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

Kevin Chaffee

Tuesday, September 1, 2020 | **6:00 PM** | **Virtual Meeting (Zoom)**

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on September 1, 2020 at Virtual Meeting (Zoom) , Virtual Meeting, N/A, NA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived

II. Public Portion

Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order concerning the Open Meeting Law, the City of Springfield is providing public notice that this public meeting will be conducted utilizing remote collaboration technology. ***To View/Listen to the public meeting:***

- *<https://www.facebook.com/SpringfieldCommunityPreservationCommittee/>*

III. Minutes

Springfield Community Preservation Committee

Remote Meeting

September 1, 2020

Present: Gloria DeFillipo, Juanita Martinez, Ralph Slate, Willie Thomas, and Robert McCarroll

Absent: Lamar Cook, David Finn, Terry Rodriguez, Terry Mitchell

Robert McCarroll began the meeting by introducing the Committee: Present for tonight's meeting is Gloria DeFillipo: Planning Board Representative; Juanita Martinez; Conservation Representative; Ralph Slate: Neighborhood Representative; Willie Thomas: Housing Authority Representative; Robert McCarroll; The Springfield Preservation Trust Inc.
The other representatives not with us tonight are: David Finn: The Historical Commission; Terry Rodriguez; The Park Department Commission; Terry Mitchell: Neighborhood.

With that we will approve the minutes of our last meeting which was August 4, 2020. Robert then made the motion to accept the minutes. Ms. DeFillipo made the motion and Ms. Martinez second the motion.
Roll Call Vote: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Thomas: abstain,

Mr. McCarroll: yes

The next order is that we have Stuart Saginor of the Community Preservation Coalition on Bonding. We had a discussion this past funding round and although we chose not to go to the bonding route Stuart has offered to give us a little tutorial on it so if that issue comes up again we will have an idea of what is in involved. I think many people know Stuart from when we were first organized he came and ran a workshop for us and Ralph and I had met him prior to that. He came to help the Citizen Committee get started and advocated for the adoption of CPA. So with that I'm going to turn the meeting over to Stuart.

Stuart then thanked Robert and stated that Karen will run the slides for a short presentation that we have about bonding. This is a topic that is very popular in the state. Well over one hundred CPA communities have bonded against their future revenue stream for big projects. It is pretty popular as a way to do things that you don't have the money sitting in the bank for. At this time Karen put up the first slide. Stuart then stated that although you can bond for most things that CPA can pay for the most popular ones are: when communities buy land, when they do a top to bottom restoration of a historic building, or when they are building a large recreational asset such as an athletic field complex, or parks or things like that. Those are the three most popular.

When you bond against your future CPA revenue stream it is a general obligation bond of the City of Springfield. But what's backing it is your CPA revenue stream not the general municipal revenue stream of the city. When you are trying to figure out how much you can bond, how much capacity you have to bond, you can only bond against what you bring in locally in Springfield. As you all know CPA has two revenue streams your local surcharge revenue from your one and a half percent property tax surcharge. However, you also get your state match on November fifteenth. However, that varies as we have seen. You can only bond against the local portion not the state portion because it is an unreliable funding source. The one thing to remember is when the CPC recommends bonding for a project now it goes to the City Council for approval. But it ratchets up the level of majority to two thirds. So most recommendations that you make to the council with a few exceptions can be passed by the majority vote of the council but if you are recommending that a project be paid for with a CPA bond that would require a two third vote of the council.

It's a good idea to always know what your bonding capacity is. You will get applications this year and you never know what type of applications come in. You will consider which ones you want to do. You may find you want to do more than you have money for. If you always know how much capacity you have to bond it makes the discussion much more productive. What we recommend folks do is work with your municipal officials, Accounting and Finance

Department and they can do an estimate of how much bond capacity you have and how much money you would have to issue in a bond. It's a good idea that towards the end of the year to make an appointment with them and go sit down and look at the figures and have them do a bond estimate. Keep in mind it would have to be updated every year.
Stuart then stated that you will see a sample in a second of a Bonding Capacity Spread Sheet from a Community where they met with their municipal officials they looked at what the revenue would be in the next twenty years from the one and a half surcharge. They subtracted other bonds that the town had already issued and they come up with an amount every year

over the next twenty years that you have to bond the money you could use for projects.
There is a sample of a bonding capacity spreadsheet. We actually have this on a spreadsheet so if you want this in a live spreadsheet it would be easier to build with your numbers I would be happy to share it with you. They were talking about an open space bond here so as I've mentioned you can't spend the entire amount for an open space purchase because every year you have to reserve ten percent for housing and ten percent for historical and probably five percent for administration. They had some existing bonds out there so in the end the fund that was available starting in 2008 in this community to pay for the bond was $135,000. The finance Department was able to figure out that the town could borrow one point seven nine million dollars at the current interest rate of 4.5% for twenty years and that would come up to $135,000. Interest rates now are a lot lower. Your city can get a much better rate that you would get if you went to get an auto loan or a mortgage or a home equity loan. They are probably in the one and a half to two percent range to borrow money for a municipality these days.
When you issue a bond there are both principal and interest. If you go to your officials and say that you are interested in buying this piece of open space or we are thinking of rehabbing this historic building. Please let us know how much a two million dollar bond would be. They would be able to get a debt service schedule. Your finance people could come up with the current interest rates.
There is a Historic building in Springfield owned by the city that needs rehabilitation. You as a committee can look at that project and decide if you want to use bonding as the funding source. You can decide you want to pay for some of it right up front with the money you have in the bank and bond the rest of it. You also have the option of how long the bond is for. In Massachusetts the limit for bonds used to be twenty years. Five years ago the state extended that to thirty years. You can go thirty years on a bond and every year the payments are lower. The negative is you have to pay more interest. The state has a big schedule that shows what assets can be bonded for and what period of time. Most things that are CPA eligible are usually thirty years. When you recommend that project you get to determine how long that bond is because that effects the payment every year and that affects how much money you are going to have to spend on other projects. You might want to ask the finance department to show you

what it would cost us each year if we did a ten year bond, fifteen year bond or a thirty year bond. You then can see what the debt service will be each year and then you could see how much money you have for other projects. The shorter you go the less money you have. The longer you go you have more money for other projects every year.

Once the city votes for it their order for another CPA project that they vote on it is being bonded and which is CPA. We would always recommend that when you recommend a bonded project that you include not only the two million dollars you need for the rehab of that historic building but also the miscellaneous closing cost because to issue a bond for a municipality there are definitely some costs. It can be anywhere from $30,000 to 50,000 or more in legal fees and other miscellaneous costs to issue a bond. If you were bonding a two million project you want to get an estimate from the city of what the miscellaneous costs were. Recommend to the City Council that a project would be two million and fifty thousand so you could pay for the expenses as well. With CPA there is no subsequent election you already had your election. The residents already gave you a one and a half percent revenue stream to work with. Your just bonding against that previously authorized revenue stream. There is no need to go back to the ballot. The process is you recommend it. The City Council so approved. Then they can issue the bond. There is no election necessary.

Gloucester City Hall's steeple was in need of repair. The steeple was in such terrible shape that If the wind blew above thirty knots they had to evacuate the building because they were worried the steeple would tumble over. CPA came to the rescue to issue them a bond to rescue that building. When you recommend the project you are going to have debt service every year. The city will tell you that you will have to make your first payment just like you make a payment on a mortgage. You need to include it in your budget. You're going to have to recommend that for the next twenty or thirty years. The city council could choose to pay that out of another funding source because it is a general obligation bond of the city. It doesn't work in reverse. If the city already has a bond for something that is a CPA eligible project, and if they already bought a plot of open space, or used money to restore an Historic building and they are in year five and they say that's an Historic building let's have CPA pay the bond and let's apply for the money to have CPA pay the debt service that is not legal. It has to be bonded by the very beginning. Under the CPA under Chapter 44B.

The neat thing about the Annual Debt Service is if payment on the project bond is more than 10% of your annual CPA revenue, bond payment counts as your 10% requirement for that category.

At this time Stuart explained the figures of CPA Budget - Including a bond as seen on page 11 of the bonding 101 with the Community Preservation Act.

This question comes up all the time. I guarantee you that if y you start discussing the bonding of a big project in Springfield someone is going to ask you the public, city councilor or municipal officials if we issue a twenty year bond against our revenue stream are we then locked into having CPA for thirty years. Once you reach the five year point CPA can be revoked.

That question always comes up. As citizens, does it take our right to revoke CPA in Springfield If the committee does something terrible and we don't like it anymore? The answer is no. They cannot take away the right to revoke. You could still have a ballot election and revoke CPA in Springfield. You still would have to pay back the bond. If the community wanted to revoke CPA they would add up all the money that you have in your accounts and if that was enough to pay off the rest of the debt then the 1 1/2 percent would fall off the tax rules. If it wasn't enough they would keep the CPA surcharge on your tax bills and the 1 1/2 percent would continue on your tax bills but you wouldn't be able to do any other projects. All that money would go directly to the bond payment. They probably end up paying it off faster that way if you were putting every bit of your revenue to that bond payment. There is a third way to do it but you would need the Department of Revenue approval but let's say if you have 1 1/2 percent surcharge. Let's say the amount of money you need to raise for the bond debt service every year is a half percent of your revenue. You could lower it to half a percent for the next twenty five years or however long the bond was and that half percent would go directly to the bond payment for the next twenty-five years. Effectively, you would be out of business. However, the half percent would stay on your tax bills. The bottom line to remember here is that it doesn't take away the communities right to revoke CPA if they want to but the bond has to be paid someway before the surcharge will completely drop off the tax bill. This has never happened. Luckily this has never been an issue for anyone but it is possible if need be.

Robert then asked Stuart can CPA be a funder of a portion of a larger bond? Let's say that something was going to cost two million dollars and the applicants came to us and state that they want us to help with a million dollars of that two million dollars. I think it is going to be a bonded project but they are only asking for half of it. Is that a case where there are two separate bonds going out of municipal bond and a CPA bond? Is there something that states that CPA commits that CPA can fund half of the municipal costs once the bond goes into effect. Stuart said that it's the second thing you said. That is not actually uncommon. You absolutely can do that. They are only going to issue one bond. The city would only issue one two million dollar bond. They would have an authorization with the CPC and the city council for one million to be charged against CPA and one million charged to some other revenue source. When the bill came in every year they would just divide it in half. One other thing that is possible and this is encouraged in the act as well. Because of these issue costs it does make sense for cities to group projects together in one bond. Let's say that you guys recommended that two million dollar historic fixing of the building and you recommend it for twenty years and you pass it and the city council passes it. Around the same time the city council might pass two million dollars to rehab the fire station. So now they have two million dollars that they have to bond over the same twenty years for the fire station. The city can combine the CPA project and the non CPA project in one bond and put it out to market. This is very common. In the spring we bonded over twenty years but in the fall the town knew that they were going to be voting on a new police station. The town agreed to do the police station they went out to the market with a ten million dollar bond and eight million dollar police station and two million dollars of CPA open space purchase when the bill comes in every year the town just charges twenty percent into the CPA budget and eighty percent to the Police Station.

At this time Juanita asked that if an applicant comes in with a large project and we bonded can they come back to us not for a bond but for a regular application? Stuart stated that they absolutely, assuming that you haven't bonded everything on that first project or on other projects. That bond is already issued, the work will be already done on the first project and fifteen years later they need something else and you still have five years of debt service left and they may come to you and say we need $50,000 to build a new basketball court. That is perfectly fine. You cannot add on to the bond that is already outstanding.

Karen then asked Stuart if he could please send that spreadsheet template to her. Do you offer a similar workshop for affordable housing workshop? Stuart answered by asking what are you looking for? Before Covid there were a few of us that were going to a workshop that was for the Preservation Restrictions, Housing Restrictions on projects funded by CPA. Stuart stated that housing as you found out is incredibly complicated. I think that we are sort of jack of all trades and master of none. When we get more detailed questions especially in the housing area which is complicated we have partners that specialize in Mass Housing Partnership and they have a free circuit rider service. Shelley just came back last week and she does do presentations. If you need Shelly's contact information I can give it to you. She is an expert on this. Stuart said he would give Karen the information needed.

Robert began by stating a request from coming Home City Development regarding the affordable restriction that we had requested for the Elias Brookings Project. Robert had been under the impression that a perpetuity restriction was required if CPA money went into any housing project. Perhaps I misunderstood Shelley from the housing partnership and Peter questioned that and followed-up with Stuart at the Coalition and Stuart says that the state law says that if your using CPA money to acquire affordable housing that has to be in perpetuity. If you are helping in the other areas besides the acquisition the law is mute and therefore it's up to the individual Community Preservation Committee to decide the length of the affordability restriction on the units they are assisting. So with that being said let me turn this to Peter Serafino.

Peter began by thanking Robert and thanked all the members of the Committee for approving assistance to this project. We applied for assistance in the beginning of the COVID era back in February or March. Even though the CPA portion of this project is relatively small portion it is significant because it is a local match and we had experienced some real changes in the market for tax credits. Both the Low income Housing and the Tax Credits we were using for this project and the State and Federal Historic Tax Credit. At the time we were about to apply we were conservatively estimating that the low income housing and tax credits would generate eighty nine and a half cents per dollar of tax credits. We assumed eight point nine five million dollars of the loan credits. Now, since the economy has done so poorly and companies don't have the profits that they need to protect as badly the market for the low income housing tax credit has changed and now they are only offering us eighty-six and a half cents. The assistance you are providing not only helps in that way but it helps our budget hold.
All of our funders on these projects and mostly it's DHCD which allocates the federal low income for tax credits and offers us over four million dollars of soft debt. It is money that comes in as loans it accrues interest it doesn't get repaid during the next twenty years.
All those resources are really assisted by your funds and they come with varying sources of funds that have been authorized by the legislature over time. One of our sources is a fifty year affordability restriction. I'm here to request today that the CPC agreed to an affordability restriction for fifty years rather than in perpetuity. Robert then stated that they had asked for five units and you are willing to put all forty two under the fifty year. Peter agreed that this was correct.
Robert then stated that Peter is asking that we change our requirement that instead of five Units being a perpetuity affordability restriction into forty two units that will have a fifty year affordability restriction.

At this time Ralph made the motion to amend our recommendation to change the affordability restriction to fifty years from which was previously in perpetuity and to expand it to all forty two units. Gloria second the motion.
All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo, Ms. Martinez, Mr. Slate, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. McCarroll
Robert then stated that we will amend the requirement on that Peter.

Robert then stated that we have two projects that we voted to recommend but we haven't put the finishing touches on them and I guess we will start with the Historic Home Restoration Program which is going to be run by the office of Planning and Economic Development. When we actually voted to recommend the $200,000 that they asked for. Ralph was going to have a conversation with them at the last meeting Ralph had a question do property owners have to put some money in and Ralph stated that he had submitted to Planning a proposal that was a sliding scale of the percentage of what the owner would have to have in the project based on their income and there were a few other issues that we were still trying to hash out. At this time Robert gave the floor to Ralph.

Ralph began by saying he called Scott Hansen and I traded some voice mails to him and he conveyed to me that they were okay with the restrictions we put on them as far as the income eligibility. That is not an issue for them. The other issue we talked about was we generally ask for the work to be accomplished first before the reimbursement. Is that going to unfairly impact people who are lower income and can't front the money. I got in touch with Cambridge CPA and asked that question of them and basically Cambridge outsources their projects to a third party organization and they just don't deal with the management of the money basically. They just give the money to the third party and the third party works with the homeowners. There is no avenue there. My recommendation for the first year at least, we just go with a reimbursement if the work is done approach. It would be up to somebody doing the work, talk to their contractor and perhaps the contractor would be willing to cover the money up front until the work is done for the first year and see how it goes. See if there are issues with that rather than solve the problem that we don't know if it's going to be a problem or not. Planning told me that they want to run this as easy as possible. They are interested that when the project is finished they reimburse.

Robert then asked if in the terms is it when the project is finished? it's either the property owner has paid the contractor through the process and we reimburse the homeowner or is it that the homeowner hasn't paid anything? Assuming that the contractor is comfortable with that we end paying the homeowner who hasn't paid any money to the contractor?

Ralph then stated that the point I'm trying to make is that instead of getting into a complicated type of planning is trying to make this simple and we shouldn't be concerned about the details of how people are going to be. Any flow of money to reimburse their project. The stipulation is that we don't pay money until the work is completed. It's too risky otherwise.

Robert asked would we be comfortable making partial payments but planning doesn't seem to bother to make partial payments. Ralph stated that personally for the first year I don't think it makes sense to get into that. I think there is of risk with that and there is a lot of management that's involved in making partial payments. Someone puts in refurbished windows, storm windows and real windows and painting. Ralph stated that painting is probably the best example because certainly I know that there are probably people who have been defrauded by painters or at least know people who have been defrauded by painters. I wouldn't want to get into an issue when someone comes along and says $10,000 for paint and it gets awarded and then halfway through they say well I've done partial work can you give me $5,000. Planning wants to be able to say is the painting done? Okay here is your money. I am not comfortable to getting into the management with these small projects. I think there is a lot of risk there.

Robert stated that his concern is more that when we take this to the City Council I don't know if they are going to have questions. Then we will have to go to Committee and then Planning will have to go to Committee and we will have to go to Committee. The more flushed out the proposal is there is less chance that the City Council will have questions that I can't answer them. Ralph stated that the answer is money will be paid after completion of work. There will be no partial payments. Robert stated "payment only on successful until completion of the project."

At this time Gloria asked Robert how are the people going to be able to afford to be able to take advantage of this project? Robert stated that some people can't and some people can so we will find out in the year that's coming whether there are people that have no ability to up fund their own money and then get reimbursed; or can go and get an equity loan and take that five grand to fix the windows. Once it's done they get the five grand from planning and pay off the equity loan. You are right there will be people that won't be able to do that. We don't know what percentage of the population will fall into that crack.

Karen then asked Robert I have a question pertaining to that. If there is a preferred painter who is willing to absorb the cost until the job is done is that a bidding thing that painters can go out to bid but they would have to agree not to charge the homeowner until the job is done and be reimbursed by us.

Robert then stated that he has no idea regarding this is something that we have to flush out with Planning that's going to be running the program. Like with the First Time Homebuyer

Program we are going to be giving the money into an account that is accessed by Planning. They are not going to come back to us and say the paint job on Clarendon Street is finished can we pay them? It will be their decision to go into the account that has $200,000 to begin with and we are going to take $15,000 from here because Mary Smith is being reimbursed the $15,000.

Gloria stated that if something goes wrong with that painter let's say who is going to follow-up on it? Gloria then stated that she is very concerned the fact that they are going be people who don't have the ability whether it's money or whatever to take advantage of the program because of the way of the reimbursement. Let's say they put in ten windows in, they could send a bill for those ten windows and get reimbursed and then they could put in the remainder of the windows. In other words this is a “good faith effort” in between there to be paid. Ralph stated that he shared her concern but the point he was trying to make was that in the first year let’s see how it goes and if that’s feedback that we are hearing we can modify when we have a little more experience under our belts.

Robert then stated that he is willing to go with an experiment because there could be people asking why are you doing this only in McKnight? Robert stated that we have to start somewhere, we are testing the waters. There is an owner component starting with having to put in a significant part of the project down if your lower enough income. It is still a matter of our money doesn’t get paid out until the project is completed. Next year we will talk about tweaking the program with the planning department. It could be that after we say to City Council here’s the program and we only put two conditions on it: payment at end and percentage of owner occupant based on income. They may want to put additional requirements on that are beyond what we are thinking of. To move forward with it we probably should make a motion that one of the requirements is that there is owner occupied, owner occupant participation level based on a sliding income scale. The third motion payment is made only on completion of the project. We need a motion on those three conditions. Gloria made a motion and Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes and Mr. McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that the other project was Trinity House that we voted to recommend but we did not have a specific amount and Ralph was going to be talking to them about the issues of the windows because what they had said to us on the first floor they had wood windows and on the second floor there were no windows. Robert then turned it over to Ralph. Ralph stated that he spoke to Lisa Goodman and she referred me to Pam Howland who

is very familiar with the property. Pam of course confirmed that there are no windows on the second floor. What I expressed to her is that my initial concern was that we saw a proposal that was sort of low money and then we saw another proposal that said recreate windows on second floor and it was a substantially higher sum of money. What Pam told me was the initial proposal she withdrew because she didn’t have the correct information she was going by what a Pella representative had told her. The proposal that we saw that said to refurbish the first floor and basement windows, recreate the second floor windows was the correct proposal. I believe it was around $45,000. Then I asked her if it would make sense to buy a commercial product for the second floor windows and she said no she has an agreement with a craftsman essentially to replicate the windows on the second floor using historic materials for $400.00 per window. That’s cheap compared to Pella. That $400.00 cost for recrafting the second floor windows is a reasonable cost and we can’t improve on that in my opinion. Based on that there was another component to the proposal which was to refurbish seven doors that are on the property. The proposal that Karen had sent to me was about $50,000. Ralph's concern was that we could shave some money off that but it doesn't sound like there is room to shave off of it based on the talk that I had with her. Robert then stated that in the original proposal there was masonry and in the original budget they also included some roof work. Robert added that in the application I'm not seeing any place where they included masonry. Robert stated that what we need to decide is what we want to recommend as an amount. We need to figure out what was the quote from Pam Howland because we need to use that as a base point. Ralph then stated that this was the sheet that Karen sent out on July twenty first and in that proposal there is $45,000 for restoration of window sash, repair and reglaze nine basement windows, repair and re-glaze fourteen windows on the first floor, manufacture and re-glaze fourteen windows on the second floor and repair and re-glaze the radius window on the front gable. That was the $45,500 There was a second piece of that component which was replace and build new frames for seven doors which was $75,000 and the masonry was $37,700. The total is $90,700 The roof was $16,100 that was in the original application. Originally, they were asking for $124,800. I have no problem recommending funding for this project. One of the conditions that I think should be there is that CPA money does not come in until she has proven that she has got the remainder of the funding source. Their budget showed that this was a $250,000 rehab job and we could be in for $90,000 she has to raise the rest. I don't want to see us spend money on windows and pointing only to find out that the rest of the house sits empty and untouched and she hasn't been able to raise the rest of the money. This is the concern but that is a concern after we decide whether how much money we want to give them. Willie then asked Robert if the $90,000 include the roof? The $90,000 does not include the roof; if we include the roof that would be $106,800. I would be comfortable recommending up to that amount but I would leave it to the rest of the committee. Gloria then told Robert that she likes his idea about holding off CPA money until she sends us an acknowledgement of the rest of the funding to complete the project we will not release CPA money. Robert then stated that we wouldn't go under contract. Robert then addressed Karen's issue that in most cases with municipal departments there are instances where we are dealing with non-municipal people and I have to say this one this is the application that showed up with one copy in a box with no electronic copy that we have had to hold down the line. I am more concerned if we indeed put our money in and we fixed up windows and fixed up roof and the building continues to sit there. That is an embarrassment for us. I would recommend to the City Council and just say that one of our conditions we are not contracting with them until they prove that they have a significant portion of the funding lined up to do what we are not paying for. At this time Willie asked if she did identify what she was going to do with the building beside the windows, doors and roof and seeking additional funds? What is she using that money for? The budget that she gave us had a variety of inside work, insulation, flooring, wallboard, painting, cabinets. Her goal is to turn it into a shelter for women. Those were all parts of the cost that she had in this much larger budget. Stuart told us that temporary housing is not CPA eligible. She is not eligible under community housing. She is only eligible under historic. We will help with the exterior Historic Building. She needs to come up with all the stuff that deals with all of the plumbing, carpentry and painting issues that is going to be going on in the inside. Willie then asked that it doesn't fall into the category of eligibility for the Community Preservation Fund? Robert then stated that you always have to have a public purpose and we would argue fixing up the outside of a Historic building that has a public purpose. Fixing the inside is less so. Putting things like new bathrooms and kitchen cabinets is not a Historic Preservation item that we would want to participate in. Juanita asked those present if anyone has contact her about proving that she has some of those other sources. Robert then stated that his understanding that when Ralph was there was to give us his expert opinion regarding the windows. Ralph then asked did we ever have an electric copy of this proposal? Robert then stated that the question is do we vote on the amount and send it to city council with one of the conditions being that we will not execute a contract until the remainder of the funding sources are in place, or do we postpone even sending this to the City Council. I will not hold up the rest of the rest because of this. We do have the possibility of saying this may not get to the Council on the Fourteenth. Maybe it will go in October if we get the answers to the questions as to where is the money is coming from. Clearly we shouldn't be the first people to start putting real cash into the building. Gloria then added this is one of the problems of not providing accurate information when you submit a proposal. Ralph stated that he doesn't want to pay the money up front. Willie agreed with Ralph on this discussion. If we put forth the $124,000 dollars that is going to

give her leverage to get that additional money to complete the project; she won't leave empty handed. I would be more inclined to say that I would approve $124,000 subject to her demonstrating that she has the balance. I don't think we should table this until October but I am open to it if that's what you want to do. Gloria stated that all we are saying is just show us you have the other additional funding. I agree with Willie and what Ralph said. This will help her it's not punitive it's really being a positive move. Ralph stated that we should recommend a funding amount, we can decide what that is with the condition that the money will not be paid out until she assembles the funding for the entire amount of the project. Robert then stated that we need to decide if we are not giving her $97,700 which is the windows, the doors and the masonry. Or are we giving her $106,800 which is those three things plus the roof budget that she had in her application. Ralph then made a motion that we award $106,800 to the Trinity House. Willie second the motion.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes, and Mr. McCarroll yes.

So now we need a motion on what the condition will be which I think we were in agreement that before any of our money gets paid out she needs to come up with most of her financing. Robert stated that we want letters of commitment for the remainder part of the project which is about $125,000.

Ralph made the motion that a condition will be placed on this is that before the money is released to her the work has to be completed and she has to provide demonstrated financial commitment for the remainder of the project for the balance of the project to get it to completion. Juanita made the motion and Willie second the motion.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes and Mr. McCarroll: yes.

After the marathon meeting in July was longer than two hours Robert stated that he would ask the committee whether they want to continue, or how long they want to continue the meeting for.

We have an update from Karen on the Fiscal eighteen and the nineteen projects.
As well as a brief discussion on next month is the public hearing to solicit comments on CPA needs and opportunities in the city. How much people are willing to go forward.
Gloria stated that she would like to suggest that we hold on the review of the projects because Karen sent that today so we could review it and at the next meeting we could have our questions so she won't have to go through every single thing. If we have any questions we can

ask them then. Robert then asked: does that sound fine with people? Those present agreed with that suggestion.
Robert stated the over-arching CPA law requires that we do a CPA plan every year as a part of doing that plan we are required to hold the Public Hearing. This will be a virtual Public Hearing. I don't know the mechanics of that and Karen if you need to read Chapter forty-four B as to what the specific requirements for the public hearing are. My recollection is that we have to put an ad in the newspaper two consecutive weeks prior to the hearing. I don't think it speaks to a legal ad or whether it's a display ad and I think we have done both, but I'm not sure.
The folks in the budget office will know what they paid for and you need to read the city ordinance that created the committee because I believe that the ordinance says that we need to send written notice to every neighborhood council listed on the city website three weeks before the public hearing. The bottom line is that we need to get started on both the ad and the letters because we meet on October sixth and if my memory serves me correct that means that the letters have to be sent by the week of the fourteenth. I have the stock letter that I can send to you Karen and you can just tweak it and mail it out on CPA stationary.
So the bigger thing is that this is an opportunity for the public to come and say my neighborhood needs better play equipment in the playgrounds or I have vacant run down houses we would love to see owner occupancy no matter what it is it's an opportunity.
I don't know how we deal with that kind of public hearing during a remote meeting. So that's probably the type of thing that we need to sort of play around with. How do people get their responses? Do they sign up and are actually admitted to the zoom meeting or is everyone e-

mailing us or paper mailing us their comments. In the past these hearings had ten people at them it's not like there is a huge amount of people and they usually generated some people who have been sending letters rather than attending. Karen, I don't know if you have thoughts or anyone else has thoughts?

Karen suggested that we talk with Steve at Focus Springfield and see if we can open up this Zoom and maybe it's a Webinar type format. Gloria stated that she would go with that because As we remember when this first started there were a lot of inappropriate things that went through because it was an open meeting. We were specifically told to keep it private. I would suggest that people have to sign up beforehand to join the meeting. That might be by the deadline. That might help. Ralph then stated that he doesn't see a great need to use the sign up mechanism. I think of people bombing into the meetings but I think that risk is minimum and I think it can be handled because there is an administrator at the meeting that can take their information and let them in. I feel that a few day sign up is an unnecessary barrier. I do know that other communities don't require initial sign-ups but they do allow a lot of people to

come in on the day of the meeting. Karen asked when the City Council has their speak-out meetings how do they handle it? Ralph stated you couldn't show up and speak. Karen asked are you suggesting that we have a regular Zoom meeting and make the link public so they can watch and ask a question? Robert then stated that is not a time to have people ask us questions. This is a time for people to come and tell us what they think their needs are that CPA can address. This meeting is for people to talk about needs and opportunities that we may decide to want to include in the plan as we tweak it. Ralph agreed with this. Robert stated that the plan is already on line so we will be changing the proposed time table. Perhaps we may base it on what we hear and we will have to notify the various departments that do CPA. So we will be soliciting their input as well. Certainly they can look at the last years plan and see what we said. Karen asked do we need to do this on October sixth? We can clearly push it based on what CPC members can make. We are required to do this whether we do it on our regularly scheduled meeting and whether we move the regularly scheduled meeting. Robert then stated that it is obvious that we are using Focus Springfield don't we need to see if Focus Springfield can indeed accommodate us. We can accommodate you some other time then we may have to change the meeting. Robert stated that the letter to the neighborhood council needs three weeks' notice I believe. Robert then stated that the bigger question is whether Develop Springfield can't host us then we need to figure a format that works for this and that may be only people signing up because ninety-nine can be the limit. Ralph suggested we go with Focus Springfield do it the way we did it the first couple of meetings and doing it live if that's a possibility. Robert then stated that as of right now it is October sixth. Karen will contact Focus Springfield and if they say we can do it but not on the sixth here are the dates to choose from then Karen will send out a Doodle Poll to see what day works for the most number of Committee Members. We will change it to whatever that is. Robert stated that he would rather have it sooner rather than later because then that's when we start tweaking the plan. If we can have it set up that anyone can attend the meeting Karen controls them and if they start being unruly or irrelevant they get muted.

Robert then stated that we will have a motion to adjourn. Ralph made the motion to adjourn and Gloria second the motion.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes, and Mr. McCarroll: yes