

East Boston PierPAC

October 16, 2018

Attendance:

Mary Berninger
Peter Cardinale
David Halbert
Karen Maddalena
Frances Piantedosi

Connie Carbone
Jerry Deneumoustier
Mary Hanlon
Louise Montanino
Bob Strelitz

Fran Carbone
Lucille Drago
Sal LaMattina
Lucille Monuteaux
Melissa Tyler

Excused:

Karen Buttiglieri
Rose Petraglia

Bernardine Joslin

Adrian Madaro

Associate Members Present:

Alex DeFronzo
Libby Scimeni

Lucille Reed

Mary Romano

Attendance taken.

(Following the attendance roll call Sal LaMattina, David Halbert and Bob Strelitz arrived.)

Mary Berninger - Richard Lynds is on his way. Minutes. Corrections, deletions, additions to the last meeting's minutes.

Karen Maddalena - Correction Page 4, 3rd paragraph, change 'florist blocks' to 'porous blocks'.

Anthony Guerriero - At the meeting prior to the last one, regarding Marie Deneumoustier, the word 'plaque' was spelled 'plague'.

Jerry Deneumoustier - Motion to accept.

Connie Carbone - Second.

Voted and approved.

Mary Berninger - When Richie comes we will talk about the OSM and the Community Benefits Agreement. You'll notice on the agenda that we have made a few changes. The most significant one is that public comments will be entertained at the end of the meeting, after all of the agenda items have been taken care of and the Board members have had a chance to weighed in. Anybody else, Associate members or members of the public, will have a time at the end of the meeting for that. The meeting would go a little faster. Massport Power Point.

Anthony Guerriero - Good to see everyone as we begin the fall. Gives me great pleasure to introduce to you Amy Blake-Baldwin who is going to be our new Project Manager. Ned Dawes has decided to retire. We are in great hands with Amy, has been with Massport for 3 years, and always greets you with a smile and a great sense of humor. Most of you interacted with her during the tour. She has put the Power Point together. Working with Mary and others we will do a review of the parks tonight. Next month's meeting we will have security and maintenance guys come in, and then we will have Marion Pressley, and someone from Kleinfelder come in, and more or less set the stage of what we need to start doing for next year's design process. Really putting the pedal to the metal and getting into heavy

discussions as to what you want to see for the elements that are necessary. Take a look at the broader picture. Gathering the data that you have taken a look at over the last year, New York and Boston. You have heard from other people, have been at different community meetings, you are part of different community groups, which is important, and start thinking about what we need to do next year. We will have further discussions about that, but just so you know that, other than PAC meetings, I have to do 2 large community meetings next year. We will probably have a meeting with the Jeffries Point Neighborhood Association and I am sure, during that process, we will be required to go to another group. Someone from Orient Heights, or whoever, might say they would like us to come and present. The attendance of these meetings can be critical. Mary and Richard and others will talk about that. Just to get everyone's input. Next month, in November, there will be 2 hot pieces of the Massport presentation. The guys from Operation, Maintenance and Security (OSM), which applies to all the parks, including Festa Field, for the past year. Then with Nassar and Marion Pressley saying what they would need to extract from you moving forward. We have about 40 slides, and Amy and I will both speak through it.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - I have been with Massport for 3 years and prior to that I was an architect doing a lot of public works type projects. So I have some familiarity working with the public, and the constraints and challenges, that go with it. I think this will be fun. Piers Park at 61/2 acres and Piers Park II with about 4 acres. Just keep that in mind when we talk about the size of the various parks that we went to on Sept. 15. We went to 2 parks in East Boston, 1 in the North End, 1 in South Boston, 2 in Roslindale and 1 in Somerville. Will go through the order that we went through these parks.

In East Boston, Navy Fuel Pier Airport Buffer, a nice quiet park

Massport runs it, 3/4 of an acre, passive, natural plantings, security fencing, beautiful view, natural seating that was hand picked by the architect, light fixtures, scattered plantings, stone benches, some lovely stone work there

Anthony Guerriero - We do not have benches in our airport as buffers, so the stone work, which is decorative, also serves as seating. To Karen Maddalena's point, you have the sidewalk, and the walkway that leads into the Navy Fuel Pier, does have sea glass in it. There is a coating on it for protection.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - They left some of the pilings and on the other side there are the factories.

In Roslindale, Healy Playground, we did not go in, but did drive by

9.6 acres, renovated in 2017, Boston runs this park, they increased the size during renovations, there are different aged toys to play with and different interactive elements of play, there are 3 different sized fields, softball and baseball and there is a basketball court, interactive water play with an old fashioned water pump, water ball for balance lessons

Anthony Guerriero - We saw this, for a person with a disability, at Menino park. Resilient surface, pogo sticks designed as a reed, kids balance on that. In some of our discussions we take some things into consideration. We already have a water element for kids at Phase I, the sprinkler system, the spray pool. So, number one; do we still want to do that or do we want to do something different? This is something to what we saw in Brooklyn, the same concept. A dam, water flows into a pebbled area, etc.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - Water play on the ground, etc. We also have an obstacle course for older children.

Fallon Field and playground.

Renovated in 2016, 7 1/2 acres. This field has a huge change in grade elevation. High and low points in the field. The playground takes advantage of the height difference. 2 basketball courts, it has one of the tallest slides in Boston, no ladder, it has a climbing net. The whole playground, in general, was the squishiness of the resilient surface. Has a lot of different age elements, meant for 9 to 12. Swings of the seat kind or straps. Lots of elements to climb on, concrete blocks acts as a divider, hand holds to get up to the slide, small spray fountain.

Anthony Guerriero - This design was reminiscent in what you saw in Menino Park. A large slide so you are not constrained, climbing area. This is a hard surface, but it was low sprinklers, and you had to step on button to let it go. The reed like structures, the kids weave in between and it is also public art.

Mary Berninger - It also had street hockey.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - South Boston, Sweeney Playground

1.25 acres. Renovated in 2014. Basketball court, playground with some elevational changes, swings and water play. All of playground area has resilient surface. Obstacle course, some swings, basketball court.

Langone Park.

2.1 acres, Puopola Field, 4.8 acres, in the North End. Along Commercial St., right on the water. Pool, 3 fields, and a playground. Bocci court, and an event was going on while we were there. One of things that was liked about this, was the change in elevation, and we were worried about resiliency, and making sure we could deal with a water elevation change. The Bocci Court is closer to the street, and behind that, play elements, and swings closer to the water.

Anthony Guerriero - What Amy was talking about, on the first slide, because we are in a densely populated neighborhood, where Phase II is going to be, if the PAC is inclined to do something, because I know there has been talk about a basketball court, or a half basketball court, or a tennis court. Do you put it away from residents off the water? You can design a harbor walk, and then do something attractive that separates the harbor walk from a basketball or tennis court. If the PAC is inclined to do something like that, so it bounces off the water.

Mary Berninger - We spoke to those guys that were playing that day. They had no problem with a 1/2 court.

Anthony Guerriero - You could do that. I might be old fashioned, but I know at Constitution Beach, there is a handball court there, and as a kid, I used to practice tennis off the handball court. You have options. Dealing with 4 acres, and all I am saying is that you are moving it away from the community.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - The latter play elements is maybe putting it closer to the water.

Mary Berninger - In my own mind I was trying to figure out what could fit there. I went on line and they show baseball, and softball fields, and the regulations for those are very specific. How much square footage they need to create that, I don't know. It is just a suggestion, not doing that down there because it takes up, almost a 1/2 to a 1/3 of the whole parcel. I just wanted everybody to think about that.

Anthony Guerriero - Great point. Amy and I instructed Kleinfelder, that when we come back in February, I think that is what we are going to focus on. We are not going to focus on design, but come here, and say, that you are dealing with 4.4 acres. This is the repercussion. You are going to need parking spots. If you want to put a baseball/softball diamond or if you want to do something else. So everyone is on the same page, and we start off that way, in February, before talking about the type of bricks and benches, let's start with spacial differences.

Mary Berninger - If adding a field you can't do berms. People liked the ideas of berms to give contrast. If you do that, you really can't do the other.

Anthony Guerriero - When we went to Roxbury Community College, the park across the street, the hamster trap. That separated the kid's playground from the basketball court.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - The vendor space was between the main street, the bicycle path and the Bocci court.

Anthony Guerriero - Sal, didn't the city commit money to do that park?

Sal LaMattina - Yes, and they also sponsored the North End Pride Day.

Anthony Guerriero - (Picture of the park rules) If you take a look at the rules; Massport rules replicate the city of Boston's. Hours of operation, no alcoholic beverages, no vehicular access, no skateboarding, rollerskating or bicycling. So, when we talk about our rules, created almost 30 years ago, they replicate the city of Boston.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - Somerville, Chuckie Harris Park

1/2 acre park, with a Bocci court, water play, dual purpose movie screen, rain water capture. Has a water play, button pours down with water with a movie screen hookup and a mountain with knots in the rope to pull yourself up. The benches took into consideration handicap accessibility, all pathways are handicap accessible. There is a replication of the Edsel factory setting of making a car.

Bob Strelitz - I think the Edsel lasted 3 years.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - Different slides, and the movie screen goes up pretty tall, allows people to see.

American Legion playground

3.4 acres, water front views. Elevational change, at low point is the condor wild. Stands, baseball diamond, a shade structure, soccer field.

Anthony Guerriero - Different types of elevation, wide sidewalks. It has been rehabbed. Beautiful, multi purpose stadium. You have the shade structure that also acts as a public art element. Not a solid roof, nice shadow thrown on the ground. The pavement on the ground has different colors and shapes.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - At the end of left field you can see the shade structure. It also has public art; murals that have been hand painted. Different element for climbing, and playing, and a water fountain,

Anthony Guerriero - So we have a lot of things to discuss. Do we want to do something that incorporates some type of public art? The reeds from Roslindale Park, basketball courts from different elevation, etc. You have a fenced planting area, but there were reeds in there that served an artistic purpose.

Melissa Tyler - When I was in Canada they had something similar that were multi-purpose for adult use. You could put hammocks or tight rope straps to practice. Fun for adults to come out, because they brought their own equipment. Could just hang in and read a book.

Anthony Guerriero - Bring that to the table when we talk next year. All I am saying is that there are possibilities. We are talking about fields, playgrounds, swings, etc. There could also be an opportunity to do something creative. We did that with Phase I. Designs in granite, and stationary structures. This is something that could be different. In terms of the Chuckie Harris thing. Not saying we are making memorials here. It's just another thing that could be some kind of public art. Dr. DeAngelis had talked about Gold Star Mother parks. Very elaborate, very grandiose, but I personally would not go that way. I talked about a bench that represents the Gold Star Mother, but that, also, is not a memorial, but if you did a bench that is different, it could be a piece of public art.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - In the North End.

This is something they had involved children in, and they created fishes out of the dreaded plastic; preventing it from going into the oceans. They made it an ocean themed art project, and called it Changing Tides. They got the local kids involved in making this piece of sculpture, and visible for everybody to see.

Anthony Guerriero - So, maybe, in the future, that is a programming thing we could work on. My personal opinion is that Sam Adams School never gets the credit it deserves. Maybe that is a partnership we could do with those young kids, with the ICA. You all familiar with Steve McQue, project manager of the Navy Fuel Pier, who died right after that opening. Again, this is a memorial, and not recommending a memorial, but you could do something in stone. We could always do something that fits in subtly. So, for my data collection, these are the things that we take a look at, and they are throughout East Boston.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - In the North End, by the Bocci Court, (pointed out seating), people tend to sit up on the upper level, so they can see, and we can inscribe anything. You could make it a part of the elements of the park, a history of the areas, it could be part of an educational package, etc.

Anthony Guerriero - You could carve in the B&M railroad, and do a train. If you remember, from the woman who did Menino Park, she got the granite blocks recycled from the old I95 connector. She got timbers that were repurposed, but she got the granite blocks from there.

Mary Berninger - Still a lot there.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - So starting with an empty shack, and then we are going to have a delicate flower. (Picture of small house with Anthony depicted in it.)

Anthony Guerriero - I love the house, but, that is something you could put somewhere else in the park. I was impressed with a lot of parks that we saw in New York and Boston. Cudo to Mayor Walsh and Mayor Menino for maintaining, and spending money on those parks. They look good. You have a lot to think about, and that is going to be critical. Building 6, at Roseland, is 90% occupied, so you have a new group of residents, and neighbors living there. Building 5 should be filled by the end of December. What are those people looking for?

Karen Maddalena - Just wanted to add some comments. My sister lives in Chelsea, and the parks they built a few years ago had some musical instruments. It was part of the parks programs. I would like to see some of those incorporated; Xylophone drums, etc.

Anthony Guerriero - Earlier in the year I talked about the Haas Park, behind the Lincoln School, in Revere. They have a Xylophone, a steel drum and something else, in stainless steel.

Mary Berninger - So, earlier, you said you do not do seating in buffer parks.

Anthony Guerriero - Official seating in the buffer parks.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - Those were sculptured stones.

Mary Berninger - So, if we have any of those left, maybe 1, 2 or 3, I like odd numbers, could they be placed strategically someplace in the Neptune Buffer because it is a buffer, and you have them at the Navy Fuel Pier?

Anthony Guerriero - We can take a look at that. Thank you for that recommendation.

Lucille Monuteaux - There seems to be a great attention to children, which I have children and grand children, but what about seniors? This is all children's playgrounds.

Anthony Guerriero - I think it is equal. When we went to New York, Brooklyn was so big, but it brought attention to every person. You had a lot of children's elements, a lot of open space, bike trails, access to the water. It hit on multiple age groups. Menino Park is geared to people in the process of rehabilitation. Both adult and children. The one in Roslindale, which is 9 acres; you have athletic fields, adult and children, and then off to the side you have some areas for children.

Lucille Monuteaux - Children, children. What about seniors?

Anthony Guerriero - That is why I began the meeting with the PAC needs to think about this. Do we really need a spray fountain or do you want to do something different? You have to think about, and Sal and Mary, correct me if you think I am wrong, this neighborhood has changed. Jeffries Point has changed, completely. You have the 500 new residents alone and (bldg.) 5 and 6 before the end of this calendar year. They are primarily young professionals. You have a lot of families that have moved into Jeffries Point, and you are going to have Clippership.

Lucille Monuteaux - There is nothing there, but Bocci, in all of the designs, the parks.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - In the parks that we went to, you are right, but there are elements out there that we can look into, that are geared towards adults and seniors to play on. That is an element we can consider.

Mary Berninger - I think to Amy's point, we have the opportunity to do what other people didn't do.

Lucille Montanino - I noticed when I was on the Greenway in the North End, they had swings, big swings, where 4 or 5 people could swing on. They had a water element you could look at, for adults. Don't get me wrong; there were children on them, too. I have to agree with her, that they don't have much for adults at all. If you went through East Boston, and made a list of all the playgrounds, and all the different fields that we have, you would find that you have more than enough to take care of the new 500 people that are coming in. I don't think we are building this for the 500 people that are going to live there. Are we?

Anthony Guerriero - All I am saying is that we are painting everything with a broad brush. All of you are going to all these different community meetings, seeing what things have changed. It is up to you, starting next year, all of the data collection that we have done, all of the people that you have talked to, we have talked to, our consultants have talked to, and come to a collective conclusion as to what we want to see there. You might not want to do a swing set. We have the small workout center at Piers Park. You might want that or you might not want that either. You might want to replicate it. I think that all the parks we have seen are a little slanted towards children. Think broadly, we have this process. It will be a long, public process. You have a lot to decide, and then, when this gets opened up more, people will come into these meetings.

Lucille Montanino - Does the majority rule?

Mary Berninger - The PAC will vote on it. The 19 members of the PAC. They will offer up design features based on feasibility with Kleinfelder and Massport. We will all come up with a packet, but listen to the people in the community. Then we will decide.

Anthony Guerriero - Kleinfelder and Marion Pressley are going to have their own ideas. Marion designed Phase I, but things have changed in that 25 year period. She might recommend something different and Kleinfelder might have their own ideas. So it will be an interesting process.

Mary Berninger - To your point, I think, just speaking for the community, I think the community missed an opportunity when some of the other parks were renovated to do some of the senior features too. Down at Paris St. they have the outdoor chess tables, and things like that, that seniors are more inclined to use. But, Noyes Park is mostly young kids, adolescents and teens. The City Yard the same thing. Beautiful venues, but those ideas, that you are talking about, could have been put there too, because I listened to the Commissioner from New York. He had a thought, and the Boston Parks Dept. says it too. That it is nice to have everybody be in a walking distance to a park. That was the goal in New York and they have achieved it quite a bit. I think the city is trying to do that too.

Karen Maddalena - I was going to say, also, to revisit, for the people that did not go to the park, the Brooklyn one. Show some slides.

Mary Berninger - We already gave the Power Point. We could probably get more copies of it.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - That could be part of the meetings we have next year. Today was just a recap of what we saw.

Karen Maddalena - Again, we have seen it but, a lot other people have not.

Mary Berninger - We could have sign boards when we have a community wide group.

Sal LaMattina - I think with the seniors, stationary bikes, so they could work out.

Lucille Monuteaux - I have a list of thing that I would like. I thought it has to have a parking lot, a first aid station, water features, senior swings, foot walking, flower and greenery section, Japanese garden with Zen music, statues of animals, a walk through castle, historical elements like a Paul Revere cabin, doll house for children and a choo choo train.

Mary Berninger - That's a good list. We already have a first aid station down there, and we have first responders in the building.

Anthony Guerriero - That is a good list. And, just back to adults. The reason why we like this bench, if you remember, Bernardine sat on the bench. She is not the most mobile person, but she loved the bench because it was the right height, because her knees were not below her waist. When she got up, it was easier. This is a little different than what you have currently at the park, which is rail and post. This is different. What we have seen in New York was this type of bench, and that was where you charged your phone. A solar panel on top with the chargers down on either side.

Sal LaMattina - They had also had movable benches.

Amy Blake-Baldwin - They did. All of the furniture at Chuckie Harris was custom made.

Karen Maddalena - They had chairs that you could swivel around.

Mary Berninger - To your point earlier, Anthony, what did we find at that park, that we noticed in a lot of parks it was not maintained to the level it should be. We are very fortunate because we do get that level. There were some broken features there, and it was a shame because they were very nice, but they were broken. (Thanked Anthony and Amy for their presentation.) Moving on to the OSM. First I want to make an announcement about the Community Benefits Agreement (CBA.) It was very difficult with everything going on with the Port, and everyone's schedule. Just letting you know that the agreement has been signed. I was invited to the Port, and I signed it. Anthony was there, and many members of their team. That means that the funds can be released on the payment schedule that they have come up with for the park, the windows program, and the others things. That is done and put to bed. Richie OSM.

Richard Lynds - I passed out a memorandum which includes a summary of all of the requests that we have made, based upon the meetings concerning the Operations, Security and Maintenance Agreement (OSM). We did get back a red line version of the old agreement. And, essentially, what that is, is all the changes that the Port Authority has proposed based on our requests, and are included into what we now call the next draft of the agreement. As you can see, it is called an Amended and Restated Second OSM. My memorandum basically tracks, so people, in the interest of transparency, can understand, what we asked for, and what the Port Authority responded with, and essentially whether or not they accepted our requests, partially accepted or didn't accept it at all. This is the process by which these types of agreements are typically, especially by a larger group, go through to ensure that what we have asked for has either been acknowledged or disregarded or not included. It is now our job to determine whether or not it is acceptable. At this point we are briefly going through, and I ask the people to take this with them to ensure that there no other additional items that we have issues with. One of the things I would like to caution people about is, we are doing a review of a contract, or addressing changes as they happen. We do not want to get into going backwards, and going back to things we have already reviewed or discussed. There are some instances here, where the Port Authority has proposed additional new language that wasn't originally proposed, but that may be in response to some of the things that we proposed. We certainly can address things that they brought, being new items, and we can respond to that. The goal is to narrow this down to something that we can have as an agreeable instrument and, hopefully, we are able to vote on it soon. Any specific questions on this process?

Mary Berninger - If everyone does review it over the next few weeks, and we typically don't take up any business like that, in December, at the annual meeting, do you think we could get to a point of voting next month, so we do not go into the next year?

Richard Lynds - I do not want to prejudge the will of the PAC. I think some of the items in here require at least a further response, and I will talk about what I think those are. I think for the most part that 85% of this is on target. There are a couple of areas where they didn't respond or chose not to provide the language or address the language that we requested.

Mary Berninger - Like warm bodies in the park.

Richard Lynds - Any other questions before we start? (Hearing no questions.) Looking at sections of the memorandum that I provided.

Preamble and General Changes: See PAC request in Memorandum

Those are all the initial paragraphs of the agreement, the introductory paragraph. We just wanted to have that reflect the current situation with the park system. This agreement was written some 10 years ago, and things have changed since then, and we wanted to recognize that.

MPA response:The good news is that they have agreed, and amended all of those provisions as we requested, so that part is satisfactory.

Article 1 - Goals:Under the goals.

Section 1.1

- A** - Amended per redline. If you look you can see the exact language that they provided; the red/orange color for that section.
- B** - No change to the original language.

The memo (you have) is my notes, then you follow along the sections, this is the agreement. This is basically a summary of what is in the agreement.

B. (Explanation) So they did not make any changes to that. I don't know if that is a deal breaker. I think it is understood based upon some of the language, so I am not sure that is one we have to argue about, but we can always come back to that.

C. We requested no change with respect to Section C with that provision.

D. We asked to amend the language to recognize that the goal should include accessibility for use year round with minimal closure.

We said to amend the language and recognize accessibility, and use, and they indicated that when constructed, and open to the general public. They did include the year round language. The accessibility language was not included, so we may want to come back and address that

Article II

Section 2.1

We had asked for a quarterly interval for reviews. They have come back and proposed bi-annual. I think quarterly is important. There was a lot of discussion from this group, based upon my notes, that you wanted to see something a little more frequent when it comes to updates, questions on incidents, maintenance, etc. I think we want to hold the line on that, and ask for quarterly, or maybe come back with a counter, and say unless otherwise, a situation otherwise dictates, we would want a commitment for quarterly. We could agree to make it bi-annually. I think we want to hold their feet to the fire to have an update every 90 days. It should not be difficult when they get this information, and it would keep it fresh in our minds as to what we brought up previously, and what the response was. So, if there is no objection, I would suggest that we try to hold them to quarterly intervals.

2.2 We wanted to have the noise monitoring included with their updates, whether quarterly or bi-annually. Those noise updates are provided in the EPR. That doesn't necessarily do anything for us. You have to be almost an engineer to understand and read those. I think we want to have something in an executive summary form. I think it is important they do that. It is a fair and reasonable request.

Karen Maddalena - What was suggested was; there is nothing in here about air quality monitoring.

Richard Lynds - We were going based on the original agreement, and that basically responding and amending the original agreement. I don't know that that came up as part of the original conversation.

Karen Maddalena - Yes it did. Somebody suggested that it could be added into this agreement.

Richard Lynds - We could ask, but that is going to be now where we are adding in something, that we did not originally propose. I did pass this memo out before we actually sent it to the Port Authority. I'm not saying we can't do it, Karen, but the process here cannot expand it broader.

Karen Maddalena - I remember some meeting or something. Adrian was the one that had suggested that. Air quality. I'll question it.

Mary Berninger - I thought somebody else was talking about that. They had some type of air quality monitor, but that was an individual home in Jeffries Point, but not for this. I think that was part of the discussion, too.

Sal LaMattina - Do they do that at Jeffries Point Yacht Club?
(A comment was made that Mary Cole has one on her house.)

Karen Maddalena - (Most of her response was indistinguishable.) She ended it with 'health hazards'.

Richard Lynds - We can ask for air quality. Do they do air quality? I think they are doing noise quality, the only issue they agreed to.

Karen Maddalena - They are not measuring. And there were a lot of things that came up and (undistinguishable).

Richard Lynds - We can request it. Again, I want to limit the reopening of issues because we did have an opportunity to review this.

Karen Maddalena - But, it is a very important subject. We are just talking.

Richard Lynds - I am not disagreeing with you. It is about process, and we have to negotiate in good faith. We do that by us having the meetings we have had, and then summarizing the information. We can't, as they say, 'move the goal post'. I will make the request, but I want people to understand, by us asking for things that we didn't originally ask for, will start a never ending process. I will amend section 2 to include air quality monitoring. But, I don't think they do air quality monitoring presently.

Sal LaMattina - They don't do that right now.

Karen Maddalena - I am not sure, but they should be.

Peter Cardinale - Wasn't that supposed to be done years ago?

Richard Lynds - I think the air quality is done in general. Don't think there is a specific part that they do. I think they have certain air quality requirements under their updates to the Environment Impact Reports. So, whether or not there is a specific air quality requirement in the park, I do not know.

Karen Maddalena - So, just inquire. Thank you.

Richard Lynds - So the next question.

Article III - Security

Section 3.1

We had asked them to amend this section on security personnel assigned to the park and the hours the security personnel are present. We also asked that they specify the new qualifications of the personnel and to require the security to have 'visible presence within the park'. The language should require that the report to the PAC should be made in a semi-annual basis, at least on that issue. And, then, provided in a manner that is transparent to comprehend, and showing category, types of incidents occurring in the previous 6 months, and a comparison to the 6 month period of the prior year. All they have done is to amend that to reflect and expand the footprint potential. They made no other change. This is probably going to be the most critical component of the agreement where I think we are going to differ because this goes to the heart of security. Security levels and security monitoring. We have no ability to determine, by any type of objective data, what the incident levels are, and whether or not more security is necessary, or if security is adequate, if they are not providing us with the data or information that is being requested. It is not impossible for them to provide it. I do not think this is an unreasonable request. This is one I would strongly recommend you hold the line on. There has been a lot of talk about this, in this section, that we had. I don't think this is something that we should simply (indistinguishable) for purposes of going forward.

Mary Berninger - Especially with the acreage.

Richard Lynds - Expanding footprint, average and population. You have 3 things happening that would make this provision much more relevant today than perhaps 10 or 15 years ago. That is one that I would recommend requires additional review. Moving on to:

Sections A - C

We have proposed no change to A - C

D - We asked to provide appropriate notice to the PAC in the event of park closures as well as working with the PAC on appropriate communication with the public. They amend that to say that at least they recognize the importance of that, but they limited it to good faith efforts.

Mary Berninger - As opposed to the 24 hour notice.

Richard Lynds - They need to hype that up a little. They did agree to provide notice to the president of the PAC, even electronically, but I think there should be a window for which that should be done outside of circumstances of strict emergency. I think there is no reason not to. They obviously make an internal decision at some point. Part of their thinking needs to be, if they are going to do this, inform the PAC immediately, not wait 3 hours before it happens. I think that is a critical component.

Sal LaMattina - Does that happen a lot?

Richard Lynds - They have closed that park on occasion, and what happened is we found out after the fact.

Mary Berninger - The fire works during New Year's Eve. They almost made the unilateral decision, and it left people thinking it was open, because the public did not get notice in a timely manner.

Sal LaMattina - But, the park closes at 8 o'clock.

Mary Berninger - But, that was a special event, and they said they were going to close it. We had things on the other side of the tunnel that didn't get closed. I think it was unfortunate.

Karen Maddalena - Another time they closed the park was when they were having the oil tankers going through the harbor. The LNG's

Mary Berninger - Now they have fixed that with helicopters and all kinds of boats going along.

Richard Lynds

Section E.

Section E was a small victory. One of the things we wanted was to reflect the type of patrol and to insure the highest visibility. So the change was to include patrols to, not just by vehicle, but by foot and by bicycle, and they do indicate that the security people shall be visible to the public. We wanted that language for the purpose of not having them hide out. We think it is important that they are actually visible, and not in the guard shack with the blinds down. I think that was part of the discussion. They have agreed to that. Now, this all ties into the reporting, the transparency, the ability to come and give a report, but if they are doing it bi-annually, I think it falls on deaf ears as opposed to every quarter when we say that we have gotten some reports that the personnel are not visible. At least the interval between the time we have consulted with them, and the time it gets corrected is a lot shorter if we do something on a quarterly basis.

Section F - We proposed no change

Section G

They did amend the language relative to the proportionate increase in security. They did identify, included but not limited to, Boston Harbor events, fire works displays, etc. That is an important step forward. The fact that they are committing in a contract to doing that means that they will be obligated to increase the patrols. But, again, that ties in with the reporting, and the review. We can't have an event in July, and then not see them for 6 months to complain if it was not adequate. It needs to be done immediately. So, I think having the 3 month review, ties back into all these security issues.

Section H - No change

Section I

We did request, in Section I, to include reporting requirements from the Port Director. We wanted something in a consistent, uniform manner with comparative statistics about incidents for the previous 6 months, and prior years. Again, we have asked this every time they come. They always tell us they would get it to us, and we hardly ever get it. It is critical for this group's function to understand competitive statistics because for us to just look at simply that we have a quiet summer doesn't tell us anything, if we do not know how quiet the summer was before. It is important for them to tell us that. They have the data and there is no reason why this PAC should not get that information. I think that is one you should hold the line on.

Mary Berninger - They are coming next month. Do you want me to ask, again, if they would provide it?

Richard Lynds - You should make it a written, email request saying that we would like the statistics. Basically like I have the language in the memo. We would like the 6 month look back and compare it to the 6 months same period last year, and that way we can understand the trend. We should be able to do that. You should have that annually, so that over the next 8 to 10 years, you can see what the trend is. Then you can make a decision for the next go around to see if the security is adequate.

Lucile Monuteaux - But they continually say it is under investigation. We can't talk about it.

Mary Berninger - But we do not even get the numbers.

Richard Lynds - The existence of an incident, whether it is under investigation, is a separate issue. We do not need to know the details. We need to know there were 6 vandalism incidents, 1 mugging, 2 assaults, etc. We do not need to know names or people. We need them contractually obligated because what's happening now is, because they feel that the language is loose enough, they do not have to provide it. It really hinders our ability to be effective in making recommendations that we are charged with making, and that is adequate personnel and security.

Mary Berninger - For instance; every month A7 comes to the Orient Heights group, and I am sure they come to Jeffries Point, and they give that exact kind of report. They do not give specifics, names, etc. They are very good about avoiding those specifics, but they are very good at giving crimes, incidents, etc., whether they are up or down.

Richard Lynds - It won't make a difference if it was Mary Smith or Joe Wilson (examples only). All it matters is that the incident happened. It lets us compare to the years prior. We are going to ask them to provide that and make it a contractual obligation. If they don't do it, then that is going to tie into the days recommendation of the visit to the Board on an annual recommendation. The Board has to address that.

Section J - No change with the exception of just clarifying language.

Section K - Just want to update to make sure that is taking into account the new park.

Article 4

Section 4.1

As for term: They agreed and amended the provision as we requested, and that is two fold. We get the benefit of having a long term commitment, but we also get the benefit of, if we do not like the way the commitment or agreement is going after 7 years, we can make a determination to terminate and renegotiate. It is an option, like a sport or baseball term. We have the option, and we can exercise our option as to whether or not we want to re-negotiate our contract. We know that we at least have the right to have it for 10 years if we want that.

Article 5 Default.

Section 5.1

We had asked them, and really not to make any change except to tie it to the annual presentation that we make to the Massport Board.

Section 5.2 No changes

Article 6 - Designation of Phase II Park

There were some minor tweaks that we asked for. They made most of them.

Section 6.4 and 6.5

We wanted to address how and when we meet, and who can meet. We don't necessarily have to have the entire PAC available. That may be difficult to do, especially when there is more intense intervals of meetings. We should be permitted to have a subcommittee of the PAC attend any of these design meetings. That is one of the things we requested and they did not make that change. I am going to talk to their counsel about that, because I think that is an easy one for them to make.

Section 6.6

We also wanted a centralized system for communication and retention of records. Any resolutions that we make. That is an easy one. With the advance in technology today, there is no reason why we can't have a document that is shared with the PAC and the counterparts of the Port Authority to document, identify all of the issues we have raised, and then whether or not they have been resolved. That gives them some accountability that we have requested and things that we have addressed.

Article 7 Financial support

Section 7.1 No change.

Section 7.2

This is the one that dealt with the question of supporting other programs or events in the park. I want to clarify that because I did think about some of the comments that were made the last time before the group. I want people to be very clear as to what we communicated to the Port Authority, and why we communicated it to them. The decision to not put something specific in the agreement has nothing to do with what groups we favor, dislike, like, want to see happen, or do well in the park or not do well in the park. The goal and intent of this group is primary for the benefit of the community as it relates to that park. The interest of the community at large is what this group's charge and responsibility is. The interest of the group is not to worry about whether or not we have enough for funding, or don't have enough for funding. It is whether or not we meet our mission in being an advisory committee to the Port Authority for the operation, security and maintenance of the park. With that said, I think it is very clear, I think everybody feels very strongly, that we would all like to see the Port Authority step up to the plate and do the right thing by the Piers Park Sailing Center (PPSC). I think it is very clear by everybody here, and there is no disagreement that that is a priority to this community and it benefits this community. But, at the end of the day, it is the Port Authority's decision. They have to make that decision as to whether or not they are going to fund it. Port Authority decision to fund or not. One of the things I wanted to be very clear of is, and I have been around this game long enough to see how the Port Authority plays. I am glad Anthony is not here right now, and no disrespect to our Port Authority employees. The game goes like this. We start out, we take a little, we take a little and eventually it is on you. And, when it comes to that it makes the power change a little bit as to what the Port Authority's obligations are, and what the communities expectations are. I have seen it happen in the 18 years I sat as the Director of the East Boston Foundation, and how they operate, and what they do, and the way they structure their agreements. I understand on other things like Festa Field, and other things we have seen in and around this community. The goal for us as a community, and I say our community because I

consider myself a part of that, is to encourage the Port Authority to step up to the plate. Not to use a group like this to sort of have the infighting amongst each other that ultimately, will not get the PPSC what they need. What they need is a guaranteed commitment every year that isn't subject to us deciding one year we like it, one year we don't want to fund it because we do not want to set a precedent. That is not where we should be, and we shouldn't ever be in that position. We should be in the position of telling the Port Authority, fund it. The reason this language was put in here was not because we were sending a message that we did not want to support the PPSC. It was to send a message to the Port Authority that, 'don't ask us to do your dirty work, you step up to the plate and fund them' and don't put it on us. That is the reason, and I want that to be very clear, because I know it got a little contentious the last meeting. I didn't want the PAC to speak too far in depth on that without thinking it over. But, that is the reason. Not because we feel that the PPSC is not worthy; it is because this mechanism is not the appropriate venue for that. I don't want to give a whole discussion on it. I stated it to be clear because that is the purpose. They made no change. They indicated no increase in the funding. They suggested it is in our discretion which is exactly what they want it to be because when it is not in their discretion, it is not on their doorstep. Put it in our discretion, the perception is that we have the money, go to the PAC let them do it. It is irresponsible for the Port Authority to do that.

Mary Berninger - Are you going to ask them to look at that again?

Richard Lynds - Absolutely. I think they need to realize that a commitment for operations in that park goes beyond the PPSC. The PPSC, onto itself, is its own entity, and that is something they need to address. Fortunately, we have a new acting director coming in November. I have lunch with John November 2. It will be definitely on my list of things of what is important in the community, and I am sure he will want to be educated about a lot of this going forward. I have worked with John very closely. I know John very well.

Sal LaMattina - Richie I have a question for you. Prior to 911 was there anything in the agreement for the sailing program?

Richard Lynds - The sailing center had its own funding mechanism or agreement with the Port Authority. The fact that it wasn't in the agreement was the reason why they were able to cut it so easily. The fact is that we are looking for some commitment from them to say they will increase the funding, and that is why I made that suggestion. Let them increase the funding, then it is contractual. They can't back out on it because they have an obligation to fund us on an annual basis. If they said they were going to increase your (PAC) funding by \$100,000, that gives us the discretion, ability to fund it. They would have a contractual obligation for at least 10 years to do that. That is why, at one of the meetings, we said either increase the funding or remove the provisions. Meaning do not put it on us if you are not going to help us. Take care of it yourself. That is part of the problem.

Sal LaMattina - And the back payments?

Richard Lynds - I talked to Roberta Gotta about that. They acknowledged there are 2 payments due to us. They want to get this squared, and then we will figure out how they are going to pay. Any questions on that so far? So, moving on to financial support. I think that, like I said, they made no change relative to the \$75,000 for administrative costs and operations cost. So, all of those things will be expected of the payments they make on an annual basis. That is something they are not willing to change. I can revisit that. Ask them to relook at it again.

Section 7-4

A-B-C-D

This just really deals with the constraints of what we can do with the funds. They really did not make a lot of changes, except there is some new language limiting the types of comments. It is really to update their environmental goals, their development goals, and what we can comment

on. So, they are just simply reflecting some of the changes that are occurring on the airport and updating the agreement.

Sal LaMattina - One question on that one. It says 'consider delete this section or increase it.' But we are not doing anything. No changes? 7.4C

Richard Lynds - Yes. 'Consider delete this section or increase in funding'. That is the one we talked about. All they have added is 'PAC's discretion'. They have not changed the funding amount and not changed the mechanism. So it is still to our discretion.

Sal LaMattina - I think that is great because particularity once Phase II is completed, if we have money we might want to have a concert or something.

Richard Lynds - We do not have to get in to the whole how it is spent tonight. This is the framework.

Sal LaMattina - I just wanted to make sure the make sure the language is in there. I saw deleted and I was a little concerned.

David Halbert - Comment - So there is no change?

Richard Lynds - No. We were saying to them if you expect us to do it increase the funding or don't expect us to do it. That is basically the language.

7.4-D

So in the last, no change on whether or not we should determine a consultant is necessary. We should be able to determine that. They want us to go through a process by which they will determine whether or not a consultant is necessary.

Section 7.5 Amended as requested and expanded the level of detail provided.

Section 7.6

We pretty much give them an annual report. The information that is contained in the Attorney General's filing as well as our filing with the IRS is in essence everything they would need to comply with their requirements, and they get that annually. There is really no difference in that. The only thing they want is detail on the receipts. So when we have any type of expenditures we just want to make sure we provide the receipts. I know Maria does a good job of keeping tract of all of those items.

The last issue that I think was important. Let me just jump to that. The last one involved the actual schedule of maintenance. There was a lot of loose language in there. The 'as needed' we wanted removed, and we wanted to change/reflect a more consistent review period. That is in the exhibits on the back page.

Exhibit A-1

C. One of things we had asked was to strike the words 'as needed' to refer that back to the quarterly inspection. We at least wanted the inspection to be looked at on a quarterly basis. As needed is too vague. They can use that to essentially determine that it wasn't needed. We want to at least have an interval of time frame on that. I think that is important to insure the quality of maintenance. So it is another one I am going to recommend.

Is there anything else that we want to recommend other than the stuff we talked about tonight. Just so I can make sure I get back to her as soon as possible to let her know our comments.

Mary Berninger - Article 5. Who gives that annual presentation to the Massport Board? Anthony's group does that? The only time I have been there is years ago. In Section 5.1

Richard Lynds - (Reading from the Amended Agreement). 'Bi-annual meeting of the PAC and the members of the Authority's Community Relations Unit and Maritime Security Services Unit'. What they are saying is that is the annual. Right now they are calling it the bi-annual update.

Mary Berninger - All right because on this one it says, 'tied into the annual presentation to their Board'.

Richard Lynds - That was our recommendation. We want to be able to do that.

Mary Berninger - So they did not amend it.

Richard Lynds - So they pretty much skipped over any requests to allow for that.

Mary Berninger - Can you revisit that?

Richard Lynds - Yes.

Mary Berninger - Any questions from the Board members.

Jerry Deneumoustier - Motion to adjourn.

Mary Berninger - We are not quite done yet. Thanked Richie. It was a lot of work.

Richard Lynds - Let me do, real quickly, the mechanics of what will happen. I will do a further updated memo saying that we presented to the PAC. If there is no objection, unless people have a specific objection of doing this. What I want to do is go back to them, and specifically express that these areas are critical. We need changes on this language, and we would like them to go back and make further changes. In fact, we actually present language to them now since we have a red line version to show them that these are the changes the PAC wants, and let them come back with a further edit, and a further version. My guess is we can get that before the November meeting. It really will take at least a conversation to determine whether or not they met what we asked for. If not, then, in the November meeting, we probably will not likely be able to vote on the final language. We could do it at the annual meeting.

Mary Berninger - We were going to bring that up too. Maybe you could weigh in then. Could we jump to New Business? So, next month, by the calendar, the meeting falls on the 20th, which is the week of Thanksgiving. I personally have no objection to having it that day, but I know historically some people cook. How does everyone feel about keeping it on that day or not, because otherwise it would be the 13th or the 27th? We just have to know to get the notice into the paper. If we kept it at that date, assuming everybody does their homework, goes through it and read it we should be able to talk about it. How does everyone feel about the 20th of November (David Halbert indicated he would be out of town).

Mary Berninger - Can I have a show of hands?

(Discussion among the members of who would be able to attend or not.)

Richard Lynds - We would need a quorum in the event a vote is appropriate. Maybe have Maria poll the membership via email, etc. Find out what dates are best. Bear in mind we can suspend, and we do not have to do it on the Tuesday.

Mary Berninger - It is also nomination time. Public notice. Questioning if Maria can get the polling done, this week, for the people not here just to make certain we are good with the 20th. (Secretary answered yes.) So those will be the 2 big things next month. Go over that with you, the nominations and Fran brought up the idea about the Christmas party. This is what I meant to tell you. If we could meet here, because I know you said we cannot have the Annual Meeting outside of East Boston. I could not find out why exactly.

Richard Lynds - Annual meeting shall take place within the city of Boston.

Mary Berninger - So, if we have the annual meeting here at the same time or push it up a little to 5:30 or 6:00 in December.

Richard Lynds - You can do your business meeting here.

Mary Berninger - And then go to wherever we want because we have some things that have to be done. So, the other thing is, where do you want to go? Fran is going to call some places. If don't have to stay here, in East Boston, I have a problem with the Hyatt sometimes. I don't think they do the best job. We all liked Off the Boat. Is there someplace else or some suggestions.

Melissa Tyler - The Reel House.

Sal LaMattina - Someplace local.

Mary Berninger - Asked Fran if she could get some prices, availability?

Fran Carbone - Will make some calls.

Sal LaMattina - I can work with you with the Reel House if you want.

Fran Carbone - That would be good.

Mary Berninger - We will do that.

(Discussion on start at the Reel House and go over to Pier 6. General consensus; too cold to do that.)

Mary Berninger - The Reel House has valet. Under Old Business.

(Discussion on the date of the next meeting. Secretary will poll all the voting members, then call every one back and confirm.)

Mary Berninger - Old Business? Does anyone have any new business to introduce to the group?

Melissa Tyler - As a neighbor to Phase II I had asked Anthony when they were going to prune the weed trees down. They said they would take care of it. This was at the beginning of the summer. It has not been done yet. When the leaves drop would there be a chance to send a letter to cut them down? There are 2 things; 1 they smell and 2 they make a mess.

Mary Berninger - How about when I send the email with regard to the look back, compare and contrast, I will add a second item about the weeds.

Melissa Tyler - Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mary Berninger - Before we adjourn, Public Comment period is now open. Does anyone, Associate Members, etc., have anything to add to the conversation? Thanked everyone.

Jerry Deneumoustier - Motion to adjourn.

Connie Carbone - Second.

Voted and passed.

Draft