

**GLOUCESTER CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Tuesday, April 9, 2019 – 7:00 p.m.

Kyrouz Auditorium – City Hall

**-MINUTES-**

**Present:** Chair, Councilor Paul Lundberg; Vice Chair, Councilor Steven LeBlanc, Jr.; Councilor Melissa Cox; Councilor Valerie Gilman; Councilor Kenneth Hecht; Councilor Jennifer Holmgren; Councilor Scott Memhard; Councilor Sean Nolan; Councilor James O’Hara

**Absent:** None.

**Also Present:** Joanne Senos; Jim Destino; Chip Payson; John Dunn; Amit Chhayani; Harbormaster T.J. Ciarametaro; Donna Leete; Mike Hale; Jill Cahill; Vanessa Krawczyk; Grace Poirier

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. The Council President announced that this meeting is recorded by video and audio in accordance with state Open Meeting Law.

**Flag Salute & Moment of Silence.** Council President Lundberg dedicated the Moment of Silence in honor of Grace Lattof who passed away this week. He conveyed that Grace was a true Daughter of Gloucester who contributed much to our City. She was the beloved wife of Thomas Lattof who continues to share her love of and devotion to Gloucester.

**Oral Communications:**

**Name:** Karen Spencer  
**Address:** 67 Langsford Street  
**Subject:** Spoke against fluoridation of the city’s water supply.

**Name:** Sheila Rider  
**Address:** 64 Riverview Road  
**Subject:** Concern for the state of disrepair on Riverview Road. She suggested that this is not a private way and asked for city assistance in the matter.

**Presentations/Commendations:** None.

**Confirmation of New Appointments:**

Capital Improvement Advisory Board	Howard “Ted” Costa	TTE 02/14/2022
------------------------------------	--------------------	----------------

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor O’Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council appoint Howard “Ted” Costa to the Capital Improvement Advisory Board, TTE 02/14/22.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**MOTION:** On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to appoint Howard “Ted” Costa to the Capital Improvement Advisory Board, TTE 02/14/22.

Records Management Advisory Board	Carol A. Kelly	TTE 02/14/2021
-----------------------------------	----------------	----------------

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor O’Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council appoint Carol A. Kelly to the Records Management Advisory Board, TTE 02/14/21.

**DISCUSSION:** None.

**MOTION:** On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to appoint Carol A. Kelly to the Records Management Advisory Board, TTE 02/14/21.

Tourism Commission

Kimberly Voltero

TTE 02/14/2022

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** On a motion by Councilor O'Hara, seconded by Councilor LeBlanc, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council appoint Kimberly Voltero to the Tourism Commission, TTE 02/14/22.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Councilor LeBlanc** conveyed he knew Ms. Voltero personally from their association through the Gloucester Elks, and endorsed her appointment to the Tourism Commission. He advised he was speaking for her as she was unable to attend this evening's meeting.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor LeBlanc, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to appoint Kimberly Voltero to the Tourism Commission, TTE 02/14/22.**

**Consent Agenda:**

• **MAYOR'S REPORT**

1. New Appointments:
 

Licensing Board	Melissa Teixeira Prince	TTE 05/31/25		
Zoning Board of Appeals (alternate to full member)	Adria Pratt	TTE 02/14/2022		(Refer O&A)
2. Memorandum from City Auditor re: City's FY18 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) (Refer B&F)
3. Memorandum from City Auditor re: Gloucester Public School's End of Year Financial Report-Independent Accountant's Report (Refer B&F)
4. Memorandum from the Mayor re: request acceptance of donation of 46 WWII Veterans' Framed Portraits with an estimate of \$34,000 - \$46,000 (Refer B&F)
5. Special Budgetary Transfer (2019-SBT-8) from the Gloucester Public Schools (Refer B&F)
6. Special Budgetary Transfer (2019-SBT-9) from the Gloucester Public Schools (Refer B&F)
7. Memorandum from School Department CFO re: request to pay FY18 expenses with FY19 funds (Refer B&F)
8. Memorandum from School Department CFO re: request that Preschool revolving fund expenditure limit be increased from \$135,000 to \$150,000 to accommodate an increase in enrollment (Refer B&F)
9. Supplemental Appropriation-Budgetary Request (2019-SA-34) from the DPW (Refer B&F)
10. Memorandum from Planning Director re: request acceptance of additional grant funding from Coastal Zone Management to support the ongoing Gloucester High School Flood Mitigation Design Project; \$17,000 increase to grant with a 25% match (Refer B&F)
11. Memorandum from CFO re: loan authorization request in the amount of \$1,850,000 to abate various asbestos-containing materials from the boiler room at Plum Cove School, and to fund improvements to the Gloucester High School Field House (Refer B&F)
12. Memorandum from CFO re: loan authorization request in the amount of \$650,000 for improvements to the Stage Fort Park Visitor Center (Refer B&F)

• **INFORMATION ONLY**

• **APPLICATIONS/PETITIONS**

1. Special Events Application: request to hold the National Safety Day on May 18, 2019 with a rain date of May 25, 2019 (Refer P&D)
2. Special Event Application: request to hold the Concerts on the Boulevard on July 3 and August 3, 2019 (Refer P&D)
3. Special Event Application: request to hold the Harbor Loop Concert Series on July 4, 11, 18 and 25; August 1, 8, 15, 22 and 29, 2019, with a rain date of September 5, 2019 (Refer P&D)
4. Special Event Application: request to hold the Gloucester Schooner Festival August 26-September 2, 2019 (Refer P&D)

• **COUNCILORS ORDERS**

1. CC2019-014 (Lundberg, O'Hara, Nolan): request City Council amend GCO Ch. 11, Sec. 11-10(f) "Special Events; Transient Vendors; Parades" re: Special Events Committee and/or licensing commission shall refer all special events/parades requests that involve the use of Stacy Boulevard or Stage Fort Park to the City Council for final approval (Refer O&A)
2. CC2019-015 (LeBlanc): request City Council amend GCO Ch. 22 "Traffic and Motor Vehicles," Sec. 22-281 "Ten-Minute Parking" by DELETING Angle Street, southerly side, beginning at a point 42 feet from its intersection with Middle Street for a distance of 22 feet in an easterly direction (Refer O&A)
3. CC2019-016 (Memhard, LeBlanc): request City Council amend GCO Ch. 22 "Traffic and Motor Vehicles" Article II, Division 2 "Traffic Commission" by ADDING new Sec. 22-38 "Commission's authority to approve stop intersections"

• **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS COUNCIL AND STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

1. City Council Meeting: 03/26/2019 (Approve/File)
2. Standing Committee Meetings: B&F 04/04/19, O&A 04/01/19, P&D 04/03/19 (Approve/File)

**Unanimous Consent Calendar:**

1. Addendum to the Mayor's Report

**Items to be added/deleted from the Consent Agenda & Unanimous Consent Calendar:**

**By unanimous consent of the Council the Consent Agenda and the Unanimous Consent Calendar was accepted as amended.**

**Committee Reports:**

**Budget & Finance: April 4**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Cox) absent, to recommend that the City Council accept under MGL c. 44, §53A, donations from members and business partners to the Cape Ann Office of Veterans’ Services for the purpose of supporting on-going efforts to serve Veterans and Active Duty military for a total of \$387.00 as follows:

<u>Name/Entity</u>	<u>Dollar Amount</u>	<u>Date Received</u>
Andrew and Ann Kouiletis	\$100.00	02/01/2019
Third Annisquam Parish	<u>\$287.00</u>	01/14/2019
TOTAL:	\$387.00	

**DISCUSSION:**

**Councilor Cox** extended thanks to the donors’ contributions to the Cape Ann Office of Veterans’ Services.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to accept under MGL c. 44, §53A, donations from members and business partners to the Cape Ann Office of Veterans’ Services for the purpose of supporting on-going efforts to serve Veterans and Active Duty military for a total of \$387.00 as follows:**

<u>Name/Entity</u>	<u>Dollar Amount</u>	<u>Date Received</u>
<b>Andrew and Ann Kouiletis</b>	<b>\$100.00</b>	<b>02/01/2019</b>
<b>Third Annisquam Parish</b>	<b><u>\$287.00</u></b>	<b>01/14/2019</b>
<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$387.00</b>	

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Cox) absent, to recommend that the City Council approve Supplemental Appropriation 2019-SA-32 in the amount of \$90,000.00 (Ninety Thousand Dollars) from the Building Maintenance Stabilization Fund-Undesignated Fund Balance, Account #7700-359000, to O’Maley Innovation Middle School HVAC System – Building Improvements, Account #770007-582003 for the purpose of funding building maintenance improvements to the O’Maley Innovation Middle School HVAC System.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Councilor Cox** explained that the O’Maley School, built as a closed system with fixed windows, has a central cooling system consisting of two “chillers.” This funding will enable the DPW to replace one of the two chillers necessary to have a full on-line cooling system for the school.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to approve Supplemental Appropriation 2019-SA-32 in the amount of \$90,000.00 (Ninety Thousand Dollars) from the Building Maintenance Stabilization Fund-Undesignated Fund Balance, Account #7700-359000, to O’Maley Innovation Middle School HVAC System – Building Improvements, Account #770007-582003 for the purpose of funding building maintenance improvements to the O’Maley Innovation Middle School HVAC System.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Cox) absent, to recommend that the City Council approve Supplemental Appropriation 2019-SA-33 in the amount of \$90,000.00 (Ninety Thousand Dollars) from the Capital Projects Stabilization Fund-Undesignated Fund Balance, Account #7600-359000, to Stacy Boulevard Capital Projects Improvements – Site Improvements, Account #760023-584000 for the purpose of funding various capital improvements that includes Stacy Boulevard walkway improvements, ADA assessment and garden irrigation.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Councilor Cox** conveyed that this \$90,000 appropriation, while for two different projects both requested by the DPW, are to be funded through the Capital Projects Stabilization Fund, are presented together due to timing for improvements to the Elizabeth Gordon Smith Garden and the completion of the city's ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Transition Plan. With the completion of this required plan, the city will become eligible for annual grant funding for up to \$500,000 to execute ADA changes for areas that were identified by the plan, she added.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to approve Supplemental Appropriation 2019-SA-33 in the amount of \$90,000.00 (Ninety Thousand Dollars) from the Capital Projects Stabilization Fund-Undesignated Fund Balance, Account #7600-359000, to Stacy Boulevard Capital Projects Improvements – Site Improvements, Account #760023-584000 for the purpose of funding various capital improvements that includes Stacy Boulevard walkway improvements, ADA assessment and garden irrigation.**

**Ordinances & Administration: April 1**

There are no matters for Council action under this heading.

**Planning & Development: April 3**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Planning & Development Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council permit the withdrawal of CC2019-013 (Lundberg): Establishment of an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee re: Assisted Living Residence at Gloucester Crossing without prejudice.

**DISCUSSION: None.**

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor Holmgren, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to permit the withdrawal of CC2019-013 (Lundberg): Establishment of an Ad Hoc Advisory Committee re: Assisted Living Residence at Gloucester Crossing without prejudice.**

**Councilor Gilman** noted the P&D Committee's Thursday, April 11<sup>th</sup> Site Visit at Fuller Street #35 at 3:00 p.m., the former site of Tony's Pizza and four apartment dwellings, for a Special Council Permit to rebuild the structure destroyed by fire (application for SCP2019-004 on file).

**Scheduled Public Hearings:**

1. **PH2019-015: RZ2019-001: Rezoning of property located at 28 Rockport Road, Assessors Map 178, Lot 28 from EB (Extensive Business) to R-10 (Medium/High Density Residential) (TBC 04/23/19)**

**This public hearing is opened at 7:21 p.m.**

**Council President Lundberg** advised this public hearing is continued to April 23, 2019.

**This public hearing is continued at 7:21 p.m. to April 23, 2019**

2. **PH2019-016: Loan Order 2019-002: Loan Authorization in the amount of \$190,000 to pay costs of permanent repairs, including paving to Souther Road, a private way in the City**

**This public hearing is opened at 7:21 p.m.**

**Those speaking in favor: None.**

**Those speaking in opposition: None.**

**Communications: None.**

**Councilor Questions: None.**

**This public hearing is closed at 7:22 p.m.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Hecht, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the Budget & Finance Committee voted 2 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 (Cox) absent, to recommend that the City Council approve the following a loan authorization of \$190,000 as follows:

Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates One Hundred Ninety Thousand Dollars (\$190,000) to pay costs of permanent repairs, including paving to Souther Road, a private way in the City, including costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Section 7(5), or pursuant to any other enabling authority. Although any borrowing by the City to meet this appropriation shall constitute a general obligation of the City and a pledge of its full faith and credit, one hundred percent (100%) of the amount needed to repay any borrowing pursuant to this order shall be raised in the first instance through the assessment of betterments upon the abutters of the private way, in accordance with MGL Chapter 80, and any other applicable authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the city are authorized to take any and all actions necessary to assess the betterments described above, the term of which will not exceed 10 years, or such shorter time as proscribed by Massachusetts General Law. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.

Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes.

#### DISCUSSION:

**Council President Lundberg** pointed out this is a case of a road betterment under the Code of Ordinances.

**Councilor Memhard** extended thanks to Dr. Mike Stelluto, Steven Smit, and Betsy Works for serving as the point persons for their neighborhood throughout the betterment project. He conveyed that he and Councilor O'Hara worked with this group of about 20 residents consisting of about 26 properties to address the poor condition of Souther Road, a private way used for public access. He recounted the many meetings with the neighbors and the city's Administration, saying that this is the culmination of that process with the loan order and then the paving will proceed. He added that these residents will be paying for the betterment with their taxes.

**Council President Lundberg** thanked both Councilors Memhard and O'Hara for their assistance shepherding the neighbors through this betterment process, confirming that the city will front the money for the paving project and then residents will pay back the city as a betterment.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Cox, seconded by Councilor Memhard, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to approve the following loan authorization of \$190,000 as follows:**

**Ordered: That the City of Gloucester appropriates One Hundred Ninety Thousand Dollars (\$190,000) to pay costs of permanent repairs, including paving to Souther Road, a private way in the City, including costs incidental or related thereto. To meet this appropriation the Treasurer, with the approval of the Mayor is authorized to borrow said amount under and pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 44, Section 7(5), or pursuant to any other enabling authority. Although any borrowing by the City to meet this appropriation shall constitute a general obligation of the City and a pledge of its full faith and credit, one hundred percent (100%) of the amount needed to repay any borrowing pursuant to this order shall be raised in the first instance through the assessment of betterments upon the abutters of the private way, in accordance with MGL Chapter 80, and any other applicable authority. The Mayor and any other appropriate official of the city are authorized to take any and all actions necessary to assess the betterments described above, the term of which will not exceed 10 years, or such shorter time as proscribed by Massachusetts General Law. Any premium received by the City upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.**

**Further Ordered: That the Treasurer is authorized to file an application with the Municipal Finance Oversight Board to qualify under Chapter 44A of the General Laws any or all of the bonds authorized by this order and to provide such information and execute such documents as the Municipal Finance Oversight Board may require for these purposes.**

3. PH2019-017: Amend GCO Ch. 10 “Waterways” Sec. 10-52 “Use of public landings” by ADDING new subsection (c) “Kayak and Paddle Board Storage” AND reletter the remaining subsections and insert the language, “and storage of kayaks and paddle boards” in relettered subsection (h)

**This public hearing is opened at 7:25 p.m.**

**Those speaking in favor:**

**Harbormaster T.J. Ciarametaro**, noted that having been approached by a variety of boaters that frequent public landings, and in speaking with the Manchester Harbormaster, it was determined that constructing and adding kayak/paddle board racks at city public landings would be a way to increase ways to get out on the water and have more secure storage. He noted that people store kayaks throughout the city with unintended consequences - tides come up; kayaks go to sea with authorities having to make the assumption that people are lost when they aren't. A nominal annual rental fee of \$100 for a kayak slot in a city storage rack is proposed in order to build and maintain the racks for: Lane's Cove, Magnolia, potentially at Corliss Landing and Rocky Neck. He put forward that this is good overall for the city for people that don't want to pack up their paddle boards and kayaks each time they want to gain access to the water.

**Those speaking in opposition: None.**

**Communications: None.**

**Councilor Questions:**

**Councilor O'Hara** asked about the present situation with leaving kayaks unsecured on the city's shorefront. **Harbormaster Ciarametaro** explained that when people leave their kayaks on shore, and then an astronomical high tide occurs, kayaks/paddle boards get pulled out to sea which is unidentified. He reported that the Coast Guard, local law enforcement and Harbormasters assume “unmanned adrift,” that someone was attached to that vessel. Last year in this district it cost on the federal and state side about \$6.5 million for air assets, personnel, boats searching for victims, and in general no one is attached to adrift kayaks and paddle boards. If you are a renter of one of these slots, you will be required to affix a sticker in a certain location to your kayak or paddle board with the name and address of the owner. He expressed the hope that this effort will also see a cut back in frivolous searches, thereby saving the taxpayers money.

**Councilor Cox** asked how the storage rack slots will be awarded. **Harbormaster Ciarametaro** advised it is hoped there will be enough rack spaces and explained that the city will advertise in the paper and on social media of the new racks' availability. Should there be more applications than space at a particular landing, his office will conduct a lottery to assign spots as they do with other mooring situations. Once all racks are assigned, then the rack lists will be managed the same as city moorings, including a wait list. **Councilor Gilman** asked if spots will be allowed to be passed down through a family member or does it start fresh if the person doesn't want to keep the rack spot. The **Harbormaster** reported that the slot can be passed down to immediate family as with the moorings with one exception in the city which is Lobster Cove, a federal project area which falls under the “Fair and Equitable Act,” that the Army Corps of Engineers established.

**This public hearing is closed at 7:30 p.m.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor O'Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO Ch. 10 “Waterways Administration”, Sec. 10-52. - “Use of public landings.” as follows:

“Sec. 10-52. - Use of public landings.

- (b) *Tie-up period.* No owner nor anyone else in charge of or operating a vessel of any description, shall use the head of any float moored or attached to any public landing for any greater period of time than ordinarily and reasonable required to load or unload the passengers or occupants of any such vessel, together with whatever merchandise might accompany or be in the possession of the persons or passengers alighting therefrom. In no case shall any vessel be tied to the head of a public landing float for more than 30 minutes except by permission of the harbormaster. However, dinghies, tenders and other auxiliary vessels less than 12 feet in length, used by mooring holders or transient boaters, may be tied up at the sides of undedicated floats at public landings for up to four hours while the owners

thereof are purchasing goods and services. No such auxiliary vessel shall block the head of a float or interfere with permitted activities. The harbormaster may permit the seasonal tie-up of dinghies, tenders or other auxiliary vessels less than 12 feet in length at portions of any public landing so designated by the waterways board, provided that the fee set forth in subsection ~~(e)~~ (h) of this section has been paid. Such permitted vessel shall be marked by an official sticker on their transoms.

- (c) *Kayak and Paddle Board Storage.* The Harbormaster may permit the seasonal storage of kayaks and paddle boards of appropriate size to be stored in racks provided by the Waterway Board at portions of any Public Landing so designated by the Waterways Board, provided that the fee set forth below has been paid. Such permitted vessels shall be marked by an official sticker on the aft, top portion of the kayak or paddle board.
- (ed) *Conducting business or soliciting.* It shall be unlawful for any person to conduct any business, including vending on or from a public landing. The sale of tickets or the solicitation of passengers in any other manner for boat or fishing trips from any public landing is prohibited. However, any person operating a harbor sail, ferry, excursion vessel, vessel livery or party fishing vessel but maintaining a wharf headquarters or principal place of business elsewhere, may use a public landing as a port-of-call and may discharge or take-on passengers. The vessels engaged in such ventures shall not lie at any float at a public landing longer than shall be ordinarily and reasonable necessary for their occupants, passengers or customers to board or alight therefrom, and shall not block or otherwise interfere with other permitted activities.
- (de) *Other prohibited activities.* No person shall clean fish, or leave ropes, lobster pots, barrels, rocks, bricks, boards or any other material on any public landing, or launching ramps, floats or piers thereof, for longer than is reasonable necessary in the act of loading or unloading the same onto or from vessels, unless authorized by the harbormaster. No person shall load or unload lobster pots, bait, or other gear on or from any public landing, or floats, wharfs or piers thereof, except those designated by the waterways board. No vessels, vehicles or trailers may be stored on any public landing.
- (ef) *Encroachment.* No person shall encroach upon a public landing in any way.
- (fg) *Restrictions on hours.* Stone Pier and Long Wharf shall be closed to prohibit all activities between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m. Any use of this area between the prohibited hours shall constitute trespassing, a violation of section 14-6. Any person who violates said ordinance shall be subject to arrest under section 14-6 and/or fined pursuant to section 1-14. The city will use reasonable and practicable means to inform the public of such curfew. Further, this section is not intended to conflict with or supersede the authority of the conservation commission or any rules enacted by them under their M.G.L. c. 40, § 8C, powers.
- (gh) *Fees.* The annual fee for the seasonal tie-up of dinghies, tenders or other auxiliary vessels, less than 12 feet in length, *and storage of kayaks and paddle boards* at designated areas of public landings shall be \$100.00.

#### DISCUSSION:

**Councilor Holmgren** offered her support, thanking the Harbormaster for his creative solution saving the taxpayers money and in turn making kayaking more attractive to all citizens.

**Councilor Gilman** conveyed her thanks to the Harbormaster and the Waterways Board for their forward thinking. She advised the amendment is well supported by her Ward 4 constituency and offered her support.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to Amend GCO Ch. 10 “Waterways Administration”, Sec. 10-52. - “Use of public landings.” as follows:**

“Sec. 10-52. - Use of public landings.

- (b) *Tie-up period.* No owner nor anyone else in charge of or operating a vessel of any description, shall use the head of any float moored or attached to any public landing for any greater period of time than ordinarily and reasonable required to load or unload the passengers or occupants of any such vessel, together with whatever merchandise might accompany or be in the possession of the persons or

passengers alighting therefrom. In no case shall any vessel be tied to the head of a public landing float for more than 30 minutes except by permission of the harbormaster. However, dinghies, tenders and other auxiliary vessels less than 12 feet in length, used by mooring holders or transient boaters, may be tied up at the sides of undedicated floats at public landings for up to four hours while the owners thereof are purchasing goods and services. No such auxiliary vessel shall block the head of a float or interfere with permitted activities. The harbormaster may permit the seasonal tie-up of dinghies, tenders or other auxiliary vessels less than 12 feet in length at portions of any public landing so designated by the waterways board, provided that the fee set forth in subsection ~~(g)~~ (h) of this section has been paid. Such permitted vessel shall be marked by an official sticker on their transoms.

- (c) *Kayak and Paddle Board Storage.* The Harbormaster may permit the seasonal storage of kayaks and paddle boards of appropriate size to be stored in racks provided by the Waterway Board at portions of any Public Landing so designated by the Waterways Board, provided that the fee set forth below has been paid. Such permitted vessels shall be marked by an official sticker on the aft, top portion of the kayak or paddle board.
- (ed) *Conducting business or soliciting.* It shall be unlawful for any person to conduct any business, including vending on or from a public landing. The sale of tickets or the solicitation of passengers in any other manner for boat or fishing trips from any public landing is prohibited. However, any person operating a harbor sail, ferry, excursion vessel, vessel livery or party fishing vessel but maintaining a wharf headquarters or principal place of business elsewhere, may use a public landing as a port-of-call and may discharge or take-on passengers. The vessels engaged in such ventures shall not lie at any float at a public landing longer than shall be ordinarily and reasonable necessary for their occupants, passengers or customers to board or alight therefrom, and shall not block or otherwise interfere with other permitted activities.
- (ee) *Other prohibited activities.* No person shall clean fish, or leave ropes, lobster pots, barrels, rocks, bricks, boards or any other material on any public landing, or launching ramps, floats or piers thereof, for longer than is reasonable necessary in the act of loading or unloading the same onto or from vessels, unless authorized by the harbormaster. No person shall load or unload lobster pots, bait, or other gear on or from any public landing, or floats, wharfs or piers thereof, except those designated by the waterways board. No vessels, vehicles or trailers may be stored on any public landing.
- (ef) *Encroachment.* No person shall encroach upon a public landing in any way.
- (fg) *Restrictions on hours.* Stone Pier and Long Wharf shall be closed to prohibit all activities between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 4:00 a.m. Any use of this area between the prohibited hours shall constitute trespassing, a violation of section 14-6. Any person who violates said ordinance shall be subject to arrest under section 14-6 and/or fined pursuant to section 1-14. The city will use reasonable and practicable means to inform the public of such curfew. Further, this section is not intended to conflict with or supersede the authority of the conservation commission or any rules enacted by them under their M.G.L. c. 40, § 8C, powers.
- (gh) *Fees.* The annual fee for the seasonal tie-up of dinghies, tenders or other auxiliary vessels, less than 12 feet in length, *and storage of kayaks and paddle boards* at designated areas of public landings shall be \$100.00.

**4. PH2019-018: Amend GCO Ch. 2 “Administration” Division 8 “Human Rights Commission”, Sec. 2-499 “Purposes” subsection (2) and Sec. 2-500 “Powers and duties” subsection (3)**

**This public hearing is opened at 7:33 p.m.**

**Those speaking in favor:**

**Donna Leete**, Director of Human Resources, reported she was requested to evaluate a proposal the Mayor received for the creation of a Disabilities Rights Commission. As much as they support the Disabilities Rights ordinance, there is already an ordinance that established a Human Rights Commission but was inactivated. She conveyed that the Mayor is in support of equal rights and promoting diversity throughout the city and protecting the rights of all members of any protected class not only because of disability status but also race, color, national origin, age, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information, marital status and veterans' rights. It was found as they researched the matter that there was an ordinance that established in the 1990's the Human Rights

Commission, but has been inactive since that era. She related that the Mayor asked her to look at the Human Rights Commission to reactivate it as a baseline. She advised she did that, and conveyed that this is a positive direction for the city to take. She pointed out that there is zero tolerance for discrimination or harassment of any kind with the goal of ensuring the reestablishment of civility and respect for all people in the city. This Commission will stand for that, she pointed out. She highlighted the suggested revisions and reviewed that under the Purpose, Item #2, there is a modification -- the original ordinance offered voluntary mediation in a public forum which she advised is not appropriate. Now mediation would be offered by the HRC but in a confidential setting. The purpose of the Commission is to refer for appropriate resolution with resources within the community. The second modification recommended is under Powers and Duties #3, deleting the language associated with the HRC's power for hearing complaints in matters of alleged discrimination, et. al. and to add language that will, "provide a public forum in which citizens may identify specific barriers that may prevent them from taking advantage of city programs, policies, and facilities." The Commission may advise the Mayor on any recommended corrective actions, she noted, and asked for the Council's support for the amendments to the ordinance.

**Those speaking in opposition: None.**

**Communications: None.**

**Councilor Questions:**

**Councilor Cox** asked if members of this Commission will be appointed like all other commissions. **Council President Lundberg** conveyed they would. In response to a question by **Councilor Cox, Ms. Leete** confirmed the Mayor is welcoming applications for the Human Rights Commission now, but that the amended language would be valid in 30 days.

**This public hearing is closed at 7:40 p.m.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor O'Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO Ch. 2 "Administration", DIVISION 8-HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, Sec. 2-499. - Purposes. Subsection (2) and Sec. 2-500. - "Powers and duties" subsection (3) as follows:

"Sec. 2-499. - Purposes.

(2) Assist persons in the city who believe that their human or civil rights, as defined by existing local, commonwealth and federal law, have been violated in the city, by ~~providing~~ offering voluntary and independent mediation for all parties concerned in a confidential setting, and informing such people of the local, commonwealth and federal agencies available to address their grievances; and...."

Sec. 2-500. - Powers and duties.

(3) To provide a public forum in which citizens may identify specific barriers that may prevent them from taking advantage of city programs, policies, and facilities. The commission may advise the mayor on any recommended corrective actions. ~~for hearing complaints and answers thereto in matters of alleged discrimination, and to resolve such complaints by mediation. No party to any alleged discrimination shall be compelled to appear before the commission, nor such party be compelled to submit to mediation."~~

**DISCUSSION: None.**

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to Amend GCO Ch. 2 "Administration", DIVISION 8-HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, Sec. 2-499. - Purposes. Subsection (2) and Sec. 2-500. - "Powers and duties" subsection (3) as follows:**

"Sec. 2-499. - Purposes.

(2) Assist persons in the city who believe that their human or civil rights, as defined by existing local, commonwealth and federal law, have been violated in the city, by ~~providing~~ offering voluntary and independent mediation for all parties concerned in a confidential setting, and informing such people of the local, commonwealth and federal agencies available to address their grievances; and...."

Sec. 2-500. - Powers and duties.

(3) To provide a public forum in which citizens may identify specific barriers that may prevent them from taking advantage of city programs, policies, and facilities. The commission may advise the mayor on any recommended corrective actions. ~~for hearing complaints and answers thereto in matters of alleged discrimination, and to resolve such complaints by mediation. No party to any alleged discrimination shall be compelled to appear before the commission, nor such party be compelled to submit to mediation.~~"

**5. PH2019-019: Whether or not to endorse the application of the Gloucester Historical Commission to submit the City of Gloucester properties collectively known as "Dogtown" for consideration for listing as a National Register of Historic Places**

**Councilor Gilman** declared under MGL Ch. 268A as she is an abutter to the boundary of Dogtown and would therefore recuse herself from the Council proceedings on this matter and left the dais.

**Council President Lundberg** conveyed his appreciation for the turnout of the public for this public hearing noting the full auditorium, expressing the presumption they were gathered because they all believed in protecting the important asset of Dogtown. He reported the Council will hear a presentation from the Gloucester Historical Commission (GHC) on the request to apply for Dogtown to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places, on the process and what they believe are the benefits of such a process. He announced that Public Works Director, Mike Hale, will speak in opposition to the request to apply for Dogtown to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places and review at the Council's request a Dogtown Management Plan. He pointed out whether or not Dogtown is placed on the National Register list the city will have a plan that protects Dogtown. Within the city, they don't have a city position -- the Mayor hasn't taken a position at this time, he noted. After the GHC and Mr. Hale make their presentations, the Council will hear from the public for or against the proposal which is limited to the Council's hearing rule of three minutes per person.

**This public hearing is opened at 7:47 p.m.**

**Main speaker in favor:**

**William Remsen**, 23 River Road, Registered Architect and GHC member introduced GHC members in attendance -- Mary Ellen Lepointka, Co-Chair; Sandy Barry, Jude Seminara and Robert Whitmarsh, Co-Chair. He advised that the GHC is before the Council because they love Dogtown and don't wish to see it developed. He noted the National Registry listing doesn't change things; rather it is a tool for the proper stewardship of Dogtown and then presented a Power Point presentation (on file) as follows:

- The GHC composition of volunteers appointed by the Mayor and its mission were touched on briefly;
- The National Register of Historic Places list is of 93,000 significant historic places in America; the Register was established in 1966 in reaction to the "massive destruction" of heritage by developers and by federal and state urban renewal programs;
- Essex County has 450 listings; Gloucester has 35 listings including National Register Districts - Central Gloucester (1982); East Gloucester Square (2010) and Rocky Neck (2017), and specific sites such as the Schooner Adventure, the First Parish Burial Grounds, the Fitz Henry Lane House and Gloucester City Hall are several amongst the 35;
- Dogtown is mostly undeveloped public land mostly in Gloucester and Rockport including conservation land, public land for open space and recreation and of critical importance, watershed and reservoirs for Gloucester's drinking water;
- Cape Ann was one of the first English settlements in America; the remains of a colonial village are in Dogtown; other features are the Babson Boulder Trail; the Mass. Historical Commission has officially stated that Dogtown is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Quoting from a recent letter by Mr. Hale to the Council (on file), "...There should be no question that Dogtown is historic and worthy of protection.";
- Dogtown includes 2,057 acres that meet the technical criteria for a historic district; the results of a 2018 Archeological and Historic Survey explains how the boundaries were drawn are posted on the GHC's webpage;
- A Google Earth picture of the outline of Dogtown within Cape Ann was shown;
- Two detailed maps showing the Dogtown Historic and Archaeological District Boundary and that of the Rockport Parcel(s) were associated with the application for National Register listing.
- Thanks were extended to the Town of Rockport for their support;

**Mary Ellen Lepoinka**, 17 Hammond Street, Co-Chair of the GHC continued the narrative:

- The benefits of Dogtown being listed on the National Register of Historic Places was noted as an honor and calls attention to the significance and value of Dogtown as well as the need to pay more attention to preserve it for future generations;
- The National Register listing would make Dogtown eligible for grants because the listing makes the area attractive to potential donors and granting agencies; some state and federal grants such as “Save America’s Treasures Grant” are earmarked for places that are listed on the National Register;
- Other potential benefits were noted as: (Municipalities, businesses, non-profits and income-producing properties) eligibility for Federal and state preservation tax credits;
- The National Register leave things just as they are and has the potential to attract additional funding;
- Grants can come with strings attached particularly if originating with the state or federal government which is public tax money and so municipalities are held to certain standards in how the money is used including doing no harm to public resources. It was pointed out that any project of any nature in Dogtown conducted with public funds would trigger a review such as an environmental impact study. Being listed on the National Register wouldn’t change that fact. A project in the Dogtown National Register District would trigger a historical impact assessment as well. The review may recommend to prevent or mitigate harm to historical resources, but those recommendations aren’t binding - National Register status isn’t impactful;
- Ways in which Dogtown might be helped through listing it on the National Register of Historic Places were mentioned but whether anything happens has to do with the willingness of local government and its citizens;
- National Register status carries no restrictions or requirements to owners in what they can do because Dogtown is listed on the National Register; it is different from a “Local Historic District” such as the city’s downtown which does have restrictions and is a different type of district; a National Register district doesn’t have such restrictions or regulations, although if someone takes a tax preservation credit on their taxes which could trigger a review to ensure fraud isn’t being committed;
- Properties can be sold, leased, rented or disposed of like any other private property if within a National Register District;

**Mr. Remsen** continued that:

- Listing on the National Register will not impact the activities of the Cape Ann Sportsmen’s Club as it isn’t within the boundaries within the proposed National Register District. The listing wouldn’t require any change of use so there would be no impact on club members’ activities in Dogtown inside or outside of club property;
- Rumors of moving compost facility and creation of a visitor’s center: These ideas were named as having nothing to do with nominating Dogtown to the National Register as any changes to Dogtown would have to go through existing government rules and procedures with Council approval;
- National Register status wouldn’t necessarily increase tourism to Dogtown as it doesn’t automatically lead to more users; research indicates that people generally don’t consult the National Register when planning their vacations; the National Park Service only features national parks as tourist destinations on its website; listing on the National Register would not make Dogtown a park of any kind;
- The listing wouldn’t create traffic and parking problems necessarily; other cities and towns in Massachusetts with similar sites report no increase in traffic, parking problems or visitors because of National Register listing alone. Gloucester doesn’t have to provide any new parking or visitor services;
- There is not loss of local control as the city already follows state and federal laws and regulations; state and federal grants do have their own requirements, but such grants are optional and the city doesn’t have to apply or accept such grants; when federal or state money is used on a National Register site there is a historical assessment -- if there is no risk to the heritage the project proceeds -- if there is potential risk the review makes suggestions to mitigate the damage to the heritage; if there are no alternatives, the project can then proceed even if the heritage is damaged or destroyed;
- The goal is to protect the heritage of Dogtown. National Register listing is not a loss of control but helping to protect Dogtown. Any changes to Dogtown would have to go through the City Council and other established procedures;
- Unprotected land in Dogtown could be either sold or used in ways that people may not like but it is possible. It is important for the city to be encouraged to place permanent conservation restrictions on all Dogtown land to help protect Dogtown from development.
- Dogtown will not change unless acting through the local municipal government that change is initiated;

- Support for the National Listing was noted by: The GHC; Dogtown Advisory Commission; Open Space & Recreation Committee; Rockport Historical Commission; Rockport Board of Selectmen; Rockport Rights of Way Committee; Cape Ann Trail Stewards; Cape Ann Sunday Morning Hiking Group - the Gloucester Fire Department finds no reason to stop the National Register Listing (statement on file) and the Health Department offered its support (on file);

**Mr. Remsen** asked for the Council's support for forwarding Dogtown to be listed on the National Register to the Mass. Historical Commission and the State Review Board which is the next step in the process.

#### **COUNCILOR QUESTIONS:**

**Councilor Hecht** noted the tax credits used for improvements saying it is difficult to get a tax credit through. He asked if there are structures in Dogtown that can be rehabbed. **Mr. Remsen** advised that those tax credits are to encourage commerce and business activity and Dogtown doesn't have those opportunities. **Councilor Hecht** asked what the magnitude is for potential grant funds. **Ms. Lepoinka** noted that federal grants can go to millions of dollars for historic districts. National Register status alone doesn't entail money but increases the attraction of funds, from non-profits, from the state or federal government, she highlighted. **Councilor Hecht** asked if in the GHC's research, in their opinion, what percentage of grant monies is dependent on being on the National Register. **Mr. Remsen** advised that he had knowledge of a National Register building that received up to \$1 million in grant funds from being on the National Register. Being on the National Register is an official acknowledgement that it (district/structure) is historically significant. The grants go to landscape not just structures, **Ms. Lepoinka** pointed out.

**Councilor Memhard**, noting that Dogtown plays an important role in the city's public watershed, and has a unique historical significance because of the Roger Babson Boulder Trail, asked about controlled burns by the city if it was determined to be beneficial in order to restore the landscape to what it was 100 years ago. **Ms. Lepoinka** advised that being listed on the National Register would not affect that project; there is nothing to prevent a controlled burn but there may be a survey to ensure no burning of historic sites took place. **Councilor Memhard** asked if in the future Gloucester or Rockport wanted to erect wind turbines in Dogtown would the National Register listing affect that. **Mr. Remsen** advised it wouldn't if it didn't disturb a historic site.

**Councilor LeBlanc** noted the phrase used in the GHC presentation, historical resources in Dogtown, and asked what the definition of a historical resource was in Dogtown, in Ms. Lepoinka's opinion. **Ms. Lepoinka** advised it wasn't her opinion but rather is the definition of the National Park Service and the Mass. Historical Commission which is comprised of four criteria to determine historical significance: age or antiquity; is there the association of a place with a significant person or event in the history of a community; association with a significant architect or builder in history and a fourth criteria which she advised she was unable to recall. More than one criteria may apply, she pointed out, saying that in the case of Dogtown, three of the four criteria apply. **Councilor LeBlanc** acknowledged the GHC's 122 page application and asked for a list of the historically significant places in Dogtown. **Ms. Lepoinka** recounted as follows: Dogtown Common; the cellar holes; people's pastures, trails; a 1642 site of a mill; the Babson boulders; the cooperage house; the stone walls, all things associated with the colonial development between the late 17<sup>th</sup> century and around 1840 and the Babson legacy. She pointed out the railroad tracks are in the district but aren't features that contribute to the historical site. No review would be triggered for work on Babson Reservoir because it isn't a contributing property. **Councilor LeBlanc** noted grants were mentioned several times and receiving monies from them. He cited that when he went to the National Register of Historic Places website and viewed "Frequently Asked Questions," quoted, "...If federal monies are attached to the property then any change to the property have to allow an advisory council on historic preservation to comment on this project." **Ms. Lepoinka** expressed she concurred, saying that any owner in the district would have a review if making changes. The federal government sends that request for change to the GHC asking them to confer and write a letter listing why or why not these changes may be of concern. A third party would have to weight in, **Councilor LeBlanc** pointed out. **Mr. Remsen** noted the GHC has been tasked to do these reviews for federal grants. They did that for the railroad bridge as to its historical impact which they reported back to the state on; the only thing the state required was full documentation for posterity -- the GHC documented with photographs of the bridge to be the permanent record.

**Councilor Cox** indicated Ms. Lepoinka and Mr. Remsen were speaking about private property that's owned by someone else and the registry is asking for an independent review which is the city of Gloucester. She pointed out that in this instance the city owns the property so why would the (federal or state government) go to a city-appointed board to ask if the city is doing something appropriate. She expressed concern that the city-owned property being reviewed by a city-appointed board is that they would bring in a different committee to conduct the review which they should as in her opinion a city board shouldn't be conducting such a review. She advised she had asked for a full list of grants from Ms. Lepoinka for federal monies in order to review what strings might be attached and didn't

get that list from her. **Ms. Lepoinka** advised she didn't get the communication. The GHC didn't research the grants, but this was to enable the city to have more options to find more grant money, she pointed out, and didn't know how much money that was available. **Councilor Cox** expressed she was less concerned about the money but more about the conditions of a grant. **Council President Lundberg** pointed out that the National Register listing doesn't change the city's process for applying for a grant; that any grant to be accepted has to come through the Council for approval. **Councilor Cox** continued to express concern for associated grants. **Ms. Lepoinka** offered the services of the GHC to assist the Council in researching possible grants

**Councilor Nolan** noted he was following on the placement of a wind turbine in Dogtown, citing it was said that such an installation wouldn't change anything as long as it didn't go in a historic cellar hole. He pointed out that the GHC said that the other issues they considered an asset by standard is the Dogtown Common, the boulder trail and other areas. If the city decided that a wind turbine installation in the common area was needed, the GHC is saying that it wouldn't affect the historical aspect. **Mr. Remsen** conveyed that the goal is not to damage the heritage if they can; if the city decides that's what they have to do, they can "pave it over." This would cause a delisting from the National Register. If a historic house is on National Register, it can be torn down. **Councilor Nolan** clarified that they're saying it isn't just restricted to the cellar holes. **Mr. Remsen** advised is that the only issue is trying to protect as best as possible the identified heritage. If it has to be destroyed for the greater good of the city, they can legally do it, if it doesn't violate any other existing statute. **Ms. Lepoinka** advised National Registry listing doesn't prevent the municipality from doing anything at all with its property. All it does is give an opportunity for people to review what is being done and inform you that if you do this these are the consequences and suggest an alternative or mitigation for less destruction of a cultural heritage -- it would only be a discussion. **Councilor Nolan** reviewed that that the city decides to do something in Dogtown that would change the historical aspect of it, they have to go through a 107 compliance review with a third party deciding whether to recommend it or not. He suggested in the worst-case scenario the city loses its historic status. **Mr. Remsen** pointed out the historic status is lost if they completely destroy it but want to keep it as it is. **Ms. Lepoinka** pointed out that no one wants to see any residential or commercial development on Dogtown.

**Councilor LeBlanc** held up the 122-page application completed by the GHC that was submitted, advising it is an "amazing" document lauding its contents. He conveyed the only lacking element was a vision for Dogtown and asked for a general reference of where the GHC sees Dogtown in the future. **Mr. Remsen** conveyed that wasn't within the purview of the GHC and isn't their job; rather, that is a city planning issue. The GHC's focus was on the historic heritage. **Ms. Lepoinka** expressed her agreement with Mr. Remsen saying there are a lot of ideas that could be done in Dogtown that benefit the environment, health and safety consideration, and passive recreation. She mentioned the loss of high bush blueberry bushes because of invasive plants; watersheds are so broken up that certain flora and fauna of Dogtown have been lost. It is up to the city and the public to decide what to do in Dogtown, she pointed out.

#### **Main speaker in opposition:**

**Mike Hale**, Public Works Director, noted he's rarely been before the Council as an opponent to anything saying he didn't see himself as an opponent of Dogtown. He explained that Dogtown is a special place worthy of protection for its cultural heritage, is of historical significance and its changing environment and landscape. For generations this land has been held as "precious." He lauded the work of the Historical Commission for this application and past efforts, demonstrating the uniqueness of the area. When asked to weigh in on the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register, he advised he was unable to understand what the real purpose and expectation is.

Mentioning a "Q&A" submitted by the GHC (on file) which stated that (National Register listing) is an honor and something to be proud of and advised he agreed. He pointed out that the Q&A also states that it carries no restrictions, requirements, demands no additional protection now and in the future. He asked how is it helping to protect the land, and expressed he was unsure how that would be accomplished. He spoke to grant funding also mentioned several times in the Q&A and how the National Register provides access to additional funding. He pointed out that the city applies every week for grants, which goes through the Administration, through to the Council and is administered by city staff, he conveyed. He recounted that there are conditions on certain grants that are difficult to "work around." He highlighted that the city recently turned down a National Park Service \$250,000 grant for Stage Fort Park which would have removed local control for parking -- they wouldn't have been able to have resident sticker parking and a daily fee for that parking lot. He cited that one of his concerns as Public Works Director is that two-thirds of the Dogtown acreage is watershed. He noted 1,150 acres were granted by Roger Babson in 1931 which was intended to remain as untouched open space to be shared by the community. This nomination doesn't change the distinction of this land from watershed to something else, but he expressed concern

for the unintended consequences of future grants. He highlighted that if it isn't protecting the land, it's not offering anything to the city.

**Mr. Hale** advised that Dogtown needs a more complete management plan which was suggested by Councilor Gilman. There is no management plan yet, he pointed out, and they're coming up with ideas for a working group that can create an inventory of parcels; identify the ownership in the area known as Dogtown; learn what measures, if any, are in place to protect the land. If it is determined that more protection is necessary, he suggested that the Administration and the Council should take appropriate action with community input. The matter of the issue of past grant acceptances and what the city's obligation is for past grants needs to be addressed. He pointed out that all corrective action should be reviewed openly and using caution about future grant funding. He highlighted they've already been told by one of the Dogtown groups that the city is in non-compliance with past grants accepted by the city which jeopardizes future acceptance of grants. He pointed to a long discussion of the appropriateness of the current location of the municipal composting operation. He conveyed that Public Works isn't interested in being in non-compliance with the grant used to purchase this property, but also recognizes that there is a need for such a service in the community. If the Administration and the City Council and citizens should determine that this location is not appropriate, then they need to work to develop an exit strategy and develop a better location for the composting facility which he advised he was not opposed to. He suggested that the working group should consist of city staff including Public Works, Police, Fire, Community Development, City Council, various community groups and citizens to have input in creating a living document that evolves as needs change.

**Mr. Hale** conveyed he didn't support the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register. He recounted he agreed Dogtown is a historic and environmental asset for Cape Ann which must receive the appropriate attention for its protection and perpetual care. He expressed that the only way to get there was to have a "true" management plan because being nominated to the National Register of Historic Places doesn't develop that plan -- all it does is gives the city a "gold star."

He concluded his remarks by saying that in his 20 years with the Public Works Department, 11 of those years as Director, they've done minimal work in Dogtown which he advised he recognized. He spoke of changing priorities and that the nomination doesn't change anything, and asked what the funding source is and what does it do for the city. He pointed out that the nomination does nothing to protect Dogtown, saying that it is something the city should do and should remain with complete local control with decisions made by members of this community, the Administration and City Council.

**NOTE:** Mr. Hale's letter to the City Council enumerating his opposition to the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register is on file dated 4/9/19.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT:

**Joseph Orange**, 16 Taylor Street, Dogtown Constable, spoke about keeping the Dogtown watershed in a pristine wilderness state and other prohibitions by state statute that minimizes human involvement, construction or placement of buildings, cutting, removing or otherwise destroying trees, grasses, or other vegetation; the subdivision of premises; and many others. He added that there can only be passive recreation on such land. He cautioned about loss of local control and any violation of the watershed ordinance. Council President Lundberg offered the thanks of the Council for Mr. Orange's lifetime of service saying that they appreciated his efforts and rely on him.

**Bob Whitmarsh**, GHC Co-Chair, 2 Blueberry Lane, noted the approval is more than about Dogtown. He pointed out that Gloucester is currently a Certified Local Government noting that only about 25 communities out of 351 in the state have this designation and means Gloucester has the opportunity to obtain 10% of all of the funds that comes to the State Historical Commission. He pointed out that using federal grant funds is optional and can be refused saying that there are no strings attached to being listed on the National Register.

**Richard Quateman**, 10 Dennison Street, noting his background in historical preservation, and a former member of the Dogtown Advisory Committee (DAC), lauded the creation of a Dogtown Management Plan recounting the work of the DAC in the past. He asked the Council to support the Dogtown nomination. A designation has no restrictions, but is recognition of the value of Dogtown and Cape Ann's heritage, he added.

**Leslie Dale Bartlett**, 21 Harbor Street, Manchester, speaking as a Cape Ann historian, conveyed that this is a way to preserve Dogtown, and encouraged the Management Plan for Dogtown. Encouraging Dogtown's preservation he added his support for the National Registry listing.

**Christopher Leahy**, 67 Perkins Street, member of the Dogtown Advisory Commission, but speaking as a citizen of Gloucester, addressed objections - if through the designation grants come to the city, be they federal or state with strings attached, the Council, and the Mayor have full authority to reject a grant. The objection of through some marketing scheme thousands of people after the designation will rush to Dogtown and overrun it, he pointed

out, has no precedent. Noting a 40 year career with Mass. Audubon, he conveyed that people from all over the country won't come to just look at the Babson boulders. He asked the Council to vote in favor of the nomination.

**Charles Crowley**, 19 Biskie Head Point, Open Space & Recreation Committee and Dogtown Advisory Committee member, speaking as a citizen, pointed out that Gloucester's portion of Dogtown is about 1,900 acres consisting of about 180 separate lots, with about 150 as public; 15 are owned by non-profit conservation organizations, 15 are privately owned. The public uses most of the privately-owned parcels, but he pointed out there are no formal easements or use agreements over this land. He highlighted much of the land in Dogtown has either no or "relatively weak" conservation protection meaning that it's possible at some point land could be developed or diverted for another use sometime in the future. He urged that the city needs to put meaningful conservation protection in place for Dogtown and work to acquire the remaining private parcels, especially those at risk for development. Since 1986 the city hasn't acquired any land in the Dogtown area. He noted that the Essex County Greenbelt Association has been monitoring parcels as they come up for sale and when they're at risk for development the ECGA has been purchasing them. He conveyed that grants the city may get as a result of the National Registry designation could have strings attached that would restrict the city's future use of the land, that he termed, "a myth". He pointed out that much of the municipal land in Dogtown was purchased with state and federal through grants that already have restrictions. He noted that in 1985 and 1986 land adjoining Dogtown Road was purchased with "Self-Help" grants and some of the watershed was purchased with HUD grants. While the city may be complaining now about those grant restrictions, he added, that they wouldn't own the land without the grants. He highlighted areas of the city it wouldn't own without grant funding such as Lane's Cove, Long Wharf, Red Rocks, Marble Road conservation land, Dykes Watershed, Pole's Hill, and Magnolia Park. Without grant funding the city wouldn't have been able to afford the repairs and rehabilitation of Burnham's Field, Newell Stadium and St. Peter's Park. He concluded his remarks by saying that if there is work to be done, and the city can't afford to do then do it with grant funding; the net result is that it's a good thing to do for the city.

**Susan Quateman**, 10 Dennison Street, former director of MassDOT Open Space program, spoke of her work for conserving land, and noting her use of Dogtown for passive recreation. She spoke to the issue of grants, and offered her support for the National Register listing.

**Gardner Winchester, II**, 62 Veterans Way, spoke of the history of Dogtown, of his concern for possible development of Dogtown and advised he was in favor of the nomination.

**Noel Mann**, 3 Primi Lane, member of the Open Space & Recreation Committee, expressed her concern for Dogtown Common and lands purchased with the Self-Help grants. She spoke about the Open Space Plan 2020 update for the city and an inventory of open spaces which supports the city's application for grant funding with the state and federal agencies. She voiced her support for the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**Salvatore Frontiero**, 14 Warner Street, noted his research into the National Registry nomination to learn of any negative impact by the designation for public lands saying he found nothing. Noting many properties already in the National Register that are districts containing municipal watersheds, many properties of which are nearby to Cape Ann such as the Lynn Woods -- not well known as a National Register district even 20 years after it was listed. He suggested that the Council should talk to municipalities that have districts on the National Register to learn the pros and cons. He asked the Council to get that information before they vote.

**Clay Kern**, 28 Green Street, biologist and hunter and fisherman, advised he supports the nomination of Dogtown's listing on the National Register and a Dogtown Management Plan.

**Phil Schwartz**, 4 Old Farm Lane, Co-leader of Cape Ann Hiking Group, advised that National Register listing is not inconsistent with city tenants and can be pursued. There is no requirement with the National Register to approve grants, he pointed out, so that if there are undue restrictions, the city can turn the grants down. The listing will give a goal for the city. He asked the Council to make a decision on facts not hypotheticals.

**Christian Kishida**, 34 Marmion Way, Rockport, asked that Dogtown remain open for passive recreation.

**Dan Greenbaum**, 318 Concord Street, author, highlighted the deterioration of Dogtown over time due to neglect, trash, vandalism and other negatives. He suggested the National Register will help to strengthen a Management Plan and urged the Council to support the nomination.

**Jeff Brown**, 3 Broadway Avenue, Rockport, noted he was raised in Gloucester near Dogtown and expressed his concern about the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register. He recounted experiences in Dogtown as a child and then focused on his concern for the city's reservoirs and watershed area in Dogtown. He asked the Council vote against the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register. He called for a referendum to place the matter of Dogtown on the city's municipal ballot.

**Darrell Jackson**, 20 Eastern Point Road, expressed concern for the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register. He asked to what level Dogtown would be restored and under what parameters.

**Nick Holland**, 11 Jebeka Lane, representing the Cape Ann Trail Stewards, spoke in favor of the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register as it would give the city more tools to preserve Dogtown. He highlighted the Lynn Woods which is a municipal watershed area reporting that's not overrun by visitors and that the city of Lynn has maintained local control. He encouraged the Council to contact Dan Small, Park Ranger for Lynn Woods to learn more about it.

**Laurie Hagar**, 54 East Main Street, spoke in favor of the nomination of Dogtown for the National Register saying the designation would help with the city's Management Plan.

**Laurel Tarantino**, 16 Commonwealth Avenue, spoke to concern for the displacement of the fauna of Dogtown by the National Registry listing, and encouraged a grassroots efforts to conserve Dogtown.

**Eric Hutchins**, 45 Pooles Lane, Chair of the Rockport Water Protection Committee and Rockport property owner of 13 acres in Dogtown, expressed support of the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register. The main reason to do this is for the stewardship of Dogtown, for people willing to work to conserve Dogtown, an "awesome" resource. He also expressed support of a municipal Management Plan saying that it is about stewardship in support of the mutual Public Works' for better water.

**Ann Rhinelander**, 16 Pine Street, spoke in favor of the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register, lauding the work of the GHC. She expressed she welcomed Mr. Hale's proposal for a Management Plan which isn't mutually exclusive, she pointed out.

**Hazel Hewitt**, 16 Haskell Street, spoke in favor of the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**Cindy Dunn**, 93 Wheeler Street, and member of the Dogtown Advisory Committee (DAC), conveyed the DAC fully supports the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register and as a citizen of Gloucester she offered her support. She commended the DPW Director for his work offering support for his Management Plan and expressed respect for his opinion. She noted that Dogtown has many invasive species and that the woods need attention; bird species have been lost. She touched on grant issues as well.

**Monica Lawton**, 11 Story Street, Rockport, spoke in support of the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**Catherine Goodick**, 10 Dogtown Road, an abutter to Dogtown surrounded by conservation land spoke in opposition to the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**Zenas Seppala**, 92 Granite Street, Rockport, spoke in opposition to the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**James Ugone**, 33 Main Street, Rockport, Chair of the Rockport Historic Commission, noted the RHC's support of the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register. Highlighting Rockport's Downtown Historic District he conveyed it has no bearing on how a property is managed, and that being on the historic register is not detrimental.

**Sam Favaloro**, 318 Western Avenue, voiced his opposition to the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register based on concern for federal government intervention.

**Mark Ames**, 55 Cart Track Drive, a part-time Gloucester resident, expressing his support for the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register related that he saw no issues with a group of community-minded people who've gone to a great deal of effort to set up something that could be beneficial to everyone.

**Peter Leathers**, 30 Thatcher Road, Rockport, spoke in opposition to the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**Mary Devaney**, 1 Holbrook Court, Rockport, Trail Steward for the New England Forestry Foundation, a group that owns a large tract of conservation land in Dogtown, spoke of the Foundation's support for the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**Keith Palazola**, 57 Western Avenue, spoke to waiting on the vote for the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register asking what the plan is for Dogtown.

**Doreen Wonson**, 6 Honeysuckle Road, asked the Council to delay its vote on the nomination so that more people can have input on the matter and expressed concern for tree die-off.

**Linda French**, 8 Hutchins Court, not able to stay for the entire hearing submitted her statement to the Council through the Clerk of Committees. **Joanne Senos**, City Clerk, advised in Ms. French's note she asked that her voice be added to those in opposition to the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register because loss of authority over Dogtown, another layer of bureaucracy, increase in traffic.

#### **Communications:**

**In support:** In joint letter to Chair of Rockport Board of Selectmen & President Gloucester City Council from Nicholas Holland, President of Cape Ann Trail Stewards; joint letter from Monica Lawton of Rockport & Phil Schwartz of Gloucester; by email: Cathy Tarr, Gloucester; Donna Polizzia, Gloucester; Marilyn Arnold & Michael Sussman, 13 Youngs Rd.; Renee Barrett & husband (unnamed), 5 Clarendon St.; by email the Richard Calnan

Family of Gloucester & Rockport; by email: Paul McGeary, 301 Cobblestone Lane, Gloucester; Michael Ronan, 18 Centennial Ave.; by email: Morey Ronan, 18 Centennial Ave.

**In Opposition:** by email: Bob Gillis, 31 Sayward St.; Joseph W. Butler, III, 12 Ledge Road

**Not for or Against:** by email: Ron Cole, 11 Lilac Lane, Belmont, NH suggested a referendum question on Dogtown nomination to weigh public opinion; Martha Farnsworth, Gloucester, expressed concern for the railroad tracks that run through Dogtown and the public trails that are near it.

**Councilor Questions:**

**Councilor O'Hara** thanked the P&D Committee for their review of the GHC nomination application but expressed concern that information had come forward after the P&D Committee voted their recommendation such as Mr. Hale's letter of opposition and other information offered during the public hearing. He suggested the nomination should be returned to the P&D Committee for its further investigation.

**Councilor Cox** clarified that CPA money comes from the citizens of Gloucester and they have funded the purchase of property through CPA funds in the city with the Essex County Greenbelt Association. To say that the city hasn't purchased land for conservation purposes is incorrect.

**Councilor Hecht** expressed his respect for the GHC and the Open Space & Recreation Committee as well as Mr. Orange and his stewardship. He asked what would be the general categories for the proposed Dogtown Management Plan, how would it be accomplished, what kind of resources would be needed, and how long would it take. **Mr. Hale** conveyed his belief there is a Management Plan that is being worked on to some degree already. He reported that in looking at the last Management Plan, at its successes and failures, what needs to be done and what hasn't been done. He highlighted there were environmental issues, cultural, historical issues, watershed, big categories to be reviewed; what are the competing uses and the trail walk. He cautioned to fully understand all the issues will take some time and won't be a quick process. He suggested they'll need to start with lower hanging fruit, and then develop a priority list for levels of protection and what measures they need to take. He highlighted it is a great undertaking and that a rough draft of the framework may be available in the fall.

**This public hearing is closed at 10:13 p.m.**

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: On a motion by Councilor Lundberg, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Planning & Development Committee voted 2 in favor, 1 (Nolan) opposed, to recommend that the City Council endorse the application of the Gloucester Historical Commission to submit the city of Gloucester properties collectively known as "Dogtown," for consideration for listing as a National Register of Historic Places as an area of historical significance through the U.S. National Park Service.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Councilor O'Hara** moved and **Councilor Cox** seconded to return the matter of the application of the Gloucester Historical Commission for Dogtown for listing as a National Register of Historic places through the U.S. National Park Service be returned to the P&D Committee for further consideration.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION TO THE RETURN MATTER TO P&D:

**Councilor LeBlanc** pointed out that the Council has listened to this matter this evening; there's been social media outreach; they've heard from the DPW, their Constable, the GHC, and asked who else they'd hear from if they returned the matter to P&D. Citing the lengthy dialog the Council engaged this evening with the public, he expressed he didn't see the need for the matter to return to P&D saying it wouldn't add anything new to the conversation. He advised he wouldn't support the matter returning to P&D as he was ready to vote this evening.

**Councilor Holmgren** pointed out that there are well informed opinions and a lot of people who've researched Dogtown for some time. She expressed her agreement with Councilor LeBlanc that there'd been ample opportunity for the Council to do their homework, noting she had. She also expressed she was pleased to learn about the proposed Management Plan, and that she was "relieved" to learn that if there were negative consequences of the listing of Dogtown on the National Register it could be delisted. She expressed further agreement with several speakers on a delay of vote by the Council to receive more information as the nomination was an important decision of the Council so as not to operate in a vacuum. She conveyed she'd support a postponement of the vote in order to look to Lynn Woods and agreed if they needed to return it then to P&D she'd support that or take up the matter as a Committee of the Whole.

**Councilor Cox** offered that the Council has done their homework but have been inundated with new information and supported the matter returning to P&D for more review. She noted that she briefly researched Lynn Woods and

would want to ask those who run it questions on their designation. She cited that Mr. Hale's Management Plan should come first before listing Dogtown on the National Register. This main motion could be withdrawn without prejudice, she pointed out because they can't do what they need to do in one week.

**Councilor Memhard** advised that he wanted a vote this evening saying that they need to honor the work of the GHC. While there may not be sufficient votes on the Council, they should vote, he added.

**Councilor Hecht** expressed agreement with Councilor Cox but that he was against the motion to return this matter to P&D.

**Council President Lundberg** added his objection to the motion to return this matter to P&D saying he couldn't see what more they could do with the question on the National Registry. He indicated he could see the Council doing a lot of work on the Management Plan and what it would look like, but as far as the National Registry, he suggested the Council has heard everything there is and should vote on the main matter.

**On a voice vote and then by show of hands by the Council, the motion to return the matter of the application of the Gloucester Historical Commission for Dogtown for listing as a National Register of Historic places through the U.S. National Park Service be returned to the P&D Committee for further consideration was defeated 2 in favor (O'Hara, Cox), 6 opposed, 1 (Gilman) recused.**

#### **DISCUSSION ON THE MAIN MOTION:**

**Councilor LeBlanc**, thanking those present for attending, pointed out no one was wrong in opposition or in favor and put forward that there was good dialog that brought Dogtown to the forefront, opening the door for future discussions. He noted the Council had heard from renowned people with a lot of history in Gloucester. He urged people to read the GHC's application saying was very interesting, full of historical facts. Citing that this wasn't just a tract of land that the city is trying to put on the National Register, this was about the city's watersheds and the city's drinking water; its sustainability and the city's future. He asked where the city would turn if anything happened to it. He mentioned the city's Public Works Director's opposition who's been with the department for 20 years. He suggested that the city's watershed shouldn't be a part of the National Register designation. He highlighted that this is city-owned land designated by Roger Babson, with the deed saying that Dogtown, "...should stay as a natural park and bird sanctuary to be known as the Nathaniel Babson Sanctuary for the use and enjoyment of people forever..." The deed also says that, "...the old cellars on said lands outside of said reservoir shall be left untouched..." He highlighted various concerns expressed by the public during the hearing and the opinions expressed. He advised he wouldn't support the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register that Dogtown was "perfect" the way it is now.

**Councilor Hecht** suggested there are options if the Council doesn't vote in favor of the nomination. He suggested that the Council might wish to consider tabling this matter until the DPW generates its Management Plan.

**Council President Lundberg** advised he would vote against the nomination, expressing his belief that the impetus to have a designation on the National Historic Register must come from a Management Plan which would inform the Council whether this was a good idea or not. There is great historical significance in Dogtown, he highlighted, citing the archeological study that was done, saying it is "fantastic." If what they get out of this is a discussion about what to do about Dogtown then they have succeeded, he pointed out.

**Councilor Cox**, thanking the GHC for their work, conveyed she wouldn't support the National Register nomination citing the manner in which the process took before referral to the Council. She expressed her hope that the development of a Dogtown Management Plan will create better stewardship, advising she would do her own research for the properties contained within Dogtown to learn what layers of protection are already there and what they can do to provide more protection without unnecessary restrictions to local control.

**Councilor Nolan** thanked people for coming out this evening, pointing out this was long in the works. Citing several members of the public who spoke as good stewards of Dogtown, he named a few such as Charles Crowley, Nicholas Holland, and the Dogtown Advisory Committee members. He advised he could find no reason to support the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register based on the merits of what he has read and learned, and in meeting and talking to people.

**Councilor Memhard** noted part of the goal was accomplished by putting the matter before the Council to encourage this conversation if the GHC hadn't come before them with their application. He indicated that the application for listing of Dogtown on the National Registry moves in "lock-step" with the Dogtown Management Plan and aren't exclusive. There is additional public process to get public involvement and buy-in for the good work done by the GHC. Dogtown has been reinvigorated by these efforts, and they need to ensure the ball doesn't get dropped, he noted.

**Councilor O'Hara** expressed that there were enough questions raised on the Dogtown nomination which was what prompted his suggestion to return the matter to the P&D Committee. He advised the application was very educational for the history of Dogtown. Noting the DPW Director will keep an eye on Dogtown as will Mr. Orange and many others; he pointed out that with many questions raised he wouldn't be able to support the nomination of Dogtown to the National Register.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Holmgren, seconded by Councilor Lundberg, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 2 (Holmgren, Memhard) in favor, 6 (Cox, Hecht, LeBlanc, Lundberg, Nolan, O'Hara) opposed, 1 (Gilman) recused, to endorse the application of the Gloucester Historical Commission to submit the city of Gloucester properties collectively known as "Dogtown," for consideration for listing as a National Register of Historic Places as an area of historical significance through the U.S. National Park Service.**

**Councilor Gilman** returned to the dais.

The Council recessed at 10:37 and reconvened at 10:43 p.m.

**6. PH2019-020: Amend GCO Ch. 24 "Vegetation", Article II "City Plantings Committee" by DELETING Article II "City Plantings Committee" in its entirety**

**This public hearing is opened at 10:44 p.m.**

**Those speaking in favor: None.**

**Those speaking in opposition: None.**

**Communications: None.**

**Councilor Questions: None.**

**This public hearing is closed at 10:44 p.m.**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** On a motion by Councilor O'Hara, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed, to recommend that the City Council Amend GCO Ch. 24 "Vegetation" by DELETING Article II "City Plantings Committee" in its entirety.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Councilor LeBlanc** explained that the City Plantings Committee has not met for some time now and is defunct. Additionally, with the advent of other groups, such as Generous Gardeners, the city has not relied on the City Plantings Committee. He advised that the Mayor is in agreement.

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Nolan, the City Council voted 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to Amend GCO Ch. 24 "Vegetation" by DELETING Article II "City Plantings Committee" in its entirety.**

**For Council Vote:**

- 1. Decision to Adopt: SCP2019-003: Washington Street #742, Map 116, Lot 33 pursuant to GZO Sec. 5.5 "Lowland requirements" and Sec. 5.5.2 construction on land less than 10 feet elevation above U.S.G.S. datum**

**MOTION: On a motion by Councilor Gilman, seconded by Councilor Holmgren, the City Council voted by ROLL CALL 9 in favor, 0 opposed, to adopt the Special Council Permit decision for SCP2019-003 for Washington Street #742 pursuant to Sections 5.5 and 5.5.2 of the Gloucester Zoning Ordinance.**

**Unfinished Business: None.**

**Individual Councilor's Discussion including Reports by Appointed Councilors to Committees:**

**Update on the Downtown Development Commission from by City Council Representative, Councilor Melissa Cox,** highlighted that the DDC would like to thank the DPW for the Christmas decorations and are looking forward to the spring flowers.

**Councilors' Requests to the Mayor:**

**The City Council wished Councilor Holmgren a Happy Birthday!**

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 10:47 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

*Dana C. Jorgensson*  
**Clerk of Committees**

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING:**

- **PH2019-019 submitted written statements of speakers with supporting documentation if any:**

Leslie Dale Bartlett, 21 Harbor St., Manchester  
Susan Quateman, 10 Dennison St., Gloucester  
Monica Lawton, 11 Story Street, Rockport  
Hazel Hewitt, 16 Haskell Street, Gloucester  
Gardner Winchester II, 62 Veterans Way  
Jeff Brown, 3 Broadway Avenue, Rockport  
Kathryn Goodick, 10 Dogtown Road, Gloucester  
Linda French, 8 Hutchins Court, Gloucester