



Community Preservation Committee

Regular

~ Minutes ~

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103

<http://www.springfieldcityhall.com>

Kathy Calvanese

Tuesday, October 1, 2024

6:00 PM

Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on October 1, 2024 at Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology, (Online), Springfield, MA.

II. Public Portion

Springfield Community Preservation Committee

October 1, 2024

Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic and pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order concerning the Open Meeting Law, the Springfield Community Preservation Committee will continue to meet remotely until further notice. A full video recording of this meeting can be viewed here:

<https://www.facebook.com/Springfield> <<http://www.facebook.com/Springfield>>

CommunityPreservationCommittee/Annual Public Hearing public comments are accepted until September 30, 2024 for inclusion in the Community Preservation Plan. Telephone 413-530-1268. Mail to Community Preservation Committee, City Hall, 36 Court St, Springfield, 01103 or e-mail to: cpc@springfieldcityhall.com

Present: Clinton Harris (Park Department Representative), Juanita Martinez (Conservation Commission) Robert McCarroll (Springfield Preservation Trust), Stephen Bosworth (Neighborhood Representative), Gloria DeFillipo (Planning Board Representative), Yolanda Cancel (Neighborhood Representative) Judy Crowell (Historical Commission) Rhonda Sherrell - (Neighborhood Representative) **Absent:** Willie Thomas (Housing Authority)

Call to Order 6:00 p.m.

Approve Minutes of September 2

Contract Extension and Change of Scope Requests:

Indian Orchard Fire Station

Myrtle Street Playground

Spanish American War Monument

Reconsideration of Historic Homes Program Policies

Set dates for 2025 Application Cycle

Review Annual CPA Plan

Review Application Template and Instructions

Other Matters

Next Meeting for November (General Election is Tuesday, November 5th)

Approval of Minutes

Approval of September 4, 2024 Minutes. Motion to accept the minutes by Clinton Harris seconded by Judith Crowell . Abstain. Juanita and Rhonda. Motion passed.

Requests for Contract Changes

Indian Orchard Fire Station

Myrtle Street Playground

Spanish American War Monument

Indian Orchard Fire Station

Brian Connors from the City of Springfield Economic Development. The funding commitment is \$1.5M ARPA funding and \$550,000 CPA grants. The new estimates have come in higher than expected and instead of the \$300,000 CPA grant designated for ADA compliance and the elevator, Mr. Connors requested the funds be used to shore-up the steel under the building and other stabilization efforts. The use of the first \$250,000 CPA grant will remain the same (windows, doors). Deconstruction of the historic cornice and elements will be reconstructed where possible. Mr. Connors was asked about the future of completing the ADA compliance elements and they are continuing to look for funding sources including the State's Underutilized Property grant. The Indian Orchard Citizens Council is fund raising privately for the interior of the building

Motion by Steve Bosworth to combine the two grants for use of exterior work and stabilization. Juanita seconded. All in favor. Motion passed.

Myrtle Street Playground

Laura Walsh, Senior Parks Project Manager for the Dept. of Parks, Buildings & Recreation Management returned with a request to eliminate the fitness course installation at the park and install a playground along with a number of the original elements requested (game tables and walking path). The Myrtle Street Park playground is at the end of its life cycle. The Indian Orchard Citizens Council sent a letter of support but was unable to attend the meeting. The project is anticipated to remain on budget and on time. The letter was read into the record.

Motion to shift the scope of the Myrtle Street Playground made by Rhonda and seconded by Yolanda. All in favor, motion passed.

Spanish American War Monument

Laura Walsh, Senior Parks Project Manager for the Dept. of Parks, Buildings & Recreation Management requested an extension for the project from November 30, 2024 to June 30, 2025. The processing of city contracts with procurement was delayed due to the volume of ARPA and ESSER grants and obtaining a bidder through the RFP process. A vendor was hired but the weather is now a factor.

Motion to extend contract from November 30, 2024 to June 30, 2025 made by Juanita second by Judith. All in favor. Motion passed.

Reconsideration of Historic Homes Program Policies (Summary)

- A. Argument in favor of removing the homeowner income qualifying test
- B. Arguments in favor of keeping the income test
- C. Alternate option

A) Argument in favor of removing the income qualifying test from the Historic Homes Program.

Requiring a means-test for this program inhibits the program goal (preservation of a finite collection of 956 historic homes). The income test requirement debate encourages personal judgments rather than program judgments regarding which homes are worthy based on income of the current resident.

The mission of *this* program is focused on the preservation of homes into the future. The mission of social assistance programs address the individual or family in their present situation; (for example, the goal of the city-run Exterior Home Repair program uses HUD funding to ensure a safe home for the occupant, the goal of the Historic Homes Restoration program is to ensure the home is repaired properly and that it is preserved for the future. Those are two very different program goals. *It doesn't mean that we ignore the lives of the people inside the homes, rather today we're here to focus on ensuring the future of the house so it is maintained without compromising our limited housing inventory and the public/community benefit.*

The SCPC has invested in HHP to ensure the homes are restored properly and a historical consultant is paid for that purpose. There are unintended consequences with a homeowner who may take short-cuts when the AMI is too high on paper to qualify for HHP. It is likely that work

on the home won't include a review by a preservation consultant and the use of inappropriate material purchased from Home Depot to mitigate the immediate problem. Qualifying a homeowner by income is shortsighted when you consider homeowners who take short-cuts defeat the HHP mission which is to properly preserve what we have. It also encourages non-compliance in the repairs when homes are excluded from the eligible 956 houses and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards may not be followed in restoration by the homeowner.

B. Arguments in favor of keeping the income test

- The argument to restrict funds in the HPP using an income sliding scale to close some of the gap is a valid one in a grant funding decision, but is it the best decision for *this* program?
- *Those with higher AMI have the financial resources to repair their homes.*

This may or may not be true. The SCPC are not social workers who are trained to accurately assess an individual's financial situation. The HHP uses one determining factor--AMI. The process is flawed as it is not relevant to the preservation of historic resources. The income test retards the mission of the program and it is recommended to abolish the requirement..

C. Alternate option

The committee could move closer to the mission by offering all 956 homes some level of funding in recognition of 1) being in the defined cohort and 2) the additional costs (regardless of income) to appropriately repair a historic home. In addition, not all homeowners will apply for the lottery and not all homes need work but nonetheless the program should be open to all 956 homes.

The alternate option would support a) raising the AMI to 100% for a full grant b) raise the minimum grant to \$15,000 and c) remove the eligibility cap (currently at 200%) to anyone earning over 170% AMI will receive the minimum grant. All other requirements remain the same.

Motion by Clinton Harris to a) keep the income eligibility test but raise the AMI to 100% to qualify for a full \$30,000 grant and b) raise the minimum grant from \$10,000 to \$15,000 but keep the cap at the current 200% . Second by Gloria.

Discussion. Motion by Yolanda to amend Clinton's motion to include the third element (anyone over 200% AMI will be eligible for a minimum \$15,000 grant). Second by Rhonda.

Discussion of amendment.

Vote to include the amendment in the original motion.

Yes: Yolanda, Bob

No: Judy, Clinton, Gloria, Rhonda, Steve Juanita

Amendment fails.

Vote on original motion by Clinton Harris to a) keep the income eligibility test but raise the AMI to 100% to qualify for a full \$30,000 grant and b) raise the minimum grant from \$10,000 to \$15,000 but keep the cap at the current 200%.

Yes: Clinton, Yolanda, Rhonda, Steve

No: Judy, Gloria, Bob

Abstain: Juanita

Motion passes.

Postcards will be mailed to 956 homeowners in the designated seven local historic districts announcing the next lottery drawing at our regularly scheduled meeting on December 3, 2024.

Set dates for 2025 Application Cycle

Workshop January 7, 2025

No meeting in February

Applications due on February 27

Meet twice in March, April, May

Recommendations to City Council June

Unanimous vote to accept

Review Annual CPA Plan

Goals and plans reviewed. Minimum changes. New comments from the Annual Public Hearing are inserted in Exhibit 2. Next month review for missing goals and the application review.

Next Meeting November 12

Motion to adjourn