent with the legislation. The agreement/understanding was that they would do so, but the payment would be that the site would be left in park ready condition. I think we need to reconcile what that means, and what costs that would peel off. That is probably worth a few million dollars. Where are we starting from? Are we starting from zero or from plus the million and a half park ready? That is an important feature. When we are talking \$15 million dollars; is it 16.5 or 13.5? That is what we are asking.

Mary Berninger - I asked Anthony, today, how much did they charge Roseland in rent for the lay down area. I asked him to find out by tonight. I feel this is an important dollar amount for this group to know.

Sal LaMattina - I think the deal was to make it park ready.

Karen Buttiglieri - Park ready. There was never a discussion of money.

Mary Berninger - So Roseland never paid them any rent.

Fran Carbone - Park ready. They were supposed to put some kind of membrane down.

Sal LaMattina - When we were on that committee, we were working towards making sure it was park ready.

Bob Strelitz - We have to know what park ready is.

Sal LaMattina - I understand they are doing it right now. They are cleaning up the site, seeding it.

Mary Berninger - We don't know that.

Richard Lynds - It was supposed to be a clean site.

Karen Buttiglieri - We were on that committee.

Mary Berninger - So you know for a fact that Massport did not ask for rent.

Sal LaMattina - On thing I can tell you is that, at that time, we were probably begging to get the construction done there. Nothing was happening in our neighborhood. The plan was, always, that they would return it, after lay down, to park ready.

Karen Buttiglieri - So we thought because Massport had not been really doing anything with the second Phase of Piers Park, that at least if they saw it was park ready maybe either the construction companies, like Clippership, or Roseland and Massport, maybe would be able to do something. Finally get second Phase of Piers Park done.

Mary Berninger - So, out of the pool of money, the \$15 million is inadequate. That is just my opinion as an IAG member. It does not address what we talked about in those meetings. To achieve, or close to, at the same point or beyond, what your group did years ago in terms of a design.

Karen Buttiglieri - Why in heavens name are we going on all these tours, to all these places, when we do not even know how we can spend the money since there is not even enough money to do a park?

Sal LaMattina - There is money. But it might not be a luxury park.

Karen Buttiglieri - What I am saying is that we are looking at all these things, which are certainly, many million of dollars. So just to bring in, and I am not saying the park would not be ready as a park, but what if you can't bring anything into the park, then what?

Karen Maddalena - I was going to say. Historically, not just Massport, but the city; they spend all of this money in the planning process, playgrounds or whatever, but when it comes down to the bare facts you do not get what you talk about.

Richard Lynds - Bob had asked me about something from Nov. 22, 2006. You sent a letter to Lowell Richards representing the PAC. (Read the letter. Bob provided material and information relative to Massport's request to use Piers Park II.) Your letter dated Nov. 6, 2006 to Richard Salini says it was a follow up to your meeting with members of PierPAC at the senate president's office.

to 'The purpose of the right of entry would be to permit Roseland to use Piers Park II site for lay down staging and to locate their sales office for construction. Although the members of the PAC understand the importance of this for Massport of having the development of the pier proceed as expeditiously and as inexpensively as possible, I have been asked to convey PierPAC's disappointment with Massport's failure to advise or consult with the PAC's membership prior to the decision to extend such an offer. The rental of Piers Park II to facilitate construction for \$200 plus million dollars residential development constitutes a substantial deviation of the legislation's intent to use this park parcel solely as a new addition to Piers Park. The significance of the legislature's designation as a park cannot be discounted by the fact that the construction is contingent upon funding from the Commonwealth. Furthermore, the legislation's mandate that PierPAC serve as an advisory capacity, regarding Phase I and Phase II, it seemed to obligate Massport to consult with the PierPAC prior to offering such an arrangement. Offering a right of entry to Roseland before consulting PierPAC ignores the PAC's advisory role, a basic requirement established by the legislation. So, we have laid out a number of things that we said we want. We generally support the development at Pier I, we do not want to delay Massport's plans, we do not want to jeopardize the prospect of the expeditious construction of the Piers Park II site either. So should funding become a reality in the future, PierPAC would insist, while reserving all its rights that prior to Massport's agreement to a right of entry, that the following conditions be included.'

We laid out a number of things.

- Prior to the placement of any equipment or material, Massport should establish, through a qualified consultant, a base line definition of the existing environmental conditions, including air and soil quality, at both the Piers Park II site and Phase I site, identify and clarify the condition after the 3 year usage of the Piers Park II site.

The letter also acknowledges that a considerable portion of soil being removed from the Pier I site and then returned as urban fill with modest levels of contamination.

- We said that while Massport indicated that it is not inclined to store such materials on barges due to potential negative environmental impact, we did not want that on Piers Park Phase II site.

That was a condition we insisted on. We wanted a specific time frame, and we wanted it to be completed as park ready, so that once they were done using the site, it would be ready for construction. That was the request that we had and that was something we sent in 2006.

Karen Buttiglieri - And that was what we were told was going to happen. In addition to that, there is a little history there. They initially asked Clippership if they could store their materials there and Clippership denied them. That is when they felt the need to put it on us.

Richard Lynds - They had no place to go and they would have had to pay for it.

Karen Buttiglieri - But, they did ask Clippership first. Winn, part of Clippership Development said no.

Mary Berninger - There was line in there that you said about fees or rent paid.

Richard Lynds - Yes, it was called 'rental' quote unquote.

Sal LaMattina - But, there was never a (undistinguishable).

Richard Lynds - In 2012 we followed up and sent a letter to Katy McDonald, and attached the letter sent to Lowell. (read letter to Katy)

- Attaching the letter sent to Lowell in 2006 when the concept of Phase II for lay down staging was first proposed. I would suspect the same concerns and issues remain include the use of Phase II site for stockpiling. At a minimum I think it is entirely reasonable for Massport to acknowledge it is willing to meet those requests made by the PAC in 2006. I recall in 2006 Lowell indicated there was a fee being paid to Massport by Roseland for the use of the Phase II area.

So Lowell did say there was a fee.

- Please confirm that Massport is not requiring Roseland or any other contractor to pay any rental fee for the period that the land would be occupied as a part of their license.

She did respond and provide a response with respect to the temporary use of it. She sent back a description of what they were doing. She confirmed that Roseland was not paying any fee in rental in connection with the right of entry.

Karen Buttigieri - You know they are going to be building again and if they want to build again?

Mary Berninger - Speaking from an IAG point of view, I am just concerned about the \$15 million.

Karen Maddalena - You mentioned the budget for PierPAC, the planning process. Allocating so much money?

Mary Berninger - Before my coming here, things happened and I have always been told that there was this much money spent on the design, that Marion came up with the design, and the estimated cost at that time would be in excess of \$17 million. When I saw the \$15 million it concerned me that how do we create a new park getting all the design elements in we might decide we want? Whether some from the old one, it is a new slate as Anthony said. How do we do that with \$15 million when we are this many years ahead when things cost more money?

Karen Maddalena - So in that \$15million dollars is the design process budget. At a prior meeting it says that the PierPAC, and maybe I am wrong, that the PierPAC had to allow money to hire a consultant.

Mary Berninger - No, what we said was; if we decided down the road, this group, if we voted on hiring our own consultant to work with us on any aspect of this process because whether or not we agree with Massport or not, we wanted our own set of eyes and ears. We would use our own money for that, but that would not come out of the \$15 million, that would come out of our money.

Karen Maddalena - Thank you for clarifying that.

Mary Berninger - When we went to a meeting at Massport, especially the one at the Port that Richie and I were at, Liz said whatever it takes to make sure is that is what the community wants. There is no language here reflecting that. It is \$15 million. I said to Adrian today, I am not sure as an LIAG member, very comfortable. It is like the city budget. Vote it up or down. It concerns me because it does not reflect what was talked about in those meetings, and the Senior Center also concerns me after 10 years.

Karen Buttigieri - I agree with you on that.

Bob Strelitz - Talking about park ready condition. We have to determine the present condition of the soil that is going to underlay Phase II. I think we need, as we did for Phase I, a soil engineer do borings into the soil to determine whether it is toxic, as I am sure it is, and it needs to be cleaned. What we did with Phase I; we put a membrane over the existing soil and brought in clean soil to form the foundation for Phase I. I suspect something like that needs to be done for Phase II. We need to test the soil that is presently there, and then Roseland, in accordance with their agreement, should make it park ready. They should pay to bring it up to park condition.

Sal LaMattina - I agree. I will find that out.

Lucille Montanino - Do they have a date of when this should be done so that it is ready for Massport to start?

Mary Berninger - I thought the original letter said they would give them 30 days to cease and desist if they were able to get the funding. But, it has gone beyond that because this wasn't signed. They can't go forward until this was signed. They are asking us to look at this and conceivably have that ceremony next month, or thereafter. I am just worried that, we go into this process, we do all of this work on design, and at the end of the day we fall short of money, and they say, 'but you signed it.'

Margaret Farmer - The trips we are doing, are they counting that against our total?

Mary Berninger - No, it is the bench marks for construction.

Michael Bruno - I would say the way this was written it would count against that total. It says fiscal year 18 and a period of planning would be charged against the \$15 million.

Karen Buttiglieri - So, every time we go on a tour, are they going to take it away from the budget?

Michael Bruno - Maybe you read it differently, but that is how I would read it. The table on the bottom of page 2. I would say that since they (undistinguishable) the community planning process, any dollars being spent goes against the \$15 million.

Margaret Farmer - I am saying we should clarify that. I want to know exactly what we are going to be paying for because we may need that money, and it should come out of PAC money, and then the \$15 million stays.

Richard Lynds - It is not identified as a milestone. It is really just a place holder. They say a milestone. The first milestone is when the (undistinguishable) that's when the real dollars are proposed for Piers Park Phase II as well as the East Boston Foundation.

Mary Berninger - I think the \$15 million is time enhanced.

Karen Maddalena - Any way to figure out mathematically, like with the cost of living or something, inflation, to figure it out?

Mary Berninger - I don't think it is helpful right away if it was less money. So they went into the negative right away. It was \$17 million dollars years ago. Even if you take that into account, like the water feature, but you match that to inflation, you still come out short.

Michael Bruno - There may be a way to find out the what cost was of some of the parks you are looking at. If they were publicly funded that number may be available.

Q. What did it cost for Phase I?

Richard Lynds - Close to \$20 when it was all done.

Bob Strelitz - And that was in those dollars, 1995 dollars.

Michael Bruno - This is my first time seeing the time line and it looks like they are not proposing to start construction until they have occupancy in Terminal E. Was that the discussion previously?

Sal LaMattina - It's all milestones.

Mary Berninger - They always did say that, and they did tell us at meetings in the past year, that we are looking at 5 years minimum to complete it. We knew we were in this for the long haul because they were tied to those milestones.

Michael Bruno - It looks like it's 5 years to start construction.

Mary Berninger - Once you get the design done, and I think they can get it done, and finish it by that time. By 5 years.

Bob Strelitz - I'll be 85. I'll be in an old age home. 'Thank you' from a wheelchair.

Mary Berninger - So we have this, and then we have the OSM to think about for the month. What do we do now? Since it is either up or down?

Richard Lynds - This is not an agenda vote, doesn't have to be put on the agenda for the next meeting. The earliest would be the next meeting to be voted on. I think it is worth having/putting that 1/2 hour aside for the next meeting to have a discussion on it before having an actual vote. So, the motion would be to accept the agreement, then a discussion on the motion, and then someone could either move the table or move it for a vote. It would need a majority of the members of the PAC, and a majority of the PAC to agree to have the president sign it.

Mary Berninger - But in your wisdom, and I know you did not represent the IAG, how does the community go back to the Port and say this is inadequate?

Richard Lynds - I think that it is the elected officials that would have to communicate that on behalf of their constituents. To say that we feel that this is not, you know. I think as a group, before we are actually asked to sign it, it should at least have the endorsement of those who represent the community at large. We are not elected to represent anybody. We are signing an agreement on behalf of the community and that is a little different than the OSM. So, I think if the elected officials are prepared to endorse it, then it at least gives this group the understanding that the agreement represents what is best for the community. I think we have our own thoughts and ideas on this, but I think that is a function, I think, of the elected officials.

Sal LaMattina - I don't remember what was said, what was spent, seeing the \$15 million, at that meeting. Looking for a figure.

Mary Berninger - There wasn't any because the only figure we were going off of was, anecdotally, we were told what the older design would cost in dollars back then. So we asked Massport that it has to be language that allows us to do that, but move up to the 2018, and to the 5 years in cost increases. I don't see how this does that.

Sal LaMattina - That is a conversation we would have to have with Massport.

Michael Bruno - A \$15million dollar conversation. I don't think I have the latest draft of the OMS. The version I have they said that the \$2.4 million would be reserved for design and environmental assessment. This draft says that at this time, \$1.3 million had already been spent of that.

Mary Berninger - What document are you reading.

Michael Bruno - It is Section 6.3 of the OMS.

Richard Lynds - Of the second amended Operation, Security and Maintenance Agreement?

Michael Bruno - I do not have the most recent version.

Mary Berninger - I don't see it. I only have the marked up one that we sent to their legal department.

Alex DeFronzo - What Bob said earlier, I have seen DEP documents for testing on the soil saying it was poisonous. They did the testing already, as part of the \$1.4 million, in the 90's.

Bob Strelitz - They did test it, and they found it to be contaminated. It didn't get any cleaner since then.

Mary Berninger - And I get that Massport isn't comfortable with long term (undistinguishable). I get the 10 year thing with the Senior Center, but it would be a shame.

Alex DeFronzo - That expires, in 9 years, there would be no more money for the Senior Center.

Richard Lynds - (To Michael Bruno) This was back in 2010, their first go-around about that. This is a the slate clean. We are starting over. I would say outside of that \$15 they already spent \$1.3 million on matters, so this is the original Phase II design. When Phase II design was completed they spent \$2.4 million on that.

Karen Buttiglieri - So are we deducting that from the \$15 million.

Richard Lynds - No. It is not part of this. It is a different agreement. They are reciting the Phase II in the OSM and we have asked them to strike that and to update the references to the current, to reflect the current (undistinguishable). That is just dated language.

Mary Berninger - For now, if you will just keep that, and at some point after we vote on it, it will be posted on the web site. In the meantime, if the voting members will take one from here, please do not send it around the community at large because it is not a document in force yet. The other document that Richie gave to Massport.

Richard Lynds - We have communicated with Massport legal. We sent them all of our requested changes in the OSM. All of the updates we talked about basically outlined what we feel was captured in discussions over the past several months for what we feel should be included as amendments of the OSM. The next step, and hopefully I will get it in the next 2 weeks, is their response back with the edited version. That will be distributed to voting members. We will see how much of our changes they have actually accepted. Then we will have to decide whether or not there are sticking points; meaning things that are absolutely crucial, that need to be in there. That may result in one more go-around of the OSM. My guess is if they come back and accept everything we provided, we at that point will be expected to vote on accepting those changes and signing off on the OSM. It could happen at the next meeting, so we do need a quorum, and that is one of the reason I want the Open Meeting Law Compliance all done before we vote on either of the matters.

Mary Berninger - Before we go into Executive Session, does anyone have any Old Business they want to talk about.

Michael Bruno - Questioning if the public would have input on that process. Would those documents be made available ahead of time?

Richard Lynds - Once we get comments back from the Port Authority. The protocol is that the membership has to accept them. Right now it is negotiations. We are fine having an open transparent process, but the confusion that can arise by putting out documents that are not the ones that we have ultimately accepted, can create some issues. What we like to do is have the voting members come to a point where they accept the document. When that document is accepted we will then make that a public document. We will add that to our website.

Michael Bruno - So will the group have already voted to execute? At the time of the public comments?

Mary Berninger - That night we can ask for comments because that will be the document. And that night if we decide to vote, that is when we will vote.

Richard Lynds - That last memo I think was made public. I can put it on the website. The memo actually identifies all of the things we have asked of the Port Authority. I will put that on the website under documents.

Mary Berninger - New Business.

Sal LaMattina - Under Old Business. Last meeting we talked about the 2 Groups that were looking for funding from us; the YMCA and the Sailing Program. So, looking at the by-laws, Section 74C, it says reasonable expenses including administration expenses, concerts, events, including the free youth Sailing Program at the Piers Park. I want to know if we can talk about that again, and bring it up, because, I think, as a member of this group, we really need to support the Sailing Program. I don't know how much they need to raise. (Asked Alex.)

Alex DeFronzo - It costs us about 1/2 million dollars to operate. Right now we have 31 employees. We have instructors, young adults from East Boston. The summer programs have been running for 2 weeks and the payroll for 2 weeks is \$25,000. It is expensive. We have 600 kids in the summer, and to teach all of those kids, costs a lot of money. I saw the minutes from last meeting and there are a couple of things that I would like to clarify. One is that Massport has made it clear to us, that we are not at the point yet, that they are going to re-instate the funding that once existed. We have made a lot of progress. 2 years ago the award over the entire year that they gave the Sailing Center was less than \$11,000. This year they will give us a little over \$41,000 through the Community Summer Jobs Grant and the Operations

Grant. I think, incrementally and work on that. My hope would be that the PAC would see the value of the Sailing Center in the park. I know a lot of people said they would vote on it and that was it. If there is money available, and it can support us getting more kids in the program doing after school programs, we would appreciate it. It is going to allow us to employ young adults from the neighborhood to work as instructors in the program, and to get more kids in the program.

Sal LaMattina - I bring that up for 1 reason. In another 3 or 4 years Phase II would be completed. Our job was to make sure that Massport keeps on funding us, so we can have events in the park. We have to make sure that Piers Park Sailing Program doesn't go under, doesn't close. So, for the \$25,000 that they are requesting now? I don't think that is a lot. I don't think we are going to spend \$200,000 for consultants. They are paying for (undistinguishable.)

Richard Lynds - I want to be clear. They are paying for their consultants, not our consultants.

Sal LaMattina - If we have to hire consultants, I don't think it would be \$200,000.

Richard Lynds - I think the Sailing Center is great and don't take this as a knock on the sailing center. This is about process and corporate governance. We have a duty and obligation to deal with Phase II. To address the design and construction of Phase II, which is going to take place over the next 4 to 5 years. We get \$75,000 a year, and we have to cover all of those costs, and we do need consultants to do that. That is not something we can go to the Port Authority because, I can assure you that the Port Authority is not going to pay for any of our consultants. Especially if we say we need more money over and above what we need for our operations. They might say they would give us more money to pay the Sailing Center and that is something we have asked for. I understand the importance and the significance of the Sailing Center. That is not lost from a legal stand point. I think members have to understand that to vote to give away the money that is intended for their administration and operational costs, you do that at your peril.

Sal LaMattina - The agreement says that we can support programming.

Richard Lynds - If we have the money.

Karen Buttiglieri - We do have the money to do that.

Richard Lynds - We have the money for operations of this organization.

Sal LaMattina - I don't think we will spend \$300,00 for consultants.

Richard Lynds - People can take advice of counsel or not. You can decline to take the advice of counsel. I think it is a dangerous precedent to spend money that is dedicated for your operations for this organization, continue to do that, and it is not the first time we have done it. We have done it multiple times in the past. And every time we have the same issues.

Sal LaMattina - I would like us set a precedent to spend money for programming in that park. That is what we should be doing.

Richard Lynds - So the first thing we do is to get the Port Authority to up the amount of money that they give us because we have not changed from day 1. We have gotten \$75,000 dollars from 1998 and moving forward. They owe us additional money. They owe us 3 years of money. Maybe if they give us the \$225,000 they owe us, have them give it to the Piers Park Sailing Center. Maybe that is the argument, the request.

Karen Maddalena - But, until then, I still think that we should, even if it is for this year, support the Sailing Center. To give money. You had said that a precedent would be set by doing this. When we had the discussion with the Y, Bob Strelitz was the one who suggested that we should have programming down at Piers Park. So, based on his recommendation, PierPAC paid or allocated money for that program. So, a precedent was started there. That was never brought up in our discussions. We are the ones who initiated the program and we in turn, because we initiated it, we paid them. It shouldn't have

come from the Y. A precedent was set, and I think we should be able to support, even if for just this year, to give the \$25,000 for the Sailing Center.

Sal LaMattina - It is in our agreement that we can do this.

Richard Lynds - It is not in our agreement that we are obligated to do it. It doesn't say we have to do it financially. We have to be honest about that. It says support.

Sal LaMattina - It is financial support they are looking for, so we can do that.

Mary Berninger - I think last month, if we are honest with ourselves, we spent a lot of time on the matter. It was revisited and it is reflected in the minutes.

Karen Buttiglieri - I think we can revisit it again.

Mary Berninger - Can I please finish?

Karen Buttiglieri - Yes, of course. You always do.

Mary Berninger - Excuse me?

Karen Buttiglieri - You always do. Anytime anyone has a little problem there is always a little....This issue has been a problem.

Mary Berninger - I think I would take exception. You can put this in the minutes. I appreciate this. I think this is a very democratic process, and I recognize people around the room when they raise their hand, and then when I want to address something

Karen Buttiglieri - Yes, you do.

Mary Berninger - And we have exhausted the topic of discussion last month with the 2 votes.

Sal LaMattina - Well last month I did not have the agreement in my hand, at that time. You said it would set a precedent, but it won't because it is in our agreement that we can give to programming. We should be doing that.

Mary Berninger - The precedent in light of the planning for Phase II.

Sal LaMattina - Like I said, in 4 years that park will be built. If we want to set a precedent then, yeah.

Mary Berninger - We are not a Grant making organization though.

Bob Strelitz - Not basically, that's true. Isn't it possible to know what work we have to do in preparation for Phase II? Isn't it possible for us to get a handle on what we will have to spend for consultants?

Mary Berninger - You mean, prepare a review, but we do not know what the issues will be yet.

Richard Lynds - We have to scope it yet.

Sal LaMattina - Your right. But how much would it cost us to hire a consultant if we disagree with Massport.

Fran Carbone - In working on Phase I, Marion Pressley was wonderful. She guided us so that we really did not need much consulting. She was awesome, and she is going to do it again.

Sal LaMattina - Yes, I know that.

Richard Lynds - It is not Marion I am worried about.

Bob Strelitz - Who are you worried about?

Richard Lynds - It would be the Port Authority. It would be the Port's decisions. We are already at stage 1 where they are already trying to cut the price of this at \$15 million. Who does Marion work for? She doesn't work for us, she doesn't work for the Port Authority.

Fran Carbone - She guides us.

Richard Lynds - So, when the Port Authority says the purse strings are here, and this is how much we are spending, and this is the way we are going to do it, then we want to be in position to say no, that is not the correct way to do it and this is the way it should be done.

Sal LaMattina - I agree with you and I am sure we could hire some expert consultants for less than \$200,000 dollars. To be honest with you.

Bob Strelitz - Marion Pressley is our expert. She did a beautiful job on Phase I. Why shouldn't she do an equally beautiful job?

Tom Bruno - I am concerned. Massport owes this group 3 years of funding. What is the process of getting that money from Massport even before we have this argument/discussion over how we will be spending future funding?

Bob Strelitz - Can we initiate an arbitration process for that, make the request? Can't hurt. We have asked them a number of times.

Sal LaMattina - And, what was their response?

Bob Strelitz - No response. They didn't pay us.

Sal LaMattina - In our agreement they were supposed to pay us \$75,000 a year.

Richard Lynds - During the Salini years, when we were without agreement, the Port Authority's position was that the obligations of the agreement concerning operations, security and maintenance would continue, but they were silent as to the funding. So, therefore, when we didn't have a signed agreement, they feel they have no obligation. We have a broader reading of the agreement, but I do not think we are running into court over it just yet. It is something they feel they either owe us or don't owe us.

Margaret Farmer - So if that is the linchpin, then we should prioritize that, potentially vote on it next month and then say here is the agreement, where is our cash?

Richard Lynds - The second thing that we asked them is to include 2 things that have been asked by the Piers Park Sailing Center, to include, as part of the OSM, to include the maintenance in the OSM for Piers Park Sailing, and to include additional funding so we can fund them. You know what their answer is going to be? Why would we do that? You get \$75,000 a year. So, is it the long game we want to play or the short game? The short game today to give \$25,000?

Margaret Farmer - So, my answer to that, if they said that to me, my answer would be that we are not in a position to help them.

Richard Lynds - We have communicated to Massport that we are not in a position to fund anybody.

That we are in a position to operate the park and to do things that are required for the park. Not necessarily to be a Grant making organization. We can support whatever we want to support, but eventually you are going to be asking us for \$75,000 a year because if the funding sources are not there for you, and your costs continue to increase, and Massport doesn't pick up things like maintenance for your facility, it will fall on us.

Sal LaMattina - Alex has been doing an awesome job.

Richard Lynds - Nobody has said that Alex is not doing a good job. It's comparing apples to oranges.

Sal LaMattina - I get it. Our job is to make sure this program is successful and if we can't help him with \$25,000 this year shame on us.

Karen Buttiglieri - So, for the 3 years that we did not have the maintenance agreement it wasn't because of us. It was because of them.

Bob Strelitz - It was because of us. The president at that time would not sign the agreement.

Karen Buttiglieri - So it's our fault. So we're not going to get the money then. If that's the case. I don't know if it is our fault.

Richard Lynds - I think your better fight is to get them to include funding in the OSM so that we can fund components of the legislative mandate. So we can do that, Sal. We are saying that we had a base line of \$75,000. If they want us to fund things they should increase that number. There is nothing wrong with that. That solves their problem because it gets us on a continued basis for the next 10 years of additional funds. This is not the only organization that is waiting for funding from the Massport

Authority. There are others that are waiting too. It is not a unique situation. There are other groups that the Massport gives money to and they are waiting, too.

Bob Strelitz - As our legal counsel, do you think we should initiate a process to determine whether or not we can get that \$225,000? It seems to me that it is hanging up there undetermined. It should be resolved one way or the other.

Richard Lynds - The problem is that the file gets passed to the next Chief Corporation Council. It goes back as far as when Katy took over. That was the last time we had that conversation. They have it on their books, they know it is an obligation. As to whether or not they want to release it, that remains to be seen.

Bob Strelitz - Isn't that going to have to be determined by arbitration?

Richard Lynds - No. I think the timing is right to ask now.

Bob Strelitz - It certainly can't hurt. But if they say no?

Richard Lynds - Then we have to decide if it is worth arbitration.

Lucille Montanino - Questioning if they went to the Foundation for money.

Alex DeFronzo - Yes.

Mary Berninger - We are going to go into Executive Session now. Voting members stay.

Sal LaMattina - I thought we were still going to talk about it. I thought maybe to open up the discussion again, and move to give the money to the Sailing Center.

Mary Berninger - Last month, after the second vote, it was up to the chair whether or not to open it. (2 votes were taken last meeting).

Richard Lynds - So, technically under Old Business, you can raise it for discussion not a vote. You can move to have it on the Agenda for the next meeting.

Sal LaMattina - I move to put it on the agenda for next meeting.

Mary Berninger - But, you (Richard) said the president sets the Agenda.

Richard Lynds - If he makes a motion and it is seconded.

Sal LaMattina - I make that motion.

Karen Maddalena - Second.

Mary Berninger - All in favor.

Voted and passed.

Mary Berninger - I just want to say that I greatly resent the implication that somehow I am not running these meetings in a meaningful way.

Karen Buttiglieri - That is not what I meant.

Mary Berninger - May I finish please. And, that I am somehow not allowing people to talk. I go around the room and I recognize when I see a hand raised. I think the amount of talking that we do in these groups is reflected in the usual 15 pages of notes which reflect these conversations. I just wanted to say that. I think it was inappropriate. Thank you, we will see you next month.

Karen Buttiglieri - I would like to say something to Mary. That is not what I meant. I meant for that vote, you actually shut us right down and said you as a chair. It was only for that vote, nothing else. I am not talking about how you handle a meeting. You do a great job, and I mean that.

Mary Berninger - I was told by counsel it was up to the chair, and I do not how often we are going to beat something into the ground when we are trying to build the Parks too.

Karen Buttiglieri - We all have different view points when it comes to that.

Mary Berninger - And we expressed those last month.

Karen Buttiglieri - I know.

Mary Berninger - There was no action taken.

Richard Lynds - So, the appropriate way to do it, include it, or it can be moved to be put on the Agenda, and if a vote carries, then it is added to the Agenda.

Sal LaMattina - I make a motion to add it to the Agenda.

Mary Berninger - It is already on the Agenda.

Richard Lynds - So, it is on for a vote in August. Now we need a motion for an Executive session.

Sal LaMattina - I would like to add that I like this setup. Very nice.

Lucille Montanino - Motion to go into and Executive Session.

Fran Carbone/Bob Strelitz - Second.

Voted and passed.

Richard Lynds - Questioning if there was a quorum.

(Count was taken for the quorum. There were not enough voting members for a quorum. Only 10 members remained, and 11 members are needed for a quorum. No voting by proxy or phone. Richard stated that you can do the Executive Session before the actual meeting, to make sure you have enough members.)

Lucille Montanino - Motion to adjourn.

Bob Strelitz - Second.

Voted and passed.