

Appendix 1 -- Fiscal Assessment

This Appendix includes information on the factors affecting the costs associated with Northern Conomo Point going forward and the several levels of revenue that might be realized from the different scenarios presented in this report. Scenarios 2 and 3 include select components of Scenario 1. Scenario 3 includes select components of Scenario 2 also. The expense categories are covered first, including the costs to develop new public facilities, and the potential cost to undertake any necessary demolition on the site. This information is included in Table A-1. The rest of this Appendix includes projected revenues from sale and/or rental of properties to remain or be developed, and a summary of the overall impact of the several options described.

Table A-1: Revenue and Expenses by Scenario

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Existing Revenue</i>	<i>Estimate of One- Time Revenue</i>	<i>Estimate of One- time Costs</i>	<i>Estimate of Annual Revenue</i>	<i>Estimate of Annual Costs</i>	
SCENARIO 1						
1.1	Survey and engineering work		\$ 30,000			
1.2	Creation of waterfront park		\$ 100,000		\$ 3,000	
1.3	Maintain 2 public piers / floats				\$ 6,000	
1.4	Maintain 2 public boat ramps (existing)				\$ 1,250	
1.5	Improvements to small craft boat ramp at north of point		\$ 5,000		\$ 500	
1.6	Parking areas and access road to ramp (28,000 sq ft)		\$ 84,000		\$ 500	
1.7	Provide seasonal restrooms (2)		\$ 1,200		\$ 1,200	
1.8	Removal of outbuildings on 13 lots		\$ 104,000			
1.10	Rent and taxes (unabated)	\$ 454,000		\$ 1,476,415		
1.11	Rent and taxes (abated)	\$ 454,000		\$ 1,060,479		
1.12	Total Revenue / Costs (high)¹	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 324,200	\$ 1,476,415	\$ 12,450
1.13	Total Revenue / Costs (low)²	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 324,200	\$ 1,060,479	\$ 12,450
SCENARIO 2 – Option A						
2.1	Removal of 34 dwellings and associates outbuildings	\$ 226,100		\$ 510,000		
2.2	New access road and parking for Front Beach boat ramp			\$ 6,000	\$ 500	
2.3	Creation of picnic areas			\$ 5,000	\$ 1,000	
2.4	Improvements to boathouse			\$ 15,000	\$ 10,000	
2.5	Creation of walking paths (4,650 linear feet)			\$ 76,725	\$ 1,335	
2.6	Rent and taxes (28 properties, unabated)	\$ 227,900		\$ 767,065		
2.7	Rent and taxes (28 properties, abated)	\$ 227,900		\$ 564,693		
2.8	New Costs/Revenues (high)³	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 612,725	\$ 777,065	\$ 10,835
2.9	New Costs / Revenues (low)⁴	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 612,725	\$ 574,693	\$ 10,835
2.10	Total Revenue / Costs (with Scenario 1 components) --high⁵	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 936,925	\$ 777,065	\$ 23,285
2.11	Total Revenue / Costs (with Scenario 1 components) -- low⁶	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 936,925	\$ 574,693	\$ 23,285

Table A-1: Revenue and Expenses by Scenario

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Existing Revenue</i>	<i>Estimate of One-Time Revenue</i>	<i>Estimate of One-time Costs</i>	<i>Estimate of Annual Revenue</i>	<i>Estimate of Annual Costs</i>
SCENARIO 2 – OPTION B					
2.12	Removal of 24 dwellings and associated outbuildings	\$ 187,305		\$ 360,000	
2.13	New access road and parking for Front Beach boat ramp			\$ 6,000	\$ 500
2.14	Creation of picnic areas			\$ 5,000	\$ 1,000
2.15	Conversion of dwelling to community facility			\$ 150,000	\$ 17,000
2.16	Creation of additional walking paths			\$ 83,325	\$ 1,425
2.17	Sale of Robbins Island (dwellings remain)	\$ 66,200	\$ 3,957,000	\$ 158,280	
2.18	Rent and taxes (28 properties rented plus RI taxes, unabated)	\$ 200,495			\$ 739,181
2.19	Rent and taxes (28 properties, plus RI taxes, abated)	\$ 200,495			\$ 534,700
2.20	New Costs/Revenues (high)⁷	\$ 454,000	\$ 3,957,000	\$ 762,605	\$ 756,181
2.21	New Costs / Revenues (low)⁸	\$ 454,000	\$ 3,957,000	\$ 762,605	\$ 551,700
2.22	Total Revenue / Costs (with Scenario 1 components) --high⁹	\$ 454,000	\$ 3,957,000	\$ 1,086,805	\$ 756,181
2.23	Total Revenue / Costs (with Scenario 1 components) -- low¹⁰	\$ 454,000	\$ 3,957,000	\$ 1,086,805	\$ 551,700
SCENARIO 3					
3.1	Removal of all buildings	\$ 454,000		\$ 1,042,000	
3.2	New Costs/Revenues	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 1,042,000	\$ -
3.3	Total Revenue / Costs (with Scenario 2A components)¹¹	\$ 454,000	\$ -	\$ 1,364,925	\$ 10,000
3.4	Total Revenue / Costs (with Scenario 2B components)¹²	\$ 454,000	\$ 3,957,000	\$ 1,664,805	\$ 73,905

Notes 1. Summary of items 1.1-1.11

2. Summary of items 1.1-1.10 and 1.12

3. Summary of items 2.1-2.6

4. Summary of items 2.1-2.5 and 2.7

5. Includes revenue and costs from 2.8 and costs from 1.12

6. Includes revenue and costs from 2.9 and costs from 1.13

7. Summary of items 2.12-2.18

8. Summary of items 2.12-2.17 and 2.19

9. Includes revenue and costs from 2.20 and costs from 1.12

10. Includes revenue and costs from 2.21 and costs from 1.13

11. Includes costs for items 1.1-1.7, 2.2-2.5, 3.1 and revenue for 2.4

12. Includes costs for items 1.1-1.7, 2.13-2.17, 3.1 and revenue for 2.15 and 2.17 and estimated real estate taxes for Robbins Island

REDEVELOPMENT COSTS

Park and Community Facilities

WATERFRONT PARK

Approximately one-acre park with benches, grass and landscaping / fencing along perimeter estimated cost to be about \$100,000.¹ This estimate considers costs of supplies and labor for asphalt removal, grading, hydroseeding, fencing and plantings, benches, and erosion control.

The average cost for park maintenance includes mowing, trash pick-up, site furniture repair and other general maintenance. Per acre cost is estimated at about \$3,000 per acre.²

BOAT RAMPS

For new concrete ramp construction, the price per 100 feet is about \$18,600. This is for a 12' wide, 10" thick pre-cast concrete ramp with stainless steel hardware and a one foot crushed stone bed. With labor (2 days, a crane and flatbed, 2 people) the total estimate is about \$25,000.

To determine the cost for annual maintenance, a 20-year life of the ramp is estimated and replacement costs are distributed over that period – approximately \$1,250 per ramp per year.

PARKING AREAS AND ACCESS ROADS

Estimate for grading and gravel at \$3 per square feet. Total square feet of parking would be 28,000 for Scenario 1 and 29,000 for Scenarios 2A, 2B, and 3.

RESTROOMS

Two options for public restroom facilities were considered. These would be in addition to any restrooms included in a community facility.

Permanent composting toilets cost around \$50,000 per unit installed and around \$1,000 year to service. There is some daily maintenance as well as some off-season maintenance required.

Portable toilets with a weekly service contract are \$125 a month per unit. Based on availability of May to September (5 months) this would be about \$625 a year per unit.

As Scenarios 2A, 2B, and 3 all include a community facility that would likely include public restrooms, the fiscal assessment assumes the outside seasonal restrooms will be portable toilets.

WALKING PATHS

The cost for the creation of walking paths is based on a price per linear foot. For a paved 10' wide path the cost is \$133 per linear foot plus 10% for engineering and design. For a 10' wide crushed-stone

¹ Does not account for seawall reinforcement as this would be a Town cost that would need to be considered regardless of what future uses occur on the Point. The Town may want to consider having an engineer evaluate the seawall for structural soundness.

² From Northern Arizona University, *Recreation Facility and Area Planning* (based on National Park Association Maintenance Standards), also from Ben Brennan District Park Maintenance Operation, 2007 (Alexandria VA).

walkway the cost is approximately \$15 per linear foot plus 10% premium for engineering and design.³ Both of these types of paths would be ADA compliant.

Average maintenance cost is about \$1,500 per mile per year.⁴

Pedestrian paths for each scenario are in linear feet:

- Scenario 2A: 4,650
- Scenario 2B: 5,050
- Scenario 3: 5,050

PIERS/DOCKS

Includes estimate for maintenance and insurance for piers and wooden floats that are attached. The Town's existing liability insurance covers the docks only, but no activities. Additional insurance for physical damage would be around \$3,000. The Conomo Point Association (CPA) currently carries \$1,400 in liability insurance and maintains the wooden floats only. Cost for removal and replacement of floats is about \$2,000 and regular maintenance about \$1,500. The CPA also pays for lifeguards at \$8,000 per year.⁵

SURVEY AND ENGINEERING WORK

Survey and engineering work of the entire site will be required for most of the activities considered, including the development of recreation facilities, parking, and other common uses of the town-owned land. Estimated costs for survey and engineering work for the Northern Conomo Point were provided by two firms, and ranged from about \$26,000 to about \$40,000 to \$50,000, depending on the final scope. These estimates were based on photogrammetric mapping with land reconnaissance on the entire area, and development of a survey plan defining approximately 30 exclusive use lots to be rented (Scenarios 2A and 2B) and the remainder to be developed for the proposed park activities by the Town.⁶

PUBLIC BUILDING

While there are several buildings well located for use as a public facility, it is likely that substantial changes would need to be made to create a community facility that would also be suitable for rental for private and/or public functions and events.

For a community facility, either new or converted from an existing building, the construction costs are estimated to be about \$150,000. This would include modest kitchen facilities, public restroom and changing facilities, and a general meeting area. Other uses could include an office space for facility staff or the Harbor Master.

Potential revenue is estimated to be between \$17,000 to \$60,000 based on 50% occupancy during the week and full occupancy on weekends, or 100% occupancy six days a week. The facility would be

³ Jamestown (NC) *Comprehensive Pedestrian Transportation Plan* (2010) and MassDOT *Alternative Pavements for Shared Use Paths* (2007). Estimates ranged from \$8 to \$25.

⁴ Rails to Trails Conservancy, NE Regional Office, *Rail Trail Maintenance and Operations* (2005).

⁵ Based on information provided by Mark Osburn of Cabot Risk and Essex resident and Paul Collins of Conomo Point regarding current Town and CPA expenditures. Further assessment of the condition of the piers and docks and any desired improvements would need to be undertaken.

⁶ Dan Ottenheimer, R.S., Mill River Consulting; Philip Pattison, Meridian Associates.

available for rental for 18 weeks of the year. Rental fees are based on Tucks Point (see below) with a special rate offered for residents.

Costs for Tucks Point (see below) run about \$17,000 per year. Therefore, it may be expected that the facility would be able to run a break-even operation at a minimum. The Town could consider increasing rates for residents to increase expected revenues.

If the Town used the existing Conomo Point boathouse with modest improvements (as presented in Scenario 2A), the construction and maintenance costs would be reduced, but anticipated annual revenue would be more limited due to the constraints of the facility.

Tucks Point, Manchester-By-The-Sea

Tucks Point in Manchester-By-The-Sea is one model for the type of community facility that might be considered for Northern Conomo Point. Tucks Point is located on 5.4 acres with outdoor public amenities that include a beach, swings, picnic area, and open lawn. The community facility (the "Chowder House") is a seasonal, partially enclosed building with accessible bathrooms and a kitchen sink for rinsing cooking equipment. It can accommodate a maximum of 150 people for a sit-down meal. The site has adequate parking capacity located near the building.

The Chowder House is available for rent between the 3rd week of May to the 4th week of September. The rentals can be for up to 5 ½ hours at a time. Residents rent for \$175 weekdays and \$200 on week-ends, non-residents rent for \$500 weekdays and \$600 week-ends.

Tuck's Point runs roughly as a break-even operation for events, but revenues do not cover capital costs for maintaining the facilities or site. For the 2009 season, 68 of the 150 available rental slots were filled (64 by residents and 4 by non-residents.) These generated \$14,675 in revenue in the summer of 2009. Expenses for the same period for staffing included a part-time attendant and DPW maintenance at \$8,000. Cleaning services ran \$3,000, and building repairs ran \$2,300. Total expenses were \$16,875 for the period.

According to the Manchester Recreation Department, summer week-ends are almost always booked particularly during the heart of the summer season. This suggests that other similar facilities in the area might also attract rentals. The rental rates are considered extremely low for local residents, and still a relatively inexpensive option for non-residents.

Lynch Park, Beverly

The City of Beverly rents out the Rose Garden in Lynch Park for wedding ceremonies but organized receptions are not currently allowed. The Rose Garden rents for \$500 for up to 2 hours for photographs and ceremony for a non-resident, while a resident fee is \$200. This is a formal setting and not comparable to what has been discussed for Northern Conomo Point.

Demolition of Buildings

Northern Conomo Point has a variety of building types on site, from small sheds and garages with no foundations, 1,000-2,000 sf residential properties with no foundations (both seasonal and year-round), to residential properties with concrete foundations. Estimated demolition costs will vary considerably and will need to be determined on a case-by-case basis. The tight working conditions on Northern

Conomo Point could present some challenges, but a contract to demolish multiple buildings is likely to reduce per unit costs.

The demolition of a typical 2,000sf home (a larger home by NCP standards) can be estimated to produce 127 tons of debris. Rough estimates for demolition and disposal run \$15,000 to \$20,000 for residential properties. Estimates for the sheds and garages without foundations would likely be below \$10,000. For the purposes of this analysis, an average of \$15,000 per dwelling and \$8,000 per outbuilding is applied.⁷

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS PRECEDE DEMOLITION ACTIVITIES

Before determining the extent of the demolition, planning must take place regarding how each individual lot will be incorporated into the reuse of the site. If any excavation might be required in the future for buildings or equipment installation, the site will need to be cleared of the septic fields, tight tanks, and other wastewater features, as well foundations. Filling, grading, and some landscaping could occur over a foundation wall and floor that has been pushed in on itself and used as fill if future earth work is not anticipated.

PROPERTIES SHOULD BE EVALUATED AND TREATED BEFORE DEMOLITION

- Determination of demolition vs. deconstruction – The quality and quantity of wood, copper piping, or other materials should be assessed to estimate whether it may be worth it to deconstruct the building partially or fully. The deconstruction process costs more in labor and time, but may produce revenue that exceeds the additional costs.
- Assessment of hazardous materials – Seasonal properties are less likely to have hazardous materials such as pipe and other insulation than year round properties. Some shingles were noted that may include asbestos. Any of these materials will need to be removed by licensed professionals before demolition

PRE-DEMOLITION ACTIVITIES

- Strip and Clean – buildings will need to have all the appliances and fixtures removed
- Shut off water and power in coordination with utilities
- Disconnect sewer lines
- Remove oil and/or propane tanks

⁷ www.deconstructioninstitute.com, and consultation with Jeff Richon, at G. H. Richon Co., and Joe Ginn, of Northern Essex Ltd.

PROJECTED REVENUE

Rentals

An ad-hoc group of the Conomo Point Planning Commission has recommended a rental rate equal to 3%-5% of the assessed value of the land for any new leases for properties on Conomo Point after the 2011 deadline.⁸ When the assessed land values are increased to 100% of assessment (corrected for the 30% abatement and deleting the land assessments that were less than the value of a residential lot), the average rent based on 3% of land values is \$14,462.

Many other factors can impact this analysis, such as whether the landlord or tenant pays for the variety of necessary services, such as utilities. The fact that on NCP the improvements are owned by the tenant creates a greater responsibility for maintenance of the property overall and should lead to a comparable reduction in rent levels.

This analysis has reviewed market conditions in areas similar to Northern Conomo Point with current market information provided by Coldwell Banker. This information was used to estimate market rental rates for future rental of land by the Town to the leaseholders. The most similar rental properties were found on Eagle Hill in Ipswich, an area with a clambers' landing and small boat launch area surrounded by small residential properties on relatively small parcels, and most residences with views of the saltmarsh and water. Five homes were for rent in the area during May 2010. ***These properties showed that the proportion of the total value of the parcel attributable to the land runs from 57% to 81%, but averages 70%.*** Applying the proportion of assessed value of land to the monthly rent and then annualizing it, establishes annual rents for the land. As a result of this analysis, ***the annual rent for land for these five parcels averages \$16,736***, running from a low of \$13,320 to a high of \$21,384. All of these lots are generally small – around .1 to .2 acres.

Following the methodology of Petersen-LaChance to reduce rents for a seasonal property to 75% of the value of a year-round property, **the average seasonal rent could be estimated to be \$12,552 for NCP properties (75% of \$16,736).**

It is important to note that with typical market rentals the landlord provides ongoing maintenance of the building and grounds, and makes capital improvements to the buildings. It has not yet been determined how long the leases would be on Northern Conomo Point, and how and by whom the buildings would be maintained. The "market rent" could justifiably be discounted if the leaseholder is responsible for maintenance and capital improvements.

While the discounted market rent may represent a more careful assessment than a straight "3% of assessed value of the land", the 3% approach does take into account the significant differences in the current assessed value of the land areas being leased, and therefore is more useful in determining the costs and benefits in keeping specific properties as leased properties. As a result, for the purposes of this study, the "3% of unabated assessed land value" has been used to approximate market rate rents.

Regardless of the methodology for determining rents, it is clear that the costs for leasing the properties at Northern Conomo Point will rise significantly for the leaseholders. One option to ease the transition and stabilize the property might be to phase in the increase in rents from the current rents to market

⁸ Essex "Chowder Group" report to CPPC on lease terms, March 17, 2010.

rate over the next five years. The increase in rents could be generally evenly divided to apply over the five year phase-in.

LONG BEACH, ROCKPORT

The most comparable property to Northern Conomo Point is the Long Beach area of Rockport. Long Beach is a densely developed barrier beach owned by the Town of Rockport. The seasonal cottages are served by a Town water line and a public sewer line running to the City of Gloucester waste treatment plant.

All leases on Long Beach are for ten years terminating on December 31, 2013. As a result, rental rates on these lots experience the same market constraints as do lots on Northern Conomo Point. Rental rates are pegged to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) in December of the preceding year. The CPI is not particularly reflective of local real estate values and changes. In the current economy it may be more so, but for most of the last decade real estate value has increased far faster than the CPI. **For 2010, all sites with direct ocean views have land rents of \$2,401.68/year, while the sites back one row from the beach front rent for \$1,486.75/year.**

Some of the properties on **Northern Conomo Point** have views comparable to the direct ocean views of Long Beach in Rockport. Many are more comparable to the sites with restricted views. On NCP **rents this year vary little whether the properties are year-round or seasonal, with year-round properties showing an average rent of \$1,270.38, and seasonal properties showing an average rent of \$1,113.54.**

Using the Rockport data for Long Beach to estimate market rents for NCP would not likely result in a significant change in the lease rates from existing rates for certain properties. For example, \$2,500 would be the approximate rent for properties with a high view value.

Sales

In order to estimate market value for sale of properties on Northern Conomo Point, this analysis reviewed the appraisal for Southern Conomo Point⁹ as well as comparable properties in other areas. This information is covered in Table A-2. Although the only sale included in the Scenarios presented is for the Robbins Island properties, an analysis of potential revenue generated from sale of all lots is provided herein for reference should the Town decide to consider other options. The sales analysis compares projected sales values using two different estimation methods and also presents differences between seasonal and year-round uses.

SOUTHERN CONOMO POINT APPRAISAL

Petersen/LaChance estimated the sale value per lot for all properties on SCP. The SCP appraisal assumed a sale of all of the land to one buyer who would then install or upgrade the necessary services for the newly subdivided site. This SCP appraisal included:

- Analysis of recent house and lot sale data for lots in Essex and the surrounding area, comparing lot size and other key parcel characteristics

⁹ Prepared by Petersen/LaChance Realty Advisors April 30, 2009.

- Analyses of sales of seasonal and year round properties in similar areas. Most sales were on Little Neck in Ipswich which has a longer rental season by one month. It was estimated on Little Neck that the sale price of a seasonal property is roughly 75% of that of a year-round property.
- Capitalized weekly seasonal rental rates (weekly rentals could be allowed or prohibited in any cottages on Northern Conomo Point)
- Each lot's share of the gross estimated revenue from the sale of the entire parcel
- Potential growth in values which were found to be flat, and assumed flat through 2010
- Absorption of the sales over time (Essex might set a time limit to require purchase or commitment to a lease)
- Expense estimates for hard costs of developing the site and the soft costs of making it market-ready, including sales expenses, legal costs, survey and engineering, resolution of sewage disposal issues, and others.

Lots that were most similar to lots on Northern Conomo Point were reviewed for their estimates. The lots on NCP are smaller and are largely seasonal. A total of 24 of the cottages in SCP were on lots of less than 12,000 square feet. The 19 seasonal properties had a range in value from \$112,000 to \$168,000 (averaging \$124,737 per lot.) The 5 year-round properties had little variation in estimate, and averaged \$159,000 per lot.

In order to generate parcel specific information for sales on Robbins Island and Northern Conomo Point, the average projected sale price of \$123,000 was proportionally applied to parcels in question based on their variance from the average value for all properties. This information is reflected in Table A-2.

MARKET ANALYSIS FOR NORTHERN CONOMO POINT

For Northern Conomo Point, Community Investment Associates reviewed sales of similar properties in the area from January 1, 2009 through April 9, 2009, comparing the actual sale prices to the appraised value of the parcels. Of the 22 properties listed, 12 had been sold. Of these, 4 were located on Little Neck in Ipswich – properties on land leased by the Feoffees of the Grammar School, a trust established in the 1600's to support the costs of schools in Ipswich. **The average assessed value of these lots was \$245,000.** The comparison of sale price to assessed value varied greatly, with some sale values in considerable excess of the appraised value, and others being considerably less. Overall, the assessed value of the land only for these comparable sales averaged 66% of the assessed value of the entire parcel.

Community Investment Associates also reviewed sales of all properties in Essex from January 1, 2009 through April 9, 2010. The sales averaged 94% of the assessed values. None of these sales included cottages on Conomo Point. One way of estimating the sale price of land on NCP would be to **apply the 94% to the assessed value of the land for each lot.** This methodology is included in Table A-2. If year-round properties were restricted to seasonal use the land value was estimated to be 75% of existing. This is also shown in Table A-2.

REAL ESTATE EXPENSES

Broker's commission, should the Town decide to sell the land through a realtor, would be around 4-5% of the purchase price.

Table A-2: Two Methods for Projecting Sales of Parcels Included in Northern Conomo Point, with Values for Current Ownership and Seasonal Only

MAP	LOT	Owner's Name	Location	Unabated Land Value	Model 1	Model 2			
					Projected Sale Value (SCP Appraisal)	Projected Sale Value (.94 Assessed Value)	Unabated Land Value - All Seasonal	Projected Sale Value Unabated - Restricted to Seasonal (.94 AV)	
19	65	RETTBERG, RICHARD D &	30 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$315,286	\$100,687	\$296,369	\$315,286	\$296,369	
19	66	CALDER, DAVID A &	34 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$512,429	\$163,646	\$481,683	\$512,429	\$481,683	
19	67	DENTON, RICHARD &	34A ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$519,000	\$165,744	\$487,860	\$519,000	\$487,860	
19	68	MACDOUGALL, STEPHEN C &	36 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$514,429	\$164,284	\$483,563	\$514,429	\$483,563	
19	69	CLARK, PETER B &	38 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$586,286	\$187,232	\$551,109	\$586,286	\$551,109	
19	70	PRATT, JUDSON &	40 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$590,857	\$188,692	\$555,406	\$443,143	\$416,554	
19	71	RIGGS, JUDITH R	42 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$600,571	\$191,794	\$564,537	\$450,429	\$423,403	
19	72	SACHSSE, NANCY L	44 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$600,857	\$191,886	\$564,806	\$600,857	\$564,806	
19	73	RYAN, JAMES E JR &	46 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$623,143	\$199,003	\$585,754	\$467,357	\$439,316	
19	75	RIGGS, JUDITH R	43 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$116,000	\$37,045	\$109,040	\$116,000	\$109,040	
19	76	KING, ROGER H	41 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$515,286	\$164,558	\$484,369	\$515,286	\$484,369	
19	77	ROMANO, JOSEPH	29 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$316,857	\$101,189	\$297,846	\$316,857	\$297,846	
19	78	KING, ROGER H	25 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$525,714	\$167,888	\$494,171	\$394,286	\$370,629	
19	79	FRYOU, CHARLENE &	1 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$315,286	\$100,687	\$296,369	\$315,286	\$296,369	
19	81	AVERAY, JOANNE	39 MIDDLE RD	\$411,571	\$131,437	\$386,877	\$411,571	\$386,877	
19	82	DAVIS, JANET P TRUSTEE	2 CONOMO LN	\$343,143	\$109,584	\$322,554	\$343,143	\$322,554	
19	83	SPUNT, JEANNE L	4 CONOMO LN	\$338,286	\$108,033	\$317,989	\$253,714	\$238,491	
19	84	ELDRIDGE, CHARLOTTE SPINTIG	8 CONOMO LN	\$348,286	\$111,226	\$327,389	\$261,214	\$245,541	
19	85	WEBBER, WILLIAM	187 CONOMO POINT RD	\$608,286	\$194,258	\$571,789	\$456,214	\$428,841	
19	86	MAZZARINO, MARTHA	114 CONOMO POINT RD	\$611,286	\$195,216	\$574,609	\$458,464	\$430,956	
19	88	MARSOLAIS, ROBERT L	110 CONOMO POINT RD	\$433,857	\$138,554	\$407,826	\$325,393	\$305,869	
19	89	SISK, ROBERT A &	CONOMO POINT RD	\$1,571	\$502	\$1,477	\$1,571	\$1,477	
19	91	SISK, ROBERT A &	115 CONOMO POINT RD	\$690,143	\$220,399	\$648,734	\$690,143	\$648,734	
19	92	SMITH, ELEANOR M	111 CONOMO POINT RD	\$681,000	\$217,479	\$640,140	\$681,000	\$640,140	
19	93	TRUE, KRISTINE OLSEN	109 CONOMO POINT RD	\$710,571	\$226,923	\$667,937	\$710,571	\$667,937	
19	95	BARRON, MELVIN M &	11 BEACH CIRCLE	\$715,000	\$228,337	\$672,100	\$715,000	\$672,100	
19	96	ADAMS, THAYER	9 BEACH CIRCLE	\$690,143	\$220,399	\$648,734	\$690,143	\$648,734	
19	97	HULL, JONATHAN B &	105 CONOMO POINT RD	\$315,286	\$100,687	\$296,369	\$236,464	\$222,276	
19	98	MAUCERI, ROBERT J	103 CONOMO POINT RD	\$318,571	\$101,737	\$299,457	\$318,571	\$299,457	
19	99	DESCENZA, ALFRED J &	7 BEACH CIRCLE	\$669,429	\$213,784	\$629,263	\$502,071	\$471,947	
19	100	TRUE, JOHN G &	5 BEACH CIRCLE	\$671,714	\$214,514	\$631,411	\$503,786	\$473,559	
19	101	LUNT, MARILYN ET AL	3 BEACH CIRCLE	\$345,143	\$110,222	\$324,434	\$345,143	\$324,434	
19	102	MEARS, WALTER G & EVELYN	101 CONOMO POINT RD	\$519,143	\$165,790	\$487,994	\$389,357	\$365,996	
24	1	HARTLEY, STEPHEN &	11 CONOMO LN	\$513,714	\$164,056	\$482,891	\$513,714	\$482,891	
24	2	LANE, MARJORIE	9 CONOMO LN	\$132,714	\$42,383	\$124,751	\$132,714	\$124,751	
24	3	COLLINS, PAUL J &	31 MIDDLE RD	\$585,714	\$187,050	\$550,571	\$585,714	\$550,571	
24	4	JONES, JAMES C &	29 MIDDLE RD	\$601,857	\$192,205	\$565,746	\$601,857	\$565,746	
24	5	LANE, MARJORIE	179 CONOMO POINT RD	\$533,429	\$170,352	\$501,423	\$533,429	\$501,423	
24	7	MEARS, DAVID A	175 CONOMO POINT RD	\$518,571	\$165,607	\$487,457	\$388,929	\$365,593	
24	8	MEARS, DAVID A	173 CONOMO POINT RD	\$209,571	\$66,927	\$196,997	\$209,571	\$196,997	
24	9	EARL, SEFTON	171 CONOMO POINT RD	\$514,571	\$164,330	\$483,697	\$514,571	\$483,697	
24	10	COAKLEY, RALPH &	169 CONOMO POINT RD	\$519,714	\$165,972	\$488,531	\$519,714	\$488,531	
24	11	MURPHY, MARION L TRUSTEE	167 CONOMO POINT RD	\$519,714	\$165,972	\$488,531	\$519,714	\$488,531	
24	12	WALKER, NINA & EDWIN	165 CONOMO POINT RD	\$1,571	\$502	\$1,477	\$1,571	\$1,477	
24	13	RIDGE, CHARLES K & JAMES LANE	163 CONOMO POINT RD	\$208,000	\$66,425	\$195,520	\$208,000	\$195,520	
24	14	CONOMO POINT ASSOCIATION	161 CONOMO POINT RD	\$430,714	\$137,550	\$404,871	\$430,714	\$404,871	
24	15A	LERoyer, JEAN C TRUSTEE	159 CONOMO POINT RD	\$75,571	\$24,134	\$71,037	\$75,571	\$71,037	
24	15B	WENDELL, DOROTHEA R TRUSTEE	159 CONOMO POINT RD	\$2,143	\$684	\$2,014	\$2,143	\$2,014	
24	16	EMERSON, J H COMPANY	155 CONOMO POINT RD	\$170,286	\$54,381	\$160,069	\$170,286	\$160,069	
24	17	RAFFERTY, CARRIE R	153 CONOMO POINT RD	\$682,571	\$217,981	\$641,617	\$682,571	\$641,617	
24	18	RICHARDSON, FRANKLIN T &	154 CONOMO POINT RD	\$610,571	\$194,988	\$573,937	\$457,929	\$430,453	
24	19	WENDELL, DOROTHEA P TRUSTEE	1 MIDDLE RD	\$523,429	\$167,159	\$492,023	\$523,429	\$492,023	
24	20	WENDELL, DOROTHEA R TRUSTEE	162 CONOMO POINT RD	\$205,571	\$65,650	\$193,237	\$205,571	\$193,237	
24	21	WALKER, NINA & EDWIN	166 CONOMO POINT RD	\$496,714	\$158,627	\$466,911	\$496,714	\$466,911	
24	22	WOODWARD, JOAN GOLDSBERRY	168 CONOMO POINT RD	\$133,143	\$42,520	\$125,154	\$133,143	\$125,154	
24	23	WOODWARD, JOAN GOLDSBERRY	123,857	\$7,619	\$22,426	\$23,857	\$23,857	\$22,426	
24	24	HERRMANN, JOAN BROWN	172 CONOMO POINT RD	\$526,857	\$168,253	\$495,246	\$526,857	\$495,246	
24	25	DAVIS, JANET P TRUSTEE	CONOMO POINT	\$11,143	\$3,559	\$10,474	\$11,143	\$10,474	
24	27	ROWE, WALLACE H III/CAROL RO	25 MIDDLE RD	\$414,714	\$132,440	\$389,831	\$414,714	\$389,831	
24	28	SMITH, CLINTON B &	23 MIDDLE RD	\$411,000	\$131,254	\$386,340	\$411,000	\$386,340	
24	29	HOLLERAN, GERALD C & GERALD C	21 MIDDLE RD	\$435,857	\$139,192	\$409,706	\$435,857	\$409,706	
24	30	MACGRATH, HILARY QUEEN &	19 MIDDLE RD	\$419,143	\$133,855	\$393,994	\$419,143	\$393,994	
24	31	LEMCKE, NANCY B &	17 MIDDLE RD	\$422,143	\$134,813	\$396,814	\$422,143	\$396,814	
24	32	CUTHBERTSON, ALAN W TRUSTEE	15 MIDDLE RD	\$422,143	\$134,813	\$396,814	\$422,143	\$396,814	
24	33	WOODWARD, JOAN GOLDSBERRY	11 MIDDLE RD	\$422,143	\$134,813	\$396,814	\$422,143	\$396,814	
24	34	LANE, JAMES B L	9 MIDDLE RD	\$422,143	\$134,813	\$396,814	\$422,143	\$396,814	
24	35	LANE, JAMES	144 CONOMO POINT RD	\$614,143	\$196,128	\$577,294	\$460,607	\$432,971	
24	36	CROSSEN, BETTY ANN REVOCABLE	142 CONOMO POINT RD	\$602,286	\$192,342	\$566,149	\$451,714	\$424,611	
24	37	FOLEY, JUDITH H	138 CONOMO POINT RD	\$599,286	\$191,384	\$563,329	\$449,464	\$422,496	
24	38	CUSHING, SARAH R	136 CONOMO POINT RD	\$584,571	\$186,685	\$549,497	\$438,429	\$412,123	
24	39	HEALY, BRIAN & MARILYN RANKE	134 CONOMO POINT RD	\$582,714	\$186,092	\$547,751	\$582,714	\$547,751	
24	41	WENDELL, DAVID R TRUSTEE	130 CONOMO POINT RD	\$601,857	\$192,205	\$565,746	\$601,857	\$565,746	
24	42	HATFIELD MARGARET/FRANK HAR	126 CONOMO POINT RD	\$603,857	\$192,844	\$567,626	\$603,857	\$567,626	
24	43	DAVIS, JANET P TRUSTEE	124 CONOMO POINT RD	\$601,429	\$192,068	\$565,343	\$601,429	\$565,343	
24	44	LERoyer, JEAN C TRUSTEE	122 CONOMO POINT RD	\$597,143	\$190,699	\$561,314	\$597,143	\$561,314	
24	45	MAHER, LEAH	120 CONOMO POINT RD	\$599,286	\$191,384	\$563,329	\$599,286	\$563,329	
				AVERAGE	\$450,414	\$153,567	\$423,390		
				TOTAL SALES PROJECTION	\$34,182,000	\$10,916,127	\$32,131,080	\$31,585,679	\$29,690,538
				Subtotal Robbins Island	\$6,855,000	\$2,124,337	\$6,443,700	\$6,066,929	\$5,884,669

ASSUMPTIONS:

.94 is the ratio of value of property sales in Essex to total assessed value of those properties sold between January 2009 and April 9, 2010.
 The Peterson/LaChance appraisal for Southern Conomo Point estimated the average retail lot value for a sell-out of \$153,567 based on total sale price of \$6,296,250. Individual lots on NCP were projected based on their percentage difference of the lot value from the average assessed value.
 The Peterson/LaChance appraisal estimated an average value of \$126,530 for seasonal lots, and \$195,938 for year-round lots. The \$126,530 average could be used to generate yet another possible scenario for sale of lots as all seasonal property.
 The AVERAGES do not include the very low outlier values below \$25,000.
 Based on all properties being sold as seasonal only. All existing year-round units were converted to seasonal units by reducing the value to 75% of current value.

Factors Impacting Sales and Rental Rates for Northern Conomo Point

As a result of the review of the various sources of information identified above, the factors that affect market price for sale or rent of lots on Northern Conomo Point include improvements made by the tenants (the number of bedrooms and the condition of the waste water disposal system), the location of the lot, and whether the Town has approved the building for year-round use or seasonal use.

The inflating real estate market in recent years has occurred largely as a response to the scarcity of land with valuable views and locations, and not as much to the increasing value of the buildings. The benefits of these increasing land values have been reflected in the assessed value of the land, but primarily in the inflated sale value of the property. In other words, the value of the land owned by the town is captured by the leaseholder when buildings and leaseholds are sold on Northern Conomo Point.

Number of Bedrooms

Buildings with more bedrooms are more valuable in the subsequent resale of the building along with the right to rent the lot associated with the building.

Valuing the View

The quality of the view is factored into rentals rates for properties in Long Beach. The rentals with a secondary view are rented at a rate that is about 62% of the rent of the sites with a primary view. Older appraisals for Little Neck in Ipswich included 5 or 6 levels of view quality assigned to each parcel.

Condition of the Wastewater System

The condition of the existing systems and their compliance with state wastewater regulations will affect both the rental rates of individual properties as well as the future sale value.

Seasonal/Year Round Use of Site

Lots that are permitted for year-round use will likely have a higher rental value. This would also impact the sales value.

Taxes

PROPERTY TAXES

Under the proposed renegotiation of the lease terms, leaseholders would continue to be responsible for paying taxes on both the land and the buildings. The Town currently provides a 30% abatement on the assessed value of the land. Removal of this abatement would increase the property tax value by 43% from existing value.¹⁰

BUILDING VALUES

Assessing the Value of Buildings on Northern Conomo Point

To date the Town has assessed the value of the buildings based on standard assessing procedures. The Town may want to consider including the following factors in the consideration of assessed value:

¹⁰ The CPPC voted on October 7, 2010 to recommend that any consideration of future leasing of the properties on Northern Conomo Point retain the 30% abatement (70% of assessed land value) on property taxes.

- Contribution of the building to the rental value of the land;
- Contribution to the character of the neighborhood, including the historic value and style of the buildings;
- Impact on the development costs of the site, including waste water issues;
- Costs for maintenance of the building.

CHANGE FROM EXISTING LEASE ARRANGEMENT

The financial impact of the changes in rental and tax rates will be significant. For example, for a property where the house is currently valued at about \$150,000 and the land valued at \$415,000 and abated by 30%, the leaseholder is paying a rent of \$755, and taxes of about \$5,500. With the transition to market conditions and the elimination of the abatement on land values, the rent could rise to approximately \$12,500 and the taxes to \$7,100. In sum, the total expenses for the seasonal property, would rise from approximately \$6,255 to \$19,600.

Costs Not Factored into the Analysis

INSURANCE

If the Town became the default owner for any buildings left by the tenants, it would become necessary for the Town to obtain liability insurance for these properties. This is difficult to estimate without more specifics on the individual properties and would also be dependant on which properties were re-leased or not.

LEGAL COSTS

Legal services would be required for real estate transactions, preparation of new lease terms, and resolution of any potential legal actions. Legal costs are a consideration for any redevelopment of the Point, but could vary widely depending on the circumstances of the transition. The Petersen/LaChance Real Estate Appraisal estimated this cost at \$750/lot for Southern Conomo Point.

SEWER IMPROVEMENTS

Costs for sewage disposal improvements will be dependent on how many and which properties continue to be leased. Engineering and design work will be required for any changes in the way wastewater is disposed.

Massachusetts DEP Regulations related to wastewater

Title 5 regulations only come into play when the site (under single ownership) produces less than 10,000 GPD. As long as the site produces more than 10,000 GPD it must obtain a Groundwater Discharge Permit. At present Northern Conomo Point is estimated to produce more than 10,000 GPD of wastewater discharge. As the site does not have the capacity to handle that amount of discharge, it is unlikely that DEP would grant a discharge permit.

For individually-owned properties that discharge less than 10,000 GPD, Title 5 compliance can be met through conventional septic systems, innovative/alternative technology approvals, shared systems and variances. All properties must achieve "maximum feasible compliance." This means that wherever feasible, a failed system must be upgraded to full compliance with Title 5.

If an upgrade to full compliance is not possible, in many instances the local Board of Health is authorized to approve a Local Upgrade Approval that brings the system as close to full compliance as possible in accordance with certain minimum criteria.

One option that has been considered by some of the tenants on Northern Conomo Point are “tight tanks.” Tight tanks are similar to septic tanks, except that they have no outlet and must be pumped out at regular intervals. **Title 5 strongly discourages the use of tight tanks, but they are allowed in situations where an existing system has failed and there is no other feasible alternative.** Tight tanks are not allowed for new construction or increases in design flow.

An innovative/alternative (I/A) system is any septic system or part of one that is not designed or constructed in a way consistent with a conventional Title 5 system. A conventional system has a septic tank, a distribution box or dosing mechanism, a soil absorption system (SAS) and a reserve area. Some examples of alternative systems are recirculating sand filters, aerobic treatment units, Wisconsin mounds, peat filters, humus/composting toilets, and intermittent sand filters. Recirculating sand filters and humus/composting toilets are specifically approved for general use by Title 5, subject to certain conditions. MassDEP has issued many approvals and certifications for I/A technologies, and new technologies are under review on an ongoing basis.

OTHER ENGINEERING COSTS

Any improvements to the roads or seawall at Northern Conomo Point would likely need to occur regardless of what the Town decides to do in the future. Without an assessment by a qualified engineer, this cost would be difficult to estimate.

BEACH MANAGEMENT

The Conomo Point beaches are located in mud flats along a tidal river. Weather and tides change these beaches each year. Although there was some public discussion about adding sand to these beaches (particularly Clammers Beach) to make them more desirable as a public beach, this type of renourishment is highly regulated in Massachusetts (and most coastal communities). The regulations make it unlikely and also costly to consider beach nourishment as an option for Northern Conomo Point.

MA DEP Beach Nourishment Guidelines

Proponents of beach nourishment projects in Massachusetts are required to determine beach conditions and stability, characterize the physical and chemical properties of the material to be dredged, as well as the physical properties of the material on the receiving beach.

The most important factors for beach nourishment projects are matching the grain size of the sand and the location of the project in relation to sensitive coastal environments.

Additional permits are required in all tidal and wetland areas.

A beach nourishment monitoring and maintenance plan is required for all projects to ensure that the added material is functioning as the native beach has functioned.

Long-term Fiscal Impact

Whatever the Town decides, any redevelopment of Northern Conomo Point will likely be implemented over a number of years. To understand how costs and revenues might be distributed over a period of time, the fiscal assessment projected costs and revenues over a ten-year period. This analysis is only useful for comparison purposes as an accurate projection would require a more detailed analysis of inflation rates, appraisal on the specific parcels in question, the future housing market, and trends in labor and supply costs.

Scenario 1 projects to generate approximately \$1 million in net income over a ten-year time frame. This exceeds the extension of current revenues and additional expenses by about 100%.

Scenarios 2A and 2B have roughly the same costs for development of park facilities, and the same projected revenue from improvements to and leasing of a community building. Each maintains leasing of a different set of properties, based on maximizing either revenue or desirability of land for public use. In both cases, it is projected that there will be adequate revenue to cover the costs of recreational development in all years included.

Scenario 3 leaves no leased property to generate revenue and has the highest projected costs for park development. In addition, it removes approximately \$500,000/year in annual Town revenue.

Table A-3 -- 10-Year Projection Scenario 1

SCENARIO 1

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
Revenue										
Rent (unabated)	\$ 976,376	\$ 976,376	\$ 976,376	\$ 1,036,138	\$ 1,036,138	\$ 1,036,138	\$ 1,099,558	\$ 1,099,558	\$ 1,099,558	\$ 1,166,859
Rent (abated)	\$ 683,463	\$ 683,463	\$ 683,463	\$ 725,296	\$ 725,296	\$ 725,296	\$ 769,690	\$ 769,690	\$ 769,690	\$ 816,802
Property tax (unabated)	\$ 500,039	\$ 510,040	\$ 520,241	\$ 530,646	\$ 541,259	\$ 552,084	\$ 563,125	\$ 574,388	\$ 585,876	\$ 597,593
Property tax (abated)	\$ 377,016	\$ 384,556	\$ 392,247	\$ 400,092	\$ 408,094	\$ 416,256	\$ 424,581	\$ 433,073	\$ 441,734	\$ 450,569
Projected Total Revenue (high)	\$ 1,476,415	\$ 1,486,416	\$ 1,496,617	\$ 1,566,783	\$ 1,577,396	\$ 1,588,221	\$ 1,662,683	\$ 1,673,946	\$ 1,685,433	\$ 1,764,453
Projected Total Revenue (low)	\$ 1,060,479	\$ 1,068,019	\$ 1,075,710	\$ 1,125,389	\$ 1,133,391	\$ 1,141,552	\$ 1,194,272	\$ 1,202,763	\$ 1,211,425	\$ 1,267,371
Expenses										
Park and infrastructure improvements			\$ 190,200							
Removal of outbuildings		\$ 104,000								
Site survey and engineering		\$ 30,000								
Provide seasonal restrooms Management & maintenance	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,212	\$ 1,224	\$ 1,236	\$ 1,249	\$ 1,261	\$ 1,274	\$ 1,287	\$ 1,299	\$ 1,312
				\$ 12,450	\$ 12,575	\$ 12,700	\$ 12,827	\$ 12,956	\$ 13,085	\$ 13,216
Projected Total Expenses	\$ 1,200	\$ 135,212	\$ 191,424	\$ 13,686	\$ 13,823	\$ 13,961	\$ 14,101	\$ 14,242	\$ 14,385	\$ 14,528

Assumptions:

Rent -- All residential buildings to remain, rent estimated to be 3% of assessed value. Projected to increase every 3 years. Shown with abated and unabated assessed land value.

Property tax -- based on 2010 taxes for residential properties with and without the 30% abatement and inflated by 2% based on increase in total residential assessed value in Essex of 3% from 2007-2010, and predictions by several sources that the low point in home values has been reached

Engineering / survey costs -- Scheduled to occur in advance of other site improvements

Park and infrastructure improvements -- park, boat ramps, parking scheduled to occur in Year 3

Management and maintenance -- start after other improvements have been made (annual costs of upkeep), projected 1% annual increase

Table A-4 -- 10-Year Projection Scenario 2A

SCENARIO 2 - Option A

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
Revenue										
Rent (unabated)	\$503,601	\$503,601	\$503,601	\$545,114	\$545,114	\$545,114	\$567,137	\$567,137	\$567,137	\$601,850
Rent (abated)	\$364,683	\$364,683	\$364,683	\$381,580	\$381,580	\$381,580	\$396,996	\$396,996	\$396,996	\$421,295
Property tax (unabated)	\$263,464	\$268,733	\$274,108	\$279,590	\$285,182	\$290,885	\$296,703	\$302,637	\$308,690	\$314,863
Property tax (abated)	\$200,010	\$204,010	\$208,090	\$212,252	\$216,497	\$220,827	\$225,244	\$229,748	\$234,343	\$239,030
TOTAL Rent and Taxes (high)	\$767,065	\$772,334	\$777,709	\$824,704	\$830,296	\$836,000	\$863,840	\$869,774	\$875,827	\$916,714
TOTAL Rent and Taxes (low)	\$564,693	\$568,693	\$572,773	\$593,832	\$598,077	\$602,407	\$622,240	\$626,744	\$631,339	\$660,326
Revenue from public facility				\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000
Projected Total Revenue (high)	\$767,065	\$772,334	\$777,709	\$834,704	\$840,296	\$846,000	\$873,840	\$879,774	\$885,827	\$926,714
Projected Total Revenue (low)	\$564,693	\$568,693	\$572,773	\$603,832	\$608,077	\$612,407	\$632,240	\$636,744	\$641,339	\$670,326
Expenses										
Park and infrastructure improvements			\$292,925							
Removal of bldgs designated		\$614,000								
Site survey and engineering		\$30,000								
Provide seasonal restrooms Management & maintenance	\$1,200	\$1,212	\$1,224	\$1,236	\$1,249	\$1,261	\$1,274	\$1,287	\$1,299	\$1,312
				\$23,285	\$23,518	\$23,753	\$23,991	\$24,230	\$24,473	\$24,717
Projected Total Expenses	\$1,200	\$645,212	\$294,149	\$24,521	\$24,767	\$25,014	\$25,264	\$25,517	\$25,772	\$26,030

Assumptions:

Rent- 28 buildings to remain, rent estimated to be 3% of assessed value. Projected to increase every 3 years. Shown with abated and unabated assessed land value.

Property tax -- based on 2010 taxes for residential properties with and without the 30% abatement and inflated by 2% based on increase in total

residential assessed value in Essex of 3% from 2007-2010, and predictions by several sources that the low point in home values has been reached

Public Facility -- small community building, estimated revenue projected as an average (to account for variations in seasonal use)

Engineering / survey costs -- Scheduled to occur in advance of other site improvements

Park and infrastructure improvements -- park, boat ramps, parking, community facility scheduled to occur in Year 3

Management and maintenance -- start after other improvements have been made (annual costs of upkeep), projected 1% annual increase

Table A-5 -- 10-Year Projection Scenario 2B

SCENARIO 2 - Option B

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
REVENUES										
Rent (unabated)	\$588,776	\$632,970	\$632,970	\$460,902	\$460,952	\$460,952	\$489,113	\$489,166	\$489,166	\$519,051
Rent (abated)	\$412,143	\$443,079	\$443,079	\$322,632	\$322,632	\$322,632	\$342,379	\$342,379	\$342,379	\$363,336
Property tax (unabated)	\$228,496	\$233,066	\$237,727	\$242,482	\$247,331	\$252,278	\$257,323	\$262,470	\$267,719	\$273,074
Property tax (abated)	\$173,772	\$177,247	\$180,792	\$184,408	\$188,096	\$191,858	\$195,695	\$199,609	\$203,601	\$207,673
Total Rent and Taxes (high)	\$817,271	\$866,036	\$870,697	\$703,384	\$708,284	\$713,230	\$746,437	\$751,636	\$756,886	\$792,125
Total Rent and Taxes (low)	\$585,915	\$620,326	\$623,871	\$507,039	\$510,728	\$514,490	\$538,074	\$541,988	\$545,980	\$571,009
Sale of RI				\$3,798,720						
Revenue from public facility				\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000
Projected Total Revenue (high)	\$817,271	\$866,036	\$870,697	\$4,519,104	\$725,284	\$730,230	\$763,437	\$768,636	\$773,886	\$809,125
Projected Total Revenue (low)	\$585,915	\$620,326	\$623,871	\$4,322,759	\$527,728	\$531,490	\$555,074	\$558,988	\$562,980	\$588,009
EXPENSES										
Park and infrastructure improvements			\$434,525							
Removal of bldgs designated		\$464,000								
Site survey and engineering		\$30,000								
Provide seasonal restrooms	\$1,200	\$1,212	\$1,224	\$1,236	\$1,249	\$1,261	\$1,274	\$1,287	\$1,299	\$1,312
Management & maintenance				\$27,375	\$27,649	\$27,925	\$28,204	\$28,487	\$28,771	\$29,059
Projected Total Expenses	\$1,200	\$495,212	\$435,749	\$28,611	\$28,897	\$29,186	\$29,478	\$29,773	\$30,071	\$30,372

Assumptions:

Rent- 28 buildings to remain, rent estimated to be 3% of assessed value. Projected to increase every 3 years. Shown with abated and unabated assessed land value.

Property tax -- based on 2010 taxes for residential properties with and without 30% abatement and inflated by 2% based on increase in total residential assessed value in Essex of 3% from 2007-2010, and predictions by several sources that the low point in home values has been reached

Public Facility -- estimated revenue projected as an average (to account for variations in seasonal use)

Engineering / survey costs -- Scheduled to occur in advance of other site improvements

Park and infrastructure improvements -- park, boat ramps, parking, community facility scheduled to occur in Year 3

Management and maintenance -- start after other improvements have been made (annual costs of upkeep), projected 1% annual increase

Sale of Robbins Island -- net minus real-estate fees

Table A-6 -- 10-Year Projection Scenario 3

SCENARIO 3 (w/ Option 2B)

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
REVENUE										
Sale of Robbins Island Property Tax (Robbins Island) unabated				\$3,798,720						
Property Tax (Robbins Island) abated	\$ 76,367	\$ 77,894	\$ 79,452	\$ 81,041	\$ 82,662	\$ 84,315	\$ 86,002	\$ 87,722	\$ 89,476	\$ 91,266
Revenue from public facility	\$ 56,905	\$ 58,043	\$ 59,204	\$ 60,388	\$ 61,596	\$ 62,828	\$ 64,085	\$ 65,366	\$ 66,674	\$ 68,007
				\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$17,000
Projected Total Revenue high	\$76,367	\$77,894	\$79,452	\$3,896,761	\$99,662	\$101,315	\$103,002	\$104,722	\$106,476	\$108,266
Projected Total Revenue low	\$56,905	\$58,043	\$59,204	\$3,876,108	\$78,596	\$79,828	\$81,085	\$82,366	\$83,674	\$85,007
EXPENSES										
Park and infrastructure improvements			\$624,725							
Removal of bldgs designated		\$1,146,000								
Site survey and engineering		\$30,000								
Provide seasonal restrooms	\$1,200	\$1,212	\$1,224	\$1,236	\$1,249	\$1,261	\$1,274	\$1,287	\$1,299	\$1,312
Management & maintenance				\$27,375	\$27,649	\$27,925	\$28,204	\$28,487	\$28,771	\$29,059
Projected Total Expenses	\$1,200	\$1,177,212	\$625,949	\$28,611	\$28,897	\$29,186	\$29,478	\$29,773	\$30,071	\$30,372

Assumptions:

Property tax -- based on 2010 taxes for properties to remain with and without 30% abatement and inflated by 2% based on increase in total residential assessed value in Essex of 3% from 2007-2010, and predictions by several sources that the low point in home values has been reached

Public Facility -- estimated revenue projected as an average (to account for variations in seasonal use), public facility described in Scenario 2B

Engineering / survey costs -- Scheduled to occur in advance of other site improvements

Park and infrastructure improvements -- park, boat ramps, parking, community facility scheduled to occur in Year 3, based on improvements from Scenario 2B

Management and maintenance -- start after other improvements have been made (annual costs of upkeep), projected 1% annual increase

Sale of Robbins Island -- net minus real-estate fees

Table A-7: Projections of Revenues and Expenses of Current Status and All Scenarios

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
Continuation of Current Status										
Rent	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733	\$71,733
Property Tax	\$392,203	\$400,047	\$408,048	\$416,209	\$424,533	\$433,024	\$441,684	\$450,518	\$459,528	\$468,719
TOTAL Rent, Taxes, and Revenue	\$463,936	\$471,780	\$479,781	\$487,942	\$496,266	\$504,757	\$513,417	\$522,251	\$531,261	\$540,452
Scenario 1										
Projected Revenue high	\$1,476,415	\$1,486,416	\$1,496,617	\$1,566,783	\$1,577,396	\$1,588,221	\$1,662,683	\$1,673,946	\$1,685,433	\$1,764,453
Projected Revenue low	\$1,060,479	\$1,068,019	\$1,075,710	\$1,125,389	\$1,133,391	\$1,141,552	\$1,194,272	\$1,202,763	\$1,211,425	\$1,267,371
Projected Expenses	\$1,200	\$135,212	\$191,424	\$13,686	\$13,823	\$13,961	\$14,101	\$14,242	\$14,385	\$14,528
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue High	\$1,011,279	\$879,424	\$825,411	\$1,065,155	\$1,067,307	\$1,069,503	\$1,135,165	\$1,137,453	\$1,139,788	\$1,209,472
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue Low	\$595,343	\$461,027	\$404,505	\$623,760	\$623,301	\$622,834	\$666,753	\$666,270	\$665,779	\$712,390
Scenario 2 -- Option A										
Projected Revenue high	\$767,065	\$772,334	\$777,709	\$834,704	\$840,296	\$846,000	\$873,840	\$879,774	\$885,827	\$926,714
Projected Revenue low	\$564,693	\$568,693	\$572,773	\$603,832	\$608,077	\$612,407	\$632,240	\$636,744	\$641,339	\$670,326
Projected Expenses	\$1,200	\$645,212	\$294,149	\$24,521	\$24,767	\$25,014	\$25,264	\$25,517	\$25,772	\$26,030
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue High	\$301,929	(\$344,658)	\$3,778	\$322,241	\$319,263	\$316,229	\$335,158	\$332,006	\$328,793	\$360,232
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue Low	\$99,557	(\$548,299)	(\$201,157)	\$91,369	\$87,044	\$82,636	\$93,558	\$88,976	\$84,306	\$103,844
Scenario 2 - Option B										
Projected Revenue high	\$817,271	\$866,036	\$870,697	\$4,519,104	\$725,284	\$730,230	\$763,437	\$768,636	\$773,886	\$809,125
Projected Revenue low	\$585,915	\$620,326	\$623,871	\$4,322,759	\$527,728	\$531,490	\$555,074	\$558,988	\$562,980	\$588,009
Projected Expenses	\$1,200	\$495,212	\$435,749	\$28,611	\$28,897	\$29,186	\$29,478	\$29,773	\$30,071	\$30,372
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue High	\$352,135	(\$100,956)	(\$44,833)	\$4,002,551	\$200,120	\$196,287	\$220,541	\$216,612	\$212,553	\$238,301
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue Low	\$120,779	(\$346,666)	(\$291,659)	\$3,806,206	\$2,564	(\$2,454)	\$12,179	\$6,964	\$1,648	\$17,185
Scenario 3 (w/2B)										
Projected Revenue high	\$76,367	\$77,894	\$79,452	\$3,896,761	\$99,662	\$101,315	\$103,002	\$104,722	\$106,476	\$108,266
Projected Revenue low	\$56,905	\$58,043	\$59,204	\$3,876,108	\$78,596	\$79,828	\$81,085	\$82,366	\$83,674	\$85,007
Projected Expenses	\$1,200	\$1,177,212	\$625,949	\$28,611	\$28,897	\$29,186	\$29,478	\$29,773	\$30,071	\$30,372
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue High	(\$388,769)	(\$1,571,098)	(\$1,026,278)	\$3,380,208	(\$425,502)	(\$432,628)	(\$439,894)	(\$447,302)	(\$454,856)	(\$462,558)
Net Revenue in Excess of Current Revenue Low	(\$408,231)	(\$1,590,949)	(\$1,046,526)	\$3,359,555	(\$446,567)	(\$454,115)	(\$461,811)	(\$469,658)	(\$477,658)	(\$485,816)

Notes

High and low revenue reflects the difference between continuing to apply a 30% abatement on the value of the land or removing the abatement.

Table 8 -- Northern Conomo Point Properties

MAP	LOT	Name (2010)	Location	Outblgd Value (2010)	Primary Rd Va2010	Lnd Va2010 (Abated)	Existing Tax (2010)	Land Value (Unabated)	Total Value (Unabated)	Total Tax (Unabated)	Rent (2010)	Potential rent (unabated)	Potential Rent (abated)	Bdrms	YR/S	DWL	BLD	DATE	Scenario 1	Scenario 2A	Scenario 2B
19	65	RETTBERG, RICHARD D	30 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$0	\$74,700	\$220,700	\$3,722	\$315,286	\$389,986	\$4,914	\$616	\$9,459	\$6,621	3	0	1	1	c. 1910	1	0	0
19	66	CALDER, DAVID A	34 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$1,900	\$50,500	\$358,700	\$5,156	\$512,429	\$562,929	\$7,093	\$616	\$15,373	\$10,761	3	0	1	2	c. 1920	1	0	1
19	67	DENTON, RICHARD	34A ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$2,700	\$83,800	\$363,300	\$5,633	\$519,000	\$602,800	\$7,595	\$616	\$15,570	\$10,899	1	0	1	2	c. 1910	1	0	1
19	68	MACDOUGALL, STEPHEN C	36 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$8,400	\$109,700	\$420,100	\$6,675	\$600,143	\$709,843	\$8,944	\$616	\$18,004	\$12,603	2	0	1	2	c. 1905	1	1	1
19	69	CLARK, PETER B	38 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$0	\$85,100	\$410,400	\$6,243	\$586,286	\$671,386	\$8,459	\$874	\$17,589	\$12,312	3	0	1	1	c. 1900	1	1	1
19	70	PRATT, JUDSON	40 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$3,100	\$185,000	\$413,600	\$7,542	\$590,857	\$775,857	\$9,776	\$874	\$17,726	\$12,408	4	1	1	2	c. 1875	1	0	1
19	71	RIGGS, JUDITH R	42 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$1,600	\$76,200	\$420,400	\$6,257	\$600,571	\$676,771	\$8,527	\$1,489	\$18,017	\$12,612	4	1	1	2	c. 1900	1	0	1
19	72	SACHSSE, NANCY L	44 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$6,600	\$126,300	\$420,600	\$6,891	\$600,857	\$727,157	\$9,162	\$1,112	\$18,026	\$12,618	2	0	1	2	c. 1900	1	1	1
19	73	RYAN, JAMES E JR	46 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$5,300	\$156,500	\$436,200	\$7,468	\$623,143	\$779,643	\$9,824	\$1,489	\$18,694	\$13,086	3	1	1	2	c. 1905	1	1	1
19	75	RIGGS, JUDITH R	43 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$6,000	\$0	\$81,200	\$1,023	\$116,000	\$116,000	\$1,462	\$0	\$3,480	\$2,436	0	0	0	1	c. 1935	0	0	1
19	76	KING, ROGER H	41 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$1,900	\$39,200	\$360,700	\$5,039	\$515,286	\$554,486	\$6,987	\$616	\$15,459	\$10,821	1	0	1	2	c. 1915	1	0	1
19	77	ROMANO, JOSEPH	29 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$1,200	\$182,500	\$221,800	\$5,094	\$316,857	\$499,357	\$6,292	\$616	\$9,506	\$6,654	2	0	1	2	c. 1955	1	0	0
19	78	KING, ROGER H	25 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$0	\$39,600	\$368,000	\$5,136	\$525,714	\$565,314	\$7,123	\$616	\$15,771	\$11,040	3	1	1	1	c. 1900	1	0	0
19	79	FRYOU, CHARLENE	1 ROBBINS ISLAND RD	\$0	\$47,800	\$220,700	\$3,383	\$315,286	\$363,086	\$4,575	\$616	\$9,459	\$6,621	2	0	1	1	c. 1920	1	0	0
19	81	AVERAY, JOANNE	39 MIDDLE RD	\$1,400	\$47,600	\$288,100	\$4,230	\$411,571	\$459,171	\$5,786	\$616	\$12,347	\$8,643	1	0	1	2	1914	1	0	1
19	82	DAVIS, JANET P TRUSTEE	2 CONOMO LN	\$300	\$60,800	\$240,200	\$3,793	\$343,143	\$403,943	\$5,090	\$755	\$10,294	\$7,206	4	0	1	2	1901	1	0	1
19	83	SPUNT, JEANNE L	4 CONOMO LN	\$0	\$167,000	\$236,800	\$5,088	\$338,286	\$505,286	\$6,367	\$755	\$10,149	\$7,104	2	1	1	1	1880	1	1	1
19	84	ELDRIDGE, CHARLOTTE SPINTIG	8 CONOMO LN	\$3,000	\$166,000	\$243,800	\$5,163	\$348,286	\$514,286	\$6,480	\$874	\$10,449	\$7,314	4	1	1	2	1897	1	1	1
19	85	WEBBER, WILLIAM	187 CONOMO POINT RD	\$800	\$227,800	\$425,800	\$8,235	\$608,286	\$836,086	\$10,535	\$2,462	\$18,249	\$12,774	4	1	1	2	1889 or 1895	1	1	1
19	86	MAZZARINO, MARTHA	114 CONOMO POINT RD	\$400	\$54,900	\$427,900	\$6,083	\$611,286	\$666,186	\$8,394	\$1,251	\$18,339	\$12,837	3	1	1	2		1	1	0
19	88	MARSOLAIS, ROBERT L	110 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$180,300	\$303,700	\$6,098	\$433,857	\$614,157	\$7,738	\$1,509	\$13,016	\$9,111	3	1	1	1	c. 1970	1	0	0
19	89	SISK, ROBERT A	CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$0	\$1,100	\$14	\$1,571	\$1,571	\$20	\$2,125	\$47	\$33	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
19	91	SISK, ROBERT A	115 CONOMO POINT RD	\$600	\$235,500	\$483,100	\$9,054	\$690,143	\$925,643	\$11,663	\$0	\$20,704	\$14,493	3	0	1	2	1892	1	1	1
19	92	SMITH, ELEANOR M	111 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$152,000	\$476,700	\$7,922	\$681,000	\$833,000	\$10,496	\$1,251	\$20,430	\$14,301	2	0	1	1	1899	1	1	1
19	93	TRUE, KRISTINE OLSEN	109 CONOMO POINT RD	\$6,900	\$300,800	\$497,400	\$10,057	\$710,571	\$1,011,371	\$12,743	\$1,251	\$21,317	\$14,922	4	0	1	2	1888	1	1	1
19	95	BARRON, MELVIN M	11 BEACH CIRCLE	\$600	\$49,900	\$500,500	\$6,935	\$715,000	\$764,900	\$9,638	\$874	\$21,450	\$15,015	3	0	1	2	1921	1	1	0
19	96	ADAMS, BYRON K & THAYER	9 BEACH CIRCLE	\$1,900	\$49,100	\$483,100	\$6,706	\$690,143	\$739,243	\$9,314	\$874	\$20,704	\$14,493	3	0	1	2	1915	1	1	1
19	97	HULL, JONATHAN B	105 CONOMO POINT RD	\$1,800	\$194,900	\$220,700	\$5,237	\$315,286	\$510,186	\$6,428	\$834	\$9,459	\$6,621	2	1	1	2	c. 1910	1	0	0
19	98	MAUCERI, ROBERT J	103 CONOMO POINT RD	\$1,700	\$80,100	\$223,000	\$3,819	\$318,571	\$398,671	\$5,023	\$616	\$9,557	\$6,690	3	0	1	2	1911	1	0	0
19	99	DESCENZA, ALFRED J	7 BEACH CIRCLE	\$3,900	\$93,800	\$468,600	\$7,086	\$669,429	\$763,229	\$9,617	\$874	\$20,083	\$14,058	2	1	1	2	c. 1914	1	1	1
19	100	TRUE, JOHN G	5 BEACH CIRCLE	\$600	\$165,000	\$470,200	\$8,004	\$671,714	\$836,714	\$10,543	\$616	\$20,151	\$14,106	2	1	1	2	1880	1	1	1
19	101	LUNT, MARILYN ET AL	3 BEACH CIRCLE	\$2,700	\$51,300	\$241,600	\$3,691	\$345,143	\$396,443	\$4,995	\$755	\$10,354	\$7,248	3	0	1	2	1895	1	0	1
19	102	MEARS, WALTER G	101 CONOMO POINT RD	\$500	\$334,600	\$363,400	\$8,795	\$519,143	\$853,743	\$10,757	\$874	\$15,574	\$10,922	3	1	1	2	1950	1	0	1
24	1	HARTLEY, STEPHEN	11 CONOMO LN	\$0	\$52,100	\$359,600	\$5,187	\$513,714	\$565,814	\$7,129	\$616	\$15,411	\$10,788	3	0	1	1	1936	1	0	0
24	2	LANE, MARJORIE	9 CONOMO LN	\$3,100	\$0	\$92,900	\$1,171	\$132,714	\$132,714	\$1,672	\$1,728	\$3,981	\$2,787	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
24	3	COLLINS, PAUL J	31 MIDDLE RD	\$0	\$50,000	\$410,000	\$5,796	\$585,714	\$635,714	\$8,010	\$755	\$17,571	\$12,300	3	0	1	1	1888	1	1	1
24	4	JONES, JAMES C	29 MIDDLE RD	\$300	\$192,900	\$421,300	\$7,739	\$601,857	\$794,757	\$10,014	\$755	\$18,056	\$12,639	4	0	1	2	1897	1	1	1
24	5	LANE, MARJORIE	179 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$218,900	\$373,400	\$7,463	\$533,429	\$752,329	\$9,479	\$0	\$16,003	\$11,202	5	0	1	1	1886	1	0	1
24	7	MEARS, DAVID A	175 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$88,700	\$363,000	\$5,691	\$518,571	\$607,271	\$7,652	\$0	\$15,557	\$10,890	2	1	1	1	c. 1930	1	0	0
24	8	MEARS, DAVID A	173 CONOMO POINT RD	\$8,100	\$0	\$146,700	\$1,848	\$209,571	\$209,571	\$2,641	\$1,231	\$6,287	\$4,401	0	0	0	1	c. 1920	0	0	0
24	9	EARL, SEPTON	171 CONOMO POINT RD	\$300	\$54,200	\$360,200	\$5,221	\$514,571	\$568,771	\$7,167	\$0	\$15,437	\$10,806	2	0	1	2	c. 1960	1	0	0
24	10	COAKLEY, RALPH	169 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$45,800	\$363,800	\$5,161	\$519,714	\$565,514	\$7,125	\$1,231	\$15,591	\$10,914	3	0	1	1	c. 1970	1	0	0
24	11	MURPHY, MARION L TRUSTEE	167 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$111,300	\$363,800	\$5,986	\$519,714	\$631,014	\$7,951	\$1,231	\$15,591	\$10,914	2	0	1	1	1931	1	0	0
24	12	WALKER, NINA & EDWIN	165 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$0	\$1,100	\$14	\$1,571	\$1,571	\$20	\$616	\$47	\$33	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
24	13	RIDGE, CHARLES K & JAMES LANE	163 CONOMO POINT RD	\$6,500	\$0	\$145,600	\$1,835	\$208,000	\$208,000	\$2,621	\$1,344	\$6,240	\$4,368	0	0	0	1	c. 1920	0	0	0
24	14	CONOMO POINT ASSOCIATION	161 CONOMO POINT RD	\$5,400	\$0	\$301,500	\$3,799	\$430,714	\$430,714	\$5,427	\$616	\$12,921	\$9,045	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
24	16	EMERSON, J H COMPANY	155 CONOMO POINT RD	\$4,600	\$0	\$119,200	\$1,502	\$170,286	\$170,286	\$2,146	\$0	\$5,109	\$3,576	0	0	0	1	c. 1905	0	0	0
24	17	RAFFERTY, CARRIE R	153 CONOMO POINT RD	\$500	\$212,400	\$477,800	\$8,697	\$682,571	\$894,971	\$11,277	\$1,251	\$20,477	\$14,334	3	0	1	2	1918	1	0	0
24	18	RICHARDSON, FRANKLIN T	154 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$164,700	\$427,400	\$7,460	\$610,571	\$775,271	\$9,768	\$1,251	\$18,317	\$12,822	3	1	1	1	1915	1	1	1
24	19	WENDELL, DOROTHEA P TRUSTEE	1 MIDDLE RD	\$0	\$64,000	\$366,400	\$5,423	\$523,429	\$587,429	\$7,402	\$0	\$15,703	\$10,992	3	0	1	1	1918	1	1	1
24	20	WENDELL, DOROTHEA R TRUSTEE	162 CONOMO POINT RD	\$6,100	\$0	\$143,900	\$1,813	\$205,571	\$205,571	\$2,590	\$1,489	\$6,167	\$4,317	0	0	0	1	c. 1900	0	0	0
24	21	WALKER, NINA & EDWIN	166 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$44,500	\$347,700	\$4,942	\$496,714	\$541,214	\$6,819	\$0	\$14,901	\$10,431	3	0	1	1	1880	1	0	1
24	22	WOODWARD, JOAN GOLDSBERRY	168 CONOMO POINT RD	\$3,100	\$0	\$93,200	\$1,174	\$133,143	\$133,143	\$1,678	\$2,094	\$3,994	\$2,796	0	0	0	1	c. 1920	0	0	0
24	23	WOODWARD, JOAN GOLDSBERRY	170 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$0	\$16,700	\$210	\$23,857	\$23,857	\$301	\$0	\$716	\$501	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
24	24	HERRMANN, JOAN BROWN	172 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$72,800	\$368,800	\$5,564	\$526,857	\$599,657	\$7,556	\$1,489	\$15,806	\$11,064	1	0	1	1	1926	1	0	1
24	25	DAVIS, JANET P TRUSTEE	CONOMO POINT	\$1,200	\$0	\$7,800	\$98	\$11,143	\$11,143	\$140	\$1,609	\$334	\$234	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
24	27	ROWE, WALLACE H III/CAROL ROWE	25 MIDDLE RD	\$700	\$148,900	\$290,300	\$5,534	\$414,714	\$563,614	\$7,102	\$755	\$12,441	\$8,709	4	0	1	1	1897	1	0	1
24	28	SMITH, CLINTON B	23 MIDDLE RD	\$400	\$37,600	\$287,700	\$4,099	\$411,000	\$448,600	\$5,652	\$755	\$12,330	\$8,631	3	0	1	2	1885	1	0	1
24	29	HOLLERAN, GERALD C GERALD C JR	21 MIDDLE RD	\$5,900	\$56,300	\$305,100	\$4,554	\$435,857	\$492,157	\$6,201	\$1,887	\$13,076	\$9,153	4	0	1	2	1892	1	0	1

Properties highlighted in yellow are on Robbins Island and along Robbins Island Road.

Table 8 -- Northern Conomo Point Properties

MAP	LOT	Name (2010)	Location	Outblgdg Value (2010)	Primary Rd Va2010	Lnd Va2010 (Abated)	Existing Tax (2010)	Land Value (Unabated)	Total Value (Unabated)	Total Tax (Unabated)	Rent (2010)	Potential rent (unabated)	Potential Rent (abated)	Bdrm	YR/S	DWL	BLD	DATE	Scenario 1	Scenario 2A	Scenario 2B
24	30	MACGRATH, HILARY QUEEN	19 MIDDLE RD	\$0	\$33,400	\$293,400	\$4,118	\$419,143	\$452,543	\$5,702	\$755	\$12,574	\$8,802	3	0	1	1	1892	1	0	1
24	31	LEMCKE, NANCY B	17 MIDDLE RD	\$400	\$57,000	\$295,500	\$4,442	\$422,143	\$479,143	\$6,037	\$874	\$12,664	\$8,865	2	0	1	2	1887	1	0	1
24	32	CUTHBERTSON, ALAN W TRUSTEE	15 MIDDLE RD	\$0	\$46,400	\$295,500	\$4,308	\$422,143	\$468,543	\$5,904	\$755	\$12,664	\$8,865	4	0	1	1	1894	1	0	1
24	33	WOODWARD, JOAN GOLDSBERRY	11 MIDDLE RD	\$5,200	\$59,500	\$295,500	\$4,473	\$422,143	\$481,643	\$6,069	\$0	\$12,664	\$8,865	4	0	1	2	1892	1	0	1
24	34	LANE, JAMES B L	9 MIDDLE RD	\$1,400	\$62,300	\$295,500	\$4,508	\$422,143	\$484,443	\$6,104	\$755	\$12,664	\$8,865	2	0	1	2	1894	1	0	1
24	35	LANE, JAMES	144 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$344,400	\$429,900	\$9,756	\$614,143	\$958,543	\$12,078	\$2,462	\$18,424	\$12,897	6	1	1	1	1917	1	1	1
24	36	CROSSEN, BETTY ANN REVOCABLE TRUST OF	142 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$54,600	\$421,600	\$6,000	\$602,286	\$656,886	\$8,277	\$1,251	\$18,069	\$12,648	3	1	1	1	1920	1	0	0
24	37	FOLEY, JUDITH H	138 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$108,500	\$419,500	\$6,653	\$599,286	\$707,786	\$8,918	\$1,251	\$17,979	\$12,585	2	1	1	1	c. 1960	1	1	0
24	38	CUSHING, SARAH R	136 CONOMO POINT RD	\$100	\$95,800	\$409,200	\$6,363	\$584,571	\$680,371	\$8,573	\$1,251	\$17,537	\$12,276	3	1	1	2	1894	1	1	0
24	39	HEALY, BRIAN & MARILYN RANKER	134 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$55,300	\$407,900	\$5,836	\$582,714	\$638,014	\$8,039	\$1,251	\$17,481	\$12,237	2	0	1	1	1886	1	1	0
24	41	WENDELL, DAVID R TRUSTEE	130 CONOMO POINT RD	\$400	\$446,800	\$421,300	\$10,938	\$601,857	\$1,048,657	\$13,213	\$1,251	\$18,056	\$12,639	5	0	1	2	1894	1	1	0
24	42	HATFIELD MARGARET/FRANK HARDY/	126 CONOMO POINT RD	\$800	\$92,100	\$422,700	\$6,486	\$603,857	\$695,957	\$8,769	\$1,251	\$18,116	\$12,681	3	0	1	2	1880	1	1	0
24	43	DAVIS, JANET P TRUSTEE	124 CONOMO POINT RD	\$800	\$95,900	\$421,000	\$6,513	\$601,429	\$697,329	\$8,786		\$18,043	\$12,630	5	0	1	2	1898	1	1	0
24	44	LE ROYER, JEAN C TRUSTEE	122 CONOMO POINT RD	\$100	\$50,000	\$418,000	\$5,897	\$597,143	\$647,143	\$8,154	\$1,450	\$17,914	\$12,540	5	0	1	2	1886	1	0	0
24	45	MAHER, LEAH	120 CONOMO POINT RD	\$3,100	\$54,400	\$419,500	\$5,971	\$599,286	\$653,686	\$8,236	\$1,251	\$17,979	\$12,585	4	0	1	2	1886	1	1	0
24	15A	WENDELL, DOROTHEA R TRUSTEE	159 CONOMO POINT RD	\$1,900	\$0	\$1,500	\$19	\$2,143	\$2,143	\$27	\$2,681	\$64	\$45	0	0	0	1		0	0	0
24	15B	LE ROYER, JEAN C TRUSTEE	159 CONOMO POINT RD	\$0	\$0	\$52,900	\$667	\$75,571	\$75,571	\$952	\$616	\$2,267	\$1,587	0	0	0	0	c.1920	0	0	0

Properties highlighted in yellow are on Robbins Island and along Robbins Island Road.

Appendix 2 -- Focus Group Discussions

FOCUS GROUP 1, ESSEX SENIOR CENTER, 6:30PM-8PM, MARCH 2, 2010

Meeting began with introductions and a brief presentation on the “ground rules” for discussion. The purpose is to listen to each other, share information and views, ask questions, but not to reach consensus or agreement. All should be comfortable expressing their views. Differing opinions were welcomed and questions were encouraged.

- Clarification about ownership of Robbins Island Road properties
- Observation from CP resident that waterfront use and access has changed in recent years, people seem to be Town residents and use all week long
- Discussion about waterfront access – what areas of Conomo Point are currently publicly accessible and whether there is opportunity to create more
- Discussion about need for improving lines of communication between residents of Conomo Point and other members of the community -- some perceptions don't seem accurate, but they persist
- Discussion about providing clear information – “just the facts” – to give people in the public meeting sufficient background on Conomo Point in order to make informed suggestions on the future
- Discussion about financial limitations and tax implications -- how this really influences people's ideas about what can happen at Conomo Point
- Discussion about history of this issue in the community and the perceived failure of lines of communication that have led to fracturing within the community
- Discussion about need to understand and plan for Conomo Point within the context of the Town as a whole
- Discussion about challenge of overcoming existing perceptions and views (whether founded in fact or not)
- Discussion about historic value of existing properties
- Discussion about access for commercial clambers
- Clarification about access and costs associated with public piers
- Participant's vision – close off roads, restrict to seasonal residences, provide green and open space
- Participant's vision – close off roads, provide access for clambers
- Participant's vision – boat house for public use
- Request for information about examples of other communities that have dealt with similar issues
- Request to have the planning process generate a list of options to which the community can respond
- Discussion about limitations of Northern Conomo Point – wastewater capacity, seasonal water supply
- Discussion about providing public open space, community space (whether by removing buildings or working around existing)
- Discussion about what would happen to existing buildings if leaseholders were forced to vacate

Participants asked a number of questions about the history of Conomo Point as well as the existing planning process. They shared some of their own frustrations about the misperceptions and failures to communicate effectively on the part of the Town. They provided some ideas on what might be helpful for the public meeting and indicated that it would be helpful to also seek participation from other community representatives/stakeholders in the future through a similar focus group format.

FOCUS GROUP 2, ESSEX SENIOR CENTER, 6:30PM-8PM, APRIL 12, 2010

Meeting began with introductions and a brief presentation on the “ground rules” for discussion. The purpose is to listen to each other, share information and views, ask questions, but not to reach consensus or agreement. All should be comfortable expressing their views. Differing opinions were welcomed and questions were encouraged.

The following is a list of the responses and discussion points raised in response to the following questions.

Question: “The town has voted that the leases expire on December 31, 2011. What are the possibilities for the future of Northern Conomo Point?”

- Thoughts about how to improve access
 - Expand parking – consider Beach Circle
 - Expand Clammers Beach
 - Expand parking along northern portions
 - Provide park-like areas for picnicking
- Proposal to keep existing buildings and only remove where needed to increase public access
- Proposal to eliminate all residential uses and only keep buildings if appropriate for conversion to public uses
- Opinion that Town should be cautious about selling the Point, “Once it’s sold, it will be gone forever”
- Question about ramifications of allowing some existing residences to remain and requiring others to be removed – concern about equal treatment
- Discussion about lack of knowledge/education about Conomo Point among many residents -- Town residents may not be aware that they are landlords
- Opinion that CP is one of a kind for Essex and a unique waterfront location for many reasons
- Observation that CP has been good for local businesses in Essex (seasonal influx of demand for goods and services)
- Discussion about if Town continues to be the landowner how can it generate revenue
- Discussion about general limitations for public access to CP as a whole – limitations of the road networks coming in (width, etc) and limited capacity once people arrive (parking, restrooms).
- Opinion that CP is attractive as a destination for residents and non-residents, particularly for canoe/kayak access
- Observation that Town management of CP has been a problem for a long time
- Opinion that residents/non-residents are not likely to use CP as it’s not set up for recreation access
- Question about potential costs of removal of properties versus letting the properties remain
- Question about what sewage/water treatment would be required if buildings remain, are tight tanks really an option?
- Observation that DEP has set a 10,000 gpd limit on wastewater flows from northern CP, estimate of existing flows are around 20,000.
- Opinion that any future decision on the number of properties (if any) that remain, should use the 10,000 gpd limit as the driving parameter for reducing the number of residential properties.
- Concern about environmental impacts
- Observation that Town finances are tight, concern about loss of revenue if residential uses are eliminated
- Opinion that Town needs to be clear about the fiscal implications of any decision.

- Discussion about ways to generate revenue and still retain enough for public use and access
- Proposal to increase rent and taxes to market rate and see what happens (likelihood that many people would leave and Town would reclaim area through attrition)
- Observation that termination of leases will help Town move forward
- Opinion that Town may need to hire property / project manager for Conomo Point
- Discussion about Robbins Island
 - Robbins Island should be part of the plan for Southern Conomo Point
 - Robbins Island has less value for public access
 - Robbins Island might have more value for sale
 - Recent example of sale of Able Island – could be comparable to sale of RI
- Discussion about possibility of selling or leasing a portion to be run as a business
 - Invite developer to create a seasonal community (cottage style)
 - Museum or other tourist attraction
 - Overnight accommodations
- Proposal to consider how CP can support local town businesses by creating a destination that will attract people to Essex
- Proposal to provide public area with amenities (restrooms, welcoming center, etc)
- Opinion that Town should get out of the property management business – example of the Grove which is not maintained well
- Discussion about how to support commercial clambers
 - Add more parking
 - Allow commercial uses for clambers
- Proposal to charge non-residents a user fee
- Opinion that decreasing the number of properties (decreasing density) would increase the value of existing properties – remove some, sell others at market rate

FOCUS GROUP 3, ESSEX SENIOR CENTER, 9AM-10:30AM, APRIL 16, 2010

Meeting began with introductions and a brief presentation on the “ground rules” for discussion. The purpose is to listen to each other, share information and views, ask questions, but not to reach consensus or agreement. All should be comfortable expressing their views. Differing opinions were welcomed and questions were encouraged.

The following is a list of the responses and discussion points raised in response to the following question.

Question: “The town has voted that the leases expire on December 31, 2011. What are the possibilities for the future of Northern Conomo Point?”

- Observation that Town should have/deserves more access to Conomo Point
- Opinion that solution should be a compromise, allow some residential properties to remain while also increasing Town use and access
- Opinion that the entire area shouldn’t be vacated, it wouldn’t be fiscally responsible
- Observation that loss of income from rent and taxes is a concern
- Discussion about existing lack of capacity to handle wastewater treatment on Northern Conomo Point, how would this get addressed if residential uses remain, do all residential properties need to be eliminated to protect environment, are any soils suitable for septic

- Opinion that protection of the estuary and sensitive environmental areas around Conomo Point should be the primary concern – eliminate leaching of pollutants from residential properties on the Point
- Opinion that reducing density of the number of buildings would free up land needed to improve wastewater treatment systems
- Discussion about possibility of an on-site treatment plant, costs, location
- Observation that this is a very emotional issue for the Town and many people may not be that concerned about the environmental implications, but rather are more concerned about fiscal impacts and public access to the waterfront
- Opinion that Town needs to stop being a landlord
- Opinion that a public park would be very costly
- Discussion about how to pick which buildings should stay (if any) and which should go (if any)
- Observation that any selection of buildings to remain or go should have a clear process, clear guidelines, and transparency about how decisions were made, should be a fair process
- Discussion about potential linear park along Conomo Point Road
- Opinion that increased access to the sandy beach off the Point could be provided via a boardwalk
- Opinion that clambers need access year round and dedicated parking near where they access the clam flats
- Observation that the Trustees of Reservations (or another non-profit organization) might be interested in partnering to purchase a portion of CP for preservation and public use
- Observation that if the plan for CP is implemented right, it could be a self-sustaining (financial) project
- Observation that concern about threat of litigation from current leaseholders could get in the way of the process
- Opinion that money from sale of Southern CP should be used to create a trust fund to manage and protect open space / park and build public facilities on Northern CP
- Discussion about Robbins Island
- Opinion that Robbins Island should be sold for residential use, not as much opportunity for public access
- Observation that Robbins Island would still need to figure out how to comply with wastewater issues
- Opinion that Robbins Island would need to be restricted to seasonal uses
- Observation that required buffer around waterways and wetlands limits what can happen on Robbins Island
- Opinion that Northern CP should be re-zoned as residential with public use/open space
- Participant vision to sell about ¾ of the land on Northern CP for residential use and keep ¼ of the land for public use
- Opinion that public access should focus on the “gold coast” of CP – the northern portions with pier, beach, etc.
- Observation that even if some properties are sold, overall there would be a need to decrease the existing density of development, existing layout is overcrowded.
- Opinion that tight tanks should be a way to solve wastewater capacity issues
- Opinion that tight tanks are not a responsible solution
- Opinion that if properties are sold, they should be year-round if desired
- Opinion that the Town needs to comply with the final legal judgment and not extend leases
- Discussion about if properties are sold what would be the impact on Town services and infrastructure
- Observation that Town has poor record of property management and problem enforcing decisions

- Opinion that any sale of properties should not be done with preferential treatment to existing leaseholders, sell on the open market
- Opinion that another way to comply with state is to sell properties and require compliance with existing DEP regulations for wastewater treatment
- Observation that leaseholders have made any improvements to their properties with the understanding that these were all temporary
- Discussion about options for generating revenue for the Town from future uses on Northern CP
- Opinion that Town could create a property like Tuck's Point in Manchester with a facility available for rent (priority to residents, also open to non-residents)
- Discussion about types of public uses that should be included on Northern CP – beach, park, picnic areas, restrooms, parking, boating club (revenue generator), rental facility (revenue generator)
- Opinion that a non-Town entity could manage the public uses on Northern CP (including rental facility, operation of ramps, etc), could also manage "the Grove" (another Essex public area)
- Opinion that Town needs to be firm, even-handed, equal treatment, but stick to original decision

FOCUS GROUP 4, ESSEX SENIOR CENTER, 7PM-8:30PM, MAY 6, 2010

Meeting began with introductions and a brief presentation on the "ground rules" for discussion. The purpose is to listen to each other, share information and views, ask questions, but not to reach consensus or agreement. All should be comfortable expressing their views. Differing opinions were welcomed and questions were encouraged.

The following is a list of the responses and discussion points raised in response to the following question.

Question: "The town has voted that the leases expire on December 31, 2011. What are the possibilities for the future of Northern Conomo Point?"

- Opinion: Consider that the vote for Town Meeting was what the community wanted then, may not reflect what the community wants for Northern CP today.
- Opinion: Town shouldn't assume that the leases will expire, as it could be put to another Town vote.
- Question: How does Robbins Island fit into this plan?
- Observation: One of the properties on Robbins Island is not leased, it is privately owned and that owner also owns a large portion of the waterfront along the water side of Robbins Island.
- Observation: Water access from Robbins Island is limited to a few hours a day due to tides.
- Observation: Water levels occasionally rise enough to cover the causeway along Robbins Island Road, cutting off access.
- Opinion: Robbins Island is different from the rest of Northern Conomo Point because it isn't as suitable for waterfront access due to partial private ownership and restriction of tides and water levels.
- Opinion: Public access to Northern CP can be improved without completely removing the residential properties.
- Discussion: A sailing club run by Essex residents makes use of the Conomo Point Association boat house and the piers. This program is open to anyone (Essex residents and non-residents) for a fee.
- Observation: The Town owns the waterfront, public is allowed to access the waterfront and the docks.

- Opinion: In the past, people who did not live on Conomo Point may not have felt welcomed, but attitudes have changed and CP tenants are welcoming and want all Town residents to feel comfortable using CP.
- Question: What are the terms of the lease related to access for the stone pier (and dock)?
- Discussion: There is a perception that the lease stipulates limited use of pier (and dock) for non-CP tenants. There is general agreement that all Essex residents should have unlimited use and access to the pier and that lease terms for pier should be corrected if necessary.
- Question: Conomo Point Association and Town each have liability insurance to cover the pier – is it shared or two separate policies?
- Opinion: Attitudes about “us vs. them” (ie, tenants and non-tenants) are inappropriate and destructive – all CP tenants engage in the community life of Essex and take an active part in the Town. CP is just another neighborhood of Essex.
- Observation: There are long-time residents of CP, just as there are long-time residents in the rest of the community.
- Opinion: We have to do what’s right for the Town at large.
- Observation: CP generates revenue – taxes and leases for the Town.
- Opinion: Emotionally charged discussions are not productive and will hamper the decisions about the future of CP.
- Opinion: There are some constraints that the Town needs to work within in making decisions about the future of CP. One of those constraints is the 10,000 gpd limit for wastewater flows set by DEP.
- Opinion: Need to consider if new technologies for on-site wastewater management on individual properties may be a solution – at least see if other options are out there and if DEP would consider this.
- Observation: Signs for parking that state “residents only” may give impression that the parking is only for CP tenants (rather than any resident in Essex).
- Discussion: Parking will be necessary to accommodate more public access to the beaches and the water.
- Opinion: Look for options to add parking locations in Southern Conomo Point that people can use to park and walk to the beach (satellite lots).
- Discussion: There are different parking needs for people loading or unloading boats. Satellite parking may not work for them.
- Opinion: Consider parking areas with time limitations (to accommodate clammers or boaters).
- Opinion: Consider removing the uninhabited and uninhabitable buildings to make more room for public use and access.
- Opinion: Retain residential properties while improving overall public access. Parking is a key part of this solution.
- Discussion: Who uses CP and how do they use it – boaters, kayakers, beach-goers, clammers.
- Observation: Conomo Point Association helps maintain the beaches.
- Discussion: There are options for adding parking areas within existing properties (without removing residences) – Emerson’s lot (to access Cross Island), add more along Clammer’s Beach, provide drop off access at fire lanes, satellite lot in Southern Conomo Point “hay field”.
- Opinion: Need to protect the character of the community on CP, need to retain the homes.
- Opinion: If the Town increases property taxes and lease rates, some existing tenants would probably leave because it would be unaffordable – Town could remove those properties first.
- Question: Do the terms of the existing leases give right of first refusal to the tenants should the Town decide to sell the property?
- Opinion: Town should continue as a landlord and existing tenants should remain tenants, with new leases.

- Observation: Some existing tenants will not be able to pay any increase in fees (taxes and leases).
- Opinion: Any future leases will have to benefit both the Town at large and the tenants and will need to be fair.
- Opinion: Process for moving forward needs to help build trust between the Town at large and the tenants of CP.
- Opinion: Beaches are really mudflats and have limited capacity/opportunity as a destination beach.
- Observation: The point at the top of CP (where there is currently parking) is actually a good scenic location for picnicking or viewing.
- Opinion: Clammer's Beach is ideal for families with kids.
- Opinion: Convert some of the existing buildings to a facility for the public to use for restrooms or changing.
- Opinion: Consider a facility that could be rented for parties or other uses.
- Opinion: Consider building a boardwalk (that could be removed) below the seawall for access along the waterfront.
- Observation: Remember that the 10,000 gpd limit needs to be complied with.
- Opinion: Conomo Point should be for the exclusive use of Essex residents (and invited guests). Town shouldn't make any decisions about the future until after the leases expire in 2011.
- Opinion: Greenhead flies in summer season make CP undesirable as a park.
- Opinion: Consider reconstructing a new pier where a previous one existed (at top of the Point).
- Opinion: Consider building a floating boardwalk to Walker's Creek to improve access for clambers.
- Opinion: Consider limiting vehicular access along front Conomo Point Road, but accommodate boaters.
- Discussion: Narrow roads might limit desirability of using CP Road and Middle Road for two-way traffic, especially when more people are using the Point. Public safety access needs to be accommodated (fire lanes, etc).
- Discussion: Should CP be year-round or limited to seasonal. Some year-round residents might be willing/able to switch to seasonal, others might not (particularly seniors).
- Opinion: Taxes and leases should be based on value of property for seasonal OR year-round use.
- Opinion: Some existing seasonal users would prefer to have year-round use.
- Opinion: CP has year-round appeal.
- Question: How does/would the Town regulate or enforce seasonal occupancy restrictions?
- Opinion: Robbins Island is more limited for public access and uses because of the water level and tides, it should be kept as leased land.
- Opinion: Town should have a plan in place before the end of 2011.
- Opinion: Until a plan is implemented, the Town should retain the existing lease arrangements and tax revenues.

FOCUS GROUP 5, ESSEX FIRE STATION, 9AM-10:30AM, MAY 14, 2010

Meeting began with introductions and a brief presentation on the "ground rules" for discussion. The purpose is to listen to each other, share information and views, ask questions, but not to reach consensus or agreement. All should be comfortable expressing their views. Differing opinions were welcomed and questions were encouraged.

The following is a list of the responses and discussion points raised in response to the following question.

Question: “The town has voted that the leases expire on December 31, 2011. What are the possibilities for the future of Northern Conomo Point?”

Opinion, Question, Observation

- Opinion: The CPPC presented a plan to the Town a few years ago for Conomo Point, while it did not get passed the vote was close and the plan should be re-considered.
- Observation: The Plan submitted previously by the CPPC increased public access and minimized tenant disruption and displacement.
- Observation: The previous plan did not address DEP flow restrictions, which are a constraint to maintaining existing residences.
- Observation: A seasonal community in Hamilton, MA had a similar problem with sewer capacity constraints, they fixed it with a mix of tight tanks and sewer systems.
- Observation: The cost of fixing the sewer capacity at Northern Conomo Point may be cost prohibitive. For example, one person’s experience was that four units on a common septic system cost \$140K and took 3 years to construct.
- Opinion: In order to meet clammer and boater needs the docks/piers need to be improved. Other amenities would include more parking, toilets.
- Observation: Harbor Master could use a location to work on and store channel markers (small bldg – 12’X20’, +/- ½ acre).
- Opinion: Providing satellite parking that was within a reasonable walking distance from the boat ramps and loading areas wouldn’t be problematic as long as boaters had temporary access to bring trailers down to the water.
- Opinion: There are three primary issues at CP – public access, potential loss of income, DEP requirements.
- Opinion: Existing CP residents generate income for the Town by purchasing services / products from Town businesses.
- Question: What should CP generate for income to the Town – ½ to 3 million?
- Opinion: Up to a ¼ of existing tenants would not be able to stay if lease was extended and rent was increased substantially.
- Opinion: Full-time residents should be allowed to stay year-round until a change of ownership of the land occurs.
- Opinion: A deed restriction on the property not a zoning change would be required to keep properties seasonal.
- Opinion: Town should not sell, but keep ownership because this is an asset that should be retained.
- Opinion: Town should retain the land, but increase public access.
- Opinion: More people would use CP if there was more available access.
- Opinion: It would be better for public safety if some residences remained to monitor activities.
- Opinion: Town has a contractual obligation to offer right of first refusal to the tenants if they choose to sell the land.
- Question: What would be the criteria for reducing the density (getting rid of some of the homes)?
- Opinion: Year-round homes should stay, sewer capacity should limit remaining.
- Question: Would the Town be interested in buying the buildings if the tenants wanted to sell them?
- Observation: Uninhabited buildings and boat houses on the back road along the marsh could be a good location for the Harbor Master to use for storing channel markers and also might be a good location for parking.
- Observation: 1/3 to ½ of the moorings off of CP are leased from the Town by CP residents. All moorings can be leased by anyone (resident or non-resident) and there is a long waiting list.

- Opinion: Town could charge a parking fee to park on CP and could also provide services to boaters for a fee.
- Opinion: Robbins Island should be considered separately from the rest of Northern CP, limited public access.
- Observation: Existing Robbins Island tenants are divided on preference for the Town to sell or continue to lease the properties.
- Opinion: CP residents are committed to resolving the DEP sewer requirements at no cost to the Town.
- Question: Do Cross Island residents have any legal right to parking at CP (e.g. deed restriction on parking area, etc)?
- Opinion: People genuinely want to see dual use and increased access at CP.
- Observation: CP is more welcoming to non-tenants than historically.
- Observation: Clammer's Beach is maintained by the Conomo Point Association.
- Observation: Back side of Conomo Point Road needs more maintenance.
- Opinion: Provide a drop off location for people to use and then provide parking at satellite location.
- Opinion: CP qualifies for application to the National Historic Register.

Appendix 3 – Public Meetings

Public Meeting 1, March 11, 2010

Juliet Walker, senior planner at Taintor & Associates, Inc., began with some introductory remarks outlining the purpose of the public meeting, the consultants' role, and the general format for discussion.

Purpose of this meeting was to discuss future possibilities for Northern Conomo Point.

Consultants provided a handout with some very basic facts about the area (as well as the Town). The area to be discussed is area north of Robbins Island Road. Discussion about the future of Southern Conomo Point is part of a separate planning process.

This was the first of three public meetings to discuss this issue. Format of the meeting was intended to allow everyone to feel free to share their ideas, and participants would be asked to weigh in on whether they agreed or disagreed with some of the ideas shared.

The entire planning process (concluding in July) will draw from community members in these public meetings as well as information provided by the Conomo Point Committee and other stakeholders in the community. The goal after the first meeting will be to review the different input and consider different scenarios to then present back to the community at the second meeting. Consultants will also begin to consider any other limitations – including fiscal – that might help guide the proposed uses.

Participants were then asked to join one of four break-out groups organized around the room with a consultant facilitator.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Brainstorming Exercise

Brainstorming means that everyone gets a chance to share their ideas without conditions.

Participants were asked to respond to the statement – **“The town has voted that the leases expire on December 31, 2011. What are the possibilities for the future of Northern Conomo Point?”**

Discussion

Participants in the small groups were asked to discuss some of the ideas presented. This provided participants opportunities to offer reasons they might agree or disagree with a specific idea. This also provided an opportunity to combine or group similar ideas together.

Dot Voting

Participants were asked to indicate (using sticker dots) which of the ideas discussed by their group they were most interested in considering. This would not necessarily be used to drop any of the proposed ideas off the list; it would just help everyone to understand general areas of agreement.

Report Back

A representative from each small group gave a brief presentation back to the full group highlighting some of the ideas from the discussion.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS POINTS

The lists below are organized by group. These represent the discussion points raised by the participants as recorded on the easel pads by the facilitator. No additional review or evaluation has been done to compile these lists – they represent the “raw” input received at the meeting. The number in () indicates the number of votes the idea received from participants in the small group. Votes are used only to show level of interest in pursuing a particular idea, they are not used to eliminate any of the ideas presented.

Group 1 – Facilitator Carolyn Britt➤ **Wind Turbine (5)**

- Undertake a feasibility study
- Some work has already been done by Mass Technology Collaborative
- There is a concern for noise in the relatively densely developed area
- Don't place in areas desirable for other public use

➤ **Harbormaster Station (4)**

- Combine this with other construction on-site – retail sandwich/food shop and community building
- Have a deep water launch ramp as part of the station – Town would need to dredge in order to accomplish this
- This would provide a land-based office, rather than being only in the boat
- Could also expand moorings as part of this – add transient moorings for visitors
- Put showers in the building for all users of the area, and bathrooms

➤ **Add Parking to NCP (1)**

- It would be hard to add parking on NCP if all residences stay
- Need enough parking for residences, boat users
- Limit the parking from the most beautiful areas, along the borders with the water
- Some feel there should not be parking on NCP but it should be south of there at the old Town Farm
- Could parking be placed along the roadways?

➤ **Create More Open Fields (0)**

- Hard to level area with much exposed and covered ledge
- Would like a place for children to play, informal sports activities

➤ **Public Access in general (5)**

- For picnic area, for access to tip of NCP – but where would people park?
- Could select another area for more public boat access
- Public access should be unfettered
- Could develop a shuttle circuit around NCP to keep cars out
- Need car access for boat launch
- If parked off NCP, would have to carry things a great distance to get to boat or picnic
- Wall on the north side (on the water I believe) is deteriorated from cars parking over it – it is a stone wall that needs repairs, has had some repairs recently
- Trailers and storms also damage the wall

- There is a problem with clammers parking there in the winter stressing the wall
- **Walking/Bicycling paths (5)**
 - Some existing pathways, need to improve the surfaces, add directional and interpretive signage
 - Clarify where the trail is – a bridge may be needed at one point where the trail is diminished
 - Develop a comprehensive plan for a pathway out there that would be multi-use
 - Make the traffic and road safer
- **Remove invasives, replant with native vegetation (5)**
 - Marsh restoration
 - Address stormwater run-off from NCP
 - Use new waste technologies that don't result in contaminated run-off
- **Dock Access (5)**
 - Add enough dock area so there is adequate space for people with moorings to keep skiffs attached to the dock (note – this might be quite a bit of dock as I believe there are a number of moorings)
 - Generally increase dock access
 - Town should support (financially) a float system the way other towns do **Store/Community Building/bathrooms/Harbormaster (3)**
 - Have a community building where events could be held like at Tuck's Point, such as reunions and clambakes
 - There is a small community building there now for residents
 - It could have a composting toilet
- **Keep all Cottages (17)**
 - Consider the transition as a long term project
 - Allow current owners to renew leases to allow a lifetime tenancy
 - Take over cottages as owners die or want to get out
 - Homeowners should be compensated
 - Preserve historic buildings
 - Cottages that remain should pay fair market rent
- **Develop Comprehensive Plan for Road and Pedestrian Improvements with Remaining and New Land Uses (5)**
 - Need improvements on access road of NCP if more public uses
 - Address these off-site issues at the same time as preparing the on-site comprehensive plan
- **Start a summer sailing program at the site**
- **Maintain character of Northern Conomo Point – including the type of structures and mass, look of summer community, etc.**

Group 2 – Facilitator Bonnie Sontag

- **Sell all properties to home-owners (4)**
 - Generate income for town
 - Private owners install tight-tanks or compostable toilets
 - Preserve historical community and architecture
 - Town purchase a house and use if for public activity
 - 30% discount on land tax goes away at end 2011 producing increased revenue for town
 - Would need to address Title V and DEP requirements
 - If lease-holder can't purchase, provide option for life-time rental (for year-rounders and/or others)

- **Public park on all the land**
 - Investigate if State wants to buy land, or other land conservation group, or create our own conservation group to manage it
 - Cost of maintenance, insurance, security if taken over by the town (1)
 - No structures (2)
 - Improvement to ecology of marsh
 - Voted by town in 1999
 - Attractive to artists, photographers
 - What happens to year-round residents?
 - Loss of revenue (1)
 - Cost of getting rid of everything & what happens to tanks?
 - Possibility of underutilization – off the beaten path
 - Roads exist – potential for unsavory behavior
 - Impact on abutters
 - So many unanswered questions that could lead to lawsuits and other costly problems
 - Destruction of a historic neighborhood
- **Current residential structures & seasonal recreation with more access to waterfront small parking lots (4)**
 - Part privately owned, part public
 - Focus on parcels not currently occupied or vacant
 - Increases access for Essex residents (1)
 - Preserves historic community (2)
 - Improves town finances (1)
 - Respect for all Essex residents (1)
 - Ability to have multiple uses: boathouse, restaurant, etc.
 - Economic activity for local businesses
 - Potential compromise that could work for all parties, or at least a majority of the community (1)
 - Seasonal water restricts types of residences
 - May resolve septic and water needs if could meet Title V requirements with private owners' funding their own solutions
- **Access to waterfront**
 - Boating - in addition to sailing (facility and access to waterfront)
 - Build out a beach area
 - Marina
 - Expand piers for deep water access
 - Access and facilities for clammers (3)
 - Access for kayaking
 - Create (northern) Conomo Point club
 - Be welcoming to public – access to waterfront without destroying fabric of the neighborhood
 - Publicize access that exists today
 - Make it easy to be near water: picnic, walk, play, etc.
 - Beaches are tidal – limits access
 - Concerns about flooding
 - Recreational opportunities are seasonal
 - Have to provide facilities (e.g., restrooms)
- **Create income for town: tax revenue, rental, sales, support of local businesses**

- **Leave it as it is (1)**
 - Create new leases at today's market values (1)
- **Public access to C.P. for town residents and non-residents**
 - More public parking
 - Restroom facility
 - Rentable pavilion (1)
 - Need to improve parking for handicapped and elderly
 - Need to improve in general and make use of multiple small areas for parking
 - Need bike and bike paths and parking for bikes
 - Make use of shuttle from remote parking area
- **Historic preservation (1)**
- **Natural resources protection (2)**
 - Address flooding issues, especially roads
 - Solve septic issues
 - Protect health of the marsh
 - Involve DEP in conversation
 - Concerns about shifting shoreline
- **Incremental improvements before leases expire (e.g. signage) (1)**
- **Commercial uses**
 - Summer camp
 - Develop resort hotel
 - Boat house and restaurant
 - Clammers
 - ERBA – offer a permanent rack in exchange for ERBA kayaks reserved for residents (1)
 - Lobstering
 - Home-based businesses
 - Kayaking
 - Marina
 - Bike “hostel” – place for long-distance bikers to sleep with basic facilities/amenities
- **Promotion and Education – need to involve more people in this conversation**
 - PTO
 - Senior House presentation
 - Rotary presentation
 - Chamber of Commerce presentation
 - Volunteer email list (via town website?)

Group 3 – Facilitator Juliet Walker

- **Clear land, remove all structures (6)**
 - Town needs to consider long-term benefits – unique waterfront area, “one of a kind”, public benefits as open area with usable public space, natural beauty also brings value to the Town
 - Clearing land would require mitigation (clean-up)
 - Problem with what to do with the land in the interim (as structures are being removed and land is being made usable in natural state)
 - Unimproved land could be a liability (public safety problem) for the Town
 - Returning land to natural state not really an option, would need to be landscaped
 - Need to address what happens to buildings -- either move or demolish

- Concern about clean up costs
- Concern about loss of revenue to Town when properties are vacated
- Concern about impact on local businesses due to loss of CP residents
- Create a park
 - Natural area
 - No buildings / structures (like Choate Island)
 - Picnic tables
 - Fire pit / grills
- Allow land to be reclaimed by attrition -- phase property conversion
- Convert some buildings to public use
- Compensate tenants for buildings (Town buys buildings)
- Have lease end with current individual tenants (can't be transferred)
- **Consider different options for allowing all existing properties to remain occupied**
 - Maintain existing arrangement (2)
 - Raise rent
 - Make all houses seasonal
 - Make all houses year-round
 - Sell to current residents at fair market value (2)
 - Dwellings are improvements to the properties, bring value to the Town
- **Expand public waterfront access with minimal disruption to existing properties (10)**
 - Improve access and add facilities for professional clammers (1)
 - Do what we can to make it "user friendly" (1)
 - Protect what's beautiful
 - Preserve "quirky" historic character of the neighborhood
 - Limit commercial uses
 - Continue current non-commercial requirement
 - Provide boat house for public use (2)
 - Town sailing program
 - Kayak access
 - Kayak rentals
 - Provide public docks
 - Provide facilities to enable small boat launching at all tides and related small boat amenities
 - More parking, expand existing at Cross Island lot, Back Road, Front Street, Clammers Beach
 - Consider public uses for existing leased lots that are vacant
 - Consider public uses for existing leased lots that are occupied by outbuildings
 - Consider new locations for boat access
 - Public demand for access is seasonal
 - Improve what's already there
 - Build up/ add to the existing seawall to make more land accessible for public use (2)
 - Provide a boardwalk across the marsh
 - Provide a gazebo / picnic tables (1)
 - Improve access road at Front Beach and extend this road to provide access for clammers (2)
 - Turn Conomo Point Road to land for public access
- **Keep some properties, remove others (8)**
 - How to select which stay and which go

- Need to figure out what the Town wants to do with the land and then develop criteria for what properties will need to be vacated (5)
- Provide facilities for seasonal programs (sailing, summer camps)
- Provide access and facilities for clambers
- Consider loss of revenue
- Consider cost to maintain
- Houses are part of the beauty, historical scale, seasonal community
- Make improvements to existing access areas (1)
- **Fiscal considerations should drive the decision (3)**
 - Potential loss of revenue
 - Cost for improvements / mitigation
 - Concern about meeting other Town needs
 - Need to research other sources of funding (conservation groups, Community Preservation Act)
 - Cut Robbins Island out of the equation, should convert to private use

Group 4 – Facilitator Sue Brown

- **Town reclaim possession/control**
- **Waterfront access**
 - Better access to Clammer’s Beach with improvements to and including launch, parking, raised area for play, toilet facilities (10)
 - Improved access to sandbar from Clammer’s Beach (1)
 - Year round launching access at Front Beach
 - Currently people park on launch
 - Inadequate parking
 - Flat area with homes could provide space if homes were removed
 - Capital expenditures will be required
 - Potable water only six months a year would prohibit year round use
 - Consider a fee for launch approach at front beach
 - Could also support Harbor Master operations, pump out station, restrooms
 - Dock fees could offset dock maintenance expenses
 - Boardwalk to access sandbar in front of Clammer’s Beach would be well used
- **Sell to current leaseholders (1)**
 - Do not want to consider sale to leaseholders
 - Would like to see some land retained for public use
 - It is more fiscally responsible to sell at fair market price
 - It is irresponsible to sell Town’s only waterfront property
 - Is there a compromise that allows improvement and allows houses to remain
 - Would improvements actually be made
 - Concern regarding safety of area if people do not live on Conomo Point throughout the year
 - With sale to leaseholders, sewer problem would be shifted from Town to owners
 - Town isn’t receiving fair tax value at this point
- **Age restricted housing – over 55 (1)**
 - Would preclude use by others
 - Would it be a seasonal community only
 - Proceeds from sale would greatly benefit Town
 - Fire and Safety access could be problematic

- **Bike and pedestrian path from 133 to Point (5)**
 - Old path exists on private land
 - It would be good to get bikes and pedestrians off roads
- **Improved access at end of point - remove stone impediment (1)**
 - Access is blocked by concrete
 - Should be available for parking
 - There are great views here
 - Would like to see Town take better use of lots they do control
- **Two new piers (1)**
 - Piers would help keep waterways clear of vegetation
 - It would be expensive
 - Piers stop flow of water and sediment
 - Safe steps from the pier are needed
 - There are environmental restrictions to consider
- **Rewrite leases (4)**
 - There are ambiguities in leases
 - Rockport's Long Beach as a model
 - Town should not be in the leasing business
 - The end of the lease offers opportunity to assess full value for tax and rent
 - DEP Consent Decree could be negotiated
 - Tight tanks were used at Little Neck as a solution
 - Opportunity to look at rents
 - Higher rents will have an effect on fixed income residents
 - Town needs plan for properties that are not leased
- **Create a large grassy play area (1)**
 - There are costs involved
 - Include picnic tables, benches, barbecue grills
- **Power generating windmill (2)**
 - It would ruin views
 - Noisy
 - If Town owned would provide revenue
- **Restrooms – in up to three locations**
 - Unanimous support
 - Cranes Beach doesn't have adequate restrooms, perhaps they would share costs
- **Parking**
 - More resident parking (1)
 - More general parking
 - Some parking is needed for people from out of town
- **Reroute traffic to make access more bike/pedestrian friendly**
 - Access will still be needed for boat trailers
- **Waterfront facilities for activities/rental/ etc. – Tuck's Point model (4)**
 - Potential income
 - Could use a house not currently used
 - Not much parking to support the use
 - Consider a chowder house
- **Return to nature**

- Views would be eliminated
- **Summer rental of town-owned homes**
 - Likely to be a smaller income than currently received by leaseholder
 - Some current leaseholders sublet for substantial income
 - Is there a market, empty houses noticed
 - It isn't suitable for Town to be in the rental business]
 - The septic issue would remain
- **Renew as many leases as possible while improving public access (6)**
 - More financially feasible option
 - Middle ground
- **Youth Hostel to take advantage of marsh/environmental resources (1)**
 - Is it financially feasible
 - General support for the idea
- **Increase road and pier safety and parking –include storage area and facility for harbor master equipment and operations**
 - Space is needed for Harbor Master operational equipment
- **Public kayak rack**
 - General support
 - Also bike racks

QUESTIONS

- What are the absolute limits set by MA DEP?
- Can sewer be extended, or can septic waste be managed on site for the current cottages?
- Can the dock/waterfront be more accessible given environmental constraints?
- Can funds received from the sale of Southern Conomo Point go toward the Northern Conomo Point project?
- Can this be seen as a long term project or is there a timeframe it needs to be accomplished within?
- Can we subtract Robbins Island and Beach Circle from northern part?
- How restrictive are the Title V requirements?
- What are state's legal requirements for public "waterfront access" (Chapter 91)?
- What can this area support ecologically?
- Is kayak launching by commercial vendors allowed/permitted? By whom?
- Has a survey been performed to determine how many leaseholder would stay if given the option to purchase land at fair market value?
- If the Town retains buildings, do they owe the leaseholder?
- Who is responsible for removal of the buildings, what are the requirements of the property owners to vacate the premises?
- Why is there one private property on Robbins Island, is there another on the causeway to Robbins Island?
- What is the Town's obligation for vacated property structures?
- Would it be possible to get permitting to fill wetlands and/or build up the seawall?
- Can CPA funds be used for a park and public access to the waterfront?

Public Meeting 2, June 17, 2010

PRESENTATION OF DRAFT SCENARIOS

Juliet Walker, senior planner at Taintor & Associates, Inc., began with some introductory remarks outlining the purpose of the public meeting, the consultants' role, and the general format for discussion. She presented a power point presentation summarizing the three scenarios and preliminary fiscal impacts. This presentation is available for download from the project web page along with handouts provided at the meeting.

Purpose of this meeting was to respond to draft scenarios for future land uses at Northern Conomo Point prepared by the consultants.

This was the second of three public meetings to discuss this issue. Format of the meeting was intended to allow everyone to feel free to share their ideas, and participants would be asked to weigh in on whether they agreed or disagreed with some of the ideas shared.

The entire planning process will draw from community members in these public meetings as well as information provided by the Conomo Point Committee and other stakeholders in the community.

Participants were then asked to join one of three break-out groups organized around the room with a consultant facilitator.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Participants in the small groups were asked to discuss the three scenarios presented, using the following questions.

- 1) What do you like?
- 2) What are the limitations?
- 3) How would you suggest addressing these limitations?

Finally, they were asked to discuss the pros and cons of a phased approach as presented by the consultants.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS POINTS

The lists below are organized by group. These represent the discussion points raised by the participants as recorded on the easel pads by the facilitator. No additional review or evaluation has been done to compile these lists – they represent the “raw” input received at the meeting.

Group 1 – Facilitator Sue Brown

➤ **General Comments**

- Concern regarding access – make sure there is a need for the amount of access being proposed
- What is the cost of yearly maintenance and supervision
- Ramp facility should be separate from beach to separate boaters and swimmers
- Parking – bear in mind access for mooring users
- Opinion that North Shore communities break even or make money on beaches

➤ **Scenario 1 Comments**

- Doesn't go far enough – Town is still a landlord
- There is a problem mixing boaters and swimmers, if year round access is allowed at ramps
- DEP may not approve: is it feasible
- In the past getting Title V approval has been responsibility of tenants, approvals last 2 years
- Road provides accessibility – should not be removed
- Conomo Point Road needed as promenade to provide access for bikers, strollers, and ADA
- Detached verandas could provide users with space for enjoying park as opposed to just lawn

➤ **Scenario 2 Comments**

- Building fronting on north part of Conomo Point Road should be eliminated to provide better access
- Conomo Point is a real neighborhood, the type planners are trying to create, it should be appreciated
- Beach Circle: should it stay, does it provide public access
- Fiscal impacts should consider annual maintenance, etc.
- Concern about year-round safety and security if uses shift to seasonal with fewer dwellings
- Has historic preservation been considered as a way to reduce density
- Lynch Park in Beverly may be a good comparable as park
- The back or marsh facing properties are not as desirable for open space

➤ **Scenario 3 Comments**

- Phase gradually, create a park half this size and see what happens. This allows usage to be tested
- Cox Reservation may be comparable for recreational park
- Scenario 3 is not affordable nor will a park that large be used
- The Town may not have money to maintain this size park
- A park here is not as attractive as people may believe due to insects and limited beach and limited season of use
- What is the true cost of being a landlord, including lawyers, insurance, services, maintenance, etc.
- ERBA is the primary commercial use at this time and doesn't pay any fees to Town
- Fear of next use if park proves to be unaffordable (McMansions, subdivision)
- Continue leasing Robbins Island
- Beach Circle should be kept for rental as it doesn't provide desirable access
- Consider that previous Town open space off Lufkin Road used inappropriately and closed

➤ **Discussion about Phased approach**

- Are there different strategies for phasing
- Unknown -- how much will a park be used, this approach allows time to evaluate use and gives a starting point that does no initial harm
- Consider granting life leases to current tenants: allowing present owners to live life out there at new rate, but could not pass on to family, this would gradually reduce density
- Have other communities used phases to satisfy DEP requirements, plum Island residents granted life tenancy

Group 2 – Facilitator Bonnie Sontag

➤ **General Comments**

- Be sure to include responses on the Town Long Term Planning Committee survey that relate to CP
- Loss of a historic community. Do something to capture it as an asset before it's gone, e.g., history project in words and pictures
- Has the cost of repairing docks been figured into any of the scenarios
- Need to define level of access
- Need to define level of preservation
- Keep it as it is in terms of access and require use of technology to meet DEP limits
- How to reach people in Town who care about this area and want to protect it

➤ **Scenario 1 Comments**

Pros

- More access to residents
- All residents stay
- Create green park on open space at start of northern boat ramp access
- Why so much parking on the Point? There's plenty just before entering the Point
- Create parking lot in back green space
- Create more resident-only on-street parking and ticket offenders
- Explore this option more thoroughly: add car access for looping around at access to northern boat ramp; don't eliminate "scenic vista" road access for visitors, especially those who can't walk

Cons

- Leave Robbins Island as is. It doesn't provide improved access. Robbins Island is a separate issue from Northern C.P
- Removal of front road eliminates viewing from car; this is a shame for folks who can't easily walk around

Questions

- Why were accessory buildings chosen for removal? Couldn't they be reused for something such as restrooms or changing rooms?
- How can a privately owned garage (on Emerson Island) be designated for removal?
- How will price of properties be set? Will it vary if the property is partial or year-round use?
- Where is the actual buffer line proposed in relation to dwellings, i.e., how close/far away?
- Why are two structures on Robbins Island suggested for removal? Their removal doesn't seem to add any benefit/serve any purpose.

➤ **Scenario 2 Comments**

Pros

- Keep public access to Robbins Island, even if properties sold off to one or more buyers
- Make clear what is public and what is private space
- Explore new technology (or older technology) to meet DEP limits and keep more/all dwellings, What would it cost home-owners to install this technology
- Temporary parking at north end boat launch for viewing from car
- Parking exists at Poor Farm and Sumac Road – these locations do not take up scenic sites like some of the proposed sites on CP
- Create drop off point at northern end for people who can't walk far

Cons

- Traffic flow would still be tight, even with one-way road system

Questions

- Options for tenants to purchase properties? (Voted down in past)
- What happens to the three houses on the road to Robbins Island
- What is the financial trade-off for the Town in selling vs. leasing Robbins Island properties
- Why is a green park proposed for space where structures have been removed, ,on't understand the value/benefit of a "back park"

➤ **Scenario 3 Comments**

Pros

- Land available for other uses or sale

Cons

- Open land and need for maintenance/up-keep and loss of revenue could ruin the benefit of having all that land available to the public (and any other benefit anticipated)
- Loss of income, cost of removals and increased cost for maintenance/up-keep
- Loss of "free" maintenance by current residents
- Seasonal use will replace all-year use
- Loss of CP residents' business to local merchants – estimated \$.25 -.50m
- Too many parking lots

➤ **Discussion of Phased approach**

- Do Scenario 1 plus sell lots – keeps as many dwellings as can be sold
- Observation in moving from Scenario 1 to Scenario 2: some of the leased properties could be bought by the Town and used by the public as they become available

Group 3 – Facilitator Juliet Walker

➤ **General Comments**

- What about the DEP constraint? What is the BOS doing to address this, how can it be solved? Are tight tanks an option? Town should talk to DEP to determine options.

➤ **Scenario 1 Comments**

- Agree with keeping seasonal parking on the beach
- Existing limitations -- not enough enough parking therefore not enough public use
- Priority for use of NCP should be Town of Essex residents and not over-accommodate non-residents
- Adding parking could create more demand for increased public use (chicken and egg problem)
- Consider adding a resident use fee for NCP
- The proposed location for a public boathouse lacks direct access to beach
- Cost of ongoing maintenance should be considered for fiscal impacts
- Make sure creation of waterfront park is realistic from an engineering standpoint – will the retaining wall have to be reinforced
- Proposed location for a new boat ramp has limited access due to tides, also would interfere with views
- A bike path or walking path should connect the entire perimeter of NCP

➤ **Scenario 2 Comments**

- Robbins Island shouldn't be sold, Town should increase public uses there, as well
- Increase the green space from the north of the Point rather than from the south – removing buildings along north part of Conomo Point Rd.
- The priority for use should be Essex residents only, define "public" as such. "We don't want a Stage Fort Park."
- Consider wastewater treatment facility as way to solve DEP constraints

- Consideration should be given to keeping year-round uses on NCP
- Restrooms can be difficult to maintain and costly
- Plan should add pedestrian-only ways
- Maintenance should be considered in fiscal implications – e.g. seawall
- There is a moral and ethical concern about vacating the existing properties – what to do about seniors?
- There is also a moral and ethical concern about honoring lease terms
- **Scenario 3 Comments**
 - This is unrealistic and too costly to maintain
 - Parking would interfere with scenic attraction of area
 - Focused on non-resident uses, should be for residents only
 - Mix of trailer and non-trailer parking is good
 - Break up parking into smaller spots
 - Less parking more green space
 - Get rid of Phase 3 – it's awful
 - Put parking in less scenic locations
- **Discussion of Phased approach**
 - Town has poor track record in maintenance of other Town properties
 - Seems more realistic from a fiscal standpoint
 - Would help understand parking need
 - Also would help understand maintenance costs
 - Consider getting rid of buildings by attrition or give Town right of first refusal
 - Would help transition existing tenants (particularly seniors)
 - Time frame could be as long as 50 years to reach Phase 3
 - Prefer less than 50 years to implement
 - This is a legacy that should be returned to the Town
- **Questions**
 - Do CP tenants own their improvements or not?
 - Is use of Emerson lot (existing parking for Cross Island) for other purposes restricted?

Public Meeting 3, October 14, 2010

PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT SCENARIOS

Juliet Walker, senior planner at Taintor & Associates, Inc., began with some introductory remarks outlining the purpose of the public meeting, the consultants' role, and the general format for discussion. She presented a power point presentation summarizing the revised three scenarios and the fiscal impact assessment.

Purpose of this meeting was to respond to revised scenarios for future land uses at Northern Conomo Point prepared by the consultants. This was the final of three public meetings to discuss this issue.

DISCUSSION

Following the presentation, attendees were asked to respond to three questions.

Questions

1. Which of the scenarios presented tonight do you prefer? Or, are there specific concepts represented on the scenarios that you support.

- Scenario 1 is preferred – however it doesn't comply with DEP – it retains the character of the point
- Public Access/Use is enhanced and includes parking, distinction between public and private space, places to linger
- amenities to serve visitors should include kayak racks and storage facilities, etc.
- Scenario 2B provides public access that is more attractive and functional
- Would like to have total public access/ownership in time.
- Would like to have an ocean /marsh alliance to focus on education, resources, economic development, etc. (research alliance/institute)
- Scenario 1 is preferred; but sell some properties not needed or desired for public access in order to meet DEP compliance criteria
- Scenario 2B has more desirable public use
- Prefer sale of Robbins Island, but maintain as public road, and allow public paths/access
- Want option to implement something quickly in order to see progress
- Scenario 1 allows modest change and the option to evaluate outcome incrementally
- Use Scenario 1 as first phase to see what else the Town may want to implement

2) Scenario 2 presents two options for reducing the number of dwellings in order to comply with the DEP wastewater flow limits. Share your ideas on other types of criteria that might be considered for selection of properties to remain or go.

- Status of tenants should be considered in the short to mid term only
- Distinctive buildings should remain
- Architectural or historic character should be considered
- The collection of buildings should be considered
- What will be the impact of changes (reduced density, increased public access and amenities) on the remaining lots?
- A survey performed by the Conomo Point Tenants Association indicated that about 20% of the current tenants would not be able to continue leasing if rates were increased to 3% of land value. Tenants who are not offered new leases should be able to have first right of refusal to lease sites vacated by others.

3. What other ideas do you want to see the Town pursue that you did not hear reflected tonight?

- Use some area in Southern Conomo Point for parking, walk or bike from there
- Concepts should show connections to Southern Conomo Point
- Town Recreational Department should organize activities on the Point so it feels like accessible public space. For example the sailing program (currently run the by Conomo Point Tenants could be operated by the Town.
- Would like to see a summary of the number of homes that are recommended to go and who owns them.
- Let people know that anyone can join the Tenants' Association and work to protect and enhance Conomo Point