



Community Preservation Committee

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103

<http://www.springfieldcityhall.com>

Regular

~ Minutes ~

Kevin Chaffee

Tuesday, January 5, 2021

6:00 PM

Utilizing Remote Collaboration Technology

I. Call to Order

6:00 PM Meeting called to order on January 5, 2021 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/>](https://www.facebook.com/SpringfieldCommunityPreservationCommittee/)

III. Minutes

Springfield Community Preservation Committee

January 5, 2021

Remote Meeting 6:00 p.m.

Recordings of remote meetings are available to view

[<https://www.facebook.com/SpringfieldCommunityPreservationCommittee/videos>](https://www.facebook.com/SpringfieldCommunityPreservationCommittee/videos)

[<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLolIDZ1Yth5SiJXppYWJIVSmFtoX7>](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLolIDZ1Yth5SiJXppYWJIVSmFtoX7)

Present: Lamar Cook (Neighborhood Representative) Juanita Martinez (Conservation)
Terry Mitchell (Neighborhood Representative) Ralph Slate (Neighborhood
Representative) and Robert McCarroll, Chair, (Springfield Preservation Trust, Inc.)

Absent: Terry Rodriguez (Park Commission) Willie Thomas (Housing Authority)
David Finn (Historical Commission)

Agenda:

1. Approve minutes of December 1 meeting
2. Rockrimmon Boathouse Study
3. Conservation Trail Head Signage
4. Project Extensions
5. Contract Dates
6. Administrators Update
7. Remote Workshops Planning

Person's wishing to address the SCPC remotely should register at cpc@SpringfieldCityHall.com [<mailto:cpc@SpringfieldCityHall.com>](mailto:cpc@SpringfieldCityHall.com) by February 2, at 5 pm. Log in information will then be sent.

Written public comments may be mailed to:

Community Preservation Committee, City Hall Room 412, 36 Court Street, Springfield 01103

Or e-mailed to cpc@springfieldcityhall.com [<mailto:cpc@springfieldcityhall.com>](mailto:cpc@springfieldcityhall.com)

The administrative Consultant, Karen Lee opened the meeting by reading the Governor's Order for remote meetings during the current Covid-19 pandemic and offered a brief overview of the CPA in Springfield. The Chair introduced the Committee and asked for a vote to approve last month's minutes.

December Minutes:

Mr. Finn made the motion to approve the minutes for the December 1 meeting. Juanita second the motion.

Roll call vote to approve minutes:

Juanita Martinez: yes Gloria DeFillipo: yes David Finn: yes Lamar Cook: yes

Ralph Slate: yes Willie Thomas: yes and Robert McCarroll, Chair yes **Opposed** none

Robert began the meeting by stating that we are waiting for at least one more committee member to come in order to have a voting quorum. We will be functioning as a committee of the whole so that we can talk about things. We have some quests tonight and I have told them we would have them at the beginning of the agenda so that they don't have to sit through our entire meeting although they are welcome to do that should they choose.

The first item is the Rockrimmon Boathouse Study: Let me just say that this was an application last year submitted by the Pioneer Rowing Club who attended our zoom question and answer meeting with applicants. We recommended funding the study the City Council then indeed approved the funding and then we heard that really the Park Department will be Carrying out the study and that was not something that had ever been raised with us before. The Committee really felt that it would be most comfortable if we had a session that involved the Pioneer Valley Rowing Club and the Park Department and Kathy Breck of the Law Department just so that we are all on the same page and know how we are then moving forward with the study. That being said I am going to turn it over to Karen because I don't know whether we want to talk to Pat first or Ben or Kathy.

Karen stated that she would give the background on it. Attorney Kathy Breck, Ben Quick, Park Department is in it to discuss the contract. The Committee requested that the Law Department review the CPA contract and the City License Agreement for the Pioneer Valley Riverfront Club for an opinion as to who has the responsibility for carrying out the study submitted by the Pioneer Valley Riverfront Club. While the Law Departments recommendation is the Park Department should administer the grant for the study. We the Committee invited all parties asked the Riverfront Club for an opinion as to who has the responsibility for carrying out the study submitted by the Pioneer Valley Riverfront Club. While the Law Departments

recommendation is the Park Department should administer the grant for the study we the Committee invited all parties to this meeting at 6PM on January 5, 2021 at 6PM for a discussion on this matter. Karen then stated that this was the background on it.

Robert then stated that given that we deferred to the Law Department I'm going to let Kathy Breck speak and then we will be talking with Pat and Ben.

Kathy Breck then stated that she was happy to meet Ben and then stated that Pat Sullivan and Laura Walsh are also on from the Park Department. Kathy stated that she came into this late. I was asked about who is to administer the contract. It's a city building and it is on city land and even though it is a study it will have ramifications depending on the follow-up steps and part of this study would also look at expanding the park property from what I understand. Based on those factors I also reviewed the license agreement between the City and the Pioneer Valley Rowing Club. It looks like the most appropriate way of doing it is to have the Park Department administer it but work closely with the Pioneer Valley Rowing Club. I apologize if I am saying it wrong on the project and their input and any information that they may have and my understanding based on the series of e-mails was that Mr. Quick agreed with that. I am not sure if you need me to get it into more detail and I would be happy to do that and the license agreement. It does put a lot of responsibilities on the club but for the most part the interior work that they may want to do for their own needs, most of all any kind of serious changes are required the approval of the Park Department, Pat Sullivan and the Park Commission so they have to work hand and hand. Hopefully, everyone will work together and get the study done and then the city and the Park Commission and the Park Department will have to look at the recommendations as a result of the study to see how to move forward in the near future. I also feel there was some concern that if the city was doing it would be subject to procurement but based on the memos that I have seen from the Community Preservation Coalition I did research on their Website today. Whenever there is a publicly owned property, publicly owned building and it is being administered by the public agency you would have to follow procurement. The good thing about that is that the Park Department already has architects and engineers and even the subject matter experts are already under contract. Pat was telling me that he would seek the quotes from the various folks that have under contract and I understand that the PBRC also had in its application has some information and hopefully with that everyone can work together with that information.

Robert thanked Kathy and asked the committee if they had any further questions. If not I am going to turn to the next person over to Ben so that we can hear his comments.

Ben shared some backgrounds with the board of directors insisting that every time one of them is on a zoom call there shall be no shabby drapes, no frumpy pillows, and there will be beautiful river scenery on their backgrounds. Most of them complied. Ben then stated that this is the

first time we have applied to the CPC so were following guidance from others and I am glad we are at this point. The project being approved it's simply a matter of figuring out the logistics of

legal specifics. Without the Parks Department PBRC would not exist. We are happy to collaborate with them every day and far into the future. We try to take care all of the projects that we can and without burdening the Parks Department. This is a project of great magnitude and it would not work without a collaborative effort. I think our prospective was when we drove the plan was let's put the burden on our plate because I have a small army of volunteers that are invested in doing a lot of leg work in doing the research in making this a successful project. That is our prospective and that is why we wrote a proposal in the beginning. That said that we did in our proposal list professional services of people who we were directed to by the Park Department. Steve Jablonski as well as GZA as well as other vendors that are familiar with the property and with the wonderful work that was done to create the park and are excited to be involved in Phase Two. We will be happy with whatever the Committee decides, we thrilled with the proposals that are coming forward and we are excited to get working and we will do everything that we can to get out of the way or get involved.

Robert then asked Patrick are the two vendors that were in the application, are they part of your stable of architects and engineers that you go to get pricing? Patrick responded that the GZA has just been awarded an engineering contract on the on call services. I do not believe that Steve Jablonski applied and because this is an Historic Building we might take that opportunity just to put out an RFQ or an RFB to solicit a more specialized architect like Steve Jablonski to protect the historic integrity of the boat house as we want to restore this boat house to its original grand statement that it made. Probably it will take an extra month to go through that process to pick the right party to do the work. We have a great relationship with Pioneer Valley Rowing Club and they have fulfilled our dream and as you know this was a property that was allowed to be in private hands and Mayor Sarno heard that we wanted to return it back to the public and this is how the great relationship started with the Pioneer Valley Rowing Club and as I told Ben that we want to make this Phase Two Project. We are grateful that the CPA committee for choosing this project to get us to the next step. I want to thank all of you for your time that you have put into for the last few years. We are very appreciative for the funding of other projects that you have funded and we are looking forward to this next round. The CPA is bringing a lot of people from the neighborhoods and the Park Commission ideas and we are getting a lot of work done across the city and when COVID calms down we can't wait to get you out in the field to see what kind of work we are getting done with the

funds that have been allocated. Robert then asked in terms of the original application I thought it would be completed by December 2020 and obviously that wouldn't have happened. Usually we have projects saying we want them to be completed by the end of 2021 so do you still feel that it is a reasonable time frame for this study to be completed? We do once you reaffirm on the vote tonight myself, Laura will get on this tomorrow work with procurement to get it out on the street and meet that deadline by the end of this calendar year. Ralph stated that this is a question or Pat and Kathy. My understanding of the lease agreement with is that PBRC is responsible for all maintenance and repairs. You said that you need approval from the park department. If this were to lead to a project in the future presumably shouldn't it be PBRC's responsibility because it is a lease agreement. They are responsible for the day to day cleaning

however if they want to replace carpet or tile of the room they could come to the Park Commission. However, any capital repairs will always be the city's responsibility and they are not responsible for the roof. Two years ago we had a sewage issue and that was our responsibility not theirs. Ralph then stated that it makes more sense to him now.

Robert then stated that we probably should have a vote stating that the contract will be with the Springfield Park Department which will work closely with the Pioneer Valley Rowing Club. Ralph stated that he had a question on that point. At that time Kathy responded by stating that the City Council actually just voted on a dollar amount and that's historically been that they just say the project and the dollar amount. So you don't have to worry about going back to the City Council. This is a CPC decision. At this time Ralph made the motion to amend our earlier vote to say that the contract to clarify that the award was to the city's Park Department working closely with the PVRC. Juanita second the motion.

All in Favor: Juanita, Ralph, Terry, Lamar and Robert **Opposed:** None

Robert then thanked Kathy, Ben, Laura and Patrick for coming tonight. I guess the next step will be that Karen, our Administrative Consultant will be working with Kathy Breck at the Law Department to get the contract so that we will get it signed as quickly as possible. Kathy then asked Robert if he had extended the dates for performance to September 31st 2021? Robert replied that he felt that it was November 30th of 2021 and asked do you need it to go past November 30th of this year? Patrick did state that November 30th will be fine. Robert stated we look forward to see the fruits of this study and seeing some actual efforts to put it into effect.

Conservation Trail Head Signage: Robert stated that Kevin Chaffee is here from the conservation commission to give us an update as to what is happening. It was agreed that Karen would give an overview. Karen began by stating that the prices have changed since

the original quote given to the CPA application and what sign pricing is today. This impacts the second part of the CPA award regarding bollards being installed in trail heads with the revised signage pricing. This effectively eliminates the budget for bollards at one of the locations or possibly two. So please advise that this part of the project will be eliminated and the excess money will be returned to the CPA fund or move forward to as many sights as this budget allows. Kevin is going to speak about the many processes and he is looking forward to an extension to the end of June 30, 2021.

Kevin Chaffee has been delayed and that is why we are asking for an extension. However, the signage piece we went through the full procurement process. We have our preferred vendor who was the same vendor that gave us the quote during my application. Their pricing structure has changed so it is more expensive that we had anticipated. That meant that there was less of a budget for installing the bollards at the four locations. Basically, I have enough funding for 2.9 locations so essentially we don't have enough money for. The procurement is all finished and we are ready to issue the contract to Design Workshop and they are ready to schedule the work even do it during the winter, weather permitting they feel that there will be four week lag time. The signage part will get done in the spring so the biggest thing is what do we do with the two bollards that are lesser part of the application was putting bollards to indicate where you where you enter the trail. Most of the sites it is pretty obvious how you get in so my discussion I thought of three scenarios: 1.) We install the bollards with the current funding which we

extend the contract which we will install two of the bollards and we picked two of the four sights and we picked the two not quite as obvious where the trail head is and we leave the obvious ones to put a sign next to it the people will use it. The second option is we eliminate the bollard part of the project and the balance of the contract just goes back to the CPA fund and then I work to submit a future application that goes to have a discussion off line for general enhancements that we do the bollards, benches and interpretive signage or something like that. So we focus on the signage, the destination signage that was the bulk of the proposal and we do a separate the application to do the bollards and some other things. The third would be that an additional amount of money would be added to the current application to bridge the shortfall that we now have. Being somewhat conservative it amounts to an additional \$600.00 gap. I imagine that it would be far more difficult just because there was a certain dollar amount recorded that was approved by the City Council and there may be more hurdles to that. I leave those three general options for discussion for the committee.

Robert then wanted to express his thoughts on this. I was interested in this as a promotion of the recreational opportunities to the walking trails. In fact, we wanted the actual words on the

sign that would say: Garvey Promontory Conservation Area Walking Trail. You, Kevin didn't like it nor did Juanita. Since you were already talking about having bollards to mark the trail heads and to keep larger vehicles out of the trails the compromise that we came to the bollards would bare the words would be Walking Trail or Trail Head. So to eliminate the bollards means that we simply signed the conservation area which is not what I thought was our intent. I guess I would throw out a couple of other options. One of which is you do one less conservation area so there is money in the budget to do the bollards. Two, we could go out for slightly smaller signs that cost \$600 less so that we can do the bollards. I just don't like the idea not promoting the walking trail aspect in any fashion.

Kevin then stated that maybe it's too much time has passed between these ongoing conversations and where we are now. The last design that I thought you were willing to accept was the sign said walking trails. That is what got submitted to the Design Workshop and that is what they gave quotes for. It does say walking trail on the signs. Robert stated that this was fabulous. Kevin then stated that if we put walking trail on the sign and that works for you let's not concern ourselves with the bollards. Let's get nice signs that I worked with Design Workshop to propose. I liked what they gave us and it says walking trails and lets just move on and lets not concern ourselves with the rest. Most of the sights are fairly obvious. There is one In particular that is a little tricky seeing where the walking trail goes in but that can be addressed with some creative vegetation management.

At this time Juanita is it feasible that we can come up with the \$600.00 from the monies we have or does that go through City Council?

Robert then stated that his inclination would be that we would have to go back to City Council. Robert stated that we have an Administrative Budget that is more than what we will spend and it is such a small amount I don't know if we can simply make the decision that we will take \$600.00 out of the Administrative Budget. Without Kathy Burns the controller I'm not sure what to say.

Kevin then stated that if you want to entertain this that's fine but my preference after I did a quick calculation it's like 85% of the budget goes to the signs. My preference would be to not

delay it any more than it has been and I take full responsibility on that. I would like to tell the Design Workshop that we plow ahead with the signs. I'm fine with the balance of that going back to the committee and I come back with another proposal we really look at the trail head and bollards and all that stuff. The reality was conservation land signage so people would have a name for a place so that they could go and visit. If it doesn't matter to the committee I would rather push to extend the contract so that we can get the signage done. However, you want to

sort it out we will deal with the bollards later.

Juanita then asked can we start the signage and find out if we could spend some of our monies (\$600.00) for the rest of it, can we do that Bob? Bob replied that at this point it is clear that the four signs will have the name of the conservation area and the words walking trail. Bob then stated that he was sorry that we had come to a different compromise. I think it is perfectly okay to go ahead with ordering those four signs. I would be comfortable with either if you said you would put bollards in two of the locations because it fits in the budget. We know that there isn't enough money to put bollards at the other two locations or you don't do the bollards at all. Robert then added that now that the signs, now that they state walking trail It is the biggest part of the project.

Ralph asked is there one sign per conservation area? What does the sign say? Kevin stated that is says Conservation Commission on the top and on the bottom is says brought to you by the Community Preservation. Kevin added that the big letters are the name of the actual name of the conservation area and then walking trail. Ralph stated that he never cared about the Bollards I cared about just the scenario to let the public know that it is a walking trail and a conservation area as well.

Kevin stated that putting it on the bollards to me is like the bollards aren't going to catch your eye. To me it doesn't make sense to necessarily to put it there it's the sign itself. I thought that's where it was left that it has to go on the sign so that is what I gave Design Workshop to lock it up and that is what they have for the proposal. Robert added that we are in a good place.

Robert stated that he didn't know if we have to take a vote on this. Clearly the sense of the committee is the bollards are secondary to the signs let's move forward with getting the signs ordered and made and put up.

Kevin stated that he hasn't verified with the sign company, it's a different sign company it's actually a fence company that I had priced out the bollards. There may be a difference if we only install the two there will be a buffer that will allow for any price increase. Maybe we will be lucky and we can install three but I don't see that happening. If we stick to everything as is we will try to get the two installed in the more troublesome sights and if there happens to be a price increase the balance that exists should cover that.

Ralph then stated that this is the first time we have ever had a situation like this. We granted money for a project and the project will be less than 100% complete. How do we handle that as far as the City Council goes.

Juanita asked is it sorry because they didn't want to do it or because they ran out of money?

Ralph stated that we had some issues before the legal department regarding a contract.

What we need to know is what the process needs to be. We don't care about the bollards but maybe the City Council feels that the bollards are the most important thing. How do we push this through the City Council?

Kevin felt that the distinction is that the pricing for the signage changed as the company itself updated their pricing structure. I went out for quotes from other company's and no one gave a better quote that they did. We chose them for the quality of their materials. We ended up in a situation where the original contract doesn't cut it for the balance of what we were normally going to do. Kevin had stated that they were awarded a certain amount of money and we are going to spend as much money as we can and the balance will be returned to the CPA fund. Bob stated that we can certainly handle it at the committee level that simply says we see the problem and this is strictly a CPA funded project. Yes, we can live with four signs and two sets of bollards. If City Council asks why we will state the costs went higher than previously expected.

Ralph then stated that he would like to make a motion we acknowledge that the project for the trail head signage will consist of two less bollards than what was originally proposed in the application. They would also like to extend the installation of the signage and the bollards until June 30th, 2021. Juanita second this motion.

All in favor: Juanita, Ralph, Terry, Lamar, Robert **Opposed:** none

Karen spoke on the McKnight Rail Trail: Andrew Krar [City Engineer] has asked for an extension to March 30th, 2021. There is a balance remaining in the CPA project account in the amount of \$7,557.22. Karen wasn't sure that there are invoices coming in to take care of this and get clarification on it but it sounds like that and he isn't asking for a long extension. Robert then asked if someone wanted to make a motion. Juanita made a motion for exactly what Karen said. Terry second the motion.

All in favor: Juanita, Ralph, Terry, Lamar, Robert **Opposed:** none

Karen then stated that David Bloniarz account balance for the Re-Green account is \$1,999.51 according to the invoices sent last week. David stated that he received a check and we should have under \$2,000.00 remaining that we need the extension for. So that request for March 3rd to allow purchase of some equipment that they were not able to get.

David stated that the project and the CPA team saw some work that we did and we have been very successful. We are going to get another contract for next year but one of the tools we have been using as the injector guns. We have found a supplier and they are made in Germany and they are \$1,120.00 apiece. They had to stop manufacturing because of COVID. They

expect inventory at the end of January and we have back ordered two injectors for about \$2,000.00 which will clear the balance in the CPA account.

We will have those ready to go for this year with an extension to March 30th we expect to get the guns sometime in February.

Karen stated that as long as the invoice is marked before the end of the extension date, the invoices will be paid. David stated that this extension would help us until March 30th so we can buy the tools that we need for next year's projects.

Robert asked those present if they would make a motion for an extension to March 30th, 2021?

Ralph made the motion and Lamar second the motion.

All in favor: Juanita, Ralph, Terry, Lamar, Robert **Opposed:** none

At this time Karen wanted to speak about Contract Dates.

The first batch of contracts went out with the date of November fifth and signed about the same time. Those were fine but now we have contracts that are not going to be signed possibly to the end of January and that shorts the grantees by two months if we use the November thirtieth date the Committee agreed as an expiration date. The grantee will have less than 12 months to complete the project. With COVID and other situations I just think that twelve months is not enough time and ten months is not enough time. We should write the contract so that it is effective the day the mayor signs it because it could give it a couple of extra weeks just to get the signature process. Robert then asked Karen what contracts for this year do we still have to do? Karen responded with Brookings. Robert stated that Brookings has asked for April of 2022, we have already dealt with that one in that sense. Karen then stated that Trinity House, hopefully we have the last bit of information from that. The Rockrimmon which should be soon and Historic Homes contract still needs to be worked out. Karen again stated that ten months isn't long enough for any of those programs. Karen stated that asking for extensions and what it entails it's kind of an extra step and inefficient that we should give better indication of the time period right up front, even fifteen months but at least twelve months.

Robert then stated that the reality is that Pat had said that November 30th is not a problem with him. So why don't we just vote that for Trinity House and Historic Homes we will extend their contracts to April 30, 2022. Brookings is April 30, 2022, and we will extend Trinity and the Historic Homes program to that same date. Robert asked if someone wanted to make a motion. Robert asked Karen if she thought we should extend it further than 2022? Karen stated that this is fine. Robert then stated that let's have a motion to extend Trinity House, Historic Homes to April 20, 2022 and then as we set policy for next year we can keep in mind

that we will give them a fifteen month extension or whatever. At this time Ralph made the motion to extend the contracts for Trinity House and Historic Homes until April 20, 2022.

Juanita second that motion. Robert then stated unless we have something else to add let's take a vote.

All in Favor: Juanita, Ralph, Terry, Lamar, Robert **Opposed:** None

Administrator's Update:

Press Releases:

Karen stated that we had one in the Reminder for the Upcoming Remote Virtual Workshop.

Mass Live: They did an article on previous funding. There should also be another article on the remote workshops that are coming up.

Karen stated that is all the media that I have seen. I sent out the press releases for the application workshops. Maybe we can get a decent crowd on line.

The extensions granted 2018 - 2019 Projects:

Parsons House and French Row -extended

Gunn Block: extension granted until 12/30 and Chris Russell has sent the invoices. They will be paid after we have a final walk through.

The Work Hub: That was extended.

Parks Projects: (2018-2019) Contracts have been extended to 2021.

The Extension Requests: The Rail Trail, Trail Signage, and Re-Green

2019 Projects: Drama Studio, Steve sent me an e-mail today. He has the invoices for the full balance and it is just over \$50,000. Those can be paid when we do a final walk through.

In process of completion:

Veteran's Memorial, Riverwalk, Godfrey Triangle, East Forest Park Rail, Barrows Park

2020 Projects: Rockrimmon, Historic Homes, Brookings, and Trinity final 4 contracts to sign.

Local Historic Districts applications:

- The Gunn Block has been approved.
- The Drama Studio is on its way to approval.
- The museums were approved.
- Trinity House has just begun the LHD process.
- The Brookings Apartment has submitted a preliminary report to the Planning Department.
- 77 Maple Street (The Female Seminary) we're waiting for the Mass Historic Commission tax approval letter showing that the project meets standards.
- Parks Department Pavilion not yet started the LHD process.

Robert then stated that the other item we want to talk about is the remote workshops at the February second meeting and our March second meeting. After the workshop is over we will

conduct whatever official business we have to conduct. Karen is in the process of creating the PowerPoint Presentation as part of the process of explaining the workshop. One of the questions she had is do we want to invite a successful neighborhood applicant to speak as we did last year or not.

Juanita stated that she felt it depends on how many people would be there. A long zoom meeting could be difficult unless we had someone come in to briefly talk. At this time Karen said we could use the PowerPoint presentation but do we have specifics that we want to include? Robert stated that with the Power Point Presentation some slides are not necessary. For example, telling people how their CPA surcharge calculated in giving them examples, those slides are not relevant to the workshops. What is relevant to the workshop is helping them understand how do you do an application? Probably we need to enlarge some slides like the instructions because we will be reading through that.

Karen suggested that we could look through the minutes of that meeting and see if there are particular questions that were asked that we could address. It would be nice to have a former grantee to speak but without that interaction I don't know if that is effective.

Juanita stated that the woman who spoke last year was great last year. Then I noticed at the end of the meeting people were talking to her. Karen stated that she did forward the workshop handout that the guest created to everyone and we could add that to the slide show. Juanita asked Karen do you have anyone in mind? Robert then stated that we want things that we will speak to. Whether it's one of the neighborhood groups that got funded the project doesn't have to be completed. We had two speakers last year. Having one speaker at the most would be sufficient. I think having two of them just adds to the meeting time. Karen then asked do we need to do two live meetings?

Ralph stated that we really want to outreach. Robert stated that we need two workshops because that is what we said so whether the second workshop starts with a recording being played of the first workshop and then we take questions live is a different issue. I agree with Karen that is an interesting idea if we can do it so I don't have to say the same thing twice. I also have to tell you that I want this time for more Committee Members to take part in this in terms of reading and talking about some of the sections. I can't be the only person who knows CPA. Ralph said "tell me what you want me to talk about and I'll talk about it." So that's an

interesting idea to simply record the workshop number one, play it then we are there live and at the end to answer questions. If we are going to do that Focus Springfield can help with that. Robert suggested that Karen look into that and the worse thing is we do what we did last year; two live workshops. Robert stated that we could ask Kathy Brown and Elizabeth Letterman to come and reprise what they did last year. Karen then said we should decide so I can contact and ask them if they would like to do that. I think Zaida Govan would be good if you can reach

out to her. Robert said that whoever we have they have to be told that it can't exceed a five minute talk. So we aren't sure yet that the March meeting will be a repeat of the February second meeting. If we are in agreement we want to have a successful neighborhood applicant. We need to get someone for February second and at the same time Karen is figuring it out whether she has the capabilities of filming this because there is no use in asking someone to March second if indeed we are only doing a tape at the March second meeting. Karen stated that it is a problem using all that to try to put a video in there as well. Robert stated that it sounds like we are going to have to have two live workshops and that isn't the end of the world. Robert stated that he wonders if Betsy Johnson would be willing to speak on the about the bike park. It was her group that was heavily involved in moving that along. Karen asked should we also have someone from the Parks Department? Robert stated that he hates to say it but he feels that the most important thing is to focus on the nuts and bolts on how you write the application. I am fearful even though we tell people look at and read the department of revenue allowable use chart. We are going to get proposals that are nice ideas but even though they have the word Historic in it they don't meet the DOR definition of what is Historic. Also, what is Open Space? Robert feels that we should be focusing on that opposed to the issue of how do you come up with a project at this late date. If you don't have a project already in mind that you have done some work on the chances are slim that you are going to be able to get together to get an application and go to a city department if that's what it takes in that short period of time. Ralph stated that he still believes in the sort of community led project of the aspect of the CPA. I have created a late date now for somebody to get in a proposal by March. I think it is important that we keep pounding on people and letting them know that we are out there and they can do this and even if they don't get for this year it's going to take fifteen months ahead of time which would be now. I would like to let people know that there are general steps. If you are sitting there in your house and you are thinking I would like to do something in my neighborhood here is what you should do. Start off by finding people in your neighborhood and work out the details. The next step: go to your neighborhood council and talk to them about it and see if they like it. The parks department, get some support from local

businesses and that sort of thing. I think that is what we should be telling people at this workshop. Karen stated that is the local Historic district that is a whole little piece in itself. Learning the steps that would help them. Ralph stated that last year we saw a number of community projects that I think is great. I agree that a lot of them were weak. Some of them were on the topic some of them were a little far out. I just think that is the matter that the Park Department put their projects every year. If we don't go to the people we don't know the extent of the city's budget. Juanita asked Karen if people have called you now and then with questions or ideas? Have you heard anything at all? Karen did state that yes, every now and then someone will send an e-mail and ask some questions. However, most of the

correspondence is from people needing help getting through their contract. There was a woman from the Forest Park section who wanted to know about Historic Homes project. There is interest in that pilot program. By April first what happened to the First Time Homebuyers program they never applied the following year. Robert then stated that if you want someone who can talk about how do you get the idea for a project and move it along we are back to choosing someone and certainly Indian Orchard did a project and went to the Park Department and East Springfield has done it twice with Kathy Brown. McKnight has done it. Ralph stated that the Gazebo was a perfect example because I started posting on nextdoor.com that stated we are having a meeting and a couple of people contacted me and I outlined for them exactly what they might do. Just like I said "you might want to go to your neighborhood council and that's what they did for the Gazebo project. I know that it was destroyed for nine years. No one stepped forward because no one knew how to do that. There may be things in the city that a playground is in really bad shape, that the parks department is not on top of it but the neighbors say hey we could get this restored. That's the kind of thing I would prefer to see rather than Patrick Sullivan going to each neighborhood council saying that we have our list of projects and this is what we are going to do and please support us. Ralph stated that we are going to get some junk stuff but it is just part of the process. Karen then stated that we have agreed to have one person for the workshop. Robert confirmed that Betsy Johnson was active with both of the Riverfront Signage Project and with the Bike Park and Zaida worked on the Loon Pond and the Indian Orchard pond study so those folks are guest options.

Ralph will develop an outline or punch list for guest speakers.

Ralph stated that they have done it successfully and they know more about the process that anyone here does. Ralph stated that the important thing is that the guest speaker describes their experience.

Robert then stated that Ralph is going to write up something for Karen to give it to the neighborhood presenters that explains how you get a project from an idea to application.

Lamar will work with Karen on the issue of how to get the recording into a broader audience.

Lamar agreed that he would be available to assist Karen in a dry run. Robert and Karen will work on the actual PowerPoint in the coming week or so. Robert added that once we get all the various slides then I will start farming it out to members who will handle sections of it.

Robert stated at this time that this finishes tonight's agenda.

Robert then asked for a motion to adjourn. Juanita made a motion to adjourn. All in favor? Those present agreed to adjourn.

The next meeting will be February 2, 2021