



Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 10, 2023
Special and Annual Town Meeting
Scituate High School Gymnasium – 6:30 pm

Committee Members Present: Jamie Gilmore; Chair, Jerry Kelly, Missy Seidel, Dan McGuiggin, Marc DiCosimo, Conor Doherty, Elise Russo, Patrice Metro and Lynda Ferguson

Committee Members Not in Attendance:

Also in Attendance: Nancy Holt, Finance Director/Town Accountant; Dan Fennelly, Community Preservation Committee, Chair; Paul Bartkiewicz, Scituate Harbor Advisory Redevelopment Commission (SHARC), Chair

Mr. Gilmore called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Ms. Metro made a motion to accept the agenda which was seconded by Mr. McGuiggin and voted unanimously in favor (9-0).

Mr. Gilmore called for a motion to accept the minutes of the March 27, 2023 meeting which was made by Mr. McGuiggin and seconded by Mr. Kelly. The minutes were voted in favor (9-0).

Review of Special and Annual Town Meeting Articles

Annual Town Meeting Article 12 Community Preservation – Item 8 – Pier 44 Design

Mr. Fennelly stated he understood concerns relevant to the park and respects the Advisory Committee's opinions. Mr. Fennelly stated the \$300,000 is to fund a design and permitting to decide whether there will be parking or a pavilion and what both would be in final form. It is not to fund parking and a pavilion. The funds are to make the project shovel ready and then town meeting would decide whether to fund it. He noted the CPC had done this with multiple other projects including the baseball field and athletic fields.

Mr. Bartkiewicz stated this project had been ongoing since 2010. He noted the availability of grants and the impact of a delay. He noted that the Commission had 60 meetings and over 1,300 responses to surveys. He hoped that the final project would be funded through grants and/or

CPA funds. Mr. Bartkiewicz said that if the vote is not in the affirmative tonight, it will be a huge setback. Mr. Fennelly commented that any unspent CPA funds would be turned back and used for another purpose. He also noted that the CPC tries to be conservative so applicants don't have to come back to town meeting multiple times.

Ms. Russo asked about the funds already allocated to the Copley Wolff contract of \$300K and these funds, including the grant, would bring the total up to \$700K for design. She noted the \$800K spent on the athletic fields study which resulted in a \$8M project. Ms. Metro asked about funds that have been spent prior to the Copley Wolff contract after the purchase and she asked about the grants that they hoped to obtain and how much would they cover.

Ms. Ferguson stated that any design is contingent on the parking and that needs to be addressed before any designs are entertained. Mr. Fennelly stated the reason is to design it and that will be addressed as part of the project. Mr. Chick noted that part of the contract with Copley Wolff includes final design and this funding will address the public input and technical design.

Mr. Doherty stated that there seems to be a missing piece between demo and final design such as leaving this area as an open space rather than developed. He noted the open space option is missing and it could be much less expensive than the engineered designs.

Ms. Metro asked what Copley Wolff was providing tonight. Mr. Chick responded that they are still incorporating the 1,300 comments to provide design options. Mr. Chick noted that they were trying to run the permitting phase concurrent with the design as it is quite extensive due to its location and hazardous materials such as asbestos, and it can be a lengthy process.

Ms. Ferguson commented that the survey options did not come with a cost so it did not generate reasonable responses as participants did not have all the information. Mr. Gilmore noted that the survey concerned him as well as it seemed we were jumping ahead. He commented that he thought the members of the Advisory Committee had made their concerns very clear.

Ms. Metro asked for clarification that the \$300K was to do the permitting before the final design which Mr. Chick confirmed. Mr. Chick stated there would be interim reviews throughout the design process and continued public input.

Mr. Kelly stated he supports re-use of the parcel but development of the area will attract users and there is not anywhere for them to park. Ms. Russo stated that the \$700K is very expensive. Mr. Chick responded that for this type of project the design could be 15-20% and the final cost could be \$3-4M.

Mr. DiCosimo commented that once the building is demolished, there will need to be design, engineering and permitting.

Mr. McGuiggin made a motion to reconsider the Pier 44 project for \$300K which was seconded by Mr. DiCosimo. The motion passed by majority (5-4); Ms. Ferguson, Mr. McGuiggin, Mr. Kelly and Ms. Russo were the dissenting votes.

Other Business

The members discussed meeting to discuss the Plymouth County letter prepared by Mr. Kelly. The date of April 20th was decided by consensus.

Mr. McGuiggin made a motion to suspend the meeting and attend special and annual town meeting until the end of town meeting and adjourn immediately following which was seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously in favor (9-0).

Town meeting was dissolved at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nancy Holt
Recorder