



Community Preservation Committee

Regular

~ Minutes ~

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

Kevin Chaffee

Tuesday, November 10, 2020

6:00 PM

Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on November 10, 2020 at Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology, (Online), Springfield, MA.

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

November 10, 2020

Robert McCarroll began the meeting by introducing the Committee: Those present for tonight's meeting are Gloria DeFillipo: Planning Board Representative; Juanita Martinez; Conservation Representative; Ralph Slate: Neighborhood Representative; David Finn: The Historical Commission Representative; Terry Mitchell: The Neighborhood Representative; Willie Thomas: The Housing Authority Representative; and Robert McCarroll: the Springfield Preservation Trust Inc. Representative.

The first order of business is simply to approve the minutes of the October 6th meeting. Ms. DeFillipo made the motion and Mr. Slate second the motion.

Roll call vote: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Finn: yes, Ms. Mitchell: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes, Mr. McCarroll: yes

Robert continued with the second item on the agenda and invited Roger Robarge the developer of the Parsons Apartment House and the French Row Houses who is requesting an extension for completion and an assignment of the grant.

Roger gave an overview as to why this has been delayed.

Mr. Robarge thanked those present for having him at the meeting. The projects and construction have been delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. He expected to secure financing but unfortunately, there are delays on that end as well. There were restrictions as to what kind of work had to be done for a site at 169 Maple Street because we didn't have proper sanitation facilities, without having utilities, running water and things of that nature. We just got electricity at 169 Maple Street yesterday. So with the delays related to Covid-19 we are still in the pre-development phase. We are trying to put in the last pieces of the puzzle for the financing of the project. One of those was the city's Property Taxes Extension Financing Agreement. That was the gateway for us to make the application for the Housing Development Incentive Program at the state level which is additional grant funding to really secure this project. I have had a conversation with the city, with all the parties, about a week ago and they are targeting being on the City Council agenda in December and we expect to have the City Council vote. That is the final part of the puzzle, the CBC extension, the deadline was the end of this month. I believe we signed the documents in February if I'm not mistaken. Unfortunately, we weren't able to get any progress on these items and we would like a one year extension with this project and your help with CPA funds. Karen then stated that it would be November 30th, 2021 which is the contract, so you want to extend it one year? Yes. At this time Robert then asked Roger if he could speak to the Committee about the assignment of the grant. Roger then stated that the lender for the project is looking for a traditional banking piece. In other words, the bank would like CPA funds or pledges for the project assigned to the bank.

Robert explained that Roger's attorney has been in communication with Kathy Breck who is our point person in the Law Department. Kathy informed Robert that the CPA law does allow for this type of assignment as long as the committee is agreeable to it. The agreement and actual legal terms that are in the agreement will need to be finalized. So if we are going to approve this we should have it contingent on the wording of the amendment by the Law Department. Robert then stated we take a two part vote. One motion to extend the contract to November 30, 2021 and a second motion to allow an assignment of funds.

Ralph asked about the risk. Obviously, the CPC funds were awarded to be given out upon completion. Let's think of the worst case scenario if the money is spent from the bank and the work isn't done, can the bank say we are attaching that money and we wind up with no money and no work? Robert responded by stating that his understanding is no. I made it clear to Kathy Breck that in the contract, CPA funds are not disbursed until the work has been done and documented. Kathy explained the CPC would not be an exposed position [where we would disburse funds without work occurring].

Robert asked for a motion to extend both contracts [Parsons Apartment and the French Row Houses] until November 30th, 2021. Gloria made the motion to extend the contract until November 30, 2021. Juanita second the motion.

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

Robert asked for a vote on the second motion to agree to assign funds to the bank provided that the wording of the amendment is approved by our law department. Gloria made the motion and Ralph second the motion. Robert asked if there was any discussion.

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

Bob. Once the assignment language is agreed to and Roger does the work, funds will be distributed to Roger or directly to the bank. Roger was reminded to send quarterly reports to Karen once production starts and to send a photo of the banner once it is installed. The report doesn't have to be lengthy but we do want to keep track of what is happening with the project. We hope it moves forward quickly now.

Robert stated that we had the public hearing in early October but written or e-mail comments could be submitted all the way to the end of October. Robert then asked Karen if he was correct in stating we didn't get any additional comments. Karen stated that just one last comment from Laura Walsh from the Park Department. Robert stated that it was in the packet that you e-mailed everyone. It is a one and a half page letter from Pat outlining what they would like to see us doing in the coming year. Obviously, all of the comments that we received both from the city department and the ones that were mailed and e-mailed by private citizens and organizations will be incorporated in the public comment section of the revised Community Preservation Plan.

Robert continued by stating that this is indeed the plan that the state law requires that we do a plan and that we revise it every year following the Public Hearing. The biggest thing in my mind is just establishing one time table for the coming year because that is part of the plan. I e-mailed folks that suggested the time table which was basically what we planned on doing last year. We were delayed because we got the Covid shutdown. We would have workshops in February and March, applications due on April first, meet with all the applicants with their five minute presentation and questions and answers time in April and May. We would be deliberating in May, June, July and making recommendations to the City Council in August. So what are folks thoughts on that? Gloria stated that she has no problems with the dates. Ralph said its fine.

Robert suggested that we have a motion that will adopt that and it will be one of the tweakings that we do to the plan tonight. Robert asked does someone want to make a motion that this will be the schedule we are adopting? Gloria stated so moved as did Willie.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Finn: yes,

Ms. Mitchell: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes, Mr. McCarroll: yes

Robert stated that the other part of it is whether we want to change what we have had as our priority based on anything that we have come up with or what we have heard. Karen will send to you last years plan to review. So under Housing what our priorities have been is rehabilitating vacant deteriorated houses to sell to income eligible buyers, providing first time home buyer incentives to increasing owner occupancy especially of two and three family houses in the neighborhoods with low owner occupancy and assisting income eligible owner occupants with repairs, especially owners of two or three family houses.

Our current priorities for Historic is focusing on structures that are deteriorating structures in imminent danger of demolition, structures that are vacant, structures that will not be renovated without CPA funding, structures built before 1850, structures that are in a landmark with significant historic architectural or civic importance.

Our Open Space priorities are renovating small neighborhood playgrounds in green spaces creating and improving community gardens, creating and enhancing opportunities for bikeways, walkways, trails on park and conservation land, controlling invasive plant species on park and conservation land, improving access to the Connecticut River and other water bodies for water based recreation and enjoyment. So that's what we currently have given. What we heard at the public hearing people wanted tennis courts and there were a variety of things that were uplifted that they wanted to see fixed in open space. I don't remember hearing of any larger category something different that is already on our priorities. I defer to the other committee members.

Gloria stated that this seems very comprehensive Bob. Juanita said that she thought for a safer conservation, recreation, that's sort of a big umbrella that comes with several possibilities. Robert then stated that unless one of you committee members has an additional priority in one of the three areas that you feel we should be discussing we should probably leave our priorities the same. At this time Willie asked if you if you could explain about the application for Open Space such as tennis courts. I think there were two requests one was next to the Springfield Girls Club and another one was for another area. Are they considered to be eligible? Robert responded that they certainly are Willie. Tennis courts are recreational facility one was next to the Girls Club on Acorn Street and the other one was someone who mentioned that the tennis courts in Blunt Park aren't in good condition. Individuals should be working with the Park Department on an application that will come in at that funding cycle. How many other recreation applications came in we don't know and how that application will fair when we see all the other applications we can't predict but it is clearly an eligible area.

Robert stated that not hearing anyone else suggesting that we should be raising other priorities to the plan I guess we will leave that as it is. Those are the two major areas of tweaking of the plan that we do. Karen will be updating the appendix that talks about CPA affordable Housing limits because those change every year with HUD revisions and the only other thing is that

when we do the plans we also look at the applications. We will have the application on next month's agenda to talk about whether we want to tweak the application itself, that cover page or any of the instructions that we give to people regarding the completed application. Unless we have any other questions, that we sort of adopted the time line, we have chosen not to change our priorities. The rest of it is sort of simple boiler plate of putting in the public comments and putting in the revised income guidelines. The next task we have will be the application and the instructions and then we will take a vote and adopt all of that and that may be by early January we have everything available for the public before we start workshops in February. Gloria then asked if there is there any way we can have the application be a fillable form?

Robert stated that he would defer because the only thing we really have is the application. Are you talking about the coversheet Gloria? Gloria replied that even if it were a cover sheet they could fill it in typed because if somebody's hand write's it we sometimes have difficulty and it also provides them when it's typed a little more space to write. Robert then stated that his understanding I think it is fillable you can fill it out online, print it out and then send it in with it but I don't know whether we ought to require it to be typed as to being opposed to handwritten. Karen then stated that people that have the software to do a fillable PDF can do that. The handwriting has been okay so I think if someone handwrites it that it's okay. Robert asked Karen to double check if it is currently fillable. Then when we meet in December, which will be when we actually discuss the component of it we will know one hundred percent.

Regarding the 2020 Projects Update: Robert stated that basically the good news is that Karen has been working very hard with Kathy Breck. We already have five of the fifteen contracts are soon going to be ready for signatures with us and the grantees. We put the two museum ones into that pile, Duggan Park at the park request, the Forest Park Gazebo at the park request and the School Street School request because they really want to fix the windows before winter comes. So those are the five that we hope that next week we will be sitting with the grantees signing the contracts. Karen is now working on the remaining ten. So we are ahead of schedule for where we were last year which is a good thing. Robert stated that we have two projects that we need to at least discuss tonight. Robert asked Karen to give them the overview of the boathouse study.

Karen stated that the other contracts are already approved by the legal department and they can also be signed next week, most of them are the parks I think all but four should be done by the end of next week. The four that are going to take a little bit longer are Brookings Apartments, The Historic Homes, Trinity House and the Boat House. Pat Sullivan had a conversation with Ben Quick (Pioneer Valley Riverfront Club) about the Boat House Study. Pat said the Parks Department would coordinate the study and the Pioneer Valley River Club could be involved in every step of the way. Ben was satisfied with this arrangement although he expressed to me that he, Ben, would like to see the architect and the engineer who worked on

the application to be involved in the process. Then that gets a little tricky because there are procurement laws that guide the process so that's where we are on this. I don't know how you all feel about it because Ben was the person who applied and filled out the application; although it's a long-term lease of a City owned property. Does anyone have anything to add?

Robert stated when we recommended the McKnight's engineering study for the bike trail we first thought it was going to be the Park Department project and later we learned that the DPW was going to be responsible. This was simply a one department verses another department taking over the project but the boathouse isn't quite the same thing, and the committee should be aware of the discussion that took place. The application came from the Riverfront Club and was solely written by PVRC. From the PVRC point of view, they came to the CPC meeting, twice, and were interviewed by us and now the Park Department wants to assume the project. I certainly understand that they own the land and that makes sense. However, that decision is not mine as the Chair to make. As Karen pointed out the city has procurement laws so the vendors of choice can't be used without the proposal going out to bid first.

Ralph stated that he had a question stating that they had a long-term lease and they are asserting that because they own the property. Any work and any studies have to be done by them. That seems a little strange to me. Like if it was a grant organization that wasn't related to the city whatsoever, it seems what they are saying is because this organization is using property that is city-leased, the city has to do the study and not that private organization. It doesn't seem to make any sense. At this time Gloria stated that she agreed with Ralph. You're renting a house you're paying somebody for the rental of that house. Ralph stated that this was a good example Gloria. If your renting a house and you have a year lease on it and you want to update the kitchen why would the owner have to do that study? Robert then stated here is my thought. If enough members of the committee are not comfortable with simply switching from the first party [Riverfront Club] to the Park Department I would invite both of them at our next meeting so it can be fully flushed out. I can't necessarily answer the question you raised Ralph other than to say the study is on the Boathouse and the Boat Shed and on expanding the park to the vacant land which is on the other side of the dike. That's what the Park Department would do if the word were to come out and it's probably not what the Riverfront Club would do.

Karen then asked Robert: so say if the contract went directly to the Riverfront and they completed the study. The next step is to actually do the work the study recommends. So at that point would it become a city project? What if the city said no, we don't like the results of your study so we aren't going to complete the work according to that study. I don't think we can just exclude the city but the point that Ben was making is he came in twice to speak to all of you and not once did anyone say "well, it's a city property and have you spoke to the city yet?"

Juanita asked have we talked to the Legal Department? Maybe, they could shed a little light on this. Karen said she sent Kathy the project contract and let her know there will be questions

about who will receive the contract. Juanita asked if PVRC is leasing the building. Robert stated that he thought it is a twenty-year lease.

Are they actually paying rent? Karen stated yes. Ralph then stated that it depends on the terms of their lease right? So if their lease says that they are responsible for any changes to the area solely it seems that it is more of the Riverfront Club. If their lease says that they are responsible for any changes to the fence it would be the responsibility of the city to fix the property. That would be a different story. Karen. I understand what you are saying, we can't really ignore the city. Ralph. I would be a little shocked that the city paid for it to be honest. It would be a fundraising effort on their part if they could ask the city for some funding and they could ask the CPC for some funding the city would allow for it to be done I suppose, right? Karen then asked what if the Riverfront Club does some fundraising and they raise all the money and they put it into this project and they improve the property and the city didn't lift a finger? Ralph then stated that if the study comes back and they say that we can totally fix up the boat house and it will look great and it's going to be \$200,000 thousand dollars and the boat house says we like that then they would have to talk to the city of course and the City could say in theory of course we don't like that, it's their property. If their lease says yes you can renovate the property the city shouldn't have part in this. Karen then stated that this was a good point and that she was going to check the lease and I am also going to have a conversation with Kathy Breck at legal. I will present all of this to her and see what she has to suggest.

Robert stated besides talking with the law department it would be good to have both Parks and Riverfront at the next zoom meeting. Gloria felt that this was reasonable. David also agreed.

Since City Council voted to give the contract to the Riverfront will the City Council have to vote to change the recipient? I don't know. Obviously, this contract will not be one of the ones that are ready to sign soon.

Robert then stated that the next project we have to discuss is the Historic Homes Program. I guess we should leave the Ward Four letter aside for the time being Karen. Where are we with this contract and the arrangement for this program to move forward leaving the letter aside.

Karen stated that her last communication with Pat Burns was on Thursday. He indicated that the office of Planning and Economic Development contacted Kathy Breck to discuss drafting the contract used for Historic Homes when it's awarded for the allotted funding.

Similar to the First Time Homebuyer Program they keep at the Office of Housing. The question to be resolved is who is responsible for signing the contract. Kathy has been pretty busy so she hasn't got back to me on that. Robert asked if he was correct because I thought I saw something from Kathy that there was a meeting with the planning department on Friday. I assume this is a zoom meeting, are you part of that? Karen responded by saying she may have missed that because she sent it to the city address. If you have that, forward it to me please.

Robert stated that because we haven't had a city program that's helped homeowners in Historic Districts for more than a quarter century. We are somewhat building the new wheel. I am assuming at this point that Planning is the one who is vetting the Homeowners and inspecting the work that authorizes the payment. However, we may find that whenever this conversation takes place that they aren't doing all of that. We may have to be hearing about this later as well. You all were sent by Karen the letter from the Ward Four Committee that was the email that was sent to us brought to our attention. The letter that was addressed to us in the City Council and it was also sent to Justin Hurst and Marlow Brown and the Planning Department. Justin decided that he was going to get the Law Departments opinion so rather than three bodies coming up with answers he sent it to the City Solicitor who gave us a response which I e-mailed to everyone maybe around five thirty. Karen is going to read the letter and the petition into the record and then we can discuss what we want to do in response.

Robert pointed out that of those sixty odd signatures on the petition only 4 addresses are in McKnight and all the others are not in McKnight. I don't know if everyone had a chance to look at the letter from [City Attorney] Eddie Pikula and his response but he writes: "the point is the CPC and the City Council can point to a legitimate non-discriminatory reason for the allocation of funds for the McKnight Historic District as opposed to the entire neighborhood". In his opinion this is not a redlining issue that has occurred. Do we respond to this letter or the City Council or the Office of Planning and Economic Development? It's addressed to the CPC. Robert then asked those present if they had any comments or whether we should take any action with this or simply have Karen acknowledge that we received it and it has been sent to Law Department for analysis.

Ralph suggested that we should at the very least let the City Council outline the distinction between a local Historic District and a National District. I would also like to point out to the City Council that the districts were created in 1976 or 1978. Robert then stated that the local district was created in 1976 and the local district may have been nominated into the National Register perhaps in 1976. There was a later expansion of the National Register District so it would include all of the neighborhood and I'm not sure when that occurred, but the entire neighborhood was an amendment at a later date for the National Register. Ralph then stated that he felt it is important that the City Council recognize that the non-local historic district of Historic protection for thirty five to forty years and that the application was to focus on the properties that haven't been preserved for years.

Karen then stated the point of the letter was to suggest that a racial or a redlining action from a previous decade may have excluded that neighborhood. I think that was the crux of his letter was he understood the distinction but is there recourse or pathway to be included now, given that possibility. Ralph stated that this is a separate issue because I really believe that they were prohibited from applying for either streets or the entire National Register District to be Historic. That's what is confusing me because I can appreciate that there be a grievance around 1976 and it was the City Council at the time. My thought on this proposal goes to the people

who love the Historic District but have higher required maintenance costs. McKnight National District does not. To me that is a large part of the proposal. My thought on this proposal was it goes to the people who love the Historic District. To me, that's a large part of the proposal. We would like to have the McKnight Historical district expand to Yale Street and that is a large part of the proposal and I think the City Council would grant that. Ralph stated that there is a clear path to remedy it now. I believe it was a City Council decision but I think it was basically the residents of the McKnight Neighborhood from what I understand. People didn't have their properties controlled by a local Historical Commission in 1976. There was opposition to it.

Willie stated that he wasn't sure that he didn't understand the grievance that the Ward 4 Committee is filing in this complaint. Robert then stated that there are two kinds of Historic Designations. There are local Historic Districts where the outside of buildings are controlled by the local Historical Commission and there are National Register districts that are more of an honorary designation but anything that is payed for by federal money indeed has to be reviewed. All of McKnight is now on the National register of Historic Places. But only let's call it the western half of McKnight is a designated local historic district.

The proposal that came to us for this Historic program from the office of Planning and Economic Development said that they would be working with owner occupants within the local Historic District. Theoretically, they could have said it will be for anything within the entire McKnight National register district and it would also have been CPA eligible. The application that came to us was for the McKnight Local Historic District which is about four hundred houses as opposed to the National Register District that probably has seven hundred or eight hundred houses in it. So the complaint for the Ward four folks was that they feel it should not be restricted just to the local district but should be available for everyone. Ralph's point is: the people who live in the local district can't just run out to Home Depot and come up with the cheapest and easiest solution for their house. Therefore, they may need more assistance than someone who lives in the other part of the neighborhood.

There isn't a right answer or a wrong answer it's just that the proposal that came to us had a specific geographic boundary that these folks are now taking an issue with. Robert stated that I would suggest Ralph I feel that we should explain to the City Council so that they will understand the difference between the two kinds of Historic designation. Ralph, why don't you take that e-mail you sent to committee tweak it slightly and send it to me and I'll send it to City Council if that's the will of the committee so that we at least explained to them the difference. There is still an issue if we want to respond to the Ward four people. Let's get the City Council portion off the table. Ralph do you want to make a motion that we send to the City Council the communication that explains the two kinds of Historic designation? Ralph agreed to make the motion and Jaunita second it. Juanita asked if we heard from the office of Planning and Economic Development?

Robert stated that we have not but maybe if Karen has a zoom meeting she can bring this up when she sees them on Friday. Robert has been speaking with Phil Droney on a different

issue in the office of Planning and he called me on an opinion on something. I asked him if he got the Ward Four letter and he went through his e-mail and he found it. Other than he had just seen it he didn't say anything regarding it. Willie asked if we had received request proposals from the local district as well as the residents of the National District have we received requests for consideration for funding from both sectors? Robert then stated that in the first year of CPA funding we received an application from the McKnight Neighborhood Development Corporation for significant funding to run a revolving loan program that would be city wide.

In meeting with them they felt it was awfully ambitious and they suggested that we start off with a smaller program and we will give you a little bit of money and why don't you restrict it to the McKnight local Historic district just to start. However, that never got funded because the City Solicitor advised the City Council because he did not think it was wise that CPA money be given to a non- government entity to in turn give out. The current Historic Homes program was submitted by the Office of Planning and Economic Development and would be administered through that department.

Robert stated that this past year McKnight Community Development Corporation submitted another application to us to run a Revolving Loan fund and I think it was for all of McKnight. So in a sense we had two applications before us. One was from a city department to run a program that was just in the local Historic District and the McKnight Community Development Corporation to run it perhaps neighborhood wide. Certainly, I was mindful of the city solicitor saying we shouldn't give money to non-city groups. I was more supportive of doing it with the office of Planning and Economic Development. So, we are back to the discussion of the motion that Ralph will send a communication to the City Council just so that they are aware of the difference. So if there is no further discussion on that we will take the vote.

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

Robert then stated that now the question is what do we respond to the Ward Four committee? We have a couple of options. One is to say thank you we have received your communication and City Council President Justin Hurst has sent it for review to the Law Department. Eddie Pikula said that we could certainly feel free to send him his comments and he said we don't to respond. There are a variety of options we could have. I think we should acknowledge the

receipt of the letter and at least say the City Council President has referred it to the Law Department. I don't know if we have to say anything more. David stated that he would support that. I think we would open a can of worms if we get too involved in that response.

Robert then asked is that a motion David. David responded by making a motion to acknowledge the letter but offer no additional response and wait for a response from the City Council. Robert then said other than the City Council has referred it to the Law Department. David agreed to that. Robert then asked for the second motion and Willie made that motion. Robert asked those present if there is any further discussion?

All in Favor: Ms. Defillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Finn: yes,
Ms. Mitchell: yes, Mr. Thomas: yes, and Mr. McCarroll: yes

Robert then stated that we have no policy on press releases. When we do things like our Public Hearing or our workshop Karen handles publicity. However we never talked about what do we do with our projects? Do we rely solely on the recipient to do a promotion if at all? This comes from the folks that were involved in the Riverwalk Interpretive signage. Betsy Johnson sent me an e-mail and to Pat Sullivan saying that she had received an e-mail from someone stating why is there no publicity on these interpretive signage that is now on the Riverfront?

My response was that the CPC doesn't have a policy on that but I will put it on the agenda.

I am not the Czar of the CPC I am only the Chair. Thinking of the Riverfront it could be a press release that both celebrates the new banners and interpretative signage. We could celebrate the first phase of Knotweed treatment along the Riverfront. We could promote two of the projects that we promoted. What are people's thoughts?

David responded that he was all for sending out a press release from the CPC once a project or a significant portion of the project is complete. A statement of what was awarded and a summary of the application and the work that has been done. I think that would be great. I'm not sure what the best solution is. Juanita agreed with that. Juanita also suggested that whenever a project is done and it's able for the public to see it maybe we should add that with every project. Willie also agreed that we should send out a press release when a project is done. It should be when we sign the contract that the project is on its way and demonstration that the project is moving along slowly. Robert stated that the media reports that City Council approves our recommendations. When a project is completed we should have some press as well. David then stated that the City Council does release the list of the projects that they have approved. Here tonight is a case in point where Roger Roberge comes in front of us and had we done a press release when we approved that application and here we are a year later and he is asking for an extension. I think it's important for us to just focus on projects that are completed. Robert then stated that he agreed with David. If we are going to do a press release it should be a celebration of a successful completion of a project. Willie then stated that at the Housing Authority we do it in two ways. They do it when there is a groundbreaking ceremony we do a press release and usually when the project is complete they also do a second press release just for consideration. David made a motion to initiate a press release from the CPC upon the completion of a project that was funded by CPA funds. Juanita second the motion. Robert stated that the Republican Mass Live covering that meeting and does a story and I know quite often around that time I get a call from the Albany Public Radio Reporter who is stationed out here for Western Mass News and he does a story. It seems that the story gets out there

when we make the recommendations when the City Council takes action it isn't as clear as to when the projects are finished. Robert would be happy to start with the policy that we did issue the press release on the successful completion of the project and we can always add more times that we do releases after we got this one under the belt.

All in Favor: Ms. DeFillipo: yes, Ms. Martinez: yes, Mr. Slate: yes, Mr. Finn: yes
Mr. Thomas: yes, Robert: yes

Robert then stated that this will be the policy and Karen why don't you take a stab at a press release that we can send out regarding the two things that got funded at the Riverfront the knotweed and the Interpretive Signage and the banners. Once we send it to the media we can't guarantee that they will take it and run with it but at least we will have done that.

At this time Karen presented the "Administrator Updates (November 10, 2020)" to the committee of the updates for the FY18 and FY19 Projects. The Administrator Update is attached below.

The meeting was adjourned.

Administrator updates (November 10, 2020):

(subject to change and further updates)

The banner text for the 2020 projects has been sent to the printers. The banners will be delivered when the contracts are signed.

Contracts that are ready for the signature process include:
Youth Social Educational Training program (School Street School)
Duggan Park
Forest Park Aquatic Gazebo
Kilroy House
GW Smith Art Museum

contracts waiting for final draft from Kathy
Marshall Roy Walking Path
Springfield Bike Park
Spanish American War Monument
Regreen Springfield
Indian Orchard pond study
Thompson Triangle Fountain

4 contracts will need additional work:
Brookings Apt
Historic Homes
Rockrimmon Boathouse
Trinity House

Remaining public comments

Laura Walsh from Parks sent in annual plan recommendations and you each were sent a copy of that letter.

WARD 4 Committee for Equity**Rockrimmon Boat House**

Since the property is city-owned, the word received from Pat Sullivan is that the contract needs to be signed by Parks. Pat had a conversation with Ben Quick about the boathouse study. He said the Park Department would coordinate the study but that PVRC would be involved every step of the way. Ben was satisfied with this arrangement although he expressed to me that he'd like to see the architect and engineer who worked with him on the application be involved in the process.

Historic Homes Program

In my last communication with Pat Burns on Thursday, he indicated that the Office of Planning & Economic Development contacted Kathy Breck (Legal) to discuss drafting a contract to be used when a historic homes grant is awarded from the allotted funding (similar to the first time homebuyer program came under the Office of Housing). The question to resolve is who is responsible for signing the contract and the vetting of applicants.

2018-2019 project updates

Campanile project- Completed

My-Ron Hatchett from the Department of Capital Asset Construction is working on obtaining an executive summary from the firm who did the work and he hopes it will be submitted by the end of the week. He did send a copy of the completed report but it is rather voluminous.

Homebuyer Downpayment Assistance

Program is complete, all funds are depleted.

The program assisted 31 new homebuyers

22 people @ \$2,500

8 people @ \$4,000

1 person @ \$1,000

Zip locations

01104 [9]

01109 [7]

01108 [4]

01105 [3]

01118 [3]

01119 [2]

01107 [1]

01129 [1]

01151 [1]

McKnight Rail Trail

This project was initially placed into the Capital Improvement Account but is now recorded properly under CPA funds. I've requested an interim or executive summary from Chris Cignoli of DPW and he forwarded the request to Andy Krar. The remaining balance encumbered is \$7,557.22 so it appears the project is about complete.

Gunn Block

After recently paid invoices the account has a remaining balance of \$20,000/\$250,000 grant

Extensions granted for Gunn Block until 12/30/2020

Work Hub (to 2022), applied for Change of Use

Parks projects . Extension dates were processed and all 2019 project schedules have been impacted by the Covid pandemic. Parks will make every effort to complete these projects as soon as possible or by the extension date of November 30, 2021.

Of the 2018 Park projects remaining:

Veterans Memorial -complete -The plaque has been installed. Parks will send updated photos of the project area.

Riverwalk Signage -complete The original 12 panels have been installed. This phase of the project is complete. All CPA funds have been expended.

Godfrey Triangle is almost complete. Parks is confirming pricing for the final project elements (irrigation, light for flagpole) in order to close out the project.

East Forest Park Rail -The design firm is working to update the schematics for public presentations and Parks hope to hold community meetings before the end of the year.

Parks will provide photos in the project reports.

Drama Studio

Fire alarms have been installed. Shannon Walsh spoke with Bob Haveles with Architectural Insights who provided the written description of work (scope) by the contractor and she is reviewing the specs for compliance.

Trail Head & Signage

The Community Development Office is assisting Kevin Chaffy. The project went out to bid and they hope to have a contract within the next couple of weeks.

Parsons Apartment House**French Row House Apartments**

Roger Roberge of Facta Non Verba is requesting an extension as the contract expires on 11/30/2020. He is expected to attend the meeting on Tuesday.

Mr. Roberge has requested a line of credit from New Valley Bank and an assignment of CPA funds to the bank.

Roger's intent is to use the funds from the line of credit to pay for the work on the front porch decks, balusters, and main façade windows at the Parsons Apartment House, then be reimbursed by CPA funds. One of the Bank's conditions for the line of credit is the assignment of the CPA funds as collateral for the Bank's loan. The Bank will fund the work but wants the assignment of the funds to secure repayment of the money they have disbursed for the work.

Kathy Breck reviewed the request and the CPC Grant contract allows an assignment with the City's prior written consent, so as long as the CPC approves, Legal can draft a contract amendment to reflect the assignment and the extension of time, if granted. His attorney sent Kathy in Legal the assignment requested by the bank.

No word was provided about the funds for the French Row House project.
