



**EDIC MEETING MINUTES**  
**Wednesday, October 3, 2018**  
**CATA Conference Room**  
**3 Pond Road**

- **Call to order of the Board**
- **Meeting started at 5:05pm**
- **Roll call taken. In attendance were Bill Bramhall (Acting Chair), Ruth Pino (Treasurer), Mike DiLascio, Carl Gustin, Tom Balf and Taylor Hedges. Also in attendance: John Cunningham, Attorney for the EDIC, Linda Stout-Saunders representing the Clean Energy Commission for the City of Gloucester, Jerrold Oppenheim, Attorney at Law, Jill Cahill, Director of Community Development with the City of Gloucester.**
- **Meeting minutes from the August 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018 meeting were approved subject to 3 minor revisions. All were in favor of make the revisions and approving the minutes.**
- **Carl Gustin started the meeting with questions around the UMASS proposal. Carl explained that he and Tom Balf went through the EDIC files at the Annex location. Gustin said that there is not a lot of good hard information about what is going on in the industrial park right now. Some process needs to be developed as to how we keep track of this information of owners and renters. Tom Balf stated that the documents in the files historically were all about the industrial parks. Inherently, what is important is what the EDIC's ongoing role tied to our mission. How we move forward will be part of our mission and discussions for the next several months. Is it clear what the ongoing role of the EDIC will be?**
- **Mike DiLascio asked if we do have some obligation to the owners of the buildings in Blackburn Park.**
- **Tom Balf asked about what is the Blackburn Park Association Trust? We are not quite clear what this entity is. John Cunningham, Attorney to the EDIC, brought light on the past history surrounding the Association Trust. Covenants and restrictions apply to the expanded section beyond Varian. The rest of the industrial park- lots were sold and no covenants or restrictions apply. The Blackburn Park Association was responsible for the storm water detention. This was some entity to monitor those and for maintenance. Conservation has a role of how they are being maintained. Owners of the lots would become the trustees and take an interest in it. However, larger companies did not want any participation in this. This is an ongoing issue for the EDIC to have a role in the storm water systems work.**
- **John Cunningham asked who the current trustees are. There was an effort to get owners to be the trustees and the EDIC members to fill in.**

- C. Gustin stated that the EDIC guidelines are very specific. We need to come up with a list of other businesses and look at the existing park. We need to think more about the non-manufacturing occupants there and to further the economic development of the area. McNiff has building offices and business park activity and does not have any manufacturing.
- Attorney Cunningham brought up that we can go back and look at the economic development plan. Under 121c, people are taking a little more liberal view of what is industrial. Mr. McNiff never purchased land from the EDIC. Pond Road was developed by another developer (Norse). Is there any reason to create a special statute to help broaden the scope of the EDIC?
- Jill Cahill asked what role did the EDIC play in the Happy Valley project. Attorney Cunningham explained the EDIC's involvement with regards to the covenant and the EDIC's approval of the use of the land, structural design of the building, employment and if it all meets the criteria of the EDIC. Land, building, setbacks, parking, structural design, and loading docks were some of the issues concerning the EDIC.
- Bill Bramhall stated that we cannot go against the state statute. The structural design requirements for manufacturing.
- J. Cahill asked the Board if new businesses were to come in would the EDIC get involved. Attorney Cunningham explained that it all depends on the location of the lots. The IDC developed Kondelin Road. The remaining lots transferred to EDIC and the other lots were sold. Another observation that came out of it was that the EDIC relied heavily on the Conservation Commission and the City Council special permitting.
- J. Cahill informed the Board that Happy Valley is now going through the next site plan review. They held a pre-existing medical marijuana permit and now moving towards an adult use recreational. They now have to go in front of the Planning Board. Potentially they are now tripling their customer base and there are now parking concerns. This is required in our zoning. There will be a higher customer base and the increased traffic flow and parking issue.
- C. Gustin produced a map of Blackburn Industrial Park and showed the Board the McNiff property. If we were to do a SWOT analysis of how owners and tenants feel about this- would there be any reason why we shouldn't include the McNiff property? In the past, the EDIC consulted regularly with Mr. McNiff on the maintenance of the entire park.
- T. Hedges asked if we have any obligations for any maintenance. Kondelin Road was looking for street light repair and street curb repairs. Are the owner's responsible? Attorney Cunningham interjected and since it is a public way than that responsibility falls upon the City and turned over to the DPW.
- Ruth Pino brought up the fact that the EDIC still oversees the maintenance of the beaver problem.
- C. Gustin brought up another topic of the Weston and Sampson documents. One document included a July 2007 memo which talks about the Kondelin Road property including the upside of the Akerley, Cohen, and City of Gloucester lots. In the July 2007 memo, Weston and Sampson identified certain lots that they thought had potential for development. There is an amendment to the Weston and Sampson contracts. We had them concentrate on the 400 acres. Nothing else appears to have been done with Kondelin Road. These are the lots just

above where Hiltz currently is located. If those have the potential, we may be able to expand the industrial foot print there. If we do take a look at existing sites and if that is worth taking a fresh look at those 5 lots and giving the EDIC some capability.

- T. Hedges stated that there is an easement on Kondelin Road to the Hiltz property. To access City land and the Akerley land we would need an easement to get into the property.
- Attorney Cunningham brings up the question if the lots would perk or not. Further analysis would be warranted and if Akerley would be willing to sell and at what price. The City would have to decide if it was worth it.
- C. Gustin again quoted Weston and Sampson's findings: "Significant development area when combined with other lots."
- Attorney Cunningham brought up the discussions concerning the emergency egress from Blackburn to Pond Rd. This property is owned by Paul Butman. Mike Hale would know the history on this. There were discussions of an easement and a gate. This has never gone forward. There is only one way in and one way out of Blackburn. It makes sense for emergency vehicles entering and exiting into the park.
- C. Gustin asked if this was a concern with current owners and tenants.
- J. Cunningham answered that it is a concern when there is an emergency. That is when you hear about it.
- Attorney Cunningham made a comment that it would be interesting to see where Paul Butman stands on this issue before it is brought up with owners and tenants of Blackburn.
- DiLascio, Balf and Gustin spoke to Professor Raciti from UMASS and the professor is very eager to work with the EDIC. Can the EDIC work with the City and the Chamber of Commerce in trying to reach out to the owners and tenants that are there? We are looking more for an urban planning and community development effort versus a class approach.
- C. Gustin made a comment about the 3<sup>rd</sup> step in Professor Raciti's proposal. What are the economic development opportunities? This might be done jointly with the EDIC role and a city wide effort.
- J. Cahill informed the Board about her efforts last year with the EDA Grant. Many of these grants you need to supply economic development data. At this time, the City does not have access to this data. How do we go about gathering the data? Cunningham's group has started conversations with the Donahue Institute which is part of UMASS Lowell. Initial conversations were proposing a SWOT analysis city wide. We could use this secondary data about unemployment rates, real estate, and other information to create a dash board. Cunningham is still pulling together the funding on it. The cost is between \$20,000 and \$40,000. This would be Phase 1. We are not able to pursue several of these grants because we lack the hard facts. It is hard for us to tell the Gloucester story. We are missing out on opportunities. Donahue Institute would be able to put the data all together for us.
- R. Pino asked how would the data be delivered and J. Cahill answered that they would create a dash board. It would be internal and external data we could pull from on various topics including real estate data which we currently do not have access to. We would be able to get access to any information that we would need.

- M. DiLascio asked if this would be an annual subscription fee. J. Cunningham responded by saying that we would have to enter into a master agreement. This is as far as the discussions got.
- Attorney Cunningham inquired about some of these grants.
- J. Cahill gave the Board an overview of some of the grants in question:
  - Existing water tower- putting it in for National Fisheries.
  - Haskell Dam- water security. There are certain reporting requirements that you must meet when applying for these grant and because of the lack of data, we cannot do any of the necessary reporting. There are a lot of questions surrounding our infrastructure and the cost of improvement. We need to do a hard data and analysis. Are we a job hub? How many people are unemployed here? How many trucks are coming in? There are a lot of questions. We as a city do not have the tools to answer these types of questions.
- C. Gustin made a comment that we currently have no data on the flow of traffic coming into Grant Circle and what is coming out of Blackburn.
- J. Cahill stated that this will change considerably with the Fuller development and accessing all of the development there.
- C Gustin commented on we need to look at this as a 3 phase approach.
  - Phase 1) We need to assess the current state of the existing parks and determine whether there may be additional potential.
  - Phase 2) EDIC redefines specific economic development analysis relating to the charter
  - Phase 3) Pursue the ecological and development issues specific to Westside and consider other sites relevant to the EDIC. Then we can have conversations with the Donahue Institute or UMASS or a national firm. This lays out as a 12 month process for the EDIC.
- J. Cahill mentioned that Sal DiStefano is in conversations with Comcast about internet capacity. We need to consider infrastructure issues in our phase 1 talks. Water, housing, road ways- these are all issues that we would need to address. Energy reliability as well as costs.
- T. Balf emphasized that we need to scope out the phase 1 work. What would a SWOT analysis look like? Here is an outline of the Proposed Phase 1 Scope:
  - Collection of Information and Review
    - Review most current assessors information about business owners and tenants
    - Review economic data for these businesses
    - Review relevant city or regional plans that are not specific to business parks
    - Hold focus group meeting
    - Meet with 5 key employers
  - Report Preparation
    - Identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to grow
    - Recommend metrics/ dashboard for use by EDIC

- Identify key supply chain/ business partners
  - Based on SWOT analysis identify 2-4 projects for consideration by the EDIC in the next 2 years
- Funding for the UMASS project was approved. This would now require some re-negotiation. We need to have UMASS revise the proposal and present a new budget. M. DiLascio mentioned that the scope of the entire project will be revised and reduced. How would we do this? Do we just look at phase 1? Do we retract? We are still negotiating the scope.
- Attorney Cunningham advised to leave it in place and that we need to develop a new scope and get a revised budget.
- C. Gustin commented that Professor Raciti needs to be aware that there is now a city component in the next steps.
- Treasurer Pino asked if at some point Community Development will be asking the EDIC to fund the Donahue Institute project and J. Cunningham answered “yes.”
- Next steps: DiLascio will set up another call with Professor Raciti. T. Balf will flush out phase 1 of the work flow and will be presenting this revised scope to the Board.
- T. Balf added that our mission is about jobs. Some metrics associated with jobs or projects around housing is needed.
- R. Pino commented that we need to understand this data because it is part of the big picture. EDIC moved Gloucester forward in a different time. This new Board and its energy will move this City forward again.
- Attorney Cunningham also brought up citizen satisfaction about living on Cape Ann.
- Gregg Cademartori has provided a bunch of data to Professor Raciti already about the Westside G1S.
- J. Cunningham asked some of the questions that need to be answered with current business owners. How satisfied are you as a business owner on Cape Ann? Do your employees have access to housing here? Are you confident in the infrastructure to help your business?
- Gustin said this is the metrics you have to think of. Balf responded by stating it is of value to ask questions and to make some recommendations and go with a metric that makes more sense.
- R. Pino reminded the Board that the Chamber of Commerce would jump right in and create a way for the EDIC to communicate with that community of business owners.
- C. Gustin commented that the Chamber is situated to gather the data we might need. The Chamber would be able to survey all of its members.
- J. Oppenheim commented about how the scope seems to be interested in infrastructure issues and what businesses would need to move here- housing, schools, and trained workers. Mr. Oppenheim would represent low income people to this Board and has a back ground in legal services. Mr. Oppenheim represents energy efficiency for low income households and statewide energy efficiency programs. His task was in bringing 22 agencies together on the low income front. This has grown to 100 million a year. Oppenheim has deep roots in engineering and economics and has his own consulting firm called “Democracy and

Regulations.” Some of his clients are utility companies. Also, Mr. Oppenheim previously worked in the Attorney General’s office.

- M. DiLascio asked how many people you would consider to be low income in Gloucester.
- J. Oppenheim responded that state wide it is 30 percent. Action, Pathways, Open Door, Food Pantry all have this data because the federal government funds each of these organizations. R. Pino stated that there is a way to apply for free lunch and that the schools are collecting this data as well.
- J. Oppenheim commented that there is good census data which is readily available and easy to get to.
- M. DiLascio asked how do we make sure that the Gloucester School system gets some benefit from this project with UMASS? How do we create a job-entry on someone’s resume from high school- perhaps being a part of the survey and knocking on some doors? We would like to benefit kids in the Gloucester Schools somehow.
- T. Balf- Scope would include focus groups. Perhaps having Professor Raciti’s group meet with young people. There are many young professionals associated with the Chamber. There are connected groups of business owner’s in that age group.
- Next Steps:
  - Contact UMASS
  - Develop revised scope
  - Reach out to Chamber to access what their capabilities are
- How many more drafts do we need before we present this to UMASS? Any Board members with comments get back to T. Balf before the end of the week. T. Balf will revise document.

#### Other Business

- J. Cahill provided updated on the following:
  - Wetlands/ Climate change Grant
  - We have a grant about wetland study and climate impact
  - Natural water source- how does climate change potentially change that?
  - Soil erosion? We will be severely affected by
  - Does someone in the EDIC want to be involved?
  - The Grant has been awarded. We met with consultant and have not launched into discussions yet. The focus will be the water shed.
  - Planning for the Production Grant
  - Deep dive into our zoning and multi-families
  - Highlights density, cluster vs. open space
  - We are looking to our Team Housing Production Plan
  - R. Pino is currently a part of the Housing Production Plan Board
  - There are many Boards involved
  - We have hired a consultant: Judy Barrett who works state wide
  - The beauty of it is that it gives elected officials the data they need in zoning issues
  - These are 2 exciting projects that Community Development is working on and hoping that the EDIC will be involved in.

- We are also working on appointing a Chair for the EDIC and securing J. Oppenheim as a the EDIC's newest member.
- Once the new Chair has been appointed we will make all necessary changes to the EDIC's website pages.
- The next EDIC Board Meeting will be on Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018
- Meeting was adjourned at 7:01pm.