*Approved 11.10.16*

**HARWICH Community Preservation Committee**

**October 27, 2016, Harwich Town Hall, Griffin Meeting Room**

Present: Chair Bob MacCready, Vice Chair Kathy Green, Cindi Maule, Walter Diggs, Jim Atkinson, David Nixon, and Robert Bradley

Absent: Daniel Tworek and Selectmen Liaison Michael MacAskill

Vacant: Housing Committee representative

Guests: Ilene Brady, Harwich Historical Society; Heinz Proft, Harwich Natural Resources Director; Amy Usowski, Harwich Conservation Administrator; Charleen Greenhalgh, Harwich Assistant Town Administrator; Eric Beebe, Harwich Recreation Director

* Meeting called to order by Chair Bob MacCready at 6:09 PM.
* Guests were welcomed
* The voting on the October 13, 2016 CPC Meeting minutes - put on hold until the next CPC meeting, 11.10.16.

**New Business**

Presentations of CPA Applications:

# R6 Pleasant Lake Ave. Crossing Lights, submitted by Bikeways Committee, Robert Cafarelli, project manager.

No presentation. He did not respond to the invitation to appear for tonight’s meeting. The application will be evaluated without their presentation unless the committee hears from them. Vice Chair Kathy Green will reach out to them and ask if they want to submit a written presentation.

# R2 Hinckleys Pond Restoration, submitted by the Town of Harwich, Harwich Town Administrator Chris Clark, project manager.

Charleen Greenhalgh and Heinz Profit presenters:

This application is nearly identical to the 2014 CPA application. Hinkleys Pond is the largest pond inside Harwich. The pond’s summer algae blooms have increased in length. The problem was studied and the 2012 Report recommended an Alum treatment. A full copy of the report can be found in the Brooks Free Library. This application contains a segment of that report. They went back to the same consultant, additional studies were conducted, and it was determined this is the correct treatment. This process will lengthen the success, but this will not be permanent. Other towns have also done this process, including Long Pond. The pond will still be dealing with runoff, stream flow and fertilizer. Though it doesn’t have traditional public access, it is used by swimmers and boaters. It does serve as a herring run. The Cape is losing herring runs. If the pond can be healthier, it is a good thing overall. This project is for cleaning up only. It is a part of the town’s (Comprehensive) Wastewater Management Plan (no implementation date yet). The Alum treatment gives the biggest bang for the buck.

Committee questions:

* + Questions raised when the 2014 application was rejected included: The Alum treatment.

Response: Alum is regulated and permitted. It doesn’t harm the fish or wildlife.

* + The size of the pond, the private homes around the pond, and the public access.

Response: Public access – The boulders prevent any parking in the limited area. Bike riders off the bike path can access the area. No money or plans are in place at this point for increased public access. Permitting and environmental review would be needed prior to maybe adding stairs to the water or adding benches. The application mentioned kayaking, but there is nowhere for the public to launch. Years back the boulders were placed to block parking because of a safety concern. They have investigated homeowners abutting the pond about getting public access, but nothing has turned up.

* Access is part of this project, listing an additional $50,000. There is a concern about using CPA funds for creating access and improving private property values by improving the water.

Response: The town could apply for grants and go through the permitting process for public access. Property owners could be asked for a right of way; this is one way to get homeowners involved.

* Was there any bloom this summer?

Response: No; maybe as a result of the lack of rain.

* Has there been any research on the alum and herring?

Response: Not on herring specifically. But alum doesn’t affect fish. Algae takes up the oxygen fish need. If we don’t kill the algae, there won’t be oxygen left for the fish.

* How many homeowners have water irrigation within 50 feet of the pond front?

Response: The 2012 90-page report lists septic systems: 43 are within 100 feet; 18 are 100 to 200 feet; 24 are 200 to 300 feet.

* Has anything been done by the town to reduce the phosphorus problem; reduce fertilizer use at the pond level and upstream?

Response: The town has used an informational education piece. There are no new conservation regulations. No fertilization is permitted within 100 feet of the water.

* What happens to the bottom of the pond?

Response: That is where the Alum treatment binds – on the mud level, at 15 feet. The impact is negligible because there is no live on the bottom of this pond.

* The 2014 presentation stated the treatment may wear out in 5 years, not 20 years as stated.

Response: 20 years may not be realistic, but the consultant believes this.

# R5 Brooks Park Expansion/Improvement Phase 4, submitted by Harwich Recreation Department and Commission, Harwich Recreation Director Eric Beebe, project manager.

Eric Beebe presenter:

Update on the past Brooks Park CPA projects: Phase 1 – Engineering and design. Phase 2 – Installation of two pickle ball/tennis courts and renovating the basketball court. Some 300 people have signed up for pickle ball. The basketball court has had tons of use. Phase 3 – resurfacing the tennis ball courts, new practice tennis wall, half basketball court, parking, and picnic pavilion. The Harwich Highway Department will work on the parking and picnic area this November, weather permitting. All should all be completed by next summer.

Phase 4 Request: The park’s playground is geared towards younger kids. Requests have been for a playground that would be geared towards the 8 to 12 year-olds. Three apparatuses would be installed. The new playground would be about 60 feet from the current playground. A second restroom facility is needed. The request is for an 8 x 17 foot size structure. The park has recently been using a porta potty to handle the increased demand, in addition to the one rest room facility. A proper restroom would be less expensive overall. The project would also cover additional bits and pieces desired, like garbage cans, bubbler, picnic tables, benches, etc.

Committee questions:

* The project has a 15% contingency plan. That seems high.

Response: The other phases also budgeted 15% but have stayed within that amount.

* Lighting?

Response: They have discussed lighting. Currently it is very old. It is very expensive to change to LED lights.

* The ACT description of recreational limits to the acquisition, creation, preservation, rehabilitation

restoration of land for recreational use. Does the creation of the playground meet the ACT?

Response: Yes. The new playground would be on the currently owned grass area. The grass area is too large for current use/need. The restroom is one of the amenities and would support the recreational use. All the phases have used CPA funds.

* Passive use vs. active use was questioned. Is it proper to use CPA funds on parking and maintenance?

Response: Maintenance – Every two years the mulch for the playground is replaced. The Recreation Revolving Fund (money collected from the Rec.’s programs) covers the cost of the mulch. The restroom facility would be built by the town highway and Rec. departments. The town has many active and passive things. The Pavilion is a passive picnic area. The Rec. Department tries to accommodate the town’s needs. There is a demand for tennis, pickle ball, basketball, pavilion, etc.

* Is Brooks Park is being too developed, little by little? These phases are rather a large push.

Lighting is intrusive, quite a change from ten years ago. Parking is springing up. Why is this not tying up with the High School? The Rec. Department is well run. But there is concern about all this coming in piecemeal to us. Landscaping questioned, the many fenced areas vs. open space to walk. Maintenance costs keep coming up.

Response: They have not removed many trees; doing little, to no clearing. But haven’t planted any new trees. There are no plans to go into the back forested area. Work would be on already cleared land.

* Poorly attended public meetings were held for the other phases, only one neighbor abutter attended one meeting. Plans on public impact?

Response: This project won’t invade any abutters. No calls have been received on unleashed dogs.

* Mulch use?

Response: Mulch is a safety composite. They are required to use it.

# R3 Whitehouse Field Irrigation Project, submitted by Harwich Recreation Department and Commission, Harwich Recreation Director Eric Beebe, project manager.

Eric Beebe presenter:

Update on past the Whitehouse Field project: The new fence will go in next month.

Irrigation is to preserve and upkeep the field. It is one the best amateur fields around. The current system is 20 years old. The town’s highway department maintains it. Their irrigation expert has done patchwork jobs to keep it going, but it is beyond that now and needs to be replaced. It is leaking water and increasing the water bills. They will hire an irrigation company to do the job correctly.

Committee questions:

* With the cost of water, did any one look at putting in a well?

Response: Yes, but since the problem is with the sprinkler leads, etc., the water use is skyrocketing, tripling costs.

The Harwich Mariners contribute to field’s costs. Next year the Mariners will be gifting a new restroom facility to the town. Director Beebe will need to get back to this committee with the cost of the system vs. water cost. Because of the leaks it was hard to keep up with the watering. If not properly done, the field is going to degrade. The new system will have rain sensors in addition to timers.

* Source of water still questioned.

# R4 Veterans Memorial Field Track Fit submitted by Harwich Recreation Department and Commission, Harwich Recreation Director Eric Beebe, project manager.

Eric Beebe presenter:

The Track Fit stations would be at Veterans Memorial Field, which is behind the Community Center, a highly active park area, and a natural fit.

Committee questions:

* How does this project fit the ACT’s allowances for recreation?

Response: Recreation Dept. plans to have fitness programs and to have more recreational amenities at this field park.

* Location of stations?

Response: The stations will be around the track at a little less than .4 of a mile apart; a little short of desired distances apart. They will be strategically placed; outside the track there is room.

* Maintenance?

Response: Each station will be on a shell type of base with edging.

* Signage?

Response: There is a big sign at the Veterans Memorial Field and one at Brooks Park saying CPC funds were used.

* Impact on abutters?

Response: No; no additional noise or clearing needed.

**Old Business**

* Update on town financial records:

The auditor did send Chair MacCready a reconciliation of the General Ledger. Bob is still going through it. The money that we have available for this year’s projects are the same. The figures are still wrapped up with old articles from 2006-2013. The numbers are still confusing. Responding to Bob’s request, Mr. Gould would like to meet in the future. There are three entries that need clarification.

* No new Community Preservation Plan (CPP) Updates.
* Vice Chair Kathy Green researched Historical Resource Projects CPA compliance. She found a flowchart on this

subject. She will email the historical project applicants and remind them to the importance of getting the Harwich Historical Commission support for their project.

* An ACT’s view on an historical resource was discussed. The general thought is a resource is a historical record; a

piece of paper, a book, etc. is a record. Preserving the record is the preservation. But what changes the path is allowing public access. We don’t know the boundaries of this added component. The job of preserving the historical resource, like putting a record in an acid free folder, now is leading to digitized it and creating a back-up, and then providing public access via the internet. There is accepted room for this. But does preserving the resource mean putting the record on the internet? It does allow public access, and those records are then searchable, but is that enough? The current proposed application for the digitizing of newspapers was discussed. Does this provide something for the community? Does this stretch the boundaries? The town’s historical projects are confusing; further information will be needed.

Adjournment 7:45 PM.