I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on October 2, 2018 at City Hall -- Room 310, 36 Court Street, Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived

II. Public Portion

III. Minutes

Springfield Community Preservation Committee
Tuesday, October 2, 2018 at 6:00 pm
City Hall Room 310
36 Court Street, Springfield

Present: Gloria DeFillipo, Juanita Martinez, Robert McCarroll, Angela Robles, Steve Shultis, Ralph Slate
Absent: Lamar Cook, Terry Mitchell

Mr. McCarroll opened the meeting at 6:05 pm. Ms. DeFillipo moved to approve the minutes of September 17; Ms. Martinez seconded. The vote was accepted, except for Ms. Robles who abstained.

Mr. McCarroll outlined the procedure for making 2018 funding recommendations. We will start with projects with most frequency on everyone's top eight projects list down to the lowest. We will have a motion to fund, a second, a discussion and vote. If that is successful, a motion as to the amount, a second as there can be an amendment to fund more or less, a second vote and if that prevails that will become the motion. If it fails that will be the original amount. We will then have a discussion as to what are the restrictions and conditions. Mr. Slate is our bookkeeper to keep track of what we tally after each vote. There is a FY18 amount of $1,308,545 in three designated reserves of $70,500 each and one undesignated reserve of $1,097.045. As we recommend money we must specify from which account the money will come. If we allocate the full $1,308,545, we will discuss we willing to go into the FY19 money. Stuart from the Coalition has said that CPCs quite often have two years of stored up money and it is our right if we choose to recommend allocation from some of the FY19 money.

East Springfield Veterans Memorial Garden: Ms. DeFillipo move to recommend the proposal; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. Slate stated that this is a decent project that should have a good impact for little money. Ms. DeFillipo added that the Neighborhood Council is putting in money and will maintain the perennial garden. A unanimous vote was made. Ms. Martinez moved to recommend the full amount of $10,750.00. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. McCarroll then raised the issue of conditions. He suggested there should be a sign acknowledging CPA during construction, a small permanent sign that acknowledges the CPA,

any remaining money at the end of any project that money should be returned to CPA, and if the project does not take place that money should be returned to CPA. It was so moved and unanimously passed.

Mr. Slate asked if recommended funds would be dispersed as reimbursement or in advance of the project. Mr. Shultis suggested that we need to decide what degree of oversight the CPC will have on projects. Ms. DeFillipo suggested that we make a recommendation to the City Council and if asked how we are going to handle it we will inform them that we will discuss disbursement at our next meeting. Mr. McCarroll stated that for tonight we will go through funding of the projects and for what amount and we will deal about payment scheduling later

ReGreen Springfield Invasive Plant Program: Mr. Slate moved to recommend the program; Ms. Martinez seconded. Ms. DeFillipo mentioned that the program will train individuals to help with this project. The motion was unanimously passed. Ms. DeFillipo moved to fund for the requested $40,000. Mr. McCarroll stated that he was thinking $25,000 and they can re-apply next year. Mr. Shultis stated that he was in favor of the full amount because he feels it is an excellent program. Ms. DeFillipo agreed. A unanimous vote was made for $40,000. Mr. McCarroll stated that he felt this project should be doing areas that CPC was also helping. Mr. Slate moved that the project should first deal with spaces where the CPC has approved projects. A unanimous vote was taken in favor of this motion.

Office of Housing Homebuyer Down Payment Assistance Program: Ms. DeFillipo moved to recommend; Ms. Robles seconded. Mr. Slate felt that this is a worthwhile program that targets a demographic between 80% and 100% of median income so that is an unmet need and it meets our goals. Ms. DeFillipo agreed. The motion unanimously passed. Ms. DeFillipo made a motion for the full amount of $150,000. Mr. McCarroll felt that they can fund for less because they aren't sure what the demand will be for this new demographic and he would rather give them less so we can fund more projects and they could come back next year after they could tell us how many projects they had. Keep in mind that their maximum assistance per household is $2,500.00. Mr. Slate stated that he considered $100,000 and made the motion to amend the distribution to $100,000; Ms. DeFillipo second. A unanimous vote in favor was taken. A vote was taken on the amended motion and was passed unanimously. Mr. McCarroll felt that we must be very clear that they assist households between 80 to 100% of median. Mr. Slate added that he would like a list as to who received the money because he feels that this is a transparency issue. Ms. DeFillipo suggested that we get the name and addresses of the people who received these funds. It was moved to restrict funding to households between 80% and 100% of median income and to require quarterly reports showing names and addresses assisted. A unanimous vote in favor was taken.

McKnight Rail Trail Design Study: Mr. Slate moved to approve the study; Ms. Martinez seconded. Mr. Slate stated that this project will be good for the entire city not just the McKnight neighborhood. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Shultis moved the amount of $200,000; Ms. DeFillipo seconded. All were in favor. Mr. McCarroll said that if they get other sources of money that pay for the study we will get what they don't need back. It was so moved and unanimously voted.

Riverwalk Park Enhancement: Ms. DeFillipo moved to fund the project; Mr. Slate seconded. It was unanimously voted. Ms. DeFillipo moved to fund the full amount of $24,000. A unanimous vote was taken. Mr. McCarroll stated that a sub-committee needs to approve the ultimate design of interpretive signage and banners. Mr. Slate posed the question of the possibility to have history of the area on the signage. Mr. McCarroll agreed that the interpretive

signage should be history or natural history. Mr. McCarroll stated that the applicants should reach out to other potential sponsors of interpretive signage, such as Eversource, Six Flags, and the Water/Sewer Commission. Mr. McCarroll said a CPC sub-committee should be working with them on text and design. A unanimous vote was taken in favor.

Ms. DeFillipo asked who is paying for the temporary signage that states that this project is sponsored by the CPA. Mr. McCarroll stated that it is our administrative budget. We would come up with a stock sign that when we are in the midst of a project we would loan it to them.

Wayfinders Rehab Loan Program: Mr. Slate moved to approve funding; Ms. DeFillipo seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that Stuart has said rehabilitation is only allowable if the housing is acquired or created with CPA. We need to say to them that they need to modify their proposal and come back to us next cycle or we could fund them a little and say this is for a project that you need to agree to put on an affordability restriction. Mr. Shultis suggested that we should tell them what to do to help them qualify and tell them what the need to do to create a program that qualifies and then encourage them to come back. Ms. DeFillipo suggested that we would tell them that we liked the idea however it's not currently CPA-compliant. All present voted against recommending but voted to inform the applicant to reapply with an affordability restriction on assisted properties.

Campanile Study: Mr. Slate moved to recommend the proposal; Ms. Martinez seconded. Ms. Martinez stated the historic importance of the Campanile and felt we should fund it. Ms. DeFillipo disagreed because several studies have been done there is no work. She would like to fund the study if they could provide us where the funding would come from after the study. Mr. McCarroll stated that the Campanile was for many people the "poster child" for CPA in Springfield. Mr. McCarroll would rather we participate now and inform the City Council that this study needs to lead to a project. Mr. Slate did agree that there were at least two studies done in the past but the difference now is that the building is far worse than it was when the past two studies were done. He suggested that we should have a restriction that we need an affirmative letter of support and commitment from the highest in the city, either the Chief Development Officer or the Mayor, stating that they are going to explore finding the money to do this project. Ms. Martinez agreed with Mr. Slate regarding the necessity of their promise. A unanimous vote was taken in favor. Mr. Slate made the motion for $250,000; Ms. Robles seconded. Mr. Slate suggested that they have to commit that this study is not going to sit on a shelf. If they are not willing to commit then he didn't think they should get the money. Ms. DeFillipo then added that this would be the way but with stipulations that there has to be a follow-up. Mr. McCarroll did state the study is $449,000 with the City providing the remainder. A unanimous vote was taken in favor. *Restrictions:* CPA has concerns that there have been previous studies and we would like to seek a firm commitment from the city for the stabilization. A unanimous vote was taken in favor.

Godfrey Triangle: Ms. DeFillipo made the motion that we fund the Godfrey Triangle and Mr. Shultis second the motion. Mr. McCarroll began stated that fixing monuments as well as flag pole are not recreation but historic. In June, Mr. McCarroll told them that if they want this project to be CPA eligible that they would have to get a determination from the Historical Commission. We do not have that document. Mr. Slate agreed that the historic element is not there but that open space element is. Mr. McCarroll suggested that we have an amendment that we fund the project without the historic component. Mr. Slate agreed and so moved; Ms. DeFillipo seconded that motion. A unanimous vote was taken for the amended motion. A motion was made to fund $62,500. A unanimous vote was taken. *Restrictions:* We need of historic verification for the flag pole, monument and eagle. However, we would consider a future

application with historic verification of the flag pole, monument and eagle. A unanimous vote in favor was taken.

Conservation Trail Heads: Ms. DeFillipo moved to recommend funding; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that he was in favor of this project but not of the current design of the signs. He felt that whatever gets people walking and making them aware of these gems that people don't know they exist would be beneficial. All were in favor. Mr. Slate moved to recommend $12,196; Mr. Shultis seconded. All were in favor. It was also voted to require final text and design be approved by CPC.

East Forest Park Rail Trail Study: Mr. Slate made a motion to fund; Ms. DeFillipo seconded. Mr. Slate stated that he liked the fact that the McKnight Rail Trail would connect to East Forest Park putting the rail trail right through the heart of the city. A unanimous vote was taken in favor. Ms. DeFillipo made the motion that to fund in the amount of $63,200.00. Ms. Robles second. Mr. Slate moved that they must connect it to Hickory Street; Ms. DeFillipo seconded. All voted in favor.

Gunn Block Stabilization: Mr. Shultis moved to fund; Ms. DeFillipo seconded. Mr. Shultis stated that it was a lot of money however that it is a highly visible historic building in need of much repair. Ms. Martinez pointed out that the project hits all historic priorities. It was a unanimous vote in favor. A motion for the amount of $250,000 was moved by Mr. Shultis; Mr. Slate seconded. A unanimous vote in favor of this project was made.

Springfield Historic Preservation Fund: Mr. McCarroll and Mr. Slate recused themselves and left the room. Ms. DeFillipo moved to fund the proposal; Ms. Martinez seconded. Ms. DeFillipo said it is a great project because it will go outside of the MGM area. Mr. Shultis agreed. There were four in favor and two abstentions. Ms. DeFillipo moved to fund in full at $100,000; Ms. Robles seconded. All four present were in favor with two abstentions. Ms. DeFillipo moved that the CPC receive a list of addresses of those that were funded; Mr. Shultis seconded. Four were in favor and two abstentions.

East Forest Park Community Reading Garden: Ms. Martinez moved to fund; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that there are two components: the community garden which has more structural elements and the story garden which has fewer structural elements. He would be interested in helping with the community garden. Mr. Slate asked what is the cost for that one? Mr. McCarroll stated that they have $138,000 for the community garden, $42,000 for the story garden and $20,000 for the site costs of trees and shrubs. Mr. McCarroll stated that we must make the decision. A unanimous vote was taken for fund. Ms. DeFillipo moved to fund with $138,000 for the community reading garden; Mr. Shultis seconded. A unanimous vote in favor was taken. Mr. McCarroll suggested that the reading garden be open to the community for the remainder of their lease with the School Department. A unanimous vote in favor was taken.

Catholic Charities Homecoming: Mr. Slate moved to fund the proposal; Mr. Shultis seconded. Mr. McCarroll had a problem that they have read our goals and our goals are to fix vacant housing, increase owner occupancy and help fix -up owner occupied buildings as long as there is an affordably restriction. However, they have crafted a program but they are giving rental vouchers to people who are in shelters and are trying to get them to use the rental vouchers in owner-occupied two family houses. Mr. Slate stated that this is really a rental voucher program. Mr. McCarroll stated that he isn't in favor of funding this program. Motion to oppose this program. Ms. DeFillipo stated that it has been determined that this is a rental voucher program and does not meet the goals of owner occupancy. All members are in favor of her rationale.

Old First Church Accessability Study: Mr. Shultis moved to fund the program; Ms. Martinez seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that the study asks for $125,000 for professional services, $25,000 for historic consultants, $15,000 for testing and material services and that amounts to $165,000. Mr. Slate feels that the committee doesn't have the money this year and he doesn't feel it is an urgent project. Ms. DeFillipo also stated that she wasn't in favor of this project at this time. Funding this project was denied. The committee voted that they would encourage them to re-apply next year.

McKnight Preservation Revolving Fund: Ms. Martinez moved to fund; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. Slate wondered if we could fund a small amount but oversee because we have concerns. Ms. DeFillipo stated that she does not want to fund this. Mr. McCarroll stated that they came in with three programs. One was a loan fund to homeowners, one was for endangered buildings, and another was a curb appeal program. Mr. McCarroll stated that curb appeal does not meet our priority. He also suggested that we could work with them on the long term Restoration Fund and that we could give them $50,000. Mr. Slate suggested that the endangered building fund would be easier for us to monitor and we could have a tight rein on and it may not happen because it's going to depend on an endangered building. Mr. Shultis liked the idea of a small opportunity to let him move forward with the energy that they have. What if we gave him $25,000. for that kind of a loan fund. He gets people in the neighborhood and trains them he is big on training the youth. Mr. Shultis said we should approve it or we don't and then we approve it for a lesser amount we target which parts of his application. Five members voted in favor; Ms. DeFillipo voted against. Mr. Slate then proposed a funding amount of $25,000; Mr. Shultis seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that we are funding the Long Term Restoration Fund. A unanimous vote was taken. It was voted to restrict the program to income eligible owner occupants living in the McKnight Local Historic District and that all work needed approval of the Historical Commission. The CPC wants a quarterly report with names, addresses, and what has been assisted. At this time a unanimous vote was taken.

Colony Hills Island Restoration: Mr. Shultis moved to fund the project; Mr. Slate second. Mr. McCarroll stated that this is actually recreating on a small island what was originally designed to go there. Mr. Slate did state that they had some things that were not historic like the granite curbing. Mr. McCarroll replied that they revised their request and took out the curbing and the bird house but added a bench which really isn't needed if they are handling this under historic. The cost of the sign has increased and the bottom line of their project has gone from over $100,000 down to $81,868. Mr. McCarroll felt that it could probably be done for less money. Grass seed, irrigation, mulch, and sign, concrete sidewalk which is no longer brick $16,900, totaling $45,700. Landscaping which includes shrubs, trees, plants comes to $26,000. Removing shrubs that weren't part of the original design is $3,000. Design and engineering is $23,000. Mr. Slate thought that this was a very expensive for a small project. Mr. Shultis then posed the question are we voting for this now as to whether we are funding this project? Ms. Martinez stated that it wasn't very visible to most Springfield residents. Mr. McCarroll, Mr. Slate, Mr. Shultis voted in favor; Ms. DeFillipo, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Robles voted against. The tied vote failed. It was voted that they could re-apply in another funding cycle.

Trinity Building Facade Renovation: This building has a terracotta façade in need of repair. The cost of fixing it is much higher than expected and it is not in their budget. Their dilemma is that they have to finish the project before December in order to take advantage of the tax credits. Mr. McCarroll voted in favor of funding; the five members voted against.

Restoration of McKnight Dingle: Mr. Shultis moved to recommend the project; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. McCarroll had requested a letter from the Park Department stating that they were supporting the project and we never received that. What they did give us is a revised budget that puts in crosswalks for Thompson Triangle. The project has gone up in cost and we have received nothing from the Park Department. Mr. Slate felt that this isn't urgent and it isn't put together well. Mr. McCarroll did state that the Japanese Knotweed that is in the McKnight Dingle will be part of what we tell the Invasive Plant Program to address. All voted against funding for this project and voted to inform the applicant that they can re-apply if a letter of authorization from the Park Department.

Kingoke Farmhouse Protective Wall : Mr. Shultis moved to fund the proposal. All present opposed this motion and then voted to inform the applicant that a high sound wall which hides the historic building from public view is not Historic Preservation.

Mixed Income Housing Cooperative: Mr. Shultis moved to fund the program; Ms. Martinez seconded. Ms. Defillipo stated that the budget didn't match what was on the cover page. Mr. Slate felt that it wasn't a strong proposal and the group doesn't have a track record yet. Mr. Shultis added that this seems very complex to loan and then get the money back. All present were opposed. It was voted to inform the applicant that the proposal should be clarified and the CDC would need more of a track record with similar programs.

Atwater Triangle Fountain Restoration: Mr. Shultis moved to recommend the project; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. McCarroll stated that he would like to help the project but $150,000 for a fountain is too much. Ms. Martinez said that there were no benches. Mr. Shultis added that the style of the fountain was inappropriate too. He also added that the electric fountain was misguided in that they simply don't get repaired. Ms. DeFillipo thought $150,000 was a lot of money. Mr. McCarroll noted that the total cost of the project is $216,000. Leaving the rest of the area is $66,000. Ms. Martinez stated that she asked them if there were benches there and they replied that they did not want benches. Ms. Martinez was told that they bring their own chairs when there is a concert. All present opposed the project. It was then voted that they could re-apply in a future funding cycle with a less costly proposal and that if they go to the Historical Commission and the Commission states that the fountain is a historic resource the CPC could help fix the existing fountain.

Headstart Window Project: Mr. Shultis moved to recommend; Mr. Slate seconded. Mr. Slate stated that in his opinion the windows were not beyond repair and that replacement windows are not historic preservation. He felt that only in extreme cases would replacement windows be warranted. He also stated Historic Preservation funding should go to preserving not changing the materials of the original windows. A unanimous vote was opposed to this project. It was then voted that if they could re-apply in a future funding cycle for restoration of windows.

Ms. DeFillipo suggested that we give the City Council a list explaining our decisions with a rationale. She also suggested that we give them a cover letter and behind it a list showing what projects we recommend to fund and which we will not fund. Mr. McCarroll does not feel that we have to list the projects that we do not recommend to fund. Ms. DeFillipo stated that she will do it up and send it to Mr. Slate, who will tweak it and then send it to Mr. McCarroll.

The next meeting will be on Monday, November 5 in City hall Room 220. We will be advertising that this will be a public hearing for input regarding needs going forward.