Community Preservation Committee

Regular

~ Minutes ~

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103
http://www.springfieldcityhall.com

Kevin Chaffee

Tuesday, August 4, 2020	6:00 PM	Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on August 4, 2020 at Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology, (Online), Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived

II. Public Portion

III. Minutes

Springfield Community Preservation Committee
Remote Meeting
August 4, 2020

Present: Lamar Cook, Gloria DeFillipo, David Finn, Juanita Martinez, Terry Rodriguez, Ralph Slate, Robert McCarroll

Absent: Terry Mitchell, Willie Thomas

Robert McCarroll began the meeting by introducing the Committee: Mr. Cook: Neighborhood; Gloria DeFillipo: Planning Board Representative; David Finn: The Historical Commission Representative; Juanita Martinez: Conservation; Terry Mitchell, Neighborhood; Terry Rodriguez: The Park Department; Ralph Slate: Neighborhood Representative; and Robert McCarroll: The Springfield Preservation Trust

We may be joined with Willie Thomas the Springfield Housing Authority representative.

Mr. McCarroll stated that the first item on the agenda is to approve the minutes of our July 21 st meeting. Ms. DeFillipo made the motion and Mr. Cook second the motion.

In Favor: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Slate, and Mr. McCarroll

Springfield Bike Park Study: Robert began by refreshing the memories of those present. We had voted to recommend it and David has made a motion to recommend the $80,000 which is what they asked for. However, there was a question as to whether it could be done for less. So we made a motion to table. So what we need to do is to make a motion to remove it from the table, and then we will take a vote on that and that will take us to the original motion to recommend $80,000. So if I could make a motion to take from the table the Bike Park Study. David made the motion to remove the Springfield Bike Park Study. Juanita second that motion. Now we are voting on whether we should move it from the table and then go back to the discussion we were having.

In Favor: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll

The motion that was made prior to when we tabled and we recommended funding for the whole $80,000. So we will go back to that discussion. Karen and David you were going to look into this and I don't know if you have anything to report. David stated he had a couple of questions and asked what would we get from the Bike Study? That was clarified for me so I still feel relatively comfortable with my original recommendation. I am certainly open to other options as well. Robert asked David to clarify what he found out. Can you inform the rest of the Committee? My question was what are we getting from this study? I realized we would get a complete study in terms of design, location and a full set of construction documents as well. I had a couple of concerns regarding number five and seven. I wanted to get some clarity as to what that cost actually entailed and I personally feel comfortable with the response that I got back. Juanita stated that we wanted to know how they arrived at the figure of $80,000. Juanita asked David how he arrived at that figure. David stated that one of the comments regarding the cost relative to the dog park is much more in terms of planning and preparation and assembling and construction of documents. It is a much different purpose. The cost is much more involved in terms of putting a set of working documents. Robert stated that he is fairly comfortable going ahead with the request that is submitted.

Mr. Cook asked for the same amount as the dog park figure of $80,000. David stated that the terms of planning are much more involved than the dog park. Lamar then stated that David did his due diligence. Mr. McCarroll then asked that we take a vote on this for the sum of $80,000.

In Favor of Table: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate, and Mr. McCarroll

Robert stated that other than the usual conditions the study carries an acknowledgement.

Historic Renovation Project: We tabled this project before we took any votes. Ralph and David

were going to have a conversation with the office of Planning and Economic Development who had submitted it. I will look at either Ralph or David to give us an update on their meeting. David asked Ralph if he could give an introduction and you can speak as to what you sent back to Planning. David did state that they did have a meeting with Scott Hanson, and Alvin Allen a few days back. Some of the questions that we had: How does the program actually get implemented? My project is funded so how much do I have to contribute? Perhaps you could explain the projects that will actually get funded. Which applicants will receive funding? Who would the external consultant be? As far as income there were no guidelines as to how much of the project should be funded? Should there be matching funds? Ralph put together a good proposal and it was sent back to Planning.

They are reviewing that and I haven't heard any comments from them. I don't know if you have. Ralph then stated that he created a linear function all the way down to zero. If you make two percent of the median you get zero percent for all intent and purpose. We looked at some of the numbers and they look pretty good. That is the general framework of the proposal.

Mr. Finn then asked how do we prioritize projects and the recommendation was first come first serve and there were concerns about that. How would the program be promoted? They assured us that it would go through the McKnight neighborhood Council. They would be willing to do a mailer to inform people of the program so that there would be no bias. They assure us they would do everything to reach out to as many people in the McKnight neighborhood. They feel that this is the fairest way. Mr. McCarroll asked if this is a grant program and the answer was yes. They told us that the end goal is to improve homes in the McKnight neighborhood and it didn't matter that someone would live there after.

They are meeting in August and in September first and we still have time to tweak it. While tying the loose ends up we can put on two restrictions and it has to be publicly known.

Mr. McCarroll then stated that we should have a motion to recommend the project and take a

vote on that. After that we will have a motion on the amount to recommend.
Robert then said we need to make a motion to table. Ms. DeFillipo asked Robert if we have to un-table it? He replied that we need to make the initial motion first.
All in Favor: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate and Mr. McCarroll
Now we need to make the motion to recommend the project. Mr. Finn stated that the request is for two hundred thousand dollars. The application suggests that there is a maximum of thirty thousand dollars per grant. I don't know if we think of it in multiples of thirty. I'm comfortable with recommending less and I would also support the full amount. Robert stated that he felt if they are having a program it is crucial. We can always tweak it if there is going to be a second year of it. I'm certainly happy to start it off and we need to say we need the program. We will have a discussion on the amount. Ralph pointed out that not all people will receive a $30,000 grant. There will be some smaller projects. Robert then stated he would a vote to fund:
All in Favor: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Ms. Rodriguez Mr. Slate and Mr. McCarroll
Robert then stated that it is time to vote on the amount that they will recommend.
Juanita made a motion that we give them the full amount of $200,000. Ms. Rodriguez second the motion.
All in Favor: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Ms. Rodriguez Mr. Slate and Mr. McCarroll
Robert then suggested that we put in the restrictions that Ralph had spoken about but they haven't yet agreed to, is that correct? Ralph stated that he thinks that they were on the way to agreement. The issues that I sent out with the numbers and Scott had gone home that day and he was going to get back to us yesterday but he didn't. They were most concerned with easement of administration. So this is a very easy way to do it. Once you know what percentage of the area median is you just look it up on the chart and it tells you how much the imbursement you are going to get. I don't think they are going to have any problems with that they just didn't want to get into anything super complicated. The only other restriction that we talked about is making the projects public, not necessarily the dollar amount just in general so people can see who is getting funded and what types of projects they are and how they are being handled. Robert then asked are there any requirements that we want to put on this that will ultimately go as we recommend it to City Council. David then stated that we had talked about a percentage relative to the total that was allowed to do repair work prior to the actual project. There was not a percentage in the application. Is that a restriction that we need to set and say that no more than X percent of the total grant will be used to do related repairs. Ralph felt that this would be reasonable to put in there since it was under application. David asked are you okay with five percent? Ralph stated that was fine.
David then made a motion that we have a restriction that states that no more than five percent of the total grant money can be used for repairs related or adjacent to the actual work being done. Robert then asked David you're speaking about the specific individual grant not five percent of the $200,000? David answered yes. Robert asked second to that? Terry second the motion. Any further discussion? Robert then stated we will now go to a vote.
All in Favor: Mr. Cook, Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll
Robert asked if there are any restrictions? Robert stated that he would still like something in there that says something like there is a sliding scale of city participation based on income. It is

not part of their original proposal. Ralph stated that we definitely need to say that and we also need to put that in because what if the projects became publicly invisible. Robert then asked Ralph if these two restrictions were a motion. Ralph stated yes and I will send out a worksheet of the meeting, that shows the exact formula for determining the percent.
Gloria then asked shouldn't that be included in the restrictions that table? Robert replied that he thought so. Robert felt that they could send it. Ralph stated that he e-mailed Karen the percentages and it was shared on the screen so people can get a feel for what the reimbursement will be. Robert asked Ralph if you were at 100% of median what is the reimbursement? The reimbursement would be 68%.
If an applicant is at 150%, the reimbursement would be 34%. At 50% it would be 95%. If income is at 175% reimbursement is 17%. Robert told Ralph that the range that you proposed makes sense and we now have at least a document that we have agreed to and this is going to be the condition of the percentage of the city's share of the individuals project based on income so this will be attached to the condition. Ralph then stated that after a year we can tweak this.
The thing that Scott and Phil were sort of adamant about is they don't have the ability to sort of walk people through their projects. Gloria stated that when the person goes out and gets their contractor the contractor knows that the reimbursement will come from the city when their project is done. Perhaps that should be a stipulation for them to do the work. Ralph stated that the only suggestion that I have is we maybe should get in touch with Cambridge. Cambridge has a program where they fund this type of activity but they do restrict it to people that are under the area median of 100% or lower. We could probably find out how they handle it. I don't think that this holds up their program. Robert stated they are only meeting in August and it's a public hearing meeting. My understanding is that they will resume their normal schedule in September meeting on the fourteenth. We would be meeting on September first. We certainly can still tweak it then give them the final report by agenda day which is the ninth. Robert feels that we should tie up any loose ends that we can because I don't want to be the one to sit in front of City Council on the fourteenth or the twenty first explaining a program that isn't fully prepared. Let's put on the two restrictions that are currently motions, which is the chart on the percentage based on income and the issue that whoever gets it has to be publicly known. Then you can talk to Phil and Scott and we are recommending them and here are the conditions. We figure we need to get some other things nailed down by September first so we can officially set that on part of the recommendation with the City Council. Ralph stated that what we need is to have a CPC meeting before September first. Robert stated that as long as we meet on September first we will adopt whatever needs to be addressed. Robert stated that the motion is on the table to put on the additional requirements regarding the income which were in that e-mail that Karen shared on the screen and the fact that whatever properties need assistance must be publicly known.
So who is in favor of the additional conditions?
All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Slate Mr. McCarroll
Trinity House: Exterior work needs to be done. We ran out of energy at our marathon meeting. After discussion of this project a vote was taken to take this off the table. Ms. Martinez made the motion to take this project off the table and Ms. Rodriguez second the motion.
All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Ms. Rodriguez, Mr. Slate

Mr. McCarroll
Robert then stated that we need to make a motion as to whether we want to recommend this project for CPA funding. Mr. Slate stated that he would like to make a motion to approve the project for consideration to replace windows and doors and masonry at the Trinity House. Ralph made the motion and Juanita second the motion. Robert then stated that now we have a discussion. Ralph then said if I remember correctly we lost steam when we were talking about the first floor windows and if they are present and we talked about repairing them. The second floor windows we had a proposal from Howland which was to reconstruct the second floor windows to be accurate I guess. As far as the masonry I didn't have an issue with the masonry. The question is we have a property that is historic and has been abandoned for a while but the cost of replicating the windows on the second floor is fairly substantial if I am not mistaken. Robert asked Karen if she had the information that Trinity House had provided for us. Ralph felt it was about $63,000 on the window work. Karen stated that it was $63,000. Robert asked if it was for the ground floor windows and replication on the second floor windows. Is that correct? Ralph agreed that it was correct. The question I have in my head is I'm not necessarily sure that the property is Historic but it is important enough to replicate the second floor windows. I think that the first floor windows should be refurbished because they are present and they appear to be repairable at least. The question comes with the second floor that is why I spoke about facades there may be a way to replicate the façade on the secondary or in the back. This would be a substantial amount of money for this property. The property is a contributing property but it's not the best property. David asked if there are thirty seven windows? Ralph stated that it sounds correct. David stated that the total estimate is $53,800. It's about $1,400 per window. David stated that this is a lot of money. There are beautiful windows that are significantly less. The second quote came from Pam Howland for significantly less. Ralph felt that one of the quotes was to replicate the missing windows and the other one was to not replicate them. That is probably why there is a difference. There is a substantial difference between the two proposals. David then said there was a quote for $28,245. What was the work for that price? David stated that the labor and materials to reglaze thirty six windows and sashes at our workshop. Karen added that it also included seven doors. David stated that there are two sashes per window.
Ralph then added by stating that they are restoring the existing windows. We could go with something good enough for $2,000 per window. We could also replace doors and repair the masonry. Should we fund or table this? Could we meet with them or should we vote on a maximum we would give them. Mr. Slate made a motion to approve this project. Table the dollar amount and work with the original plan.
Not in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll
Robert then stated that there seemed to be an issue as to recommend funding.
We could table the whole thing until our September first meeting. We could pass it and perhaps either Ralph or David could meet with them and talk about alternatives for the windows. We could vote tonight on a recommended maximum amount that we are willing to give. Even though the proposal before us may be totally near one hundred we could say that we recommend $75,000 or whatever. So those are the options before us. At this time Ralph made a motion that we move forward with this project. Robert stated that we had a motion to recommend it. We should just vote if we are interested in recommending this project. Then we can take a motion on whether we want to table the amount or whether we want to put a maximum on it. Mr. Finn made the motion and Ms. Martinez seconded the motion.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate and Mr. McCarroll
Robert then said we can either put an amount on it, or we can table it or we can have some folks that can do some research and go to the site and meet with them. Robert also stated that he didn't know what to do with those second floor windows. Ralph made the motion to table the dollar amount and volunteered to work with the organization to reach an acceptable compromise plan. Robert made the motion to table the project at this time. Gloria second the motion.
All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll
Robert asked Ralph that whatever you come with the Trinity house people please just run it by Shannon Walsh to make sure that she feels that what we are going to recommend before we meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. Ralph agreed to do that.
Robert then said that the next thing that we have tonight we need to set the date for our annual public hearing which we have in the autumn and I'm suggesting that we have on October 6 th meeting. This is where we solicit comments as to needs and opportunities in the coming year. David asked if we need a motion on this? Bob agreed to that suggestion. David made a motion to have a Public Speak Out at our October sixth meeting. Juanita second that motion.
All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll
Ms. Martinez asked Bob stated that she had a little note regarding Duggan Park. At the last meeting we were waiting to see itemized accounts so where do we stand on that? We took a vote that was an e-mail that we sent to them asking for specific costs for the basketball court, the baseball field and the community gardens. Bob said that we have not received that yet right? Karen was going to follow-up on that before our September meeting. Bob then stated that what Karen and I will be working on is notifying the bike park study people that we recommended them and we will let the planning folks know that we are recommending them with the amount.
And we still have to tweak the program before we send it to City Council. We will let Trinity know that we recommend them but we still haven't decided on a dollar amount. Karen and I will also be working on the e-mails that will be going to the folks that did not get funded. Then we will start working on the communication with the City Council as we sent our recommendations to them. We will try to get that all wrapped up with the exception of the Historic Rehab Program and Trinity House by September First. Once we finish those off we will quickly add them to the packet and send it to the City Council.
Editor's Note: At the July 21 st meeting Mr. Slate stated that the School Street School Building is probably the second or third oldest building remaining in Springfield. Mr. Slate researched the status of the school and found out that it is the sixth oldest school standing in Springfield.
Motion to Adjourn: Gloria made the motion to adjourn. Juanita second the motion.
All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Mr. Finn, Ms. Martinez, Ms. Mitchell, Mr. Slate, Mr. McCarroll
Our next meeting will be Tuesday, September first.